

ATTIC POTTERY FROM SEYİTÖMER HÖYÜK

SEYİTÖMER HÖYÜK ATTİKA SERAMİKLERİ

Gökhan COŞKUN

Keywords: Attic, pottery, Seyitömer, Inner-Western Anatolia, Achaemenid Period, glaze.

Anahtar Sözcükler: Attika, seramik, Seyitömer, İç Batı Anadolu, Ahamenid dönem, firnis.

ABSTRACT

This paper presents an analysis and the catalogue of the Attic painted pottery excavated at Seyitömer Höyük. The majority of fragments are black glazed and belong to small vessels such as drinking vessels, plates and perfumed oil jars. There are also fragments of black and red figure vases. This study shows that Attic pottery was imported during the period between the beginning of the 5th and the last quarter of the 4th century BC, the highest quantity and largest variety of shapes falling into the 5th century BC. The Attic pottery assemblage in this study contributes towards understanding the commercial network in the region and the social status of the people during Achaemenid rule as well as the dating of the architecture of the corresponding level at Seyitömer Höyük.

ÖZET

Bu çalışmada Seyitömer Höyük'te bulunan Attika seramiklerinin kataloğu yapılmış, tarihlenmiş ve söz konusu malzemenin incelenmesi sonucunda elde edilen veriler sunulmuştur. Mevcut parçaların büyük bir çoğunluğu siyah firnislidir ve içki kaseleri, tabaklar ve parfüm kapları gibi küçük boyutlu vazolara aittir. Bunların yanı sıra siyah ve kırmızı figür tekniği ile bezeli örnekler de mevcuttur. Attika seramikleri Seyitömer Höyük'e MÖ 5. yüzyılın başları ile MÖ 4. yüzyılın son çeyreği arasındaki dönemde ithal edilmişlerdir. Hem sayısal çoğunluk, hem de biçim çeşitliliği açısından MÖ 5. yüzyıl seramikleri dikkat çekmektedir. Attika seramikleri höyüğün Akhaemenid Dönem tabakasındaki mimari yapıların tarihlendirilmesinde önemli rol oynamaktadır. Diğer yandan höyüğün sosyal, kültürel ve ticari pozisyonu hakkında bir takım öneriler sunmamıza olanak sağlamaktadır.

INTRODUCTION

Located 25 km northwest of Kütahya and on the premises of the Seyitömer Lignite Enterprise reserve site, Seyitömer Höyük measured roughly 150 m east-west and 140 m north-south with a maximum height

of 23,5 m above datum in the beginning of the fieldwork. The archaeological excavations were first initiated by the Eskişehir Museum in 1989 (Aydın 1991: 191-204), and then carried out by the Afyon Museum

from 1990 to 1995 (İlaslı 1996: 1-20; Topbaş 1992: 11-34; Topbaş 1993: 1-30; Topbaş 1994: 297-310). Since 2006 a team under the supervision of Prof. Dr. A. Nejat Bilgen of the Department of Archaeology at Dumlupınar University has been excavating the site (Bilgen 2008: 321-332). These campaigns have shown the presence of five major occupation levels: the Roman, Hellenistic, Achaemenid periods, and the Middle and Early Bronze Ages. The Attic pottery studied in this paper is from the third level attributed to the Achaemenid period.

Attic painted pottery has long been recognised as a significant tool by archaeologists for the dating of excavated deposits in the wider Mediterranean world. Although it has not been represented in great numbers at Seyitömer Höyük, it provides significant help in the dating of the strata and the architectural remains.

The catalogue shows that smaller shapes were generally preferred. Drinking vessels are the most common. The shapes comprise: cup, stemless cup, skyphos, cup-skyphos, kantharos, cup-kantharos, mug, phiale, bolsal, bowl, plate, fish plate, lekythos, askos and animal-head cups. A large amount of the Attic pottery discovered at the mound is black glazed. Along with purely black glazed pottery, red figure and black figure and silhouette decorated pottery have also been found.

POTTERY TYPES

Cup

Three types of the black glazed cups (For black glazed cup types see Sparkes and Talcott 1970: 88-97) produced in Attica during the 5th century BC have been found at Seyitömer Höyük. These are Type C, Concave Lip Vicups and Acrocups. Only a rim fragment related to Type C, Concave Lip cup has been found at the mound. Sparkes and Talcott report that the high incurving lip of the earlier types later became shorter (For form development see Sparkes and Talcott 1970: 91). Cat. No.1 dated to 480-450 BC has a shorter lip compared to earlier examples. It seems this type of cup that appeared in Attica during the last quarter of the 6th century BC (Sparkes and Talcott 1970: 91) reached Seyitömer by 480-450 BC. The vicup production in Attica appears to be limited to the second quarter of the 5th century BC (Sparkes and Talcott 1970: 93). The cup of this type

produced in such a short time span has attracted attention at Seyitömer right from the beginning of its appearance. The vicup fragments found in Seyitömer Höyük comprise two foot fragments (Cat. Nos. 2-3).

Sparkes and Talcott suggest that the acrocups that were introduced into the repertoire of Attica during the 5th century BC were produced by a single workshop only for a limited time just like the vicups (Sparkes and Talcott 1970: 94). These cups have been widely seen as adaptations of the Achaemenid metal cups (Miller 1993: 127-129). A foot fragment of an acropup has been identified at Seyitömer (Cat. No.4), and has been dated to 475-450 BC. (The citations for similar samples and comparisons are given in the catalogue section).

There are two additional cup fragments, the exact shape of which, however, could not be determined. The first is a black glaze foot fragment (Cat. No. 5) showing a profile that could not be matched with any Attic counterparts. A similar profile to this relatively short foot has been observed among acrocups dated to 480-460 BC (Sparkes and Talcott 1970: fig 5 no. 440), and stemless cups dated to 470-450 BC (Sparkes and Talcott 1970: fig 5 no. 471). Its diameter is close to the size of the foot of acrocups. In contrast, however, our fragment has neither the high stem of the acrocups, nor the large foot of the stemless cups. It seems the best typological match would be among cups. The graffito inscribed at the bottom reads APΔΔΔ (For similar graffito samples with triple or quadruple delta signs see Robinson 1950: pl. 235 no. 918-919).

The typology of a second fragment that could not be precisely defined is the foot of a cup (Cat. No. 6). The outer surface is black-glazed. The floor is decorated in red figure. It shows part of a figure too fragmentary to be identified.

In summary, the Attic cups found at Seyitömer Höyük have been represented by six fragments in total, and they were used in this settlement approximately between 480 and 450 BC.

Stemless Cup

There are four fragments of Attic stemless cups among the Seyitömer Höyük finds: three fragments of rim and body (Cat. No. 7) and a foot fragment (Cat. No. 8). They are all black-glazed.

ATTIC POTTERY FROM SEYİTÖMER HÖYÜK

The stemless cups are divided into two major categories based on their dimensions: large stemless and small stemless cups (For black glaze stemless types see Sparkes and Talcott 1970: 98). So far no small stemless cup has been found at Seyitömer Höyük. The fragments all belong to the large inset lip stemless cups. This type of stemless cup was first observed in the Attic pottery repertoire during the second quarter of 5th century BC (For the emergence and development of this type see Sparkes and Talcott 1970: 101-102). The Seyitömer Höyük fragments are identical with finds from other centres dated to 470-450 BC.

Skyphos

The diagnostic sherds in the category of skyphoi appear to match with Types A and B (For Attic black glazed skyphos types see Sparkes and Talcott 1970: 81).

