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For more than one hundred years black-figured vases were made and decorated in Athens. Among the many artists who worked in the Kerameikos, the potters’ quarter, the Amasis Painter1 seems to have had the longest career. His first vases are datable around 580 B.C., not long after the completion of the “François vase,” and he worked until about 515 B.C., more than a decade after the invention of the red-figure technique. Thus, his latest vases are contemporary with those of the most innovative red-figure vase-painters, the Pioneer Group. Each newly recognized vase by the Amasis Painter helps put the career of this important artist, as well as the history of black-figure vase-painting, into sharper focus. The most recent attribution is that of an oinochoe purchased in 1978 by The Metropolitan Museum of Art (Figures 1–4), and identified by Dr. Dietrich von Bothmer as an early work. This article will examine the place of that vase among others by the Amasis Painter, and will also consider the early development of its shape and ornament in the context of black-figure vase-painting.

The Amasis Painter is the name given to the anonymous artist responsible for the painted decoration of vases made by Amasis the potter, whose signature is found on nine vases, and perhaps on a small red-figured cup too. Six times the potter signs Ἄμασις followed by μεπόιςεν ("Amasis made me"), and twice Ἄμασις ἐπόιςεν ("Amasis made"); the two other signatures are incomplete. The Amasis Painter not only decorated these signed vases, but also many others, unsigned, that are like them in drawing and therefore must be from his hand. The meticulous style of the painter is well matched to the small, refined shapes fashioned by Amasis the potter, and it is probable that potter and painter were the same person.8

Our trefoil-mouthed vase is the earliest example of an oinochoe of shape III, called a chous, which has a

A list of abbreviations is given after the appendix to this article.

2. Florence 4209: ABV, p. 76, nos. 1; 682; Para., p. 29. For the most recent bibliography see Simon and Hirmer, pp. 69–77, pls. 51–57.
5. ABV, pp. 152, nos. 29–27, 29, 30; and 153, no. 32; Para., pp. 69–64.
6. ABV, pp. 153, no. 37; and 157, no. 87; Para., p. 65. See also R. M. Cook, JHS 68 (1949) p. 148.
squat, piriform body continuously curved from the lip to the join of body and foot. In Attic black-figure we know of approximately eighty other trefoil-mouthed choes, and two circular-mouthed choes. Further, four fragments attributed to the Amasis Painter may be from choes, as Beazley observes. The ancient name chous has been applied to this bulbous shape because on Attic red-figured choes—particularly those datable during and immediately after the Peloponnesian War—many scenes are associated with the Anthesteria, the oldest of the festivals of Dionysos in Athens. The Anthesteria were celebrated from the eleventh through the thirteenth days of the month called Anthesterion (February–March). The second day, known as Choes, was largely devoted to drinking the new wine from vessels named choes. Ancient literature indicates that chous was the most commonly used term for a jug, and as depicted on


10. ABV, pp. 153, nos. 39, 40; 155, nos. 66, 68; Para., p. 64. Two other fragments Beazley thought were possibly from choes are from different shapes. Oxford G 568 (CVA, pl. 3,15), once described by Beazley as the fragment of a chous related to the Amasis Painter, is more likely to be from an amphora. Not only is its bud ornament framed by double glaze lines, but it is also reserved inside—both abnormal characteristics for choes. Oxford 1929.19 (ABV, p. 153, no. 38) may be from an olpe; see note 33 below.

red-figured choes, the shape served both as a pitcher and as a drinking vessel. Not one black-figured chous, however, has a subject that can be securely connected with the Anthesteria. Even on red-figured choes not all the pictures are related to the festival. If the Anthesteria in the sixth century were already celebrated in the manner reported by fifth-century and later authors, and indeed there is no evidence to the contrary, then one may conclude that black-figure vase-painters simply did not choose to represent events of the festival on choes.

The chous in the Metropolitan Museum is the 117th vase (fragments included) attributed to the Amasis Painter. The figural decoration is contained in a panel opposite the handle (Figure 1): on the left, a bearded man stands to right; then three warriors stand to left; on the right, a youth stands to left. The subject may be a departure of warriors or a homecoming. The warriors are armed with helmets, round shields, and greaves, but do not hold spears. They are dressed for travel in long chlamydes that hang down to their ankles. The two spectators wear himatia that cover their hands. Above the picture is a band of fifteen upright black lotus buds, alternately open and closed, with single glaze dots between them. Below the panel a red stripe runs around the vase.

12. Green, Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies of the University of London 19 (1972) pp. 6–7. For some illustrations on choes of chous in use, see van Hoorn, figs. 25, 49, 73, 82, 83, 85, 86, 89–94, 107, 109, 123, 124, 131, 136, 168b, 201, 207, 213–216, 219–221, 247, 265, 343, and 350. Many more choes have pictures of choes placed on the ground or on blocks or tables. A fine unpublished Apulian chous, Brooklyn 60.129.1, depicts a satyr drinking from a chous.

13. The main sources are quoted by Pickard-Cambridge, Dramatic Festivals, pp. 1–9.

14. Painted in added red: top of mouth, stripe below panel running around the vase; youth’s hair, stripes on garments of man and youth, helmet crests of first and third warriors, center of shields of first and third warriors, inner ring on shield of second warrior, greaves. There are no traces of added white. The lower half of the vase is largely misfired.

