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T. M. P. DUGGAN*

Archaeology, through employing scientific methods, as expressed for example through the stratigraphy exposed in excavation, through the chronological sequencing of the material, through the discovery and documenting of physical evidence, including artefacts, structures and other finds, provides us with a scientific record, leading to a more chronologically informed understanding of the past from its physical traces, the remains from humanities’ existence through the millennia, from pre-history to modernity. Archaeology is distinct from treasure hunting and is likewise distinct from the various expressions of interest and curiosity, without employing a developed scientific method, concerning the remains of past civilisations, a wider interest in the surviving evidence from the past, including textual sources, an antiquarian interest which was of course taken in antiquity to its past, as by Pliny the Elder, by European antiquarians from the Renaissance into the 19th c., as by those in the Islamic world such as Abū al-Rayḥān Muḥammad ibn Aḥmad al-Bīrūnī (973-1052) and ‘Abd al-Latif al-Baghdadi (1162-1231), as in China by Lü Dalin (1046-1092), etc. Likewise archaeology is distinct from, while providing relevant material for, those who study history in its varied aspects, religious and cultural.

* Öğr. Gör., Mediterranean Civilisations Research Institute (MCRI), Akdeniz University, Antalya. tmpduggan@yahoo.com
The exercise of discrimination between different things and between different terms is the basis of the practice of science, and antiquarians, be they travellers, clergymen, surveyors, architects or artists, are not archaeologists. They did not call themselves archaeologists or proto-archaeologists but antiquarians, they were interested in, and they studied the ancient in all its varied aspects, the remains and relics from the past, any form of written text, customs, architecture, coins and seals, pottery, megaliths and stone circles etc. The word “antiquary” was first used in English in 1563, and the College of Antiquaries was established c. 1585, the Society of Antiquaries of London from 1707, established by Royal Charter in 1751, the Dilettanti Society was founded in 1734; of antiquarians, educated travellers who took an informed interest in, recorded and collected and, at times, published evidence of past civilisations, including ruins, epigraphic material, coins and papyri, and the related recording of views of the ancient site, object or structure, sometimes in plan, elevation and section, work often provided by artists and architects. The word “archaeologist” employed to mean a person undertaking the scientific study of ancient peoples and past civilisations, is only recorded in English usage from 1824 onwards, with the Royal Archaeological Institute (RAI) established in 1844, distinct from the related, but different research and documenting activities of antiquarians, such as those who dug at Stonehenge in the 17th century and the cities of Pompeii and Herculaneum in the 18th c., when the digging was not conducted by ordinary treasure hunters, it was not conducted by anybody who thought of themselves and described themselves as archaeologists and such work was carried out by antiquaries into the 19th c.

The first part of this review offers some corrections to some factual errors contained in a chapter entitled, “Lycia and Classical Archaeology: The Changing Nature of Archaeology in Turkey”, by the Reader in Mediterranean Archaeology at the University of Bristol, Dr. Tamara Hodos, one in a collection of 14 articles in book form on the subject of the theory and practice of archaeology in the Greek world. The publishers of Classical Archaeology in Context: Theory and Practice in Excavation in the Greek World, state: “This

---

1 SOD 1969, s.v. ‘antiquary’.  
2 SOD 1969, s.v. ‘archaeologist’.
book compiles a series of case studies derived from archaeological excavation in Greek cultural contexts in the Mediterranean (ca. 800-100 B.C.), addressing the current state of the field, the goals and direction of Greek archaeology, and its place in archaeological thought and practice”³. The second part of this review presents some of the important omissions from the history that is presented in this chapter, which may perhaps allow for a better understanding of the course of European research, both antiquarian and archaeological in ancient Lycia in the 18th and 19th centuries, and it concludes with some remarks on the vexed matter of the degree to which ancient Lycia, not to mention Çaltılar, can properly be said to have had a Greek cultural context and to be considered as being an integral part of “the Greek world”, which the inclusion of this chapter in this volume seems to assume. It would seem an editorial decision was taken to widen the scope of the book to include an article on the large höyük by Çaltılar, which is said to be in Lycia, but which for centuries was in the disputed northern border area, in an area that was only defined as being securely Lycian, within Lycian territory through the Roman-Lycian Treaty of 46 B.C., that is after the dates given in the title of this volume, ca. 800-100 B.C., indicate. How far a report on the archaeological survey at Çaltılar with its concentration on finds dating from the IIIrd to early Ist millennium B.C. can be regarded as pertinent to a book concerning, “archaeological excavation in Greek cultural contexts in the Mediterranean (ca. 800-100 B.C.),” seems debateable, is there a Greek cultural context, or is there rather an Anatolian cultural context at Çaltılar, with only limited finds of imported Greek ceramics?⁴.

Part One

The aim of the chapter is stated by the author: “This article examines the history of archaeological work in Lycia, which begins in the 18th century, to the present day to illustrate the changing nature of Turkey’s heritage focus”⁵, and goes on to describe this history over the next three pages (91-93), in the section entitled, The Archaeology of and in Lycia. However, it can be noted that “archaeological work” in Lycia did not begin in the 18th, but in the 19th c. and so the first part of the sentence can perhaps be more accurately

³ https://www.degruyter.com/view/product/128539
⁴ Hodos 2015, 108.
⁵ Hodos 2015, 89.
written, “European interest in the remains of ancient Lycia began in the last quarter of the 18th c. and archaeological excavations began in Lycia in 1842”. The first archaeological work undertaken in Lycia was conducted by Charles Fellows in the excavation he oversaw of what he termed the Ionic monument (the Nereid Monument) at Xanthus in 1842, where he found and recorded that the remains of the monument had fallen down upon the late antique and Byzantine housing below the hill. He writes in his Account of the Ionic Trophy Monument Excavated at Xanthus: “At that time (early Vth c. A.D.) there were a number of small houses, occupied by Christians, at the foot of the cliff upon which the Trophy Monument stood; into some of the walls around these houses the stones of the cella were built, but the temple-like Monument still towered above them. At this period an unforeseen and awful visitation awaited this and many neighbouring cities of Asia Minor: earthquakes, shaking even the massive monuments of the early Lycians, threw down and destroyed every building of the Greeks and Christians and the whole city of Xanthus lay in ruins; not a marble fragment of the superstructure mentioned in these pages remained upon its base, and the ruins buried the houses below; these ruins have perhaps never been visited, certainly they were never moved, until I discovered them in 1838”⁶, and that, “At the assumed level, in excavating on the north side, we ceased to find the fallen fragments of the building and soon afterwards lost all trace of the chips of broken marble; we then came to a dark-coloured native earth, on the surface of which we found several bronze and bone pins, arrow-heads etc….During the whole of the excavations, although we found the limbs, feet, fingers and drapery of the statues, we never discovered a fragment of the heads,—not a curl or feature, not an ear, a nose, or any chip of the heads of the statues, notwithstanding a careful examination of the earth surrounding the ruins. The reason for this did not occur to me at the time, and I urged the men to persevere until they should lay bare the rock; thinking the heads might have first fallen, and their broken fragments have been shaken down amongst the blocks, and that they might still lie concealed below. Instead of finding the expected pudding-stone rock, we came upon small irregular stones, artificially cemented together; and on advancing, we found regular walls forming a series of small houses; in these, near the openings left for

---

⁶ Fellows 1848, 14.
doorways, were decayed iron hinges, bolts, rings, and numerous nails; in the houses weights, scales and broken pottery. Upon the tiles of the floor were imprinted patterns, and amongst them the Cross of the early Christians was conspicuous; whilst upon some of the walls the Panagia of the Greek church was still to be recognised”. And he published a plan, “shewing the fallen sculptures and their position as exposed by excavation”. He drew attention in this account to the “stratigraphy” of this site, discovered through its excavation, describing the layer of small finds and the undisturbed soil beneath and the bedrock, although the scientific use by archaeologists of stratigraphy, of the natural and cultural layers exposed through excavation, was only later adopted as archaeological method from geology.

