

## REVIEWS

CORINTH, DEMETER, AND SICILY  
A review of three publications of Corinthian pottery from  
Demeter sanctuaries in Sicily

C.W. Neeft

‘The quantity of Greek painted pottery retrieved by excavation .... must be greater than most non-archaeologists would imagine in their wildest fantasies’, Snodgrass remarked in the chapter on Economic Realities in his essayistic ‘Archaic Greece’ (Snodgrass 1980, 126-127). I fear that even Snodgrass or whatever other archaeologist has not the faintest idea what is deposited in the museum stores. This situation mainly pertains to Greece and Italy. One could even state that the main hindrance to our knowledge of the ancient Greeks and Italians is formed by the delay in publication of the results of so many excavations. Too many archaeologists do take their secrets into their graves; at times nothing more can be done than publish the list compiled by the excavator, the material having been disappeared in the meantime.

This harsh judgment has some elements of unfairness. Clandestine digging, provoked by the existence of an art market abroad, had to be counteracted by rescue excavation, especially in areas where state and law are weak<sup>1</sup>. Also, the sheer mass of material turns publication into a difficult task. Sicily certainly ranks among the areas in which the conditions described above prevail. It is a pleasure, therefore, to see that three studies are devoted to the publication of (part of) the material found in Demeter sanctuaries in Sicily<sup>2</sup>.

The earliest and most comprehensive of these publications is Christiane Dehl-von Kaenel’s, *Die archaische Keramik aus dem Malophoros-Heiligtum in Selinunt. Die korinthischen, lakonischen, etruskischen und megarischen Importe sowie die ‘argivisch-monochrome’ und lokale Keramik aus den alten*

---

<sup>1</sup> For clandestine digging, see *Antichità senza provenienza. Atti della tavola rotonda*, February 18, 1995, Suppl. to *Bollettino d’Arte* 89/90 (1995).

<sup>2</sup> At about the same time, 1998, Hinz finished a thorough study on the Demeter sanctuaries in Southern Italy. The three authors of the publications under review could not use it nor could Hinz these three publications of material.

*Grabungen*, Berlin, 1995 [ISBN 3 88609 371 9], pp. 436, pl. 85<sup>3</sup>. Apart from sheer publishing the finds, Dehl discusses many issues regarding Selinus and Corinthian pottery. I will confine myself in this review article to these topics. In her first chapter, Dehl gives a survey of the excavations held in the Malophoros sanctuary, basing herself largely on an unpublished thesis of M. Dewailly. A sad affair. The first ten excavation campaigns led to short descriptions only and the retrieved material has largely disappeared in the Palermo museum. The material taken into consideration for this publication comes mainly from Gabrici's excavations (p. 18), but accurate though these were, the material could not be tied to his notes anymore. Thus, the objects have more or less been reduced to art-historical items. Dehl has also come to recognize that selections of various kind have been applied to the material during excavations (also p. 196)<sup>4</sup>. Nevertheless<sup>5</sup>, the material taken into consideration is considered to be representative (p. 21, 304 + note 576).

The second chapter is devoted to Corinthian pottery. Dehl first discusses the method used to establish the hands of painters in Corinthian pottery. Twice she states that the poor results of her stylistic efforts has brought her to realize that these must be due to a too strict an application of the Morellian method. Her arguments are as follows. Most Corinthian pottery is produced in series. The work attributed so far is a stylistically and chronologically coherent output, the result of a painter in a particular mood (*Stimmung*), but painters must have been responsible for other output. Differences in rendering can be expected on pots in other such series by the same painter. So far, everything is theoretically correct, but the proof is in the practice.

First of all, Dehl's reasoning is: because Amyx and I – her work seldom goes beyond his – could only recognize a limited number of painters, there must have been a limited number of painters only. I can state here that I have been able to recognize about three times as many hands as Amyx. Then, the Morellian method is, according to Dehl, only suitable for the distinction of painters' hands in good work (cf. also p. 319), not in Corinthian mass production. I have always understood the contrary. Not the act of will/caprice, but the act of repetition lies at the core of the detection of an identity in the Morellian method<sup>6</sup>. When Dehl comes to her own work, she cannot but admit that she has to proceed in the same way (p. 29) and all her high-handed theories fall flat. How can one attribute another group of vases when most ren-

---

<sup>3</sup> The book has been reviewed by R.M. Cook, *American Journal of Archaeology* 103, 1999, 145-146. The results have been 'verbraten' twice elsewhere: Dehl-von Kaenel 1994 and 1995.

<sup>4</sup> Seeing that the material was found stuck to the sand (p. 19; cf. Giudice/Tusa/Tusa 1992, 24, fig. 10), I wonder whether this selection not has taken place in the museum after cleaning the material.

<sup>5</sup> Also despite the observations made p. 198, 249.

<sup>6</sup> It is only very rarely and when few distinctive elements are available that sloppiness makes the products of two different hands undistinguishable.

derings of details do not show any similarity? And as she singled out my own work as an example, science is more interested in the arguments how the Fol Painter has to be plugged into or on the Dolphin Painter (p. 26 n. 64) than in an opinion that they are the same hand. Of course, stylistic research requires great tenacity, a photographic memory, a lot of documentation, and the results, yes, in the case of Corinthian pottery, are very slow and meagre. Or, as Patricia Lawrence once exclaimed to me: ‘Has the Good Lord me given brains for this.’ Dehl, instead, opts for the flight forwards, a phenomenon aptly labelled by John Boardman as ‘discovering that the best way to deal with the complicated structure of a subject may be to deny its validity’ (Boardman 2002, 13).

In the second part on Corinthian pottery, Dehl discusses the various theories on the absolute chronology and the role of Selinus in it (p. 32-42). Dehl’s account and conclusions largely repeat Amyx’ discussion. I confine myself to Selinus, the core of Dehl’s work<sup>7</sup>. Three problems: one or two foundations, how to relate the Corinthian material to the foundation-date(s), and how to relate the finds from the Malophoros to the foundation of the colony. To start with the last, Dehl comes to the correct conclusion that the majority of the Corinthian pottery from the Malophoros sanctuary dates from the advanced Early and especially the Middle Corinthian period (p. 33). Dehl also correctly states that settlement (Akropolis, Manuzza settlement) and necropolises have yielded very little Late Protocorinthian (LPC) or Transitional (TR) material so far, as did the Malophoros sanctuary (note 114). The point, however, is that, as Dehl rightly concludes (p. 33) but forgets afterwards (p. 314, with false arguments, p. 318), the Early Corinthian material from the Malophoros sanctuary belongs to a later phase than such material from the Buffa necropolis. Thus, the beginning of the deposition of the votives at the Malophoros sanctuary cannot be tied to the foundation of the colony. Arguments in support can be brought in from other sides<sup>8</sup>.

The third part forms the catalogue of the various shapes, each preceded by a lengthy and uninspired introduction<sup>9</sup>. Entries are loaded with descriptions of features of decoration<sup>10</sup> and shape, and with many comparanda, testifying only to ant assiduity. I will give more specific comment on the various entries below, but discuss Dehl’s stylistical work here. Generally, Dehl gives an

---

<sup>7</sup> The topic is hotly debated in the last twenty years, the authors (except for the last one mentioned below) not paying much attention to the arguments of the others: Neeft 1987, 370-371 (not mentioned by Dehl); Bowden 1991, Morris 1996, and Harrison 1996.

<sup>8</sup> I will discuss the issue more extensively in the introduction to the forthcoming publication of the alabastra, aryballoi, amphoriskoi, and exaleiptra from the votive-deposit of the sanctuary of Demeter in Catania by R. Marino, S. La Spina, V.F. Fichera, and L. Grasso.

