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Some Observations on a North-Syrian/Cilician Jug in the Antalya Museum

Erkan DÜNDAR

Classification and Distribution

The jug published in this article was brought to the Antalya Museum in 1999, as a consequence of the arrest of people involved in illegal excavation, the confiscation of this jug by the security services who brought it to the museum (Figs. 1a-e). The painted decoration of this trefoil mouthed and flat bottomed jug is quite attractive. The origin of some similar decorated painted pottery dating from the Middle Bronze Age (ca. 2100 – 1750 B.C.) is thought to have been in the region of North-Syria/Cilicia and the Amuq Valley. There is no common terminology for this group, and it has been described in different ways by previous researchers. There have been some different terminological descriptive terms for this material that has been frequently found in Northern Syria, Cilicia and in the Amuq Valley. Garstang used “Cilician Hittite”, “Cilician Painted Ware” or “Pre-Hittite” according to the material uncovered from the XI – IX levels at Mersin. Goldman described the finds from Tarsus as, “Bronze Age Painted Ware”, Smith described it as “Syrian Type” by dating this material to Middle Minoan I - II. Gjerstad used “Painted I Pottery” and “Handmade Painted Pottery”, Merrillees – Tubb, Wild-Wülker and than Matthiae used the description,
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1 Inv. no: 13-11-99; h: 40,2 cm.; body r: 40 cm.; rim r: 0,7 cm.; foot r: 11,2 cm.; bottom thickness: 1,5 / 2 cm.
2 Tubb 1981, 403, 405. For the MBA I group of Kenyon see; Merrillees - Tubb 1979, 226.
4 Garstang 1953, 213-214 Fig. 143, 2-5, 9 Fig. 148, 7, 9-10; Seton-Williams 1953, 57 note 1; Waechter et al. 1951, 196.
5 Goldman 1940, 63, Fig. 4; Goldman 1938, Fig. 5, 8-9.
6 S. Smith, “Middle Minoan I-II and Babylonian Chronology”, AIA 49.1, 1945, 5.
7 Gjerstad 1934, 155-203.
10 Matthiae 1989, 310.
"North-Syria/Cilician Jugs", Yener\textsuperscript{11} "Syrian – Cilician" ware, and Tubb\textsuperscript{12} termed this material, "Amuq/Cilician Ware". It can easily be understood that this material, classified under these different descriptive terms, is distributed in a region extending from Northern Syria to Mesopotamia, from the Amuq Valley to Cyprus and Cilicia and also to Kültepe lying beyond the Taurus Mts\textsuperscript{13}. So the term "North-Syria/Cilicia" has been employed in this paper.

The material can easily be determined from its style of painting and shapes employed. The pottery of this group that was decorated with geometrical and/or naturalistic elements patterned in panels, divided by vertical lines, can be seen in two main different shapes, open and closed. The open shaped forms are usually carinated and footed bowls with craters. The trefoil-mouthed jugs are the most common form of closed ware. On both shapes the friezes bordered by horizontal bands are also divided by vertical lines. The decoration of open shapes is usually very simple and mostly consists of empty panels. The simplest pattern to be employed is on friezes between panels of vertical lines\textsuperscript{14}. On closed vessels all of the decoration is on the belly and it is much richer than those on the open bowls. Some of the characteristic features of this decoration are: animals like goats and birds, stylized tree motifs under the handles, and some geometrical motifs such as butterfly triangles\textsuperscript{15}, ray and wave motives. On the most common form of closed ware, the trefoil-mouthed jugs, there is occasionally a hawk eye motive implying a bird's head\textsuperscript{16}.

This material contains a very specific common shape and even the undecorated pieces can be determined easily; but there is also a very large variety to the clay fabric textures and the colours employed. According to Tubb\textsuperscript{17}, this variety indicates the regional clay differences and so there is no possibility that all the vessels of this type were produced in one centre. The examples usually have a hard fabric, formed from a pink to light pink or brownish clay. The paint on them is reddish brown, sometimes brownish to black and has a tendency to split\textsuperscript{18}. Normally the decoration is monochrome but sometimes, in unusual cases, bichrome decoration also can be found\textsuperscript{19}.

