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Introduction

The genre of wood painting, widespread in antiquity according to written sources, is almost completely lost to us (Koch 1996: 7-8). Only a few wood paintings have survived unscathed in burial chambers and grottoes. The earliest surviving example of Greek wood painting is of the sixth century B.C.: four panel paintings dedicated to the nymphs that were venerated in a cave in Pitsa near Corinth have survived due to beneficial conservation conditions (Koch 1996: fig. 1). In addition to these Corinthian panels, there are two small wooden pinakes from tombs in Egypt (Nicholls 1979: 74-78 no. 284 pls. 60, 85).

Among these rare samples of ancient wood painting, there are four painted beams in Munich. In 1989, they were handed over to the “Archäologische Staatssammlung” as a gift and permanent loan. In 1993, Peter Calmeyer published a preliminary acquisition report in the “Münchner Jahrbücher”, unfortunately with inadequate and sometimes upside down illustrations (Calmeyer 1993: 7-18). Even though shortly thereafter two colour photographs of the details of the beams were published in the exhibition catalogue “Orient und Okzident”, these pictures were reproduced the wrong way around (Zahlhaas 1995: pl. D), so that they were not recognisable as a coherent scenic ensemble. Probably because of this inadequate photographic publication, scholars have hardly taken notice of these important monuments of Achaemenid-era wood painting. Twelve years after the first publication, the Munich beams are still widely unknown with only a few casual references in literature.\(^2\) In this paper

---

1 Former “Prähistorische Staatssammlung”.

2 Casually mentioned by Jacobs 1994: 138; Özgen-Öztürk 1996: 45; Boardman 2000: 247 n. 150. Borchhardt 2000: 95-96 includes the Munich beams in the catalogue of historical scenes referring to Calmeyer’s interpretation. Briant 2003: 247 fig. 40 republishes in his book “Darius dans l’ombre d’Alexandre” a detailed photograph and a drawing of one of the beams with a combat scene. The drawings are unfortunately faulty in details, since they have been created from inadequate photographs.
I describe the painted timbers using new photographs and drawings, review the interpretation of the images proposed by Calmeyer, and argue that their original context was a wooden tomb chamber in Tatarlı, near the royal residence of Kelainai in Phrygia.

The Munich paintings consist of four painted cedar beam parts. Originally there were two beams, which were sawn apart in recent times, probably to make transportation easier. The two parts that belong together are easily recognisable due to the continuity in the imagery. Only 1 mm. is missing between the parts belonging together, which was probably destroyed during the sawing process.

The first beam is 221 cm. long and 32 cm. high. The second beam is a little smaller. It is 212 cm. long and 27 cm. high. Carefully crafted mortises show that the beams were attached to other beams above, below, and at the sides. The timbers are flattened out on one side in order to create a surface for painting, while the other sides remain roughly cut from the trunk. The surface to be painted is smoothed by a sharp axe, which left grooved traces. Unlike the known samples of ancient wood paintings from Greece and Egypt, the Munich beams are not smoothed with a stucco layer. Rather, the figures are first incised into the wood and then the colours are applied directly on the wood surface. Black outlines and red, black, white, brown, grey, or blue paint spots still remain. The preservation condition of each colour varies. The black, probably a carbonisation product, as well as the red, most likely cinnabar, seems to be applied in a thin layer. The fine particles of pigment apparently penetrated the wooden surface so deeply that the colours are still preserved today. On the other hand the compact fragments of brown, grey/blue and white suggest that these colours were applied in thick layers, of which only tiny traces remain.

The painted beam with a battle scene

On the first, better-preserved beam, a battle scene is rendered (figs. 1, 2). Two groups of warriors march towards each other. The party coming from the left consists of twelve warriors. The party on the right side has eleven warriors in total. It is unclear whether a warrior was destroyed on the far right when the beam was sawn off. However, the composition suggests that the number of warriors on the two sides was unequal. In this manner the party coming from the right side is shown as inferior, while the left side is winning the battle. The advance of victorious warriors from the left is a convention of battle representations (Luschey 2002: 17-18).

The party on the left consists of three archers on foot, seven riders, a driver, and an archer on the chariot.\(^3\) The party on the right consists of five archers on foot and six riders. One archer is already dead, lying on the ground, while one of the riders has fallen off his injured horse. The warrior on foot on the outer right edge is hit by an arrow, which is still sticking in his neck. Only five riders in the middle seem ready for battle. But the arrow flying in the air above the injured horse indicates that these warriors will be put out of action in the next moment.

\(^3\) Calmeyer 1993: 13 lists only six riders and two archers on foot. He seems to have missed the head of the archer on the outer edge and a rider.
In the centre of the depiction the respective leaders of the two parties are fighting. The leader on the left is thrusting his dagger into the stomach of his opponent with his right hand, while he is pulling him towards himself by the beard. The leader on the left side is shown larger than his opponent. The disproportion between his large head and his relatively small body is striking. Probably, two different figural schemes are combined here in order to modernise an earlier model.

The champion of the party on the left is wearing red garments with complex drapery and closely sewn sleeves (fig. 3). A dagger hangs from his belt. A long round bow and a white painted quiver hang over his left shoulder.\(^4\) The drapery of this costume is similar to Perso-Elamite draped garments (Calmeyer 1988: 34-36). However, these usually have open pseudo-sleeves (Bittner 1985: 106-110; Calmeyer 1988: 44-47)\(^5\) and not long sewn sleeves as depicted on the wooden frieze. Calmeyer explains this peculiarity as due to the inability of the painter to render pseudo-sleeves (Calmeyer 1993: 13), but it obviously was not the intention of the painter to depict pseudo-sleeves here. Rather, he has indicated with fine black lines that he meant to show sewn sleeves. This oddity suggests a misinterpretation of the painter, who obviously was not aware of Perso-Elamite costume.

Although the painting in the lower part of the scene is largely faded, the triple-laced red shoes are still visible. As Calmeyer also points out, they do not correspond to the shoes of Elamites and Great Kings, but to the shoes of ordinary Persians (Calmeyer 1993: 14).\(^6\)

The leader has long hair, rolled at the nape of the neck, and a long beard (fig. 3). He wears a cylindrical crown with a horizontal band and points on the top. A round-shaped, red-painted earring is still visible on his earlobe. His facial profile has a long, faintly curved nose line; his lower lip is stuck out slightly. He has a heavy chin and a thick black mustache. A curved eyebrow line surrounds his large eye, which is angled at the end but open in the front.

Calmeyer calls the headgear of the victor kidaris (Calmeyer 1993: 13). The term kidaris is used by the Greek authors for a royal hat, the identification of which is still much debated.\(^7\) Contrary to widespread opinion, wearing of a dentate or crenelated cylindrical crown was not reserved to the kings (Jacobs 1994: 138). Such crowns were worn by other noble Persians, so-called royal archers, women, servants, sphinxes, and also by Ahura Mazda.\(^8\) Additionally,

---


\(^5\) This costume is usually connected to the Greek word kappyris, which was according to Pollux (7.59) a chiton with sleeves. For the pattern of this costume, see Koch 1992: 206 fig. 151.

\(^6\) The royal shoes usually are not laced: Calmeyer 1988: 47-48; Koch 1992: 211 fig. 143.

\(^7\) Referring to Calmeyer, Borchhardt goes even further and identifies this headgear as the kidaris of the Great King: Borchhardt 2000: 95. For the latest discussion on the identification of royal hats kidaris and tiara orthé, see C. Tuplin, “Treacherous Hearts and Upright Tiaras: The Achaemenid King’s Head-Dress”, which is to be published in the proceedings of “the Celtic Conference in Classis” held in Rennes in 2004. I am grateful to the author for sending me his unpublished manuscript.

two further archers on foot on the far left have the same hair- and beard style and the same headgear. They are also dressed in Perso-Elamite draped garments, even though these figures are painted with less accuracy. Apparently these archers represent a Persian military unit, to which the leader also belongs.

