



Publikationen des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts

Philipp Niewöhner

From Early Christian Region to Later Byzantine Hinterland. New Byzantine Marbles in the Archaeological Museum Kütahya

Istanbuler Mitteilungen 73, 2023, § 1–30

<https://doi.org/10.34780/mi0c-m4c5>

Herausgebende Institution / Publisher:

Deutsches Archäologisches Institut

Copyright (Digital Edition) © 2024 Deutsches Archäologisches Institut

Deutsches Archäologisches Institut, Zentrale, Podbielskiallee 69–71, 14195 Berlin, Tel: +49 30 187711-0

Email: info@dainst.de | Web: <https://www.dainst.org>

Nutzungsbedingungen:

Mit dem Herunterladen erkennen Sie die [Nutzungsbedingungen](#) von iDAI.publications an. Sofern in dem Dokument nichts anderes ausdrücklich vermerkt ist, gelten folgende Nutzungsbedingungen: Die Nutzung der Inhalte ist ausschließlich privaten Nutzerinnen / Nutzern für den eigenen wissenschaftlichen und sonstigen privaten Gebrauch gestattet. Sämtliche Texte, Bilder und sonstige Inhalte in diesem Dokument unterliegen dem Schutz des Urheberrechts gemäß dem Urheberrechtsgesetz der Bundesrepublik Deutschland. Die Inhalte können von Ihnen nur dann genutzt und vervielfältigt werden, wenn Ihnen dies im Einzelfall durch den Rechteinhaber oder die Schrankenregelungen des Urheberrechts gestattet ist. Jede Art der Nutzung zu gewerblichen Zwecken ist untersagt. Zu den Möglichkeiten einer Lizenzierung von Nutzungsrechten wenden Sie sich bitte direkt an die verantwortlichen Herausgeber*innen der jeweiligen Publikationsorgane oder an die Online-Redaktion des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts (info@dainst.de). Etwaige davon abweichende Lizenzbedingungen sind im Abbildungsnachweis vermerkt.

Terms of use:

By downloading you accept the [terms of use](#) of iDAI.publications. Unless otherwise stated in the document, the following terms of use are applicable: All materials including texts, articles, images and other content contained in this document are subject to the German copyright. The contents are for personal use only and may only be reproduced or made accessible to third parties if you have gained permission from the copyright owner. Any form of commercial use is expressly prohibited. When seeking the granting of licenses of use or permission to reproduce any kind of material please contact the responsible editors of the publications or contact the Deutsches Archäologisches Institut (info@dainst.de). Any deviating terms of use are indicated in the credits.

IMPRESSUM

Istanbuler Mitteilungen

erscheint seit 1933/*published since 1933*

IstMitt 73, 2023 • 444 Seiten/*pages* mit 553 Abbildungen/*illustrations*

Herausgeber/*Editors*

Prof. Dr. Felix Pirson • Dr.-Ing. Moritz Kinzel
Deutsches Archäologisches Institut
Abteilung Istanbul
İnönü Caddesi 10
34437 Gümüşsuyu – Istanbul
Türkei
www.dainst.org

Wissenschaftlicher Beirat/*Advisory Board*

Prof. Dr. Albrecht Berger (München) • Prof. Dr. François Bertemes (Halle) • Dr. Jérémie Chameroy (Mainz) • Prof. Dr. Ortwin Dally (Rom) • Doç. Dr. Yaşar Ersoy (Çorum) • Prof. Dr. Ralf von den Hoff (Freiburg) • Prof. Dr.-Ing. Adolf Hoffmann (Berlin) • Prof. Dr. Klaus Kreiser (Bamberg) • Prof. Dr. Mehmet Özdoğan (Istanbul) • Prof. Dr. Peter Pfälzner (Tübingen) • Prof. Dr. Christopher Ratté (Ann Arbor) • Prof. Dr.-Ing. Klaus Rheidt (Cottbus) • Prof. Dr. Frank Rumscheid (Bonn) • Prof. Dr.-Ing. Dorothee Sack (Berlin) • Prof. Dr. Dirk Steuernagel (Regensburg) • Juniorprof. Dr. Fabian Stroth (Freiburg) • Prof. Dr. Engelbert Winter (Münster) • Prof. Dr. Martin Zimmermann (München)

Peer Review

Alle für die Istanbuler Mitteilungen eingereichten Beiträge werden einem doppelblinden Peer-Review-Verfahren durch internationale Fachgutachterinnen und -gutachter unterzogen./*All articles submitted to the Istanbuler Mitteilungen are reviewed by international experts in a double-blind peer review process.*

Indices

Istanbuler Mitteilungen sind indiziert im/*Istanbuler Mitteilungen are indexed in the* European Reference Index for the Humanities and Social Sciences ERIHPLUS und in der/*and in the* Expertly Curated Abstract and Citation Database Scopus.

Redaktion und Layout/*Editing and Typesetting*

Gesamtverantwortliche Redaktion/*Publishing editor*:
Deutsches Archäologisches Institut, Redaktion der Abteilung Istanbul, İnönü Caddesi 10, 34437 Gümüşsuyu-Istanbul, Türkei
Kontakt für Manuskripteinreichung/*Contact for article submissions*: redaktion.istanbul@dainst.de
Redaktion/*Editing*: Martina Koch, Ulrich Mania
Satz/*Typesetting*: le-tex publishing services GmbH, Leipzig
Corporate Design, Layoutgestaltung/*Layout design*: LMK Büro für Kommunikationsdesign, Berlin

Umschlagfoto/*Cover illustration*: Füße einer weiblichen Statue im Bad-Gymnasium von Sagalassos (Abb. 60 im Beitrag von Beaujean et al.; Foto: © Sagalassos Archaeological Research)/*Feet of a female statue in the Bath-Gymnasium of Sagalassos (fig. 60 in the article by Beaujean et al.; photo: © Sagalassos Archaeological Research)*

Druckausgabe/*Printed edition*

© 2024 Deutsches Archäologisches Institut, Berlin
Druck und Vertrieb/*Printing and Distribution*: Dr. Ludwig Reichert Verlag Wiesbaden (www.reichert-verlag.de)

P-ISSN: 0341-9142 – ISBN: 978-3-7520-0811-1

Das Werk einschließlich aller seiner Teile ist urheberrechtlich geschützt. Eine Nutzung ohne Zustimmung des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts und/oder der jeweiligen Rechteinhaber ist nur innerhalb der engen Grenzen des Urheberrechtsgesetzes zulässig. Etwaige abweichende Nutzungsmöglichkeiten für Text und Abbildungen sind gesondert im Band vermerkt./*This work, including all of its parts, is protected by copyright. Any use beyond the limits of copyright law is only allowed with the permission of the German Archaeological Institute and/or the respective copyright holders. Any deviating terms of use for text and images are indicated in the credits.*

Druck und Bindung in Deutschland/*Printed and Bound in Germany*

Digitale Ausgabe/*Digital edition*

© 2024 Deutsches Archäologisches Institut, Berlin
Webdesign/*Webdesign*: LMK Büro für Kommunikationsdesign, Berlin
XML-Export, Konvertierung/*XML-Export, Conversion*: digital publishing competence, München
Programmierung Viewer-Ausgabe/*Programming Viewer*: LEAN BAKERY, München

E-ISSN: 2940-8202 – DOI: <https://doi.org/10.34780/ye60-e5a0>

Zu den Nutzungsbedingungen siehe/*For the terms of use see*: <https://publications.dainst.org/journals/index/termsOfUse>

The image is a composite background. On the left side, there is a close-up of a large, cylindrical stone tower or wall, constructed from irregular, weathered stones and bricks, showing horizontal bands of different masonry. On the right side, there is a panoramic view of a city, likely Kütahya, nestled in a valley with hills in the background under a cloudy sky.

ABSTRACT

From Early Christian Region to Later Byzantine Hinterland

New Byzantine Marbles in the Archaeological Museum Kütahya

Philipp Niewöhner

This paper presents four dozen Byzantine marble carvings that the Archaeological Museum Kütahya acquired during the last two decades, since the publication of the museum's earlier holdings. The marbles include architectural sculpture, mostly from the Early Byzantine period, and liturgical furnishings, also from later Byzantine times. The find-spots range widely across the huge catchment area of the museum, but the city of Kütahya and the district of Altıntaş each stand out for a cluster of finds. The paper provides an art-historical analysis and observes that, while some Early Byzantine carvings apply super-regional forms that are also known from other parts of the Eastern Roman empire, others and in particular liturgical furnishings are specifically Anatolian and attest to early Christian regionalism. This appears to have increased in the 6th century, as super-regional forms became rare. After a collapse during the Invasion period, Middle Byzantine stonemasonry followed different trajectories, certainly due to a lack of a major regional workshop and possibly in response to a new, aristocratic clientele that was oriented directly towards Constantinople instead of any regional centre, thus turning the formerly self-dependent region into an extended hinterland of the capital city.

KEYWORDS

Altıntaş, Phrygia, liturgical furnishings, templon epistyles, Late Antiquity

From Early Christian Region to Later Byzantine Hinterland

New Byzantine Marbles in the Archaeological Museum Kütahya

Introduction

¹ This contribution presents Byzantine marble carvings that have been acquired by the Archaeological Museum Kütahya during the last two decades¹, thus supplementing and updating earlier catalogues of the museum's holdings². The new acquisitions underscore the point that Anatolia is no »Neuland der Kunstgeschichte« any more, as Josef Strzygowski famously entitled his ground-breaking study of early Christian art in Asia Minor³. Change has been twofold. On the one hand, Anatolia has become the object of intensive archaeological exploration, including ever increasing numbers of surveys, excavations, and collections; the expanding holdings, activities, and publications of the Kütahya Museum are an outstanding example among many⁴. On the other hand, the same ascendancy of provincial archaeology has also led to results that upend Strzygowski's methodological approach to, and vision of, early Christian Anatolia.

² At the turn of the 20th century, Strzygowski had set out to discredit the primacy of the Roman Catholic church and to prove that early Christian art was essentially Eastern, rather than Roman, in origin⁵. This then provocative hypothesis was followed by half a century of debate as to the origin and character of Christian art⁶,

Title page: Kütahya, upper gate of the Byzantine fortifications on a hill above the Roman, late antique, and Turkish city, looking east

¹ The directorate of museums in Kütahya kindly provided permission to study and publish the pieces under consideration here. I would also like to thank Serdar Ünan (formerly Kütahya, now Samsun) for access to and help with the collection.

