THE "KOTTABOS-TOAST"
AND AN INSCRIBED RED-FIGURED CUP

(Plates 97–100)

There is a small red-figured stemless cup in London (B.M. 95.10-27.2) decorated inside and out with eight symposiasts singing, making music, conversing, and playing kottabos.¹ Their song and conversation is rendered by inscriptions:

In the tondo (retrograde; Pl. 97:a)

\[ \text{ΣΟΛΙΠΥΣΕΤΑΙ} \]

On Side A (boustrophedon; Pl. 97:b)

\[ \text{ΑΚΕΤΙ} \]

¹ We are grateful to B. F. Cook for permission to study the cup and D. Williams for assistance at the British Museum. We wish to thank T. J. McNiven, O. Murray, W. J. Slater, and especially H. R. Immerwahr for advice on various aspects of this paper, E. R. Maloy for the drawing of Figure 1, and F. Lissarrague for permission to use his drawing for Figure 2. F. W. Hamdorf of the Munich Antikensammlungen and B. Tailliez of the Musée du Louvre graciously undertook to provide for our specific photographic needs. Both authors gratefully acknowledge the financial assistance of the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada.
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Hartwig = P. Hartwig, Die griechischen Meisterschalen, Stuttgart/Berlin 1893
Herzog = R. Herzog, Die Umschrift der älteren griechischen Literatur in das ionische Alphabet, Basel 1912
Jacobsthal, 1912 = P. Jacobsthal, Göttinger Vasen nebst einer Abhandlung mit Συμποσιακά (AbhGött XIV, No. 1), Berlin 1912
Jahn = O. Jahn, “Kottabos auf Vasenbildern,” Philologus 26, 1867, pp. 201–240
Schneider = K. Schneider, s.v. Kottabos, RE XI, 1921, cols. 1528–1541
Wilamowitz = U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, Sappho und Simonides, Berlin 1913

The cup is illustrated in Jacobsthal, 1912, pl. 22; R. Lullies, “Zur Boiotisch rotfigurigen Vasenmalerei,” AM 65, 1940 (pp. 1–27), pl. 3; M. Wegner, Das Musikleben der Griechen, Berlin 1949, pl. 30:1; Weber, pl. 24.
and on Side B (boustrophedon; Pl. 97c)

\[ \text{KISAO} \]
\[ \text{ALEOE} \]
\[ \text{TAYTA} \]

Although few artifacts of the age of Pindar allow so full an opportunity to view and eavesdrop upon the practice of the symposium, the cup has suffered unjustly from neglect, suspicion, and abuse: “Altogether the cup is poor evidence for anything.”

The bad reputation dates back to the very first record of its existence. The British Museum Registry for October 27, 1895 reads as follows:

Fictile red-figured kylix, an ancient imitation, in style and subject, of the work of Duris; int. and ext. three scenes of banqueters with incised inscriptions, the genuineness of which is open to doubt. Ht. 1 3/4 in. Diam. 4 3/8 in. Purchased of Mr. A. Decaristo. From Thebes.

The doubt about the inscriptions probably arose from the rather unusual (but by no means unparalleled) fact that they were incised after firing and from the apparent unintelligibility of Side A. Perhaps there was also some question of the reliability of the dealer or his source; one of the six items purchased together with the cup from Mr. Decaristo was soon withdrawn as a forgery. But whatever the oddities of both cup and inscriptions, any doubts about their authenticity must give impossible credit to the scholarship and ingenuity of 19th-century forgers.

It would have been more profitable to doubt not the age but the provenience ascribed to the cup. Mr. Decaristo’s claim that the cup came from Thebes encouraged Jacobsthal to declare the work a Boeotian imitation of Douris. More recently, Weber, with an eye to the apparently Oriental headgear worn by one of the symposiasts, has gone so far as to suggest that it represents the Theban banquet of Attaginos described by Herodotos (9.15). There are, however, specific grounds for doubting the cup’s Boeotian manufacture. The cup is dated stylistically to ca. 470–460 B.C., yet Boeotian red figure is very rare until about

3 Jacobsthal’s assertion that graffito inscriptions of this sort are un-Attic (1912, p. 60), accepted by E. Pfuhl (Malerei und Zeichnung der Griechen, Munich 1923, II, p. 774), is corrected by Lullies ([footnote 1 above] p. 7). Apart from signatures (e.g. Sotades: see Immerwahr, 1990, p. 104), however, graffito inscriptions do not occur at the time the London cup was manufactured. Professor Immerwahr points out to us that this does not necessarily eliminate the possibility that the vase painter added the inscriptions himself, since the letters are as crude as the figures in this careless piece while the use of graffito for writing can be explained by the absence of added red in the painted scenes.
4 Jacobsthal, 1912, pp. 53–61. For another imitation of an earlier work, see the ram-head cup by the Painter of the Naples Hydriskai, from a Sotadean mold: Vatican, ARV2 1267, 23; H. Hoffmann, Attic Red-figured Rhyta, Mainz 1962, no. 121, pl. 23:1 and 2.
5 Weber.
6 And general grounds too: “...a great deal of pottery both Boeotian and non-Boeotian that appears on the market, especially in Athens, is given a Boeotian provenience, no matter what its true finding place” (B. A. Sparkes, “The Taste of a Boeotian Pig,” JHS 87, 1967 [pp. 116–130], p. 117).
7 P. Jacobsthal, review of G. Jacopi, Scavi nella necropoli di Camiro, 1928–1930 (CIrh IV, 1931), in Göttingische gelehrte Anzeigen, 1933 (pp. 1–16), p. 10; Lullies (footnote 1 above), p. 6; Pfuhl (footnote 3 above), II, p. 714.
430 B.C. 8 Martin Robertson convinced Sparkes that the “shape, glaze and details of potting point to Attica.” Moreover, Jacobsthal himself later recanted and recognized the cup as Attic. 10 In any case, the dialect and lettering of the inscription are unambiguously Attic.

