

THREE SCULPTURES FROM SARDIS IN THE MANISA MUSEUM

GEORGE M. A. HANFMANN and KEMAL ZİYA POLATKAN

During the excavations undertaken by Howard Crosby Butler from 1910 to 1914, a number of ancient sculptures was found at Sardis. Some of them are well published¹ but others are known only through inadequate photographs and brief allusions in Butler's preliminary reports.² Even prior to the resumption of the excavations by the Harvard-Cornell-American Schools of Oriental Research Expedition in 1958, the soil of Sardis brought forth through chance finds many architectural and sculptural fragments. These have been brought to the Manisa Museum. We publish herewith two important finds of recent years as well as an interesting piece found by Butler.

I.

The archaic torso (Pl. 9-10) is of great historical and artistic importance. Apart from a peculiar herm, formerly in the Berlin Museum, this is the first archaic statue of a human being³ found in the capital of Lydia. The remarkable piece bears testimony to the high standing of the Lydian school of sculptors at the time of Croesus and illustrates the close affinity of their style to the work of Ionian sculptors at Ephesus.

Data: Manisa Museum No. 5. Preserved height: 0.63 m. Girth around chest, 1.07 m. Length of upper arm, 0.37 m. Length of locks preserved on the back: 0.30 m., their width, 0.16 m.

¹ T. L. Shear, *Art Bulletin* 19 (1928) 215; 13 (1931) 127. G. M. A. Richter, *Met. Mus. Cat. of Greek Sculpture* (1954) 5, nos. 6, 41. C. R. Morey, *Sardis* 5: 1 (1924).

² *Sardis* I, figs. 2, 47, 49, 57, 58, 61, 86, 96, 93, 99, 122, 137-8, 151-3, 164, 172f., 179f. A complete list is available in the mimeographed Preliminary Bibliography compiled by the writer with the aid of M. Golding.

³ Archaic lions: T. L. Shear, *Art Bull.* 13 (1931) 127ff. An interesting sphinx is in the Archaeological Museum, Istanbul. Herm: L. Curtius, *Die antike Herme*, 18, figs. 12-14.

The torso is preserved down to somewhat above the knees and somewhat below the buttocks. Head and neck are lost. The top part of the statue is so thoroughly and evenly worn as to suggest that after the head had broken off, this side was both worn down and exposed for some time to weathering. This condition resulted from its re-use in a Roman wall. The fingers of (his) right hand are broken off. Recent surface damage has been inflicted upon the lower left corner of the rectangle of locks on the back, upon the adjacent vertical folds, and upon the same folds over the left buttock. The material is local Sardinian white-gray marble with the characteristic reddish discoloration which most sculptures of Sardis acquire in contact with red clay soil.

The statue was found in 1954 by peasants taking stones from the high (eastern) right bank of the Paktolos torrent several hundred yards south of the modern highway bridge over the Paktolos⁴. The excavation guard, Hüseyin Karataş, has pointed out to us the exact spot. Here the Paktolos has worn away parts of Roman structures. Their floors and walls are exposed at depths varying from 2 to 10 feet from modern surface. Two walls, 0.80-0.85 m. thick, protrude out of the embankment in such a way that their continuation might form a right angle. They are connected by a mosaic floor, ca. 5 m. long, made of square white tesserae which are separated by a band of greenish black stone tesserae. The floor lies ca. 0.85 m. below the modern surface. It is laid over reddish stucco. This stucco bedding rests in turn on irregularly laid red baked bricks and field stones. The preserved height of the southern wall is ca. 0.65 m. A water pipe of terracotta issues 0.45 m. below the floor, ca. 0.60 m. north of the southern wall (C). The archaic piece formed part of the top of the southern wall (C) and was thus not more than 20 cm. below the surface; the present top of the wall, on which the statue was lying, is 0.55 m. below surface. The embankment continues down below the Roman walls, some of which are sunk in very deeply, to (estimated) 10 to 15 feet. At the bottom are layers of pebbles (they seem no more than earlier deposits of the river) separated by even layers of clay. In any case, while Lydian sherds occur in various levels of the embankment,

⁴ Cf. *Sardis* I (1922) Ill. 18 and the revised version with the excavations of 1958, *Archaeology* 12, No. 1 (1959) 4 53-61.

the structures at the top are Roman. From the type of wall construction, which includes field stones and spoils and is liberally cemented with mortar, and from the character of the mosaic, third or fourth century A. D. seems the most likely date.

