

RECENT WORK AT PHOKAIA IN THE LIGHT OF AKURGAL'S EXCAVATIONS

In the VIth Turkish History Congress Akurgal, who presented a paper on the excavations at Foça, stated: "The excavation of this ancient Ionian city, an important *desideratum* of archaeological literature, has provided important results for the pottery of the Hellene Archaic Period and for the Ionic architectural order"¹. Here Akurgal wished to emphasize that Phokaia was an important object of desire in archaeological literature. Again, years later, when we again took in hand the excavations of Phokaia, Akurgal said: "Phokaia has a truly enchanting natural setting; not only was it the most charming and magical city of antiquity, it was the most beautiful one as well"².

Archaeological excavations at Foça were begun by Felix Sartiaux, who made soundings here in the years 1913, 1914 and 1920. All these exploratory digs coincided with the war years; for this reason Sartiaux was unable to do long-term work at Foça. For a long period after the 1920's no scientific excavations were done here.

After 32 years had passed excavations at Foça were again on the agenda. Akurgal first went to Foça in 1948, when he began the Bayraklı excavations, and he immensely admired the natural beauty of the place. In 1951 he interrupted the excavations at Bayraklı. Akurgal and the General Director of Museums, Dr. Cahit Kınay, together prepared a plan. The carrying out of systematic work was planned for the clarification, in western Anatolia, of the material relevant to cultures

contemporary with the Troy I – VI strata, to traces of the most ancient Thracian tribes in Anatolia, to the Greek colonization, and also with the aim of identifying the remains belonging to the Aeolian and Ionian civilizations. According to this program it was decided to make excavations at Kyme and Foça. The latter city was an Ionian settlement in the midst of Aeolis. At the end of the 7th and in the first half of the 6th century BC it held an important place in the Hellene world. It also founded colonies in the eastern Mediterranean. From all these standpoints it was a center that needed to be studied. Thus the decision was made to recommence excavations here. Because the results of the old excavations had been insufficiently published and because the location of the excavated material was unknown, it was very necessary to do systematic work. In October of the year 1952, together with the director of the Izmir Museum, Hakkı Gültekin, Akurgal made a few investigative soundings in Foça. Thus scientific excavations were again taken in hand here after a very long interval of 32 years³.

Beginning in July of 1953 the excavations, which had started as exploratory work in 1952, again began to be done in a comprehensive fashion⁴. From 1952 until

¹ Akurgal 1967,76.

² Özyiğit 1998b, The preface and the back cover.

³ Akurgal 1956a, 13; Akurgal 1956b, 32-33.

⁴ The first excavation team, under the direction of Prof. Dr. Ekrem Akurgal, consisted of Dr. Yusuf Boysal and Baki Ögün from the Faculty of Language and Historical Geography of Ankara University, Division Director Ahmet Dönmez from the General Directorship of Museums,

1957 they were done continuously. Later excavation work was also done in 1970 and a few of the preceding excavation seasons. Throughout all the excavations work was mainly done on the peninsula. Digging on the peninsula was carried out in six different sectors. These sectors, in the form of large trenches, were each identified with a letter: A, B, C, D, F and H. Some digging was also done on the isthmus and on the mainland. The work done on the Maltepe Tumulus is an example. On the other hand, besides the cleaning and digging work done at the Şeytan Hamamı, south of the city, investigations were also carried out on the Persian Monumental Tomb located by the Izmir highway 7 km. east of Foça. Now let us examine one by one the work done in all these sectors in the light of the publications we have in hand.

Trench A

This trench was dug in 1952 when the excavations first began. It was located near the isthmus section of the peninsula, by the no longer extant ruins of the Aya Fotini Church. In the digging here, besides Archaic Period pottery in black figure technique, Late Geometric ceramics were also retrieved. In addition to this pottery the existence of architectural remains on the bedrock was also established. Thus it was understood that in the location of this Trench A there had been Archaic city settlement⁵. With these excavation results the conclusion was reached that the Archaic city had been located on the peninsula. Whereas in the most recent

archaeologist Nihal Koloğlu, Nezih Fıratlı from the Istanbul Archaeology Museums, and doctoral student Ms. Marion Pies who was studying at the Institute of Archaeology of the Language and Historical Geography Faculty of Münster University. Akurgal carried out these excavations with Cevdet Bayburtluoğlu, Ümit Serdaroğlu and Cevat Erder. The last campaigns of the Second Phase Excavations were realized on behalf of Akurgal under the direction of Ümit Serdaroğlu.

⁵ Akurgal 1956a, 14; Akurgal 1956b, 33; Akurgal 1993, 57; Akurgal 1995, 34.

excavations that we have carried out it has been established that the Archaic city was essentially located on the mainland, that it spread over a very large area, and that it naturally also had extensions on the peninsula.

Trench B

Trench B was opened on the isthmus section of the peninsula, in the area where the Ottoman Cemetery was located. Today this Turkish cemetery no longer exists, for in later years it was removed and in its place new buildings were constructed. Soundings made here reached a depth of 1.60 m. In the upper levels Byzantine pottery was found. At a depth of 1.60 m., however, a layer of sand was encountered; for this reason the conclusion was reached that in the Roman Period this point had been part of the sea. The fact that at this depth no ancient cultural levels were encountered either led the excavators to this conclusion. The aim of the excavations done here was to determine the boundaries of Archaic Phokaia and to determine whether in antiquity the peninsula had or had not been an island⁶. In the most recent excavations we brought answers to these questions. These will be considered below.

