Introduction: Reconstructing the Performance Reception of Greek Tragedy in Antiquity

In a fragmentary speech probably dated to AD 96, Dio Chrysostom describes an unflattering episode from his days in exile. Invited to deliver a speech in Cyzicus, he made his way there and got ready to address his audience only to see them drifting away, choosing a citharode's performance over his lecture. The citharode upstaged him, but Dio humoured the crowd, joined them and later mentioned this episode to illustrate his fondness for all types of performance but especially drama. Dio is keen to explain why citharodes and actors are better performers than orators. Their voices are more pleasant to hear, their texts well-crafted and the authors of these texts worthy of respect: 'most of what [actors] give us,' he writes, 'comes from ancient times and from men much wiser than our contemporaries.' Dio mentions again these plays 'from ancient times' in another work in which he exposes ambition and its dangers. After reviewing the many legends surrounding the house of Pelops, from the golden lamb to Orestes' fit of madness, Dio urges his audiences and readers to believe in these stories, 'which were written by no ordinary men, Euripides and Sophocles, and are also recited in the midst of the theatres'.[1] Dio refers to these myths as Euripides and Sophocles treated them in their tragedies and emphasises that they deserve to be trusted. They matter not only because of their venerated authors but also because of the actors who keep staging them. Their survival in contemporary theatres adds to their cultural capital.

For most of antiquity, Greek tragedies circulated both as performance scripts and written texts; they had a 'double life'.[2] The dramatic productions mentioned by Dio promoted their dissemination just like the many papyri and ancient books that preserved their texts. While both types of sources help us reconstruct the enduring appeal of Greek drama in

[1] D. Chr. 19.5, 66.6; **SPT 6** [366] and **7** [367]. See Jones (1978) 135, 110 on these speeches and Saïd (2000) on Dio's use of mythology in general. Dio's claim that actors are superior to speakers stands out. The fact that actors recite texts composed by others has elsewhere negative connotations: see Webb (2019) 317–18, comparing this passage with Lucian, *Salt* 27 and Plu. *Mor.* 345e.

[2] The expression is by Webb (2019), who focuses on the afterlife of tragedy under the Roman Empire.

general, performance-related records belong to a specific strand of its afterlife – one involving actors, stages and audiences. This strand is the subject-matter of this book.

Greek dramatic texts were originally meant to be staged in open-air theatres: poets composed them for performance, and actors and choruses delivered them to an excited audience as a piper provided musical accompaniment. Obvious as it is by now, this point is a relatively recent one. We owe it to several works published over the last fifty years or so and generally known as performance studies. Focusing on the theatrical aspects of dramatic texts, performance studies reconstructed how ancient plays were produced and how specific poets crafted their scripts.[3] As the venue that hosted the premiere of most surviving plays, fifth-century Athens and her Theatre of Dionysus dominate these scholarly narratives, rooting them all in a specific and well-defined historical context. Central as they are in performance studies, they both faded into the background when performance studies intersected with another scholarly trend now forming a distinctive subfield, reception studies. The focus shifted from premieres to post-premiere performances or reperformances, as they are usually called, and work in this area took two main directions. One turned mostly to contemporary stages and the other to their ancient counterparts.[4]

The single main impulse that pointed scholarly research in the second direction came from vase-paintings. After an increasing number of vessels from fourth-century Sicily and South Italy were identified as reproducing specific Greek (Attic) tragedies and comedies, Western Greece became a focal point of attention.[5] So did also Macedon and Attica, as scholars pieced together all kinds of records for how Greek drama spread outside the city of Athens: literary sources on travelling poets, theatre-related inscriptions, remains of theatrical buildings as well as select passages

[3] Select references: Taplin (1978), Mastronarde (1979) and Bain (1981) on tragedy in general; Taplin (1977) on Aeschylus, Seale (1982) on Sophocles and Halleran (1985) on Euripides. More recent works include Rehm (1992), Wiles (1997), Ashby (1999) and Powers (2014).

[4] The Archive of Performances of Greek and Roman Drama, which is an Oxford-based research project, was instrumental in promoting studies on modern performances of ancient plays. Founded in 1996, it originally focused on performances from the Renaissance to the present day, later extending its remit back in time and across genre. It produced works such as Hall, Macintosh and Wrigley (2004) and Hall and Macintosh (2005). Other influential studies include McDonald (1992) and Foley (2012).

