

Bibliothèque Maison de l'Orient



151451

[From the *Proceedings of the Society of Antiquaries*, Jan. 27, 1887.]

SIR EDWARD SIEVEKING, Knt., F.S.A., exhibited a chalcedony gem, engraved with the Apollo of Kanachos, upon which Cecil Smith, Esq., communicated the following remarks:—

“The Greek gem, which is the subject of my short paper, and which is exhibited to you to-night, is the property of Sir Edward Sieveking, who has asked me to communicate to you a few remarks, which I put down for him, inasmuch as the subject engraved upon it is one which seems to be of importance to the history of Greek art.

It is a pale chalcedony, 2 centimètres in length by 1·5 centimètres broad. Its present thickness is only 4 millimètres, but the general appearance of the stone suggests that it has been originally a scaraboid, of which the upper part has been rubbed or cut down for purposes of setting. This would coincide very well with the style of the border which encloses the design—a circle of oblique hatched lines. This form of border is much more commonly found among the scarabs and scaraboid gems of early Greek times than among those of a later period. A portion of the border below the design has been rubbed away in the careless handling of the setter, but otherwise the surface of the design seems to be intact.

The subject here represented is one that is already well known, both from the descriptions of ancient writers and also from several works of art that have come down to us. Kanachos of Sikyon, living somewhere about B.C. 500, made, we are told, two statues of Apollo holding a stag; the one at Branchidæ, near Miletos; the other, a counterpart of it in general appearance, but probably slightly varied in detail, placed in a temple at Thebes. The Branchidæ statue, Pausanias adds, was of bronze, while that at Thebes was of cedar wood.

Concerning the Theban statue, this is all the information we have; but of its twin brother, at Branchidæ, Pausanias tells us the subsequent eventful history. Xerxes, he says, carried off the statue from Branchidæ to Ecbatana, where it remained until the time of Seleukos Nikator, who restored it to its original habitation among the Milesians.* On certain coins of Miletos, which date from the Roman period, is a small figure of Apollo, obviously copied from some statue, and which is usually referred to this same statue of Kanachos; and further evidence is afforded by two bronzes, the so-called Piombino statuette in the Louvre, and the Payne Knight figure in the British Museum, of which a rough sketch is here exhibited. In all these cases the figure of the deer crouches on the outstretched hand of the god, and, to admit of this arrangement, has been reduced to diminutive proportions. But now comes a difficulty—in a passage which even for Pliny is a masterpiece of distracting entanglement, that author elaborately discourses of this very statue; from his description we may gather, at any rate, this much: that the stag was, by a skilful application of mechanical principles, balanced carefully between the hand of the figure and the ground. In all probability, the weight of a solid body in bronze like this would have bent the arm out of position if hanging free; on the other hand, if it rested too completely upon its outstretched slim hind-legs, the pressure would have been too much for them; so that what Pliny intended to point out was probably merely the success of the artist in avoiding both these difficulties.

It seems most likely, therefore, that the type represented on our gem gives a more correct representation of the original motive, and that, following Pliny's statement, the stag must have hung down to the ground with the fore-feet resting in the hand of the god. This, after all, is quite in keeping with types that are known to have existed of archaic deities, especially those which show traces of an Oriental origin.†

And, in fact, it does not appear that Kanachos necessarily even invented this particular type of Apollo. In the *Bulletin de Corresp. Hell.* 1886, p. 190, is published a bronze Apollo, recently found on the site of the temple of Apollo Ptoos, near Thebes, very similar in style to the Payne Knight bronze, and which would seem to have been copied from the same original; the left hand has been folded round some cylindrical object

* For historical reasons it seems almost certain that the writer is in error here; and that he means, not Xerxes, but Dareios, who sacked Miletos in B.C. 494.

† A number of instances of these types in archaic Greek and oriental art are collected in the *Arch. Zeitung*, 1854, taf. lxi.-lxiv.

To face page 253.



1



2



3

GEMS, WITH THE APOLLO OF KANACHOS.

which has disappeared, but which may very well have been a bow and arrows; the right hand, also folded, cannot possibly have supported a crouching hind, but may very well have held the fore-legs of an animal, as in our gem; its position, with the bent fingers uppermost, and the wrist slightly turned downwards, would correspond with this suggestion. But if the inscription engraved on this bronze is correctly attributed to the sixth century, the type must, in all probability, have been in existence previously to the date of Kanachos.

That the type was very much in favour in antiquity is shown by its frequent repetition in works of art; in connection with our gem it may be well to quote two others, which are already known.

1. The gem published in Millin, *Pierres gravées*, pl. 6, and Müller, *Denkmäler*, i. No. 61. As the drawing appears very inadequate, and there is no criticism of its style, we can only say it seems to be a late copy resembling in all respects No. 2.

2. A sard intaglio in the British Museum,* of which a reproduction is here given.† (See Plate, fig. 2).

3. The gem now under notice. (See Plate, fig. 1).

In comparing No. 2 with our gem, which we may call No. 3, it will at once be seen that the chalcedony is both the earliest as regards date, and the best in point of style. It is true, the outline of the figure is scratchy in places and not so clearly defined as is the case in the finest period of engraving; but the conception is large and spirited, and the engraver has admirably caught the style of the artist he was following; the 'somewhat severe rigidity,' and the strong and almost clumsy proportions which, as we gather from Cicero, were the characteristics of Kanachos. The faults, such as they are, are due to the want, not of artistic instinct, but of technical skill. The feet of the deer in this example are indicated merely by the rough drill-holes which characterise most of the earliest works of torentic art. In short, I should be disposed to assign the chalcedony to a period not very much later than the time of Kanachos himself.