Since the doubts expressed in the British Museum Registry no one has openly questioned the antiquity of the inscriptions (or the cup). Rather, concern about the value of the inscriptions has focused on the fact that, because the incisions were made after firing, there is no guarantee that they have any direct connection with the painter’s inspiration: Campbell, for example, used this argument to dissociate the pipe player and the lyre player from the inscriptions of their respective scenes, a lyric fragment and a putative elegiac, 11 and by the same means Weber sought to dissociate the Attic graffiti, something of an embarrassment to her theory of the painting’s specifically Boeotian inspiration:

Da die Buchstaben ... nicht gemalt, sondern geritzt sind, d.h. technisch nach der Be- malung und nach dem Brand hinzugefügt sein müssen, dürften sie unabhängig von der Malerei, zumindest nicht vom originalen Vorbild übernommen worden sein. Daher kann das mit ihnen verbundene Problem hier ausser Betracht bleiben. 12

There are, however, serious limits to these attempts at dissociation. One might first mention an argument by Jacobsthal in support of the derivation of the inscription from the supposed copy’s original. The tondo inscription twice shows dotted delta (A), a very rare letter form, but so characteristic of Douris’ middle period that Jacobsthal felt the inscriber must have found the letters where the copyist found the images, on a cup of Douris. 13 Hindsight helps show that the letter form is not so idiosyncratic as to urge an attribution of the model to a specific painter. Nevertheless, the form does demonstrate the close contemporaneity of the style of the images and inscriptions on this cup. Unique to Attic inscriptions, dotted delta first appears on late 6th-century B.C. ceramics, 14 enjoys a certain popularity in Athens between ca. 495 and 480 B.C., 15 then slowly fades from view. In the second quarter of the 5th

8 We are grateful to Ian McPhee for information concerning the chronology of Boeotian red figure.
9 Sparkes (footnote 6 above), p. 123, note 56.
10 Jacobsthal (footnote 7 above), p. 10.
11 Campbell (footnote 2 above), p. 66.
13 Jacobsthal, 1912, p. 60. Other features offered support to the “attribution”. For example, Douris experimented with the stance of the symposiast at the right on Side B (Pl. 97:d), a rear view from the head of the couch (London, B.M. E 49, ARV² 432, 52). Although dotted delta is the only really distinctive Dourian letter form, three-stroke sigma is characteristic of Douris’ middle and later phases, the upsilon in the tondo is standard Dourian (but the forked upsilon on Side B has parallels on late vases by Douris), and upright chi and circular phi (here lacking cross stroke) are typical. The tondo does not seem to have the tailed rho generally used by the painter. On Douris’ letter forms, see Immerwahr, 1990, p. 87.
15 P. Kretschmer, Die griechischen Vaseninschriften ihrer Sprache nach untersucht, Gütersloh 1894, p. 96; Barron, p. 46 and notes 60 and 61; M. Lang, “Writing and Spelling on Ostraka,” in Studies in Attic Epigraphy, History and Topography Presented to Eugene Vanderpool (Hesperia Suppl. 19), Princeton 1982 (pp. 75–87), p. 79; Immerwahr, 1990, pp. 81, 136, and nos. 919 and 920. Immerwahr (1990, pp. 81, 137) suspects an origin from inscriptions on bronze. It is found on the bronze Persian helmet dedicated at Olympia and discovered in a deposit with a contextual date in the 450’s (E. Kunze, OLBer VII, Berlin 1961, p. 136) and on
century it appears on a calyx-krater by the Altamura Painter (ca. 460 B.C.), and on one (mid-century) ostrakon found in the Agora.\textsuperscript{16} In the third quarter of the century dotted delta appears in inscriptions on two pelikai by the Painter of the Birth of Athena (450–440 B.C.), on a number of inscribed stamnoi of Polynotos and his Group down to ca. 430, on a krater fragment by the Kleophon Painter, and on an oinochoe fragment of ca. 430 B.C.\textsuperscript{17} It also appears, somewhat surprisingly, on three marble boundary stones in Samos of the later 5th century B.C., written in Attic dialect and alphabet and probably to be associated with an Athenian clerouchy.\textsuperscript{18} Since the London cup has nothing in common with the products of the later painters, it can be argued that the letter form best suits a date before ca. 470 B.C. and is probably not later than ca. 450 B.C. The three-bar sigma, the V-shaped upsilon (in the tondo; Side B has a transitional Y-shaped upsilon), and the Archaic Attic lambda also favor a date in the first half of the 5th century B.C.\textsuperscript{19}

The Archaic nature of the letter forms, however, will not suffice to demonstrate that the London cup was inscribed by an Archaic hand. One can explain the Archaic letter forms by supposing that the inscription on the London cup is only a copy of an Archaic inscription and could have been made at any time after the manufacture of the cup. Therefore, the image and inscription are still dissociable in two respects: (1) although the original of the inscription must be Archaic, the date at which it was copied onto the London cup is so far indeterminable and could be much later than the date of the cup’s manufacture; (2) since it is possible that we are dealing with a copy of an Archaic inscription, we need not suppose that the inscription was copied from the same source as the images.

An examination of the peculiar stance of the letters may permit a closer determination of the relation between the pot and its inscription. At the time of the manufacture of the London cup, retrograde writing was out of date except on vases where it was attached to speaking figures who face left (e.g. Rome, Villa Giulia 50329; see Appendix, No. 12).\textsuperscript{20} The London cup is in perfect conformity with this norm but is unique in one respect: the inscription on the tondo and the first word of the inscription on either side are not true retrograde. Although the sequence runs from right to left, the letters consistently face right. Parallels exist in which a few letters are turned around in this way, but the consistency of the confusion here shows a hand that is totally unfamiliar with retrograde writing. One can imagine a number of scenarios to explain this abnormality, yet, for the present purpose, it is more useful to consider those which the presence of this unusual feature would eliminate. It


\textsuperscript{20} H. R. Immerwahr, personal communication; we are also much indebted to Professor Immerwahr for pointing out and suggesting some explanations for the peculiar retrograde of the London cup.
is not likely, for example, that the inscriber of the London cup copied the reversed letters from his model. We assume that such deviation from the normal practice of retrograde would seem sloppy by contemporary professional standards, so that the right-facing stance of the letters is better ascribed to the carelessness and inexperience of the inscriber of the London cup (in conformity with the general quality of the painting) than to that of the hypothetical inscriber of its model. But if the inscriber of the cup is responsible for the stance of the letters, then he must also be responsible for their Archaic forms, for it is unlikely that he was careful to copy the rare and outdated forms of the letters on his model and yet totally disregarded their stance. It follows that the Archaic letter forms cannot simply be ascribed to an earlier model: they are the forms which came naturally to the actual inscriber of the London cup and can be used to date the graffito. If copied, the copy was made in the earlier part of the 5th century B.C. If not copied, then an earlier 5th-century date for the graffito must hold a fortiori.

