

Symposia Tarentina

The artistic sources of the first Tarentine banqueter terracottas

Ágnes Bencze

Abstract

The archaic terracotta figurine Budapest 77.104.A, belonging to the well-known class of Tarentine votives representing a reclining banqueter, is taken here as a starting point for a discussion concerning the artistic sources that determined the style and iconography of this class at its beginning. A number of comparisons with a wide range of works of art of the 6th century BC help to reconsider the assertion, generally accepted up to now, according to which the theme and the scheme of Tarentine banqueters would have been adapted directly from Eastern Greek art. A thorough stylistic analysis of early Tarentine banqueter types shows, in fact, that Eastern Greek models played a role in the formation of local types only as a part of a more complex whole, in which the impact of Laconian models must have been equally important. In fact, it seems more likely that the ultimate origin of the Tarentine banqueter scheme can be traced back to the art of its metropolis, Sparta. On the other hand, in the second half of the 6th century, an interest for East Greek models can be observed also in Laconian art itself, with strikingly similar results as it is shown by some coroplastic documents in Taras.

1. A TARENTINE SYMPOSION TERRACOTTA IN BUDAPEST

A fragmentary Tarentine terracotta figurine of the archaic period is on display among the relics of pre-Roman South Italy in the Collection of Greek and Roman Antiquities of the Budapest Museum of Fine Arts (figs 1-3).¹

Its maximum height preserved is 17,2 cm, its length is 9,5 cm. The piece is made of a light orange colored (Munsell HUE 7.5YR 7/6 - 6/6), medium fine, slightly porous clay, baked medium hard. The figurine is molded with one mould, completely filled with clay, the back smoothed down roughly with a wooden tool. That is, the terracotta was prepared as a solid and fairly flat 'relief with cut edges'. It is likely that all the details formed part of the original mould, perhaps with the only exception of the right hand and the bowl in it, which might have been produced with the help of a separate mould and attached to the freshly molded, leather-hard terracotta figurine. The surface betrays a number of smaller 'accidents' due to the way the craftsman removed the still soft piece from the mould, such as the blurred surface at the lower portion of the tresses on the right, the trace of a nail marking unintentionally the chin just under the lips, and the truncated point of the nose, most probably lost as this protruding element got stuck in the mould. All these inaccuracies would have been hidden by the thick coating and painting that originally covered the piece, of which only some remains of the white paint are preserved.

The figurine is fragmentary: the lower part of the body is missing from the waist onwards, on its right,

only shoulder and hand are preserved, while the left hand is incomplete, together with the lyre it is holding. The point of the mantle hanging down from the left elbow is missing, too. We cannot know if the composition included also a couch or some sort of 'abbreviation' of it, anyway the piece does not preserve any trace of it today. It was broken in three fragments and reassembled in modern times.

The whole composition can be reconstructed on the base of other pieces of roughly the same date, such as the terracotta no 20047 of the National Museum of Taranto (fig. 4)² or no 1660 of the Allard Pierson Museum, Amsterdam.³

It represents a man reclining on his left elbow in the typical pose of a banqueter. Following the most recurrent typology, the banqueter represented by the Budapest figurine must have been reclining with the right leg bent at knee and the left stretched out, the pelvis turned towards to the spectator in a fully frontal view, and the upper body lifted to an almost perfectly upright position, lifted by the vertical left upper arm. Above the horizontal line of the shoulders, the head, modeled in a much deeper relief, is supported by a flat element substituting the neck. This element can be regarded more properly as a relief representing the neck and the three tresses falling down on each side of it; this is the weakest point of all the pieces of this group of terracottas, where the need for a realistic representation comes in conflict in the most evident way with the obstacles inherent to the technique of this genre. In the case of our figurine, the head and the neck are united in one



Figs 1-3. Terracotta figurine of a banqueter, Budapest, Museum of Fine Arts (photos László Mátyus).

inversed U shaped element, the surface of which is simply smoothed down on the top and on the sides without modeling. Above the forehead, a slightly prominent band is delimited by two grooves, and probably represents a ribbon or diadem, in a way quite usual in the case of female figures, especially *protomai*. Under this 'band' the forehead is encircled by a fringe of hair in the shape of an almost perfect semicircle, composed by a sequence of short 'fongues' of the same length ending at both sides with the slightly bigger and faded patches of the ears. On each side of the neck, three tresses, reduced to a row of small globes, fall down to the shoulder of the figure and are spread on the chest in a fan-like pattern. Roughly half of the bust is covered by a himation, draped in oblique and curved folds from the left shoulder and upper arm towards the hip, leaving uncovered the pectorals of the right half and the right shoulder; the left forearm is naked, too, the edge of the mantle being rolled up under the left elbow and falling down from it in a thick, vertical bunch. The left hand, resting on the hip with rigidly stretched fingers, holds a lyre, its drum, without indication of any further details, is to be seen below the forearm, while its chords are hidden by the hand. The right arm is bent back against the chest, the hand holding a ribbed bowl

(*phiale*) between the thumb and the outstretched fingers.

The modeler must have neglected deliberately several details of the face, reserving them to painting. Nevertheless, the basic structure of a characteristic physiognomy can be clearly recognized. The structure of this large, smiling face, which also appears to be essentially rounded at a first sight, is fundamentally determined by the converging planes of the eyes and the cheeks. Opposed to the large and flat arch of the forehead, the lower portion of the face visibly tapers downwards; thus, the arches of the eyebrows and the edges of the chin define a regular trapezoid, turned upside down. The slightly oblique position of the large,



Fig. 4. Terracotta figurine of a banqueter, Taranto, Museo Archeologico Nazionale (photo László Mátyus).



Fig. 5. Small bronze banqueter from Samos, Frankfurt, Liebighaus. Detail: frontal view of face (Walter-Karydi 1985, fig. 27,3).



Fig. 6. Colossal kouros from Samos, Vathy Museum. Detail: profile view of face (Samos X, pl. 27).

smooth, almond-shaped eyes and of the swelling cheeks produces a fluent transition between the frontal and the side planes of the head, the traits being all convergent towards the short and slanting nose. The mouth is composed of short lips, slightly curving upwards at the edges, placed almost immediately under the nose, sunken into the circle delimited by the full cheeks and the small but markedly protruding chin. The relief of the profile view is characterized in its lower portion by the dimples encircling the mouth, and in the upper part by the sliding and continuous line going from the front to the tip of the nose.

There are two more exemplars of the coroplastic type⁴ of Budapest 77.104.A, which, however, do not provide us with any further information concerning the rest of the composition and its possible variants: the two figurine heads of identical appearance,⁵ broken off at the neck, form part of the collection of Tarentine terracotta fragments entered in the Louvre as a gift of F. Lenormant. They simply show that the Budapest banqueter belongs to a Tarentine type, represented at least by two exemplars in the votive deposits of the town discovered between 1879 and 1881.⁶ The much less precise provenance of the Budapest terracotta matches with the data concerning the origin of the two small fragments of the Louvre: according to the Museum registers it comes from the collection of Dr. Lóránt Basch, which contained a number of terracottas acquired through the collector's sister, who lived in Italy for a time.

Although for the moment no further exemplars are known of this type, these facts, together with the physical and technical characteristics of the piece prove beyond doubt that we have to do with a typical creation of the Tarentine votive terracotta production, an early banqueter composition. Tarentine 'reliefs' - with a more appropriate term: half figurines of outstretched composition - representing a banqueting male figure (a beardless youth like in the type of the Budapest terracotta or a bearded, thus mature man) were the most popular kind of votive offerings in the city-state's sanctuaries and an essential class of local terracotta production, from the late archaic period down to the end of the 4th century BC.⁷ To judge from the evidence provided by the thousands of exemplars preserved to our days (mostly fragments), local craftsmen formulated and reformulated the theme of the reclining man many times during these two centuries or more, in reliance on the changing stylistic tendencies of Greek sculpture and on their personal artistic training and view. It must be observed, too, on the other hand that the iconographic scheme of these compositions remained almost unchanged during these

generations which can perhaps be explained in terms of the constraints of the religious cult, in connection with which these pieces were used. For example, these Tarentine terracottas always tended to represent only one male banqueter each and not a couple or a company of symposiasts.⁸ We should also notice the outstretched posture of the figure, turning towards the spectator in a not very realistic way, which is found also in the more realistic compositions of the classical period. The drapery pattern is basically identical throughout almost the whole production (a mantle covering the bigger half of the chest, leaving the right arm naked and enveloping the lower body), although the stylistic approach naturally changed from time to time. From the archaic period onwards, an obligatory element of the iconographical scheme of Tarentine banqueter compositions is constituted by a complicated head-gear, composed by more or less stylized floral motifs, which is still not to be found on the Budapest exemplar, an early piece of the class.