<sup>9</sup> As in the whole work, there is a lot of redundancy. See, *e.g.*, the introduction on small aryballoi p. 46-47 which tells in words the same story as the first part of table I on p. 424; *cf.* note 222 with note 229 (but *cf.* main text, p. 47); note 80 with comment to

attribution with the left hand and takes it away with the right one, adding to the attribution the label 'or close to the painter'. This type of comment not only reveals an appalling lack of knowledge and sensitivity for style, it is also in contradiction with what she tries to make us believe before, i.e. that the number of painters is limited. As fundamentalist primitivists will certainly embrace Dehl's conclusion in support of their theories (see already so R.M. Cook, *AJA* 104 (1999) 145), it must be eradicated before it comes to fruition. Then, what does the expression 'close to the painter' otherwise mean than that there exists at least one more painter working in a closely related style (cf., however, below). Not the number of painters is limited, but Dehl's knowledge and moderation are. Suffice to point out here that the 26 amphoriskoi attributed by Dehl to the Ampersand Painter (or his circle) come from five quite distinct hands, working in three different workshops. Another seven items or fragments, as yet unattributable, represent as many other painters; only one fragment from among these seven might be from the Ampersand Painter's workshop. And if the number of painters should have been so small as Dehl wants us to believe, why has Dehl not tried to identify these 'few' hands among the kotylai and tall closed vessels?

In the evaluation of the material (p. 304-331) the weakness of the stylistic basis brings forwards disastrous results. Not only leads it to the identification of much less painters than there really are, but as regards material which was first, rightly or wrongly, identified as in the circle of a named painter, she also concludes (p. 311): 'Die Zusammensetzung der korinthischen Keramik aus dem Malophoros-Heiligtum insgesamt scheint jedoch zu fordern, dass ein bedeutender Teil von diesen Importen mit nur einer Hand zu verbinden ist'. As on Procrustes' bed, the evidence is trimmed to fit to the conclusion that there are few Corinthian painters<sup>11</sup>.

Dehl observes that the painters recognized among the Malophoros material match with those known from Selinus in general (p. 314-315). In itself not a surprising conclusion, although it must be pointed out that the comparison is based on very little material from the graves, of which the pottery usually shows great correspondence to votive material, and even less from the settlement. Also, the unattributed or incorrectly attributed material should have been taken into account. Then, it is even less surprising that the limited number of recognized painters is represented in the Malophoros material as well as elsewhere in Selinus.

After a discussion of the function of the Corinthian material in the cult, Dehl tries to derive conclusions for the production in Corinth. First of all, without much argument, she considers the Malophoros material representative for

---

<sup>11</sup> Notice Dehl's method (p. 310-311) to obtain the desired result. First, the Early Corinthian (nos. 617-705) rather than the Middle Corinthian period (nos. 706-820-824) period; then the attribution of 34 items to a highly questionable concept, the Walters Painter; finally, no attention for nos. 668-705 which, unattributable so far, reflect many

Corinth's production (p. 304). The fact that some painters produced a variety of shapes (p. 312, 320) leads Dehl to conclude that there is no specialisation (p. 312), with which she means that painters must have produced a great variety of shapes. Alas, in the Transitional and Early Corinthian period they are usually recognizable in one pot shape only (p. 320). Fault of the Morellian method, according to Dehl. Later she modifies her view and concludes that the 'expansion of production' in the beginning of the sixth century B.C. brought about specialisation. Why not earlier? The point is that there is an expansion in shape repertory at the transition from the Early to the Middle Corinthian period and that there is quite a shift from subgeometric to black-figure decoration. Painters thus become more easily identifiable and on a greater variety of shapes. However, some odd birds apart, including the Sphinx Painter (p. 320) and the Royal Library Painter (p. 312) indeed, painters by and large confine themselves to one particular functional group of pots, either small respectively tall oil-flasks, tall containers, or drinking-vesels, the pyxides apparently being felt as a hybrid category<sup>12</sup>.

Dehl rightly concludes that direct trade brought the Corinthian pottery to Selinus (p. 328) (cf. Neeft 2000, 28). It is, therefore, strange to ponder about trade-routes, and even stranger to conclude that the difference in products and not trade-routes is responsible for the different representation of painters in Selinus compared to Taranto. Apart from a few local preferences, the types of shapes found are quite the same.

As regards the tables, one may remark that they only weigh Dehl's catalogue. In view of Dehl's selection (cf. the comment given at the beginning of each shape section), the preservation policy of the excavators, and the difficulty to weigh fragments vs. complete vases, the tables only roughly indicate the original numbers. As a strategy, I think that one can better indicate exactly the amount of material<sup>13</sup> so that someone who is compiling tables can apply the same criteria to all the evidence at hand.

The profile-drawings and tracings are excellent; one would only wish for more of the latter; the photographs often too dark and without contrast and the printing falls short of German standards. Despite all the critics on method and ideas, to which I should add the way of writing, one cannot be but grateful that Dehl has made the Malophoros finds finally available. One eagerly awaits the publication of its Attic pottery.

As Dehl laconically stated (p. 44), the material from the Malophoros sanctuary was not numbered before nor was it during or after her work. It implies that I

---

<sup>12</sup> See, e.g., the Painter of Bucharest 18796 (Ingoglia, p. 29) and the Oppenheimer Painter (Grasso 1998, 29); cf. Amyx 1962, 7; Blomberg 1983, 33; Blair Brownlee 2003, 190 n. 52.

<sup>13</sup> As has been done by Vallet/Villard 1964.

<sup>14</sup> My thanks are due to dr. C.A. de Stefano, dr. L. Gandolfo, dr. R. Camerata-Scovazzo,

had to identify the material again almost from scratch<sup>14</sup>. I, therefore, comment here only on items illustrated or described in such a way that a correct identification may be assumed<sup>15</sup>.

As regards dating, apart from a tendency to place into the Early Corinthian material which already belongs to the Middle Corinthian period<sup>16</sup>, Dehl simply gives the date that Payne allotted to his various categories. However, there are enough contexts and stylistic arguments to show that the kotylai NC 928-940 and the amphoriskoi NC 1073-1089 are not confined to the Middle Corinthian period, but continue to well into the Late Corinthian one<sup>17</sup>. All this makes the table p. 424-426 a laudable exercise of dubious value.

### 1. Small Aryballoi (1-292)

It is strange to start the catalogue with the small aryballoi instead of the small alabastra, the generally older shape. Dehl (p. 46, 48) incorrectly confines the aryballoi types E and B and those with komasts to the Early Corinthian period. These three types of aryballoi certainly continued into the Middle Corinthian period, although Payne only explicitly said so for aryballoi type E.

#### *Type E* (1-71)

Dehl correctly (*pace* Payne) starts with the aryballoi pendant of the small alabastra type A. I am less happy with her label 'group', which she uses in the way Payne did (cf. n. 38). When the similarity is confined to shape and system of decoration, 'type' is the appropriate description, whereas 'group' should imply stylistic coherence. Entries are loaded with descriptions of decorational features that, as typical for type E, should more economically have been given under a general heading.

3. No compelling reason to see it as a work by the same hand as Corinth KP 1284 and even less to connect these with the Gela Ox-head Painter (cf. further under no. 84). Dehl (and Benson) could better have provided the filling-ornaments in their tracings.
5. Nothing to do with the Bead Painter or companions.
8. Fol Painter, indeed, as no. 6.
11. Royal Library Painter, correctly compared with no. 18.
14. Painter of Candia 7789 (cf. next); comparison to the Lion Group unapt.
15. Painter of Candia 7789, for which see Neeft 1986.
16. Painter of London A 1462; not belonging to the Dolphin Painter's Workshop (p.

---

<sup>15</sup> When an identification cannot be made out trustworthily, the number is given between inverted commas.

<sup>16</sup> See, e.g., the number of oinochoai allotted to the Early respectively Middle Corinthian period (n. 12).

<sup>17</sup> Although the conclusion that the amount of Late Corinthian pottery in the Malophoros sanctuary is more limited (p. 325), i.e. than before, is undoubtedly correct, it is less sparse than Dehl assumes.