The history of this European research in Lycia continues: “Interest in the history and archaeology of Lycia began at the turn of the eighteenth century and was led by Europeans. The English prelate Richard Pococke (1704-1765) visited the region in 1739-40 as part of a grand tour of Greece and the Near East, publishing an account of his travels in 1745 (Pococke 1745). The English classical scholar and antiquarian Dr. Richard Chandler (1736-1810), the artist and neo-classical architect James Stuart (1713-1788) and the painter William Edmund Pars (1742-1782) came in 1764 on behalf of England’s Society of Dilettanti to record Lycia’s ruins, search for and transcribe inscriptions, in which Europeans were beginning to become interested (Stuart 1769; Chandler 1775)”

It is unfortunately the case that of the first four above named individuals: Rev. Richard Pococke, Dr. Richard Chandler, James Stuart and William Edmund Pars, who are said by the author to have visited Lycia in the 18th c., the four earliest modern European explorers of the remains of ancient Lycia, not one in fact did so. The closest Richard Pococke, LLD, FRS,

8 Fellows 1848, 17.
9 “Archaeological stratigraphy evolved from geological practices in the last century (19th), but was little refined for some time. The publication of archaeological textbooks by Dame Kathleen Kenyon and Sir Mortimer Wheeler in the early 1950s underlined the importance of stratigraphy in archaeology” Fagan – Beck 1996, 698.

Hodos 2015, 90. The same error, asserting that both Pococke and Chandler visited Lycia in the 18th c. is also recorded at http://www.lycianturkey.com/discovery_lycia.htm which states, “One of the first to write about Lycia was the British Rev. Richard Pococke, who travelled to Lycia in 1739-40. Twenty years later the Classical antiquary Dr. Richard Chandler (also British) was sent by the Dilettanti Society to explore and investigate”. 
came to visiting the region of Lycia was when he sailed past the coast of Lycia in July 1739 on his way from Alexandria to Crete, a maritime route followed and described by many pilgrim travellers before Pococke. He provides the following description of the Lycian coastline in his *Description of the East, Observations on Palestine or the Holy Land, Syria, Mesopotamia, Cyprus and Candia*, recorded in Volume II, Part One, not in Volume II, Part II, the volume that is cited by T. Hodos in reference to Pococke visiting the Lycian region in 1839-40 in her bibliography: “In the evening (of the 8th of July, 1739) we came up with the island called Castello Rosso: This was, without doubt one of the Chelidonian islands (it is not), which Strabo mentions as opposite to the sacred promontory where Mount Taurus was supposed to begin; and may be that island Rhoge of Pliny, and the present name may be a corruption from it (it is not), as I could see no reason for their calling it the red island; it is high and rocky, and about two miles in length. There is a town and castle on the highest part of it, and the south side of this island seemed to be covered with vinyards; there is a secure harbour to the north, and they told me that it was not above half a mile from the continent, and they have plenty of good water; it is inhabited by Greeks, and is a great resort of the Maltese (corsairs), as there is no strong place to oppose them. Proceeding on our voyage I saw two small islands at a considerable distance, which, if I mistake not, are called Polieli, and seem to be those rocks, which are marked in the sea chart, and in the map I give of Asia Minor (Fig. 1). We were now opposite to Lycia; a little to the north west of these islands the river Lymira (sic.) probably falls into the sea; near it was the city Myra of Lycia, to which St. Paul came in his voyage from Caesarea to Italy, and embarked on board a ship of Alexandria bound to that country. Further to the west the river Xanthus falls into the sea; Patara was situated to the east of it, where St. Paul embarked on board a ship bound for Phoenicia, in his voyage from Miletus to Tyre. On the eleventh (of July) we were opposite to Cape Sardeni; to the north of it is the bay of Mecari (Macri-Fethiye), which extends a considerable way to the east, they told me there were three or four islands in this bay, which must be very small, being marked in the sea charts only as rocks. On the thirteenth we came near the east end of the isle of Rhodes, where there was so great a current coming from the north east between the island and the continent, that the sea broke in the cabin windows, even in calm weather. As the plague was at the capital town of Rhodes we did not think proper to
go to it"\textsuperscript{11}. After visiting Rhodes, the Rev. Richard Pococke took ship to Candia-Crete. He did not visit Lycia in his travels, his feet never touched Lycian soil and he provided a very odd, error-full map of Lycia in 1743 for his publication (Fig. 1), but he did visit Caria, and also Laodicea on the Lycus, but both are not in Lycia and both of which are recorded in Volume II, Part II of his Description of the East.

![Fig. 1. Detail of the map published with Richard Pocock’s Description of the East of 1743\textsuperscript{12} showing Richard Pocock’s understanding of the topography of Lycia, from ancient sources and observation of the Lycian coastline from the sea in 1739. The dotted line on the map indicates the course of the vessel from Alexandria in July 1739 to Rhodes and Crete, past the coast of Lycia.](https://commons.wikimedia.org/wiki/File:A_description_of_the_East,_and_some_other_countries_\%281743\%29\_%2814770157571%29.jpg)

Nor in the 18\textsuperscript{th} c. did any Society of Dilettanti Mission or any of its members visit Lycia. Dr. Richard Chandler, James Stuart and William Edmund Pars, did not come to Lycia in 1764 on behalf of the Society of Dilettanti to record Lycia’s ruins. It is a matter of careful reading of the published text, as it is the case that the illustrations of Lycian views that were engraved by William

\textsuperscript{11} Walpole 1745, II, Part I, 236-237.

\textsuperscript{12} https://commons.wikimedia.org/wiki/File:A_description_of_the_East,_and_some_other_countries_\%281743\%29\_%2814770157571%29.jpg
Bryne (1743-1805) in the Society of Dilettanti publication entitled, *Antiquities of Ionia*, London, 1797, Vol. II, with Plates LVI and LVII of the theatre at Myra, but which in error are labelled “Theatre at Patara” described in the List of Plates as: “Views of Patara on the Coast of Lycia, shewing the remains of the Scene, the hill above the theatre is covered with sepulchral monuments”; the view of Telmessus entitled, “Theatre at Macri” Plate LIX, described in the List of Plates as: “A View of the theatre at the extremity of the Sinus Glaucus, near to Macri or Telmessus, in the Province of Lycia” and Plate LVIII, the view entitled “Theatre at Castel Rosso”, described in the List of Plates as: “View of a Theatre in the Island Cistene, now called Castell Rosso, situated near the Southern point of Asia Minor” another labelling error, as the theatre recorded in this depiction is the theatre at Antiphellus-Kaş on the coast facing the island of Cistene-Castel Rosso-Meis, were not made by, nor were these illustrations made for the Society of Dilettanti, nor were these views drawn for its publication. It is clearly stated that, “The Society are indebted to Sir Robert Ainslie for the two views of the Theatre at Patara (= Myra), that of Castell Rosso (= Antiphellus), and of Macri or Telmessus, which are taken from drawings by Mr. Myers (sic.) in his possession, and finished under his inspection”.

