2011

Sculpted Symposiasts of Ionia

Elizabeth P. Baughan

University of Richmond, ebaughan@richmond.edu

Follow this and additional works at: http://scholarship.richmond.edu/classicalstudies-faculty-publications

Part of the Ancient History, Greek and Roman through Late Antiquity Commons

Recommended Citation


This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Classical Studies at UR Scholarship Repository. It has been accepted for inclusion in Classical Studies Faculty Publications by an authorized administrator of UR Scholarship Repository. For more information, please contact scholarshiprepository@richmond.edu.
Sculpted Symposiasts of Ionia

ELIZABETH P. BAUGHAN

Abstract

Statues and statuettes of reclining banqueters were dedicated at several Ionian sanctuaries during the sixth century B.C.E., beginning with the Geneleos Group at the Samian Heraion. Though common for small bronze and terracotta sculpture, this figure type is not otherwise attested in monumental dedicatory sculpture and is rare as architectural decoration elsewhere in archaic Greece. This article explores the social implications of this Ionian sculptural tradition, which paired the luxury of the reclining banquet with bodily corpulence, in light of archaic poetry and Samian history. The short-lived trend of reclining banqueter dedications may be understood as a locally specific type of aristocratic self-definition and an Ionian corollary to burials on klinai (banquet couches) in neighboring western Asiatic dynastic cultures. These sculptures also challenge conventional distinctions between private and cultic banqueting and illuminate the place of sympotic culture in archaic Ionian sanctuaries and the social implications of East Greek sculptural style.*

INTRODUCTION

The image of the reclining symposiast is so familiar from its many occurrences on Greek vases, Etruscan tomb walls, and later funerary reliefs that its appearance in freestanding sculpture may seem to have been inevitable. But, in fact, it was only in archaic Ionia that the type was used for marble dedicatory sculpture, including both life-sized figures and smaller statuettes. The reclining figure of the Geneleos Group, set up along the Sacred Way before the entrance to the Heraion of Samos ca. 560 B.C.E., may be the earliest example of this sculptural type and is by far the most well known today, being one of the few archaic monuments attributable to a particular sculptor (figs. 1–3; see appx.). It also offers one of the most elegant displays of East Greek sculptural style, with doughy contours and low-relief folds that gather beneath the belly like poured chocolate sauce, as Boardman has observed.1 At least nine additional marble statues and statuettes depicting reclining banqueters, whether alone or part of a larger sculptural group, were dedicated at Samos and other sanctuaries in Ionia over the remainder of the sixth century.

This Ionian sculptural phenomenon was identified by several scholars in the 1970s,2 but apart from observations that the reclining posture was likely a “status symbol” for East Greek men, the social significance of the type has yet to be explored.3 The Samian examples have been adduced in discussions of ritual banqueting at the Heraion, as possible representations of alfresco cultic dining,4 but the others have not been integrated into such questions, and even the inscribed figure from Myous (cat. no. 6) has not received much scholarly attention;5 and in the last few decades, several more specimens have been recognized in museum storerooms (cat. nos. 7 [Fragment B], 9, 10). This article examines these sculptures against artistic parallels, archaic poetry, and Samian history to explore some of the many questions they raise: Whom do they represent? What is the significance of their lack of banqueting furniture, or klinai? To what kind of banqueting—cultic or private—do they allude, and is such a distinction even valid for the Archaic period? Why were they dedicated, and what can they tell us about the place of sympotic culture in archaic Ionia?6

* Preliminary thoughts on this topic were presented at the 107th Annual Meeting of the Archaeological Institute of America (6 January 2006) and in a chapter of the author’s dissertation (Baughan 2004, 225–48), but this article supersedes both, having benefited greatly from discussion with audiences at the University of Richmond and the University of Indiana and from firsthand examination of the Myous sculptures in Berlin in 2008. I thank Volker Kästner for granting me access to fragments in storage at the Pergamon Museum and the University of Richmond Faculty Research Committee for supporting my work there. I am also indebted to all the mentors and colleagues with whom I have discussed these sculptures and the questions they raise, including Crawford H. Greenewalt, Jr.; Andrew Stewart; Leslie Kurke; Adam Rabinowitz; Tyler Jo Smith; Kathleen Lynch; Marcus Folch; and Julie Laskaris. I am especially grateful to the anonymous reviewers for the AJA and Editor-in-Chief Naomi J. Norman for helpful comments on earlier drafts. All translations are by the author unless otherwise noted.

1 Boardman 1978, 70.
Is their corpulence merely a symptom of regional style, or may it carry social significance? The terms “symposion” and “symptotic” here refer to the social institution of elite, predominantly male gatherings centering on the ritualized consumption of wine. It is suggested that this distinctive figure type served as a vehicle of self-expression for elite Ionians in the sixth century and illuminates the sympotic aspects of sanctuary feasting in archaic Ionia. These sculptures challenge the traditional dichotomy between cultic and domestic banqueting and may reflect a time before such a distinction became important, when symposia could take place not only in private homes but also in sanctuary spaces.

THE GENELEOS GROUP

The earliest example of this figure type is *arakes*, the nearly life-sized reclining figure in the Geneleos Group from Samos (see figs. 1–3; cat. no. 1). Its plinth occupied the rightmost position on a long base for a statue group that included three korai, a draped youth with aulos, and an enthroned woman. A dedicatory

---

*The chronology presented here follows Tuchelt 1970, 1976; Freyer-Schauenburg 1974. Fuchs and Floren (1987, 347, 376) place the examples from Didyma and Miletos earlier than the Geneleos Group (ca. 570–560) and so argue that Geneleos combined established figure types in an innovative family group. For the association of the aulos fragment with this group, see Walter-Karydi 1985, 91–5.*
inscription on the worn marble cushion on which the figure reclines reads, in retrograde:7

... ἀρχης ἡμε[ᾶ]ς κἀ[ν]έθηκε τῇ Ἡρη-

-arches dedicated us to Hera.

Since some figures carry inscribed names while the reclining figure does not, it is logical to conclude that the inscription on the mattress serves both to signal the dedication and to identify the figure reclining above it.8 The reading of the name, however, is controversial, inextricably tied to the questionable identification of the figure as male or female, owing to its full bosom. It was first identified, by Buschor, as “eine gelagerte Ma-

trone” and priestess of Hera.9 Buschor read the name as -οχη,10 but there is consensus now for -αρχης.11 Those who still believe the figure represents a woman have accounted for the masculine ending (-ης) by suppos-

ing that the word is a cult title (e.g., agelarches, “leader of a band”) rather than a personal name, and that the figures represent a group of priestesses.12

Whether -arches refers to a name or priestly title, iconographic details support a male identification.13 The long-haired figure wears a lightweight, short-sleeved chiton under a heavier himation that drapes over the back from the left shoulder to the right hip, resting over the knees and lower legs (see fig. 2, bottom). The lighter full-length chiton protrudes beneath the hem of the himation on the back of the ankles. Long chitons were evidently standard male attire in ar-

chaic Ionia,14 and it is probably not coincidental that in Homeric poetry, Ionians are described as ἑλκεχίτωνες, “with dragging chitons.”15 The figure’s posture, too, suggests the male world of sympotic banqueting. Reclining while banqueting was normally a male social privilege in ancient Greece.16 When women are shown reclining in Greek art, they are usually in the company

---

7 IG 12.6 559; Freyer-Schauenburg 1974, 122–23, pl. 55; see also Dunst 1972, 132–35; Jeffery 1990, 329 n. 3, 341, no. 6.
9 Buschor 1934b, 28.
10 Buschor 1934b, 28; Simon 1986, 101 n. 113.
13 Bieber 1967, 26–7, pl. 8.1; Tuchelt 1976, 64; Özgan 1978, 98; Barletta 1987, 236; Miller 1992, 99; infra n. 129. For this fashion in Attic vase painting, explained variously as effemi-

nizing or eastern, see Kurtz and Boardman 1986; Frontis-Ducroux and Lissarrague 1990; Price 1990; Kurke 1992, 97–8; Miller 1999; DeVries 2000.
14 Homer. Il. 13.685; Homeric Hymn to Apollo 147; see also Asius fr. 13; Thuc. 3.104; Tuchelt 1976, 65; Geddes 1987, 307.
15 Cic. Ver. 1.66; Dem. Against Neaira 33; Iac. 3.14; Dentzer 1982, 432; Simon 1986, 87; Reinsberg 1989; Kurke 1997; Burton 1998.
of male symposiasts and so identified as hetairai, an unlikely explanation in this setting.  

17 The wineskin that serves as a pillow supporting the left elbow also suggests a sympotic context, and the crescent-shaped object held in the left hand, before the chest, is most likely a drinking horn (see fig. 3). It was originally identified as a bird, but its shape more closely approximates a rhyton or keras, the most common attribute for reclining male figures, in both large- and small-scale East Greek sculpture. Unusual, however, is its apparent orientation, with the narrow end up and the wider (open) end pointing down. This placement could suggest that the vessel was “empty” and therefore prized for its material rather than its contents, or it could signify that its contents have been consumed; alternatively, the object scar may not correspond to its full three-dimensional shape.  

The figure of -arches is therefore a male banqueter, and the group as a whole may be a sort of family portrait, with the seated lady (wife/mother) balancing the legs and torso of a long-haired figure wearing a long chiton and himation and leaning on the left elbow (fig. 4). The aulos—or perhaps both?—and on the vexed question of whether families celebrated ritual banquets together in the Heraion. Another alternative is that each family member is shown engaged in a typical activity or ideal pose, whether or not related to cult worship; for an elite male in the Archaic period, this was banqueting, whether in a sanctuary or in a private context.  

OTHER RECLINING STATUES AND STATUETTES IN ARCHAIC IOnia

In the decades following the dedication of the Geneleos Group, two additional monumental statues of reclining banqueters may have been set up at the Samian Heraion. One is attested by two large fragments, from the legs and torso of a long-haired figure wearing a long chiton and himation and leaning on the left elbow (fig. 4; cat. no. 2). Like arches, this figure holds a curved object in the left hand, before the chest. In this case, the curved object terminates in a flat edge at the top and is more readily identified as a drinking horn. Another probable reclining figure of monumental scale from Samos is represented by a marble fragment in the form of a folded pillow (fig. 5; cat. no. 3).

17 Freyer-Schauenburg 1974, 119. For controversial “Hetärensymposion,” see Peschel 1987, 70–4, 110–12; Reinsberg 1989, 112–14; Caopo and Miller 1991, 380; Burton 1998, 152; Kurke 1999, 205–8; Ferrari 2002, 19–20; Topper 2009, 21. Isolated examples of reclining women in small-scale bronze and terracotta sculpture are not yet fully understood; some have been identified as hetairai or goddesses, and others may represent ritual banqueting or nuptial ceremonies (Jantzen 1997, pls. 2, 8, 29; Fehr 1971, 124, nos. 541–43; Bell 1981, nos. 83–94, 478, 483; Viernisel-Schlörf 1997, 516, no. 117, pl. 24; Kilker 2009).  

18 Freyer-Schauenburg 1974, 116; Walter-Karydi 1985, 95–7. For the distinction of wineskins from other pillows, see Möbius 1964.  