North-Syria/Cilician Ware has been uncovered in several sites in the region as mentioned above. This material which is found particularly in Cilicia and the Amuq Valley in Anatolia, is also found at sites in both Inner and Northern Syria. This group is the most characteristic one in the painted pottery of Tell Atchana, levels XVII – VIII, of Woolley’s excavation\textsuperscript{20}, it is

\textsuperscript{11} Yener 2006, 39.
\textsuperscript{12} Tubb 1983, 50. Although Tubb indicates that this terminology is not the ideal one to describe this group of pottery, he uses this because Antioch and inner Cilicia are the main distribution area of this group of material see; Tubb 1981, 403.
\textsuperscript{13} Özgüç 1950, Pl. LX 327-328, 341.
\textsuperscript{14} Woolley 1955, Pl. XCI-XCII; Garstang 1953, Fig. 144 no. 2, 5, 8, 12, 15; M.- H. Gates, “Kinet Höyük 2003”, Newsletter of the Department of Archaeology and History of Art. Bilkent University Vol 3, 2004 Fig. 6.
\textsuperscript{15} Woolley 1955, 341; Merrillees - Tubb 1979, Pl. XXIV no. 5; Goldman 1956, Pl. 295: 859; Özgüç 1950, Fig. 327, 617; Garstang - Goldman 1947, Pl. 95 no. 6.
\textsuperscript{16} The examples of the eye motifs on the both side are common to several sites; Garstang 1953, Fig. 143 no. 2-5 Fig. 148, 10; Seton-Williams 1953, Fig. 3, 5; Goldman 1956, 173-174, Pl. 295 no. 859-860; Hrouda 1957, Taf. 11 no. 1, 8; Garstang - Goldman 1947, Pl. 96 no. 6-7; Matthiae 1989, Fig. 4; Tubb 1981, Fig. 230 no. 1; Tubb 1983, Fig. 1 no. 1; Margueron 1968, Fig. 1; du Buisson 1927, Fig. 47; Woolley 1955, Pl. LXXXV, a, Pl. LXXXX, b, Pl. XCI, a-b.
\textsuperscript{17} Tubb 1981, 403.
\textsuperscript{18} Tubb 1981, 403; Woolley 1953, 326.
\textsuperscript{19} Garstang 1953, Fig. 143 no. 5.
\textsuperscript{20} Woolley 1955, Pl. LXXXIV-LXXXV, XC-XCII; Yener 2006, Fig. 7.
also characteristic of the Gözlükule MBA levels\textsuperscript{31} and can be found in the XI – IX levels at Mersin\textsuperscript{23}. Also it is well represented from Kültepe II- IV\textsuperscript{23}, Tilmen Höyük III a-b\textsuperscript{24}, Kazanlı and Domuztepe\textsuperscript{25}, Alapinar and Yenice Höyük\textsuperscript{26}, Maltepe in Göksu Valley\textsuperscript{27}, Sakça Gözük\textsuperscript{28}, Tilbeshar\textsuperscript{29} and Kinet Höyük\textsuperscript{30}. According to the results of Gjerstad’s Cilician Survey, it is obvious that this group of material extends from Anatolia to Silifke\textsuperscript{31}. Also in Syria, the royal tombs of Ebla\textsuperscript{32}, Mishrife-Qatna\textsuperscript{33}, Kadesh\textsuperscript{34}, Ras el-Ain\textsuperscript{35} and the finds from the Tell Rifa’at Survey\textsuperscript{36} provide some good examples from this group. The most western example of this type of North-Syria/Cilicia pottery is an undamaged jug from Ayia Paraskevi on Cyprus\textsuperscript{37}. In addition to these finds from excavations and surveys, there are also some examples in several museum collections, such as: Aleppo\textsuperscript{38}, the Oxford Ashmolean\textsuperscript{39} and the Amsterdam Allard Pierson Museum\textsuperscript{40}.