A fallen warrior of the opponent group is lying at the feet of the leader. He has been wounded or killed by two arrows, which still stick in his back. Presumably the arrows were shot from the biga approaching behind the leader (figs. 1, 2). The body of the chariot with a swung parapet, on which two quivers are incised symmetrically, and the studded wheel with eight spokes correspond to Achaemenid chariot depictions. A red arch-shaped chariot pole merges with the floor of the chariot, at the end of which is a triangular object, probably a bell. Such a draught pole and the harnessing of the horses are rather unusual.

On the chariot there are two warriors. The man in the background has his hand on the reins of the chariot; he wears a sort of “skirt” with leather flaps, probably *pteryges*. On the foreground an archer is stretching his bow with his right arm. The wide sleeve of his red Achaemenid garment is hanging down. Behind the archer another right arm drawing the string of the bow appears. Mistakenly, both arms of the archer are drawn as right arms.

The chariot is followed by two rows of riders set in order behind each other. All riders are wearing Median trousers with zigzag pattern and tiaras; their armour consists of bows and quivers. The opposing group coming from the right also consists of archers on foot and cavalry but does not have a chariot. All the warriors wear Median trouser costumes and are armed with a double-curved composite bow, which is usually used by Scythians and other northern nomadic people (Brentjes 1995/1996: 187-198). The warriors on foot carry battle-axes hanging down from the waist. The soldiers of the right party are characterised by their pointed tiaras as Scythians. Obviously, the painting depicts a battle between Persians and Scythians, out of which the Persians emerged victorious.

crowns are usually taller than the headgear on the wooden frieze. A low dentate crown with horizontal bands as is shown on the beam is depicted on a pottery fragment from Gordion on the head of a bearded Persian: Voigt-Young 1999: 197 fig. 1.

9 Representations of chariots with eight spokes on Achaemenid seals: Boardman 2000: figs. 5.9-5.10; Garrison 2000: fig. 29. The chariot models in the so-called Oxus Treasure: Curtis 2000: fig. 70.

10 Bronze bells are found in the Tumulus 89 in Bintepeler (Lydia) together with parts of a chariot. Kökten Ersoy 1998: 120 figs. 7 c, d suggests that they were attached to the harnessing straps of the horses.

11 The specialists on ancient vehicles have not yet analysed the chariot type shown on the Munich wood. On Near Eastern chariot representations, see Littauer-Crouwel 1979; 2001. Joost Crouwel (Amsterdam), after having studied the wood paintings from the photographs, informed me kindly that a chariot with such a curved draught pole is not known elsewhere. Interestingly, such a chariot occurs only on the wooden frieze from Tatarlı, to which I will return later.


13 It is unlikely that the second right arm belonged to a second archer, who was concealed by his companion in the foreground. A figure with two left hands appears on the wall painting in Karaburun II: Mellink 1971: 252 pl. 56 fig. 27.

14 Calmeyer 1993: 7 calls this costume west Iranian-Cappadocian, because Medes, Armenians, and Cappadocians are wearing such trousers on the Apadana reliefs.

15 Judging by its shape, it seems to be a battleaxe of the Scythian type: Bittner 1985: 176 n. 6 pl. 14.3.
According to Calmeyer the battle scene on the wooden beam refers to the campaign of Darius I against the Scythians (Calmeyer 1993: 14-15). Following Calmeyer’s suggestion Jürgen Borchhardt even identifies the champion as Darius the Great (Borchhardt 2000: 95). But this identification is based only on the disputed relationship between the royal hat kidaris and the dentate crown, as has been noted above.

Calmeyer argues that Persian-Scythian wars are known from the written sources only in this period and that in later times the Scythians played no role as enemies of the Persians.16 However, the Scythians may have been conceptualised as a generic enemy for the Persians long after their defeat under Darius. As Calmeyer himself points out, Strabo (15.3.15) relates a legendary battle between the Persians and Scythians that took place in Zela in northern Anatolia. According to this account, the Scythians raided and destroyed the domains of the Cappadocians. However, the Persian generals stationed in Cappadocia attacked the Scythians at night and repulsed them successfully. We do not know when this event occurred, but it must have been formative for the Persians, because there was an annual celebration, a cultic festival, up to the time of Strabo.

Calmeyer tries to support his attribution of the battle scene to the Scythian campaigns of Darius on the one hand with the date of the painting about 500–490 B.C. On the other hand, he seems to derive this precise date from historical interpretation (Calmeyer 1993: 17). Calmeyer does not discuss the stylistic peculiarities of the painting in detail but describes it in general terms as “subarchaic” which consists of both Ionian and early Achaemenid elements. Although the composition and style of the painting consist of archaic elements, some details indicate a much later date. For example, the head of the champion of the winning party, which is the most elaborately painted figure of the whole frieze, shows developed stylistic treatment. The eye with a long upper lid and an iris placed at the open end follows a stylistic development that begins in the early Classical period in Greek art.18 On the other hand, in

---

16 It seems that the Persians and the Greeks called different northern nomadic peoples by the ethnic name Saca/Scythians. The Sakā tigrakhādā (‘Sacae with pointed hats’) were defeated in 520/519 B.C. by the Persian king Darius the Great who appointed this tribe a new leader. One of the earlier leaders was killed; the other, named Skunkha, was taken captive and is visible on the relief at Behistun: Shahbazi 1981: fig. 1. Herodotus (3.92) calls the Sakā tigrakhādā the Orthocorybantians (‘pointed hat men’), and states that they lived in the same tax district as the Medes. This suggests that the Sakā tigrakhādā lived on the banks of the lower reaches of the ancient Amudārya, which used to have a mouth in the Caspian Sea south of Krasnovodsk: Shahbazi 1982: 223-226; Nagel 1983: 169-189. The Sakā paradrayā (‘Sacae across the sea’) were living on the northern coast of the Black Sea. In 514/513 B.C. the king Darius launched a disastrous campaign against the Sakā paradrayā. Herodotus gives a long description of the Scythian campaign of Darius. The latest discussions on this topic: 235; Georges 1987/1995: 97-146; Jacobs 2000: 93-102.

17 It is unclear from where the chronological precision 500–490 B.C. is derived: Calmeyer 1993: 7; Borchhardt 2002: 95. At any rate, it cannot be derived from the 14C dating. The samples of the Munich beams were carbon dated by H. Willkomm of the C-14 Laboratory of the Institute for Pure and Applied Physics at the University of Kiel. In his letter of 8 January 1991 addressed to Dr. Gebhard, Prof. Willkomm gives the following results obtained by testing two samples:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>δ13C ‰</th>
<th>14C-Age B.P. ± 1σ</th>
<th>Calendar Years ± 95</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-22.8</td>
<td>2420 ± 90</td>
<td>790-275 B.C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-23.2</td>
<td>2490 ± 65</td>
<td>795-415 B.C.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The first sample gives a date between 790 B.C. and 275 B.C. and the second one between 795 B.C. and 415 B.C. Willkomm explains the discrepancy of dating between the two samples as due to the imprecision of the results. But he also stresses that a more precise dating could be reached only through crossdating with tree rings. I am grateful to Dr. Gisela Zahlhaas for sending me a copy of Prof. Willkomm’s letter.

18 See for example, the eye treatment on red figure vase paintings: Boardman 1989: 14.
the human representations of the late Archaic period, eyes in profile faces are usually shown in frontal view, without any foreshortening. Accordingly, Borchhardt’s claim that the battle scene on the Munich beam is “eine zeitgenössische Ereignisdarstellung” of Darius’ Scythian wars cannot really be entertained (Borchhardt 2000: 96).