15. There are many more examples of upright bud friezes in black-figure. They appear most frequently below the pictures on neck-amphorae, on oinochoai, on the shoulders of lekythoi, on the rims of plates, and below the panels on hydriai. Some
5, 6. Amasis Painter, Handle from a chous. Paris, Musée du Louvre (photos: R. Clark)

The bud ornament on this chous is characteristic of the Amasis Painter, as Bothmer has shown.\(^\text{16}\) Of the nine chous attributed to the painter, eight have upright buds above the picture; the ninth is represented only by a handle in the Louvre (Figures 5, 6).\(^\text{17}\) Only four other chous have this ornament: two attributed to the Taleides Painter (Figures 7–9), who was a workshop companion of the Amasis Painter, one in Hillsborough whose drawing style is Amasean, and an Amasean fragment from the Athenian Acropolis. We shall return to these vases later.

examples of upright buds as the upper panel-border on amphorae and oinochoai are listed by Bothmer (AK 3 (1960) pp. 76–77) and H. Mommsen (Der Affector [Mainz, 1975] p. 36). Additions to their lists are given below, grouped in two categories.

1. Black buds, all open, a single dot between the buds. Seven vases in this category are attributed to the Amasis Painter: one is an olpe, London B 52 (ABV, p. 153, no. 31; Para., p. 64); the others are chous and are discussed in this article (New York 1978.11.22, Orvieto 1001, Louvre F 37, Bristol H 809, Oxford 1965.122, and the fragment Oxford G 137.22). Vases by other painters: Athens, Acropolis (no number), chous fragment (unpublished) related to the Amasis Painter in style (photograph in the Beazley Archive, Ashmolean Museum, Oxford: the fragment preserves part of the picture, a fight [helmeted head of a warrior to right, his raised right hand holding a spear], and a good bit of the ornament); Mytilene 58 and 59, olpe fragments (unpublished); Madrid 10932, chous, Taleides Painter (ABV, p. 174, no. 4); Louvre C 10600 + RS 424, and Louvre C 11128, amphorae of type B, Group of Leningrad 1469 (ABV, p. 302, nos. 2 and 5; Para., p. 131); an amphora of type B in the London market (unpublished: A. return of Hephaistos; B. Dionysos between satyrs and maenads), Group of Leningrad 1469 (Bothmer). There is a variation of this ornament on Brunswick 562, a fragment probably from an amphora rather than an oinochoe (CVA, pl. 10.13).

2. Black buds, all open, a black droplet (or dot) between the buds, and a dot (usually smaller) in the spandrel under each bud. Athens, Acropolis 825, chous fragment, Near the Madrid Painter (ABV, p. 330, II, no. 1); an olpe once in the New York market (Emmerich Gallery, Art of the Ancients [1968] no. 10); Florence 3828, amphora of type B (L. Ghali-Kahil, Les Enlèvements et le retour d'Hélène [Paris, 1955] pl. 84:2; augmented by three fragments from the Metropolitan Museum, acc. no. 64.108a–c) and Athens 18022, olpe (ABV, p. 445; Para., p. 102), both close to the Painter of Berlin 1686 according to Bothmer.


17. ABV, pp. 153, nos. 41–44; 154, nos. 45, 46; and 155, no. 67; Para., p. 64.
8, 9. Taleides Painter, Chous; warrior arming, attended by woman and males. Madrid, Museo Arqueológico Nacional 10932 (photos: Museo Arqueológico Nacional)

vases of other shapes attributed to the Amasis Painter. However, the frieze on the chous fragment in London varies in that although all its buds are open, there is a small glaze dot at the base of each and alternate buds are red. The same pattern appears on two amphorae of type B by the Amasis Painter, New York 56.171.10 and Orvieto 118, which suggests that the London fragment is contemporary with them. In contrast, the ornament of the chous in New York is distinguished by its pattern of alternately open and closed black lotuses. The irregularities in the size and spacing of these buds have no parallels in the other lotus-bud ornaments by the painter, and suggest that the chous is an early work.

This is borne out by the simplicity of the picture's composition and drawing. The figures and drapery lack the painter's normal incised details. There are no hands, feet have no toes, earlobes are cursorily articulated, and garments have neither folds nor Amasean fringes. Moreover, it is unusual that the warriors and spectators do not carry spears, and that the shields have no blazons. Other distinctive features of the drawing are the short hair of the onlookers, with added red for the youth's hair, and the use of longish incisions to decorate the chitons of the onlookers and the helmet-crest supports of the warriors.

Some details have parallels on other vases by the Amasis Painter. On his earliest lekythos, Villa Giulia 24996, the single human figure, a running male, wears a chlamys without folds, fringes, or other ornamentation; there are no incisions to articulate his fingers and toes; his hair, though shoulder-length, is red; and the shape of his ear comes very close to those on the chous. Ears of similar configuration are found on another very early lekythos, Philadelphia 4849, on which nearly all the figures' feet are also toetless. There are no parallels for the longish incisions of the garments and helmet-crest supports, though very short incisions or incised dots are two of the

18. Amphorae of type B: Louvre F 26 (ABV, p. 150, no. 5; Para., p. 63) and once Riehen, Hoek (Para., p. 65); shoulder lekythoi: Montclair, Dusenbery (ABV, p. 155, no. 59; Para., p. 64), Athens 19163, and Warsaw 198552 (Para., p. 66); neck-amphora: Cabinet des Médailles 222 (ABV, p. 152, no. 25; Para., p. 63); and olpe: London B 52 (ABV, p. 153, no. 31; Para., p. 64).
20. ABV, p. 154, no. 54; at the head of the list on Bothmer's chart (AK 5 [1960] p. 80).
21. ABV, p. 154, no. 50; Para., p. 64.
Amasis Painter's preferred drapery ornaments. Incisions approaching the type on the chous appear on a lekythos in a Zurich private collection, bordering the edge of the himation worn by the male standing on the right.\textsuperscript{22}

The Villa Giulia and the Philadelphia lekythoi offer the best comparisons to the bud frieze on the chous. These three vases exhibit the only ornaments by the Amasis Painter composed of alternately open and closed lotuses. On the lekythoi the friezes are undotted, the individual buds are more neatly rendered, and the tip of every fourth lotus is enlivened with added red. As on the chous, the sepals and connecting tendrils are not drawn with relief lines but

\textsuperscript{22} Para., p. 66.