Since they were first discovered at the end of the 19th century, Tarentine banqueter terracottas have been studied on several occasions. The direction of research, however, mostly focused on questions concerning their iconographic and religious interpretation.⁹ With respect to the origin, possible artistic sources and starting date of this series, the similar reconstructions advanced by R.A. Higgins¹⁰ and H. Herdejürgen,¹¹ published at about the same time, were generally accepted, practically without discussion by the authors of later publications, although both scholars based their conclusions on rather limited evidence. It seems that the question is worth revisiting now in the light of other, more recently published groups of Tarentine terracottas¹² and especially given the opportunity I have had to acquire a familiarity with the mostly unpublished material of the National Museum of Taranto and some other collections.

2. SAMIAN STYLE FACES AND BANQUETERS

The objective of the following analyses is to locate the coroplastic type of the Budapest banqueter figurine and some other Tarentine types of the same date in the history of archaic Greek art, with the help of a network of precise correspondences which are likely to provide us with a more coherent picture of those multiple artistic impulses that could be perceived and assimilated by the craftsmen of this overseas Greek colony. Most of our comparisons will be taken from outside the area of terracotta sculpture, and often even from out-

side the field of small scale sculpture. It seems likely, in fact, that the artistic sources of our late archaic Tarentine modelers should be sought among the extant remains of Greek artistic production of their own period without regard to genre, technique, or scale.

Although this approach is far from being generally accepted today, the comparison of sculptural remains of different scales and materials seems to be a useful method, more and more convincingly, as far as the archaic period of Greek art is concerned.¹³ In fact, marbles, which are rare in several regions of the Greek world, and bronzes, which are usually most difficult to attribute to a given place, show us no more of the artistic production of their age than the tip of an iceberg; that is why the rich documentary material of terracotta-sculpture has to be taken into account in order to try to fill in the inevitable gaps of our knowledge. Divergences due to differences of scale and technique are of course to be recognized in each case, but we should also consider that among the conditions of archaic Greek society a craftsman working a cheap material and another, who was perhaps the creator of works of art of a more expensive category or of a larger scale (in the view of their times both considered as 'artisans'), were separated by a gap that was certainly less important than the connection established between them by the community of their *poleis* and commissioners. We have to admit to possess very scanty information concerning the working method of the archaic workshops, both small and large scale, and this is particularly true as far as the method of teaching apprentices is concerned; nevertheless, on the ground of the evidence of archaic local styles it is likely that, in all the centers where characteristic local stylistic solutions were invented for the most popular themes, these became dominant 'formulae' for a while in several artistic genres, and were adopted as a point of emulation among craftsmen, at different levels of quality, according to their individual skills and creativity.

Until the end of the 6th century BC Tarentine craftsmen were not in possession of such a unique local stylistic dialect of their own, as far as we can judge from the eclectic character of the hundreds of terracottas, the few marble fragments¹⁴ and the bronzes,¹⁵ which can be attributed more or less convincingly to this city. The town of the Laconian Parthenioi freely accepted any kind of stylistic models, which arrived to its harbor from the Aegean or from the neighboring Western Greek world. Through the groups of votive terracottas we

can observe, however, a degree of selection that clay modelers made consciously among stylistic models available to them. Apparently they made use of different traditions deriving from Aegean Greece, at times even simultaneously, perhaps everyone depending on his own origin or training. In this eclectic picture it is especially useful to observe which of the multiple 'motherland' traditions became dominant in Tarentum, and which were the sources of the elements that made up those new syntheses that in the end merit the name of 'original local artistic creations'.

The physiognomy of the coroplastic type represented by Budapest 77.104.A and by the two heads from the Louvre - a type of face which can be promptly recognized in spite of the negligent modeling of some details - can be easily assigned to one of the best known stylistic groups of the East Greek world, which can be attributed in all likelihood to Samos. The connection of our Tarentine banqueter heads with this context can be clearly illustrated by a comparison with two, almost randomly chosen exemplars: for example, with the head of a Samian small scale bronze statuette (*fig. 5*)¹⁶ and, even with the face of the colossal kouros of Isches found on Samos (*fig. 6*).¹⁷ This stylistic formula of representation of the human face, with a characteristic ensemble of large, curving contours and convergent planes, is to be found practically always in this same structural unity, in a good deal of sculptural creations, with no regard to scale and material. This group of representations was associated with Samos by F. Croissant, whose analyses were based on a group of terracotta *protomai*.¹⁸ It was also demonstrated that this formula had been established at the latest in the second quarter of the 6th century BC,¹⁹ and then was reproduced again and again during the second half of the century in a wide range of genres and dimensions by artists and craftsmen of Samos or of Samian training, even if not necessarily working on the island themselves.²⁰ Thus, different versions of this stylistic scheme appear regularly in Western Greek archaeological contexts of the 6th century BC. It seems to make part of the visual culture of several 'overseas' communities, without ever becoming an exclusive or even a dominant scheme of representation in the coroplastic repertoires of South Italy and Sicily, which seem to be essentially eclectic in this time.²¹

We can observe a similar situation in the repertory of Tarentine banqueters, too: here for the moment the coroplastic type of Budapest 77.104.A is the only known face of Samian style. On the other hand, in the repertory of types created rough-

ly in the same period we find at least three others which are closely related to another stylistic group of the East Greek world, developed in the immediate neighborhood of Samian, and perhaps through a certain rivalry with the former. These large faces, encircled by almost perfectly round contours, are not characterized by the convergence of traits and fluent transition of planes, typical of Samian, but on the contrary by a rigid separation of the frontal plane and the sides, as well as by a monotonous articulation of the face by a series of horizontal traits; this scheme seems to be connected most probably to Miletus and the sanctuary of Apollo at Didyma.²² Two more Tarentine coroplastic types, fortunately, each represented by one complete figurine (Amsterdam, Allard Pierson Museum, inv. no 1160 and Taranto, inv. no 20047, here *fig. 4*),²³ can be considered as two sculptural creations of exceptional quality, a synthesis of apparently heterogeneous models borrowed from different Greek centers; their faces represent however a particular, local interpretation of Milesian models.²⁴

In a most unusual way, up to this point we only have been dealing with the style of heads and faces of the coroplastic types that were taken into consideration. This approach may be particularly surprising, if we take in account the fact that Greek art usually viewed and represented the human figure as a whole. However, as far as the Tarentine terracotta production is concerned, a number of considerations suggest that the modelers of this class of artistic production did not follow this rule so strictly. First of all, we should make an observation of a technical kind, namely that already as early as in the second half of the 6th century BC some of the figurines were produced with the help of at least two separate moulds, one for the head and one for the rest of the composition, attached to the whole composition only after the molding. This technical solution permitted variations in the combination of faces and iconographical frames and perhaps also resulted in the fact that there were in use less types of full compositions than types of faces in the same period.²⁵ Secondly, as it is shown especially by the coroplastic type we are dealing with, and by its contemporaries, it seems that even Tarentine modelers did not consider these figurines to be esthetically uniform: while the faces were modeled with a regard to the mentioned stylistic formulas, the bodies were given a form following clearly different models.

