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The Doric Rock Tomb at Antiphellos

F. Fatih GÜLSEN*

The monument at Antiphellos known as "The Doric Tomb" is located at the northwestern edge of the summit of ancient Antiphellos (modern town of Kaş) Acropolis (Fig. 1) which dominates the entire area. Tombs are to be found scattered all over the town with some on the north slopes of the acropolis facing the opposite side of the harbor. There are also rock tombs and sarcophagi, some bearing Lycian inscriptions, to the north and north west of the tomb. The rather soft calcareous structure of Kaş territory plays an important role in this distribution. Although the tomb has attracted the attention of several travelers and scholars¹, it has never been examined in detail until the present day.

The tomb and its surroundings, except for some upper architectural elements, are entirely carved out of the bedrock (Fig. 11). The tomb is situated on a levelled terrace chiseled out of the native rock. It resembles a Doric temple facing to the east, and the other 3 sides are carved out of the solid rock with a walkway, cut out from the solid rock, at the foot of these 3 walls (Fig. 2,11). The tomb is entirely preserved up to the pilaster capitals. However, the pilaster capitals, architrave, most of the triglyph-metope frieze and the upper structure are entirely destroyed. The modern building construction works around the monument have resulted in the destruction, removal and loss of those architectural blocks fallen and scattered around the tomb.

The dimensions of the terrace, carved out from bedrock are 16.50 m to the east-west, and 9.30 m to the north-south directions (Fig. 2). While the entire south and west outer sides of the tomb walkway are surrounded by chiseled rock, the north part is only 1 m high (Fig. 11). The highest part of this rock chiseled wall is 3.20 m high. On the south side


This work is a summary of my unpublished graduate thesis, completed within the constitution of Akdeniz Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü. See F.F. Gülsen, The Temple Rock Tomb at Antiphellos (Antalya 1995). I would like to express my thanks for their valuable scientific support to B. Varkovancı, H. Işık, F. Işık, C. Işık, S. Akerdem, N. Çevik, S. Bulut, Ş. Aktaş, M. Bulba, L. Gültekin. For their efforts to publish this paper to K. Dörtlück, U. Muşkara and N. Seber. I thank archaeologist Umit Işın for translating this article into English.
of the rock wall are two sockets, one is damaged and is 0.14 m in diam and 0.05 m in depth, and the other is preserved and measures 0.20 x 0.20 x 0.20 m. Three more sockets are opened on the west surface of the rock wall, 0.08 m deep and measuring 0.13 x 0.15, 0.40 x 0.30, 0.20 x 0.20 m. No receiving sockets can be found on the outer face of the tomb itself. Although the rock tomb must have been chiseled from the top to the bottom, the locations of the sockets on the rock wall indicate the use of scaffolding and cranks. The west and south sides of the terrace are entirely and the east is partly filled with earth.

Within this earth filling, a platform on the terraced bedrock can be partly seen measuring 5.85 x 6.79 m and 0.40 m high (Fig. 11). This platform is clearly visible on the east, partly on the north and not visible on the south and west sides due to the earth filling. The platform recalls a temple stylobate and extends 0.54 m on the north, west and south sides and 1.79 m on the east of the tomb.

An installation, placed on the north side of the platform measures 0.40 x 1.24 m. The function of this installation cannot be determined due to the earth filling. On the platform a clamp hole can be seen measuring 0.02 x 0.05 m wide and 0.01 m deep and located 0.04 m from the north edge of this installation (Fig. 2). With its location right across the tomb entrance, this clamp is probably related to a small staircase, although the height of this platform does not exceed 0.40 m.

The tomb is close to a square and narrows towards the top by 0.06 m with a vertical inclination of 0.72 percent. The four sides of the tomb are decorated with pilasters bearing at different points six “U” shaped projecting devices (Fig. 14). Profiled pedestals were carved under the pilasters of this Doric tomb and it is rare to encounter pedestals for columns or pilasters within Doric buildings (Fig. 15, 16). The pilasters are not ornamental but were made to imitate the similar ones on constructed buildings. These pilaster pedestals are square and consist of toichobat, molding, cavetto, torus and a thinner upper molding. The toichobat and the cavetto circle the tomb and enc on either side of the door. The pilaster capitals consist of two moldings at the bottom, ovolo, cavetto and abacus parts (Fig. 14).

