The Annual of the British School at Athens

<http://journals.cambridge.org/ATH>

Additional services for *The Annual of the British School at Athens*:

Email alerts: [Click here](#)

Subscriptions: [Click here](#)

Commercial reprints: [Click here](#)

Terms of use : [Click here](#)

The so-called 'Sardanapalus'

Bernard Ashmole

The Annual of the British School at Athens / Volume 24 / November 1921, pp 78 - 87

DOI: 10.1017/S0068245400010091, Published online: 11 October 2013

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0068245400010091

How to cite this article:

Bernard Ashmole (1921). The so-called 'Sardanapalus'. The Annual of the British School at Athens, 24, pp 78-87 doi:10.1017/S0068245400010091

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

THE SO-CALLED 'SARDANAPALUS.'

(PLATES III.—V.)

THE torso of this type published by Arndt in 1893¹ was found at Athens in the Theatre of Dionysos in 1865 and put into the magazine of the National Museum. In the register of the Acropolis Museum shortly after 1891 is entered the fragment of a bearded head, consisting of the front upper part to the lips, again found on the South Slope, which was placed in the Acropolis Museum magazine. To this in 1918 Dr. Keramopoulos joined the lower part of the beard, which had also been among the fragments there. At the end of 1920 I was fortunate enough to notice the connexion between the torso of the National Museum and the head of the Acropolis Museum. The touching surface leaves no doubt that they originally formed part of the same statue, and the combination (unrestored except for plaster in the irregular joins of head with beard and beard with body) appears to represent a straightforward copy of about the beginning of the first century B.C. (Pl. III.).² That, though accurate in essentials, it was not highly finished, may be seen by examining the line where the hair leaves the side of the forehead, the ends of the curls on the *chiton*, and the summary, but confident, treatment of material both in *chiton* and *himation*: yet the work can at once be seen to be softer, fresher, and more valuable stylistically than the conventional herms of Naples,³ Palermo,⁴ and the Uffizi.⁵

¹ Arndt-Amelung, *Einzelaufnahmen*, 714.

² Pentelic marble. Total height 1·23 m. The upper part of the head was referred to by Sanborn in a paper read at Athens in or about 1912. The cruciform arrangement of marks on the forehead shows that the defacement here was at Christian hands: the injuries to the right eye are also clearly deliberate.

³ Guida, No. 273, p. 88. The herm-bust as well as the nose is restored.

⁴ Arndt-Amelung, *op. cit.*, p. 557.

⁵ MacDowall, *J.H.S.*, xxiv. (1904), p. 255, note 1, *d.* I was not able to see this head in Florence; very probably its position has been altered during the recent rearrangement of the Museum.

In a comparison with the head of the Vatican statue, of the twelve most obvious measurements eight correspond to within one millimetre : of the remainder the most important difference is in the height of the eye, where the maker of the statue in Rome has entirely missed the subtlety of curve in the lids, just as elsewhere in the face he has missed the subtlety of the modelling.¹

In the body there is considerable variation both in measurement and technical treatment. The variation of measurements is probably to be explained by the fact that the Athens copyist either took too few points from his cast, or that he used a cast for the head only and a model of smaller scale for the body (Fig. 1). The difference in technical treatment is partly due to facility and hastiness in the Athens copyist : the maker of the Vatican statue had less ability and less artistic feeling but perhaps less imperfect mechanical appliances. His larger measurements are probably the more correct, but his work generally is much harder and more lifeless, while he can be just as summary and careless as the other, witness his work with the drill in the folds at the bottom of the *chiton*. The question of the accuracy of the Athens copy is important, for it throws the only light we have on the problem raised by its provenance. If the original was an Attic work, by far the most satisfactory hypothesis to account for the setting up of a copy in the Theatre of Dionysos at Athens in early Roman times, is that the original, of bronze, was carried off to Rome, while the Pentelic marble suggests that the copy was made at the same time in Athens. This hypothesis would not only account for the finding of a number of copies in and near Rome, but would also explain certain of the technical differences between the two copies with which we are dealing. Some of the hardness of the Vatican statue, especially in the drapery, may be due to the retention of the firmer lines of the metal. The Athens work may be a partial translation, by a copyist of some artistic feeling, from the technique of bronze to that