The earliest fragments, a total of four, belong to Type B (For type B skyphos see Boulter 1953: 73, fig. 2, pl. 28-29; Knigge 1976: taf. 31, fig. 6-2, no. 122-2; Sparkes and Talcott 1970: 86-87, no. 360-363, fig. 4, pl. 17). There are two rim-body-handle fragments (Cat. No. 9) and two foot fragments (Cat. No. 10).

The Type B skyphos emerged in Attica during the last years of the 6th century BC (Sparkes and Talcott 1970: 86). The full round body of this type is well observed on the rim and body fragment in Cat. No. 9 (Knigge 1976: taf. 31, fig. 6-2, no. 122-2). Cat. No. 10 displays the ring foot of this type. The finds of Seyitömer Höyük match with finds from other centres dated to 480-450 BC.

The only sample of a Type A skyphos discovered at Seyitömer Höyük is a foot fragment presented in Cat. No. 11. Sparkes and Talcott report that the Type A skyphos was first produced in Attica during the 6th century BC (Boulter 1953: pl. 38 no. 134; Boulter 1957: 195; Sparkes and Talcott 1970: 84-85, no. 334-354, fig. 4, pl. 16-17), and reached a mature form by the beginning of the 5th century BC (Sparkes and Talcott 1970: 84). With a profile comparable to those dated to 460-430 BC, Cat. No. 11 demonstrates that this type of skyphos reached Seyitömer Höyük in the mid-5th century BC.

In addition to the plain black glazed skyphoi fragments there are two decorated skyphos fragments.

The rim-body-handle fragment in Cat. No. 12 belongs to the Saint Valentin Group (For Saint Valentin Group see Howard and Johnson 1954) and can be dated to the second half of the 5th century BC both in terms of decoration and shape. Cat. No. 13 shows a small body fragment with a palmette pattern in red figure, and can be dated to the second quarter of the 4th century BC.

Cup-Skyphos

The cup-skyphos fragments excavated at Seyitömer Höyük can be studied under the Black Glazed Group (For Attic black glazed cup-skyphos types see Sparkes and Talcott 1970: 109-112) and the Haimon Group. There are five black glazed rim and body fragments which belong to heavy wall type (For heavy wall type cup-skyphos see Sparkes and Talcott 1970: 111-112). The earliest fragment (Cat. No. 15) can be dated to approximately 410 BC. The other fragments shown in Cat. No. 14 are dated to the first two decades of the 4th century BC. It appears that the heavy wall type cup skyphos that emerged in Attica around 420 BC (Sparkes and Talcott 1970: 111-112) reached Seyitömer Höyük within a short span of time.

All the decorated fragments (Cat. Nos. 16-23) can be associated with the Haimon Group regarding their form and decoration (For samples of Haimon group and its vicinity see Boardman 1959: pl. 38-39 no. 100, 102; Görkay 1999: taf. 10-12 no. 135-148; Ivanov 1963: taf. 99; Robinson 1950: pl. 12 no. 4-7, pl. 22 no. 16; Stern 1973: fig. 231; Tuna-Nörling 1999: taf. 4-6 no. 93-153). There are eight rim and body fragments in this category and date from 490-470 BC based on their profile and decoration.

We suggest the cup-skyphoi were used at this centre during 490-380 BC based on their typology.

Kantharos

Although the kantharoi were the most popular drinking vessels of the 4th century BC only one rim-body-handle fragment was discovered at Seyitömer Höyük. This black-red glazed piece (Cat. No. 24) is an example of the plain rim type (Sparkes and Talcott 1970: 122), and can be dated to 375-350 BC.

Cup-Kantharos

The cup-kantharos fragments discovered at Seyitömer Höyük are all black glazed. These are examples of a standard type of moulded rim cup-kantharos (For standard type see Sparkes and Talcott 1970: 118-119).

As a result of the excavations carried out at Athenian Agora it was suggested that the cup-kantharos first emerged during the early 4th century BC. The foot of the early examples is similar to that of heavy wall cup-skyphos and the underside was decorated with concentric rings. The shape gradually grew taller and into a slender body and base with concave profile on the neck and coarsely made handles. The underside of the foot is completely black glazed (For the emergence and development of this form see Sparkes and Talcott 1970: 118-119).

The standard type was very popular during the 4th century BC. It shows a high concave neck and thick outturned moulded rim, which could be hollow inside. Cat. No. 25 represents this type.

The standard type cup-kantharoi that were used during the 4th century BC continued to be in use during the Hellenistic Period and then disappeared by 275 BC (Sparkes and Talcott 1970: 119).

The cup-kantharoi of this type found at Seyitömer Höyük are dated to the second and third quarters of the 4th century BC. So far three pieces were discovered that consist of fragments of a rim-body-handle and a foot. Based on stylistic analysis Cat. Nos. 25 and 27 were dated to 375-350 BC, and Cat. No. 26 was dated to 350-325 BC.

There are also two body fragments with ribs on the lower part (Cat. Nos. 28-29) which belong to vessels like kantharos or cup-kantharos. A date between 375-325 BC can be suggested for those fragments.

Mug

The black glazed mugs that were intensively produced in Attica during the second half of the 5th century BC are represented at Seyitömer Höyük only by one fragment. The foot and body fragment (Cat. No. 30) dated to approximately 450 BC belongs the Pheidias Shape (For Pheidias mugs see Sparkes and

Talcott 1970: 72-74, no. 201-222, fig. 3, pl. 11), a type known for showing Achaemenid influence (Miller 1993: 133-134, taf. 23 no. 1-2; Miller 1997: 140, fig. 42-44; Shefton 1971: 109-110, pl 21, fig. 8A-8B).

Phiale

Only one phiale (For general information on phialai see Lushey 1939) fragment was found at this center. This rim and body fragment presented in Cat. No. 31 is classified as an "Achaemenid Phiale," matching those in the Attic pottery repertoire. The phialai of this category have been interpreted as imitations of the Achaemenid metal bowls (Miller 1993: 113-114; Miller 1997: 136-139; Shefton 1971: 109). The fragment discovered at Seyitömer Höyük can be dated to the first half of the 5th century BC based on its profile.

Bolsal

The bolsal which became popular during the third quarter of the 5th century BC in Attica continued to be in production in the 4th century BC as well (For shape development see Sparkes and Talcott 1970: 107-108). The finds of Athenian Agora shows that early versions of this shape are dated to 430 BC (Sparkes and Talcott 1970: 107, 273, no. 532-535). All of the Seyitömer Höyük finds are black glazed, the earliest examples dating from the last quarter of the 5th century BC. These consist of three fragments in Cat. Nos. 32 and 33. There are also three rim fragments from the late 5th-early 4th centuries BC (Cat. No. 34). It is difficult to find a matching counterpart; however, there are similar examples dated to the late 5th-early 4th centuries BC. The sherds datable to the early 4th century BC consist of foot and body fragments (Cat. Nos. 35-37).

Another foot and body fragment in Cat. No. 38 can be dated to the second quarter of the 4th century BC and the foot fragment on Cat. No. 39 compares with those dated to approximately 375 BC.

Bowl

Two types of black glazed bowls from the Attic pottery repertoire were discovered at Seyitömer Höyük. These show outturned rim and incurving rim types (For black glazed Attic bowl types see Sparkes and Talcott 1970: 128).

