THE GELEDAKIS PAINTER

(Plates 28-30)

The handsome Middle Corinthian amphora which was found a few years ago at Corinth, and published in this Journal by Oscar Broneer,¹ has more than one quality to attract notice. The shape itself is unusual for Corinthian ware of this period, and the panelled pictures are painted in a clean, bold style. The main panel has a remarkable subject: a rider mounted on a truncated horse, of which only the forward half is shown. On the reverse side there is a commoner theme, a lion standing to right, with head turned back; but stylistically this part of the vase’s decoration is more revealing than the obverse. From the shape of the lion and from the incised details, we may confidently assign this work to the artist who has come to be known as the Geledakis Painter.²

This artist, who belongs to the circle of the Dodwell Painter,³ has a distinctive and fairly consistent style which is usually easy to recognize. To see the mark of his hand on the amphora, we need only to compare the lion on its reverse side (here, Pl. 28, a) with typical animals by the Geledakis Painter, such as the panthers on his “name-piece,” the stemmed pyxis in New York (Pl. 28, b-c).⁴ We can see clearly the painter’s characteristic manner of rendering anatomical details of felines: the peculiar kidney-bean shape of the line enclosing the shoulder area; the two curved, parallel lines which begin in this area and extend downward into the near foreleg; the strongly

¹ Hesperia, XX, 1951, pp. 295-296, pl. 92. For permission to publish the photograph in Pl. 28, a, I am grateful to Professors Oscar Broneer and John L. Caskey; for the use of the remaining illustrations, to the Metropolitan Museum of Art (Pl. 28, b-c) ; the Oxford University Press (Pl. 29, a-b) ; C. H. Beck’sche Verlags-Buchhandlung, Munich (Pl. 29, c-d) ; and Presses Universitaires de France, Paris (Pl. 30, a-c), from Léon Rey, “Fouilles de la mission française à Apollonie d’Illyrie, 1930-1931,” Albania, IV, 1932, p. 11, fig. 6, p. 13, fig. 9, and p. 15, fig. 13. I wish also to thank Professor H. R. W. Smith for reading my manuscript and making valuable criticisms of it.

² Payne, Necrocorinthia, p. 307, under NC 902; cf. also p. 308, top, and remarks under NC 907, 1097-1098, 1384. Benson, J. L., Geschichte der korinthischen Vasen, Basel, Schwabe, 1953, pp. 52-53, Sec. 85. For this artist the term “Geledakis Painter” is, as Hopper has pointed out (B.S.A., XLIV, 1949, p. 235, No. 10), a misnomer. Since, however, the name has gained some currency and is conventional in any event, there may be no harm in allowing it to stand (cf. Benson, loc. cit.). In Benson’s list, the museum number for his No. 2 should read “Oxford 1879.102;” No. 6 should be “New York 06.1021.14.” His No. 9 (NC 888; on the attribution, see further below) is also published in Lane, Greek Pottery, pl. 26, C; to Benson’s C.V.A. reference, add “and pl. 7,9.”


⁴ Payne, NC 908 and pl. 29, 6 and 8; Benson, p. 52, No. 85.6.
marked belly-line and the heavy, straight, parallel rib-markings; and the fringe of hair along the animal’s hindquarters. In the field, the presence of large “whirling” rosettes is also consistent with this artist’s style. The drawing on the amphora is neater, but both vases are plainly works of the same hand.

The style of this painter was first recognized by Payne,² who grouped together as products of one hand the stemmed pyxides NC 906-910, the convex pyxides NC 902-903, and the oinochoe NC 1098. Payne’s juxtaposition of NC 904 with NC 902-903, and his comments under NC 1097 and NC 1384, also invite comparison of these three vases with those which he attributed to the Geledakis Painter. In my remarks on the artist,³ I once observed that the pyxis NC 904 “is very close to his work,” and added tentatively an olpe and an oinochoe from Apollonia, published in Albania, IV, 1932, p. 11, fig. 6 and p. 15, fig. 13, stating that a third piece, the broad-bottomed oinochoe ibid., p. 10, fig. 4 and p. 13, fig. 9, “is at least related to the style” (for convenience, the three Apollonia vases are reproduced here, Pl. 30, a-c). From the series of vases thus far mentioned, J. L. Benson⁴ has drawn up a systematic list of vases which he would give to this artist. Benson’s canon of the Geledakis Painter’s work admits, from the foregoing, NC 902-903 (Benson, Nos. 1-2), NC 906-909 (B., Nos. 4-7), NC 1098 (B., No. 8); and adds, as new attributions, a privately owned pyxis in Basel (B., No. 3, pl. 10) and the pyxis in Oxford with handles in the form of female heads, NC 888 (B., No. 9, “wahrscheinlich vom Geledakismaler”). Under the heading, “Manner of the Geledakis Painter,” he places NC 904 and the three vases from Apollonia. Benson gives no placement for NC 910, NC 1097, or NC 1384.

