

‘Heroa’ and the City. Kuprlli’s new architecture and the making of the ‘Lycian Acropolis’ of Xanthus in the early Classical period

Catherine M. Draycott
 Durham University Department of Archaeology
 Honorary Fellow, University of Liverpool

Abstract

This paper considers the architectural design of a group of three buildings erected on what is commonly called the ‘acropolis’ of Xanthus in Lycia in the second quarter of the fifth century BC – a time of increasing social, political and economic complexity in this corner of the Aegean/Eastern Mediterranean. Although as the first examples of stone imitations of timber architecture these buildings are often mentioned in discussions about the origins of Lycian ‘house tombs’, and sometimes summarily discussed in terms of their function, the architectural phenomenon that these buildings represent has not received extensive consideration. Here it is argued that their genesis can be located in the building of a monumentalised skyline, potentially drawing on other cities’ acropoleis as models. In addition to this, the buildings also represent quite new commemorative practices. It is proposed that these three innovative structures could be related to a broader practice of erecting monuments to honour city founders in prominent public spaces. In this way, both the terms ‘acropolis’ and ‘heroa’ – loaded terms usually only loosely applied in the literature on these monuments – may be useful for capturing the peculiar qualities of the architectural projects that transformed Kuprlli’s Xanthus.

Introduction

Compared to other monuments from the city of Xanthus, such as the Harpy Monument and the even more renowned Nereid Monument, the three earlier, mid-fifth century buildings which adorned the area of the city dubbed the ‘acropolis’ by modern archaeologists are far less celebrated – a fact that is somewhat surprising given that they are generally recognised as the first known stone built imitations of timber structures, and stand therefore at the beginning of a long architectural tradition in Lycia. This may be due partly to preservation. Whereas almost all the remains of the Nereid Monument were found in a heap at the bottom of the slope on which it stood, enabling almost complete reconstruction (Coupel and Demargne 1969; Demargne and Childs 1989), the remains of these buildings, dubbed Buildings F, G and H, were found reused in Byzantine buildings and walls, and are far fewer in number (Metzger 1963). Yet while there are difficulties with some aspects of their reconstruction, what does survive evidences highly decorative buildings of strikingly unusual form, which were part a programme of urbanisation at Xanthus during a period described by one of the French excavators as ‘the most outstanding’ in the history of the town (Demargne 1968: 91; see also *RE* s.v. ‘Xanthos’, 1387-89; echoed in e.g. Bruns-Özgan 1987: 20-21; Zahle 1989 and 1991).

This period falls in the wake of the great Greek victories of the Greco-Persian Wars in 480 and 479 BC, when the Athenian led Delian League was continuing to battle Persians in the Aegean and Eastern Mediterranean, and which is associated in Lycia with the emergence of a dynast known as Kuprlli. There has been some discussion about whether this figure should be equated with the Kyberniskos Sika named in manuscripts of Herodotus (7.98) as the captain of the Lycian contingent in

the Persian naval fleet in 480 BC, without conclusive resolution (Keen 1998: 88-90, 116, noting the change in modern scholarship to *Kybernis Kossika*; Thonemann 2009: n. 18). The name 'Kybernis' is known in a later, Hellenistic inscription (Baker and Theriault 2013; Cavalier and des Courtils 2012), but not in earlier materials, unless it is abbreviated in some pre-480 BC coins with the mark KYB (Keen 1998: 87-90).

The name Kuprlli is, however, distinctly rendered in both inscribed monuments of his immediate descendants and his own coins. It is not, as has sometimes been reported (Bousquet 1975: 141-42), listed as a forebear on the inscribed bases of statues set up at the Letoon, the extra mural sanctuary of Xanthus, by the early fourth century Lycian dynast Arbinas/Erbinna (Neumann 1979: N 11; Bryce and Zahle 1986: Erbinna I, 94; Bousquet in Bourgarel *et al.* 1992). It is, though, in the Lycian text of the late fifth century BC Inscribed Pillar (aka the Xanthus Stele or Obelisk), generally attributed to Arbinas' father. Both the dedicator, usually now thought to be Kheriga, and what may be his brother Merehi are described as descendants of Kuprlli (TL 44a 2-3: *k[u][pr]lle[h]: xahba* and TL 44a 29-31: *ku][pr]lleh: xahb*, respectively; Bryce 1982; Keen 1998: 116-18; Cau 2003; Domingo Gyax and Tietz 2005; Eichner 2006; Schürr 2007; Thonemann 2009: esp. 168-70n.9 and n.23). The same name, spelled *koprllē*, appears on a plethora of coins issued between roughly 480 and 440 BC (Mørkholm and Zahle 1972; Mørkholm and Neumann 1978; Zahle 1989; 1991; Keen 1998: 112-24, esp. 115-16; Vismara 2006; 2007).

At the time that Kuprlli's coins appear, Lycia's silver coinage surges, making it one of the most prolific minting regions of Asia Minor (Mørkholm and Zahle 1972: 58-59; Borchhardt 2000: 75). Between 475 and 450 BC there was some economic change, with varying coin standards followed by consolidation, a light standard employed in western Lycia and a heavier one in the central and eastern parts (Zahle's Group B: Zahle 1989: 170-71; Zahle 1991: esp. 149-50 and 153, with more emphasis on the breakdown of standards in this group than in his 1989 paper). Among the coin issues, Kuprlli's are the most abundant, and he was the only to have coins struck both in the West, at Xanthus, and in the East at Limyra, the Lycian names of those cities, *Arnña* and *Zemuri*, featuring on the coins alongside his name (Mørkholm and Zahle 1972; Keen 1998: 79 and 111; also Mørkholm and Neumann 1978 on issuers and city names).

At some point during Kuprlli's floruit (precisely when is debated), Lycia changed its political allegiance, joining the Delian League. The *Lykioi* – listed as a single polity – appear in the Attic tribute Lists of 451/2, 451/0 (both restored) and 446/5 (*IG I³* 261.i.30, 262.v.33, 266.iii.34; *ATL* 3, 7; Keen 1998: 118-34; Borchhardt 2000: 94-95; Thonemann 2009: 171). Scholars have debated what these two phenomena, the coining and the allegiance shift, imply about the political structure of Lycia (compare Childs 1981 [Delian League allied dynastic continuity, controlled by Western Lycia]; Zahle 1991 [Persian supported Western Lycian dynasts], Keen 1998: 79, 111 and 112-18 [ala Childs implies Athenian supported dynastic continuity controlled from Xanthus], and Borchhardt 1998: 156-57 and 2000: 91-107 [Delian League shift to democratic federation of Lycian cities, again led by Xanthus]; also Thonemann 2009: 171, briefly). Whatever the specifics, however, it is clear that Kuprlli oversaw major economic and political developments. It is in this context that the above-mentioned urbanisation programme at Xanthus, in which the buildings considered here played a significant role, was carried out. The forms and functions of these buildings are key to new ideas entering the conceptualisation of a Lycian city

during this transformative period.

Since their initial publication in a 1963 final report, discussion of these buildings has been spotty and fragmented along three lines of interest: sculpture, function and precedent. The lion's share of attention has gone to the attributed sculptures, which have been discussed in terms of content, style and chronology, to some extent in isolation from the buildings, and even from each other (Bernard 1965; Coupel and Metzger 1969; Metzger 1971; 1974; 1975; Coupel and Metzger 1976; Demargne 1981; 1983; Bruns-Özgan 1987; Rudolph 2003; more holistic: Jenkins 2006: 169-74). Some pieces have been held up as evidence of original fifth century BC 'Greek' marble sculpture (e.g. Ridgway 1970: 37n.5, fig. 59; Boardman 1995: 190), while others attributed to the same building have been seen as evidence of 'Persianising' ambitions or even pro-Persian political orientation on the part of the Xanthian leaders (Bernard 1965; Childs 1981 [Persianisms show independence within Delian League]; Jacobs 1987: 37 [moderate Persianising perhaps due to pro-Athenian populace]; Zahle 1991 [pro-Persian]; Borchhardt 2000: 89 [pro-Persian, for this reason dating them earlier than Lycia's entry to the Delian League]; Briant 2002: 503-05; Allen 2005: 94-95 [both, locals adopting Persian power imagery]).

The architecture of the buildings has received less attention in general, more often being brought up in the course of other discussions than forming the subject itself. The more direct, although often limited considerations concern function. The excavators initially argued that the buildings were shrines, but subsequently described them as 'funerary or heroic in character' (Coupel and Metzger 1976: 247). Since then, most authors have adopted the term 'heroa', meaning very generally 'monuments for heroes', to capture this ambiguity, summarily describing the buildings as having a quasi religious-funerary aspect (e.g. Bruns-Özgan 1987: 19; des Courtils 2011b: 366; des Courtils 2012a: 157; Jenkins 2006: 169). The use of the term 'heroa' in connection with these structures has been most extensively discussed by Oliver Hüllden, who addresses the concept of 'heroisation' more broadly (Hüllden 2006: 179n. 813, esp. 348-52), but since the initial reports in the 1960s there has been no direct consideration of the buildings' actual architecture and how this relates to their designation.

More often publications have been devoted to the origins of the Lycian 'house tomb' – a type of monumental stone-built tomb that seems to imitate timber frame structures, traditionally thought to be houses. Within such discussions, the three Xanthus buildings are usually placed at the beginning of the tradition (Marksteiner 1993a; Thomsen 2002: esp. 110-11, 352-53; Hüllden 2006: 176-77, 200 and 350; for reconstructions of timber structures based on tombs: Strathmann 2002: esp. 95-114; Mühlbauer 2007; Mühlbauer 2012).

Although some have briefly touched on the introduction of this new building type and historical context, there has been little elaboration on the significance of this (e.g. Zahle 1991: 151 [new ruler tomb type]; Borchhardt 2000: 89-90 [sees as development of a princely necropolis]). The most direct acknowledgement of the buildings' roles in the ideological designs of Kuprlli has been Antony Keen's proposal that Building G may have been the Sarpedonion – a shrine to the Lycian hero Sarpedon – described as standing at Xanthus in Roman period literature (Keen 1998: 186-92, esp. 192; cf. Borchhardt 2000, 89n. 97 and Dusinberre 2013: 222-25). While recognising the importance of this move and the choice of building form, however, he too does not go into any depth on the issue.

This paper aims to fill these gaps, focusing directly on the Xanthus buildings and their historical significance. It is divided into four parts. In the first, the historical background and evidence of the urban development of Xanthus up to the time of the fifth century programme is outlined. The second part lays out the evidence for the reconstructed forms of the three buildings and their potential utilities, showing that while aspects point to sepulchral function, their new forms and location suggest something more.

The third section goes on to consider the symbolism of the ‘timber style’, reviewing ideas about the origins of ‘house tombs’, and consequentially the models for these buildings. It is suggested that the theory that the forerunners were shrines or ceremonial public buildings would help to explain them as part of a choice to create a monumental ‘acropolis’-like point in Xanthus’ cityscape. In this respect, although the term ‘acropolis’ is already generally used to designate the area in which the buildings sat, seemingly due to its prominence over the river (it is not the highest point in the city) and to the fact that it seems to have been monumentalised with walls, palatial residences and cult buildings, the term may have further relevance for characterising its fifth century development.

The fourth and final section returns to the fact that the buildings, while perhaps resembling sanctuary buildings for the purpose of effecting a kind of ‘acropolis’, seem to have had sepulchral, memorial functions as well. Monumental tombs had formed important landmarks in Lycian cities before this time, and one could think that they were simply co-opted into a revised city aesthetic in a superficial way. The introduction of such new architecture, however, suggests that new ideas about commemoration may have been integral to this. One possibility, related to Keen’s thesis and mooted in some of the literature, but not unpacked (e.g. Jenkins 2006: 169), is that these structures were a Lycian response to the practice of erecting monuments in honor of city founders, practiced at Mediterranean cities with which Lycia was in contact.

In this way these buildings, so often casually labelled ‘heroa’, can be seen as having been designed to introduce something along those very lines – not necessarily hero cult or heroisation, per se, but symbols of people considered central to the idea and status of the city, important for boosting its profile and defining it in a cosmopolitan fifth century world.

1. Background: Xanthus and its monuments up to the fifth century programme

Along with the rest of Anatolia, Lycia, roughly equated with the mountainous coast of the Tekke Peninsula in the southwest corner of Turkey (**Figs 1 and 2**), was conquered by the Achaemenid Persians sometime in the 540s BC, 80 or so years before the construction of the Xanthian buildings under the spotlight here. Before that time only a little is known of the region. Homer and Herodotus both speak of earlier Lycian heroes, the latter recounting the settlement of the peninsula by Cretans under Sarpedon, who pushed preceding local populations to the north, and who were later joined by the Athenian prince Lycus, from whom the Lycians took their (Greek) name (Herodotus 1.173; cf. Strabo 12.8.4-5). Hittite texts, however, suggest that the area was inhabited by native Anatolian Lukka people (Bryce and Zahle 1986: 1-10; Işık 1994; Keen 1998: 22-29; Savaş 2006; Kolb 2009; des Courtis 2011b: 359; also Işık 2010a).

The tenacity of some place names in Hittite and later fifth and fourth century Lycian inscriptions points to continuity in the Anatolian language speaking population, whether or not Greeks or others joined them over the centuries (Bryce and Zahle 1986: 26; Keen 1998: 214-20; des Courtils 2011b: 329). A few finds belong to the Bronze Age (Keen 1998: Kolb 2008: 1-32; figurines found at Patara in 2014 are adding to this), but the earliest occupation levels reached at sites such as Xanthus and Patara in Western Lycia and Limyra in the East (see e.g. Kahya 2001-2; Işın 2010; Gebauer 2012; Marksteiner 2012) belong to the late seventh/early sixth century BC – around the time of a general increase in monumental stone building in the Mediterranean and Anatolia.

Excavations at Xanthus in the 1950s and 1960s, took place on the southwestern rocky promontory of the city known in modern literature as the ‘acropolis’ (occasionally the ‘Lycian acropolis’ as opposed to what is sometimes called the ‘Roman acropolis’ at the northern peak of the site) – as noted above, a term thought to fit its situation and character as a walled area with what may be early palatial and cultic buildings (**Figs 3-5**). There, they found the earliest architectural remains in this area’s southeastern corner, where the sloping off of the bedrock allowed soil levels to accumulate (**Fig. 6**). At the lowest levels were discovered a series of elongated rooms belonging to a substantial building, dubbed ‘Building A’, thought to be a potential residence of a ruler (Metzger 1963: 16-19; Cavalier 2006: 329-30; des Courtils 2011b).

More recently, reliefs of lions and bulls which could belong to one or more monumental buildings of this period have been discovered on the slope of the hill immediately east of the ‘acropolis’, not far east of the later Nereid Monument, dubbed the South East Sector (**Fig. 5**, des Courtils 1995; Cavalier 2006: 336-37; des Courtils 2007a; 2007b; 2011a: 336-39, 346; 2011b: 363-66; 2012a; reliefs now in Antalya Museum). The excavators’ early tentative suggestions that they could belong to a monumental tomb, a forerunner of the later ‘heroa’ discussed here, were amended over time (e.g. des Courtils 2011b: 364-66; 2012a: 156-57). So far very little, including date, is clear; the structures continue to be investigated by a Turkish team from Akdeniz University in Antalya, under Prof. Burhan Varkıvanç.

On the ‘acropolis’, at around 540 BC based on the earliest associated sherds, Building or ‘Residence’ A was replaced by another even more substantial building called ‘Building’ or ‘Residence’ B, to which several storerooms (M1-3) and a court wall seem to have been attached (**Fig. 7**, Metzger 1963: 20-28; Cavalier 2006: 331-32). Another building (C) sometimes called the ‘three cella temple’ was erected just to the northwest. This perhaps replaced an even earlier sanctuary represented only by items found in a kind of *favissa* or *bothros* within the ‘temple’ (Metzger 1963: 29-38; des Courtils and Cavalier 2001: 151; Cavalier 2006: 332-33).

The dating of these new buildings has encouraged the idea that the earlier Building A and associated structures were destroyed in the Persian capture of the city, which according to Herodotus involved Xanthians setting fire to their city (Herodotus 1.176). Although no destruction layer of this time is clearly described in excavation reports (Metzger 1963: 47, *contra* Keen 1998: 105), the final report on the pottery and rare small finds (Metzger 1972) from time to time mentions traces of burning on pottery of the pre-540 period. A 2009 sondage in the southeastern corner of the acropolis to check the stratigraphy notes a charred level of this period (Pichonneau in des Courtils 2010: 289-93, esp. 291 and 293, figs 12 and 13, unit 40016) and burnt

materials in the fill of the foundation cut (unit 40027) and lowest levels (unit 40013) associated with the construction of the walls of ‘Residence’ B.

About the time Building B was constructed, the first of a new type of tomb was erected near what would later become the northeast gate into the city. The Lion Tomb (British Museum B 286, c. 550-30 BC; Pryce 1928: 118-22, B286, fig. 176, pls 18-20; Demargne 1958: 29-33, pls 2 and 3; Rudolph 2003: 35-41) was one of, if not the first ‘pillar tomb’ – a type of towering monolith with a chamber carved or constructed at the top (Deltour-Levie 1982). This was matched or shortly followed by similar tombs at other cities in Central Lycia (Draycott 2007).

‘Residence’ A is usually held to be the domain of some kind of ‘ruler’ at Xanthus already, but the appearance of the pillar tombs should signal a shift in Lycian society, with the elevation and incorporation of certain individuals or groups within the mental and physical structure of the city. Some have proposed that these developments should be linked to a Persian installation of a ruler at Xanthus after their conquest, even an ethnically Persian or Median one based on the evidence of a Lycian dynast of the generation after Kuprlli called Harpagus, the same name as the Persian commander that took the city (Herodotus 1.176; Shahbazi 1975: 15; Bryce and Zahle 1986: 101; Jacobs 1987: 27-29, 37; sceptical: Keen 1998: 76-86; Marksteiner 2005: 35; Hüllden 2006: 347; Thonemann 2009: esp. 168-69). It is not clear, however, that the social change suggested by the pillar tombs was due to immediate, top-down Achaemenid political interference (cf. Keen 1998: 79-86; des Courtils 2011b). Indeed, it is not clear whether the first pillar tombs certainly post-date the Persian conquest (Özhanlı 2002; Draycott 2007: postscript).

At some point during the second half of the sixth century, other monuments collected at Xanthus: a small relief (Istanbul Archaeology Museum 5237 and 5187) dating stylistically to about 520 BC or so, often attributed to another pillar tomb (the so-called Pillar of the Wrestlers), was found sealing an archaic burial placed within a later tomb known as the ‘Sarcophagus on a Pillar Tomb’ (Draycott 2007: 107-08; Cavalier and des Courtils 2012). Two other reliefs in Istanbul (5234 and 5236 T), the first from a later cemetery east of Xanthus, the second found near the post scaenia of the later theatre, suggest other decorated monuments, the forms of which remain unknown (Demargne 1958: 33-35, pl. 4; 1979: 291-96; Rudolph 2003: 54-55). On the so-called acropolis, a head and leg of a small marble *kouros* (Istanbul Archaeological Museum 1971 and 3089) and a marble *perirrhanterion* (basin on a stand) found in later fill at Buildings B and C suggest the possible erection of substantial imported votives in the area (Metzger 1963: 93-96, pls 51 and 52; Poggio 2010).

What, if anything, was constructed on the higher ground in the centre and western sides of the ‘acropolis’ is unclear; the bedrock here preserves few traces of any architecture before the mid-fifth century BC. Traces of a storeroom (M4) thought to be contemporary with ‘Residence’ A (that is, pre-540 BC) were found under the south bastion of later defensive walls (**Fig. 6**), which led the excavation director Metzger to suppose an older, archaic rampart (Metzger 1963: 44-47, 78-79, 81; Cavalier 2006: 330). Traces of a small stretch of wall running Northwest-Southeast just north of this (**Fig. 7**) could belong to the post 540 BC phase (Metzger 1963: 39 and 80). Metzger also thought there could be traces of stonework belonging to an archaic wall in the northeast corner of the ‘acropolis’ zone (Metzger 1963: 14). Other than this, relatively rich caches of pottery including some restorable feasting vessels

(craters and plates, for example) suggest potential ceremonial and possibly votive activities in the area (Fig. 8, Metzger 1963: 39, 60, 67-69, 75 and 79; 1972: inventory numbers beginning with A6 and A7).

At the tail end of this phase, c. 480-70 BC, the monumental Harpy Tomb was erected – a pillar tomb which outstripped the previous generation of such tombs, signalling a new monopolisation of public focus by one group at Xanthus (Draycott 2007). This was set up on the west side of a level patch of ground north of the ‘acropolis’, which by the end of the fifth century BC was called an ‘agora’ in the Greek epigram on the Inscribed Pillar (*TL* 44c; *SEG* 42, 1245; but see Domingo Gygax and Tietz 2005 for alternative suggestion about location of the so-called agora; also Işık 2010a, Cavalier and des Courtils 2012 and des Courtils 2012b [revising des Courtils and Cavalier 2001: 154] on the problems of the Greek concept of *agora* for this space). Although its erection roughly coincides with the earliest coin issues of Kuprilli, many attribute this tomb to the ‘Kybernis’ mentioned by Herodotus (assuming they are not the same person, see above; Herodotus 7.98; Demargne 1958: 44-45; Shahbazi 1975: 15-50; Keen 1992: 59; 1998: 87-96, esp. 89; Borchhardt 2000: 90; Benda Weber 2005: esp. 37; Jenkins 2006: 163-68; Cavalier and des Courtils 2012; cf. alternatives: Fronig 2004: esp. 315; Draycott 2007: 127; Thonemann 2009: 184-85n.19).

Even if not generally accredited with the Harpy Monument, the name Kuprilli tends to be associated with the next phase of building at the city. According to Metzger’s interpretation of his excavations, Residence B was destroyed by a fire, which based on the latest ceramics – this time from a clearly described destruction level – would date to about 470 BC (Metzger 1963: 22-23, 32-33, 60, 68-69, 80-81). The excavators suggested the possibility of an attack by the Athenian general Cimon, who was ‘persuading’ cities of the coast of Asia Minor to join the Delian League at the time (Diodorus 11.60.4; Metzger 1963: 80-81; Childs 1981: 56; Keen 1998: 97-107, esp. 104-05). As noted above, at some point during the mid-fifth century the Lycians joined the Delian League, but there are no clear signs Xanthus was besieged, such as for instance weapons in the destruction layer (*contra* Cimon theory: Bryce and Zahle 1986: 103-04; des Courtils and Cavalier 2001; des Courtils 2012a: 156).