The only preserved pilaster capital of the tomb stands at the top of the south-west corner and it is partly preserved where it was chiseled out from the rock. Apparently the rest of this pilaster capital, the other pilaster capitals, and most of the upper architectural elements were constructed from stone blocks independent of the rock of the tomb itself. The reconstruction of the pilaster capital suggests measurements of 0.48 m for the lower

---

2. Similar cases can be encountered in Tyana (Kemerhisar): M.U. Anabolu, Küçük Asya’da Bulunan Roma İmparatorluk Çağını Tapınakları (1970) 72 pl. 147a, 147b.

3. In case of a lack of depth to the bedrock or fracturing, the missing portion of the rock could be completed by the use of additional blocks: P. Roos, The Rock-Tombs of Caunus. SIMA 34.1 (1972) 72; P. Roos, "Reparations and Spare parts in Carian Rock-Cut Tombs" Baki Bildir Anı Kitabısı (to be published); J.P. Oleson, “Technical Aspects of Etruscan Rock-Cut Tomb Architecture”, RM 85, 1978, 283 ff. Pl. 122; P. Demargne, Tombes-Maisons, Tombes Rupestres et Sarcophages. FoIX V (1974) 28 ff. Fig. 1. Pl. VIII; H. Yılmaz-N. Çevik, “Tlos 1994”, XIII. Araştırma Sonuçları Toplantısı, 1996, 186. Contrary to the other examples, most of the rock-tombs on the acropolis of Tlos, another Lycian town, have applied facades (Fig. 27). A sarcophagus found at Çamurçağı, near Tlos, is a good example for the widespread use of this stone block application technique, even in the construction of sarcophagi. See Yılmaz-Çevik, op. cit. 186. On this technique further information is also provided by field research on Rock-Cut Tombs at Tlos, carried out by The Lycian Research Center and the Akdeniz University, Archaeology Department. This phenomenon can normally be seen at sites with brittle rock formations. According to our surveys at Pinara, stone block application technique was also widely used on rock-cut tombs.
molding and 0.64 m for the abacus. The reconstruction of the ovolo provides measurements of 0.05 x 0.58 m, the cavetto of 0.06 x 0.634 m and the abacus of 0.05 x 0.642 m long, this should have extended 0.10 m from the tomb.

On the top of pilaster capitals is placed the architrave, where the regulae under the taenia and guttae underneath the triglyph can be followed (Fig. 17,18). Some of the rock chiseled architrave and triglyph-metope elements are preserved on the south, west and north walls of the tomb (Fig. 12,24,25).

On the facade, underneath the molding of the architrave, two, well chiseled, niche like hollows can be seen, both of different dimensions. Even though we may assume that the tomb was chiseled from top to the bottom, these hollows were presumably used for beams during the construction and were patched with stone blocks after the tomb was completed. Similar hollows can also be traced on the west and south walls (Fig. 13).

The three clamp holes on the east, and one on the north wall of the tomb were to hold the architrave blocks (Fig. 3,19). The architrave and the triglyph-metope frieze are carved from monolith blocks. This can be seen both from the ones on the south and west walls, which were chiseled out from the rock, as well as on the surviving five fallen blocks around the tomb (Fig. 4,17,18,25). A clamp hole situated at the top of the triglyph-metope frieze on the west wall provides essential information for the reconstruction of the tomb (Fig. 3). The middle larger canals of the triglyph are unfinished, they should be reconstructed oval-like as are the smaller ones on either side. The oval ends of the triglyph canals, mutulacae and via sections must have been carved on another block placed on top of the triglyph-metope frieze which has not been found so far (Fig. 4). On the topmost part of the west wall of the tomb, a 0.50 m deep and 0.30 m high surface is chiseled to situate the block. A profile to hold the back part of this block is also seen at the same place (Fig. 13,25). The chiseled surfaces for similar blocks on the top of the triglyph-metope frieze on the south wall measures 0.48 m deep and 0.36 m high (Fig. 13,25). Consequently the additional blocks for the west wall must have been 0.06 m higher than the ones of the south wall thus establishing a common level for the topmost part of the tomb below the roof.