18, 19. Amasis Painter, Chous; return of hunter. Bristol, City Museum and Art Gallery H 803 (photos: City Museum and Art Gallery)

roughly brushed in. These comparisons confirm that the New York chous belongs very early in the Amasis Painter’s career, and following Bothmer’s relative chronology may be dated to about 560 B.C. One cannot expect an exact correspondence in drawing between the chous and the smaller figures on the lekythoi. It is clear, though, that the earliest large vases by the Amasis Painter, the neck-amphora in the Embriocos collection in Lausanne, formerly in Castle Ashby, and the amphorae of type B in Rome and New York, are executed in a more advanced style.

The Metropolitan Museum chous is datable in the

24. ABV, p. 152, no. 23; CVA, pls. 7, 8; Christie’s, London, July 2, 1980, no. 96. ABV, p. 150, nos. 1, 2; Para., p. 62.
second quarter of the sixth century. The nearest comparisons for its composition are files of hoplites on the reverses of neck-amphorae attributed to the Camtar Painter (Boston 21.21, Louvre C 10521, Leningrad 2417) and the Painter of London B 76 (Munich 1450, once Cervetri [Ruspoli], Taranto 52.148), which are also datable to the second quarter of the sixth century. The subject is not a common one, and elsewhere occurs only on six neck-amphorae of the Tyrrenian Group, where the figures are on a smaller scale and are rather different stylistically. On Boston 21.21 the six hoplites wear full armor but carry no weapons. There are no spectators beside the warriors on the six neck-amphorae by the Camtar Painter and the Painter of London B 76. On three of these vases the warriors must be Myrmidons, as Bothmer observes, for the subject of the obverse is the first arming of Achilles. On the Taranto vase they may be companions of Herakles, and on the Leningrad neck-amphora reinforcements coming to aid the hoplites with round shields shown in combat on the obverse. The four warriors on the vase once in Cervetri have no connection with the Judgment of Paris on the obverse, unless they are meant to bring to mind the consequences of Paris’s choice. Five hoplites also appear on Cambridge 44, attributed to the Camtar Painter, but they are Amazons instead of Greeks, and are running, not marching, to help the Amazons fighting Herakles and Telamon on the obverse. Unfortunately, there is no clue on the chous in New York to indicate a possible narrative context for its picture.

Besides the thematic and compositional links with vases by the Camtar Painter and the Painter of London B 76, the ornament on the chous is also related to these artists, and to one of the Tyrrenian Group, the Komos Painter. Upright bud friezes are not widespread before the middle of the sixth century, and it was the influence of the Amasis Painter that popularized the motif. In the second quarter of the sixth century, bands of upright lotus buds, alternately open and closed, occur often on the lips and bodies of neck-amphorae attributed to the Camtar Painter, the Painter of London B 76, and the Komos Painter. All the bud friezes on their neck-amphorae are undotted, the buds are often embellished with added red and white, horizontal incisions are sometimes used under the calyces of the buds, and the sepals are separated from the emerging flowers by incisions. In contrast to these, the band of buds on the Amasis Painter’s chous in New York is the first of its kind to appear directly above the picture, to be composed of all black buds, and to have dots between the buds.

A workshop association may underlie the links between the Amasis Painter early in his career and the Camtar Painter, the Painter of London B 76, and the Komos Painter. Although there is not yet enough evidence to justify speculation on this point, the Metropolitan Museum chous shares certain significant characteristics with the work of these artists: its subject and composition—a file of hoplites—and its ornament—upright lotus buds. In drawing, however, the Amasis Painter is far closer to the Camtar Painter and the Painter of London B 76 than to any artist of the Tyrrenian Group, which specialized in multizoned decoration of ovoid neck-amphorae. With regard to other possible early influences on the Amasis Painter, Bloesch notes that Amasis the potter made one vase decorated by Lydos, and this observation may serve as a point of departure for further investigations.

Since the Metropolitan Museum chous fits into the Amasis Painter’s chronology as a very early work, it must antedate his chous in Orvieto, until now the earliest known example of the shape in Attic vase-painting. The potterwork of the chous in the Metropolitan Museum (Figures 1–4) should be compared with that of the eight other chous attributed to the Amasis Painter (Figures 10–23). The chart below tabulates the measurements of five of his nine chous, listed in

