

## Sexual art on Roman lamps: analysis of provincial data

Sanja Vucetic

Department of archaeology, University of Sheffield <s.vucetic@sheffield.ac.uk>

Supplementary Table 1. *Distribution of idealized figures symplegma in rear-entry position.*

<b>Position Date</b>	<b>Variation (a) woman looking straight ahead</b>	<b>Variation (b) woman looking down</b>	<b>Variation (c) woman looking back at man</b>	<b>Variation (d) woman reclining on her side</b>	<b>Variation (e) symplegma with child</b>	<b>Variation (f) standing rear entry</b>
0–50 CE	Salamis	Trier Vindonissa Lyon Salamis Carthage	Vindonissa Athenian Agora Berenice	Pergamum		
50–100 CE	Vindonissa Lyon	Trier	Trier Berenice	Pergamum		
100–150 CE			Berenice	Pergamum		
150–200 CE			Berenice	Pergamum		Corinth
200–250 CE	Berenice		Berenice	Pergamum Salamis	Salamis Ephesus	
250–300 CE					Athenian Agora Kerameikos Ephesus Salamis	
300–350 CE				Ephesus	Corinth	Salamis
350–400 CE				Athenian Agora Corinth Ephesus		
500–550 CE				Ephesus		

Supplementary Table 2. *Distribution of idealized figures symplegma in woman reclining position.*

<b>Position Date</b>	<b>Variation (a) woman's right leg on man's shoulder</b>	<b>Variation (b) man holding woman's left leg</b>	<b>Variation (c) canopy symplegma</b>	<b>Variation (d) man standing</b>	<b>Variation (e) couple reclining</b>
0–50 CE	Vindonissa Carthage	Vindonissa Lyon Salamis Carthage			
50–100 CE	Vindonissa Carthage	Trier			Lyon
100–150 CE		Vindonissa			Corinth
150–200 CE		Berenice		Corinth Ephesus Berenice	
200–250 CE		Berenice		Athenian Agora	
250–300 CE			Athenian Agora Ephesus	Salamis	
300–350 CE			Athenian Agora Kerameikos Ephesus	Kerameikos	

Supplementary Table 3. *Distribution of idealized figures symplegma in woman riding reverse position.*

<b>Position Date</b>	<b>Variation (a) woman leaning forward</b>	<b>Variation (b) woman holding drapery</b>
50–0 BCE	Athenian Agora	
0–50 CE	Salamis	
100–150 CE	Berenice	Berenice Corinth
150–200 CE	Berenice	Berenice Corinth
200–250 CE	Berenice	Ephesus Pergamum Berenice
250–300 CE	Berenice	Ephesus Pergamum

Supplementary Table 4. *Distribution of idealized figures symplegma in woman riding position.*

<b>Position Date</b>	<b>Variation (a) woman lowering onto man's penis</b>	<b>Variation (b) lampstand symplegma</b>	<b>Variation (c) old man symplegma</b>
0–50 CE	Vindonissa Carthage		
50–100 CE	Vindonissa Carthage		
100–150 CE	Carthage		
150–200 CE	Berenice	Pergamum	
200–250 CE	Berenice	Corinth Berenice	
250–300 CE		Athenian Agora Kerameikos Corinth	Athenian Agora Kerameikos
300–350 CE		Athenian Agora	Athenian Agora Kerameikos

Supplementary Table 5. *Distribution of dwarf symplegma in rear entry position.*

<b>Position Date</b>	<b>Variation (a) woman's right leg on man's shoulder</b>	<b>Variation (b) man holding drapery</b>	<b>Variation (c) standing couple</b>
0–50 CE	Vindonissa Lyon Carthage	Vindonissa Pergamum Berenice Carthage	
50–100 CE	Trier Vindonissa Carthage		
100–150 CE	Carthage		
150–200 CE			Carthage

Supplementary Table 6. *Distribution of dwarf symplegma in woman riding reverse position.*

<b>Position Date</b>	<b>Variation (a) woman crouching, man's arm on woman's back</b>	<b>Variation (b) man's arm up, woman's arms up</b>
0–50 CE	Trier Vindonissa Ephesus Carthage	Vindonissa Salamis
50–100 CE	Trier Vindonissa Salamis Carthage	Trier Vindonissa Lyon Salamis

A Fisher's Exact test (Monte Carlo Method) analysis indicated that the relation between site and human figure type is statistically significant ( $p < .001$ ). The observed frequencies of the human scene categories are significantly different from the expected frequencies. This outcome may be best explained by the overrepresentation of the dwarf coupling in Carthage and Vindonissa, and the underrepresentation of the same category in the Athenian Agora, Corinth, and Berenice (Benghazi).

