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The castle and its identification (N. Çevik - B. Varkivanç)

The investigation and identification of Kastabara: E. Kalinka published in 1944 an account of some archaeological remains from Deliktaş settlement that was discovered by Heberdey in August 1898. In this first and unique publication concerning this site, we find the transcription of two milestones, an altar and two sarcophagus inscriptions, that of a sarcophagus lid from the grave monument of Firnaz, as well as a sketch showing the façade of the castle1. Our pioneer team was the first to inspect, in the summer of 1994, these remains with their neighboring settlements to the southeast of Tlos, namely: Köristant, Zindan, Eriklı, Dikmen, Girdev and Kincilar2. We decided to devote two investigation seasons respectively to the Darıözü and Köristant settlements when we for the first time climbed together with F. İşık to the steep Darıözü Acropolis. Due to the fact that the work and transport conditions were the most difficult in Darıözü, our group was only able to conclude our research on that settlement a year after the completion of our research relating to Köristant, at the end of the summer in 19983.

The way from Kemer near Fethiye to the settlement of Darıözü consists of a road 32 kilometers long, which begins before the Tlos exit and passes Kayacık and Deresapağı through a forested area. Then via a mountainous and wooded path, one can reach the

---

1 TAM II (1944) 265-266 Fig. 1.
2 For initial information concerning these settlements, see Yılmaz - Çevik 1996, 196 Fig. 10-12.
3 For the detailed survey report about Darıözü settlement, see Çevik - Varkivanç 2000, 329-344.
Dereköy village, also called Darnöüz, in about two hours. From the Karamuur quarter, the fairest point a motor vehicle can reach, you have to walk for an hour to reach the Deliktaş hilllock, where the ancient settlement lies. Between Deliktaş and Karamuur there is a place called Kumorözü, where our group stayed in a plateau house nearest the hilllock. The climbing from this plateau house to the Deliktaş Acropolis takes 30 minutes (Fig. 2-3).

Darnöüz, situated on the ancient road leading from Tlos eastwards to mountainous Lycia, is the most important settlement on the long pass called Akdağlar between Tlos and Choma. It is also the last settlement before reaching the Girdev plateau in Akdağlar. The information we obtained from the 22B, 23B and 24B blocks of the miliarium-or ‘milestone’ or ‘Stadlasmus’-that serves as a road guide to the Province of Lycia, shows that the only town between Tlos and Choma was called Kastabara. Another northwest road, that is initially parallel to the road Tlos-Choma, leads via Plata to Oinoanda. The distance of 32km from Tlos to Darnöüz is confirmed by the Patara millarium, where the distance between Tlos-Kastabara is given as 128 stadia (24 km). A difference of 8 km between the ancient road and the present road can be considered usual once one understands that the ancient road benefited from some shortcuts. Although we don’t possess any find giving us the ancient name of Darnöüz, the most convincing supposition is that the remains in Darnöüz should be identified with the settlement of Kastabara. Inscriptions showing organic ties between Tlos and this settlement support this supposition. The most noteworthy inscription is on the sarcophagus lid that belongs to the most monumental grave to be found in the settlement. From it we learn that the grave belongs to the son of a Tlos citizen. This inscription, dated to the 2nd century AD, suggests that Kastabara was ruled by one of the most important families of Tlos. Further evidence towards the identification of this road Tlos-Kastabara is provided by the milestone extracted and reevaluated by S. and N. E. Akyürek Şahin during the 1995 Tlos surveys. Two more stones, exactly identical in form and inscription, had been observed at Deliktaş. On this milestone, dated to the time of Severus, an inscription reads “18 Roman miles”. S. and N. E. A. Şahin believe it to belong to the road between Tlos and Darnöüz/Deliktaş-a locality that our working team proposed for the first time in 1998, as the site of Kastabara. Our researches

---

6 The distance between Tlos and Kastabara, measured as 128 stadia equals 24,6 km., if we consider 1 stadia as 192,3 m. Cf. K. Pauyl 5 (1979) 337 "Stadlum" (Chantaires). The fact that the figures are almost completely unreadable because of the damage inflicted on the inscription block 24B (Işık - İskan Işık - Çevik, op.cit., Pl. 27c.) resulted in the first reports concerning Darnöüz, giving a false distance: Çevik - Varlıkvanç 2000, 329. S. Şahin suggests a reading of 128 stadia on this hardly readable surface, and this supposition has been adopted by H. İskan Işık in the comprehensive publication of the monument: Işık - İskan Işık - Çevik, op.cit., 36 note 173.
7 Tam II (1944) 266 No. 722.
8 C. Naur claimed, however S. Şahin identified it as a milestone: N. E. Akyürek Şahin - S. Şahin, "Ein Meilenstein aus Tlos", Klio 52, 2000, 475.
9 TAM II (1944) No. 718 ff.; Akyürek Şahin - Şahin, op.cit., note 11. During our research we were unable to find them.
10 Akyürek Şahin - Şahin, op.cit., 475-462.
covering the whole region made it possible to highlight that in this direction, Danözü was
the biggest frontier castle of Tlos; they also enabled us to define the borders of the region
under Tlos’s control. We think that its powerful neighbors, such as Telmessos, Pinar and
Xanthos the capital, having managed to weaken Tlos’s hold on all the areas along the
Xanthos Valley, Tlos then acquired a larger degree of control in the mountains. On the
other hand, as Tlos had the plains to the east of the Xanthos valley, its economy became
multivalent and therefore richer than that of its seaside neighbors. The reason why Tlos
had far more ties with garrisons and semi-garrisons, such as at Zindan, Eriklı, Köristan, was
that the area under its control was large, and its geographical conditions were, as shown
by Kastabara, very demanding.

In the following pages we shall study the settlement in three parts: Acropolis,
Necropolis, and the surrounding area (extramural). Although the inscriptions we found
we had hoped would form a part of this study, this objective proved unrealizable at the
present time.\(^1\)

**Acropolis: (Fig. 2, 3, 5, 6, 12)**

The acropolis is situated on the prolongation of the southeast summit of Deliktaş (Fig.
2, 3). The environmental structures aside, the castle itself is located on a rectangular base
measuring 29.50x15.00m (Fig. 6). The remains on the rock floor of some structure to the
northwest part of the acropolis indicate that the settlement continued as far as the end of
this rocky surface. The deep, abrupt and sheer cliff of Karadere limits the extent of the
long western side of the castle. Its east side dominates the entire valley and the
Pırnaz/Fırnaz plateau to the south. The surrounding area and the scarce arable resources,
meadows and water sources are under the castle’s control (Fig. 1, 2).

At the east foot of the castle-hill, there is a natural entrance carved in the main rock;
there are also some finds of early attempts to emphasize this entrance in order to create a
kind of monument from it. These are the footing sockets for an arch, dug in the rock, with
their respective dowels, and around them, some surviving traces of the columns. Still in
this area, we find some traces at the east foot of the mountain, providing a monumental
access to the east entrance of the town. Parts of a column, found among the material used
in the construction of a Byzantine church quite near to these remains, complete the
monumental picture. On the segment of this rocky surface that overlooks the road, we
found three stelai holes of similar measurements, namely 0.10x0.18m. These stelai must
have been the first group of “monuments” welcoming those who approached the
settlement (Fig. 11).

