

Anatolia and the Bridge From East to West in the Early Bronze Age

İlk Tunç Çağında Anadolu ve Doğu'dan Batıya Köprü

Machteld J. MELLINK*

Keywords: Anatolia, Aegean, Cyclades, Early Bronze Age, Mesopotamia, Pushkin, Schliemann, Syria, Troy, Tarsus
Anahtar Sözcükler: Anadolu, Ege, Kiklad'lar, İlk Tunç Çağı, Mezopotamya, Puşkin, Schliemann, Suriye, Troya, Tarsus

Tarih öncesi Ege'de, doğu-batı bağlantıları hakkındaki yeni tartışmalar Batı Anadolu'nun Lefkandi'deki Kiklad yerleşmeleri ve kara Yunanistan'ın kıyılarındaki yerleşmelerle olan ilişkilerinin belirtilerini kapsamaktadır. Uzun kazı rekoru ile Troya ana başvuru kaynağıdır. Limantepe-Urla-Klazomenai'deki yeni çalışmalar önemli yeni verilerle bu bağlantılara katkıda bulunmaktadır.

Ege ilişkileri ayrıntılı olarak incelendiği zaman, Batı Anadolu kıyılarının, Orta, Doğu Anadolu ve Kuzey Suriye ile olan bağlantıları, belirtiler olmasına rağmen, daha az belgelenmiştir. Troya'daki A hazinesinde ele geçen altın takıların Alaca yakınındaki Eskiypar yerleşmesinde bulunanlarla yakın ilişkileri vardır. Arkeo-metallurji uzmanları bakırın, kalayın ve değerli madenlerin kaynaklarını ve yayılımını incelemektedirler. A hazinesindeki içki kapları Tarsus ve Eskiypar üzerinden geçiş yaparak Amuq J tabakasında görülen Kuzey Suriye gelenekleriyle bağlantı kuran altın ve gümüş kupalar şeklindedir. Troya II'nin sonuna ait kupa, Anadolu'nun İlk Tunç Çağının daha erken ve verimli bir evresine has olan depas'ın yerini alır. Troya, Afrodiasias, ve Tarsus'da ele geçen, depas, maşrapa, çark yapımı kaseler ve geniş kırmızı açkılı tabaklar, ilk çanak-çömlek örneklerinin alışılmamış temsilcileridir. Bu repertuar Elmalı-Burdur bölgesine ve Eskişehir'in güney-doğusu'ndaki Küllüoba yerleşmesine kadar yayılır, fakat Zircirli'nin kuzey-doğu'sundaki Gedikli'de kesin olarak ortaya çıkar. İlk Tunç III yerleşmelerinin Kuzey Suriye ve kuzey Mezopotamya ile olan ilişkileri, kara ve deniz yoluyla Toros Dağ'larından yapılan gümüş ticaretiyle bağlantılı Tarsus gibi şehirler üzerinden yapıyordu. Troya'yı, Tarsus kadar uzaktaki yerleşmelerle eşleştirmek için yapılan yeni yaklaşımlar henüz kesinlik kazanmamıştır. Birçok İlk Tunç I-II yerleşmeleri bu yeni gelişmelere katılmamaktadır ve Orta Anadolu (Kültepe, Alaca), bazı bağlantılar göstermekle birlikte, farklı kalmaktadır.

As the recent international symposium on the Aegean in the Neolithic, Chalcolithic and Early Bronze Age (in Urla, October 18-19, 1997) showed, Early Bronze Age interconnections between the Anatolian West coast and the Aegean islands, especially the Cyclades as well as sites on the East coasts of the Greek mainland, are beginning to be evident enough to be analyzed and made part of the study of the economic and cultural development of early settlements in the Aegean area.

Much survey and excavation has been accomplished on the Greek side of the Aegean, and progress reports at Urla presented the current projects. On the Anatolian side, new excavations, especially the *İzmir Region Excavations and Research Project* under the direction of Hayat Erkanal, are yielding ample new data to refine the understanding of West-East Aegean relations in the Early Bronze Age. The new results at Limantepe - Klazomenai and Baklatepe are, from the Anatolian point of view, a much needed counterpart to the evidence which has been accumulating in the Troad from the days of Schliemann and Blegen to the present area of Korfmann's excavations.