While the architrave, guttae, regulae and taenia sections are preserved, the triglyph-metope frieze on top has not survived. This is neither due to natural effects nor to the rearrangement of the tomb at a later date. The probability of the tomb being unfinished is also out of question. It is clear that some of the triglyph-metope frieze were carefully cleared by chiseling to obtain a thin and rugged surface4 (Fig. 17,18). Despite insufficient data, the use of an additional material such as stucco for the triglyph-metope frieze is likely to be the case, as can also be understood for the upper part of the tomb where additional blocks were used. The existence of the triglyph-metope frieze on additional blocks indicates a similar arrangement on native rock as well. The roughly chiseled and cleared surfaces lack clamp holes and sufficient depth to hold additional blocks, this therefore supports the idea of painted stucco for the triglyph-metope frieze. It is probable that along with the native rock and additional blocks, painted stucco was also used to complete the friezes and the upper structure of the tomb.

4 In a burial chamber in Macedonia, while the elements of guttae, regulae and taeniae are depicted, the triglyph and metopes are intentionally missing on a Doric pilaster. Fedak, op.cit. (supra n.1) 140.
The carved canals on either side of triglyphs are shorter compared to the ones in the middle (Fig. 4.18). Although these types of triglyphs are not very common, we find them at Ionian cities such as Miletos⁵ and Priene⁶. The oval shape endings of both the middle and side triglyph canals are probably designed in archaistic style and a similar sample comes from the Hieron at Samothrace⁷.

The missing blocks on which the mutule and via sections were carved must have measured 0.50 m deep and 0.30 m high. With the support of the existing evidence, the reconstruction of the entire tomb, stage by stage to the topmost level under the roof can be traced and established (Fig. 4). Consequently, although no architectural elements belonging to the roof are preserved, the different stepped levels that we see on the tomb today are completed. On the other hand, the lack of any preserved architectural elements cause great difficulty in the reconstruction of the roof. Failing to see the clamp holes and ignoring the possibility of additional blocks, Fedak, reconstructed the roof as pyramidal considering only the existing stepped levels of preservation of the upper part of the tomb⁸.

The facade wall of the tomb is 0.70 m higher than the sidewalls, in other words the design of the tomb is almost a square and both technically and traditionally this leaves out the probability of a triangular roof with a pediment. Even though a flat roof is architecturally possible, no other tomb examples, consisting of a flat roof with triglyph-metope frieze and plasters, exist. The suggestion of a pyramidal roof is also supported by the fact that the tomb in general does not reflect the Lycian style. Although none of the following tombs are chiseled from the native rock, tombs bearing pilasters and triglyph-metope frieze at: Alinda, Halicarnassos, Cnidos, Belevi, Olba, Cyrene, Amphipolis, Syracuse (Fig. 26) and Bargylia³ were all covered with pyramidal roofs. This seems to support the idea that the Antiphellos tomb was covered with a pyramidal roof as well (Fig. 10).

All four sides of the tomb are decorated with pilasters. Some of these pilasters carry at different heights “U” shaped carved projections (Fig. 14). These projections are found at a height from the platform of: 1.38 m on the southern face of the pilaster on the south-east corner, 1.38 and 3.02 m on the southern face of the pilaster on the south-west corner, 1.85 m on the western face of the south-western corner, 1.35 m on the northern face of the pilaster on the north-west corner and 1.51 m on the northern face of the pilaster on the north-east corner of the tomb. These projecting horseshoe shapes resemble the lifting projections for independent blocks⁹. These projecting parts were sometimes left on the rock even after the blocks were lifted into place and left when the construction was completed¹⁰. In some cases these are transformed into religious or decorative ornamentation¹¹.