At the very least, then, inscription and image are linked by the background of a shared culture: both are Athenian, both products of the Late Archaic period. Therefore, to say that the letters "need not be the work of the artist, who in any case was only a copyist" is not enough to demolish the testimony of the inscription. An unknown ancient graffiti artist (who employed an impeccable Late Archaic Attic script) may still have known as much about contemporary symposia as the most admired writers and artists of the Classical Who's Who. If we admit, with Weber, that one cannot discount the possibility that an Attic wit, good at adding captions, supplied the inscriptions at some date after acquiring the pot, and that therefore the inscriptions need not impinge directly upon our interpretation of the scene, this does not also mean that the inscriptions are "unabhängig" in the converse sense: the illustration is necessary to the interpretation of the inscriptions. A close examination of the painting shows that the inscriptions are very skillfully adapted to their visual context, such that, so far as their value as evidence is concerned, they are no less eloquent and instructive than they would be if one could affirm with certainty that they were etched by the painter's hand.

In the tondo a diaulos player accompanies a singer as they recline on a couch covered with an elaborately decorated textile (Pl. 97:a). Singing symposiasts on Attic vases adopt a distinctive posture. The head is bent back, and the right hand rests on the nape or the crown of the head, presumably to expand lung capacity. At times men who adopt the pose appear to be only listening because their mouths are closed, but even these may be singers since inscribed lyrics sometimes issue from mouths not obviously open (e.g. Munich 2646; see Appendix, No. 11). Such musical inscriptions, though not common, are well enough known (see Appendix). The first letter issues from the singer's mouth even if the flow is

---

21 Campbell (footnote 2 above), p. 66.
22 The kline covering on the tondo is decorated with a frieze of Pygmies and Cranes. Although the subject is more renowned for its examples in 6th-century Attic black figure, a few notable examples also occur in red figure of the second quarter of the 5th century. See F. Brommer's list (Heldensage, p. 547).
thereby interrupted by the singer’s raised arm: \textsuperscript{25} proximity to the mouth rather than clarity of inscription is the primary goal. In the London cup, given the combination of \textit{diauletes} and symposiast in “singing” pose, \textsuperscript{26} it is not surprising to find here a verse flowing from the mouth, retrograde, as is customary, from a left-facing singer: \textit{ΩΔΙΑΤΕΣΘΥΡΙΩΣ} (\textit{δ ὁ διὰ τῆς θυρίδος}). Occasionally, as here, the verse is a recognizable fragment of lyric poetry. \textsuperscript{27}

Three symposiasts recline on Side B, and a young cup-bearer approaches from the left (Pl. 97.c). The nearest symposiast is intent upon tuning his barbiton. The other two are engaged in close discussion. \textsuperscript{28} Their gaze interlocks. One rests his right hand on his left shoulder at ease; \textsuperscript{29} the other lifts his beaker in his right hand as if to urge his point. Beside him runs the boustrophedon inscription \textit{ΦΑΣΙΝΑΛΕΘΕΤΑΥΤΑ} (\textit{φασίν ἀληθὴ ταῦτα}). \textsuperscript{30}

The position of the letters clearly shows that the phrase emanates from his mouth. Jacobsthal and Herzog take the words to be a song, \textsuperscript{31} but their accompanying gesture does not connote “singer”. Rather, the words carry on a conversation or introduce a story with \textit{ταῦτα} looking forward to a narrative which follows (\textit{=} \textit{τάδε}), as often in Greek prose. \textsuperscript{32} In either case, words match gesture extraordinarily well.

---


\textsuperscript{25} E.g., Munich 2646: OY arm ΔΥΝΑΜΟΥ (Appendix, No. 11); Munich 2636: Κ[ΑΛΌ] arm ΣΕΙ (Appendix, No. 4).

\textsuperscript{26} Owing to lack of space, a problem of poor planning throughout the cup, the head does not tilt back as much as usual.

\textsuperscript{27} Praxilla 8 (Page). See below, footnote 43 and Appendix, Nos. 11, 13.

\textsuperscript{28} Cf. Wilamowitz, p. 121.

\textsuperscript{29} T. J. McNiven, who is engaged in compiling a lexicon of gestures in Attic vase painting, kindly informs us that this shoulder-holding gesture is comparatively rare and that many of the examples he has collected are in conversation scenes.

\textsuperscript{30} Boustrophedon is exceedingly rare after \textit{ca.} 530 B.C. On stone inscriptions it last occurs, probably as a deliberate archaism, in the inscriptions from the Eleusinion in the Athenian Agora; the latest of these is dated \textit{ca.} 500–480 B.C. See L. H. Jeffery, “The Boustrophedon Sacral Inscriptions from the Agora,” \textit{Hesperia} 17, 1948, pp. 86–111. On pottery it appears in a book roll on a Late Archaic cup (\textit{ca.} 480 B.C.) by Onesimos (Oxford G 138.3,5,11 = \textit{ARV}\textsuperscript{2} 326, 93; Immerwahr, 1964 [footnote 24 above]; Lissarrague, fig. 105). The report of a reading \textit{φασίν ἀληθὴ} οὐκ ἔτι by Weber (p. 494) is surely a copy error.

\textsuperscript{31} Jacobsthal, 1912, p. 62; Herzog, no. 12, p. 20.

\textsuperscript{32} For \textit{ταῦτα} = \textit{τάδε}, see, e.g., H. W. Smyth and G. M. Messing, \textit{Greek Grammar}, Cambridge, Mass. 1956, p. 308. Jacobsthal and Herzog (locc. cît.) were inspired by the identification of a known verse fragment in the tondo to suppose these words begin a lost elegy or skolion. On this theory a \textit{gnome} would follow the utterance as in Simonides, fr. 5 (West):

\begin{quote}
\begin{align*}
    \text{η}
    \text{ν} \quad \text{δρ} \quad \text{ἐπο} \quad \text{τὸδ} \quad \text{ἀληθὲς, \ δὴ \ οὐ \ μόνων \ ἔδατος \ αἰταν,} \\
    \text{ἀλλὰ \ τι \ καὶ \ λέγχῃς \ οἴνῳ \ ἔχεις \ έθέλει}
\end{align*}
\end{quote}


\begin{quote}
\begin{align*}
    \text{ἡν} \quad \text{ἀρ} \quad \text{ἀληθὲς τοῦτο, Θεόκριτε, οἴ γάρ \ ἔρωτες} \\
    \text{ποιμήνας \ πολλοὺς \ ἔδοξας \ τοὺς \ πρὶν \ ἀμόνους.}
\end{align*}
\end{quote}