Not so, however, is the case of the British Museum sard (No. 2). There the work is not only unskilled but careless into the bargain; the original is evidently the same, but the treatment of this copy is feeble and uncertain, and it can hardly be earlier than the Roman period; a date which is rendered

* The illustration in King's *Antique Gems*, Introd. p. xii. is evidently a feeble rendering of the British Museum sard. King saw it in the Mertens-Schaafhausen collection, from which Castellani bought largely; from Castellani it passed to the British Museum in 1865, with no note of *provenance*.

† See Murray, *Greek Sculpture*, i. 140, note 2.

more probable by the meaningless introduction of a rag of drapery, which hangs at the back of the figure, and which is much more in keeping with the ideas of Roman than of Greek taste.

There is one curious point in connection with these two gems which I think is worth noting, as it shows the necessity of caution in diagnosing too readily a figure in the round from a representation of the same figure rendered in the flat. It will be noticed that whereas in the chalcedony and in the bronzes both forearms of the figure are advanced on the same level, in the sard (No. 2) the hand holding the arrows is raised almost to the level of the shoulder. If we assume that both are copied from the same original this difficulty is explained, for in No. 3 the figure is turned to the left, and, as it is in three-quarter face, there is room for the arrows on the right. In No. 2, however, the figure is reversed, and since the stag must of necessity come in front, the bow and arrows would, in their natural position, be hidden by the stag; so that, in order to show them, the engraver has been forced to raise them above their natural level.

It is tempting to suppose that in these gems we have the bronze statue made for Branchidæ, and that the Payne Knight figure is a copy of the cedarwood statue at Thebes, the latter type presenting less difficulty for execution in wood. But then the question arises, If so, how is it that on the late coins of Miletos, which presumably copy the statue brought back by Seleukos, we have the Payne Knight type, and not the other? This question must remain unsolved, unless we may suppose that in the course of its travels the Branchidæ statue lost its stag, and on its return was restored on the model of the type still existing at Thebes. That the attribute might very well be lost we see in the case of the Ptoos Apollo; and it is worth while to add that we have in the British Museum a bronze figure of a dead stag, which has evidently belonged to a group of this description. The coins of Miletos would thus represent the statue in its restored condition.

P.S.—Since this paper was written, I have come across yet another instance, engraved upon a ruby-coloured paste, the property of Mr. Arthur Evans (*see* Plate, fig. 3). In this case we have the same figure of Apollo, with the bow and arrows in one hand, and the forefeet of the deer supported in the other. The tripod which stands beside the group is probably only an attribute of the god, inserted here in order to fill the space, just as in the case of similar types on coins we have a *kerykeion* in the field as suitable for Hermes, and this same tripod as marking Apollo. From the style of work, I should say that this gem, which is

perhaps the most skilfully worked of all our examples, would stand chronologically after Sir Edward Sieveking's, and before both the others.

If the date I have assigned to the chalcedony is correct, it is interesting to possess two representations of Kanachos' famous statue, which must probably have been executed during the lifetime of Kanachos himself.

As the above notes were put together in a somewhat hurried form, I should like briefly to summarise the points I have intended to suggest. They are as follows :—

- (i.) Kanachos made two Apollos of similar type: the one in wood, at Thebes, the other in bronze, at Miletos.
- (ii.) A. At Miletos, an Orientalising Ionian colony, we should naturally expect an Oriental conception of the type; and
B. Difference of materials demanded different treatment of the stag; hence
- (iii.) The wooden statue held a diminutive stag on the hand (as our Payne Knight figure); the bronze statue held a larger deer by the forelegs, the hind legs touching the ground (as in our gems).
- (iv.) The bronze statue was removed to Persia by Dareios at the looting of Miletos, and, two centuries later, was restored by Seleukos. In the sacking of the town and the two journeys it underwent, it may very well have lost the stag, especially as this was, according to Pliny, only lightly attached.
- (v.) On the return of the statue to Miletos, the missing stag was restored after the model of the Ismenian type, well known to be by Kanachos and still extant as it left the artist's hand.
- (vi.) In this (wrongly) restored condition it was copied on the Miletos coin, and was also described by Pausanias;* whereas Pliny's statement † is evidently borrowed from some earlier authority, probably Greek, written about the original type; hence the discrepancy."

* IX. 10, 2. His expression shows that in his time, at any rate, there was little or no variation between the two types. Thus he says of the Theban type, *Τὸ δὲ ἄγαλμα μέγθει τε ἴσον τῷ ἐν Βραγχίδαϊς ἐστὶ, καὶ τὸ εἶδος οὐδὲν διαφόρως ἔχον.* And further: *Διαφέρουσι δὲ τοσόνδε* ("just so far") *ὁ μὲν γὰρ ἐν Βραγχίδαϊς χαλκοῦ, ὁ δὲ Ἰσμήνιος ἐστὶ κέδρου.*

† Nat. Hist. xxxiv. 19. 'Canachus Apollinem nudum, qui Philesius cognominatur in Didymaeo, Æginetica aeris temperatura. Cervumque una vestigiis suspendit, ut linum subter pedes trahatur, alterno morsu calce digitisque retinentibus solum, ita vertebrato dente utrisque in partibus ut a repulso per vices resiliat.' The obscurities of this passage are quite hopeless, unless we can explain them as due here as well as in other similar cases in Pliny's works, to a misconstruction of his Greek authority.