[5] See pp. 7–11 for select references.

from dramatic texts supposedly appealing to non-Athenian audiences.[6] The topic grew in popularity, and articles gave way to books. In 2014, Vesa Vahtikari treated both premieres and subsequent performances in his *Tragedy Performances outside Athens in the Late Fifth and the Fourth Centuries BC*. Anna Lamari can claim credit for the first two books featuring reperformances and reperforming on their covers: the volume that she edited in 2015, *Reperformances of Drama in the Fifth and Fourth Centuries BC: Authors and Contexts*, and the monograph that she authored in 2017, *Reperforming Greek Tragedy: Theater, Politics, and Cultural Mobility in the Fifth and Fourth Centuries BC*. Published shortly after Lamari's monograph, Edmund Stewart's *Greek Tragedy on the Move* (2017) covered much of the same ground to argue that tragedy spread much earlier and much faster than generally thought. I also count at least one recent reference work with a dedicated entry on reperformances and at least one companion with a whole chapter on them.[7] The second volume of *A Social and Economic History of the Theatre to 300 BC* by Eric Csapo and Peter Wilson, which appeared in 2020, is subtitled *Theatre beyond Athens: Documents with Translation and Commentary*. As a massive collection of sources documenting how theatre reached all corners of the ancient world, this volume is, in many ways, the culmination of this scholarly trend.

While this book adopts the same multidisciplinary approach that characterises all these studies and builds on their findings, my focus and my scope are both different. At its core, this work collects the records for the performance reception of Greek tragedy from the fourth century BC through to the third century AD. My main interest is in the tragedies that ancient actors continued to stage, and ancient audiences continued to watch: their titles, their authors, the features that made them successful, how they were selected and how they relate to the preserved tragedies. As it turns out, the performance reception of Greek tragedy in antiquity is largely concerned with fifth- and fourth-century scripts. At least occasionally, however, Roman Republican tragedy does offer a few glimpses into later plays and their survival.

I will detail below the records that inform my discussion, but I hasten to make a few points on terminology. First, here as throughout the book, I draw a distinction between the first, original production of a play and a subsequent staging by using the terms 'premiere' and 'performance' or

[6] Select references: Taplin (1999) and Dearden (1999) on reperformances in general; Revermann (1999–2000) and Moloney (2014) on Macedon; Csapo (2004) on Attica and Easterling (1994) on select lines from Euripides' plays as possibly related to later productions.

[7] Entry: Summa (2019). Companion chapter: Lamari (2020).

'post-premiere performance' whenever 'performance' could otherwise create confusion. I consistently avoid both 'revival' and 'reperformance' for several reasons. Revival implies loss and resurrection, conjuring up notions of dead plays and daring actors, while reperformance makes later productions sound secondary and unoriginal. In short, neither term presents these productions for what they were, theatrical events in their own right. This is why we do not use these expressions when talking about contemporary productions: theatrical companies do not revive or reperform *King Lear* or *Hamlet*; they perform them.[8] Second, my interest is in the tragedies that circulated on various stages, and the expression 'performance reception' is deliberately broad and flexible, covering performances in Greek as well as in Latin. Roman tragedies are Latin adaptations of Greek plays staged for Latin-speaking audiences and, as such, they are part of the theatrical afterlife of their Greek models. In other words, Roman drama can be treated as a special chapter in the history of Greek drama in performance.

The records are listed in two Appendices. Appendix I collects the sources related to identifiable tragedies and Appendix II those related to their unidentifiable counterparts. Either way, I call these plays 'repertoire tragedies' or 'theatrical classics'. Note also from the onset that over half of the tragedies listed in Appendix I are attested more than once. If some of the sources listed in Appendix II do belong to identifiable tragedies, the number of instances could be higher.[9] As Vahtikari (2014: 215) already noted, 'the same tragedies . . . pop up again and again when discussing the different types of evidence'. This trend is important because it suggests continuity in actors' activities. As I note in my epilogue, this pattern is probably rooted in a well-documented practice that characterises the world of ancient actors and artists in general: the transmission of their craft through family traditions.

Both Appendices collect four main types of records: inscriptions, literary sources, tragedy-related vases and Roman tragedies. They are chronologically arranged under five major headings: fourth-century Athens and Attica, fourth-century Sicily and South Italy, Republican Rome, select sites during the Hellenistic period and select sites across the Roman Empire.

[8] Both Hanink (2017) 34 and Jackson (2019) 90 make similar points.