25. ABV, pp. 84, nos. 3, 4; 86, nos. 10, 12; Para., p. 63.
26. Conservatori 96 (ABV, p. 95, no. 2; Para., p. 36) and Louvre E 858 (unpublished); by the Castellani Painter. Munich 1436 (ABV, p. 95, no. 4; Para., p. 36); by the Timiades Painter. Louvre E 855 (ABV, p. 99, no. 53, and p. 684); O.L.L. Group. London B 24 (ABV, p. 106, no. 2); Near the O.L.L. Group. Brussels A 715 (ABV, p. 103, no. 109); by the Kylenios Painter [Bothmer].
28. ABV, p. 84, no. 2.
29. Camtar Painter: Louvre C 10521 (ABV, p. 84, no. 4), Laon 37.1017 (Para., p. 31, no. 9). Painter of London B 76: London B 76 (ABV, p. 85, no. 1; Para., p. 32). Komos Painter: Munich 1433 (ABV, p. 98, no. 37; Para., pp. 36, 37); Paris, Niarchos (ABV, p. 102, no. 103; Para., pp. 36, 37); Berlin (East); Humboldt University (ex Berlin F 1708; ABV, p. 689, no. 72 bis); Künschn, Hirschmann G 40 (unpublished); Leipzig T. 3383 (ABV, p. 96, no. 9).
31. ABV, pp. 107; 109, no. 24 (Berlin 1685).
chronological order. Regrettably, I do not have the measurements for Orvieto 1001, which would be second on the list; the three other chous are known only from the handle in the Louvre, and two small fragments of pictures and ornament in London and Oxford.

The chous listed in the chart may be divided into an earlier class of smaller vases and a later class of larger ones. Each class is remarkably uniform in its measurements. Louvre F 37 (Figures 12-14) is closest to the chous in the Metropolitan Museum, and a comparison of their profiles demonstrates that their shapes are well-nigh identical (Figure 24). Photographs show that the Orvieto chous (Figures 10, 11) should be classified with the New York and Paris vases. All nine chous are almost certainly by the same potter, Amasis, to whom the invention of the shape may be safely ascribed. Beazley observed that the pottery of Oxford 1965.122 (Figures 20-22) was not that of Amasis, and indeed its greatest diameter comes somewhat higher up on the body than on the other chous; it also tapers more sharply above the foot (Figure 25). Its measurements, however, are so near those of the Florence and Bristol vases (Figures 15-19) that a second potter need not be postulated.

All the chous by the Amasis Painter have upright bud friezes above the picture. Furthermore, except for the chous in New York and the fragment in London, the six others have the same variety of bud ornament, and the pattern is framed by one glaze line above and two below. The lotuses on the chous in New York have just one line above and below, and the buds on the London fragment are framed above and below by two glaze lines. Such double glaze lines, as Bothmer observes, are characteristic of the Amasis Painter’s amphorae. First-hand examination of the London fragment reveals, however, that it must be from a chous; it is too thin for an amphora, and there is a tiny bit of black preserved on the upper edge of the reverse.

The handles of the Amasis Painter’s chous are ridged (except for the handle of Florence 3791, which is alien). Although there is no ornament below the handle of the chous in the Metropolitan Museum, the other four chous and the Louvre handle (Figures 5, 6) are decorated with hanging palmettes, a characteristic Amasean feature. Furthermore, the palmettes on the Florence, Bristol, and Oxford vases, and on

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Collection</th>
<th>Height including handle cm.</th>
<th>Height to lip cm.</th>
<th>Width of handle cm.</th>
<th>Dimensions of mouth cm.</th>
<th>Diameter of neck cm.</th>
<th>Maximum body diameter cm.</th>
<th>Diameter of foot cm.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Louvre F 37</td>
<td>18.235</td>
<td>17.89</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>6.3 x 8.2</td>
<td>6.65</td>
<td>14.74</td>
<td>9.295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florence 3791</td>
<td>23.9</td>
<td>22.35</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>10.91 x 9.8</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>18.75</td>
<td>10.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bristol H 803</td>
<td>24.235</td>
<td>23.25</td>
<td>2.785</td>
<td>10.78 x 9.82</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>18.59</td>
<td>10.415</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford 1965.122</td>
<td>22.35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

32. Louvre handle: max. H. 10.86 cm., W. 2.13 cm. London B 600.31 (ABV, p. 155, no. 67; Par., p. 64): 4.85 x 6.6 cm. (max.). Oxford G 137.52 (ABV, p. 154, no. 46): 5.8 x 3.475 cm. (max.).

33. Oxford 1929.19 (ABV, p. 153, no. 98), which Beazley thought was a fragmentary chous rather than an olpe, has a palmette-lotus festoon above the picture. I am inclined to think that it is an olpe, not just on the basis of the ornament, but because the profile does not seem bulbous enough for a chous. Moreover, on some nonjoining fragments, there is a bit of a reserved stripe preserved below the panel, which is a characteristic of olpai, not chous.

34. There are identical bud friezes on seven other vases placed by Bothmer in the Amasis Painter’s middle period. See note 16 above.

35. AK 3 (1960) p. 77. M. Robertson (AK 9 [1975] p. 82, n. 16) also notes the similarities between the Bristol and Oxford palmettes. For Beazley’s description of the palmette on the chous in Bristol, see JHS 51 (1931) p. 261.
the Louvre handle, are considerably larger than the one on Louvre F 37. These palmettes are composed of from eleven to thirteen fronds and have red hearts, an unusual detail apparently confined to the Amasis Painter. Moreover, the shape and ornament of the handles of the Florence, Bristol, and Oxford choes are so distinctive that I immediately recognized the handle in the Louvre as part of a lost chous by the Amasis Painter.

