



A STATUETTE FOUND AT THE EXCAVATION OF TEPEBAĞLARI

TANJU ANLAĞAN

The statuette¹ recovered from a context where a group of coins was also unearthed gives us an opportunity to study the art of sculpture in the round to which little attention has been given so far in Anatolia. According to the coins found together with it, the statuette should be dated later than the 1st Century B.C. Its casting technique and attributes would also confirm this date.

Statuettes made of various materials form a separate volume in Greek art. They, in particular the small bronze ones, are seen diffused over a vast area and have been recovered abundantly. Unfortunately, researches and investigations until now have not shown us a production center² either in West, Central, or South Anatolia. From the 3rd Century B.C. onwards Pergamon becomes an important artistic center³ in Anatolia with its own school of marble sculpture. A similar school of sculpture in cast bronze seems likely. However, only future explorations will clarify this situation.

The statuette was found in the mud brick debris of the second building-level at the Höyük which is situated near Tepebağları on the main road between Niğde-Bor in the province of Niğde (Nagidus), a part of ancient Cappadocia.

Cappadocia was an underdeveloped country, and King Ariarathes V's efforts to spread Hellenistic culture throughout Cappadocia do not show any development in the country⁴, though Hellenism was absorbed by the educated and rich people. Throughout the Hellenistic period bronze statuettes are also used as decorations in houses⁵ besides being cult objects. Alongside the native cults such as those of Argaios, Apollo, Tyche, and Serapis⁶, we do not see the

¹ I would like to thank the Director of the excavation, Prof. Dr. Nimet Özgüç, who kindly permits me to publish this statuette.

² Charbonneaux, *Greek Bronzes*, p. 127.

³ Lamb, *Greek and Roman Bronzes*, p. 195.

⁴ N. Baydur, *Kayseri Tarihi*, p. 117.

⁵ Lamb, *Ibid.*, p. 195.

⁶ N. Baydur, *Ibid.*, p. 123.

cults of Heracles or Hermes in Cappadocia, which became administratively dependent on Rome in the 1st Century B.C.; therefore the statue probably comes from either the west or south of Anatolia.

The statuette from Tepebağları (Pl. I, 1) is 9.4 cm in height, and the widths of shoulders and hips are 3.7 cm and 3.6 cm respectively. The weight of the body rests on the left leg, and the right leg bent at the knee is seen stepping forward. The body is slender, and the muscles are indicated loosely. The legs are a little longer than the body and are bent in the manner of Polykleitos⁷. There is no doubt that this statuette represents a god. Yet it is not possible to identify which god it represents, since the head and feet are missing. The right arm is stretched downward and might have been holding Heracles Club or Hermes Kerykaion. If it represents Heracles it should hold a club⁸. The left arm is bent at the elbow, and in the hand there is a globular object. This object may be an apple stolen from the Hesperides by Heracles⁹ as his one of the 12 labors. Reinach shows a Hermes holding a globular object in his hand¹⁰, but among the standard attributes of Hermes there is no such symbol¹¹. The prominent feature on the representations of Hermes for particularly the late Hellenistic and Roman periods is that his chlamys is worn around his shoulder and left arm¹². On the other hand, the animal head, which seems to be a continuation of the chlamys, looks like a wolf or dog rather than a lion (Pl. I, 2). Kerberos¹³ and Heracles are depicted together on many statuettes. On these statuettes, however, the animal is seen near the feet. Yet it should not be forgotten that our statuette represents a completely provincial style.

During the Late Hellenistic and Roman periods, copying from original Greek objects was a fashion, but in these replicas there is always a Roman feature. This statuette as whole does not reflect a Greek origin, and it does not even show features of a certain school of the period it belongs to. The artist is influenced by the canons of Polykleitos in the renderings of the legs, but when rendering the body he worked the bronze freely. At the back of the statuettes the anatomy of the body is successfully rendered (Pl. I, 3). Two relief

⁷ Lamb, *Ibid.*, p. 169, Pl. 61 c. M. Comstock and C. Vermeule, *Greek, Etruscan and Roman Bronzes*, no. 111.

⁸ Reinach, *Rep. III*, p. 63 no. 8. Mendel, *Vol. III*, no. 860.

⁹ Reinach, *Rep. I*, p. 476, Pl. 802 H no. 3.

¹⁰ Reinach, *Rep. III*, p. 42, no. 5.

¹¹ RE 8, p. 758.

¹² Reinach, *Rep. III*, p. 44, no. 7. Reinach, *Rep. IV*, p. 79, no. 1.

¹³ C. B. Avery, *Classical Handbook*, p. 270.

bands running on the shoulder blades to the sides are part of the diadem he wears on his hair¹⁴. This diadem is seen both on Heracles and Hermes figures¹⁵. Muscles are too soft for a Heracles or Hermes representation. For this reason, we doubt that this statuette represents Heracles. Yet the god might have been depicted in a relaxed pose¹⁶.