[9] D. Chr. 66.6, **SPT 7** [367], for instance, suggests to me performances of both Euripides' *Orestes* and Sophocles' *Thyestes at Sicyon*. At least some of the Roman tragedies listed in Appendix II could also be based on plays listed in Appendix I but we do not have enough fragments to identify them.

Epigraphic and Literary Sources

Epigraphic and literary records are both geographically and chronologically diverse. We have several inscriptions, mostly catalogues from specific festivals, documenting dramatic activities. They attest to premieres and performances until the third century AD, in both the Greek- and Latin-speaking parts of the Roman Empire. Some festivals left behind more records than others, but only very few of these records name the plays staged. Since they lack specific details, inscriptions are necessarily fewer in Appendix I than in Appendix II.

By contrast, literary sources tend to refer to identifiable plays. I count a little over forty passages recording or suggesting post-premiere performances, and relatively few of them speak to performances in general. They come from all kinds of works: court speeches, biographies, philosophical and historical writings as well as epigrams and comic texts. As for comedy, I list in Appendix I only one passage that explicitly refers to tragedy on the stage, but I discuss several comedies suggesting exposure to specific tragedies.[10] Literary references also come in different formats, ranging from passing remarks to stories about audiences and actors. Add also at least a few comments scattered in the notes that accompany the preserved tragedies, the scholia, which probably shed light on dramatic activities in Hellenistic Alexandria.[11]

The scholia provide information of all sorts, and while I include comments related to post-premiere performances, I exclude those that typically fall under the heading of 'actors' interpolations'. It stands to logic that actors of all periods tampered with dramatic scripts, but the interpolations that ancient scholars detect in the texts are all problematic. Scholiasts report a handful of instances, all aimed at 'actors' in general rather than a specific performer and often based on the authority of a specific scholar, especially Didymus. These claims are sometimes phrased as guesses.[12] Specific charges include misattributing lines, slightly changing individual words or verses, omitting a sense pause and adding one line in one case and

[10] The relevant passage is Men. *Epit.* 325–33, S. *Tyro B* ***T1** [303]. For comedies suggesting exposure to specific tragedies, see pp. 55, 71–2, 107–8.

[11] See further pp. 191–3.

[12] The case against the authenticity of the extant prologue of *Rhesus*, for instance, rests on the claim that 'it may well represent a revision by some actors': so hyp. (b) *Rh.* p. 431, ll. 31–2 Diggle. But see also Fantuzzi (2015).

three lines in another.[13] These are the kinds of mistakes that scribes could easily make.[14] Even if we assume that they go back to performers, they cannot qualify as 'expansive interpolations' motivated by an actor's desire 'to add something of his own'. We know that actors became increasingly visible from the fourth century onwards, apparently overshadowing poets in Aristotle's opinion, but the actors' interpolations mentioned by ancient scholiasts are nowhere substantial enough to justify this theory.[15]

Modern scholars continue to debate how much the extant tragic texts suffered from interpolation and how much of this interpolation is due to performers. This debate rests, more generally, on another one: the relationship between actors' copies and the extant texts and the impact that the performance tradition had on the textual one.[16] While some scholars credit actors for tampering with our texts at several junctures,[17] only three tragedies are generally thought to show histrionic interventions on a large scale: *Seven against Thebes*, *Phoenician Women* and *Iphigenia at Aulis*. The case of *Iphigenia at Aulis* is unique because the play, which premiered after Euripides' death, may have been left unfinished and was also apparently interpolated at various periods,[18] but the suspected alterations to both *Seven against Thebes* and *Phoenician Women* share some similarities.[19] The ending of the *Seven against Thebes*, which brings onto the stage Antigone and Ismene, seems to have been crafted under the influence of one or two tragedies, Sophocles' *Antigone* and Euripides' *Phoenician Women*.[20] Although there is no agreement on the extent of

[13] See, respectively, schol. E. *Med.* 148 and 169; *Med.* 228, 356, 380, 910 and *PW* 264; *Med.* 84; *Andr.* 7 and *Or.* 1366. Finglass (2015) provides translation and discussion of all these passages, summarising the relevant bibliography (p. 264 n. 23). Hamilton (1974) remains fundamental.

[14] Finglass (2015) 270. See also Lamari (2017) 128.

[15] Page (1934) 118 (quotations), Arist. *Rh.* 1403b33.