On Attic vases, palmettes under handles originate in the period of earliest black-figure, the late seventh century. The first example known to me is under handle B/A on an amphora of type B, London A 1561, attributed to the Chimaera and Nettos Painter, who is a conflation of two painters that Beazley once considered separate personalities. Handle palmettes appear next on four neck-amphorae datable in the second quarter of the sixth century: Boston 21.21 and Louvre C 10521, attributed to the Camtar Painter; Athens 559, perhaps not far from the painter of the Kleimachos vase; a fragmentary Tyrhenian neck-amphora in the Villa Giulia, attributed to the Timides Painter; and a neck-amphora related to the Tyrhenian Group in a German private collection. On these four vases the palmettes are attached to the handles by tendrils. The earliest handle palmettes

36. The Bristol and Oxford palmettes have special characteristics. On the Bristol palmette, there are two black horizontal bars across the palmette's stem, and the root of each frond is marked by a tiny white dot. The Oxford palmette has two red horizontal bars across its stem.

37. A handle palmette and tendril are partially preserved on a fragmentary unpublished black-figured chous from the Athenian Agora (P 9278).

38. On Corinthian vases, an early example of a handle ornament appears on the late Protocorinthian Chigi olpe (Rome, Villa Giulia 22697). Under its handle is a hanging lotus bud in added white. The vase is datable in the middle of the seventh century. For good illustrations of the ornament see Antike Denkmäler II (Berlin, 1908) pls. 44, 45; see also P. E. Arias, M. Hirmer, and B. Shefton, Greek Vase Painting (New York, 1965) pls. 275, 276; and Simon and Hirmer, pls. vii, 25, and 26.

24. Profile drawings of two choes by the Amasis Painter: The Metropolitan Museum of Art 1978.11.22 (left), and Paris, Musée du Louvre F 37 (right)


39. ABV, p. 3, no. 2; Para., p. 2, no. 2.

40. Boston 21.21 and Louvre C 10521: ABV, p. 84, nos. 3, 4; Para., p. 31; see also Bothmer, Bulletin of the Museum of Fine Arts, Boston 47 (1949) p. 89. Athens 559: ABV, p. 85, no. 1; Para., p. 32. Villa Giulia: ABV, p. 100, no. 78; Para., p. 38. German private collection: K. Schauenburg, Aachener Kunstblätter 44 (1973) pp. 15–16, figs. 1–4a. b. Compare with these: an upright palmette located in the zone of animals below handle A/B on Tyrhenian neck-amphora Louvre E 840 (Goltyr Painter: ABV, p. 99, no. 52; Schauenburg, Aachener Kunstblätter 44 [1973] p. 21, fig. 21); and an upright palmette next to handle A/B on Tyrhenian neck-amphora Frankfurt VF 319 (Castellani Painter: Para., p. 49, [no. 1]).

Bothmer observes a parallel development on some Tyrhenian neck-amphorae, on which lotus buds are attached by tendrils to the lower handle root: Munich 1436 (ABV, p. 95, no. 4;
without connecting tendrils occur on an unattributed Tyrrhenian neck-amphora in the Bareiss collection, and on a red-bodied olpe in the Käppeli collection by the Princeton Painter, which also has a ridged handle. 41 There are no ridged handles in black-figure earlier than the chous in New York and the Käppeli olpe, and since the two are contemporary, it is impossible to determine whether Amasis invented this handle.

In summary, study of the chous in the Metropolitan Museum establishes that it is a very early work by the Amasis Painter, datable to about 560 B.C. This makes it the earliest chous known to us, and suggests that the invention of the shape should be credited to the potter Amasis, who was probably himself the Amasis Painter. Both in shape and ornament the chous is wholly consistent with other chous attributed to the Amasis Painter. In size his chous fall into two rather uniform classes, and there can be little doubt that all were made by the same hand.

The chous, as will be discussed below, is a vase that was designed from the first to contain a small, specific volume of liquid. Consequently, even before the potter set out to formulate its shape, he already knew that the vase had to be small and that there would not be room for a large figured panel. As owner of the workshop, the potter also had to devise a scheme of decoration that would be well suited to the new shape. If not himself the artist, he must have told the painter just what the dimensions of the figured panel and ornament band ought to be, and possibly have even chosen the pattern to appear above the picture; 42 the subject of the latter may have been a joint decision. On a chous, relatively little space is allotted to the ornament; thus the patterns can be neither large nor complex. Evidently, the upright lotus bud frieze, a simple ornament, was considered successful, because it is found on the chous attributed to the Amasis Painter, as well as on many of his small amphorae of type B. 45 In Attic black-figure no individual demonstrates the importance of the potter better than Amasis, whose chous aptly illustrate Beazley's observation that "the potter Amasis is as clearly defined a personality as the Amasis Painter; he has his own idea of shape and goes his own way." 46

Naturally, even a potter as skillful and inventive as the young Amasis drew inspiration from established black-figure shapes. It seems that, at least in some respects, the chous is related to an older type of oino-

choe, the olpe. 43 Both shapes are pitchers whose profiles describe a continuous curve, but the chous has a squatter body, a smaller foot, and a different handle. The majority of olpai in the first half of the sixth century follow the Gorgon Painter's trefoil-mouthed model with the picture placed to one side of the body (not opposite the handle), and an abstract eye on the other side. 44 This is not the type of olpe that is related to the invention of the chous.

On the other hand, some olpai with circular mouths are decorated with pictures opposite the handle, either in panels or continuing around the body, sometimes in more than one register. 45 The Amasis Painter used a picture panel on the new shape, the chous, but

Para., p. 96; Timiaed Painter), Louvre E 845 (ABV, p. 102, no. 93; Para., p. 98; Fallow Deer Painter), Louvre E 890 (ABV, p. 102, no. 105; Para., p. 39; Guglielmi Painter), and Swiss private collection (Para., p. 40, no. 6; Schauenburg, Aachener Kunstblätter 44 [1973] p. 36, fig. 56; Guglielmi Painter). Compare with these lotus buds the volute under handle B/A on a Tyrrhenian neck-amphora once in the Basel market, now Zurich (Para., p. 42, [no. 7]; Schauenburg, Aachener Kunstblätter 44 [1973] p. 21, figs. 19, 20; Castellani Painter).