A possible later date does not, however, exclude the possibility that the battle scene might refer to a historical combat between Persians and Scythians. Indeed, it is hardly believable that the sophisticated composition of the frieze was first created for this artistically undemanding wood painting. Plausibly, a celebrated battle painting was used here as a model. Depictions of historical events on the so-called tabulae are mentioned by some ancient authors. According to Pliny (Naturalis Historia 35.55), a historical illustration of the defeat of the Magnesians was painted on wood by the Greek artist Bularchos about 700 B.C. (Borchhardt 2000: 91). Herodotus mentions wooden pinakes with the representation of Darius’ floating bridge and the Persian army crossing the Bosporus. Accordingly, it is quite possible that a painting of the subsequent Scythian wars was also commissioned by the Great King or by one his officers. But any attempt to determine a concrete relationship between this supposed historical depiction of Darius’ wars in 513/512 B.C. and the wood painting in Munich is trapped in a vicious circle.

To sum up: the Munich wood painting probably used a painting of the Archaic period showing a battle scene between Persians and Scythians as a model. But the question of whether it was meant as a historical depiction of a specific event or as a generic depiction of war against the northern nomadic people must remain open. At any rate, in the Classical period this archaic model was transformed and realised with details according to the ability and needs of both painter and commissioner.

Illustrations of warfare are extremely rare in Achaemenid art. So far the only known example for a battle between Persians and Scythians occurs on a cylinder seal in the Bibliothèque Nationale in an extremely abbreviated manner (Ghirschman 1964: fig. 331). Only the monomachy of the respective leaders, each supported by a further warrior, is shown. The evidence of the Munich painting suggests that this abbreviated illustration must have been adopted from a detailed battle scene.

See for example the faces on the wall paintings from Kızıbel (Mellink 1998: pl. 7b), Gordion (Mellink 1980: fig. 4.5), and the Lydian tomb in Aktepe (Özgen-Öztürk 1996: 68–69, 71–72 nos. 2, 3, 4, 7–8), which are dated stylistically to last decade of the sixth century B.C.

According to Borchhardt 2000: 95–96, the archer on the chariot was the tomb owner or commissioner of the wood paintings who participated in the Scythian campaigns of Darius either in 519 or in 513 B.C.

4.88.1: “Mandroklēs [a Samian architect who made a floating bridge for the Persians across the Bosporus] had a picture made with them, showing the whole bridge of the Bosporus, and Darius [the Persian] sitting aloft on his throne and his army crossing; he set this up in the temple of Hera, with this inscription: ‘After bridging the Bosporus that teems with fish, Mandroklēs dedicated a memorial of the floating bridge to Hera, having won a crown for himself, and fame for the Samians, doing the will of King Darius’”. Scholars consider the pinakes of Mandroklēs as a historical depiction (Hölsscher 1973: 36; Borchhardt 2000: 93–94).

Jacobs 1987: 52 calls the phenomenon of representative images of repeating events “exemplarische Historienbilder”.

On a seal from the Oxus Treasure a Persian warrior killing enemies is shown: Boardman 2000: fig. 5.5.
The painted beam with a convoy scene

The second beam illustrates a procession scene (figs. 4, 5). A total of 19 human figures, 16 horses, and two chariots can be identified. Calmeyer identifies only 18 human figures (Calmeyer 1993: 10). He seems to have missed one of the riders. The convoy is moving from the right to the left. The representation repeats a similar composition twice: riders and attendants accompany two led chariots on foot.

At the beginning of the procession there are two attendants leading horses. They are wearing red tiaras and red garments that cannot be specified further. A striking detail is the vertical stripe in white or black that seems to suggest an undergarment or trimming of the coat.24

The second horse has its frontal mane bound upwards in the shape of a cone. This custom of binding horse’s manes upwards comes from Iran and is familiar in Anatolian art of the Persian era (Nollé 1992: 58).25

A led chariot follows the two leaders of the horses. The leader of the chariot wears the same garments as the attendants on foot. This time the clothing is white with a red stripe.

The biga is white with a large wheel. The swung parapet and the lateral rail of the chariot are dotted in black and red to suggest nails. The man in the chariot is wearing a sleeved coat of white colour. The edges are drawn with curled strokes. This is apparently a simple rendering of a *kandys* with fur trim.26 The upper part of his head is destroyed, but his brown tiara is still visible, which distinguishes him from the other male figures of the frieze that wear red tiaras. He is shown larger than others, which along with the motif of being seated, points to his high status. The higher rank of this man is also made clear by the spear-bearers following the chariot. Interestingly, they are carrying their lances with the point downwards.27 The first lance-bearer behind the chariot additionally holds another object in his outstretched right hand, which is probably a fan.28 Fan-bearing servants are also present on the symposium scene of the wall painting in Karaburun II and were originally devised in oriental iconography.29

In the convoy scene on the beam, four riders are drawn up overlapping in an echelon. The riders wear again Median trousers and red tiaras. A *gorytos*, a combined quiver and bow case, can be seen on the first and third rider.30

---

24 Male figures wearing garments with plastically differentiated middle stripes with small circles imitating buttons are shown on the gold plaques of the Oxus Treasure: Curtis-Searight 2003: figs. 4, 25.
26 Fur trimming of the kandys is clearly visible on a golden statuette in the chariot from the Oxus Treasure (Curtis 2000: fig. 70) and on the wall paintings of the Tomb II in Karaburun (Mellink 1973: 298 pl. 46. 9).
27 Calmeyer 1993: 10 calls these lance-bearers “bodyguards”, but does not mention the peculiarity with the downward-pointed lances.
28 Calmeyer seems to have missed this detail.
29 The fans on the Karaburun II wall painting have a rectangular shape: Mellink 1971: 252-253 figs. 20, 23. Fan-bearers in the paintings of the palace of Ashurnasipal at Nineveh: Nunn 1987: pl. 126. Fan-bearers played a significant role as a sign of high authority and prestige. On this topic see also Miller 1997: 202-203.
30 For this type of *gorytos* see Brentjes 1995/1996: 179-187.
On the second sawn-off part of the frieze an attendant leading a packhorse follows the riders. He is wearing the same costume as the other horse leaders and spear-bearers. The horse is coloured white on which lie a red side saddle and a box-shaped load with a semicircular top. The frame trim and the vertical stripes on the semicircular top are still visible. Obviously, this object is a chest.

A lavishly decorated quadriga follows the packhorse. The horses again in echelon are painted black, white, red, and again white. They have bright red bands on their foreheads with pendent red tassels and bands. Red straps are tied on the shoulder with terrets, the rings through which the reins pass. The chariot of the quadriga has a semicircular top and a large red wheel with eight spikes and is studded with nails. On the chariot frame and on its top no traces of colour are discernible. But the wooden surface is a little darker here than the surrounding background. It is likely that the artist used stain instead of colour in order to represent the wooden material of the chariot. Indeed, some red and black spots on the trim of the chariot frame representing nails indicate clearly the wooden construction of the cart. The charioteer looks somewhat strange: His body is formed only by a rectangle with a zigzag pattern representing his trousers. His tiara with round comb corresponds to the headgears of other male figures. He is holding red-painted reins in the crook of his arm; the hands are not drawn. It seems that the artist had problems drawing this figure. Possibly, such a figure was absent in the original composition of his model. The artist must have created it himself squeezing it into the narrow space between the horses’ tails and the rim of the cart.