There was no Dilettanti Mission to Lycia in the 18th century. The mis-description of the theatre at Myra as the theatre at Patara in the 1797 volume was pointed out in a letter from William Wilkins R.A. to W. R. Hamilton, Treasurer and Secretary of the Society from 1830, who wrote the general articles for Part III of Antiquities of Ionia, a letter which was noted in Volume V of Antiquities of Ionia, London, 1915, “The Roman theatre (at Myra) was first illustrated in the second part of the Antiquities of Ionia, but under the title Patara. This fact is pointed out in a letter from Wilkins to Hamilton, and he was certainly right”.

---

13 This same incorrect spelling of Luigi Mayer’s surname as Myers was employed by W. R. Hamilton in a paper on the *Budrun Marbles* read on March 26th, 1846 and published in the *Transactions of the Royal Society of Literature of the United Kingdom*, Second Series, Vol. 2, J. Murray, London, 1847, 251. It probably derived from the mis-spelling published in the Dilettanti’s Antiquities of Ionia, of 1797, as he was also Treasurer and Secretary of the Society of Dilettanti from 1830-1859.

14 *Antiquities of Ionia* 43. See also (Cust 1914, 104) who records these four Lycian engravings as taken from the drawings of Luigi Mayer.

15 *Antiquities of Ionia* 16.
that Plate LVII depicts the theatre of Antiphellus, it had also been mislabelled, it does not depict any theatre at Cistene-Castel Rosso-Meis.

It can also be noted that although the author gives as a reference for this passage, (Stuart 1769), listed in the bibliography as “Stuart, J. 1769. Ionian Antiquities, London”16, it is the case that the first edition of Antiquities of Ionia was published in 1769 with permission of the Society of Dilettanti, in London, by R. Chandler, M.A. F.S.A., N. Revett architect, and W. Pars artist; Stuart, J. was not an author of Antiquities of Ionia and, secondly, there is not one single reference to Lycia in the volume, no account of visiting Lycia, so why has it been cited? The second reference for this passage, (Chandler 1775) is also in error, listed in the bibliography as, “Chandler, R. 1775. Travels in Asia Minor, London.”17, but Richard Chandler’s Travels in Asia Minor An Account of a Tour made at the Expense of the Society of Dilettanti, did not include any account of Lycia, he did not visit Lycia, so why is it cited? It is worth noting that William Pars work also appears in the Antiquities of Ionia, Part the First, published in 1812.

This same group of 18th c. travellers is recorded earlier, in 2010 by Dr. Holger Koock, in the book, Empires of the Imagination: Politics, War and the Arts in the British World, 1750-1850, under the subtitle “Triumph at Xanthus”, where one reads the lines: “Ancient Lycia was a sea-girt, mountainous area in what today is western Turkey. Richard Pococke (1704–65) had visited that region in 1739-40 as part of his tour of Greece and the Near East. In 1764, the classical scholar Dr Richard Chandler together with James Stuart and the painter William Edmund Pars explored parts of Greece and Asia Minor. (sic.) On behalf of the Society of Dilettanti, and following Stuart and Revett in setting new standards of precision in documentation and representation, they drew ruins and transcribed inscriptions. The resulting publications include the first part of Ionian Antiquities (1769) and Chandler’s Travels in Asia Minor (2 vols, 1775)”18. Richard Pococke did not visit Lycia19.

16 Hodos 2015, 118.
17 Hodos 2015, 114.
18 Hoock 2010, 243.
19 This error may in part stem from an error in Walpole 1820, 231-232 where instead of writing Lydia he wrote Lycia, “Some of them are mentioned by Pococke in Phrygia, Lycia (sic.), Cappadocia; others are pointed out by Le Brun, Choiseul, and Dr. Clarke”.
as is pointed out above, but Dr Holger Koock does not state in this passage, a single sentence divided by a misplaced full stop, that Chandler, Stuart and Pars visited Lycia, but parts of Asia Minor.

It is also quite surprising to read that it was only in the second half of the 18th c. that Europeans began to become interested in, to “search for and transcribe inscriptions”\(^{20}\). From the birth of scholarly research into inscriptions in the early Italian Renaissance, largely in Latin on surviving Roman monuments and remains in Italy, in the attempt to find the correct orthography of pre-Medieval Latin, to return to an earlier Pagan Roman authenticity in language, after the variants of Medieval Latin and canis latinicus, and to make some sense of the remaining evidence from the Roman past, the search for and the transcription of ancient inscriptions had been undertaken. By scholars such as Fra. Giocondo da Verona (c. 1433-1515), as recorded by Giorgio Vasari (1511-1574): “In his youth Fra Giocondo spent many years in Rome, giving his attention to the study of antiquities, and not of buildings only, but also of the ancient inscriptions that are in the tombs, and the other relics of antiquity, both in Rome itself and its neighbourhood, and in every part of Italy; and he collected all these inscriptions and memorials into a most beautiful book, which he sent as a present, according to the account of the citizens of Verona mentioned above, to the elder Lorenzo de’ Medici, the Magnificent, to whom, by reason of the great friendliness and favor that he showed to all men of talent, both Fra Giocondo and Domizio Calderino, his companion and compatriot, were always most deeply devoted. Of this book Poliziano makes mention in his Mugellane, in which he uses various parts of it as authorities, calling Fra Giocondo a profound master in antiquities”,\(^{21}\) as also by Giovanni Marcanova (1414-1467) in his Collectio antiquitatum. However, the earliest European collection of Greek and Latin inscriptions was recorded in manuscript in the Anonymous Einsiedlensis of the IX\(^{th}\) or X\(^{th}\) centuries.\(^{22}\) Cristoforus Buondelmontis (1389-1430) recorded inscriptions from antiquity in his Liber Insularum Archipelagi, and Ciriaco de Pizzicolli/ Cyriacus of Ancona (1391-1453/55) transcribed and studied both Latin and Greek inscriptions and of most of the nearly one thousand Greek and Latin

\(^{20}\) Hodos 2015, 90.
\(^{21}\) Vasari 1996, II, 2.
\(^{22}\) Woodhead 1959, 95.
inscriptions that he transcribed during his travels in Italy, Greece, the Mediterranean islands, and Asia Minor, his transcriptions and copies of them, is today the only surviving record. The first major collection of the Latin epigrammata of Rome was collected by Poggio Bracciolini in manuscript (Vat. Lat. 9152) c. 1450 and the first corpus of Latin inscriptions was published in 1505 by Conrad Peutinger of Augsburg, entitled, *Romanae Vetustatis Fragmenta in Augusta Vindelicorum et eius dioecesi*, printed in a type cast to print in replica the antique Roman letters. Epigrammata Urbis, printed by Giacomo Mazzocchi in April 1521, a published a corpus of the inscriptions of Rome, including in part the late 15th c. collection recorded in Mss. by Francesco Albertini and this was followed by the publication of a Europe wide corpus of inscriptions compiled by Petrus Apianus-Peter Apian (1495-1552) and Bartholomaeus Amantius, entitled, *Inscriptions Sacrosanctae Vetustatis* published in Ingolstadt in 1534. These were followed by Janus Gruter’s (1560-1627) *Inscriptiones Antiquae Totis Orbus Romani* in two volumes, Heidelberg, 1602-3, republished in 1616 and revised in 1707, and *Marmora Arundelina*, of 29 Greek and 10 Latin and 4 Hebrew inscriptions, including the so called “Parian Chronicle” a 93 line Greek inscription on marble recording an account of Hellenic history, purchased by William Petty, the agent of the Earl of Arundel in Izmir 1626, which were edited by J. Seldon, published in Oxford in 1628. For more than 800 years before the first Dilettanti Mission to Ionia in 1764, Europeans had searched for, collected, recorded, studied and displayed discovered Greek and Latin epigrammata.