43 See Bothmer's list in AK 3 (1960) pp. 77–78, 80.

44 J. D. Beazley, The Development of Attic Black-figure (Berkeley, 1951) p. 57.

45 Agora XII, p. 63.


in imitation of the less popular method of olpe decoration he placed the panel opposite the handle. Four olpai attributed to the Amasis Painter also follow this system of decoration, and beginning around the middle of the sixth century it becomes the rule on circular-mouthed olpai. The earliest of these have Amasean upright buds above their pictures, and in fact are attributed to artists related in style to the Amasis Painter.

A few choes imitate the Amasis Painter’s bud friezes. Two of these choes are attributed to the Taleides Painter, the fragmentary chous Boston 10.210 signed by Taleides as potter, and Madrid 10932, unsigned (Figures 7–9). The Madrid vase is also very near in size to the Amasis Painter’s larger chous. A third vase, in Mrs. Randolph A. Hearst’s collection at Hillsborough, is unattributed but certainly Amasean in drawing. An unpublished fragment from the Athenian Acropolis is identified by Beazley as part of a chous and compared in drawing with the Amasis Painter. The fragment preserves a good part of the ornament, upright black lotus buds, all open, with single dots between the lotuses. Although the buds are too stubby to be attributed to the Amasis Painter himself, they are bordered by three glaze lines (one above and two below), his normal framing pattern.

Similarly fat lotus buds are found on the choes by the Taleides Painter (Figures 7–9), although their ornament bands are larger and framed by single black lines. As is usual in the Amasis Painter’s bud friezes, there are single dots between the lotuses on the Madrid chous, but on the Boston and Hillsborough vases the bands are a little different. On the former there is a glaze dot in each spandrel under the buds, and a black droplet between the lotuses. On the Hillsborough chous the subsidiary ornaments are reversed; the droplets are in the spandrels and the dots are between the buds. A similar ornament appears once in the Amasis Painter’s work, on the shoulder of the lekythos London B 548, placed by Bothmer in the painter’s middle phase. It is roughly contemporary with the Boston and Hillsborough choes. A fragment of a chous from the Athenian Acropolis, attributed to an artist near the Madrid Painter, has a lotus frieze that recalls those by the Amasis Painter and the Taleides Painter. The buds are somewhat thinner, but there are glaze dots both between and below the lotuses.

One more aspect of our chous remains to be discussed, its liquid capacity. In the Greek world, chous was the name of a liquid measure as well as of a vase shape. The standard chous equals twelve kotylai, which is the twelfth part of a metretes, and according to Hultsch a chous holds 3.285 liters. Filled with water to the glaze ring inside the neck, the New York chous holds 1.35 liters, a little more than 41 percent of the standard or 5.5 kotylai (filled to the brim it contains 1.365 liters). Louvre F 37, nearly identical in

49. Leningrad 1453 (St. 129), attributed to the Taleides Painter by Bothmer (unpublished); Conservatori 6 (ABV, pp. 176, and 671, no. 3); Paris, Niarchos (Münzen und Medaillen, Basel, Nov. 29, 1958, no. 89, pl. 25; D. von Bothmer, AJA 80 (1976) p. 437; mommsen, Der Affecter, p. 36, n. 193); once New York market (Emmerich Gallery, Art of the Ancients [1968] no. 10); Louvre F 158 (unpublished) and Rhodes (no number; Clara Rhodos 8 [1956] p. 137, fig. 123.8; 3; p. 139, fig. 125), both by the same painter; Cabinet des Médailles 258, close to the Affecter (ABV, p. 229 (viii); Para., p. 108; Leningrad 1450 (St. 38; unpublished); and Mytilene 58 and 59, fr. (unpublished).
50. ABV, p. 174, nos. 3, 4. Madrid: H. incl. handle 23.3 cm., to lip 22.3; mouth 9 x 10; D. body 18.3, foot 10.5. Taleides the potter may have been a member of Amasis’s workshop. Dr. Olmos informs me that the Madrid chous has a ridged handle, but that it is not possible to determine if there was a handle palmette because the vase is restored at the lower handle attachment.
53. ABV, p. 154, no. 58.
measurements and profile, holds slightly more, 1.44 liters (filled to the brim 1.59 liters).

Since little research has been done on the volumetrics of painted Attic vases, we must turn to black and plain vases for comparisons. A smaller, incomplete plain-ware chous from the Athenian Agora holds 0.875 liter filled to the neck, where it is broken. It is inscribed δεµ[ωςουν] and is an official measure, but it contains slightly more than 3.1 kotyli or 27 percent of a chous, a little greater than half the volume of the vase in New York. Other vases from the Agora confirm the 3.283-liter chous, at least in the fifth century. A cartellino from a well deposit datable about 400 b.c. is inscribed XX, an abbreviation of χοος χοος (two choes) and holds 6.44 liters or a little more than double the standard when filled to the level of the overflow hole. Filled to the brim, two black choes from the last quarter of the fifth century hold approximately the same standard amount. An unusual cylindrical measure of the fifth century from the North Slope of the Acropolis, inscribed δεµ[ωςουν] and probably a dry measure, holds 3.2 liters, nearly a full chous. The half-chous measure also exists. Agora P. 2077, for example, a black chous, holds 1.55 liters filled to the brim.