² The earlier catalogues have been published as Niewöhner 2006 and Niewöhner 2008. For epigraphic annotations, see Mitchell 2023, 262 f. 359, but note that the latter item (Niewöhner 2006, 445 cat. 62 fig. 28) was in fact found at the site of an illegal excavation in the Koçderesi district of Altıntaş village near Gediz and not at the town of the same name (Altıntaş). The village in question is mapped on the fold out of Belke – Mersich 1990, and Mitchell kindly confirmed in writing (August 2023) that his attribution to the better-known town (Altıntaş) was a mistake.

³ Strzygowski 1903. Cf. Ousterhout 2021.

⁴ Two newly excavated churches are particularly noteworthy: Akduğan et al. 2013; Altunkaynak Duğan – Ünan 2019.

⁵ Strzygowski 1901.

⁶ Weigand 1923; Jäggi 2009; Foletti – Lovino 2018.

for example Richard Krautheimer's influential history of early Christian and Byzantine architecture, according to which the 4th-century origins were Roman, but were followed by an ›Aegean‹ phase around the turn of the 5th century or so, until Constantinople took over about a century later⁷. However, as provincial archaeology reveals ever more differences among the many early Christian regions of the later Roman empire, the notion of a single, monolithic church art is called into doubt and may be replaced by the concept of diversity⁸. Each early Christian province appears to have built and decorated churches differently. The question of originality arose later, in particular after the collapse of the Roman empire, when various smaller successor states each started to enforce a greater degree of unity and to claim primacy, for example the Iconoclast controversy in Byzantium that unified formerly diverse attitudes to Christian images and their veneration.

³ The new acquisitions at Kütahya throw more light on regional characteristics of central Anatolia. The marbles include forms that are also known from other regions and may thus be referred to as super-regional. Such forms were widely disseminated in many, if not in all provinces of the Eastern Roman empire, as is discussed in the first section of this paper. The same section will also ask why these common forms mainly date from the 5th century, whereas their 6th-century equivalents appear to be ill-attested in central Anatolia. A second Early Byzantine section turns to forms that represent central Anatolian regionalism, in particular liturgical furnishings. A third section engages with Middle Byzantine carvings that attest to fundamental changes in both the organisation and the stylistic orientation of stone masonry, suggesting that the formerly self-dependent region had now turned into something like an extended hinterland of Constantinople. A final section addresses issues of settlement history, in particular the character of Byzantine urbanism and ruralisation.

⁴ The holdings of the Kütahya Museum are currently distributed between the old museum inside and around the historic Vacidiye Medrese (fig. 2. 4. 5. 6. 12. 13. 14. 22. 23. 25. 26. 28. 30. 31. 32. 33. 34. 35. 37. 40. 41. 42. 43. 44. 46) and various secondary locations, including in front of the historic Şengül Hamamı and Geological Collection (fig. 15. 24. 27), the Tugay Anadolu Kültür Sanat ve Arkeoloji Müzesi at an airbase outside the city (fig. 1. 20. 21. 29. 36. 45), and on the campus of Dumlupınar University (fig. 3. 7. 8. 9. 10. 11. 16. 17. 18. 19. 38. 39). In due course, everything is expected to move to a new museum building that has just been erected on the outskirts of the city.

Super-Regional Forms

⁵ Five column capitals stand out for the quality of their fine white marble and deeply undercut carvings (fig. 1. 2. 3. 4. 5). Their formal repertoire dates from the 5th century and is identical or closely comparable to other capitals in central Anatolia, from Proconnesus/Constantinople, and in the central Balkan mountains⁹. Two similarly large composite capitals with fine-toothed leaves from the Turkish village of Gecek in Altıntaş İlçesi or district likely belonged to the same Early Byzantine building, although one of them is of the so-called Theodosian kind with a row of standing leaves instead of the traditional egg-and-dart (fig. 1. 2). Large Early Byzantine composite capitals were rare in central Anatolia, and it seems unlikely that rural Gecek and vicinity contained more

⁷ Krautheimer 1965. Similarly, Grabar 1966 also identifies the Aegean as the heartland of Early Byzantine art. Cf. more recently Ousterhout 2019, 101. 104. 130.

⁸ Deichmann 1972; Niewöhner 2023b.

⁹ For some examples, see Niewöhner 2021, 66 fig. 167 (on composite capitals like fig. 1); 69 fig. 21. 174. 175 (on Theodosian capitals like fig. 2); 70 fig. 177. 178 (on wind-blown capitals like fig. 3); 72 fig. 124. 127. 183–185 (on double leaves like fig. 4); 77 fig. 200 (on capitals with two zones like fig. 5).



1



2



3



4



5

Fig. 1: Composite column capital with fine-toothed leaves. H > 47, Ø < 47, abacus 60 × 60. Tugay Anadolu Kültür Sanat ve Arkeoloji Müzesi inv. E28 = A_15330. Acquired in 2004 from Gecek Köyü in Altıntaş İlçesi. Broken at the bottom. The top was later hollowed out in order to serve as basin for a Turkish fountain

Fig. 2: Theodosian column capital. H 55, Ø 42, W 65. Vacidiye Medrese inv. A_25618. Acquired in 2018 from Gecek Köyü in Altıntaş İlçesi, together with the middle Byzantine barrier slab Fig. 37

Fig. 3: Corinthian column capital with wind-blown fine-toothed leaves and opulent caules. H 52, Ø 44. Dumlupınar University inv. A_22818. Inventoried in 2017

Fig. 4: Medium-sized Corinthian column capital with double leaves. Vacidiye Medrese

Fig. 5: Medium-sized basket capital with two zones. Vacidiye Medrese

than one building with such exceptional parts. The combination of different composite and other capitals was not uncommon and appears to have been fashionable in Early Byzantine Anatolia, Constantinople, and the Balkans alike, where some of the finest buildings, including churches, employed similarly varied carvings¹⁰. The capitals from Gecek most likely belonged to a church, as churches were normally the only buildings that employed architectural sculpture in rural Anatolia¹¹. A Middle Byzantine barrier slab from Gecek that reached the museum together with the Theodosian capital may have come from the same church (fig. 37).

6 A Corinthian column capital combines wind-blown fine-toothed leaves with opulent caules (fig. 3) as is also attested at Nicaea/Iznik and at Thessaloniki, for example¹². Although caules were otherwise rarely carved any more in Byzantine times, they seem to have often and traditionally been associated with wind-blown fine-toothed leaves, e.g. a Late Roman column capital from Sidamaria/Ambar in Lycaonia¹³. On a different note, a badly mutilated basket capital with two zones preserves clearly recognizable remains of wickerwork in the lower zone (fig. 5), whereas the upper zone may possibly have had doves, as such are displayed on a similar basket capital that was recently excavated in the vicinity of Kütahya¹⁴.

7 The likeness of column capitals in central Anatolia, from Proconnesus/Constantinople, and in the central Balkans seems to have been brought about by three quarries and their related workshops, one in each region, Docimium in Phrygia, Pro-

¹⁰ Niewöhner 2021, 30.

¹¹ See below note 87.

¹² Mentzos 2001, 321–323 fig. 8; Barsanti 2003, 274 fig. 26. 27.

¹³ Mert – Niewöhner 2010, 396 f. cat. 8 fig. 21.

¹⁴ Altunkaynak Duğan – Ünan 2019, 38 fig. 9. For examples of other such capitals elsewhere, see Peschlow 1998, pl. 20, 13.

connesus/Marmara Adası near Constantinople, and Sivec in northern Macedonia¹⁵. The three quarries appear to have been closely related, possibly through the imperial estate that is known to have had stakes in Docimium and Proconnesus during the Roman period¹⁶. However, production from Sivec marble lapsed after the Huns and the Ostrogoth invaded the Balkans in the later 5th century, and central Anatolia is likewise poor in new 6th-century forms, which stand out at Constantinople and from Proconnesian marble. None of the many column capitals at Kütahya reflects any 6th-century development, and all of central Anatolia has yielded few 6th-century forms, the most notable exception being a couple of impost capitals with cornucopias, paired leaves, and imperial monograms¹⁷. Many other 6th-century innovations from Proconnesus/Constantinople seem not to have reached the Anatolian plateau, although they were shipped wherever possible across the Mediterranean Sea and informed provincial workshops in Lycia and Egypt, for example¹⁸. Docimium appears to have fallen out of step with Proconnesus in the 6th century, possibly due to a decline in major urban building projects, as shall be argued in the conclusion to this paper.

8 Lesser Anatolian churches that may still have been built in large numbers, including in rural settlements, were mainly equipped with local marbles that were more easily available and would be carved by local workshops with less quality and sophistication than the high-end products from Docimium¹⁹. Columns were most often crowned by Ionic impost capitals, and five new specimens at Kütahya show a wide spectrum of quality and decoration (fig. 6. 7. 8. 9. 10)²⁰. A sixth capital can be described as an impost capital with column drum (fig. 11), but may have been conceived as a reduced form of Ionic impost capital, as is suggested by Ionic impost capitals with similar decoration on the imposts in the older collection of the museum²¹ as well as by a comparable capital from Stobi in northern Macedonia, where the ›drum‹ is decorated with an egg-and-dart²².

9 The Ionic impost capitals were likely combined with simplified column bases that had become general standard in the Byzantine period and were also made from local marbles (fig. 12. 13. 14). One of three newly acquired bases is carved more precisely than the other two, including a chisel-draft around the upper edge (fig. 12)²³, which confirms that simplified column bases were considered finished end-products in the Byzantine period, although they had once started out as semi-finished workpieces of Attic bases²⁴. Mullions could employ even more basic forms, were often carved from one piece, including base and capital, and mostly employed in arched windows (fig. 15. 16. 17. 18)²⁵. Mullions were a lot easier to carve than columns, as even a rough, uneven, and faceted surface was sufficient to evoke the idea of a precisely rounded shaft (fig. 18). A larger mullion shaft was carved from a decorative polychrome breccia, separate from base and capital (fig. 19), and might have belonged to a tall window, for example in the apse (cf. fig. 23). A column shaft with a cross in high relief required extra work and

15 Niewöhner 2021, 20. 38. 54.

16 Fant 1989; Fant 1993, 157–160 (Docimium). 164 f. (Proconnesus); Drew-Bear 1994; Hirt 2010, 291–307. 318–323.

17 Niewöhner 2007, 126 f.; Niewöhner 2021, 108. 114.

18 Peschlow 1998; Severin 1998.

19 Niewöhner 2007.

20 Fig. 8 has a close parallel in the older collection of the museum: Niewöhner 2006, 431 cat. 18 fig. 11.

21 Niewöhner 2006, 432 f. cat. 20 f. fig. 13 f.

22 Audley-Miller et al. 2013, 133 f. cat. 39.

23 For another such base with chisel-draft at a village half-way between Kütahya and Aezani, see Niewöhner 2007, 202–204 cat. 12 fig. 22 pl. 1.