[16] Hamilton (1974) 402 concludes that 'although there was clearly reworking of plays for dramatic production, there is no objective external evidence that the dramatic texts had any influence on our texts'. Mastronarde (1994) 39–49 holds a similar view but allows that actors' interpolations could infiltrate readers' copies. It is worth noting that performers' scripts do not look like readers' copies. See further on P.Oxy. LXVII. 4546 (E. *Alc.* **Pap1** [305]), discussed on pp. 194–5.

[17] Kovacs (2005) 382 briefly surveys different kinds of suspected interpolations ranging from one line to longer passages and arranges them into six categories.

[18] Scholars have debated how much the text of *IA* has been altered and interpolated: see especially Diggle's edition (1994) and Kovacs (2003) esp. 102–3 with Appendix. The end of *IA* features linguistic and metrical anomalies unanimously credited to a later scholar: see further West (1981) 74–6, who suggests a date between the fourth and seventh century. Collard and Morwood (2016) 55–9 provide a recent and valuable survey of the whole debate ('the issues of authenticity and interpolation') while inclining strongly to 'editorial tolerance'.

[19] As noted by Scodel (2007) 144–5.

[20] A. *Th.* 1005–78. For this scene as spurious, see esp. Hutchinson (1985) 209–11 with earlier references and Sommerstein (2010) 90–3. See also Scodel (2007) 145 for its suspected sources.

interpolations marking Euripides' *Phoenician Women*, the play's final part has generated most controversy. For one scholar, it may have been 'added to reflect the events of both *Antigone* and *Oedipus at Colonus*'.[21] If we tie these interventions to ancient producers and identify these texts with their copies, we could have here a glimpse into the early reception of Greek tragedy on the stage.[22] The records collected in this book are limited to ancient sources and do not include the histrionic interpolations identified by modern scholars. It is worth noting, however, that nearly all the tragedies named here as possibly interpolated or mined by ancient producers do come up in my Appendix I.[23]

Like inscriptions, literary records refer to performances held in fourth-century Athens or Attica, in various cities across the Hellenistic Greek East and at the Greek festivals celebrated during the Roman Empire. By contrast, two different types of sources bring us to ancient Italy. The tragedy-related vases speak to the performance reception of Greek tragedy in Sicily and South Italy during the fourth century, and Roman tragedies tell us about its success in Rome from the mid-third through to the early first century. They both deserve to be fully presented and, as I argue below, should be considered together.

Tragedy-Related Vases and Their Contexts

Anybody who studies the pictorial record from Western Greece or has an interest in ancient theatre will come across several vases bearing some connection to comedy and tragedy. These vessels entered the scholarly discussion well before Arthur Trendall catalogued, classified and attributed the thousands and thousands of pots excavated across Sicily, Apulia, Lucania and Campania.[24] Trendall treated comic vases in a separate collection

This text may be one of the 'revised tragedies' mentioned by Quint. *Inst.* 10.1.66 (on which see also pp. 32, 72); West (2000) 352 ascribes it to one of Aeschylus' sons.

[21] Kovacs (2005) 382, referring to *PW* 1625–757; see also Lamari (2010) 117 for the ending of *PW* as a response to Sophocles' *OC*. The extent of interpolations in this tragedy remains debated: see Lamari (2010) 205–7 for a recent and helpful overview. Mastronarde (1994) remains fundamental: see esp. 39–49.

[22] Scodel (2007) 144–5; Finglass (2015) esp. 272–3.

[23] Interested readers can consult Vahtikari (2014), who does include the actors' interpolations identified by modern scholars. See esp. 54–8 and *passim*.

[24] Trendall authored or co-authored several catalogues and related supplements between the 1960s and the 1990s, collecting a total of about 25,000 vessels (see Sisto *CFST* 100 for this figure; in 1989, Trendall himself spoke of some 20,000 vases in *RVSIS*, p. 7). Earlier works on the theatre-related pots include Robert (1881) and Séchan (1926).