This statement may be illustrated in a particularly convincing manner with the coroplastic type of our banqueter of Budapest. As already observed,

the face of this type of banqueter follows - for the moment uniquely in the whole Tarentine repertory - the stylistic formula of Samos. Thus, it is linked in some way to the center where we find the earliest exemplar and, as it seems, the starting point of the most widely diffused formula of the sculptural representation of a reclining man in archaic Greek art. The earliest known sculptural scheme for the theme of a reclining man, leaning on one elbow and holding a drinking vessel in one hand is in fact the '*...ilarches*' statue of Samian Geneleos, the figure representing the commissioner of the famous six figure monument in the Samian Hera sanctuary (*fig. 7*).²⁶ The group of Geneleos was probably produced towards 560 BC. Its preserved figures show that the sculptor worked within the frames of an already established Samian tradition in the case of the korai and the sitting figure (that is to say, a tradition which can be traced back at least until the two korai of Cheramyes); he introduced a slight, but not indifferent change in the case of the standing youth, while with the figure of the reclining man he created a new sculptural type which might be considered to be his personal achievement, although it was certainly rooted in the tradition of his homeland.²⁷ It can be asserted at least that the numerous terracottas and some small bronzes, produced in the second half of the 6th century BC, which repeat very precisely the pose and the proportions of '*...ilarches*', all may have been inspired by the statue of Geneleos. If this is the case, we have here a whole series of identical sculptural creations, connected with the same place and apparently depending on the personal creativity of one man, working in large scale sculpture who also wanted his name to be conserved by his signature. In any case, it must be observed, that there is no other sculptural scheme of the banqueter type in archaic Greece that is as homogeneous and copious in the mean time, as this 'Samian style' group.²⁸ For the sake of comparison, we can introduce a bronze exemplar here, conserved in Frankfurt²⁹ (*fig. 8*): this statuette reproduces the pose and the proportions of Geneleos' reclining figure with the usual fidelity, which is to be found also in the other works of this group.

We could conclude here with the statement that the thesis formulated by Higgins and Herdejürgen and generally accepted since then,³⁰ according to which Tarentine modelers borrowed both the iconographical type and the stylistic solution of their banqueters from 'Ionian art', simply needs to be formulated in a more precise way, as we

have now identified their source with Samian art and even more precisely with the sculptural type of Geneleos' '...ilarches'. But a review of the Tarentine coroplastic types mentioned above is sufficient to show that this assertion would be oversimplistic, if not utterly mistaken: alongside with the unique Samian physiognomy represented in Tarentum by the Budapest figurine and by the two heads in the Louvre, we can point out at least three others, which are connected with another stylistic tradition, although still an East Greek one.³¹

But there is also a more interesting observation that we can make by comparing the whole figures (not only heads), from a stylistic point of view. The Budapest banqueter terracotta (*figs 1-3*) is the best preserved exemplar of its type known to us; it is rather fragmentary, but it allows nevertheless some basic observations concerning the whole



Fig. 7. The commissioner's figure from the Geneleos group in Samos, represented as a banqueter (Samos XI, pl. 52).



Fig. 8. Bronze figurine of banqueter from Samos, Frankfurt, Liebighaus (Walter-Karydi 1985, fig. 27,3).

composition. Thus, it is evident, judging from the right hand holding the phiale before the chest, that this figure was not conceived following the same concept which is to be found behind the 'Geneleos style' or 'Samian' banqueters: that is to say, that we do not find here the same pose with the legs bent together at the knee and pulled back towards the chest, embraced by the right arm, the latter playing the role of a curving, oblique hoop assuring the transition between the rounded shoulders and the protruding volume of the knees, as can be observed in the reclining figures in the Samian style. On the contrary, as it has been mentioned above, the pose of the Budapest figurine was almost certainly identical with that illustrated for example in the statuette no 20047 of the National Museum of Taranto (*fig. 4*).

Another version of the same scheme, certainly an earlier one, is represented by the terracotta no 2111 of Taranto, an almost complete banqueter figurine (*fig. 9*).³² Its most conspicuous trait is its outstretched composition, which is particularly obvious if one looks at the triangular surface covered by the drapery of the mantle falling down from the right knee, enclosed by the right leg, bent at knee and pulled back, resting however within the plan of the bust and the left leg, which is here stretched out horizontally. The hands, bent before the body holding the accessories of the banquet, do not interrupt the shallow bas-relief character of this one-plan composition, with their outstretched fingers attached to the bust and with the arms of a rigidly strait pose. In sum, while the principal characteristics of the Samian sculptural type of the reclining man were precisely the three dimensional approach, the stressing of dynamically overlapping, rounded forms, the fluidity of transitions between planes, here, in the case of the first Tarentine representations of the same subject, the composition seems to follow the opposite of this logic and moreover, to be conceived for two dimensions. The choice of this two-dimensional conception can not be explained simply by the technical limits of molded terracottas: while Tarentine banqueter figurines are molded with the help of only one mould, representing the frontal view, and so certainly meant to be viewed only from this perspective, those following the Samian sculptural type, although they are also molded, have the same three-dimensional character that can be observed in the case of bronze and stone exemplars of their group; these terracottas are modeled also on the back side and, in spite of all the scarcity of their quality, they were clearly meant to be representations in the round.³³



Figs 9-11. Terracotta figurine of a banqueter, Taranto, Museo Archeologico Nazionale (photo László Mátyus).

3. TARENTINE TYPES DEPENDING ON LACONIAN MODELS

Summing up the results of the observations made up to this point, we can state that in the case of some early types of banqueters, Tarentine artisans referred to East-Greek models for a stylistic formula for the face (more precisely, these models seem to have been mostly Milesian, and for the moment only in one case certainly Samian). But it can be excluded that the whole composition could be modeled directly on the scheme of the well-



Figs 12-13. Terracotta head of a banqueter, Paris, Musée du Louvre (photos author).



Figs 14-15. Mirror handle in the form of a naked girl, Berlin, Staatliche Museen. Details: frontal and profile view of the head (Herfort-Koch 1986, pl. 7,7-8).



Fig. 16. Female head ending of a bronze hydria handle, New York, Metropolitan Museum of Art (BABesch 69).



Figs 17-18. Terracotta head of a banqueter, Taranto, Museo Archeologico Nazionale (photo László Mátyus).



Fig. 19. Bronze figurine of a running woman, Palermo, Museo Archeologico A. Salinas (Rolley 1967, fig. 103).

known sculptural type established by Geneleos. I shall introduce, in the following pages, an alternative theory concerning the first artistic sources of this Tarentine class, based on the above mentioned early banqueter of Taranto and a group of further Tarentine coroplastic types, closely related to it.

The banqueter no 2111 of the National Museum of Taranto, of a rather weird appearance at first sight and quite rudimentary in many respects (fig. 9), was inspired with all probability by models coming from another center of the archaic Greek world. Iconographical elements, pose and drapery (a himation draped over the left arm and the left side of the chest, but leaving naked more than half of the bust on the right) are the opposite of



Fig. 20. Cup by the Naukratis Painter, Paris, Musée du Louvre. Detail: figure of a banqueter (Stibbe 1972, pl. VI).

what is seen in Samian banqueters, of roundish forms and wrapped in their draperies. On the other hand, this scheme coincides with the corresponding details of the Tarentine banqueter compositions of the same period, illustrated here by figs 1-4, though the execution itself, that is to say, the modeling of details is reasonably different from one to another. The modeler of Taranto 2111, for example, was apparently not interested at all in the details of drapery: he transformed the mantle into one smooth sheet of hardly plausible form on the left side of the chest, while he found it important to show the relief of the pectorals and even the clavicles and the muscles of the upper arm. In contrast to the tresses reproduced in detailed relief of the two other Tarentine types, this figure has two formless clay elements, roughly smoothed down on the two sides of the face, strengthening the neck and connecting it to the shoulders.