24 Kramer 1970.

25 Niewöhner 2021, 122.



6



7



8



9



10



11

Fig. 6: Ionic impost capital. H 26, W 51, D 57. Vacidiye Medrese inv. A_22854. Inventoried in 2017. Broken at the upper left corner. The top was later hollowed out and pierced by two holes, apparently in order to serve as basin

Fig. 7: Ionic impost capital. Dumlupınar University

Fig. 8: Ionic impost capital with egg and pointed leaflets on the echinus and a cross on the impost. H 28, W 48, D 75. Dumlupınar University inv. A_22799. Acquired on 15.05.1997 from a building site on Hamam Street in İstiklal Mahallesi at Altıntaş. Until 2010 at Altıntaş Open Air Museum inv. 38

Fig. 9: Ionic impost capital with lozenge and ivy leaves on the echinus and cross on the impost. Ø 33, D 70. Dumlupınar University inv. A_22795. Until 2010 at Altıntaş Open Air Museum

Fig. 10: Ionic impost capital with many-pointed foliage. H 34, D 64. Dumlupınar University inv. A_22801. Acquired in 1998 from Yayla Köyü in Altıntaş İlçesi. Until 2010 at Altıntaş Open Air Museum inv. 40

Fig. 11: Impost capital with column drum, cross, and pointed foliage. W 69, D 85. Dumlupınar University inv. A_22766. Until 2010 at Altıntaş Open Air Museum inv. 1

is thus indicative of higher ambition and achievement (fig. 20)²⁶. A wide corbel has the traditional shape of a volute, in addition to which it is also decorated with a cross (fig. 21).

Early Byzantine Regionalism

Two more capitals, one for a column (fig. 22), the other for a mullion (fig. 23), are fluted, a form of decoration that was most common in Byzantine Asia Minor and relatively rare in other parts of the oecumene²⁷. Fluting had a long ancient tradition in Asia Minor and remained in fashion throughout the Early Byzantine period and beyond, for example the 7th-century chapel of the episcopal palace at Miletus and the 9th-century church of St Clement at Ankara, both of which applied fluting to capitals as well as architraves and cornices²⁸. In the case of the mullion capital at Kütahya, the fluting of the long sides is interrupted by a boss for the seamless attachment of window frames (fig. 23). In addition, one end of the mullion capital stands out for a fine kantharos vase

26 Cf. for example Ötügen 1996, 138. The column shaft in fig. 20 is already listed, but not illustrated, as Niewöhner 2006, 427 cat. 8. See also Drew-Bear 2007, 368,

27 Aşık 2020, 190–204; Niewöhner 2021, 45; Mitchell et al. 2021, 200–204.

28 Peschlow 2015, 213–216; Niewöhner 2016, 44. 169 cat. MK63; 173–177 cat. MK83–97; 178 f. cat. MK105. 106; 180–184 cat. MK115–137.



12



13



14

Fig. 12: Simplified column base with chisel-draft. H 25, W 45. Vacidiye Medrese inv. A_22750. Inventoried in 2017

Fig. 13: Simplified column base. H 30, W 61. Vacidiye Medrese inv. A_22848. Inventoried in 2017

Fig. 14: Simplified column base with lateral groove. H 26, W 50. Vacidiye Medrese inv. A_22734. Inventoried in 2017

Fig. 15: Mullion drum with reduced Attic base. Şengül Hamamı and Geological Collection

Fig. 16: Mullion with reduced Attic base. H 123, W 12, D 59. Dumlupınar University inv. A_22802. Acquired in 1998 from Yayla Köyü in Altıntaş İlçesi. Until 2010 at Altıntaş Open Air Museum inv. 41

Fig. 17: Mullion with simplified base. Limestone. H 138, D 62. Dumlupınar University inv. A_22809. Until 2010 at Altıntaş Open Air Museum inv. 53

Fig. 18: Mullion with schematic capital. H 121, W 10, D 34. Dumlupınar University inv. A_22812. Until 2010 at Altıntaş Open Air Museum



15



16



17



18



19



20



21



22



23



24

Fig. 19: Polychrome mullion shaft. H 141, W 22, D 65. Dumlupınar University inv. A_22772. Acquired in 1992. Until 2010 at Altıntaş Open Air Museum inv. 9

Fig. 20: Column shaft with cross. H > 140, Ø 44. Tugay Anadolu Kültür Sanat ve Arkeoloji Müzesi inv. 6573. Found near Kemer Hamamı

Fig. 21: Corbel with volute and cross. H 20, L > 68, W 41. Tugay Anadolu Kültür Sanat ve Arkeoloji Müzesi inv. E97 = A_15371. Acquired in 2006 from Aslanapa İlçesi together with the barrier slab Fig. 36. Broken at the back

Fig. 22: Fluted column capital. Vacidiye Medrese

Fig. 23: Mullion capital with a kantharos vase in the shape of a chalice, a vine, a cross, paired doves, fluting, and an ivy scroll on top. The long sides are each halved by a boss for the seamless attachment of a window frame. Vacidiye Medrese

Fig. 24: Octagonal press weight with rounded corners, central rotating pan inside a square recession, flanking dovetailed sockets, and cross, H. 70, Ø ca. 100. Şengül Hamamı and Geological Collection

in the shape of a chalice, with a cross, a pair of doves, and a vine. The motives were common on Early Byzantine capitals, including a closely comparable mullion capital at nearby Tavşanlı²⁹, their Christian associations suggest a church, and the large size of the mullion points to the window of the apse. Compare similarly rich decoration of mullion capitals that belong to apse windows elsewhere, including a specimen in a village half-way between Kütahya and Aezani/Çavdarhisar³⁰.

11 An octagonal weight belonged to a press for oil or wine (fig. 24), and its Christian decoration with a cross represents a typical Anatolian feature³¹. Elsewhere, such press-weights were not decorated, let alone with Christian motives. A roof-shaped sarcophagus lid with a cross in the pediment appears special (fig. 25), because sarcophagi are rare in the Kütahya region. Funerary customs were local and varied greatly, with numerous Christian sarcophagi in some areas, notably in the southern provinces of Lycia and Cilicia³², whereas other places are chiefly known for Christian grave stones, for example Ankara and Hattuşa/Boğazköy in Galatia³³. Around Kütahya, sarcophagi were exceptional already in the Roman period (but note fig. 42. 43), when most graves

29 Tavşanlı: MAMA IX, 172 cat. 561b pl. 46. For other examples, see Niewöhner 2021, fig. 212. 278–280. 286.

30 For the latter, see Niewöhner 2007, 225. 229 cat. 188 fig. 46 pl. 20. For some examples of other richly-decorated mullion capitals belonging to apse windows, see for example Niewöhner 2021, fig. 186. 469.

31 Aşık 2020, 253–256. Cf. Mitchell et al. 2021, 204–217; Ohlshausen – Sauer 2023, 48–54.

32 İşler 2016; Deckers – Koch 2018; Cubas Díaz 2021.

33 Bittel 1975; French – Mitchell 2019; Krüger 2021.

were marked by pagan door stones or early Christian stelae³⁴. A few Roman sarcophagi of Docimian marble count among the most exquisite regional monuments of their age and were made for highly distinguished burials³⁵. In contrast, the Christian lid is clearly of local marble and workmanship, but as a local rarity, the sarcophagus may still have served to single out a prominent burial, for example a high ranking cleric, as clerics are particularly numerous among Christian sarcophagus burials in general³⁶.

¹² A fragmented slab shows two quadrupeds that face each other across a central cross, the left one larger and therefore maybe male, the right one smaller (fig. 26). Both animals are open-mouthed, with their tongues sticking out, which would seem to identify them as lions³⁷, but their feet appear to be cloven-hoofed as with sheep (cf. fig. 35); lions were commonly rendered with large claws (cf. fig. 41). The combination of a cross and a flanking pair of sheep was omnipresent in early Christian iconography³⁸; pairs of lions were relatively more common in the Middle Byzantine period³⁹. However, in the case of the slab at Kütahya, inferior local workmanship obscures the date as much as the iconography. The relief is shallow and the surfaces rough.

¹³ In case of an Early Byzantine date, the fragmented slab fig. 26 might once have been part of a baptismal font. At a village near Aezani, a similarly sized relief of two sheep (?), a horned ram to the left and a ewe to the right of a central cross medallion, decorates a rectangular basin that appears to be a baptismal font⁴⁰; the basin is too short for a sarcophagus, the lower part is unhewn and was to be inserted into the ground, and the interior is tub-shaped, with rounded corners as well as a drain, all of which are typical features of monolithic fonts that were common in baptisteries of Asia Minor and Constantinople⁴¹, but rare elsewhere⁴². A second basin with similar technical features as well as several crosses at Tavşanlı, a western neighbour of Kütahya and Aezani, bears an inscription that refers to Psalm 28, 3 and leaves no doubt as to the function as baptismal font⁴³. A decoration with crosses and paired animals, in particular with sheep, is attested on a monolithic baptismal font at Türkmen Köy in the vicinity of Amorium, also in Phrygia, as well as further east on the Anatolian plateau⁴⁴.

¹⁴ A different kind of tub-shaped basin is lower and more narrow than baptismal fonts and sarcophagi, decorated with compass flowers, and roughly hollowed out at one end, apparently in order to be attached to a column (fig. 27)⁴⁵. The basin could have been placed in an intercolumniation of a colonnaded street and served as one of the many public fountains that were typical of Early Byzantine urbanism in Asia Minor⁴⁶. At a fountain, a low basin would have been more accessible and made it easier to fill and lift containers with water. Compare a similarly low basin with compass flower in

³⁴ MAMA X; Kelp 2015.

³⁵ Türktüzün 1993.

