

TAHSİN ÖZGÜÇ'E ARMAĞAN

ANATOLIA AND THE ANCIENT NEAR EAST

Studies in Honor of Tahsin Özgüç

Edited By

Kutlu Emre
Machteld Mellink

Barthel Hrouda
Nimet Özgüç

ANKARA 1989

ANATOLIAN AND FOREIGN RELATIONS OF TARSUS IN THE EARLY BRONZE AGE

M.J. MELLINK

In honor of the excavator of Kültepe, whose investigations of the great cultural, economic and political center of Kanish have revealed the inter-Anatolian and international network of urban centers in the beginning of the second millennium B.C. as well as the roots of these interrelations in the Early Bronze Age, this study, in gratitude and admiration wants to offer some comments on a different region of Anatolia, the Cilician plain, which Tahsin Özgüç has referred to extensively in his analysis of Anatolian-Syrian connections in the third millennium B.C.¹ Tarsus-Gözlü Kule is the best known Cilician mound, with a long stratigraphic sequence excavated down to its Neolithic origins by Hetty Goldman, whose friendship with Tahsin Özgüç will also be honored in these pages.²

Tarsus was always a site of mixed affinities. From the beginning it showed its Anatolian roots as well as its links with the ceramic Neolithic sites in the Amuq and the coastal zone of Lebanon. The inventory of Neolithic Mersin revealed the importance of obsidian trade and technology. Cilician trade was already functioning as a middleman carrying obsidian from the South Anatolian plateau to the Levant, presumably from the aceramic period on. This suggests that the route through the Taurus mountains (Cilician Gates) was seasonally functioning in the 7 th millennium B.C.; early trade routes were beginning to develop linking the resources in the Acıgöl-Çiftlik area to a chain of sites extending to the Levant.

In the Chalcolithic era, combined evidence from Mersin and Tarsus reveals that Cilician sites, although part of a large Anatolian string of communities on the coast and on the southern plateau, increasingly came to rely on contacts with North Syria and North Mesopotamia. Unlike Southwest Anatolian counterpart sites, such as Hacilar and Çatal Hüyük West, or even Can Hasan, Mersin and Tarsus revealed contacts with the Halaf as well as Ubaid expansion which extended West of the Euphrates. In Late Chalcolithic, Cilicia shared the ceramic koine of North Mesopotamia and North Syria, Amuq F, which had a predominance of buff chaff-faced wares of partially wheelmade manufacture. Thus in the fifth and fourth millennia B.C. Cilicia peripherally felt the benefits of the economic development along the Euphrates, where Mesopotamian interests continued to manifest themselves. The routes by which these contacts reached Cilicia ran through the Gaziantep area and the Amanus Gates (Arslanlı Bel) with contact points at Sakçagözü and Gedikli and expansion into the middle Ceyhan valley at Domuztepe. Connections with the Amuq were via the coast and the Beylan pass, the Syrian Gates.³

Apparently, shortly before the Late Uruk colonization era (Habuba Kabira, Samsat, Hassek) along the North Syrian and Turkish Euphrates, these early contacts with Cilicia were interrupted. Tarsus shows a strong new orientation in the direction of Anatolia and the Taurus mountains. Both the Chalcolithic connections and the disruption may be the products of increasing and conflicting interests in the control of new resources.

¹ Ancient Anatolia pp. 31-47.

² Tarsus II and John Garstang, Prehistoric Mersin. Oxford 1953.

³ U. Bahadır Alkım, Anadolu Araştırmaları 2, 1965, 1-45.

The Early Bronze I Period

In conventional terminology the change comes at the beginning of the Early Bronze Age. EB I at Tarsus shows a break with the past. Architecturally we know little about the town on Gözlü Kule.⁴ There is an entrance system at the south side. Domestic evidence is available for the use of metal (copper awls, chisels, pins, blades), for weaving (loomweights) and large storage provisions (pithoi). Ceramically we note a sudden turn to the production of handmade brick red pottery, fired to a hard consistency, with Anatolian beaked pitchers as a leading shape. This "red gritty" ware⁵ suddenly forms at least one third of the ceramic production at Tarsus in EB I, in shapes which had been unknown before (Pl. 58, 3 a,b). The technique is primitive, with plugged-in handles and finger-modeling of bodies with concave bases. A finer class of cups of the same ware carries bichrome painted designs of matt red and white on a reddish ground. The pitchers have some of this paint in simpler lines, perhaps in continuation of a Chalcolithic predilection for polychromy. Pithoi are made in a related, but sturdier brick red fabric. They appear in considerable quantity, made with big handles and leaf-impressed stump-bases. These pithoi are handmade and do not change much through the EB period; they are the product of a series of professional potters.