The statuette may Heracles or Hermes, but this can be determined only if its head is recovered. The animal reminiscent of a dog is sacred both to Hermes¹⁷ and Heracles¹⁸, but the prominent feature of our statuette is that the animal is not depicted completely but shown only as a head. We could not find a parallel for our statuette, but the technique of casting bronze (in the Late Hellenistic and Roman Periods the surface of a cast is very smooth) and particularly the chlamys he wears around his shoulder and arm are characteristic features of the Roman Period. Drapery is rendered in hard crisp creases.

There are so many bronze statuettes coming to light from the end of the Hellenistic period, i.e. 200 B.C. to 100 A.D., that these are classified under the heading of Greco-Roman¹⁹. Some of these figures are rendered unskillfully; others show good workmanship but of a provincial style. Our statuette belongs to the latter group, and though it depicts a Hellenistic subject and style, its new additional feature of Roman type dates it to the period defined by historians as Roman.

¹⁴ G. Bordenanche, *Sculpture Greche e Romane*, Pl. LVI, 127.

¹⁵ Reinach, *Rep. III*, p. 64, no. 1, 2. Reinach, *Rep. IV*, p. 82, no. 7.

¹⁶ Goldman, *Tarsus I*, Plates, no. 162, 163, 163.

¹⁷ *RE* 8, p. 758.

¹⁸ Reinach, *Rep. IV*, p. 133, no. 1.

¹⁹ Lamb, *Ibid.*, p. 210.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- J. Charbonneaux, (Translated by Katherine Watson) *Greek Bronzes*, London 1962.
- W. Lamb, *Greek and Roman Bronzes*, London 1929.
- N. Baydur, *Kültepe ve Kayseri Tarihi Uzerine Araştırmalar*, İstanbul 1970.
- M. Comstock - C. Vermeule, *Greek Etruscan and Roman Bronzes in the Museum of Fine Arts*, Boston 1971.
- S. Reinach, *Répertoire de la Statuaire Grecque et Romaine Vol. I-IV*, Paris 1904.
- P. G. Wissowa, *Real Encyclopädie* 3, Stuttgart 1913.
- C. B. Avery, *The New Century Classical Handbook*, New York 1962.
- G. Bordenanche, *Sculpture Greche e Romane del Museo Nazionale di Antichita di Bucarest*.
- H. Goldman, *Excavations at Gözli Kule, Tarsus Vol. II, Plates*, Princeton 1950.
- G. Mendel, *Catalogue des Sculpture Grecques, Romaines et Byzantines Vol. III*, Constantinople 1914.

TEPEBAĞLARI HÖYÜĞÜNDE BULUNAN TUNÇ BİR HEYKELCİK

TANJU ANLAĞAN

Tepebağları höyüğünde bir gurup sikke ile hemen hemen aynı yerde bulunmuş olan bir tunç heykelcik, Anadolu'da çok az araştırılmış olan bu konuda bize çalışma imkânı verdi¹. Beraberinde bulunan sikkelere göre M.Ö. 1. yüzyıldan sonraya tarihlenmesi gereken heykelciğin gerek döküm tekniği, gerekse atribüleri bu tarihlendirmeyi kanıtlamaktadır.

Küçük heykelcikler Yunan sanatının apayrı bir bölümüdür. Çok çeşitli malzemelerden yapılan bu tür eserler arasında, özellikle tunç heykelcikler, ölçülerinin ufaklığı nedeniyle, çeşitli bölgelere dağılıma olanağını bulmuşlar, ve böylece bol miktarda ele geçmişlerdir. Şimdiye kadar yapılan araştırmalar ne yazık ki gerek Batı Anadolu ve gerekse Orta ve Güney Anadolu için belirli bir imal merkezi² ortaya koymamıştır. M.Ö. 3. yüzyıldan itibaren Anadolu'da Bergama³ bir heykeltraşlık ekolü olarak büyük önem kazanmıştır. Kendine özgü karakteri ile mermeri işleyen bu atölyelerde tunç dökümünün de varlığı kuşkusuzdur. Ancak yeni araştırmalar ve veriler bu hususu daha açıklığa kavuşturacaktır.

Tunç heykelcik, antik Kappadokya'da yer alan Niğde (Nagidus) ili belediye hudutları içinde, Niğde-Bor yolu üzerinde Tepebağları adıyla bilince mevkide oluşan höyüğün 2. yapı katının kerpiç yığıntıları arasında bulunmuştur. Geri bir ülke olan Kappadokya'da Kral Ariarathes V'in Helen kültürünü yayma çabasına rağmen, fazla bir gelişme olmamış, Helenleşme yüzeyde kalmıştır.⁴ Ancak eğitim gören zengin sınıf bu kültürü almıştır. Esasen tunç heykelcikler, Helenistik devir boyunca, bir kült malzemesi olmalarının yanısıra zengin evlerini de süslemekteydiler⁵. M.Ö. 1. yüzyılda idari yönden Roma ha-

¹ Bu heykelciği yayınlamama izin veren Sayın Prof. Dr. Nimet Özgüç'e teşekkürlerimi sunarım.

² Charbonneau, Greek Bronzes, s. 127.

³ Lamb, Greek and Roman Bronzes, s. 195.

⁴ N. Baydur, Kayseri Tarihi, s. 117.

⁵ Lamb, aynı eser, s. 195.