The history of this European research in Lycia continues: “In 1776, the Comte de Choiseul-Gouffier, the future French Ambassador to the Ottoman Empire, accompanied the Marquis de Chabert on a voyage around the Aegean shores, which took in the Lycian coast, to chart a mathematically rigorous representation of the Mediterranean (Choiseul-Gouffier 1782)”24. If this was in fact the case, and given that French maps of the eastern Mediterranean were captured over the course of the Napoleonic wars, why would the British Admiralty charge Captain Francis Beaufort with the task of mapping this Lycian coastline again in 1811 and 1812? It is rather the case that the French hydrographic survey of 1776 only charted the North-Western corner

---

23 See for example, Goldschmidt 2010.
24 Hodos 2015, 90.
of the Lycian coastline, only the Gulf of Macry and Macri-Telmessus-Fethiye eastwards to the mouth of the Xanthus River, but the rest of the Lycian coastline was uncharted in 1776 and remained uncharted until 1811. The relatively accurate French chart of the Aegean and the west coast of Anatolia of 1776 was published three times in Maria Gabriel Florent August, Comte de Choiseul-Gouffier’s, ‘Voyage Pittoresque de la Grèce, dans le Troade, les îles de l’Archipel et sur le cotes de l’Asie Mineure’, Tome 1, Paris, 1782, entitled, Carte de la Grèce modern25, Carte de la Grece Ancienne (detail Fig. 2.)26, showing the Glaucus Sinus-Gulf of Fethiye, a chart that stops north of the mouth of the Xanthus-II Scamandro-Esen River, together with, Détaillee de la Route de l’Auteur Depuis le Golfe de Macri, jusqu’au Méandre27, and a Plan du golfe de Macri anciennement Glaucus Sinus, in Chapter VII28. The Lycian coastline extending to its east remaining uncharted by hydrographic survey. The location of the cities of Xanthus and Pinara, possibly from classical authorities combined with local information collected in 1776, are also marked in their approximate respective positions.

![Fig. 2. Detail from the Carte de la Grece Ancienne in Comte de Choiseul-Gouffier’s, ‘Voyage Pittoresque…” of 178229, showing the area of coastal Lycia mapped in 1776.]

The vision of Joseph Bernard, the Marquis de Chabert, to accurately chart through hydrographic survey the entire Mediterranean for the King of France, due to the French revolution followed by years of warfare, remained incomplete and the first scientifically accurate chart of the Mediterranean

25 http://gallica.bnf.fr/ark:/12148/btv1b8449081d/f33.image
26 http://gallica.bnf.fr/ark:/12148/btv1b5962163s/f1.highres
27 http://gallica.bnf.fr/ark:/12148/btv1b8449081d/f266.image
28 http://gallica.bnf.fr/ark:/12148/btv1b8449081d/f237.image
29 http://gallica.bnf.fr/ark:/12148/btv1b5962163s/f1.highres
was published in London in 1826 or 1827, “A New Chart of the Mediterranean Sea Comprehending the Coasts from Cape St. Mary: in Portugal to Constantinopel; and from Rabat, In Africa, to Alexandretto or Iskenderoon, in Asia, &c. Reduced from the late Spanish and French charts made by Order of the respective governments. With the Recent Surveys of Capt. Wm. Hy. Symth, R. N., Capt. F. Beaufort, R. N. and other British Officers”. It was drawn up by Capt. W. H. Symth and R. H. Laurie.

Spratt and Forbes wrote in their introduction to their Travels published in 1847: “before Captain Beaufort’s visit, Colonel Leake, in 1800, had been turned aside from this interesting province by fever. He had, however, visited and determined Antiphellus. He had also examined Telmessus, and large ruins at Kakava, either Aperlae, or one of the cities called Cyanae”\(^{30}\). And the author, citing from Spratt and Forbes writes “Lt. Col. William Martin Leake (1777-1860), who was also a topographer, visited Telmessos, Antiphellos and the Kekova region in 1800 before being turned back by fever”\(^{31}\). However, Leake himself writes, “I was detained at Alaya (Alanya) by illness; and while General Koehler, with his two remaining companions pursued their journey overland to Constantinople, I proceeded thither by sea, visiting the most remarkable places on the coast…”\(^{32}\). He was not turned back by fever from the exploration of Lycia. He returned to Constantinople by sea, visiting some of the sites of coastal Lycia because it was quicker and more comfortable than travelling with General Koehler overland in a condition weakened by fever-malaria, and because it enabled two routes to be investigated, rather than one. He further wrote: “Of those places which I visited on the coast and which deserve to be more thoroughly described than they have yet been, the most remarkable are, 1. The ruins of a large city, with a noble theatre, at Kakava, in a fine harbour, formed by a range of rocky islands. … 3. Antiphellus, on the mainland, opposite Castel Rosso. Here I found a small theatre nearly complete, the remains of several public buildings and private houses, together with catacombs, and a great number of sarcophagi, some of which are very large and magnificent. The greater part have inscriptions, few of

\(^{30}\) Spratt – Forbes 1847, I, xiii.
\(^{31}\) Hodos 2015, 90.
\(^{32}\) Leake 1824, 127-128.
which are legible. In two or three, however, I read the name of the city Antiphellus. 4. Telmissus, at Méi, the port of Makri, at the bottom of the gulf anciently called Glacus. The theatre, and the porticoes and sepulchral chambers, excavated in the rocks at this place, are some of the most remarkable remains of antiquity in Asia Minor”33. From which it seems evident that he visited Myra, described as, “The ruins of a large city, with a noble theatre, at Kakava, in a fine harbour, formed by a range of rocky islands”, rather than as Spratt and Forbes state, “either Aperlae, or one of the cities called Cyanae”. Hodos states Leake visited “the Kekova region”. If, rather than citing from Spratt and Forbes, Leake’s own account had been read, the reference to “a large city with a noble theatre” would probably have identified the place he visited as being Myra, as Aperlae has no theatre and the miniature theatre in the castle at Simena-Kale would not have been described by Leake as, “a noble theatre”. On a point of detail, W. M. Leake held the rank of Captain in 1800 and was a member of a military mission when he visited coastal Lycia, not Colonel as stated by Spratt and Forbes, nor, Lt. Col., as is implicit in T. Hodos’s sentence. He was awarded a brevet rank of Lt. Col. in 181334 for service in Ottoman territory from 1799 onwards, and on the title-page of his book, Journal of a tour in Asia Minor, with comparative remarks on the ancient and modern geography of that country, he is named, William Martin Leake, FRS, etc., not with his military rank, but as a Fellow of the Royal Society, etc.