Although Wilamowitz (p. 121) cites the latter parallel (albeit incorrectly as \textit{ην} \textit{ἀρ} \textit{ἀληθὴ} \textit{ταῦτα}, probably because he is citing from memory), he saw that the figures on the vase were engaged in conversation, not singing. Nonetheless he also supposed that, as in the elegics, there followed “ein weises Dichterwort.” We
It is the inscription on Side A which has caused problems (Pl. 97:b). Here again three symposiasts recline. The man on the left raises a cup to his lips and gazes blankly at the viewer. The central man, wearing a peaked hat with lappets, turns his head back towards his neighbor and holds his right hand in a gesture of speech, while cradling wine in the left. His interlocutor whirls a cup to show that he is playing kottabos. The inscription comprises two words, one retrograde, reading TOI, the other apparently orthograde, on which the letters AXETI are clearly visible. The words are not written on the same line, but TOI is written on a line above AXETI as on the boustrophedon inscription of Side B. Unlike Side B, however, the change in line and direction is not for want of space but because the inscriber deliberately wished to separate the words. TOI issues directly from the mouth of the kottabos player. AXETI follows after the central man’s gesturing hand. Even though the second word does not appear to issue directly from the mouth of the second speaker in the customary fashion, the position of the words clearly indicates an exchange of dialogue.

Indeed, Jacobsthal noted that the inscription on Side A, like the tondo inscription, had more than a casual connection to its visual context. The kottabos player’s TOI shows him to belong to a small group of cup-whirling λάταξιν-tossers who speak through inscriptions on Attic red-figured vases:

1 (Pl. 98). Leningrad 644 (St. 1670). Psykter, Euphronios, ca. 520 B.C. “Hetären-Symposion” with four nude women. ΤΙΝΤΑΝΔΕΛΑΤΑΣΩ ΛΕΑΓΡΕ (retr.) (ARV² 16, 15; 1619; Paralipomena 509; Beazley Addenda 153; Peschel, pl. 42; Immerwahr, 1990, no. 361, pp. 63–64, 74).

2 (Pl. 99). Munich 2421. Hydria (shoulder), Phintias, ca. 520 B.C. “Hetären-Symposion” with two women. ΚΑΛΟΙ (retr.) ΣΟΪΤΕΝΔΙ ΕΥΘΥΜΙΔΕΙ (ARV² 23, 7; 162; Paralipomena 323; Beazley Addenda 155; Peschel, pl. 44; Immerwahr, 1990, no. 389, p. 67).

3 (Fig. 1, Pl. 100). Munich 2636. Cup (tondo), Proto-Panaetian Group, ca. 500 B.C. Single nude woman on kline. ΤΟΙΤΕΝ (ARV² 317, 16; Beazley Addenda 214; Peschel, pl. 47; Immerwahr, 1990, no. 502, p. 84). See also Appendix, No. 4.

4 (Fig. 2, Pl. 100). Louvre G 114. Stamnos (A), Copenhagen Painter, ca. 480 B.C. Dionysos, Herakles, and a satyr as cup-boy. ΤΟΙΤΕΝΔΕΙΛΥΚΟΙ (ARV² 257, 14; 1596; Beazley Addenda 204).

All four vases depict kottabos-playing symposiasts whirling their cups by the handle around their extended right index fingers in precisely the same way as the gentleman on Side A of London cup. The words of the kottabos-players inscribed on 2, 3, and 4 are in the normal position with initial letters in immediate juxtaposition to the speaker’s open mouth (Figs. 1, 2, Pls. 99, 100). On 1, however, the words issue from the back of the hetaira’s head (Pl. 98). The abnormality of this position is explained by Klein as representing the frozen traces of words produced before she turned her head in preparation for launching a difficult backwards shot. The hetaira of 3 and the Dionysos of 4 say nearly the same thing: 3 reads

owe to Professor Immerwahr the alternative suggestion that φασιν ἀληθῆ ταῦτα directly introduces a story. Compare the question-narrative beginning Lucian’s Runaways (Fig. 1.1): ἀληθῆ ταῦτα φασιν, πάτερ, ὡς ἔμβαλοι τες φέρων αὐτῶν εἰς τὸ πῦρ κατείηνατ ’Ολυμπίων, ἣν πρεσβύτης ἀνθρώπος, οὐκ ἄγεννης θανματοπούς τὰ τοιάντα;

33 Jacobsthal, 1912, p. 61.
34 W. Klein, Euphronios, 2nd ed., Vienna 1886, p. 110; cf. FR, II, p. 16, Schneider, col. 1539. A different interpretation is offered by C. A. Mastrelli (“Per una interpretazione del greco κότταβος, gioco siciliano,”
(retrograde) TOITEN,\textsuperscript{35} 4 reads (also retrograde) TOITEN[ΔE]. The first words of the hetaira's speech on 2 have been variously read: originally published as ΔΟΣΤΕΝΔΕ,\textsuperscript{36} Brunn established the dominant 19th-century reading TOITENΔΕ,\textsuperscript{37} and Furtwangler the dominant 20th-century reading ΣΟΙΤΕΝΔΙ.\textsuperscript{38} There can be no doubt that this formula somehow

\footnotesize
\hspace{1em}Bollettino del Centro di Studi Filologici e Linguistici Siciliani 5, 1957 [pp. 1–41], p. 20. The same might be true of 3; only a tip survives from the hetaira's head. It looks less like the nose restored by Hartwig (p. 129, fig. 18) than the end of a sakkos.

\textsuperscript{35} The location of the gap near the inscription on the tondo will not allow the usual restoration TOITEN[ΔE]. The drawing in Hartwig (p. 129, fig. 18) misleads; see Pls. 99:b, 100.

\textsuperscript{36} O. Jahn, Beschreibung der Vasensammlung König Ludwigs in der Pinakothek zu München, Munich 1854, p. 4; later revived by P. J. Meier ("Zu den Vasen mit Meistersignaturen," AZ 42, 1884 [pp. 237–252], p. 252).