This group of pottery can be dated from the stratigraphical evidence provided by the excavated sites. Although probably the earliest examples that have been found are from Kültepe Level IV (2100 B.C.)\textsuperscript{41} and the Transitional EBA III/MBA and the MBA levels of Gözlükule\textsuperscript{42}, the starting date for this material remains today in some doubt\textsuperscript{43}. Further,

\textsuperscript{21} Goldman 1956, Fig. 287, 291, 295, 297, 311 no. 882, 889 Fig. 369 no. 859-859, 865 Fig. 370, 372 no. 898 Fig. 374 no. 887, 888.
\textsuperscript{22} Garstang 1938, Pl. LXVI-LXVIII, LXXI.
\textsuperscript{23} Özgüz 1950, 84; Fig. 327=617, 331=595; Özgüz 1955, 452, Fig. 29. Özgüz suggests that this material which is not very common at Kültepe, would have been imported from Galicia or somewhere in central or western Syria; idem. 1950, 84. It is known that this style of pottery is missing after the first level of the colonisation age, Level II.; idem. 1955, 452. The pottery gathered from these levels of Kültepe are painted in a similar manner to Cappadocian painted Ware; Seton-Williams 1954, 131.
\textsuperscript{24} Alkim 1969, 286-287.
\textsuperscript{25} Seton-Williams 1954, 132 (There are no illustrations in this report).
\textsuperscript{26} Seton-Williams 1953, Fig 27, 47.
\textsuperscript{28} Wæchter et al. 1951, 196.
\textsuperscript{29} C. Kapinski, “Tilbeshar about the Early/Middle Bronze Age Transition”, KST 25/2. 2004, 467 ff. Fig. 3 upper right.
\textsuperscript{31} Gjerstad 1934, 155-203. For the numerous examples of this pottery type gathered during the surveys of Seton-Williams in Cilicia see; Seton-Williams 1954: 131-133.
\textsuperscript{32} Matthiae 1989, 303 ff.
\textsuperscript{33} du Buisson 1927, 16 Fig. 47. Pl. VIII 1-2 Pl. XI 1 Pl. XIII 1; R. du Mensil du Bussion, “Compte Rendu de la Quatrième Campagne de Fouilles à Mishrife-Qatna”, Syria 11, 1930, Pl. XXXI, 61.
\textsuperscript{34} Tubb 1981, 405.
\textsuperscript{35} J. Ory, “Excavations at Ras el-Ain, II”, QDAP 6, 1938 106 Pl. XXV.
\textsuperscript{36} Tubb 1981, 403 Fig. 230.
\textsuperscript{37} Merrillees - Tubb 1979, Pl. XXIV no. 1-2; Åström 1971, 12 Fig. 7.
\textsuperscript{38} Tubb 1983, Fig. 2.
\textsuperscript{39} Margueron 1968, Pl. XI.
\textsuperscript{40} Wild-Wülker 1977-78, Abb. 1-3.
\textsuperscript{41} Özgüz 1950, 84.
\textsuperscript{42} Goldman 1956, 39, 165 Fig. 287, 291, 295, 297, 311 no. 882, 889 Fig. 369 no. 859-859, 865 Fig. 370, 372 no. 898, Fig. 374, no. 887, 888. The chronological beginning of this ware is usually dated by the constant chronological points of these two settlements; Wild-Wülker 1977-78, 37-38.
\textsuperscript{43} For the ideas and suggestions see; Wild-Wülker 1977-78, 38 fn. 25-28.
both Seton-Williams⁴⁴ and Hrouda⁴⁵ suggest the 15th century B.C. as the *terminus post quem* for the production of this ceramic ware.

**Description**

The product of a well thrown fast potter’s wheel, Antalya Museum Inv. No. 13.11.99, forms the main subject of this paper. It is broken on its frontal part and has been restored and another broken piece from the trefoil large mouth has also been restored. The neck extending to the shoulder, carrying a light and concave line that enlarges again close to the shoulder, is narrow. The ovoid body, is connected to the shoulder by a slight bend, ending in a flat rounded foot. The single handle begins from just under the rim, extends slightly to the shoulder. On the left side of the body there is a slight deformation caused by the transportation of the vessel before firing and at the bottom there are some indications of cutting with a cord to detach the vessel from the wheel.