Much of the previous speculation on Aegean interaction was indeed focused on Troy. The Homeric fame of Troy kept the site in the center of attention even if Schliemann started out with the wrong chronology, treating Troy II material as belonging to Priam's era, but giving it publicity before other Early Bronze Age treasures and their context were known.

At the present state of Aegean-Anatolian research, Troy II remains a major example of architectural organization, strategic coastal vigilance, social hierarchy, developed metallurgy, ample use of bronze and precious metal, production of metal and clay vessels for special drinking (and libation?) rituals, and the maintenance of contacts for trade and exchange on a major geographical scale, along with supply routes in the fertile orbit of the Troad's villages.

We can draw up a list of archaeological characteristics of Troy II (and, less successfully, of Troy III-V) and use it as a test chart for the measuring of East-West Aegean contacts. Along with the Western liaisons we have to probe not only the Anatolian contemporaries of Troy along the Aegean coast, but also inland sites and those along the Pontic and Mediterranean shores. Ultimately, the question of some form of contact with the early historical sites of Northern Syria and Mesopotamia has also to be considered, especially because it might yield clues to absolute chronology and economic-technological motivation of approaches in Eastern and Western direction.

It has become clear that navigation is a major factor in the development of the site of Troy and that exploitation of contacts that could yield direct access to copper as well as precious metals would be pursued. One of the most active branches of research in Trojan resources is the analysis of the tin bronze which became available in the early stages of Troy II, as well as the provenance of the silver and gold used for the manufacture of Priam's treasure. Lively exploration and discussion are conducted by Turkish, British, German and U.S. archaeometallurgists⁽¹⁾.

The archaeological and artistic approach to the study of the precious metal artifacts from Troy leads East into Anatolia as well as West to Poliochni on Lemnos.

The Eskiypapar treasure, found in the final Early Bronze III level of a large mound 6 km West of the modern town of Alaca, has close affinities to Troy in the shape of basket earrings (although less refined than those of Treasure A, 'Priam's'), beads and a gold torque⁽²⁾. Multiple references to the jewelry idiom represented at Troy are unmistakable and help to reveal interconnections of Troy with the area that was to become the Hittite coreland.

Much discussed, among the collection of Troy Treasure A, is the omphalos pan Schmidt Nos. 5817 and 5822, reunited on paper by K. Bittel in 1959 as he published a series of similar pans which had turned up in a shop in Çanakale⁽³⁾. The Troy pan is now in the Pushkin Museum in Moscow, the handle in the Hermitage in St. Petersburg.

Eskiyapar yielded a small silver pan of this type⁽⁴⁾ and later examples of such pans are known from two Old Assyrian tombs in Assur and from an Old Babylonian tomb in the Hamrin area⁽⁵⁾. This type of pan was therefore known beyond the Tigris in the early second millennium B.C., but its Trojan context is earliest and strongest. The Troy pan is also the largest of the known series, and rather unwieldy, as the break of the handle demonstrates. The purpose of such pans is not yet agreed upon. The association of the Troy II pan with precious metal vessels suggests that it had a function in the context of privileged drinking ceremonies, possibly to provide some kind of snack that needed to be roasted. Whatever other guesses may be made, the difference in size and elegance between the Troy and Eskiyapar specimens has to be accounted for. A small silver pan of Eskiyapar type was listed by Schliemann as once belonging to Treasure J⁽⁶⁾. The group of looted pans from Çanakale has lost all context, but their multiplicity suggests either a workshop or a residue of communal celebration.

The precious metal vessels from Treasure A are the best demonstration of Aegean and Anatolian interconnections. The most eloquent is the gold hybrid sauceboat Schmidt 5863, Pushkin 5, which is a Trojan variant provided with double spouts and handles. The handles are typical depas or tankard handles, symmetrical and providing ample space for a grip from either side. This turns the Early Helladic sauceboat into a drinking vessel to be shared by partners, like the depas which could not be put down safely on its base but

would be offered to a fellow drinker. The Troy II sauceboat was converted to serve as a depas by a craftsman who knew Early Helladic originals but worked in his own style and milieu.

It is chronologically significant that there is no depas in Treasure A. The closest relative is the silver two-handled tankard Schmidt 5873 which held the jewelry. Sauceboats in Greece are known from their clay versions, which were in wide use in Early Helladic II and must amply be represented in Lerna III. No gold or silver sauceboat has been found in regular excavations, although the gold specimen from Arcadia is probably authentic⁽⁷⁾. Sherds of clay sauceboats were identified at Troy by Blegen's team in late Troy I context⁽⁸⁾. The sauceboat-depas hybrid Schmidt 5863 could have been made in Troy when the sauceboat was still familiar and the depas had been introduced early in Troy II.