- 46-47).
18. Royal Library Painter.
  25. Probably Painter of Amsterdam 601.
  27. Owl rather than swan; Owl Painter, cf. Berne, Kunsthistorisches Museum 22509 and Giessen KIII-20, CVA 1, pl. 12:15-18. Not belonging to Dolphin Painter's Workshop (p. 46-47).
  28. Painter of Reading V.63 (cf. CVA Reading 1, pl. 4:1), active in the Workshop of the Sphinx Painter.
  - 31 ff. Without mentioning it, Dehl, p. 47 rightly saw that my remarks (*Bulletin Antieke Beschaving* 52/3, 1977/1978, 143) referred to this type of aryballoi, which I have now discussed in greater detail (Neeft 1998, 265-285); the references given below are to that publication.
  31. 152.5, p. 277, Thebes' Bird Painter, M-13.
  32. 38452, p. 268, Fledgling Painter, C-2.
  36. 38455, p. 267, Fledgling Painter, B-8.
  37. 38456, p. 269, Painter of Taranto 20688, D-4.
  38. 38457, p. 277, Stevens Painter, L-3.
  39. 38458, p. 273, The Juggler, G-18.
  40. 15201, p. 269, Painter of Taranto 20688, D-3.
  41. 38459, p. 267, Fledgling Painter, B-12.
  45. Does not belong here (p. 48, but cf. 47); by the same hand as *Perachora* II, 153 no. 1624, pl. 63 and Dublin, UCD 553 (V 2007), CVA Ireland 1, pl. 6:9-11.
  46. P. 278, Workshop-19.
  47. By the Juggler (not discussed in above-mentioned publication).
  - 51, 63, 65, 66. are associated with the workshop of the Dolphin Painter in the introduction (p. 47-48) without any sound reason. In all, the number of Early/Middle Corinthian aryballoi to be associated with the Dolphin Workshop comes to twelve certain (nos. 6, 8, 31-32, 36-41, 46-47) and two questionable items (nos. 1, 4).
  - 67-69. Group of the Malophoros Lotus-Palmettes Aryballoi.

#### *Group B, Warrior Group (72-76)*

72. not Equine Constellation, but close to Wellcome Painter, that is, the item should have been listed with the next category.

#### *'Group' C (77-81)*

Dehl conflates Payne's Comast Group (NC 528-532-537) with the simpler specimens with komasts NC 1250-1254. As in fact only no. 72 belongs to Payne's Comast Group proper (*pace* the comment on no. 77), it would have been better to speak about Komast aryballoi. Then, Dehl lists other aryballoi with komasts (nos. 91-94) under the heading 'pantherbird group', although they have nothing to do with Payne's NC 609-621.

77. Falstaff Painter, late (?), that is, the item belongs with such items as *CorVP*, 107:A-21/22 and the aryballos in Eleusis NC 537(*CorVP*, 108:E) which differ



81.       slightly from the core-pieces.  
          Better not listed here.

### *Group D, Lion Group (82-90, 98)*

83. On display in the museum.
84. Although they show different schemes of decoration, no. 84 could very well be the work of the hand responsible for no. 3. However, I do not see any relation to the works of the Gela Ox-head Painter.
91. Painter of Tübingen 1262; by the same hand as *CorVP*, 103:B-5 and B-7, etc.
92. Bestum Painter, late.
99. Kalauria Painter, indeed; for the painter, see C.W. Neeft, in *Camarina, 2600 anni dopo la fondazione. Nuovi studi sulla città e sul territorio* (in print), appendix II. Why speak about a Pantherbird Group? (p. 48)
100. Valleggia Painter; for the painter, see under no. 99.
101. Painter of Rifriscolaro 1705; for the painter, see Neeft, in *Camarina* (see under no. 99), n. 22.
102. Valleggia Painter; for the painter, see under no. 99.
104. Not Pegasus Painter, but closer to the Pony Painter. For the whole complex, see Blomberg 1996, 44-48. Nothing to do with the workshop of the Dolphin Painter (n. 228).
111. Not from the later Dolphin Workshop, but probably from the Workshop of the Kalauria-Valleggia Painters (cf. above under no. 99).
112. Scaglione Painter, early, which phase may still belong to the Middle Corinthian period, indeed.
- 113-114. Herzegovina Painter.
115. Scaglione Painter, early. There is another aryballos from the Malophoros sanctuary, 15203 (2129), with regardant bird to left, by the Scaglione Painter, not included by Dehl (belonging to the 24 items mentioned p. 45?).

### *Warrior Aryballoi (118-198)*

- p. 28, n. 83 Even among these simply decorated aryballoi, hands can be distinguished, *pace* Dehl.
120. American Academy Group (Painter?); cf. Copenhagen, Ny Carlsberg Glypt. IN 3549, F. Johansen, *Greece in the Archaic Period*, Copenhagen, 1994, 148 no. 106, ill.
  122. Probably the Painter of Madrid 32646; cf. name-piece, *CorVP*, 156:1.
  123. Laghos Painter, Neeft 1991b, 127 no. 2.
  - '124' Not from the Agano Workshop.
  - '125' Painter of the Mt. Holyoke Warriors; for the painter, see Neeft 1991b, 128.
  - '126' Agano Workshop; cf. Neeft 1991b.
  128. Painter of Taranto 112459; cf. the name-piece, *Bollettino d'Arte* 46, 1961, 268 no. 1, fig. 1:d.
  131. By a hand that I now call the Painter of the Aphaia Warriors; cf. AA 1993, 564-565 nos. 210-211, 213, where labelled Rhitsona 95C Group.
  165. Painter of Amiens 28.
  166. Painter of the Malophoros Warriors, to which two more items from the same sanctuary can be attributed.



### *Quatrefoil aryballoi*

199. Buonfornello Painter; cf. *Himera* I, pls. G:5, 25:1b; *CVA* Karlsruhe 1, pl. 39:8 (none of the parallels cited by Dehl belongs to his oeuvre, but to that of the Painter of Stockholm 249, *CVA* 1, pl. 9:3). There is another example, 15222, by the same hand among the Malophoros material, not mentioned in catalogue or index p. 431-432.

### **2. Tall aryballoi (293-335)**

- 300-303. I still cannot bring myself to believe that all the works attributed to the Painter of Berlin F1090 are by one hand, *pace* Lawrence 1998 and Dehl, *Gnomon* 74 (2002) 431.
304. Close to the Edmonton Painter (in the Otterlo Workshop), but I don't think it is his.
307. By the same hand as Iraklion 7774 (*CorVP*, 155:C-7), that is by the Painter of the Hatched Blobs.
313. Late Corinthian.
319. Laurion Painter.
320. Winged feline to left.
321. Three joining fragments providing foot (diam. 45); Late Corinthian.

### **3. Ringaryballoi (336-351)**

339. I have now called the hand the Stella 3340 Painter after two items found in Pontecagnano, Stella constr., grave 3340.

### **4. Small alabastra (352-416)**

- 353-354. Thematic, not stylistic similarity to Painter of Bochum S-305.
- 355-356. Kestner Workshop. For the workshop, see Neeft 1991a, 31, where it has been referred to as Mehrengs Workshop.
363. Fol Painter, as I stated, with parallels, the Corinth and Perachora ones among these, in an appendix to the article on the Dolphin Painter's Workshop (Neeft 1977/8) included in my 1984 thesis, a copy of which is in Dehl's possession.
367. Flamingo Painter, Gela G 280 by the same hand indeed.
372. Painter of Amsterdam 601; cf. the name-piece, *CVA* The Hague, coll. Scheurleer 1, pl. 4:10; *CVA* Kassel 1, pl. 7:13; Cerveteri, from Monte Abatone, grave 117.
375. Painter of Candia 7789, late. For the painter, see Neeft 1986.
378. Painter of the Catania Black Cocks
- 394-401. Type NC 376A, characteristic of the Middle Corinthian period.