ATTIC POTTERY FROM SEYİTÖMER HÖYÜK

There are four rim and body fragments and a foot fragment associated with outturned rim bowls at Seyitömer Höyük (Cat. Nos. 40-42). The outturned rim bowls took their classical shape in the 4th century BC and they continued to be popular until the middle of the Hellenistic Period (For shape see Corbett 1949: 328; Sparkes and Talcott 1970: 128-130. For Hellenistic examples see Crowfoot et al. 1957: 245, fig. 48; Thompson 1934: 486, fig. 17). The shape went through some changes with time: During the 4th century BC the upper and lower curves of the body became more pronounced: the upper steep, the lower joining the foot sharply. The join of the upper and lower curves gradually form a right angle (For shape development see Sparkes and Talcott 1970: 128-130). It is possible to observe the formation of this right angle on Cat. No. 40 dated to ca. 380 BC.

Incurving rim bowls emerged in Attica during the late 5th century BC, continued during the 4th century BC and remained popular until the middle of Hellenistic Period (For shape development see Sparkes and Talcott 1970: 131-132). Those from the 5th century are among the rare finds. It appears these bowls were most popular during the 4th century BC. Only three black glazed rim and body fragments of this type were found at Seyitömer Höyük. Parallels of these fragments (Cat. No. 43) are from the Athenian Agora dated to 350 BC.

There are also three small bowl (For small bowls see Sparkes and Talcott 1970: 132ff.) fragments. They are all black glazed and have incurving rims. No 44, which has a complete profile and bears a groove on the resting surface, matches well with those from the Athenian Agora and can be dated to 475-450 BC. Based on their profiles No 45 is datable to the last quarter of the 5th century BC and Cat. No. 46 to the third quarter of the 4th century BC.

Plate

There are three plate fragments. These are black glazed plates (Cat. No. 47-48) and belong to the rolled rim type. They belong to late 4th century BC for their profiles and the grooves below the rim.

The fish plate fragment (Cat. No. 49) has been dated to approximately 375 BC by comparison to those discovered at other centres. The fish plate

(For Attic black glazed fish plates see Sparkes and Talcott 1970: 147ff.) which entered the Attic repertoire during late 5th century BC reached Seyitömer Höyük around the 4th century BC.

Lekythos

The largest number of diagnostic sherds of Attic production belongs to lekythoi, a total of 16 fragments. The decoration varies: some of the fragments were black glazed and some were plant ornamented in red-figure and black-figure. There are a few, however, too fragmentary for any comment about their decoration.

The rims on Cat. Nos. 50-52 and the foot fragment (Cat. No. 53) are black glazed and dated to the 5th century BC. The body decoration of these sherds remains obscure. The body fragment (Cat. No. 54) belongs to the first half of the century for its shape and decoration. The preserved part of the decoration on the shoulder fragment (Cat. No. 55) shows tongues and a chain of lotus buds. The shoulder fragment on Cat. No. 56 bears the same ornamentation. This type of ornamentation is frequently observed on lekythoi dated to the first half of the 5th century BC. The body fragment with palmettes on Cat. No. 57 belongs to the same group. The lower body fragment in Cat. No. 58 can be dated to the first three quarters of the 5th century. The rim fragment on Cat. No. 59 belongs to the globular-body-sub-type of Black Deianeira lekythoi, and shows a profile similar to those produced during 325-310 BC.

There are also four squat lekythoi fragments. The black glazed fragment on Cat. No. 60 is dated to 420-400 BC. The red figured shoulder fragment on Cat. No. 61 is dated to the late 5th and first half of 4th century BC. The lekythos presented on Cat. No. 62 belongs to the second quarter of the 4th century BC for its profile and palmette decoration. The body fragment on Cat. No. 63, which belongs to the Bulas group, is dated to the first half of the 4th century BC.

Amphoriskos

There are three black glazed amphoriskos fragments among Seyitömer Höyük finds (For Black glazed amphoriskos see Sparkes and Talcott 1970: 155-156). Cat. No. 64 represents a rim and neck fragment, and can be dated to 430-420 BC. The

ribbed body fragments in Cat. Nos. 65-66 date from 430-400 BC.

Askos

Only one askos was discovered at this centre. Shown as Cat. No. 67 this black glazed sample is classified among the Guttus Type Askoi (For types of askos see Sparkes and Talcott 1970: 157-160). Sparkes and Talcott, report that the earliest examples of Guttus Type Askoi may belong to the beginning of the 4th century BC (Sparkes and Talcott 1970: 160). The fragment discovered at Seyitömer Mound is in accordance with those produced around 350 BC.

Animal-Head Cup

Animal-head cups (For general information see Hoffmann 1961) entered the Attic pottery repertoire as adaptations of the Achaemenid metal animal-head cups (Miller 1997: 141-142). Only three fragments of Attic animal head cups were discovered at Seyitömer Höyük. Two of the black glazed rim and body fragments (Cat. No. 68) which seem to belong to the straight type of animal-head cups do not find exact parallels (Miller 1997: 141, fig. 47). It is possible to find the horn and ear depictions on Cat. No. 69 among the straight and bent types of the animal-head cups (Hoffmann 1961: 21-23, pl. 8-10; Miller 1997: 141, fig. 48). The fragments in Cat. Nos. 68-69 can be dated to the first half of the 5th century BC.

GENERAL EVALUATION

It is quite reasonable to suggest that Seyitömer Höyük was economically well-off during the Achaemenid period as it acquired a substantial amount of fine Attic pottery, long regarded as high quality and expensive in the pottery market. This may have been highly possible, but it is difficult to corroborate it with the archaeological features of the occupation level, because the entire material including the very few associated small finds comes from the fifth and fourth century fills, nothing intact and mendable. The pottery, mere scraps, and general scarcity of small finds give us the impression that the inhabitants gathered their belongings and left the settlement by the end of this occupation period since there is no indication of destruction or warfare. It is likely that the settlement was abandoned for a brief period by its inhabitants as the empire was collaps-

ing after the defeat at the Battle of Granicus.

The classical writers Arrian and Strabo report that Parmenion, a commander of Alexander the Great, captured the "deserted" Daskyleion after the Battle of Granicus (Arrian. *Anabasis*. 1.17. 1; Strabo. *Geographica*. 16. 776). In contrast, the excavations at Daskyleion have shown that the satrapal centre was not deserted when the Macedonian army reached there. It was captured after a military confrontation resulting in plunder and destruction (Bakır 2003: 8). Even though the comments of Arrian and Strabo might not reflect what really happened in Daskyleion, there may have been such situations when people fled before the arrival of the Macedonian army. In fact the barren and abandoned look of Seyitömer Höyük around the time of the Battle of Granicus fits well into the kind of scenario mentioned by Arrian and Strabo.

The Attic pottery from Seyitömer Höyük helps to date the other findings of the Achaemenid period settlement such as Achaemenid bowls and bullae, idols, fibulae, arrow heads, etc. On the other hand, this pottery provides significant information concerning the Achaemenid period settlement and its trade connections. Our study shows that Attic pottery was imported during the period between the beginning of the 5th and the last quarter of the 4th century BC, the highest quantity and largest variety of shapes falling into the 5th century BC. This is the period when the region was ruled by the Achaemenid Empire. If the long lasting wars and political conflicts between Persians and Greeks were taken into account it is not possible for Seyitömer Höyük to have had direct trade relations with Athens. Attic pottery must have reached Seyitömer Höyük indirectly. Despite the lack of specific evidence we could suggest that the trade relations of the settlement depended on the west Anatolian poleis, Daskyleion and Sardis, the satrapal centers (For commercial activities in central Anatolia see Miller 1997: 71-72).

