



MERSİN ÜNİVERSİTESİ KILIKIA ARKEOLOJİSİNİ ARAŞTIRMA MERKEZİ  
MERSIN UNIVERSITY PUBLICATIONS OF THE RESEARCH CENTER OF CILICIAN ARCHAEOLOGY

KAAM  
YAYINLARI

OLBA  
XIX

(Ayrıbasım / Offprint)



MERSİN  
2011

**KAAM YAYINLARI**  
**OLBA**  
**XIX**

© 2011 Mersin/Türkiye  
ISSN 1301 7667

OLBA dergisi;  
ARTS & HUMANITIES CITATION INDEX, EBSCO, PROQUEST  
ve  
TÜBİTAK-ULAKBİM Sosyal Bilimler Veri Tabanlarında taranmaktadır.

OLBA dergisi hakemlidir ve Mayıs ayında olmak üzere,  
yılda bir kez basılmaktadır.  
Published each year in May.

KAAM'ın izni olmadan OLBA'nın hiçbir bölümü kopya edilemez.  
Alıntı yapılması durumunda dipnot ile referans gösterilmelidir.  
It is not allowed to copy any section of OLBA without the permit of KAAM.

OLBA dergisinde makalesi yayımlanan her yazar, makalesinin baskı olarak ve elektronik ortamda yayımlanmasını kabul etmiş ve telif haklarını OLBA dergisine devretmiş sayılır.  
Each author whose article is published in OLBA shall be considered to have accepted the article to be published in print version and electronically and thus have transferred the copyrights to the journal OLBA..

OLBA'ya gönderilen makaleler aşağıdaki web adresinde ve bu cildin giriş sayfalarında belirtilen formatlara uygun olduğu takdirde basılacaktır.  
Articles should be written according to the formats mentioned in the following web address.

OLBA'nın yeni sayılarında yayınlanması istenen makaleler için yazışma adresi:  
Correspondance addresses for sending articles to following volumes of OLBA:

Prof. Dr. Serra Durugönül  
Mersin Üniversitesi Fen-Edebiyat Fakültesi, Arkeoloji Bölümü  
Çiftlikköy Kampüsü, 33342-MERSİN  
TURKEY

Diğer İletişim Adresleri  
Other Correspondance Addresses  
Tel: 00.90.324.361 00 01 (10 Lines) 4730 / 4734  
Fax: 00.90.324.361 00 46  
web mail: [www.kaam.mersin.edu.tr](http://www.kaam.mersin.edu.tr)  
[www.olba.mersin.edu.tr](http://www.olba.mersin.edu.tr)  
e-mail: [kaam@mersin.edu.tr](mailto:kaam@mersin.edu.tr)

Baskı / Printed  
BİLTUR Basım Yayın ve Hizmet A.Ş.  
Tel: +90 216 444 44 03 [www.bilnet.net.tr](http://www.bilnet.net.tr)  
Sertifika No: 15690

Dağıtım / Distribution  
Zero Prod. Ltd.  
Tel: 00.90.212.244 75 21 Fax: 00.90.244 32 09  
[info@zerobooksonline.com](mailto:info@zerobooksonline.com) [www.zerobooksonline.com/eng](http://www.zerobooksonline.com/eng)



MERSİN ÜNİVERSİTESİ  
KILIKIA ARKEOLOJİSİNİ ARAŞTIRMA MERKEZİ  
(KAAM)  
YAYINLARI-XIX

MERSIN UNIVERSITY  
PUBLICATIONS OF THE RESEARCH CENTER OF  
CILICIAN ARCHAEOLOGY  
(KAAM)-XIX

Editör

Serra DURUGÖNÜL  
Murat DURUKAN  
Gunnar BRANDS

Bilim Kurulu

Prof. Dr. Serra DURUGÖNÜL  
Prof. Dr. Haluk ABBASOĞLU  
Prof. Dr. Tomris BAKIR  
Prof. Dr. Sencer ŞAHİN  
Prof. Dr. Erendiz ÖZBAYOĞLU  
Prof. Dr. Susan ROTROFF  
Prof. Dr. Marion MEYER



MERSİN

2011



## İçindekiler/Contents

Engin Akdeniz <i>Neolitik Çağ'da Manisa Yöresi</i> ( <i>Manisa Region in the Neolithic Age</i> ) .....	1
Hatice Kalkan <i>Doğu Anadolu'da Geç Demir Çağ: Sorunlar ve Gözlemler</i> ( <i>Late Iron Age in Eastern Anatolia: Problems and Assessments</i> ) .....	47
Gökhan Coşkun <i>Achaemenid Bowls From Seyitömer Höyük</i> ( <i>Seyitömer Höyük'ten Akhaemenid Kaseler</i> ) .....	57
Ertekin M. Doksanaltı <i>Karaman Müzesi'nden Bir Grup Siyah Figürlü Lekythos</i> ( <i>A Group of Black Figure Lekythos from Karaman Museum</i> ) .....	81
Murat Çekilmez <i>Geç Hellenistik Dönemden Bir Mezar Steli</i> ( <i>A Funerary Stele From the Late Hellenistic Period</i> ) .....	107
F. Eray Dökü <i>Eurymedon Vadisi Asarbaşı Yerleşimi Kaya Mezarları</i> ( <i>Rock-cut Tombs at the Asarbaşı Settlement, Eurymedon Valley</i> ) .....	127
Figen Çevirici-Coşkun <i>Maraş Müzesin'de Bulunan İki Heykel</i> ( <i>Two Statues in the Maraş Museum</i> ) .....	159
Celal Şimşek – M. Ayşem Sezgin <i>Laodikeia Kuzey Tiyatrosu</i> ( <i>Laodicea's North Theater</i> ) .....	173
Mustafa Şahin – Yasemin Polat – Thomas Zimmermann <i>Der Hafen von Kapanca: Ein Neuer Vorschlag Zur</i> <i>Lokalisation der Stadt Caesarea Germanica</i> ( <i>Kapanca Limanı - Caesarea Germanica Kenti'nin</i> <i>Lokalizasyonu İçin Yeni Bir Öneri</i> ) .....	203

Çiğdem Gençler Güray	
<i>Elaiussa Sebaste'nin Roma Dönemi Cam Buluntuları</i> ( <i>The Roman Glass Finds from Elaiussa Sebaste</i> ) .....	233
Mehmet Oktan	
<i>The Route Taken By Cilicia To Provincial Status: Why And When?</i> ( <i>Kilikia'yı Eyaletleştirmeye Götüren Yol: Ne zaman ve Neden</i> ) .....	267
Ebru Akdoğu Arca – Nuray Gökalp – Nihal Tüner Önen	
<i>Pamphylia Bölgesi'nin Mısır ve Kıbrıs İle Olan İlişkileri</i> ( <i>Relations of Pamphylia with Egypt and Cyprus</i> ) .....	287
Nurşah Çokbankir	
<i>Pamphylia, Lykia, Kilikia ve Pisidia'da Epigrafiik Verilerle</i> <i>Roma İmparatorluk Dönemi'nde Atletik Oyunların Finansı</i> ( <i>Financing the Games in Pamphylia, Lycia, Cilicia and Pisidia in the</i> <i>Roman Imperial Period from the Epigraphic Evidences</i> ) .....	313
Fatih Onur	
<i>New Inscriptions From Hadrianoi Pros Olympon (Mysia)</i> ( <i>Hadrianoi Pros Olympon'dan (Mysia) Yeni Yazıtlar</i> ) .....	331
N. Eda Akyürek Şahin	
<i>Nikomedeia'dan İki Entellektüel: Basilikos ve Kyrion'un Mezar Epigramları</i> ( <i>Zwei gebildete Maenner aus Nikomedeia: Die Epigramme des</i> <i>Basilikos und des Kyrion</i> ) .....	349
Ayşe Aydın	
<i>Antik Atlı Herosların Hristiyan Atlı Kahramanlara Dönüşümüne</i> <i>Bir Örnek: Tarsus Müzesi'ndeki Aziz Georgios Kabartması</i> ( <i>Ein Beispiel für die reitende Heiligen von umgewandelte antike</i> <i>reitende Heros: Relief mit der Hl. Georg im Museum von Tarsos</i> ) .....	371
Hatice Özyurt Özcan	
<i>Examples of Architectural Sculpture with Figurative and</i> <i>Floral Decoration of the Byzantine Period at Muğla, Bodrum and</i> <i>Milas Archaeological Museums</i> ( <i>Muğla, Bodrum ve Milas Arkeoloji Müzeleri'ndeki Bizans</i> <i>Dönemine Ait Figürlü ve Bitkisel Bezemeli Mimari Plastik Eserler</i> ) .....	389

## EXAMPLES OF ARCHITECTURAL SCULPTURE WITH FIGURATIVE AND FLORAL DECORATION OF THE BYZANTINE PERIOD AT MUĞLA, BODRUM AND MILAS ARCHAEOLOGICAL MUSEUMS

Hatice ÖZYURT ÖZCAN\*

### ABSTRACT

Our investigations at the museums in Muğla and her townships brought to our attention a group of sculpted architectural pieces decorated with figures and motifs. Balustrade fragment no. 1 from Muğla Museum, baluster no. 14 and column capital no. 17 from Bodrum Museum are decorated with symbolic depictions involving vines, vine leaves and grapes, which have a special place in Byzantine iconography.