The analysis should begin once again with the head and the face (figs 10-11). The long and pointed oval contour of Taranto 2111's face is conspicuously different both from the large and curving Samian and from the flat and circular Milesian faces. After all, the head of this banqueter is a volume of ovoid shape, pointed at one extremity and a bit 'flattened' on the frontal side, although the surface is still slightly curved here, too, with a suddenly jutting nose, but otherwise not disturbed by the other traits, nor by the elongated almond-shaped eyes of oblique position, nor by the short, straight mouth, nor by the long, vertical chin. Above the rather low forehead the ovoid is crowned with a typically stylized hairdo, represented by a range of small 'tongues' of uniform length.

For the moment, the banqueter Taranto 2111 is the only known exemplar of its coroplastic type. We find however several faces of a similar structure in the Tarentine repertory. Another type, much stylized, is represented by two heads in the Louvre (*figs 12-13*);³⁴ still another by the head no 740 of the National Museum of Taranto (*figs 17-18*).³⁵ Finally, we can probably assign to this tradition a type and its variants represented by a long series of small scale and bad quality pieces.³⁶ Thus, alongside the different physiognomies of East Greek origin, there is also another group of faces, in which Taranto 2111 is to be considered probably the starting point of the series. It is certainly a rather rare formula for the interpretation of the forms of human face, in any case less widespread in the archaic Greek world than the East Greek ones mentioned above; however, as we have seen, there is a good number of closely or partially related face types in the copious Tarentine terracotta production. There is anyway an even closer connection between the face of the banqueter figure in question and those of some small scale bronzes, which can reasonably be connected to Sparta, although they do not represent the most common physiognomy version of Laconian sculpture.

The best comparison is the one offered by a bronze mirror handle, conserved now in Berlin, in the form of a naked girl, with a characteristic face of pointed oval shape, with a short, suddenly jutting nose, breaking the surface of the frontal plane and with narrow almond-shaped eyes, encircled by a fine relief contour, but very similar in proportion and position to the eyes of our Tarentine banqueter (*figs 14-15*).³⁷ Although the Spartan provenance of the piece is recorded only by a note in the museum registers, scholars dealing with it never doubted, except for one isolated tentative,³⁸ that it was one of the small masterpieces of 6th century BC Laconian bronze craft. The genre of the mirror handles in the shape of a naked adolescent girl is in fact by itself a Laconian specialty, to be explained with the phenomena of local cult and belief, without parallel in the bronze craft of any other Greek center.³⁹ The handle-girl of Berlin can be inserted easily in this Spartan group both from a typological and an iconographic point of view; the dates proposed for her oscillate in the central decades of the 6th century BC.⁴⁰ On the other hand, stylistically she is not a commonplace exemplar of her series: the characteristic face, so closely related to our Tarentine group, is not among the most usual physiognomies of Laconian art.

Nevertheless, it is in this context that we find the closest parallels for it, among which some

examples, which can be considered forerunners of the stylistic solution that we do not see until the middle of the 6th century BC in its fully developed form: so, for example, the female head adorning the vertical handle of the Rosenbaum hydria (*fig. 16*), a vase, which finds its place among the vases of the Telesstas hydriae on the ground of its shape. C.M. Stibbe, who published it more than once, connected it without doubt to Sparta, although he was apparently less sure about its dating, which varies from the third to the last quarter of the 7th century BC.⁴¹ The reason behind this contradiction in the dating may be explained by the fact that Stibbe tried to insert this face in one of the known phases of 'Daedalic style' (first in the middle, later in the last one), certainly on the ground of its typical, pointed oval outline. It seems however that this face does not correspond precisely to the criteria of any of the 'Daedalic' phases, if we consider its eyes of realistic proportion, its clearly modeled ears and its short, but rather full and realistic lips. In other words, the structure itself cannot be explained simply with the tradition of 'Daedalic style', but should be considered more correctly as a stylistic formula of Laconian art, which does not indicate a chronological period, but seems to continue in the physiognomies of creations as the banqueter Taranto 2111.

Beside the mentioned Tarentine coroplastic types there are at least two more documents which can be connected to this circle: two bronzes produced by Laconian or at least by a 'laconianizing' Western Greek workshop. The first one is another hydria handle, i.e. the figural ornament of the Schimmel hydria, found by W. Helbig in Capua and today conserved in Jerusalem, which appears as a 'rustic' version of the face of Taranto 2111, exaggerating its typical features in a caricature-like way.⁴² To these we can add another comparison: the coroplastic type of no 740 of the National Museum of Taranto (*figs 17-18*) represents a further version of the Tarentine series of 'pointed oval faces'. The only work of art which can be truly compared to it is, as far as I know a small bronze figure of a running maiden, conserved in the Archaeological Museum of Palermo, of unknown, but very probably Western provenance (*fig. 19*).⁴³ As for the origin of this bronze statuette, this is much less certain than in the case of the previous pieces, however its type and iconography link it again to the Laconian tradition.⁴⁴ Taking in consideration the whole sequence of examples, comprising the two last elements which cannot be illustrated here, we can say as a conclusion, that the physiognomy that can be observed in its more recent

form on the banqueter Taranto 2111 and on a good number of other, similar Tarentine terracottas, goes back in the reality to a Laconian tradition originating in the protoarchaic phase and was perhaps revived at the middle of the 6th century BC particularly by those Western Greek craftsmen who had been trained in some way in a Laconian milieu.

If we return now to the question of the artistic source of the whole composition, the stylistic formula for the representation of a banqueter, it may be useful to look for a good comparison to Taranto 2111 among examples of Laconian art. As we observed already, what is particularly striking in this composition, is its relief-like or even two-dimensional character; it not only lacks the rounded forms of Geneleos' East Greek sculptural type, but also the vividly three-dimensional gestures of the few known small bronze banqueters attributed to Peloponnesian workshops.⁴⁵

The most probable result is, then, that we have to look for a model among the two-dimensional artistic genres. Since we do not know about reliefs which could be compared to our banqueter figurines and might have been accessible to the Tarentines at this time, it is logical to turn to the painting, more precisely to vase-painting, the only genre which can inform us (and probably 'overseas' Greeks of the time, too) about the inventions of Greek major painting. This choice seems to be the more logical, since we know that the theme of the symposium appeared much earlier on vases than in the sculpture.

The motif of the symposium appeared on Corinthian vases already between the end of the 7th and the beginning of the 6th century BC, by 580 it was used in the Athenian vase-painting and from the second quarter of the century in the Laconian, too.⁴⁶ It is equally certain that the archaic pictorial scheme of this subject matter was elaborated in Corinth and transmitted from this center to the two others, where it went through modifications, according to local taste. In Athenian vase-painting these modifications were introduced only after 530 BC, first of all probably as a consequence of the red-figure painters' innovations, who transformed the aristocratic Corinthian symposia of nameless, or strictly mythological heroes to a current everyday life scene, recharged with anecdotal elements. As for the first half of the 6th century, however, banquet scenes were not a particularly important element in Athenian vase-painting and their occasional examples do not differ much from their Corinthian models.⁴⁷

It seems, on the contrary, that Laconian vase-painting, during its short heyday in the central

third of the 6th century, treated the theme of the banquet and the banqueter as a particularly important one since the first moment. This is demonstrated in itself by the particularly frequent appearances of these representations in the relatively modest Laconian production: there are more known symposion-scenes in the Laconian than in the Corinthian vase-painting, not only relatively, but also in actual numbers.⁴⁸ But still more interesting than these statistics is the way in which the painters of Laconian cups reformulated practically on each occasion the model borrowed from Corinth according to a specifically local taste. Laconian innovations are most conspicuous as far as iconography is concerned: on Laconian vases symposion scenes are enriched with numerous unusual motifs, which seem to fill the pictures probably not with a mythological, but with a ritual content. Besides snakes, birds and lizards, the most particular iconographical element of Laconian banquet scenes is the figure of the winged 'daemon', approaching in several cases to a reclining man, either walking or flying and holding out a wreath towards him.⁴⁹