In fact, the 2009 sondage has thrown some doubt on whether there was a violent destruction of this period, noting only thin traces of burning, which could be occupational (Pichonneau in des Courtils 2010: 291 and 293; less strongly asserted in des Courtils 2012a: 155-56). Nevertheless, whether the opportunity was opened up by widespread fire or not, there seems to have been a new wave of urban development at this time, and the distribution of building evidence changes. The usage of the southeast area, the old ‘residential’ zone, is not totally clear: by the Hellenistic period the area was terraced (the *kouros* head was found in this fill) and interior walls of a square corner defensive tower were built (Pichonneau in des Courtils 2010: 289-93). It had been thought that the area was simply unoccupied in the Classical period (Metzger 1963: 27-28, 36-38, 93; Marksteiner 1997: 102), but the stratigraphy of the 2009 sondage suggested to the excavator that Residence B may in fact have continued in use until the construction of the tower (Pichonneau in des Courtils 2010: 293; not asserted in des Courtils 2012a). Varkivanç’s excavations at the site may shed further light on the usage of this area. Building or Temple C appears to have remained in use, and other buildings added around it.

Now, though, footprints of buildings in the centre and on the west side of the ‘acropolis’ are visible (**Fig. 9**). They include bases of two large buildings. One, oriented North-South (Building D), consists today of a rock cut platform with a line of several massive orthostats along its eastern side. The excavators thought this might be a temple of Artemis on the basis of a Hellenistic altar inscribed to Artemis of Ephesos found close by (today lost, text 2006-29, as yet unpublished, preserved only in squeeze; Patrik Baker, personal communication, 2009; Metzger 1963: 40-42; des Courtils and Cavalier 2001: 151; cf. another inscription mentioning an altar and temple to Artemis, *TAM* II.1, 263).

An east-west oriented building (Building E) is only represented by bare cuttings for foundations. The excavators tentatively suggested this could have been a new residence, but the function is quite unclear. The fact that it was monumental, however, could indicate some important ‘public/palatial’ building (Metzger 1963: 42-44). Some early Classical relief sculptures including one showing running women and another with flying *nikai*, not attributed to the three buildings under consideration here, may have belonged with these two buildings (D and E), or even others for which there is no other evidence (Demargne 1968).

On the western side of the ‘acropolis’ are the remains of bases attributed to a set of three smaller buildings – the so-called ‘heroa’ that are the focus of this article. The poorly preserved southern end of the base of Building F, possibly the oldest of the three, lies just about one metre southwest of ‘Temple’ D (**Figs 9 and 10**). Of Building G only the southern and eastern edges of the massive terrace platform on which it is thought to have stood remain *in situ* (**Figs 11 and 12**).

The base of Building H, perched on the promontory overlooking the Xanthus River at the far west of the ‘acropolis’, is the best preserved, clearly visible today (**Fig. 13**). It was noted already when Fellows was at the site in the nineteenth century, and it was here that the French team began their excavations at Xanthus (Metzger 1963: 63). They first took the platform for the socle of an altar based on size and small finds discovered in cracks in the rock around it – a supposition also made for the base of Building F. Marks on the top, however, were later taken to indicate a building with a shorter structure before it (**Fig. 14**).

With this indication, the excavators saw that some relief-carved gables in the British Museum, which had been removed from the site in the nineteenth century, were proportionally appropriate for buildings on this base and that of Building F (**Figs 15-16**). Other fragments found reused in later Byzantine structures and walls were then also attributed. Although the carving is more ‘early Classical’ in style (Rudolph 2003: 59-64), the reliefs on these fragments show clear continuities in style from the reliefs of the Harpy Monument (**Fig. 17**), especially in the long-bearded men in the gable attributed to Building F (**Fig. 15**) and a frieze subsequently associated with Building G (**Fig. 18**). The architecture of the buildings, however, is entirely innovative. Fragments of roofing and blind doors/windows indicate stone buildings which in their external appearance seem to strongly imitate timber constructions of a distinctive kind, well represented in the later so-called ‘house tombs’ of Lycia (**Fig. 19**).

These buildings seem to have been part of a larger overall urban plan shaping the city. The large terrace platform on which Building G is reconstructed as sitting is bonded with the southwest corner of the ‘acropolis’ wall (Metzger 1963: 5, 11, 49). This in turn shares masonry style with other stretches of the city’s walls, suggesting

that monumental walling not just of the ‘acropolis’, but the whole city too may have been initiated at this time (Metzger 1963: 1-8, 11-14, 67-69, 82; Marksteiner 1993c; des Courtils 1994; Marksteiner 1997: 101-07; des Courtils and Cavalier 2001: 151-53; see also east wall of the ‘acropolis’ [m3] in Pichonneau in des Courtils 2010: 289-93, figs. 11-13; and Cavalier and des Courtils at press; Lemâitre at press, *non vide*).

It is tempting to see this as a new definition of the city space, distinguishing the so-called ‘acropolis’ from the area to its north, which as noted above was called an ‘agora’ in the Greek inscription on the late fifth century Inscribed Pillar. There are difficulties in deducing whether this really amounts to new zoning and revised functions of spaces, however. No traces of archaic mud brick walls or wooden buildings which preceded the mid-fifth century stone ones have been found, but neither can they be ruled out (Cavalier 2006: 330). Remains of and in ‘Temple’ C and traces of what may have been archaic votives (the *kouros* and *perirrhanterion*) along with the later Hellenistic altar to Artemis suggest continuity of cultic activities on the ‘acropolis’. The archaic ceramic vessels and figurines from the sondages south of the summit of that area (**Fig. 8**) may point to ceremonial feasting or depositional activities that took place there, which could have had associated architecture, the foundations for which were entirely erased.

On the other hand, even if we cannot properly analyse a ‘before and after picture’, the stone building remains of the fifth century help one to gather a sense of what, or at least a part of what, was prioritised and consolidated in the city at that time. The disposition of the so-called ‘heroa’ indicates both the range of practical functions they could have performed and their role in defining the space and appearance of this quarter of Xanthus.

2. The ‘Heroa’: Forms and functions

There are two entangled questions concerning Buildings F, G and H: first, what was their function, and second, how does one explain the choice of architectural form for whatever they are? Direct discussion has tended to focus on function. As noted in the introduction, although recognising that the buildings resembled later ‘house tombs’, the excavators at first proposed that the three were shrines. This was based mostly on finds of what may have been offerings near Building H and the above-mentioned archaic period pottery and figurines (**Fig. 8**), which could have been used for ceremonial feasting and as votives, found on the southern slopes of the ‘acropolis’. However, the excavators subsequently softened this stance, speaking of the buildings as having a ‘funerary or heroic’ character (Coupel and Metzger 1976: 247).

Many now identify the buildings as tombs for Lycian rulers, primarily due to the fact that, as will be shown below, they are reconstructed as sealed rather than open and accessible. Often, however, this identification is qualified with a caveat that the buildings may have had a special, extra-funerary function. And the ruler tomb interpretation has been challenged by Keen, who as noted in the introduction has argued that Building G may have been a shrine for the Lycian hero Sarpedon (Keen 1998: 186-92).

Uncertainty about the function of these buildings is often summarily resolved by the rather generic application of the term ‘heroa’ – a term which can variously refer to tomb-shrines or memorials for long dead ancestors or Homeric heroes, or to extraordinarily monumental tombs (*mausolea*) that aggrandise the more recently

deceased, thereby covering a multitude of possibilities. This term signals the extraordinary nature of the buildings, but *how* they are extraordinary – how their particular form relates to why they are considered special – and the historical significance of this creation has not been specifically addressed.

In order to unpack this, both utilitarian and symbolic functions of the buildings need to be considered. The latter, including the ‘meaning’ of the form and location of the buildings, is considered in the next section. This section prefaces that with a review of the empirical evidence for the buildings and their potential uses, and the factors which lend them an ambiguous and special status. A supplementary catalogue of the remains attributed to each building, including associated small finds and full references, is provided in an appendix to this article.

Building H

Building H is the most firmly reconstructed of the three buildings. As noted above, the base, preserved on a promontory jutting out over the Xanthus River (**Figs 9 and 13**), has marks on it indicating the lines of a small building and another structure before its southern, short side (**Fig. 14**). Four fragments from two sculpted gables in the British Museum carrying sculptures of seated sphinxes and lions, and remains of stepped frames of blind windows (**Fig. 16**) were recognised as fitting a building of this size. These, along with another twelve architectural fragments with parts of similarly proportioned blind windows and doors, and faux traverse beams were subsequently attributed, reconstructing two façades of a structure resembling a timber-frame building, similar to later ‘house tombs’ in Lycia (**Fig. 20**). As reconstructed, Building H would be approximately 5.85 metres in height, with façades divided into three storeys: a blind door stage at the bottom and two further stages with blind windows, capped by a sharply angled gabled roof.

The interior of the Building H would be a tall space with a floor plan of approximately 1.84x1.34m (2.46m²). Concerning access, the dimensions of the innermost panels of the blind doors (1.18x0.634m) are too small to have been intended to allow normal foot passage, and remains of clamp marks, mortises and tenons suggest that neither doors nor windows were meant to be disassembled on any regular basis. However, although there are remains of two doors, one attributed to each façade, the remains of windows are only few, all attributed to façade A. It is possible, therefore, that one of the windows, perhaps one on façade B, could have been built with a removable slab enabling easier access to the chamber. If so, this may have been a middle, second storey window, for there is a strange feature associated with the third, upper storey which merits notice: remains of cross beams restored as running between the second and third storeys on both façades of the building (see stones 3339 and 915 in the appendix and fig. 20) bear single rows of small drill holes in their upper surfaces. It was proposed that these could be cuttings for the insertion of bars or grills which screened the upper storey windows. The function of such a grill is perplexing, given that at least one of these upper storey windows (the one restored to façade A, see fig. 20) would have been sealed shut. If the intention were to screen off an open window space on the opposing façade, that has implications for any sepulchral function of the building. Such grills or bars could, however, have been included to enhance the imitation of larger, accessible buildings rather than for practical reasons.

This is impossible to resolve; at any rate it seems the only access to Building H's chamber could have been through a window, if one were provided with a removable panel. Such windows or doors with removable panels are paralleled in pillar-tombs such as the Harpy Monument, and in later Lycian sarcophagi. The function of these openings is not clear; for the pillar tombs it has sometimes been suggested that they were exits for the souls of the dead, but they could also allow deposits to be made if desired (Hülken 2006: 28 and 90-91).

Small finds from crevices around the base of Building H, including one sherd each of an Attic black figure cup and an early Classical white *lekythos*, pieces of a bone spindle and some gold jewellery (see Appendix), have been interpreted as possible offerings predating and postdating the construction of Building H. This implies continuity in use of space, although whether this should suggest a predecessor of Building H is not at all clear.

Building F

The remains of Building F are far fewer, comprising only three fragments attributed to one façade of a building similar to H (**Fig. 22**). The fragments include the 'Siren Gable' in the British Museum (**Fig. 15**), and two further architectural fragments. One of these preserves a sloping edge, the angle of which matches that of the Siren Gable, and the edge of a stepped blind window frame. It is thought therefore to belong to one of the lower angles of a gable with a pair of blind windows, on top of which the Siren Gable sat. The size of the resulting gable indicates a building of about 2.90m wide.

Such a building could fit the above-mentioned remains of the base about one metre away from the southwest corner of Building (Temple?) D (**Figs 9 and 10**). The association is not secure, since the poor preservation of that base means that its dimensions are not really possible to calculate, but there is no other known candidate. The other architectural fragment attributed to Building F also preserves one side of a stepped frame. Its height (1.325m), suggests a blind door. Originally, a frieze showing a cock fight and hens was attributed to an upper step of the base of this building (shown in **Fig. 22**). In subsequent publications it was tentatively attributed to Building G, although there are difficulties with this; it could still belong with Building F (see Appendix under Building F).

Despite the few fragments, even the gable parts provide solid evidence that a building of this general kind existed. If it followed the proportions of Building H, as assumed in the excavators' proposed reconstruction, it would be slightly larger at 6.65m high. The interior would be roughly 2.60x1.90m (4.94m²). Both the door and window fragments indicate that they were not removable elements. If one of the other doors had a removable inner panel, this would be 1.20x0.60m – possible to get through, but not made for comfortable walking access. There could again have been removable panels of upper storey false windows.

The excavators suggested that the rich cache of archaic pottery and figurines from slightly further south (**Fig. 8**) may have slipped from this area, and could suggest votive and ritual activities associated with a predecessor of Building F. There were no small finds immediately associated with the structure, however.

Building G

Building G differs from the other two in size (the building would be twice the size of the others in plan) and in form and elaboration. Forty-six fragments in all, both architectural and sculptural, have been attributed to a flat-roofed building (**Figs 23-24**) and the terrace platform at the southwestern corner of the 'acropolis', on which it is reconstructed as having stood (**Figs 9, 11 and 12**). Various details such as access, interiors, heights and decoration are not resolved, and have been further complicated by adjustments proposed in publications following the initial report (Marcadé 1964; Bernard 1965; Coupel and Metzger 1969; Coupel and Metzger 1976; see Appendix) but the reconstruction is reliable in basic form.

Three roofing elements, including an almost fully preserved roof slab with a stepped moulding on the edge and faux log ends on its underside attest a flat-roofed building with overhanging eaves. This roof type is well known among the so-called 'house tombs' of Lycia (see for example **Fig. 28**, below). Seven fragments comprising two orthostats and five fragments of pavers, most with similar simple mouldings, were attributed to a podium or socle. Two of the pavers with preserved edges adjoin, forming a large composite paver of 1.42m in width (see **Fig. 25**). The excavators realised that if multiplied by three, this could form the front of a building 4.26m in width. The roofing slab could also be multiplied by three for a proportionally related frontage. Further, four roofing slabs along the sides would yield a building with the same 2:3 proportional ratio as the terrace, encouraging the assignment of those elements to a building in that spot.

The excavators reconstructed a superstructure with a high podium and a chamber room. The height of the podium, and whether or not it contained a lower chamber, or even two lower chambers are problematic. The attribution of two reliefs which seem to belong to a frieze showing a banquet, and the above-mentioned cock fight and hen frieze have a bearing on this (see Appendix). Also not entirely certain is the decoration attributed to the terrace platform. A frieze depicting satyrs and wild beasts, an elaborately moulded pavement edging and three marble (imported) *peplophoros* statues have all been assigned, and while there is no absolute evidence, they are usually accepted as belonging. Of concern here is the nature of the chamber, the accessibility of both it and the terrace, and any evidence for activities associated with the building.

To the walls of the chamber have been assigned a series of reliefs belonging to a frieze showing what is summarily described as a parade or convoy (**Figs 18, 23-24**). Walls of three courses high are assumed, based on the fact that later rock-cut 'house tombs' regularly show three such (faux) courses in their chamber walls. Multiplying the height of the attributed frieze blocks by three arrives at a height of c. 2.50-70m for the walls of Building G, proportionally similar to what is found in 'house tombs' (see Mühlbauer 2007: figs 324 and 351, especially the rock cut tomb façade CH I/8 at Limyra).

The chamber itself would be a roomy 3.32x5.46m in plan. In order to support the heavy, stone roof slabs, the excavators proposed a series of pillars in the chamber (see **Figs 24-25**), which would affect movement, but would not totally restrict it (*contra* Borchhardt 2000: 89n.97). The lateral spaces in the centre of the chamber, between the columns, would measure c. 3.40x1.60m (5.44m²) – larger than the chamber plans of Buildings H and F. As with Buildings H and F, there is no evidence for interior fixtures, unless a relief showing furniture legs found in the area, which has

been linked before with the Nereid Monument, belonged here (British Museum B308: Pryce 1928: 141, fig. 185; Baughan 2013: 380n.192).

Originally, the building's podium was reconstructed with two courses of orthostats, and subsequently raised even further with the tentative attribution of the cockerel and hen frieze, as noted above (**Fig. 26**, Coupel and Metzger 1976). There is actually only extant evidence for one course of podium orthostats, and it may not be necessary to insist on a very high podium, a feature which may be modeled on later monumental temple tombs like the Nereid Monument and the 'heroön' tomb of the fourth century Lycian dynast Perikle at Limyra (Borchhardt 1970; 1976; Şare 2013), but which is not always found in later 'house tombs'. Either way, though, unless one is to imagine steps, even a one-course podium of c. 1 m high would restrict ordinary foot access.

There is no actual evidence for the façades of the main chamber; the reconstruction is based on the spacing of the assumed internal pillar supports and the assumption that the building would have had step-framed, blind windows and doors similar to Buildings H and G. The resulting façade has a particular resemblance to the rock cut 'house tomb' CH I/8 at Limyra mentioned above (see Mühlbauer 2007: fig. 351), reinforcing the reconstruction. If there were two, narrow, double blind doors, as reconstructed, their inner panels would be 1.30m high and a mere 0.25m wide, which would not be useful for regular access.

If the building itself was not made to be accessed, the terrace was. As noted earlier, this was integrated with the south and west walls of the 'acropolis' precinct and formed a kind of bastion-like feature in this corner. A parapet along those edges seems likely, even if there is not physical evidence for one. The proportions of building to terrace would leave generous 2.70m wide spaces on either side, and a rectangular formation of stones on the north side is thought to have been the foundations of a ramp or stairs. The attribution of the three above-mentioned marble *peplophoros* statues to this terrace would partly cut down space, but not so much as to prevent movement on it.

It has been proposed that the terrace could have serviced some kind of cultic or ceremonial performance before the building, although this is not necessary (cf. Hüllden 2006: 201). There is no evidence of an altar or any small finds which would ascertain such use. The terrace would, however, form a mini-precinct or kind of *temenos* itself, giving the space and building a ceremonious quality and formalising human interactions with the area.

Discussion

To sum up, the forms of these three buildings, as far as can be reconstructed, suggest that they were sealed chambers, not intended for regular access. There is nothing in their design which encourages their identification as shrines, treasuries or androns, which generally have larger interiors and which would anyway require more useable entrances. Their sealed nature, as already mentioned, would ordinarily lead one to suspect a sepulchral function (cf. Marksteiner 1993a: 93; Hüllden 2006: 200). In appearance, their resemblance to later 'house tombs' in Lycia also points in this direction.

The sculptural repertoires are also related to those typically found in (usually later) tomb decoration (Metzger 1963: 61 and Keen 1998: 187). For example,

although antithetic sphinxes (as in the gable of Building H) are found earlier in the gable of the large sixth century rock cut votive monument called Arslankaya in the Phrygian Highlands (Haspels 1971: 87-89; figs 186-91 and 523; Berndt-Ersöz 2006: 222-24, no. 16, fig. 27), even closer examples of confronted, seated sphinxes are found on a gable relief of about 470-60 BC from Hellespontine Phrygia, usually thought to have belonged to a tomb (Istanbul Museum 5433 T; Nollé 1992: 123; Karagöz 2007; Karagöz 2013: 76-77, cat. 16, fig. 48), and a fifth century stele from Altıntaş in Western Phrygia, again presumed to be funerary (*MAMA* 6 1939: 126, no. 369, pl. 65; Pfuhl and Möbius 1977: vol. 1, no. 75, 31-32, fig. 19).

More certainly funerary and closer to home, sphinxes are shown in the gables of later Lycian sarcophagi, for example the Payawa Sarcophagus and Merehi Sarcophagus from Xanthus (Demargne 1974: S 5, 61-87, pls 28, 35-37 and S 4, 88-96, pls 47 and 53 respectively; see also S 1, pl. XXIV and pl. 23). There is, as well, a further removed, but more obvious example in the marble 'Lycian' sarcophagus from Sidon (Istanbul Museum 367 T; Schmidt-Dounas 1985; Langer-Karrenbrock 2000). And one might add here that the massive Hellenistic tumulus at Amphipolis in Macedonia, which hit the news in the summer of 2014, has two free-standing sculptures of seated, antithetic sphinxes in the arch above its door.

The Siren Gable attributed to Building F is unusual, but has some similarities with images of seated opposing figures shown in relief in later Lycian sarcophagus gables (for example those just cited; see also Bruns-Özgan 1996/1997). And the 'parade' frieze attributed to the side walls of Building G fits into a 'convoy' theme widely found in tombs in Achaemenid Asia Minor (Draycott 2010). A later Lycian parallel is a parade/convoy frieze from the side walls of Perikle's tomb at Limyra (Borchhardt 1970; 1976; Şare 2013). None of these themes are exclusively funerary, but the continued use of them for funerary monuments at least highlights a pattern, at the beginning of which the Xanthus buildings can be seen as standing.

Small finds associated with the area (**Fig. 8**, above) suggest votive and/or feasting activities may have taken place in the period prior to the erection of these buildings, but there is very little that is contemporary with the buildings. The bench or step before Building H could invite offerings and it is possible that the few contemporary and later finds next to the base of this building could have been offerings placed there or inside the chamber. There is nothing, however, which suggests cult to a deity or hero rather than offerings in memory of the dead, such as were left at later tombs in Lycia (Hülnden 2006: 198 and 350-51). Indeed, the fragment of white ground *lekythos* among these finds, a shape often associated with funeral rites and used as grave gifts in Athens, where they were made, could feasibly have had a sepulchral use here too.

These signs then support identifying these buildings as tombs, or sepulchral monuments, as most scholars would now have it. As most would also admit, however, this does not solve the issue of their nature; they resist categorisation as *simply* tombs.

One question not addressed elsewhere is how a deposition would have taken place. The restored blind doors of Building G would be very narrow, but could have allowed access for a deposition post construction if there were removable panels. Mortises on remains of the door parts from Building H, however, suggest these were fixed. With pillar tombs, the initial entombments (and there may have been only one) would presumably have taken place before the heavy caps were put in place over the

chambers. The same would be the case with later sarcophagi, which provided for further burials with more easily accessible hypogea below. If other depositions were to be placed in the main upper chambers, the lid would have to be removed, probably with great ceremony – but this would be possible (see e.g. *TL* 36 and *TL* 57: Bryce 1979; Bryce and Zahle 1986: 74-76; also Hüllden 2006: esp. 90-91 and 343; on Lycian sarcophagi see also İdil 1985; Strathmann 2002: 114-26).

Buildings F, G and H, on the other hand, would have required a different approach. If not accessible after construction, they would have had to be built up around a burial – or at least the upper levels would have had to be built post-deposition. Although tumuli might be raised over a grave following a deposition, monumental stone tombs were often constructed prior to death, in readiness – at least, that is known to be the case with some prominent examples (see the Inscribed Pillar and the Mausoleum of Halicarnassus, for instance) and is assumed to be the usual practice. Construction post death, and around a body would be uncommon and raises questions about the method of assemblage and deposition. Would, for instance, the blocks have been made in parts, awaiting assemblage when needed? This would also be unusual, and the variations in the way pieces were cut suggest ad hoc, experimental construction, which seems to exclude that. It is possible that the buildings were constructed first, and then disassembled in part when deposition was required, being reassembled relatively rapidly following that.