In Benson’s list, the seven pieces originally attributed by Payne (B., Nos. 1-2, 4-8) appear, so far as they are controllable at present,⁵ convincingly enough to be works of one artist. Furthermore, Benson’s addition of the pyxis in Basel (B., No. 3) is certainly correct. On the other hand, it seems to my eyes that the pyxis NC 888 (B., No. 9)⁶ cannot belong to the Geledakis Painter; although there are certain likenesses of style, the painter’s characteristic complex of renderings is not present.

If the attribution of NC 888 were correct, it would be a discovery of unusual importance, for it would place an artist of the Dodwellian school squarely in the center of the Middle Corinthian “Delicate Style.”⁷ But it seems rather to arise from another of those still puzzling instances of a limited stylistic correspondence between certain elements of the Delicate Style and the coarser styles which are contemporaneous with it, most pertinently that of the Dodwellian camp.⁸ It must suffice here

---

² See above, note 2.
³ Cor. Vases, p. 224, and p. 232, note 127.
⁴ See above, note 2.
⁵ I have not seen the Bonn oinochoe (NC 1098; Benson, No. 8), which is unpublished.
⁶ C.V.A., Oxford, 2, pl. 5, 8/10/12 and pl. 7, 9; Lane, pl. 26, C.
⁷ Payne, pp. 64-65 and NC 881-891; Cor. Vases, pp. 209-210.
⁸ Cf. Payne, p. 64; Cor. Vases, pp. 224-225; Benson, p. 95.
to add that the exact nature of these relationships, though they obviously exist, still presents many problems.

Let us turn to the other vases. After further study of the only published illustration of NC 904,\textsuperscript{12} I have become all but certain that this vase is not merely a "school-piece," but a work from the painter's own hand. The road to this conclusion leads through NC 1384, a globular oinochoe in London,\textsuperscript{13} which Payne (p. 325) compares stylistically with NC 904. Indeed, a comparison of the griffin-birds on NC 904 with the siren on NC 1384 reveals a strong likelihood that both vases are by one hand; but we can now see quite plainly that the panther on NC 1384 was drawn by the Geledakis Painter. I conclude, therefore, that both vases quite probably belong to him.

The Syracuse oinochoe NC 1097, like the Bonn vase NC 1098 (B., No. 8) with which Payne compares it, is unpublished; both should be kept in mind for future study. Likewise, Payne's attribution of the stemmed pyxis in Palermo, NC 910 (apparently unpublished), should not be forgotten.

The Apollonia vases (Pl. 30, a-c) which are mentioned above present a special problem. They are, I think, rightly placed in close proximity to the Geledakis Painter, but I now agree with Benson that they are not his own. Rather, they appear to be clumsy but reasonably faithful copies made by one or more of his pupils.\textsuperscript{14} If, as Hopper thinks,\textsuperscript{15} all three vases are by one artist, then the broad-bottomed oinochoe (here, Pl. 30, c), on which the style of painting is most debased, must show the artist already grown weary of copying, and now reverting toward his own wretched style. At least, there is nothing in these three vases to suggest that he was capable of improvement.

It has been said above that the Geledakis Painter decorated the amphora in Corinth, and that NC 1384 surely, NC 904 probably, are also his. There are two other vases which certainly belong to him: the convex pyxides with upright handles Reading