### **5. Tall alabastra (417-520)**

- n. 275 Plus five more fragments with black-figure decoration (but cf. nos. 432-433) and 21 fragments of mouthplates.
- 418-420. I do not yet see reason to connect these fragments with the Columbus Painter.
421. Painter of London O.C. 376 (*CorVP*, 89; I once called the part, to which no.

- 421 belongs, the Painter of Taranto 20644, *CORINTH, Corinthian Pottery* VIII, ad no. 4, but saw afterwards that it goes with the earlier alabastra listed by Amyx; cf. Taranto 20644, from Vaccarella, grave 8 (4.8.1922).
424. See the much more subtle comment Lawrence 1996, 80, 128:S-7.
425. Does the fragment join entry 434a?
426. Winged feline.
- 428-430. Not Erlenmeyer Painter.
431. Erlenmeyer Painter, indeed. Three joining fragments; cock to right as always in the painter's oeuvre.
- 432-433. Not identified, thus probably not by the Erlenmeyer Painter.
434. Does fragment a join entry 425? Erlenmeyer Painter, indeed.
435. Erlenmeyer Painter, indeed.
- 436-437. No reason to connect these with the Erlenmeyer Painter.
438. Otterlo Painter himself, indeed, early.
442. Not Otterlo Workshop.
- 445-448. Scale adepts who do not belong to the Scale-Pattern Workshop.
449. Close to the Painter of Erlangen I 819, for which see Neef 1991a, 45.
- 450-453. Scale Painter.
- 454-455. Scale-Pattern Workshop.
- 456-457. Scale Painter.
458. Scale-Pattern Workshop.
- 459-460. Scale Painter.
461. Scale-Pattern Workshop.
- 462-463. Scale Painter.
477. Direction unknown; at the left below the wing is a filling-ornament, not part of a tail.
491. D'Aquino Painter; cf. below no. '968'.

## 6. Conical Oinochoai (521-570)

- p. 104 Some juggling with the numbers led to the amount of 50 in catalogue and table XI on p. 424; but cf. the same juggling p. 108 without any effect on the numbers.
522. Elvehjem Painter?; Middle Corinthian.

## 7. Broad-bottomed oinochoai (571-616)

- n. 295 21 more parts of broad-bottomed oinochoai.
579. As far as I can see, nothing to do with the Dodwell Painter.
581. Not likely by the Painter of Athens 931.
589. Japigia Painter; for the painter see further under nos. 1086-1088. From among the comparanda, only the references to the San Simeon item and no. 1087 are relevant.
- 599-600. Painter of Boston F 471 rather than SSWW Painter, but certainly not Ampersand Painter or his companions.

## 8. Oinochoai (617-832)

This sector needs a lot of work; I only comment on issues on which I can be completely certain; it does not imply that I agree with the observations or attributions by Dehl, on which I do not comment.

- p. 116 While thirteen fragments described by Dehl could not be identified, there are 86 more fragments of oinochoai, or better closed vessels other than olpai, with black-figure decoration, among which one that dates from LPC to TR.
- 617-650. cf. also 848-861. The concept of the Walters Painter is questionable to the extreme.
619. Same vessel as nos. 691-692; see there.
652. The comparison with Leipsic T 3256 is interesting, but, the amygdaloid eyes and to some degree the forehead apart, all other details tend to be different.
654. By the Painter of Naples 80253, indeed; another oinochoe by this hand Pontecagnano 14825, from Malangone, grave 590 (L. Cerchiai, *Le officine etrusco-corinzie di Pontecagnano*, 1990, 22 no. 36).
666. By the same hand as Rhodos 12096, indeed; all other attributions by Amyx and Benson to be discarded (cf. no. 679 below).
667. Despite some differences, most probably by the hand responsible for Mormino 413, now Giudice/Tusa/Tusa 1992, 45 no. C 10, figs. 91-93 (colour), for which cf. Blair Brownlee 2003, 191 n. 59; another s.f. oinochoe, Malibu 71.AE.252, is at least very close.
676. NC 743.
679. Canessa Painter (*CorVP*, 222), to which, apart from the two vessels in New York and this Malophoros fragment, I would attribute the fragments Corinth KP-1088 (*Corinth* XV.iii, 88 no. 397, pl. 21; *CorVP*, 145:A-2), the convex pyxis without handles Vienna IV.1830 (*CorVP*, 448), the head-pyxis Dublin, N.M. 1921.100 (Johnston, *Ireland*, no. 299), and the b.b. oinochoe Athens, N.M. 928 (CC 528). The area is under scrutiny, see Blair Brownlee 2003, 190-191.
690. Nonsense comment.
- 691-692. Same vessel as no. 619. The description, thus, should read: I) panther and avian to right; II) panthers facing ram to right.
- 711-713. Nothing to do with Medallion Painter.
714. A third fragment at the left added, now 82 x 100; Medallion Painter, indeed.
715. Medallion Painter, indeed.
716. Painter of Athens 931.
- 717-718. Not enough preserved to ascertain an attribution.
719. Dodwell Painter, indeed.
- 725-728. Painter of Athens 931, indeed.
- 738-739. Nothing to do with the Ampersand Painter or his circle.
740. Not Scale-Pattern Group.
741. A scale adept, not working in the Scale-Pattern Group.

---

<sup>18</sup> The painter is well attested among the convex pyxides, though.

807. The fragment is, from a Corinthian point of view, at least misfired, but its green fabric, brown paint, and several stylistic features make me wonder whether it is 'Geloan'.
- 809-810. A very distinctive style, indeed, in which no. 810 looks earlier than 809.
817. Probably convex pyxis; Late Corinthian.
821. Another fragment added; more animals with some incision.
827. Painter of Louvre E 649, indeed.
828. Not to be compared with the Geladakis Painter, but to be attributed to the Painter of Athens 931, cf. the sphinx on no. 1070, pl. 27.
829. Leontinoi Painter, to which the Zurich item indeed belongs (*CorVP*, 259:A-1).
831. Attic.
837. East-Greek.

## 11. Olpai (848-947)

- p. 144 Seven more wall fragments with black-figure decoration.
848. Nothing to do with the Walters Painter, for which cf. above under 617-650, but with the fragment Göttingen Hu 539e (CVA 2, pl. 11:3), incorrectly attributed by Dehl, *l.c.*, to the Painter of Vatican 73 (for the painter, see Neeft 2000). Cf. also the olpe, once Basel, Market (Cahn, 1963), *Kunstwerke der Antike* 26, 5.10.1963, no. 64, pl. 21, later London, Market (Ede, 1995), *SAMOS, Corinthian & East-Greek Pottery* IX, no. 8, ill. (colour) and there are others, e.g. the olpe Basel, Market (Cahn, 1967), *Kunstwerke der Antike* 34, 6.5.1967, no. 92, pls. 22-23, but the borders of the style are not yet clear to me.
851. Oinochoe rather than olpe.
860. A fragment with dog to left in the lower frieze, a broad band + wRw – wRw, and ray belonging (cf. next).
871. Joins the fragment described as 860d, 98 x 130.
888. The wing probably belongs to a sphinx, less likely a siren. Not Geladakis Painter.
889. Some similarity to the Geladakis Painter, indeed, but certainly not his.
890. By the same hand as a fragment once in the London Market (Ede, 1990), *CARIA, Corinthian & East Greek Pottery* VII, no. 13, ill.
891. Nothing to do with the Scale-Pattern Group.

## 12. Lekythos (948)

No comment.

## 13. Amphoriskoi (949-1024)

Following Payne, Dehl dates all the figural amphoriskoi but one in the Middle Corinthian period, although this kind of amphoriskoi certainly was also produced in the Late Corinthian period.

