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Introduction

Aktepe lies within a cluster of tumuli near Güre in eastern Lydia, where many items in the famous ‘Lydian Treasure’ were unearthed by tomb-robbers in the late 1960s. It had the most lavishly decorated chamber of them all, with an ornamental façade, false barrel vault, and life-sized human figures painted on the side walls, one on each side of a monolithic limestone burial couch resembling a Greek-style kline with volute and palmette decoration (figs. 1–2). Based on the style of the wall-paintings and the masonry, the tomb has generally been dated c. 525–500 BC, early in the era of Persian rule. The original tomb assemblage cannot be reconstructed because finds from the salvage excavation were very limited and the chamber was already nearly empty when would-be looters first entered it in 1967. They soon returned and cut parts of the paintings from the walls, broke the kline, and removed fragments of its decorated supports. The rest of the couch remained in the chamber and bore witness to further vandalism before being moved to the Uşak Museum and reunited with some of its stolen fragments (fig. 2), upon the return of the Lydian Treasure from the Metropolitan Museum of Art in 1993. The 1996 publication of this material included a digital rendering of the front rail of the kline, showing incised lines that once delineated a painted frieze, including horsemen, a wheeled vehicle, and a winged animal. In 2002, Christopher Roosevelt and

![Fig. 1 – Reconstruction of the Aktepe chamber and kline (ÖZGEN and ÖZTÜRK 1996, fig. 82).](image-url)

2 For this type of kline, see RICHTER 1966, 58–60; KYRIELEIS 1969, 151–177; KNIGGE 1976, 60–83, fig. 22.
4 Finds recovered in rescue excavations after the looting include lydion sherds, alabastra fragments, and a carved bone or ivory lion, ROOSEVELT 2003, 577.
5 ÖZGEN and ÖZTÜRK 1996, 44.
6 ÖZGEN and ÖZTÜRK 1996, 41–42, figs. 75, 78, 82.
I examined the kline under varying light conditions in order to discern more of this frieze. This analysis has not only allowed a more complete reconstruction of the original decoration – horsemen at each end of the frieze, flanking a central confrontation of lions and bull – but also adds an important new element to the socio-cultural significance of the tomb's decoration, because the horsemen wear typical Persian riding attire. This paper will present our new reading of the Aktepe kline frieze (fig. 3) and consider the significance of this decoration to the dating of the tomb and to the social and cultural identity of the tomb occupant.

**Preservation and methods of analysis**

Only a few small traces of red pigment survive on the rail of the couch, and in some areas the surface of the limestone is badly broken or weathered. But details of the painted frieze are indicated by incised outlines, which are sometimes deep enough to remain even where the surface itself is lost, and by other variations in surface preservation. Because the paint was applied directly to the limestone without an initial surface treatment, some areas that once held paint have weathered less than areas that did not and thus remain like smooth islands surrounded by weathering (fig. 4a). In other places, the opposite is the case: areas of consistent, shallow weathering delineated by smooth edges (fig. 4b) may be ‘ghost’ traces of pigment that, over time, reacted with and removed some of the limestone surface. All these variations, though very slight, become visible in heavily raking light and may be enhanced by digital photography, since a camera processes light differently than the human eye. The drawings presented here were created by tracing the incisions and surface differentiations over multiple digital views of each portion of the frieze, in Adobe Illustrator.

---

7 A drawing and preliminary description of the frieze were included in BAUGHAN 2004, 76–77, 99–100, 366–368, no. A34, fig. 32. See also, ROOSEVELT 2003, 577; 2009, 172, fig. 6.41.
8 Red paint is also preserved in several locations on the supports and the remaining volute capital.
9 As is the case for ‘ghost’ patterns in the tomb paintings at Kızılbel, where a chemical reaction resulted in the removal of the stone surface along with certain pigments, MELLINK ET AL 1998, 21.
10 It should be noted that some of the incised lines appear to have been filled with pencil for visual emphasis, some time after the discovery of the kline, and that some of the lines and shapes visible in our photographs appear to be natural features of the limestone or the results of geological processes. In addition, some prominent, light-colored lines appear to be recent scratches, probably incurred during looting and vandalism, before the kline was moved to the museum. Other faint diagonal lines, which become more obvious in raking light, appear unrelated to the figural compositions and are probably chisel marks. These factors have made it difficult, in some areas, to distinguish between intentional and unintentional patterns on the surface; dashed lines in the drawings presented here indicate the uncertain status of a visible line or pattern.
Subject matter, composition, and style