¹	<i>Discrepancies in remainder :</i>	Vatican.	Athens.
	Upper edge of fillet	·10 m.	·115 m.
	Lowest point hole of right ear to right inner eye corner	·121 m.	·115 m.*
	Lowest point right ear to highest point forehead	·198 m.	·192 m.*
	Height of eye (max. excl. lids) . .	·013 m.	·0115 m.

* Approximate owing to breakage.

of marble; he could not depart from the main features of the original bronze conception, *i. e.* the structural design of hair, beard and drapery,

	Vatican.	Athens.
1.	'34 m.	'34 m.
2.	'31 m.	'32 m.
3.	'40 m.	'395 m.
4.	'443 m.	'485 m.
5.	'122 m.	'112 m.
6.	'143 m.	'127 m.
o	perhaps 'points'	

FIG. 1.—THE ATHENS 'SARDANAPALUS' AS COMPARED WITH THE VATICAN STATUE.

but he could, and did, soften the transitions from plane to plane, and left out the metallic chasing finish. On the left side, too, he brought the lower edge of the cross-fold back against the main drapery instead of

making it overhang by undercutting : the hair, on the other hand, where it waves back sharply from the side of the forehead, is strictly reproduced in its intricate arrangement of interlacing strands, with deep undercutting and angular curves which are meaningless in marble.

Amongst many examples the Amazon head in the Palazzo dei Conservatori at Rome (Orti Mecenaziani, No. 3), which is certainly an unmodified translation from bronze to marble, well illustrates how the elegance of the intricate coils of hair, beautiful though it is, becomes cold and almost unpleasing without the life which would be given to it by the lustre

FIG. 2.—TREATMENT OF HAIR IN MARBLE COPY OF BRONZE ORIGINAL.

of metal (Fig. 2). In the hair of the Athens "Sardanapalus" something of the same kind is evident : it has indeed been mistaken for the last traces of archaism. On the crown of the head there is a parallel difference between Athens and the Vatican. The former has the same main design of striated lines radiating from the crown, with a hint of other lines between : the latter subsidiary divisions marked. We may assume that the Palermo copy gives the original treatment quite closely, showing as it does each main division further divided by at least two lines parallel to the main ones : this treatment, which clearly demands metal to show its full beauty, is thus quite close to that of the corresponding part in the Eirene of Munich, again a copy from bronze (Fig. 3). In the drapery,

the economy of line in the design of primary folds, combined with the play of carefully-subordinated small surfaces in detail, is just such a method as gives life to work in bronze, while the suitability of that material for rendering the contrast between the folds of *chiton* and *himation*, by fine incision and broad planes respectively, is evident; and a good example, the fragment from Cyzicus in Berlin, has been pointed out by Amelung.¹ In particular, on the left side of the Vatican 'Sardanapalus' the sharp lower edge of the cross-fold of the *himation*

FIG. 3.—TREATMENT OF HAIR OF THE EIRENE (MUNICH) COMPARED WITH THAT OF THE ATHENS HEAD (from Casts).

with its deep undercutting and its folds dependent from the elbow: below it the great tubular and scroll-like folds of the *himation* itself, hanging not only clear of the body at the side, but free of the *chiton* in front, favour strongly the derivation from a bronze original.

Before proceeding to a judgment of the style of that original, we must put aside those copies which add nothing to our knowledge of it. In the British Museum statue from Posilipo, which, as Arndt suggested,² is not to be considered as an exact replica, the number of folds is multiplied and their functional character emphasised; but it would be a mistake to assume, with Amelung, that this shows an

¹ *Arch. Anz.*, 1915, p. 279 ff.