Trench C

This trench was to the west of what is today the old middle school building, located on a level rocky platform that was the site of the Temple of Athena. In digging done here the bedrock was quickly reached and, together with pottery belonging to the Late Geometric Period, gray Aeolian pottery was also retrieved. For this reason, because of the presence of gray Aeolian ware of a single type, Akurgal stated tentatively that Phokaia had been colonized, at the latest, in

⁶ Akurgal 1956a, 14; Akurgal 1956b, 33-34; Akurgal 1993, 57; Akurgal 1995, 34.

the 8th century BC ⁷. In this trench it was made clear that the layer belonging to the first half of the 6th century BC rested upon bedrock. The location of Trench C is not certain. However according to its description it must have been to the west of the temple. After remaining open for years the trench was filled in by the school administration around the end of the 1970s. In the course of the third phase excavations recommenced by us, digging was done at the Temple of Athena in 1998 at the place of Trench C; it was not possible to carry out excavations of the temple's southern part due to the fact that this was a place where the school's athletics were done. On the seaward facing western edge of the level rock surface upon which the Temple of Athena was located, a lime pit and numerous Ionic column drums were revealed. Thus in the course of these excavations it was understood that a large structure had been located upon this level rock surface and that, after the building had been destroyed, its marble architectural elements were burned to make lime.

Trench D

Trench D was located at the center of the peninsula in the place which is now a car park and was excavated by archaeologist Nihal Koloğlu, of the General Directorate. In the excavations it was emphasized that underneath the layer belonging to the first half of the 6th century there were two settlement levels. In trench D important sections of a house belonging to the 6th century were revealed. Of this house three walls are of rectangular masonry, and one wall is, on the exterior face only, of polygonal masonry. In the digging done in this trench numerous examples of black figure East Greek pottery of the Klazomenian type were retrieved. Abundant examples of this type of ceramics were also found in the Bayraklı excavations. On the

⁷ Akurgal 1956a, 14-15; Akurgal 1956b, 33, 35; Akurgal 1995, 34.

other hand much Attic black figure pottery was also found in this trench ⁸.

Trench F

Trench F was located near the medieval city wall on the isthmus section east of the peninsula. It was also near and to the south of trench A. In the excavations done here marble columns and upper structural elements of a large building belonging to the Roman Period were retrieved. According to Akurgal it perhaps belonged to Phokaia's Roman Period agora⁹. It is most unfortunate that the area where this building was located is now filled with multistoried concrete buildings.

The Temple of Athena and Trench H

Akurgal relates thus how he found the location of the Temple of Athena: "I first went to Foça in 1948 at the time when I was beginning the excavations at Bayraklı and I was enchanted with its natural beauty. The Small Port, the Great Port and the small islands to the west of the peninsula presented a charming picture. In those days at the tip of the peninsula of Foça, on the highest part of the level rock surface in the area where the lycée is now situated, there was an unfinished middle school building. After three walls of the middle school had been built, construction was interrupted. In its half finished state the middle school gave me the impression of being an ancient temple. I thought to myself that here must probably have stood the Temple of Athena mentioned by Xenophon and Pausanias..."¹⁰. In fact Akurgal's impression proved to be correct, for this

⁸ Akurgal 1956a, 14-15; Akurgal 1956b, 33, 35; Pl. 2, 4a; Akurgal 1961, 180, Fig. 128-130; Akurgal 1993, 58-59, Pl. 102b, 103; Akurgal 1995, 34, 36-38.

⁹ Akurgal 1956b, 38, Pl. 5-6; Akurgal 1993, 59; Akurgal 1995, 36.

¹⁰ See: footnote 2.

level place was the highest and most beautiful point in the city. It was very natural that such a place should be set apart for the goddess Athena, chief deity of the city. Akurgal had reasoned correctly and in the excavations that he made here he encountered the remains of the Temple of Athena. With this in mind digging was begun in those sections of the rocky flat area which were covered with earth and, as the first finds, architectural *terra cotta* fragments belonging to the temple were retrieved on the northern edge of the level rock surface. Circular acroterion fragments and various pieces of gutter decorated with Ionic kymatia were the first indications of the temple¹¹. Trench H was immediately south of the level ground where the temple was located, where the basketball field is now. The trench was first opened in 1954 and from that year to 1957 the trench was enlarged. In the excavations of 1954 an Ionic capital belonging to the first half of the 6th century BC was found and this capital was retrieved together with other architectural fragments of the temple. Thus Akurgal's theory, that is, the location of the Temple of Athena, was proved correct¹². All these architectural fragments were of tufa stone. Thus it was understood that the older temple was of this material, while the Roman Period one was of marble. It was seen that many architectural fragments belonging to the temple were used as filling material in a Roman Period wall. The architectural finds retrieved in Trench H were studied by Ümit Serdaroğlu¹³. From this work we obtain information about the architectural fragments and especially about their find places. However a wall which, in this study and in others of the Second Period Excavations, had been termed "the large Hellenistic wall", was understood, in the excavations later carried out

by ourselves, to be a podium wall belonging to the time of the earliest construction of the temple. In other words, in our view this podium wall must be from the first quarter of the 6th century BC. Also all the column capital elements were naturally retrieved in front of this wall, that is, outside of the temple's podium area. For example, in 1955 in the eastern section of Trench H, within a wall belonging to a later period and perpendicular to the podium wall, an architectural element similar to and representing a continuation of that kind which at Bayraklı was termed the mushroom capital was found in two large pieces. As to the Ionic capital, this was found 2 m. in front of the podium wall in 1954, that is, when Trench H was first opened. We are of the opinion that this capital is the real column capital of the temple. Unfortunately the Ionic kymatia of this column capital, now in the Izmir Museum, are no longer in place¹⁴. Between the years 1954 and 1957 numerous column drums of tufa stone were retrieved in Trench H. These had generally been used as fill in walls of later periods and bore 31 or 33 flutes. In 1955, in room A of Trench H, a column fragment with a *torus* was retrieved. Other than this, besides the abundant column drums which were retrieved, a few other architectural elements were found. For example, *scotia* fragments belonging to column bases, a piece of a *torus* and pieces having bead and reel decoration which may have been elements of the superstructure; all these must have belonged to the temple. One of the most interesting of the finds is the palm capital retrieved in 1957, again in this trench. Dated towards the middle of the 6th century BC, this capital shows a great resemblance to the palm capital of the Treasury Building of Marseilles; but the palm capital of Phokaia is, in our opinion, perhaps the

¹¹ Akurgal 1956b, 36; Akurgal 1993, 58, Pl. 107; Akurgal 1995, 35.