On the only flat portion, which is at the southeast end of the settlement, there are
mounds of architectural remains but it is impossible, given the nature of this survey, to
provide an accurate reconstruction of these structures, to which at present we can offer no
reasonable suggestion as to their function. The villagers cultivating the plateau have trans-

---

12 R. Tekoğlu, responsible for inscriptions, informed us that he did not want to give his name to this article and so
we cannot incorporate any detailed information concerning these inscription. These inscriptions will be published
in ZPE (forthcoming). For this reason, we have to content ourselves with what was published by Kalinka, and the
data provided by our own observations.
formed this flat portion into an arable place and have caused great damage to the ancient architectural remains and, in fact, considerably altered as a result the surviving evidence. There is only one building whose plan is entirely recognizable. This is of an early Byzantine church built on an east-west axis, with dimensions of 12.90x24.00m (Fig. 10, 12). It is a three-aisled church, the central nave, nearly 4.20m wide, begins from the apse, the western and the eastern aisles being respectively 2.40m and 3.20m wide. Most of the stones used in its construction came from a Roman building. The existence in situ of some blocks in the long north wall indicates that on this site there was an earlier Roman structure before the church was constructed. Broken stones and mortar debris were used to seal up the Roman door during the Byzantine epoch. Only the small blocks that can be seen in the apse are of undoubted Byzantine production. A 5.50m thick wall reinforces the entire exterior of the apse. A 4.80m wide narthex runs along the western side. The 1.18m wide entrance to the church is slightly to the north of the axis of the main nave 13.

In the foothills of Deliktaş, especially on the foothills to the southwest and southeast, there are mounds of architectural remains. The small structures to which these remains belonged must have been residences demarcating the approach to the acropolis by two routes. These residencies are situated on sloping ground, and have rough stone walls, hence the great damage caused by the erosion to which they have been exposed. These buildings are so fragmentary that it has proved impossible to draw plans and, for this reason, one cannot distinguish their entrances and other architectural details. We suppose that these houses, in serried rows in the districts that are in direct connection with the acropolis, constituted, by forming a wall, although less carefully built than the inner one, a second defense system. To the south an exterior tower, in connection with these structures, fortified the system.

The tower, as well as the walls along the hill, are carefully constructed, quite protected and mostly remain standing (Fig. 3). This unique tower assured the security afforded by a garrison, and offered a warning-pre-defense system. All the towers we find in the settlement are of two floors. All the second floors of these towers have salient parts as some support holes for wooden beams set into the stonework, especially those in the inner blocks of tower nr 2, that informs us of the situation to the second floor. The empty space between the first tower, that is the tower situated at the southern end, and the median tower is filled by a huge staircase that leads to the terrace of the acropolis. Three towers, built on the same line, and identical in dimensions, form and building manner, constitute the monumental façade of the castle (Fig. 5).

**Tower I:** (Fig. 14, 15, 7) This tower was built 37.00m south of the central buildings, where the southern steep slope of the Deliktaş hill begins, at a point where the acropolis overlooks the ancient road leading from the main settlement to the Pınaraz/Fırmaz plateau. This place is also where the acropolis is the most exposed to attack and so, at this point, its inhabitants erected a defensive tower. Since they felt no need to construct other towers at other points in the outside, it remained the only defensive element at the outside of the castle. Except for its back wall, it is still standing.

---

13 For other examples in Lycia, see R. M. Harrison, "Churches and Chapels of Central Lycia", AnatSt XIII, 1963, 117-151 Fig. 17; For Pisidia, see S. Aydal - S. Mitchell - L. Vandeput, "1966 Yılı Pisidya Yüzyıl Araştırması", AST XV.2, 1998, 281 ff. Fig. 5, 6.
The façade and the western wall of the tower are constructed in polygonal masonry technique with bossage; as for the eastern wall, it is constructed in pseudoisodomic masonry. The inner walls are made of smaller and less good stones. Although its plan is approximately the same as those of other towers, its polygonal stonework distinguishes it from them. Although it is nearly square inside, its appearance from outside is not that regular. The entrance is offset slightly to the south in the façade; with its width narrowing from 1.17m to 1.01m, and measures 2.20m in height. A block found in situ at the north-west corner indicates that the floor of the second storey was 0.70m above the lintel header of the first floor door. One of the fallen blocks inside is a threshold block belonging to a double door, probably from the door leading to the second storey. These two-storied towers provide for a strengthened defense; besides facilitating access from the upper levels to the sloping ground behind. A cross, engraved on a block found to the right side of the first storey entrance, provides us with evidence that this tower was used during the Byzantine period.

All along the slope behind the tower, there are a lot of masonry fragments from some other structures, whose walls were built of polygonal, isodomic or rough masonry. Since the quite dispersed buildings from which these remains have come, have not as yet been studied, neither for their structure nor for their plans, we cannot say anything further about them.

The entire eastern façade of the central settlement is still mostly standing\(^\text{14}\). (Fig. 5, 6, 13). Three towers provide a splendid view from the front, constitute the acropolis’s terrace. The fact that the eastern façade was constructed with so little space between the towers, is due not only to a defensive problem but also, by so building, they aimed to provide a monumental appearance to the castle-settlement. The eastern and northern faces of the castle, both of which are standing, as well as the remaining half of the southern wall are built from bossage blocks in pseudo-isodomic construction. Most of the blocks are rectangular but, in some places thinner ones are used to fill the empty spaces. A fascia of 5 cm encloses these bossage blocks. In each of the towers, the external faces are uneven while the inner faces are built from smooth ashlar stones. On the façade there are two set back closets built from smooth faced blocks. The joints follow round the castle walls without any irregularity, with the exception of a couple of 5-10 cm deviations made intentionally to strengthen the stonework. The four first courses of the wall are composed of stone blocks measuring 0.60-0.70m, while higher up the wall, the smaller the stone blocks are, above the first 4 courses measuring 0.40-0.50m. The transition from the first to the second floor of the tower is confirmed by straight and oblong blocks of 0.35m, that must have been laid to extend outwards into the inner space of the tower, so that the floor of the second storey could be placed on these supports. The technique used in the wall masonry as well as the stonework is in accordance with Hellenistic examples\(^\text{15}\). As for the remaining upright western extension of the southern long side, the wall is built in the polygonal technique. We could find neither clamp or insert, nor are there any anchorages relative to these stone blocks.

\(^{14}\) Yılmaz - Çevik 1996, 196 ff. Fig. 10.