The brick red wares and their repertoire of shapes must have been introduced into Cilicia from the plateau North of the Taurus, the Niğde-Konya area, for which we hitherto have insufficient EB I evidence. The arrival of the new ceramic technique and shapes means a reinforcement of the Anatolian plateau component among the inhabitants and craftsmen of Tarsus. The Cilician Gates must have been used more intensively than in the Late Chalcolithic era.

On the other hand, a good amount of light chaff-faced pottery of Syro-Mesopotamian affinity is still being made and used in EB I Tarsus, (Pl. 58, 1). In the course of EB I it gradually diminishes from ca. 40 % to 25 % of the household wares. It is still manufactured with the aid of a simple wheel or tournette. There even is a fine wheelmade ware, represented in a small quantity of small bowls, slipped and finished with spiral-scraping on the interior,⁶ (Pl. 58, 2a, b). The rare appearance of some comb-patterned red ware sherds of hard fabric in the later part of EB I (Pl. 58, 4) may be a sign of continuing Syrian contact.⁷

The two ceramic traditions, red and light wares, Anatolian and Syrian, coexisted in EB I Tarsus, reflecting not only a variety of technical and cultural affinities, but probably also a symbiosis of different population groups which will remain characteristic of Cilicia. Metallurgical developments remain to be explored as one of the motivating factors for the changes of EB I, and for the high firing temperatures which were introduced by the Anatolian group of potters.

The Early Bronze II Period

Matters are clearer in EB II. The mound of Gözlü Kule in this period gradually came to rise more than 20 m. above the level of the plain. At the beginning of EB II the town was expanded toward the South on a newly laid levelling stratum. Tidily built mudbrick row houses were set along E-W and N-S streets. At the ground level they had elaborate hearths and benches; windows and cupboards were reserved in the walls. This town suffered a major attack and burning at the end of EB II. 2, after which the inhabitants retrenched and put sections of a mudbrick fortification wall in the ruins of the south side houses, phase EB II.3. This fortification was gradually improved, as was its South gateway, EB II. 4-6; subsequently the area was built over again, II. 7-8. Then another attack and conflagration put an end to the prosperous EB II phase.⁸

⁴ Tarsus II, 9-12.

⁵ Tarsus II, 99-100; Fig. 237: 55. For the technique see F. R. Matson's observations in Tarsus II, 359-360 ("sandy ware").

⁶ Chaff-faced ware Tarsus II, 98, Fig. 235. Fine wheelmade ware Tarsus II, Fig. 236.

⁷ Such wares are known from the Levant (Ugarit, Byblos) and exported to Giza in Dynasty IV, e.g. G.A. Reisner and W.S. Smith, *A History of the Giza Necropolis II*, Cambridge Mass. 1955, p. 74-75, Fig. 98, pls. 53 a, b; pp. 64-65, figs. 61, 80, 95-96, pls. 46d, 51-53. The occurrence at Tarsus in late EB I is earlier than most of the known North Syrian instances, see OIP 61, Phase H, pl. 38: 8, 9, 11, pp. 369-370.

⁸ The EB II phases are distinguished here by the plans as published in Tarsus II: plan 4 = phases 1 and 2; plan 5 = phase 3; plan 6 = phases 5 and 6; plan 7 = phase 7; plan 8 = phase 8; plan 9 = phase 9 (and EB III.1).

This prosperity can still be inferred from the remnants of domestic inventories. Metal was used in the households; small tools and ornaments survive. Togglepins of a thin type become popular⁹; tin bronze is attested.¹⁰ Some of the stamp seals are made of bronze or copper in elegant stalk shapes.¹¹ Stamp seal impressions appear on handles of jars and pitchers and on the top of weights.¹² These marks may have had more than a decorative purpose.