19 Tuchelt 1976, 57 n. 2; Walter-Karydi 1985, 95; Fuchs and Floren 1987, 347; Ridgway 1993, 199; Bumke 2004, 84. Even Schanz (1980, 17–18), who maintains that the figure is female, admits that the object “could possibly be a rhyton.”  

20 Walter-Karydi (1985, 95) and Stewart (1990, 117) both read the aulos as an attribute of the banquet (infra n. 152).  

21 Kron (1988) presents compelling evidence for ritual outdoor feasts in the Heraion, but there is no indication that these were family affairs, unless we read representations of men and women reclining together on Attic and Lakonian black-figure vases found there as scenes tailored for a Samian audience, as Pipili (1998, 90) suggests for cups by the KX and Arkesilas painters (infra n. 152). For the question of mixed dining, see Bookidis 1990, 91; 1993, 49–51, 57 n. 2; Kilker 2009.  

22 Freyer-Schauenburg 1974, 11–18; Tuchelt 1976, 57 n. 2; Walter-Karydi 1985, 95; Fuchs and Floren 1987, 246–47, 476; Day 1994, 46; Kolbe 2004, 149. Ridgway (1993, 510 n. 5.25) raises the possibility that the youth could be a “hired man for the ritual banquet or dance.”  


25 Kron (1988) presents compelling evidence for ritual outdoor feasts in the Heraion, but there is no indication that these were family affairs, unless we read representations of men and women reclining together on Attic and Lakonian black-figure vases found there as scenes tailored for a Samian audience, as Pipili (1998, 90) suggests for cups by the KX and Arkesilas painters (infra n. 152). For the question of mixed dining, see Bookidis 1990, 91; 1993, 49–51, 57 n. 2; Kilker 2009.

26 Kron (1988) presents compelling evidence for ritual outdoor feasts in the Heraion, but there is no indication that these were family affairs, unless we read representations of men and women reclining together on Attic and Lakonian black-figure vases found there as scenes tailored for a Samian audience, as Pipili (1998, 90) suggests for cups by the KX and Arkesilas painters (infra n. 152). For the question of mixed dining, see Bookidis 1990, 91; 1993, 49–51, 57 n. 2; Kilker 2009.

27 Fehr 2000, 124; Bumke 2004, 88.  


29 A marble fragment of a hand holding a horn, now lost, associated with fragments of a bare torso and attributed to Geneleos, could have belonged to another monumental reclining figure, but other interpretations (lyre player, archer, Theseus with Minotaur) are equally plausible (Buschor 1934a, 16–17, figs. 47–51; 1935, 59, fig. 226; Schmidt 1971, 31–2; pls. 16.1, 16.2; Freyer-Schauenburg 1974, 130–35, no. 64A/B, pls. 53, 54; Ridgway 1993, 90, 116 n. 3, 370, 433; 2005).
Around the same time (ca. 540–530), the type also appeared in monumental form at Didyma. From the Temple of Apollo, fragments belonging to two under-life-sized reclining banqueters were excavated and later lost. One was rediscovered in 1974, and part of an additional, life-sized reclining figure was found in a nearby field that same year. The newly discovered figure (fig. 6; cat. no. 4), like those from Samos, is fully draped and holds a drinking horn. The rediscovered figure (fig. 7; cat. no. 5) is more fragmentary but evidently was bare-chested and held a grape cluster and drinking horn. Due to its small scale and the treatment of its undersurface with anathyrosis, Tuchelt has suggested that it may have served as architectural sculpture, but anathyrosis could also have been used to prepare the bottom of a sculpture for placement on its plinth.

Three marble reclining figures on a smaller scale (best considered large statuettes) come from Myous, near Miletos, and are now in Berlin (cat. nos. 6–8). All have been dated stylistically to the mid or late sixth century. Their original findspots are not known, but one carries an inscription that proclaims its dedication to Apollo, for whom there was evidently a sanctuary at Myous. The dedication reads, in boustrophedon across the figure’s chest:

```
Ἑρμῶναξ με και τὸ τέκνον ἀνέθεσαν δεκάτην ἔργων τῶι Ἀπόλλωνι
```

Hermonax and his son (?) dedicated me [as] a tenth of [their] works to Apollo.

This figure also wears a long chiton with a himation draped loosely around the back and holds a large cup that looks remarkably like a modern beer mug (fig. 8; cat. no. 6). The second large statuette from Myous...
is similar, though uninscribed and without a drinking vessel preserved (figs. 9–11; cat. no. 7). Similarities in drapery, workmanship, form of pillow and plinth, marble type, and dimensions allow for the possibility that catalogue numbers 6 and 7 may have been associated with each other in a sculptural group. The third statuette from Myous (fig. 12; cat. no. 8) is somewhat larger and reclines to a greater degree than the others, with the whole left side of the torso as well as the outstretched legs completely supported by the cushion below. It, too, wears a full-length chiton with himation draped over the shoulders and across the back. This figure has been dated slightly later than the others, to the second half of the sixth century, owing to its more fluid rendering of bodily forms.

Two archaic marble fragments in the Miletos Sculpture Depot belong to two other reclining banqueters from the vicinity, though their exact findspots are uncertain: the back of a small reclining statuette, which may have come from Myous, since it is stored with items from Wiegand’s excavations (fig. 13; cat. no. 9); and a life-sized bare foot relaxed over a curved, shoulder varies by only ca. 0.01 m.

---

36 Length cannot be exactly compared, since neither figure is completely preserved and each exists in two fragments, but the distance from the bottom of the plinth to the top of the
mattresslike plinth, with the hem of a long chiton surrounding the heel (fig. 14; cat. no. 10). The latter probably came from Miletos, Didyma, or the Sacred Way connecting the city and the sanctuary. The genre of reclining banqueter dedications thus appeared in several different Ionian sanctuaries by the middle of the sixth century, but its brief floruit appears to have ended by ca. 500.38

Reclining Banqueters in Archaic Imagery

The reclining banqueter motif has been the subject of numerous studies.39 A Near Eastern origin has been assumed, though the Garden Party relief of Ashurbanipal (fig. 15), long heralded as the progenitor of the type, no longer occupies chronological primacy; if the recent redating of some Cypro-Phoenician bowls (e.g., fig. 16) to the eighth or early seventh century is correct, these now provide the earliest known representations of reclining banqueters, and they are concurrent with the earliest literary testimonia for such dining.40 By the end of the seventh century, the motif occurs in Etruscan and Corinthian art.41 In the eastern Aegean and western Asia Minor, arches provides our earliest visual attestation of the practice, though it is celebrated by East Greek poets of the seventh century and is suggested also by sanctuary dining rooms equipped with klinai in the late seventh century.42 In much of the archaic Greek world, representations of reclining banqueters were generally confined to scenes painted on pottery used in symposia and small-scale figures of bronze and terracotta (e.g., figs. 17, 18); the bronzes

---

38 A similar marble statuette from Proconnesus seems to be an archaizing Roman version of the type (Kleemann 1969).
39 Most notably Thönges-Stringaris 1965; Dentzer 1971, 1982; Fehr 1971.
41 Fehr 1971, 28; Dentzer 1982, 78–81; Boardman 1990, 125; Baughan 2004, 26, 210. An Etruscan cinerary urn with a reclining figure on the lid (Torelli 2001, no. 193 [ca. 630–620]) predates the earliest Greek examples.
were usually attached to kraters, and the terracottas have been found in votive deposits and funerary contexts. A few archaic reliefs showing reclining male banqueters and seated women seem to presage later Totenmahl reliefs, but their function (votive or funerary) is uncertain, and their findspots are disparate: Tegea, Paros, Thasos (fig. 19), northern Ionia, and (possibly) Miletos. Reliefs with similar subjects but in Anatolian-Persian style, from satrapal centers of Asia Minor such as Daskyleion (fig. 20), are more probably funerary, and most are dated later (fifth and fourth centuries). These funerary monuments are corollary to the conceptualization of the dead in elite tombs of western Asia Minor (particularly Lydia) as banqueters, through furnishings such as funerary klinai (fig. 21), grave offerings such as drinking vessels and tables, and sometimes tomb decoration. Outside of Etruria, the reclining banqueter motif does not become common for funerary sculpture until the Roman period, when it is used on sarcophagus lids and other funerary monuments throughout the empire. An important early exception, and the only known example of this figure type in monumental archaic Greek sculpture in the round, aside from the works catalogued here, is an archaic sarcophagus lid with reclining banqueter from Pantikapaion, a colony of Miletos.

---

---


44 Winter 1905, 191–207; Stillwell 1952, 104–12, pls. 18–23; Fehr 1971, 122, 126, nos. 496–525; Herdejürgen 1971, 5 n. 29; Freyer-Schauenburg 1974, 120–21; Tuchelt 1976, 63; Dentzer 1982, 163–216. These were most likely freestanding offerings, but some could have been attached to ceramic vessels (Dentzer 1982, 218 n. 627; Klinger 1997, 566, fig. 18); cf. bal- 

45 Thönges-Stringaris 1965, pls. 4–6; Fehr 1971, 111;
Reclining banqueters are also found among archaic Cypriot limestone votive statuettes and statuette groups, from Cyprus and some East Greek sanctuaries (fig. 22). Those from Samos and Lindos have been dated to the first half of the sixth century, contemporary with the earliest Ionian sculpted banqueters. They share with the Ionian sculptures the basic reclining pose (which Fehr dubs the “östliches Liegeschema,” with legs laid flat, to be distinguished from the “western” scheme with one knee raised) and lack of banqueting furniture, but they differ in style, placement of the left hand (usually resting on a pillow rather than holding a drinking vessel), and the frequent inclusion of a woman seated on the hip of the reclining man. These statuettes may be understood as a localized expression of banqueting imagery, and they strengthen the idea that the reclining banquet was particularly at home in the Cypro-Phoenician realm, but it is unclear whether such imports played a role in the establishment of the sculptural type in Ionia, given their contemporaneity.

Interpretations of small-scale banqueter sculptures have varied widely depending on context. While the
Cypriot groups seem to represent mortals engaged in communal banquets, lone figures are more difficult to classify. Those found in graves tend to be seen as representations of the deceased enjoying the pleasures of life or in the afterlife, while those from sanctuaries (often nearly identical in appearance) are read as dedicants engaged in ritual meals or banqueting deities or heroes. Lone banqueters on moldmade reliefs from Tarentum and Corinth, usually shown reclining on couches, have been associated with hero cults and have been read as representations of heroes, though this identification only seems certain when other heroic attributes are present. Similar problems surround interpretations of so-called Totenmahl reliefs (see figs. 19, 20); although the later examples often include heroic attributes, the earliest (late sixth century) lack any clearly heroizing traits. And the figure of a reclining banqueter is clearly presented as a mortal worshiper in the protection of a deity in a small terracotta group in Bonn, where a reclining man occupies the lap of an enthroned goddess. Moreover, the occurrence of small bronze banqueters in sets of three or four around the edges of large bronze mixing vessels suggests that, in concept, they represent communal banqueters rather than isolated deities or heroes. This range of interpretation highlights the adaptability of this figure type, and it is possible that it was used with different intended meanings in mind, in different contexts, sometimes to show a god or hero “receiving the banquet offering” and sometimes to show mortals “participating in a ritual banquet for the god.”