Some scenes of the early Christian period are depictions with symbolic statements and a narrative language built on with influences from Antiquity. Looking for their sources, both symbolic and schematic, it was seen that they formed the primary sources for the scenes depicting the events told in the Bible. However, it is also known that some depictions that emerged in the Early Christian period and continued to be used later have in fact their origins back in Antiquity. One such example is the compositions with vines and grapes. This composition found in many variations and in a great variety of context within the frame of Dionysiac cult continued to be used in the Early Christian period assuming a symbolic meaning. Compositions with vines were used not only on wall paintings but also frequently on architectural sculpture.

Bodrum, Muğla and Milas museums house a balustrade, a balustrade fragment and an architrave fragment decorated with a peacock motif. The peacock represents the immortality of the soul and reincarnation; thus, just like the vine motif, the peacock, too, goes back to Antiquity and is one of the symbolic figures that stayed in use in Early Christian and Middle Byzantine periods.

Balustrade no. 10 at Milas, no. 14 and 7 at Bodrum and no. 2 at Muğla museums are decorated with mythical and predatory animals. Animal figures were always commonly used in Byzantine art and due to prohibition of figurative images during

---

\* Yrd. Doç. Dr., Muğla University Faculty of Art and Humanities Department of Archaeology 48000 Muğla-TR. E.mail: ozyurthatice@mynet.com

the Iconoclasm they stepped forth, replacing the religious depictions together with the floral decoration, and continued to be used in the Middle Byzantine period.

These stone works of art with figurative decoration dating to the Early and Middle Byzantine periods reflect the characteristics of the capital and nearby provinces with regards to iconography and motifs; but it is possible to say that they reflect a unity with regions neighboring Caria in the rendering of the figures and craftsmanship quality.

**Keywords:** Muğla, Byzantine, Architectural Sculpture, Figurative Decoration.

## ÖZET

### **Muğla, Bodrum ve Milas Arkeoloji Müzeleri'ndeki Bizans Dönemine Ait Figürlü ve Bitkisel Bezemeli Mimari Plastik Eserler**

Karia'nın önemli bir bölümünü oluşturan Muğla ve çevresinde Erken Hıristiyanlıktan itibaren Bizans'ın farklı dönemlerine ait birçok mimari plastik eser, yüzeyin yanı sıra müzelerin depo ya da teşhirlerinde bulunmaktadır.

Muğla ve ilçelerindeki müzelerde yaptığımız incelemeler sonucunda tespit ettiğimiz eserlerin bir grubunu figür ve motif bezemeli mimari parçalar oluşturmuştur. Bu mimari plastik eserlerin benzer örnekler ışığında dönemsel ve bölgesel özellikleri irdelenerek teknik ve üslup açısından değerlendirilmeleri bu çalışmanın konusunu oluşturmaktadır.

Muğla müzesindeki 1 numaralı levha parçası, Bodrum'daki 14 numaralı levha payesi ile 17 numaralı sütun başlığı üzerinde yer alan asma dalları, yaprakları ve üzüm salkımlarından oluşan sembolik tasvirin Bizans ikonografisinde önemli bir yeri vardır. Bu tasvirlerde asma dalı ve üzüm salkımları İsa'nın kanını sembolize eden şarabı, asma dallarının içinden çıktığı kantharos da kalisi simgelemektedir. Dallar arasında üzüm tanelerini gagalayan kuşlar ise İsa'nın kanını içen inananları temsil ediyor olmalıdır. Bu sembolik ifade incelediğimiz mimari parçalar üzerinde iki farklı şekilde tasvir edilmiştir. Bunlardan ilki, bir kantharos içinden çıkan asma dalları ve onun üzerindeki yaprak ve üzüm salkımları ile bu üzümleri gagalayan kuşlardan oluşmaktadır. İkinci tipte kantharos olmaksızın, tasvir edildiği yüzeyde 'S' kıvrımları çizerek uzanan asma dalları, dalların üzerinde yapraklar ve üzüm salkımları yer alır.

Bodrum, Muğla ve Milas Müzeleri'nde tavus kuşu figürünün işlendiği levha, levha parçası ile bir arşitrav parçası bulunmaktadır. Cennet bahçesinde ruhun ölümsüzlüğünü ve yeniden doğuşu simgeleyen tavus kuşu, asma tasviri gibi ortaya çıkışı antik kültürlerle uzanan, Erken Hıristiyanlıkta ve Orta Bizans dönemlerinde benzer anlamlarla kullanılmaya devam eden sembolik figürlerden bir diğeridir.

Birçok kompozisyonda yer alan tavus kuşunun yaptığımız çalışmada dört farklı tipi ile karşılaşılmıştır.

Milas müzesindeki 11, Bodrum'daki 15, 7 ve Muğla'daki 2 numaralı levhaların üzeri efsanevi ve yırtıcı hayvanlarla bezenmiştir. Bizans sanatının her döneminde yaygın bir bezeme unsuru olan hayvan figürleri özellikle ikonoklazma döneminde



tasvir yasağı sebebiyle daha da ön plana çıkmış, bu dönemde bitkisel bezemeler ile birlikte dini konulu tasvirlerin yerini almış, Orta Bizans döneminde de bu tasvirler kullanılmaya devam etmiştir. Bu dönemin yaygın kullanılan figürleri olan aslan, kartal grifon, geyik ve ejder gibi efsanevi ve yarı hayvanların Bizans sanatına girişi Sasani etkilidir. Bu figürler tasvirlerde çoğu zaman stilize edilerek ya tek başlarına ya da bir mücadele sahnesi içinde birlikte gösterilmişlerdir.

Muğla, Milas ve Bodrum müzelerinde tespit ettiğimiz figürlü ve bitkisel bezemeli mimari plastik eserlerin, tipoloji, süsleme ve üslup bakımından Erken ve Orta Bizans dönemlerinin özelliklerini taşıdıkları görülmektedir. Her iki döneme ait eserlerde kullanılan malzeme kireç taşı ve mermerdir. Karia Bölgesi her iki malzeme bakımından da oldukça zengindir. Milas, Bodrum, Yatağan önemli kireç taşı ve mermer yataklarına sahip yerleşimlerdir.

Erken ve Orta Bizans dönemine ait bu figürlü taş eserler, ikonografi ve motif bakımından dönemlerinin başkent ve yakın eyaletlerinin özelliklerini taşımakla birlikte figürlerin şekillendirilişinde ve işçilik kalitesinde yerel özelliklerin yanında Batı Anadolu'daki Karia'ya yakın bölgelerle de bir üslup birliği içinde olduğunu söylemek mümkündür.

**Anahtar Kelimeler:** Muğla, Bizans, Mimari Plastik, Figürlü Bezeme.

Numerous examples of architectural sculpture dating to the Early Christian and Byzantine periods from Muğla and environs, which constituted the greatest part of ancient Caria, and are found in the storerooms or displays of the museums as well as still on site. During our surveys in the museums of Muğla and its townships<sup>1</sup> we have noted a group of architectural sculpture decorated with figures and motifs. Study of these pieces with respect to their regional and contemporary features in light of parallel examples constitutes the scope of the present paper.

## 1) Panels and Panel Fragments

Items from Muğla Archaeological Museum

Panel nr. 1 (fig. 1)<sup>2</sup>:

This marble panel is broken on top, bottom and left sides and it is decorated with a composition of floral and animal figures in low relief technique. In the middle of the composition is a double-handled kantharos

<sup>1</sup> Our study of the Byzantine architectural sculpture at Muğla, Milas, Bodrum, Marmaris and Fethiye Archaeological Museums started in 2008 with the permission issued by the Ministry of Culture and is still going on. I would like to express my thanks to the museum directors and staff.

<sup>2</sup> Inv. nr. 2233, L: 44 cm., Th: 8.5 cm.

whose globular body is extant only partially. The body of the kantharos is decorated with flutes and its neck is plain. The handle on the left terminates in a C-curve and a similar arrangement should be expected from the right handle which is not extant. Vine branches rising from the kantharos bear grapes and heart-shaped leaves and cover the entire surface of the panel. In the middle is a bunch of grapes, hanging from a long branch, whose grapes are rendered raised in relief. This bunch of grapes is flanked with two birds, whose one foot is rendered resting on the branch and the other foot in motion forward. The long beaks are reaching the grapes and the details of their well-rounded bodies, wing and tail feathers, eyes and beaks are executed in engraving.

Panel nr. 2 (fig. 2)<sup>3</sup>:

This limestone panel is well-preserved although broken in the middle. The panel is framed with a thick moulding and decorated with a stylized lion and deer in low relief. In the upper part of the composition is a lion with small ears and whose body enlarges around the neck and the chest and tapering toward the back. In spite of the short front legs, the hind legs are long and its tail extends along his body, making a knot and terminating in a leaf motif. Beneath the feet of the lion is a horned wild deer with a long neck, whose body tapers toward the back. Both figures are depicted in profile and details of their eyes and motifs on the legs are engraved.

Panel nr. 3 (fig. 3)<sup>4</sup>:

The limestone panel is broken on lower right and left sides. The decoration is rendered in low relief while the details are engraved. In the middle is a floral motif, rising from an unknown bottom and forming the axis and stretching all over the panel with interlacing leaves. On the left is a rabbit whose front legs extend to the floral motif. Facing the rabbit is another figure, which has survived very fragmentary reminiscent of a horn.