Unfortunately the author, quoting accurately from Spratt and Forbes who wrote, “Mr. Hamilton, indeed, prepared to explore the country, but was prevented by rumours of plague”35, writes, without quotation marks, “Mr Hamilton, indeed, prepared to explore the country but was prevented by rumours of plague”. However, firstly, Hamilton did not state he prepared to explore Lycia. But rather, that he recorded he wanted to visit Adalia-Antalya and the region, as to if that included the exploration of Lycia, as well as Pamphylia, in which he did express an interest36, seems rather unclear.

33 Leake 1824, 127-128.
35 Hodos 2015, 90.
36 He wished to check on the outflow of subterranean water by Adalia-Antalya from the Lakes region. He writes of Lake Egerdir (sic.) “Here it ceases to be seen, and having formed to itself a subterranean channel, does not re-appear until near Adalia, where it enters the
Secondly, William R. Hamilton was not prevented from exploring the Antalya region because of “rumours of plague”. These were not simply “rumours of plague” but “accounts” of the plague outbreak at Adalia-Antalya that Hamilton received near Yalvaç on Friday, August 18th, 1836. He writes, “The accounts which I received of the state of the country towards the sea coast and Adalia (Antalya) were not more satisfactory: the plague was raging violently throughout the whole district”37. Plague had been brought from Cyprus, the outbreak also reached inland to Pisidia and was a very serious matter, as anybody who has read Hamilton’s first-hand account of the plague devastation in 1836, recorded in Volume I of his, *Researches in Asia Minor, Pontus and Armenia, with some account of their antiquities and geology*, of 1847, will recognise38. A mass grave from the 1836 plague outbreak, fully dressed bodies buried in lime, was recently found in excavations at Pisidian Antioch by the east gate and this plague outbreak is reported to have killed a third of the population of Cyprus39. From the unfortunate errors in Spratt and Forbes’ 1847 introduction, perhaps it would have been better to cite from the original publications by W. M. Leake and W. R. Hamilton, even though it may have taken more time. Spratt and Forbes also give the date of the publication of Beaufort’s Karamania to 181840, it was first published in 1817. Some other errors in the text of volume I are: the misdating of Cockerell’s visit to the Lycian coast to 181341, rather than 1812, and attributing the discovery of the Myra theatre to him42, when it was in fact “discovered” and was drawn by Louis-Francois Cassas43 at Myra in 1786, and it was visited by

---

37 Hamilton 1847, 354.
38 Hamilton 1847, 351-361.
40 Spratt – Forbes 1847, I, xii.
41 Spratt – Forbes 1847, I, 150.
42 Spratt – Forbes 1847, I, 131-132, “Its diameter according to Mr. Cockerell, who first discovered it”.
43 A later version of his original drawing of the theatre at Myra, painted in France, dated 1808, in ink and water-colour is in the V&A, London, SD214. His work, *Voyage pittoresque de la Syrie, de la Phénicie, de la Palestine et de la Basse-Égypte*, Paris, Year VI (1798), was sponsored by the French Ambassador to the Porte, the Comte de Choiseul-Gouffier.
a party of Englishmen, Mr. Graves, Mr. Berners and Mr. Tilson and drawn again by Luigi Mayer in 1792, with the two plates of it from his Lycian drawings published in *Antiquities of Ionia* in 1797, Plates LVI and LVII, as noted above, and one of Luigi Mayer’s drawings of the Myra theatre was published in aquatint in 1803 in Luigi Mayer’s collection of views entitled, *Caramania...*, Plate 5. entitled, *An ancient Theatre at Cacamo*. The theatre at Myra was also visited by Captain Leake in 1800, “a large city with a noble theatre” as noted above. Although Captain Beaufort reports that Cockerell in 1812, “found at Myra, the ruins of a considerable city: the theatre was very perfect, and he saw many fragments of sculpture executed in a masterly style”\(^44\), and, presumably it was from Captain Beaufort’s text that Spratt and Forbes stated that the Myra theatre was discovered by Cockerell, it was the case that others had noted the same for more than 20 years, C. R. Cockerell in his visit of 1812 discovered neither Myra, nor the “noble” theatre at Myra.

The cities of the Xanthus valley, Tlos, Xanthus and Pinara, as also Cadyana on the border of Lycia with Caria, were explored by Charles Fellows in 1838 and 1839, as was related in 1839, “The interior of this country was entirely unknown till the recent visit of Mr. Fellows”\(^45\), as likewise the Dublin Review, in its March 1847 article entitled, *Recent Antiquarian Researches in Lycia*, notes, “But their researches (Leake and Beaufort), and those of Mr. Cockerell, who afterwards accompanied Captain Beaufort, were confined exclusively to the coast-line; nor was it till 1838, and subsequently 1840, that the interior of the country was explored by Mr. (now Sir Charles) Fellows”\(^46\) a fact likewise recorded by A. G. Keen in 1998\(^47\). Yet, in this chapter we read, “The interior cities that belonged to the Roman Lycian League were first explored by Spratt and Forbes in 1842”\(^48\).

T. Hodos writes, “Initially, it was Lycia’s rich classical heritage that was

\(^{44}\) Beaufort 1817, 28.
\(^{45}\) Knight 1839, 210.
\(^{46}\) Dublin Review, March 1847, Vol. XX, No. XLIII, “Recent Antiquarian Researches in Lycia”, 159.
\(^{47}\) “…but the most important work done on Classical Lycia in the nineteenth century was that of Charles (later Sir Charles) Fellows, who in 1838 and 1840 ventured inland to the cities of the Xanthus valley, in some cases being the first westerner to see them since they had been abandoned in late antiquity” Keen 1998, 3.
\(^{48}\) Hodos 2015, 93.
mined by Europeans, and its Greco-Roman periods remain a major focus of modern archaeological research”\textsuperscript{49}. However, this seems not to have been the case. Rather, it was the distinctively non Greco-Roman part of Lycian culture, including Lycia’s particular types of rock cut tombs, pillar tombs and sarcophagi, the inscriptions in a different language, Lycian, and a sculptural art that was different from, but related to both Greek and Persian art, that initially drew the attention successively of French, Italian, British and Austrian travellers to Lycia in the 18\textsuperscript{th} and 19\textsuperscript{th} c. With the use of the verb “mined” one suspects the author may be referring to excavations, digging and removal, and, if this is the case, then it can be noted that the initial “mining” by Europeans, was largely of examples of Lycian art, a distinct art including native and Greco-Iranian elements, rather than of “classical heritage” in the sense of those works that are characteristic of the Greco-Roman heritage. Charles Fellows largely selected for removal works of Lycian art, such as the Payava Tomb, the reliefs of the “Harpy Tomb” and those carved on the lid of the Tomb of Merehi (an exception being the IV\textsuperscript{th} c. B.C. Nereid Monument), and the only subsequent 19\textsuperscript{th} century so-called “mining” by Europeans in Lycia was at Trysa in 1882, by the Austria team led by Otto Benndorf and Felix von Lushan which was of a Lycian Heroon, its outer wall covered in c. 152 carved stone relief plaques, today in the Kunsthistorischen Museum, Vienna, the like of which is not to be found amongst works that are characteristic of Greco-Roman/classical heritage.