Architectural occurrences of the reclining banquet motif in Archaic Greece are limited to Ionia and western Asia Minor, with the exception of a pediment from Keryra (probably for a temple of Dionysos, ca. 500). At Samos, evidence suggests that a reclining banquet was depicted on two fragmentary archaic limestone friezes, and one fragment from the parapet frieze of

Fig. 17. Small bronze banqueter from Samos. Berlin, Staatliche Museen, inv. no. Sa 116 (© Bildarchiv Preussischer Kulturbesitz/Art Resource, NY).

Fig. 18. Small bronze banqueter from Samos, front and rear views. Vathy, Archaeological Museum of Samos, inv. no. B2 (H. Wagner; © DAI Athens, Samos 1845, 1846).
the archaic Artemision of Ephesos shows an elbow of a reclining figure. The Samos and Ephesos banquet friezes are too fragmentary to identify with certainty, but the presence of feathers or wings on associated fragments suggest nonmortal contexts. Less fragmentary but still ambiguous is the banquet on the unusual architrave frieze from the Temple of Athena at Assos (ca. 530), with figures reclining on the groundline supported by pillows under their left elbows and holding various drinking vessels (fig. 23). It may depict a mythical banquet, since other parts of the frieze are decorated with mythical animals or myths involving Herakles (and he may be identified as the figure with an extra pillow to lean on and a Persian-style vessel to drink from), but a real cultic banquet has also been proposed, owing to the lack of identifying attributes and klinai. At Larisa on the Hermos in the middle of the sixth century, reclining banqueters decorated a series of lively architectural terracottas (fig. 24) for a building of uncertain function, and fragments produced from the same matrix have been found at Çal Dağ (Kebren).

The geographic concentration of these architectural banquets is probably not a coincidence of survival: a motif that elsewhere in Greece was normally restricted from monumental contexts was, in Ionia and western Asia Minor, explored in both temple sculpture and votive monuments. The high visibility of volute capital, legs, and cushion. The “Grosser Tempelfries,” associated with the Late Archaic temple, includes a reclining male figure (though with legs stretched toward the right, the reverse of the normal pictorial convention for banqueters). Another unassigned frieze fragment with a volute suggests the form of a kline (Buschor 1957, 34, Beilage 44.2).

62 Pryce 1928, 84, no. B293, fig. 125; Muss 1994, 81, 86; Wescoat 1995 n. 5. This reclining figure also relaxes, unusually, on the right side.

63 For various mythical and cultic interpretations, see Buschor 1933; Walter-Karydi 1973, 34–5; Dentzer 1982, 238; Finster-Hotz 1984, 48; Fuchs and Floren 1987, 357.


66 Dentzer 1982, 237; Wescoat 1995, 296–97. If klinai had been included, though, the scale (and visibility) of the figures would have been greatly reduced; see also Miller (forthcoming).

67 Boehrli and Scheufele 1940, figs. 27–30; Kjellberg 1940, 15–16, 64–80, 160–63, pls. 22–33; Åkerström 1966, 7, 56–8, fig. 2, pls. 28, 29; Fehr 1971, 107–9, nos. 465, 466; Langlotz 1975, 84–6, pl. 22.3; Dentzer 1982, 230–35, figs. 320–28, 331. The fragments were found within a general deposit of archaic material that served as fill for a podium of the “Small Sanctuary” on the Acropolis, so it is unclear to what type of building this frieze belonged. Langlotz (1975, 84) assigned it to a palace, but it is associated with the Temple of Athena in current scholarship (Winter 1993, 245; Marconi 2007, 21).
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Of the reclining banqueter in Ionia is matched only in Etruria, where the motif is found on architectural terracottas, tomb paintings, and figural sarcophagi as well as in bronze attachments and other small-scale works. In Etruria, monumental images of reclining banqueters, whether decorating tombs or palaces (or sacred or civic structures, as the function of buildings decorated with architectural terracottas is often uncertain) seem to encapsulate or project an idea of the elites’ "good life." The Larisa terracottas may have sent a similar message, but the temple friezes may represent cultic or mythical banquets. Whether this banqueting imagery was included in these contexts because it was representative of cult festivities or of the lifestyles of the elite that worshiped in these sanctuaries, even if circumscribed within the realm of myth, its relative prominence is striking.

IDENTIFICATION AND SELF-REPRESENTATION

The Ionian votive sculptures presented here clearly represent banqueters, but were these banqueters gods, heroes, or mortals? The anthropomorphism of Greek deities allows for the possibility that nearly any figure type could apply to mortal or god, depending on context or situation. Few divine figures, however, were ever shown reclining in Greek art. Only Herakles and Dionysos offer regular exceptions to this rule, both explained by their connections with the mortal realm—Herakles as originally a mortal himself, and

---

69 Miller (forthcoming) suggests that the mode of banqueting depicted on the Larisa plaques is self-consciously Lydian.
70 The exceptional Divine Banquet cup, attributed to the Codrus Painter, with coupled deities sharing klinai, may be explained by connotations of marriage or death (London, British Museum, inv. no. E82 [ARV², 1269, no. 3; BAPD, no. 217212; Dentzer 1982, 122; Carpenter 1995, 163; Avramidou 2006]).
Dionysos as god of the mortal symposion.⁷¹ Dionysos was also frequently shown holding a drinking horn, the most common attribute of these reclining figures. A close examination of their iconography and votive contexts suggests that these sculptures were most likely intended to represent their dedicants—elite Ionian males—and not Dionysos himself.

The two inscribed figures are crucial to this question. Although the “X dedicated” formula does not necessarily identify an associated statue as “X,” several factors support reading both figures as self-representational “speaking statues,” and it is likely that the uninscribed figures were understood in a similar light in their Ionian dedicatory contexts.⁷² For the reclining figure in the Geneleos Group (see figs. 1–3), it is the lack of a name label on the figure itself, unlike the other members of the group, that gives the dedicatory inscription on its plinth an identifying function. The identity of the inscribed figure from Myous (see fig. 8) is less clear, since two dedicants are named (Hermonax and his son); but the consecration of the figure “to Apollo” makes it unlikely to represent Dionysos. We may assume, then, that it represents the primary (named) dedicant.⁷³ If the similar, uninscribed statuette from Myous (cat. no. 8) accompanied this figure, it is possible that it was meant to represent Hermonax’s son.

Such self-representational “speaking statues” are attested for archaic Greece only in Ionia, probably inspired by Near Eastern models.⁷⁴ In addition to -arches, Keesling lists only the enthroned statue of Chares of Teichioussa at Didyma and a lost work from Samos as true “speaking statues,” to be distinguished from “talking objects” that identify the dedicator but not necessarily the subject (as is clear, e.g., with korai dedicated by men).⁷⁵ Although Hermonax’s dedication falls into

---

⁷¹ De Marinis 1961, 113; Dentzer 1982, 153; Boardman 1990, 124; Verbanck-Piéard 1992; Wolf 1993; Fehr 2003; Sourvinou-Inwood 2003, 83–5; Bruit and Lissarrague 2004. The two are sometimes shown enjoying this shared privilege together, as on an Attic red-figure cup in Basel (BAPD, no. 352; Bentley Addenda’ 394).
⁷² Keesling 2003, 16, 104.
⁷³ See also Dentzer 1982, 163; Fuchs and Floren 1987, 376; Ridgway 1993, 198.
⁷⁴ Keesling 2003, 16–21, 103–4, 175–78; see also Tuchelt 1976, 65–6.
the more ambiguous category of “talking objects,” in its Ionian votive context it would have easily been perceived as a representation of Hermonax himself. When Herodotus saw two wooden statues dedicated by Amasis of Egypt behind the doors of the “great temple” in the Samian Heraion, he assumed they were depictions of the pharaoh himself, and Theodorus of Samos was said to have created a self-representational bronze statue, probably for the same sanctuary. The many uninscribed enthroned statues from Ionian votive contexts (e.g., Samos, Didyma, Miletos, the Sacred Way Temenos) were probably also understood as representations of their dedicators, members of priestly and/or noble families, or rulers such as Chares and their wives and/or ancestors. Even if intended to represent dead ancestors rather than living dedicators, these figures seem to embody mortals rather than gods. In the same way, Hermonax’s dedication was probably meant to embody its dedicants and, in particular, their lifestyle of leisure.

The inscribed figures also attest to the versatility of the reclining figure type as a dedicatory medium, since one served as an offering to Hera on Samos and the other to Apollo at Myous. The uninscribed statuettes from Myous were likely offered to Apollo or Dionysos, the two deities known to have been worshiped there, but since their precise findspots were not recorded, we cannot be more specific. This versatility suggests that the figure type reflects more on the identity of the dedicant himself than the nature of the divine recipient and therefore provides further support for the self-representational function of such dedications.

But what about the three reclining figures from Didyma, including one holding a grape cluster (see fig. 7)? Find location makes Apollo the most likely dedicatee, but the grape cluster has led scholars to identify its holder as Dionysos and therefore to assume that all three sculptures were dedicated to the wine god. The act of holding a grape cluster is a rare occurrence in Greek iconography but need not necessarily identify a figure as Dionysos. Grapes were indeed standard Dionysiac pictorial elements, but archaic representations of the god holding them while reclining are quite rare and always show him holding a whole vine rather than a single cluster. Moreover, there are no certain images of Dionysos reclining like a symposiast until ca. 540–530 B.C.E., concurrent with the Didyma figures but a few decades later than the onset of our figure type. If the grape-holding figure does represent Dionysos, it is among the earliest examples of the reclining god. The meaning of the figure’s bare chest is ambiguous, since in archaic art, Dionysos usually wears the long chiton that was standard male attire in archaic Ionia.