Lions and bull (Figs. 5–7)

At the centre of the rail, two lions approach a bull, facing left with head lowered. The left-hand lion’s head is discernible in profile, with open mouth, and some lines above its back evidently belong to a wing\(^{11}\). The right-hand lion is less well preserved, but some incisions suggest a mane or the beginning of a wing\(^{12}\). The central animal is here identified as a bull on the basis of size, the beginning of a hoof-outline discernible on the forward hind leg, the long tail, and the wrinkled creases of its lowered neck, as characteristic of bulls in both Greek and Near Eastern art\(^{13}\). A horn is suggested by slight variations near the head but is uncertain. Several diagonal lines visible within the body of the bull are probably chisel marks, rather than arrows wounding the animal, as has been suggested\(^{14}\). Some of the enigmatic lines in the gaps between each lion and the bull, and between the right-hand lion and the horsemen on the right may belong to patterns that served as ‘filling ornament,’ as is common in Archaic East Greek (and Lydian) painting\(^{15}\).

At first glance, the lion–bull confrontation looks typically Archaic, and the lions have Lydian parallels: the elongated body, thick neck, and massive paws of the better-preserved (left-hand) lion are paralleled, for instance, on a Lydian ‘Wild Goat’ style dinos\(^{16}\), and its rear paw is very similar to one engraved on a silver skyphos.

\(^{11}\) Cf. ÖZGEN and ÖZTÜRK 1996, fig. 75.

\(^{12}\) Cf. the manes of lions on a silver skyphos in the Metropolitan Museum of Art (1971.118), von BOTHMER 1984, no. 49; ÖZGEN and ÖZTÜRK 1996, fig. 4.

\(^{13}\) COOK 1981, 103, nos. G12, G28, pls. 53, 64–65. E.g., BOARDMAN 1975, fig. 8; 1978, fig. 191; 1989, figs. 84, 123; OATES and OATES 2001, figs. 81, 86, 104, pls. 10a, 11b; von HOFSTEN 2007, pls. 1, 3–7, 30.

\(^{14}\) ÖZGEN and ÖZTÜRK 1996, 41.


\(^{16}\) GREENEWALT 1970, no. 1, pls. 2.1 and 3.1; COOK and DUPONT 1998, fig. 8.28.
in the Metropolitan that probably came from Lydia\textsuperscript{17}. The double-outlining of the lions’ legs and bellies calls to mind the reserved bands and paired incisions delineating animal anatomy in Wild Goat style and other East Greek vase painting\textsuperscript{18}, but the fact that it occurs only on the lions (not the bull) is puzzling and raises the possibility of different artistic models for the lions and bull. The possible wing adds a further unexpected element to this familiar motif – it is not matched in any Archaic Greek or Lydian representations known to the author, but wings of a different shape do appear on some lions and lion-creatures in Achaemenid art\textsuperscript{19}.

The motif of two lions flanking a bull with head lowered is found often in early Greek art, but by the late Archaic period lion attacks are much more prevalent\textsuperscript{20}. This scheme, however, with bull facing left, is repeated almost formulaically on Clazomenian sarcophagi of the late sixth and early fifth century\textsuperscript{21}. Although very different in style and composition, the Clazomenian paintings and the Aktepe animal confrontation may derive from a common artistic or conceptual model, and this stock motif may have carried a general significance in funerary contexts, as an apotropaic or heroizing device\textsuperscript{22}. But it is also possible that it occurs here as known (even if not typical) kline decoration: on an Attic red-figured skyphos of about 480 BC, a feline faces a bull at the centre of a kline rail, flanked by snakes and floral patterns in a tripartite composition like the Aktepe frieze\textsuperscript{23}, and lions or panthers decorate kline rails on several other Attic red-figured vases, both confronting other animals and in file alternating with floral ornament.\textsuperscript{24} It is unclear, then, whether the lion–bull confrontation in this context carries a special funerary significance.