---

⁵ H. Knackfuss, Milet (1908) 47 Fig. 30.
⁶ M. Schade, Die Ruinen von Priene (1964) Pl. 63.
⁸ Fedak, op. cit. (supra n.1) 79 Pl. 93.
¹⁰ W. Müller-Wiener, Griechisches Bauwesen in der Antike (1988) 80 ff. Fig. 39.6.7.
¹¹ C. Praschniker - M. Theuer, Das Mausoleum von Belevi. Fie 6 (1979) Fig. 11; E. Pedersen, The Mausoleum at Halicarnassos (1991) Fig. 9, 12.
Nevertheless, because the tomb is chiseled out of bedrock these projection parts cannot have been carved for lifting purposes. Also, as they are placed irregularly and there are no receiving moldings on the tomb itself they cannot have functioned to support scaffolding. Technically the tomb must have been constructed from top down to the bottom and so the problem of lifting the additional independent blocks may not have arisen, as the blocks were placed in their position before the sculptors carved their way down to the base of the tomb. These “U” shaped projections are not found on the facade, they don’t follow an order, they are not clearly visible and they do not have a regular form in terms of ornament, therefore they cannot be decorative. Although there are no ancient records of such a function, they may have been carved to keep away bad spirits or evil (apotropaic) and were painted accordingly.

On the east facade of the tomb is the monumental entrance which narrows towards the top. It is displaced 0.08 m towards the north from the center of the facade of the tomb. The door measures 1.76 x 0.80 m (Fig. 5,20). The doorframe is encircled with fascia bearing bead decoration and the door of the tomb is in the Doric style suitable to the general architectural design of the structure. At either side of the door are carved two bowl shape hollows on the platform area 0.07 m in diam. and 0.025 m in depth whose function is not clear (Fig. 15). Between the platform and the threshold is situated a level area measuring 0.22 m high, 1.68 m long and 0.16 m deep (Fig. 10,15). Both the lento and the threshold extend from the door posts and a molding with a frame encircle the door (Fig. 20,21). This type of a thin molding around the door can also be found on Macedonian tombs, all of them with Doric doors, these are well preserved within their tumuli. This situation is rare in Anatolia and we only have two examples; the Belevi and Caunos tomb doors, which both of them are parallel to the Attic-Ionic style. On the doorframe molding bead and reel motif is applied, consisting of alternately one bead and two reels sequence and this is also found on the Samothrace Hieron. Because the beads were carved flat and stuffed, a space occurred between the beads and the reels and the sharpened reëls (Fig. 21). Besides a more natural and lively structure the design becomes smaller and harder. It indicates a similarity with the upper part of the Priene Athena temple architrave, Didymaion and Belevi tomb monument ornaments. Frame and molding of a fascia like appearance and the bead and reel design on the fascia is peculiar to Ionic doors. These examples reveal that Ionic door features are blended to the solely Doric doorframe of the Antiphellos tomb building. Although this evidence may lead to us conclude that the simi-
lar appearance of Ionic fascia in Doric structures is an Anatolian feature, it does not seem possible to characterize this within a certain typology or as a geographical issue. The Doric elements on the door of a nearby Ionic tomb\textsuperscript{20}, support the idea that Ionic, Doric and Attic elements were very often blended at Antiphellos.

At the top of the door is the corona consisting of three fascia. On the corona three projections similar to acroteria are situated which measure 0.16 m long and 0.06 m high. Despite being heavily worn, half-finished projections on the sides are also visible (Fig. 20). At a height of 1.64 m from the threshold, on the left doorjamb is a 0.01 m deep dowel hole measuring 0.02 x 0.04 m and on the right doorjamb another 0.03 m deep dowel hole measuring 0.08 x 0.06 m (Fig. 6, 8). For the placement of the sliding door, which is traditional in Lycian architecture, the outer side of the upper sliding channel was beveled (Fig. 6, 8). In order to be placed in the 0.04 m channel in the threshold, it can be observed from the cuttings that the door was first inserted in the upper sliding channel (Fig. 6, 8). The door block was first placed on the 1.94 m high south side and was closed by sliding towards north. There is no evidence of the sliding door block itself. However the northwards projection of the sliding channel on the threshold indicates that the door block was 1.89 m in height, 0.89 m in width and 0.12 m in depth (Fig. 6). A 0.05 m deep dowel hole, measuring 0.06 x 0.10 m, was cut on the south side of the lower sliding channel and another on the couch leg in the same direction probably functioned in the support of the door block. The door construction in general is of significance and obtains its special character for combining Ionic, Doric, Attic and Lycian features.