Panel nr. 4 (fig. 4)<sup>5</sup>:

The panel is broken on top and bottom and its sides are damaged. The panel is decorated with a vertical arranged composition flanked with

---

<sup>3</sup> Inv. nr. 186, L: 62 cm, 75 cm., Th: 15 cm.

<sup>4</sup> Inv. nr. n/a, L: 47 cm., Th: 13 cm.

<sup>5</sup> Inv. nr. n/a, L long side: 33 cm, L short side: 30 cm, Th: 15 cm

moulding on either side. In the middle are two peacocks, the lower one of which has survived quite intact while the upper one has survived only in tail and feet. One faces left while the other faces right.

Panel nr. 5 (fig. 5)<sup>6</sup>:

The panel is broken on the right and there is a moulding only on the top. The main figure is a long-necked peacock whose tail forks down and up and whose beak extends toward the tree surviving half. Between the tail and the neck of the main figure is another peacock figure, but smaller. The figures are rendered in low relief with the feathers engraved.

Items from Bodrum Archaeological Museum

Panel nr. 6 (fig. 6)<sup>7</sup>:

Apart from the broken right lower corner, the limestone panel has survived in very good condition. On the outside is a moulding, narrow on three sides and wider on the bottom. In the middle is a roundel in relief with a Latin cross inside. In the lower corners of the roundel are peacocks of different sizes in profile. Their beaks and feet touch the body of the cross in the middle. The feathers of both peacocks' wings and tails stretching outside the roundel are executed with engraved lines in different directions. From the flaring top and arms of the cross motif hang heart-shaped leaves. Beneath the roundel are two interconnected roundels, the right one of which is slightly larger, and decorated with rosettes inside.

Panel nr. 7 (fig. 7)<sup>8</sup>:

This oblong marble panel has survived in very good condition with some small broken parts in right top corner and sides. The panel is framed with a wide moulding and decorated with a stylized animal figure rendered in low relief. The small ears of the figure touch the top moulding and its back stretches toward the hip as a horizontal line. The bottom moulding forms the ground for the bent front legs and standing hind legs. As the front legs bend, the chest extends downward; the head looks ahead on the same axis as the back.

---

<sup>6</sup> Inv. nr. n/a, L: 80 cm., 46 cm., Th: 30 cm

<sup>7</sup> Inv. nr. n/a, L: 35 cm., 20 cm., Th: 15 cm

<sup>8</sup> Inv. nr. 1935, L: 28 cm., 14 cm., H: 14 cm

Panel fragment nr. 8 (fig. 8)<sup>9</sup>:

The north and south parts of this marble panel are broken and the extant fragment exhibits a horizontally arranged composition. The fragment is bounded with wide mouldings on top and bottom and in the field are two branches form an oval frame and surround a peacock. The peacock pecks at a leaf and its foot moves forward. The long tail terminates where two branches intersect. The vine branches rendered in relief survive beginning in the right corner while grapes are found in the left.

Panel nr. 9 (fig. 9)<sup>10</sup>:

The limestone panel is broken on the right side and bottom has a half-cross relief on the back side, which shows that it was in second use. The panel is framed with a moulding and the composition comprises a palm tree motif in the centre flanked with a goose on either side. The tree has six leaves and heart-shaped leaves hang down from it.

Panel nr. 10 (fig. 10)<sup>11</sup>

The marble panel framed with multiple mouldings contains a composition of two peacocks placed back to back in the centre formed by a tree-of-life-like motif. The vines rising from the corners have several leaves discernible.

*Items at Milas Archaeological Museum*

Panel nr. 11 (fig. 11)<sup>12</sup>:

The marble panel is broken on the left and on the bottom partially. It is framed with a moulding wider on the right side. The moulding is adjoined with a frieze of egg and dart on the top and sides. The field in the centre is a rhombus housing a roundel with a peacock in it, all in relief. The peacock has a long straight neck, no crest and its large crop protrudes out. Eye, beak, wing and details of the tail are rendered in engraving. Between the top and bottom corners of the rhombus and the roundel are palmettes.

<sup>9</sup> Inv nr. u-14 depot, L: 24 cm, 33 cm., Th: 10 cm., acquisition: donation.

<sup>10</sup> Inv nr. n/a, L: 55 cm., 40 cm., Th: 11.50 cm.

<sup>11</sup> Inv nr. n/a, L: 110 cm., 85 cm., Th: 27 cm.

<sup>12</sup> Inv nr. n/a, L: 116 cm., 83 cm., Th: 17 cm

Panel nr. 12 (fig. 12)<sup>13</sup>:

The marble panel is framed with a raised frame. The figures on the panel are rendered in low relief. In the centre is a *kantharos* with a wide rim and a stem on which a lion is depicted sitting. His tail rises erect above his back behind his head. The *kantharos* is flanked with peacocks stretching their heads toward it. Above the peacock on the left is an eagle figure with its wings open while above the peacock on the right is a mountain goat with its horns, depicted in profile.

## 2) Piers and architraves

*Architrave at the Milas Archaeological Museum*

Architrave fragment nr. 13 (Fig. 13)<sup>14</sup>:

The rectangular marble fragment is decorated in relief on one side while engraved on the other side. The relief side has a single moulding along the side. The rest of the surface is filled with nine roundels of interlocking circles. The first two on the left are filled with a peacock each facing each other. The five roundels in the middle are decorated with rosettes, pomegranate and stylized leaf motifs. The next roundel has a peacock while the last roundel, which is broken, features a cross surviving partially. The peacocks are depicted in profile and their details are given with lines engraved in different directions. On the other side is a soffit.

*Pier at the Bodrum Archaeological Museum*

Baluster nr. 14 (fig. 14)<sup>15</sup>:

This marble baluster features a small knob on top. It has double mouldings framing a foliate vine in relief, rising from bottom going upward. The vine stem is enhanced with engraved flutes. Inside one curve on the left is a heart-shaped leaf and a bunch of grapes in the other on the right. The vine terminates in another heart-shaped leaf on top.

<sup>13</sup> Inv nr. n/a, L:80 cm., 87 cm., Th: 25 cm

<sup>14</sup> Inv. nr. 1789, L: 67 cm., 13 cm., Th: 12 cm

<sup>15</sup> Inv. nr. 4820, L: 58.50 cm., 16 cm., Th: 7 cm

*Architraves at the Bodrum Archaeological Museum*

Architrave fragment nr. 15 (fig. 15)<sup>16</sup>:

This marble piece is broken on the right and left edges and decorated on the front and lateral sides in low relief technique. On the front side is a composition of interlocking circles. The middle one is small filled with a wheel-of-fortune motif. The large roundel on the right has a lion figure whose limbs adapt to the round frame and whose tail rises upward. As the other big roundel is half missing has a figure whose beak and feet remain only, reminiscent of a duck. Above the small roundel is a wolf and below it is a rooster whose tail and wings are rendered in engraving. On the lateral side of the piece is a geometric interlacing composition.

Architrave fragment nr. 16 (figs. 16a- b)<sup>17</sup>:

This marble architrave fragment is broken on the left. It is decorated in low relief technique on two sides. On the front side is a griffin within moulding frame. The griffin's wing, neck, eye and mouth are rendered in engraving. The outer frame consists of a chain motif. On the lateral side of the architrave is a frieze of lozenges formed with interlacing lines.

### 3) Column capitals

*Bodrum Archaeological Museum*

Impost capital nr. 17 (fig. 17)<sup>18</sup>:

On the short sides of the capital, the Latin cross in the centre is surrounded with bunches of grapes.

*Iconographical and stylistic evaluation*

The symbolic depiction of vine branches and leaves and bunches of grapes found on the panel fragment nr. 1 (Muğla Museum), baluster nr. 14 (Bodrum Museum) and capital nr. 17 has an important place in the Byzantine iconography.

<sup>16</sup> Inv. nr. 2213, extant L: 47 cm., H: 33 cm., Th: 15 cm., provenance: Köyceyiz İlköğretim Müdürlüğü.

<sup>17</sup> Inv. nr. 2212, extant L: 55cm., H: 33.50, Th: 16 cm

<sup>18</sup> Inv. nr. n/a, diam: 21x36 cm.

Some scenes in the Early Christian period have depictions based on symbolic expressions<sup>19</sup>, formed by narrative telling enhanced with effects of the ancient tradition<sup>20</sup>. Looking for their origins, whether symbolic or schematized, it is seen that the events told in the Bible constitute the primary source for the scenes depicted. However, it is also known that some depictions that emerged in the Early Christian period and stayed in use in the later periods do indeed have an earlier background. One such example is the composition of vines and bunches of grapes. This motif that came into being with the cult of Dionysus<sup>21</sup> was depicted in a great variety of media and forms<sup>22</sup>; then with the Early Christian period it assumed a new meaning disguising a symbolic expression and stayed in use.