\textsuperscript{17} Supra N. 12.
\textsuperscript{18} Reserve bands are usually limited, however, to inner divisions (e.g., of haunches from chest), except along the edge of the belly: e.g., \textsc{Cook} and \textsc{Dupont} 1998, figs. 8.17, 21–22; \textsc{GreeneWalt} and \textsc{Rautman} 2000, fig. 21. See also, \textsc{Cook} 1981, pls. 4–5, 7, 9, 11–13, 14–15 and no. E2a, fig. 12, pl. 19.6. \textsc{Vismara} (2007, 61) lists double-outlining as an Achaemenid stylistic trait on Lycian coins, and bands do outline some features of the lions on glazed bricks from Susa (e.g., \textsc{Allen} 2005, fig. 3.10), but there are no ready parallels for these lions in Achaemenid art. Cf., however, animals on so-called Ziwiye gold plaques, such as Metropolitan Museum of Art 1987, 138–9, and on Phrygian orthostat reliefs from Ankara, \textsc{Prayon} 1987, pls. 6–8.

\textsuperscript{19} E.g., \textsc{Porada} 1962, p. 52; \textsc{Boardman} 1970, 33–35, pl. 6 nos. 144, 146, 149; \textsc{Curtis} and \textsc{Tallis} 2005, nos. 85, 112, 118, 292.

\textsuperscript{20} \textsc{Hölscher} 1972; \textsc{Von Hofsten} 2007, 9 n. 1, 37.

\textsuperscript{21} E.g., \textsc{Cook} 1981, nos. E8, G12–13, G28, H1, H4, pls. 23, 53–54, 64–65, 94–96.

\textsuperscript{22} \textsc{Hölscher} 1972; \textsc{Markoe} 1989, 86–115; \textit{contra} \textsc{Cook} 1981, 109; also \textsc{Von Hofsten} 2007, 46–57, who argues that in minor arts the motif may have been primarily decorative, inspired by more expressive monuments such as temple sculptures.

\textsuperscript{23} \textsc{Vienna 3710}: ARV\textsuperscript{2} 380.171; \textsc{Mannack} 2008, vase 204068. \textsc{Von Hofsten} (2007, 42) suggests that such decoration on Greek klinai may have been inspired by Syro-Phoenician ivory furniture inlays, but by the time of this vase, the lion–bull motif had already become well-established in Greek art and was especially common in horizontal border zones such as predellae on black-figured vases.

\textsuperscript{24} E.g., 1) Attic red-figured cup Basel L35, ARV\textsuperscript{2} 179; \textsc{Mannack} 2008, vase 352451; \textsc{Berger} and \textsc{Lullies} 1979, 94–97, no. 35; 2) Attic red-figured amphora Munich 2303, ARV\textsuperscript{2} 245.1; \textsc{Mannack} 2008, vase 202451; and 3) Attic red-figured kalyx krater by Euphronios, Munich 8935 \textit{et al}, ARV\textsuperscript{2} 1619.3bis; \textsc{Mannack} 2008, vase 275007; \textsc{Boardman} 1975, fig. 25. It is also worth noting that a row of leaping
Horsemens and chariot (Figs. 4a–b, 8–11)

The riders flanking the central animal confrontation are more forward-looking in style and contemporary in theme. On the right end, three horsemen ride towards the right, led by a chariot (fig. 8). On the left end, two riders are clear, facing left (fig. 9). All wear some item of dress that can be associated with Achaemenid riding costume\textsuperscript{25}. Knee-length tunics had been noted in previously published drawings\textsuperscript{26}, but our analysis reveals long trousers beneath them, long sleeves, and caps framing some of the riders’ faces. In two cases, the trouser-leg ends in a flared edge, and on one rider a zigzag pattern is suggested by several diagonal lines on the thigh. The long sleeves of the left-hand riders are rendered with subtle folds, and a thick border marks the sleeve edge on the leftmost rider. This sleeve has a reddish tint, and another red mass is visible to the right, behind the figure’s back. Although the outlines of this area are not incised and its shape resembles some of the geological formations in the stone (such as the oblong void just to its right), it is suggestive of a cloak with an unused sleeve fluttering behind, as a Persian kandys\textsuperscript{27}. Even if this is a kandys, however, it is difficult to determine, on the basis of dress alone, whether these particular riders are meant to be understood as locals or Persians\textsuperscript{28}. The kandys may have been adopted by Anatolian elite as a mark of status (or style) or to express an affiliation with the ruling nobility. And long pants, long-sleeved shirts, and long caps comprise general ‘Asiatic’ costume, worn by some riders in East Greek art (such as on Clazomenian sarcophagi) and by others that could well be Anatolian rather than Persian (for instance, at Tatarlı or Daskyleion)\textsuperscript{29}. Even zigzag leggings, which are attested at Susa and are common in Greek depictions of lions decorates the stretcher of Assurbanipal’s couch on the famous garden-banquet relief from Nineveh, possibly as symbols of royal power, Kyrileis 1969, pl. 6.