The statue, then, was re-used in the Roman wall, and need not be in or near its original place. On the other hand, our excavations of 1958 have uncovered Lydian strata only some 500 m. away from the find spot of the statue, and a few archaic pieces were found in Building "B".

The figure stood proudly erect, the entire left side of the body slightly forward of the right. The sex is not clearly indicated; a man is suggested by the analogy of the statue from Tigani⁵ on Samos, which exhibits the same attitude and posture. The contour in profile and the downward taper of the figure indicate that, like the youth from Tigani, the man was long-legged. The statue was more slender and columnar than one might surmise from its present state. The front is nearly flat, but shoulders and arms are well rounded, and the contours of the back with its strong buttocks are lovingly carved in large tense curves. When complete, this proud and aristocratic image stood forth in somewhat "stony" fullness of body, without any suggestion of softness of flesh. The large geometric volumes are still paramount in determining its design, and this adherence to early archaic geometry is also evident in the formation of the folds of the cloak, in the rectangle of hair on the back, and in the angular formula used for the hands.

Some features link the fragment to statues of the Korai: the differentiation of the fine undergarment and the thicker cloak; the general arrangement of the cloak in the diagonal descent; the sharp contrast of "naked" back and vertical fall of folds along one side; finally the six individual strands of hair that descend forward on arms and chest. None of these traits, however, is exclusively feminine, and the statue is certainly not in the normal type of the Samian Korai.⁶ As

⁵ Ch. Picard, *Manuel d'archéol., Sculpture* I (1935) p. 548, fig. 186 - L. Curtius *AM* 31 (1906) 87, pls. 10-12. E. Buschor, *Altsamische Standbilder* 3 (1935) 46 f., figs. 160-162, says it was brought to Samos from Asia Minor.

⁶ The central figure of a bronze group taken by Buschor as a woman has the locks and a somewhat earlier type of folds. He dates the group to the third quarter of the sixth century. *Altsamische Standbilder* I (1934) 12; for the korai, *ibid.* 24ff., figs.

far as one sees, there is no sign that the figure grasped drapery with the right hand, as do those Samian maidens who have their arms along the sides; but then, in the Sardis statue the crucial part of the hand is missing. A fragment from the Artemisium of Ephesos,⁷ described by Pryce unhesitatingly as that of a girl, has a good deal of resemblance, but the Ephesian girl very definitely does grasp a fold—there is no such fold in the Lydian statue (Pl. 9 c).

The hair of the statue from Sardis (Pl. 9-10) is arranged according to a mid-archaic formula in an oblong of "beads" composed of nine horizontal rows, seven beads to each row.⁸ The six long tresses are curiously widespread, the two outermost rolling down the upper arms.

The undergarment with half-length sleeves (chiton) seems to have a wide semicircular border around the front of the neck. Above this half circle, the join of the collar bones is given in rather linear rendering. Whether the two halfcircles below the neck-line are borders of the garment or necklaces is not quite certain—but probably the former. The undergarment is stylized in lovingly drawn, rippling streamlets of folds. It is seen over the chest and right arm, the right shoulder, and the left arm. Quite singular is the way in which this garment is seen along the entire height of the right ("his" left) side of the figure. Seams are very clearly shown along both sleeves.