On page 90-91 one reads, “These Lycian carved remains were regarded as the epitome of Greek artistic achievement, and their images convinced the British Museum to support a second expedition to retrieve these antiquities for the museum”\textsuperscript{50}. This sentence raises a number of points indicated in bold. Firstly, there’s a question, concerning the so-called “second expedition” – insofar as when did the first expedition to “retrieve” these antiquities for the museum depart? Charles Fellows had already been twice independently to Lycia, in 1838 which he described as an excursion and again in 1840, which he described as a second excursion, and he joined what was in fact the first government mission to Lycia in 1841-2, which was his third visit to Lycia and he returned from his fourth in 1844.

\textsuperscript{49} Hodos 2015, 89.
\textsuperscript{50} Hodos 2015, 90-91.
Secondly, in this sentence one reads that the plates and figures, the “images,” in Charles Fellows’ book, *A Journal Written During an Excursion in Asia Minor*, of 1839, convinced the British museum to support an “expedition to retrieve these antiquities for the museum”. The British Museum’s own account published in 1850 tells it somewhat differently, “*His own representations, and those of one or two leading men connected with the British Museum, induced government to send out a vessel to bring away such specimens of these remains as could most easily be obtained*”\(^{51}\). Fellows himself writes on this same matter: “*On my return to England and the publication of my Journal, and my numerous drawings and inscriptions attracted the attention of some of the leading men connected with the British Museum, and they in the spring of 1839, at my urgent request, applied to Lord Palmerston to ask of the Sultan a firman or letter, granting leave to bring away some of the works of ancient art which I had discovered*”\(^{52}\). And he names these “leading men” in his footnote, “*To the well-directed zeal of Mr. Hawkins, furthered by two of the trustees, the Marquis of Northampton and Mr. Hamilton, the country is indebted for the promotion of this expedition*”\(^{53}\). It was at the urging of Charles Fellows, both spoken and written, not simply the images published in his book, *A Journal Written During an Excursion in Asia Minor of 1839*, that resulted in the government mission of 1841. And it was brought about through the zeal of Edward Hawkins, the numismatist and Keeper of Antiquities at the British Museum from 1826 to 1860; of Spencer Compton, the second Marquis of Northampton, President of the Royal Society and of William James Hamilton (1777-1859), Permanent Secretary for Foreign Affairs from 1809 to 1822, Secretary of the Dilettanti Society from 1830-1859 and elected a Trustee of the British Museum in 1838\(^{54}\); and, Henry John Temple, Lord Palmerston, who was Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs from 1830-1841, who approved of this action, and informed Lord Ponsonby, British Ambassador to the Sublime Porte 1832-1841, who requested and negotiated for this on behalf of Britain, and of Stratford Canning, Ambassador from October 1841-1858, who received the Ottoman permission granted on Nov. 29\(^{th}\) 1841 for the removal of the

\(^{51}\) Masson 1850, 328.

\(^{52}\) Fellows 1843, 1-2.

\(^{53}\) Fellows 1843, 2, fn.

\(^{54}\) Dawson 1999, 114.
“Zanthian Marbles” and forwarded it to the Smyrna-Izmir Consulate for collection by the Government mission. The British Navy would, with Charles Fellows direction, remove the Xanthian marbles from Lycia via the Xanthus-Esen river between 1842 and 1844. Charles Fellows’ own “representations” included the removal of these works to Britain being pre-announced in the preface to his book published in 1839, A Journal written during an excursion in Asia Minor in 1838, which, in advance of either explicit government support, or of the Sultan’s firman being obtained for this removal, which was granted two years later, wrote: “The drawings introduced here have been selected from my sketchbook for the purpose of illustration only. Those which represent the sculptural remains found at Xanthus have been seen by the Trustees of the British Museum, and I hear that on their recommendation the Government has given directions for having these monuments of ancient art brought to this country; we may hope therefore to see them amongst the treasures of our National Institution”\textsuperscript{55}; as again is related in 1840 in the Edinburgh Review, “that the government has given directions for this and other specimens of sepulchral art in the same locality to be added to our national collection”\textsuperscript{56}. It seems probable that Lord Palmerston in deciding to support this action in the spring of 1839 was aware that Félix Marie Charles Texier had been commissioned in 1833 by M. Guizot, then France’s Minister of Public Instruction, to study the antiquities of Asia Minor and in his 1836-1837 expedition, to select and “procure antiquities for the French State,” as is noted by the author\textsuperscript{57}, permission was granted by Sultan Mahmut II in 1838 to Désire Raoul-Rochette for their removal\textsuperscript{58}; including the removal of one capital and 13 metopes and bas-reliefs from the architrave of the Temple of Assos, visited by Texier in June 1835, the II\textsuperscript{nd} c. B.C. frieze from the Temple of Artemis Leukophryene, at Magnesia ad Meandrum depicting a battle between Greeks and Amazons and the vase from Pergamus, all of which, brought from Ottoman territory, had just arrived in the Musée du Louvre in Paris.

Thirdly, these “Lycian carved remains” were not in fact in the first place

\textsuperscript{55} Fellows 1839, v-vi.
\textsuperscript{57} Hodos 2015, 92.
\textsuperscript{58} Westcoat 2012, 10-13.
in the possession of the British Museum, London, and were then somehow mislaid or lost in Lycia. Consequently, a much better choice of verb than “re-
trive”, which implies - to regain possession of, repossess, redeem or have returned - would certainly have been, obtain, remove, bring or bring away.

Finally, there seems to be little solid evidence to suggest the images of sculptures from Xanthus depicted in Fellows’, A Journal Written During an Excursion in Asia Minor, of 1839 were regarded at the time as being “the epitome of Greek sculpture”. Such a phrase is not to be found in the contemporaneous texts. Fellows on April 17th 1838 at Xanthus wrote, “In the ruins there are many parallelisms to the Persepolitan”\(^{59}\), and he describes the sculptures as “monuments of ancient (not explicitly of Greek) art”\(^{60}\) and, although he writes, “they are of pure Greek date”\(^{61}\) presumably implying they dated from the archaic period, and, subsequently after stating on April 21st 1840, “The whole of the sculpture is Greek, fine, bold, and simple, bespeaking an early age of that people”\(^{62}\), he then goes on in the same volume to qualify his statement, and again relates some of the Xanthian reliefs to “Persepolitan or Egyptian bas-reliefs”\(^{63}\). In 1843 he describes them simply and accurately as, “works of ancient art”\(^{64}\). On their arrival and display they were certainly not regarded in the published record as being “the epitome of Greek sculpture.” For example, Samuel Birch, who became the Keeper of Oriental Antiquities at the British Museum from 1860-1885, remarked in his publication of 1843 on the sculptures from Xanthus exhibited in the British Museum before the “Xanthian Saloon” opened in 1848\(^{65}\), on the Persian character of some of the relief sculpture from Xanthus\(^{66}\), that some resemble the earliest Greek art – relief carving from the Treasury of Atreus.