\textsuperscript{26} Özgen and Öztürk 1996, figs. 75, 78.

\textsuperscript{27} On the kandys, supra N. 25; also Linders 1984, 107; Miller 1997, 165–167. For fluttering kandys sleeves, see, e.g., the Satrap and Alexander sarcophagi from Sidon, Kleemann 1958, pl. 10; von Graeve 1970, pls. 32, 38; and an Attic red-figured lekythos in the Hermitage Museum (c. 390 BC), AfV\textsuperscript{5} 1407.1; Manack 2008, vase 217907.

\textsuperscript{28} See Draycott 2007, 75–76 on the kandys as a public robe and mark of status for “Persian Empire nobles,” not limited to actual Persians as court-style (‘Elamite’) robes may have been. See gifts of robes in Sekunda 1992, 9–10.

\textsuperscript{29} Mellink 1973, 298, pl. 46, fig. 9; Cook 1981, 116–117, no. G11, fig. 22, pl. 52.1; Linders 1984, 111; Calmeyer 1992, 9–14, figs. 1–3, 7–9; Miller 1997, 183–4; Summerer 2007a, 132–141, figs. 2, 5; 2007b, 3–30.
Persians, may be more generally Anatolian-Persian\textsuperscript{30}. The same is true for the saddlecloths that are suggested by faint incisions on two of the horses' bellies\textsuperscript{31}.

The poses of some of the horsemen, however, are also culturally suggestive. On the right end, they ride comfortably, with arms resting before them (where discernible), holding reins or an idle, upright spear (fig. 8). Both of the preserved riders on the left-hand side of the frieze (figs. 4a–b, 11), however, strike dynamic poses, with arms extended diagonally upwards, presumably wielding spears (the horizontal lines above the riders look like spears but seem in fact to belong to a continuous border running along the top of the frieze, balancing a similar borderline below this portion of the frieze)\textsuperscript{32}. The riders' spears were most likely held at a diagonal, as usual for this pose, which is common for Near Eastern rulers and Achaemenid elite hunting or fighting from horseback, with one arm raised before or behind the head; in either case, the elbow is usually bent to some degree\textsuperscript{33}.

This dynamic variant of the pose, with arm held straight and so creating a strong diagonal, is more distinctly Achaemenid—it is found, for instance, on a Persian stater, a ‘Graeco-Persian’ stele from Bursa, and a frieze of the Nereid Monument at Xanthos, all of the fourth century\textsuperscript{34}. Earlier examples, with a slight bend in the arm, occur on the Satrap Sarcophagus from Sidon (c. 450–400) and, even earlier, on sealings made by a cy-

\textsuperscript{30} See e.g., BOARDMAN 1975, figs. 17, 29; MILLER 1997, figs. 22, 49; CURTIS and TALLIS 2005, no. 58; SUMMERER 2007a, 134, fig. 2.

\textsuperscript{31} Slight incisions on the leftmost and rightmost preserved horses suggest straight-edged cloths placed at a diagonal. For merlon-edged saddlecloths in ‘Graeco-Persian’ art, see SEVİNÇ ET AL. 2001, 400, figs. 3–6; MERRILLEES 2005, pl. 4 no. 9, pl. 13 no. 6; VASSILEVA in these Proceedings, N. 32.

\textsuperscript{32} Neither an upper nor a lower borderline is present on the other portions of the frieze.