Three attendants follow the chariot. They have no beards and wear no tiaras or armour, but have hair down to the neck where it rolls upwards. While their garments are not further distinguished, their neckbands are indicated with red paint. This obviously is a representation of women. The end of the procession is formed by three overlapping riders, who are wearing tiaras. Each is armed with a gorytos.

Similar convoy scenes are known from some funerary monuments of the Achaemenid period. The wall paintings of Karaburun II in northern Lycia of the early fifth century and the balustrade frieze of the “Mourning Women Sarcophagus” of the mid-fourth century from Sidon (Fleischer 1983: 44-58 pls. 36-39) are close iconographic comparanda. The so-called Graeco-Persian grave stelai from Daskyleion show abbreviated renderings of such procession scenes (Nollé 1992: pls. 2, 5, 8a). An overview of the known convoy scenes with roughly-sketched drawings shows that the Munich wood frieze with its 19 human figures, 16 horses and two chariots is the longest procession scene of this type known so far (fig. 6). It shares the closed chariot pulled by a quadriga with the Mourning Women Sarcophagus, while in all other convoy scenes the closed chariot is pulled by a biga. The motif of the three women following the closed chariot is to be found on the stele from Sultaniye in Bursa (fig. 6 S3), while on two further stelai (figs. 6 S6. S2)
the number of women following the closed chariot is reduced to two. On the other hand, the saddle horse on which lies a load with semicircular top and the cavalry at the end of the convoy occur only on stele S6. As it has been already mentioned, the representation of the sitting man with the white kandys on the chariot appears only in the wall painting from Karaburun.

But despite the varying numbers and details of figures, the structural and iconographic overlaps among these chariot convoys dating to the late Archaic through the late Classical period are striking. Therefore, it is widely believed that all these convoy scenes refer to a particular type of public procession, though the identification of the procession is debated. The fact that these procession scenes occur only on grave monuments led to their interpretation as an ekphora. As an ekphora presupposes that the deceased is taken along, some scholars have identified the closed chariot as a funeral cart. According to this interpretation, the round top on the cart represents a sarcophagus of wood or clay, as a stone sarcophagus would have been too heavy (Weller 1970: 219-227; Fleischer 1983: 47-54). The sarcophagus would then supposedly have been covered with a cloth. But the interpretative model “coffin on the chariot” contains a problem: The chariot appears too small to contain a body in the normal extended position. As a solution to this problem Weller assessed the possibility that the viewer was seeing only the short side of the sarcophagus, i.e. it must have been arranged crosswise to the direction of travel (Weller 1970: 225-227). This explanation has been accepted by some (Fleischer 1983: 47-54). Peter Calmeyer and Suad Ateşşiler, who generally agree with the hearse model, attempt to vary this model slightly and independently of each other reach the same interpretation. They do not see a coffin on the chariot (Calmeyer 1993: 12; Ateşşiler 2002: 77-95), but a diagonally extended wooden chariot body, on which the corpse lies covered by a cloth top.

Indeed, on the Munich wood painting it is clearly visible that the chariot frame and the top are two separate parts. As the nailed frame indicates, the parapet of the chariot was made of wood. The unpainted surface of the round top does not give any indication of its material. It could be a separate wooden lid as well as a canopy out of canvas. Therefore, the evidence of the wood painting does not help to support the hypothesis of the cloth-covered hearse.

However, the interpretation of the closed chariot as hearse poses a further problem: who is the seated dignitary on the second chariot shown in the detailed representations of the Karaburun II wall paintings and the Munich wood painting? According to Machteld Mellink (1971: 253-254; 1973: 298-301), he is the tomb owner; in other words, this is the epiphany of the deceased participating in his own funeral procession, while the closed chariot is carrying only the grave offerings. If one accepts this proposal, one should explain why the supposedly

---

33 These figures have been interpreted as men by some authors (for example, by Fleischer 1983: 48), but Nollé 1992: 18 pl. 3 points out rightly that they cannot represent male attendants because they wear long garments and carry no weapons.

34 Apparently, Ateşşiler (2002) did not take notice of the Munich frieze.

35 See the reconstructions of the chariots on the steles from Daskyleion (Istanbul-5763 and Istanbul-5764) with diagonally extended chariot bodies proposed by Ateşşiler 2002: figs. 8, 9. As an argument for the hypothesis of the diagonally extended hearse, it has been referred to a chariot with a yoke width of 2.25 m. in the Tomb 47 at the necropolis of Salamis (Cyprus): Karageorghis 1967: 78-79. But this chariot belongs to the seventh century and is a very rare example. Cart and chariot finds from the tombs in Salamis usually have small dimensions: Crouwel 1985: 212-214. Additionally, it is quite unusual to transport the corpse diagonally to the travel direction. The rare representations of ekphora always show the corpses lying on chariots with the head in the direction of travel: Kurtz-Boardman 1985: fig. 51a; Crouwel 1985: figs. 2, 3.
deceased is lacking in the abbreviated convoy scenes on the grave stelai. The representation of the seated dignitary was apparently not essential for the understanding of the scene. Therefore, he might represent a successor or a relative of the deceased, as has been proposed by Robert Fleischer (Fleischer 1983: 51; Calmeyer 1993: 13). With regard to his high importance in the scene, the dignitary on the chariot could be interpreted also as a priest who was responsible for conducting the funeral rites.

However, the funeral cortège-interpretation has been challenged in recent scholarship. There are repeated attempts to identify the chariot convoys as a display of worldly wealth. According to Margaret Nollé, the wife of the owner of the tomb travels along in the closed chariot, protected from strangers’ eyes (Nollé 1992: 88-92). The author identifies this chariot with a travel chariot mentioned in the written sources as harmamaxa. In her opinion, the depiction of the woman in the closed chariot alludes to her role as a precious possession of the deceased, thus emphasizing his higher social position.

Bruno Jacobs sees the procession as the ceremony of a religious festivity, such as the one rendered on the steps of the great reception hall in Persepolis (Jacobs 1992: 24-27). According to Jacobs, the closed chariot contains a holy object that is protected from the profane surroundings by being covered with cloth. Neither of these interpretations is particularly convincing, because they lack an evidential basis. Firstly, Persian women are generally shown in representative scenes. They appear in banquet scenes and ride horses. Why should they appear as hidden in a representative procession? Secondly, it remains unexplained why the supposedly hidden women or hidden religious objects feature only on grave monuments.

Assessing all these arguments against each other, the reading of the scene as a funeral cortège seems more reasonable. A strong evidence for this opinion is the lamenting figures leading the convoy in the balustrade frieze of the Mourning Women Sarcophagus. Tearing clothing and hair is well attested as an expression of grief in written sources as well as in iconography (Huber 2001: 32-45, 159). In the case of the Munich wooden frieze the unusual way that the warriors behind the chariot of the seated dignitary hold their lances pointing downward is perhaps also an expression of grief. Another possible indication of funeral lamentation is the woman behind the chariot, who touches the chariot frame as a last salutation of the deceased.

However, there is no iconographical evidence to confirm this interpretation of such gestures.

---

36 The interpretation „Haremswagen“ is mostly based on written sources, which mention Persian women travelling in closed tents, curtained on all sides and set upon a wagon: Nollé 1992: 64-65, 91. Some clay or stone chariot models with an arched tilt and partly drawn curtains from Cyprus show a woman sitting inside: Crouwel 1985: fig. 1; Hermary 2000: 131 pl. 69 no. 868. But the use of tilt vehicles was not reserved only to women, as the chariot models with male passengers show: Crouwel 1985: fig. 1 SM 4. Thierry Petit presented a paper on “Chars et harmamaxes à Chypre sous domination achéménide” in “the Celtic Conference in Classis” in Rennes in 2004. On the basis of stone and clay models of two-wheeled carts with U-shaped top, Petit argues that such chariots represent the Persian harmamaxa mentioned in written sources. Petit does not include the representations of covered chariots of the Anatolian convoy scenes in his discussion. I owe thanks to Thierry Petit for sending me a copy of his paper.