¹² Akurgal 1956b, 36, Pl. 3; Akurgal 1993, 58-59, Pl. 104-108; Akurgal 1995, 35-37, 39-40.

¹³ Akurgal 1961, 283 ff., Fig. 252, 286; Serdaroğlu 1967, 35, 40.

¹⁴ Akurgal 1956b, Pl. 3a-b; Akurgal 1993, 102 a, 105 a; Akurgal 1995, 37, 39.

oldest of its kind. Other than this, pieces of *toechobate* were also found. All these architectural pieces are insufficient for a full restitution of the ancient temple. For this the excavations must again be continued. In 1970, after another long interval in which digging ceased, Prof. Dr. Ümit Serdaroğlu carried out excavations on behalf of Akurgal, again in Trench H.

Pottery and Small Finds

In work done on the peninsula in the course of the Second Phase Excavations, Mycenaean pottery was not encountered, but it is stated that a few potsherds belonging to the Early Bronze Age were retrieved¹⁵. It is understood that Ionian settlement and Protogeometric pottery go back as far as the 9th century BC. After the Protogeometric pottery, Geometric pottery and monochrome gray ware belonging to the 8th and 7th centuries BC were found in quite abundant quantities. Other than Protogeometric, Geometric and Orientalizing ceramics, large and numerous quantities of black figure East Greek pottery were retrieved in the course of the excavations. It was seen that in the 6th century BC, besides the Klazomenian type pottery, there existed other types as well. Nevertheless, no works were encountered which might indicate that pottery types produced in Etruria and in other Italian centers, such as the Ceretan Hydriai or the Northampton Group, had been made by artisans coming from Foça¹⁶. On the other hand, Attic works in the black figure technique and belonging especially to the first half of the 6th century BC were retrieved from the surroundings of the Temple of Athena. The Attic ware was published by Yasemin Tuna Nörling¹⁷. Other than pottery, a few small finds were obtained. Terra cotta

statuettes belonging to the Archaic, Classical and Hellenistic periods were also retrieved in Trench H; it is probable that they were offerings to the Temple of Athena.

The Archaic Necropolis

In his published reports Akurgal mentions that the work they had done towards identifying the Archaic cemetery had so far not produced any result, and that if the Archaic necropolis of the city should be found, the work at Foça would enter a much more productive phase¹⁸.

Research on the City Walls

During the Second Phase Excavations, in the search for the 6th century BC city wall that Herodotus had so highly, praised no finds belonging to the Archaic Period fortification wall were obtained; however one section of the Roman Period wall was found. Akurgal stated that because the city wall of Foça was to a great extent founded upon bedrock it would be very difficult to find any remains belonging to this wall¹⁹.

Excavations at Maltepe

Beyond the excavations done on the peninsula, work was done together with Nezih Fıratlı on the hill called Maltepe, located 500-700 m. east of the peninsula. The aim here was to find Lophos, which Nikolaos of Damascus mentioned as being contemporary with *Nesidion*, that is, the small island section of the town. In the test soundings here no architecture at all was retrieved; however abundant pottery belonging to the Hellenistic and Roman Periods was obtained. For this reason it was concluded that this hill was occupied during those periods. But because Archaic Period

¹⁵ Akurgal 1956b, 35; Akurgal 1993, 37; Akurgal 1995, 58.

¹⁶ Akurgal 1956b, 35-36; Akurgal 1957, 39; Akurgal 1993, 58; Akurgal 1995, 37; Bayburtluoğlu 1967, 33-34.

¹⁷ Tuna-Nörling 1993, 16 ff.; Tuna-Nörling 1997 435ff.

¹⁸ Akurgal 1956a, 15; Akurgal 1956b, 39.

¹⁹ Akurgal 1956a, 15; Akurgal 1965b, 37-38; Akurgal 1993, 59; Akurgal 1995, 40.

pottery was also found, the reports state that it was understood that this hill was also the scene of settlement in the Archaic Period. In the reports mention is made of the fact that the colored pottery retrieved here indicated the existence of cultural levels which belonged to the 6th century BC at the latest. In later years, although it was decided to carry out various excavations in this area, no digging was again done at Maltepe, for although pottery belonging to the Archaic, Hellenistic and Roman Periods was very abundant, no architectural stratum was obtained²⁰. In the investigations we later carried out here it became clear that this place was not a settlement mound but a tumulus.

The Work at Şeytan Hamamı

On the slopes of the hills immediately south of Foça a tomb carved from the rock face was found. In this grave, called Şeytan Hamamı, research was carried out by Akurgal. It is stated that this tomb resembles those of Lydia. Based on ceramics obtained in the work done here it was thought that the tomb was made at the end of the 4th century BC²¹.

Work on the Monumental Persian Tomb

Akurgal also conducted work upon a monumental tomb located 7 km. east of Foça and north of the asphalt road; this tomb was made by carving a single rock mass. Akurgal notes that this monument was carved out of rock as in Lykia, Lydia and Phrygia, and he states that examples similar to the false door on its front are also encountered in Lydian works. On the other hand he states that it is very similar to the tomb made for King Kyros in the 530s at Pasargadae in Iran, and that such a monument showing Iranian influence, being particular to kings, was foreign to the Hellene democratic way of thinking. Such tombs were

made in Anatolia in the time of Persian rule. The tomb was first dated by Akurgal to the 4th century BC; later he stated that it must be of the 5th or 4th century BC and surmised that it might belong to a tyrant ruling a small area around the monument²². First excavation, and later restoration and landscaping work were done by us at this monument in 2000 and 2001. This subject will be considered again below.