It is also possible that the buildings would not have taken that long to build and that a body could have been kept for some time while the structures were designed and erected post mortem. If so, the buildings were either pre-planned in theory or only designed after death, the latter suggesting an extraordinary response. Still, this would not be the only way to achieve a functional stone built tomb of this kind on the level bedrock of the ‘acropolis’. One could simply include removable door panels. Reasons for apparently not employing solution this could be practical (prevention of tomb robbing), but there could be a symbolic dimension. The odd construction leaves open possibilities that the buildings were used for the secondary burial of much older remains, or that they could have been symbolic rather than utilitarian, cenotaphs rather than sepulchres proper.

An issue which comes up more often in discussions of the unusual nature of the buildings is their location. On the one hand, Lycian tombs, both earlier pillar tombs and later types, were often intramural and integrated into the cityscapes of the region (see most recently Hüllden 2013). Indeed, if the structures shown in them are tombs and not public buildings themselves, ‘city reliefs’ in some later tomb sculptures (**Fig. 27**) highlight how integral tombs could be to the identities of Lycian cities (Childs 1978; Marksteiner 1993a: 90; 1993b; Borchhardt 1993: 31-32; Thomsen 2002: 267-69; Hüllden 2006: 178; Mühlbauer 2007: 183-85).

On the other hand, the space in which the three Xanthian buildings were erected differs subtly from the locations of many other Lycian tombs in its very public feel (cf. Bruns-Özgan 1987: 19). It appears to have been a planned area or precinct that did not attract ongoing burials, as one might perhaps expect if it were conceived of as a necropolis for a family of long standing power. And this was an area with other large buildings, seemingly including cult buildings and possibly including palatial or administrative buildings – characteristics which encouraged the use of the Greek term ‘acropolis’ to describe this area in the first place.

Later monumental tombs (often called ‘heroa’) can be contained within *temene*, but these tend to be discrete areas, cordoned off within the city space. Examples include the cluster of three large ‘house tombs’ at Phellus, which sit within a quarried *temenos* (Fig. 28; Zimmerman 2004; 2005; 2006) and the so-called ‘heroön’ at Trysa (Benndorf and Niemann 1889; Noll 1971; Oberleitner 1994; *temene* and tombs in general in Işık 1998 and Hüllden 2006: 323-35, esp. 323-25). There are examples of earlier ‘temenos tombs’ as well (e.g. the sixth century pillar tomb at Trysa: Marksteiner 2002: 225, cat. 48, fig. 3; Hüllden 2006: 201). The Nereid Monument at Xanthus and the ‘heroön’ of Perikle at Limyra, although perhaps not in *temene*, exactly, seem to have stood in a kind of splendid isolation within or over their cities.

Beyond their integration into a seemingly ‘public’ precinct, one might also argue that because later ‘house tombs’ resemble these three buildings does not mean that they shared the same function. As the excavators initially pointed out, both these buildings and the ‘house tombs’ may have drawn on the same source material. It is also quite possible that these buildings themselves influenced the development of the ‘house tombs’ in *form*, without having had exactly the same *function*.

Perhaps most importantly – indeed it is the point of this article – these buildings represent a significant architectural change, which distanced them from previous sepulchral structures such as the relatively recent and very impressive Harpy Monument. Certainly the pillar tombs were not ‘simply’ tombs either, but this only underscores the difference of this next generation of monuments, which did not compete in the same terms. Rather, they indicate a conceptual shift.

In order to get any further with understanding this shift, one needs to turn from considering purely practical aspects of function – essentially, worrying about what the buildings may have contained on the inside – to considering their external appearance, what this symbolised and how this may have functioned within the city space. In this respect, what seems to be ambiguity might be an important aspect of their design. That does not mean that they were designed to be deliberately ambiguous, but rather that they can be seen as structures which were specifically intended to perform several functions for the city, and for which architectural ideas were appropriated to create new ‘hybrid’ forms appropriate for this purpose that did not fit any established, recognisable type of building.

3. Models and meaning

The above discussion leads to the question of source materials – were these new stone buildings supposed to resemble or recall something in particular, and if so, what? In the literature this question concerning forerunners has largely been applied to Lycian ‘house tombs’ in general, rather than these buildings in particular. Several theories have been put forward. The traditional one, as is suggested by the common term for the tomb type, is that the models were Lycian houses, largely based on observations of similar looking modern timber-framed houses in the region, thought to represent continuity (Kjeldsen and Zahle 1975; Zahle 1979; cf. Thomsen 2002: 111n.32; Strathmann 2002: 83-114, esp. 92-93; Mühlbauer 2007).

Due in part to limited archaeological evidence for ancient houses employing such architecture and in part to the idea that the tombs might have drawn on more prestigious models, some have suggested other precursors. Jürgen Borchhardt has

proposed that the models were banquet houses – androns – which could explain the location of the Xanthian buildings as well as the banquet reliefs attributed to Building G (Borchhardt 1998: 156; Borchhardt 2000: 82-83; at 90 he suggests in fact that Building F could have served as an andron itself).

In a way related to this, Andreas Thomsen has argued that the forerunners may themselves have been funerary buildings – not wooden tomb chambers (*contra* Keen 1998: 184), which while appropriate for underground tumulus chambers (Henry 2010; 2013) might be less suitable for above-ground interments, but wooden buildings on top of burial podia or terraces, used for funerary cult activities such as feasting (Thomsen 2002: 316-56). His evidence for this was what he saw as the remains of cuttings for timber structures on the tops of terraces or podia containing burials in Central Lycia. The ‘petrification’ of such buildings, and the change of function from cult house to burial chamber, he linked to the potential influx of Achaemenid Persian burial customs and beliefs, in which a ‘house of the dead’ played a role (Thomsen 2002: 352-56).

This notion has been challenged by Oliver Hüllden, who besides pointing out that such Achaemenid beliefs are quite hypothetical themselves, argues that cuttings for supporting timber structures cannot be securely identified on the tops of terraces/podia that were certainly used for burials (Hüllden 2006: 172-81, and esp. 191-205). Marks which do seem to suggest a wooden superstructure are found on a monumental podium (podium 252) on an open area dubbed the ‘agora’ at the site of Avşar Tepesi in Central Lycia, but it is possible that this building may have been a public building such as a temple (Thomsen 2002: 108-13; Hüllden 2006: 179, with n. 813, pl. 17; Kolb 2008: 53-60; des Courtils 2012b: esp. 289-90, *contra* Kolb on the identification of the area as an ‘agora’).

This revives and strengthens an earlier proposal of Thomas Marksteiner that the forerunners of Lycian ‘house tombs’ could have been shrines (Marksteiner 1993a; cf. Strathmann 2002: 92-93; Hüllden 2006: 175-79). Marksteiner had pointed out that there is little evidence for the use of woodwork of the elaborate nature represented in the tombs in what scant remains there are of Lycian houses. He noted that there is better evidence for wooden or partly wooden superstructures in cuttings of blocks from shrines, such as the early temple of Apollo at the Letoon, located in the marshy plain below Xanthus (Marksteiner 1993a: esp. 91-92; Cavalier 2006: 333-34; on the Letoon: des Courtils 2009; Hansen and Le Roy 2012; Fouache et al., 2012). (Blocks with similar cuttings have been found at Xanthus, although out of context: Cavalier 2006: 333-34; Hüllden 2006: 177). In support of the idea of traditional wooden shrines in Lycia, Marksteiner also pointed to what appears to be a wooden edifice with a flat, log-built roof shown in the centre of the upper registers on later Roman period ‘12 God’ reliefs from the region (Marksteiner 1993a: 92-93; Freyer-Schauenburg 1994; Hüllden 2006: 177). Hüllden (2003) additionally points out an earlier small rock cut niche with ‘timber’-type façade decoration near Tyberissos in Central Lycia.

That cult buildings, shrines or temples specifically formed the models for the ‘house tombs’ of Lycia (and by extension the three Xanthus buildings), as opposed to other prestige palatial or public buildings, remains hypothetical, but the proposal is tempting. First, it would take the later ‘temple tombs’ of Lycia, such as the Nereid Monument, out of isolation. Rather than a new imitation of temple forms in tombs of the fourth century, one might see a (still significant) change in the style of temple,

from local timber tradition to Ionic style (Marksteiner 1993a: 93; Hülken 2006: 203). Second, this would help to explain why the buildings have the shrine-like appeal that raised questions about their function in the first place. Marksteiner (1993a: 93) described the buildings as having a mediating role between sacral and funerary architecture. This could be interpreted in the sense of formal evolution of the house tomb type, but it could also be taken in the sense of occupying a special role, different from the later house tombs, but exerting an influence on them.

If one considers the buildings purely in terms of funerary or memorial capacity, one could contextualise them in a period of particularly competitive tomb construction in Western Anatolia. Although the chronology is not refined, it is roughly around this time that unusual tombs such as the Pyramid Tomb at Sardis (Ratté 1992; Kleiss 1996; Dusingberre 2003: 138-41) and the tomb known as Taş Kule near Phocaea (Cahill 1988; Ateşlier 2004) were erected. But if one sees the Xanthus buildings as part of a larger urban project, they can be seen as part of competition with urban developments at other centres as well. Some of the fragments of large stone buildings found at Dascyleum may belong to public or palace buildings of the mid-fifth century, when a dynasty of Persian satraps was establishing the site as its seat of power (Kaptan 2002: 5-8; Aytekin 2007; İren and Atay 2012). The Persian King Xerxes is himself said to have been constructing a residence at Celaenae in southwestern Phrygia (Xenophon, *Anabasis*, 1.2.7-9; Summerer et al. 2011).

Closer to home, podium 252 at Avşar Tepesi, mentioned already above, is thought to have supported a monumental wooden building potentially dating to the early Classical period (Thomsen 2002: 108-13; Marksteiner 2006: 241; Kolb 2008: esp. 57-58). Finds such as that start to take the developments at Xanthus out of isolation. Although as yet there are no signs of similar stone structures built elsewhere, if other settlements were embellishing their public spaces with prestigious wooden structures, this puts the choice of developing stone imitations or versions of such at Xanthus into perspective (see Kolb 2000; 2008; 2009; and Kolb and Tietz 2001: esp. 365-69, esp. 368 on the contemporary primacy of Avşar Tepesi [ancient Zagaba?] in Central Lycia; also Işık 2010b on other possible temples).

The Xanthus buildings can also be seen not just as individual structures, but as a set, which together imparted a particular effect. As already said, they seem to have been placed not in their own discrete *temenos*, but within and around an important public/palatial part of the city. The shrine-like aspect of the buildings and their positioning, especially on the cliff edges overlooking the river below and landscape beyond (**Figs 3-4 and 19**), recalls the ways that Greek sanctuaries were adorned with smaller temples, treasuries and *oikoi* alongside larger buildings. One thinks not just of the major pan-Hellenic sanctuaries such as Olympia and Delphi, with their collections of treasuries, but city acropoleis – perhaps most obviously the acropolis of Athens, which up until it was damaged by the Persians in 480 BC was adorned with the small archaic Temple of Athena Nike on its western promontory as well as a series of small buildings, *oikemata*, now represented only by parts of limestone relief-carved pediments (Hurwit 1999: 112-16, 124). These last may have survived or been repaired, and new ones added in the second half of the fifth century (Hurwit 1999: 116, 142).

As noted, the area in which the three buildings were erected is usually called the ‘acropolis’ of Xanthus. The term was used by Herodotus to describe a place in Xanthus (1.176 – the area where the Xanthians took refuge and then set alight during

the conquest of Harpagus the Mede; Keen 2002: 29-30) and is known in the Greek text of the Inscribed Pillar (TL 44c 26 – the son of the Lycian Harpagus is described as having conquered many *acropoleis*). This is, however, largely an external, *etic*, Greek (and modern) identification of this space (Keen 2002: esp. 30; Işık 2010a; des Courtils 2012b). The term may, however, have relevance for the internal, Lycian, *emic* vision of what this place would become with the fifth century construction project, aesthetically if not functionally or politically. One might see the introduction of these new buildings as part of a plan to create a sanctuary-like, ‘acropolis effect’, to some extent modeled on and in competition with the acropoleis of major cities with which the Xanthians were in touch, such as Athens. That the Athenian acropolis was at this time itself left partly unreconstructed following the Persian destruction, as least in its major temple architecture (Hurwit 1999: 141-45), need not preclude this; it could even be seen as a stimulus to would-be rivals keen to take advantage and outstrip it. In this way, although not the same kind of buildings, and nor, importantly, the same kind of space as one might find in a classical Greek city, the design of the three small buildings may have been conceived of as part of a plan to crown Xanthus with its own kind of ‘acropolis’.

Considering this aspect of their function, the particular form chosen for these buildings – the ‘timber style’ – is all the more remarkable. An Ionic column shown in relief in the centre of the Siren Gable attributed to Building F (**Fig. 15**) suggests that it would have been possible to use Ionian style architecture if that had been desired. The choice of imitating wooden structures may have been guided in part by competition with monumental wooden shrines being erected at other places in Lycia, and which may well have been prominent at Xanthus’ own extra mural sanctuary, the Letoon. But the choice to use this type of architecture as a model for these structures also implies a deliberate attempt to reify a distinctively Lycian type of architecture.

It has been argued that the choice of mixed Ionic and Doric orders, as well as use of some ‘Persian’ looking elements in the buildings at the Carian sanctuary of Labraunda may have been an attempt to distinguish a Carian architectural identity (Carstens 2009; Held 2011). Something similar could be the case here, but rather than drawing on the tools of Ionic and Doric architecture, the designers drew on another model altogether. Such a move would be particularly significant in this period, when Lycia, positioned at the interface of the Delian League and Persian territory, was making decisions about its political allegiances. This is not so much because choosing an architectural style used by either the Persians or the Greeks would directly indicate political and cultural affiliation – the above-mentioned monumental buildings at the Persian satrapal seat of Dascyleum in fact seem to have included Ionic elements (Aytekin 2007) – but because choosing an entirely distinctive one indicates a strong expression of independent ambition, befitting the economic benefits Lycia was experiencing (cf. Childs 1981: 61 and Zahle 1991: esp. 145 on Lycian independent cultural identity; also on cultural contact and the emergence of local identities in general, see e.g. Asheri 1983 and the ‘glocalisation’ of Vlassopoulos 2013).

It is worth here briefly commenting on other aspects which show the level of investment and innovation involved in this project. A number of explanations have been put forward concerning the origins and nature of the unique pillar tombs of Lycia (recently, Froning 2002: 142-43; Hüllden 2006: 26-31 and 340-42), but apart from any eschatological meanings, the ability to extract and erect such large monoliths indicates impressive quarrying and engineering skills. The acropolis

buildings departed from this, requiring rather more finesse. The method of supporting the roofing slabs of Building G, even if not the hypothesised pillars, suggests some experimentation with translating this kind of roof into stone form. Other aspects of the stone working such as the tight fit of the blocks and a water drainage system incorporated into those same roofing slabs (see Appendix) appear to be quite developed, however, suggesting some practice with this form of construction, or rapid development of the skills needed, even if it is not clear how effective these solutions were.

Innovation was not limited to the masonry; the sculpture too shows advanced aspects. The *peplophoros* statues may or may not have adorned the terrace of Building G, but they still show that importation of marble sculptures in the contemporary early Classical style was part of the wider scheme (Poggio 2010). The reliefs indicate iconographic initiatives too: the sphinxes on the gables of Building H are shown with breasts, an unusual feature at this time, less so later on (Boardman 1995: 189; Rudolph 2003: 59).

The ‘parade’ frieze on Building G has often been compared to the processional reliefs on the Apadana stairs at Persepolis in Iran and Elspeth Dussinberre has recently highlighted seemingly replicated details such as the bend of horses’ knees (Dussinberre 2013: 224). Others have pointed out that this frieze shows the earliest known example of the ‘flying mantle’ – the cloaks of riders and charioteers are shown flying out behind shoulders (Rudolph 2003: 63). One of the horses is also cleverly shown jumping over one of the faux cross beam ends below it. In general one gets a sense of different rhythms of movement and interactions of participants in the procession (see **Fig. 18**, esp. block B313a), reminiscent of the changes in pace and jostling seen in the frieze of the Parthenon (cf. Castriota 1992: 221-27; Boardman 1995: 189-90; on Parthenon frieze, Neils 2001). The latter did not yet exist.

The careful crafting of these buildings as shrine-like ornaments of the city, collectively contributing to the impression of a special sacred ‘acropolis’-like space may help to explain the genesis of this new Lycian architecture at the time: an architectural type associated with traditional local ceremonial buildings, including shrines, was appropriated to enrich the profile of the city as a rapidly growing urban centre of power.

This has two further corollaries that must be considered: first, this could imply that that idea of an ‘acropolis’, or something along those lines, would have been considered an important mark of a city – a part of a ‘dress code’ in the way that civic architecture like theatres, stoas, agoras and their public buildings such as the prytaneum and assembly rooms came to be for Greek poleis, especially from the fourth century on (Hansen and Fischer-Hansen 1994; Morgan and Coulton 1997: esp. 103-16; Hansen and Nielsen 2004: 138-43).

It may be the case that high points were monumentalised as part of increasing urban transformations and compartmentalisations of Mediterranean city spaces in the sixth and fifth centuries BC (see brief mention in Neer 2012: 81; Hölscher 1991: esp. 365-68, tangentially), but to what extent a rather specific idea or iconography of an ‘acropolis’ was reified and imitated at cities at this time, in the Mediterranean or Near East, is not clear. As noted above, Athens’ own acropolis was not redeveloped (at least its major architecture) until the so-called Periclean Programme some ten or so years later. How far the Xanthus project was part of a broader trend, then, requires further consideration (see Thomsen 2002: 19-71, and especially 65 and 68 on

contemporary Avşar Tepesi; Katchadourian 2014: esp. 138-39 briefly on variations in central space creation in towns within the Achaemenid Empire).

The second corollary returns us to the memorial or sepulchral function of the buildings. If the organisation and form of these buildings can be explained in part as an attempt to create an 'acropolis effect', does this mean that they were merely follies serving the aesthetics of the city? Or did this bring along with it rather deeper changes concerning the role of memorial monuments, the people they honored and the idea of Xanthus?

4. 'Heroa' for the city?

The term 'heroa' often applied to the Xanthian buildings in the literature is both vague and useful. Vague, in that it avoids making clear whether the structures celebrate the memory of 'heroes' in the sense of long dead Homeric heroes and/or legendary founders; whether they imply belief in 'heroisation' – i.e. some kind of 'apotheosis' or transfiguration into a supernatural being – either of the long dead or more recently dead, potentially involving cult worship; or whether they 'heroise' whoever they represent by elevating them as objects of admiration, even veneration, for a given community. Useful, in that even if it is not possible to decide on the first two definitions of 'heroa', the third may be a helpful way of thinking about how the above-discussed shrine-like aspect of these buildings worked for a new kind of memorial, and why this design may have been important in the urban plan.

Who did these monuments memorialise, if anyone in particular? No inscriptions help here; they do not appear on Lycian stone monuments until later in the fifth century. There are two main options. The prevailing opinion, not always stated outright, is that they served as tombs or monuments in honour of the ruling family of the time: Kuprilli and his court. The other option is that they were 'heroa' proper: monuments erected in the memory of long dead local heroes. This last idea was most forcefully put forward by Keen, who called the 'Lycian acropolis' a 'cult complex' and identified Building G as the Sarpedonion, a monument to the Lycian hero of that name, described by Appian in his account of the Brutus' siege on the city in 42 BC (Appian, *The Civil Wars* 4.10.76-80; Keen 1992, 1998: 182-96; further, Bryce and Zahle 1986: 27; Borchhardt 2000: 89n.97; Dusinberre 2013: 222-25, who follows Keen's idea of the cult complex, but sees G as a ruler's tomb; see now Cavalier 2015, *non vide*).

It should be inserted here that there are seemingly two Sarpedons associated with early Lycia (Bryce and Zahle 1986: 11-35; Keen 1998: 208-10; Benda-Weber 2005: 254-67; Durnford 2008). Homer names one, a son of Zeus who famously fought, and died, in the Trojan War, and was afterwards transported to his native land of Lycia for burial (*Iliad* e.g. 2.876-77, 16.671-83; Keen 1998: 208n.129 for further references). This Sarpedon was a grandson of Bellerophon, who had himself come to Lycia from the Argolid and there slew the Chimaera (Bryce and Zahle 1986: 14-16; Keen 1998: 211-12; Strathmann 2002: 21-26). Herodotus (1.173.1-3) speaks of a seemingly earlier founder hero of the same name, also a son of Zeus, but a brother of Minos, from Crete. Although later writers struggled to reconcile the chronology of the founder and the Trojan War hero, proposing two different men (e.g. Diodorus 5.79.3) or one long-lived one (Apollodorus, *Library* .3.1.2) this distinction may not have been a concern earlier on (Bryce and Zahle 1986: 21; Keen 1998: 208-09).

There are problems with Keen's identification of Building G (Hülken 2006: 330; see Thomsen 2002: 110 and Cavalier 2015 alternative candidates), but it is useful to start with some positives. In the first place, while the three Xanthus buildings were erected at a time of monumental tomb building and urbanisation at various sites in Western Anatolia, as mentioned above, they can also be placed in a context of increasing interest in founding heroes in the Mediterranean. Most obviously, perhaps, in 476 BC the Athenian general Cimon collected the bones of Theseus and brought them to Athens, where a kind of temple to the hero was erected (Plutarch, *Life of Cimon*; *LIMC* s.v. 'Theseus' [Neils]; Shapiro 1991; Turner 2014; hero cult in general: Hägg 1999). In the Troad, the identification of old tumuli and even natural small hills as the tombs of fallen Homeric heroes may have begun in the fifth century or before (Rose 2013: chs 2 and 8; Rose and Körpe at press; cf. Persian magi sacrificing to heroes in Herodotus 7.43).

Stories of migrations and the founding of settlements in Ionia and Aiolia on the Western coast of Turkey have been seen by scholars as at least partly later rhetorical tools, employed in arguments surrounding shifting political allegiances and cultural identities. These stories seem to have gained in intensity in the fifth century BC, when relationships with the Delian League and Athens were important (Lemos 2007; Rose 2008; Greaves 2010; Mac Sweeney 2013; Mac Sweeney 2014; differently, Dusinger 2013: 222-25 on hero cults as local responses to Achaemenid rule).