Over this garment, the man wears a cloak (Pl. 9-10) draped in three hanging broad folds across his front. Three folds go under the right arm but only two come out to make corresponding curves on the back. Deep curving incisions below intimate that the garment was wrapped more lightly around the lower part of the body. They, too, fail to continue around the back; but two vertical incisions visible just above the break (Pl. 10 b) show that something was done to relieve the monotony. The cloak was pleated on the right (the statue's left) side to make vertical folds; here again the sculptor was not

74 ff., esp. 92f., 113f. Strands or tresses falling on the shoulders were also worn by men: Buschor, *op. cit.*, figs 29, 179, 181, 193. They appear on the statue dedicated by Aiakes and taken to be a statue of Hera by Buschor, a male portrait by others. *Ibid.* 2 (1934) 40f., figs. 141-143.

⁷ F. N. Pryce, *Cat. Sculpt. British Museum* 1: I (1928) 63, fig. 70, B 139.

⁸ Cf. Buschor, *op. cit.*, 1, pp. 13, 19f., figs. 45f., 65, dating to the second and third quarter of the sixth century B. C.

bothered by logic or symmetry—four vertical folds go down front, five down the back.

The man wears simple bracelets around his wrists. The better preserved left hand shows four fingers as loosely bent, the thumb held down vertically. The angular way in which the little finger is bent adheres to the formula used for early kouroi.

It is, I hope, clear even from photographs that the new statue is fundamentally a work of Eastern Greek art. It does not have, to be sure, the poetic, singing quality of the Samian sculpture nor again the soft, ponderous fleshliness of the Milesians. There is more to be said for seeing stylistic kinship with the Croesan sculptures from Ephesos. We already mentioned the fragment of a girl from the Artemisium. Her heavy, large, somewhat stiff arm resembles quite closely that of the Sardis statue; the metallic folds are there, too, but in a slightly more advanced version, bending in adjustment to the body.⁹ Other comparisons with the sculptures of the Artemisium are harder to make; but the rippling lines of hair on the head of a woman from one of the Croesan columns of the Artemisium¹⁰ were drawn by a hand very close to that which drew the lines of the undergarment on the statue of Sardis (especially "his" right side of chest and shoulder). However, on the fragment of the column relief, the treatment of tresses looks somewhat more fluent and advanced than on the torso from Sardis.

Both the head from the column of the Artemisium and the statue from Sardis were made by artists employed by King Croesus in the decade just prior to his fall (546 B. C.). We may with some confidence think of them as by sculptors of his "court school". It may be splitting hairs, but the statue in Manisa appears to be somewhat less fluent and more provincial than the Artemis reliefs—either because it is earlier or because it is the work perhaps of a Lydian assistant rather than a Greek master. To prove this would take more detailed examination of the originals from the Artemisium. Enough to say that the heavy, metallic drapery, greater massivity, and well-roun-

⁹ F. N. Pryce, *op. cit.*, 63, fig. 70. The piece does not come from one of the Croesan columns but was thought by Pryce to be late Croesan, from some rectangular member ranging with the columns.

¹⁰ F. N. Pryce, *op. cit.*, 51, pl. 5, no. B. 91. The Ephesian girl seems to have a similar circular neckline of garment.

ded flesh seem to distinguish the style of this court school of Croesus from the Samian and Milesian ateliers. These "Croesan" sculptures are, on the other hand, more tense and vigorous than the fat man from Tigani whom Buschor assigns to a mainland sculptor.¹¹ Whether this "court school" developed before or after the capture of Ephesus by Croesus, we cannot tell. But it is tempting to assume that just as the dedicatory inscriptions on the column given by Croesus were in Lydian as well as Greek,¹² so there were Lydians as well as Greeks in the workshop which worked for Croesus at Ephesus and Sardis.

II.

The over-life size statue of a woman (Pl. 11) was found in 1955 north of the theatre.¹³ Manisa Museum No. 1031. Height: 1.96 m. The material is again local marble. The statue was made of several pieces. The breaks across the chest and lower legs are later damages; but dowel holes clearly show that the left arm and left foot were made of separate pieces; so were the head and neck, which are now missing.