The pottery inventory of the successive house levels of EB II also gives indications of prosperity as well as diversity. The red gritty Anatolian ware still predominant, best represented by pitchers from miniatures to ca. 50 cm. in height (Pl. 60, 1 and 2). Rising spouts become narrow and long, trefoil and pinched spouts develop gradually. The necks are still made separately and stuck onto the globular bodies. Handles are often incised on top and pushed through the walls of the handmade pitchers at the lower end. Pithoi of sturdy brick red ware continue to be made, as in EB I, with leaf-impressed stump-bases; the bodies are elongated with a short neck and two handles from rim to shoulder. Incised marks occasionally appear on the rims, simple notations of some reference to contents or quantity, perhaps.

Red and black polished wares occur sparingly, with or without incised decoration, but in quite some variety as products of a modest home industry, as they did in EB I. They, with the red gritty wares represent the authentic Anatolian component of Tarsus pottery in EB II, nearly all handmade except for some experiments towards the end of the period.

On the other hand, there is a large contingent of light colored wares of buff appearance. The average domestic inventories still contain about 20 % of light slipped chaff-faced ware, but this diminishes towards the later phases.

A hallmark of EB II are light clay bowls, tournette-made and well fired.¹³ (Pl. 59, 5). The ware is fine with little visible temper, and the class must be derived from the wheelmade ring-slipped EB I bowls. The EB II bowls are larger (diameters 12-22 cm.) and initially still ring-slipped in the interior. They form up to 20 % of household wares in early EB II, and remain prominent until they are replaced by red wheel-made bowls in the last phase, EB II.8.

To the light clay group also belong two-handled jars, and pitchers with rising, pinched and trefoil spouts, handshaped and tournette-finished. They are sand-tempered and provided with a light slip which is wiped or brushed on, and may be reserved in horizontal stripes.¹⁴ (Pl. 59, 1 and 2). One of such pitchers was found as far away as the cemetery at Giza.¹⁵ Incised marks occur on shoulders and bodies of jars and pitchers.

These large groups of light wares are indigenous and made by potters who essentially continue the Syrian light ware tradition and still have a simple wheel to produce their wares. One can imagine that two different potters' quarters coexisted peacefully along the Tarsus river. In individual households the red and light wares appear mixed. Pithoi are always of the brick red ware, bowls nearly always of the light ware. Jars more often are of light ware than of red gritty fabric, but small and multiple jars appear in a better quality of red gritty ware. The light wares were fired at a lower temperature than red wares.

The diversification of EB I and II ceramics at Tarsus is in contrast to the homogeneity of EB I-II production in West, Central and East Anatolia, which relies on handmade Anatolian red- or black-burnished wares. The Syro-Mesopotamian light ware tradition dominates along the lower Turkish Euphrates, in the region of Adiyaman-Urfa to Carchemish.

⁹ Tarsus II, p. 296; Fig. 431: 210-221.

¹⁰ Room 94, blade 38.1597; Tarsus II. Fig. 423: 16; Ufuk Esin, KSA No. 17 925.

¹¹ Tarsus II, Fig. 392: 13-15.

¹² Tarsus II, Fig. 396: 1-4 and Fig. 395: 1-5.

¹³ Tarsus II, Fig. 245: 155.

¹⁴ Tarsus II, Fig. 248: 201, 202, 204, 206.

¹⁵ G. A. Reisner and W.S. Smith, *A History of the Giza Necropolis II*, Cambridge Mass. 1955, p. 73, pl. 53 f left.

Imports in EB II Tarsus

Non-Cilician wares increase the diversity considerably. Arranged by presumed geographical origins, the principal imports are:

1. From the *Taurus mountains and the adjoining plateau* region comes the ware discussed by Dr. Aliye Ökten in this volume, a relative of Tarsus red gritty ware but distinctly different in fabric and shapes. It is handmade, of buff yellowish clay, fired quite hard, and decorated with purplish red paint. Shapes represented at Tarsus are two-handled jars with vertical necks and lug-handles, bowls, and pitchers with rising spout and small throat-lugs.¹⁶ (Pl. 61, 1). Their stratigraphic context is EB II. 1-2 (room 114), 5-6 (second phase of the fortification wall, rooms 107, 110), and a few sherds from EB II. 7-8. The connection is with the Konya and Acemhöyük zone via the Cilician Gates, as suggested by the finds from Bol-karmaden and Darboğaz. This distinctive ware must have accompanied traffic from Bol-karmaden and the plateau to Tarsus (and Mersin). One may think of increasingly important metallurgical links and interests.