The regular drinking vessels in Treasure A gold or silver handleless goblets holding small individual servings, Schmidt 5864-67, Pushkin 6-8. The gold cups, 7-8 cm high, have vertical or slanting ribbing as decoration; the silver cups are plain, as are two similar cups from Eskiyapar which have a more curvaceous profile⁽⁹⁾. In this category of luxury drinking vessels Treasure A betrays affinity to the new goblet fashions of the North Syrian and adjoining territories, evident in Amuq phase J and at Tarsus by the end of the Early Bronze Age⁽¹⁰⁾.

The group of vessels in Troy Treasure A also betrays affinity to North Syrian types in Schmidt 5862, Pushkin 4, the globular gold bottle which must have served as a container of special liquids, as did the many clay "Syrian bottles" that gradually made their way into Anatolia. Troy 5862 is ample in size and earlier in the comparative ceramic sequence. The Eskiyapar hoard had a silver Syrian bottle of slender type, grooved horizontally on the upper body⁽¹¹⁾. In any case, Treasure A has a

chronological range from early to late Troy II, which would be a normal phenomenon in a collection of jewelry and treasured belongings of an established wealthy center. The later features of the treasure point to contact with the North Syrian and Cilician cultural zones, which in turn have ceramic comparanda in the North Mesopotamian and Khabur area, with a good globular 'metallic' flask from Tell Chuera as a comparandum for Troy 5862⁽¹²⁾. The occasional depas which made its way to the Amuq in phase J or to sites like Tell Bi'a, Selenkahiye and Titriş⁽¹³⁾ in the Euphrates area belongs in a minor curio exchange category accompanying the trade contacts with Cilicia. In any case, the depas does not make a success in Syria as an exotic favorite in the manner of the 'Syrian bottle' in Anatolia, but this may be a matter of contents (perfumed oil?) in the latter instance.

Nevertheless, the sparse eastern diffusion of the depas can aid the archaeologist in tracing chronological links. The story might be more informative if we knew of foreign travels of precious metal vessels as a result of diplomatic alliances or warlike expeditions. A relevant instance may be seen on the Akkadian stela from Nasirya, if indeed booty shown brought in after an Akkadian victory includes a metal two-handled vessel of depas type⁽¹⁴⁾.

Mesopotamian connections of the gold jewelry types represented at Troy have been suggested for some of the earrings from treasure A, compared with a gold basket-earring from Ur by R. Maxwell-Hyslop⁽¹⁵⁾, who also considers some technical details of Trojan jewelry as of Mesopotamian origin.

The possibility of technical links in the manufacture of precious jewelry has also been raised by J.V. Canby, who pointed out that Early Bronze Age moulds for the casting of metal trinkets had an Anatolian link, with parallels for the earrings of Troy and figurines of nude women of the type fo-

und in Troy (Schmidt 6446)⁽¹⁶⁾. Traveling craftsmen might have spread some types of jewelry and trinkets from Mesopotamia to Anatolia and have left objects of strong Mesopotamian affinity as far away as Troy.

The link with Mesopotamia and Syria, incomplete though the material evidence is at present, presents itself as a remote privilege of Troy not shared by its Early Cycladic or Early Helladic neighbors. Poliochni has some traits in common with the metal trinket link referred to. Among the jewelry from the yellow period is a lead lion pendant which has parallels on the early trinket moulds.

Poliochni is one of the closest relatives of Troy, although it is not architecturally organized in the Troy fashion and may have maintained a different social structure of its own with local roots in its early periods. The same applies to the basic material inventory of the Poliochni houses. The imprint is local, with gradual signals of Anatolian interaction: one-handled tankards and depas appear in the red and yellow periods, along with tin bronze. Therme on Lesbos is not participating in the Troy II evolutionary pattern, and dwindles before the liveliest Aegean-Anatolian interaction develops.