³⁶ Peschlow 2016; Deckers – Koch 2018, cat. 184. 212. 246. 248. 294. 302. 309. 319. 340.

³⁷ Cf. Grabar 1976, cat. 93. 100. 152 (Middle Byzantine); Firath 1990, cat. 49. 306 (Early Byzantine). 323. 325. 338 (Middle Byzantine).

³⁸ See below, notes 40 and 44, as well as Herdejürgen – Kollwitz 1979, 140–148.

³⁹ See above, note 37 as well as, at the Archaeological Museum Kütahya, Niewöhner 2008, cat. 11. 47 (Middle Byzantine).

⁴⁰ Niewöhner 2007, 263 cat. 334 pl. 37. A more recent interpretation as sarcophagus does not account for the functional features of the basin and seems unlikely: Deckers – Koch 2018, cat. 241.

⁴¹ Aşık 2020, 249–253; Niewöhner 2021, 163.

⁴² Ristow 2023.

⁴³ Koçabaş et al. 2023, 80 f. fig. 43. 44.

⁴⁴ Türkmen Köy: MAMA VII, 67 cat. 300 pl. 18. 19; Lightfoot 2017, 66 cat. 178. Eastern Anatolia: Strzygowski 1918, 242. 336 fig. 383. Numerous more examples have the paired animals flanking a central vase or fountain instead of a cross, probably in reference to the water of baptism.

⁴⁵ Aşık 2020, 257–260.

⁴⁶ Richard 2016.



25



26



27



28



29

Fig. 25: Roof-shaped sarcophagus lid with acroterium and a cross in the pediment. H 28, W (broken) 68. Vacidiye Medrese inv. A_22847. Inventoried in 2017

Fig. 26: Fragmented slab with cross and flanking quadrupeds. The animals appear to be cloven-hoofed(?), with their tongues sticking out, the left one larger than the one to the right. Vacidiye Medrese inv. A_15388. Acquired in 2012 from Altıntaş İlçesi

Fig. 27: Tub-shaped basin with a straight front and three compass flowers, the right side hollowed out for attachment to a column, H 42, L (broken) 133, W 54. Şengül Hamamı and Geological Collection

Fig. 28: Flanking ambo slab with champlévé, including a deer, a bird, as well as various plants and ornaments. H 152, L 79, Th 8. Vacidiye Medrese inv. A_21611. Inventoried in 2016

Fig. 29: Polygonal ambo platform with semi-cylindrical moulding and 'ear' on the right side, broken on the left. L 107, W 105. Tugay Anadolu Kültür Sanat ve Arkeoloji Müzesi inv. E87 = A_15362. Acquired in 2006 from Altıntaş İlçesi

the territory of Aezani⁴⁷; it has two compartments on the inside and can thus not have served as baptismal font or sarcophagus, but conceivably as fountain⁴⁸.

¹⁵ Liturgical furnishings and in particular ambos were made and looked differently in various parts of the Early Byzantine empire, for example Constantinopolitan ambos from Proconnesian marble, Carian ambos in southwestern Asia Minor, Macedonian ambos, and Adriatic ambos⁴⁹. Central Anatolia had its own kind of ambo that is known from a few outstanding carvings of Docimian marble as well as from numerous mediocre specimens of local marbles and workmanship⁵⁰. The latter are simplified versions of Docimian showpieces; Docimium seems to have set the example, and imitation by local workshops can explain how one particular type of ambo became standard in the region. A good example is provided by a slab that flanked and hid the stairs as well as serving as banister (fig. 28). The overall layout is owed to the example of Docimian slabs with openwork in the upper, trapezoid panel that served as banister,

⁴⁷ Niewöhner 2007, 267 f. cat. 349 pl. 40.

⁴⁸ A more recent interpretation as sarcophagus seems unlikely: Deckers – Koch 2018, cat. 243.

⁴⁹ Niewöhner 2021, 140 f. 148.

⁵⁰ Niewöhner 2021, 145.

whereas the lower triangle hid the stairs⁵¹. The champlévé decoration with animals, plants, and geometric ornaments also imitates Docimian carvings that employed such champlévé like a trade mark on various items of liturgical furnishings⁵². However, original Docimian products used champlévé mostly as small additional decoration on the framework, whereas larger animals in the main panels are carved in high relief. Moreover, the slab at Kütahya is lacking in precision as well as in variety and is thus clearly an imitation product of a second-rate local workshop.

¹⁶ A polygonal ambo platform has an entablature that includes a thick semi-cylindrical moulding above four fasciae (fig. 29). An ambo platform from the vicinity of Aezani employs a similar moulding⁵³, at Proconnesus/Constantinople, such mouldings became fashionable in the Justinianic period⁵⁴, and the Anatolian carvings may thus be attributed to the same time. At Kütahya, the entablature ends in a round protrusion or 'ear' that is particular to central Anatolian ambo platforms. The 'ear' widens the narrow end of the platform, where the stairs attached, and contains a slot for the slab that flanked the stairs, thus connecting the different marble parts of the ambo and holding them in place⁵⁵. Whereas the 'ears' of other Anatolian platforms as well as the hollow bottoms, which reduce weight, are carved with ornaments, the specimen at Kütahya is unusually plain. In contrast, a supporting ambo slab that hid the back of the stairs and carried the platform is carved with as much detail and as well as possible, considering the mediocre quality of the local marble (fig. 30)⁵⁶.

¹⁷ A low post with soffit, knob, and slot has reached the museum from the site of a rescue excavation at Tokul village (fig. 31). The excavated building turned out to be an Early Byzantine columnar basilica with Ionic impost capitals, a high templon screen, an ambo, a monolithic baptismal font, and a triconch annex chapel to the northeast⁵⁷. Later, the original columns were replaced by piers. The high templon screen employed large posts with colonnettes, and the low post at the museum may have been part of the ambo. The post could have stood at the lower end of the stairs and held a flanking slab in place, or it could have formed part of the parapet on top of the platform⁵⁸.

¹⁸ A larger post with soffits on two opposite sides and an Attic base for a colonnette was likely part of a high templon screen (fig. 32). Such templa were standard in central Anatolia⁵⁹, and the older collection of the museum contains a similar post⁶⁰. No find spot has been recorded, but the fact that two such large, unwieldy, and not particularly precious or otherwise desirable items arrived at the museum independently of each other and at different times could suggest a local origin from the city of Kütahya, i.e. from its Early Byzantine predecessor Cotyaeum. Another, smaller post is peculiar in so far as one side is carved with an oval instead of the customary soffit (fig. 33).

¹⁹ A small Corinthian column capital also belongs in this context (fig. 34), because it was probably part of the liturgical furnishings, most likely a high templon screen, and because it is typical for central Anatolia. Elsewhere, notably at Proconnesus/Constantinople, such a small capital would normally be carved together with

⁵¹ For a fine Docimian openwork slab in the older collection of the museum, inv. 53, see Niewöhner 2006, 464 f. cat. 102 fig. 63. 64.

⁵² Niewöhner 2021, 147.

⁵³ Niewöhner 2007, 255–257 cat. 317 fig. 115 pl. 33.

⁵⁴ Niewöhner 2021, 126.

⁵⁵ Niewöhner 2021, 144 f.

⁵⁶ For other such supporting ambo slabs, see Niewöhner 2021, 146.

⁵⁷ Akduğan et al. 2013.

⁵⁸ For some examples, see Niewöhner 2021, 140. 145.

⁵⁹ Niewöhner 2021, 150.

⁶⁰ Inv. 27: Niewöhner 2006, 440 cat. 49; Niewöhner 2021, 128 fig. 341 (left).



30



31



32



33

the colonnette and often also the post from a single piece of marble⁶¹. In central Anatolia, numerous small capitals are separate, made to the highest standard, and consist of fine white marble from Docimium, which is surely also the case with the museum piece under consideration here⁶². In contrast, posts and colonnettes are mostly of local marble and workmanship⁶³. This made sense, as the relatively simple soffit-decoration of the posts could be executed locally to a satisfactory standard, whereas buying and bringing these large and heavy items from Docimium would have been expensive and difficult. The small capitals, on the other hand, were available only from Docimium, as no local marble and workshop were up to the fine-toothed leaves and deeply undercut ornamentation. Small Docimian capitals have been found in remote villages, for example in the mountains south of Kütahya and around Aezani⁶⁴, where they would have crowned otherwise locally made templon screens and thus enabled rural communities to participate in the highest standard of church building and decoration at relatively little cost.

20 Two barrier slabs are made of local marbles and betray local workmanship in so far as their decoration does not replicate standard patterns. One slab has an outstandingly deep relief and includes a moulded base as well as a handrail that were otherwise often omitted or made of separate parts (fig. 35)⁶⁵. The figural relief is limited to a medallion (rather than the more common wreath), with much empty space on the outside, which was uncommon in Early Byzantine carvings that tended to be crowded, for example the champlévé that fills all available space on some marbles (cf. fig. 28).

Fig. 30: Supporting ambo slab. H 130, L 68, Th 13. Vacidiye Medrese inv. A_10893. Acquired in 2007 from the garden of a house next to the Şengül Hamamı and Geological Collection

Fig. 31: Post with soffit, knob, and slot. H 110, L 20, W 20. Vacidiye Medrese inv. A_22841. Acquired in 2012 from the rescue excavation of a Byzantine church at Tokul Köyü

Fig. 32: Post with soffits on two opposite sides, a central boss on the third side, a central slot on the fourth side (not visible in this picture), and an Attic column base on top. H 104, L 29, W 29. Vacidiye Medrese inv. A_22852. Inventoried in 2017

Fig. 33: Post with soffit and oval. H 86, L 43, W 34. Vacidiye Medrese inv. A_15277. Acquired in 2010 from Gediz

61 Deichmann 1969–1989, I, fig. 72–76; II, 2, p. 114 f.; Terry 1988, 33–35. 39–43 cat. 27–38 fig. 88–106; Peschlow 1990–1991; Duval et al. 1994, 195–234.

62 Cf. several specimens in the old museum collection, inv. 39. 46. 687, see Niewöhner 2006, 462 f. cat. 96–100 fig. 59. 60.