The earliest known and perhaps also the most beautiful example of Laconian banquet scenes is represented by the famous cup of the Naukratis Painter, decorated with a crown of five symposiasts, two of them being accompanied by the winged youth just mentioned, two by a small siren and the fifth by a cup-bearer, all holding a wreath to the banqueter.⁵⁰ If we look at any of the five figures of identical form (*fig. 20*) and compare it to the banqueter Taranto 2111 (*fig. 9*), we discover in a moment the conspicuously close stylistic similarity between the two. Correspondences are evident, no matter if we compare the proportion and the pose of the whole figures, the form of heads or the drapery, or else such tiny details as the form and the gesture of the hands, the range of 'tongues' encircling the forehead, or the design of muscles on the right half of the torso and on the right arm. Even the left hand of the Naukratis Painter's figure, pressed against the stomach is identical to the left hand of the Taranto figurine, holding the lyra. We can notice here also another fact: the lyra, one of the most popular attributes of Tarentine banqueters, is also a frequent accessory of Laconian symposion cups, although it generally appears, not in the hand of the banqueter, but as the instrument of the lyra-player, a figure of equally controversial interpretation, who appears often in Laconian banquet and komos scenes.⁵¹

Laconian pottery has a special importance in the range of Aegean products imported to Tarentum

in the archaic period,⁵² and it seems that the imagery of Laconian black-figure vases played a significant role in the development of the visual culture of the Tarentine in the 6th century BC, even if evidently not an exclusive one, besides the important amounts of Corinthian and Athenian pottery and the small scale sculpture of East Greek and perhaps Peloponnesian origin.⁵³ However, as far as the symposion scene is concerned, the first Tarentine representation of this subject happens to be so closely connected with the current scheme of Laconian vase-painting, and exclusively with this, as to convince us that the Laconian representation was the direct forerunner of the whole Tarentine genre. This hypothesis is confirmed, moreover, by the fact that the stylization of the face of Taranto 2111 (together with a number of similar Tarentine coroplastic types) appears to be directly related to a circle of Laconian or Laconianizing small scale sculpture.

Thus, it seems that the old question of the beginning of Tarentine banqueter compositions and of the artistic source of their first series can be answered convincingly if we take a close look at Laconian art. This statement is also significant in the light of another old question, which is still without a definitive answer: that of the artistic connections of Taras and her metropolis Sparta. The long debate concerning this question, which is too complex to be summarized here in detail, comes from the contradiction that while Taras was the only known western colony of Sparta, no artifact considered to be 'Laconian in style' could be connected unequivocally to this center.⁵⁴ It seems however that it will be possible to retrace precisely this archaic Laconian stylistic element in the copious production of Tarentine small scale terracotta sculpture, the only obstacle being actually the low level of publication of this class of finds: in fact, an important amount of votive terracotta material, in which these indices would to be found is for the moment mostly unpublished.⁵⁵ The study of these early documents, to be dated mostly around the middle of the 6th century BC, confirms however the hypothesis that some of the much debated banqueter compositions, and very probably the earliest versions of them, can preserve the traces of Laconian culture in Taras.

An increasingly coherent picture of Laconian-Tarentine connections is available now, thanks to a number of other sources, besides this early, unpublished group of terracottas,⁵⁶ and it seems that the hypothesis of the Laconian origin of Tarentine banqueter compositions can be plausibly inserted in this picture.

When looking for the origin of this genre, it is not without importance to recall what we know about its function: since Tarentine banqueter terracottas were found exclusively in ritual contexts, that is to say, in votive deposits, it seems to be evident that the whole genre was created and maintained for religious purposes, in order to serve a special, local cult. From this point of view the connections of the South Italian colony with its mother city seem to be particularly important: it becomes more and more certain that many of the Tarentine cults were of Spartan origin or at least present in the same period also in Sparta in a very similar form.⁵⁷ We cannot yet define actually with certitude the Tarentine cult that comprised the dedication of banqueter terracottas, thus it is also impossible to identify precisely its Spartan counterpart. However, it is worth recalling in this connection what has been said about the symposion scenes of Laconian black-figure cups: the key of the interpretation of these images might be once again a specific Spartan cult, still difficult to describe with precision. While M. Pipili connected Laconian symposion cups to Samos, more precisely to a group of Spartiates established near the Samian sanctuary of Hera,⁵⁸ I find more convincing the reconstruction formulated independently by C.M. Stibbe and R. Förtsch. The two authors, dealing with two different groups of documents, recognized more or less the same ritual practice, in which individual prestigious families venerated their eminent deceased members, seen and represented as heroes and perhaps even identified with Dionysos, exactly through the image of a banquet.⁵⁹

4. SYNTHESIS OF EAST GREEK AND LACONIAN IN SPARTA AND TARAS

The complex and much debated problem of the interpretation of Tarentine banqueter compositions and the identification of the related cult would exceed the limits of this paper. From the perspective of the art historical reconstruction we can assume however, as we have seen, that the origin of the representation itself may be looked for in Sparta, at least if our hypothesis concerning the chronology of Taranto 2111 (*fig. 9*) was correct, and the type was created effectively not much later than the middle of the 6th century BC. Thus, this type must have been one of the first, if not the very first creation which inaugurated this long-lived genre. On the other hand, the middle of the 6th century BC is also the heyday of archaic Laconian art and craft, after which (presumably because



Fig. 21. Female terracotta protome. Detail: frontal view of face (Croissant 1983, pl. 16).



Fig. 22. Terracotta figurine of a banqueter, Amsterdam, Allard Pierson Museum (photo author).



Fig. 23. Hero relief from Chrysapha, Berlin, Staatliche Museen. Detail: face of the figure turned towards the viewer (Förtsch 2001).

of the radical transformation of the city-state's political and social system), Laconian artistic production declined in the quantity and in the variety of genres. In the last third of the century previously established, markedly local stylistic solutions were gradually mixed up with those clearly recognizable East Greek and, subsequently, Attic models, which in the same period flooded much of the Greek world, including South Italian Greek colonies.⁶⁰

The coroplastic type of the terracotta Budapest 77.104.A, the starting point of our present investigations, may be considered a result of this 'second generation' change. If our hypothesis concerning the identification of local styles is correct, this coroplastic type is the only Tarentine sculptural creation known which clearly depends on Samian models; in addition, the formula created in Samian art was only used for the modeling of the face of this figurine type. It could also be seen through the examples listed above⁶¹ that besides this single Samian type, Milesian models were more popular in Taras.

The banqueter statuette no 1160 of the Allard Pierson Museum of Amsterdam (fig. 22) is one exemplar of a Tarentine series which comprises the variants of a physiognomy satisfying also for modern eyes.⁶² This large circular face structure, delimited by very clear contours and filled with a good amount of vitality finds its closest parallel once again in the repertory of Milesian art: the connection is best illustrated by the comparison with another protome type of Croissant's 'Milesian'

group (fig. 21).⁶³ In this case, however, the Tarentine face is not a precise reproduction of the East Greek physiognomy: it lacks the latter's roundedness and its fluid transitions from one plane of the head to the other, as well as from the forehead to the nose and to the eyebrows. The whole seems as if the modeler could only follow his Eastern model with some restrictions. We have almost the same impression, if we look at a famous rounded face of Laconian sculpture: the face of the figure turned towards the spectator on the so-called hero-relief found near Chrysapha, now in Berlin (fig. 23) denotes a striking similarity with the face of the Tarentine banqueter of Amsterdam, not only as far as its iconography is concerned, but also as for the structure of the face and the concept of modeling.