---

\(^{59}\) Fellows 1839, 226.  
\(^{60}\) Fellows 1839, v.  
\(^{61}\) Fellows 1840, 172.  
\(^{62}\) Fellows 1840, 165.  
\(^{63}\) Fellows 1840, 170.  
\(^{64}\) Fellows 1843, 2.  
\(^{65}\) It was called the: Xanthian Saloon, Xanthian Saloon, and in British Museum publications between 1847 and 1856, Lycian Saloon, Lycian Saloon and Lycian Room. Sometimes in the same text both Lycian Room and Lycian Saloon, eg. Clarke 1855, 12.  
\(^{66}\) Birch 1843, 11.
(Mycenean) and Archaic Greek sculpture\(^{67}\), while the Harpy Monument he regarded as an example of Lycian (not Greek) Art\(^{68}\), although there were examples of pure Greek art, such as the Nereid Monument.\(^{69}\) The Athenaeum article on *The Xanthian Marbles* of August 24\(^{th} \) 1844, divided the sculptures into “four classes: 1. The earliest works, Greco-Lycian, we may term for the present, for want of a better designation; 2. The Greco-Persian, as combining Grecian workmanship with Persian story; 3. The Greco-Roman; 4. the Byzantine and early Christian relics...”\(^{70}\) and writes of the Lion Tomb in the first group of Greco-Lycian works, that it “is singularly interesting and remarkable, as linking these Xanthian remains with known examples of Babylonian and Persepolitan art, thus affording indirect evidence of the oriental origin of the early people of this country”. The Athenaeum in its notice of the arrival of the Budrum (sic.) Marbles, of September 12\(^{th} \) 1846, in comparing the Halicarnassus Mausoleum reliefs with those from Xanthus writes, that these reliefs have “no trace of the careless, barbaric ignorance so apparent in the Lycian friezes,”\(^{71}\) “barbaric” as indicating non-Greek, Persian influence. The Dublin Review of March 1847 in an article entitled, “Recent Antiquarian Researches in Lycia,” suggests the influence of Persia on the relief sculpture\(^{72}\), and, *The Land We Live In*, of 1847, in describing the “Xanthian Marbles” records: “These tombs, and all the bas-reliefs and other objects, distributed about the gallery illustrate the mythology and early history of the Lycians and other nations of Asia Minor.”\(^{73}\) In 1850, David Mather Masson (1822-1907), in describing the Xanthus marbles, while recording that “the Zanthus monument (Nereid monument) is clearly a work of Greek art”,\(^{74}\) also writes, “Near the Horse Tomb’ is a cast of a stele or obelisk, that formed part of one of the peculiarly Lycian (that is Persian) monuments found at Xanthus.”\(^{75}\)

One further point of detail, one reads, “In 1941, the Turkish archaeologist

\(^{67}\) Birch 1843, 10.
\(^{68}\) Birch 1843, 18.
\(^{69}\) Birch 1843, 19.
\(^{70}\) Athenaeum, Aug. 24\(^{th} \) 1844, No. 878, 779.
\(^{71}\) Athenaeum, Sept. 12\(^{th} \), 1846, No. 985, 939, “*The Budrun Marbles*”.
\(^{72}\) Dublin Review, March 1847, Vol. XXII, No. XLIII, “Recent Antiquarian Researches in Lycia”.
\(^{73}\) Knight 1847, 42.
\(^{74}\) Masson 1850, 333.
\(^{75}\) Masson 1850, 336.
Ekrem Akurgal (1911-2002) published a study of sixth century A.D. reliefs in Lycia (Akurgal 1941)”76. It was Ekrem Akurgal’s thesis and it was not on Christian sixth century A.D. relief sculpture in Lycia, but on sixth century B.C. Lycian reliefs, entitled Griechische Reliefs des VI. Jahrhunderts aus Lykien, Schriften zur Kunst des Altertums, Berlin 1941.

Part Two: missing from the account

Missing from the account provided of European interest in Lycia in the last quarter of the 18th c. is any mention of the French scholar, antiquarian and painter, Louis-Francois Cassas at Myra in 1786 as noted above, of Thomas Hope on his extensive tour of Ottoman territory, who drew in coastal Lycia including the tombs at Antiphellus-Kaş in the early 1790’s77, who wrote, “on the now almost deserted coast of Lycia, the thousands of sepulchral monuments, of an era apparently preceding its conquest by the Romans, and bearing Greek inscriptions”78. There should also have been mention of Luigi Mayer, a Neapolitan of German descent, in the employ of the British Ambassador to the Porte, Sir Robert Ainslie, to provide a drawn record of the antiquities in Ottoman territory, who was in Lycia in 1792, at Myra, Andriake, Kekova, Antiphellus-Kaş and Telmessos-Fethiye with Mr. Graves, Mr. Berners and Mr. Tilson and for whom he made additional copies of his drawings. Copies of his gouache drawings were published in aquatint in a bilingual volume, English-French, published in 1803, entitled: “Views in the Ottoman Empire, Chiefly in Caramania, a Part of Asia Minor, hitherto Unexplored. With Some curious Selections from the Islands of Rhodes and Cyprus and the Celebrated Cities of Corinth, Carthage and Tripoli: From the original drawings in the possession of Sir R. Ainslie, taken during his embassy to Constantinople by Luigi Mayer: with Historical Observations, and Incidental Illustrations of

76 Hodos 2015, 92.
77 His drawings are today in the Benaki Museum, Athens. He converted his drawing of a Lycian rock-cut tomb at Antiphellos into the design for a fireplace of black marble, Hope 1807, 43, Plate XLVI. No. 1. Mantle-piece of black marble, copied from a facade of a sepulchral chamber, hewn in the solid body of a perpendicular rock, on the coast of ancient Lycia, and on the spot where formerly stood the city of Anti-phellos, mentioned by Strabo. It represents a facade or screen of rude and massy timber-work, in which may be discerned the upright posts, the transverse beams, the rafters, the wedges, and the bolts.” https://archive.org/details/Householdfurnit00Hope
78 Hope 1835, I, 384.
the Manners and Customs of the Natives of that Country”. This volume contained the largest collection of views drawn by a European up to this date in Lycia, 15 gouache drawings from Lycia were published among the 24 coloured plates in the volume, 11 of which were of considerable interest to antiquarians, four of the drawings made by Mayer in Lycia had been published in 1797 by the Society of the Dilettanti as noted above, others remained unpublished.