THE MOST RECENT EXCAVATIONS

The most recent, that is, the Third Phase Excavations began by chance. In 1969 the Izmir Museum began test digging on the Roman Period pottery waste dump which forms an artificial hill in the northern part of Foça. Undertaken by permission of the Ministry of Culture and at the request of the owners of the land, who wanted to reduce the site's classification level, the aim of the digging was to determine whether or not there were archaeological remains here. Thus the limits of the protected site areas would be even more narrowed and construction could be done. In the year 1984 Foça also had been affected by the rush to reduce protected site areas in Turkey and the already insufficient extents of the sites had been made even smaller. This hill was in the center of the city and was a First Class Archaeological Site Area. It was desired to remove the hill from the area classified as a protected site or else to reduce its classification, so that building could be done. With this aim digging was begun. Confronted with the finds which emerged as a result of these excavations, the land speculators in pursuit of rents were unable to realize their aims. Through the intervention of the Izmir Museum's Director, Nihat Sümer, I later joined these

²⁰ Akurgal 1956a, 14; Akurgal 1956b, 34; Akurgal 1993, 57; Akurgal 1995, 34.

²¹ Akurgal 1976, 709; Akurgal 1993, 57; Akurgal 2000, 292.

²² Akurgal 1961, 294-295, Fig. 262; Akurgal 1976, 709; Akurgal 1993, 56-57; Akurgal 2000, 291-292.

excavations and became their scientific director, and so the third phase excavations were begun. From 1989 to 1992 the work here continued as an excavation with a scientific director. Later, by a Cabinet of Ministers' Decree, the direction of the excavations passed to me. The excavations done by Akurgal provided us with considerable information about ancient Phokaia, which at that time we did not know very well. However this earlier digging was not fully sufficient and even more research was needed; for this reason we intensified our work and investigations within the city. Yet if the excavations done by Akurgal had not existed we would not have been able to achieve the necessary aims, for the information coming from Sartiaux was extremely insufficient. Where Akurgal had excavated, we also carried out digging. For example, we investigated the problem of the location of the Archaic city and did research on the famous Phokaian city walls. We carried out work on the Monumental Persian Tomb. We investigated the question of the location of the Archaic necropolis and did work concerning it. We also studied the Temple of Athena and the founding of the city, and the problem of the *Bakkheion*. Of these subjects we would like to consider first the founding of the city.

Concerning the Foundation of Phokaia

According to the ancient writers, Phokaiaans arriving under Athenian leadership founded their first settlement in a place allowed to them by the Kymeans. Akurgal states that Josef Keil attributes this account of the ancient writers to a mistaken identification of the Phokaiaans with the people living in Phokis in Greece, and to the effort to link all Ionian colonization to Athens²³. Akurgal emphasizes that the great quantities of gray ware that he found in his excavations prove that these first settlers were Aeolians, as was the case at Kyme. Akurgal also states that Protogeometric

pottery yielded by the excavations indicates that the Ionians lived at Phokaia from at least the end of the 9th century BC²⁴. In the excavations done by us it was understood that Phokaia existed long before the Aeolians. On the slopes south of the city, further south than the city walls mentioned by Herodotos, was located the first settlement area of the Phokaiaans (Fig. 1). Digging here revealed oval houses of the Protogeometric Period underneath Orientalizing Period megarons. The existence of two separate houses belonging to the Protogeometric Period indicates that the Ionians settled here. The fact that in the same area Mycenaean and Gray Minyan pottery was found is also important. That in lower strata of the same area traces of 3rd and 2nd millennium settlement, together with pottery, were encountered shows that Phokaia existed from at least the 3rd millennium BC onwards²⁵. This situation is an important advance from the standpoint of Phokaia's foundation, for not only pottery but also proofs of settlement were found.

The Location of the Archaic Settlement

As was related above, from soundings done in the course of the Second Phase Excavations, for example in digging carried out in Trench A, the conclusion was reached that the Archaic city had been on the peninsula. In the excavations we undertook from 1989 onwards, finds coming from foundation digging in many construction sites, as well as Archaic potsherds that were found in the museum soundings, gave the impression that in the Archaic Period the city was much bigger. Again in the center of Foça, when numerous finds belonging to the Archaic Period turned up in the course of water

²³ Akurgal 1956b, 38.

²⁴ Akurgal 1995, 32; Akurgal 2000, 290.

²⁵ Özyiğit 1998a, 772-777, Drawing 2; Özyiğit 2003 (under press).

channel work that the Municipality did with a steam shovel (Fig. 2), we began excavations in this area that is, between the ancient theatre and the Small Port in the place called by us "the area with mosaics". We reached the conclusion that here the city was occupied from at least the 7th century BC until sometime within the Byzantine Period²⁶. In these excavations we established the fact that upon the settlements of the 7th and 6th centuries BC, levels belonging to the Classical, Hellenistic, Roman and Byzantine periods were one on top of another. Thus it was understood that the city's main settlement area was upon the mainland, and that in the Archaic Period its boundaries were quite extensive. As for the peninsula, the resulting conclusion was that here more important buildings, in particular the temples, were located. Further, in excavations done immediately north of this area beneath the Roman Period ceramic dump²⁷ and also in a parcel a little bit to the north of that, the uncovering of a megaron belonging to the 7th century BC²⁸ shows that in the Archaic Period the settlement was very big indeed.