\(^{15}\) Cf. Marksteiner 1997, 167 Fig. 90.
Tower II: (Fig. 5, 6, 16). This tower situated on the southwest corner of the castle, is, by comparison with the other towers, the best preserved and provides the most valuable information about a possible restitution of the entire structure. Thanks to its state of preservation we can provide a description of almost all the architectural elements. Its external measurements are 6.50x6.35m; only a 6.60m high part of this structure remains standing. From some technical details on the column found in situ at the southern corner, we understand that there was at least one row of blocks. The first storey is 3.70m high. The southwest substructure is deeper than the other parts, because of the inclination of the ground. The entrance to the tower is slightly offset from the first floor axis and is 1.94m high; its width is 1.00m at the top, 1.05m at the bottom. The way the door frame has been worked, leads us to suggest it was a double door and each door leaf could be bolted from behind. About 1.00m above the door, in a central position, there is a window opening (Fig. 5, 16). There is also a 0.60m wide embrasure, slightly offset from the door axis. Another window profile, about 1.00m high, is on the upper storey. Details from the in situ blocks indicate that a single wooden leaf closed each widow. If we ignore the deviations of 0.05-0.10m by the door and those to both sides of the second storey window, the line of the joints continues without any interruption. Although there are some thin blocks reminding one of isodomic masonry, the tower is, as a whole, made from pseudo-isodomic blocks of mainly identical height. The southeast and southwest faces of the tower, whose back wall is destroyed, are made from bossage blocks; as for its northeast face, it is smoothly worked. The first storey walls are thicker than those of the second storey, and their internal face is composed of small polygonal stones. As far as we were able to observe, no binders of any kind, such as clamps or inserts, were used in the construction. The interior of the tower is, to the height of the second storey, full of mounds of blocks fallen and abraded by the wearing passage of time. Among them there is one block belonging to the door. We found an in situ threshold stone in the middle of the back wall just at the start of the second storey, from which we understand that there was a wooden staircase leading to the upper storey, which was on the same level as the ground floor of the acropolis, and thus led to the interior space of the tower. The perimeter wall that limits the place in the south joins the southwest corner of this tower. This wall going 2.40m southwestwards in the same direction as the back wall of the tower then makes a ninety-degree angle before turning toward the northwest. The stonework of this wall, joint lines and block dispositions are, for some 8.00m, identical to those of the tower (Fig. 5, 17), but the wall continues, after this, with polygonal stonework. Although this polygonal wall has been destroyed from a point 21 meters from the tower’s corner, we can follow it thanks to the notches cut in the bedrock.

Between towers II and III there is a 3.60m large and 6.35m long passage (Fig. 5, 16). We understand from the fact that the steps are as large as the whole aperture, that through this passage one climbed to the terrace of the castle, and the main entrance of the castle was at this point. Although the fallen blocks are dispersed, the position of some of them leads us to think that some steps led to the top of the first storey, 4m high, as well as to the open floor area of the castle’s interior. A partial cleanup has revealed that these steps

---

16 During the visit they paid to the region, Heberdey and Kalinka supposed that there was a five-step access. (TAM II 1941 265 Fig. 1) For this supposition to be correct each of the steps should be 0.80m high, which is absurd.
are 0.25m high and 0.45m wide. Thus, there must have been a total of 16 steps. As far as we can see, they are mostly worn through use over a long period of time. Besides, the fact that the last in situ blocks on the back wall are threshold stones leaves no room for doubt in this matter (Fig. 18). Among the blocks fallen in the passage, we found two parts of the doorframe belonging to this entrance and some fragments from a sarcophagus. In the Byzantine period, this entrance was restored to its initial form.

In the anterior courtyard, situated on the main rock 5.80m before the stepped exit, there is a circular hollow, where we see a dowel niche with its lead pouring duct (Fig. 5). Unique in the neighborhood, this niche suggests that there may have been a stele. Near the niche we found a fragment of an inscribed stele measuring 0.58x0.25x0.24m and dated to the late II. Century A.D (Fig. 19)\textsuperscript{17}.

**Tower III:** (Fig. 5, 6, 13) It has a square ground-plan, measuring 6.35x6.40m. The front wall is like the other towers, 1.00m thick, and the sidewalls are 0.80-0.90m. The reason for the front wall being thicker than the others is that the pressure on it is stronger. As is the case with tower II, the door of tower III is slightly offset from the axis; it is on the same level, and as high as the door of the tower that stands next to it. The tower has some joint deviations at the threshold level. Its highest point is 1.80m above the door lintel level. Almost all the blocks of the superstructure have fallen into the interior of the tower. Unlike tower II, here we cannot see the window aperture because the row of blocks in which it was set have fallen down. There is no embrasure window to this tower. The masonry and stonework are the same throughout the entire building. However bumped blocks are only used on the façade. The sideway looking onto tower IV is bossed only on its first row of stones, the rest are without any peculiarity.

The three-walled, court shaped recess between towers II and III was definitely closed off by a wall that began 0.50-0.60m from the floor. This wall was probably built in the Byzantine period. As is the case with the other towers, the back wall is preserved to the height of the second storey. The back walls not only completed the towers, they constituted the wall of the terrace of the castle.

The most important detail of tower III is a 0.55m wide niche (Fig. 5); that begins at the top level of the door and descends 1.20m, with a depth of 0.15m. On the ceiling of this niche there is a nearly square-shaped mortise and at the upper and lower external corners of the niche we can see joint holes that were made in order to attach something. This attached object may have been an inscribed plaque providing information about the settlement to those arriving through the monumental staircase of the three towered acropolis\textsuperscript{18}.

\textsuperscript{17} The inscription reads: “Pompeia Valentina built this stele as a memorial to a slave called Neike”.
\textsuperscript{18} We find other niches constructed to pay respect to the builders of cities or to venerate the ancestors at Dayran, Silyon, Termessos and Trebenna. Cf. K. G. Lanckoronski, Städte Pamphyliens and Pisidiens I (1890) 68; G. E. Bean, Kleinasien\textsuperscript{1} 2 (1986) 117 Pl. 22 lower, Çevik \textit{et al.} 1999, 405 Pl. 2; Çevik 2000a, 42 Fig. 4.
Tower IV (Fig. 5, 13, 20). The external dimensions of this tower, which completes the castle façade, together with two previous ones, is 6.60x6.90m. The thickness of the walls varies from 1.00 to 0.90m. The northeast wall facing onto the hillside was given a higher substructure in order to compensate for the slope of the ground. In accordance with these ground conditions it was built outside the great wall. The fact that the entrance is, unlike that of the other towers, offset towards the left, must have been necessitated by the same thinking, because a central aperture would have caused the weakening of the northwest face of the tower's static force. The dimensions and the workmanship are the same as in those of the other towers; the sole difference is that its masonry bumps are left in a rougher condition.

A 9.80m fragment of the wall going from this tower all around the castle is still standing. It has on its external face pseudo-isodomic masonry, but internally, we mostly find polygonal masonry. On the terrace behind the towers there are many architectural remains. Since these are mostly in a poor condition, their initial plans and functions have not, as yet, been determined. The first architectural group on the terrace behind the towers passes along the back of towers II and III. Between them there is a corridor of 4.00m. The back door of the tower opens into that corridor. We can see two square shaped rooms there, whose respective dimensions are 5.50x6.70m and 5.50x5.70m. The entrances are to the southeast. For the sidewalls the builders have in part, used the surrounding wall. The entrances to these rooms have their original door blocks from the Roman period. Of the other walls, only a few courses of which can be seen, they were built in the Byzantine period (Fig. 5).

The most important element we found within the castle is an architectural structure that extends 19.00m in a northwestern direction and is parallel to the inner wall of tower 1\(^9\). Only a fragment 3.15m in length and 1.20m in height can be seen. It is located on a podium whose two steps we can see in the substructure (Fig. 21). This fragment exhibits the best workmanship in the entire settlement. It is the podium of an important monument that is located within the castle, just in front of the monumental entrance corridor leading into the large rooms at the end of the acropolis. Some relief blocks which were found about 4-5.00m to the south, might belong to this structure. Among these remains we see a grave altar carrying a bust in relief (Fig. 22)\(^{20}\) and some fragmented blocks with garlands and wreaths of flowers on them. This evidence leads us to think that the whole edifice constituted an arched structure, probably a grave monument, with a monumental façade (Fig. 23).