37 As far as I can see, the “Haremswagen”-interpretation has not received acceptance by scholars. Borchhardt, who originally agreed with the interpretation of a funeral cortège (Borchhardt 1968: 195; 1970: 372-380), seems to have changed his position. In case of the wooden frieze, the author thinks that the aristocratic tomb owner was represented in the open chariot, with his wife in the closed chariot: Borchhardt 2000: 95-96.

38 Similar interpretation of this gesture is also proposed in case of the stelai from Daskyleion: Ateşliler 2002: 86.
On the other hand, it is evident, that the closed chariot was the most important part, i.e., the core, of the procession as even the most abbreviated representations on the grave stelai from Daskyleion show. It alone was sufficient for understanding the meaning of the image. All other figures including the man sitting on a chariot could be left out, since they occur only on the more detailed depictions. Consequently, the chariot with the round top was a means of transport, which played the main role in the funeral cortege. The recent findings of two-wheeled vehicles in tumulus tombs in Lydia, Phrygia, and Hellespontine Phrygia confirm this assumption. The two-wheeled chariots were dismantled prior to the entombment and only wheels and harness elements were placed in the dromoi of the tumuli (Kökten Ersoy 1998: 107-133; Ateşliler 2002: 85-86). In light of this fact, the interpretation seems to be reasonable that the two-wheeled chariots with round top represented in the procession scenes were employed during the funeral rituals and then buried in such a manner that they would never be used again.

On the basis of these new data, we can conclude that the chariot convoy scenes on Anatolian grave monuments refer to a funeral cortege. It remains, however, still unclear whether the closed chariot was used as a hearse, and if so, how the transportation of the corpse was arranged in it.

At any rate, chariots with round tops seem to go back to an old Anatolian tradition, as a representation on a recently discovered fragmentary relief vase of the Hittite period shows. As far as is recognisable, this chariot too seems to be represented within a procession scene. But whether this procession refers equally to a funeral cortege or not is difficult to answer on the poorly preserved frieze.

In his acquisition report, Peter Calmeyer, as mentioned above, dates the wooden beams to the time of Darius I because he interprets the battle scene in the historical context of the Scythian campaigns of this king. He generally supposes that the beams come from the western satrapies of the Achaemenid Empire (Calmeyer 1993: 16-17). But he also states that a more specific localisation is not possible because of the inexistence of comparative material.

The wooden tomb chamber in Tatarlı

In 1970, following reports of tomb raiding, the staff of the Afyon Museum excavated a robbed wooden tomb chamber in a tumulus near Tatarlı (fig. 7). The timbers preserving paintings were removed to the Museum in Afyon, and the excavation was published in a preliminary

---

39 In case of the Gümüşçay tomb, the remnants of two wheels, one on top of the other, are found leaning against the sarcophagus: Sevinç 1996: 252 fig. 4. Two-wheeled carts and chariots in tomb contexts are also attested on Cyprus: Crouwel 1985: 212-214.

40 Crouwel 1985: 212 points out rightly that if these two wheelers were really hearses they must have carried either a corpse in a contracted position or the cremated remains. He sees it more likely that they only contained grave goods.

41 Ediz et al. 1999: fig. 8. On the poorly preserved frieze of the vase, a closed chariot is recognisable on the horizontal of which a woman is sitting. The white painted vertical lines on the arched siding suggest an open railing with vertical supports. The brown-painted topmost line may indicate a cloth cover. Contrary to the closed chariots in the procession scenes of the Achaemenid period, this Hittite chariot is constructed with four wheels. The fragments of this vase were found together with another better-preserved vase with scenic reliefs. This second vase is published with detailed descriptions and photos (Sipahi 2000: 63-85).
The tomb was found in great disorder, but at least the architecture of the tomb could be documented. According to the excavator, the tumulus tomb was altered and reused several times in antiquity. In the tomb chamber itself, only some Roman coins, pottery sherds, and glass fragments were discovered. According to the bone remains, 15 humans were buried in the tomb in different eras (Uçankuş 1979: 308-309).

The tomb is in the form of a wooden chamber with an earth pile (fig. 8) the construction of which corresponds to the design of Gordian tumuli (Young 1981: pls. 1-7; Kohler 1995: pls. 1-6). The original wooden chamber was mantled with a stone chamber probably in the Hellenistic-Roman period and expanded with a barrel-shaped dromos. The height of the tumulus is 6 m. and its diameter is 50 m. The interior dimensions of the chamber are 250 x 200 cm. The height of the chamber seems to be irregular, since the measurements vary between 185 and 175 cm. It was constructed from 20-30 cm. wide wooden beams of juniper and cedar. The beams were piled on each other and mortised and tenoned together. The walls were made up of 7-8 beams each and the gabled ceiling of 7 beams. The length of the beams varies between 200 and 250 cm.

All wooden walls of the chamber are carefully smoothed on the inside and the wood is painted on directly without stucco or plaster. Some timbers in the lower position were removed already in antiquity to create new grave niches in the wall. According to the excavator, some beams were removed very recently, probably during the looting of 1969. Unfortunately, the description does not indicate how many timbers from which wall and from which position are lacking.

After having been removed to Afyon, the storage of the bulky timbers posed great problems for the museum. The beams from the upper part of the northern wall with the best-preserved paintings were put on exhibition. The other timbers were stored first in a pavilion in the garden and then put in a dark attic, where they are difficult to access. Due to the disadvantageous conditions of storage, the colours have faded and fewer are apparent on the beams than at the time of excavation in 1970. Therefore, no detailed comments can be made before the paintings have been cleaned and studied properly, but a few remarks on their subject matter can be made.

The best-documented side of the chamber is the northern wall, of which an in situ photograph has been published (figs. 9, 10). This wall was formed by 8 timbers in total. The middle of the lower wall was cut out secondarily to create a niche. The top four beams are divided into four friezes by straight lines, double waves and zigzag bands. The topmost beam (115 cm. long and 15 cm. high) is decorated with a pair of heraldic felines, lions, or sphinxes, of which only the bodies survive. The beam below is somewhat taller and longer (156 cm. long and 19 cm. high). The frieze extends to the beam below. It depicts four hoplites, grouped in pairs. Two pairs of warriors oppose each other. The heads of the warriors are almost completely destroyed, but

---

42 Although this excavation report has now been published three times (Uçankuş 1979: 306-334; 2002a: 23-51; 2002b: 358) scholars, have hardly taken notice of it.
43 For the latest discussion on tumulus graves in Anatolia, see Eckert’s dissertation (1998).
44 In her Ph.D. thesis Anja Eckert seems to doubt the Hellenistic-Roman date of the stone chamber proposed by the excavator, as she calls it “ein lydisches Steinkammergrab” without any further remark: Eckert 1998: Chapter 3.1.1.3.
45 Uçankuş (1979: 306 fig. 8) states only that the villagers entered into the wooden chamber from the northwestern corner and destroyed the timbers there.
their helmets with plumes are still visible and identical on all the warriors. They also share similarities on other armour and weapons. They all have greaves, large shields, sickle-shaped daggers, and lances. The antithetic grouping, the identical armour and weapons, and finally the lunging position of the warriors do not point to a simple rendering of monomachy, as has been supposed (Uçankuş 1979: 310-311), but rather to an armed dance. Dancers equipped with helmet, shield, and spear occur often on Greek vases (Poursat 1968: figs. 6-32; Delavaud-Roux 1993: passim). A close iconographic parallel for the representation on the wood painting appears on a red figure hydria in New York (Poursat 1968: fig. 16; Delavaud-Roux 1993: 91 no.18). Two mirror-inverted armed men stand face to face. Just like the warriors in the wooden frieze, they are depicted in a lunging position with arms drawn back. The flutist between the warriors leaves no doubt that this is a dance, not a fight.