\textsuperscript{33} Various diagonal lines are visible before the second rider, but it is unclear if any of these belong to his spear. On this scheme in Achaemenid art, derived ultimately from Assyrian models: KLEEMANN 1958, 135; NOLLE 1992, 77–78. E.g., SCHMIDT 1957, pl. 10 no. 34; WISEMAN 1959, no. 107; GARRISON 1991, figs. 3–4; ROOT 1991, figs. 3, 6; COLLON 1995, fig. 122; BOARDMAN 2000, fig. 5.39; 2001, pls. 888, 1070; MERRILLEES 2005, 105 fig. 10g. For the same pose with arm held in front, see e.g., SEVİNÇ ET AL. 2001, figs. 3–4, 11–12; MERRILLEES 2005, no. 9. For spears held at a diagonal, even when multiple riders are shown, see the lost relief from Yeniceköy, near Daskyleion: MACRIDY 1913, 354 figs. 5–6; KLEEMANN 1958, pl. 33b; NOLLE 1992, 37–38, FV, pl. 15a–b; DRAYCOTT 2007, no. 22, pl. 46.

\textsuperscript{34} 4th-century stater: CURTIS and TALLIS 2005, no. 327. Bursa stèle: CREMER 1984, 87–91, pl. 5c; NOLLE 1992, no. S8, pl. 11; DRAYCOTT 2007, pl. 41b. Nereid Monument: KLEEMANN 1958, 126, 135, pls. 22c–d; CHILDS and DEMARGNE 1989, 187–8, 355, pls. 115–117, XLIV–XLV. Cf. also, BOARDMAN 2000, fig. 5.1 and MERRILLEES 2005, no. 13, fig. 10g, pl. 6, an Achaemenid seal of ‘mixed’ style in Switzerland (and a modern copy of it); and KAPTAN 2002, no. DS95, pl. 282–3, a ‘Persianizing’ sealing of the late fifth/early fourth century.
linder seal belonging to Cyrus of Anšan, probably the grandfather of Cyrus the Great. The circulation of such imagery on sealstones and the use of such poses in monumental commissions such as battle paintings or satrapal palace decoration may account for this consistency over such a long period of time.

The chariot on the right end of the frieze (figs. 8 and 10) is less easily matched in Greek or Achaemenid art. It is not fully preserved, and there are many overlapping lines that make the original design difficult to determine; what is clear is a wheel, with six spokes indicated by incised lines (though their spacing suggests that wheel was painted with ten or twelve spokes), a chariot box with straight back and curved front, and pole(s) extending to the right. Little of the charioteer remains, and the horses cannot clearly be discerned among the various lines visible on the preserved surfaces to the right. The straight back and large wheel of the chariot are comparable to heavy Achaemenid-style chariots such as those depicted at Persepolis and in the tomb paintings from Tatarlı, but the curved front profile also recalls chariots depicted in Archaic East Greek art.

What, then, are these horsemen doing, and what is their thematic significance? The spears of the right-hand riders suggest that they are setting out for hunting or warfare. Stray lines and patterns beneath their horses are suggestive of running dogs, but none are certain; and since dogs are found in association with both hunters and warriors in contemporary East Greek art, their presence would be inconclusive. The active poses of the left-hand riders could likewise suit hunting or battle, but the composition at the far left suggests human combat: here the surface of the stone is poorly preserved, but there seem to be several overlapping figures including a leg of a striking figure, wearing long trousers or leggings, and perhaps a sleeved figure extending an arm towards the leftmost horse. Both themes of course find ready parallels in Anatolian-Persian funerary art, sometimes even combined in a sort of ‘biographical narrative’. A hunting scene may reflect the tomb owner’s enjoyment of this Achaemenid elite pastime, while a battle scene may allude to his participation in military campaigns. In the context of kline decoration, however, the precise nature of the riders’ action may not be as important as their display itself: elite riders, whether local or Persian, here serve as furniture decoration, framing a more traditional decorative yet symbolic motif, the lion–bull confrontation. The riders may also serve a symbolic function, to express affiliation with or admiration for Achaemenid-era cavalry.