The meaning of depicting grape bunches and vines are hidden in the various sayings of Christ in the gospels. One is: "I am the true vine and my father is the gardener" (Jn 15:1). Another is: "This bowl is the new covenant made with my blood poured for your sake" (Mt 26: 17-30; Mk 14: 12-26). This last phrase is also the basis for the Eucharist<sup>23</sup> ceremony of the Christian liturgy<sup>24</sup>. The Eucharist was expressed with a symbolized composition of vines, vine leaves and grapes on the works of the Early Christian period. In these depictions, the vine branches and grapes symbolize the wine which in turn symbolizes the blood of Christ while the kantharos from which they rise symbolizes the chalice. The birds pecking the grapes among the branches must be representing the faithful drinking of the blood of Christ.

This symbolic expression is depicted in two ways on the pieces studied here. The first is the vine branches rising from a kantharos and leaves and grapes above them with birds pecking at them.

---

<sup>19</sup> Lamberton 1911, 507-522. In the apse mosaic of San Apollinare in Classe the cross represents Christianity uniting with Christ while the three lambs represent the saints. See Speake 1994, 143.

<sup>20</sup> Kitzinger 1963, 95- 115; Weitzmann 1960, 43-68. The baptism scene at Arians and Orthodox Baptisteries in Ravenna, the old man represents the River Jordan and this is attributed to the allegory from Antiquity. See Grabar 1953, 186, fig. 139; Beckwith 1979, 39, fig. 24.

<sup>21</sup> Schefold 1978, 72, Abb. 305-6.

<sup>22</sup> For the Hellenistic examples see Luca 1990, Taf. 27,1,2,3; For the Roman examples see Koch 2008, Abb. 20, 23.

<sup>23</sup> For detailed information on the Eucharist Mercangöz 2001, 43.

<sup>24</sup> Acara 1998, 188-195.

The kantharos with outturned handles and fluted body from which the vine branches rise on panel fragment nr. 1 at Muğla Museum is frequently found in many depictions of the early period. The closest parallel, as an arrangement, to the vine branches and bunches of grapes rising from the kantharos is found on a panel embedded in a wall in Medet Village of Tavas<sup>25</sup>. In this example a cross motif is placed instead of grapes in the middle of vine branches. A similar arrangement is also seen on the altar panel of San Apollinare in Classe Basilica<sup>26</sup>. The way the branches rise from the kantharos, their grooved stems and the form of kantharos are closely parallel to the depiction on the sarcophagus of Ataulphus in Milan<sup>27</sup>. In addition to numerous architectural sculpture in a variety of uses<sup>28</sup> floor mosaics too feature vine branches rising from a kantharos as a common décor in the early period<sup>29</sup>.

The two birds pecking at the large bunch grapes placed in the centre of vine branches rising from the kantharos constitute an antithetic arrangement. This arrangement widely encountered in Early Christian art<sup>30</sup> has a common composition although the figures and the symbol in the centre may change. On the panel nr. 8 at Bodrum Museum the antithetic arrangement is given with two geese flanking the axis formed by a palm tree. Some examples feature two different animals symmetrically flanking the axial motif in the centre. An example is the panel nr. 3 at Muğla Museum. The vegetal motif in the centre is flanked with a rabbit and a mountain goat, of whose only horns are visible. A similar arrangement is also seen on a panel from Myra, now at Antalya Museum<sup>31</sup>.

---

<sup>25</sup> Buckler – Calder 1939, Pl. 28.160.

<sup>26</sup> Beckwith 1979, 123, fig. 99.

<sup>27</sup> Smith – Cheetham 1893, 337.

<sup>28</sup> For the arrangements on the ambos see Ruggieri 2005, 237, figs. 19-20; on the piers see Angello 1962, 86, fig. 80; Buckler – Calder 1939, Pl. 89, 288b; Fıratlı 1990, Pl. 89, 288b; on stelae, Pl. 62, fig. 360; on sarcophagi see Fıratlı 1990, Pl. 33, fig. 87a, 87b; on column capitals see Parman 2002, Photo 143. A62.

<sup>29</sup> For similar arrangements in the corners of the panels in the nave of the East Basilica in Xanthos see Raynaud 2009, 93-95, figs. 99, 102; for the examples on the border at the Mausoleum in Bodrum - Torba see Özet 2008, 15 fig.18; Ruggieri 2005, Fig. III/22c. For the arrangement in the apse mosaic of the chapel to the north of the Domed Basilica in Kaunos see Zäh 2003, Abb. 58. For an example in Bursa see Okçu 2007, figs. 8, 13; for a similar floor mosaic in Syria see Fansa- Bollmann 2008, cat. nr. 100.

<sup>30</sup> For the panels with antithetic animals see Ulbert 1969/1970, 356 ff.

<sup>31</sup> Feld 1975, 360-428, nr. 46.



Birds pecking at the grapes are first attested at the Callictus Catacomb of the 4<sup>th</sup> century<sup>32</sup>. On a tomb stele from Caria of the 5<sup>th</sup> century two well fed birds flank the grapes in the centre, just like on panel nr. 133. On the side panels of the 6<sup>th</sup>-century ambos at Milas Museum are birds pecking at grapes with one foot up in a gesture of walking<sup>34</sup>. Sometimes these birds can be peacocks as well<sup>35</sup>.

The second type features vine branches with grapes and leaves on them and extending in S-curves, without any kantharos.

On panel nr. 14 at Bodrum Museum is a single vine branch making S-curves and leaves and grapes extending from it. A similar example is found on a pier fragment of the 6<sup>th</sup> century at Milas Museum<sup>36</sup>. On this example the stem of the vine rises from a trefoil motif<sup>37</sup> while the vine composition without grapes on a pier at Priene Basilica terminates in a cross motif<sup>38</sup>. The example at Didim, on the other hand, features a vine composition with grapes framed with a wide moulding<sup>39</sup>. On a baluster at Tire Museum, the vines rise from a kantharos.

Grooved vine branch and heart-shaped leaves on a pier are reminiscent of the panel fragment nr. 1 at Muğla Museum while parallels of foliate leaf sprouts rising from the vine stem are also found on the ambos at Milas Museum<sup>40</sup>. Beside the examples of the architectural pieces from the early period which have vine depictions as borders or corner fills<sup>41</sup> similar compositions are seen also on floor mosaics<sup>42</sup>.

---

<sup>32</sup> Smith – Cheetham 1893, 695.

<sup>33</sup> Buckler – Calder 1939, Pl. 64 fig. 368.

<sup>34</sup> Mercangöz 1996, figs. 7–8, 10–11.

<sup>35</sup> Ruggieri 2005, 241, fig. 33, 237, fig. 19. The panel nr. 8 at Bodrum Museum has a peacock pecking at the grapes and will be evaluated in the section on the peacocks.

<sup>36</sup> Ruggieri 2003, 282 photo: AA79–80. For the vine compositions at Siracuso Museum see Angello 1962, figs. 76–78, 83, 87; for the pier with vine depiction at Nazionale Museum see Farioli 1968, fig. 47.

<sup>37</sup> Ruggieri 2003, 299, photo: AA28.

<sup>38</sup> Westphalen 2000, fig. 11.

<sup>39</sup> Peschlow 1975, Taf. 41, fig. 1.

<sup>40</sup> Mercangöz 1996: figs. 7–8. For the vine depictions on the other ambos see Mango – Sevchenko 1961, 243–247 fig. 3; Harrison – Fıratlı 1967, 273–278, figs. 7–10; Ruggieri 2003, 315, photo: AA133; Ruggieri 2005, 239, figs. 27–28, 240, figs. 31–32, 241, fig. 34; Feld 1975, Taf. 34, figs. 1, 2; Taf. 35, fig. 1, 2.

<sup>41</sup> On the ciborium arch Martinelli 1968, I, fig. 34; on the door borders Gough 1968, 455–464, figs. 4–6.

<sup>42</sup> Okçu 2007, 170, fig. 4; Tok 2007, 157, fig. 6.

The Latin cross on the impost capital nr. 17 at Bodrum Museum is surrounded with vine branches with leaves and grapes. Cross motifs on column capitals are seen as décor starting in the early times<sup>43</sup>. Some feature the cross alone<sup>44</sup> while some have floral motifs surrounding the cross as well<sup>45</sup>. Depictions with palmettes or acanthus leaves foliating from the bottom arm of the cross are known as “cross-of-life” in Byzantine art<sup>46</sup>. The bottom part of the Latin cross on the impost capital at Bodrum Museum is broken. Therefore, the exact point where the vines rise is not known but it is possible to consider the composition of vines surrounding a cross a variation of the cross-of-life from the 5<sup>th</sup>-6<sup>th</sup> centuries.

Bodrum, Muğla and Milas Museums have panels, panel fragments and an architrave fragment with a peacock depiction. The peacock representing the immortality of the soul in the Paradise and its re-birth originated in the ancient cultures<sup>47</sup>; and it is one of the symbolic motifs that remained in use with similar meanings in the Early Christian and Middle Byzantine periods<sup>48</sup>.