In the wooden frieze there is an oddity about the warriors facing to the right. It is not clear on which arm they are carrying their shields. The shields are rendered in the foreground and cover the body completely. Therefore, it is to be expected that the shield hangs on the right arm. But the right arm is raised and swings the sickle-shaped dagger backward. The right arm, therefore, cannot carry the shield, which seems to levitate in the air. This in-sequential rendering by the artist is certainly not a painting error. Such an error could easily have been corrected with the artist painting over it. Rather, it seems that the artist changed his model in order to follow an Anatolian convention of strict symmetrical representation, as can be observed on the late Hittite reliefs from Karatepe (Çambel-Özyar 2003: pls. 36-37). The sickle-shaped daggers, which are quite unusual for Greek weapon dance representations, seem also to be a local peculiarity, since the use of war sickles (drepanon) is well attested in Anatolia (Sekunda 1996: 7-17). The representation of a weapon dance in a tomb context is not astonishing, since Pyrrhic dances played an important role during the funeral rites.

The beam beneath the weapon dance frieze (191 cm. long and 22 cm. high) shows a chariot procession headed by two larger scale human figures (figs. 9, 10). Reading from the left to right, the frieze begins with three chariots moving to the right. Each is pulled by a biga. The chariots have two large wheels with eight spikes, a large chariot frame with a swung parapet, and antithetically painted quivers. According to the drawing in the excavation report a charioteer is standing on the third and holding the reins (fig. 10). This figure is completely destroyed today. In front of the chariot convoy, two figures, of which the heads are not preserved and who are oversized in relation to the chariot, are shown heading to the right with large strides. The first figure from the left wears short garments. His legs are painted red. He

46 The coloured drawings of the armed dancers published by Uçankuş 2002a: fig. 5; 2002b: 403 are not correct in many details.
47 A warrior with a sickle-shaped dagger was depicted on a limestone relief, which was seen and drawn by C. Texier in Konya in 1849, but lost today: Sekunda 1992: fig 24; Greenewalt 1997: fig. 13. An iron sickle has been found at Sardis in a military context near the city gate: Greenewalt 1997: fig. 11. But, according to Greenewalt 1997: 12, the identification of this sickle as a war weapon remains tentative, because the context also includes objects of non-military significance.
49 The detail photo (Uçankuş 2000: colour pl. 7) is reproduced backwards.
50 See also the coloured reconstruction published by Uçankuş 2002a: fig. 7; 2002b: 404.
is carrying a long object in his right hand, most probably a lance. Apparently these figures represent warriors. Unfortunately, on the right side of the beam the surface has flaked off so that no paintings are discernible there. In spite of this preservation condition, the departure scene of a warrior can be deduced from the remaining figures, though it is unclear why the chariots and the warriors on foot are depicted in contrasting proportions.

The chariots of this frieze conform to the type and proportions of the chariot depicted on the Munich beam with the battle scene (figs. 1, 2). Additionally, even some details coincide. The eight spikes of the curved draught pole also appear here, including the peculiar harnessing, which is not attested except on the Munich and Tatarlı beams. The only difference between the two chariot renderings is the small proportion of the horses on the Tatarlı beams.

The timber below the chariot frieze was repaired before painting. A lozenge-shaped part was cut out, probably because it was damaged, and replaced by another piece of wood. This frieze shows seven winged bulls. They are not lined up behind each other, but overlapping each other so that the hindquarters of the animals are not visible. The outline of the animals is painted in black. The colour of the bull figures alternates between red and black. Their wings are differentiated by stripes and dots alternating between red and brown shades. The bulls' legs are stretched forward, pointing to a fast running movement. On the right side of the beam there are two birds. The extended wings and the heads pointing down indicate that they are flying or falling. The bodies of the birds are decorated with wavy lines, while the wings are striped, each alternating between red and brown. Below the birds is an animal painted grey or blue that is difficult to identify. It has a long tail and a slim head with raised ears. The animal is pushing forward and turning its head around. Probably this is a dog.

This, together with the running herd of bulls and the falling birds, points to a hunting scene. Winged bulls are well known in oriental art. But the only comparanda for winged bulls within a hunting scene is found on a Caeretan hydria influenced by East Greek vase painting (Hemelrijk 1984: pls. 116-117).

In the southern wall, as has been mentioned above, a doorway was added as the entrance to the later dromos. Most timbers were cut out during this reconstruction (fig. 8b). Only the door retained a beam, on which (like on the northern front wall) two antithetic felines are displayed in a lunging pose.

The situation of the western and eastern walls is unclear because no adequate documentation has been published. Only in the case of one beam does the excavator state clearly that it was positioned in the middle of the east wall (remaining length 168 cm., height 45 cm., thickness 25 cm.). It still yields some colour traces, and some figure remains are visible, which are as yet difficult to bring into any coherent context.

In all other cases no exact position of the beams is given in the excavation report, but they are imprecisely indicated to come from the “side walls”. One of these beams (120 cm. long, 22 cm. high, 10 cm. thick) was partly cut off already in antiquity. The excavator could discern a fragmentary image on it with two men moving to the right and another man walking to the left and leading a big animal, probably a bull, which might point to a sacrifice
scene (Uçankuş 1979: 316 fig. 25). The men were wearing short skirts and thighs painted red, yellow, and black. Unfortunately, I have not been able to identify this beam at the Afyon Museum yet. Judging by the description of the excavator, the figures seem to wear costumes similar to the attendants in the Lycian wall paintings of the Karaburun II tomb chamber (Bingöl 1997: pl. 8.2).

Another beam from one of the “side walls” (preserved length 130 cm., height 30-32 cm., thickness 15-30 cm.) was painted with a multifigured scene that is unfortunately hardly discernible today. Still visible is a man facing to the right. He is wearing red-painted shoes, black-painted trousers, and a knee-length red skirt. He is holding an undefined object diagonally in his hands, perhaps an aulos. However there are no traces of his head. Behind the man there is a kind of furniture with two legs, painted in red outline. Another piece of furniture, a stool or table with four legs, is also discernible on the left. Even though the paintings of the frieze are very poorly preserved, the representations of furniture bring a domestic scene to mind. If the interpretation of the man as a flute player is right, this could be a symposium scene.

The date of the wooden tomb chamber

The Tatarlı tomb chamber was first dated to the last quarter of the sixth century B.C. considering the style of the paintings (Mellink 1976a: 26; 1984: 172; Uçankuş 1979: 333; Özgen-Öztürk 1996: 45; Bingöl 1997: 39; Uçankuş 2002a: 41; 2002b: 358).51 This dating has been dramatically altered after dendrochronological and wiggle-matching 14C tests. According to the tests, carried out by Peter Kuniholm in cooperation with Bernd Kromer in 1996, the timbers were cut in 451 B.C.±22. However, after the most recent radiocarbon results, Kuniholm is arguing now strongly for an earlier date in the year 478 B.C. +4/-7. But he also stresses that the precise dating of the Tatarlı tomb will remain open until more overlapping wood material is found.52

On the other hand, as noted above, the latest stylistic treatments in the battle scene suggest rather a later date in the middle of the fifth century. This inconsistency could be explained if the paintings, at least partly, were executed some time after the timbers were cut.