In Anatolia itself, the interaction of Troy with other prominent Early Bronze Age sites is unevenly known and in no case convincingly close. The most likely partners are coastal stations with good hinterland, including sites across the Hellespont: the Protesilaos mound and the unexcavated mound at Eceabat opposite Çanakkale. As Mehmet Özdoğan discovered through his extensive surveys of Thrace, Troy II sites are otherwise rare on the European side of the Dardanelles and the sea of Marmara.

Early Bronze Age sites in Northwest Anatolia are unevenly known after the looting of the so-called Yortan cemeteries, the ceramic harvest of which shows a steady tradition of Early Bronze I-II pithoi

and handmade bowls, jars, pitchers, of consistent types. A few hints of Troy II incipience appear just before the relevant cemeteries cease to grow⁽¹⁸⁾.

Better evidence comes from the inland area of Demircihüyük where M. Korfmann's excavations of the habitation site have revealed a fortified circular compound with adjoined rectangular houses, a rather cooperative dwelling system, preserved principally in the Early Bronze I, II levels, again with local traits in the handmade ceramic repertoires overlapping with Troy I⁽¹⁹⁾. The excavations of the cemetery at Sariket by Jurgen Seeher⁽²⁰⁾ has provided evidence that the habitation site continued in the transitional Early Bronze II, III period, but went into a hiatus during the Troy II phase and until Middle Bronze. The cemetery near Bozüyük also ceased to be used at the end of Early Bronze II⁽²¹⁾.

The Troy II hiatus is a common phenomenon to many sites in the Troad, in the Demircihüyük zone, and to Thermi. It is important to supplement our knowledge with evidence of surviving sites. Turan Efe has recently begun surveys in the Eskişehir - Kütahya area which yielded Early Bronze III material from Bahçehisar and other sites. His new excavations at Küllüoba yielded Troy II type pottery in abundance⁽²²⁾. This discovery is very helpful in reconstructing the network of sites that may have been active centers of trade and contact in the Early Bronze III period.

The lack of evidence for the crucial Troy II phase in the majority of known mounds in Northwestern Anatolia (including the Troad) is not just due to lack of exploration but to a change in settlement, economy and safety in the relevant period. If we look for convincing evidence of Anatolian sites coexisting with the most prosperous phase of Troy II, we have few stations to list. The points of comparison are: fortification and internal architectural organization of a site with evidence of a ruler's station and auxiliary buildings, developed

building techniques, local metallurgy both utilitarian (tin bronze) and luxury purposes (gold, silver); storage of supplies and wealth: ceramic fashions: wheelmade bowls, large red polished platters, depas, tankards, gradually all wheelmade; occasional appearance of Syro-Mesopotamian traits (e.g. lead figurines, use of decorative seal impressions on pottery),

Not all of these traits are likely to appear in any one comparable excavated site in Anatolia, but a partial overlap of evidence will also be meaningful. None of the coastal sites south of the Troad qualifies at present. Bayraklı-Old Smyrna has a prominent location and evidence of Early Bronze occupation, but remains unexcavated. Limantepe now takes its prominent place as a harbor site with an Early Bronze Age fortress of Troy I-II date, impressive with its curved stone-fitted bastion, presumed dimensions and stratified habitation levels in the fortress with fragments of early, sharply profiled sauceboats and an occasional example of a Troy II type depas⁽²³⁾. The exact stratification of the Helladic and Anatolian-Trojan ceramics awaits detailed publication, but the connection with Early Helladic sauceboats seems better represented so far than the depas link. The study of a long narrow architectural space as an example of a corridor-house is also in progress. The importance of the strongly fortified harbor site in Early Bronze II and III seems established through its size and densely stratified large buildings. Limantepe will contribute basic evidence to the question of Anatolian links with the Aegean world through the Bronze Age.

The signals from the early levels below the Heraion on Samos include the one-handed tankard and the bell-shaped two-handed bowl, the early depas, wheelmade buff plates, goblets of early and later type⁽²⁴⁾. At Iassos on the Carian coast our Early Bronze evidence is still restricted to the cemetery. Early Cycladic affinities are prominent⁽²⁵⁾.

If we move inland in Caria, the acropolis mound of Aphrodisias presents the first rich corpus of parallels for the Troy II complex. Probed in several trenches, a burnt level with rectangular houses revealed an inventory of typical Troy II pottery (depas, tankard, red platters, wheelmade bowls) with stacks of plates and bowls collapsed on their burnt shelves⁽²⁶⁾.