All of the decoration is upon the upper part of the belly. There are two horizontal bands that are separated by an irregular space between the shoulder and the neck (Fig. 6). On the upper band there are some irregular dots and upon the lower one there is a wave line. There are four panels, divided by vertical lines on the belly. The first panel contains two goats one standing behind the other, on the second, there are two birds standing in a similar manner and on the third panel there is a depiction of a single bird. On the fourth panel beneath the handle, there is a stylized tree branch. There is a horizontal line beneath these four panels that borders the decorated area. There are three lines under the tree branch in the fourth panel, which stretch down extending from the point above and splayed⁴⁶. There is a decoration of parallel lines on the handle. There are dots on the rim, an eye decorated like a semi circle (Figs. 1c-d, 5) and beneath this there are two lines starting from the handle and joining the line between the rim and the neck. Although the other side of the rim is not well preserved, it can be understood that there was another eye motive on this part of the vessel (Figs. 1d, 5). There is no decoration upon the neck.

The two goat figures on the front panel of the jug, attractive with their straight lines and strong configurations, are interesting (Fig. 2) These standing figures are depicted moving towards the right. The narrow bodies enlarge towards the hindquarters because of the long back legs. Although there are some hair-like horse manes on the long and thin necks, the horns, tails, genitals and beards indicate that these are depictions of goats. The heads are not elaborate, and most unusually they have long noses just like bird beaks. The eyes are reserved areas and the pupils are depicted as dots of paint. The filling of the empty areas of the panel is quite interesting, in particular the zigzags hanging from the upper part of the panel are just like the horn, beard or tail lines of the goats. In addition to these lines, the tree branches in front and between the goats are also of interest. These stylized tree branches that are depicted parallel to the ground are drawn at the breast level of the goats and are decorated in double groups.

---

⁴⁴ Seton-Williams 1953, 64-65.
⁴⁵ Hrouda 1957, 28-30.
⁴⁶ There is no standardization of the lines mentioned above. For the other examples see; Matthiae 1989, Fig. 1-3; Merrillees - Tubb 1979, Fig. 2; Tubb 1983, Fig. 1 no. 2; Woolley 1955, Pl. XC. According to Matthiae these lines on the jugs are termed painted “tail”; Matthiae 1989, 311. But the existence of these lines on the caryated jugs in addition to the “bird headed” ones does not support this suggestion (Matthiae 1989, Fig. 6-7).
The compositions of the two side panels, one of which contains two and the other a single bird depiction, are very similar to the central one. The manner of depiction of the head of each of the birds are quite similar to the goats but the workmanship is more elaborate and realistic (Figs. 3-4). The legs and the outlines are thick and the wings drawn by the brush through leaving a reserving area of a rhombus-shape. The filling ornaments of the both bird panels are similar to the first panel. On the double bird panel, there are only the zigzags hanging from the upper part, but on the other panel, there are also the stylized tree branches.

Conclusion

The decoration of this jug matches compositions found on North-Syria/Cilician pottery. The arrival of this vessel in the Antalya Museum as a result of its confiscation from the finds from an illegal excavation makes it most difficult to determine the find spot, as also the possible production place of the jug, but its well preserved condition, except for the broken part on the rim, indicates a find from a grave. In general this example fashioned on a fast wheel exhibits first class workmanship, but it is impossible to determine from its shape the place of manufacture, as similar forms can be found at several of the sites mentioned above. The figures on the panels divided by vertical lines may be of assistance in determining the place of production. The goats on the frontal panel can be differentiated from similar examples from Mersin, Kültepe, Tell Atchana, Tell Judeidah, Ebla and Aleppo Museum by the hairs on the neck and the zigzag shaped horns, the genitals and breasts. Although there are no exact parallels of this representation, the closest examples to this manner of depiction come from Tell Atchana. Although the goat type seen on the piece recovered from Level XI is an “ibex”, not a wild goat with short horns, the “bird type” representation of the heads is quite similar to the Antalya example and the similarity in the filling ornaments also supporting this suggested place of production (Fig. 8).