About 0.90m from the podium, there is another wall about 7.00m long, which is built from large blocks, 1.00m thick, and has the strength of a city wall. There is also an in situ block with a relief among the remains 16.00m to the northeast of the wall. On this fragment there is a horse's head (Fig. 24). Both the relief itself and the metope or corner part of a Doric frieze that characterize this block suggest a religious monument on this site, but we were unable to determine the precise type of structure to which this relief belongs. The monuments, for which evidence is provided by all these finds, show that the castle had not only a military function, but also had a civilian character.

---

\(^{19}\) Yılmaz - Çevik 1996, 196 f. Fig. 11.

\(^{20}\) TAM II (1944) 266 No. 723.
The rocky hill, partially used as a quarry, marks the end of the group of buildings. The hill has passed through some few transformations. In this last section there are two large rectangular structures, measuring 27.00x14.00m (Fig. 6). As far as we can ascertain, there was a residence built round a court-corridor group of buildings, that began between two first towers and extended westwards. Past this point, on the prolongation of the hill, we can observe various remains. However, none of them provide useful information concerning their layout. We can follow them only from the foundations dug onto the bare rock. The unconquerable precipice that ends in Karadere is so deep that there was probably no need to build an external city wall at this point.

From Lycia and the adjacent cultures towers and walls similar to these in technique and stonework are known. Among them there are defensive towers as well as observation towers as part of city walls, and as part of fortified farms that are called “tower-farms”, which were built with the same defensive thinking. Although there are no significant technical differences between these three main types of tower, there may be some points where they differ. Around the cities, in the farms dependant on the city wall, they stand independently, and their dimensions could be bigger and the number of towers larger. The number of storeys, the stonework and the thickness of the walls differ from one tower to another. Examples comparable in form and workmanship to the Darnözü towers, that are still standing are to be found in Lycia in fortified farms. They are found in a similar situation in Cilicia. As for Pamphylia, in addition to those built within the fortified farms, there are also defensive towers pertaining to the city wall. Some features to be seen in the towers at our site have exact parallels with those of Beymelek, Myra, Andriake and Oinoanda in Lycia, such as external visible embossed or slightly bulging faces to these towers built in the pseudoisodonomic technique; the fact that they are framed, with narrow blocks inserted between big ones to provide an impression of dynamism; the fact that through narrow and long blocks, the limits between the different storeys are denoted. All these examples have been dated to the Hellenistic period. The use of regular shaped

---

21 For a detailed bibliography, see Konceny 1997.
23 The closest Lycian region where a similar defensive system of architecture is to be found is at Pydna. Especially the use at Pydna of regular blocks at the corners and irregular polygonal ones in the internal spaces is comparable to those in Darnözü. See Adam, op.cit. 124 ff. Fig. 170. We also find many examples, comparable in workmanship and form, to these at Latmos Herakleia. For these see Adam, op.cit. 46 ff. Fig. 83.
24 In almost all the texts published to the present this kind of settlement has been called a “tower-farm”. More precisely, they are “farms having defensive structures”, and, in spite of the tower form these structures only fulfill the function of a secure home for the head of farm and provide a storehouse where the harvest is kept.
25 Çevik 2000b, 82 ff. Fig. 7, 8.
26 For Pamphilian examples see A. Akara, Şehir ve Savunması (1998) 18. For Lycian towers as a part of a fortification system see Marksteiner 1997.
27 Marksteiner 1997, 166 ff. Fig. 182-183, 193.
28 We have found, during field investigations in Trebenna and its environment, more examples of “farms having defensive structures” (turmgehöfte). One of the best is in Lyboboton Kome (Elaïsaris), others being near Kelbessos, and in Belen: Çevik 2000b, 82 ff. Fig. 6-8. For Hellenistic towers see Konceny 1993, 47-54; Konceny 1997.
large blocks in the external walls, and small and of amorphous stones as well as poor quality workmanship in the mortared internal ones, was very usual in thick walled structures constructed throughout ancient times. These characteristics are especially to be observed as a common feature of Hellenistic Lycian architecture. That the windows are in the second storey, reminds us of typical tower farm examples. This is a defensive measure. In the Lycian examples it is rare for the second floor window to be just above the entrance however, this feature is well-established elsewhere. The particular workmanship and the polygonal stonework distinguish tower I that stands independently of the other towers. Like its Lycian counterparts, it is built of rougher and more amorphous stones than those towers that date from the Classical period, and it is completed, in conformity with the polygonal wall technique of the Hellenistic period, by filling the holes between the blocks with small irregular stones. This practice is due to the poor quality of the joint connections between the larger blocks. On the other hand, the embossments on the block surfaces resemble those of the Hellenistic period, left rough and cambered, rather than the smooth ashlar masonry surfaces of the Classical period. A most significant example for comparative purposes to this Hellenistic type of masonry, is provided by the city wall and tower at Pydna, another example is Kadyanda.

There is still an unanswered question concerning the early Hellenistic phase of this settlement. If this settlement is dated to the Hellenistic period, it was inhabited, after some repair work, all the way through the Roman period and yet, we have been unable to discover where the dead from the Hellenistic period were buried, as all the graves to be seen, with one exception, date from the Roman period, most being from the 3rd century A.D. Only one single Hellenistic grave has been found. We think that more examples of simple sarcophagus coffins, as well as simple burial chambers, will be discovered in future investigations.

The ancient path that climbed to the Firnaz plateau was the only link to the outside for the settlement. The path went down in front of the acropolis, and up to Firnaz (Fig. 25), crossed Karadere over a wooden bridge, whose piers rested on two massive rocks. We can cross the same watercourse through a similar simple bridge today. The road is still in use and, in spite of some repairs, it is the same as it was in ancient times.

In the castle, there are three niches cut into the rocks facing Firnaz. They are not related to any known structure in the town. In two of these niches we found some relief carvings. In the westerly-situated one there are three figures (Fig. 26). In the easterly-situated niche there is only one relief; of a roughly carved human figure throwing up his hands (Fig. 27). The fact that these three niches are within the rocky part of the settlement and situated beside of a road, suggest they served the function of protecting the town. There is a similar

29 Except for a few unusual examples, these towers do not have any window on their ground floor. Konency 1993, 48.
31 For the characteristics to be found in the Classical and Hellenistic periods, see Marksteiner 1997, 119 ff. 167 ff.
32 Marksteiner 1997, 167 ff. Fig. 179, 180, 192.
33 For a similar example see S. Durugönül, Die Felsreliefs im Rauen Killiken, BAR 511 (1989) 48 Cat. 40.
niche in Kibyra. It has an inscription and four figures—a women and three men-. As we learn from the inscription this niche dedicated to the Gods of Justice by a person—”Gerechte Götter”\textsuperscript{34}. The figures in the niches at Kastabara presumably local deities.

Mounds of pottery have been found in the settlement (Fig. 28). A few shards are dated to the Roman, but most to the Byzantine period. Beside large vessels there are fragments from small vessels in daily use. Most of them are of poor quality and have been fired without any previous polishing. Except for red slip painting on a light brown background, they are all monochrome. As for the decoration, we mainly find a decorative crenulated circle round the apertures. The next most common decorative elements are carved triangular belts. In addition to vessels, fragments of Byzantine roofing tiles are also to be found.