One could of course pose the following question: if wars and political strife between Persians and Athenians actively continued during the 5th and 4th centuries BC, why did the inhabitants of Seyitömer Höyük under Achaemenid rule use Attic pottery?

Part of the answer lies in the Achaemenid satrapal system in which each satrap, the highest

ATTIC POTTERY FROM SEYİTÖMER HÖYÜK

Achaemenid official in a province, appointed local governors to smaller divisions within their area of administrative responsibility (Xenophon. *Hellenica*. 3. 1. 10-15). The satraps and their local officials imitated the lifestyle of the Great King (*Imitatio Regis*; Xenophon. *Kyropaidia*. 8. 6. 10) as his representatives. This included a tendency towards using expensive luxury items. Fine Attic pottery, regarded as the highest quality of its time, was in

high demand by the local rulers and the wealthy class. In such an environment it is no surprise to see some shapes in Attic pottery that were heavily influenced by Achaemenid metal ware (Miller 1993: 109-146, taf. 18-42; Miller 1997: 135-152; Shefton 1971). No doubt, the Achaemenid world was an important market for the Attic potters (Coşkun 2004, 2006; Görkay 1999; Miller 1997: 65ff.; Tuna-Nörling 1999; Vries 1977).

CATALOGUE

Cup

1- Type C, Concave Lip (Fig. 1)

H. pres. 0.022. D. of rim. 0.15.

Rim and body fragment. Shallow convex body. Black glaze inside and out.

Parallels: Bloesch 1940: taf. 36 no. 4; Sparkes and Talcott 1970: fig. 4 no. 413.

480-450 BC.

2- Vicup (Fig. 1)

H. pres. 0.011. D. of foot. 0.076.

Foot fragment. Resting surface and wall slightly concave and reserved. Underside reserved with one circle in thick glossy black glaze.

Parallels: Bloesch 1940: taf. 38 no. 3; Sparkes and Talcott 1970: fig. 5 no. 434.

Ca. 475 BC.

3- Vicup (Fig. 1)

H. pres. 0.014. D. of foot. 0.088.

Foot fragment. Resting surface and wall slightly concave and reserved. Underside reserved with one circle in thick glossy black glaze.

Parallels: Sparkes and Talcott 1970: pl. 20 no. 436.

470-460 BC.

4- Acrocup (Fig. 1)

H. pres. 0.013. D. of foot. 0.074.

Foot fragment. Concave upper and convex lower part. Wall and resting surface reserved. Thick glazed circle on underside. Glossy black glaze.

Parallels: Bloesch 1940: taf. 39 no. 3.

475-450 BC.

5- Others (Fig. 1)

H. pres. 0.014. D. of foot. 0.066.

Foot fragment. Conical. Resting surface grooved and reserved. Black glaze.

For comparison see: Sparkes and Talcott 1970: fig 5 no. 440 (acrocup: 480-460), no. 471 (stemless: 470-450). 480-450 BC.

6- Others (Fig. 1)

H. pres. 0.029. W. pres. 0.046.

Stem and floor fragment. Two scraped grooves outside the stem. Black glaze outside, painted in red-figure inside.

Too fragmentary.

5th century BC.

Stemless Cup

7- Large: Inset Lip (Fig. 1)

H. pres. 0.029. D. of rim. 0.136.

Rim, body and handle fragment. Slightly concave lip, inset at junction of body and rim. Black glaze inside and out. Handle-panel reserved.

Parallels: Alexandrescu 1978: fig. 11 no. 519; Boardman 1959: fig. 11 no. 185; Boulter 1953: fig. 2 no. 199; Sparkes and Talcott 1970: fig. 5 no. 471.

470-450 BC.

8- Large: Inset Lip (Fig. 1)

H. pres. 0.013. D. of foot. 0.078.

Foot fragment. Black glaze in. Side and resting surface reserved. Horizontal groove over upper part of side. Two concentric circles and dot in black glaze on underside of the foot.

Parallels: Alexandrescu 1978: fig. 11 no. 519; Boardman 1959: fig. 11 no. 185; Boulter 1953: fig. 2 no. 199; Sparkes and Talcott 1970: fig. 5 no. 471.

470-450 BC.

Skyphos

9- Type B (Fig. 1)

H. pres. 0.026. D. of rim. ?

Rim, body and handle fragment. Plain rim. Black glaze

inside and out.

Parallels: Sparkes and Talcott 1970: pl. 17 no. 362.
480-450 BC.

10- Type B (Fig. 1)

H. pres. 0.021. D. of foot. 0.042.

Foot and body fragment. Horizontal reserved fillet on the lower wall. Convex ring foot. Black glaze inside and out. Resting surface reserved. Thick circle in black glaze and central dot on reserved underside of foot.

Parallels: Sparkes and Talcott 1970: pl. 17 no. 362.
480-450 BC.

11- Type A (Fig. 1)

H. pres. 0.017. D. of foot. 0.094.

Foot and body fragment. Convex ring foot. Resting surface and underside of foot reserved. Black glaze inside and out.

Parallels: Robinson 1950: pl. 199 no. 561.
460-430 BC.

12- Saint Valentin Group (Figs 1, 5)

H. pres. 0.055. D. of rim. 0.104.

Rim, body and handle fragment. Plain rim. Black glaze inside and out. Decoration: Olive branch painted in added white in two bands between handles. Vertical strokes in reserved band in between.

Parallels: Howard and Johnson 1954: pl. 34, fig. 19; Tuna-Nörling 1999: taf. 15 no. 285a-285b.
450-400 BC.

13- Red Figure (Fig. 5)

H. pres. 0.031. W. pres. 0.024.

Body fragment. Part of palmette pattern in red figure. Black glaze in.

Parallels: Tuna-Nörling 1999: taf. 25 no. 458A.
375-350? BC.

Cup-Skyphos

14- Heavy Wall (Fig. 1)

H. 4.3. D. of rim 11.8.

Rim, body and handle fragment. Groove at juncture of lip and body. Black glaze inside and out.

Parallels: Cook 1965: fig. 1 no. 1; Kastenbein 1974: abb. 236 B; Sparkes and Talcott 1970: pl. 27 no. 622.
400-380 BC.

15- Heavy Wall (Fig. 1)

H. pres. 0.023. D. of foot. ?

Rim and body fragment. Black glaze inside and out.

Parallels: Sparkes and Talcott 1970: fig. 6 no. 617.
Ca. 410 BC.

16- In the Manner of Haimon Group (Figs 1, 5)

H. pres. 0.063. D. of rim. 0.23.

Rim and body fragment. Convex body. Black glaze on outer surface of lip. Thin reserved band on black glazed inner surface. Decoration: From left: palmette, head and torso of nude male reclining right. Black Figure.

Parallels: Boardman 1959: pl. 38 no. 100; Gökay 1999: taf. 10-12 no. 135-148; Ivanov 1963: taf. 99; Robinson 1950: pl. 12 no. 4-7, pl. 22 no. 16, pl. 39 no. 102; Stern 1973: fig. 231; Tuna-Nörling 1999: taf. 4-6 no. 93-153.
490-470 BC.

17- In the Manner of Haimon Group (Figs 2, 5)

H. pres. 0.003. D. of rim. 0.16.

Rim and body fragment. Slightly outturned rim. Convex body. Lip black glazed outside. Silhouette ornamentation on reserved body: dotted ivy leaves and palmette. Thin reserved band on black glazed inside.

Parallels: Boardman 1959: pl. 38 no. 100, pl. 39 no. 102; Gökay 1999: taf. 10-12 no. 135-148; Ivanov 1963: taf. 99; Robinson 1950: pl. 12 no. 4-7, pl. 22 no. 16; Stern 1973: fig. 231; Tuna-Nörling 1999: taf. 4-6 no. 93-153.
490-470 BC.