The Archaic Period City Wall

We know from Herodotos the existence of Foça's ancient city wall. Because the Archaic period city was so extensive we reached the conclusion that this wall would have enclosed a very wide area. Following research done in the city it was understood that the Archaic city walls passed over the summits of the hills east of Foça. The traces of wall beddings cut into the bedrock of these hills had been perceived by Felix Sartiaux as stairways. However, as the result of the investigations we made, it was understood that the depressions carved into the

bedrock of both the Değirmenli and the Altın Mağarası hills were really the traces of bedding cuts into which the blocks of the Archaic Period walls were placed. To do excavation work relating to the Archaic Period city walls we decided to dig at Maltepe. The first scientific work at Maltepe was carried out by Akurgal, together with Nezih Fıratlı, in the years 1953-1955. As we mentioned above, as a result of soundings made here it was proposed that there was an extensive settlement here in the Hellenistic and Roman periods and, from the pottery retrieved, that there also existed cultural strata belonging to the 6th century BC and earlier. Whereas in the excavations carried out by us it was understood that this place was not a settlement mound but a tumulus, and inside it a section of the city walls mentioned by Herodotos was revealed (Fig. 3)²⁹. As a result of the digging at Maltepe those famous walls related by Herodotos were displayed before the eyes of the world in all their magnificence. These walls, which we think were built between 590-580 BC, were considerably more than 5 km. in length. Together with the walls the city gate was uncovered (Fig. 4). The Persians took Phokaia around 546 BC; the gate, which burned during their attacks, was retrieved just as it was left, together with catapult balls and the heads of arrows that they had shot at the city. In this manner a Persian destruction layer of burning was revealed with certainty in excavations done in Ionia. A catapult ball which was retrieved *in situ* upon the ground surface of the city gate is also the most ancient stone catapult ball whose date is known. The length of the city's fortification walls proves that at the beginning of the 6th century BC Phokaia was one of the largest and most important cities of the world.

²⁶ Özyiğit 1995d, 432-437, Drawing 5, Fig. 7-12; Özyiğit 1997 1-4, Drawing 1, Fig. 1-7; Özyiğit 1998a, 3-4, Drawing 1, Fig. 1-7.

²⁷ Özyiğit 1991, 129.

²⁸ Özyiğit 1997, 5-9, Drawing 2-5, Fig. 8-15; Özyiğit 1998a, 770-772, Fig. 18-22.

²⁹ Özyiğit 1993, 1-22; Özyiğit 1994, 77-109; Özyiğit 1995a, 50-55.

The Excavations of the Temple of Athena

As was mentioned above, the location of the Temple of Athena at Phokaia was first identified by Akurgal. Until the second phase excavations the temple's site was unknown; as a result of excavations done by Akurgal, it was understood that the temple stood on the northern end of the peninsula on the area where the former middle school is now located. The trenches opened in the course of the second period excavations at Foça, that is, those of Akurgal, which were abandoned after the 1970s, remained opened until 1979. However in 1979 the school directorate had these trenches filled in. After an interval of about 20 years had passed, in the course of the most recent excavations the Temple of Athena was again taken in hand by us and digging was recommenced west of the temple (Fig. 5). In excavations done between 1998 and 2000 important results were obtained. It was understood that the temple rested upon a podium and that this podium was not exactly rectangular. It was seen that the walls of this 50 meters long podium were constructed of large rectangular blocks and that their masonry style was the same as the style of the Archaic Period city wall uncovered at Maltepe. That these podium walls, which had been taken to be Hellenistic Period walls in the course of the Second Phase excavations, were in fact podium walls belonging to the temple's first phase was understood in the course of the most recent excavations³⁰. In digging carried out west of the temple numerous column drums made of tufa stone were encountered. Architectural fragments made of marble were also found. Accordingly, it was understood that in the Archaic Period, the first phase, the temple was made of tufa stone in the Ionic order, while in the Roman Period it was made of marble and in the Corinthian order. In these works it was understood that the Archaic Period city wall

and the Archaic temple were contemporary or very nearly so. Accordingly the fact emerged that the Temple, which had been dated towards the middle of the 6th century BC, was in fact earlier, having been built in the first quarter of the same century. However, had it not been for the excavations done by Akurgal, and had he not discovered the location of the temple, it would not have been possible to reach these later conclusions.

Was the Temple of Athena's Peninsula an Island?

The island of *Bakkheion* (*Bacchium*)³¹ mentioned by Livy was, according to one view, held to be the peninsula upon which the Temple of Athena was located. Through a misinterpretation of Livy's writings the conclusion was reached that this island had been joined to the mainland and transformed into a peninsula³². Pliny mentions this island as *Bacchina*³³. At some point between 1952 and 1955 during the Second Phase Excavations, and with the aim of determining whether the peninsula was really a peninsula or in fact an island, a sounding was made on the isthmus (Trench B). At a depth of 1.6 m. a layer of sand was found; this led to the conclusion that during the Roman Period this point had been part of the sea³⁴. In our opinion these sandy layers came from streams running off the mountains. During the Sartiaux excavations various soundings had also been made for geological research purposes³⁵. Mentioning the confusion in the texts of Livy, Sartiaux stated that the rocky Hagios Giorgios Island (İncir Adası) would never have been covered with buildings; for this reason Sartiaux was of the opinion that this island could not be Livy's *Bakkheion*, which was

³⁰ Özyiğit 2000, 33-35, Fig. 1-4; Özyiğit 2001, 1-3, Drawing 1, Fig. 1; Özyiğit – Erdoğan 2000, 11-13.

³¹ Livius, XXXVII, 21.

³² Sartiaux 1952, 8, 12.

³³ Plinius, N.H. V 138.

³⁴ Akurgal 1956b, 33-34.

³⁵ Sartiaux 1921, 122ff.

adorned with statues and temples³⁶. Yet Livy shows us clearly the location of the *Bakkheion* Island. He states that this island is close to the city of the Phokaiaians, that it is adorned with temples and statues and, further, that it was at a distance which permitted the Romans to return easily there from Phokaia with their fleet³⁷. In research carried out on İncir Adası numerous sacred areas were found. In our opinion today's İncir Adası must be the *Bakkheion* Island mentioned by Livy, for it fits his description³⁸. Moreover in 2002, when sewage system works for the modern settlement were carried out on the isthmus, it was understood from this digging that there was settlement here and that this place definitely could not be an island.