published in 1959 and updated in 1967, *Phlyax Vases*. In 1971, he co-authored with T. L. B. Webster a larger work discussing comic vases along with vessels related to both tragedy and satyr play, *Illustrations of Greek Drama*. While both studies are still important reference works, their titles soon came under fire. Trendall knew that at least some of the comic pots that he collected reflect Attic comedies, not the *phlyakes* traditionally associated with Rhinthon.[25] Years later, two scholars independently identified an Apulian bell krater as reproducing Aristophanes' *Thesmophoriazusae*.[26] As more pots were tied to specific Attic comedies, the visual record from Western Greece came to be placed within a new narrative: how Attic comedies travelled across the Adriatic to be staged in local theatres.[27] Trendall and Webster did not explicitly define the word 'illustration', but this term did not serve them well.[28] If anything, it gave scholars some ground for common agreement. Since the pots do not show photographs of tragic texts or tragic performances, they do not illustrate plays. Building on this premise, some scholars went even further by treating these images as simple products of iconographic conventions, devoid of any source.[29] The debate has been vigorous, and the two positions have been variously branded. One scholar speaks of philo-dramatists and iconocentrists, another of 'text-driven' philologists-iconographers and 'autonomous'

[25] See the introduction to the first edition of *Phlyax Vases* (p. 9), where he cites Webster (1948) and (1956) 98–9. Webster (1948) was the first to make a link between South Italian pots and Attic drama. For Rhinthon, see further pp. 140–2.

[26] Csapo (1986) and Taplin (1993) 36–40. The relevant vessel, now in the Martin von Wagner Museum in Würzburg (H 5697), is attributed to the Schiller Painter and dated to ca. 370. See also Green (2014) for the iconographic tradition of its image and more generally *SEHT* II 419–24.

[27] The relevant pots are a 'lost' Apulian bell krater dated to 375–350 and now preserved only in one photo and one drawing (formerly Berlin, Staatliche Museen zu Berlin F 3046) and a Paestan bell krater ascribed to Asteas and dated to ca. 350 (Salerno, Museo Provinciale Pc 1812). They can be related to Aristophanes' *Frogs* and Eupolis' *Demes* respectively. Select references: Taplin (1993) 45–7, Revermann (2006) 69, Csapo (2010) 58–61 and *SEHT* II 416–18 on the first vase; Taplin (1993) 42, Revermann (2006) 147–8 and 318, Csapo (2010) 61–4 and *SEHT* II 425–8 on the second vessel. Granted that these and possibly other artefacts reflect Attic comedies, some scholars argue that some theatre-related vases from Sicily and South Italy reflect local dramatic traditions. See Dearden (2012) and Bosher (2021) ch. 5.

[28] In *IGD* p.1, the two scholars refer to the vessels as 'represent[ing] situations' from specific tragedies. As the title of the book drew criticism from all corners, Trendall continued to clarify his views on the relationship between vases and theatre: see, for instance, Trendall (1991) 170 and *RVSIS* p. 262. As he put it in the latter work, 'vase-painters probably drew their inspiration from an actual performance which remained in their memory and influenced the representation on the vases'.

[29] Moret (1975) most strongly promoted this view. Small (2003) partly builds on it by treating texts and images as two parallel worlds.

iconologists.[30] Labels aside, the shortcomings of both views seem clear. It stands to reason that expressions such as 'total dependence' or 'total independence' are too reductive for the world of visual arts. They do not bring us far.

Few scholars would now deny that at least some vases reflect tragic versions of specific myths. The story of Orestes' revenge, for example, goes back to the archaic period, and so do many of its elements: the oracle of Apollo, the famous hairlock, the Furies and probably Orestes' trial in Athens as well.[31] No source, however, brings Orestes to Delphi before Aeschylus' *Eumenides*. As far as we know, Aeschylus introduced this episode into the saga, and ancient painters continued to reproduce it on their pots.[32] Another legend that brings Orestes to Delphi, this time to kill Neoptolemus, offers a second example. Several poets mention that Neoptolemus died at Delphi, but Euripides was the first to involve Orestes.[33] In *Andromache*, Orestes announces to a despairing Hermione that Neoptolemus will die. Then he travels to Delphi, where Neoptolemus falls at the hands of local men and 'a stranger from Mycenae,' as a messenger reports.[34] This specific version of Neoptolemus' death lies behind an Apulian volute krater attributed to the Ilioupersis Painter, who took care to label three figures: Neoptolemus, Orestes and Apollo.[35] The wounded Neoptolemus kneels at the altar, Orestes crouches behind the *omphalos* with a drawn sword and Apollo sits high above, his temple looming over the whole scene.[36] The Ilioupersis Painter and his colleagues did not illustrate a specific scene as they may have read it on a papyrus or

[30] See respectively Giuliani (1996) 72–4 and Taplin (1993) 21.