Supplementary Table 7. *Cross-tabulation table: Human scene figure type by site.*

		Figure Type			Total
		Idealized	Dwarf	Uncertain	
Berenice	Count	36	2	0	38
	Expected Count	27.4	9.8	.8	38.0
	Standardized Residual	1.6	-2.5	-.9	
Carthage	Count	12	19	0	31
	Expected Count	22.4	8.0	.7	31.0
	Standardized Residual	-2.2	3.9	-.8	
Athenian Agora	Count	35	0	1	36
	Expected Count	26.0	9.2	.8	36.0
	Standardized Residual	1.8	-3.0	.3	
Corinth	Count	34	0	0	34
	Expected Count	24.5	8.7	.7	34.0
	Standardized Residual	1.9	-3.0	-.9	
Ephesus	Count	18	1	1	20
	Expected Count	14.4	5.1	.4	20.0
	Standardized Residual	.9	-1.8	.9	
Pergamum	Count	9	1	2	12
	Expected Count	8.7	3.1	.3	12.0
	Standardized Residual	.1	-1.2	3.4	
Salamis	Count	26	7	0	33
	Expected Count	23.8	8.5	.7	33.0
	Standardized Residual	.4	-.5	-.8	
Kourion	Count	1	1	1	3
	Expected Count	2.2	.8	.1	3.0
	Standardized Residual	-.8	.3	3.7	
Vindonissa	Count	41	34	2	77
	Expected Count	55.6	19.8	1.6	77.0
	Standardized Residual	-2.0	3.2	.3	
Trier	Count	16	10	0	26
	Expected Count	18.8	6.7	.6	26.0
	Standardized Residual	-.6	1.3	-.7	
Lyon	Count	8	9	0	17
	Expected Count	12.3	4.4	.4	17.0
	Standardized Residual	-1.2	2.2	-.6	
Total	Count	236	84	7	327
	Expected Count	236.0	84.0	7.0	327.0

A Fisher's Exact test (Monte Carlo Method) analysis indicated that the relation between site and human sexual coupling type (human-human vs. human-animal) is statistically significant ( $p < .001$ ). The observed frequencies of the human scene categories are significantly different from the expected frequencies. This may be best explained by the overrepresentation of the human-animal sexual imagery in the Athenian Agora, and the overrepresentation of group sex and the mixed motif in Salamis.

Supplementary Table 8. Cross-tabulation table: Human sexual coupling scene type by site.

		Figural coupling						Total
		Male-female	Human-animal	Threesome	Mixed Motif	Male-male	Uncertain	
Berenice	Count	37	1	0	0	0	0	38
	Expected Count	32.3	4.3	.2	.5	.1	.6	38.0
	Standardized Residual	.8	-1.6	-.5	-.7	-.3	-.8	
Carthage	Count	30	1	0	0	0	0	31
	Expected Count	26.4	3.5	.2	.4	.1	.5	31.0
	Standardized Residual	.7	-1.3	-.4	-.6	-.3	-.7	
Athenian Agora	Count	26	10	0	0	0	0	36
	Expected Count	30.6	4.1	.2	.4	.1	.6	36.0
	Standardized Residual	-.8	2.9	-.5	-.7	-.3	-.7	
Corinth	Count	29	5	0	0	0	0	34
	Expected Count	28.9	3.8	.2	.4	.1	.5	34.0
	Standardized Residual	.0	.6	-.5	-.6	-.3	-.7	
Ephesus	Count	16	3	0	0	0	1	20
	Expected Count	17.0	2.3	.1	.2	.1	.3	20.0
	Standardized Residual	-.2	.5	-.3	-.5	-.2	1.3	
Pergamum	Count	6	3	0	0	1	2	12
	Expected Count	10.2	1.4	.1	.1	.0	.2	12.0
	Standardized Residual	-1.3	1.4	-.3	-.4	5.0	4.2	
Salamis	Count	25	2	2	4	0	0	33
	Expected Count	28.1	3.7	.2	.4	.1	.5	33.0
	Standardized Residual	-.6	-.9	4.0	5.7	-.3	-.7	
Kourion	Count	2	0	0	0	0	1	3
	Expected Count	2.6	.3	.0	.0	.0	.0	3.0
	Standardized Residual	-.3	-.6	-.1	-.2	-.1	4.5	
Vindonissa	Count	70	6	0	0	0	1	77
	Expected Count	65.5	8.7	.5	.9	.2	1.2	77.0
	Standardized Residual	.6	-.9	-.7	-1.0	-.5	-.2	
Trier	Count	23	3	0	0	0	0	26
	Expected Count	22.1	2.9	.2	.3	.1	.4	26.0
	Standardized Residual	.2	.0	-.4	-.6	-.3	-.6	
Lyon	Count	14	3	0	0	0	0	17
	Expected Count	14.5	1.9	.1	.2	.1	.3	17.0
	Standardized Residual	-.1	.8	-.3	-.5	-.2	-.5	
Total	Count	278	37	2	4	1	5	327
	Expected Count	278.0	37.0	2.0	4.0	1.0	5.0	327.0