The liquid capacity of olpai is also measured in chous, as shown by the retrograde inscription in the cartellino on the circular-mouthed olpe Louvre F 339, a black vase: Λυσίας µ’ έποιεσαν हेमχονελ. The first part is clear—"Lysias made me"—and the rest is interpreted to mean "I am half a chous." Long ago de Witte filled this olpe to the brim with sawdust and found that it held 1.46 liters. He tried to compensate for the difference between wet and dry measures, and estimated the true liquid capacity of the vase at 1.62 liters, or just under half a chous. Using water, Dr. von Bothmer recently remeasured the cubic content of this vase. Filled to the glaze ring, it holds 1.44 liters, the same amount as Louvre F 37, and when filled to the edge of the mouth 1.65 liters. Both Louvre F 37 and Louvre F 339 may be safely considered half-chous measures.

A trefoil olpe in Newark, made by a potter close to Amasis if not by Amasis himself, is nearly the same size as Louvre F 339, yet holds 1.35 liters when filled to the glaze ring, the same amount as the New York chous. A second black olpe with an inscribed cartellino, Warsaw 142449, potted by Kriton, is very closely related in size and shape to Louvre F 339, and may well have the same capacity as the Paris vase. A fragment from an olpe similar in shape to those of Lysias and Kriton is signed by the potter Priapos. A comparison of the olpai fashioned by these three potters, who are brought together by Beazley to form the Kriton Group, shows that they were very likely members of the workshop of Amasis. Taleides the potter and the Taleides Painter were probably also members of this workshop.

62. *ABV*, p. 446, no. 1; *Para.*, p. 192. H. incl. handle 27.2 cm., to lip 20.75; D. mouth 9.65, body 13.75, foot 9.46.
64. Newark 50.264: *ABV*, p. 445, no. 9; Keverklian Collection, American Art Association, New York, Jan. 21, 1928, no. 324; filled with potting soil to measure its capacity—H. incl. handle 25.41 cm., to lip 20.505; mouth 8.165 × 7.9; D. neck 7.79; body 13.27, foot 9.845. Compare the capacity of the Newark olpe with that of a black olpe from Athens in East Berlin (F 2669; *Agora* X, p. 57, pl. 16). This vase, whose neck and mouth are partially restored, is inscribed δεµ[ωςουν] and holds approximately 1.3 liters.
65. *ABV*, p. 446, no. 2; *Para.*, p. 192. H. incl. handle 26.5 cm., to lip 20.505; D. mouth 9.5, body 13.5, foot 9.5.
66. *ABV*, pp. 170; 446, no. 3.
attributed to the Amasis Painter.\textsuperscript{69} When filled with water to the glaze ring it contains 2.8 liters, slightly less than double the cubic capacity of Louvre F 37 and Louvre F 339, and a little more than twice the volume of the chous in the Metropolitan Museum and the Newark olpe. It seems that the olpe in New York indeed holds a full sixth-century chous, and that this measure is less than the traditional contents of 3.283 liters for one chous. Furthermore, an olpe in the university of Mainz, attributed by Bothmer to the Painter of the Nicosia Olpe, is nearly identical in shape and measurements to New York 59.11.17, and has almost the same liquid capacity.\textsuperscript{70} This vase has been pieced together from many fragments, and its interior is roughly patched in many places. Filled with salt, it holds about 2.0 liters to the glaze ring, and 2.75 liters to the brim.

The chous in the Metropolitan Museum stands at the head of a series of black-figured oinochoai of shape III that continues into the fifth century. The invention of the shape by Amasis so early in his career shows that from the beginning he was a master potter, and similarly, the characteristic drawing style of the Amasis Painter may be recognized even in the simple figures and ornament of our chous. If potter and painter were the same, then the apparent contrast between the refinement of the shape and the unsophisticated picture suggests that Amasis was a skilled potter before he turned to painting. Choes datable later than the third quarter of the sixth century, however, have no direct connection with Amasis the potter and the Amasis Painter, and fall outside the subject of this article.\textsuperscript{71}
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\textsuperscript{69} ABV, p. 698, no. 3 bis; Para., pp. 66, 192. H. incl. handle 32.9 cm., to lip 27.0; mouth 11.6 \times 11.2; D. neck 10.060, body 16.541, foot 12.901. New York 59.11.17 is very close in proportions and measurements to an unattributed trefoil olpe from the Athenian Agora (P 1227; ABV, p. 445, no. 7), which may also have been fashioned by Amasis: H. incl. handle 32.5 cm., to lip 26.4; D. body 16.5, foot 12.0.

\textsuperscript{70} Mainz 87: CVA, pl. 38,1–3; Bothmer, AK 3 (1960) p. 77.

\textsuperscript{71} The principal painters, classes, and groups to which Beazley attributes these choes are: Painter of Brussels R 236 (ABV, p. 436, no. 7), Class of Vatican G. 50 (ABV, p. 439; Para., p. 190), Class of Red-bodied Oinochoai III (ABV, pp. 439–440; Para., p. 191), Gela Painter (ABV, pp. 473. Hapsels no. 196: 474, nos. 22–27; Para., p. 216), Near the Gela Painter (ABV, p. 475; nos. 1, 2), Manner of the Haimon Painter (ABV, p. 555, no. 434), Swan Group (ABV, p. 658, nos. 134, 135), and Near the Swan Group (Para., p. 315).
Appendix

CHOES: ADDENDA AND CORRIGENDA

This appendix includes some additions to Beazley's lists in ABV and Para., and notes the unattributed choes known to me. Page references are to ABV, unless otherwise stated.