[31] Stesichorus' *Oresteia* (fr. 171–91 in the edition by Davies and Finglass 2014) already included most of the details known from later versions. Sommerstein (1989) reviews the legends that bring Orestes to Athens (so already *Od.* 3.307) and argues that his trial in Athens was part of the tradition inherited by Aeschylus.

[32] This detail is absent in earlier sources, all discussed by Sommerstein (1989) 1–6. See also *P&P* 58 and Csapo (2010) 45 on Aeschylus' innovation on the legend. See pp. 72, 74–6 for the pots showing Orestes at Delphi.

[33] Neoptolemus' death is invariably placed at Delphi, although different figures are involved in it: see, among others, Pi. *P.* 6.117–20 (Apollo), *N.* 7.40–3 ('a man') and S. *Hermione*, as summarised by schol. *Od.* 4.4 (a certain Machaireus). Gantz (1993) 690–3 reviews and examines the relevant sources, concluding that 'we see grounds for supposing that Euripides himself concocted Orestes' role in the killing' (p. 693). See also Dunn (1996) 52 and Allan (2000) esp. 25–9.

[34] E. *Andr.* 993–1008 (Orestes speaks of Neoptolemus' imminent death) and 1075 (quotation); see also 1115–16 and 1241–2 for Orestes' involvement in the murder. For Orestes' journey to Delphi, see Allan (2000) 76–7, *P&P* pp. 139–40.

[35] Milan, Collezione H.A. (Banca Intesa Collection) 239; E. *Andr.* **P1** [311].

[36] Two more figures complete the scene, a male threatening Neoptolemus and the Pythian priestess who counterbalances Apollo on the left.

watched it on the stage, but tragedy both informs and defines the images that they painted. The catalogue by Todisco and his team (*CFST*) calls these vessels 'of tragic subject-matter'. Taplin's selective collection (*P&P*) speaks of pots 'interacting' with Greek tragedies. Kannicht includes several of them among the testimonia for Euripides' fragmentary plays (*TrGF* V 1–2). These pots are, in other words, tragedy-related.

The tragedy-related vases have grown in number over the years, now counting in the hundreds.[37] They are dated from around 400 to shortly after 320, when the activities of the artists traditionally associated with the Darius Painter came to an end. Apart from a few Attic imports, most pots were locally produced in all the fabrics that Trendall identified: Apulian, Lucanian, Campanian, Paestan and Sicilian.[38] My list reflects the relative prominence of these fabrics, and this trend coincides with the findspots of the vases. While most vessels are Apulian and were found in Apulia, Sicily both produced and preserved the lowest number of them.[39] The data for the comedy-related vases show a similar pattern in terms of fabrics and distribution.[40] Note also that at least a few artists painted images related to tragedy as well as scenes or masks related to comedy. They include the Tarporley Painter, the Dirce Painter, Asteas and the Darius Painter.[41]

The comedy-related vases are self-consciously theatrical. They show masked figures acting on a stage, wearing costumes comparable to those that Aristophanes describes in his plays and sporting phalluses of varying size.[42] By contrast, only a couple of their tragic peers include a stage or hint at masks.[43] Many others, however, look 'stagey'. At least some of the figures painted on the tragedy-related vases, including the 'Furies' or 'Erinyes' that mark so many of them, have long-sleeved costumes and boots. These costumes recall the theatrical attire that we find on vessels that have a clear connection to the world of the stage, such as the Pronomos vase

[37] *CFST* catalogues 401 vessels, which make up 1.6 per cent of all the vases catalogued by Trendall (so Sisto, *CFST* p. 100). Vahtikari (2014) includes 619 items in his Appendix I.

[38] *CFST* gives the following figures: 243 Apulian, 56 Lucanian, 56 Campanian, 56 Paestan and 20 Sicilian.

[39] See *CFST* Tabella 8. See pp. 14–5, 18–9 on the specific findspots of the vessels.

[40] Trendall (1967) included 185 comic vases, noting that 'the great majority (about 120) is Apulian; most of the remainder may be divided up between the fabrics of Paestum (30), Campania (15), and Sicily (15), with a few still undetermined' (p. 10).

[41] Vahtikari (2014) 202 with n. 14.

[42] See especially Taplin (1993) and Compton-Engle (2015).

[43] The best-known exemplars are the two Sicilian pots ascribed to the Capodarso Painter, one in Syracuse (Museo Archeologico Regionale Paolo Orsi, 66557) and the other in Caltanissetta (Museo Civico 1301bis). See S. *OT* **P1** [298] and **SPP 1** [353].