\textsuperscript{38} FR, II, p. 63; J. C. Hoppin, Euthymides and his Fellows, Cambridge 1917, p. 115; J. D. Beazley, "Three Red-figured Cups," JHS 39, 1919 (pp. 82–87), p. 83; idem, "Two Inscriptions on Attic Vases," CR 57, 1943 (pp. 102–103), p. 102; R. Lullies, CVA, Munich 5 [Germany 20], p. 18; Beazley, ARV\textsuperscript{2} 23, 7; R. M. Cook, Greek Painted Pottery, London 1972, p. 253; J. Boardman, Athenian Red Figure Vases: The Archaic Period,
FIG. 2. Louvre G 114: Copenhagen Painter, stamnos (A), ca. 480 B.C. Drawing courtesy of F. Lissarrague, after Lissarrague, fig. 71

relates to the customary “toast” by which a kottabos player names the object of his (or her) affections before hurling the wine lees at the kottabos. For this there is abundant literary evidence, although Greek literature gives no examples of a specific formula beginning TOI.\textsuperscript{39}

It is clear that the TOI on the London cup must be an abbreviation of the TOITENΔΕ formula, which is itself generally taken to be an abbreviation of something like τοι τήνδε λάταγα ἵημι “I toss these wine lees for you.” To this formula a name in the dative is added in \textsuperscript{2} and \textsuperscript{4}, \textsuperscript{1} adds a name in the vocative, and \textsuperscript{3} is simply the bare formula. We should expect that the remainder of the inscription on Side A of the London cup will also represent a proper name in the dative in conformity with this pattern. As it stands, however, it resembles no recognizable Greek word, proper name or otherwise. Jacobsthal’s solution to this problem was to take the gibberish at face value: making a connection between the un-Greek word and the un-Greek hat of the man closest to the inscription, he decided that the man must

\textsuperscript{39} Schneider, col. 1538.

\textsuperscript{40} On the authority of Brunn ([footnote 37 above] p. 219) most 19th-century scholars read Εὐθύμιδης, including Jahn (p. 223), who originally read Εὐθύμιδη [footnote 36 above] p. 4). Kretschmer ([footnote 15 above] p. 87, note 3) pointed out that Εὐθύμιδης is not Greek, the vocative being in fact Εὐθύμιδη. K. Meisterhans (Grammatik der attischen Inschriften, Berlin 1900, p. 196) read nominative Εὐθύμιδης, supplying the predicate ἔγραψεν, a supplement which takes no account of καλοὶ lining the other border of the scene and is, in any case, demolished by the attribution of the painting to Phintias. Since the name certainly has nine letters and this does not appear to be an instance where one might allow the nominative to substitute for the vocative, the reading Εὐθύμιδη seems inevitable and has been almost universally adopted, the notable dissenters being Schneider (col. 1538) and Mazzarino ([footnote 38 above] p. 361, note 3), who continued to read the pseudovocative.
speak “echtes oder fingiertes barbarisch.” One year later Wilamowitz made the second and last attempt to explain AXETI, one more purely philological and a little less sensitive to the visual context: “ἀχέτι, was der Nächste sagt oder singt, wird der Anfang eines Liedes an eine Cicade sein, die ἀχέτι sehr gut nach dem ἕχετα τέττικ genannt werden konnte.”

Neither interpretation is satisfying. First, Wilamowitz’ word for cicada has a unique inflexion not known to any Greek dialect. Secondly, Doric ἀχέτας for Attic-Ionic ἕχετης might be excusable if it represents the beginning of a lyric poem, but not on this cup where the fragment of Praxilla incised in the tondo (identified by Wilamowitz himself) is Atticized. Thirdly, Wilamowitz’ interpretation ignores the evident desire of the vase painter to show the hat wearer in conversation with the kottabos player: the man’s gesture is interlocutory and not comparable to the type of the singing symposiast. By contrast, Jacobsthal’s interpretation depends rather too heavily on a single detail of the immediate context, the hat which he terms skythische Mütze, and the assumption that Oriental hats are necessarily worn by Orientals. One might add, incidentally, that no Athenian would have invented a “Scythian word” of this sort, since the distinctive feature of Scythian speech was its failure to reproduce aspirated consonants. This is abundantly clear from Aristophanes’ parody of the Scythian “police” (Thesmophoriazusae 1001–1225).

There is a possible solution to the problem of understanding AXETI which, for a good reason, has eluded previous commentators. A recent cleaning of the cup in preparation for its publication in a forthcoming volume of the Corpus Vasorum Antiquorum (British Museum) has removed modern over-painting of the damaged surface extending below the hat wearer’s eye from the hat’s lappet to his upraised right hand. This 19th-century restoration, visible on all the published photographs (including our Plate 97:b), concealed the possibility of a lacuna in the text, for if the inscriber began his text in the usual fashion by placing the initial letter as close as possible to the speaker’s mouth, the break destroyed every trace of it. As in the tondo, there is ample space for an incised letter between the face and arm of the speaker. One should not hesitate to supply a lambda, the only letter which can offer a satisfactory reading of the inscription: [Λ]AXETI, dative of the Athenian masculine name Laches and a kalos-name which appears six times on vessels by and in the Manner of the Antiphon Painter (ca. 500–480 B.C.).

41 Jacobsthal, 1912, p. 61.
42 Wilamowitz, p. 121.
43 D. Page (Poetae Melici Graeci, Oxford 1967, fr. 752 [Praxilla 8]) is in agreement with Herzog (p. 19) and Wilamowitz (p. 120, note 1) that the singular of the London cup θυράδος is preferable to the plural θυρίδων cited by Hephaestion, yet Page prints the plural in his text. W. Aly (s.v. Praxilla, RE XXII, ii, 1954 [cols. 1762–1768], cols. 1764–1765) unconvincingly denies Praxilla’s authorship of the fragment in Hephaestion and connects the tondo inscription with the “Lokrikon” in Athenaios, 15.697b–c.
44 The “Scythian symposiasts” are now collected in M. C. Miller, “Foreigners at the Greek Symposium?” in Dining in a Classical Context, W. J. Slater, ed., Ann Arbor 1991, pp. 59–81, where their identification as Orientals is challenged.
45 ARV² 1591; a seventh “Laches kalos” is now reported from the Geneva Market (Beazley Addenda² 396). The presence of the name may link (remotely) the London cup with the circle of the Antiphon Painter. D. M. Robinson and E. J. Fluck wondered whether the Tyszkiewicz Painter’s Laches was the same man (A Study of the Greek Love-Names, Baltimore 1937, no. 165, p. 132). Despite the excessively long time frame, Robinson and Fluck argued that the Λάχης καλός of ca. 490 was the Athenian general of the Peloponnesian War, Laches Melanopou (pp. 141–142). Such an association had been rejected by K. Wernicke (Die griechischen
The situation here is exactly parallel to 4, on which the retrograde letters TOITENΔΕ streaming from the mouth of Dionysos are answered by the orthographic ΛΥΚΟΙ, “for Lykos,” streaming from the mouth of the satyr (Fig. 2, Pl. 100). On the London cup, the reading Λάχις “for Laches,” gives a response to the kottabos player’s TOI that seems admirably suited to the visual details of the situation. The two speaking figures are in communication, one making an appropriate response to the words of the other, not Scythian in response to Greek, nor Doric song in response to spoken Attic, but Attic speech for both alike.