Our study has noted four different types of peacocks. The first is the arrangement of antithetic peacocks turned toward the symbol in the middle. On panel nr. 6 at Bodrum Museum, the peacocks touch the axial Latin cross with their feet and beaks<sup>49</sup>. On a broken panel (Inv. nr. E.968, Tire Museum) on one side of the Latin cross is a realistic peacock depiction,

<sup>43</sup> For numerous cross motifs on the Ionic-impost capitals, Zollt 1994, Taf. 14- 22; in Ephesus see Pillinger – Kresten 1999, figs. 35-40; in Didyma see Feld 1975, 360-428, Taf. 1,2; in Phrygia see Parman 2002, photo: 164, 174-176; in Bithynia see Ötügen 1996, Taf. 37, 3-6; in Iasos see Serin 2004, figs. 37-40; in Knidos see Yalçın 1996, fig. 7. For a few examples of cross motifs on impost capitals see: Zollt 1994; 31 vd.; in Bithynia see Ötügen 1996, Taf. 42, figs. 3-4; Tezcan 1989, fig. 447; Parman 2002, photo: 154.

<sup>44</sup> For some examples see Parman 2002, photo: 164; Yalçın 1996, fig. 7; Dennert 1997, Taf. 13, 73-74, Taf. XIV, XVI.

<sup>45</sup> See Parman 2002, photo: 165, 181; Dennert 1997, Taf. 23, 119.

<sup>46</sup> Rice 1950, 72-82; for variations of the motif see Spitzing 1987, 201-202; for a study on cross-of-life based on a capital at Alanya Museum see Doğan 2009, 139-149; for unknown examples in Istanbul and Iznik Museums see Yalçın 2008, 302-303, figs. 4-5.

<sup>47</sup> For its meat decayed late the peacock symbolized immortality, see Lurker 1985, 524-25. Furthermore, for the Romans the peacocks carried the soul of the empress to the deities. It is also the symbol of Juno/Hera. The peacock also appears as a type on some Roman coins of the 2nd century AD. For detailed information see Head 1911, 606; for peacock figures in frescoes (AD 300) of Houses on Terraces in Ephesus see Vettters 1978, III, Pl. 332-339b.

<sup>48</sup> Parman 1993, 87-89.

<sup>49</sup> Yalçın 2005, 328, fig. 12.

just as on our Bodrum example. A panel of the 11<sup>th</sup> century at Iznik Museum features a similar composition and rendering technique but this time the symbol in the middle is a kantharos and the peacocks touch on the kantharos with their feet and drink the water of life from the kantharos<sup>50</sup>.

On panel nr. 11 at Milas Museum the peacocks bodies turn outward but their heads are turned toward the kantharos in the middle. A similar arrangement can also be found on a great variety of objects from the Early and Middle Byzantine periods<sup>51</sup>. Our panel here differs with the lion figure sitting above the kantharos. The panel nr. 10 at Bodrum Museum features peacocks with their backs turned towards the axis.

A similar arrangement is also found on a panel at the Athenian Agora<sup>52</sup>. Here the peacocks' heads face the tree-of-life although they are back to back. The heads of the peacocks on the Bodrum panel are not extant. On the panel from Myra, the bodies of the peacocks in the roundel face the tree-of-life<sup>53</sup>.

In such depictions, the cross, kantharos, tree-of-life or bunch of grapes standing in the centre express the water of life while the peacocks, birds or other animals<sup>54</sup> drinking from it or touching it express the faithful souls. Many panels, sarcophagi, manuscripts and wall paintings of mausolea of the early period and mosaics with such compositions are known<sup>55</sup>.

---

<sup>50</sup> Ulbert 1969/70, 351, Taf. 74,2, nr. 42.

<sup>51</sup> In the fresco of the 4<sup>th</sup>-century hypogeum in Elbeyli village of Iznik, on the arch fragment of the 7<sup>th</sup> century in the yard of the Erdek governorate, on the 6<sup>th</sup>-century balustrade at Bode Museum in Berlin, the peacocks face the kantharos. See Parman 1993, Pl. I, dwg. 1, Pl. V, dwg. 1, Pl. VI, 2; for a similar arrangement on a column capital in Afyon Museum see Anabolu 1988, fig. 3, Inv. nr. 434; Parman 2002, photo: 131, Pl. 102. The mosaic uncovered during a salvage excavation at Akyaka, Muğla, in 2009 also features a depiction with peacocks facing the kantharos. For the 12<sup>th</sup>-century floor mosaic in San Donato Church in Murano Island of Venice see Parman 1993, Pl. VIII, dwg. 1.

<sup>52</sup> Grabar 1976, Pl. LXXIX, b. The Bari Cathedral also has a similar example, see Grabar 1976, Pl. CXXX, a.

<sup>53</sup> Peschlow 1990, Taf. 45, 1. On a sarcophagus at Beroi two peacocks back to back flank a cross and their heads facing the cross peck at grapes, see Pazaras 1977, Taf. 63, fig. 3.

<sup>54</sup> In the floor mosaics of a church in Gördes, Manisa, deer flank a kantharos, see Tok 2007, 157, fig. 6; a similar example is known at Xanthos, see Raynaud 2009, 70, fig. 67. A plate uncovered at Kadikalesi features lions flanking a tree-of-life, see Ödekan 2007, 85; for rabbits flanking a tree-of-life see Firatlı 1990, Pl. 99, 324; for senmurvs see Firatlı 1990, Pl. 100, 328a.

<sup>55</sup> The peacocks on the altar panel of the San Apollinare in Classe in Ravenna flank the cross rising above the kantharos, see Farioli 1968, I, fig. 77a. On the sarcophagi at the same church are peacocks flanking a Latin cross with their feet on vegetal motifs and their beaks touching the cross,

The second type features the peacock in solitude. Panel nr. 11 at Milas Museum has a peacock inside a roundel dominating the entire surface. Peacocks in solitude are also known on ambo pieces of the 6<sup>th</sup> century at Istanbul<sup>56</sup>, Kütahya, Eskişehir and Izmir Museums<sup>57</sup>.

Panel nr 13. at Milas Museum features three peacocks within foliates. Two are antithetic but have different postures. The other's beak stretches toward the cross motif within the roundel. The peacocks are executed realistic and that the details of their bodies are rendered with engraved small lines is considered the period's characteristic seen as of the second half of the 6<sup>th</sup> century<sup>58</sup>. One of the foliate roundels has a pomegranate motif, which is a symbol of bounty in ancient cultures while it was used as a symbol of immortality in funerary art in the Cretan, Mycenaean and Egyptian arts. However, the pomegranate became the symbol of Christ and Virgin Mary in Christianity. Just like the grape juice represents the blood of Christ, the pomegranate juice represents the blood of the martyrs<sup>59</sup>. On a balustrade panel in a Byzantine basilica in Side<sup>60</sup> the pomegranates are depicted together with their seeds<sup>61</sup> as different from the Milas example while they are placed in a roundel as on the Milas example<sup>62</sup>. Parallels of the floral rosettes with eight or nine petals filling the other foliate roundels are also found in the middle of the geometric arrangements on the column capitals of the 6<sup>th</sup> century from Milas<sup>63</sup>.

---

see Farioli 1968, II, 36b.c; Farioli 1968, II, 37d; Farioli 1968, II, 35a. For peacock depictions on tombs of the Early Christian period see Fıratlı 1978, II, 912- 932, III, Pl. 332, 333a, 338a-b, 340b. For other examples see Anadolu 1988: fig. 4; Grabar 1976: Pl. LIII, a,b; Lassus 1967, fig.213; Farioli 1968, III, fig. 55; Farioli 1968: II, fig. 35b. For manuscripts see Evans – Wixom 1997, 107, fig. 61, 93, fig. 46.

<sup>56</sup> Ulbert 1969/70, Taf. 67 fig. 3.

<sup>57</sup> Anadolu 1988, fig. 8-11, 14.

<sup>58</sup> Ulbert 1969/70, 342, Taf. 67, 1-3.

<sup>59</sup> Dutilh 1994, 198-99.

<sup>60</sup> Mansel 1978, 261, fig. 290.

<sup>61</sup> Pomegranate, which was the coat of Side, was also depicted on ancient coins, see Mansel 1978, 26, fig. 6.

<sup>62</sup> On a pier fragment of the 6<sup>th</sup> century at Siracusa Museum are pomegranates together with bunches of grapes amidst scrolls of vines, reminiscent of item nr. 12 studied here. See Angello 1962, fig. 82.

<sup>63</sup> See Ruggieri 2003, 300-301, photo. AA82-91. More developed examples of such rosettes are found on many architrave blocks and column capitals, rendered in relief or in a boss in the Middle Byzantine period. See: for architraves Grabar 1976, Pl. XIV; for capitals Dennert 1997, Taf. 28, 155; Ötügen 1996, Taf. 39, 3.

In the third type of depiction the figure is placed amidst bunches of grapes just like the other birds. The peacock amidst vine branches on the panel fragment nr. 8 at Bodrum Museum pecks at the grapes. As the panel is broken the presence of a kantharos is not certain; however, peacocks pecking at grapes amidst foliate are frequently seen on the side panels of ambos in the early period<sup>64</sup>. A panel of the 7<sup>th</sup> century at Selçuk Museum has scrolls rising from a kantharos that is reminiscent of the Bodrum example<sup>65</sup>. This arrangement is a composition seen in mosaics beside the architectural sculpture<sup>66</sup>.

Panel nr. 4 at Muğla Museum features two peacocks placed on top of each other but facing opposite directions and this is the fourth type not encountered very often. These peacocks are closely parallel to those of the 5<sup>th</sup>-6<sup>th</sup> century at Milas Museum with their crests, round and curving lines in their tail feathers<sup>67</sup>.