The Chrysapha relief is a crucial element of the history of Laconian art, but since Langlotz's contribution it has been studied almost exclusively from the point of view of religious interpretation, in the context of the other pieces of the same kind, but much less well preserved.⁶⁴ Concerning its place in the history of Laconian art, following the statement made by Langlotz and more recently by C. Blümel, it is usually dated to the third quarter of the 6th century and considered beyond doubt to be a typical example of Laconian style, only superficially adorned with the formal accessories of East Greek representations. It was recognized for the first time in 2001 by Förtsch that the drapery and the whole stylistic execution of the seated figure finds its closest parallel in Milesian art, by

comparing the Chrysapha hero with the Chares of the Didyma sanctuary.⁶⁵ We can add that some other seated figures of the same circle can be equally well compared to the Spartan relief, and there is even one which shows a still closer relationship to it.⁶⁶ As for the frontal face, in spite of the sharpness of its contours and the general stiffness of its modeling, that breaks here and there the round forms, it seems to reflect much more a Milesian scheme than a Laconian one. At least, in the repertory of Laconian sculpture of the 6th century we do not find any directly related structure, either in small or in large scale sculpture, no matter if stone, bronze, or ivory. It is more likely that what we see in the face of the Chrysapha hero, is one of the Milesian variants for the representation of human physiognomy, appearing here in that form, which it could assume in the hands of a Laconian master, who 'translated' it in this way into 'Laconian', responding to his own training and traditions. The type of Amsterdam 1160 (together with the other types related to it) illustrates an analogous learning process, that could take place perhaps a bit later, during the last quarter of the 6th century BC, among the craftsmen of Sparta's colony Taras. The result, two strikingly similar stylistic solutions, encourage the inference of at least two parallel stories in the background.

The modelers of the late 6th century BC Tarentine banqueters might have produced their more or less successful syntheses as a result of such learning processes. Their two-dimensional compositions, rooted in Laconian black-figure vase-painting, continued to abound with graphical solutions for a long period still, while in the modeling of faces, more and more often conceived in the round, the repertory of East Greek sculpture seems to have become an unavoidable point of reference. The synthesis of Laconian tradition and a new model, borrowed from Milesian art, produced the first typical local formula of the banqueter theme that was to achieve a more lasting success, and to be replaced later on, toward the end of the century, by forms dictated by the subsequent change of taste, that preferred the style of late archaic Athenian art.

NOTES

* This study was realized within the framework of a research project supported by the Hungarian Scientific Research Fund (OTKA), project no OT68558 (Catalogues of the Antiquities Department of the Budapest Museum of Fine Arts VI).

I express my gratitude to Dr. Árpád M. Nagy, head of the Department of Greek and Roman Antiquities of the

Museum of Fine Art, Budapest, for authorizing and encouraging me to study the Department's South Italian Greek terracottas. I am thankful to Dr. Antonietta dell'Aglio and Dr. Giuseppe Andreassi (Taranto), Dr. R.A. Lunsingh Scheurleer (Amsterdam) and Dr. Alain Pasquier (Louvre) for permitting research on published and unpublished Tarentine terracottas. I wish to thank the Editors of this review for the careful reading and for the publication of this article. I am particularly thankful for the friendly help of Prof. Thomas McGinn, who kindly revised the English text of my manuscript. Photos reproduced on figs 1-4, 9-11 and 17-18 were taken by László Mátyus (Budapest).

- 1 Inv. no 77.104.A. Z. Oroszlán/A. Dobrovits, *Antik Kiállítás*, Budapest 1947, 23, no D.14; J.Gy. Szilágyi, *Bull-MusBAHongrie* 46-47 (1976) 18-19 and 151-152, fig. 10.
- 2 C.W. Lunsingh Scheurleer, *Beiträge zur tarentinischen Kunstgeschichte*, *Critica d'Arte* 2 (1937) 146, fig. 3; B. Neutsch, *Der Heros auf der Kline*, *RM* 68 (1961) 150-163, 156, fig. 66,2; Langlotz 1963, 61, no 23; P. Orlandini, in *Megale Hellas*, 420, fig. 428; D. Loiacono, *Le terrecotte figurate*, in E.M. De Julis/D. Loiacono, *Taranto. Il Museo Archeologico*, Taranto 1985, 342, fig. 409; Iacobone 1988, 54, fig. 42,b; Bennett/Paul 2002, 142-143 (with illustration).
- 3 Wuilleumier 1939, 401, no 7, fig. XXVIII,3; R.A. Lunsingh Scheurleer, *De Grieken in het klein*, Amsterdam 1986, 59, no 52 (with previous literature).
- 4 The term 'coroplastic type' indicates a group consisting in a 'prototype', i.e. a first hand-modeled figurine, used for the preparation of moulds, all the moulds derived from it, secondary generations included, and all the terracotta figurines molded with these; in other words, I use the term in the sense of the term 'series' of Nicholls 1952.
- 5 Louvre, MNB 2219 and MNB 2499, see Mollard-Besques 1954, nos B439 and B438, pl. XXV.
- 6 For the most up to date presentation of the topography and cults of ancient Tarentum see Lippolis 1995. About the history of archaeological excavations started in Taranto in 1879 and the uneasy foundation of the National Museum see C. D'Angela, *Il Museo negato (Taranto 1876 - 1896)*, Taranto 2000. On F. Lenormant's Tarentine 'excavations' see F. Lenormant, *Les terres cuites de Tarente*, *Gazette des Beaux-Arts* (1892) 202-224 and *Notes archéologiques sur Tarente*, *Gazette Archéologique* 7 (1881-1882), 148-190; see also V.C. Belli, *François Lenormant archeologo avventuroso*, in *Atti Taranto* 13 (1973), Naples 1977, 7-14 and Chr. Morin, *François Lenormant et la découverte des terres-cuites de Tarente* (mémoires de maîtrise, Université de Paris 1, 1996-1997).
- 7 A number of general presentations were published about this class of Tarentine terracottas: see e.g. Herdejürgen 1971; Letta 1971, 61-73; Iacobone 1988, 166-169; Lippolis 1995, 51-53; Bencze 2001, 141-157.
- 8 We must mention however the composition scheme in which a female figure, alone or with a child, is associated to the banqueter (e.g. Iacobone 1988, type C4XV, pl. 70).
- 9 For a historiography see Lippolis 1995, 51-54.
- 10 Higgins 1971, 267-282.
- 11 Herdejürgen 1971, 1-25.
- 12 The material of the six votive deposits published by Iacobone 1988 represents a particularly important source of documents.
- 13 See *in primis* Croissant 1983. E. Langlotz's classical monograph (Langlotz 1927) must be mentioned as the most important forerunner of this methodological approach.