Tahsin Özgüç has pointed out that this network also extended to Kültepe.¹⁷ He published a small jug from a cist-grave in Kültepe of the EB II period, level 14.

2. From the *region across the Amanus*: Zincirli, Gedikli Höyük, comes the incised brickred ware represented in handleless jars of elegant profiles with incised patterns of cross-hatching, lozenges, wavy lines and triangles in neat bands.¹⁸ (Pl. 61, 2, 4). Early samples are found in EB II.2; more elaborate versions come from II.4. These are wheelmade or tournette-made. Samples of this ware continue in small quantity through the EB II period and in a coarse variety last well into EB III. They all seem to be imports in Tarsus.

The ware and its special shapes were known from Zincirli. We now have much more evidence from the late Bahadır and Handan Alkım's excavations at Gedikli.¹⁹ This ware also trickles into the Amuq²⁰ and into the Khabur region at Tel Brak²¹, but its home is in the Islahiye-Antep region. Tarsus has a good connection with the center of this ware. Cilician contacts with the sites across the Amanus must have been lively in EB II. This means that the road to the Euphrates was indirectly known as well.

3. Through the South Amanus from the *Amuq* come light wheelmade wares in small quantity and in several variants. Corrugated light buff, truncated conical cups and small jars with everted rims are of a fine, often greenish ware, and occur first in EB II. 1-2: rooms 113, 114, also in the mudbrick of the first fortification wall.²² (Pl. 59, 3,4). Fragments continue through EB II.

Similar cups and jars appear fully developed in Amuq phase I, after the elimination of the Khirbet Kerak wares of Phase H.²³ Amuq phase I is later than Tarsus EB II, and the Tarsus occurrence is likely to have been brought about by contacts with Northwest Syrian sites unaffected by the Khirbet Kerak disruption. Gedikli also has samples of corrugated truncated conical cups²⁴, but does not seem to be a production center. At Tarsus these small wheelmade cups and jars, like the fine spiral-scraped bowls of EB I, may have been made by a resident Syrian potter. They are a luxury ware belonging to the greater West Syrian buff wheelmade class.

4. The *Euphrates* connection: spiral burnished wheelmade jars and bottles of "metallic ware".

Tarsus EB II yielded a few samples of this imported ware in the form of jar and bottle fragments²⁵ (Pl. 61, 5a and b). The jar sherds come from room 116, EB II.4; the bottle sherds were embedded in walls

¹⁶ Tarsus II, p. 107; Fig. 247.

¹⁷ Ancient Anatolia pp. 38-39. Fig. 3-21.

¹⁸ Tarsus II, pp. 122-123; Fig. 255: 278-283.

¹⁹ Handan Alkım, VIII. Türk Tarih Kongresi I, 1979, pp. 135-142, pl. 88, especially figs. 14 and 15. U. Bahadır Alkım and Handan Alkım, Belleten XXX, 1966, chamber tomb M 1, p. 48, figs. 41-42.

²⁰ OIP 61, pl. 87: 2; pp. 368-370.

²¹ K. Fielden, Iraq 39, 1977, p. 249, pl. XIII. 13.

²² Tarsus II, pp. 106-107, Fig. 245: 178-187.

²³ OIP 61, pp. 410-412; Fig. 315, 3-5; pl. 87: 3, 5; cf. M. Tadmor, Israel Exploration Journal 14, 1964, p. 264.

²⁴ Handan Alkım, VIII. Türk Tarih Kongresi I, 1979, pl. 89, Fig. 19.