Stylistically, the riders present a striking contrast to the Archaizing animal confrontation. We have already seen that the dynamic poses of the left-hand riders find their closest parallels in the fifth and fourth centuries, on works like the Nereid Monument and the Satrap Sarcophagus. These works, and ‘Graeco-Persian’ art of other media, such as carved sealstones, also offer parallels for the rendering of the soft volumes of the riders’ sleeves through subtle modulations across the forearm. Such parallels do not require dating the Aktepe as late as the fourth century; more probably, elements of the kline frieze derived from Achaemenid seals or commemorative paintings that also served as models for these later works. Still, the
style of the left-hand riders, perhaps even rendered with three-quarter perspective, falls more comfortably in the early to mid-fifth than the late sixth century; as the tomb has previously been dated; the kline decoration therefore helps to refine the date of the initial burial in the tomb chamber to the first half of the fifth century. The concurrence of Archaizing and fifth-century styles is unexpected but not without parallel. A similar combination of Archaic Greek and contemporary ‘Graeco-Persian’ styles and themes is found in the wall paintings of the tumulus at Tatarlı in western Phrygia, now dated by dendrochronology to the mid-fifth century. And on Clazomenian sarcophagi of the early fifth century, Archaizing animal confrontations are juxtaposed with more stylistically advanced scenes of hunting or cavalry battle, just as at Aktepe.

**The Aktepe kline in context**

Such extensive figural decoration is unusual for a kline, to judge from the many representations of klinai in Greek art, other replicas in stone, and actual remains of wooden couches. Usually, kline rails were decorated (if at all) with a series of rosettes, stars, or lotus-rosettes. Animals sometimes occur in alternation with these patterns, or in confronted groups (see above), but human figures are virtually unknown before the Macedonian era, when they become a focal point of kline decoration, with elaborate compositions involving human and/or animal figures. The only other known example of a rider frieze on a kline rail occurs in a late fourth-century Macedonian tomb at Dion.

Besides the painted frieze, the Aktepe kline has several other distinctive features that support a fifth-century date and reflect the varied cultural landscape of the Güre region. In brief: its monolithic design and heavily tapered legs are matched elsewhere in Anatolia in the early fifth century; the form of its head rest seems to be derived from a type better known in central Lydia; and the maeander pattern on its edge is a special type, with hooks mirrored rather than interlocking, that is paralleled, thus far, only on a Phrygian

---

45 Since there is only one kline, we can assume that it is contemporary with the earliest burial in the chamber (though the actual number of tomb occupants is indeterminable, as no skeletal remains were recovered). In fact, the central position against the rear wall of the chamber was the most common position for couches in single-burial tombs in Lydia. Also, its size (2.05 m L, 0.85 m wide, 0.54 m high) and weight (about 0.55 metric tons, based on the average weight of limestone, 2611 kg per m³) tell us that this monolithic couch was no afterthought or casual addition to the tomb.
46 Draycott in these proceedings; Sommerer 2007a, 145; Kuhnholm et al. 2007, 155–158.
47 E.g., Cook 1981, no. G13, pl. 54. See also, an incised silver alabastron from the Basmacı tumulus, also in the Güre region, where two riders (wearing short tunics and perhaps trousers) are paired with a lion-attacking-bull motif: Akbıyıköülü 1991, 22 fig. 2; Özgen and Öztürk 1996, 239 cat. 228.
48 Baughan 2004, 36.
49 A single possible example in Greek art is known to the author: a scene of the Pygmies and Cranes on a kline rail (or coverlet), on the interior of an Attic red-figured cup c. 470–460 BC, BM 1895.10–27.21; Miller 1991, fig. 19; Csapo and Miller 1991, 371, n. 22, pl. 97a; Mannack 2008, vaso 11911. For Macedonian klinai, see Sismanidis 1997, 35–47, pls. 1–7. On other known funerary klinai from Anatolia, rail decoration is vegetal or non-figural, except for the sphinxes that border a lotus-and-palmette frieze on the rear kline from Lale Tepe: Greenewalt et al. 2003, 141, fig. 32; Baughan 2004, 74–75; 2008, 65–67.
50 Sotiriadis 1932, 43–45, fig. 5; von Graeve 1970, 65, pl. 76.2, 77.3; Gessel 1980, 122–124; Sismanidis 1997, 91–95; Boardman 2000, fig. 5.88b (mislabelled as wall-painting). The 6th-century relief with a rider frieze, from Bin Tepe, is too small to belong to a kline rail, as has been suggested: Hanfmann and Ramage 1978, 156 no. 231, fig. 401; Baughan 2004, 79–80. But cf. the file of galloping horsemen on a kline mattress on a red-figured kylix attributed to Oltos, Munich 2618, ARV² 61.74; Richter 1986, fig. 297; Mannack 2008, vaso 200510. The relationship of Macedonian and Anatolian funerary architecture and klinai lie beyond the scope of this paper, but it is likely that tombs such as Aktepe in western Anatolia inspired Macedonian kings or tomb-builders. See also, Gessel 1980, 58; Baughan 2004, 7; Sapirstein and Fattalkin 2005.
51 At İkötepe, also in the Güre region, Özgen and Öztürk 1996, 49 (although this kline has a continuous slab-like support on each end rather than four individual legs); and at Karaburun II, Mellink 1971, 251; 1974, 357–358, pl. 69, fig. 16 (although this is essentially a block with legs carved in relief and is thus more akin to rock-cut couches). See also, Baughan 2004, 56.
52 Baughan 2004, 267. Cf. the kline legs painted on the marble supports from Dedetepe, dated by associated finds c. 475 BC: Sevinc et al. 1998, 311, fig. 7; Baughan 2004, no. A186, fig. 76.
architectural terracotta\textsuperscript{54}. Completely unique as \textit{kline} decoration are the recumbent deer or calves\textsuperscript{55} decorating the feet (fig. 2a–b). Their pose, with legs folded beneath bellies and heads turned back towards their bodies, recalls Near Eastern models\textsuperscript{56} and, although the head placement is different, the many gold and electrum pendants and bronze formers in the shape of recumbent animals in the Lydian Treasure, from another tumulus in the Güre region\textsuperscript{57}. Overall, then, the Aktepe couch presents a particularly Anatolian-Persian approach to traditional \textit{kline} form.