The burial chamber measures 2.98 x 3.22 m and has a trapezoidal rectangular plan with an 0.06 m inclination towards its west side (Fig. 2). Between the three couches projections were left at the south-west and north-west corners\textsuperscript{21} (Fig. 2). The couches average 2.22 m in length, 0.62 m in width and 1.08m in height with the couch plate itself being 0.22 m in height (Fig. 2, 6-8). The cushions on the couches measure 0.28 x 0.62 m with a height of 0.26 m. The cushion of the south couch is placed at the couch's western edge, while the one of the north couch is at the eastern edge. The cushion of the destroyed west couch was probably on the northern edge (Fig. 7). The lateral faces of the couches were decorated with floral motifs such as lotus and rosettes. These rosettes consist of twelve leaves around a hardly visible central bud (Fig. 9). On the sides of the couches, open lotus flowers are also carved\textsuperscript{22} (Fig. 29, 30). By rounding off the edges of the leaves and enriching the pattern by additional rosettes, a new type and pattern particular to the tomb was created with a lively and solid character attained by shortened leaves. The natural character of the flowers, the button pattern in the center of the helix, solidified form and shortened dimensions in the decoration of the Temple of Athena at Priene\textsuperscript{23} constitute a close analogy for the natural and lively flowers found on the tomb at Antiphellos. On the leg of the

\textsuperscript{20} Zahle, op. cit. (supra n.1) 331 Pl. 53.

\textsuperscript{21} A similar situation is encountered at the tombs numbered 64 and 100 in the Myra necropolis. Of these, the tomb numbered 100 is of a dwelling type with a flat roof. The other one numbered 64 is of the antis variety with temple facade, a freestanding example of this type as carved out of rock is unknown: Borchhardt, Myra 109,110 Nr. 64, 100 Pl. 60B.

\textsuperscript{22} Similar rosettes are encountered at Cos and Samothrace: Rumscheid, op. cit. (supra n.18) Pl. 170.8,9; 199.4,5.

\textsuperscript{23} Koçhan, op. cit. (supra n.18) Pl. 18B.
northern couch, a palmette was carved between the volutes springing from a small box at the top of a column (Fig. 22). However, the worn state of the motif prevents further commentary. As far as it is visible, the lotus flowers consist of leaves springing from double frames over two superimposed triangular roots. Today we are unable to make stylistic and typological comparisons due to the wear of the surface, but in the drawings of the decoration of the tomb by Heuzey and Daumet in 1876, the lotus flowers were shown as having 13 leaves and the decorations on the couch have close resemblance to those in Phrygia, Etruria, Ionia, Macedonia, mainland Greece and Lycia (Fig. 29). These decorations, when compared with the closest parallels, are obviously original. The grooves cut along the edges of the couches indicate that the couches were probably closed off by a wooden screen (Fig. 6,7).

On the inner western wall and the corner projections, figures of dancing women are depicted (Fig. 7,23,30). The 3.36 m long “U” shaped frieze is within upper and lower round shaped borders, it contains 26 female figures, 5 on each sides and 16 in the middle, form a line together. The total height of the frieze, including the borders, is 0.225 m These figures are depicted frontally, dressed in chiton and mantels, which flare sideways from the hips, showing little folds between legs and on the sides of their feet. On the drawings of Texier, one of the earliest investigators of the tomb, the women are shown with scarves (Fig. 30). Due to the extensive wear of the surface, nothing related to these head scarves can be seen today. The arms are drawn upwards by a slight bending from the elbows and while the palms of the left hands of the figures dancing hand in hand are shown, of the right hands the reverse side is depicted. Although these carved figures are worn the following observations can be made: the upright and more or less motionless pose of the female figures, the manner of holding hands; together with typological resemblances, the sideways flare of the mantles, the straight folds flowing between the legs, and the subject-matter, exhibit a style that can also be seen at Myra, Smostrace, Athens (Fig. 28) and Svestharia.