NORTH SLOPE GROUP
P. 129, no. 5 (Athens, Agora P 1255): a chous, not an oinochoe of shape IV.
Add:
ATHENS, Agora P 25577, fr., from Athens. (Warrior, and a male holding a staff.)

THE AMASIS PAINTER
P. 153, no. 38 (Oxford 1929.19, fr.): probably from an olpe.
P. 155, no. 67 (London B 600.31, fr.): from a chous.
Add:
LOUVRE, fr. Ridged handle, decorated with a palmette.
Add the following, related to the Amasis Painter:
ATHENS, Acropolis, fr., from Athens. Fight (head of warrior to right, raised right hand holds a spear). [Beazley].

NEAR THE MADRID PAINTER
P. 330, II, no. 1 (Athens, Acropolis 825, fr.): from a chous.

NEAR THE MICHIGAN PAINTER
Add:

CLASS OF VATICAN G.50
P. 439, no. 7 (Berlin 1938): destroyed in the Second World War.
P. 439, no. 8 (Ferrara T. 251): CVA, pl. 33, 1 and 2; the number is 199.
Add:
ATHENS, Agora P 15723, fr., from Athens. Dionysos and a woman. Related in drawing to the Dot-ivy Group [Frel].
BALTIMORE, Archaeological Society KS 95 (Johns Hopkins University). Komos. [Bothmer].
TOKYO MARKET. Lion and boar flanking a tree. Sotheby at Mitsukoshi, Tokyo, October 1-2, 1969, no. 79.
VIENNA, Kunsthistorisches Museum IV 907. Satyr and maenad.

DOT-IVY GROUP
Add:
ATHENS, Agora P 17466, from Athens. Warrior between women.
LIMOGES 78.97. CVA, pl. 8, 1 and 3. Fight.
VIENNA, Kunsthistorisches Museum IV 500. Warrior between youths.

RED-BODIED OINOCHOAI III
Para. p. 191, no. 6 bis (to ABV, p. 439; Ferrara T. 26 C VP): CVA, pl. 33, 5 and 6; the number is 14309. Belongs to the Haimon Group. [Beazley].

THE GELA PAINTER
P. 473, Haspels no. 196 (Athens, Vlasto): now Tour la Reine (Attica), Serpieri.
P. 474, no. 22 (Ferrara T. 253): CVA, pl. 7, 3 and 6; the number is 197.
P. 474, no. 23 (Ferrara T. 790): CVA, pl. 8, 1 and 5; the number is 193.
P. 474, no. 25 (Ferrara T. 135): CVA, pl. 8, 2 and 6; the number is 196.
P. 475, no. 26 (Berlin 1490): on loan to Göttingen.
Add:

Ferrara 16353 (T. 1049 B), from Spina. CVA, pl. 7, 4 and 7. Dionysos reclining. [Beazley].

**NEAR THE GELA PAINTER**

P. 475, no. 1 (Ferrara T. 274): CVA, pl. 8, 3 and 7; the number is 198.

P. 475, no. 2 (Ferrara T. 748): CVA, pl. 8, 4 and 8; the number is 194.

**BY OR NEAR THE ATHENA PAINTER**

Athens, Agora P 5209, fr., from Athens. (Male, or perhaps a satyr). [Smith].

**NEAR THE PAINTER OF VILLA GIULIA M. 487**

Para. p. 296 (to ABV, p. 590; Agora P 24681): the correct number is P 24675, and the shape is probably a chous.

**SWAN GROUP**

Add:


**UNATTRIBUTED**

Athens 19175, from Vari. Departure of a warrior (draped youth standing to right; nude youth moving right, looking around; horseman to right; warrior standing to left; nude youth standing to left).


Athens, Agora P 4276, fr., from Athens. (Youth).

Athens, Agora P 4573, fr., from Athens. (Woman).

Athens, Agora P 6091, fr., from Athens. (Dionysos reclining on a couch).

Athens, Agora P 8886, frr., from Athens. Dionysos and two satyrs.

Athens, Agora P 9278, fr., from Athens. (Woman; at the left, the feet and part of the body of an animal [a deer? held by the woman?]).

Athens, Agora P 12495, frr., from Athens. Fight.

Athens, Agora P 17140, fr., from Athens. (Youth on horseback, holding two spears, opposite a male hand grasping a spear or staff).

Athens, Agora P 24681, fr., from Athens. (Dionysos and Hermes).

Athens, British School. Van Hoorn, fig. 420. Leto, Apollo, Artemis.

Ferrara 247 (T. 660), from Spina. CVA, pl. 33, 3 and 4. Satyr and a dancing man.


Maplewood (N.J.), Noble. Satyr pouring wine from a skin.


Moscow, Pushkin II 1 b 361. Man in a Phrygian cap reclining on a couch, holding out a phiale. Small.

Tübingen S./10 1504, fr. C. Watzinger, Griechische Vasen in Tübingen (Reutlingen, 1924) cat. no. D 6, pl. 6; CVA, pl. 22,1. Dionysos between satyrs. [Bothmer].

**ABBREVIATIONS**


AJA—*American Journal of Archaeology*

AK—*Antike Kunst*

Bonner Jb.—*Bonner Jahrbücher*

CVA—*Corpus Vasorum Antiquorum* fr., frr.—fragment, fragments

Hesp.—*Hesperia*

van Hoorn—G. van Hoorn, *Choes and Anthestheria* (Leiden, 1951)

JHS—*Journal of Hellenic Studies*


RE—Paulys *Real-Encyclopädie der klassischen Altertums-wissenschaft*