The next urban context with Troy II features, as we explore the coastal zone eastward, is Tarsus, well known for its Early Bronze III phase of new houses rebuilt after a destruction with conflagration. The ceramic list of Troy II types is complete and starts with some early predecessors not familiar at Troy, especially the two-handled bell shaped bowl and the tankard with a single handle put on the lower body. The development of the depas continues from the early tall type to flaring vessels with a flat or profiled base, ultimately reconciled with the North Syrian goblet tradition in wheelmade versions and leading to new hybrids in the Syrian goblet shape provided with a single handle of depas type. As at Troy and Aphrodisias, wheelmade bowls and red polished platters are amply represented, and the favorite finish for depa, carinated bowls and pitchers is a red polished slip. At the end of the Early Bronze III period the simple handleless goblet has made itself popular. Although the beginning of the 'Troy II phase' is sudden and follows a destruction of the houses in the main excavated trench, the end of the ceramic fashion is gradual and merges with the Syro-Cilician Middle Bronze repertoire.

The fortifications of the excavated part of Tarsus Early Bronze III were cut away in later remodeling of the slopes. If we look for signs of wealth in the houses, no treasures were left behind except for a small jar in room 74 with faience beads, bronze pins and earrings and a small piece of iron. Nearby lay some haematite weights⁽²⁷⁾.

The links of Tarsus were the land routes in the Cilician plain East-West and North thro-

ugh the Cilician Gates. Navigation reached the site via the Cydnus river with an inland harbor south of the town. The Early Bronze III connections of Tarsus could have been maintained overseas with East and West as well as by the land routes that had long served the trade needs of the Cilician center.

Mersin, less thoroughly explored by excavation for the third millennium B.C., has traces of similar Early Bronze III pottery and other Cilician sites may also contain good levels of this period.

The most surprising extensions of the Early Bronze III traits to the East of Cilicia were found in Bahadır Alkım's excavations at Gedikli Höyük in the İslahiye district along the road East from the Ceyhan river-crossing to Gaziantep. On the East side of the mound, Early Bronze III cremation burials were found in the necropolis⁽²⁸⁾. Along with the cinerary urns, pottery gifts appeared in the shape of depa, goblets, tankards and Syrian bottles. Enough of these are locally made to explain that Anatolian fashions had been adopted. Gedikli hitherto remains the easternmost Early Bronze site to have made the 'depa' tradition its own, thoroughly enough to feel the need to provide the dead with this drinking gear (or to require it at the funerary rites).

The strong sites for comparanda to the Troy II phenomena are therefore Aphrodisias, Tarsus, and Gedikli, which adds a question of its own about the introduction of cremation burials in the later stages of the Early Bronze Age. These three sites make their own pottery in the new fashion in great quantities (at Gedikli a small exploratory trench yielded 30 depa). At Tarsus, Early Bronze III botroi were filled to the rim with broken red polished platters, depa, tankards and buff wheelmade bowls. At Aphrodisias the new style platters and bowls stood in piles on the shelves in Early Bronze III houses.

Smaller signals of similar developments are found elsewhere in the coastal

zone. Karataş-Semayük in Northern Lycia had its own production of red polished tankards, still handmade in late Early Bronze II, wheelmade in the Early Bronze III phase and best represented as burial gifts. The Early Bronze III phase of Karataş does not last to the end of the millennium, and the *depas* does not appear in tombs, although fragments were found in habitation areas. Tankards are numerous and develop in profile, with reminiscences of bell-shaped cups⁽²⁹⁾. Wheelmade bowls and red platters appear in the ruins of megaron-type houses. Much pottery of the *depas* family was also collected from sites in the Burdur area, as can be seen in the Burdur Museum. All this begins to make a transitional Burdur-Elmalı zone for the area between Aphrodisias and Tarsus.

None of the authentic 'Troy complex' Early Bronze III shapes are adopted by potters in the proto-Hittite zone of Central Anatolia. The closest instance of tankard use is at Acemhöyük, where a two-handled tankard was found in the same pot-grave as a single-handled specimen with elegantly swung loop-handle on the lower body. Tahsin Özgüç discussed this and other instances of tankard and *depas* appearance at Kültepe, where imported wheelmade bowls occur with *depas* variants in levels 11b-12 of the mound⁽³⁰⁾. The imported *depas* becomes familiar enough to inspire a local variant at Kültepe and Alişar in the form of a rounded bowl with two *depas* handles; one wide red band is painted vertically on the external axis, another band covers the handles. One elegantly flaring *depas* from Kültepe level 12 has a wide red band on the sides between the handles, a typical local experiment to adopt the *depas*.