Apart from pottery shards, one silver coin, ceramic spindles, and the highly corroded metallic fragments from wooden door leaf fittings have been found.

Outside areas (N. Çevik - I. Kızgı)

Within the Deliktaş Acropolis and in its near surroundings there are some highland houses, farms and observation towers; these are not parts of the structures directly attached to the acropolis. They are agglomerated in three places: Between Erentepe and Deliktaş, in Firnaz and in Karamuwar. Among these three places, only Firnaz/Pirnaz has an organic relationship with the acropolis and it will be described later. As for Karamuwar, since there is nothing but graves in this locality, we shall describe it in the section concerning the Necropolis.

Eren Hill and its surroundings

Eren is the highest peak to the northwest of Akdağlar from where, it is approximately 3 hours climbing distance. It overlooks the entire valley of the Xanthos and of the territory of Tlos. For this reason, it was chosen as an observation point. It is one of the most important links in the communication chain of Tlos’ dominance. It binds Tlos, the dominant power in Lycia, to Girdev, to Choma and the Lycian plateau through Kastabara with the strongest garrison in the region (Fig. 4).

On the sharp rocky part of Erentepe, there is an oblong structure, visible from everywhere, on an axis passing from northwest to southeast. Treasure hunters have savagely plundered it. This oblong structure finishes, at both ends with two larger parts. Its plan is in conformity with a well-known pattern of architecture. As for its floor plan type, the nearest similar examples are to be found in settlements such as Büksez or Gürses\textsuperscript{35}. Its plan is in accordance with what is to be expected for this structure: Both the dimension and the form of its various parts could provide shelter for military units in sufficient number, as well storing the necessary to satisfy their vital requirements. The treasure hunters committed their uncontrolled excavations on such a large scale that we can now

\textsuperscript{34} Th. Korsten, “Kibyra 2000”, ASI 19.2, 2001, 139 Fig. 9; Th. Korsten, Die Inschriften von Kibyra (2002) 123 Nr. 96.

\textsuperscript{35} Marksteiner 1997, Fig. 29, 102.
easily find architectural fragments all over the site. On both ends of the hill there are the remains of some observation structures. A corridor passing along the hill binds them to each other. In the northwest we see a group of structures and here we can distinguish at least three separate units. One of them, measuring 1.90x3.00m, and retaining its plaster layer, provides us with information on the architecture of the other two, which are hardly visible under mounds of earth and mortar. The walls are constructed from small and irregular stones with layers of plaster over them (Fig. 29). When we go from this area to the other end of the hill we find connection walls or traces of them. At the southeast end there is a control point whose substructure is entirely cut into the rock. The entire site must have been kept under surveillance, from both ends of the hill, covering the two main directions, thanks to this system.

Not only guard posts are found surrounded by the remains on the hill, but there are also other structures connected with them. Among the structures in the northwest there is a 4.60x5.30m room, and adjoining it another structure, which has a nearly circular plan. Its architecture as well as the residual mortar, show this circular structure to have been a cistern. Pottery shards have been found in the interior of all these structures. They mostly belong to large storage jars. Access to and from this key observation point was not easy, because of the distance to the main settlement (3 hours’ walk away), when one considers the daily needs of the guards, who lived permanently on this observation hill, with their provisions kept in pottery pithoi in these houses.

To the west of the hill, before the rocky peak, there are some architectural remains, which could have only been housing structures for the military. In addition to these, there is a 0.25x0.45m stele hole (Fig. 30).

On the abrupt eastern slope of Eren, some terraces were obtained by leveling the main rock, and we find some remains on them. On the first terrace the finds suggest a three storied structure. We can distinguish all the walls of another structure, cut into the bedrock, on the lower terrace. This 5.70x2.30m rectangular structure has rendered walls and a barrel vaulted roof.

**Farm I:** It is located midway on the road leading from the southeast point of Eren Hill to Daniözü. It has the characteristics of a fortified farm, with a square plan of 10.00x10.00m and 1.00m thick walls. These heavy walls suggest a high and fortified structure. Because of the vandalism conducted by treasure hunters, the entrance is not clearly distinguishable any more. Three faces of the structure are built into the rock and so the entrance must have been on the northwest face. The pottery examples found in this structure consist mainly of parts of big pithoi. The large plateau in the west is suitable for extended agriculture and for livestock farming; and indeed the land is still used today for these same purposes. So, we may expect there was already some civilian housing, similar to today’s highland houses. The farm might have been used as a residence for the head of community and his family, as well as a storeroom for the harvest, and an intermediary protective link within the defensive chain binding Eren to Daniözü. In front of the tower farm, the highland houses with the characteristics of today’s seasonal dwelling also carry some traces from past periods (Fig. 31). The easily perishable wood construction explains why there are today no surviving remains of the ancient highland houses. The present structures have a rectangular plan and consist of a single room covered by a triangular
roof. There is a platform along the back wall, and a shelf to the right of the entrance. All
these buildings, technically and from the point of view of measurement and internal
arrangement, conform to an astonishingly strict standardization. Only the wooden frame is
durable and each season of summer pasturage, the spaces within this wooden skeletal
structure are filled in again to form the walls.

**Farm II:** In front of the only known grave monument in the neighborhood, on the
slightly inclined slope of the foothill to the northeast of the narrow transverse valley where
the ancient road reaches the plateau, there are some architectural remains, which are
connected each to other (Fig. 32). The plans of some of them are still recognizable. The
most easterly group comprises two rooms and a corridor. One of the rooms is rectangular
(4.90x9.80m), the other being a square (4.35x4.45m), and the corridor is 4.00m long. The
wall thickness is about 1.10m. In an area completely covered with fallen construction
stones, the second structure whose plan can be recorded is located about 21.00m to the
west of the first architectural group and its dimensions are 7.50x9.20m, with a wall
thickness of 0.80m. About 9.00m before these structures, and situated on the same line,
there is a terrace wall, approximately 18.00m long still standing. In the small rocky mass
6.00m to the west of the last structure we find a stylized sun carved in relief (Fig. 33). Not
all of the sunrays on this relief are identical; in addition they are superficially done. This
sun carved in relief, as well as another similar relief on the top of the necropolis, might
have been in carved in the hope for an abundant harvest from the agriculture areas.\(^{36}\)

**Farm III:** Near the eastern border of the plateau, some remains have been found of a
farm. Although it is impossible to record its plan, from the use of huge and irregular
blocks, we deduce that it might well be dated to a very early period. Its external
dimensions are 6.80x5.00m and its entrance is to the south. In the interior of this building,
at the southeast corner there is a room measuring 2.10x1.80m. The walls stand today to a
height of 2.20m. Similar to this building, there is another structure located 5.00m away to
the southwest. Only the south wall of this second structure, which is made from large
blocks, is today standing.

**Farm IV:** This farm is situated near the village of Karamuar, at the northern foot of
Darozü. There are few finds relative to the farm structures and we can only see some
traces on the rock. The sarcophagi that we shall describe in the section concerning the
necropolis, suggests that here there was a permanent farming structure. In addition, we
can deduce from the leveled land that a farm once existed at this place.