- p. 154 Three more fragments (one might come from a convex pyxis, though) with black-figure decoration.
- 955-956. Not likely to be by the Dodwell Painter himself; interesting as amphoriskoi are extremely rare in his workshop.
- 957-982. Dehl gives 26 items to the Ampersand Painter or his Circle. First, most amphoriskoi attributed by Amyx to the Ampersand Painter or labelled as probably by the painter, belong to his colleague the Mignot Painter (cf. *CorVP*, 322:A-24). Secondly, the Ampersand Painter, nevertheless, did decorate amphoriskoi. Thirdly, most of the amphoriskoi listed under the Painter of the Louvre Amphoriskoi (p. 155 n. 362) are the work of the SSWW Painter (so named after his preferred drawing of shoulders and ears of felines) and his younger colleague, the Painter of Boston F 471, both not belonging to the Workshop of the Ampersand Painter (cf. Neeft 1995, 401 fig. 16). Fourth, only one (*sic*) fragment, labelled '966', out of the 26 items given by Dehl to the Workshop of the Ampersand Painter *might* actually belong there<sup>18</sup>.



- 957-961 and '962'. SSWW Painter.  
 '963'. Painter of Boston F 471.  
 '964-965'. Japigia Painter (cf. under nos. 1086-1088).  
 '968' D'Aquino Painter (cf. Neeft 1995, 401 fig. 16).  
 971. Horse to left, man facing goat.  
 972 (?), 973-974, 977, 979, 980 (?), 987A, and 988. Candida Painter.  
 975. SSWW Painter.  
 '976' Probably SSWW Painter.  
 978. D'Aquino Painter.  
 984. Godalming Painter (I named the hand 'Charterhouse Painter' – Neeft 1995, 401 fig. 16 - , not realizing that Beazley, *ABV*, 202 had given this name to an Attic black-figure painter of cups). The name-piece of the Corinthian painter was recently sold in the Freiburg Market (Puhze, 2003). *Kunst der Antike* 17, no. 140, ill. (colour).  
 986. Probably Melli Painter (cf. Neeft 1995, 401 fig. 16).  
 '993' Ibbenbüren Painter; cf. *Boreas* 7 (1984) 414 no. 6, pl. 30:7-8; *Himera* I, 95 no. Ac1, pl. 28:3.

#### 14. Bottles (1025-1034)

No comment.

#### 15. Concave Pyxides (1035-1060)

No comment.

#### 16. Kotylai-pyxides (1061-1066)

1061. It would be interesting to connect this shape to the Columbus Painter, but there is little to prove it. The fragments are most likely (some details, *e.g.* the mane, make me a bit hesitant) the work of the Heraldic Lions Painter who used exactly the scheme of decoration found on the upper part of the Malophoros item on the kotyle-pyxis Basel, coll. Cahn 1025 (*CorVP*, 119:A-8). The painter also experimented with ringhandle pyxides: Basel, Market (Cahn, 1990), fragmentary.  
 1062. A tracing would have been welcome here.

#### 17. Convex Pyxides (1067-1202)

- p. 169 No. 1124 not seen, no. 1128 not identified; thirteen more wall fragments with black-figure decoration.  
 1067-1069. The first two probably not by the Dodwell Painter; no reason to associate no. 1069 with the Dodwell Painter.  
 1072. Cf. *CorVP*, 213:B-7.  
 1073. Dipinto.  
 1077. Not to be associated with the Geladakis Painter.  
 1079(-1080?). No relation at all to the Geladakis Painter.

1081. Late Corinthian.
1082. Fragment c does not belong. However, four joining fragments, from rim to well below maximum diameter, giving the opposite side, almost certainly belong: panther facing ruminant, panther to right. Japigia Painter; cf. below under Cat. 1086-1088.
1083. Ampersand Painter, indeed.
1084. Although quite unusual, most probably the Ampersand Painter, indeed.
- 1086-1088. Japigia Painter. Dehl correctly saw that no. 1087 is by the same hand as the San Simeon pyxis and the reference to *CVA Gela 2*, pl. 19 is also most apt. Faced with this material, it is strange that Dehl did not see that no. 1082 is also by this quite distinctive hand. Another convex pyxis, *e.g.*, *Tocra I*, no. 135, pl. 11; *CorVP*, 220:C-4. Among the Malophoros material, the hand is also responsible for another fragment of a convex pyxis, tentatively identified as no. '1086' and also the amphoriskoi nos. '964-965' and the b.b. oinochoe no. 589. For the hand, cf., furthermore, quite surprisingly, the kotyle-pyxis London, Market (Ede, 1994); *SAMOS, Corinthian and East Greek Pottery IX*, no. 17, ill. (colour).
1094. Despite similarities probably not the Ampersand Painter.
1095. Hipponion Painter, late stage. Comparison with *Tocra 136* correct, but not so with Heidelberg 101 and no. 958.
1097. Nothing to do with the Ampersand Painter; apparently by a painter who was influenced by the secondary decoration, but not the style current in the Scale-Pattern Group, as, *e.g.*, the Painter of Stockholm 1654 (Neeft 1991, 46).
- 1101-1106. Another fragment with feline and goat to left by the Stobart Painter not described.
1104. Nine joining fragments: ram to right between feline and panther.
1118. Painter of Syracuse 53809.
1121. Hipponion Painter, latest phase.
1133. Related to the late Elvehjem Painter.
1145. Painter of the Hybrid Avian.
1152. Rather a small narrow footed oinochoe.
1157. Flat-bottomed aryballos; the 'floral' probably decoration of the back.
1186. From a convex pyxis without handles with, originally, black-figure-decoration.
1187. Dipinto.
1190. Foot diam. 52.
1202. Inv. no. 15199; local.

---

<sup>19</sup> For Corfiote III, see Neeft 2001, 87-88; the Selinus fragment bears most similarity to types XI-XII, pls. 41, 229.

### 18. Head Pyxides (1203-1206)

For head-pyxides, see now Katz 1997.

1203. Katz 1997, 17 no. 59 and *passim*; as the Hill-Stead pyxis by the same hand, among the tallest head-pyxides.

### 19. Tripod-Pyxides (1207-1237)

- p. 191 ff. Severeanu, not Severanu.  
1207. Fragments b and c join.  
1209. A photograph kindly given to me by J.L. Benson shows a lid with seven regardant birds to right.  
1212. Painter of Seattle 67.122.

### 20. Powder pyxides (1238-1252)

No comment.

### 21. Pyxis Lids (1253-1464)

- p. 197 Two more lids belonging to 'flat' pyxides with black-figure, one more with silhouette decoration.  
notes 440-441 Better to speak about convex pyxides without handles (and ring-handle pyxides) instead of 'mit convexer Wandung und flacher, breiter Mündung' and about convex pyxides with handles instead of 'mit runder Wandung und hoher, gerader Mündung'.  
1256. Late Corinthian.  
1271. Scale Painter, late or latest phase.  
1272. Not Scale-Pattern Workshop.  
1286. Scale-Pattern Workshop, close to (late work?) the Painter of the Hatched Blobs.  
1384. Not Long Ducks Painter.  
1389. Not Long Ducks Painter.  
1390. I do not see the relation with the Severeanu Workshop.  
1394. From a tall pyxis?  
1395-1401. The size makes it likely that these belong to kotyle-pyxides.

### 22. Exaleiptra (1469-1587)

- 1469-1480. I had called this hand the Painter of Naples 85840 after the item that shows a panther and bird to right in the third panel and which, as Dehl rightly remarks, is a more careful specimen. The Toronto exaleiptron is not by this hand, but there is an exaleiptron in Palermo, known to me from Benson's photographs, which shows three birds in (at least) one panel.  
1471. I did not see a bird to left.  
1472. Does not seem to be a work by this hand.  
1476. The ornament in the shape of a cross is a floral as found on floral kotylai, Neef 1991a, 54-55; cf. also the comment under the Painter of the Queensland Floral Kotylai there. A complete exaleiptron by the Painter of

Naples 85840, Tunis, Bardo 459, from Dermech, grave 290, *Musée Alaoui, Suppl. I*, 289 no. 459; P. Cintas, *Manuel d'archéologie punique I*, 1970, pl. 22 fig. 118 (grave-group), shows this floral ornament on two out of the three panels.