The imposing figure represents a style which can best be described as an "Asiatic" version of Late Hellenistic Classicism.¹⁴ A significant trait is the peculiar canon; the lower body and legs very high and massive, the upper body relatively slender and small.¹⁵ Gone is the dynamic unrest of the "Pergamene" style, gone the twisting and tording of the body, the restless and complex interplay of the garments strongly contrasted in their textures. The motion is more implied than expressed by the posture; the slightly advanced left leg, the

¹¹ *Op. cit.*, 46, "the find spot, Cape Phineas, was only a transit station of the statue, which hails from Asia Minor" The statue dated by Buschor 550-540 B. C. is certainly somewhat later than the statue from Sardis.

¹² F. N. Pryce, *op. cit.*, nos. B 16, 32, 136. *Sardis* 6: 2, no. 28.

¹³ For the location of the Theatre cf. *Sardis* 1, Ill. 18 and *Archaeology* 12 (1959) 54, fig. 2.

¹⁴ Cf. in general R. Horn, "Stehende weibliche Gewandstatuen in der hellenistischen Plastik — Röm. Mitt. Suppl. 2 (1931) 76 ff., pls. 28, 36 ff., M. Bieber, *The Sculpture of the Hellenistic Age* (1955) 128 ff., 165 f., figs. 498-501, 507-525, 600 f., 707-712, on female figures; "Classicism", *ibid.*, 157 ff.

¹⁵ Cf. e. g. Bieber, *op. cit.*, figs. 522-527, 710-12, all of the late second or first centuries B. C. Horn, pls. 21: 3; 30 ff.

slightly displaced right hip. The arrangement of the garment, too, is aimed at achieving what the artist obviously (but erroneously) believed to be the Classic means for portraying dignity, clarity, and nobility. To this end he arranges nearly symmetrical falls of folds in Classical "swallow-tail" pattern framing the upper body, and introduces the same formula in the most decidedly un-Classical central fold which bestows such a marked central accent to the lower part of the figure.¹⁶ The long thin folds which he uses in the cloak and even more to reveal the legs are ultimately imitated from the Classic style best known from the Nike Balustrade. Yet the sculptor's notion of the way in which his statue should be viewed is quite un-Classical. Its front is a façade enframed by two pillars of drapery; the sides count for little; the back is hardly worked at all. Such "Einansichtigkeit", reduction of a statue to one major view, has long been recognized as a Late Hellenistic trait.

The fine sense for portrayal of different textiles and the treatment of certain folds are good "Asiatic" workshop tradition, which goes back to Pergamene style. Note the dainty transparency of the garment over the breast. Note, too, the peculiar crossing pattern of folds over her foot (Pl. 11 c); something of the sort may have occurred in the original of one of the Muses from Miletos.¹⁷ The execution of this motif on the Sardis status is lively, closer to the "Middle Hellenistic" statues from Pergamon than to the Late Hellenistic statues from Phocaea and Magnesia.¹⁸ This style of carving is certainly far removed from the metallic stylization of Roman statues.¹⁹ For dating purpo-

¹⁶ This centralization begins in the second century B. C., cf. e. g., Kleopatra of Delos, dated 138 B. C.; gains momentum in the first; cf. Bieber, *op. cit.*, figs. 511 f., 521, 708. Horn, 82, 85, 90, pls. 23:1; 25:1; 30:3; 32:1; 36:3, among them some of the figures of the frieze of Lagina, dated ca. 100 B. C. The interesting portrait statues of Roman ladies from Magnesia use such Classic "swallow-tail" folds - much less prominently. Cf. C. Humann, C. Watzinger, *Magnesia* (1904) 198 ff., figs. 198-200, cf. also 202. None attains the elegant, precise but also non-sensical and arbitrary effect of the statue from Sardis. Roman examples go beyond it: e. g. stele of Alexandra, Athens no. 1193; S. Papaspiridi, *Guide* (1927) 225, fig. 45. Bieber, *op. cit.*, 120-122. Horn, p. 39: 2. There is a curious relation in the treatment of this drapery to the statue recently found at Aulis, *Ergon tis Arkheol. Eteirias* 1956 (1957) 36, fig. 35.