As Tahsin Özgüç pointed out, there are points of contact to be traced in the ceramic and in the jewelry repertoire. These affinities belong to the most progressive partners in contacts from the Anatolian West coast to the centers of Anatolian cultural initiatives that later participated in

the Old Assyrian trade and the rise of literacy in trading centers.

In the Old Assyrian period glyptic usage and production will flourish in central Anatolia, whereas the '*depas*' age is uneven in seal usage so far as excavated in Anatolia.

Troy has yielded very few stamp seals from its third millennium levels. The use of a stamp-cylinder to decorate a pithos with impressed zones is a habit transferred to the Aegean from the East and found in a single instance on Schmidt 2552. The ivory stamp-cylinder from Poliochni betrays its affinities to Early Dynastic seal carving⁽³¹⁾. Other examples come from Mersin and Tarsus, where the use of seals starts in Early Bronze II. There is still decorative use on pottery, but at Tarsus cylinder and stamp seal impressions occur on clay plugs in Early Bronze III⁽³²⁾. Here the contact with North Syria has its lasting effect, and Tarsus, unlike Troy, has the best of both worlds.

The concept of Anatolia as a bridge from East to West has some validity in the ambivalent position of Tarsus between its cultural partners in Northern Syria and its newly acquired West Anatolian - Trojan affinity. We cannot give Troy the sole responsibility of having instigated the changes in Tarsus at the end of Early Bronze II. The increasing strength of the '*depas*' and affiliated complex in Caria, Lycia and even inland south of Eskişehir needs to be geographically investigated and the sites responsible for trade issuing from centers such as the silver mines in the Taurus (Bolkarmaden) need new attention.

Troy has the most extensive record of Early Bronze II-III excavation. The present excavations will weigh the importance of Trojan activities along all coasts of Anatolia, and its involvement in the reshaping of more than ceramic fashions in inland sites like Aphrodisias. We need to explore how autonomous some of the coastal and inland si-

tes were and whom to credit with Anatolian initiatives in the Aegean south of Poliochni. Intensive excavations of sites like Limantepe and inşallah some day the acropolis of Aphrodisias will provide archaeological facts and stratified material to be tested by

archaeometallurgists, geophysicists, dendrochronologists and a series of specialists who are equally eager to solve questions of contact, development, innovations and the growth of interdependent cultures in the final great prehistoric phase of Anatolia.

FOOTNOTES

(1) U. ESIN, 1967, Kuantitatif Spektrel Analiz Yardımıyla başlangıcından Asur Kolonileri çağına kadar Bakır ve Tunç madenciliği, İstanbul.

N. H. - Z. A. STOS-GALE, E. PERNICKA, P. BEGEMANN, F. SCHMIDT

STRECKER, Discussions in Oxford Journal of Archaeology from 1984 to 1997.

(2) T. ÖZGÜÇ, R. TEMİZER, 1993, Studies in Honor of Nimet Özgüç, Ankara: 613-628.

(3) K. BITTEL, 1959, Jahrbuch des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts 74: 1-34.

H. SCHMIDT, 1902, Heinrich Schliemann's Sammlung Trojanischer Altertümer, Berlin. In text referred to by catalogue number: Schmidt XXI.

V. TOLSTIKOV - M. TREISTER, 1996, The Gold of Troy. New York, Moscow. In text referred to as: Pushkin XXX catalogue number.

(4) T. ÖZGÜÇ - R. TEMİZER, 1993, Studies in Honor of Nimet Özgüç, 619, fig. 48a, b; 50.

(5) A. HALLER, 1954, Die Gräber und Gräfte von Assur. Berlin, Grab 20, 21; 10, pl. 10b, 21a.

(6) H. SCHLIEMANN, 1881, Ilios, New York, 503, 923.

H. SCHMIDT, 1902, Heinrich Schliemann's Sammlung Trojanischer Altertümer, 240, list of missing items, treasure J.

D. EASTON, 1984, "Priam's treasure.", Anatolian Studies XXXIV: 158.

(7) H.G. BUCHHOLZ - V. KARAGEORGIS, 1971, Altägäis und Altkypros, Tübingen: 1032.