18- In the Manner of Haimon Group (Figs 2, 5)

H. pres. 0.038. D. of rim. 0.132.

Rim and body fragment. Plain rim. Convex body, outer face of lip black glazed, inner face reserved, black glaze in. Decoration from left: Dotted ivy leaves, male facing right and palmette. Black figure.

Parallels: Boardman 1959: pl. 38 no. 100, pl. 39 no. 102; Gökay 1999: taf. 10-12 no. 135-148; Ivanov 1963: taf. 99; Robinson 1950: pl. 12 no. 4-7, pl. 22 no. 16; Stern 1973: fig. 231; Tuna-Nörling 1999: taf. 4-6 no. 93-153.
490-470 BC.

19- In the Manner of Haimon Group (Figs 2, 5)

H. pres. 0.029. D. of rim. 0.154.

Rim and body fragment. Slightly outturned rim, convex body, outer face of lip black glazed, inner face of lip reserved; black glaze in. Decoration: palmette and ivy leaves. Black figure.

Parallels: Boardman 1959: pl. 38 no. 100, pl. 39 no. 102; Gökay 1999: taf. 10-12 no. 135-148; Ivanov 1963: taf. 99; Robinson 1950: pl. 12 no. 4-7, pl. 22 no. 16; Stern 1973: fig. 231; Tuna-Nörling 1999: taf. 4-6 no. 93-153.
490-470 BC.

20- In the Manner of Haimon Group (Figs 2, 5)

H. pres. 0.032. D. of rim. 0.156.

Rim and body fragment. Slightly outturned rim, convex body, outer face of lip black glazed, inner face of lip reserved; black glaze in. Decoration: palmette. Silhouette black figure.

Parallels: Boardman 1959: pl. 38 no. 100, pl. 39 no. 102; Gökay 1999: taf. 10-12 no. 135-148; Ivanov 1963: taf. 99;

ATTIC POTTERY FROM SEYİTÖMER HÖYÜK

Robinson 1950: pl. 12 no. 4-7, pl. 22 no. 16; Stern 1973: fig. 231; Tuna-Nörning 1999: taf. 4-6 no. 93-153. 490-470 BC.

21- In the Manner of Haimon Group (Fig. 5)

H. pres. 0.036. W. pres. 0.037.

Lip and body fragment. Outturned rim, convex body, outer face of lip black glazed, inner face of lip reserved; black glaze in. Decoration: Unidentified silhouette. Black figure.

Parallels: Boardman 1959: pl. 38 no. 100, pl. 39 no. 102; Görkay 1999: taf. 10-12 no. 135-148; Ivanov 1963: taf. 99; Robinson 1950: pl. 12 no. 4-7, pl. 22 no. 16; Stern 1973: fig. 231; Tuna-Nörning 1999: taf. 4-6 no. 93-153. 490-470 BC.

22- In the Manner of Haimon Group (Fig. 5)

H. pres. 0.029. W. pres. 0.039.

Lip and body fragment. Outturned rim, convex body. Glaze fired reddish brown on outer face of lip, and reddish black in.

Decoration: Obscure figure in silhouette black figure.

Parallels: Boardman 1959: pl. 38 no. 100, pl. 39 no. 102; Görkay 1999: taf. 10-12 no. 135-148; Ivanov 1963: taf. 99; Robinson 1950: pl. 12 no. 4-7, pl. 22 no. 16; Stern 1973: fig. 231; Tuna-Nörning 1999: taf. 4-6 no. 93-153. 490-470 BC.

23- In the Manner of Haimon Group (Fig. 5)

H. pres. 0.037. W. pres. 0.053.

Body fragment. Decoration: On reserved body palmette and two thin bands below. Lower wall black glaze out; reddish mottled black glaze in.

Parallels: Boardman 1959: pl. 38 no. 100, pl. 39 no. 102; Görkay 1999: taf. 10-12 no. 135-148; Ivanov 1963: taf. 99; Robinson 1950: pl. 12 no. 4-7, pl. 22 no. 16; Stern 1973: fig. 231; Tuna-Nörning 1999: taf. 4-6 no. 93-153. 490-470 BC.

Kantharos**24- Plain Rim (Fig. 2)**

H. pres. 0.064. D. of rim. 0.084.

Rim, body and handle fragment. Slightly outturned rim. Horizontal spur levels with the rim. Upper part of the body concave, lower part convex. Glaze fired black and red in and out.

Parallels: Sparkes and Talcott 1970: fig. 7 no. 707. 375-350 BC.

Cup-Kantharos**25- Moulded Rim: Standard (Fig. 2)**

H. pres. 0.083. D. of rim. 0.079.

Rim, body and handle fragment. Outturned molded rim. Hollow channel inside the rim. Upper part of the body

concave, lower part convex. Handle stem preserved. Decoration inside: palmettes within rouletting. Black glaze inside and out.

Parallels: Blondé 1985: fig. 16 no. 128; Robinson 1950: pl. 184 no. 500; Sparkes and Talcott 1970: pl. 28 no. 657. For comparison see Vaag 2002: pl. 1, A8. 375-350 BC.

26- Moulded Rim: Standard (Fig. 2)

H. pres. 0.021. D. of foot. 4.3.

Foot fragment. Molded. Concave beneath. Reserved groove at junction of moldings. Resting surface reserved. Black glaze inside and out.

Parallels: Sparkes and Talcott 1970: fig. 7 no. 661. 350-325 BC.

27- Moulded Rim: Standard (Fig. 2)

H. pres. 0.025. D. of foot. 0.05.

Foot fragment. Scraped line at junction of two moldings. Resting surface reserved. Black glaze inside and out.

Parallels: Sparkes and Talcott 1970: pl. 28 no. 657. 375-350 BC.

28- Cup-kantharos or kantharos (Fig. 5)

H. pres. 0.043. W. pres. 0.058.

Body fragment. Upper wall flaring slightly. Ribbed lower wall. Black glaze inside and out.

Parallels: Sparkes and Talcott 1970: pl. 28 no. 673-674, pl. 29 no. 704, 711. 375-325 BC.

29- Cup-kantharos or kantharos (Fig. 5)

H. pres. 0.0615. W. pres. 0.052.

Body fragment. Upper wall flaring slightly. Ribbed lower wall. Black glaze inside and out.

Parallels: Sparkes and Talcott 1970: pl. 28 no. 673-674, pl. 29 no. 704, 711. 375-325 BC.

Mug**30- Pheidias Shape (Figs 2, 5)**

H. pres. 0.024. D. of foot. 0.068.

Foot and body fragment. Groove at junction of convex body and foot. Vertical grooves on wall. Low ring foot. Black glaze inside and out.

Parallels: Sparkes and Talcott 1970: fig. 3 no. 202. Ca. 450 BC.

Phiale**31- Achaemenid Phiale (Fig. 2)**

H. pres. 0.029. D. of rim. ?

Rim and body fragment. Plain rim. Concave rim and convex body. Black glaze in and out except the body

reserved outside.

Parallels: Shefton 1971: pl. 20, fig. 2; Miller 1993: taf. 20 no. 20.2.

500-450 BC.

Bolsal

32- Bolsal (Fig. 2)

H. pres. 0.025. D. of rim. ?

Rim and body fragment. Plain rim. Body tapers down slightly. Black glaze inside and out.

Parallels: Sparkes and Talcott 1970: fig. 6 no. 554.