Earlier and elsewhere heroic founders (oikists/*ktistes* and/or *tritopateres*) were also being touted and monuments are said to have been erected to them in prominent public spaces, most often agoras, at places such as Cyrene, Miletos and poleis on Sicily and in South Italy (Herda 2013). Coins of Kuprilli which copy the Zeus Ammon of Cyrene illustrate the extent of Xanthus' contact with such cities (Mørkholm and Zahle 1972: esp. A33 and a49-50, 67, pl. 4 and 106-08). The Athenian Acropolis too had heroa – apparently accessible shrines, but incorporating tombs – to early kings of the city such as Pandion, Erechtheus and Cecrops. The first was perhaps built in the 440s, but the others may have been around for longer, and consolidated in a Cimonian period 'pre-Erechtheion' building project (Hurwit 1999: 144-45, 188-89).

As for local evidence for Sarpedon, inscriptions attest that by the Hellenistic period there were games in his honour (*SEG* 28: 1248) and demes of Xanthus and Tlos named after him (*TAM* 2: 264.2, 265.1 and 597.a.2 [cf. *SEG* 37: 1234.12]; see Keen 1998: 194, 210 and Robert 1990: 412-13; Benda-Weber 2005: 299). This may be a part of the very busy politics of the Hellenistic period and cannot be simply retrojected back onto earlier Lycia. However, the traditions of both Homer and Herodotus indicate that the connection between Sarpedon and Lycia was alive and important in earlier times.

In particular, Herodotus' foundation stories suggest that such myths may have been an issue for Lycians around the time he was writing in the 430s BC. According to his story (1.173.1-3), Sarpedon, having been driven out of Crete by Minos, came to what was called 'Milyas' with a group of followers, pushing out the original group of Milyans living there. At this point, according to Herodotus, Sarpedon's group called themselves Termilai. Later, Lycus, an Athenian prince who had also been expelled by his brother Aigeos, arrived at the court of Sarpedon, and it is from him that the Lycians eventually took their name.

This story smacks of a reconciled argument over the foundation and cultural identity of Lycia, which may have been bound up in the same politics surrounding the Greco-Persian Wars and alliances with the Delian League that affected the migration stories mentioned above. Homer's Sarpedon has Greek ancestry, suggesting Lycian-Hellenic relations were mooted earlier, but Herodotus' story specifically makes Sarpedon a *non-Greek*. In this scenario, Lycus would form a precedent for Lycia's bonds with and obligations to Athens, while Sarpedon would represent an alternative, non-Hellenic identity (cf. Borchhardt 1990b: 30-31 on significance of the Minos stemma and Borchhardt 2000: 92-93 on Lycus, but not Sarpedon; also Benda-Weber 2005: 290-96, 300-01 on Bellerophon as the main 'Greek' ancestor of the Lycians [not covering Lycus]).

Such an alternative cultural identity may be significant in terms of the distinctive architectural style chosen to adorn the acropolis at this time of political pressure, and it is notable that where clear in later fifth and fourth century inscriptions, Lycians called themselves *Trmmili* – a name obviously related to that of Sarpedon's 'Termilai' (Bryce and Zahle 1986: 21-23, 29-35; Keen 1998: 30; cf. Thonemann 2009 on strongly Asiatic, non-Greek identity of Lycians by the later fifth century). Another tradition which could suggest an alternative, possibly *autochthonic* Lycian identity was apparently recounted by Herodotus' relative (uncle?), Panyasis, himself an epic poet. A fragment of one of his texts (Fragment 18 K) preserved by Stephanus Byzantinus (s.v. Τρεμίλη) says a *Tremiles* sired, via a nymph called Praxidike, the eponymous founders of cities in the Xanthus valley: Tloos (Tlos), Xanthos, Pinaros (Pinara); and Kragos (Matthews 1974: 100-08; Bryce and Zahle 1986: 21-22; Keen 2002: 29).

Such stories suggest that founder heroes of Lycia were a topic of discussion around the time these buildings were constructed and allows the possibility that they could be monuments honoring such figures. Of the issues that could be raised against such an identification, two may not be as problematic as one might think: first, the accessibility of the buildings is not addressed by Keen, but 'heroa' to long dead heroes could take a variety of forms, including cenotaphs and *mnemata*. If the Sarpedon imagined was killed by Patroclus at Troy and buried in Lycia (this could be both the Cretan founder and Homer's Lycian prince, if conflated), then a tomb or tomb-like monument would be a particularly obvious choice (as Keen 1992: 56). (It might be noted that although Appian's words are sometimes translated as stating that the Romans took refuge *in the temple* of Sarpedon, he says simply παρὰ τὸ Σαρπηδόνειον – beside the Sarpedonion [see again Cavalier 2015 on Appian and the Sarpedonion].) The issues surrounding deposition and the construction of these buildings, addressed in Section Two, above, could even encourage a view of these buildings as cenotaphs and therefore symbolic tombs for imagined rather than recently dead.

A second seeming problem with identifying the buildings as monuments to mythical heroes, as Keen himself admitted (1998: 191-92), is that although mythical creatures are included in the sculptures of the three Xanthian 'heroa', none depicts heroic exploits. In fact, as noted already, there are certain continuities in self-styling from the reliefs on the Harpy Monument, and the 'parade' or 'convoy' theme on Building G is most closely related to imagery employed in contemporary Achaemenid Anatolian tombs for, one presumes, the recently dead. This might lead one to associate the buildings with mortals, rather than immortals. But it should be remembered that is not a given that a heroön should carry images of mythological

exploits; such monuments could, theoretically, draw on the same repertoire of images used for the decoration of tombs or other monuments celebrating mortals, without concerning themselves about whether non-initiates would be able to identify the specific honoree. Such decoration could even complement the tomb-like aspect of cenotaphs for heroes.

More compelling may be the erection of the buildings as a set. Keen in fact raises this in support of seeing the buildings as heroic cult installations, remarking that it would be 'odd that three tombs should be built in this part of the acropolis when two other certain dynastic tombs, the Harpy Tomb which predates Building G and the Inscribed Pillar which postdates it, were built in a different area... If F, G and H were tombs, some reason must be found for their being given special attention' (Keen 1998: 188; cf. Keen 1992). Keen suggested that Buildings F and H may have been subsidiary monuments to other Lycian heroes or treasuries of the cult (1998: 189). Their sealed nature does not encourage the latter interpretation, but if the former, are we to imagine then that the three monuments honour three Lycian heroes or a group of *tritopateres*, such as were honored at some other cities around the Mediterranean (Herda 2013; cf. Borchhardt 2000: 89n.97)?

This is possible and there are names available: Homer's Bellerophon and Glaukos, Herodotus' Lycus, Panyasis' Termilas and Xanthos himself, but one is pressing up against the limits of evidence here. The grouping of three buildings, although unusual, does not preclude their identification as dynastic tombs. The three rock cut 'heroa' tombs at Phellus (**Fig. 28**), which seem to have been made for depositions of bodies of mortals, would provide an example of such a grouping, albeit later (Hüllden 2006: 324). Those buildings are more accessible than the Xanthus ones, but the difficulties with the construction of the Xanthus buildings and the deposition of bodies within them, while suggesting possible use as cenotaphs need not exclude their use as sepulchers.

Links between the sculptures of the Xanthus buildings and those on the Harpy Monument would seem to fit comfortably into a scenario of court continuity. I have argued elsewhere that the Harpy Monument's reliefs mark a turn from previous representation of individual masculine exploits to the representation of a dynastic house (Draycott 2007). The three 'acropolis' buildings could feasibly be seen as a progression of this idea, accommodating several generations and asserting a projected longevity of a fairly newly established dynasty.

If these buildings were successors of the Harpy Monument as dynastic tombs, as well, this could account for a perceived gap in monumental tomb construction at Xanthus between the erection of these buildings and that of the Inscribed Pillar at the end of the fifth century (Borchhardt 1980: 7; Childs 1981: 61; Borchhardt 1990a: 46; Zahle 1991: 152; Keen 1992 [indirectly]; Borchhardt 1998: 157). The three may have been conceived of as catering to the same group for several generations, a legacy broken by the owner of the Inscribed Pillar, who 60 years or so later wanted to make his own, different statement.

Again, aspects of the Harpy Monument's east relief (**Fig. 17**) recall audience scenes like those in Persian court art, but they also recall votive images to deities from the Greek world in a way which may convey a particularly venerable status for the person or persons honoured by that monument (Draycott 2007). The adoption of buildings which perhaps resembled shrines and effectively formed special kinds of

honorific tombs for members of the same court could enhance this kind of claim, moving the recipients onto a higher plane.

This would not be just a simple next step; it would imply something fundamental about the way the honorees were understood. But it is also not necessary to see this as a move to ‘heroisation’, per se. This issue has been extensively discussed by Hüllden in his book on Lycian tombs, in a section where he interrogates the use of the term ‘heroa’, so often applied to monumental Lycian tombs (Hüllden 2006: 340-52, esp. 348-52).

While it might be tempting to associate the spread of the ‘house tomb’, whether tied to notions of a ‘house of the dead’ or a cult building, as a spread of new eschatological beliefs (Marksteiner 2002: 186), as Hüllden points out (2006: 204 and 349), there are no pre-Hellenistic inscriptions that enable any resolution on eschatological concepts which might accompany this architectural shift (cf. similarly Jacobs 2010, on the tombs of Persian kings and religious beliefs). He suggests that the only way one might be able to infer such beliefs are through either architecture or small finds which might indicate long standing cult. Yet although aspects such as towering height, provision of forecourts, location and offerings are telling concerning status, it is unclear whether these specifically indicate cultic worship of apotheosised or ‘heroised’ dead as opposed to mortuary ritual in remembrance of the dead (2006: especially 326-27 and 351; cf. in contrast Işık 2001/2 and 2003).

As noted above, there are signs that offerings may have been left at Building H and the ramp or steps to the platform of Building G might have invited use of that space, but one must be careful not to claim this as evidence of new tomb cult in the sense of worship. No altars or anything which would indicate performance on a grand scale has been found. Ideas about eschatological status cannot and should not be excluded, but neither can they be positively interpreted (cf. again Jacobs 2010 and Draycott at press on equivocal data for interpretation of such beliefs).

Without needing to *insist* on beliefs in some kind of apotheosis, the term ‘heroa’ might, however, still be useful in the third sense described above: the raising up of certain parties for the admiration of the community. Hüllden (2006: 351-52) notes that the concept of heroisation is an ‘intellectual crutch’ for realising a phenomenon of elevating particular personalities, particularly rulers, even in their own lifetimes. If one takes the pillar tombs as having provided such a service, however, one still needs to try to account for how the Xanthian ‘heroa’ might have done this in a new way.

One potential opening for this is to return again to the notion of monuments to founders, which might not be restricted to mythological heroes. At this time there were statues, cenotaphs and other markers being erected not only for those long dead figures, but also for political, cultural and civic ‘heroes’. Honorific portraits seem to have crystallised in this period, with statues of generals at Delphi, Themistocles apparently on the agora at Magnesia on the Maeander (Calza 1964: 11-14, pl. 1; Richter and Smith 1984: 210-12, figs 173-74) and somewhere, possibly, Pindar (Richter and Smith 1984: 176-80, fig. 140; Bergemann 1991; for the emergence of honorific portraits see also Tanner 1992 and 2006: 97-140).

It has been argued that there was an intramural honorific tomb erected for Thales of Miletos, possibly already in the sixth century BC (Herda 2013). The term ‘hero’ was not always applied for these figures or mythological heroes; a later sacred

law from Cyrene calls its founder Battos *archagetes* – ‘first leader’ (a term which seems, however, to have usually been reserved for the gods recommending colonisation campaigns; Herda 2013: 87n. 96). Albeit later, a Hellenistic honorific grave for an historical Sicyonian is said to have called him ‘founder and saviour of the city’ (Plutarch, *Aratus* 53.3; Pausanias 2.8.1; Herda 2013: 88n. 105).

The three buildings erected on the Xanthian ‘acropolis’ then could have been made to honour and memorialise contemporary Xanthians, quite possibly Kuprlli and his family, as founders, or refounders and new leaders of the city, in much the way the later and grander Mausoleum of Halicarnassus did its eponymous occupant. In the case of that singular monument, offerings found at the bottom of the stairs to the tomb chamber below could relate to more esoteric concepts attached to Mausolus following his death, and the reliefs include mythological events which pertain to the history of Caria (Hüllden 2001; Carstens 2009; 2013; McGowen 2013; Carstens at press). This may not have been the case at Xanthus, where more limited dynastic concerns could have guided the decoration and number of monuments, while an urge to suggest something new about the role of the honorees steered the choice of architectural form and placement.

If recognised in some way as ‘founder monuments’, then knowledge of this might explain why Building G could feasibly have been taken as a Sarpedonion in the Roman period, centuries later, by which time structures could have been reidentified with a mythological hero strongly associated with Lycia’s early history (but again see Cavalier 2015 for an alternative building). It could also explain why this area remained seemingly untouched for centuries. That idea is complicated by the fact that in the Hellenistic period the Harpy Monument seems to have been identified as a heroön (possibly of a Kybernis, no less) – something suggested by a series of burials collected around its foot (Cavalier and des Courtils 2012; refs to earlier literature in Hüllden 2006: 330n.374). But the status of this ‘Kybernis’ may at that time have been imagined differently to that of the recipients of the ‘acropolis heroa’, and the ‘acropolis’ as a space some 300 years earlier in the fifth century BC.

In the end, though, just as it is not imperative to decide whether these buildings were primarily ‘funerary’ or ‘religious’, tombs or *heroa*, in order to look beyond that issue and see how their design could play a role in articulating an impressive new cityscape, neither is it necessary to make a forced either/or decision about specific occupants or recipients of these monuments in order to grasp their basic role for the physical and mental architecture of Kuprlli’s Xanthus. Whether erected to long lost heroic ancestors who will remain anonymous to us or intended for Kuprlli and his court, or some other party altogether, the addition of these buildings to the city space would still have provided new focal points, and communicated the special status of certain people held up as central to the idea of the city (cf. Hölscher 1991: esp. 35; Hüllden 2006: 200).

This would make an impression both on the city’s foreign contacts, but importantly also on its own citizens/subjects, who may have erected the monuments *for* their ‘heroes’ (cf. Tanner 2000; 2006 for the imposition of expectations on those honored), or whose loyalty and awe pressured community leaders may have wanted to win. Ultimately, their function would be to consolidate both the built architecture of the city and its community. It is this which is important in the design choice made here: these monuments had properties capable of generating a monumental, sanctuary-esque ‘acropolis effect’ and, alongside this, exalting chosen parties in a

way which had not been done before, potentially using a new architectural language to distinguish them as ‘founders’ or ‘refounders’ of a city in transformation. In this way, one could say that Kuprilli’s city plan had ‘heroa’ at its heart.

Conclusion

The term ‘acropolis’ may be used in the Greek epigram on the Inscribed Pillar (as is ‘agora’: *TL* 44c), but as Fahri Işık and Jacques des Courtils have been at pains to point out, such Greek terms (and this would include ‘heroa’) can misleadingly imply ideas and structures more commonly associated with Greek cities, from which the spaces and monuments at Xanthus ought to be distinguished (most recently Işık 2010a; des Courtils 2012b; cf. related Borchhardt 2000: 90; Keen 2002; Keen and Hansen 2004; Hüllden 2006: 330-35). Although the monumental tombs along its edges do seem to suggest that it was an important public central space, the so-called ‘agora’ north of the ‘acropolis’ at Xanthus does not seem to have had any civic buildings in the pre-Roman period. Acropoleis might have heroa, sometimes conceived of as tombs, as per the case of the Cecropeion on the Athenian Acropolis, and this could potentially have served as a model for the Xanthus project, but one should be careful not to assume that the spaces were conceived of in the same way.

Further, although one might assume that new ceremonies accompanied the revision or consolidation of the Xanthian city space (Harmanşah 2011a), and even new eschatological ideas, one should not assume beliefs and practices akin to those bound up in ‘heroisation’ as it developed in the Hellenic world. In fact, as noted above, in the Hellenistic period it seems that it was the Harpy Monument on the so-called ‘agora’ that was identified as the tomb of a ‘hero’, collecting further burials around it – behavior which is not known to have been associated with the three monuments on the ‘acropolis’ of the city. In that sense, they differ from that kind of heroön and that kind of heroisation, as imagined in the Hellenistic period.

The terms ‘acropolis’ and ‘heroön’ have been used here really as analogies to try and describe the character of the unusual developments at Xanthus. It may be, however, that such terms were not totally alien to Lycian thought at the time of their construction. The use of the term ‘acropolis’ in the Greek on the Inscribed Pillar shows some awareness of that term, seemingly as it pertained to ‘citadel’. What has been argued here, though, is that the forms of Buildings F, G and H may have been selected as part of a specific plan to give the promontory a sanctuary-like profile, which could function visually as an answer to the prestigious high sanctuaries and acropoleis of Greek cities with which Xanthus was in touch – Delphi and Athens, for instance. This may have been a conscious act. That is not to say that the area was conceived of as the *same* kind of ‘acropolis’, but that the design deliberately gave it an appeal similar to such high, monumentalised spaces.

The buildings themselves, which seem to have been sealed, entombing structures, and which show some continuities from the Harpy Monument in sculpture, architecturally conveyed in both placement and form profound differences from that memorial. If one thinks of pillar tombs as holding certain parties up for community honour, Buildings F, G and H were a new order of monument, which may have drawn on sacral architecture, and which would have expected a different reaction from their public. The integration of the buildings into a special, prominent and seemingly public precinct of the city is in some ways comparable to the erection of public

monuments honouring heroes – also a practice at cities (perhaps not only *Greek* cities) with which Xanthus was in touch. While the term ‘heroa’ has often been loosely used to convey the quasi-funerary, religious qualities of these monuments, this has not been explained or unpacked as an historical phenomenon. These buildings mark an historical point when a new concept important to the city was introduced – a concept comparable to if not precisely the same as that informing the construction of ‘heroa’ elsewhere, and which the architecture of the buildings was designed to capture.

Every narrative about cities creates its own cities (Price 2006). When addressing the character of places such as Lycia, there can be a tendency to lean toward perceived cultural poles: Hellenic, Anatolian, Persian, other Near Eastern, depending on the academic and political frameworks in which the writer is operating. Certainly, the developments at Xanthus can be placed in the context of a long tradition of Near Eastern rulers, including the Achaemenids, building grand monuments as part of the expected obligations of rule (Waters 2014: e.g. 11, 26, 30, 44; Osborne 2014: esp. 201 and 205; on comparing Lycian cities with Near Eastern cities see now also Borchhardt and Bleibtreu 2013, *non vide*). As noted above, the parade frieze of Building G may be seen as a local response to the processional reliefs in Persian palace sculpture. One could also emphasise ‘native’ Anatolian aspects. That the ‘timber style’ in stone seems to have drawn on a Lycian vernacular architecture has been stressed, but one could frame this in longer, broader Anatolian monumental timber building traditions (Işık 1996, esp. highlighting Phrygia). The character of monumental architecture in the Eastern Mediterranean basin, especially at cities along the Anatolian coast such as Tarsus, is not well known, but could have been a major influence.

As well, the tighter Xanthian urban context is important. The ‘heroa’ need to be seen within a wider urban plan involving other monuments, about which little is understood, and within long term understandings of the city’s spaces (Harmanşah 2011b; 2013; Osborne 2014). Building inscriptions of earlier Syro-Anatolian rulers emphasise fortifications (Osborne 2014: 204-05) and it is notable that in the later Lycian ‘city reliefs’ that may show tombs so prominently (**Fig. 27**), walls are another feature constantly emphasised. The positioning of Buildings H and G at the edges of the ‘acropolis’ could relate to defensive concerns.

Whether Building/Residence B survived in use makes a difference. If so, the Xanthus developments could be compared to the earlier practice of monumentalising ‘acropoleis’ or citadels in the Syro-Anatolian kingdoms, where shrines and palaces intermingled, and where community consolidation was conceived of within top-down authority (Osborne 2014). The ‘heroa’ in this case would be an extension of this. If there were no palace/residence, a potential change in use of space means they could be read as part of quite a different ethos. As things stand, previous cultic or ceremonial activities in the same area, indicated by votives and feasting pottery, suggest it was already a special place, underscoring the distinctive position of the three new buildings, which could literally build on this, even if they did not replace predecessors.

The discussion here has framed the extraordinary programme at Xanthus in terms of a Mediterranean outlook. This is not to dismiss other spheres of influence and dynamics, by any means, but such an outlook is also a crucial aspect of Lycia, perhaps more than ever before at this time of sea battles and engagement with the maritime Delian League (cf. Keen 1993; 1998: 31-33). Strong contacts with what is

often lumped together as the ‘Greek world’ are shown through the importation of pottery, marble sculptures (Poggio 2010) and the early Classical style employed for the sculptures of the buildings examined here. Jan Zahle (1991), while noting what were for him strong Persianisms in coin motifs and the sculpture of Building G also notes that the coinage which flourishes in Lycia can be seen as an offshoot of Greek coinage (albeit seemingly not traded with them). Some coins imitate motifs of various cities in the Aegean and Eastern Mediterranean (Mørholm and Zahle 1972) and there were close connections with Rhodes from early on; even the Lycian script is thought to have been derived from the archaic Greek script used on Rhodes (Bryce and Zahle 1986: 55; Rhodian connections: Metzger 1963: 12, 78; Keen 1998: 29). Indeed, as the traditions of Sarpedon and Lycus show, there were debates about to what extent Lycians were themselves of Hellenic stock.

Lycian engagement with the Mediterranean could have placed them in a position of competing with cities boasting impressive acropoleis and heroa, and it may be significant that the ‘acropolis effect’ proposed here would have been best perceived from the approach to the city from the sea to the South, looking up at the promontory (see **Fig. 4**). The Xanthus material shows well enough itself that such ideas would not have been imported wholesale, but would have formed pieces in a bricolage that served the specific aims of Kuprlli’s city, and one assumes Kuprlli himself. While participating in a recognisable type of monumentality on the one hand, the buildings also effectively distinguished the city of Xanthus, and contributed to the creation of a particularly Lycian culture.

The architecture of the Xanthian ‘heroa’ is essential in understanding the particular kind of city being created in this period of shifting engagements and redefinition. Although Lycia’s political and urban structures may remain enigmatic in many details, it is clear that these ‘heroa’ were part of a period of great significance for Lycia – one which would shape Lycia for generations to come, and one which has broader consequences for the modeling of Mediterranean history in the period of the Delian League, with all its economic and cultural complexities.