63 For example in and around Aezani: Niewöhner 2007, 233–249 cat. 228–290 fig. 64–97 pl. 26–29.

64 Now also at the Kütahya Museum, inv. 854. 7653. 8525, see Niewöhner 2007, 271 cat. 363–365 pl. 42.

65 For rare slabs with animals and similarly deep relief, see Ulbert 1969/70, 339–342. For some examples of separate bases and handrails from Aezani, see Niewöhner 2007, 251 f. cat. 301–304 fig. 105–108 pl. 30.



34

Fig. 34: Small Corinthian column capital with fine-toothed leaves and cross in wreath. Vacidiye Medrese



35

Fig. 35: Barrier slab with ram and tree inside a medallion, moulded base, and handrail. H 73, L (broken) 85, Th 9. Vacidiye Medrese inv. A_22171. Acquired in 2014 from Gövem Köyü



36

Fig. 36: Barrier slab with lozenge and cross. H > 51, W 53, Th 8. Tugay Anadolu Kültür Sanat ve Arkeoloji Müzesi inv. E88 = A_15363. Acquired in 2006 from Aslanapa İlçesi together with the corbel fig. 21. Broken above. Bottom left and right corners broken off

However, the slab's image of a sheep in front of a tree was common in the period, e.g. on sarcophagi and mosaic floors⁶⁶. The second slab displays a lozenge with a cross (fig. 36), which was a common motive, but the execution does not comply with what was customary at Docimium or Proconnesus, where the lozenge would be rounded in profile and terminate in plants⁶⁷.

Middle Byzantine Workshops

21 The Early Byzantine traditions came to an end during the Invasion period, when Persians and Arabs ravaged Asia Minor from the 7th to 9th centuries. Later marble carvings from the Middle Byzantine period are fewer in number, limited almost exclusively to liturgical furnishings, decorated differently, and appear to have followed other trajectories than in the Early Byzantine period. Three newly acquired barrier slabs can serve as examples (fig. 37. 38. 39). As a general rule, the relief is less deep and elaborate than in Early Byzantine times, but the patterns are more complex, typically on the basis of knotted interlace that forms concentric medallions, lozenges, and rectangles, often including roses and crosses⁶⁸. No two slabs are exactly alike, suggesting many different local workshops, but all employed roughly the same repertoire. The regionalism that characterised the Early Byzantine period is not in evidence any more, probably because Docimium (as well as Proconnesus) had stopped to function as dominant regional production centres that would be emulated by all local workshops and thus establish common regional styles and repertoires. The landed aristocrats, who appear to have been behind most later Byzantine church building in Anatolia⁶⁹, will have been oriented towards Constantinople rather than to various local cities and bishoprics, as the latter had lost most of their former standing.

66 E.g. Herdejürgen – Kollwitz 1979, 140–148. For numerous Anatolian examples of early Christian floor mosaics with various single animals in front of trees, see Niewöhner 2016, fig. 142. 143. 153; Lafli – Pataci 2019, fig. 106. 118. 120. 121. The mosaic floor of an Early Byzantine church at Simav includes a ram (without tree): Bakır et al. 2016, 188 fig. 23, 6.

67 For some examples, see Barsanti – Guiglia Guidobaldi 2004, 89–228. 315–474; Niewöhner 2007, 273–275 cat. 377 fig. 141 pl. 43; Niewöhner 2021, fig. 323. 422. 423.

68 See in general Niewöhner 2021, 158; Niewöhner 2023a, fig. 5–11. For more examples from the region of Kütahya, see Niewöhner 2008.

69 Howard-Johnston 2020. Mitchell 2023, 607–610 elaborates on the Constantinopolitan relations and describes middle Byzantine Phrygia as subordinate to, and »hinterland« of, the capital, but on p. 468–478 assumes somewhat contradictory that Phrygian urbanism did exceptionally well during the Middle Byzantine period, because numerous inscriptions attest to the renovation of urban churches. However, excavated examples such as Aezani show that Middle Byzantine renovations could amount to little and were not necessarily related to a civilian settlement of urban character; see Niewöhner 2023a.



37



38



39

22 Some of the same observations can be made with respect to Middle Byzantine templon epistyles⁷⁰, save a comparison with the Early Byzantine period, because few Early Byzantine templon epistyles have survived. Apparently, most Early Byzantine templon epistyles were made from wood and precious revetments that have disintegrated, burned, and probably also been robbed during the Invasion period. This can also explain why the number of Middle Byzantine marble epistyles exceeds that of other, related templon parts like posts, colonnetts, or capitals; marble epistyles needed to be newly made in order to replace lost wooden beams, while other parts that had been made from marble already in the Early Byzantine period survived the Invasion period, continued in use, and did not need to be replaced.

23 However, a templon epistyle, which was recently acquired from the city of Kütahya and may thus have belonged to a church of Cotyaeum, stands out because it does not employ typical Middle Byzantine features, but has a front that looks like an Early Byzantine cornice in the shape of a sima (fig. 40). This is hardly accidental, as the stepped base and the concave relief of the sima required considerable extra labour. The decoration with an ivy scroll is likewise comparable to Early Byzantine carvings, for example on top of the mullion capital fig. 23. The epistyle may thus conceivably date from the Early Byzantine period and count among the few known marble templon epistyles from before the Invasion period that are generally more sombre in style than Middle Byzantine carvings⁷¹. Alternatively, the epistyle in question could be an exceptional later Byzantine carving in Early Byzantine style, similar to an epistyle at Manisa in western Asia Minor that employs a sima in front and lozenges underneath, almost as if from the Early Byzantine period, but was made to measure for a later Byzantine verse inscription⁷². Thus, it does not (yet) seem possible to date the epistyle at Kütahya with any degree of certainty.

24 In contrast, a templon epistyle block from Simav/Synaüs⁷³ to the southwest of Kütahya (fig. 41. 42. 43) is so close to two other epistyle blocks in the older museum collection as to indicate the same workshop⁷⁴, particularly considering the general variety of Middle Byzantine carvings. The parallels include the vertical front, the twisted cord at the bottom of the front, the arcade with a profile or fasciae and with oblong,

Fig. 37: Long barrier slab, the left side with cross on a spike inside a concentric interlace medallion, square, lozenge, and outer square, with medallions in the spandrels; the right side with vertical interlace columns that include medallions and roses. H (broken) 35, L (broken) 68, Th 10. Vacidiye Medrese inv. A_25619. Acquired in 2018 from Gecek Köyü in Altıntaş İlçesi, together with the early Byzantine column capital fig. 2. The cross appears to have been partly erased, suggesting that the slab was re-used in Turkish times.

Fig. 38: Barrier slab with rose and interlace-medallion. H 50, L 50, Th 10. Dumlupınar University inv. A_22817. Acquired in 2011 from Örenköy in Aslanapa

Fig. 39: Narrow ambo parapet(?) slab with a central rose and concentric interlace medallion, lozenge, and rectangle, with medallions in the spandrels. H 70, Th 10. Dumlupınar University inv. A_22776. Until 2010 at Altıntaş Open Air Museum inv. 13

70 See in general Niewöhner 2021, 160, and for more examples from the region of Kütahya, Niewöhner 2008.

71 For some Early Byzantine examples, see Niewöhner 2017, 314–316 fig. 171 and note 162 with references to more.

72 Niewöhner 2008, 342 f. cat. 58 fig. 62. More generally on later Byzantine carvings that copied Early Byzantine styles, see Melvani 2018.

73 On ancient and Byzantine Synaüs, see Belke – Mersich 1990, 395 f.; MAMA X, xviii f. 115 f. 183; Altunkaynak Duğan et al. 2018; Mitchell 2023, 359.

74 For the other blocks, inv. 10045 f., see Niewöhner 2008, 335 f. cat. 47. 48. fig. 51. 52.



40



41



42

Fig. 40: Two blocks of a templon epistyle, the lower side with various crosses, roses, a bird, and a boss for a column capital, the front shaped like a *sima*, with a cross and an ivy scroll. The cross on the front corresponds with a large cross medallion on the lower side of the left block, and the symmetrical decoration on both sides of the cross medallion suggests that this block is complete and may have bridged the central door of the templon. H 18, L 140, W 32. Vacidiye Medrese inv. A_24246. Acquired by/from the Jandarma Komutanlığı of Hisarcık in Kütahya. Inventoried in 2017



43

Fig. 41: Templon epistyle with a twisted cord at the bottom, an arcade and trees on the left side, and a pair of lions on the right; the lions face each other across a spiral column, the left one with a mane and thus male, the right one without and thus presumably female. H 19, L 59, W 33. Vacidiye Medrese inv. A_15386. Acquired in 2002 from a private person in Simav

Fig. 42: Same templon epistyle as in the previous figure, seen from above. Imbrex and tegulae remain from the roof-shaped lid of an ancient sarcophagus that was re-used to carve the Byzantine templon epistyle

Fig. 43: Same templon epistyle as in the previous figures, seen from below. On the left side compass flowers, on the right a recess for the seamless attachment of a column capital

club-shaped forms in the spandrels, the spiral column with trapezoidal base and capital, and the flanking lions. The other blocks are from *Kilise-Orhaniye/Malos* in the Phrygian highlands, and in turn linked to three epistyles that may once have belonged to a three-partite sanctuary, but have been re-used to decorate the façade of a Turkish mausoleum or türbe at *Kümbet/Meros*, also in the Phrygian highlands, to the northeast of Kütahya. The epistyles at Kümbet share the same features as the museum pieces save the lions, but including the trees under the arcade⁷⁵. The Middle Byzantine workshop in question thus appears to have produced at least three templa at three distant places in Phrygia that are 100 and more kilometres apart. At *Simav*, the marble was sourced by re-carving the roof-shaped lid of an ancient sarcophagus. Such re-use of ancient parts was common in the Middle Byzantine period (cf. fig. 46), when most ancient quarries appear to have been abandoned.

⁷⁵ Niewöhner 2008, 292–294. 333–335 cat. 42–46 fig. 2. 46–50. On *Kilise-Orhaniye/Malos* and *Kümbet/Meros*, see most recently Mitchell 2023, 373–375.



44



45



46

25 Two blocks are decorated with scrolls of alternating half-palmettes (fig. 44, 45) that were sometimes employed on later Byzantine cornices and door frames⁷⁶. The museum pieces could thus also have belonged to door frames. Alternatively, one block with a lozenge on the lower side may conceivably have served as templon epistyle, as such decoration, including with scrolls of alternating half-palmettes⁷⁷, is also attested for Middle Byzantine templa.