25 Borchhardt, Myra 111 Fig. 25 Pl. 62A,B; Petersen-von Luschan, op. cit (supra n.1) 30 Fig. 22.
26 Texier identified 19 figures on the tomb’s western wall. A total of 27 figures were recorded during the registration work conducted by S. Erdemgil and F. Özoral on behalf of the Antalya Museum in 1974. Zahl counted 24 figures total; Bean 25, 17 of which carved on the western wall; Özgar 24. A result of the detailed surveys and measurements carried out by us, a total of 26 figures are established.
27 Texier, op. cit. (supra n.1) Pl. 197 ff.
28 From early periods, one finds on different materials the relief of women holding hands and dancing. Some of these carvings represent a cheerful celebration enriched with elements of action or worship: B. Lillian Lawler, The Dance in Ancient Greece (1964) 99, 102, 117 Pl. 37, 38, 48; D.M. Robinson, Greek Altars (1949) Fig. 68; F. Matz, Die geometrische und die früharchaische Form (1950) Fig. 12, 19. The figure of girls dancing by holding hands, and also carrying the “tree of life” symbols in their hands are very meaningful. See B. Schweitzer, Greek Geometrik Art (1971) 53, 62, 63, 67 Fig. 18, 21, 22, 28.
29 Borchhardt, Myra 71E.
30 H. Ehrhardt, Samothrace (1985) 150 ff. Fig. 43; K. Lehmann, Samothrace (1955) Fig. 31.
31 D.M. Robinson, Greek Altars (1949) Fig. 73; Travlos, Athen 142. Fig. 193.
32 Fol-Chichikova-Ivanov-Teofilav, op. cit. (supra n.24) 6 ff.
The Monumental Tomb at Antiphellos, completely carved out of the bedrock, is unique in design and should be considered as a follow-up or perhaps the most important example of the numerous examples of a continuous Anatolian tradition of rock architecture in Lycia. The Antiphellos tomb was carved as a free standing building cut out of the bedrock, and like temples, was oriented towards the east. As the result of cutting the building from the bedrock to attain a monumental appearance, a U-shaped corridor was formed between the tomb and the bedrock surrounding the tomb on three sides. The sides of this corridor were also smoothly chiseled. The Antiphellos tomb, carved from a massive rock outcrop, as a reflection of the temple form in funeral architecture, can be compared to those carved as free standing buildings out of the bedrock, at Phellos, Tlos, Isinda, Caunos, Hoyran, Bayandır Limanı, Phokaia, Limyra, Myra, Cyana, Cadianda, Elmali, Çindam, Sura, Idyma, Amasya and Pinara. Among the examples at Sura, Tlos, Hoyran, and Caunos, besides the completely freestanding structures, semi-independent structures with only the sidewalls cut out from the bedrock can be seen. Being unique and the most monumental structure of the town, this tomb must have been dedicated to a dignitary.

33 However much of the Belevi mausoleum is finished by block workmanship in large scale, it can be included in these examples with its use of rockbed for the basic structure and podium, as well as being cut out of the rockbed on these sides.
34 O. Benndorf-G. Niemann, Reisen in Lykien und Karten 1 (1884) 79 Fig. XXXVII.
35 The tomb, identified during the field surveys conducted by Department of Archaeology of Akdeniz University and the Lycian Research Center from 1992 onwards, is situated on the eastern bank of the Tlos Acropolis. The tomb’s front faces to east. In having its northern side and western rear completely separated from rockbed by a corridor, it displays a semi-independent character similar to that found at Hoyran.
36 Baybulutluoğlu, op. cit. (supra n.1) 48.
40 E. Akurgal, Ancient Civilizations and Ruins of Turkey (1983) Fig. 46; Fedak, op. cit. (supra n.1) 282 Fig. 43 ff.
42 Borchhardt, Myra 147 Fig. 32 Pl. 60A; J.H. Wagner, Die türkische Südküste (1977) 4.
43 Petersen–von Luschan, op. cit. (supra n.1) 20, Fig. 14; Idil, op. cit. (supra n.38) Pl. 24.
44 Benndorf–Niemann, op. cit. (supra n.33) Pl. XLV; Idil, op. cit. (supra n.38) 22 f.; Bean, op. cit. (supra n.1) 5.
45 Two of the tombs, within the boundaries of Armutlu village, 4 km to the south of Akçay town in Elmali-Antalya, have been carved in an independent manner out of the massive rock.
46 Bean, op. cit. (supra n.1) 54; Zahle, op. cit. (supra n.1) 281 Fig. 21. An original variety of tomb is created by placing a sarcophagus lid over the dwelling type of tomb which has its ground floor carved out of rockbed and is free-standing.
47 The example of Sura, like those in Hoyran and Tlos, is in the class of semi-independent, with one side still attached to the rockbed, but in its overall structure, it can be considered to belong to the class of free-standing examples like the other two. J. Borchhardt, AA 1968, 180 Pl. 11; Idil, op. cit. (supra n.38) Pl. 65; Borchhardt, Myra, Pl. 49.
48 G.E. Bean, Karia (1987) 185 Fig. 39.
49 Fedak, op. cit. (supra n.1) 384 Fig. 128.
50 On the SW of Pinara there can be seen another example belongs to the class of free-standing rock tombs.
Depending on the funeral epigram on the door, E. Kirsten states that the owner of this tomb was a Milesian\footnote{E. Kirsten, Phellos und Antiphellos, in: Lebendige Altertumswissenschaft. Festschrift H. Vettes (1985) 24 ff.}. However, the present damaged state of the inscription is far from supporting this idea.