Relationship between the Tatarlı wooden tomb chamber and the Munich painted beams

Although both sets of beams have been published, the possibility that the Munich beams originally belonged to the Tatarlı tomb has not yet been seriously discussed among scholars.53 This is astonishing, as a number of overlaps in material, construction techniques of

51 For the date 531 B.C., Uçankuş 2002b: 358 refers to Peter Kuniholm’s dendrochronological test. Indeed, in the report of 1991 Kuniholm proposed the dendrochronological date of about 530 B.C. for Tatarlı with some doubt: (http://www.arts.cornell.edu/dendro/91adplet.html). But he withdrew this opinion after the reexamination of the wood using the wiggle-matching method in 1996: http://www.arts.cornell.edu/dendro/96adplet.html

52 See the Kuniholm-Newton-Griggs contribution in the appendix.

53 The only mention of a possible relationship between Munich and Tatarlı is by Özgen-Öztürk 1996: 45, as they refer to both sets of beams in the same context in their book on the Lydian Treasure. Borchhardt (2000: 95) gives the provenance of the Munich planks as “Kelainai/Dinar” without any further comment.
joinery, painting techniques, and iconographic details are obvious.

The type of wood used for the Munich beams is cedar, while the Tatarlı timbers are partly of cedar and partly of juniper. The measurements of the timbers, the lengths varying between 2-2.50 m., heights varying between 27-32 cm., and the thickness ranging from 10 cm. to 30 cm., correspond also. The techniques of the joinery with mortises on top, bottom, and back of the beams are very similar. The technique of the paintings, whereby the figures are first incised, then outlined with red or black and subsequently painted, is identical. The colour schemes used on the both sets of the beams are very similar, especially in the alternation of red and black for the horses in the battle scene of the Munich beam and in the scene with winged bulls on the Tatarlı beam. The bodies of the chariots are painted white in both cases.

In terms of the figure types used, the resemblance is striking in the chariot renderings. As has been mentioned above, the chariot type with this particular harnessing and curved draught pole is attested only on the wood paintings in Munich and Afyon. But apart from the identical chariot renderings, there are differences in clothing, proportions, and some other details of the figures. However, these can be explained by different painters’ hands and changing models for the subject matter, which was possibly composed using different sources.

Although all these correspondences point to a common provenience of the beams in Munich and Afyon, some may still be sceptical. However, after having tested the Tatarlı timbers years ago, the dendrochronologist Peter Kuniholm was able to examine the ring-sequences of the Munich planks in June 2005. Not only did they match the Tatarlı timbers chronologically, but they even proved to be from the same original tree as the set of beams from Tatarlı, which was cut around 478 B.C.54

Conclusion

With this evidence it can be definitively confirmed that the Munich beams come from the side walls, either east or west wall, of the Tatarlı tomb chamber. Their sizes indicate that they were originally positioned approximately in the middle of the wall.

In conclusion, the Munich timbers must have been sawn out of the wall during the looting of the Tatarlı tomb in 1969, after which they entered the art market and - sometime in the 1970’s – came to Munich. Possibly they could not be sold because of their low market value, and this is the reason why they were finally given to the “Archäologische Staatssammlung” at the end of the 1980’s as a gift and permanent loan.

As preserved, the painted friezes show scenes of fighting, hunting, funeral procession, weapon dance, symposium, sacrifice, and representations of crouching felines. These subject matters are part of the image program in other Persian-era grave monuments in Lycia.55 The wall paintings in the tomb Karaburun II, stylistically dated around 480 B.C., do not only

54 See the Kuniholm-Newton-Griggs-Sullivan contribution in the appendix of this article.
show the same subject matter, but also similar iconographic characteristics (Mellink 1976b: 546-547; 1978: 807-808 figs. 7-8). However, they have stronger Greek influence than the wood paintings from the Tatarlı grave, which are closer to Persian models.

The location of the tumulus tomb in Tatarlı near Dinar lies in the border region between Lydia and Phrygia. Modern historians locate at Dinar the ancient city of Kelainai, which ancient authors describe as being located near the sources of the Maeander River (Müller 1997: 129). Due to its position on the Royal Road from Sardis to Susa, Kelainai gained importance during the Persian rule in Anatolia (fig. 11). According to Xenophon (Anabasis 1.2.9), Xerxes constructed a palace on the acropolis of Kelainai immediately after his defeat at Salamis (Briant 1996: 551). Another palace at the foot of the acropolis, surrounded by a large paradeisos full of wild animals, was built by Cyrus the Younger (Xenophon, Hellenica 4.1.15; Briant 1996: 309-310). Xenophon (Anabasis 1.3.7-8) calls Kelainai the largest city in Phrygia. Possibly it functioned simultaneously as a seat for the satraps.

Tatarlı is located about 30 km. northeast of Kelainai on the road to Gordion (fig. 11). According to epigraphic and numismatic evidence, modern Tatarlı was called Metropolis in the Roman period (Ruge 1931: 1496). Whether there was a preexisting settlement in the Phrygian-Persian period or whether the area of Tatarlı was used as a necropolis by Kelainai are questions which cannot be answered yet. Future archaeological surveys in this area can provide new data on the historical geography of this region.

In conclusion, the Munich wooden beams, which come from illegal excavations, can be assigned to their original context in the tumulus tomb near Tatarlı via detours. The special Phrygian burial custom of building a tomb chamber covered by a tumulus has meant the preservation of an example of the major art of ancient painting on wood. In the Tatarlı tomb the old Phrygian tradition of grave chambers constructed out of wood was employed and the beams were then decorated with images from Anatolian-Greek convention as well as with images from the cultural background of the Persian rulers.

The recovery of this tomb context is useful for further research in many respects. It does not only open up a glimpse into the lost genre of ancient wood painting, but also into the burial customs and the processes of mutual cultural influence between indigenous Phrygians and the ruling Persians. It shows the ways in which selected images could be combined within the context of a tomb and how local elites were adapting Greek and Achaemenid image models to their own needs.

---

56 The city of Kelainai and its vicinity are archaeologically not well known. The historian Müller 1997: 129-145 is the first scholar, who attempted to locate the royal palaces according to the descriptions in written sources. But for a reliable identification of the palaces, detailed archaeological surveys considering ruins still visible on surface are needed. Beside the Tatarlı tomb, the only archaeological evidence of Achaemenid presence in this region is a large coin hoard with Persian sigloi from Dinar, which came to light through an illegal excavation: Carradice 1998: 65-81. In the Hellenistic period the name of Kelainai was changed to Apameia: Strabo 12.8.15.

57 At any rate, the Tatarlı tomb does not seem to be an isolated case. In 1967 the Archaeological Museums of Istanbul acquired a silver belt of the Phrygian type, which is said to have been excavated in a small tumulus tomb near Dinar: Eckert 1998: Chapter 3.1.1.3.
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Fig. 1  Painted beam Munich 1 (Photo: Kai-Uwe Nielsen)

Fig. 2  Painted wooden beam Munich 1. Reconstruction of the paintings (Drawing: Ingrid Dinkel)

Fig. 3  Detail from the paintings on the beam Munich 1 (Photo: Kai-Uwe Nielsen)

Fig. 4  Painted beam Munich 2 (Photo: Kai-Uwe Nielsen)

Fig. 5  Painted wooden beam Munich 2. Reconstruction of the paintings (Drawing: Ingrid Dinkel)
Fig. 6
Schematic drawings of the convoy scenes on Anatolian grave monuments
(Drawing: Ingrid Dinkel)

Fig. 7
Tomb chamber in Tatarlı
(After Uçankuş 2002a: colour pl. without number fig.3)
Fig. 8
Construction of the Tatarlı tumulus grave
(After Uçankuş 2002b: 398)

Fig. 9
The northern wall of the tomb chamber in Tatarlı
(After Uçankuş 2002a: colour pl. without number fig.4)

Fig. 10
Drawing of the paintings in the northern wall in the Tatarlı tomb chamber
(After Uçankuş 2002b: 400-401 without figure number)
Fig. 11 The environs of Tatarlı (After TAVO B IV 23).
APPENDIX

Dendrochronological Analysis of the Tatarlı Tomb Chamber

Peter Ian Kuniholm – Maryanne W. Newton – Carol B. Griggs

I. The Archaeological Museum in Afyon, Turkey

In 1989 the Aegean Dendrochronology Project was invited by the late Director Ahmet Topbaş to core tree-ring samples from a pile of painted timbers from the Tatarlı Tomb, then stored in the basement of the Afyon Museum. Due to deterioration of the logs over the years and problems of identifying micro-rings, the cores came out in multiple pieces, and crossdating proved extremely difficult.