Although the birds on the side panels are typical of North-Syria/Cilician pottery and parallels to them can be found on several examples, the filling ornaments are important in drawing distinctions between them. Except for the birds, the filling ornaments and the wavy lines inside the horizontal bands on the shoulder provide some important indications for the place of manufacture. The position of the birds and the hanging zigzags are very similar to the “local painted ware” of the Tell Atchana jug (Type 70) pieces (Figs. 8-10). Also the wavy lines inside the horizontal bands on the shoulder and the stylized

47 Garstang 1953, Fig. 143, no. 2.
48 Özgüç 1955, Fig. 29.
49 Woolley 1955, Pl. LXXXIVa, e, ATP/47/123, ATP/47/78, Pl. XC, ATP/47/174, Pl. XCI, ATP/47/108, Pl. XCII, ATP/47/72, Pl. XCIII, a, c-f, Pl. XCVIII, b-i.
50 Tubb 1983, Fig. 1, 1.
51 Matthiae 1989, Fig. 1-4.
52 Tubb 1983, Fig. 1, 2.
53 Woolley 1955, 309, 341-342, Pl. XCII.
54 For the bird representations see: Åström 1971, Fig. 7; Woolley 1955, Pl. LXXXIV, c, Pl. LXXXV, ATP/47/72, Pl XCI, ATP/47/109, Pl. XCII, ATP/47/72.
55 Woolley 1955, 326.
56 Woolley 1955, Pl. XCI.
tree branches supporting this localization (Figs. 7-10). The example investigated in this paper, due to the similarities in the style of painting and the type of the decoration, must have been produced in the same workshop as the Tell Atchana jugs. Due to the similarity in the compositions employed, this jug was produced in the same workshop but by a different painter as the Tell Atchana example illustrated in Fig. 8, and by the same painter who decorated Fig. 9. All of these comparative examples were produced in a local workshop and were uncovered in fragments in Tell Atchana Level XII. The well preserved example in the Antalya Museum provides an important example, indicating both the shape and decorative compositions of this group of fragments from Tell Atchana.

According to Woolley, Level XII of Tell Atchana is dated to 2700-2350 B.C. Woolley thought that the geometric decorated examples should be Chalcolithic, but recent investigation indicates they date to the beginning of the 2nd millennium B.C. Consequently scholars suggest that Levels XII – XI must be contemporary with Kültepe Ib and similar in date to the MBA levels of Ebla. From this a date of 1900 – 1800 B.C. seems a reasonable date for the Antalya Museum example.

The MBA levels of the sites in the region where North-Syria/Gilician ware has been uncovered are controversial (Tell Atchana XII and XI levels), and there is no commonly accepted date. So it must be understood that this example, due to its manner of arrival at the Antalya museum, not through legal excavation but through confiscation, and therefore lacking a dateable archaeological context, provides no help in respect to these arguments. The main aim of this paper was to add this uniquely preserved piece to the repertory of North-Syria/Gilician ware and because it is a well preserved example, it adds to our understanding of the fragmentary excavated examples that issued from this same workshop at Tell Atchana.

57 Woolley 1955, 380.
59 For the early 2nd millennium B.C. chronology see; P. M. M. G. Akkermans – G. M. Schwartz, The Archaeology of Syria: From Complex Hunter-gatherers to Early Urban Societies (ca. 16,000-300 BC) (2003) Fig. 9.2.
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Öz

Antalya Müzesi’nde Bulunan
Kuzey Suriye/Kilikya Surahisı Üzerine Bazı Gözlemler


Çalışma konusunu oluşturan ve Kuzey Suriye/Kilikya boyalı seramikler grubuna giren malzemenin ait olduğu Orta Bronz tabakaları (Tell Atchana XII ve XI. tabakaları) ve bunların tarihlendirmeleri söz konusu bölgedeki yerleşimlerde oldukça tartışmalıdır ve bu konuda ortak bir karara varılamamıştır. Bu doğrultuda, zoralım yoluyla Antalya Müzesi’ne getirilen eserin de söz konusu dönem tabakalarına ve stratigrafilerine bir açıklık getiremeyeceği bilinmelidir. Burada yapılan, ünike özellikleri ile heren fark edilen ve Kuzey Suriye/Kilikya seramikleri içerisine yerleştirilen bu eserin söz konusu seramik grubunun repertuarını zenginleştirdiği ve üretildiği yerleşim olan Aşana’da parçalar halinde temsil edilen aynı atolye ürünü örneklerine bir bütün olarak örneklik ettiği belgelendirilmesidir.
Fig. 8  Tell Atchana (Woolley 1955, Pl. XCII)

Fig. 9  Tell Atchana (Woolley 1955, Pl. XCI)

Fig. 10