Appendix: Catalogue of remains attributed to the ‘heroa’, with comments

Building F (Metzger 1963: Ch. 7, 71-75; Bruns-Özgan 1987: cat. M6)

Base: remains of base *in situ*, c. 1m southwest of Building D, consisting of steps cut from bedrock and some built masonry on the southwest corner (**Figs 9 and 10**, Metzger 1963: pl. 49). Reconstructed as a three-stepped base.

Base frieze?: 11 fragmented blocks from a frieze showing fighting cocks and hens, ten fragments (making eight blocks) in the British Museum (B299-306) and one in Antalya Museum (1391), 0.41m high, varying widths (Pryce 1928: 137-38, fig. 183; Metzger 1963: fig. 26, pl. 48.1; Bernard 1965; Coupel and Metzger 1976; Bruns-Özgan 1987: 21, cat. M4b; Rudolph 2003: 62-63, pls 43 and 44; Jenkins 2006: 174). The British Museum slabs, brought to the museum by Charles Fellows in the nineteenth century, had been sawn off large. Thick blocks. The French team later found two of these blocks (3354 and 3355, Metzger 1963: 73; Coupel and Metzger 1976). They show dovetail clamp cuttings on sides and back edges. The block with relief in Antalya Museum (1391) preserves the full width and has sides of two different lengths so that the back edge is slanted. These indicate that the relief frieze did not adorn a wall of a chamber, but the edges of a podium or socle, possibly at floor level.

The frieze, which was estimated at c. 13-14m in length, was at first attributed to the bottom level of Building F (as shown in **Fig. 22**, here; Metzger 1963: 73-75, fig. 27; this reconstruction is still prevalent in publications). Paul Bernard (1965: esp. 264-65) argued that the excavators had neglected to take into account the missing portions of fragmentary blocks, which if considered bring the total length to c. 17m – too long for Building F’s base. He also suggested that there was a correspondence in lengths of the relief slabs with another frieze depicting satyrs and wild beasts, which had been attributed to the edge of Building G’s terrace platform (see below), and proposed the cockfight and hen frieze should surmount that, making a double frieze along the edges of the terrace.

Subsequently, Pierre Coupel and Henri Metzger (1976) pointed out that Bernard was mistaken in assuming that the lengths of all the relief-carved blocks should be regular, so the total length need not amount to as much as he had suggested. (Note that Bernard’s proposal may be based on the assumption that the reliefs would have been carved on evenly proportioned blocks prior to installation, rather than on irregular masonry blocks, post construction.) Moreover, Coupel and Metzger reiterated that the frieze blocks had edged a pavement, and were quite different from the satyr and beast frieze, which comprised plaques that had faced a core behind. They did, however, prefer the attribution to Building G, based on perceived similarities with the carving style of the satyrs and beasts frieze. They very tentatively attributed it to the floor/base of a hypothesised lower chamber or two chambers of Building G (**Fig. 26**, Coupel and Metzger 1976: esp. 255).

As there are problems with the idea of a lower chamber within the podium of Building G (see below), the cockfight and hen frieze could just as well still belong to the upper level of the stepped base of Building F.

Superstructure: three limestone fragments attributed in total, all belonging to one short end or façade of the building (**Fig. 22**). The reconstruction proposes a façade with four storeys separated by transverse beams, each with a double set of blind windows/doors, including the ‘attic’ or gable. Fragments attributed are:

- 1) The ‘Siren Gable’, British Museum B289, found reused in the south Byzantine wall of the acropolis, 0.83x1.05m (**Fig. 15**, Pryce 1928: 130-31, B189; Weicker 1902: 96-98 and 100, fig. 25; Buschor 1944: 39-40 and 56-60, fig. 45; Möbius 1960: 163; Metzger 1963: fig. 25, pl. 48; Zahle 1979: 345 cat. 4; Bruns-Özgan 1987: 19, 21, 23, 26, 258, cat. M6; Bruns-Özgan 1996/97: 48; Rudolph 2003: 59-61, pl. 38; Jenkins 2006: 173-74, figs 168-70; Draycott 2008: 149; Karademir and Özdemir 2013).

- 2) 3344: part of a lower section of a gable with slanted edge on left and part of a stepped blind window frame on right, found on the southern slopes of the acropolis, 0.53x0.86m as preserved (Metzger 1963: fig. 25, pl. 50).
- 3) 3353: part of a larger stepped blind window or door frame tentatively attributed to a lower storey of the edifice, 1.325x c. 0.50m (Metzger 1963: fig. 19, where it is depicted with stones attributed to Building H, fig. 27, pl. 50).

Orientation: North-South (?)

Height of building: estimated at c. 6.65m.

Plan dimensions: estimated, base c. 5.30(?)x4.60m. Edifice c. 3.60(?)x2.90m (Metzger 1963: 73-74). Interior c. 2.60(?)x1.90(?)m, based on approximate wall thickness of 0.50m (as for Building H, see below).

Access: the fragment belonging to a lower blind door (3353), the innermost panel of which measures c. 1.20x0.60m, indicates that the whole door along with its frame, was a discrete element in the construction, but traces of a shallow mortise and clamp depression on the left upper surface of the frame suggest it was not intended to be removed regularly. The fragment of an upper false window attributed to the attic, c. 0.50 m high, indicates it was integral to the wall on its left, and so not removable.

Small finds: none in the immediate vicinity, which the excavators attribute to the shallow depth of any soil on the bedrock and the considerable Byzantine period use of the area. Fragments of sixth century figurines and vases were found further south, however, and it was thought that these had slipped from the summit of the acropolis, around Building F (**Fig. 8**). They include fragments of 'indigenous' pottery, Attic black figure, Fikellura and 'Rhodo-Samian' figurines from sondage A7 excavated in 1953, and 'indigenous' pottery sherds deemed to be of the orientalisising period along with Attic black figure fragments including those of a crater in the manner of Sophilos from sondage A6 excavated in 1959.

The pottery and other small finds are published in Metzger 1972, where 'A' numbers indicate sondages (explicitly stated in the case of cat. 192, A33-2324). There were a total of 74 vase items (sherds and reconstructed vessels) and four lamps from sondage A6, and 25 vase items, four ceramic spindles and one lamp from sondage A7 (108 items in total, which amounts to 24% of the small finds from the acropolis catalogued in Metzger 1972 and includes a number of restorable pots). There is no plan showing the exact locations of sondages in the final report; preliminary reports were published in *Comptes-rendus des séances de l'académie des inscriptions et belles-lettres (CRAI)*.

It was felt by the excavators that the richness of the finds suggested votives offered at an archaic edifice that was replaced by Building F in the fifth century (Metzger 1963: 75).

Building G (Metzger 1963: Ch. 5, 49-61; Coupel and Metzger 1969; Coupel and Metzger 1976; Bruns-Özgan 1987: cat. M4)

Terrace/platform: preserved *in situ* are stones and bedrock cuttings for four retaining edges of a large terrace/platform, the south and southwestern parts of which are constructed of massive roughly polygonal orthostats integrated into the fortification wall of the acropolis (**Figs 9, 11 and 12**, Metzger 1963: pls 30-32). This structure would be a kind of bastion on which (or in which, if provided with parapets) Building G sat. The southwestern extremity of a later Byzantine fortification wall sits on the top of the eastern terrace edge, which is constructed of neatly drafted ashlar blocks. Massive stones in a roughly rectangular formation on the north side have been identified as the foundations of a ramp or stairs to the terrace/platform. 13 other architectural fragments and parts of three statues have been attributed to higher levels of

the terrace. Because of the number of fragments, these are presented here in three groups rather than singly:

- 1) 10 relief carved slabs depicting satyrs and wild beasts, seven in the British Museum (B292-298: Pryce 1928: 134-37, pl. 28), three found by the French, now (presumably) in Antalya Museum (3341, 3533, 3534: Metzger 1963: 49-51, pls 33 and 37.1; Coupel and Metzger 1969; Metzger 1974; further, Bernard 1965; Bruns-Özgan 1987: 21, pl. 1.1-2; Rudolph 2003: 61-62, pls 39-42; Jenkins 2006: 169-70, figs 160-63). 0.80m high, varying widths (1.47-1.57m). Based on proportion, these have been attributed to the north and east sides of the upper course of the terrace, facing the acropolis (accepted by Bernard 1965). Traces of clamp cuttings indicate that these were slabs applied as facing of this terrace, rather than slabs sawn from the fronts of building blocks, as the excavators pointed out in their refutation of Bernard's (1965) proposal that the cock fight and hen frieze (see Building F, above) belonged above this frieze. Dimensions of the neat ashlar forming the east side of the terrace are not given, preventing checking the sizes against these blocks.
- 2) Three cornice fragments of 0.32m high, with two rows of egg and dart and a row of bead and reel mouldings, two found by the French team (1061 and 3340) and one in the British Museum (B961) (Metzger 1963: 50-51, fig. 7, pl. 34). These were attributed to the edge of the terrace/platform, above the satyrs and wild beasts frieze, although no join confirms this placement. The decoration contrasts with the timber style of Building G, which raises doubts about the attribution, although it does not constitute grounds for dismissing it. The largest of these cornice slabs, 3340, has a preserved dimension of c. 0.95x1.20m in plan, suggesting use as the edge of a pavement rather than roof edge. A shallow square cutting of 0.60m wide on its upper surface has been interpreted as a potential bedding for a column/pillar or statue socle (see next).
- 3) Five fragments of three marble (imported) *peplophoros* statues: torsos and part of a head in the British Museum, B316-318 (torsos), 1956.9-24.1 (head fragment) and another fragment of the same head found by the French team, 873 (Pryce 1928: 32-33; Metzger 1963: pls 35 and 36; Bruns-Özgan 1987: 23, cat. M4g; Boardman 1995: 190; Ridgway 1970: 37n.5, fig. 59; Rudolph 2003: 65-66, pl. 46; Jenkins 2006: 169 and 171, figs 160 and 164). The best-preserved figure (B318) has part of a square socle of the right proportions, although no fit with cutting in the cornice block 3340, mentioned above, has been tested. The excavators note that the statues themselves are of the right date and proportions, and would follow the model of the later Nereid Monument, with its nymphs ringing the building on its high podium (Metzger 1963: 51; Demargne and Childs 1989; on the meaning of the figures, see Hüllden 2006: 341-42, with refs).

Edifice: reconstructed using 27 architectural blocks, decorated and non-decorated, found re-employed in later structures on the immediate site of Building G and in the Byzantine phase of the acropolis wall. They represent three basic levels of a building: socle/floor, one course of walls and roofing. Except for one of the roofing level elements, most of the pieces belong to the long sides of the building rather than the fronts (**Figs 23-24**). The reconstruction of height, interior and access is problematic. Elements can be roughly divided into four groups, from bottom to top:

- 1) Seven podium/socle parts comprising two orthostats (3343 and 3347) and five pavers (905, 906, 908, 913 and 3346) (Metzger 1963: figs 8-9, 11, 13-14, 15, pls 37.2-5 and 40). The two orthostats and three of the five pavers (905, 908 and 913) have identical simple flat mouldings running along their sides, showing that they belong together. (Note that although included in the drawing, in fact this moulding is not visible on orthostat 3343 as shown Metzger 1963: pl. 37.3, where the surface is shown to be roughly picked).

The two orthostat elements are of different heights, 3343 being 0.85m and 3347, the larger of the two, being 1.015m, but the former has the remains of a tenon on its bottom surface, which would have secured it to a lower element, together making up the same height. Both are attributed to central portions of the long sides

of the podium. The ends/corners of the podium are reconstructed differently, with lower blocks carrying flat pavers, which together arrive at the same height as the orthostats of the middle.

Four of the paving stones, and especially two from corners (908 and 913) show sophisticated stepped modulation of their upper surfaces so that the sides were slightly higher than the inner floor of the chamber, which are in turn slightly higher than the façades (see **Figs 24 and 25**, where an attempt has been made to distinguish different levels with different shades of gray; also Metzger 1963: figs 9, 11 and 16).

Note that paving slabs 908 and 3346 are thought to have been clamped together, combining to make a composite corner slab which would run to 1.42m along the front of the building (Metzger 1963: figs 11 and 13). The excavators supposed three such lengths would give a width of the building's front, which would agree proportionally with three proposed roofing slabs (see below). This would produce a building with a width of 4.26m. Whether the podium under the paving stones was solid or there was a lower chamber below is problematic – see further discussion below.

It is worth pointing out at this point that the sides of the building starting at this level are reconstructed as pierced by three or four alternating transverse beam ends, imitating relieving transverse wall beams or clamps securing horizontal relieving beams (in appearance like joist ends; see **Figs 23, 24 and 26**; for relieving beams in Anatolian Iron Age architecture, see Erarslan 2013). Such transverse elements are commonly seen in the later 'house tombs' and are suggested here by the cuttings articulating the bottom of the 'parade' frieze attributed to Building G (see below). The stone versions would have been shallow Pi-shaped stones which clamped the tops of blocks below (cf. reconstructions proposed in Kjeldsen and Zahle 1975; Strathmann 2002; Mühlbauer 2007; Mülbauer 2012). They would, in some areas (but seemingly not all) have been secured on their bottoms with tenon and mortise, as shallow mortises in the upper surfaces of orthostat 3347, and pavers 905 and 913 (these last two join) show (see cuttings in tops of stones in **Fig. 25**).

- 2) Five pieces from what is here summarily called a 'parade' or 'convoy' frieze 0.852m high, attributed to the exterior walls of the chamber (**Figs 18, 23, 24, 26**) (Fellows 1852: 495-97; Pryce 1928: B311-14, 141-42, 144-46, pls 30-31; Akurgal 1961: 136-38; Metzger 1963: figs 10, 14 and 16, pls 38-39 and 41.1; Bernard 1965; Borchhardt 1968: 209-10, no. 1; Coupel and Metzger 1969; Metzger 1971; Metzger 1975; Bruns-Özgan 1987: 21-22 and 204-08, cats M4c and d, pls 1.3-4, 2.1-2; Jacobs 1987: 34, 49-51, esp. 50; Boardman 1995: 189-90, fig. 214; Rudolph 2003: 61-66, pl. 45; Jenkins 2006: 169-71, fig. 165). Four slabs in the British Museum (B311-314; Pryce 1928 and Metzger 1963 as above) were sawn off the fronts of masonry blocks. One block of full thickness (0.47m) is in Antalya Museum (3532; Coupel and Metzger 1969). This one has remains of a shallow rectangular mortise for securing a block above and dovetail clamp marks at either end for attachment to neighbouring blocks.

Articulating the bottom of the frieze blocks/slabs are the rectangular cuttings for receiving the pi-shaped faux transverse relieving beams described above. The spacings of these cuttings could proportionally fit the proposed size of Building G's lateral sides. Further, the cutting for the faux transverse relieving beam on the bottom of slab B311 can be made to align with a mortise for the securing of some element (the bottom of the same faux cross beam/clamp?) on the upper surface of the join between paving stones 905 and 913 (see **Figs 23 and 25**). The attribution of the parade frieze to the sides of Building G is also supported by a later parallel, a 'parade' frieze on the sides of the tomb 'heroön' of the fourth century Lycian dynast Perikle at Limyra (Borchhardt 1970; 1976; Şare 2013).

Typically, the 'house tombs' show three (faux) courses on their sides. An estimated three courses of similarly sized blocks as represented in the reconstruction would arrive at a height in keeping with the proportions one might expect from later flat-roofed 'house tombs' (e.g. Mühlbauer 2007: figs 324 and 351, esp. the rock cut

tomb façade CH I/8 at Limyra). The frieze is reconstructed as a first of three courses. Although Christian Rudolph (2003: 169-71) feels it could equally be restored to the central course, the alignment of the cutting for the faux beam/clamp and shallow mortise, possibly for securing its bottom, noted in the paragraph above, suggests that the original proposal could be correct.

The excavators suggested that the equestrian part of the parade frieze should belong to the south side of building, with the parade heading toward what is assumed to be the principle side of the monument, facing the 'acropolis'. This is not certain. The footmen slab (B314), which would not fit on the same side as the equestrians, still shows them heading in the same direction, suggesting that the procession was unidirectional, not divided into two 'mirrored' files as on the Limyra tomb of Perikle or on the Parthenon. Besides that, it is not known which façade of the building would have had an entrance. Note that the excavators supposed there could have been other friezes on the sides too (Metzger 1963: 54-55).

- 3) Two fragmentary, non-adjoining slabs from a banquet frieze, both in the British Museum (B309 and B310; Pryce 1928: vol. 1.1, 142-44, fig. 186, pl. 29; Metzger 1963: figs 10 and 13, pl. 41; Coupel and Metzger 1969; Metzger 1971; Bruns-Özgan 1987: 22-23, cats M4e and f; Draycott at press, fig. 20). The attribution of these fragments is uncertain (as Bruns-Özgan 1987 points out) and raises questions concerning the arrangement of the interior of the chamber or chambers. The reliefs both depict standing servants, one (B310) with the foot of a figure reclining on a couch at the right edge, suggesting that both belonged to a 'banquet' frieze. The figures are similar in style and size to those of the parade frieze, but the slabs are slightly shorter: 0.848m (B309) and 0.717m (B310), and they lack mouldings along the tops.

Vertical cuttings on the same face as the reliefs indicate that some adjacent slab or block abutted them at a right angle, indicating that the frieze should belong to an interior chamber. The excavators initially suggested they belonged in the chamber of Building G, at the same level as the parade frieze. When they found the piece of that frieze now in Antalya Museum, which preserved the full width of the architectural block, they realised that this was not possible, but rather than proposing that the banquet frieze belonged to another course, they took the extra step of suggesting that it could belong to another, lower chamber within the podium. Further, one of the slabs (B309) preserves a substantial blank, smoothed surface on the left side of the vertical cutting, suggesting that the slab may have stretched between two chambers, one decorated and one not, the abutting wall dividing the two rooms (Coupel and Metzger 1969: 228). For problems concerning a lower chamber and the division of chambers into two, see further below under 'interior'. Whether the slabs were originally parts of full architectural blocks and sawn off by Fellows, as the 'parade' frieze, or originally revetments which faced other blocks has not been investigated.

- 4) Three roofing level parts: 3129 is a well-preserved large flat roof slab with moulded cornice edge and traces of dovetail clamp marks along the other edges, 2.03x1.595m, 0.19m thick/high (0.46 m including cornice moulding) (**Figs 23 and 24**; Metzger 1963: figs 12, 13, 15 and 16, pl. 42). The underneath of the moulded edge (front) is carved into faux log ends extending 0.788m, indicating overhanging eaves of that length. The slab is not completely rectangular, one side being longer than the other, the rear edge slanting (Metzger 1963, fig. 15).

874 is a fragment of the cornice part of such a slab, but without integral faux logs underneath, 0.29x0.663m, 0.327m in thickness/height (Metzger 1963: figs 12 and 15, pl. 43.1-3). It is thought to have belonged to the side of the building, rather than façade. It has four preserved surfaces: top, bottom, front and one edge.

Another fragment (3342) is described as imitating the end of a transverse beam/joist, which would have taken the form of 'crosses présentant une face arrondie et une face plane.' The element is not itself illustrated clearly (see Metzger 1963: pl. 43.4, where it is on the left), but Metzger's fig. 12 (bottom) includes it, labelled, in a reconstructed plan of the roof, and shows this to be a faux beam end in a flaring hook-

like form of a kind known from other rock cut house type tombs in Lycia. The excavators pointed out that such faux transverse beam ends would be purely ornamental, the heavy weight of the stone roof slabs being supported in some other way. They propose six pillars within the chamber(s) (see below under 'interior').

Details indicate sophistication of design. Both of the roofing slab parts preserve protrusions running along one of their side edges, which would fit into channels carved in the side edges of neighbouring slabs. The protrusions themselves were channelled on their top surfaces, and have small holes drilled through the ends nearest the cornices, interpreted as water drainage holes (Metzger 1963: 59, fig. 15). A small channel running behind and parallel to the cornice edge of 3129 is also thought to have functioned to channel water off the roof, and the roof is reconstructed as having a slight slope to help with this as well.

Additionally, a line running laterally across the rear upper surface of the large roof slab 3129 suggested to the excavators the setting of another element on top of the flat roof, which they tentatively suggest could have been a lantern of some kind (Metzger 1963: 58 and 59, fig. 15, indicated with shading in fig. 16, **Fig. 24**, here). This element would be roughly 4x1.75m in plan, on a roof of c. 7.6x4.785m. Rather than a lantern, exactly, later tombs in Lycia suggest the possibility of another pitched roof element. The lids of some later Lycian sarcophagi have the appearance of crowning a flat roof, although they are more convincing imitations of vaulted roofs supported by cross beams than vaults sitting in the centre of a flat roof. There is, however, an example of a smaller vault centred over a squarish lower chamber with flat roof in the later tomb of *Ñθurigaḫā* at Çindam (Seyer 2004; Hülten 2006: vol. 2, 71, cat. CH 8, pl. 33.3-4). Something similar is seen also in the rock cut façade tomb at Bucak-Tyberissus (Zahle 1979: 336, no. 37, fig. 60). A small marble sarcophagus lid with early Classical style reliefs in the gables has been found at Xanthus (Demargne 1974: S 2, 110-11, pl. 60; Bruns-Özgan 1987: 33-35, 284, cat. S 23, pl. 3.3), but apart from being in another material (marble rather than limestone), which would not automatically disqualify it, it is smaller than most Lycian sarcophagus lids at 1.70x0.50m, and certainly too small to have covered the space here.

Note that there is another fragment of a timber imitation flat roof from Xanthus in the British Museum (museum number 1848,1020.144), dated to the sixth century BC in the museum's online database, which may be related, but which has not been accounted for in the literature so far. The cornice moulding differs from the pieces attributed to Building G.

Orientation: West-North-West – East-South-East.

Height: estimated based on attribution of the cockfight and hen frieze and some extra elements below, assuming three courses of stones for the main (upper) chamber: c. 6.095m. Without cockfight and hen frieze: c. 5.30m.

Plan dimensions: terrace/platform, 15.50x10.25m, with ramp or stairs at middle of north long side of c. 3x2m. Building 6.40x4.26m on the exterior of the chamber as reconstructed (relying on the idea of three roofing slabs and paving slabs along the front, four along the sides). The excavators point out this would result in a building with the same 2:3 proportions as the terrace platform (Metzger 1963, 51n. 11). This would leave 2.7m wide walkways around the monument on the platform.