26 A water spout with a stylised face and mane (fig. 46) represents a lion head in the tradition of numerous other lion-headed water spouts from the Middle Byzantine period⁷⁸. All of them roughly carved, the lion-headed spouts imply distant viewers and appear to have been placed at the roof line of domed churches that collected a lot of water in certain places, where it needed to be thrown off far enough to protect the walls from moisture. The lion heads continued the tradition of ancient water spouts and will have had a similar apotropaic meaning. All this seems to be confirmed by comparison to fountain heads with different, more varied as well as detailed decoration that required to be seen from close up and from above, and with pointed outlets that would help with collecting the water into containers. The water spout at Kütahya was carved from the fluted shaft of an ancient column, same as numerous other Middle Byzantine spouts. A similar water spout is attested at Çardaklı, south of Tavşanlı⁷⁹.

Fig. 44: Door lintel or templon epistyle (?), the lower side with lozenge and rose, the front with a scroll of alternating half-palmettes. H 14, L 60, W 47. Vacidiye Medrese inv. A_22756. Inventoried in 2017. A round hole suggests later re-use, possibly at a Turkish fountain.

Fig. 45: Door post (?) with a scroll of alternating half-palmettes. Tugay Anadolu Kültür Sanat ve Arkeoloji Müzesi

Fig. 46: Lion-headed water spout. H 35, L 77. Carved from a fluted column drum (Ø 39). Vacidiye Medrese inv. A_10617. Acquired in 2002 from Gövencer Mevkii in Domaniç, on the road to Aksu

Settlement History

27 The new finds from the city of Kütahya itself (fig. 30, 40) confirm the earlier observation that Cotyaeum did relatively well in the Byzantine period⁸⁰, at least as far as church buildings are concerned and in particular in comparison with the southern neighbour Aezani that had been more prosperous in Roman times, but appears to have

⁷⁶ For example Macridy 1964, fig. 51; Grabar 1976, pl. 70. 123; Drandakis 2002, fig. 70. 91. 95. 96. 230–232; Bouras 2010, 251 fig. 239.

⁷⁷ For some examples, see Drandakis 2002, passim; Niewöhner 2017, 322 fig. 182; Niewöhner 2021, fig. 409.

⁷⁸ Niewöhner 2021, 133.

⁷⁹ MAMA IX, 167 cat. 550a pl. 44.

⁸⁰ Cf. Aşık 2020.

fallen behind later on⁸¹. A new colonnaded street, which Aezani had built as late as the turn of the 5th century, was given up and collapsed in the early 6th century⁸², and the city's most prominent 6th-century church was housed inside a former bath building, thus rendering any new architectural sculpture superfluous⁸³. The case of Aezani appears to have been symptomatic of 6th-century urbanism in central Anatolia. Even the region's most important pilgrimage shrine at Germia in Galatia, where a 5th-century church had been built with fine Theodosian column capitals, made do with piers when the church was renovated in the 6th century, thus economizing on architectural sculpture⁸⁴. 6th-century Anatolia was generally poor in major building projects that employed large series of new column capitals, and the 6th-century production of architectural sculpture at Docimium may thus have declined due to lack of demand.

28 Numerous other museum pieces were brought from Altıntaş town, when a local open-air museum was disbanded in 2010 (fig. 8. 9. 10. 11. 16. 17. 18. 19. 39). The town of Altıntaş is not to be confused with a nearby village by the same name that continues the tradition of Early Byzantine Soa⁸⁵. Altıntaş town is not identified with an ancient polis, but is located beneath ancient marble quarries and some fortifications that have been attributed to later Byzantine times, in addition to which various marble carvings indicate Early Byzantine settlement activity (fig. 8)⁸⁶. Other pieces reached Kütahya from Altıntaş İlçesi or district, in particular from the Turkish villages of Yayla (fig. 10. 16) and Gecek (fig. 1. 2. 37), the latter probably from the same rural church.

29 The new acquisitions at Kütahya include more rural finds from Turkish villages elsewhere in the huge catchment area of the museum (fig. 31. 35. 38. 46), and a survey in the territory of Aezani, where it was possible to trace the actual find spots and identify them as Early Byzantine settlements, has confirmed that village finds are indeed indicative of local settlement activity (and have not normally been relocated from afar)⁸⁷. Thus, the many village finds lend support to the earlier observation that the Byzantine settlement pattern tended towards ruralisation and that the Early Byzantine countryside could collectively employ as many as and more marble carvings than cities.

30 The small number of Middle Byzantine finds may partly be explained with the re-use of Early Byzantine carvings and the smaller size of later churches, which normally required no more than four columns⁸⁸. Fewer Middle Byzantine carvings than in some other parts of central Anatolia may also be explained by less Arab destruction that necessitated fewer Middle Byzantine repairs, as Kütahya was reached by fewer raids than the regions further to the southeast⁸⁹. However, the survey in the territory of Aezani has shown that Middle Byzantine marbles are as unevenly distributed as they are rare⁹⁰. Considering that palynological evidence as well as general prosperity indicate continued land use in the Middle Byzantine period⁹¹, the scarcity of Middle Byzantine carvings cannot be taken to imply that large parts of the countryside became uninhabited. Apparently, new Middle Byzantine carvings were an exceptional expenditure, possibly depending on the whims of landed aristocrats, and thus not indicative of the general settlement pattern and activity any more.

81 Niewöhner 2006; Mitchell 2023, 361 f.

82 Rheidt 1995.

83 Niewöhner 2007, 143–145.

84 Niewöhner et al. 2013, 128 f.

85 Belke – Mersich 1990, 385; Mitchell 2023, 188.

86 Belke – Mersich 1990, 319; Niewöhner 2006, 414 f. 437 cat. 39 fig. 16. 17 (Museum Kütahya inv. 572).

87 Niewöhner 2007, 77 and passim; Mitchell 2023, 354–478.

88 Ousterhout 2019, 431–444.

89 Belke – Mersich 1990, 68; Niewöhner 2008, 311.

90 Niewöhner 2008, 306–308.

91 Demirel Gökalp 2017; Koder 2017; Roberts et al. 2018.

References

- Akduğan et al. 2013** S. Akduğan – S. Gürbüz – R. Karaca – M. Türktüzün, Tokul Köyü Kilise Kurtarma Kazısı ve Temizlik Çalışmaları, Kütahya Müzesi Yıllığı 1, 2013, 47–83
- Altunkaynak Duğan et al. 2018** S. Altunkaynak Duğan – O. Pekşen – S. Ünan, Simav Mozaikli Kilise Kurtarma Kazısı 2018, Kütahya Müzesi Yıllığı 6, 2018, 11–29
- Altunkaynak Duğan – Ünan 2019** S. Altunkaynak Duğan – S. Ünan, Örencik Mevkii Kilise Kurtarma Kazısı, Kütahya Müzesi Yıllığı 7, 2019, 17–41
- Audley-Miller et al. 2013** L. Audley-Miller – P. Niewöhner – W. Prochaska, Marbles, Quarries and Workshops on the Highlands of Northern Macedonia, AA 2013/1, 95–145
- Aşık 2020** M. Aşık, Kütahya Merkezde Bulunan Bizans Dönemi Taş Eserleri (Diss. Çanakkale Univ. 2020)
- Bakır et al. 2016** M. Bakır – F. Güzeladağ – M. Türktüzün, Simav Mozaikli Ev Kurtarma Kazısı, Kütahya Müzesi Yıllığı 4, 2016, 163–191
- Barsanti 2003** C. Barsanti, The Iznik-Nicaea's Archaeological Museum, in: I. Akbaygil – H. Inalcık – O. Aslanapa (eds.), Iznik throughout History (Istanbul 2003) 267–301
- Barsanti – Guiglia Guidobaldi 2004** C. Barsanti – A. Guiglia Guidobaldi, Santa Sofia di Costantinopoli. L'arredo marmoreo della grande chiesa giustiniana, Studi di antichità cristiana 60 (Rome 2004)
- Belke – Mersich 1990** K. Belke – N. Mersich, Phrygien und Pisidien, TIB 7 = DenkWien 211 (Vienna 1990)
- Bittel 1975** K. Bittel, Christliche und jüdische Grabsteine, in: Bittel et al. (eds.), Boğazköy 5. Funde aus den Grabungen 1970 und 1971 (Berlin 1975) 108–113
- Bouras 2010** Ch. Bouras, Βυζαντινή Αθήνα, 10ος–12ος αι., Μουσείο Μπενάκη suppl. 6 (Athens 2010)
- Cubas Díaz 2021** J. C. Cubas Díaz, Das Sepulkralwesen im Rauen Kilikien am Ende der Antike, AMS 98 (Bonn 2021)
- Deckers – Koch 2018** J. G. Deckers – G. Koch, Repertorium der christlich-antiken Sarkophage 5. Konstantinopel. Kleinasien – Thracia. Syria. Palaestina – Arabia (Wiesbaden 2018)
- Deichmann 1969–1989** F. W. Deichmann, Ravenna (Wiesbaden 1969–1989)
- Deichmann 1972** F. W. Deichmann, Rezension zu R. Krautheimer, Early Christian and Byzantine Architecture (Harmondsworth 1965), ByzZ 65, 1972, 102–123; Erwiderung auf die Erwiderung Krautheimers, ByzZ 65, 1972, 448–458
- Demirel Gökalp 2017** Z. Demirel Gökalp, Antik Phrygia'da Bizans Sikke Dolaşımı, Sanat Tarihi Dergisi 26/2, 2017, 379–393
- Drandakis 2002** N. V. Drandakis, Βυζαντινά Γλυπτά της Μάνης, Βιβλιοθήκη της εν Αθήναις Αρχαιολογικής Εταιρείας 222 (Athens 2002)
- Drew-Bear 1994** T. Drew-Bear, Nouvelles inscriptions de Dokimeion, MEFRA 106, 1994, 747–844
- Drew-Bear 2007** T. Drew-Bear, Ben Anadolu'da Doğdum, Tugay Anadolu Kültür, Sanat ve Arkeoloji Müzesi Yayınları 1 (Kütahya 2007)
- Duval et al. 1994** N. Duval – E. Marin – C. Metzger, Recherches archéologiques franco-croates à Salone I, Catalogue de la sculpture architecturale paléochrétienne de Salone, Salona 1 = CEFR 194 (Rome 1994)
- Fant 1989** J. C. Fant, Cavum antrum Phrygiae. The Organization and Operations of the Roman Imperial Marble Quarries in Phrygia, BARIntSer 482 (Oxford 1989)
- Fant 1993** J. C. Fant, Ideology, Gift, and Trade. A Distribution Model for the Roman Imperial Marbles, in: W. V. Harris (ed.), The Inscribed Economy. Production and Distribution in the Roman Empire in the Light of Instrumentum Domesticum. The Proceedings of a Conference Held at the American Academy in Rome on 10–11 January, 1992, JRA Suppl. 6 (Ann Arbor 1993) 145–170
- Foletti – Lovino 2018** I. Foletti – F. Lovino (eds.), Orient oder Rom? History and Reception of a Historiographical Myth (1901–1970), Studia artium mediaevalium Brunensia 7 (Brno 2018)
- Fıratlı 1990** N. Fıratlı, La sculpture byzantine figurée au Musée Archéologique d'Istanbul, Bibliothèque de l'Institut Français d'Études Anatoliennes d'Istanbul 30 (Paris 1990)
- French – Mitchell 2019** D. French – S. Mitchell, The Greek and Latin Inscriptions of Ankara (Ancyra) 2. Late Roman, Byzantine, and Other Texts, Vestigia 72 (Munich 2019)
- Grabar 1966** A. Grabar, Le premier art Chrétien (200–395), Univers des formes 9 (Paris 1966)
- Grabar 1976** A. Grabar, Sculptures byzantines du Moyen Age 2 (11^e–14^e siècle), Bibliothèque des Cahiers archéologiques 12 (Paris 1976)
- Herdejürgen – Kollwitz 1979** H. Herdejürgen – J. Kollwitz, Die Sarkophage der westlichen Gebiete des Imperium Romanum. Die ravenatischen Sarkophage, Die antiken Sarkophagreliefs 8, 2 (Berlin 1979)
- Hirt 2010** A. M. Hirt, Imperial Mines and Quarries in the Roman World. Organizational Aspects, 27 BC – AD 235, Oxford Classical Monographs (Oxford 2010)
- Howard-Johnston 2020** J. Howard-Johnston (ed.), Social Change in Town and Country in Eleventh-Century Byzantium, Oxford Studies in Byzantium (Oxford 2020)
- İşler 2016** B. İşler, Demre'nin Zeytin Mevkii'ndeki Erken Bizans Dönemi Lahitleri, Arkeoloji ve Sanat 153, 2016, 183–198
- Jäggi 2009** C. Jäggi, Die Frage nach dem Ursprung der christlichen Kunst. Die ›Orient oder Rom‹-Debatte im frühen 20. Jahrhundert, in: S. Heid (ed.), Giuseppe Wilpert archeologo Cristiano, Sussidi allo studio delle antichità cristiane 22 (Rome 2009), 231–248