425-400 BC.

33- Bolsal (Figs 2, 5)

H. pres. 0.09. D. of foot. 0.088.

Foot and body fragment. Lower wall meets the foot at a sharp angle. Flaring ring foot. Reserved underside with glazed circle. Black glaze inside and out. Impressed decoration inside: palmettes.

Parallels: Sparkes and Talcott 1970: fig. 6 no. 554.

425-400 BC.

34- Bolsal (Fig. 2)

H. pres. 0.05. D. of rim. 0.112.

Rim, body and handle fragment. Plain rim. Convex lower wall. Glaze brownish black inside and out.

Parallels: Boardman 1959: fig. 12 no. 193 (Late 5th century BC.); Robinson 1950: pl. 213 no. 663, 676. (Early 4th century BC.).

Late 5th-Early 4th century BC.

35- Bolsal (Fig. 3)

H. pres. 0.023. D. of foot. 0.058.

Foot and body fragment. Convex lower wall joins the foot at a sharp angle. Flaring ring foot. Two glazed circles and dot on underside of foot. Black glaze inside and out.

Parallels: Sparkes and Talcott 1970: fig. 6 no. 557; Coşkun 2006: fig. 2 no. 23-24.

Early 4th century BC.

36- Bolsal (Fig. 3)

H. pres. 0.021. D. of foot. 0.066.

Foot and body fragment. Convex lower wall joins the foot at a sharp angle. Flaring ring foot. Resting surface glazed. Glazed circle on reserved underside of foot. Black glaze inside and out.

Parallels: Sparkes and Talcott 1970: fig. 6 no. 557; Coşkun 2006: fig. 2 no. 23-24.

Early 4th century BC.

37- Bolsal (Fig. 3)

H. pres. 0.01. D. of foot. 0.07.

Foot and body fragment. Convex lower wall joins the foot at a sharp angle. Flaring ring foot. Resting surface glazed.

Two circles, one narrow and one wide on reserved underside of foot. Black glaze inside and out.

Parallels: Robinson 1950: pl. 213 no. 663 A.

Early 4th century BC.

38- Bolsal (Fig. 3)

H. pres. 0.032. D. of foot. 0.062.

Foot and body fragment. Convex lower wall joins the foot at a sharp angle. Flaring ring foot. Resting surface glazed. Underside of foot reserved. Glaze fired brown inside and out.

Parallels: Alexandrescu 1978: fig. 13 no. 559.

375-350 BC.

39- Bolsal (Fig. 3)

H. pres. 0.09. D. of foot. 0.06.

Foot and body fragment. Convex lower wall joins the foot at a sharp angle. Flaring ring foot. Resting surface glazed. Underside of the foot reserved. Black glaze inside and out.

Parallels: Robinson 1950: pl. 213 no. 659.

Ca. 375 BC.

Bowl

40- Outturned Rim (Figs 3, 5)

H. pres. 0.037. D. of rim 0.154.

Rim and body fragment. Upper wall straight, lower body convex and tapers sharply towards base. Narrow reserved band at junction of body and foot. Impressed decoration inside: circle of enclosed ovules within linked palmettes. Black glaze inside and out.

Parallels: Alexandrescu 1978: fig. 15 no. 587; Blondé 1985: fig. 8 no. 66; Sparkes and Talcott 1970: fig. 8 no. 802.

Ca. 380 BC.

41- Outturned Rim (Figs 3, 6)

H. pres. 0.016. D. of foot. 0.08.

Foot and body fragment. Lower wall joins sharply to foot. Junction of wall and foot reserved. Impressed decoration inside: linked palmettes within circle of enclosed ovules. Resting surface reserved. Circle on reserved underside of the foot. Black glaze inside and out.

Parallels: Sparkes and Talcott 1970: fig. 8 no. 803.

Ca. 380 BC.

42- Outturned Rim (Fig. 3)

H. pres. 0.026. D. of rim. 0.132.

Rim and body fragment. Steep curve on the join of outturned rim to convex body. Black glaze inside and out.

Parallels: Sparkes and Talcott 1970: fig. 8 no. 806

350-325 BC.

43- Incurving Rim (Fig. 3)

H. pres. 0.034. D. of rim. 0.184.

Rim and body fragment. Incurving rim. Convex bowl

ATTIC POTTERY FROM SEYİTÖMER HÖYÜK

tapers toward base. Black glaze inside and out.
Parallels: Sparkes and Talcott 1970: fig. 8 no. 830; Salles 1983: fig. 11 no. 20.
Ca. 350 BC.

Small Bowl

44- Small bowl (Fig. 3)
H. 0.031. D. of rim. 0.056. D. of foot. 0.038.
Complete profile. Incurving rim. Convex body tapers toward base. Sharp angle on juncture of lower wall and ring foot. Narrow groove on resting surface. Black glaze inside and out.
Parallels: Sparkes and Talcott 1970: pl. 33 no. 854-856.
475-450 BC.

45- Small bowl (Fig. 3)
Unknown provenance.
H. 1.9. D. of rim 8.6.
Rim and body fragment. Incurving rim. Convex body tapers toward base. Black glaze inside and out.
Parallels: Sparkes and Talcott 1970: fig. 9 no. 870.
425-400 BC.

46- Small bowl (Fig. 3)
H. pres. 0.019. D. of rim. 0.068.
Rim and body fragment. Incurving rim. Convex body tapers toward base. Black glaze inside and out.
Parallels: Jehasse 1978: fig. 28 no. 167; Salles 1983: fig. 9 no. 12.
350-325 BC.

Plate

47- Rolled Rim (Figs 3, 6)
H. 0.02. D. of rim. 0.126. D. of foot. 0.076.
Complete profile. Smooth transition from convex rim to body. Shallow and narrow groove at junction. Sharp angle at junction between convex lower wall and ring foot. Impressed decoration inside: roulette. Resting surface reserved. Black glaze inside and out.
Parallels: Crowfoot et al. 1957: fig. 51 no. 3; Hamdorf 1976: abb. 238, K 117; Rotroff 1983: fig. 6 no. 39.
Late 4th century BC.

48- Rolled Rim (Figs 3, 6)
H. pres. 0.022. D. of foot. 0.10.
Foot and body fragment. Narrow and shallow groove at junction of rim and body. Lower wall meets ring foot at sharp angle. Impressed decoration inside: roulette. Resting surface reserved. Black glaze inside and out.
Parallels: Crowfoot et al. 1957: fig. 51 no. 3; Hamdorf 1976: abb. 238, K 117; Rotroff 1983: fig. 6 no. 39.
Late 4th century BC.

49- Fish Plate (Fig. 4)

H. 0.039. D. of rim. 0.266. D. of foot. 0.124.
Complete profile. Sharp angle at junction of flat upper wall and downturned convex rim. Ring foot. Black glaze inside and out. Reserved band at junction of body and foot on outer surface. Reserved grooves on outer edge of floor and round central depression. Resting surface reserved. Inner side of foot glazed. Stacking circles on reserved underside of foot.

Parallels: Cook 1965: fig. 10 no. 1.
Ca. 375 BC.

Lekythos

50- Lekythos (Fig. 4)
H. pres. 0.034. D. of rim. 0.025.
Rim and neck fragment. Echinus mouth with incurved inner edge, reserved on top. Black glaze inside and out, neck reserved.
5th century BC.

51- Lekythos (Fig. 4)
Unknown provenance.
H. pres. 0.0135. D. of rim. 0.036.
Rim fragment. Top of mouth reserved. Black glaze inside and out.
5th century BC.