Interior: block 3532 of the 'parade' frieze, which preserves its full depth indicates walls of 0.47m thick. This gives a spacious interior chamber plan of 3.32x5.46m. The large, heavy, stone roof slabs of course necessitate some way of keeping them up, and the excavators proposed six pillars within the chamber (**Figs 24 and 25**). This would leave a central aisle of c. 1m wide and side aisles of c. 0.60m wide, and two roomy lateral spaces of c. 3.40x1.60m each. It is possible that rather than pillars, there could have been internal walls making an

inner chamber of about 1x2.30m. A potential model for this could be timber tomb chambers under tumuli, such as the Tumulus MM at Gordion, where there is a smaller chamber within an outer structure (Young 1981; Simpson 2010), although that met engineering needs that would not be encountered in the construction of Building G.

A lower chamber in the podium is not specifically addressed in the text of the original *Fouilles de Xanthos* report (Metzger 1963), but is shown in the figure on page 55, where it is also shown with pillar supports. There are problems, however, with how these would support the paving stones which would form the floor of the main chamber and ceiling of a lower one. First, the pillars would not support some of the inner corners of the paving/ceiling stones (see **Fig. 25**). Second, the paving stones along the sides would not rest on the tops of the orthostats, but abut them, so further supports along the walls would be necessary, compressing chamber space. This would not exclude a kind of chamber or *hypogeum* within the podium, within which things could have been deposited before it was sealed (from above, since no access is accounted for, either), but whether this would be a substantial chamber with decoration is doubtful. If the banquet frieze reliefs did belong with Building G, therefore, it is more likely that they would belong in the top (and only?) chamber, although this still brings with it unresolved implications for the division of space.

Note that the attribution of the cock fight and hen frieze to lowest level of the podium of Building G (**Fig. 26**; Coupel and Metzger 1976) also depends on the idea that it would serve as a floor of a lower chamber (see under Building F, above). It could belong to Building G's podium even without a chamber within, and the hypothetical reconstruction does show an attractive symmetrical arrangement of the frieze. However, the attribution is quite tenuous. It could just as well belong to the base of Building F, although this too remains unconfirmed.

Access: how high the podium of Building G was is questionable. The excavators originally proposed two courses (**Figs 23-24**), raised a further 0.80m with the addition of the cockerel and hen frieze (**Fig. 26**). Only one course is actually evidenced, and some 'house tombs', such as those at Phellus (**Fig. 28**, below) do not have very high podia in the way that later temple tombs such as the Nereid Monument and Perikle's tomb at Limyra do. A single course podium would make Building G 4.41m high as opposed to 5.30m high – shorter than either Building H or F at c. 5.58 and c. 6.65 respectively, but then Building G was also raised on its terrace platform, which is thought to have stood about 2m high. Either way, even a one-course podium would be c. 1m high, hindering regular foot access.

There are no elements of doors or windows, false or otherwise, preserved; they are hypothesised based on the appearance of Lycian 'house' tombs (see discussion in main article text), and for both ends based on the identical façades of Building H. With the two rows of pillars hypothesised to carry the roofing slabs, the excavators suggest a central pair of (blind) doors and two single such doors on each side of the pillars, at the edges of the façades. The widths, if so, would be c. 0.25m for the innermost panels of such doors, 1.10m for the whole width of the double doors including frames. Heights are estimated at c. 1.30m. Similarly arranged, but shorter (c. 0.40m high) blind windows are proposed for another storey above the doors, in keeping with the multi-storey format of Lycian house tomb façades. The doors, if they had removable panels, would have been accessible, but not made for constant foot passage.

Small finds: rare, and the contexts here seem to have been very disturbed. The contexts are not described; final reports are on architecture and pottery, separately. Only a single sherd from a sondage in this area has been published: Metzger 1972: cat. 126, inventory number A2-1459, a small fragment of a sixth century 'Rhodian' relief pithos (see Metzger 1963: 60 for the association with Building G, the implication being that sondage A2 was in the area of that building). Metzger 1963: 60 also mentioned that some Attic black figure sherds 'perhaps' belong to the same level. He very tentatively suggested that these could indicate an older building on this spot, which Building G replaced.

Building H (Metzger 1963: Ch. 6, 63-69)

Base: ten limestone polygonal paving blocks with recesses for dovetail clamps securing the outer members, set on neatly cut bedrock, still *in situ* on site (**Figs 9 and 13**). Marks on this base indicate positioning of two structures: a rectangular chamber and a shorter structure before its south façade (**Figs 14 and 21**).

Superstructure: 16 limestone fragments attributed to two short façades, named A and B, which would fit the width of the building indicated by the marks on the base. The façades, as reconstructed, show a stack of four storeys separated by traverse beams, all with blind windows/doors, including the ‘attic’/gable (**Figs 20-21**). Fragments attributed are as follows, from top to bottom of façades:

Façade A:

- 1) British Museum B290a – left hand side of gable depicting sphinx and lower part of seated lion above, 1.09x0.86m (illustration references as for B290b, below).
- 2) British Museum B290b – right side of gable showing seated sphinx and lower part of seated lion, above 0.96x0.96m. These two blocks would seem to have met in the centre of the gable (cf. the alternate resolution of the join for the other gable, below). Both: **Figs 16 and 20** (Pryce 1928: 132-35, fig. 80, pl. 26; Metzger 1963: pl. 47, top).
- 3) 3335, part of a blind window attributed to an upper story, the right edge being a smoothed surface for joining with another stone on the right, 0.665x0.36m, 0.36m deep. Step mouldings 0.055-0.07m deep.
- 4) 3335 BIS, part of false window attributed to the upper story of façade A, joining the right side of 3335 (above), 0.665x0.507m, 0.36m deep. (Numbering reversed in Metzger fig. 19.) Square dowel hole in upper surface for attaching to member above and a dovetail clamp cutting on right side of upper surface for attachment to stone on right (3336, below). Step mouldings 0.055-0.07m deep (Metzger 1963: fig. 19, pl. 45.5).
- 5) 3336, right side corner block restored as attached to the right of 3335 BIS, above. Upper surface shows dovetail clamp cutting for attachment to that stone and another dovetail clamp cutting for attachment to another stone to its rear, on the lateral side of building. Lower surface has remains of a square dowel for securing to a block below. 0.585x0.478m, 0.255m deep (Metzger 1963: fig. 21, pl. 46.4).
- 6) 3339, left upper corner of a blind window, attributed to a story below that of the stone listed above. c. 0.36x c. 0.50m, c. 0.41m deep. Step mouldings c. 0.068m deep.
- 7) 3339 BIS, right upper corner of same blind window (numbers reversed in Metzger fig. 19), c. 0.36x0.605m, c. 0.41m deep. Step mouldings c. 0.068m deep. Both this and 3339, above, have small holes drilled along the front edge of the upper surfaces, seemingly to hold vertical elements (the excavators suggested a ‘grill’), which would run in front of 3335 and 3335 BIS (Metzger 1963: fig. 19, pl. 46.1-2).
- 8) 3359, fragmentary ‘tile brick’-like block forming transverse joining corner piece between two stages of the left corner ‘pier’ of façade A. Upper surface preserves a square dowel hole or mortise for receiving a shallow tenon of the kind seen on the underside of 3336. 0.212x c. 0.51m, 0.555m deep (Metzger 1963: fig. 20).
- 9) 3356, slab with one preserved edge with a stepped moulding, attributed to the right side of a blind door on the lower level of façade A. Preserved edge with moulding has slight protrusion to fit into square ‘dowel’ hole/mortise cutting of a vertical element to its right. 0.586x0.586m, c. 0.27m deep. Step moulding 0.12m deep (Metzger 1963: fig. 19, pl. 45.4).
- 10) 920, slab with preserved stepped moulding, attributed to left side of a blind door. Two preserved edges, left side and underneath. Left side smoothed to fit against vertical element to the left. Underside with shallow square tenon to insert into shallow mortise. 0.522x0.522m, 0.40m deep. Step moulding 0.12m deep (Metzger 1963: fig. 19, pl. 45.2).

- 11) 3338, fragmented part of a transverse 'beam', attributed to the lower part of the façade. 0.21x0.686m, c. 0.41m deep. Upper and lower surfaces preserved, the upper with remains of bedding for setting of a vertical element with stepped mouldings (i.e. a blind door/window) and a square mortise. Depth of steps in bedding, c. 0.12m (Metzger 1963: fig. 20, pl. 50.1).

Façade B:

- 12) BM 291a, left side of a gable showing seated sphinx. Three preserved edges: slanted upper left, bottom and right. The right edge shows that the joining edge between the two sides of the gable was off centre. 0.79x0.66m (illustration references as for B291b, below).
- 13) BM 291b, right side of a gable showing seated sphinx. Two preserved edges: bottom and upper right slanted edge (roughly preserved). 0.68x0.61m (Pryce 1928: 132-35, figs 81 and 82, pl. 27; Metzger 1963: 47.2).
- 14) 915, tile-like fragment from a transverse element. 0.18x0.56m, 0.54m deep. Four preserved surfaces: top and bottom, front and back; side edges broken. Bottom preserves traces of square tenon; top preserves bare traces of marks corresponding to positioning of a vertical element with stepped mouldings – i.e. a stepped blind window/door. Along the front left edge of the upper surface are also drilled holes similar to those in the upper surface of 3339 and BIS (see under façade A, above). These would have held elements extending up in front of the third storey blind window, perhaps a grill of some kind, as suggested by the excavators (Metzger 1963: fig. 20, pl. 45.6).
- 15) 3345, large slab with one preserved edge and stepped moulding forming right angle. Attributed to the upper left portion of a false door. 1.08x0.75m, 0.291 deep as preserved (Metzger 1963: fig. 19, pl. 46.5).
- 16) 3348, vertical element with four preserved sides (front, back and sides, the top and bottom being broken), and preserving a stepped moulding on the front side. Attributed to the right side of a false door with stepped frame. One side (right, as restored) preserves slight protrusion for linking with vertical element to the right. 0.84x0.42m, 0.431 deep. Stepped moulding c. 0.12m deep (Metzger 1963: fig. 19, pl. 46.3).

Orientation: North-North-East – South-South-West.

Height: 5.85m approx.

Plan dimensions: base, 5.17x3.345m. Exterior of edifice, 2.84x2.34m, with a 0.96x2.34m step/bench (the excavators thought it should be an altar or offering table) at what is presumed to be the front of the building on the south. Interior of edifice, c. 1.84x1.34(?)m, presuming walls of c. 0.50 cm thick (cf. the 0.54m depth of block 915 and 0.478m width of block 3336, above). The interior width could have extended up to c. 1.80m with thinner side walls, however.

Access: fragments 3335, 3335 BIS, 3339, 3339 BIS, which have been attributed to upper storey blind windows with interior panels of c.0.505x0.36m, and fragments 920, 3356, 3345 and 3348, which have been attributed to lower storey blind doors with interior panels of c. 1.18x0.634m indicate that both windows and especially the lower doors could be assembled in slightly differing ways. Traces of tenons and mortises as well as clamp cuttings suggest that they were not intended to be removed for any regular access. However, although there is evidence for blind doors on both sides, there are remains of blind windows attributed only to façade A. It is possible, therefore that one of the windows of the upper storeys on façade B could have allowed access in the manner of the small windows in pillar tombs and later sarcophagi (see discussion in text). Note that fragment 915, attributed to a transverse beam above a hypothesised blind window on façade B, indicates that the false window below it could have been assembled from smaller parts than the windows on the other side, possibly making it removable. The holes drilled along the front edges of the upper surfaces of 3339

and BIS on façade A, and 915 on façade B, both of which are positioned just below the third storey blind windows on each side, suggest that bars or a grill could have been placed in front of those windows.

Small finds: a range of items were found in cracks in the bedrock along the east and southeastern corner of the building including (these are the ‘principales pieces’ listed in Metzger 1963: 68): pottery (an Attic black figure and white *lekythos* sherd, inv. 865 and 864 respectively), bone parts of an archaic type spindle (inv. 869) and pieces of gold jewellery/ornaments (12 in total: one fibula, three rosettes, two pendant earrings and six beads, all inv. 866), now in Antalya Museum (Metzger 1963: pl. 53). The excavators took the presence of sixth century BC materials as evidence of occupation of this area of the acropolis prior to the construction of Building H. The gold ornaments, especially the rosettes, are dated to the fourth century, leading the excavators to argue that the building(s) here continued to be used/visited through the centuries, and were therefore more likely cultic buildings than tombs, despite the fact that the form might suggest the latter (Metzger 1963: 69).

Acknowledgements

My thanks go to the staff and Council of the British Institute of Ankara, where I held a post-doctoral fellowship while producing this paper, to Durham University, where I completed it and to the University of Liverpool, which awarded me an honorary fellowship to assist me in carrying out research on Lycia. Somerville College, Oxford previously awarded me the Katherine and Leonard Woolley Junior Research Fellowship, which enabled me to conduct research that eventually fed into this paper. I am also grateful to *Anatolian Studies*’ anonymous referees and editorial committee, to Elizabeth Baughan, İlknur Özgen, Thomas Marksteiner[†], Laurence Cavalier, Jacques des Courtils, Patrik Baker, Oliver Hüllden, Olivier Henry and Olivier Casabonne, who have all been extremely generous with their time and information, and to a number of colleagues at the University of Oxford and The Courtauld Institute of Art, Koç University’s Research Centre for Anatolian Civilizations and the University of Liverpool. In particular, I must recognise mentors and friends who really introduced me to ancient architecture, Margareta Steinby, J.J. Coulton, Rubina Raja and Mantha Zarmakoupi, and express my gratitude to Marc Herzog and Malcolm Nicholson for reading drafts, and to my former supervisor Bert (R.R.R.) Smith for his ongoing support and feedback.

References

- Addenda*² = Carpenter, T.H., Mannack, T. and Mendonça, M. 1989: *Beazley Addenda*, 2nd ed. Oxford, Oxford University Press
- Akurgal, E. 1961: *Die Kunst Anatoliens von Homer bis Alexander*. Berlin, W. de Gruyter
- Allen, L. 2005: *The Persian Empire: A History*. London, British Museum Press
- Asheri, D. 1983: *Fra ellenismo e iranismo: studi sulla società e cultura di Xanthos nella età achemenide*. Bologna, Pàtron
- Ateşlier, S. 2004: 'Phokaia'daki Taş Kule Anıt Mezarının Üst Yapısına ait Gözlemler' *Olba* 9: 111-21, pls 16-18
- ATL = Meritt, B.D., Wade-Gery, H.T. and McGregor, M.F. 1939: *The Athenian Tribute Lists I*. Princeton, American School of Classical Studies at Athens
- Aytekin, E. 2007: 'Remarques sur les constructions architecturales de la période achéménide à Daskyléon' in I. Delemen, O. Casabonne, S. Karagöz and O. Tekin (eds), *The Achaemenid Impact on Local Populations and Cultures in Anatolia (6th-4th Centuries B.C.). Symposium in Istanbul, 21-22 May 2005*. Istanbul, Türk Eskiçağ Bilimleri Enstitüsü: 177-94
- Baker, P. and Theriault, G. 2013: 'Dedicace des mercenaires lagides pour Kybernis sur l'Acropole lycienne de Xanthos' in P. Brun, L. Cavalier, K. Konuk and F. Prost (eds), *EUPLOIA. La Lycie et la Carie antiques. Dynamiques des territoires, échanges et identités. Actes du colloque de Bordeaux 5, 6, 7 novembre 2009*. Bordeaux, De Boccard: Ausonius: 293-302
- Baughan, E.P. 2013: *Couched in Death: Klinai and Identity in Anatolia and Beyond*. Madison, The University of Wisconsin Press
- Beazley Archive Database* = Beazley Archive online pottery database, University of Oxford Classical Art Research Centre: <https://www.beazley.ox.ac.uk/pottery/default.htm> (last accessed 2/7/2014)
- Benda-Weber, I. 2005: *Lykier und Karer: zwei autochthone Ethnien Kleinasien zwischen Orient und Okzident*. Bonn, R. Habelt
- Benndorf, O. and Niemann, G. 1889: *Das Heroön von Gölbaşı-Trysa*. Vienna, A. Holzhauser
- Bergemann, J. 1991: 'Pindar. Das Bildnis eines konservativen Dichters' *Mitteilungen des deutschen archäologischen Instituts, Athenische Abteilung* 106: 157-89, pls 29-38
- Bernard, P. 1965: 'Remarques sur le décor sculpté d'un édifice de Xanthos' *Syria* 42: 261-88
- Berndt-Ersöz, S. 2006: *Phrygian Rock-cut Shrines: Structure, Function, and Cult Practice*. Leiden, Brill
- Boardman, J. 1995: *Greek Sculpture, The Late Classical Period*. London, Thames and Hudson
- Borchhardt, J. 1968: 'Epichorische, gräko-persisch beeinflusste Reliefs in Kilikien' *Istanbuler Mitteilungen* 18: 161-211, pls 40-57
- 1970: 'Das Heroön von Limyra – Grabmal des lykischen Königes Perikles' *Jahrbuch des deutschen archäologischen Instituts* 85: *Archäologischer Anzeiger*: 353-90
- 1976: *Die Bauskulptur des Heroön von Limyra, das Grabmal des lykischen Königs Perikles*. Berlin, Gebr. Mann
- 1980: 'Zur Deutung lykischer Audienzszenen', *Actes du Colloque sur La Lycie Antique*. Paris, Libres d'Amérique et d'Orient Adrien Maisonneuve: 7-12
- 1990a: 'Kunst in Lykien', *Götter, Heroen, Herrscher in Lykien*. Vienna, A. Schroll: 45-49
- 1990b: 'Kulturgeschichtliche Betrachtungen', *Götter, Heroen, Herrscher in Lykien*. Vienna, A. Schroll: 29-37
- 1993: *Die Steine von Zemuri: archäologische Forschungen an den verborgenen Wassern von Limyra*. Vienna, Phoibos
- 1998: 'Gedanken zur lykischen Gesellschaftsstruktur unter persischer und attischer Herrschaft' in G. Arsebük, M.J. Mellink and W. Schirmer (eds), *Light on Top of the Black Hill: Studies Presented to Halet Çambel*. Istanbul, Ege Yayınları: 155-69
- 2000: 'Dynasten und Beamte in Lykien während der persischen und attischen Herrschaft' in R. Dittman, B. Hrouda, U. Löw, P. Matthiae, R. Mayer-Opificius and S. Thürwächter (eds), *Vario Delectat. Iran und der Westen. Gedenkschrift für Peter Calmeyer*. Münster, Ugarit-Verlag: 73-140
- Borchhardt, J. and Bleibtreu, E. 2013: *Strukturen lykischer Residenzstädte im Vergleich zu älteren Städten des Vorderen Orients*. Istanbul, Suna & İnan Kıraç Research Institute on Mediterranean Civilizations (AKMED)
- Bourgarel, A., Bousquet, J., Davesne, A., Le Roy, C., Lemaire, A., Marcadé, J., Metzger, H. and Siebert, G. 1992: *Fouilles de Xanthos 9. La région nord du Létôon – les sculptures – les inscriptions gréco-lyciennes*. Paris, Librairie C. Klincksieck

- Bousquet, J. 1975: 'Arbinas, fils de Gergis dynaste de Xanthos' *Comptes rendus des séances de l'Académie des inscriptions et belles-lettres*: 138-48
- Briant, P. 2002: *From Cyrus to Alexander: A History of the Persian Empire* (= *Histoire de l'Empire perse*), translated by P.T. Daniels. Winona Lake, IN, Eisenbraun
- Bruns-Özgan, C. 1987: *Lykische Reliefs des 5. und 4. Jahrhunderts v. Chr.* Tübingen, Wasmuth
- 1996/97: 'Philosophische Gespräche in Lykien oder: Wie demokratische waren die Fürsten?' *Lykia* 3: 46-57
- Bryce, T.R. 1979: 'Lycian Tomb Families and Their Social Implications' *Journal of the Economic and Social History of the Orient* 22.3: 296-313
- 1982: 'A Ruling Dynasty in Lycia' *Klio* 64: 329-37
- Bryce, T. and Zahle, J. 1986: *The Lycians: A Study of Lycian History and Civilisation to the Conquest of Alexander the Great*. Copenhagen, Museum Tusculanum
- Buschor, E. 1944: *Die Musen des Jenseits*. Munich, F. Bruckmann
- Cahill, N.D. 1988: 'Taş Kule: A Persian Period Tomb Near Phokaia' *American Journal of Archaeology* 92: 481-501
- Calza, R. 1964: *I ritratti. I, Ritratti greci e romani fino al 160 circo D.C.* Roma, Istituto poligrafico dello Stato, Libreria dello Stato
- Carstens, A.M. 2009: *Karia and the Hekatomnids: The Creation of a Dynasty*. Oxford, Archaeopress
- 2013: 'Divine Kingship at the City Centre' in O. Henry (ed), *Le mort dans la ville. Pratiques, contextes et impacts des inhumations intra-muros en Anatolie, du début d l'Âge du Bronze à l'époque romaine*. Istanbul, Institut français d'études Anatoliennes: 175-82
- at press: 'Bridging the Boundary: The Sacrificial Deposit of the Maussolleion of Halikarnassos and its Symbolic Language' in C.M. Draycott and M. Stamatopoulou (eds), *Dining and Death: Interdisciplinary Perspectives on The 'Funerary Banquet' in Ancient Art, Burial and Belief*. Leuven, Peeters
- Castriota, D. 1992: *Myth, Ethos, and Actuality: Official Art in Fifth-century B.C. Athens*. Madison, University of Wisconsin Press
- Cau, N. 2003: 'Note sulla stele di Xanthos: TL 44B, 11-23 E 47-57' *Kadmos* 42: 50-64
- Cavalier, L. 2006: 'Observations sur l'architecture de Xanthos à l'époque archaïque' *Revue des études anciennes* 108: 327-54
- at press 'Appien, le Sarpédonion et le rempart de Xanthos' in S. Ladstätter, B. Beck-Brandt and B. Marksteiner-Yener (eds), *Turm und Tor. Siedlungsstrukturen in Lykien und benachbarten Kulturlandschaften. Akten des Kolloquiums in Gedenken an Thomas Marksteiner*. Vienna, Österreichisches Archäologisches Institut
- Cavalier, L. and des Courtils, J. 2012: 'Permanence d'un culte héroïque dans la nécropole intra muros de Xanthos ?' in K. Konuk (ed.), *Stephanèphoros de l'économie antique à l'Asie mineure. Hommages à Raymond Descat*. Bordeaux, De Boccard: Ausonius: 247-59
- at press 'Le rempart de Xanthos' in S. Ladstätter, B. Beck-Brandt and B. Marksteiner-Yener (eds), *Turm und Tor. Siedlungsstrukturen in Lykien und benachbarten Kulturlandschaften. Akten des Kolloquiums in Gedenken an Thomas Marksteiner*. Vienna, Österreichisches Archäologisches Institut
- Childs, W.A.P. 1978: *The City Reliefs of Lycia*. Princeton, Princeton University Press
- 1981: 'Lycian Relations with Persians and Greeks in the Fifth and Fourth Centuries Re-examined' *Anatolian Studies* 31: 55-80
- Coupe, P. and Demargne, P. 1969: *Le monument des Néréides: l'architecture*. Paris, Librairie C. Klincksieck
- Coupe, P. and Metzger, H. 1969: 'Reliefs inédits de l'acropole de Xanthos' *Revue archéologique*: 225-32
- 1976: 'La frise des <<coqs et poules>> de l'Acropole de Xanthos. Essai de restitution et d'interprétation' *Revue archéologique*: 247-64
- Deltour-Lévy, C. 1982: *Les piliers funéraires de Lycie*. Louvain-la-Neuve, Institut supérieur d'archéologie et d'histoire de l'art, Collège Erasme
- Demargne, P. 1958: *Fouilles de Xanthos I. Les piliers funéraires*. Paris, Librairie C. Klincksieck
- 1968: 'Sur un relief de Xanthos' *Revue archéologique*: 85-92
- 1974: *Fouilles de Xanthos 5. Tombes-maisons, tombes rupestres et sarcophages; les épitaphes lyciennes*. Paris, Librairie C. Klincksieck
- 1979: 'Recherches en Lycie d'après des publications nouvelles' *Revue archéologique*: 291-96
- 1981: 'Le décor sculpté des monuments funéraires de Xanthos. Principes explicatifs d'un art grec au service d'une idéologie orientale' in (eds), *Méthodologie iconographique. Actes du colloque de Strasbourg 27-28 avril 1979*. Strasbourg, AECR: 85-89