1478. I hesitate, for the moment being. However, the Dermech exaleiptron, for which see under no. 1476, and the fragment Gela 16745/16755 show a filling-ornament which returns on a fragment in Naples with a type of bird not unlike that on no. 1478. Notice that both the Naples and 1478 fragments have a compartmented black zone instead of chequers on the shoulder. If these wooden birds and new secondary decoration are the work of the Painter of Naples 85840, it should be considered a late(r) phase.
- 1481-1492. First, I had already given the name 'Lauffenburger Painter' to a hand in the Oberdan Workshop (Neft 1987, 164 list LXX:B). Secondly, among the exaleiptra under consideration there are two distinct groups, the Geerling and Scicli Painters, with the same motif and (often) the same secondary decoration. Although it is not unfeasible that the Geerling Painter is an early phase of the Scicli Painter, they are best kept apart for the moment being.
1481. Not seen.
1482. Probably Scicli Painter; unusual wing type.
1483. Does not seem to be by any of these painters.
1484. Scicli Painter.
1485. Not enough preserved for an attribution.
- 1486-1487. Scicli Painter.
1488. A: Ruminant to left, b: bird facing goat; Geerling Painter.
1489. Geerling Painter.
1490. Probably Scicli Painter, cf. Vibo Valentia 17139, from Hipponion, Scrimbia votive-deposit.
1491. Not identified.
1492. Geerling Painter.
- 1505-1507. Painter of Naples 85840, although the floral of no. 1505 is rather debased for this painter.
1521. Fragment a shows three rows of chequers; fragments b-c, with feline - not ruminant - to right do not belong: two rows of chequers, less heavy handles and narrower red band than on fragment a.
- 1539-1540. As far as I can see, not the Carrousel Painter.
1543. Not by the Fiesole = Quasimodo Painter.
1544. Two sirens, a sphinx, two sirens, and a sphinx to right, two animals of which the identity could not be made out, two sirens to left; palmette over handle.

---

<sup>20</sup> I would like to mention here also V.G. Rizzone, whose comment on the Corinthian items in Giudice, Tusa, & Tusa 1992 is most competent.

<sup>21</sup> Reviewed by Chr. Dehl-von Kaenel, *Gnomon* 74, 2002, 428-432.

1568. Not Corinthian, on account of clay, decoration system, and the fact that the handle is too deep.  
 1570. Not Corinthian.  
 1572. Clay and handle look local.

### 23. Plates (1588-1667)

- 1588-1609. Painter of the Thasos Plate. Strange to call the hand after a fragment in Thasos, when 22 examples, some of which complete, come from Selinus.  
 1590. Goat facing panther, bull facing feline.  
 1591. Fragment b, with feline to right, does not belong.  
 1595. Bull facing feline.  
 1596. Feline to left, ruminant (but not bull) to right.  
 1598. A bull, indeed.  
 1611. Fragment b: doe facing panther.  
 '1616-1618'. One of these fragments not likely by the Carrousel Painter; no. 1621 not enough preserved for an attribution.  
 1623-1630-1637. The Chimaera Group is recently discussed by Lawrence 1996. I include references to the various entries (nos. 1623, 1625, 1629-1631, 1633-1637 not in Lawrence 1996).  
 1624. Lawrence 1996, 127:S-1.  
 1626. Lawrence 1996, 128:S-4.  
 1627. Lawrence 1996, 128:S-6.  
 1628. Lawrence 1996, 128:S-5.  
 1632. Lawrence 1996, 128:S-8; Lawrence 1996, 128:S-9 saw that fragment b does not belong.  
 1646. The bird's tail may be a filling-ornament; fragments b and c not identified.  
 1650. Lawrence 1996, 127:S-2; why not included in the Chimaera Group?

### 24. Phialai (1668-1685)

1672. Siren, not sphinx.  
 1677. A fragment added to both goats.

### 25. Lekanides (1686-1719)

- 1689 and 1693. I do not yet see the hand of the Painter of Athens 931 in these fragments.  
 1692. Could Payne have interchanged the shapes of NC 1043 and Dehl no. 1594 in his notes?  
 1694. No similarity to Corinth C-36-195; fringe member of Scale-Pattern Group.  
 '1697'. Painter of Athens 931.  
 1715-1716. Most likely painter of Athens 931.

### 26. Cups (1720-1756)

- p. 246 One more fragment with black-figure decoration, two more with silhouette decoration. Moreover, among the material not catalogued by Dehl, there is a fragment of the typical 7th-century skyphos with squiggles in the centre

of the tripartite handle-zone decoration and paint from below the handle-zone downwards.

- 1720-1725. Could better be labelled skyphoi. Nos. 1720-1721 show a line high in the reserved handle-zone, that is representing the type *Corinth* VII.ii, pl. 69 An 70, rather than An 98. A third fragment, giving part of the handle, added to no. 1725. The applied decoration is wRwRw on the lip exterior, w below on the bowl, and R – wRww in the interior of the lip. Its fabric resembles Corfiote III<sup>9</sup>. However, such elaborate applied decoration on the rim is as yet not attested with this clay.
1728. Most likely a later work by the Painter of Berlin Inv. 4507.
1730. Painter of Strasbourg 1533.
1733. Painter of Wellcome R 367/1936.

## 27. Kotylai (1757-3352)

- p. 249 306 more fragments with black-figure decoration, those mentioned under 1855-1870 included.
1759. Moscow Painter.
1760. Photo reversed: ruminant (not feline) to right.
1785. PRK Painter; for the painter, cf. *AntK* 43 (2000) 6 n. 11 no. 2.
1789. Painter of the Gela Floral Kotylai, cf. Carthago 15137, *Cahier de Byrsa* 3 (1953) 27 no. 89, pl. 13; Neft 1991a, 55 (bottom): 3; Grasso 1998, 58-59.
1833. I see greater similarity to the oeuvre of the Painter of Athens 931.
1834. Attribution to the same hand as Montreal 59Cb3 too far a shot.
1841. Not Quagliati Painter, a thematic, not stylistic comparison.
- 1844-1854. Apart from 1844-1846, there are five more fragments by the Painter of the Queensland Floral Kotylai (cf. Neft 1991a, 54-55); I have numbered them '1847-1851'; apart from 1854, there are three more by the Painter of the Gela Floral Kotylai, numbered '1852-1853' and an unnumbered one; cf. also 1789 above.
- 1855-1856. Sodo Painter; for the painter, see Grasso, 41-43.
1861. Cock, not siren, to left; therefore, belonging with 1857?
1871. No reason to connect this fragment with the Workshop of the Patras Painter.
- 1855-1870, 1872. Apart from these, there are five more fragments from the Workshop of the Patras Painter.
1877. Siren to right.
1878. Very close to the Piepoli Painter, for which see the comment on Ingoglia, no. 0.
1879. Apparently Elvehjem Painter.
1881. Nothing to do with the Samos Painter. The style tends towards the very late oeuvre of the Painter of Athens 931, but his double-centred rosettes whirl differently and more densely.
1887. Deserved a tracing.
- 1894-1911. Not Geladakis Painter; no. 1894 probably bird facing panther.