Kelp 2015 U. Kelp, Grabdenkmal und lokale Identität. Ein Bild der Landschaft Phrygien in der römischen Kaiserzeit, AMS 74 (Bonn 2015)

Koçabaş et al. 2023 M. A. Koçabaş – S. Mitchell – P. Niewöhner, Filling in a Gap. Roman Votives and Gravestones as well as Early Byzantine Churches at Tavşanlı in Phrygia, *Anatolia antiqua* 31, 2023, 63–85

Koder 2017 J. Koder, Remarks on Trade and Economy in Eleventh-Century Asia Minor, in: B. Flusin – J.-C. Cheynet (eds.), *Autour du »Premier humanisme byzantin« et des »Cinq études sur le 11^e siècle«*, quarante ans après Paul Lemerle, *TravMem* 21, 2 (Paris 2017) 649–664

Kramer 1970 J. Kramer, Attische Säulenbasen des 5. und 6. Jahrhunderts n. Chr. und ihre Rohform, *BjB* 170, 1970, 271–278

Krautheimer 1965 R. Krautheimer, Early Christian and Byzantine Architecture, *Pelican History of Art* 24 (Harmondsworth 1965))

Krüger 2021 D. Krüger, Byzantinische Grabsteine und ein Bauglied aus der Umgebung von Boğazköy, *IstMitt* 71, 2021, 227–237

Laflı – Patacı 2019 E. Laflı – S. Patacı, Hadrianopolis 4. Early Byzantine Mosaics and Frescoes from Northwestern Central Turkey, *BARIntSer* 2928 (Oxford 2019)

Lightfoot 2017 C. S. Lightfoot, Amorium Reports 5. A Catalogue of Roman and Byzantine Stone Inscriptions from Amorium and Its Territory, together with Graffiti, Stamps, and Miscellanea (Istanbul 2017)

Macridy 1964 T. Macridy, The Monastery of Lips and the Burials of the Palaeologi, *DOP* 18, 1964, 253–277

MAMA VII W. M. Calder, Monuments from Eastern Phrygia, *MAMA VII* (Manchester 1956)

MAMA IX B. Levick – S. Mitchell – J. Potter – M. Waelkens, Monuments from the Aezanitis, *MAMA IX* = *JRS Monographs* 4 (London 1988)

MAMA X A. Cameron – C. W. M. Cox – J. Cullen – B. Levick, Monuments from the Upper Tembris Valley, Cotiaeum, Cadi, Synaus, Ancyra and Tiberiopolis, *MAMA X* = *JRS Monographs* 7 (London 1993)

Melvani 2018 N. Melvani, Late, Middle, and Early Byzantine Sculpture in Palaiologan Constantinople, in: I. Jevtić – S. Yalman (eds.), *Spolia Reincarnated. Afterlives of Objects, Materials, and Spaces in Anatolia from Antiquity to the Ottoman Era* (Istanbul 2018) 149–169

Mentzos 2001 A. Mentzos, Ο Γλυπτός Διάκοσμος της Αγίας Σοφίας στη Θεσσαλονίκη, in: K. K. Kalamartzi (ed.), *Αφιέρωμα στη Μνήμη του Σωτήρη Κίσσα* (Thessaloniki 2001) 315–334

Mert – Niewöhner 2010 I. H. Mert – P. Niewöhner, Blattkapitelle in Konya, *IstMitt* 60, 2010, 373–410

Mitchell 2023 S. Mitchell, The Christians of Phrygia from Rome to the Turkish Conquest, *Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity* 117 = *Early Christianity in Asia Minor* 4 (Leiden 2023)

Mitchell et al. 2021 S. Mitchell – P. Niewöhner – A. Vardar – L. E. Vardar, Church Building and Wine

Making East of Ankara. Regional Aspects of Central Anatolia in the Early Byzantine Period, *Gephyra* 21, 2021, 199–229

Niewöhner 2006 P. Niewöhner, Frühbyzantinische Steinmetzarbeiten in Kütahya. Zu Topographie, Steinmetzwesen und Siedlungsgeschichte einer zentralanatolischen Region, *IstMitt* 56, 2006, 407–473

Niewöhner 2007 P. Niewöhner, Aizanoi, Dokimion und Anatolien. Stadt und Land, Siedlungs- und Steinmetzwesen vom späteren 4. bis ins 6. Jh. n. Chr., Aizanoi 1 = AF 23 (Wiesbaden 2007)

Niewöhner 2008 P. Niewöhner, Mittelbyzantinische Templonanlagen aus Anatolien. Die Sammlung des Archäologischen Museums Kütahya und ihr Kontext, *IstMitt* 58, 2008, 285–345

Niewöhner et al. 2013 P. Niewöhner – Gülseren Dikilitaş – Ercan Erkul – Stefan Giese – Joachim Gorecki – Walter Prochaska – Deniz Sarı – Harald Stümpel – Ali Vardar – Alice Waldner – Andreas – Victor Walser – Heiko Woith, Bronze Age Hüyük, Iron Age Hill Top Forts, Roman Poleis, and Byzantine Pilgrimage in Germia and Its Vicinity. »Connectivity« and a Lack of »Definite Places« on the Central Anatolian High Plateau. *AnatSt* 63, 2013, 97–136, <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0066154613000069>

Niewöhner 2016 P. Niewöhner, Die byzantinischen Basiliken von Milet, *Milet* 1, 11 (Berlin 2016)

Niewöhner 2017 P. Niewöhner, The Decline and Afterlife of the Roman Entablature. The Collection of the Archaeological Museum Istanbul and other Byzantine Epistyles and Cornices from Constantinople, *IstMitt* 67, 2017, 237–328

Niewöhner 2021 P. Niewöhner, Byzantine Ornaments in Stone. Architectural Sculpture and Liturgical Furnishings (Berlin 2021)

Niewöhner 2023a P. Niewöhner, Not a Consumption Crisis. Diversity in Marble Carving, Ruralisation, and the Collapse of Urban Demand in Middle Byzantine Asia Minor, in: J. Vroom (ed.), *Feeding the Byzantine City. The Archaeology of Consumption in the Eastern Mediterranean (ca. 500–1500), Medieval and Post-Medieval Mediterranean Archaeology Series* 5 (Turnhout 2023) 171–194

Niewöhner 2023b P. Niewöhner, Diversity in Late Antique Christianity. The Cultural Turn, Provincial Archaeology, and Church Building, *ZAntChr* 37/3, 2023, 500–528

Ötügen 1996 Y. Ötügen, Forschungen im nordwestlichen Kleinasien. Antike und byzantinische Denkmäler in der Provinz Bursa, *IstMitt Suppl.* 41 (Tübingen 1996)

Ohlshausen – Sauer 2023 E. Ohlshausen – V. Sauer, Akklamationen aus Neoklaudiopolis (Vezirköprü/Samsun İli, Türkei). Mit Appendices zu christlichen Sarkophagen und zu dekorierten Pressgewichten, *Gephyra* 25, 2023, 29–68

Ousterhout 2019 R. Ousterhout, Eastern Medieval Architecture (New York 2019)

Ousterhout 2021 R. Ousterhout, Still a New Land for Art History, in: N. D. Kontogiannis – T. B. Uyar (eds.),

Space and Communities in Byzantine Anatolia, Papers from the Fifth International Sevgi Gönül Byzantine Studies Symposium, Koç University Press 257 (Istanbul 2021) 339–353

Peschlow 1990–1991 U. Peschlow, Zum Tempion in Konstantinopel, in: Αρμός. Τιμητικός Τόμος στον Καθηγητή Ν. Κ. Μουτσόπουλο (Thessaloniki 1990–1991) 1449–1475