With the close analogy to the tombs mentioned in the typological section, the date of the Antiphellos tomb should be considered as early as the last quarter of the 4th century B.C. Due to the damaged surface, the relief frieze of dancing female figures does not allow a precise stylistic comparison. Dependant on the above mentioned examples, the frieze should be dated to the transitional phase from the Classical to the Hellenistic period. The Attic-Ionic door of the tomb, with its Ionic features of surrounding fasciae and bead and reel motif reminds of examples dating from the 4th century B.C. However, the combination of Doric, Attic and Ionic elements and the application of astragal\footnote{Büsing-Kolbe, op. cit. (supra n.19) 109, 120; Theuer, op. cit. (supra n.11) 44 ff. Fig. 31, 31a.} on the fasciae suggest a date in the early Hellenistic period. The use of a more solid bead and reel motif with wider gaps between the beads, together with the small, lively and solid forms of the lotus-palmette and rosette patterns, with the button motif within the helix on this tomb, and related to the above mentioned examples, support the dating of the Antiphellos rock tomb to the early Hellenistic period.
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Özet

Antiphellos Dor Kaya Gömütü


Cephe duvarının yan duvarlarından 0.70 m daha uzun tutulmuş olması, teknik ve gele
neksel olarak yapının altını oluşturuğu ihtimalinin ortadan kaldırılmaktadır. Araştırmalar sonucu pilasterli, triglyph-metop frizli ve üzeri düz dam örtülü bir gömüt yazılmamıştır. Gömütün Likya geleneğini yansıtmaya yanında yukarıda ilkişkilendirilen örneklerde de benzerliği gömüt üst yapımının piramidal çatı olma olasılığını akılda kalmaktadır.

Gömütün dört köşesi pilasterlerle süslenmiştir ve üzerinde farklı yüksekliklerde “U” formülü altı adet çeşitli bulunur. Bu çektiriler; gömüt, tapınak ve kent kapınlardaki gibi köprü yoluyla da köprüleri koluvcu (apotropeik) bir amaç taşıyor olmalıdır. Likya için geleneksel sürgülü kapı bloğunun kendiçine ilişkin bir buluntu ele geçmemişti. Çeşitli, üzerinde inci dizisi işlenmiş bir fascianın kuşatığı antsal kapı, genel mimari düzenlemeye uygun olarak dorik tarzda yapılmıştır. Lento ve esşik sövelerden döş bağlanmuştur ve bezçeke kuşağı ile birlikte, silme kapıyı çevirmiştir. Makedonya gömütlerinde de kapıyı çeviren ince bir silme bulunur. Belirli olduğu kadarki bu durum Anadolu’dadık salt birkaç yerde, Dorik tarzındaki Belevi ve Kaunos gömüt kapları üzerinde görülür ve bu da Atik-Ionik tiplerle paraleldir. Fascia görünümündeki silme ve çevrecek ile fascia üzerine inci dizisi işlene

mesi ön kaplarına özgüdür. Antiphellos Gömüt’ünde yalnızca Dor çercevesine sahip bir kapının, ön kapı özelliği ile sentezlendiği anlaşılmaktadır. Bu örnekler arasında ön fascia

sinin Dor yapılarında benzer görünüşü Anadolu gibi görülür de, belirli bir tipolojik ya da coğrafi özellik olarak nitelikleri olası görünümemektedir. Gömütün hemen yakınında ki Ionik bir gömütün kapısının bu tez dorik tarzda işlenmiş olması Antiphellos’da ön, Atik, Dor ve Likya örgülerinin birleştirilerek sentezlendiği görüşünü desteklemektedir.
Gömüt odası üç klineli olup güney-bati ve kuzey-bati köşelerde kline aralarında çıkan-
tular bırakılmıştır. Kline üzerindeki gömüte özgü bitkisel motıfler işlemiştir. Kline kenarla-
nın boyunca işlenen kanallar, klinelerin ahşap bir paravanla kapatıldığı düşünülmektedir.