¹⁷ Bieber, fig. 501.

¹⁸ Bieber, figs. 514 f.

¹⁹ Bieber, fig. 524.

ses, it is interesting to compare the statues of the ladies of the family of L. Valerius Flaccus²⁰, which on historic grounds must be dated either to 93 B. C. or to 62-61 B. C. We note certain resemblances of detail but the design of the figures still follows the "swaying" Pergamene formula. The statue of Moschine, priestess of Artemis at Sardis, has been dated ca. 35-25 B. C. partly on stylistic, partly on historical and epigraphic grounds.²¹ It adheres to the same general formula as the statues of the Flaccus family but is more static, more quiet in effect. The stance is similar to that of the new statue but the style not nearly as polished and elegant. On style alone, the new statue should be later than that of Moschine, say 30 B. C. There is not enough dated material from Sardis and nearby sites to determine how much later it might be. Craftsmanship and style are still Hellenistic, but marked Roman influence does not seem to manifest itself in these schools of Western Asia Minor much before the Flavian era; a date anywhere before 50 A. D. would be tenable.

In any event, the sculptor of the Sardis statue emerges as an interesting individual. Nothing quite as coolly Classicistic²² and elegantly mannered seems to be known from Late Hellenistic Asia Minor in the line of female draped figures. In a stimulating article²³, G. M. A. Richter has recently attacked the notion that Roman art of the first centuries B. C. and A. D. was Neo-Classic or Classicizing. She is certainly right in saying that the period was one of complex currents, whose exponents produced works ranging from mechanical copies of Classic works to free-hand paraphrases of vigorous Hellenistic motifs. Nevertheless, a careful study of sculpture and painting by leading artists reveals beyond cavil that we find-and not only in Asia Minor - a gradual transformation of "dynamic" Hellenistic art toward

²⁰ C. Humann and C. Watzinger, *Magnesia* (1904) 198 ff., figs. 198-200. D. Magie, *The Roman Rule in Asia Minor* 1 (1950) 373 ff.; 2, 1242, 1579. Lucius Valerius L. f. Flaccus son of the older Flaccus, who governed Asia in 62 B. C. would seem to have had a better chance to have honorary statues voted to his family than his father, governor in 93 B. C., who was assassinated shortly after his arrival.

²¹ W. C. Buckler and D. M. Robinson, *Sardis* 7: 1, no. 50, pl. 10.

²² The statue in the Ashmolean Museum, Horn, p. 80, pl. 39: 2 comes nearest to that from Sardis in proportions and in the use of Classical fold patterns. Horn dates it in the first century B. C.

²³ *JRS* 48 (1958) 10 ff.

a more static, restrained, and dignified ideal. Many of these works are distinguished by conscious and deliberate use of Classical formulae and motifs, though the manner in which they are used often suggests "mannerism" rather than Classicism. The paintings of the "Villa of Mysteries"²⁴ and a number of statues are among the products of this movement for which the statue from Sardis provides new and important testimony.

What matters is not the debate about verbal terms, but the recognition of the special character, of the way in which Hellenistic and Classic elements were fused and blended to form new and distinctive schools and groups.

III.

Fragment of a female statue? Manisa Museum. No. 889. H. 1.50 m. (Pl. 12) This piece was found in the excavations of 1910.