Panel nr. 11 at Milas, nrs. 15 and 7 at Bodrum and nr. 2 at Muğla Museum are decorated with mythical animals and beasts.

Animal figures were always popular in Byzantine art and particularly in the Iconoclastic period the animal figures assumed great prominence due to prohibition of images and together with vegetal decoration they replaced religious depictions<sup>68</sup> and remained in use also in the Middle Byzantine period. The frequently used mythical and predator figures such as lion, eagle, griffin, deer and dragon stepped into the Byzantine art under the Sassanian influence<sup>69</sup>. These figures are usually stylized and depicted either in solitude or in a combat scene.

Panel nr. 2 at Muğla Museum has two animals depicted; however, this is not a real combat scene. The lion and deer figures placed on top of each other touch each other only at certain points<sup>70</sup>. Lion figures have a symbolic meanings such as power, force and protectiveness<sup>71</sup> were

---

<sup>64</sup> On ambos Feld 1975, Taf. 35, 1,4; Taf. 34, 2; Ulbert 1969/70, Taf. 69 fig. 2, Taf.74, fig.1.

<sup>65</sup> Ulbert 1974-75, Taf. 74,1.

<sup>66</sup> For examples of floor mosaics, see De Matties 2004, 314, Tav. 1, fig. 2; Koch, 379, Lev. 23, 1.

<sup>67</sup> Mercangöz 1996, figs. 5-6.

<sup>68</sup> Lazarev 1966, 123.

<sup>69</sup> Ghandi 1983, 189-203.

<sup>70</sup> For examples of animal combat scenes, see Grabar 1976, Pl. XLVIII, 73.

<sup>71</sup> Ötügen 2010, 556.

widely used, starting in Mesopotamia, in Persian, Sassanian, Hellenistic and Roman periods<sup>72</sup> and took their place with similar meanings in the Christian art<sup>73</sup>. The lion figure, which was seldom seen in the early period, gained wider use in the Middle Byzantine period becoming the symbol of the empire as well<sup>74</sup>. Deer seen in our example is not frequently depicted and in some scenes it became the symbol of Christ<sup>75</sup>.

Stylized bodies of the lion and deer figures and the lion's tail terminating in a palmette leaf are considered characteristic of the Middle Byzantine period depictions. A lion with a vegetal tail at Afyon Museum is dated to the 12<sup>th</sup> century<sup>76</sup>. Panels decorated with stylized lion reliefs are found at churches of St John at Ephesus and St Nicholas at Myra<sup>77</sup>. On panel nr. 12 at Milas Museum the lion figure depicted sitting has a foiled tail. The lion on the architrave fragment nr. 15 at Bodrum Museum is placed within a roundel as different from other examples.

The partially visible duck figure in another roundel of the same item is not a figure often encountered. The rooster outside the roundels is reminiscent of the roosters on the ancient friezes at Laodikeia<sup>78</sup>. The figure above the rooster is thought to be a fox and is a filling motif in low relief.

On panel nr. 7 at Bodrum Museum is a single animal figure covering the entire surface on its own. Such arrangements were usually used as wall panels particularly in the Middle Byzantine period and a similar example is the panel with dragon of the 11<sup>th</sup> century at Enez excavation depot<sup>79</sup>.

The eagle figure<sup>80</sup> seen on panel nr. 11 at Milas Museum is depicted in high relief with its head in profile and body facing detailed; a similar example is found on a panel with other figures too at Uşak Museum<sup>81</sup>.

<sup>72</sup> Hartner 1964, 161-171.

<sup>73</sup> Kazhdan – Cutler 1991, 1231-2.

<sup>74</sup> Kazhdan 1991, 1231.

<sup>75</sup> Kazhdan 1991, 598-599.

<sup>76</sup> Parman 2002, photo: 103, A40; Ödekan 2007, 58.

<sup>77</sup> For Ephesus see Atasoy – Parman 1983, 164, C. 30; for Myra see Ötüken 2006, 47, fig. 13.

<sup>78</sup> Şimşek 2002, 256.

<sup>79</sup> See Ödekan 2007, 111, Inv. nr. 1; for other examples see Buckler – Calder 1939, Pl. 13, 63-64.

<sup>80</sup> The eagle symbolizes the triumph of goodness over evil, see Cutler 1991, I, 669.

<sup>81</sup> Parman 2002, 169-170, U41, Pl. 96/photo: 121; for similar examples see Fıratlı 1990, 163, pl. 99, nr. 323, 324; Ötüken 1996, Taf. 13, fig. 3; for other examples see Ödekan 2007, 64; Bucton 1994, nr. 151. For examples on capitals see Ötüken 1996, Taf. 41, 2-4. Textiles and pottery have eagles in heraldic posture, see Evans – Wixom 1997, 225 fig. 49, 413 fig. 270.

Architrave fragment nr. 16a at Bodrum Museum has a griffin figure covering the surface<sup>82</sup>. This mythical creature emerged in the east<sup>83</sup>. Also used in Antiquity<sup>84</sup> this figure was frequently depicted in textiles other than architectural sculpture<sup>85</sup>. Byzantine architectural sculpture examples with similar depictions include panels<sup>86</sup>, architraves<sup>87</sup> and sarcophagi<sup>88</sup>.

Geometric forms on the items studied here have sometimes constituted an outer frame for the decors and figures for forming the compositions. Roundels framing the cross on panel nr. 6 and the peacock on panel nr. 11 are found often in the art of the early and middle periods. Rhombi with circular roundels as seen on panel nr. 11 have similar uses<sup>89</sup>.

The interlocking roundels on panel nr. 6 have rosettes with pointed leaves and their parallels are found on an architrave fragment of the 11<sup>th</sup> century at the Kıranişıklar Şahan Baba Mausoleum<sup>90</sup>.

The figures on the architrave fragment nr. 15 at Bodrum Museum fill in the interlacing roundels. Like these interlocking roundels, the wheel-of-fortune, too, is a widely used motif in the Middle Byzantine art. The architrave of the Virgin Mary's Church at Ephesus dated to the 10<sup>th</sup>-11<sup>th</sup> century has similar arrangements<sup>91</sup>. The parallel to the single banded interlacing roundels framing figures and motifs on architrave nr. 13 at Milas Museum is found on a 6<sup>th</sup>-century pier at Karaman.

Architrave fragments 15 and 16a at Bodrum Museum have the same geometric forms on their lateral sides. The rhombi interlocking with each

---

<sup>82</sup> Yalçın 2005, 330.

<sup>83</sup> Fronzo 1996, 91-97.

<sup>84</sup> Kazhdan 1991, II, 884-885.

<sup>85</sup> Kendrick 1916: 225-227; Evans – Wixom 1997, 226 fig. 150. For griffin depictions on pottery and tiles see Evans – Wixom 1997, 263, fig. 185, 319, fig. 219A-B.

<sup>86</sup> Evans – Wixom 1997, 36, fig. 2A; Pazaras 1977, 75, nr. 42, Pl. XXIII; Rorimer 1930, 98-100; Fıratlı 1990, Pl. 104, 343, 344, 347, 334a, 335a. For examples of animal combat scenes see Grabar 1976, XLVIII, nr. 73.

<sup>87</sup> Parman 2002, 112, Pl. 28, photo: 2a, 25a, b, c.

<sup>88</sup> Pazaras 1999, Abb.5.

<sup>89</sup> For examples of cross motif within circles see Parman 2002, photo: 120; Tezcan 1993, fig. 175; Ötüken 1996, 108 Taf. 10.4, Taf. 11.3-5, Taf. 20.6. For an example within a rhombus see Aydın 2008, fig. 5.

<sup>90</sup> Ötüken 1996, 86, Taf. 8.3.

<sup>91</sup> Barsanti 1988, 288. Such interlocking motifs can also be found on ivory artifacts of the 12th century, see Evans – Wixom 1997, cat. nr. 259. For some examples of uncountable wheel-of-fortune motifs on architrave see Buchwald 1995, figs. 5, 6; Yalçın 1999, fig. 2.

other as well as with the outer frame and the drill holes on them are typical for the Middle Byzantine period<sup>92</sup>. This geometric decoration is framed with geisipodes and rope motif on the outside. Used in the 5<sup>th</sup>-6<sup>th</sup> century under the influence of Antiquity and remained in use through the Middle Byzantine period as well<sup>93</sup>. Although the details are lost on item nr. 15, the two items have similar dimensions and provenance; therefore, it is clear that they complement each other.

The egg and dart frieze on panel nr. 11, of the 5<sup>th</sup>-6<sup>th</sup> century and appearing in Anatolia and Istanbul as an influence of antiquity is seen as a border. This widely used frieze is seen on the Theodosian frieze at Ayasofya in Istanbul, the architrave in the narthex of Studius Basilica and on the side panels of the ambos at Milas Museum<sup>94</sup> and between the volutes on the echinus of Ionic-impost capitals of the 5<sup>th</sup>-6<sup>th</sup> century<sup>95</sup>.

Some of the items studied here do not have an inventory number of were acquired through purchase or handed over; therefore, their find spots are not known. Panel nr. 12 is one rare example of clear provenance information. It belongs to the Basilica B in Bargylia<sup>96</sup> and bears an inscription. Ruggieri dated this panel to the 5<sup>th</sup>-6<sup>th</sup> century<sup>97</sup>.