- ¹⁴ *Catalogo del Museo* IV,1, 11-30 (it should be observed that none of them reaches the level that we usually call 'major sculpture' nor in quality, neither in scale).
- ¹⁵ It seems to be justified to handle with skepticism the attributions, which tried to connect a number of small bronze statuettes and bronze vessels of various provenances to Tarentum, considered to be a major center of archaic bronze industry: see Jantzen 1937, 26-46; Jucker 1965-1966, 1-128; some of these attributions were accepted and repeated in Borda 1979, 105-127; the decisive arguments against them are summed up in the most complete and coherent form in Rolley 1982. Besides the small bronzes of uncertain attribution, there is one major bronze work which may be attributed to a local variant of Laconianizing style: the $\frac{3}{4}$ scale, hollow bronze statuette of Zeus found in Messapian Uzentum (Ugento): for its first detailed publication see Degraasi 1981.
- ¹⁶ Frankfurt, Liebighaus; Walter-Karydi 1985, fig. 27,3.
- ¹⁷ Vathy Museum. *Samos* X, pls 26-27.
- ¹⁸ Croissant 1983, 33-48, pls 1-6; see also Langlotz 1927, 118-125, 57-59, 66-67 and pl. 69-72. But see Rolley 1994, 266-267. According to another approach the two styles are not to be attributed to two different political communities, but to the individual tradition of two workshops working side by side within the same center, see e.g. V. von Graeve, Über verschiedene Richtungen der milesischen Skulptur in archaischer Zeit. Bemerkungen zur formalen Gestaltung und zur Lokalisierung, in W. Müller-Wiener (ed.), *Milet 1899-1980. Ergebnisse, Probleme und Perspektiven einer Ausgrabung*, Tübingen 1986, 81-94, who describes the famous kore head of Berlin, no Sk1631 as Milesian, but produced by a less known workshop of Milet.
- ¹⁹ Croissant 2005 and *Αρχαιολογία* 12 (2003-2004) 141-166.
- ²⁰ One should remember here the numerous terracotta protomai and figurines of Samian style, found at different sites of the Aegean, whose Samian origin is far from being assured, not even necessarily molded with moulds produced in Samos, cf. Ducat 1966, pl. X-XI, Croissant 1983, 33-48, pl. 1-6. Figurines and protomai of Samian style have been found in Sicily and South Italy, too, see e.g. Croissant 2000, pl. XVIII; 2005, figs 1-2, 4-5 and 10 = E. Gabrici, *MonAnt* 32 (1927) fig. XVIII,9.
- ²¹ Cf. Croissant 2000.
- ²² I know three pieces belonging to the first type: Taranto, Museo Archeologico Nazionale, inv. nos 2164, 50436 and 3243 (Iacobone 1988, 52-53, figs 39c, 61a and 39b), the first one an almost complete figurine, the two others only heads; the best parallel of their physiognomy is the head of the draped youth found at Samian Cape Phoneas, but generally considered to be Milesian (*Altsamische Standbilder* III, 46, figs 160-162).
The second type of 'Milesian style' is represented by the unpublished head no 1661 of the Allard Pierson Museum, Amsterdam, to be compared to the draped youth of the British Museum from Didyma (Tuchelt 1970, 53-54, no K6, pls 10-11).
The third type is that of the fragments Louvre MNB, inv. no 2608 (Mollard-Besques 1954, no B406) and Taranto, inv. no 20014 (Iacobone 1988, pl. 39a); both fragments conserve also a portion of the body, while the faces show a striking similarity to the Milesian B4/b protome type of Croissant 1983, even in the details.
- ²³ See note 2.
- ²⁴ See below.
- ²⁵ Cf. Bencze 2001.
- ²⁶ M. Schede, *Zweiter vorläufiger Bericht über die von den Berliner Staatlichen Museen unternommenen Ausgrabungen auf Samos*, Berlin 1929; after the first publication for the first time in a more detailed manner: *Samos* XI, 106-109, pls 44-53.
- ²⁷ Walter-Karydi 1985, 91-104.
- ²⁸ Besides of the examples of Walter-Karydi 1985, 96, see also the lists of Herdejürgen 1971, 5, note 29 and Lettita 1971, 63. Further on, one large scale marble sculpture from Myous, omitted from these lists: Blümel 1963, 63, figs 213 and 214.
- ²⁹ Frankfurt, Liebighaus; Walter-Karydi 1985, fig. 27,3.
- ³⁰ Higgins 1971, 269-270; Herdejürgen 1971, 5-6.
- ³¹ It should be observed that all the few reclining banqueters conceived in the scheme of '...ilarches' and preserved with a head that can be analyzed, have a face of the purest 'Samian style'. See two more small bronzes from the middle of the 6th century BC: *Altsamische Standbilder* III, 181-182 and fig. 193 (ca 540-530 BC); Walter-Karydi 1985, fig. 27,2.
- ³² Unpublished.
- ³³ See e.g. one piece from Thera: *Ergon* 1968 (1969) 98, fig. 114.
- ³⁴ Nos MNB 2498 and MNB 2220, Mollard-Besques 1954, nos B495 and B496.
- ³⁵ Unpublished.
- ³⁶ Such as Louvre, nos MNB 2605 and MNB 2606 (Mollard-Besques 1954, nos B408 and B410), Karlsruhe, Badisches Landesmuseum, nos B1914, B1915, B1913, B1909, B1912 (W. Schürmann, *Katalog der antiken Terrakotten im Badischen Landesmuseum Karlsruhe*, Göteborg 1989, pls 48-49, 67, 24 and 36, nos 111, 112, 203, 204, 205).
- ³⁷ Berlin, Staatliche Museen, inv. no 31084. Herfort-Koch 1986, 34 and 98 (with previous bibliography), no K59, pl. 7,7-8.
- ³⁸ U. Häfner, *Kunstschaffen Lakoniens in archaischer Zeit*, Diss. Münster 1965, nos 12-3, 16, 25, 27 and 133, S5.
- ³⁹ See Langlotz 1927, 91-92; Herfort-Koch 1986, 31-38.
- ⁴⁰ L.O.K. Congdon, *Caryatid Mirrors of Ancient Greece*, Mainz 1981, 130: ca 560 BC; Herfort-Koch 1986, 98: ca 540 BC.
- ⁴¹ New York, Metropolitan Museum of Art, inv. no 1995.92. C.M. Stibbe, Between Babyka and Knakion. Three Addenda, *BABesch* 69 (1994) 63-113, especially 86-93, and The Goddess at the Handle. A Survey of Laconian Bronze Hydriae, *BABesch* 79 (2004) 14-15.
- ⁴² Israel Museum, inv. no 91.71.315. H. Hoffmann, Two unknown Greek bronzes of the Archaic Period, *AJA* 64 (1968) 185-8, pl. 64,2-4 ('Tarentine'); Jucker 1965-1966, 96 and Rolley 1982, 41-42 ('Laconianizing South Italian'); C.M. Stibbe, Frauen und Löwen, *JbRGZM* 43 (1996) 358-359 ('Laconian').
- ⁴³ Palermo, Museo Archeologico A. Salinas, inv. no 8265 (B74, C42). C.A. Di Stefano, *Bronzetti figurati del Museo Nazionale di Palermo*, Rome 1975, 64, no 106, pl. XXVI (with previous literature).
- ⁴⁴ Rolley 1967, 126 and 130.
- ⁴⁵ See Dentzer 1982, 216-217, pls 176-179, nos B7, B21 and B23bis.
- ⁴⁶ Dentzer 1982, 78, 87-95.
- ⁴⁷ B. Fehr, *Orientalische und griechische Gelage*, Bonn 1971, 53-61, 62-100; Dentzer 1982, 95-130.
- ⁴⁸ Pipili 1987, 71-72: 18 pieces; see also Dentzer 1982, 87-88 (14 pieces) and Förtsch 2001, 142-143, note 218 (16 pieces).
- ⁴⁹ For the interpretations before 1982 see Dentzer 1982, 90-95. Furthermore: Pipili 1987, 71-76 and Pipili 1998, 89-92; Förtsch 2001, 140-145.
- ⁵⁰ Louvre, inv. no E667; Stibbe 1972, 29, 49, 70-71, pl. VI, no 13.