"Among the objects discovered after the excavation of the temple began were numerous fragments of sculpture... and a quantity of coins almost all later than the fourth century after Christ. Just *below the pteroma level* in the space between the antae (of the western cella), was found a large fragment of a figure that appears to have been sculptured in high relief, and to have been sliced off from its background (111.47) The fragment includes the drapery, from shoulder to knee, and the left arm of a stout male (this is a mistake - this is a woman) figure slightly more than life size."²⁵

Seen from afar, as it leans against the wall, this over-life size fragment makes a majestic and powerful impression. The cloak-like overfold of the unusual, ungirt peplos descends in large Classic rhythms, which, unlike those of the preceding statue, have a necessary and logical connection with the entire design. The same largeness of handling is apparent in the treatment of the short sleeve. Traces of very fine painted pattern are seen descending from below the left arm nearly all the way to the floor. At first glance, Butler's notion that this was

²⁴ Cf. A. Maiuri, *La Villa dei Misteri* (1931) fig. 65, pl. 50, pl. S. For statues cf. Horn, pl. 22: 2, 30: 3, 31: 3, 32: 36: 3, 39: 2-3, 44: 1, 3, and the relief pl. 25: 2.

²⁵ Howard Crosby Butler, *Sardis* 1 (Leyden, 1922) p. 53, fig. 47.

part of a very large relief seemed appealing; perhaps the temple of Artemis at Sardis had reliefs of the kind that decorated the rectangular bases of columns in the fourth century temple of Artemis at Ephesos.²⁶ The findspot, too, "below the pteroma", awakened hopes that this might be a survivor from the Early Hellenistic or even from Late Achaemenid times. Several colleagues opined that in photographs at least, the figure seemed to them a Classical one.

Fortunately or unfortunately, the truth is otherwise. As the photograph (Pl. 12) clearly shows, this is not the fragment of a relief; the statue was a statue in the round. Indeed, there is still a preserved fragment which is the trace of (her) right hand. Much of its Classic majesty disappears in this view. The lady is reminiscent of Hellenistic statues of the third and second century B. C., of the large hipped females with a spreading lower part, with folds swinging across the figures.²⁷

Close inspection reveals that many folds are worked with mechanical, deeply gouged "runs" typical of the first half of the second century A. D. It is, indeed, incredible that any sculptor of good Greek era should have carved an arm so deadly inert (and even disproportioned) as the one seen in this statue.

This is, then, presumably one of the many Roman honorary statues which stood in the pronaos of the Artemis temple. That it was round under the level of the pteroma sounds disturbing; but in the same passage Butler mentions "coins, almost all later than the fourth century." The pteroma level which he was digging may well have been a late one. The statue may have been placed in the temple under Antoninus Pius, when the temple was certainly refurbished.²⁸

The ungirt peplos is not unusual, although it looks so at first sight in the profile view; it yet suggests some special function.²⁹ It is tempting to see in the fragment one of the *Kaueis*, priestesses of Ar-

²⁶ H. C. Butler *contra* W. B. Dinsmoor.

²⁷ Horn, pl. 8: 2-3, pl. 18: 1 (Samos) for the folds along (her) left side.

²⁸ *Sardis* 1, pp. 7 f., 111. 2, and 63 f., 111. 57, and 7: 1, p. 64; fragments of colossal statues of Antoninus Pius and the Elder Faustina together with bestowal of a second neocorate suggest that the temple was transformed into an imperial shrine.

²⁹ Artemis herself wears a somewhat similar garment. H. K. Süsserott, *Griech. Plastik d. 4. Jahrhunderts v. Chr.* (1938) Dresden Nat. Ms. 117, 144 f., pl. 30: 3-4. "Dresden" Artemis by Praxiteles, ca. 370 B. C. Cf. votive relief from Herculaneum, Horn, *op. cit.*, 13, pl. 7, showing nymphs and charites; dated Early Hellenistic.

temis, who were apparently drawn from the eminent families of Sardis and were much honored in Roman times.³⁰

It is probable that the statue follows fairly closely some (Early Hellenistic?) Greek original though we cannot find the model off-hand. Its size and quality are proof for the existence of very competent sculptors at Sardis in the second century A. D.

George M. A. HANFMAN

Kemal Z. POLATKAN

³⁰ *Sardis* 7: 1, nos. 50-55. The only extant statue of a priestess is dressed differently. The lower part of a similar statue was brought to headquarters of the Sardis excavation in 1958 (NO-EX 58. 17).