Accordingly, in 1991 we revisited the Afyon Museum with permission from Director Topbaş to cut thin cross-sections from the ends of the pieces now stored under the roof. Almost all had been surfaced flat on one side, presumably on the surfaces, which were subsequently to be painted. The many holes, not unlike a Swiss cheese, showed us why coring was not the optimal solution for sampling.

Crossdating with the sections was successful (Kuniholm 2000: 35-46). Tatarlı yielded two long ring-sequences: a 259-year sequence of Juniperus sp. from 15 trees, ending in the waney edge (German: Waldkante), and a 238-year sequence of Cedrus libani from 18 trees, also ending in the waney edge. There were additional pieces of wood stored in the Afyon Museum, but these were not collected, due to the shortness of the ring-counts and our reluctance to do any harm to the painted surfaces.

The two chronologies crossdated with each other as the graphs show (fig. 12), with good statistical fits (t-score 7.27, overlap 237 years, trend coefficient 66.1%, r-score 0.43; Cook - Kairiukstis 1989), and immediately we realized that the cedars had been cut three years before the junipers, a detail for which we did not then have a ready explanation. Our first question was: what was the date? The painting style suggested something near the middle of the first millennium B.C. We tried matching Tatarlı against the junipers from Gordion, the only available tree-ring chronology reasonably near in time, but the fits were unsatisfactory because, as we now know, the Gordion ring-sequence ends about four years before Tatarlı begins (Kuniholm-Newton-Griggs-Sullivan 2005: 41-47). In an annual newsletter (December 1991) we first proposed a date of ca. 531 B.C., which we had to withdraw almost immedi-
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ately after we realized one of the overlapping datasets (from the Ziggurat of Nabonidus at Ur) did not really confirm the placement. So we turned to radiocarbon, sending 14 decadal samples to Dr. Bernd Kromer in Heidelberg for radiocarbon wiggle-matching. A preliminary assessment of the possibilities of this dating, based on eleven samples, appeared in another newsletter in December 2003. We reported there a date of 451 B.C.±22 radiocarbon years. We were faced with the dilemma of trying to date across the so-called Hallstatt period, where the radiocarbon curve is essentially flat from the mid-eighth century B.C. to the end of the fourth century B.C. (fig. 13). As an examination of the radiocarbon statistics, now based on fourteen determinations, will show, a start date for the chronology of any time from 770 to 695 B.C. is possible. That means an end date for the cutting year of anything from 511 to 438 B.C. Sliding a graph of the radiocarbon dates back and forth across the radiocarbon curve yields the same ambiguity, this time visual, about where the proper placement for Tatarlı really should be. No matter where one places the Tatarlı samples, there will always be several outliers. Our original estimate of the first half of the fifth century B.C. is still the best we can say for now, although within the range provided by radiocarbon there is a possible dendrochronological fit with a newly-developed chronology from Ayanis (albeit with a short overlap) ending at 481 B.C. for the cedars and 478 B.C. for the junipers which is how we have prepared the graphs. Until more overlapping first millennium wood is collected and measured, the precise placement of the Tatarlı tomb will therefore remain an open question.

II. The Archaeologische Staatssammlung in Munich, Germany

Over the years English and German colleagues had reported the existence of painted timbers in the collection in Munich. On June 6 and 7, 2005, with the kind help of the Keeper, Frau Dr. Gisela Zahlhaas, and thanks to arrangements made by Dr. Lâtife Summerer (see accompanying report), we were permitted access to the four timbers, two with a funeral procession and two with an Achaemenid combat scene. Each timber, stored carefully in a wooden box with cloth padding and acid-free paper, fitted the physical dimensions and descriptions of those in Afyon, i.e., smoothed on one face that was then painted. We sanded a radius from pith to the terminal ring (Waldkante) and then measured each ring to the nearest 1/100 mm. The Munich wood not only matched the two Afyon chronologies in general but also several specific ring-sequences, so spectacularly, in fact, that we can state with complete assurance that certain timbers in Munich are from the same original tree as ones in Afyon (fig. 14). The piths and bark years are the same for the timbers in both museums. The fits between the relevant pairs of Munich and Afyon timbers are as follows:

Munich-1A and -3A (same tree) are also the same tree as Afyon-37A: t=25.77, r=0.94.
Munich-2A and –4A (same tree) are also the same tree as Afyon-38A: t=20.77, r=0.92.

Moreover, the combined length of each of these sets of pieces from the two museums, end-to-end, is about three meters, or the typical length of the longest Tatarlı timber on the longitudinal axis. What is clear is that somebody must have preceded the visit of the Afyon Museum authorities to the tumulus site, selected the two best-painted sections, sawed each of them into two suitcase-sized lengths (roughly a meter each), and then removed them to Germany.

\[\text{See also the bibliography pages on our web-site: http://www.arts.cornell.edu/dendro.}\]
III. Questions for the future

1. We need to find out from the excavator(s) and/or the Afyon Museum whether our recorded excavation numbers correspond to specific timbers in their section drawings. It would be useful to know whether cedar and juniper were intermixed randomly or whether one species was used for the walls and the other used for the ceiling. As noted above, the juniper sequence ends three years after the cedar one. If the juniper is mostly from the roof of the tomb chamber and the dromos, it may come from a building program three years later than the cutting-date of the painted cedar walls of the tomb chamber. This would imply that the tomb-builders and painters preferred to paint on dry wood rather than on freshly-cut wood. They therefore seasoned their to-be-painted cedarwood surfaces in much the same manner as did the Netherlandish painters in the Renaissance with their oak panels (Kuniholm 2000: 206-215, 225-226).

2. It will then be an informative exercise to try to reconstruct the principal sections of the Tatarlı chamber so that the scenes can be viewed and studied in their entirety and the painting program set out in proper order. For example, are there yet other parts of this painted program in collections elsewhere in the western world? This question cannot be answered until the disjecta membra of the tomb are finally reunited. We owe the Staatssammlung staff a vote of thanks for preserving their four painted timbers so carefully. The Afyon Museum will also need help in conserving the paintings and providing a temperature and humidity-controlled environment for the exhibition and long-term preservation of this important tomb. We are at work trying to find major foundation support for this effort.
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Fig. 12  Comparison of the cedar (dark line) and juniper (light line) chronologies from Afyon (18 and 15 trees respectively), with the terminal ring present for each chronology. Note that the cedars were cut three years before the junipers.

Fig. 13  Radiocarbon wiggle-match for Afyon/Tatarlı. The flat part of the radiocarbon curve from the mid-eighth century to the end of the fifth century is the so-called Hallstatt plateau (everything is approximately 2450 BP), across which dating is difficult even when one has multiple samples as here. No matter where we place Tatarlı on purely radiocarbon grounds, there is always an outlier. Thus, a number of other “fits” are possible.

Fig. 14  Measurement of the Munich Staatsammlung wood from pith to the terminal ring compared with TAT-37 in Afyon.