The Excavations of the Theatre

After identifying the approximate line of the city walls and, reasoning that within these wide boundaries there must be important buildings, the location of the theatre was sought. During our work in 1990 we thought that the city's theatre must be on the northwestern slope of the Değirmenli hill. In fact in 1991 apartment buildings were about to be constructed in this place. Immediately before the commencement of building we began excavations here and by the time the owners of the land stopped us we had found the theatre. As a result of the excavations it was understood that this was the most ancient theatre in Anatolia (Fig. 6)³⁹. In work done here the northern analemma of the theatre and a few rows of the cavea's seats were brought to light. The theatre was dated to the years 340-330 BC by ceramic finds from within the building's own fill, by a Phokaian coin retrieved *in situ* from underneath the seats, by

the style of the analemma wall and by the profiles of the seats. In particular the resemblance of these profiles to those of the seats in the theatre of Erythrai attracts attention; thus the Erythrai theatre was accordingly built in perhaps the last quarter of the 4th century BC.

The Kybele Cult Areas

During the most recent excavations it was revealed that for the Phokaiaians the goddess Kybele was of very great importance. In the work done, areas sacred to Kybele were found in many places in the ancient city and upon the islands. Thus in Phokaia reverence was paid to the goddess Kybele together with Athena. On the northern slope of the Temple of Athena's site a cult area belonging to Kybele, which we named the Port Sanctuary, was revealed on the seafront (Fig. 7)⁴⁰ in 1993. The Port Sanctuary, which we dated to the 580s BC, was landscaped and opened to display in 1994⁴¹. On the other hand research concerning the Goddess was also carried out on islands just offshore from Phokaia: İncir Adası, which we presume to be *Bakkheion*, and Orak Adası. Besides this, work was also done on the Değirmentepe hill where the theatre is located⁴².

Excavations of the Archaic Period Southern Necropolis and of the Area of Altars

In the course of the Second Period Excavations Akurgal looked for the necropolis of the Archaic city, but it was not found. When, during the most recent excavations, it was determined that the city had been of such great size, the finding of

³⁶ *Ibid.*, 127-128.

³⁷ S. Footnote 30.

³⁸ This island, which was named Hagios Georgios (St. Georges) Island in the 19th century, is also called *Bakkheion* on old maps: Papadopoulos 1879 (The map of G. Weber at the end).

³⁹ Özyiğit 1993, 1-22.

⁴⁰ Özyiğit 1995d, 426-432, Drawing 2, Fig. 1-6; Özyiğit 1995a, 55-58.

⁴¹ Özyiğit 1996, 4-5, Drawing 1-3, Fig. 1-7.

⁴² Özyiğit 1998a, 765-770, Fig. 8-17; Özyiğit 2000, 34-36, Fig. 5-7; Özyiğit 1995b, 152-156; Özyiğit – Erdoğan 2000, 16-23.

the Archaic Period necropolis became absolutely necessary. However, because the Archaic necropolis remained in a Third Class Archaeological Site Area, it was revealed by construction diggings. In 1977 some *terra cotta* sarcophagi were encountered in excavations done by the Izmir Archaeology Museum at the city's northern end. Unfortunately, since these were not scientific excavations, it was not possible to gather sufficiently the necessary information. Later, from 1998 onwards, sewage system work was done for the modern settlement on the Sevgi Caddesi street of the Atatürk Neighborhood, in the southern part of the city. In the course of this work the city's Archaic necropolis (Fig. 8) and Archaic Period altars (Fig. 9) were encountered⁴³. In digging here even Egyptian finds were retrieved. But because this street is an important thoroughfare of the city it was not possible to continue excavating here over a long period of time. We were forced to fill the trenches back in.

The Persian Monumental Tomb

A monumental tomb belonging to the Persians is located 7 km. east of Foça and north of the Izmir-Foça highway; it has been examined by many specialists. Prof. Akurgal was also one of those who took an interest in this tomb. This monumental tomb was taken in hand by us in 2000; first its excavation, then its restoration, and finally the landscaping of its surroundings were carried out. Work here was continuous throughout a year and in 2001 the tomb was opened to visitors (Fig.10). Important conclusions were reached through the excavations and relevant studies⁴⁴. Thus this monumental tomb, which had been dated by various scholars to the 5th and 4th centuries BC, must have been constructed in 546 BC. We surmise that after the fall of

Sardis and shortly before taking Phokaia, the Persians constructed this monumental tomb by the approaches to the city; it must have been built by Kyros. The decorations above the doors of the tomb that Kyros had constructed for himself at Pasargadae in Iran, of the Temple of Fire which is called the Süleyman Zindanı (Prison of Suleiman) and also of the Temple of Fire at Nakş-i Rüstem exactly resemble those above the false door of the Monumental Persian Tomb. According to us the Phokaian Monumental Tomb is older than all of these and a forerunner to them. The decorations that the Persians besieging Phokaia experimented with on this monumental tomb later appeared in Iran. Perhaps this monumental tomb was built by Kyros for King Abradatas of Susa, who is mentioned by Xenophon as having died in the battle of Sardis, and for his beautiful wife, Pantheia, who killed herself upon the death of her husband.

The Second Period Excavations constituted a point of departure and a program for the most recent excavations. The importance of Phokaia and the other Ionian cities in the first half of the 6th century BC was many times emphasized by Akurgal. The results of the most recent excavations confirm this view. In the first half of the 6th century BC Phokaia experienced its most splendid period. At this time the city reached its greatest limits. In the first quarter of the 6th century BC it was surrounded by a great fortification wall some 7-8 km. in length. The Temple of Athena must also have been constructed at this time. The ancient city was extensive and the principal settlement was not on the peninsula but on the mainland; this was confirmed in the course of the most recent excavations. Also in this period Phokaia, together with Miletos, was the city-state which founded the most numerous colonies. Thus it was one of the largest cities of the Ionians, who founded today's western civilization. It was perhaps

⁴³ Özyiğit 2000, 38-39, Drawing 1-2, Fig. 8-13; Özyiğit 2001, 3-5, Drawing 2-4, Fig. 2-10; Özyiğit – Erdoğan 2000, 14-16.

⁴⁴ Özyiğit 2002, 181-187.