52- Lekythos (Fig. 4)
H. pres. 0.02. D. of rim. 0.06.
Rim fragment. Flaring convex mouth. Black glaze inside and out. Top of mouth and neck reserved.
5th century BC.

53- Lekythos (Fig. 4)
Unknown provenance.
H. pres. 0.08. D. of foot. 0.036.
Foot fragment, disk shaped. Black glazed upper part. Toe and underside reserved. Parallels: Sparkes and Talcott 1970: pl. 38 no. 1117-1119.
5th century BC.

54- Lekythos (Figs 4, 6)
H. pres. 0.087. W. 0.055.
Shoulder and body fragment. Concave shoulder joins in right angle to body. Decoration: Tongues and rays on reserved shoulder. Scraped palmette and lotus bud chain and abraded white on reserved upper wall. Glaze fired in red partially on lower wall.
Parallels: Blinkenberg 1931: pl. 128 no. 2657; Boardman 1959: pl. 39 no. 108-109; Boulter 1963: pl. 37 no. B5; Gökay 1999: taf. 17 no. 242; Kurtz 1975: pl. 69 no. 5; Stern 1973: fig. 232 (right); Tuna-Nörning 1999: taf. 16 no. 296; For more examples see Knigge 1976: taf. 16ff.
500-450 BC.

55- Lekythos (Fig. 6)

H. pres. 0.03. W. pres. 0.033.

Neck, shoulder and handle fragment. Reserved neck. Lower part of handle reserved, black glazed above. Decoration: Tongues on reserved shoulder and chain pattern below.

Parallels: Boulter 1963: pl. 38 no. A1; Haspels 1936: pl. 35 no. 2, pl. 37 no. 3, pl. 39 no. 1, pl. 40 no. 1-2; Kurtz 1975: pl. 6 no. 4, pl. 59 no. 4a-c, pl. 67 no. 2. 500-450 BC.

56- Lekythos (Fig. 6)

pres. 0.02. W. pres. 0.021.

Shoulder fragment.

Decoration: Lotus bud chain on reserved shoulder.

Parallels: Boulter 1963: pl. 38 no. A1; Haspels 1936: pl. 35 no. 2, pl. 37 no. 3, pl. 39 no. 1, pl. 40 no. 1-2; Kurtz 1975: pl. 6 no. 4, pl. 59 no. 4a-c, pl. 67, no. 2. 500-450 BC.

57- Lekythos (Fig. 6)

H. pres. 0.029. W. pres. 0.04.

Body fragment. Decoration: Two palmettes in mirror image on reserved body.

Parallels: Kurtz 1975: pl. 69 no. 3, 6. 500-450 BC.

58- Lekythos (Fig. 6)

H. pres. 0.036. W. pres. 0.047.

Body fragment. Four narrow reserved bands on lower wall. Black glaze inside and out.

Parallels: Görkay 1999: taf. 17 no. 243, taf. 18 no. 247; Robinson 1950: pl. 31 no. 23; Tuna-Nörning 1999: taf. 18 no. 345-346. 500-425 BC.

59- Lekythos (Fig. 4)

H. pres. 0.013. D. of rim. 0.05.

Rim and neck fragment. Flaring rim. Black glaze inside and out.

Parallels: Rotroff 1983: pl. 55 no. 44; Sparkes and Talcott 1970: fig. 11 no. 1108. 325-310 BC.

60- Squat Lekythos (Fig. 6)

H. pres. 0.037. W. pres. 0.031.

Shoulder and body fragment. Fillet at junction of shoulder and body. Ribs on convex upper wall. Black glaze outside.

Parallels: Sparkes and Talcott 1970: pl. 38 no. 1129-1131. 420-400 BC.

61- Squat Lekythos (Fig. 6)

H. pres. 0.028. W. pres. 0.028.

Shoulder and body fragment. Decoration: Red Figure. Head and upper torso of female facing right.

Parallels: Ivanov 1963: taf. 6-10; Moore 1997: pl. 93 no. 947, 951, 953.

Late 5th–first half of the 4th century BC.

62- Palmette Lekythos (Figs 4, 6)

H. pres. 0.051. D. of foot. 0.034.

Neck, body and foot fragment. Plump body with sloping shoulder. Ring foot. Black glaze. Decoration: Palmette pattern in red figure.

Parallels: Berlin 2002: pl. 2 no. 6-7; Blondé 1985: fig. 2 no. 28-29; Coldstream 1999: pl. 30 no. 18-20; Felten 1982: taf. 27 no. 355; Ivanov 1963: pl. 49-50; Robinson 1950: pl. 106. 375-350 BC.

63- Bulas Group (Fig. 6)

H. pres. 0.026. W. pres. 0.031.

Body fragment. Decoration: Web pattern in black. White dots on crossings.

Parallels: Boardman 1959: fig. 10 no. 167-168; Hellström 1965: pl. 4 no. 67-68; Ivanov 1963: taf. 53 no. 161, 164; Robinson 1950: pl. 102 no. 186-194, pl. 107 no. 164-171, pl. 108 no. 172-178; Tuna-Nörning 1999: taf. 16 no. 300-303.

400-350 BC.

Amphoriskos

64- Amphoriskos (Fig. 4)

H. pres. 0.028. D. of rim. 0.028.

Rim and neck fragment. Outturned rim. Slightly flaring convex lip offset from neck. Black glaze inside and out.

Parallels: Sparkes and Talcott 1970: fig. 11 no. 1150. 430-420 BC.

65- Amphoriskos (Fig. 6)

H. pres. 0.042. W. pres. 0.04.

Body fragment. Ribbed wall. Black glazed outside.

Parallels: Shefton 1971: pl. 21, fig. 6; For surface treatment see Ivanov 1963: pl. 63 no. 244; Sparkes and Talcott 1970: pl. 48 no. 1152. 430-400 BC.

66- Amphoriskos (Fig. 6)

H. pres. 0.058. W. pres. 0.04.

Body fragment. Ribbed wall. Black glazed outside.

Parallels: Shefton 1971: pl. 21, fig. 6; For surface treatment see Ivanov 1963: pl. 63 no. 244; Sparkes and Talcott 1970: pl. 48 no. 1152. 430-400 BC.

Askos

67- Guttus Type (Fig. 4)

H. pres. 0.041. D. of foot. 0.098.

Foot and body fragment. Horizontal groove at junction of concave shoulder and body. Sharp angle between join of upper and lower walls. Resting surface and underside of foot reserved. Black glazed outside.

Parallels: Sparkes and Talcott 1970: fig. 11 no. 1194. Ca. 350 BC.

Animal-Head Cup

68- Animal-Head Cup? (Fig. 4)

H. pres. 0.06. D. of rim. 0.216.

ATTIC POTTERY FROM SEYİTÖMER HÖYÜK

Rim and body fragment. Shallow groove at junction of convex rim and lip. Slightly flaring offset lip. Convex bowl tapering towards base. Black glazed inside and out. Parallels: Miller 1993: taf. 28 no. 28.2; Miller 1997: fig. 47. 500-450 BC.

69- Ram-Head Cup (Fig. 6)

H. pres. 0.052. W. pres. 0.081.

Body fragment. Horn and ear of plastic ram head. Black glaze outside. Drips of glaze inside.

Parallels: Winnefeld 1899: 21, 23; Hoffmann 1961: taf. 8-9; Miller 1993: taf. 25 no 1-2, taf. 28 no. 3; Miller 1997: fig. 48. 500-450 BC.