- 1983: 'Serviteurs orientaux sur deux monuments funéraires de Xanthos' in R.M. Boehmer (ed.) *Beiträge zur Altertumskunde Kleinasiens. Festschrift für Kurt Bittel*. Mainz am Rhein, von Zabern: 167-70
- Demargne, P. and Childs, W.A.P. 1989: *Fouilles de Xanthos 8: Le monument des Nereids*. Paris, Librairie C. Klincksieck
- des Courtils, J. 1994: 'Nouvelles données sur le rempart de Xanthos' *Revue des études anciennes* 96: 285-98
- 1995: 'Un nouveau bas-relief archaïque de Xanthos' *Revue archéologique*: 337-64
- 2007a: 'Nouvelles découvertes à Xanthos' *Revue archéologique*: 159-61
- 2007b: 'Nouvelles découvertes à Xanthos' in K. Dörtlük, B. Varkıvanç, T. Kahya, J. des Courtils, M. Doğan Alparslan, and R. Boyraz (eds), 3. *Likya sempozyumu 7-10 Kasım 2005 Antalya: Sempozyum bildirileri (= The 3rd Symposium on Lycia: 7-10 November 2005, Antalya: Symposium proceedings)*, 2 vols. Antalya, Suna & İnan Kıraç Research Institute on Mediterranean Civilizations (AKMED): vol. 1, 145-52
- 2009: 'From Elyanas to Leto: The Physical Evolution of the Sanctuary of Leto at Xanthos' in C. Gates, J. Morin and T. Zimmermann (eds), *Sacred Landscapes in Anatolia and Neighboring Regions*. Oxford, Archaeopress: 63-67
- 2010: 'Xanthos 2009' *Anatolia Antiqua* 18: 277-99
- 2011a: 'Xanthos. Rapport sur la campagne 2010' *Anatolia Antiqua* 19: 321-50
- 2011b: 'Xanthos archaïque: une survivance du système palatial archaïque jusqu'au Ve siècle a.C.?' in L. Summerer, A. von Kienlin and A. Ivantchik (eds), *Kelainai – Apameia Kibotos: Stadtentwicklung im anatolischen Kontext/Kélainai – Apamée Kibôtos: Développement urbain dans le contexte anatolien. Akten des Kolloquiums, München 2 April-4 April 2009*. Bordeaux, De Boccard: Ausonius: 359-68
- 2012a: 'Xanthos: état des questions' in M. Seyer (eds), *40 Jahre Grabung Limyra. Akten des internationalen Symposions, Wien, 3.-5. Dezember 2009*. Vienna, Österreichisches archäologisches Institut: 155-62
- 2012b: 'Particularités des lieux de rassemblement public en Lycie', in L. Cavalier, R. Descat, and J. des Courtils (eds), *Basiliques et agoras de Grèce et d'Asie mineure* Bordeaux, De Boccard: Ausonius: 287-303.
- des Courtils, J. and Cavalier, L. 2001: 'The City of Xanthos from Archaic to Byzantine Times' in D. Parrish (ed), *Urbanism in Western Asia Minor. New Studies on Aphrodisias, Ephesos, Hierapolis, Pergamon, Perge and Xanthos*. Portsmouth RI, Journal of Roman Archaeology: 148-71
- Domingo Gygax, M. and Tietz, W. 2005: "'He Who of All Mankind Set up the Most Numerous Trophies to Zeus": The Inscribed Pillar of Xanthos Reconsidered' *Anatolian Studies* 55: 89-98
- Draycott, C.M. 2007: 'Dynastic Definitions: Differentiating Status Claims in the Archaic Pillar Tomb Reliefs of Lycia' in A. Sagona and A. Çilingiroğlu (eds), *Anatolian Iron Ages 6: The Proceedings of the Sixth Anatolian Iron Ages Symposium held at Eskişehir-Turkey, 16-19 August 2004*. Leuven, Peeters: 103-34
- 2008: 'Bird-women on the Harpy Monument from Xanthos, Lycia: Sirens or Harpies?' in D.C. Kurtz, C. Meyer, D. Saunders, A. Tsingarida and N. Harris (eds), *Essays in Classical Archaeology for Eleni Vassiliou, 1977-2007*. Oxford, Beazley Archive and Archaeopress: 145-53
- 2010: 'Convoy Commanders and Other Military Identities in the Tomb Art of Western Anatolia around the Time of the Persian Wars' *Bollettino di archeologia online 0 (Special edition: Roma 2008 – International Congress of Classical Archaeology. Meetings Between Cultures in the Ancient Mediterranean)*: G/G1/2, 7-23, (http://www.bollettinodiarcheologiaonline.beniculturali.it/documenti/generale/2_Draycott_paper.pdf) (accessed December 2014)
- at press: 'Drinking to Death: The Emergence of the "Totenmahl" and Drinking Culture in Late Archaic/Early Achaemenid Western Anatolia' in C.M. Draycott and M. Stamatopoulou (eds), *Dining & Death. Interdisciplinary Perspectives on the 'Funerary Banquet' in Ancient Art, Burial and Belief*. Leuven, Peeters
- Durnford, S.P.B. 2008: 'Is Sarpedon a Bronze Age Anatolian Personal Name or a Job Description?' *Anatolian Studies* 58: 103-13
- Dusinberre, E.R.M. 2003: *Aspects of Empire in Achaemenid Sardis*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press
- 2013: *Empire, Authority, and Autonomy in Achaemenid Anatolia*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press
- Eichner, H. 2006: 'Neues zum lykischen Text der Stele von Xanthos (TL 44)' in K. Dörtlük, B.

- Varkıvanç, T. Kahya, J. des Courtils, M. Doğan Alparslan, and R. Boyraz (eds), 3. *Likya sempozyumu 7-10 Kasım 2005 Antalya: Sempozyum bildirileri (= The 3rd Symposium on Lycia: 7-10 November 2005, Antalya: Symposium proceedings)*, 2 vols. Antalya, Suna & İnan Kıraç Research Institute on Mediterranean Civilizations (AKMED): vol. 1, 231-38
- Erarslan, A. 2013: 'Timber Construction Elements in the Kerpiç Buildings in the Early Anatolian Architecture'. Conference paper presented at *Kerpiç '13. New Generation Earthen Architecture: Learning from Heritage International Conference*, Istanbul Aydın University, Istanbul, 11-13 September 2013: Paper code 012
https://www.academia.edu/4816765/Timber_Construction_Elements_in_the_Kerpiç_Buildings_in_the_Early_Anatolian_Architecture (accessed on 30/07/2014)
- Fellows, C. 1852: *Travels and Researches in Asia Minor, more particularly in the province of Lycia*. London, John Murray
- Fouache, E., Ecochard, E., Kuzucuoğlu, C., Carcaud, N., Ekmekçi, M., Ulusoy, I., Çiner, A. and des Courtils, J. 2012: 'Palaeogeographical Reconstruction and Management Challenges of an Archaeological Site Listed by Unesco: The Case of the Letoon Shrine in the Xanthos Plain (Turkey)' *Quaestiones Geographicae* 31: 37-49
- Freyer-Schauenburg, B. 1994: *Die lykischen Zwölfgötter-Reliefs*. Bonn, R. Habelt
- Froning, H. 2002: 'Das so genannte Harpyienmonument von Xanthos. Ein Beispiel für Akkulturation im südwestlichen Anatolien' *Nürnberger Blätter zur Archäologie* 19: 137-58
- Froning, H. 2004: 'Das sogenannte Harpyien-Monument von Xanthos. Überlegungen zur Form und Funktion sowie zur Interpretation des Reliefschmucks' in T. Korkut, H. İşkan, and G. Işın (eds.) *Anadolu'da doğdu. 60. yaşında Fahri Işık'a armağan. Festschrift für Fahri Işık zum 60. Geburtstag*. Istanbul, Ege Yayınları: 315-20
- Gebauer, J. 2012: 'Die archaische und klassische Fundkeramik der Weststadtgrabung 2002-2005. Ein Überblick' in M. Seyer (ed), *40 Jahre Grabung Limyra. Akten des internationalen Symposiums Wien 3.-5. Dezember 2009*. Vienna, Österreichisches archäologisches Institut: 169-78
- Greaves, A.M. 2010: *The Land of Ionia: Society and Economy in the Archaic Period*. Chichester, Wiley-Blackwell
- Hägg, R. 1999: *Ancient Greek Hero Cult: Proceedings of the Fifth International Seminar on Ancient Greek Cult, Göteborg University, 21-23 April 1995*. Stockholm, Swedish Institute in Athens
- Hansen, E. and Le Roy, C. 2012: *Fouilles de Xanthos 11. Le Temple de Léto au Létoon de Xanthos: étude architecturale*. Paris, Librairie C. Klincksieck
- Hansen, M.H. and Fischer-Hansen, T. 1994: 'Monumental Architecture in Archaic and Classical Greek Poleis: Evidence and Historical Significance' in D. Whitehead (ed.), *From Political Architecture to Stephanus Byzantinus: Sources for the Greek Polis*. Stuttgart, Franz Steiner: 23-90
- Hansen, M.H. and Nielsen, T.H. 2004: *An Inventory of Archaic and Greek Poleis. An Investigation Conducted by The Copenhagen Polis Centre for the Danish National Research Foundation*. Oxford, Oxford University Press
- Harmanşah, Ö. 2011a: 'Monuments and Memory: Architecture and Visual Culture in Ancient Anatolian History' in S.R. Steadman and G. McMahon (eds), *Oxford Handbook of Ancient Anatolia (10,000-323 BCE)*. Oxford, Oxford University Press: 623-51
- 2011b: 'Moving Landscapes, Making Places: Cities, Monuments and Commemoration at Malizi/Melid' *Journal of Mediterranean Archaeology* 24.1: 55-83
- 2013: *Cities and the Shaping of Memory in the Ancient Near East*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press
- Haspels, C.H.E. 1971: *The Highlands of Phrygia. Sites and Monuments*. Princeton, Princeton University Press
- Held, W. 2011: 'Mischordnungen in Labraunda als Repräsentationsform persischer Satrapen' in L. Summerer, A. Ivantchik and A. von Kienlin (eds), *Kelainai – Apameia Kibotos: Stadtentwicklung im anatolischen Kontext/Kélainai – Apamée Kibotos: Développement urbain dans le contexte anatolien. Akten des Kolloquiums, München 2 April-4 April 2009*. Bordeaux, De Boccard: Ausonius: 383-90
- Henry, O. 2010: 'Wood Reflections on Stone Tombs in Southwest Asia Minor' in L. Summerer and A. von Kienlin (eds), *Tatarlı. Renklerin Dönüşü/The Return of Colours/Rückkehr der Farben (ex. cat.)*. Istanbul, Yapı Credi: 2-21
- 2013: 'Tombes cariennes, tombes lyciennes: un processus analogue de pétrification architecturale?' in K. Konuk, P. Brun, L. Cavalier and F. Prost (eds), *EUPLOIA. La Lycie et la Carie antiques. Dynamiques des territoires, échanges et identités. Actes du colloque de Bordeaux 5, 6, 7*

- novembre 2009. Bordeaux, De Boccard: Ausonius: 257-68
- Herda, A. 2013: 'Burying a Sage: The Heroön of Thales in the Agora of Miletos. With Remarks on Other Excavated Heroa and on Cults and Graves of the Mythical Founders of the City' in O. Henry (ed), *Le mort dans la ville. Pratiques, contextes et impacts des inhumations intra-muros en Anatolie, du début d l'Âge du Bronze à l'époque romaine*. Istanbul, Institut français d'études Anatoliennes: 67-122
- Hölscher, T. 1991: 'The City of Athens: Space, Symbol, Structure' in J. Emlen, A. Molho, K.A. Raaflaub and T.J. Watson Jr. (eds), *City States in Classical Antiquity and Medieval Italy: Athens and Rome, Florence and Venice*. Stuttgart, Franz Steiner: 355-79
- Hülnden, O. 2001: 'Überlegungen zur Bedeutung der Amazonomachie am Maussolleion von Halikarnassos' in H. Klinkott (ed.), *Anatolien im Lichte kultureller Wechselwirkungen. Akkulturationsphänomene in Kleinasien und seinen Nachbarregionen während des 2. und 1. Jahrtausends v. Chr.* Tübingen, Attempto: 83-105
- 2003: 'Eine Kultanlage im Norden von Tyberissos (Lykien)' *Istanbuler Mitteilungen* 53: 307-11
- 2006: *Gräber und Grabtypen im Bergland von Yavu (Zentrallykien): Studien zur antiken Grabkultur in Lykien*. Bonn, R. Habelt
- 2013: 'Dead People Among the Living? Zum Verhältnis von Siedlung und Nekropolen im vorhellenistischen Lykien' in O. Henry (ed), *Le mort dans la ville. Pratiques, contextes et impacts des inhumations intra-muros en Anatolie, du début d l'Âge du Bronze à l'époque romaine*. Istanbul, Institut français d'études Anatoliennes: 183-206
- Hurwit, J.M. 1999: *The Athenian Acropolis. History, Mythology and Archaeology from the Neolithic Era to the Present*. Cambridge
- İdil, V. 1985: *Likya Lahitleri*. Ankara, Türk Tarih Kurumu
- IG I³ = Lewis, D.M. (ed.) 1981: *Inscriptiones Graecae I. Inscriptiones Atticae Euclidis anno anteriores*, editio tertia. Berlin, G. de Gruyter
- İren, K. and Atay, Ç. 2012: 'Daskyleion: Bir Satrabin Gölgesinde' *Aktüel Arkeoloji* 25: 68-75
- Işık, F. 1994: 'Pttara, im Land vom hethitischen Lukka und homerischen Lykia' *Lykia* 1: 1-11
- 1996: 'Zum Ursprung lykischer Felsheiligtümer' in F. Blakolmer, K.R. Krierer, F. Krinzing, A. Landskron-Dinstl, H.D. Szemethy and K. Zhuber-Okrog (eds), *Fremde Zeiten. Festschrift für Jürgen Borchhardt zum sechzigsten Geburtstag am 25. Februar 1996 dargebracht von Kollegen, Schülern und Freunden*. 2 vols. Vienna, Phoibos: vol. 1, 51-64
- 1998: 'Zum Typus des Temenosgrabes in Lykien' *Istanbuler Mitteilungen* 48: 157-72
- 2001/2: 'Die Vergöttlichung lykischer Dynasten im Lichte ihrer Gräber' *Likya* 6: 114
- 2003: 'Die Vergöttlichung der phrygischen Dynasten im Lichte ihrer Gräber' *Istanbuler Mitteilungen* 53: 197-222
- 2010a: 'Anadolu-Lykia Uygurliği. Lykia'nın "Hellenleşmesi" Görüşüne Eleştirel Bir Yaklaşım' *Anadolu* 36: 65-125
- 2010b: 'Das Leto-Heiligtum in Asarcık am Xanthostal. Zur sog. "Akkulturation" in Lykien anhand seiner frühen Tempelbauten' *Istanbuler Mitteilungen* 60: 81-115
- Işın, G. 2010: 'The Building Complex on the Tepecik Acropolis at Patara' *Anatolian Studies* 60: 93-104
- Jacobs, B. 1987: *Griechische und persische Elemente in der Grabkunst Lykiens zur Zeit der Achämenidenherrschaft*. Jonsered, P. Åström
- 2010: 'From Gabled Hut to Rock-Cut Tomb: A Religious and Cultural Break between Cyrus and Darius?' in J. Curtis and S.J. Simpson (eds), *The World of Achaemenid Persia – History, Art and Society in Iran and the Ancient Near East. Proceedings of a Conference at the British Museum, 29th September-1st October 2005*. London: 91-101
- Jenkins, I. 2006: *Greek Architecture and its Sculpture*. New York, Harvard University Press
- Kahya, T. 2001-2: 'Patara Dark Age Pottery' *Adalya* 5: 35-57
- Kaptan, D. 2002: *The Daskyleion Bullae: Seal Images from the Western Achaemenid Empire*. Leiden, Netherlands Institute for the Near East
- Karademir, H. and Özdemir, B. 2013: 'Sirens as Soul Bearers on Lycian Grave Reliefs in the Classical Period' *Cedrus* 1: 89-105
- Karagöz, Ş. 2007: 'Neue Ansichten zu freistehenden Grabmonumenten aus Daskyleion' in I. Delemen, O. Casabonne, S. Karagöz and O. Tekin (eds), *The Achaemenid Impact on Local Populations and Cultures in Anatolia (6th-4th Centuries B.C.). Symposium in Istanbul, 21-22 May 2005*. Istanbul, Türk Eskiçağ Bilimleri Enstitüsü: 195-210
- 2013: *Kleinasiatisch-gräko-persische Kunstwerke im Archäologischen Museum von Istanbul*. Tübingen, Ernst Wasmuth Verlag
- Khatchadourian, L. 2014: 'Empire in the Everyday: A Preliminary Report on the 2008-2011 Excavations at Tsaghkahovit, Armenia' *American Journal of Archaeology* 118: 137-69

- Keen, A.G. 1992: 'The Dynastic Tombs of Xanthos – Who Was Buried Where?' *Anatolian Studies* 42: 53-63
- 1993: 'Gateway from the Aegean to the Mediterranean. The Strategic Value of Lycia Down to the Fourth Century BC' in J. Borchhardt and G. Dobesch (eds), *Akten des II. Internationalen Lykien-Symposions, Wien 6.-12. Mai 1990, I.* Vienna, Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften: 71-77
- 1998: *Dynastic Lycia: A Political History of the Lycians and their Relations with Foreign Powers, c. 545-362 B.C.* Leiden, Brill
- 2002: 'The Poleis of the Southern Anatolian Coast (Lycia, Pamphylia, Pisidia) and their Civic Identity. The Interface Between the Hellenic and the Barbarian Polis', *Greek Settlements in the Eastern Mediterranean and Black Sea*. Oxford, Hedges: 27-40
- Keen, A. and Hansen, M.H. 2004: 'Lykia' in M.H. Hansen and T.H. Nielsen (eds), *An Inventory of Archaic and Classical Poleis*. Oxford, Oxford University Press: 1138-43
- Kjeldsen, K. and Zahle, J. 1975: 'Lykische Gräber, ein vorläufiger Bericht' *Jahrbuch des deutschen archäologischen Instituts* 90, *Archäologischen Anzeiger*: 313-50
- Kleiss, W. 1996: 'Bemerkung zum Pyramid Tomb in Sardes' *Istanbuler Mitteilungen* 46: 135-40
- Kolb, F. 2000: 'Von der Burg zur Polis – Akkulturation in der kleinasiatischen Provinz' *Jahrbuch des historischen Kollegs*: 39-83
- 2008: *Burg, Polis, Bischofssitz: Geschichte der Siedlungskammer von Kyaneai in der Südwesttürkei*. Mainz am Rhein, von Zabern
- 2009: 'Die Entstehung der Landschaft Lykien. Historische Geographie und archäologischer Befund' in D. Krause and O. Nakoinz (eds), *Kulturraum und Territorialität. Archäologische Theorien, Methoden und Fallbeispiele. Kolloquium des DFG-SPP 1171, Esslingen 17.-18. Januar 2007*. Rahden, Leidorf: 131-41
- Kolb, F. and Tietz, W. 2001: 'Zagaba. Münzprägung und politische Geographie in Zentrallykien' *Chiron* 31: 347-416
- Langer-Karrenbrock, M.-T. 2000: *Der lykische Sarkophag aus der Königsnekropole von Sidon*. Münster, Lit
- Lemâitre, S. at press 'Les mobiliers céramiques des sondages liés à deux tours du système de fortification de la cité de Xanthos en Lycie' in S. Ladstätter, B. Beck-Brandt and B. Marksteiner-Yener (eds), *Turm und Tor. Siedlungsstrukturen in Lykien und benachbarten Kulturlandschaften. Akten des Kolloquiums in Gedenken an Thomas Marksteiner*. Vienna, Österreichisches archäologisches Institut
- Lemos, I. 2007: 'The Migrations to the West Coast of Asia Minor: Tradition and archaeology' in J. Cobet, V. von Graeve, W.-D. Niemeier and K. Zimmermann (eds), *Frühes Ionien: eine Bestandsaufnahme; Panionion-Symposium Güzelçamlı, 26. September-1. Oktober 1999*. Mainz am Rhein, von Zabern: 713-27
- LIMC = Ackermann, H.C., Gisler, J.-R. and Kahill, L. (eds) 1981–1997: *Lexicon iconographicum mythologiae classicae*, 8 vols + supp. Zurich, Artemis
- Mac Sweeney, N. 2013: *Foundation Myths and Politics in Ancient Ionia*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press
- (ed.) 2014: *Foundation Myths in Ancient Societies: Dialogues and Discourses*. Philadelphia, University of Pennsylvania Press
- MAMA 6 = Buckler, W.H. and Calder, W.M. (eds) 1939: *Monumentae Asiae minoris Antiqua* 6. *Monuments and Documents from Phrygia and Caria*. Manchester, Manchester University Press, on behalf of the American Society for Archaeological Research in Asia Minor
- Marcadé, J. 1964: 'L'acropole Lycienne de Xanthos (review of FdX 2)' *Revue des études anciennes* 66: 132-37
- Marksteiner, T. 1993a: 'Wohn- oder Sakralbauten. Die Suche nach den hölzernen Vorbildern lykischer Felsgräber' *Jahreshefte des österreichischen archäologischen Institutes in Wien* 62: 87-94
- 1993b: 'Stadtdarstellungen und lykische Städte' in J. Borchhardt and G. Dobesch (eds), *Akten des II. internationalen Lykien-Symposions*. Vienna, Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften: 31-38
- 1993c: 'Klassisches Polygonalmauerwerk in lykischen Befestigungen' in J. des Courtils and J.-C. Moretti (eds), *Les grands ateliers d'architecture dans le monde Aegaen du VI siècle av. J.-C.: actes du colloque d'Istanbul, 23-25 mai 1991*. Paris, Institut français d'études anatoliennes; De Boccard: 35-46
- 1997: *Die befestigte Siedlung von Limyra, Studien zur vorrömischen Wehrarchitektur und Siedlungsentwicklung in Lykien unter besonderer Berücksichtigung der klassischen Periode*. Vienna, Phoibos