Gömüt odası batı duvarı ve köşe çıktınları üzerine altta ve üstte iki yuvarlak bordür kuşağının sınırladığı friz içinde, 26 kadın figürü dizildir. Halay çeker durumda işlenen figürlerin birbirlerini tutuş şekli ve elbiselerinin tipolojik benzerleri; Myra, Samothrake, At-
nna ve Sveshtari’de tespit edilmiştir.

Gömüt, Anadolu mimarisisinde en erken dönemlerden bu yana devamlık gösteren ve
sayısal örnek bulunan kaya ve kaya işlemeçeli gelenekin Likya’ddaki uzantılarından biri ve
belkide en öne çıkmıştır. Kaya gömütünün etrafındaki kayalıktan soyulunanın ona bağımsız ve
anısal bir görüntü verebilecek sonucunda gömüt ile üç yönü çevreleyen kaya-
lık arasında “U” formu bir koridor duvarı oluşturmuştur. Tapınak tipinin gömüt formu-
na yarışmış biçimleri olan Antiphellos gömütü masif kayadan ve anakayalıkla bağlanışlı, işle-
Kapı üzerindeki mezar epigrafindan burada gömülken Milet’li birisi olduğu anlaşı-
lmaktadır. Antiphellos gömütü tipoloji bölümünde belirtilen gömütlerle benzerliği gözönü-
örneklarını anmsatmakta; dorik, Attik ve Ionik örgülerin birarada kullanılması ile fascılar üzerine astragaller işlenmesi, yapının Erken Hellenistik Dönem içine tarihlenmesini gerek-
tirmektedir. İnci dizisi, lotus-palmet ve rozet dizimlerinin biçimleri ve yukarıda ilskılıendir-len örneklerle olan benzerliği, gömütün Erken Hellenistik Dönem içine tarihenebilmesin-
de etken unsurlardır.
Figure 1: Plan of Antiphellos with adjacent areas and detailed plan of Antiphellos.
Figure 2
Floor Plan of Doric Tomb.

Figure 3
Plan of Tomb from above.
Figure 4
Detailing of the applied pilasters at the corners of the Tomb.

Figure 5
Detail of doorway including section.
Figure 6  Section through Tomb showing south interior wall.

Figure 7  Section through Tomb showing west interior wall.
Figure 8  Section through Tomb showing north interior wall.

Figure 9  Carved stone Rosettes on the Tomb.
Figure 10  Projected Reconstruction of the Tomb.
Figure 11  Front of Tomb.

Figure 12  NE Corner of Tomb.
Figure 13
View towards SW Corner of Tomb.

Figure 14
SW Pilaster of Tomb.

Figure 15
Platform and base of Tomb.
Figure 16
Base of Pilaster
NE Corner.

Figure 17
The Architrave of
the Tomb (guttae,
regulae, and taenia).

Figure 18
Triglyphs and
metopes.
Figure 19  Recessed area of roof.

Figure 20
Doorway into Tomb.

Figure 21
Bead and reel border to the door.
Figure 22
Palmette and volutes carved on the front of the north kline.

Figure 23
Women holding hands and dancing in the figural relief from the interior frieze.

Figure 24
SE Corner of Tomb with pilaster capital, Entablature cut stone of the upper structure of the roof.
Figure 25  The Cut stone structure of the stepped roof upper view of tomb.

Figure 26  Hellenistic period, parallel example from Syracuse.

Figure 27  Rock-cut grave from Tlos Acropolis (cut from block but applied stonework).
Figure 28
Athens, Relief of dancing women.

Figure 29
Decoration of kline of the Antiphellos Rock-cut Tomb.

Figure 30
Reliefs from kline and decorative frieze on the interior wall.