The painted frieze of the \textit{kline} must finally be considered with respect to its context within the tomb chamber, since it appeared between two life-sized figures painted on the chamber walls, each extending a branch in the direction of the \textit{kline} (fig. 1)\textsuperscript{58}. On the left was a male figure that has been heavily retouched: the lotus flower in his left-hand appears to be a modern addition, and he may have originally had a Persian-style pointed beard\textsuperscript{59}. The other figure has been identified as a woman or a young man; both wear long robes that probably reflect local Lydian (or western Anatolian) attire\textsuperscript{60}. Together, the paintings comprise a sort of tableau that must be read as a whole, as Cathie Draycott suggests\textsuperscript{61}. The life-sized figures, by their scale and interaction with the burial \textit{kline}, bring it into the world of the living. When the deceased is imagined lying atop the \textit{kline}, their offering postures seem to recreate a funerary ceremony like the \textit{prothesis} known from Greek sources, as Draycott proposes\textsuperscript{62}. The branches resemble olive, myrtle, or tamarisk, all of which were used in ceremonial contexts in antiquity\textsuperscript{63}. And the left-hand figure may originally have held an unguent container like an alabastron, a common grave offering in Lydia\textsuperscript{64}. Although the \textit{kline} form itself, which functioned equally as a banquet couch and funerary bed, brings the theme of banqueting into the tomb, the branches and the lack of drinking vessels (compare, for example, the \textit{kline}-scene at Karaburun) suggest a more ceremonial than sympotic atmosphere\textsuperscript{65}. Also in contrast to Karaburun, the figures attending the \textit{kline} here display no obvious Persian signifiers, except perhaps the original pointed beard of the left-hand man\textsuperscript{66}. While at Karaburun a local dignitary reclines on a Persian-style couch, is equipped with an Achaemenid-style wine service, and on the other walls of the tomb is shown (probably) setting out for a military campaign in Persian attire and successful in battle over foes clad as Greeks\textsuperscript{67}, at Aktepe the wall-paintings suggest a local Lydian funerary ritual, and it is the \textit{kline} frieze that provides Persianizing imagery and completes the decorative programme of the chamber.

The combination of themes and styles found on the Aktepe \textit{kline} could only occur in Achaemenid Anatolia and in this particular Lydian-Phrygian border zone: a Phrygian maeander, Lydian headrest, Lydian or Lydian-Persian recumbent animals, East Greek \textit{kline} design with volutes and palmettes, Archaizing lions

\textsuperscript{54} Virginia Museum of Fine Arts 78.61.3, probably from Düver: ÅKERSTRÖM 1966, fig. 70a.3; MAYO 1981, 33, fig. 20; BUZZI 1999, 80. For more canonical maeander decoration in this location, see BAUGHAN 2004, 33; SEVิง ET AL. 1998, 310, fig. 7.

\textsuperscript{55} ÖZGEN and ÖZTÜRK 1996, 31, 42, 70.