**Sacred Rocky:** Kızilkaya is situated at the southern limit of the Fırmaz region, in front
of the acropolis; the “Holy Rocks” are located on the flat face of Kızilkaya, which over-
looks the plateau, and they constitute its anteroom. The front part being concealed by an
earthen bank, it has been impossible until now to establish the appearance of the lower
part. Many signs cut into the surface of the rocks resembling crosses and, to lesser degree,
some Lycian ideograms, indicate that this place served a religious function (Fig. 34, 35).\(^{37}\)
The fact that there are no remains from any settlement around this place shows, by its

\(^{36}\) Yılmaz - Çevik 1996, 197 Fig. 12.

\(^{37}\) The suggestion that these signs might be Lycian inscriptions, mentioned in the first report concerning the
isolation from settlements, that it was related to some religious observance. Also, this religious function of the Holy Rocks suggests that they served at a much earlier period a religious purpose, while the creation of places of worship from rocky spaces was a traditional practice in Lycian cities. However it is mostly a single niche or a hollow that confirms the religious function of these rocky spaces. In this case, advantage was taken of the natural flatness of the rocky places. Since the ground covering the lower part is an earthen bank, we cannot give any precise opinion as to what lies behind it.

Necropolis (I. Kızgut - F. Gülsen)

In spite of the fact that all around Dariözü as well as beyond the settlement there are independent single sarcophagi, there is also an proper necropolis, situated to the east of the acropolis, on a lower rocky hill (Fig. 36) and whose uneven topography, with its large flat spaces, beginning from the deep valley in the north, extend southward and eastward. The place chosen for the sarcophagi consists of the slight slopes on hillsides and the top section of the banks of the brook flowing along the west side of the hill. The flat areas of the settlement were not used for graves, they might have been reserved for agriculture as is indicated by the terraces that are still visible.

The sarcophagi are lined along the path, beginning in Kumarözü and, in the last part of the valley, arriving at the acropolis; there are also some sarcophagi on the hillsides overlooking the valley. Although their altitude might be slightly different, the spaces left between make them seem to have been placed an even level. The reason why the hillside was chosen for the sarcophagi is that this is the best place to face the acropolis and sarcophagi are also situated on the side of the road leading from Karamuvar to it. The front sides of all these sarcophagi face the acropolis. The streams running down from the top of the hill, run between the sarcophagi, and have dragged small fragments of them into the valley. Among 8 sarcophagi, mostly broken into pieces and dispersed, 3 are nearly intact in their totality. There are also some fragments belonging to other graveyards. If we take into consideration all these fragments as well as those lids belonging to the coffins which were not found, it is obvious that the original number of sarcophagi must have been larger.

The Dariözü sarcophagi are composed of a plain coffin, a stepped podium and a lid of the Lycian type. Except for three examples with tabula ansata, there is no decoration. With these characteristics they thus conform to the unpretentious simplicity that we usually find in the Lycia examples.

---


39 During our field investigations in the vicinity of Antalya we found original examples of graveyards situated along the road, which were common traditionally in the Roman period. One can see sarcophagi all along the road leading to the settlement of Tebrhanna, Kelbessos and Neapolis. For more information, see Çevik - Kızgut - Aktaş 1999, 101-121; N. Çevik - B. Varkıvanç - I. Kızgut, “2001 yıldı Tebrhanna ve Çevresi Yüzey Araştırmaları”, AST 2002 (in press).

40 See V. İdil, Lîkya Lahilleri (1985) 11.
In and around the settlement were found 9 sarcophagi and 2 two tombs, differing from the others by their being cut into the bedrock, i.e. chamosorion. These two sarcophagi cut into the rock are near the Karamuar farm, which is situated in a lower place than the principal settlement center. In this area we do not find a single sarcophagus. The fact that the farm owner was able to choose for himself a different type of grave, even if it wasn't too far from the center, was undoubtedly due to his economic status. It is common knowledge that sarcophagi of this type, i.e. composed of a coffin dug in the rock or soil and of a lid, form the simplest type of Roman grave. The easy method of production, as well as the cheapness made the chamosorion the popular tomb and for this reason, it is to be expected that we would find them in less prosperous settlements.

Two of the sarcophagus lids that were found are saddle-roofed\(^1\) and the others are triangular-roofed, in conformity with the Lycian tradition in which both kinds of lid were used. The most common Lycian form of sarcophagi, next to the saddle-roofed, is the sarcophagus having a triangular-formed lid\(^2\), the latter has a tabula ansata on one of its long faces. For those sarcophagi that have no carved decoration, the only element that could help us to date them is the type of characters deployed on the inscriptions\(^3\).

The dating of the sarcophagi found in the Necropolis and the surrounding area does not correspond to that of the acropolis, which is the most important and the best conserved part of the settlement. All the sarcophagi, including the splendid grave monument on the Firmaz plateau, date from the Roman period, but the acropolis is however dated to the Hellenistic period, and so it is quite possible that more examples from earlier periods will be found through future excavations. Today only one chamosorion in the south of the acropolis confirms this assumption. These tombs, due to the absence of any concrete finds, do not provide sufficient information to establish a date. However the date of the sarcophagi at Darözü may be estimated, taking into consideration the fact that this kind was used from the Archaic to the Roman period over a large area;\(^4\) also the examples from Patara may prove of utility in a comparative study.

**Sarcophagus I:** (Fig. 37). This sarcophagus is situated on the hillside of the Necropolis at the northeast end. Like the other sarcophagi it faces the valley, its rear being opposite the rocky foothill. In spite of some cracks in the lid and coffin, the whole is still standing. The external dimensions of the coffin, which is on a podium cut in the rock, are 2.00x1.05x1.00m with an internal height of 0.62m. The floor of its northern narrow side is

\(^1\) Most of the sarcophagi made from local material have a lid typical of Lycia. These high lids are in the form of a roof with curved side faces. There are two acroteria on each of the long faces, and one acroterion on each of the narrow faces: G. Koch - H. Sichtermann, Römische Sarkophage (1982) 536 Pl. 22.1.

\(^2\) Koch - Sichtermann, op.cit. 537 ff.

\(^3\) Sarcophagi in vogue during the Hellenistic period and Early Empire continued in use into the 2nd and 3rd centuries. Although a great number of Lycian sarcophagi have been found, no precise criterion has been decided on in order to date them. However among triangular-roofed examples, those with a tabula ansata are dated to the 3rd century: Koch - Sichtermann, op.cit. 538.

\(^4\) N. Çevik, making use of recently excavated Pamphylian examples, studied the area and chronology of the hypogeeum and suggests these tombs have been used by numerous and varied cultural groups over a longer period and throughout a larger area than was previously thought. See, N. Çevik, “The Rock-cut Tomb Tradition in Pamphylia in the Light of New Examples at Efenna”, AnatSt 2005 (in press).
purposely left high in order to create a headrest. The lid is internally curved, externally pointed. The tabula ansata on its undecorated front side has an inscription that is only in part legible.\textsuperscript{15}

**Sarcophagus 2:** (Fig. 38). This sarcophagus is situated to the southwest of the first sarcophagus and very close to it. Both the coffin and the podium constructed from four local blocks have been dislocated but have not toppled. There is no lid. The coffin (2.43x1.10x1.27m) still has its 5cm wide lid molding around its internal edge. The rims of the tabula ansata on the front side facing the valley are each decorated with two dolphin heads.