² Arndt-Amelung, *op. cit.*, 557.

earlier taste than is apparent in the Roman group. This copy would seem to be of Hadrianic date, and the copyist has conceived and carried out the drapery under the influence of the treatment generally employed in the rendering of the *toga*, a treatment which was the

FIG. 4.—THE CRETAN 'SARDANAPALUS' (from the Original).

outcome of a renewed study of nature.¹ The head also has undergone modification, and we must beware of making it a criterion for the style

¹ Mr. Forsdyke kindly informs me that the British Museum copy agrees in the measurements of the head with the Vatican and Athens copies, and so should derive from the same original or a copy of the same original. We may recall the Persephone type of the late fifth or early fourth century, which undergoes a like modification in the drapery at the hands of sculptors of the Roman period. Compare the Eleusis relief cited by Amelung, *Basis*, p. 53, with the same type used in a Roman portrait statue, Helbig³, 1174 (Lateran). Less closely-dated copies of the same type modified in a similar way are too numerous to mention.

of the original, as Amelung inclines to do at the end of his paper. The ivy-wreathed head found in the American excavations at Corinth, an unpleasing work perhaps of the late first century A.D., is a genuine copy, though the craftsman has made one considerable error of measurement.¹ It was inset into the statue, has a high polish on the face (like the Naples herm), but is scarcely worked on top: while the hair is less crisp and more commonplace than in any other example. What seems

FIG. 5.—THE CRETAN 'SARDANAPALUS' (from Casts).

to be the base, much mutilated, lies near the small Greek temple north of the fountain of Peirene.² Such measurements as are possible correspond with the British Museum statue, and the left foot projects from the drapery.

The unrestored statuette at the Villa Ariadne, Knossos, found in the vineyard there, published here by permission of Sir Arthur Evans and illustrated in Figs. 4 and 5, is a reduced copy (total height excluding base .61 m.).

¹ Also mentioned in the paper referred to in note 2, p. 78. Greyish island marble. Measurements agree with the Vatican statue except in this particular: lowest point right ear to highest point forehead:—Vatican .198 m.; Corinth .176 m. Do, left side:—Vatican .203 m.; Corinth .19 m.

² *A.J.A.*, vi. (1902), Pl. XVII.

It has the ivy-wreath, as in the British Museum and Corinth examples, is of poor workmanship, somewhat simplified, and provides only one new detail of importance, the butt of the thyrsus on the base. At the back the diagonal folds are interrupted by the *glutei*, and not carried through from left shoulder to right side as in the Vatican, Athens, and British Museum statues. The left foot again projects from the drapery.¹

The provenance of the Athens head and comparison with all other reproductions of the type give ground for supposing it to be the purest in style. Though a copy, it may thus reasonably be used in judging the style of the original head; for the style of the body, until further

FIG. 6.—PEIRAEUS HEAD COMPARED WITH EPHEBE FROM THE ACROPOLIS.

evidence is available, we must be content with the Vatican statue. How are previous opinions affected by the new factor of the Athens fragment? The less general view, that the 'Sardanapalus' was a work of the Pheidias circle, is seriously weakened, if not disproved, by the discovery of the fine Peiraeus head (Pl. IV.), almost certainly representing a Dionysos. It seems to be the purest and most careful replica of a common type: a copy from bronze, as may be seen from the free curls on the temples, from other details of the hair, and from the careful reproduction of breaks in the metal where those curls are secured by the hair-band

¹ This feature, though it seems, especially in the British Museum copy, to disturb the balance of the statue, was almost certainly present in the original. The Vatican statue has a projection in the *chiton* at ground-level which is of the same breadth as the remains of the British Museum left foot.

(Pl. IV.).¹ Comparison with the ephebe head of the Acropolis² (Fig. 6), which has been claimed as an original by Pheidias himself, and at least, from the strikingly close connexion it has with the finest work on the

FIG. 7.—TREATMENT OF EYE IN (a) EIRENE, (b) ATHENS 'SARDANAPALUS,' (c) PETWORTH APHRODITE, (d) HERMES OF OLYMPIA.