Peschlow 1998 U. Peschlow, Tradition und Innovation. Kapitellskulptur in Lykien, in: S. Möllers – U. Peschlow (eds.), Spätantike und byzantinische Bauskulptur, Forschungen zur Kunstgeschichte und Christlichen Archäologie 19 (Stuttgart 1998) 67–76

Peschlow 2015 U. Peschlow, Ankara. Die bauarchäologischen Hinterlassenschaften aus römischer und byzantinischer Zeit (Vienna 2015)

Peschlow 2016 U. Peschlow, Heiligengrab, Kirche und Friedhof. Eine anonyme Verehrungsstätte in der antiken Nekropole, in: H. İşkan – D. Schuler – Ş. Aktaş (eds.), Patara. Lykiens Tor zur römischen Welt, Zaberns Bildbände zur Archäologie, Sonderbände der Antiken Welt (Darmstadt 2016) 134–137

Rheidt 1995 K. Rheidt, Aizanoi. Bericht über die Ausgrabungen und Untersuchungen 1992 und 1993, AA 1995, 693–718

Richard 2016 J. Richard, Where do We Go Now? The Archaeology of Monumental Fountains in the Roman and Early Byzantine East, in: B. Shilling – P. Stephenson (eds.), Fountains and Water Culture in Byzantium (Cambridge 2016) 13–35, <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781316226742.002>

Ristow 2023 RAC 31 (Stuttgart 2023) 1016–1030 s. v. Taufe II (S. Ristow)

Roberts et al. 2018 N. Roberts – M. Cassis – O. Doonan – W. Eastwood – H. Elton – J. Haldon – A. Izdebski – J. Newhard, Not the End of the World? Post-Classical Decline and Recovery in Rural Anatolia, Human Ecology 46, 2018, 313–330, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10745-018-9973-2>

Severin 1998 H.-G. Severin, Konstantinopler Bauskulptur und die Provinz Ägypten, in: S. Möllers – U. Peschlow (eds.), Spätantike und byzantinische Bauskulptur. Beiträge eines Symposions in Mainz, Februar 1994, Forschungen zur Kunstgeschichte und Christlichen Archäologie 19 (Stuttgart 1998) 93–104

Strzygowski 1901 J. Strzygowski, Orient oder Rom (Leipzig 1901. Reprint Erfurt 2018)

Strzygowski 1903 J. Strzygowski, Kleinasien. Ein Neuland der Kunstgeschichte (Leipzig 1903)

Strzygowski 1918 J. Strzygowski, Die Baukunst der Armenier und Europa. Ergebnisse einer vom Kunsthistorischen Institute der Universität Wien 1913 durchgeführten Forschungsreise (Vienna 1918)

Terry 1988 A. Terry, The Sculpture at the Cathedral of Eufrosius in Poreč, DOP 42, 1988, 13–64

Türktüzün 1993 M. Türktüzün, Zwei Säulensarkophage aus der Südwestnekropole von Aizanoi, AA 1993, 517–526

Ulbert 1969/70 T. Ulbert, Untersuchungen zu den byzantinischen Reliefplatten des 6. bis 8. Jahrhunderts, IstMitt 19/20, 1969/70, 339–357

Weigand 1923 E. Weigand, Die Orient-oder-Rom-Frage in der frühchristlichen Kunst, Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft 22, 1923, 233–256

ZUSAMMENFASSUNG

Von einer frühchristlichen Region zu mittelbyzantinischem Hinterland

Neue byzantinische Steinmetzarbeiten im Archäologischen Museum Kütahya

Philipp Niewöhner

Dieser Beitrag legt vier Dutzend byzantinische Steinmetzarbeiten vor, die das Archäologische Museum Kütahya in den letzten zwanzig Jahren seit der Publikation der älteren Bestände neu erworben hat. Bauskulptur stammt zumeist aus frühbyzantinischer Zeit, liturgisches Mobiliar auch aus der mittelbyzantinischen Epoche. Die Fundorte sind weit über das große Einzugsgebiet des Museums verstreut, aber die Stadt Kütahya und der Distrikt von Altıntaş bilden jeweils einen Cluster. Einige frühbyzantinische Arbeiten weisen überregionales Formenrepertoire auf, wie es auch aus anderen Teilen des Oströmischen Reichs bekannt ist. Andere Stücke und insbesondere das liturgische Mobiliar sind typisch anatolisch und bezeugen frühchristlichen Regionalismus. Letzterer überwog spätestens seit dem sechsten Jahrhundert, als überregionale Formen in Zentralanatolien selten wurden. Mit einem generellen Zusammenbruch in Folge der Perser- und Araberkriege ging dann auch die regionale Prägung verloren, und das mittelbyzantinische Steinmetzwesen richtete sich neu und möglicherweise mehr oder weniger direkt an Konstantinopel aus, so daß die vormals eigenständige Region jetzt als erweitertes Hinterland der Hauptstadt gelten kann.

SCHLAGWÖRTER

Altıntaş, Phrygien, liturgisches Mobiliar, Templon-epistyle, Spätantike

ÖZET

Erken Hristiyanlık Yöresinden Orta Bizans Hinterlandına

Kütahya Arkeoloji Müzesi'ndeki Taş Eserler

Philipp Niewöhner

Bu çalışmada, eski eserlerin yayınlanmasından bu yana geçen yirmi yıl içinde Kütahya Arkeoloji Müzesi tarafından yeni satın alınan dört düzine Bizans taş eseri ele alınmaktadır. Mimari heykeller, çoğunlukla Erken Bizans Dönemi, litürjik eşyalar ise Orta Bizans Dönemi'ne aittir. Eserler, müzenin sorumluluğundaki geniş alana dağılmış olmakla birlikte, Kütahya ve Altıntaş ilçesi birer grup oluşturmaktadır. Doğu Roma İmparatorluğu'nun diğer bölgelerinden de bilindiği gibi erken dönem Bizans eserlerinden bazıları, stil bakımından bölge dışı özelliklere sahiptir. Litürjik eşyalar başta olmak üzere diğer eserler Anadolu'ya özgüdür ve Erken Hristiyanlık evresindeki yerel özellikleri yansıtır. Bu evre, Orta Anadolu'da, bölge dışına ait formların seyrekleştiği – en geç – 6. yüzyıldan itibaren baskındır. Pers ve Arap savaşlarının bir sonucu olarak yaşanan genel çöküşle birlikte yerel nitelik de kaybolmuş ve Orta Bizans taş işçiliği yönünü yeniden belirlemiş ve muhtemelen az ya da çok doğrudan Konstantinopolis'e çevirmiştir. Buna göre eskiden bağımsız olan bölge artık başkentten genişlemiş hinterlandı olarak görülebilir.

ANAHTAR SÖZCÜKLER

Altıntaş, Phrygia, litürjik eşyalar, templon epistyl'i, Geç Antik Dönem

SOURCES OF ILLUSTRATIONS

Title page: Niewöhner 2021

Fig. 1: Niewöhner 2010

Fig. 2: Niewöhner 2021

Fig. 3: Niewöhner 2021

Fig. 4: Niewöhner 2021

Fig. 5: Niewöhner 2021

Fig. 6: Niewöhner 2021

Fig. 7: Niewöhner 2021

Fig. 8: Niewöhner 2021

Fig. 9: Niewöhner 2021

Fig. 10: Niewöhner 2002

Fig. 11: Niewöhner 2021

Fig. 12: Niewöhner 2021

Fig. 13: Niewöhner 2021

Fig. 14: Niewöhner 2021

Fig. 15: Niewöhner 2021

Fig. 16: Niewöhner 2021

Fig. 17: Niewöhner 2021

Fig. 18: Niewöhner 2021

Fig. 19: Niewöhner 2021

Fig. 20: Niewöhner 2010

Fig. 21: Niewöhner 2010

Fig. 22: Niewöhner 2021

Fig. 23: Niewöhner 2021

Fig. 24: Niewöhner 2021

Fig. 25: Niewöhner 2021

Fig. 26: Niewöhner 2021

Fig. 27: Niewöhner 2021

Fig. 28: Niewöhner 2021

Fig. 29: Niewöhner 2010

Fig. 30: Niewöhner 2021

Fig. 31: Niewöhner 2021

Fig. 32: Niewöhner 2021

Fig. 33: Niewöhner 2021

Fig. 34: Niewöhner 2021

Fig. 35: Niewöhner 2021

Fig. 36: Niewöhner 2010

Fig. 37: Niewöhner 2021

Fig. 38: Niewöhner 2021

Fig. 39: Niewöhner 2021

Fig. 40: Niewöhner 2021

Fig. 41: Niewöhner 2021

Fig. 42: Niewöhner 2021

Fig. 43: Niewöhner 2012

Fig. 44: Niewöhner 2021

Fig. 45: Niewöhner 2010

Fig. 46: Niewöhner 2021

ADDRESS

PD Dr. Philipp Niewöhner

Georg-August-Universität Göttingen

Christliche Archäologie und Byzantinische
Kunstgeschichte

Nikolausberger Weg 15

37073 Göttingen

Germany

PhilippNiewoehner@hotmail.com

ORCID-ID: <https://orcid.org/0009-0004-4564-8318>

METADATA

Titel/*Title*: Von einer frühchristlichen Region
zu mittelbyzantinischem Hinterland.

Neue byzantinische Steinmetzarbeiten im
Archäologischen Museum Kütahya/*From Early
Christian Region to Later Byzantine Hinterland. New
Byzantine Marbles in the Archaeological Museum
Kütahya*

Band/*Issue*: IstMitt 73, 2023

Bitte zitieren Sie diesen Beitrag folgenderweise/*Please cite the article as follows*: P. Niewöhner,

From Early Christian Region to Later Byzantine
Hinterland. New Byzantine Marbles in the

Archaeological Museum Kütahya, IstMitt 73, 2023,
§ 1–30, <https://doi.org/10.34780/mi0c-m4c5>

Copyright: Alle Rechte vorbehalten/*All rights
reserved*.

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.34780/mi0c-m4c5>

Schlagwörter/*Keywords*: Altıntaş, Phrygien,
liturgisches Mobiliar, Templonepistyle, Spätantike/
*Altıntaş, Phrygia, liturgical furnishings, templon
epistyles, Late Antiquity*

Bibliographischer Datensatz/*Bibliographic
reference*: [https://zenon.dainst.org/
Record/003056630](https://zenon.dainst.org/Record/003056630)