Although their original context are not known, a comparison with parallels points to monuments of religious function. Panels were used on the liturgical constructions like templons, ambos and cathedras or between the columns separating the aisles. Panels nr. 1, 6, 9, 10, 11 and 12, which have survived in good condition to a great extent, had one of the functions as mentioned above in their original monuments. Middle Byzantine parallels of the panel nr. 2 at Muğla Museum could have been used on the facades of buildings or fortresses. On the other hand, items nr. 4, 5 and 8 were used adjoining on the side or on top of the panels.

<sup>92</sup> For examples with drill holes see Parman 2002, photo: 2b, 6, 8, 9, 10.

<sup>93</sup> For dentils on a capital and an architrave fragment of the Middle Byzantine period at Alanya Museum, see Doğan 2009, 144, 1-2, 8.

<sup>94</sup> Mercangöz 1996, figs. 5, 6.

<sup>95</sup> For some examples of such capitals see Pillinger – Kresten 1975, 360-428, Taf. 1, 2; Parman 2002, photo: 164, 174-176; Ötügen 1996, Taf. 37, 3-6; Serin 2004, figs. 37-40; Yalçın 1996, 19-123, fig. 7.

<sup>96</sup> Castelfranchi 2005, 456 fig. 18.

<sup>97</sup> Ruggieri 2005, 66, fig. II/9.



Columns were used for connecting the panels of templons or supporting the architraves<sup>98</sup>. Item nr. 14 in our study is a baluster with a knob originally used in a templon. Balusters with knobs were widely used in Early Byzantine period<sup>99</sup>.

Extant examples show that the architraves extending on top of the templon piers connecting them were decorated on their front sides facing the congregation and on the bottom side between the piers. Items nr. 13, 15 and 16a, which we think are architrave fragments, have decoration on two sides.

In spite of the vagueness of information regarding the place of Caria in Byzantine art and the fact that archaeological evidence points to important constructional activities not only in great centres but also in lesser towns particularly in the 5<sup>th</sup>-6<sup>th</sup> century, it is not possible to talk about uninterrupted Byzantine existence in the region. The first reason for the breaks is the Arab invasions<sup>100</sup> which lasted from the 7<sup>th</sup> century to the end of the 8<sup>th</sup> century; thereafter, Byzantium got hold of the region until the beginning of the 13<sup>th</sup> century as verified by buildings remains, small finds and architectural sculpture.

Works of architectural sculpture with figurative and floral decoration at Muğla, Milas and Bodrum Museums we studied here belong to the Early and Middle Byzantine periods with respect to their typology, decoration and styles. Both periods feature marble or limestone items, which are both abundant in Caria. Milas, Bodrum and Yatağan have major limestone and marble quarries.

Chronological study shows that most of the items studied here belong to the early Christian period. Like the building remains themselves, architectural sculpture too points to the high rate of activity in the region in the 5<sup>th</sup>-6<sup>th</sup> centuries.

Although the architectural remains in the region are fewer in number for the Middle Byzantine period in comparison to the Early Byzantine period, it is worth noting that a significant amount of the figurative items studied here belong to this period.

---

<sup>98</sup> Orlandos 1952, 526, 531.

<sup>99</sup> Orlandos 1952, 526; Doğan 2004, 71-76, 74.

<sup>100</sup> Eroğlu 1939, 85-86.

The figurative stonework of the Early and Middle Byzantine periods display the characteristics of the capital and environs with respect to iconography and motifs but it is possible to claim that the shaping of the figures and workmanship quality reveal local characteristics in stylistic unison with the regions around Caria in west Anatolia.

## Bibliography and Abbreviations

- Acara 1998 Acara, M., 'Bizans Ortodoks Kilisesinde Litürji ve Litürjik Eserler', Hacettepe Üniversitesi Edebiyat Fakültesi Dergisi 15, 188-195.
- Anadolu 1988 Anadolu, M.U., 'Batı Anadolu'da Bulunmuş Olan Yayınlanmamış Tavus Kuşu Motifli Mimarlık Elemanları', TAD 28, 101-112.
- Angello 1962 Angello, G., *Le Arti Figurative Nella Sicilia Bizantina*, Palermo.
- Atasoy – Parman 1983 Atasoy, N. – Parman, E., 'Bizans Sanatı', Anadolu Medeniyetleri II, İstanbul.
- Aydın 2008 Aydın, A., 'Adana, Anamur ve Silifke Müzesindeki Figürlü Paye ve Levhalar', Adayla X, 268-286.
- Barsanti 1988 Barsanti, C., 'Scultura Anatolica di Epoca Mediobizantina', *Million* 1, 275-295.
- Beckwith 1961 Beckwith, J., *The Art of Constantinople. An Introduction to Byzantine Art 330-1453*, London.
- Beckwith 1979 Beckwith, J., *Early Christian and Byzantine Art*, London.
- Buchwald 1995 Buchwald, H., 'Chancel Barrier Lintels Decorated With Carved Arcades', *Jahrbuch der Österreichischen Byzantinistik* 45, 237-276.
- Buckler – Calder 1939 Buckler, W.H. – Calder, W.M., 'Monument and Document from Phrygia and Caria', *Monumenta Asiae Minoris Antiqua* VI, 112-135.
- Bucton 1994 Bucton, D., *Byzantium*, London.
- Castelfranchi 2005 Castelfranchi, M.F., 'Il Complesso Ecclesiale di Barglyia', Iasos e la Caria (ed. Macchiaroli), *La Parola del Passato Rivista di Studi Antich* XL, 455-465.
- Dennert 1997 Dennert, M., *Mittelbyzantinische Kapitelle, Studien zu Typologie und Chronologie. Asia Minor Studien*, Bonn.
- De Matties 2004 De Metteis, L. M., *Mosaici di Cos Dagli scavi dele missioni Italia e Tedesche (1900- 1945)*, Atene.
- Dutilh 1994 Dutilh, C., 'Granatapfel', *LCI* II, 198-99.
- Doğan 2004 Doğan, S., 'Alanya Müzesindeki Bizans Dönemi Taş Eserleri', *Araştırma Sonuçları Toplantısı* 22 (2004) II, 71-76.
- Doğan 2009 Doğan, S., 'Bizans Sanatında Yaşam Haçı Motifi ve Antalya Müzesi'ndeki Bir Sütun Başlığı' Ebru Parman'a Armağan (ed. A.O. Alp), Ankara.
- Eroğlu 1939 Eroğlu, Z., *Muğla Tarihi*, İzmir.
- Evans – Wixom 1997 Evans, H. C. – Wixom, W. D., *The Glory of Byzantium, Art and Culture of the Middle Byzantine Era*, New York.

- Fronzo 1996 Fronzo, M.D., 'Grifo', Enciclopedia dell'Arte Medievale VII, 91-97.
- Farioli 1969 Farioli, R.O., Corpus della Scultura Paleocristiana bizantina ed altomedioevale di Ravenna, III, Roma.
- Feld 1975 Feld, O., 'Die Innenausstattung der Nikolaoskirche in Myra', Myra (ed. J. Borchardt), 360-428, Berlin.
- Feld 1975 Feld, O., 'Christliche Denkmäler aus Milet', İstanbuler Mitteilungen 25, 197-209.
- Fıratlı 1978 Fıratlı, N., 'An Early Byzantine Hypogeum Discovered at İznik', Mansel'e Armağan II, 912-932.
- Fıratlı 1990 Fıratlı, N., La sculpture byzantine figuree au Musee Archeologique d'Istanbul, Paris.
- Grabar 1976 Grabar, A., Sculptures byzantines du Moyen Age, II (XI- XIV), Paris.
- Grabar 1953 Grabar, A., La Peinture Byzantine, Geneve.
- Gough 1968 Gough, M., 'A Masterpiece of Early Christian Architecture', The Metropolitan Museum of Art Bulletin 26, 455-464.
- Ghandi 1983 Ghandi,, Bizans Sanatında Sasani Motifleri (İ.Ü. Edebiyat Fakültesi yayınlanmamış Doktora Tezi), İstanbul.
- Harrison – Fıratlı 1967 Harrison, M. – Fıratlı N., 'Excavation at Saraçhane in İstanbul Fourth Preliminary Report', Dumbarton Oaks Papers 21, 273-278.
- Hartner 1964 Hartner, W. R., 'Ettinghausen, The Conquering Lion, The Life Cycle of a Symbol', Oriens 17, 161-171.
- Head 1911 Head, B.V., Historia Numorum.
- Kazhdan – Cutler 1991 Kazhdan, A. P. – Cutler, A., 'Lion', The Oxford Dictionary of Byzantium II, 1231-2.
- Kazhdan 1991 Kazhdan, A., 'Deer', Oxford Dictionary of Byzantium I, 598-599.
- Kazhdan 1991 Kazhan, A.P., 'Griffin', Oxford Dictionary of Byzantium II, 884-885.
- Kendric 1916 Kendric, A.F., 'A Griffin Silk Fabric', The Burlington Magazin for Connoisseurs 29, 225-227.
- Kitzinger 1963 Kitzinger, E., 'The Hellenistic Heritage in Byzantine Art', Dumbarton Oaks Papers 17, 95-115.
- Koch 2007 Koch, G., Erken Hristiyan Sanatı (çev. A. Aydın), İstanbul.
- Koch 2008 Koch, G., 'Kinder Sarkophage der römischen Kaiserzeit in Kleinasien', Adalya X, 145-160.
- Lamberton 1911 Lamberton, C.D., 'The Development of Christian Symbolism as Illustrated in Roman Catacomb Painting', American Journal of Archeology, 15, 507-522.
- Lassus 1967 Lassus, J., Früh Christlich und Byzantinische, Welt.