In the 19th c. unmentioned is the Rev. Dr. E. D. Clarke, who, interested in antiquity provided a fine description of the location and of the ancient ruins and remains at Telmessus-Macri-Fethiye in 1801 in the second volume of his Travels, and who transcribed the first inscription in Lycian characters to be recorded by any European, in 1801 at Telmessus, published in 1812, a three line inscription on a rock-cut tomb, which he described as formed of, “remarkable characters. A very ancient mode of writing…” However, concerning the discovery of inscriptions in Lycian, Spratt and Forbes write in their introduction: “About the same time, Mr. Cockerell, the eminent architect, visited the Lycian coast, and ultimately accompanied Captain Beaufort. This gentleman examined Myra, Limyra, Aperlae, and one of the cities called Cyanea. To him we owe the discovery of the first inscription in the character

---


80 Eg. Adam’s Auctions, Dublin, Lot. 532, 06-10-2009, “LUIGI MAYER SARCOFAGHI COLOSSALI TAGLIATI NELL’ VIVO SASSO ESISTENTI NEL PORTO DI CACCAMO NELLA CARAMANIA Tavola N LXIV del Viaggio pittoresco del Sig. Cav. Roberto Ainslie, Signed with initials LM: f, lower left (in the margin) and the letter ‘A’. SARCOFAGO COL SUO COPERCHIO ROvesciato, CHE SERVE DI ABITAZIONE AL GUARDIANO DEL PORTO DI CACCAMO Signed with initials LM: f: lower left (in the margin) and the letter ‘B’. Gouaches on paper, within painted borders, a pair, each 48 x 62cm.”

81 Clarke 1812, 231-263.

82 Clarke 1812, 254.
called “Lycian,” that one being bilingual, and thus affording a clue to the interpretation of a curious language,...”\(^{83}\), and unfortunately T. Hodos, citing from Spratt and Forbes, repeating the error, records the first inscription in Lycian was recorded by Cockerell and introduces a further one, stating the bilingual was found in Telmessos by Cockerell, when the bilingual was found near Phineka-Finike, writing, “**Beaufort was accompanied by the architect Charles R. Cockerell (1788-1863), who recorded the first Lycian inscription, at Telmessos, and which happened to be a bilingual, thus affording interpretational possibilities and linguistic interest**”\(^{84}\). The bilingual in question in Lycian and Greek was found by Cockerell at Limyra in 1812\(^{85}\) and published by Walpole in 1820. It was recopied by Charles Fellows in 1840, (Fellows 1841, 206-209, Pl. XXXVI, No. 3.). Further, Beaufort was only accompanied by Cockrell from April 1812\(^{86}\) onwards, after Cockerell had found the bilingual at Limyra, by Phineka-Finike.

Although the Society of Dilletanti Mission to Ionia of 1764 did not come to Lycia and did not “**record Lycia’s ruins, search for and transcribe inscriptions**”\(^{87}\) as is noted above, the Society of Dilletanti’s second Mission to Ionia of 1811-1813, under the leadership of William Gell, with the Hon. R. Keppel-Craven and the architects J. P. Gandy and F. O. Bedford, did visit, explore and record both structures and inscriptions at four sites in coastal Lycia in 1812: Telmessus, Patara, Antiphellos and Myra-Andriake\(^{88}\) and its considerable antiquarian record provides at times evidence of structures that 200 years later no longer exist\(^{89}\). Some of the record produced in Lycia in 1812 by the mission was published in *Antiquities of Ionia, Part the Third*, of 1840, some

\(^{83}\) Spratt – Forbes 1847, xii.

\(^{84}\) Hodos 2015, 90.

\(^{85}\) Inscription No. 1., “*copied near the town of Phineka*”, Walpole 1820, 524; Fellows 1841, 427-428, re M. Saint Martin, Cockerell bilingual from Limyra; Schmidt 1868, IV.

\(^{86}\) Cockerell 1903, 171.

\(^{87}\) Hodos 2015, 90.

\(^{88}\) Record of most of the drawings and plans produced by the mission was published in 1814. For this catalogue first published in 1814, see Antiquities of Ionia, Vol. V, 1915, 7-9. A total of 482 drawings, plans, view and maps produced by the members of this mission that were catalogued, but there were others which are unrecorded, for example those drawn by members of the Mission on Aegina in 1811.

\(^{89}\) Duggan 2018 forthcoming.
in *Antiquities of Ionia*, Vol. V, of 1915, some is however unpublished, scattered and lost, including the entire official Journal of the Mission of 1811-1813. The work of this Dilettanti Mission in Lycia was passed over unnoticed in this chapter.

**Part Three**

Can Lycia be said to have had “a Greek cultural context” and to be “a part of the Greek world”, which this chapter’s inclusion in this book indicates? Homer relates at the time of the Trojan War that the Lycians fought with the Trojans against the Greeks, including the Lord of the Lycians, Man of Counsel of the Lycians, God-like Sarpedon with his beautiful armour, killed by Patroclus, and Glaucos, son of Hippolochos, who led the great horde of Lycians at Troy including Amiso’darus and Pandaros, the shining son of Lykaon. The written Lycian language although employing some Greek characters, is not Greek, and this distinctiveness was made explicit for all to see, then as today, in the surviving bilingual inscriptions, with the inscription in Lycian characters usually coming first and containing more information than that in Greek. Fellows at Xanthus on April 17th 1838 wrote, “In the ruins there are many parallelisms to the Persepolitan” and while noting the inscriptions in Lycian characters, he writes, “I did not find any well-formed Greek letters; in an inscription over a gateway, and on one or two architectural stones, the Greek alphabet was used, but not the pure letters.” Although, following the invasion of Anatolia led by Alexander of Macedon in 334 B.C. and the ending of Achaemenid rule exercised through the Hekatomnid Satrap over the joint satrapy of Caria-Lycia since 341, after more than 250 years, Persepolitan-Persian-Achaemenid influence in Lycia declined, and inscriptions recorded in Lycian characters also become fewer in number, the Lycian population continued to be termed “barbarian,” that is, in Greek sources, meaning foreigner - non Greek speaking, by the historian Ephorus (d. 330) and by Menander (d. 291 B.C.), and cults retained their Lycian names such as Meliya rather than Athena/Athena Polias. The degree to which a population keeps its native tongue, sometimes for centuries, sometimes for a millennia or

---

90 Antiquities of Ionia, 1915, 6.
91 Fellows 1839, 228-229.
92 Keen 1998, 2.
93 Parker 2017, 40 and fn. 23, for references to 2016.
more, while the official language recorded in text is quite different, is well
known, and the increasing quantity of Greek names in Lycian families, said
to mark the change, the assimilation of the Lycian population into a Greek
population, the Hellenisation of Lycia, may hide some considerable contin-
uity in the exercise of the spoken language. In consequence of the above it
can be suggested that for the period that forms the subject of this volume
800 – 100 B.C. Lycia did not have a cultural context that can be simply de-
scribed as “a Greek cultural context,” a fact remarked upon when the
Xanthian-Lycian Marbles were exhibited in the British Museum, as is noted
above, these were largely regarded as non-Greek works. Antony Keen
writes, “In fact, the Lycians were an important part of both the Greek and
the Near Eastern worlds, since they lived at a point where the two cultures
intermingled, and an important strategic junction between east and west.
The Lycian culture was neither exclusively Hellenised, nor exclusively Oriental,
but a mixture of both, with a number of elements that were entirely Lycian”\(^94\).

In concluding this review it seems unfortunate that an interesting article
on the course and aims of archaeological survey work at the Çaltılıar höyük
should have such an error filled section entitled, *The Archaeology of and in
Lycia*. One can wonder at the degree of editing that has been exercised. Un-
fortunately any quotes within the published text are given without quotation
marks and there are no page numbers given in the references enclosed in
brackets within the text, yet the sources of quotations and references in the
footnotes, that record, who wrote what, where and when, remain of
importance to the reader, particularly when providing a historical account in
an academic publication.

\(^94\) Keen 1998, 3.
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