²⁵ Tarsus II, p. 130; Fig. 263: 369-370 (jar) and p. 114, Fig. 244: 154 a, b (bottle).

of the same level, and may therefore be a bit older. Tahsin Özgüç and H. Kühne have dealt with this spiral-burnished class of vessels, which often have thin red painted stripes on neck or shoulder. Its main distribution zone is in the Euphrates and Khabur valleys.²⁶

Kültepe, as Tahsin Özgüç pointed out, is represented by imports in EB II level 15, including a piece with the telltale red stripe.²⁷ Level 15 produced several Syrian bottles of a capacious type.²⁸ Such bottles must have been imported for their contents. At this time their average height is 7-8 cm., the maximum diameter about the same. Like the later alabastra, they may have contained perfumed oil which would be a proper cosmetic adjunct also as a tomb gift, such as the two bottles found in a cist grave of level 15 at Kültepe. These are luxuries imported along with a more utilitarian, but less directly visible part of the trade with the Euphrates region. Local imitations of these bottles are beginning to appear in Anatolia along with the spread of the custom of their use.

A small lead bottle fragment survives from the early phase of EB II at Tarsus.²⁹ (Pl. 59, 6). Its shape is related to the Syrian series, but the lead must have come from the Taurus mines. Lead vessels are beginning to appear in EB II contexts also in other Anatolian regions, to judge by specimens in the Ankara Museum and the Kocabas collection of uncertain provenance.

The Syrian contacts of Kültepe will have followed a direct route across the Antitaurus; the Cilician branch of trade runs through the Gaziantep zone and across the Amanus. It is hard to measure the relative intensity of the traffic by the ceramic residue. The count so far gives a major role to sites like Zincirli and Gedikli as intermediate stations in maintaining the contacts with Cilicia. The frequency of North Syrian imports in Kültepe levels 15 and 14 suggests that trade is indeed functioning through the difficult terrain traversed from the Euphrates valley to Cappadocia. Sites like Göksun were already accessible to late Ubaid contacts.³⁰ In EB II, Early Dynastic III, contacts were well established, and the initiatives must have come from both sides.

4. *Cyprus*. The network of Tarsus EB II apparently extends to Cyprus. Two different kinds of pottery found in Tarsus have been claimed as Cypriote in origin.

a. The first is red-painted on a white slip, which is suspected to be Chalcolithic Cypriote Erimi ware. The best specimen comes from room 120, EB II.4, a small jar with lustrous red stripes.³¹ Peltenburg points out that the shape of this small jar is unusual for Cyprus.³² More analysis is in order.

b. The second ware is better represented. It has a red-and-black streak-burnished finish and is used for large vessels, mainly bottles with slanting shoulders and straight or tapering necks (Pl. 61, 3). Bases are flattened with rounded edges. The distribution of these pieces is mostly in the period of the second fortification wall, EB II, 5-6.³³ The ware, which is foreign to Tarsus, has been compared to Philia B type wares from tombs at Philia and the settlement at Kyra Alonia, Black-Slip-and-Combed ware.³⁴

This comparison seems valid, although the technique of the Tarsus specimens deserves examination. There are several other traits in the ceramic repertoire of the Philia tombs which confirm an Anatolian-

²⁶ H. Kühne, *Die Keramik vom Tell Chuera*, Berlin 1976, pp. 67-70. Recent examples in I. Kampschulte and W. Orthmann, *Gräber des 3. Jahrtausends im syrischen Euphrattal I. Ausgrabungen bei Tawi 1975 und 1978*, Bonn 1984, tombs 5, 24; tomb 22: 215, 261; tomb 70: 10-12; tomb 71: 11; tomb 22: 14, pl. 40, with incised mark. Tarsus occurrences of wheelmade ware with reserved paint also point to the Euphrates area, Tarsus II, Fig. 248: 207; cf. Kühne op. cit. p. 49.

²⁷ Ancient Anatolia pp. 37-38; Fig. 3-18; ill. 3-11.

²⁸ Ancient Anatolia figs. 3-10, 11, 12, 15, 16.

²⁹ Tarsus II, p. 303, Fig. 435: 11.

³⁰ G.H. Brown, *Anatolian Studies* 17, 1967, p. 130. U. Bahadır Alkım, *Anadolu Araştırmaları I*, 1959, 207-222 discusses the various roads through the Antitaurus to the Kayseri area.

³¹ Tarsus II, p. 130, Fig. 263: 379; profile Fig. 347: 379. P. Dikaïos, *Swedish Cyprus Expedition IV.1*, 1962, p. 201.