The most common attribute held by these figures—the dressing horn, or keras—likewise does not require a divine identity. As a natural alternative to a man-made cup, a drinking horn connotes rustic as well as

---

36 Hdt. 2.182; Simon 1986, 85.
39 Aug. 7.2.11; supra n. 33. The results of Wiegand’s 1908 excavations at Myous were never published, but Weber (1965, 48–9) summarizes them, based on letters from Wiegand to his wife. Two archaic temple terraces were identified; the lower of the two, with the remains of a marble Ionic temple, has been assigned to Dionysos and dated to the middle of the sixth century (Blümel 1963, no. 65, figs. 193–211; Weber 1965, 49; 2002).
40 Tuchelt 1976, 63–5; Dentzer 1982, 163 n. 66; Walter-Karydi 1985, 96; Ridgway 1993, 198, 213–14 n. 5.42. Although the worship of Dionysos is not otherwise attested at the Didymaion, his cult was well established at Miletos by the end of the sixth century (Tuchelt 1976, 64; Müller-Wiener 1977–1978, 99–100 [with references]).
41 Two examples are known to the author: a red-figure cup once on the Basel market (*BAPD*, no. 352; *Beasley Addenda* 394: Wolf 1993, fig. 38) and a black-figure amphora attributed to the Priam Painter (*ABV*, 333, no. 1; *BAPD*, no. 301810). Reclining symposiasts holding grape clusters are found only on later red-figure vases (of the late fifth and fourth centuries), and they normally hold them aloft rather than before their waists: e.g., on Attic red-figure bell kraters in Paris (Musée du Louvre, inv. no. G524 [ARV², 1427; *BAPD*, no. 260104]) and in Oxford, Mississippi (University of Mississippi Museum [ARV², 1453, no. 2; *BAPD*, no. 41004]).
42 Fehr 1971, 62–7; 2003. One of the earliest representations of Dionysos reclining occurs on Exekias’ famous eye cup (Munich, Staatliche Antikensammlungen und Glyptothek, inv. no. 2044 [*ABV*, 146, no. 21; *BAPD*, no. 51045]); see also an Attic black-figure lekanis lid from Xanthos attributed to the Antimenes Painter, with Dionysos reclining in a vineyard while satyrs harvest grapes (Istanbul, Istanbul Archaeological Museum, inv. no. A15.1176 [*ABV*, 691, no. 137; *BAPD*, no. 306586]). In both scenes, the god reclines in Fehr’s “western” scheme (bare-chested, with right knee raised) and holds a large drinking horn.
43 *LMC* 3:414, s.v. “Dionysos”; Jameson 1993, 48–50. Since the legs of the figure are not preserved, it is impossible to say whether the right knee may have been raised, in which case the bare-chestedness and pose would be characteristic of Fehr’s “western” reclining scheme (supra n. 52), attested for both mortal and divine banqueters (supra n. 82).
abundant drinking (since it cannot be put down). The *keras* is a frequent attribute of Dionysos, but in early Greek art, especially on Corinthian and Attic vases of the late seventh and early sixth centuries, it is more commonly held by human revelers—reclining male figures as well as komasts or “padded dancers.” We can be sure that such reclining figures are meant to be mortals when they occur in groups, as on an Attic black-figure dinos in the British Museum, where three symposiasts out of 14 hold such drinking horns; but even lone banqueters surrounded by revelers on some komast vases need not be identified as Dionysos. The drinking horn is also the most common attribute for small bronze and terracotta banqueters of the “eastern” variety (see figs. 17, 18), and these often occur in groups suggesting their identity as mortal banqueters. In addition, drinking horns appear in the background of some symposion scenes. Whether these are meant to suggest objects hanging on a wall in a sympotic space or are included as attributes of the symposion, their presence in such scenes reveals that they were perceived as items appropriate to the mortal symposia. *Kerata* have been seen as material residue of the eastern heritage of the reclining banqueting in Greece, but they do not have markedly exotic or foreign associations in Greek art. As Dentzer notes, “the banqueters using the *keras* are apparently in the same milieu as the riders or warriors figured on the same vases,” and the use of the *keras* is not limited to special circumstances or special banqueters such as Herakles or Dionysos. By the mid sixth century, the drinking horn had become emblematic of elite banqueting in Greece. Hermonax’s tankard has few parallels, but its size suggests heavy drinking, as does the *arches*’ wineskin pillow.

Other possibly diagnostic aspects of the iconography of these reclining figures are their long hairstyles and, when preserved, their bare feet (cat. nos. 7, 8, 10). A few have long locks falling over the front of the shoulders (cat. nos. 2, 4), while others have a single trapezoidal mass terminating over the back, with individual segments delineated (cat. nos. 1, 6–8). Ridgway has suggested that the long tresses before the shoulders of the smaller reclining figure from Samos (see fig. 4; cat. no. 2) may signal divine or at least heroic status, but this variation probably has more to do with sculptural style and date than with the identity of the figure represented. Such differentiation is also found among small-scale bronze banqueters and large-scale kouroi. Long hair in general was associated with the lifestyle of *habrosyne* (luxury) embraced by East Greek elites and so does not suggest divinity. Barefootedness is notable because for comparable small bronze banqueters, it is typical only for the bare-chested varieties (whether with both legs laid flat or with one knee raised); the fully clothed “eastern” variety usually
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84 For real (natural) *kerata*in Celtic tombs, see Krause 1993; Witt 1997 (also available online at http://www.iath.virginia.edu/~umw8f/barbarians/first.html). For ceramic versions of the *keras* shape, see, e.g., a Kazanian painted rhyton from the sixth-century Smyrna (İzmir, İzmir Archaeological Museum, inv. no. 3371 [Aşgori et al. 1983, no. B67]) and later Tarentine examples illustrated in Krause 1993, fig. 3.

85 E.g., *LMC* 3:414–514, nos. 286, 291, 303–4, 326, 328, s.v. “Dionsyos”; supra n. 82.

86 Seeberg 1971, 73; 1995, 3; Dentzer 1982, 144; Carpenter 1986, 117 n. 82; Fehr 1990, 189; Krause 1993, 191–92; Smith 2000, 311–12; 2007, 56; Green 2007, 99. E.g., a Corinthian cup in Oxford (Ashmolean Museum, inv. no. 1968.1835 [BAPD, no. 550003]). Symposiasts on red-figure vases also occasionally hold drinking horns: e.g., a red-figure kylix attributed to the Epeleios Painter (Münch, Staatliche Antikensammlungen und Glyptothek, inv. no. 2619A [ARV², 146, no. 2; BAPD, no. 201289; Osborne 1998a, fig. 6]).

87 London, British Museum, inv. no. B46 (ABV, 91, no. 5; BAPD, no. 300850; Iliffe 1926, pls. 12, 13; Dentzer 1982, 144).

88 E.g., Pemberton 2000, 87, 102; Green 2007, 97, 99. Green’s (2007, 98) view is shaped, however, by the extreme position that all figures in Greek art of the sixth century and earlier are “myth-historical unless one can demonstrate otherwise” (cf. Ferrari 2002). On “monoposiasts,” see infra n. 116. For the more accepted reading of such scenes (even with single symposiasts) as mortal symposia, see Pipili 1987, 72–5;
wears pointed boots (see figs. 17, 18). While barefootedness has sometimes been read as a mark of divinity in Greek and Roman art, it is also conventional in certain iconographic contexts. It is customary for representations of symposiasts in Attic vase painting and is sometimes emphasized by shoes depicted beneath a kline. Barefootedness in a sympotic context signifies relaxation and comfort (and perhaps a practical respect for the fine coverlets used with klinai).

With the possible exception of the grape-holding figure from Didyma, the reclining men depicted in these sculptures most likely represent mortal symposiasts, the dedicants themselves. They thus fit into a larger, though limited, body of self-representational dedicatory sculpture in archaic Greece, such as the famous Moschophoros from the Athenian Acropolis. As Steiner has summarized, votive statues showing the dedicant engaged in worship serve to display “the value, status, and social connections surrounding the individual for whom it stands in” and “to negotiate and display his relations with his fellow men and with the gods” in the visible, and frequently visited, landscape of the sanctuary. A life-sized representation, such as those in the Geneleos Group or the figure to which the foot in Miletos belonged, would have conferred even greater prestige on the dedicant, given the expense.

Although the motif of the reclining banqueter is so familiar to us, because of its proliferation on Athenian vases and later reliefs, it is important to reiterate just how exceptional it would have been in archaic votive vases and later reliefs, it is important to reiterate just how exceptional it would have been in archaic votive contexts and how the custom itself would have, in the sixth century; seated dining seems to have continued into the Classical and later periods in certain geographical, religious, and political contexts. Even in late fifth-century Athens, reclining while dining was still evidently associated with elite luxury. These reclining banqueter sculptures, then, identify their dedicants as adherents of a particular aristocratic, leisure-loving lifestyle.

The statue of arches was part of a group including other figure types, and it has been suggested that Hermonax’s dedication and the other known reclining figures were also paired with enthroned figures and set on bases as family groups “beim feierlichen Gelage,” on the model of the Geneleos Group. It is worth noting that family dedications are attested epigraphically at Didyma, and the Geneleos Group was likely not the only family group at the Samian Heraion. And, as noted above, the seated statues from the Sacred Way temenos probably also represent members of a family and their illustrious ancestors. Enthroned figures on a small scale comparable to some of the reclining sculptures (statuettes) are known from Miletos and from the Sacred Way. Even without inscriptions, the grouping of otherwise “formally ‘generic’ marble statues would have helped contemporary viewers to identify them as representations of families.

---

98 See also Halle-Wittenberg, Martin Luther University of Halle-Wittenberg Museum, inv. no. 86 (Kolbe 2006, 146); Frankfurt, Liebieghaus, inv. no. 1593 (Bol and Weber 1985, no. 9; Walter-Karydi 1985, pl. 27.3); Ioannina, Ioannina Archaeological Museum, inv. no. 4910 (supra n. 95).
99 E.g., red-figure kylikes attributed to Douris in Karlsruhe (Badeisches Landesmuseum, inv. no. 70.395 [BAPD no. 4704; Belize, A. Deed [1993]) and Florence (National Archaeological Museum, inv. no. V48 [ARV2, 432, no. 58; BAPD, no. 205103]); and one assigned to the Proto-Panaetian Group (Boston, Museum of Fine Arts, inv. no. 01.8018 [ARV2, 317, no. 9; BAPD, no. 205247]).
100 See also Dentzer 1982, 163.
102 Simon 1986, 370.
106 Tuchelt 1976, 65; see also Bunke 2004, 88.
107 Fuchs and Floren 1987, 376; Ridgway 1993, 198. Tuchelt (1976, 65) wondered whether the figure type ever existed on its own in dedicatory contexts but noted that terracotta figures of reclining banqueters were often deposited as lone figures. Funerary sculptures such as the sarcophagus lid from Pantikapaeon (supra n. 49) provide further lone parallels.
108 Fuchs and Floren 1987, 376; Ridgway 1993, 198. Tuchelt (1976, 65) wondered whether the figure type ever existed on its own in dedicatory contexts but noted that terracotta figures of reclining banqueters were often deposited as lone figures. Funerary sculptures such as the sarcophagus lid from Pantikapaeon (supra n. 49) provide further lone parallels.
109 Tuchelt 1970, 119–20; 1976, 63; Keeling 2003, 102–6. Cf. also Cheramy’s dedication, with at least three korai and one kouroi (Kyrieleis 1986, 41–3, pl. 18–22; Ridgway 1993, 136, 165 n. 4.35; Lühr 2000, 156, 175; Bunke 2004, 90–5). The inscription on a lost enthroned figure from Samos (supra n. 75) implies that it was also part of a group. For family dedications at Didyma, though not all family group representations, see Lühr 2000, nos. 1, 4, 5.
110 Supra n. 78.
112 Keeling 2003, 106.
pairing reclining and enthroned figures would have been three-dimensional expressions of the basic scheme found on so-called Totenmahl reliefs and Anatolian-Persian stelae (see figs. 19, 20),\textsuperscript{113} with likely origins in Near Eastern art, as seen in Ashurbanipal’s Garden Party relief and also on a Cypro-Phoenician bowl from Cyprus (see figs. 15, 16).\textsuperscript{114} But the reading of teknon in Hermonax’s dedication and the possibility that catalogue number 7 may have accompanied it introduce another possible scenario, with multiple reclining figures. Comparanda for groups of reclining figures are found among Cypriot limestone statuettes (see fig. 22) and even, it could be argued, bronze vessel attachments.\textsuperscript{115} Perhaps both schemes were possible, with different implications: when the sole reclining figure in a composition, a banqueter may be construed as a “monoposiast,” with the eastern (and royal) connotations that carries;\textsuperscript{116} when accompanied by other reclining figures, he becomes a participant in a communal banquet or symposion. This distinction may be removed, however, if we understand a family sculptural group not as a snapshot of a family event but a portrait of each member in a characteristic or ideal activity, as has been suggested for the Geneleos Group; in that case, the reclining figure may be conceived as part of an imagined symposion, and the other dedications of reclining banqueters at nearby sanctuaries could be seen as members of his conceptual hetaireia. At the same time, the group context defines the individual through another vector of identity—the family—and the prevalence of family groups as a mode of dedication in archaic Ionia may reflect the importance of familial ties in aristocratic, clan-based communities.