\textsuperscript{56} Cf. especially the calves on the lid of an ivory pyxis from a well at Nimrud, OATES and OATES 2001, fig. 54; similar, but more naturalistic, is the pose of a sleeping deer (?) on a ‘Græco-Persian’ seal from near Massyaf, BOARDMAN 2000, fig. 5.34. More commonly, recumbent animals are shown with back-turned heads held upright, above the back, as in Scythian ‘animal style’ art and Late Geometric vase-painting inspired by Near Eastern models. See also, Achaemenid seals and metalwork: DUSINBÈRRE 2005, no. 46, fig. 56; CURTIS and TALLIS 2005, nos. 129, 168.


\textsuperscript{58} ÖZGEN and ÖZTÜRK 1996, fig. 82. The upper portions of these figures were cut off the walls and are now in the Uşak Museum. The lower portions remained in the tomb but are now nearly invisible, though their general appearance may be deduced from modern copies painted on the rear wall of the chamber, presumably to be cut out and sold as antiques.

\textsuperscript{59} ÖZGEN and ÖZTÜRK 1996, 43, 72 no. 8, fig. 81.

\textsuperscript{60} ÖZGEN and ÖZTÜRK 1996, 42, 45, 71 no. 7; DRAYCOTT 2007, 181, 183.

\textsuperscript{61} DRAYCOTT 2007, 182.


\textsuperscript{63} ÖZGEN and ÖZTÜRK 1996, 73.

\textsuperscript{64} ÖZGEN and ÖZTÜRK 1996, 43, nos. 75–8, 86, 228; DEDEOĞLU 1991, 149, fig. 9.

\textsuperscript{65} See, however, BAUGHAN (2008, n. 78) for myrtle in sympotic as well as funerary contexts. For Karaburun II, see MELLINK 1971, 252, pls. 54–55; 1972, 257, 265–286, pl. 58; 1973, 297, pl. 44; ÖZGEN and ÖZTÜRK 1996, 47. Also: BINGöl 1997, 54–57, fig. 37 and pls. 7.1 and 2.

\textsuperscript{66} ÖZGEN and ÖZTÜRK 1996, 43; DRAYCOTT 2007, 182.

\textsuperscript{67} MELLINK 1973, 301. Military imagery: DRAYCOTT in these Proceedings.
and bull but with wing(s) added, in Persian fashion, Persianizing chariot, and horsemen outfitted as Persian cavalry and represented in ‘Graeco-Persian’ style. This hybridity is of course not surprising, but what it suggests is that elite social identity, whether for local Lydians or Persians, was dependent on both local and Achaemenid traditions, and this kind of overt combination of styles may have appealed to both local Anatolians and Persian nobles. The Persian costumes of the riders on the frieze could be meant to express the identity or status of the deceased – either himself a member of the Persian cavalry, or of the local elite that could accompany the king or the satrap on hunting expeditions or military campaigns – but could also simply add a contemporary flavour to what were otherwise familiar subjects, or even express awareness of contemporary monumental artworks showing such subjects. Whatever the case, the decision to include such varied cultural signifiers at least reveals the fashion of eclecticism in this area at this time and may express an admiration for things Persian, whether or not the deceased belonged to the Persian nobility. The variable expression of Anatolian and Persian cultural elements may have been a means of social competition among neighbouring elites in this diverse border zone.\(^{68}\) We must remember, too, that this monolithic \textit{kline} would have been an ostentatious expenditure, and its position as the sole burial receptacle in the tomb was also extraordinary, at a time when multiple burials and double \textit{klinai} were becoming more common (as, for example, at nearby İkiztepe).\(^{69}\) We should not, then, be surprised at the remarkable nature of its painted decoration; perhaps future analysis with infrared or ultraviolet photography will illuminate still more remarkable details of this accomplished yet elusive painted frieze.

}\(^{68}\) DRAYCOTT 2007, 179, 183.  
\(^{69}\) On multiple occupancy tombs: ROOSEVELT 2003, 194–198; BAUGHAN 2004, 151–154. For İkiztepe, see ÖZGEN and ÖZTÜRK 2006, 48–50. Most Lydian stone \textit{klinai} were in fact the sole couch in a tomb, and Karaburun II (supra NN. 28, 51, 65) is a contemporary parallel, but equally extraordinary.
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