(8) C. W. BLEGEN, 1950, Troy. The First and Second Settlements, Text, Princeton, 193, EH 448, 572.

(9) T. ÖZGÜÇ - R. TEMİZER, 1993, Studies in Honor of Nimet Özgüç, 617, pl. 116, 3,4.

A. TOKAR, 1992, Museum of Anatolian Civilizations. Metal Vessels, Ankara, 28, 29.

(10) H. GOLDMANN, 1956, Excavations at Gözlü Kule, Tarsus II, Princeton. Clay goblets fig. 268; depas with goblet influence fig. 266, lower half.

R. J. - L. S. BRAIDWOOD, 1980, Excavations in the Plain of Antioch, Chicago. Fig. 338. Amuq J is also the context of a late type of depas, fig. 349.

(11) A. TOKER, 1992, Museum of Anatolian Civilizations. Metal Vessels, Ankara, 43.

(12) H. KÜHNE, 1976, Die Keramik von Tell Chuera, Berlin, Pl. 7,6; fig. 68.

(13) P. SPANOS - E. STROMMINGER, 1993, Studies in Honor of Nimet Özgüç, Ankara, 125.

(14) E. STROMMINGER - M. HIRMER, 1962, Fünf Jahrtausende Mesopotamien, München, pl. 119.

M. J. MELLINK, 1963, Anatolia VII: 101-115.

(15) K. R. MAXWELL - HYSLOP, 1971, Western Asiatic Jewelry c. 3000-612 B.C., 1971, London, 51.

(16) J.V. CANBY, 1965, Iraq XXVII, 42-61, Mesopotamian parallels 53, 58-59.

(17) L. BERNABO - BREA, 1976, Poliochni II, Rome, Pl. CCXXXV.

(18) T. KAMİL, 1983, Yortan Cemetery in the Early Bronze Age of Western Anatolia, Oxford, BAR International Series 145.

(19) M. KORFMANN, 1983, Demircihüyük I, Mainz and following volumes in series.

(20) J. SEEHER, 1991, Istanbul Mitteilungen 41, 97-124;

J. SEEHER, 1992, Istanbul Mitteilungen 42: 5-19.

(21) J. SEEHER, 1991, Istanbul Mitteilungen 41: 39-96.

(22) T. EFE, 1994, American Journal of Archaeology 98: 5-34.

T. EFE, 1996, XIV. Araştırma Sonuçları Toplantısı, II, 223-224, figs. 11-15.

(23) H. ERKANAL - S. GÜNEL, 1996, XVIII Kazı Sonuçları Toplantısı I: 243.

(24) V. MILOJCIC, 1961, Samos I, Bonn, pls. 46-47.

H. P. ISLER, 1973, Archaeology 26: 170-175.

H. J. WEISSHAAR, 1985, Archäologischer Anzeiger: 409-418.

(25) P. E. PECORELLA, 1984, La cultura preistorica di Iassos in Caria, Rome.

(26) M. S. JOUKOWSKY, 1986, Prehistoric Aphrodisias. Louvain-Providence, 36, 168-172, 389-588.

(27) H. GOLDMANN, 1956, Excavations at Gözlükule, Tarsus II, Princeton, pl. 266. "treasure" in room 74, 33.

(28) U. B. - H. ALKIM, 1966, Belleten XXX, 1-57, figs. 31-36.

(29) J. L. WARNER, 1994, Elmalı-Karataş II, Bryn Mawr. pl. 165a, 175a; cf.

M. J. MELLINK, 1964, American Journal of Archaeology 68, pl. 80:14; pl. 81:18; 69, 1965, pl. 61:12; pl. 65:36, 71, 1967, pl. 76:9.

(30) T. ÖZGÜÇ, 1986, Ancient Anatolia. Essays in Honor of M. J. MELLINK, Wisconsin, 40-41, figs. 34-35 (Acemhüyük)

(31) J. GARSTANG, et alii, 1939, Annals of Archaeology and Anthropology. 26, Liverpool, pls. LXXV, 17; LXXXI, 8.

L. BERNABO-BREA, 1976, Poliochni II, pl. CCLIV, 298-302. Compare also Samos,

H.P. ISLER, 1973, Archaeology 26: 175.

(32) H. GOLDMAN, 1956, Excavation at Gözlükule, Tarsus II, Princeton, pls. 397-398.