ATTIRE AND PHYSIQUE

If not for certain iconographic details, the reclining banqueters dedicated at Ionian sanctuaries would simply reflect the prominence of banqueting imagery in this region, in another monumental medium. Several features, however, distinguish the best preserved of these works from the more common image of the reclining banqueter seen in a range of other media: the specific way the himation is worn over the chiton, leaving the chiton fully exposed over the belly, and the general plumpness of belly and chest. Other reclining banqueters in contemporary Greek and Etruscan art wear their himatia fully wrapped around the lower body, whether or not a chiton is underneath (see figs. 17, 25).\textsuperscript{117} Standing and seated male figures in East Greek monumental art also usually wear a mantle draped over one shoulder and around the abdomen.\textsuperscript{118} In contrast, of the Ionian reclining sculptures with torso fully or partially preserved, all except the bare-chested figure from Didyma (cat. no. 5) wear the himation differently; hanging to the front over the left shoulder and draped around the back to rest loosely along the right side of body, leaving an ungirt chiton fully exposed in the front.\textsuperscript{119} The result is not only a relaxed appearance, befitting the repose of a banquet, but also a visual emphasis on the belly. That these differences are not simply regional variations in the iconography of the reclining banqueter in Ionia is demonstrated by comparative examples found or made on Samos (see figs. 17, 18).\textsuperscript{120} So in contrast to reclining figures with himatia covering their waists, -arches and his corollaries at Samos and other Ionian sanctuaries seem to be “letting it all hang out.”

The bellies and chests exposed by this distinctive manner of wearing the himation are notably plump and round. It is, in fact, -arches’ corpulence that has fueled the long debate over its gender. Buschor’s original identification of the figure as a priestess was based on his interpretation of the figure’s full chest as a mark of matronly status, with breasts more “developed” than those of the accompanying korai.\textsuperscript{121} Fehr, on the other hand, sees a “well-fed body” that, together with the wineskin pillow, characterizes the figure as a “prosperous hedonist.”\textsuperscript{122} As Stewart summarizes, determinations of the figure’s sex have depended on “whether one regards its suspiciously full chest as a woman’s or simply a mark of Ionian opulence.”\textsuperscript{123} A similar plumpness can be found in other reclining

\textsuperscript{113} Supra nn. 45–6.
\textsuperscript{114} Fuchs and Floren 1987, 376; supra n. 40.
\textsuperscript{115} As Tuchelt (1976, 63) suggests.
\textsuperscript{116} On “monoposiasts,” see Senff 1992; Bowie 1997, 7; Steinhart and Slater 1997, 294–8; Fearn 2007, 58–61; supra n. 88.
\textsuperscript{117} For other small bronzes of both “eastern” and “western” reclining schemes (supra n. 52) with this arrangement of dress, see supra nn. 95, 97. For comparable banqueters in terracotta, see, e.g., Jacopi 1929, fig. 136; Mollard-Desquesnes 1954, 33, no. B190, pl. 24; Laumonier 1956, 83–4, nos. 169–71, pl. 20; Dentzer 1982, fig. 139; Gercke and Löwe 1996, 43–4.
\textsuperscript{118} Özgan 1978, 98–101.
\textsuperscript{119} On catalogue numbers 2 and 7, the position of the himation is revealed by a folded corner on the lower legs, which indicates that it terminated along the right side of the body and did not extend in front of the belly.
\textsuperscript{120} A Samian workshop has also been suggested for the bronzes in Frankfurt, Ioannina, and Bowdoin (supra nn. 95, 97, 98); see also the terracotta from Tomb 28.2 at Samos (Gercke and Löwe 1996, 43–4).
\textsuperscript{121} Buschor 1934b, 28.
\textsuperscript{122} Fehr 2003, 25; see also Fehr 2000, 121–25.
\textsuperscript{123} Stewart 1990, 117. Schanz (1980, 17) maintains Buschor’s view.
sculptures with well-preserved torsos. Freyer-Schauenburg notes the “weichen, vollen Brust” of the other figure from Samos (see fig. 4), and Fuchs and Floren note how “die schwere, teigige Masse des Körpers” of Hermonax’s dedication and the Miletos fragment (see figs. 8, 13) “scheint in das weiche Polster eingesunken zu sein.” The torso of the figure that may have accompanied Hermonax (see fig. 9) also has a prominently protruding chest. The other Myous figure (see fig. 12) has a more subtly convex upper torso, but its belly is a swollen oval mass—similar in shape to that of *-arches*, though not accentuated by pooling drapery folds, as Geneleos contrived. Kiderlen aptly describes the figure’s “weichen Bauch” and “geschwellten Volumina.” And Kleemann identified “weichen fülligen Körperlichkeit” as a characteristic feature of this sculptural type in general.

This soft corpulence should be distinguished from the exaggerated or grotesque bellies of some komasts and athletes in archaic art, which may have signified a tendency to eat and drink in excess, or comic exaggeration. These contoured forms are more subtle (one might even say more naturalistic) and have normally been attributed to regional style. Archaic Ionian sculpture in general is characterized by “fleshy,” stout male figures, whether reclining or standing, and the gender of enthroned statues has been “notoriously difficult” to determine. Akurgal described the up-

---

124 Freyer-Schauenburg 1974, 148–49.
125 Fuchs and Floren 1987, 576.
126 Kiderlen and Strocka 2006, 70.
127 Kleemann 1969, 58.
128 Fehr 1990, 189; Smith 2000, 313; see also Seeberg 1971, 1995; Schäfer 1997, 30–4; Smith 1998; 2007, 61–72; 2010 (on the multiplicity of contexts for such dancers); Pemberton 2000; Green 2007, esp. 99 (for criticism of Fehr).
129 Barletta 1987, 234; Keseling 2003, 105. On Ionian style, see Akurgal 1961, 229–34; Tuchelt 1970, 175–76; Pedley 1976, 58; Özgan 1978, 42–69; Sheedy 1985, 622–23; Walter-Karydi 1985, 92; Barletta 1987, 234; Fuchs and Floren 1987, 377; Stewart 1990, 117; Ridgway 1993, 83, 91. For standing draped male statues, see Akurgal 1961, figs. 193–97; Blümel 1963, 64, no. 69, fig. 217; Özgan 1978, 42–69, 100–23; Walter-Karydi 1985, 91–5; Barletta 1987, 235–36; Ridgway 1993, 91–2. For Branchidai, see Tuchelt 1970, no. K55, pls. 53–5. These difficulties extend also to small-scale sculpture: a draped, standing male terracotta figure from Samos was, like *-arches*, identified as female upon discovery (Boehlau 1898, 51, no. 5, pl. 14.7; Buschor 1935, fig. 163; Gercke and Löwe 1996, 86). Similarly, the seated figure on the south side of the Harpy monument from Xanthos has been variously identified as a plump eunuch or woman but, most recently, as an Ionian-type male (Draycott 2007b, 124).
per body contours of draped male statues from Samos and Pitane as “runden und weiblichen.”  

130 Boardman explains that Ionian sculptors seem to have preferred contoured, “sinuous,” even “boneless” forms and “flu-

131 ent masses.” But this softness probably reflects more than a local sculptural style. A full and fleshy male body seems to have been the aristocratic ideal in archaic Ionia, and the physiques of our banqueter sculptures express elite status and opulence.

132 The discourse of consumption in archaic poetry originating from Ionia supports such a view. In works that seem to express a “middling” or non-elite perspective, rotundity or belly-ness is negatively portrayed, as a trope for aristocratic excess. Archilochus, for example, criticizes one comrade (Pericles) for letting his “belly” (γαστήρ) lead his mind and heart astray toward “shamelessness,” and he was said to have declaimed “belly” (γαστήρ) lead his mind and heart astray toward “shamelessness,” and he was said to have declaimed “belly” 

133 But this softness probably reflects more than a local sculptural style. A full and fleshy male body seems to have been the aristocratic ideal in archaic Ionia, and the physiques of our banqueter sculptures express elite status and opulence.

134 Archilochus for example, criticizes one comrade (Pericles) for letting his “belly” (γαστήρ) lead his mind and heart astray toward “shamelessness,” and he was said to have declared another for similar gluttony. Although it is not Pericles’ obesity that Archilochus rebukes but his violation of social mores (attending symposia uninvited and without contribution, drinking unmixed wine), it is significant that he presents the γαστήρ as the source of this behavior. The belly also figures prominently in the poetry of Hipponax, who condemns gluttons with uncontrollable appetites and “demonizes political enemies as rapacious pests, who threaten to gobble up the commonwealth of the city.” The “belly” that Hipponax instructs his addressee in fragment 42 to turn “towards the setting sun” has normally been imagined as empty and therefore taken as a sign of the poet’s own poverty, but given the context (an explanation of Lydian geography), it could also be read as a gibe at corpulent Lydians or Ionians, conceived as walking bellies. On the other hand, the charge of gluttony could be wielded by an elitist poet at a “base-born” political rival, as in Alcaeus’ portrayal of Pittacus as a grotesque body, a slave to his belly. It is the very nature of the belly, which can be empty or full, that gives it such multivalence. From the “middling” perspective, belly-ness is a sign of excess; from an “elitist” perspective, it is a sign of baseness and need. Moderate corpulence could also be a marker of economic health: in Solon’s view, “luxury in belly, sides, and feet” is equal to wealth in land or metals. Later, in Herodotus and Aristophanes, the wealthy are sometimes referred to as “the fat” (οἱ παχέες).

135 Perhaps we should see the memorable image of Alcmeon swollen with gold dust from Croesus’ treasury in a similar light: a caricature of the rich man swollen with his own wealth. The positive portrayal of male corpulence in Ionian sculpture, most evident in these banqueter statues with their visual emphasis on unobstructed bellies and full chests, should be understood as part of this discourse, an elite celebration of bodily wealth against which poets such as Hipponax wrote. In the medium of the dedicatory statuary, this corpulence, like the reclining posture, signaled membership in the privileged leisure class.

136 Kistler (2004, 167–71) also considers these banqueter dedications in light of Morris’ model but sees them as manifestations of the “middling” perspective, in opposition to more overtly elitist enthroned statues, with connotations of eastern royalty. While the symposiast sculptures must have existed in a sort of dialogue with the seated figures in the visual landscapes of Ionian sanctuaries, Kistler’s approach does not account for the very particular attire and characteristic physique of the banqueters and projects certain aspects of the classical symposion, such as egalitarianism, back to the Archaic period.