\textsuperscript{12} Tillyard, \textit{Hope Vases}, pl. 1, 3.
\textsuperscript{13} British Museum 93.7.12.10; \textit{J.H.S.}, XVIII, 1898, p. 282, fig. 1.
\textsuperscript{14} Hopper (\textit{op. cit.}, p. 212, No. 5, p. 234, No. 10, p. 242, No. 7), who gives all three vases to one hand, would place them closer to the Ampersand Painter; but, as Benson rightly observes (p. 53, top), these pieces lack the dryness and angularity of the Ampersand Painter's style, at the same time showing strong "Geledakian" traits. The likenesses in style to the Ampersand Painter (which are outweighed by notable differences) may be the result of parallel lines of descent within the Dodwellian group, that is, through the Geledakis Painter. On the other hand, Benson's placement of the olpe (here, Pl. 30, b) as "perhaps a late work by the painter of the remarkable alabastron \textit{C.V. A.}, Louvre, 6, pl. 3, 15-18" (i.e., MNB 627) seems only to muddy these waters. Benson does not mention Pottier's \textit{(C.V. A., ad loc.)} comparison of MNB 627 with \textit{Déllos}, X, pl. 65, 439; nor Payne's (p. 341) with "NC 888 and the related alabastron NC 802;" nor Hopper's opinion \textit{(op. cit., p. 192)} that it may not be Corinthian. In any case, and in spite of Benson's tentative attribution of NC 888 to the Geledakis Painter, none of these vases is in any way remarkably apt in this context, and the further pursuit of their relationship to the style of the Geledakis Painter seems unprofitable.
\textsuperscript{15} See above, note 14.
39.ix.6 (C.V.A., 1, pl. 7, 3a-3d) and Munich S. L. 485 (C.V.A., 3, pl. 144, 1-4). The animals on both of these vases show strongly our painter's habits of rendering. For example, we may compare the panthers of the New York stemmed pyxis, NC 908 (Pl. 28, b-c) with those of the Reading (Pl. 29, a-b) and Munich (Pl. 29, c-d) vases. The Reading pyxis shows a slight deviation from the painter's usual style, in that there is only one line within the enclosed shoulder area (but cf. NC 902: B., No. 117), whereas on the Munich vase the quadrupeds have both single and double lines within this area. On both pieces, the faces of the panthers are typically broad-jowled and loaded with circular markings for ears, eyes, nose, and muzzle. Both are done in a somewhat cleaner and more careful vein than is usual for the painter's routine efforts.

With this enlarged repertory of the Geledakis Painter's works, the style of the artist comes into clearer focus. Furthermore, especially after the addition of the Corinth amphora, we can see that the quality of his painting is not so thoroughly bad as it has been judged. The Corinthian "animal-frieze" vases were products of commercialism, often turned out in a hurry, and the range of quality in the works of even the better artists is measurably wide. Our artist's style is burdened with "Dodwellianisms," but he is no mere "lesser Dodwellian." In some ways he stands rather close to his companion (or follower?), the Ampersand Painter, but his hand is much firmer, his renderings more distinctive. And he is capable, as the amphora in Corinth in particular demonstrates, of taking some pains.

Two last observations may be fruitful. The attribution of the globular oinochoe NC 1384, taken with the appearance of lateness in certain other works of the artist, points the way into Late Corinthian. It has long been supposed that the main styles of Middle Corinthian continue on into Late Corinthian I, and a number of significant links have been found to support this belief. The attribution of the amphora in Corinth is also significant in this respect, for it is one of only two known vases of this shape which have been placed as early as Middle Corinthian. Payne had already guessed that the other, the Heidelberg amphora NC 1154, might possibly be a work of the Ampersand Painter. These connections lead to the thought that the style of

---

16 Professor and Mrs. Ure (C.V.A., text, p. 13) compare the pyxis in Reading with NC 900-904, within which series lie three vases by our artist; Lullies (C.V.A., text, p. 40) has no special placement for the Munich pyxis. The pictures used here are taken from the C.V.A. publications of these vases.

17 Mon. Ant., XXII, 1913, pl. 56, 3.

18 Cf., for example, Hopper, p. 235, No. 10: "a painter well-nigh as bad" (as the Ampersand Painter).

19 See above, note 14.

20 For example, in Cor. Vases, pp. 210, 219-220, 223, 225-226.

21 Cited by Broner, op. cit. Side A only, Payne, pl. 35, 3; both sides now fully published, C.V.A., Heidelberg, 1, pl. 14, 5-6.

22 Benson, pp. 51-52, Sec. 84, and the refs. there cited (without, however, mention of this vase). See also above, note 14. Schauenburg, C.V.A., text, p. 28, does not mention Payne's placement for
the Dodwellian school may somehow continue into the series of Late Corinthian I amphoras, \textit{NC} 1415 ff. Then, too, the noticeably Atticizing character of this whole class of amphoras \footnote{Atticizing in the shape itself; in the use (on the Late Corinthian vases) of a red-ground slip; and in numerous features of style which await more detailed investigation (cf. Payne, p. 58; also, for example, his opinion, p. 328, that elements of the style leading to Lydos are recognizable in the hydria \textit{NC} 1449).} has an important bearing on the relationships between Attic and Corinthian vase-painting, and ultimately on the chronology of both wares. But these are matters for another study.
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the amphora. Actual identity with the Ampersand Painter seems doubtful to me, but it is not essential to the point made here.
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