**Sarcophagus 3:** (Fig. 39). This sarcophagus is situated on a two-stepped podium. Its main floor cannot be examined because of the filling material that has leaked in from the top. The coffin is broken into fragments. There is no lid. The lid found found five meters away, might well belong to another sarcophagus because its dimensions do not fit this sarcophagus.\textsuperscript{16} The external dimensions of the coffin are 2.23x1.00m; its external height is 1.15m, and the internal height is 0.65m. There is an uninterrupted lid molding around its internal edge.

**Sarcophagus 4:** This sarcophagus is mostly fragmented, and is in poor condition. Only the lower part of the coffin can be easily observed. The rocky platform behind it forms a part of this sarcophagus. As far as we can establish from the remaining upright part, the coffin must have measured 1.70x1.05x1.18m. Its rear wall is thicker, and less carefully worked than the other examples. It has, like the others, a lid molding.

**Sarcophagus 5:** (Fig. 41). This sarcophagi stands at the extreme southern end of the line of sarcophagi. Due to the characteristics of the landscape, it faces the north. In spite of lacking its podium blocks and the fragmentated condition of the lid and coffin, it is still standing, and it is the best-preserved sarcophagus at Darnözu. The coffin measures: 2.26x1.20x1.34; the saddle-roofed lid of the coffin, which has a ridge beam, measures: 2.40x1.36x0.92m. The front side has a tabula ansata, the inscription\textsuperscript{17} is partly legible, and both sides of the tabula ansata are decorated with a dolphin\textsuperscript{18}.

**Sarcophagus 6:** These sarcophagi fragments are at the point where the flat ground to the east of the acropolis leads to the hillside. They are undecorated like the others, and there are very few signs as to this sarcophagi's original appearance.

**Sarcophagus 7:** (Fig. 41). This sarcophagus is situated on the southeastern foot of the acropolis, at the beginning of the entrance carved in the main rock; it is outside the Necropolis group of sarcophagi. Since it is buried up to its lid in the earth, it must be well preserved, as must be its coffin. It is the biggest sarcophagus of Darnözu, and it structurally

---

\textsuperscript{15} TAM II (1944) 266 No. 721.

\textsuperscript{16} The sarcophagi to which this lid belonged have been dislocated and have fallen into the valley.

\textsuperscript{17} TAM II (1944) 265 No. 720. For other undecorated sarcophagi of which there are many examples in Lycia, see Idli, op.cit., Pl. 5. Figs 23 Pl. 28 Fig. 1, 2; F. Koeh, Besiedlung und Bodennutzung auf dem Territorium der Lykischen Polis Kyanesi, Akten des II. Internationalen Lykien-Symposions Wien (1990) Pl. 25 Fig. 9 f.

\textsuperscript{18} For the symbolic significance of representations of dolphins in burial culture, see B. Andreae, "Delphine als Gichtsymbole", H. Roth (ed.), Zum Problem der Deutung mittelalterlicher Bildzeichen, Akten des 1. Int. Koll. in Marburg a.d. Lahn 1983 (1986) 51 ff. Some sarcophagi with dolphin description after Lycian type are also to be found outside Lycia, such as, for instance, those not yet published of Termessos.
differs from the others. We cannot measure its height because it stands underground. Its lid, saddle-roofed and broken at some points, ends with a rooftree of 0.15x0.14m. On both sides there is two akroteria.

**Sarcophagus 8:** This sarcophagi is not in situ, and stands just in front of the arable terrace that is situated to the east of the acropolis. Only four fragments of this sarcophagus, which has been smashed by dynamite, have been found. Two of the fragments belong to the saddle-roofed lid, the two others to the coffin.

**Sarcophagus 9:** (Fig. 42, 43). This sarcophagus stands alone near the “Holy Rocks”. It has fallen to the foot of the main rock platform, on which it was standing originally. It measures 2.25x1.00x0.85m and it faces the “Holy Rocks”. A lion’s foot decorates each of the corners of the podium, on which the sarcophagus was placed and it is unique, because of this particularity. The lion’s foot at the right corner is broken. The relief carved on the rocky podium provides an indication as to the direction this sarcophagus faced. It is interesting to note that for this relief carving, not the sarcophagus itself, but the rock floor was chosen. Although it is in very poor condition, we can distinguish a figure representing a woman raising her hands. (Fig. 43). Its characteristics belong mainly to the Roman period.

**Sarcophagus 10:** (Fig 44). This sarcophagus is in the rocky place near Karamuur farm, on the northern foot of the acropolis, within the limits of the actual village. It is to be related to farm IV and is a chamosorion. Except for the coffin, which is roughly carved in the main rock, nothing survives. In structural conformity with the rock, it is cut slightly crosswise toward the west. It measures 2.02x0.94x0.80m. On the tabula ansata of the front side only a small part of the inscription is legible.

**Sarcophagus 11:** (Fig. 45). This is the second chamosorion belonging to Karamuur farm, and is located at the foot of the hill to the north of the present village graveyard. One half of the coffin, dug into the rock, is buried in the ground. The lid has been toppled and lies near the coffin. It has external dimensions of 2.20x1.60m, and internal ones of 1.80x0.82m. We cannot see any inscription on its tabula ansata. The mostly broken saddle-roofed lid has both akroteria and ridge beams.

**The hypogeum:** is situated on the foot of the small hill to the left side of the ancient path leading toward south, 150 meters from the acropolis. The internal southern and northern walls of this mostly destroyed tomb have been dug into the main rock; as for its eastern and western walls, having been dug into a part of the rock that was not sufficiently solid, these walls have been strengthened by neatly cut stones. The burial chamber measures approximately 2.50x2.58m. The remaining steps suggest that the entrance was on the eastern side, and on the same level as the road. From these steps, worked from small pieces of stone, one can go down to the floor, which is partly conserved\(^\text{49}\). The same masonry technique, i.e. that by which a surface is covered with small stones, is also applied to the floor. Especially that part adjacent to the right side of the entrance where

\(^{49}\) The reason why the steps are made from little pieces of stone is that the rock was not strong enough, nor was it suitable material for decent stonework. We must not consider this to be a traditional characteristic nor yet a local particularity. For instance, in the rock-cut tombs of Patara, the steps are entirely cut into the rock. See Yılmaz - Çevik 1997, 204 Pl. 2, 3, 5.
the rock is most vulnerable, does not allow for proper stonework. As far as we can measure from a well-preserved point, the tomb was 0.85m high. Because of the natural infilling over time and the damaging effects of illegal excavation, there is today no visible plan. Lying 5m to the west of the tomb, a decorated threshold measuring 1.20x0.60m provides evidence that there was originally a bolted door; with this detail too, the hypogeum follows the Lycian tradition⁵⁰. Because of the low number of sarcophagi, and the lack of rock-cut graves, we would expect the hypogeum type of tomb to be more common at Darnözü. As at Patara, where there are very few examples of the rock-cut tradition and the hypogeum burial chamber was preferred, so too at Darnözü this same type of entombment may well have been practiced. The hypogeum type of tomb being very well hidden, they are well preserved and they are only found by chance. We expect that further hypogeum will be found and excavated in Darnözü.