REFERENCES

- Aydin, N., 1991.
“Seyitömer Höyük Kurtarma Kazısı 1989”, *Müze Kurtarma Kazıları Semineri I*: 191-204.
- Bakır, T., 2003.
“Daskyleion (Tyaiy Drayahya) Hellespontine Bölgesi Akhaemenid Satrapiği”, *Anadolu/Anatolia* 25: 1-26.
- Bilgen, A. N., 2008.
“Seyitömer Höyüğü 2006 Yılı Kazısı”, *Kazı Sonuçları Toplantısı* 29: 321-323.
- Berlin, A. M., 2002.
“Ilion before Alexander: A Fourth Century BC Ritual Deposit”, *Studia Troica* 12: 131-178.
- Blinkenberg, Chr., 1931.
Lindos. Fouilles et Recherches 1902-1914. I. Walter de Gruyter.
- Bloesch, Von H., 1940.
Formen Attischer Schalen. Druck und Verlag Benteli A.-G.
- Blondé, F., 1985.
“Un remblai Thasien du I^{ve}. Siecle avant notre ère”, *Bulletin de correspondance hellénique* 109: 281-344.
- Boardman, J., 1959.
“Old Smyrna: The Attic Pottery”, *Bulletin de correspondance hellénique* 53-54 (1958-1959): 152-181, Pl. 31-44.
- Boulter, C., 1953.
“Pottery of the Mid-Fifth Century”, *Hesperia* 22: 59-115, pl. 21-41.
- Boulter, C., 1957.
“Pottery from the Pericleon Athens”, *Archaeology* 10: 191-197.
- Boulter, C., 1963.
“Graves in Lenormant Street, Athens”, *Hesperia* 32: 113-137, pl. 36-53.
- Coldstream, J. N., 1999.
“Knossos 1951-61: Classical and Hellenistic Pottery From the Town”, *Annual of the British School at Athens* 94: 321-351, Pl. 25-40.
- Cook, J. M., 1965.
“Old Smyrna, Fourth Century Black Glaze”, *Annual of the British School at Athens* 60: 143-153.
- Corbett, P. E., 1949.
“Attic Pottery of the Later Fifth Century from the Athenian Agora”, *Hesperia* 18: 298-351, pl. 73-103.
- Coşkun, G., 2004.
“Daskyleion’da M.Ö. 5. Yüzyıl Siyah Firnisli Attika Seramikleri”, *Olba* X: 89-135, lev. 13-20.
- Coşkun, G., 2006.
“Daskyleion’da M.Ö. 4. Yüzyıl Siyah Firnisli Attika Seramikleri”, *Olba* XIII: 83-114.
- Crowfoot, J. W., G. M. Crowfoot and K. M. Kenyon, 1957.
The Objects from Samaria, (Samaria-Sebaste III). Palestine Exploration Fund.
- Felten, W., 1982.
Attische Schwarzfigurige und Rotfigurige Keramik, (Alt-Agina II, I). Zabern.
- Görkay, K., 1999.
“Attic Black-Figure Pottery From Daskyleion”, *Asia Minor Studien* 34: 1-100.
- Hamdorf, F. W., 1976.
“Schichtfunde der Grabungen 1967/68”, *Kerameikos* X: 196-223.
- Haspels, C. H. E., 1936.
Attic Black-Figured Lekythoi. de Boccard.

- Hellström, P., 1965.
Labraunda, Swedish excavations and researches II, I, Pottery of Classical and Later Date. Acta Instituti Atheniensis Regni Sueciae.
- Hoffmann, H., 1961.
“The Persian Origin of Attic Rhyta”, *Antike Kunst* 4: 21-26, Pl. 8-12.
- Howard, S. and F. P. Johnson, 1954.
“The Saint-Valentin Vases”, 58: 191-207, pl. 32-34.
- İlaslı, A., 1996.
“Seyitömer Höyüğü 1993 Yılı Kurtarma Kazısı”, *Müze Kurtarma Kazıları Semineri VI*: 1-20.
- Ivanov, T., 1963.
Razkopkita Nekropola na Apollonija prez 1947-49. Académie des sciences de Bulgarie.
- Jehasse, L., 1978.
Salamine de Chypre VIII, La céramique à vernis noir du rempart méridional. de Boccard.
- Kastenbein, R., 1974.
Das Kastro Tigani, Die bauten und Funde griechischer, römischer und byzantinischer zeit, (Samos XIV). Habelt.
- Knigge, V. U., 1976.
Kerameikos IX, Der Südhügel. Walter de Gruyter.
- Kurtz, D. C., 1975.
Athenian White Lekythoi. Clarendon Press.
- Luschey, H., 1939.
Die Phiale. Verlag Carl Nieft.
- Miller, M. C., 1993.
“Adoption and Adaptation of Achaemenid Metalware Forms in Attic Black-Gloss Ware of the Fifth Century”, *Archäologische Mitteilungen aus Iran und Turan* 26: 109-146, taf. 18-42.
- Miller, M. C., 1997.
Athens and Persians in the fifth century B.C. A Study in Cultural Receptivity. Cambridge University Press.
- Moore, M. B., 1997.
Attic Red-Figured and White-Ground Pottery, (The Athenian Agora XXX). American School of Classical Studies at Athen.
- Robinson, D. M., 1950.
Vases Found in 1934 and 1938, (Excavations at Olynthus XIII). Oxford University Press.
- Rotroff, S. I., 1983.
“The Cistern Systems on the Kolonos Agoraios”, *Hesperia* 52: 257-297, pl. 50-62.
- Salles, J. F., 1983.
Les Egouts de la Ville Classique, (Kition-Bamboula II). Editions Recherche sur les Civilisations.
- Shefton, B. B., 1971.
“Persian Gold and Attic Black-Glaze Achaemenid Influences on Attic Pottery of the 5th and 4th Centuries B.C.”, *Annales Archeologiques Arabes Syriennes* 21: 109-111, pl. XX-XII.
- Sparkes, B. and L. Talcott, 1970.
Black and Plain Pottery, (The Athenian Agora XII). American School of Classical Studies at Athen.
- Stern, E., 1973.
Material Culture of the Land of the Bible in the Persian Period 538-332 B.C. The Bialik Institute and the Israel Exploration Society.
- Thompson, H. A., 1934.
“Two Centuries of Hellenistic Pottery”, *Hesperia* III: 311-480.
- Topbaş, A., 1992.
“Kütahya Seyitömer Höyüğü 1990 Yılı Kurtarma Kazısı”, *Müze Kurtarma Kazıları Semineri II*: 11-34.
- Topbaş, A., 1993.
“Seyitömer Höyüğü 1991 Yılı Kurtarma Kazısı”, *Müze Kurtarma Kazıları Semineri III*: 1-30.
- Topbaş, A., 1994.
“Seyitömer Höyüğü 1992 Yılı Kurtarma Kazısı”, *Müze Kurtarma Kazıları Semineri IV*: 297-310.
- Tuna-Nörling, Y., 1999.
Daskyleion I, Die attische Keramik. Arkeoloji Dergisi ek sayısı, Ege Üniversitesi Yayınları.
- Vaag, L. E., 2002.
“Black and Red Plain Pottery”, *The Mousseleion at Halikarnassos* 7: 28-38.
- Vries, K., 1977.
“Attic Pottery in the Achaemenid Empire”, 81: 544-548.
- Winnefeld, H., 1899.
Altgriechisches Bronzebecken aus Leontini. Georg Reimer.

ATTIC POTTERY FROM SEYTTÖMER HÖYÜK