- ⁵¹ E.g. as on a cup of the Rider Painter found in Taranto: Stibbe 1972, no 312, pl. 110, fig. 12. See also Pipili 1987, 52 and Pipili 1998, 90-91; according to the impressive argumentation of C.M. Stibbe, Dionysos mit einer Kithara?, in *Kotinos. Festschrift für Erika Simon*, Mainz 1992, 139-145, the lyra-player clothed in a long robe is an iconographical scheme representing Dionysos in Laconian art, at the middle of the 6th century BC.
- ⁵² P. Pelagatti, La ceramica laconica del Museo di Taranto, *ASAtene* 33-34 (1955-1956) 7-44; Pelagatti/Stibbe 2002, 365-403.
- ⁵³ Cf. F.G. Lo Porto, *BdA* 47 (1962) 153-170; D. Boschung, Die archaischen Nekropolen von Tarent, *Catalogo del Museo* III,1, 176-183.
- ⁵⁴ Instead of an exhaustive bibliography I only mention a few fundamental publications: Jantzen 1937; Borda 1979; Rolley 1982; 1994, 306.
- ⁵⁵ For the moment this study exists in the form of a PhD dissertation, under revision for publication: Á. Bencze, *Recherches sur la petite plastique de terre cuite tarentine, des origines à la fin du VI^e siècle*, Thèse de doctorat, Université de Paris 1, 2005, especially 119-184, pls XIII-XVIII.
- ⁵⁶ Stibbe 1975, 27-43; Pelagatti/Stibbe 2002, 365-403.
- ⁵⁷ Stibbe 1975, 32-33 (Persephone, the Dioscures, Apollo Hyacinthus); M. Osanna, Sui culti arcaici di Sparta e Taranto: Afrodite Basilis, *PdP* 45 (1990) 81-94 (Aphrodite Basilis).
- ⁵⁸ Pipili 1987, 73 and 1998, 89-92.
- ⁵⁹ Förtsch 2001, 143-144; Stibbe 1991 and *Das andere Sparta*, Mainz 1996, 23-234.
- ⁶⁰ For a clear presentation of the changes of genres and quantity of Laconian artistic production from 725 to 475 BC see R. Förtsch, Spartan art: its many different deaths, in W.G. Cavanagh/S.E.C. Walker (eds), *Sparta in Laconia. Proceedings of the 19th British Museum Classical Colloquium*, London 1998, 48-54.
- ⁶¹ See above, note 22.
- ⁶² Another exemplar of the same type is: M. Bonghi Jovino, *Documenti di coroplastica italiota, siciliota ed etrusco-laziale nel Museo Civico di Legnano*, Florence 1972, no 62, pl. XIX. Figurines of a very similar type are Taranto, no 20047, mentioned above (see note 2 and fig. 4) and Taranto, no 52019. Another, but closely related type is the one represented by Taranto, no 50367, whose body belongs to one of the most popular types of the late archaic Tarentine production.
- ⁶³ Delos, inv. no A.3528; Croissant 1983, 64-65, no 29, pl. 16, type „B5”.
- ⁶⁴ Berlin, Staatliche Museen, inv. no B731. Blümel 1963, 22-25, no 16 (with an exhaustive bibliography of former citations). See also in part.: Langlotz 1927, 86, no 5. Recently, with a comprehensive study of the known reliefs of the same class: Stibbe 1991 and Förtsch 2001, 218-219.
- ⁶⁵ Förtsch 2001, 179, n. 1496.
- ⁶⁶ As e.g. the statue no B273 of the British Museum: Tuchelt 1970, 77-78 and 145, no K46, pl. 43,1.
- Staatlichen Museen zu Berlin, Berlin.
- Borda, M. 1979, *Arte dedalica a Taranto*, Pordenone.
- Catalogo del Museo* III,1 = E. Lippolis (ed.), *Catalogo del Museo Nazionale Archeologico di Taranto* III,1. *Taranto, la necropoli. Aspetti e problemi della documentazione archeologica tra VII e I sec. a. C.*, Taranto 1994.
- Catalogo del Museo* IV, 1 = R. Belli Pasqua, *Catalogo del Museo Nazionale Archeologico di Taranto* IV,1. *Taranto: la scultura in marmo e in pietra*, Taranto.
- Croissant, F. 1983, *Les protomés féminines archaïques. Recherches sur les représentations du visage dans la plastique grecque de 550 à 480 av. J.-C.*, Paris.
- Croissant, F. 2000, La diffusione dei modelli stilistici greco-orientali nella coroplastica arcaica della Grecia d'Occidente, in *Atti Taranto* 39, 427-455.
- Croissant, F. 2005, Observations sur quelques korés samiennes de l'époque de Chéramyès, *RA* 2, 283-305.
- Degrassi, N. 1981, *Lo Zeus stilita di Ugento*, Roma.
- Dentzer, J.-M. 1982, *Le motif du banquet couché dans le Proche-Orient et le monde grec du VII^e au IV^e siècle*, Paris.
- Ducat, J. 1966, *Les vases plastiques rhodiens*, Paris.
- Förtsch, R. 2001, *Kunstverwendung und Kunstlegitimation im archaischen und frühklassischen Sparta*, Mainz.
- Herdejürgen, H. 1971, *Die tarentinischen Terrakotten des 6. bis 4. Jahrhundert v. Chr. im Antikenmuseum Basel*, Basel.
- Herfort-Koch, M. 1986, *Archaische Bronzeplastik Lakoniens*, Münster.
- Higgins, R.A. 1971, Tarentine Terracottas, in *Atti Taranto* 10, Napoli, 267-282.
- Iacobone, C. 1988, *Le stipi votive di Taranto (Scavi 1885-1934)*, Roma.
- Jantzen, U. 1937, *Bronzwerkstätten in Großgriechenland und Sizilien* (JdI. 13. Erg.), Berlin, 26-46.
- Jucker, H. 1965-1966, Bronzehenkel und Bronzhydria in Pesaro, *Studia Oliveriana* 13-14, 1-128.
- Langlotz, E. 1927, *Frühgriechische Bildhauerschulen*, Nürnberg.
- Langlotz, E. 1963, *Die Kunst der Westgriechen in Sizilien und Unteritalien*, München.
- Letta, C. 1971, *Piccola coroplastica metapontina*, Napoli.
- Lippolis, E. 1995, La documentazione archeologica, in E. Lippolis/S. Garraffo/M. Nafissi, *Culti greci in Occidente I. Taranto*, Taranto, 29-129.
- Megale Hellas* = G. Pugliese Carratelli (ed.), *Megale Hellas. Storia e civiltà della Magna Grecia*, Milano 1983.
- Mollard-Besques, S. 1954, *Catalogue des terres cuites grecques, étrusques et romaines*, Paris.
- Nicholls, R.V. 1952, Type, Groupe and Series: a Reconsideration of Some Coroplastic Fundamentals, *BSA* 47, 217-226.
- Pelagatti, P./Stibbe, C.M. 2002, La ceramica laconica a Taranto e nella Puglia, in *Atti Taranto* 41, Taranto, 365-403.
- Pipili, M. 1987, *Laconian Iconography of the Sixth Century*, Oxford.
- Pipili, M. 1998, Archaic Laconian vase-painting: some iconographic considerations, in W.G. Cavanagh/S.E.C. Walker (eds), *Sparta in Laconia. Proceedings of the 19th British Museum Classical Colloquium*, London, 82-96.
- Pugliese Carratelli, G. (ed.), 1983, *Megale Hellas. Storia e civiltà della Magna Grecia*, Milano.
- Rolley, C. 1967, *Les bronzes grecs*, Paris.
- Rolley, C. 1982, *Les vases de bronze de l'archaïsme récent en Grande Grèce*, Naples.
- Rolley, C. 1994, *La sculpture grecque I*, Paris.
- Samos X = H. Kyrieleis, *Der grosse Kuros von Samos*, Bonn 1996.
- Samos XI = B. Freyer-Schauenburg, *Bildwerke der archaischen Zeit und des strengen Stils*, Bonn 1974.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Altsamische Standbilder = E. Buschor, *Altsamische Standbilder* I-V, Berlin 1934-1961.

Bencze, Á. 2001, Terres cuites votives de Tarente: propositions de méthode, *BullMusBAHongrie* 94, 141-157.

Bennett, M./A.J. Paul 2002, *Magna Graecia. Greek Art from South Italy and Sicily*, New York/Manchester.

Blümel, C. 1963, *Die archaisch griechischen Skulpturen der*

- Stibbe, C.M. 1972, *Lakonische Vasenmaler des sechsten Jahrhunderts v. Chr.*, Amsterdam/London.
- Stibbe, C.M. 1975, Sparta und Tarent, *MededRom*, n.s. 35, 27-43.
- Stibbe, C.M. 1991, Dionysos in Sparta, *BABesch* 66, 1-40.
- Tuchelt, K. 1970, *Die archaischen Skulpturen von Didyma. Beiträge zur frühgriechischen Plastik in Kleinasien*, Berlin.
- Walter-Karydi, E. 1985, Geneleos, *AM* 100, 91-104.
- Wuilleumier, P. 1939, *Tarente, des origines à la conquête romaine*, Paris.

DEPARTMENT OF HISTORY OF ART
PÁZMÁNY PÉTER CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY
PILISCSABA
EGYETEM U. 1., H-2087
HUNGARY
a_bencze@yahoo.it