- Lazarev 1966 Lazarev, Trois Fragments d'epistyles peintes et le templon byzantin, *Deltion tes Christianikes kai Archaïologikes Hetaireias* 4, 117-143.
- Luca 1990 Luca, De, 'Hellenistische Kunst in Pergamon', *Istanbul Mitteilungen* 40, 38-49.
- Lurker 1985 Lurker M., *Wörterbuch der Symbolik*, Stuttgart.
- Mango – Sevckenko 1961 Mango, C. – Sevckenko, I., 'Remains of the Church of St. Polyuktos at Constantinople, *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 15, 243-247.
- Martinelli 1968 Martinelli, P.A., *Corpus della Scultura Paleocristiana bizantina ed altomedioevale di Ravenna*, I, Roma.
- Mercangöz 1996 Mercangöz, Z., 'Milas Müzesindeki Bizans Ambonları', *Sanat Tarihi Dergisi* VIII, 84-98.
- Mercangöz 2001 Mercangöz, Z., 'Ortaçağ Hıristiyanlık İnanişinde Ökaristi ve Sanattaki Yansımaları', *Sanat ve İnanc Sempozyumu II* (ed. B. Mahir-H. Katipoğlu), 43-52.
- Mansel 1978 Mansel, A. M., *Side*, Ankara.
- Orlandos 1952 Orlandos, A., K., *Hexylostegos palaiochristianike basilike II*, Athens.
- Okçu 2007 Okçu, R., 'Derecik Bazilikası Kurtarma Kazısı', III. Uluslar arası Türkiye Mozaik Korpusu Sempozyumu Bildirileri, (ed. M. Şahin), Bursa, 37-45.
- Ödekan 2007 Ödekan, A. (ed), *Kalanlar. 12 ve 13. Yüzyıllarda Türkiye'de Bizans*, İstanbul.
- Ötüken 1996 Ötüken, Y., "Forschungen im Nordwestlichen Kleinasien, Antike und Byzantinische Denkmäler in der Provinz Bursa", *Istanbul Mitteilungen Band 41*, Tübingen.
- Ötüken 2006 Ötüken, Y., '2002 Demre-Myra Aziz Nikolaos Kilisesi Kazısında Ulaşılan Sonuçlar', VII. Ortaçağ ve Türk Dönemi Kazı ve Sanat Tarihi Araştırmaları Sempozyumu Bildirileri, 88-97.
- Ötüken 2010 Ötüken, Y., 'Myra'daki Arslanlı levha ve On İkinci ve On Üçüncü Yüzyıl Ortaçağ Taş Eserlerinde Üslup ve İkonografik Değişimler', 1. Uluslararası Sevgi Gönül Bizans Araştırmaları Sempozyumu Bildirileri 2007 (ed. A. Ödekan, E. Akyürek, N. Necipoğlu), İstanbul, 554-562.
- Özet 2008 Özet, A., 'Excavation in the Torba Monastery', *Halicarnassian Studies V*(ed. P.Pedersen), 9-42.
- Parman 2002 Parman, E., *Ortaçağ'da Bizans Döneminde Frigya ve Bölge Müzelerindeki Bizans Taş Eserleri*, Eskişehir.
- Parman 1993 Parman, E., 'Bizans Sanatında Tavus Kuşu İkonografisi', *Sanat Tarihinde İkonografik Araştırmalar. Günel İnal'a Armağan*, Ankara, 387-89.

- Pazaras 1977 Pazaras, T., 'Catalogue of Christian relief slab from Thessaloniki showing animals', *Vyzantina* 9.
- Pazaras 1999 Pazaras, T., 'Die frühchristliche tradition in der mittelalterlichen Sakophagkunst und in gleichzeitigen sarkophagdarstellungen' *Akten Des Symposiums Frühchristliche Sarkophage* (ed. G. Koch), Mainz.
- Peschlow 1975 Peschlow, U., 'Byzantinische Plastik in Didyma', *Istanbuler Mitteilungen* 25, 211-257.
- Pillinger – Kresten 1999 Pillinger, R. – Kresten, O., *Efeso Paleocristiana e Bizantina*, Wien.
- Rorimer 1930 Rorimer, J.J., 'An Italo-Byzantine Marble Relief', *The Metropolitan Museum of Art Bulletin*, 25, 98-100.
- Ruggieri 2003 Ruggieri, V., *Il golfo di Keramos: dal terdo- antico al medioevo bizantino*, Rubbettino.
- Ruggieri 2005 Ruggieri, V., *La Caria Bizantina: topografia, archeologia ed arte*, Rubbettino.
- Rice 1950 Rice, T., 'The Leaved Cross', *Byzantinoslavica* 11, 68-81.
- Schefold 1978 Schefold, K., *Götter und Heldensagen der Griechen in der spätarchaischen Kunst*, München.
- Serin 2004 Serin, U., *Early Christian and Byzantine Churches At Iasos in Caria: An Architectural Survey*, *Monumenti di Antichita Cristiana*, seri II. XVII. Citta del Vaticano: Pontificio Istituto di Archeologia Cristiana, Roma.
- Smith – Cheetham 1893 Smith, W. – Cheetham, S. A., *Dictionary of Christian Antiquities*, London.
- Speake 1994 Speake, J., *The Dictionary of Symbols in Christian Art*, London.
- Ulbert 1969/1970 Ulbert, Th., 'Untersuchungen zu den byzantinischen Reliefplatten des 6. bis 8. Jahrhunderts', *Istanbuler Mitteilungen* 19/20, 339-449.
- Tezcan 1989 Tezcan, H., *Topkapı Sarayı ve Çevresinde Bizans Dönemi Mimarisi*, İstanbul.
- Vetters 1978 Vetters, H., 'Zum Stockwerkbau in Ephesos', *Mansel'e Armağan* III, 1112-1135.
- Westphalen 2000 Westphalen, S., 'The Byzantine Basilica at Priene', *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 54, 275-280.
- Weitzmann 1960 Weitzmann, K., 'The Survival of Mythological Representations in Early Christian and Byzantine Art and Their Impact on Christian Iconograph', *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 14, 43-68.
- Yalçın 1996 Yalçın, A. B., 'Alcune osservazioni sul decoro scultoreo e musivo delle chiese protobizantine de Cnido in Caria', *Bisanzio e l'Occidente: arte, archeologia, storia Studi in onore di Fernanda de'Maffei*, Roma, 105-128.

- Yalçın 1999 Yalçın, A. B., 'Alcune Osservazioni Sul Decoro Scultoreo Medio-bizantino', Della Basilica Di S. Giovanni, VII. Simposio di Efeso su S. Giovanni Apostolo, 301-319, Roma.
- Yalçın 2005 Yalçın, A. B., 'Sculture Bizantine Conservate Nel Museo Del Castello Di Bodrum' X. Simposio Di Efeso Su S. Giovanni Apostolo (ed. L.Padovese), Roma 2005, XIX, 318-330.
- Yalçın 2008 Yalçın, A. B., 'İstanbul ve Boğaziçi Üniversitelerinde Bulunan Bazı Bizans Mimari Plastik Eserleri', Işın Demirkent Anısına, İstanbul, 299-311.
- Fansa – Bollmann 2008 Fansa, M. – Bollmann, B. (ed.), Die Kunst der Frühen Christen in Syrien, Mainz.
- Zäh 2003 Zäh, A., Zur Typologie kirchlicher Architektur im südwestlichen Kleinasien, Maintal.
- Zollt 1994 Zollt, T., Kapitellplastik Konstantinopoles vom 4. bis 6. Jahrhundert n. Chr. Mit einem Beitrag zur Untersuchung des ionischen Kampferkapitells, Bonn.



Fig. 1 Muğla Archaeological Museum, Panel



Fig. 2 Muğla Archaeological Museum, Panel



Fig. 3 Muğla Archaeological Museum, Panel



Fig. 4 Muğla Archaeological Museum, Panel Fragments





Fig. 5 Muğla Archaeological Museum, Panel Fragments



Fig. 6 Bodrum Archaeological Museum, Panel



Fig. 7 Bodrum Archaeological Museum, Panel



Fig. 8 Bodrum Archaeological Museum Panel Fragments



Fig. 9 Bodrum Archaeological Museum, Panel



Fig. 10 Bodrum Archaeological Museum,  
Panel



Fig. 11 Milas Archaeological Museum,  
Panel



Fig. 12 Milas Archaeological Museum, Panel



Fig. 13 Milas Archaeological Museum, Architrave Fragment



Fig. 15 Bodrum Archaeological Museum, Architrave Fragment



Fig. 14  
Bodrum Archaeological Museum, Baluster



Fig. 16a Bodrum Archaeological Museum, Architrave Fragment



Fig. 16b Bodrum Archaeological Museum, Architrave Fragment



Fig. 17 Bodrum Archaeological Museum,  
Impost Capital