137 For this ideal in early Greece in general, see Himmelmann 1996, 13–16.

138 For “middling” poetry and ideology, see Morris 1996, esp. 28–31, 34–6; 2000, 155–71; Kurke 1999, 19–21; Kistler 2004. For criticism of this approach, see Hammer 2004, 491–99; Rabinowitz 2004, 171–77, 2009, 119–20. The term is used here to describe not social class but adopted perspective, which, as Rabinowitz points out (2009, 120), could have varied even within the work of a single poet according to genre.

setting are bare feet, manner of attire, and means of reclining, but none of these solves the matter conclusively. As mentioned earlier, barefootedness is common for symposiasts, but it is uncertain whether worshipers would have removed their shoes while dining in a sanctuary context; and barefootedness is, of course, very common in Greek art. And although their particular way of wearing the himation to reveal the stomach may seem somewhat informal, there is no evidence to suggest that it would have been out of place in a sanctuary.

What has led most to interpret these sculptures as representations of cultic banqueting, besides context, is the lack of any indication of a banquet couch, or kline, when the lower part is preserved. Geneleos’ banqueter and the Myous figures recline on a plinth with a rounded profile resembling a mattress, in some cases set off from plinth proper by a recessed band. Thus, they appear to be reclining on cushions placed directly on the ground. Literary sources and visual evidence suggest that ritual banquets were usually enjoyed outdoors, on simple cushions (stibades). One source quoted by Athenaeus even describes such alfresco dining in honor of Hera at Samos, on mats made from hygos. A fragmentary Lakonian cup from Samos and a Fikellura amphora from Cyprus show figures reclining on cushions on the groundline near an altar, and on the Lakonian cup, a tree (see figs. 25, 26). A Cypriot amphora from Amathus shows two banqueters sharing a cushion and another reclining directly on the ground, in the presence of trees hung with garlands and attended by wine servers and musicians. All three vases have been interpreted as reflections of Samian cult tradition, but their significance need not be so restrictive, as outdoor cultic banqueting was, of course, not limited to Samos. Kron finds further reflections of Samian cult banqueting in Geneleos’ reclining figure and the other banqueter from Samos, but the occurrence of the same figural type in other East Greek votive contexts makes a specific connection with the Heraion unlikely.

Banqueters reclining on the ground, moreover, need not always be read as cultic or outdoor diners, for klinai may have been omitted for reasons of composition or execution. Such abbreviation may explain the many Attic red-figure kylikes with symposiasts reclining directly on the groundline, allowing greater emphasis on human action and anatomy.

149 Tuchelt 1976, 60–1; Wescot 1995, 297; cf. Kolbe 2006, 148–51. Or they have been read as reclining on simple benches (Riederlen and Strocka 2006, 72).
151 Nicaenetus of Samos (Ath. 673b–c); Freyer-Schauenburg 1974, 120; Kron 1988, 138–39. The text quoted in Athenaeus specifies only that the wreaths worn by banqueters are made of hygos, but the framing commentary (Ath. 673c–d) clarifies that Athenaeus, at least, understood the mats also to have been made from the same material. On the hygos, or chaste tree, in ancient religion and medicine, see von Staden 1993.
152 For the Lakonian cup, see Stibbe 1972, 243–45, no. 191, pl. 58; Dentzer 1982, fig. 109; Kron 1988, fig. 4; Pipili 1998, 90, fig. 8.11; Kolbe 2006, 150. For the Fikellura amphora, see Fehr 1971, no. 42; Walter-Karydi 1973, no. 109, pl. 13; Kron 1988, fig. 5; Cook and Dupont 1998, fig. 10.2. But, of course, an altar does not a sanctuary make, since altars could have been located in domestic courtyards. Smith (2000, 317) suggests that the Arkesilas Painter’s scene be understood along with the band of komasts below it and therefore reads the dining space as sympotic, even though the symposiasts do not recline on “the standard klinai.” For the possibility of outdoor symposia in domestic settings, see infra n. 162.
153 Kron 1988, 141–42. The relevance of the Lakonian scene to banqueting customs on Samos is uncertain, as its iconography has been read both as a reflection of a Spartan practice (Powell 1998, 123–28; Pomeroy 2002, 109; Sourvinou-Inwood 2003, 82) and as proof that Lakonian painters tailored their work to a Samian audience (Pipili 1998, 90; supra n. 26). Des Gagniers (1972, 55) proposed that the Cypriot scene was modeled on East Greek imports such as the Fikellura amphora discussed here, but the local Cypriot figurines suggest that the motif was, in fact, quite at home on Cyprus (cf. fig. 22 herein).
154 As Bumke (2004, 88 n. 504) also points out; see also Kron 1988, 142.
155 As Kleemann (1969, 58) suggests for these sculptures. The enthroned woman balancing the reclining figure in the Geneleos Group and the many enthroned statues from Ionia (Tuchelt 1970, 71–93; Ridgway 1993, 185–93; Tuchelt et al. 1996, 139–45) confirm that Ionian sculptors did not shy away from incorporating furniture into large-scale marble monuments, but a kline would certainly require more marble and more effort than a throne. Still, even sized-up carved stone couches exist in contemporary tombs in western Asia Minor, and some are monolithic (e.g., Mellink 1974, 355–59, pl. 69, figs. 16–19; Özgen et al. 1996, 41–2, 49, figs. 78, 96–9; Baughan 2004, 54–78; 2008). The incorporation of reclining statue and kline in one funerary monument is found in archaic Etruria and throughout the Roman empire (supra n. 48).
Sometimes background details that appear to be items hanging on a wall seem to confirm an interior setting (fig. 27). But reading space on Greek vases is no simple matter; lyres, for example, can appear to hang in a vineyard. In a recent study of “Bodengelage” in Attic vase painting, Heinrich suggests that such details be “understood as attributes of the symposion” and finds no literal representations of indoor or outdoor banquets, but rather a complex of imagery with varying degrees of Dionysiac elements (vines, vineyards, caves, and the very act of reclining on the ground) and illusionism. In another recent study, Topper interprets such scenes as creative visions of a primitive past, where the privilege of sympotic reclining was assured to Athenian citizens by its association with Athens’ founding heroes. The identification of perceived setting becomes more complicated when we consider that within the home, a symposion could have taken place wherever there was space to recline around a krater, with or without klinai.

---

157 Dentzer 1982, 89; Finster-Hotz 1984, 61–3; Neils 1995, 439–40. Neils suggests that this innovation was “invented,” for vase painting at least, by the red-figure pioneers (possibly inspired by architectural sculpture such as the Assos frieze). Heinrich (2007, 102–5, 124–29) finds abbreviation likely only on certain vase shapes, while Klinger (1997, 349–64) sees the groundline recliners painted on the shoulders of some pots as clever allusions to bronze vessels with three-dimensional banqueters (e.g., figs. 17, 18 herein) in these locations; see also Lynch 2007, 244; Topper 2009, 10 n. 40.

158 Attic red-figure kylix attributed to the Antiphon Painter (Munich, Staatliche Antikensammlungen und Glyptothek, inv. no. VAS2635 [ARV², 339, no. 57; BAPD, no. 203491]). See also a Lakonian cup in Paris (Musée du Louvre, inv. no. E067 [supra n. 89]); a red-figure cup attributed to Douris (Vatican, Museo Gregoriano Etrusco Vaticano, inv. no. 16561 [ARV², 427, no. 2; BAPD, no. 205046]); Fehr 1971, 38–9; Heinrich 2007, 103–5; Lynch 2007, 244–45.

159 E.g., on an Attic black-figure eye cup (Oxford, Ashmolean Museum, inv. no. 1974.344 [BAPD, no. 396; Boardman 1976]).

160 Heinrich 2007, 105, 112. For the different significance of Dionysos reclining on the ground and on a kline, see Heinrich 2007, 114; cf. Sourvinou-Inwood 2003, 79–89.

161 Topper 2009. This vision, however, would have contradicted the reality of the social custom, which was evidently not adopted by Greeks until the eighth or seventh century (Dentzer 1971, 1982; Fehr 1971; Boardman 1990; Matthäus 1999–2000; Wecowski 2002; Baughan 2004, 186–224; Franklin 2007, 196–97).
And not all outdoor banquets were necessarily on the ground or necessarily cultic, or at least conceived as such; fully furnished banquets may be depicted outside, as in Ashurbanipal’s Garden Party relief (see fig. 15) or on Attic vases showing erotic symposia with klinai in vineyards or arbors, whether or not they ever really took place there. Moreover, not all cultic banquets were necessarily outdoors: even in sanctuaries, certain banqueters reclined on couches or built-in benches in dining rooms, *hestiatoria*, or rock-cut caves. The lack of symposion furniture in our sculptures is therefore inconclusive.

The wineskin used as a cushion by *arches offers no further clarification. When wineskins serve this function in Attic vase painting, they usually support satyrs or mortals reclining directly on a groundline (see fig. 27), but there are notable exceptions in which wineskin pillows are used atop standard klinai, even in contexts lacking overt Dionysiac elements (fig. 28). Two of the small bronze banqueters comparable to these sculptures also appear to lean on wineskin pi-
Rather than signaling an outdoor or rustic setting, the wineskin pillow alludes to heavy sympotic drinking, regardless of locale, and helps disassociate -arches, visually, from the other members of the Geneleos Group; this compositional disunity helps the viewer perceive the figures as individual entities, engaged in their own form of cult worship or ideal activity, rather than as family members enjoying the same physical space.

The question of whether our banqueters recline for a cult meal or symposium may be not only unanswerable but also irrelevant; perhaps it was the act of reclining like a symposiast and not the location of the banquet that was important to convey. The dichotomy between “cult banquet” and “symposium” is itself misleading for the Archaic period, as it presupposes a distinction between sacred and private banqueting that is not substantiated by archaic evidence. For the Archaic period, we have more evidence for specially equipped dining rooms in sanctuaries than in domestic settings.168 Rabinowitz has recently pointed out the discrepancies between this emerging archaeological evidence and the common conception of the symposium as a private institution and, finding more references to cultic than domestic spaces in archaic poetry concerned with the symposium, has argued that archaic symposia may have taken place more often in sanctuaries than in private homes.169 Our conception of the symposium as an essentially private and nonculitic institution, but for certain ritualized aspects and sacred elements such as libations, is based largely on classical sources. Banqueting on the ground, then, is not an unequivocal marker of a sanctuary setting. The lack of a kline does not divorce the pose of reclining from its connotations of sympotic luxury nor require a cultic context.