Parthenon frieze, must belong to his circle, shows clearly that the Attic mid fifth-century bearded Dionysos was not of the 'Sardanapalus' type;

¹ Peiraeus Museum. No. 374. Pentelic marble. Unrestored. Found September 1st, 1914, in the house of Antonios Kanellas, Valaneion St., Peiraeus, in a cistern, apparently on the site of ancient baths. Total height to present lowest point of beard '32 m. Breadth of head (immediately below ears) '15 m. approx. Breadth of face across eyes (outer corner of lids) '11 m. Breadth of face (outer ends eyebrow-bones as far back as front of clustering locks) '137 m. Lowest point of hair-band to lowest point of upper lip '148 m. Mouth (at level of lowest point of upper lip to inside edges of moustache) '045 m. Height of eye (max. excl. lids) '037 m. Length of eye (excl. lids) '014 m. Height of ear (max.) '056 m. In the numerous adaptations of the type to herm form, the hair is almost invariably modified by the addition of shoulder-locks, and the arrangement at the back conventionalised.

² Dickins, *Catalogue of the Acropolis Museum*, i. p. 266, No. 699.

but shows at the same time what the creator of the 'Sardanapalus,' at least fifty years later, owed to it as a prototype. It is to the Attic school of the fourth century that the 'Sardanapalus' belonged, and much general evidence for assigning it to the Praxitelean circle, cited by Amelung, still remains valid. Compared with the Eirene of Kephisodotos, a sculptor to whom it has been attributed,¹ the eye is more advanced and the modelling more elaborate, though this may be due in part to the hardness of the Munich copy of the Eirene (Pl. V. and Fig. 7).² The two are without doubt closely related, but we may reasonably suppose that had Kephisodotos been the sculptor of the Dionysos, some literary evidence would have connected his name with a work evidently so famous in antiquity. There are, moreover, chronological reasons for believing the Eirene to have come late in his career, and other sculptures³ that we can safely trace to originals by him, show no considerable advance in style. But we can go further than this: the 'Sardanapalus,' on the evidence of the Athens head, can take its place among accepted works which illustrate the evolution of Praxitelean style. Clearly later than the Apollo Sauroktonos, it shows a treatment in detail simpler and perhaps, therefore, earlier than the Hermes of Olympia. Judged by the detail of the eye, the Petworth Aphrodite is earlier than the Hermes, and the 'Sardanapalus' earlier still (Fig. 7). For the hair, we may compare a badly-weathered female head (placed on a body which is foreign to it) at Stockholm (Pl. V. 2).⁴ From the nature of the case its evidence is purely internal; but throughout the manner is decidedly Praxitelean.

BERNARD ASHMOLE.

¹ Macchioro, *Jahreshefte*, xii. (1908), p. 189; Wolters, *Jahrbuch*, viii. (1893), p. 177.

² The evidence of the ear is neutral: missing in the Athens copy, in the Vatican statue, though, like the eye, it is executed without refinement, its main design corresponds to that employed by Praxiteles. We know only the lower part of a Kephisodotean ear.

³ E. g. Arndt-Amelung, *op. cit.*, 1778 (Madrid).

⁴ I am indebted to Dr. Ernst Kjellberg both for drawing my attention to this head and for giving me a photograph of it. There is what I believe to be a replica (set on the body of an Apollo Sauroktonos and injured by drastic cleaning) at Ince-Blundell (Michaelis, *Anc. Marbles*, p. 339, No. 12).

I

2

3

4

"THE SO-CALLED 'SARDANAPALUS': I. THE ATHENS STATUE AS RESTORED.
2, 3. THE HEAD IN PROFILE. 4. THE HEAD FROM A CAST.

ATTIC MID FIFTH-CENTURY TYPE OF DIONYSOS: MARBLE HEAD
FROM THE PEIRAEUS

1

2

3

4

THE SO-CALLED 'SARDANAPALUS': ATHENS HEAD (3) COMPARED WITH
THE EIRENE (1) AT MUNICH, PRAXITELEAN HEAD (2) AT STOCKHOLM,
HERMES (4) AT OLYMPIA.