The presentation of the “toast” on 4 (Fig. 2, Pl. 100) and on the London cup (Pl. 97:b) in the form of a dialogue shared by two speakers is quite strange and demands some sort of explanation. This must involve us in another longstanding problem of interpretation. Since Brunn, TOI has commonly been deciphered in the light of 1 (Pl. 98), where the retrograde inscription ΤΙΝΤΑΝΔΕΛΑΤΑΣΣΟ appears behind the head of the hetaira (ΣΜΙΚΡΑ) and, on a lower line, also retrograde, ΛΕΑΓΡΕ. The inscription is easily recognized as the Doric phrase τίν τάνδε λατάσσω Λεαγρέ “I throw these dregs for you, Leagros.” On the analogy of ΤΙΝ in 1, TOI is generally taken as equivalent to σοι, the second person singular dative pronoun: τοι = σοι is, in fact, a form found in literary Doric, in Ionic, and hypothesized for Old Attic-Ionic. The major obstacle to this interpretation is the lack of evidence for τοι = σοι in Attic speech. Those who attempt to explain the form regard it as a Doric formula and point to the ancient tradition of the Sicilian origin of kottabos. Now, the problem is that 1 shows that the Doric formula uses the Doric second-person dative singular form τίν not τοι, and so one is forced to hypothesize two (interchangeable) Doric formulas for the kottabos “toast”, one beginning with τίν, the other with τοι. This explanation generates a further problem. The inscribed cups have variations on τοι τήν, not τοι τάν as we would expect if we were really dealing with a Doric formula. Jahn tries to excuse this chimera as a partial Attic naturalization of a Doric phrase:

Aus diesen beispielen geht klar hervor, dass die stehende formel des zurufs beim kottabos war τίν τάνδε λατάσσω oder τοι τήν. Charakteristisch ist es, dass sie einmal rein dorisch, das anderermaul mit dem attischen τήν versetzt ist. Denn sowie es begreiflich is dass von Sicilien mit dem speil und seinen einrichtungen auch die nationalen ausdrücke und
formeln herübergebracht und beibehalten wurden—wie ja bei manchen kartenspielen und beim billiard auch von solchen und für solche, die es nicht verstehen, französisch gezählt und notirt wird—, so konnte es dagegen auch nicht fehlen, dass im täglichen verkehr die gewohnten formen sich eindrängten und ein mischdialect entstand.50

This explanation will have to do, at least for the moment, but one cannot be really comfortable with it: the problem is not in the transference of sympotic language from Doric to Attic, which is paralleled elsewhere and otherwise easily explained,51 but in the linguistic mix and mutation. If the formula is τίν τάυδε (λάτασσω), it does not explain τοι τήνδε. If an unattested alternative Doric short formula τοι τάυδε is hypothesized, it is awkward to explain the partial Atticization τοι τήνδε. Was it to save the alliterative jingle?

The interpretation TOI = ΣΟΙ is further embarrassed by the fact that the inscriptions usually identify the recipient of the “toast” as someone other than the person to whom the kottabos player is speaking. Thus on 1 Smikra “toasts” Leagros in the second person at a symposium where only hetairaí are present (Pl. 98); on 2, similarly, one hetaira is shown speaking to another, but the “toast” is for Euthymides (Pl. 99); on 4 Lykos, the recipient of the “toast”, is presumably someone other than the satyr or Herakles addressed by Dionysos (Fig. 2, Pl. 100). The fact that the “toastee” is nowhere present led Schulze to read TOI not as the second person pronoun but as τῷφ, the definite article, indicating “der Abwesenden”, and in this he was followed by Jacobsthal.52 Wilamowitz also saw TOI as a form of the definite article “das wird nur ‘dem’ sein, ‘dem N.N.’.”53 After Wilamowitz, however, translations continue to read TOI as “for you”.54

The appearance of two painted pots showing a divided “toast” may seem to support the reading TOI = τῷφ. When a kottabos player looks at a fellow symposiast and shouts “for you”, it is not easy to see why the other should answer “for Laches” or “for Lykos”, unless we are to supply a μέν οὐν and dream up a scenario in which the second speaker attempts to deflect the compliment onto the head of another in an otherwise very un-Greek display of modesty. It is better to take it as a single complete “toast” begun by one speaker and finished by another and directed by both to a third party. Yet it is equally unlikely that both speakers collaborate in a “toast” to some second person singular who stands outside the fictional world of the painting as the imagined recipient of the cup: surely if this were the case, we would expect σοι Λάκης, σοι Λάχης rather than σοι Λάκω, and σοι Λάχητι.55 If we accept the reading of TOI as the definite article, we must assume that the partition of the “toasting”

50 Jahn, pp. 225–226.
51 See Beazley, 1943 (footnote 38 above), pp. 102–103.
53 Wilamowitz, p. 121.
54 Schneider, col. 1538; Lissarrague, p. 80; Peschel, p. 73.
55 The normal practice of following a second person pronoun with a proper name in the vocative rather than in the dative suggests that 2 should read τῷ τηνδε Εὐθυμίδη, not σοι τηνδε Εὐθυμίδη. One need hardly point out that the present corpus of kottabos inscriptions, small though it be, is overwhelmingly in support of the pre-Furtwängler reading TOI (see above, footnote 37).
formula between two speakers shows fellow symposiasts breaking in upon a “toast”, either with jocular anticipation or with a humorous perversion of the “toaster’s” intended words. On 3, then, where only one figure appears, the speaker says no more than TOITEN as if inviting the viewer to fill in the blank (Fig. 1, Pl. 100).