We cannot precisely date this tomb, as no grave goods have been found in it, however, since similar tombs at Patara were in use between the 1st century B.C. and 2nd century A.D.⁵¹, we can suggest this period for the hypogeum at Darnözü, when this form of burial was in widespread use. In addition, the fact that Darnözü was inhabited from the Hellenistic period and far into the Roman period and, as its sarcophagi have been dated to the Imperial epoch, this might lead us to suspect that hypogeum met the need for burial in those earlier times.

**The vaulted tomb:** From some architectural remains we understand that on the northern hillside in which stood the hypogeum, and which overlooks the acropolis, there was a structure erected on a leveled piece of ground to the left side of the road leading to the hypogeum. The thickness of the wall is 0.80m and, as far as we were able to measure it, its long side extends 8.70m. This structure has a 1.30m wide entrance. The exact extent of the other walls, which are concealed beneath the natural filling material, cannot be clearly established. The size of the structure as well as the characteristics of the blocks, suggest a large vaulted architectural structure⁵². The fragments studied are so slight we are unable to suggest a date.

**The aedicula tomb:** (Fig. 46-51) This is situated on the southern side of the ancient road leading from the acropolis to Karadere at the point where it reaches the Firnaz plain. The most monumental grave known today at Darnözü, it is visible from the acropolis. Located on a stepped podium, and covered by an arch, it is a typical aedicula tomb (Fig 46, 49)⁵³. The lower part of the tomb is constructed from quite well cut blocks carved into the bedrock. From this bedrock the greatest advantage was taken; so that even the coffin of the sarcophagus as well as the foot of the northwestern arch are made entirely from this rock. The plan of the aedicula is of a wide rectangle measuring externally 3.03m wide and 5.42m long, the internal measurements being 2.02x3.50m. The wall thickness is, on both

---

⁵¹ Yılmaz - Çevik 1997, 200 f.
⁵² In view of the important position of this -probably- vaulted structure, together with its length, we may well expect a second grave monument in the settlement.
⁵³ see, e.g., Lanckoronski, op cit. Fig. 22, 86 f.; C. Bayburtluoğlu, “1985 Yılı Antalya Kuzey Ceylanı”, KSI XVI.2, 1994, 226 Fig. 8; N. Çevik - F. Gülşen, “Kent Antalya’nın Arkeolojik Evrakları Projesi III. Varsak Araştırmaları”, AST XV. 2, 1998, 365 ff. Fig. 4; Çevik 2000b, 89 f. Fig. 19, 20, 22.
sides, about 1.00m, and, in the back and front 0.80m. On the front side there are three steps made from blocks, and two other steps leading to the podium cut in the main rock. The height, including the stepped podium is 3.50m.

The coffin, whose walls are quite thick, is, as a prolongation of the entire substructure, carved in the rock (Fig. 46). It is separated from the main rock walls of the tomb by 0.44-0.48-0.58m wide corridors. Its external measurements are 1.50x2.44m, the internal ones being 0.73x1.73m. On its right side, there is the impost. Its total height, including the lid, is 1.40m. The lid has fallen, but it is in the main well preserved. The most important data concerning this tomb are to be found on the lid: on the front long side we see an inscription along the molding, and on the frontispiece there is a shield in relief. The inscription reads "...whoever damages this tomb shall pay a fine of 2500 drachms to the most sacred treasure house" (Fig. 49). This monument is a typical aedicula tomb, many examples of which are visible in various settlements in Lycia, Pisidia and Pamphylia. As for the inscription, it is most important because it articulates the ties between the Daniözü settlement and the center, i.e. Tlos (site of the most sacred treasure house).

---

54 TAM II (1944) 266 No. 722.
Abbreviations


Özet

Likya - Akdağlar’da Yeni bir Yerleşim:
Deliktaş / Kastabara

Yerleşime Fethiye’nin Kemer İlçesi’nden Tlos’a çıkmadan önce kuzeye, dağlara çıkan yol üzerinden Kayaçak ve Deresapağı ilencesindeki 32 km’lik orman yoluya varılır. Dağ-orman yolu Kemer’den sonra yaklaşık 2 saat sonra Dereköy ya da Darnözü olarak bilinen köye ulaşılır. Araç yolunun ulaşığı son nokta olan Karamür Mahallesi, antik yerleşimin bulunduğu Deliktaş tepessinin yaya olarak yaklaşık 1 saat uzagaındadır. İlk kez 1898’de Heberdey tarafından varlığı keşfedilen Deliktaş yerleşimindeki bazı kalıntılar 1944’de E. Kalinka tarafından yayınlanmıştır.


Yerlesimin civardan, korunabilmiş 9 lahit, 2 de chom sorion (kaya lahi) bulunmuştur. Anakayaya oyulu olasılıkla farklı olan ilki örnek, asal yerleşim merkezinden aşağıda yer alan Karamuar Çiftliği’ne yakın bulunması ile dikkat çeker. Bu bölgede serbest lahit örneği yoktur. Merkezden çok uzak olmasına karşın, kendisine farklı mezar tipi seçebilmesi,

Fig. 1  Map showing the location of Kastabara in Lycia.
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Fig. 3 The Deliktaş acropolis.
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Fig. 5  Isometric perspective of the Kastabara acropolis.
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Fig. 7. Tower I, plan.
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Fig. 9. The ruins to the south of the acropolis.
Fig. 10 Stone plan of the church.
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Rock-cut dowels.

Fig. 12
The church from the acropolis.
Fig. 13
The towers II to IV and the entrance to the acropolis.

Fig. 14
Tower I.

Fig. 15
Interior of tower I.
Fig. 16  The stepped entrance of tower II.

Fig. 17  The western wall of the acropolis.

Fig. 18  The steps and the threshold blocks.
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Fig. 20  Tower IV.

Fig. 21  Podium blocks on the acropolis.
Fig. 22
Altar with relief carving.

Fig. 23
Some of the architectural remains on the acropolis.

Fig. 24
A metope block carved with a horse’s head.
Fig. 25
The ancient road from the acropolis to Firmaz.

Fig. 26
Three warrior figures carved in the rock of the acropolis.

Fig. 27
A niche with a carved relief on the rock of the acropolis.
Fig. 28
A selection of the ceramic finds.

Fig. 29
The ruins on Erentepe.

Fig. 30
The rock-cut hollow on Erentepe.

Fig. 31
Traditional seasonal wooden dwelling.
Fig. 32  Firmaz farm II, ruins of houses.

Fig. 33  Firmaz, rock-cut relief of the sun.
Fig. 34  Firnaz, Kızılkaya, ideograms cut into the surface of the rock.

Fig. 35  Firnaz, Kızılkaya, examples of the ideograms.
Fig. 36
General view of the necropolis.

Fig. 37
Plan and sections of sarcophagus No. 1.
Fig. 38  Plan and sections of sarcophagus No. 2.

Fig. 39  Plan and sections of sarcophagus No. 3.
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No. 5.

Fig. 41  
Sarcophagus  
No. 7.

Fig. 42  Sarcophagus No. 9.

Fig. 43  
The relief carving  
on sarcophagus No. 9.
Fig. 44
Sarcophagus
No 10.

Fig. 45
Plan and sections
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No. 11.
Fig. 46
Plan of the aedicule tomb.

Fig. 47
Section of the aedicule tomb.

Fig. 48
The facade of the aedicule tomb.

Fig. 49
The inscription on the lid of the sarcophagus in the aedicule tomb.

Fig. 50
The aedicule tomb.
Fig. 51 A reconstruction of the aedicule tomb.