**HISTORICAL CONTEXT AND SIGNIFICANCE**

Surely sympotic gatherings at sanctuaries and “fat,” wealthy aristocrats were not limited to archaic Ionia, so why are dedications of corpulent symposiasts found only in this region? The prominent Geneleos Group

---

167 See also Halle-Wittenburg, Martin Luther University of Halle-Wittenberg Museum, inv. no. 86 (supra n. 98).


169 Rabinowitz 2007, 2009; see also Bowie (1997, 3 n. 27) on the possibility that ritual dining at festivals (albeit of Dionysos) was “sympotic” (supra n. 28).
may have been the catalyst for this votive trend,\textsuperscript{170} especially since all these sculptures, except the bare-chested figure from Didyma, share, where preserved, the peculiar arrangement of the himation worn by -arches. As we have seen, the image of the reclining banqueter was also evidently more visible in the monumental arts of Ionia than elsewhere in the archaic world. There is indirect evidence that votive images of banqueters, as a self-representational medium distinct from the more general visibility of reclining banqueters in Ionia, may have carried a special political significance.

To understand the place of banqueting in elite ideologies of Ionia, one must also consider Polycrates, tyrant of Samos (ca. 540–522 B.C.E.).\textsuperscript{171} Textual sources, all admittedly later than the sixth century, portray Polycrates as a seasoned banqueter, who brought the lifestyle of luxury to new heights.\textsuperscript{172} Soon after his demise, his secretary and successor, Maiandrios, dedicated the kosmos (gear) of Polycrates’ banquet hall (andron) at the Heraion.\textsuperscript{173} While it is interesting to speculate what may have constituted the kosmos of a lavish archaic andron,\textsuperscript{171} the significance of this dedication for understanding the banqueter statues and statuettes lies more in its possible political message. Polycrates was notorious for seizing possessions of political enemies and has been credited with a “clampdown on aristocratic ostentation” as a “neutralization of political enemies,”\textsuperscript{175} so Maiandrios’ act of consecration may be seen both as a means of putting an end to the cycle of appropriation and as a way of displaying Polycrates’ excess. This may have been one of Maiandrios’ outwardly democratic gestures that really favored the aristocratic status quo, pre-tyranny.\textsuperscript{176} If normal sympotic behavior on Samos, prior to the reign of Polycrates and the creation of his own lavish private andron, had involved sanctuary dining halls decked with votive kosmos, then Maiandrioi’s dedication could be seen as a return to that aristocratic norm.\textsuperscript{177} Still, Polycrates’ excesses may have cast a negative light on self-identifying as an opulent banqueter, thus weakening the popularity of this figure type as a votive medium. At the same time, Polycrates’ and other tyrants’ transfer of sympotic activity from communal (if still elite) dining halls at sanctuaries to private andrones may have played a crucial role in the development of the private symposium as we know it from classical sources.\textsuperscript{178} Once a clear distinction between cult meals and private symposia emerged, it may have been unusual to express one’s role as a private symposiast in a votive context. Our difficulties distinguishing whether these banqueters are meant to be enjoying a cult meal or symposion and understanding why elite men would have wanted to represent themselves as symposiasts in a sanctuary underscores how much our understanding of the symposion relies on classical sources, in which that distinction is important.

The earliest of our banqueter sculptures predate the reign of Polycrates and thus possibly also the distinction between public and private banqueting. The idea that symposia took place in Ionian sanctuaries during this period must remain speculative, since no specially equipped banquet halls have been identified archaeologically at the Samian Heraion or at other Ionian sanctuaries, but it is possible that even outdoor cult banquets included sympotic groups. As noted above, cult dining in the Heraion was said to have taken place outdoors, with participants reclining on mats made of hyges.\textsuperscript{179} Shenai were said to have been erected as temporary shelters, and some postholes found in the sanctuary may attest to such consecration of gold- and silver-plated klinai, gold vessels, and rich purple cloths to Apollo via holocaust (Hdt. 1.50).\textsuperscript{180} provides a possible model. This kosmos may also have included armor and weapons; cf. Alc. 357LP; Hdt. 1.34; and a symposion scene on a Middle Corinthian column krater (Paris, Musée du Louvre, inv. no. E629 [BAPD, no. 9019327; Richter 1966, fig. 311]); see also Stein-Hölkeskamp 1992, 42, 47 n. 30; Schäfer 1997, 25–7; van Wees 1998, 363–66.\textsuperscript{181} Shipley 1987, 84, 90, 92–3; see also Mitchell 1975, 84–5; von Steuben 1980, 23. The chronology of the banqueter dedications catalogued here, however, challenges the supposed decline of monumental votives in Ionia in the late sixth century; see also Sinn 1982, 50–5.\textsuperscript{182} Mitchell 1975, 86; Roisman 1985, 263–67; Shipley 1987, 104. Denzter (1982, 446) reads it as a democratic move.

170 Fehr 1971, 121–22; Freyer-Schaubeng 1974, 117, 120, 122, 149; Tuchelt 1976, 60–1; Walter-Karydi 1985, 95; Ridgway 1993, 198. Walter-Karydi (1985, 93–4) also suggests that the young male figure in this group catalyzed the trend in statues of standing draped youths (cf. Barletta 1987, 235).

171 On the chronology of his reign, see Mitchell 1975, 76 (with n. 2).

172 Ath. 12.540d–e; Hdt. 3.121; FGrHist 539; Shipley 1987, 81–4; Franklin 2007, 197–98. See Günther (1999) on the questionable accuracy of these later sources.

173 Hdt. 3.123.1: “ός χρόνοι ὅ μισθόν υπὲρτρον τούτον τόν κόσμον τόν ἐι τοῦ ἀνδρεῶνος τοῦ Πολυκράτους ἑότα ἄξιοθέντον ἁμένοις πάντα τό ἕμπορον”; see also Roisman 1985, 264–65.

174 Cf. Hdt. 7.83, where “kosmos” refers to the special equipment of Xerxes’ Ten Thousand. It can also mean, more generally, “adornment” (e.g., Hdt. 5.92ff; Hom. Il. 14.187), and Polycrates was said to have “κοσμηθῆναι” Samos (Ath. 12.540d; FGrHist 539). Rouse (1975, 316) imagined that this dedication included “splendid furniture and ornaments,” and Croesus’ conceptions of himself as a “kosmos” and his identification as a vehicle for his message of “liberty.”


176 I thank Adam Rabinowitz for this suggestion. See Roisman (1985, 263–65) for Maiandrioi’s establishment of the cult of Zeus Eleutherios as a vehicle for his message of “liberty.”


179 Supra n. 151.


181 Shipley 1987, 84, 90, 92–3; see also Mitchell 1975, 84–5; von Steuben 1980, 23. The chronology of the banqueter dedications catalogued here, however, challenges the supposed decline of monumental votives in Ionia in the late sixth century; see also Sinn 1982, 50–5.
are dated to the later sixth or fifth century, but the tradition seems to begin in the first half of the sixth century. A tumulus chamber near Sardis (see fig. 21) exemplifies the type, with a limestone kline of distinctive type set against one wall of the chamber. Though most such tombs have been looted, when grave goods are recovered they often include items associated with banqueting, such as drinking vessels and tables. A similar presentation of the deceased as a reclining banqueter is found in the funerary monuments of western Asia Minor in the late sixth and fifth centuries, particularly on Anatolian-Persian stelae (see fig. 29). These monuments are somewhat later than the votive sculptures considered here, but, like the kline tombs, they attest the prominence of such imagery— and the encoding of elite status through the image of the reclining banqueter—among dynastic cultures of Asia Minor. For Lydians of the sixth century, monumental tomb design and decoration was the primary arena for elite self-definition; in East Greece, on the other hand, such elite self-expression took place in sanctuaries more often than in cemeteries. Geneleos’ -arches and his fellow banqueters can thus be seen as East Greek counterparts to kline occupants in Lydian and other western Anatolian tombs, different forms of monumentalized elite self-expression, manifesting the ideology of the banquet but in different, socially circumscribed terms.

East Greek connections with Cyprus, home to some of our earliest evidence for the reclining banquet and for its important role in elite culture, are also relevant. These were strongest on Samos, where the reclining symposiast sculptural type was established by Geneleos. Cypriot imports, including a reclining banqueter statuette (with seated woman included), have been found at the Heraion of Samos in strata of the seventh century through the first half of the sixth century, concurrent with the Geneleos Group. The con-

---

180 Polyaeus Strat. 6:45; Kron 1988, 142–43.
181 Kron 1988, 144.
183 Ath. 673b–c.
184 For the Lakonian cup, this admittedly stretches the argument, but both Kron (1988, 142) and Pipili (1998, 90) have suggested as much because the cup was dedicated to Hera (supra n. 26).
185 On the association of the dancers with the banqueting scene, see supra n. 152. On mitra, see Alcm. Parthenon 67–8; Pind. Nem. 8:16; Sappho fr. 98a.10–11; Kurtz and Boardman 1986, 51–6; 61; Kurke 1992, 97; DeVries 2000, 359–60.
188 von Gall 1989, 149–52; Nollé 1992, 79–88; Baughan 2004, 328–42; Draycott 2007a, 57–61, 121–25. Draycott stresses the significance of the female figures on these reliefs and argues that they were meant to evoke nuptial banquets.
189 There is even evidence for such a tomb arrangement within the tumulus at Belevi, near Ephesus, next to the better-known Hellenistic mausoleum (Kasper 1976–1977, 129–79; Praschniker and Theuer 1979, 170–72; Roosevelt 2003, 619–20, no. 536). This is not surprising, since the tomb lies on a major travel route between Ionia and Sardis and has other Lydian affinities. Eckert (1998, sec. 4.2.2; also available online at http://www.sub.uni-hamburg.de/dissec221/) has suggested that the tumulus may have been associated with a pro-Persian tyrant of Ephesus in the latter half of the sixth century.
190 Supra n. 40.
exception of worshiper/dedicant as a reclining banqueter is also found on a smaller scale in Cyprus, in dedications of similar statuettes and statuette groups (see fig. 22). As noted above, the Cypriot reclining banqueters seem to be contemporary with the earliest Ionian symposiast sculptures, and it is uncertain whether one type may have provided inspiration for the other; but these two contemporary traditions at least indicate a shared conception of the image of the reclining banqueter as an appropriate vehicle for votive expression. It is also worth noting that on Cyprus, as in western Anatolia, the theme also appeared on funerary monuments of the fifth century, before the more general trend of Totenmahl reliefs in mainland Greece.192

CONCLUSIONS

Geneleos presented his patron-arches as a symposiast in full reclining glory, with chest and belly accentuated by the folds of an ungirt chiton, unusually revealed by a himation left open in the front. Whether this distinctive mode of attire was common for Ionian symposiasts or invented by Geneleos to highlight the physique of his patron, it appears on most other (subsequent) reclining banqueter dedications in Ionia and encapsulates the elite status and sympotic privilege of their dedicants. As attributes such as drinking horns and a wineskin pillow make clear, the context of the banquet is sympotic, but its perceived location is ambiguous; it need not have been the domestic symposia portrayed by classical sources, as sympotic gatherings in the Archaic period may well have taken place in sanctuary settings as much as, if not more often than, in private contexts, where evidence for specialized dining rooms is lacking for the Archaic period. At the same time, the lack of a kline does not necessarily mark these banqueters as cult worshipers dining on stibades.