There is another possible and, we think, better solution to the problem, one which gives an economic account of both the form of TOI and of the divided “toast” on the vases. It is to read TOI as the common form of the interrogative pronoun “ταύτα,” and to interpret the formula as a question “For whom [shall I toss] the wine lees?” answered by “For Laches!” and “For Lykos!” and on 2, depending on the reading adopted, “For the handsome Euthymides!” But is such a question-and-answer formula consistent with it being a toast? Or does it serve some other function?

The ancient sources allow three different interpretations of the object of kottabos: a dedication, an oracle, or a party game. Accordingly, we could take the words spoken by the kottabos player as a sort of toast or dedication to a lover; as a prognostic question about the possibility of love’s requital, answered by the success or failure of the lover’s throw; or as establishing a prize for the winner of the contest. The inscribed pots have always been read as “toasts”, largely because Euphranor’s psykter (1), with its apparently unambiguous dedication, served as both a paradigm and a sort of architext for the group. Yet on our reading, the London cup does not favor the interpretation of the kottabos formula as either a toast or an oracle. A man just about to toss his wine lees asks “For whom do I make this shot?”; another answers “For Laches”. No notion of “toast” or “oracle” provides a suitable cognitive frame for the interpretation of this text. A lover does not ask another to furnish a suitable object for his toast or a suitable subject for his oracular enquiry.

Forty years ago Paolino Mingazzini questioned the received notions of the function of kottabos and cast doubt upon its alleged “oracular function”. He demonstrated that the concrete situations described in Classical and Early Hellenistic literature show the game played for a prize and frequently for the kisses or erotic possession of a slave or hetaira. He also argued that the function of kottabos as “toast” to a love object was secondary and derivative from its function as contest with a love prize.

The exchange on the London cup is more intelligible within Mingazzini’s framework. The kottabos player asks the man in the foreign hat to set a prize for the contest. He employs a sort of dative of cause or purpose: ταύτα [λάταγα ἵμμι]; (cf. Ηρακλῆς λάταξ in the fragment of Achaios preserved by Athenaios, 668a–b). The man in the hat replies “[We will play] for

---

56 Athenaios, 10.427d: ἣν ἀπ’ ἄρχης τὸ μὲν σπέδειν ἀποδεδομένον τοῦ θεοῦ, ὦ δὲ κότταβος τοῖς ἀρωμένοις.
Laches.” Zahn once suggested that the man in the hat was the symposiarch (βασιλεύς τοῦ συμποσίου):59 if so, we would expect him to be in charge of the distribution of prizes.

If there is one fault in Mingazzini’s argument, it is that he leaves us prepared to place too much emphasis on concrete agonistic situations and too much faith in the relevance of that general mania greca dell’agone60 to the particular context of the symposium. The agonistic spirit is indeed there, but tempered to suit the convivial atmosphere. Symposiastic games, says Plutarch, should skirt the frontier between levity and earnest: “I have heard many say that the most pleasant cruise is that which hugs the shoreline, and the most pleasant walk is that which borders the sea. Just so, the good symposiarch mixes play with earnest, so that the guests are still somehow earnest at their games and, conversely, cheerful while in earnest, holding playfulness in their gaze like sailors looking landward.”61

The inscribed kottabos vases manifest the danger of overstressing the competitive aspect of kottabos. The standard agonistic format with its clear concepts and material rewards is missing. Unlike the literary passages mustered by Mingazzini in which the favors of slaves or hetairai are offered as prizes, it seems fairly clear that the names on the vase inscriptions, Laches, Leagros, Lykos, and Euthymides, belong to free men, and in the case of the first three, probably young aristocrats, whom one cannot literally hand over to the successful kottabos player or otherwise dispose of at will.62 Still less can we suppose that self-respecting Athenian youths of good family have agreed to serve in this capacity: the absence of these ἔρωμενοι on the painted scenes is not likely to be an oversight on the part of the painter. Does what is known of the social context of Athenian life then contradict and override the testimony of the inscriptions interpreted in the context of the painted images? Clearly not; to read the evidence in this way amounts to a “documentary fallacy”. The pots are not, after all, slices of life but elaborate fictions subject to all the distortions which an artist’s wit and fantasy can produce. This is clear from the very setting of the earliest vases (1–3). We may freely doubt the existence of “Hetärensymposien” in Archaic Athens. Did hetairai really get together to drink and play kottabos? Or is this simply a humorous inversion of reality (where prostitutes play for the favors of free youths), an erotic daydream, and the painter’s witty compliment to a παῖς καλός, a symposium joke for the symposium?

The London cup, however, is more realistic in this respect, and perhaps in some sense, it is a slice of life after all. The wit and fantasy which we attribute to the vase painter or inscriber may just as well be attributed to the real-life symposiast: οὗτος παραβάλει τῇ σπουδῇ τὴν παιδίαν. Mingazzini posits a general evolution of the meaning of the verbal formula from a purely pragmatic exchange establishing a prize in a concrete agonistic situation to a final phase in which the original meaning of the formula was lost and replaced with

59 Jacobsthal, 1912, p. 62, note 2; the interpretation is doubted by Miller (footnote 44 above), p. 67.
60 Mingazzini (footnote 58 above), p. 39.
61 Plutarch, Moralia 621 D 5–10.
62 Leagros remains top of the kalos charts in red figure. Lykos was evidently a popular beauty in the earlier 5th century; Beazley suggests that Lykos of 3 is the same as Λύκος καλός (ARV2 1595–1596). For Laches see footnote 45 above. Euthymides is another matter. He is commonly identified with the vase painter, like Phintias one of the circle of the “Pioneers” who frequently address each other on their vases; Euthymides is “kalos” also on other vases. See Beazley, ARV2, p. 30 and Immerwahr, 1990, pp. 58–74, esp. pp. 72–74.
vaguer notions about the dedicatory and oracular function\(^{63}\) of the game. If such an evolu-
tion took place, the London cup exemplifies an early stage in the departure from a material
to a purely ideational content for the kottabos formula, a stage in which the game was
played for an imaginary prize.

APPENDIX

Singers of Lyric Verse in Attic Red Figure

The following list is given in the order of appearance in \(\text{ARV}^2\) for easy reference; earlier
lists can be found in Hartwig, p. 255, note 6, and Herzog, nos. 6–14, pp. 17–21. “Standard”
means that the head is tilted back and the right hand held to the top of the head. “\(\pi\rho\delta\) \(\mu\nu\rho\rho\iota\nu\nu\)” is adopted from Hartwig (pp. 255–258) to refer to men whose head is tilted back
but who extend a garland in the right hand. Singing komasts are included as related mate-
rial. The list does not pretend to be complete.