1924. (also p. 312 n. 639) Completely non-sensical attribution to Scale Painter. Not only the scaly rosette, but also the whole drawing is nothing like the Scale Pattern Group.
1995. Another fragment joining: doe, not goat.
1996. Ram, not goat.
2019. Not Corinthian, indeed.
2118. Close to Elvehjem Painter, if not his.
2159. The handles found and added. Painter of KP 14, very late. The painter does not have Dehl's interest: there are eight more fragments by this hand among the Malophoros material.
- 2163-2172, 2360 and six more, labelled '2176-2177', '2193', '2215', '2361', and unnumbered (x-255). KP 64 Workshop. Another fragment, labelled '1972' most likely by the Painter of Mannheim Cg 153. The four parallels cited under no. 2163 all come from the workshop, indeed, but are from three different hands. For the Workshop, see Grasso 1998, 28; also Blair Brownlee 2003, 187-189.
- 2163-2168. Oppenheimer Painter, named after NC 883 (now Oxford, Ashmolean Museum 1933.1662). For the Painter, see Grasso 1998, 291 also Blair Brownlee 2003, 187-188, although she still conflates the Painter of Taranto 20852 and the Oppenheimer Painter.
2174. Painter of Taranto 20565, late, for which see Grasso 1998, 35. Three more fragments by the hand among the Malophoros material.
2186. Painter of the Streaming Palmettes, phase of the Painter of KP 248; for the painter, see Neeft 1995, 371 n. 5; Grasso 1998, 26; Blair Brownlee 2003, 189.
- 2302-2353. Apparently, Dehl counted, more or less, only the rim fragments belonging to the Chaeroneia Workshop (one item does not belong); apart from nos. 2312-2313, there are 19 more wall fragments.
2360. Oppenheimer Painter (cf. under nos. 2163-2168).

## 28. Kraters (3353-3387)

The area needs a thorough study, for which reason I refrain from comment.

Fortunately, there is still hope for the study of Corinthian pottery in Sicily witness the works of Caterina Ingoglia and Lorenza Grasso<sup>20</sup>. Caterina Ingoglia, *Le kotylai corinzie figurate a Gela*, Rome, 1999 [ISBN 88-8265-045-6], pp. 109, pls. 64 is published as a quaderno of the Corpus Vasorum series<sup>21</sup>. It contains the black-figure and the floral, but not the animal silhouette kotylai from the various excavations at Gela up to the early 1980's, that is, the material brought to light when Gela fell under the Agrigento soprintendenza and now stored in the Gela museum. Apart from site and year, however, there is no reference to the excavations.

Much material comes from the 1964 and 1967 excavations of Pietro Orlandini in the Bitalemi sanctuary and from his various excavations in other sanctu-

aries and settlement deposits. Professor Orlandini kindly allowed me to study and photograph the material for study purposes in 1979/80. When Ingoglia addressed me in 1994 with the results of her research I could inform her with corroborative or corrective evidence, from which she has quoted freely, generally with due acknowledgement. I have more problems with her name-giving. Too many 'Painters of Gela', although I informed here that I had given a hand another name, after a more complete or otherwise better specimen (cf., *e.g.*, under no. 180). Generally, too, there is a tendency to invoke too easily a painter, where the simple mention of a comparandum would suffice. The study starts with a useful, concise survey of the excavations. One can only feel admiration for the tireless efforts of Adamesteanu and Orlandini to rescue endangered material and for their prompt preliminary reports. After some remarks on the conservation and firing of the pottery, follow some interesting observations on the type of foot in relation to the workshop, a subject certainly worthwhile to be pursued in depth. The greater part of the introduction is devoted to an analysis of the painters recognized among the Gela material. Personally, I would prefer to have had it just in front of the entries in the catalogue. After this quite short introduction follows the catalogue. Some comment on the following catalogue numbers.

5. Comparison with the Taucheira Painter, but an attribution is too far-fetched for the moment being. For the Taucheira Painter, see now Lawrence 1998.
10. Most likely Piepoli Painter, indeed. However, except for the lotus-palmette chain strict formal links are missing as yet. I will discuss the hand in a forthcoming volume of *BABesch*.
- 12-17. There is a sound nucleus in nos. 12-14 for a Painter of Gela 20154, close to the Corinth Pyxis Painter, for which see *Corinth* XV.iii, 83 under no. 372, but nos. 16-17 certainly are not his. Does no. 15 not join no. 14? The reference to Florence 78139 at no. 16 is most apt.
- 25-26. Very close to, but in my opinion not by the Lowie Painter.
27. The available illustration does not give a clue to ascertain the attribution.
- 39-40. No reason to see these entries as products of the same hand.
45. Panther facing goat, bird facing ruminant. Why are the second ruminant to left (*sic*) and the bird not rendered in the tracing fig. 4.
54. Cf. the narrow footed oinochoe, not kotyle, Paris, B.N. 4754.
68. The entry is (not compare with) *CorVP*, 188:A-55.
76. The entry is (not compare with) *CorVP*, 188:A-59; *Corinth* VII.ii, 39 no. 40.
95. And the elbow of a second komast.
- 93 and 96. Descriptions or illustrations interchanged.
106. KP-64 Workshop, for which see Grasso, 28.
- 107-109. Ingoglia makes a good case that these kotylai with rosettes alternating with circles have to be grouped with the Painter of the Gela Floral Kotylai,

---

<sup>22</sup> L. Grasso came over to Amsterdam twice to work with my files and lists of attributions. The numbers of attributions she gives reflect the situation in 1994.



- although, curiously, she does neither mention it with entries 107-108 nor in the text, p. 25.
130. Neeft 1991a, 55 no. 5 (but erroneously listed with Gela Floral Kotylai there).
- 146-149-155. 'Painter of Gela 18494'. Nos. 147-148 do not seem to be by the same hand as one of the others. Nos. 146 and 149-152 *may* in the end turn out to be by one hand, but the evidence is very slight. Nos. 153-155 are further away and are not likely to have to do with any of the foregoing.
156. I doubt that these fragments come from the same vessel or are by the same hand.
- 157-161. Painter of Gela 28434, a sound concept, close to (but probably not the same as the later) Painter of Rouen 1687, for which see Grasso, 36.
- 163-173. Hipponion Painter, for which see Grasso, 72. I am less sure about no. 168. Orlandini 1960 (under no. 173) not mentioned in bibliography.
- 180-182/3. Painter of Gela 18015/Rennes Painter/Laon Kotylai Painter. Although I am aware that one should not change a name once given to a painter, I really prefer the name 'Rennes Painter' as the name 'Laon Kotyle Painter' is cumbersome, its name-piece much restored, Benson's attributions only pertaining to the painter's late stage, and the name 'Rennes Painter', by way of the German language, suggestive for the particular stance of the panthers. Although I informed the author about all this, she found it opportune to keep her non-descript, equally new name 'Painter of Gela 18015'.
182. Painter of KP 14, cf. Syracuse 67483, from Predio Spagna, grave 59 and two fragments from the Malophoros sanctuary, not illustrated by Dehl.
205. Ingolia may very well be right that Corinth KP 1690 and no. 205 are by one and the same hand, but a simple reference suffices.
206. Another fragment by the Painter of KP 14 from the same phase is Gela 11822, from Predio La Paglia.
215. I don't think that the item is a (very late) work by the Painter of KP 14. His birds always go to left in the late stage.
219. For the painter, see now Blair Brownlee 2003, 187 (Painter of KP 13). I have chosen 'Painter of Mannheim CG 153' to avoid constipation in the KP range. Ingolia's reference to the Cieszyn pyxis is most apt, as it is a work of the Oppenheimer Painter, for which see the comment on Dehl nos. 2163-2168.
229. I have called this hand the Enna Painter (cf. also Grasso, 21) because Benson's label PQ Kotyle Painter seemed rather awkward to me. I had the impression that no. 231 and no. 232 (20631, from Bitalemi, not Molino a Vento) are from the same vessel as no. 229.
240. I have this fragment as 10796, from Tempio Dorico. I suppose it is correct as I did not have permission to study the Molino a Vento 1973 material.
248. Probably regardant bird facing panther. I see little reason to connect this frag-

---

<sup>23</sup> On the other hand, the oeuvre of the Giessen Painter (*CorVP*, 185) seems to be an elaborate version of the Painter of Corinth MP-6.