Recent work at Phokaia in the light of Akurgal's Excavations

even the biggest. The cultural importance of such a great city must also have been of considerable magnitude. The fact that the most ancient theatre of Anatolia was located in Phokaia is no accident. As has been related above, in spite of the modern settlement upon ancient Phokaia, in the most recent excavations very important results have been obtained.

Prof. Dr .Ömer Özyiğit
Ege Üniversitesi
Edebiyat Fakültesi
Arkeoloji Bölümü
35100 Bornova-İzmir TÜRKİYE
e-mail: phokaia_excavations@hotmail.com

List of Illustrations

Figure 1. The First Settlement Area of Phokaia. Remains from between the 3rd millennium BC and the Archaic Period

Figure 2. The ancient settlement on the mainland. Settlement layers from the 7th century BC to the Early Byzantine Period. This section in the Area with Mosaics was revealed in the years 1992-1993.

Figure 3. The Archaic Period city wall. 590-580 BC.

Figure 4. The Archaic Period city gate. It was destroyed by the Persians in 546 BC. A catapult ball hurled by the Persians is visible on the ground surface.

Figure 5. The Temple of Athena. A view of the western podium walls. First quarter of the 6th century BC.

Figure 6. A view of the theater seats. 340-330 BC. The existence of this theatre was first discovered in the excavations of 1991.

Figure 7. The Port Sanctuary located on the north slope of the Temple of Athena's site. Probably made for the Goddess Kybele. 580s BC.

Figure 8. A view of the Archaic Period Southern Necropolis Area.

Figure 9. An Archaic Period altar. Southern Necropolis area. Beginning of the 6th century BC.

Figure 10. The Persian Monumental Tomb. A view of the repair work. 546 BC. Possibly constructed by the Persian King Kyros the Great.

Kaynakça / Bibliography

- Akurgal 1956a E. Akurgal, "Foça Kazıları ve Kyme Sondajları-Les fouilles de Phocée et les sondages de Kymé", *TürkAD* 6.1, 1956, 13-24.
- Akurgal 1956b E. Akurgal, "Foça Kazıları ve Kyme Sondajları", *Anatolia* 1, 1956, 33-40.
- Akurgal 1957 E. Akurgal, "Foça Kazıları", *TürkAD* 7.1, 1957, 39.
- Akurgal 1961 E. Akurgal, *Die Kunst Anatoliens von Homer bis Alexander* (1961).
- Akurgal 1967 E. Akurgal, "Foça Kazıları (Özet)", *VI. Türk Tarih Kongresi* (1967) 76.
- Akurgal 1976 E. Akurgal, "Phokaia (Foça)", *The Princeton Encyclopedia of Classical Sites*, 1976, 708-709.
- Akurgal 1993 E. Akurgal, *Eski Çağda Ege ve İzmir* (1993).
- Akurgal 1995 E. Akurgal, "La Grèce de L'Est, Berceau de la Civilisation Occidentale", *Phocée et La Fondation de Marseille* (1995) 30-45.
- Akurgal 2000 E. Akurgal, *Anadolu Uygarlıkları*⁷ (2000) 290-292.
- Bayburtluoğlu 1967 C. Bayburtluoğlu, "Foça, Ergili ve Çandarlı'da Meydana Çıkan VII. ve VI. Asır Keramik Eserleri (Özet)", *VI. Türk Tarih Kongresi* (1967) 33-34.
- Özyiğit 1991 Ö. Özyiğit, "1989 Yılı Phokaia Kazı Çalışmaları" *KST* 12.1, 1991, 127-153.
- Özyiğit 1993 Ö. Özyiğit, "1991 Yılı Phokaia Kazı Çalışmaları" *KST* 14.2, 1993, 1-22.
- Özyiğit 1994 Ö. Özyiğit, "The City Walls of Phokaia", *Revue des Études Anciennes* 96, 1994, 77-109.
- Özyiğit 1995a Ö. Özyiğit, "Les Dernières Fouilles de Phocée", *Phocée et la Fondation de Marseille* (1995) 50-55.
- Özyiğit 1995b Ö. Özyiğit, "Denizlere Açılan Kybele", *ATLAS* 75 (1995) 152-156
- Özyiğit 1995c Ö. Özyiğit, "1992 Yılı Phokaia Kazı Çalışmaları" *KST* 15.2, 1995, 11-36.
- Özyiğit 1995d Ö. Özyiğit, "1993 Yılı Phokaia Kazı Çalışmaları" *KST* 16.1, 1995, 425-437.
- Özyiğit 1996 Ö. Özyiğit, "1994 Yılı Phokaia Kazı Çalışmaları" *KST* 17.2, 1996, 1-26.
- Özyiğit 1997 Ö. Özyiğit, "1995 Yılı Phokaia Kazı Çalışmaları" *KST* 18.2, 1997, 1-26.
- Özyiğit 1998a Ö. Özyiğit, "1996 Yılı Phokaia Kazı Çalışmaları" *KST* 19.1, 1998, 763-793.
- Özyiğit 1998b S. Özyiğit, *Foça-Phokaia* (1998).
- Özyiğit 2000 Ö. Özyiğit, "1998 Yılı Phokaia Kazı Çalışmaları" *KST* 21.2, 2000, 33-46.
- Özyiğit 2001 Ö. Özyiğit, "1999 Yılı Phokaia Kazı Çalışmaları" *KST* 22.2, 2001, 1-14.
- Özyiğit 2002 Ö. Özyiğit, "2001 Yılı Phokaia Kazı, Restorasyon ve Çevre Düzenleme Çalışmaları", *İzmir Kent Kültürü Dergisi*, V, 2002, 181-187.
- Özyiğit 2003 Ö. Özyiğit, *XXIV. KST*, 2003, (baskıda).
- Özyiğit – Erdoğan 2000 Ö. Özyiğit – A. Erdoğan, "Les Sanctuaires de Phocée à la lumière des dernières fouilles", *Les Cultes des cités phocéennes, Etudes massaliètes* 6, 2000, 11-23.
- Papadopoulos 1979 A. Papadopoulos (Kerameus), *Phokaika. İstoriki kai Topographiki Meleti*, (1879)
- Sartiaux 1921 F. Sartiaux, "Nouvelles recherches sur le site de Phocée", *Comptes Rendus Acad. Inser. Et Belles Lettres* (1921) 122 vd.
- Sartiaux 1952 F. Sartiaux, *Eski Foça* (1952) 8, 12.
- Serdaroğlu 1967 Ü. Serdaroğlu, "Foça Kazılarında Bulunan Arkaik Devir Mimarlık Eserleri", *VI. Türk Tarih Kongresi* (1967) 35-40.
- Tuna-Nörling 1993 Y. Tuna-Nörling, *Arkeoloji ve Sanat* 59, 1993, 16 vd.
- Tuna-Nörling 1997 Y. Tuna-Nörling, "Attic Black-Figure Export to the East: The Tyrrhenian Group in Ionia", *Athenian Potters and Painters, The Conference Proceedings, Oxbow Monograph* 67, 1997, 435 vd.