For lyric inscriptions in other contexts (book rolls, etc.), see \textit{Poetae Melici Graeci} 938
and footnote 24 above. The famous Hipponax fragment is inscribed after firing on a frag-
mentary cup foot: West Berlin, Museum für Völkerkunde 10984: \(\text{ARV}^2\) 214; \(\text{Paralipomena}\) 218.

1. Munich 8935: (A) \(\text{OPOLONTEKEAI} \text{MAKAI} \text{PAN}\) (retr.). Unusually, the singer is frontal and holds
his cup in his right hand at his chest (Euphronios, \(\text{ARV}^2\) 14, 3bis); 1619; \(\text{Paralipomena}\) 322; \(\text{Beazley}\)
\(\text{Addenda}^2\) 152; \(\text{Supplementum Lyricis Graecis}\) 317; Immerwahr, 1990, no. 363, p. 64).

2. *Paris, Louvre G 30: (B) \(\text{MAEKEPOTEAO}\) around head of singer, from mouth. Cf. Sappho, fr. 36 (6
App.) Lobel-Page (\(\kappa\alpha\iota \pi\sigma\theta\iota\iota \kappa\alpha \mu\alpha\omicron\omicron\alpha\); F. Studniczka, \textit{JdI} 2, 1887, p. 162). Reclining lyre player (Euphro-
nios, \(\text{ARV}^2\) 15, 9; 1619; \(\text{Paralipomena}\) 322; \(\text{Beazley}\) \(\text{Addenda}^2\) 152; Immerwahr, 1990, no. 360, p. 63).

3. Copenhagen 13365: (A) \(\Pi\dot{E}N\dot{E}S\). Possibly standard pose; (B) \(\text{IOIOO}\) from mouth of older komast (Kle-
ophrades Painter, \(\text{ARV}^2\) 185, 32; \(\text{Paralipomena}\) 340; \(\text{Beazley}\) \(\text{Addenda}^2\) 187; Immerwahr, 1990, no. 488,
p. 82). (Compare: *Munich 2416: \(\text{OOOOO}\) from Alkaios’ mouth: Brygos Painter, \(\text{ARV}^2\) 385, 228; 1649;
\(\text{Paralipomena}\) 367; \(\text{Beazley}\) \(\text{Addenda}^2\) 228; Immerwahr, 1990, no. 550, p. 88.)

4. Munich 2636: (A) \(\text{EFEI[PE]}\) (retr.). Cup extended in right hand. (B) \(\text{K[AO]SEI}\), sung(?) \(\pi\rho\delta\) \(\mu\nu\rho\rho\iota\nu\nu\)
(Proto-Panaetian Group, \(\text{ARV}^2\) 317, 16; \(\text{Beazley}\) \(\text{Addenda}^2\) 214; Immerwahr, 1990, no. 502, p. 84).

5. *Erlangen 454: (I) \(\text{EMIKE[MA]} \text{ZQNHYPA}\) (\(\Lambda\Omega\)N) *orthograde to mouth, so \(\text{AY}\) are more emphatically
the last letters voiced with \(\Lambda\Omega\)N anticipated. Young komast with lyre (Antiphon Painter, \(\text{ARV}^2\) 339, 49;
\(\text{Beazley}\) \(\text{Addenda}^2\) 218).

6. Paris, Louvre G 316: (A) \(\text{HOPAI}\) (retr.), sung? Standard pose (Antiphon Painter, \(\text{ARV}^2\) 339, 61; \(\text{Beazley}\)
\(\text{Addenda}^2\) 218).

7. *Paris, Cabinet des Médailles 546: (I) \(\text{OPOLON}\) (retr.). Compare No. 1 above. Standard pose (Brygos
Painter, \(\text{ARV}^2\) 372, 26; \(\text{Paralipomena}\) 365; \(\text{Beazley}\) \(\text{Addenda}^2\) 225).

\(^{63}\) Mingazzini fails in his attempt to force the late evidence to support his own theory ([footnote 58 above]
pp. 42–44).
8. *Florence 3949: (I) ΠΛΕΚΑΙ, i.e., φίλε καλ, sung πρὸς μυρρίνην (Brygos Painter, ARV² 376, 90; Immerwahr, 1990, no. 549, p. 88).

9. Possibly: Louvre G 156: (B) Λ,Ε. (Pottier). Komast (Brygos Painter, ARV² 380, 172; 1649; Paralipomena 366; Beazley Addenda² 227).

10. Boston, M.F.A. 10.193: (I) ΣΠΑΝΙΟΝΙΕΝ, i.e. εἰς Πανωνίην, orthograde from lips. Older komast with a lyre ("somewhat akin to the early work of Douris", ARV² 1567, 12; Poetae Melici Graeci 938b).


13. *Athens, N.M. 1357: (I) ΟΠΑΙΔΟΝΚΑΛΛΙΣΤΕ (retr.). Theognis 1365. Singer extends right hand to rabbit below couch (Unattributed, CVA. Athens 1 [Greece 1], III Ic, pl. 3 [25:1]).
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E. CSAPO AND M. C. MILLER: THE "KOTTABOS-TOAST" AND AN INSCRIBED RED-FIGURED CUP
1. Leningrad 644 (St. 1670): Euphronios, psykter, ca. 520 B.C.


b. After Furtwängler and Reichhold, pl. 63

E. CSÀPO AND M. C. MILLER: THE “KOTTOBOS-TOAST” AND AN INSCRIBED RED-FIGURED CUP
a. Courtesy, Staatlichen Antikensammlungen München

b. After Furtwängler and Reichhold, pl. 71.1

2. Munich 2421: Phintias, hydria (shoulder), ca. 520 B.C.

E. CSAPO AND M. C. MILLER: THE “KOTTABOS-TOAST” AND AN INSCRIBED RED-FIGURED CUP
3. Munich 2636: Proto-Panaetian Group, cup (I), ca. 500 B.C. Courtesy, Staatlichen Antikensammlungen München

4. Louvre G 114: Copenhagen Painter, Stamnos (A), ca. 480 B.C. Courtesy, Département des antiquités grecques, étrusques et romaines

E. CSAPO AND M. C. MILLER: THE "KOTTABOS-TOAST" AND AN INSCRIBED RED-FIGURED CUP