- ment with the Painter of Bucharest 18796.
250. Piepoli Painter, the attribution not accepted by Ingoglia. Does it join entry 333?
258. Probably attributed on account of the filling-ornaments. I think that more evidence is needed.
- 265-272. Painter of Gela 31343. There are at least two painters in this area, for the moment easiest distinguishable by the type of swan and goat. Gela 20302 (no. 267) must be by the same hand as Syracuse 52126. Its panther type is completely different from that found with nos. 265-266 and 268. At a second glance, differences can also be observed in the drawing of the head of the swan, the type of filling-ornament, and muzzle and ear of the goats. Syracuse 21525 is a later work by this hand and so seems Stockholm 1307. With the other pieces, the situation is even less clear. There seems to be a group with nos. 265 and 271 on one hand, another with Gela 23337 and Tarquinia RC 1648 on the other, and further the isolated items nos. 266 and 268. And although nos. 269-270 – I'm less sure about no. 272 – belong somewhere here, they cannot be allotted more specifically.
- 278-289. Another fragment, with felines facing ruminant to right, by this hand comes from the Bitalemi sanctuary. I noted its inv. no. as 16592, again (cf. no. 211).
281. Painter of KP 14, very early. Although I brought this attribution to Ingoglia's attention, she apparently is not convinced.
283. Another fragment from Bitalemi, 23604, certainly by the same hand, may belong to the same vessel. For the painter, see bibliography under Dehl no. 2186.
284. Again unnecessary and undesirable constipation of Gela Painters. As far as I can see, the Megara Hyblaea fragment does not seem to be work of the same hand.
311. Patras Painter, early; cf. Taranto 143552 (ex coll. Rotondo).
333. Does this fragment join entry 250?
347. My notes give 29774 as inv. no.
348. The unnumbered fragment apparently not illustrated.
349. My notes say that 27542 joins 27551: panther facing goat.
358. Does this fragment not belong with no. 35?
395. My notes give 24152 (drawer 330) as inv. no. and Bitalemi as provenance.
396. I now think that this fragment is also by the Malangone Painter, i.e. the painter responsible for four kotylai in Malangone, grave 591 at Pontecagnano (cf. Grasso, 37).
429. My notes give 29777 as inv. no.
- 511-514-515. Painter of Gela 20071. For the moment being, I can only be certain about Kiel B 35 and Gela 28463, whence Painter of Kiel B 35, as I informed the

---

<sup>24</sup> For which see now Risser 2001, who, however, does not discuss this type of kotylai except for the BK Workshop, *ibid.* 142-145, pls. 138-139.

- author. The other attributions of Ingoglia may form a later stage of this hand, but there are too many differences to warrant a firm connection now.
556. Too far-fetched an attribution.
565. Malangone Painter, for which see under no. 396; cf. CVA Stockholm 1, pl. 18:1-4.
567. I would label it 'close to the Malangone Painter'.
577. Although it is a strange subject for a kotyle, Potnia Theron?
611. Close to the Painter of Dublin 1883.374 and most likely his; cf. especially Pontecagnano 35256, from Malangone, grave 591.
- 613-615. The long tails of the ruminants do not seem enough to warrant a 'hand'.
644. Probably Cremona Painter; the reference belongs with no. 645.
646. Probably Chaeroneia Painter proper.
653. Looks more like Chaeroneia Group.
693. Neeft 1991a, 58 (cf. Grasso, 57).
694. The attribution is too far-fetched.
- 701-702. Not likely Painter of KP 14, but a drawing of no. 702 (the numbers interchanged on pl. 59) could have convinced me.
703. No reason at all to connect the item with 'Painter of Gela 31343'.
745. My notes give 12075 as inv. no. and 12072 as that of a kotyle fragment with a wing.

There is no index on the inventory numbers. The index on painters and workshops has simply kept the order of presentation and is not alphabetical. A competent text editor should have pointed this out.

As Ingoglia states, the material is generally quite well preserved. When not, good photographing and printing could help a great deal to overcome the problems. However, the Bretschneider printing turns out to be the usually bad one. Here, tracings would be welcome. Unfortunately, those given are often not sharp and parts of outlines and incisions are omitted or have fallen out. There is no difference in thickness between outline and incision and the printing is quite fat. The profile drawings have apparently undergone a bit-mapping phase.

Work in Gela in the second half of the 1980's and early 1990's of the last century and in a museum with a strange macho sphere must have been quite unpleasant. It shows itself in the addition of another 82 fragments after the catalogue had been completed. The subject also is enough to drive someone completely mad. When Ingoglia started her work, there was only Benson's 1983 article to go by and Amyx paid very little attention to the painters of this shape. One can only appreciate Ingoglia's efforts to turn this unmanageable material into a product of sound science.

Lorenza Grasso, *Kotylai e coppe corinzie figurate. Stipe votiva del Santuario di Demetra a Catania* 4/1.i., Catania, [1998], [no ISBN], pp. 141, pls. 52. In the summer of 1959 Giovanni Rizza excavated part of a votive-deposit at

Piazza San Francesco in Catania. The extent of the deposit is unknown. The present fascicle is the first in a series aiming to publish this mass of material. After a short but highly illuminating introduction about the positions various scholars have taken in this particular field, Grasso states that 475 out of 502 kotylai with black-figure decoration could be attributed. The material is then presented according to painter, each introduced by a history of scholarship<sup>22</sup> and a, always difficult, short outline of the characteristics of style.

- 1-6. The attribution to the Painter of Corinth C-47-603 and the South-East Workshop is apparently based on the drawing of the groin of the ruminants. This whole complex needs fuller documentation of the material in Corinth in order to ascertain the attributions.
- 8. Seems later than the Pithekoussai-Moscow Group and I do not see the similarities with Taranto 20673.
- 9-18. Painter of KP 14, in a strange order, beginning with the latest and more or less ending with the earliest specimen. I am not certain about the attribution of no. 12. For the painter, see now also Blair Brownlee 2003, 186.
- 20-45. Enna Painter. Better: goat, panther and bird to left, except for the early works, to which no. 20 belongs. The painter is also responsible for the pyxis lid, CVA Karlsruhe 1, pl. 40:11.
- 46. I cannot be sure about the attribution to the Painter of Dublin 1883.374.
- 49-56. For the painter, see now also Blair Brownlee 2003, 189. I have problems with no. 49, of which the filling-ornament and the type of bird are outside the painter's range, but which serves well to underscore the observation made by Blair Brownlee, *l.c.*, that there is some relation between the KP-64 Workshop and the Painter of the Streaming Palmettes. For nos. 50-51, a tracing would have been welcome.
- 57-70. KP-64 Workshop. It should be observed that the type of leaf-rosette with loose strokes (for which see also no. 49) is typical for the workshop, not only for the Oppenheimer Painter (cf. no. 63). For Rennes Painter, see comment on Ingoglia, nos. 180-182/3.
- 71-83. The two painters represented here have received a fuller discussion by the author in *BABesch* 75 (2000) 165-167. The fragment Cambridge, Museum of Archaeology AG 204 provides an argument to see no. 82 as a work of the painter of Catania KC 4144.
- 84-85. Painter of Taranto 20565. No. 85 not likely by this hand, as only panthers to left are ascertained for his work so far. A tracing of the panther's head could have helped.
- p. 36 Lupoli Painter. The kotylai painter I once named Lupoli Painter has now been labelled Masseria Tesoro Painter, as the name 'Lupoli Painter' has been used for a painter of Late Corinthian aryballois, cf. Blomberg 1996, 21.
- 106-239. Patras Painter and his Workshop. I don't think that no. 118 belongs here. I will try to work out the chronology of the Patras Painter and his associates in the near future.
- 241-250. Painter of Corinth MP-6 and manner. For the hair of the sirens/sphinxes on