Resim/Figure 1



Resim/Figure 2



Resim/Figure 3



Resim/Figure 4



Resim/Figure 5



Resim/Figure 6

Recent work at Phokaia in the light of Akurgal's Excavations



Resim/Figure 7



Resim/Figure 8



Resim/Figure 9



Resim/Figure 10

ZWEI BILDNISKÖPFE DES 2. JHS. N. CHR. VON SAMOS

Özet

Samos'tan M.S. 2. yy'a Tarihlenen İki Portre Baş

Bu makalede Samos'ta bulunan Roma İmparatorluk Dönemi'ne (M.S. 2. yy) tarihlenen iki mermer portre baş ele alınmıştır. Bu zamana kadar adadaki portre buluntuları içerisinde böyle bir buluntunun olmayışı ve M.S. 2. yüzyıl portrelerinin çok az bir kısmının yayınlanmış olması, bu portre buluntularının önemini artırmaktadır. Bu yüzden ele alınan portreler, Samos için büyük önem taşımaktadır. Bu nedenle bu önemli konuyu Hocam Ord. Prof. Dr. Ekrem Akurgal'ın anısına yayımlamaktayım.

Hadrian Dönemi'nde yapımına başlanan hamam kompleksi, M.S. 147/148 depreminden sonra ikinci yapı evresinde tamamlanabilmiştir. Bu yapıdaki onarımlar, M.S. 3. yüzyıl sonuna kadar tespit edilebilmektedir. Yine Hadrian Dönemi'ne tarihlenen Aquadükt ve su yolu, Hadrian Dönemi hamam yapısı ile ilişkilendirilmiştir. Kastro tepesindeki büyük bir alanı kaplayan villa kompleksinin Hadrian Dönemi'ne kadar yoğun olarak kullanılmış olduğu tespit edilmiştir. Heraion'da ise M.S. geç 1. yüzyıldan erken 3. yüzyıla kadar değişiklik ve tamiratlar söz konusudur. Yukarıda adı geçen yapılardan dolayı Samos antik kenti Roma Dönemi'nde özellikle Hadrian Dönemi'nde de önemini korumuş olmalıdır.

Kötü korunmuş olmalarına rağmen her iki portre baş, iyi işçiliğe sahiptir. Dolayısıyla söz konusu bu başlar, bu zamana kadar portre sanatında az araştırılmış olan Samos'un önemini artırmaktadır. Bu konuda Samos'ta özellikle Kastro ikiz tepesinde yapılacak olan sistematik kazılar büyük olasılıkla yeni bilgiler verecektir.

Der größte kaiserzeitliche Baukomplex auf Samos sind die aufwendigen Thermenanlagen, deren Errichtung in hadrianischer Zeit begonnen wurde und die nach einem Erdbeben (wohl 147/148 n. Chr.) in einer 2. Bauphase fertig gestellt worden sind¹. Weitere Umbauten und Erweiterungen lassen sich bis ins späte 3. Jh. n. Chr. nachweisen². Mit der Anlage der Thermen wird der Bau des Aquäduktes und der römischen Wasserleitung in Verbindung gebracht³. Für die großzügige Villenanlage auf dem Kastrohügel von Tigani-Pythagoreion nehmen die Ausgräber eine intensive Nutzung bis in mindestens hadrianische Zeit und eine Zerstörung 177 n. Chr. durch ein Erdbeben oder erst 267 n. Chr. durch die Heruler an⁴. Im Heraion lassen sich

zwar seit dem späteren 1. Jh. n. Chr. Verfallserscheinungen feststellen, aber immerhin fallen auch hier aufwendige Baumaßnahmen wie die Pflasterung der heiligen Straße in das späte 2. bzw. frühe 3. Jh. n. Chr.⁵. Zumindest im 2. Jh. n. Chr. war Samos also keineswegs bedeutungslos; vor allem für Hadrian gibt es zahlreiche Inschriften⁶, und es wird erwogen, dass der Kaiser in Zusammenhang mit seiner zweiten Orientreise 129 n. Chr. die Insel besucht haben könnte⁷.

In den Porträtfunden der Insel spiegelt sich ein solcher Befund bisher nicht wider, und von den wenigen Bildnissen des 2. Jhs. n. Chr. ist nur wenig publiziert. Das herausragendste Werk ist die kolossale Statue des

¹ Martini 1984 233ff.

² Martini 1984, 250 ff. 261f.

³ Tölle 1969 55; Jantzen 1968,692; Jantzen 1969, 164; Martini 1984, 24. 172.

⁴ Tölle-Kastenbein 1974, 69.

⁵ Kyrieleis 1981, 51f.

⁶ Herrmann 1960, 123ff.; Tölle-Kastenbein 1974, 69. 175f.; Transier 1985, 131.

⁷ Weber 1907, 212; Herrmann 1960, 124; Transier 1985, 131.