The corpulence of some of the figures is not merely an Ionian stylistic quirk but a self-conscious statement of social identity, one that embraced luxury and opulence and may have lain behind the discourse of gluttony in archaic poetry. This localized form of elite self-expression may have been inspired by the presentation of the dead as reclining banqueters in monumental funerary art and assemblages in contemporary western Anatolia and also shares formal characteristics with some Cypriot votive sculptures. In general, the image of the reclining banqueter occupied a more prominent place in the visual landscapes of Ionian sanctuaries than elsewhere in archaic Greece: during the period of the sculpted symposiasts, reclining banqueters were depicted on several architectural relief friezes in western Asia Minor and Ionia, and Samos seems to have been a production center for small-scale bronze banqueters that served as vessel attachments. The visual prominence of this motif in Ionia is matched only in Etruria during the same period. Connections and similarities between Ionian and Etruscan art and culture in the sixth century have often been noted; a precise explanation for this particular cultural affinity lies outside the scope of this article, but it can at least be said that in both regions, the motif was employed in elite self-expression during the sixth century.

The localized votive trend represented by these sculpted symposiasts may be compared to the corpus of archaic equestrian statues dedicated on the Athenian Acropolis. Just as the equestrian type, whether used for mortal or mythical figures, was particularly suitable “for the cultic, political, and social spheres of sixth-century BC Athens,”193 so the reclining banqueter type was appropriate to the mores of archaic Ionia, whether used as a votive type representing a mortal dedicant or divine honoree, or even in mythical narrative in temple sculpture. And just as the naked kouroi erected as votive statues or as funerary markers throughout the Greek world have been seen to embody athletic virtues and thereby to identify their dedicants as members of the social class that placed value on such virtues,194 the amply clothed and ample-bodied figures of Ionian sculpture, whether banqueters or standing figures, seem to privilege a different body image and comportment. Their soft physiques look feminine to us only because we are conditioned by Atheno-centric histories of Greek art.
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Appendix: Catalogue of Banqueter Statues and Statuettes from Archaic Ionia

SAMOS, HERAION
Catalogue Number: 1 (see figs. 1–3).
Location: Vathy, Archaeological Museum of Samos, inv. no. 768.

193 Eaverly 1995, 70.
194 Osborne 1998b, 29.
Findspot: Near the Sacred Way in front of the Geneleos base. Dimensions: Preserved ht. 0.54 m (0.70 m including plinth); preserved lgth. 1.58 m; wdlth. 0.54–0.58 m. Description: Marble reclining figure from the Geneleos Group, just under-life-sized, ca. 560 B.C.E. The head, feet, and parts of both hands are not preserved. A himation with broad folds hangs loosely over the left shoulder and arm, back, and legs. Beneath it, the figure wears a short-sleeved chiton with narrow folds delineated through crisp, parallel grooves. The chiton extends beneath the hem of the himation toward the ankles. The straight edge of a trapezoidal mass of hair, divided into 19 individual locks, is preserved along the upper back. The figure holds a curved object (probably a drinking horn) in the left hand, before the chest, and rests the right hand over the right knee. The outer face of the object is broken, preserving only the outline of where it made contact with the body, except for the lowest portion, which terminates beneath the hand in a broad, flat plane. The left elbow is supported on a cushion in the form of a folded wineskin. The plinth has the rounded profile of a mattress and carries traces of painted decoration, in transverse bands, and a dedicatory inscription: “...ἀρχης ἡμεᾶς κἀ[νέθηκ]ε τῆι Ἦρηι.” References: Freyer-Schauenburg 1974, 150, no. 71, pl. 51–3; Dentzer 1982, 157, no. S19; 163, fig. 136; Sinn 1982, 52 n. 88; Fuchs and Floren 1987, 356; Ridgway 1993, 198, 213–14 n. 5.42; Brinkmann 2003, no. 354.

Catalogue Number: 3 (see fig. 5).
Location: Samos, Heraion Depot.
Findspot: The Heraion.
Dimensions: Max. preserved ht. 0.125 m; max. preserved lgth. 0.285 m; max. preserved wdlth. 0.215 m.
Description: Marble fragment of a folded pillow, possibly for a reclining figure, possibly sixth century B.C.E.
References: Freyer-Schauenburg 1974, 150, no. 70A/B, pl. 58; Dentzer 1982, 157, no. S20; 163, fig. 136; Sinn 1982, 52 n. 88; Fuchs and Floren 1987, 356; Ridgway 1993, 213 n. 5.42.

DIDYMA
Catalogue Number: 4 (see fig. 6).
Location: Didyma, Didyma Excavation Depot, inv. no. S105.
Findspot: Found in 1974 in a field about 2 km north-west of Didyma.
Dimensions: Max. preserved ht. about 0.71 m; preserved lgth. 1.285 m; preserved wdlth. 0.46 m.
Description: Fragmentary, marble, life-sized reclining figure with drinking horn, ca. 530 B.C.E. The head, right arm, and lower legs are not preserved. A himation covers the left shoulder and arm and drapes around the back (in heavy, parallel folds) to fall over the thighs in the front. A chiton with thin border and lightly incised folds covers the chest. Individual locks of hair fall before the shoulders, and a solid mass of hair with banded tresses terminates on the shoulders in the back. The figure leans his left elbow on two stacked pillows, differentiated in size and firmness as well as through decoration, as Brinkmann has recorded weathering patterns indicative of former painted decoration on both: broad vertical stripes on the lower pillow, meander on the upper cushion.
References: Tuchelt 1976, 55–8, 61–6, figs. 1–3, 6; Dentzer 1982, 157, no. S24; 163; Walter-Karydi 1985, 96; Fuchs and Floren 1987, 376; Brinkmann 2003, no. 179.

Catalogue Number: 5 (see fig. 7).
Location: Didyma, Didyma Excavation Depot, inv. no. S106.
Findspot: Found in 1911 in the “upper levels” of the southwest excavation sector at the Temple of Apollo, then lost but rediscovered in the garden of the German “Stationshauses” at Didyma in 1974.

Dimensions: Max. preserved ht. 0.46 m; preserved ht. of figure 0.35 m; preserved lgth. 0.60 m; preserved wdth. 0.41 m.

Description: Marble fragment of an under-life-sized reclining figure with grapes and drinking horn (?), ca. 530 B.C.E. The lower torso, upper legs, left elbow, and two stacked pillows are preserved over a rectangular plinth. A himation is draped in neat folds around the waist and buttocks and across the back to terminate in zigzag folds over the left elbow. This arrangement and the lack of any indication of material on the preserved portion of the stomach suggest that the figure wore no chiton and was therefore bare-chested. At the left edge of the top pillow is the bottom of an oblong object that is probably a drinking horn once held in the left hand. Before the belly is an object that appears to be a grape cluster, which must have been held in the right hand. The underside is flat, with a rough-pointed center surrounded by smooth-chiseled bands on the edges (anathyrosis).


MYOUS

Catalogue Number: 6 (see fig. 8).

Location: Berlin, Staatliche Museen, inv. no. 1673.

Findspot: Probably in Wiegand’s excavations at Myous in 1908.

Dimensions: Max. preserved ht. about 0.17 m; preserved lgth. 0.37 m; wdth. about 0.18 m.

Description: Statuette of a reclining figure dedicated by Hermonax, made of blue-veined marble, in two fragments joined with a restoration in the middle, ca. 550–525 B.C.E. The figure wears a short-sleeved, ankle-length chiton, and the corner of a himation lies folded over the lower legs. The feet are bare, with toes articulated. On the front of the plinth, a sunken band defines a mattress layer, on which Brinkmann has detected traces of pigment belonging to banded decoration. The drinking vessel was also painted, with a pattern composed of vertical interlocking rays, yellow ochre (below) and green or blue (above). Inscription on chest: “Ερμώναξ με και τὸ τέκνον ἀνέθεσαν δεκάτην ἔργον τῶ[ι] Ἀπόλλωνι.”

References: SEG 34 1189; Blümel 1963, 63, no. 66, figs. 213, 214; Weber 1965, 48 n. 11; Fehr 1971, 120, 178, no. 492; Freyer-Schauenburg 1974, 120; Jeffery 1976, pl. 45; 1990, 473, no. 39a; Dentzer 1982, 157, no. S21; 163, figs. 137, 138; Bravo 1984, 115–16; Fuchs and Floren 1987, 376, pl. 33.5; Kron 1988, fig. 7; Ridgway 1993, 198, pl. 45, fig. 5.83; Brinkmann 2003, no. 190; Schmitt-Pantel and Lissarrague 2004, 243, no. 167; see also the Anne Jeffery Archive (http://poinikastas.csad.ox.ac.uk/), no. 1311; Packard Humanities Institute Greek Epigraphy Web site (http://epigraphy.packhum.org/inscriptions/), no. 252354 (Miletos 243*5).

Catalogue Number: 7 (see figs. 9–11).

Location: Berlin, Staatliche Museen, inv. nos. 1674, V3-91.

Findspot: Probably in Wiegand’s excavations at Myous in 1908.

Dimensions: Fragment A, max. preserved ht. 0.18 m; max. preserved lgth. 0.105 m; wdth. about 0.185 m; Fragment B, max. preserved ht. 0.095 m; max. preserved lgth. 0.195 m; wdth. 0.19 m.

Description: Two fragments of a reclining statuette made of blue-veined marble, ca. 550–500 B.C.E. Fragment A includes part of the neck, torso, and left arm, leaning on a pillow; Fragment B contains the lower legs, including both feet. The figure wears a short-sleeved, ankle-length chiton, and the corner of a himation lies folded over the lower legs. On the back of the left shoulder, the pointed ends of three locks of hair, similar to those on catalogue number 6, are partly preserved. The feet are bare, with toes articulated. On the front of the plinth, a sunken band defines a mattress layer, as on catalogue number 6. Kiderlen and Strocka do not assign these two fragments to the same figure, but the marble is compatible, and the width (depth) of the two pieces is nearly identical.

References: Blümel 1963, 63, no. 67, fig. 212 (Fragment A only); Weber 1965, 48 n. 11; Fehr 1971, 122, 179, no. 494; Freyer-Schauenburg 1974, 120; Dentzer 1982, 157, no. S23; 163; Kiderlen and Strocka 2006, 72, nos. 19, 20.

Catalogue Number: 8 (see fig. 12).

Location: Berlin, Staatliche Museen, inv. no. 1672.

Findspot: Probably in Wiegand’s excavations at Myous in 1908.
Dimensions: Max. preserved ht. about 0.19 m; preserved lgth. about 0.38 m; preserved wdth. about 0.22 m.

Description: Reclining statuette of blue-veined marble, ca. 525–500 B.C.E. The feet, head, and left arm are not preserved. The right arm rests along the side of the torso and thighs, and the right hand rests atop the right knee. The figure wears a short-sleeved chiton that reaches to the ankles, beneath a himation that drapes from the left shoulder across the back and under the right arm to cover the right leg. A corner of the himation lies folded on the left knee. Subtle modulations between the figure’s lower legs distinguish the material of the lighter chiton from that of the heavier, smooth himation. The smooth heel of one foot is preserved. Although Kiderlen noted a “paper-thin sole” and presumed a “closed shoe of soft leather,” the beginning of an arch suggests that the foot is in fact bare. Traces of a painted checkerboard pattern were noted by Kiderlen on the border of the himation. On the back of the right shoulder, the ends of four locks of hair ending in a single straight edge are evident but poorly preserved.
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