- 2002: *Trysa; Eine zentrallykische Niederlassung im Wandel der Zeit*. Vienna, Phoibos
- 2005: 'Das achämenidzeitliche Lykien' in P. Briant and R. Boucharlat (eds), *Archéologie de l'empire Achéménid. Nouvelles recherches*. Paris, De Boccard: 27-48
- 2006: 'Review of A. Thomsen, Die lykische Dynastensiedlung auf dem Avşar Tepesi, Bonn 2002' *Gnomon* 78: 242-47
- 2012: 'Die Siedlungsgeschichte der ostlykischen Polis Limyra. Ein wissenschaftlicher Essay' in M. Seyer (ed.), *40 Jahre Grabung Limyra. Akten des internationalen Symposiums Wien 3.-5. Dezember 2009*. Vienna, Österreichisches archäologisches Institut: 199-209
- Matthews, V.J. 1974: *Panyassis of Halikarnassos: Text and Commentary*. Leiden, Brill
- McGowen, E. 2013: 'Maussollos's Mnema. An Iconological Approach to the Architecture of the Maussoleion at Halikarnassos' in O. Henry (ed.), *Le mort dans la ville. Pratiques, contextes et impacts des inhumations intra-muros en Anatolie, du début d l'Âge du Bronze à l'époque romaine*. Istanbul, Institut français d'études Anatoliennes: 157-73
- Metzger, H. 1963: *Fouilles de Xanthos 2. L'acropole Lycienne*. Paris, Librairie C. Klincksieck
- 1971: 'Sur deux groupes de reliefs 'Gréco-Perses' d'Asie mineure' *L'Antiquité classique* 40: 505-25
- 1972: *Fouilles de Xanthos 4. Les céramiques archaïques et classiques de l'acropole lycienne*. Paris, Librairie C. Klincksieck
- 1974: 'La frise de satyres et de fauves de l'acropole de Xanthos' in *Mansel'e Armağan (Mélanges Mansel)*. Ankara, Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi: 127-37, pls 63-64
- 1975: 'Ekphora, convoi funèbre, cortège de dignitaires en Grèce et à la périphérie du monde grec' *Revue archéologique*: 209-20
- Möbius, E. 1960: 'Die alte Königin. Zur Deutung des Harpyienmonuments von Xanthos' in F. Eckstein (ed.), *Theoria. Festschrift für W.H. Schuchhardt*. Baden-Baden, B. Grimm: 159-65
- Morgan, C. and Coulton, J.J. 1997: 'The Polis as a Physical Entity' in M.H. Hansen (ed.), *The Polis as an Urban Centre and as a Political Community*. Copenhagen, Munksgaard: 87-144
- Mørkholm, O. and Zahle, J. 1972: 'The Coinage of Kuprilli. A Numismatic and Archaeological Study' *Acta Archaeologica* 43: 57-113
- Mørkholm, O. and Neumann, G. 1978: *Die lykischen Münzlegenden*. Göttingen, Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht
- Mühlbauer, L. 2007: *Lykische Grabarchitektur. Vom Holz und Stein*. Vienna, Phoibos
- 2012: 'Modell und Invention. Lykische Grabarchitektur in Limyra' in M. Seyer (ed.), *40 Jahre Grabung Limyra. Akten des internationalen Symposiums Wien 3.-5. Dezember 2009*. Vienna, Österreichisches archäologisches Institut: 211-21
- Neer, R.T. 2012: *Art and Archaeology of the Greek World*. London, Thames and Hudson
- Neils, J. 2001: *The Parthenon Frieze*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press
- Neumann, G. 1979: *Neufunde lykischer Inschriften seit 1901*. Vienna, Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften
- Noll, R. 1971: *Das Heroön von Gölbaşı-Trysa*. Vienna, H. Holzhauser
- Nollé, M. 1992: *Denkmäler vom Satrapensitz Daskyleion: Studien zur graeco-persischen Kunst*. Berlin, Akademie Verlag
- Oberleitner, W. 1994: 'Das Heroön von Trysa; ein lykisches Fürstengrab des 4. Jahrhunderts v. Chr.' *Antike Welt* 25 (special issue)
- Osborne, J. 2014: 'Settlement Planning and Urban Symbolism in Syro-Anatolian Cities' *Cambridge Archaeological Journal* 24: 195-214
- Özhanlı, M. 2002: 'İsinda Dikme Anıtı' *Adalya* 5: 73-106
- Paralipomena* = Beazley, J. 1971: *Paralipomena. Additions to Attic Black-figure Vase Painters and to Attic Red-figure Vase Painters*. 2nd ed. Oxford, Clarendon Press
- Pfuhl, E. and Möbius, H. 1977: *Die ostgriechischen Grabreliefs*. Mainz am Rhein, von Zabern
- Poggio, A. 2010: 'Modelli di diffusione della scultura in marmo tra VI e V sec. A.C.: La Licia' in G. Adornato (ed.), *Scolpire il Marmo. Importazioni, Artisti Itineranti, Scuole Artistiche nel Mediterraneo Antico. Atti del convegno di studio tenuto a Pisa Scuola Normale Superiore, 9-11 novembre 2009*. Milan, LED: 235-49
- Price, S. 2006: 'Reconstructing the Ancient City: Imagining the Athenian Polis' in G. Weiss-Sussex and F. Bianchini (eds), *Urban Mindscapes of Europe*. Amsterdam, Rodopi: 211-24
- Pryce, F.N. 1928: *Sculpture of the British Museum. Vol. 1 Part 1: Prehellenic and Early Greek*. London, British Museum
- Ratté, C. 1992: 'The Pyramid Tomb at Sardis' *Istanbuler Mitteilungen* 42: 135-61
- RE = von Pauly, A.F. (ed.) 1894-1980: *Pauly's Real Encyclopädie der Classischen Altertumswissenschaft*. Stuttgart, J.B. Metzler

- Richter, G.M.A. and Smith, R.R.R. 1984: *The Portraits of the Greeks (abridged)*. Oxford, Phaidon Press
- Ridgway, B.S. 1970: *The Severe Style in Greek Sculpture*. Princeton, Princeton University Press
- Robert, L. 1990: *Opera Minora Selecta: épigraphie et antiquités grecques, vol. 7*. Amsterdam, Hakkert
- Root, M.C. 1991: 'From the Heart. Powerful Persianisms in the Art of the Western Empire' in H. Sancisi-Weerdenburg (ed), *Achaemenid History, 6. Asia Minor and Egypt. Old Cultures in a New Empire. Proceedings of the Groningen 1988 Achaemenid History Workshop*. Leiden, Netherlands Institute for the Near East: 1-29
- Rose, C.B. 2008: 'Separating Fact from Fiction in the Aiolian Migration' *Hesperia* 77: 399-430
- 2013: *The Archaeology of Greek and Roman Troy*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press
- Rose, C.B. and Körpe, R. at press 'The Tumuli of Troy and the Troad' in O. Henry and U. Kelp (eds), *Tumulus as Sema*. Berlin, de Gruyter
- Rudolph, C. 2003: *Das 'Harpyien-Monument' von Xanthos: seine Bedeutung innerhalb der spätarchaischen Plastik*. Oxford, Hedges
- Şare, T. 2013: 'The Sculpture of the Heroön of Perikle at Limyra: The Making of a Lycian King' *Anatolian Studies* 63: 55-74
- Savaş, S.Ö. 2006: 'Anadolu (Hitit-Luvi) Hiyeroglifi Belgeler Işığında: Hattusa'dan Lukka'ya' in K. Dörtlük, B. Varkıvaç, T. Kahya, J. des Courtils, M. Doğan Alparslan and R. Boyraz (eds), 3. *Likya sempozyumu, 7-10 kasım 2005, Antalya. Sempzyum bildirleri. (= 3rd Symposium on Lycia, 7-1 November 2005, Antalya. Symposium proceedings)*. 2 vols. Antalya, Suna & İnan Kıraç Research Institute on Mediterranean Civilizations (AKMED): vol. 2, 679-710
- Schmidt-Dounas, B. 1985: *Der lykische Sarkophag aus Sidon*. Tübingen, E. Wasmuth
- Schürr, D. 2007: 'Zum Agora-Pfeiler in Xanthos I. Anschluss eines weiteren Fragments' *Kadmos* 46: 109-24
- SEG = 1923- : *Supplementum epigraphicum graecum*. Leiden, Sijthoff
- Seyer, M. 2004: 'Ein bemerkenswerter Bau in Zentrallykien. Überlegungen zu dem Grabmal des *Ñðurigaṣā* in Çindam' *Jahreshefte des österreichischen archäologischen Institutes in Wien* 73: 221-36
- Shahbazi, A.S. 1975: *The Irano-Lycian Monuments. The Principal Antiquities of and its Region as Evidence for Iranian Aspects of Achaemenid Lycia*. Tehran, International Communicators
- Shapiro, H.A. 1991: 'Theseus: Aspects of the Hero in Archaic Greece' in D. Buitron-Oliver (eds), *New Perspectives in Early Greek Art*. Washington DC, National Gallery of Art: 123-40
- Simpson, E. 2010: *The Furniture from Tumulus MM*. Leiden, Brill
- Strathmann, C. 2002: *Grabkultur im antiken Lykien des 6. bis 4. Jahrhunderts v. Chr. Grabanlagen in ihrem baulichen und gesellschaftlichen Kontext*. Frankfurt am Main, Peter Lang
- Summerer, L., Ivantchik, A. and von Kienlin, A. (eds) 2011: *Kelainai – Apameia Kibotos: Stadtentwicklung im anatolischen Kontext/Kélainai – Apamée Kibōtos: Développement urbain dans le contexte anatolien. Akten des Kolloquiums, München 2 April-4 April 2009*. Bordeaux, De Bocard: Ausonius
- TAM 2 = Kalinka, E. 1920-44: *Tituli Asiae minoris 2. Tituli Lyciae linguis Graeca et Latina conscripti*. 3 vols. Vienna, Alfred Hoelder
- Tanner, J. 1992: 'Art as Expressive Symbolism: Civic Portraits in Classical Athens' *Cambridge Archaeological Journal* 2: 167-90
- 2000: 'Portraits, Power, and Patronage in the Late Roman Republic' *The Journal of Roman Studies* 90: 18-50
- 2006: *The Invention of Art History in Ancient Greece: Religion, Society and Artistic Rationalisation*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press
- Thomsen, A. 2002: *Die lykische Dynastensiedlung auf dem Avşar Tepesi*. Bonn, R. Habelt
- Thonemann, P. 2009: 'Lycia, Athens and Amorges' in J. Ma, N. Papazarkadas and R. Parker (eds), *Interpreting the Athenian Empire*. London, Duckworth: 167-94
- TL = (TAM 1=) Kalinka, E. 1901: *Tituli Asiae minoris 1. Tituli Lyciae lingua Lycia conscripti*. Vienna, Alfred Hoelder
- Turner, S. 2014. "Who's the Daddy? Contesting and Constructing Theseus's Paternity in Fifth-Century Athens." In N. Mac Sweeney (ed.) *Foundation Myths in Ancient Societies: Dialogues and Discourses*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press: 71-201
- Vismara, N. 2006: 'Alcune iconografie monetali della Lycia del V secolo a.C. e Kuprlli. Espressione d'imperio o realismo politico (?)' *Res antiquae* 3: 151-62
- 2007: 'Some Reflections on Iconographic Motifs in the Lycian Coinage: A Powerful Political Presence of the Achaemenid Empire in a Border Region' in I. Delemen, O. Casabonne, S. Karagöz and O. Tekin (eds), *The Achaemenid Impact on Local Populations and Cultures in*

- Anatolia (6th-4th Centuries B.C.). Symposium in Istanbul, 21-22 May 2005.* Istanbul, Türk Eskiçağ Bilimleri Enstitüsü: 59-68
- Vlassopoulos, K. 2013: *Greeks and Barbarians*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press
- Waters, M.W. 2014: *Ancient Persia: A Concise History of the Achaemenid Empire, 550-330 BCE*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press
- Weicker, G. 1902: *Der Seelenvogel in der alten Litteratur und Kunst: eine mythologisch-archaeologische Untersuchung*. Leipzig, B.G. Teubner
- Young, R.S. 1981: *Gordion Excavations Final Reports I: Three Great Early Tumuli (P, MM, W)*. Philadelphia, University of Pennsylvania Museum
- Zahle, J. 1979: 'Lykische Felsgräber mit Reliefs aus dem 4. Jh. v. Chr. Neue und alte Funde' *Jahrbuch des deutschen archäologischen Instituts* 94: 245-346
- 1989: 'Politics and Economy in Lycia during the Persian Period' *L'or perse et l'histoire greque. Revue des etudes anciennes, special edition* 91.1-2: 169-82
- 1991: 'Achaemenid Influences in Lycia (Coinage, Sculpture, Architecture). Evidence for Political Changes During the 5th Century BC' in H. Sancisi-Weerdenburg and A. Kuhrt (eds), *Achaemenid History 6. Asia Minor and Egypt: Old Cultures in a New Empire. Proceedings of the Groningen 1988 Achaemenid History Workshop*. Leiden, Netherlands Institute for the Near East: 145-60
- Zimmermann, M. 2004: 'Phellos (Orta Likya) Yüzey Araştırması 2003/Survey in Phellos (Central Lycia) 2003' *ANMED. Anadolu Akdenizi Arkeoloji Haberleri* 2004-2: 101-04, http://www.akmedanmed.com/pdf/2004_20.pdf
- 2005: 'Eine Stadt und ihr kulturelles Erbe. Vorbericht über Feldforschungen im zentrallykischen Phellos, 2002-2004' *Istanbuler Mitteilungen* 55: 215-50
- 2006: 'Phellos in Zentrallykien und die Grundmuster lykischer Siedlungsgeschichte' in K. Dörtlük, B. Varkıvanç, T. Kahya, J. des Courtils, M. Doğan Alparslan, and R. Boyraz (eds), *3. Likya sempozyumu 7-10 Kasım 2005 Antalya: Sempozyum bildirileri (= The 3rd Symposium on Lycia: 7-10 November 2005, Antalya: Symposium proceedings)*, 2 vols. Antalya, Suna & İnan Kıraç Research Institute on Mediterranean Civilizations (AKMED): vol. 2, 907-17



Fig. 1
Map of Turkey and the Eastern Mediterranean showing locations of sites mentioned in text. By author using Stepmap.com.




Fig. 2
Map of the Tekke Peninsula showing sites in Lycia, including those mentioned in text. By author using Stepmap.com.



Fig. 3
Panoramic overview of Xanthus, taken from the so-called 'Roman acropolis', showing locations of major landmarks including the three 'heroa' on the 'Lycian acropolis' overlooking the River Xanthus. Photo by author (2003).



Fig. 4
View of the 'Lycian acropolis' of Xanthus as seen from the bridge over the river below. Photo by author (2010).




Fig. 5
Plan of Xanthus showing locations of monuments mentioned in text. The 'Lycian acropolis' is located in the southwest corner. After Demargne 1958: fig. 1. With the kind permission of J. des Courtils.




Fig. 6
 The acropolis of Xanthus, pre-540 BC phase (Metzger 1963: fig. 1 with adaptations after Metzger 1963: fig. 2, with the kind permission of J. des Courtils). Cf. Thomsen 2002: fig. 18.




Fig. 7

The acropolis of Xanthus, 540-470 BC phase. (Metzger 1963: fig. 1 with adaptations after Metzger 1963: fig. 2, with the kind permission of J. des Courtils). Cf. Thomsen 2002: fig. 18.



Fig. 8

Sample of ceramics from sondages A6 (comprising the early storage room M4) and A7 (south slope) on the 'Lycian acropolis' published in Metzger 1972 (catalogue numbers provided below). All in Istanbul Archaeological Museum. Sizes give rough idea of scale, but not exact.

Left, top to bottom:

A7-1869 and A7-1871 = 'Rhodian/East Greek' figurines of seated women, Metzger 1972: cats 140 and 134 (this one a perfume vessel) respectively, pl. 30, h. 0.135m and 0.175m respectively, c. 520 BC (?);

A7-1872 = small terracotta figurine of recumbent lion, cat. 152, pl. 33, h. 0.052m, no date suggested (later sixth century?);

A6-3459 = 'Ionian' cup, cat. 45, pl. 11, h. 0.098m, diameter 0.162m, Hayes type 10, sixth century BC;

A6-3440 = fragment of an Attic white ground cup showing recumbent symposiast, cat. 361, pl. 81 h. 0.077m, c. 475-450 BC;

Middle, top to bottom:

A6-3444 = large Attic black figure crater ('in the manner of Sophilos', attributed to the Painter of Xanthus 6.3444 by Beazley), cat. 193, pl. 44, h. 0.85m, c. 570 BC (Ist. Arch. Mus. 193, *Paralipomena* 18.1; *Addenda*² 9, *Beazley Archive Database* vase number 350084);

A6-3453 = large 'Eastern Mediterranean' (called 'Anatolian' by Metzger) red slip ware (a less refined kind of black on red ware) bowl, cat. 93, pl. 22, h. 0.54m, diameter 0.172m, pre-540 BC;

Right, top to bottom:

A6-3466 = fragment of an Attic black figure band cup with Dionysiac revelry scene, cat. 287, pl. 66, h. 0.056m, c. 500 BC;

A7-1885 = 'Rhodian' bowl, cat. 32, pl. 7, no height given, diameter 0.22m, sixth century BC;

A6-3448 = cat. 52, East Greek/Anatolian crater/stamnos, cat. 52, pl. 13, h. 0.232m, mid-sixth century BC.

With the kind permission of J. des Courtils.




Fig. 9
The acropolis of Xanthus, post 470 BC, pre-Hellenistic phase. Later structures were excavated in the northeastern corner of the acropolis subsequent to the making of the plan (Metzger 1963: fig. 1 with adaptations after Metzger 1963: fig. 2, with the kind permission of J. des Courtils). Cf. Thomsen 2002: fig. 18.



Fig. 10

Photo of the remains of the base of Building F. Photo by author (2010).



Fig. 11

Photo of the remains of massive polygonal blocks forming the south wall of the terrace platform on which Building G stood, showing its position overlooking the river below. Photo by author (2010).



Fig. 12

Photo of the massive polygonal blocks and ashlars of the southern and eastern walls of the terrace platform of Building G. The wall abutting the northeastern corner belongs to a later Byzantine structure (see Fig. 9). Photo by author (2003).




Fig. 13

Photo of the remains of the terrace platform of Building H. Photo by author (2010).




Fig. 14

Drawing of the remains of the base of Building H and reconstructed plan showing step/bench before it. Metzger 1963: fig. 18 (top) and fig. on p. 64 (bottom). With the kind permission of J. des Courtils.



Fig. 15
The 'Siren Gable' attributed to Building F (British Museum B289). Photo © Trustees of the British Museum.



Fig. 16
One of the two Sphinx Gables attributed to Building H (British Museum B290a and b). Photo © Trustees of the British Museum.



Fig. 17
Relief from the East side of the Harpy Monument (British Museum B287). Photo © Trustees of the British Museum.




Fig. 18
Drawing of the slabs of 'parade' frieze attributed to Building G with photo of detail. (British Museum B311-314; Antalya 3532.) Drawings by author; photo © Trustees of the British Museum.




Fig. 19

Artists' impression of the buildings on the Xanthian 'acropolis', looking southwest. The drawing does not account for Building D, which would block the view shown. Metzger 1963: fig. 28. With the kind permission of J. des Courtils.




Fig. 20

Drawings of façades of Building H, showing attributed blocks. Metzger 1963: figs 22 and 23. With the kind permission of J. des Courtils.




Fig. 21
Reconstruction of Building H. After Metzger 1963: fig. 24. With the kind permission
of J. des Courtils.



Fig. 22

Drawing of the façade of Building F, showing attributed blocks, including the base blocks with cockerel and hen frieze, which the excavators subsequently attributed to a lower level of Building G. Metzger 1963: fig. 27. With the kind permission of J. des Courtils.




Fig. 23

Reconstructed east and south sides of Building G, showing attributed blocks, without cockerel and hen frieze. After Metzger 1963: figs 13 and 14. With the kind permission of J. des Courtils.




Fig. 24

Reconstruction of Building G showing extant blocks in grey and interior with hypothesised pillar supports for the roof slabs. After Metzger 1963: fig. 16. With the kind permission of J. des Courtils.



Fig. 25

Overlaying of plans of pavement and first level of superstructure as shown in Metzger 1963: figs 11 top and bottom, to show interior space with hypothesised pillars inside Building G. With the kind permission of J. des Courtils.




Fig. 26

Reconstructed eastern and southern sides of Building G, with the addition of the cockfight and hen friend. Note the redistribution of the faux transverse relieving beams on the sides compared with fig. 20 (Coupel, Metzger 1976: figs 13, 16 respectively; with the kind permission of J. des Courtils; note that the quality of the reproduction here is affected by the original published drawing, which is very faint and difficult to capture).



Fig. 27

Photo of the 'City Relief' on one side of the porch of the so-called 'Royal Tomb' at Pinara, showing crenellated city walls with towers, and buildings which may be house tombs and sarcophagi adorning the cityscape. Photo by author (2010).



Fig. 28

Photo of the quarried temenos with rock cut 'heroa' at Phellus, Central Lycia. Photo by author (2010).