³² E.J. Peltenburg in J. Reade, ed., *Chalcolithic Cyprus and Western Asia* (British Museum Occasional Papers 26, 1981) p. 37.

³³ Tarsus II, p. 130; Fig. 263: 371-378.

³⁴ T. Watkins in J. Reade, ed. *Chalcolithic Cyprus in Western Asia* (see note 32 supra) pp. 18-19.

Cilician contact. In addition, types of spindle whorls and the shape of metal earrings seem to reflect Cilician counterparts.³⁵

Tarsus must have had a harbor on the Mediterranean coast, the predecessor of Rhegma; and the Tarsus river allowed access to the inland settlement. Geomorphological studies will have to determine the exact configuration of land, river and sea in EB II. Navigation will have begun to serve economic ties with Cyprus and the Levant as well as Anatolian coastal communities. Cypriote metallurgy may at this time have been stimulated by Anatolian contacts. Comparisons with Tarsus are difficult because the actual residue of metal objects from EB II levels is frugal, and the town was looted twice. We do not have the EB cemetery of Tarsus, which would preserve better evidence.

The Early Bronze III Period

The devastation of EB II Tarsus may have been the result of actions by sea as well as on land. Contacts and potential rivalries had become of interregional importance along the coasts of Anatolia as well as in the Aegean. Gözlü Kule was attacked and suffered a conflagration which marks the end of the EB II era.

The first new structures on top of the burnt ruins (EB III.1) are poorly preserved, but among the surviving wall stumps are unburnt deposits of new style pottery, and many storage pits filled with telltale ceramic debris. The second building level, EB III. 2, suggests that the new houses were built with individual walls, unlike the row house system of EB II. Rooms 70+73, with large conglomerate stone foundations, may represent a small megaron with central doorway in the porch.³⁶ A tin bronze chisel belonged to its inventory; a gold pin came from a later use of the house.³⁷ Room 74, a bit earlier in EB III. 2 than 70+73, yielded a small hoard in a pot: faience beads, bronze rings, roll-head pins, again of tin bronze, a boar's tusk pendant, and a piece of iron; eleven hematite weights lay on the floor.³⁸

Subsequent rebuilding levels show agglutinative megaroid houses in EB III. 3, but multi-room houses begin to develop in EB III.4-6. It is probable that the EB III.2 layout reflects a West Anatolian building system, but this is gradually superseded through subdivision and remodeling, resulting in complexes with a large unit as the center of the house, as Hetty Goldman suggested.

We continue to get glimpses of material wealth. Room 56 of EB III. 6 yielded a hoard of bronze weapons and tools: a flat axe of tin bronze, three daggers, three chisels and a pin. A sandstone mold for flat axes and chisels lay on the floor of room 55.³⁹ Metallurgy was evidently thriving, and tin bronze was known but not generally used.

The most eloquent evidence for change is ceramic. The beginning of EB III is a typical "red ware" period. Cilician red gritty ware and its pithoid variants are healthy survivors, but acquire distinctive EB III traits. Pitcher shapes begin to be modernized, with flaring curves of the beaked spouts (Pl. 60, 3). New shapes in red gritty ware are bowls with slight carination and, in the later phases, horizontal tilted handles (Pl. 60, 5 a, b). Small jars became popular, also combined in multiple vessels, previously rare. (Pl. 60, 4). Covers are made in red gritty ware. Pithoi are still produced in the old tradition, and a pithoid ware of related fabric begins to predominate in flat-based jars and hole-mouth vessels. In the final stages of EB III this ware merges with wheelmade sandy fabrics represented in large jugs with pinched mouth, which will supersede the red gritty pitchers. The EB II light wares fade out: chaff-faced ware, a survivor from Late Chalcolithic, disappears from modern households, as do the EB II light ware bowls and jugs.

³⁵ E.J. Peltenburg l.c. (note 32 supra).

³⁶ The EB III subphases are illustrated by the following plans in Tarsus II: EB III.1 shaded walls on plan 9; III. 2 plan 10; III. 3 plan 11; III. 4 plan 12; III. 5 plan 13; III. 6 plan 14; III. 7 (transitional to MB) plan 15. For the development see H. Goldman pp. 32-40.

³⁷ Tarsus II, fig. 434: 1 and fig. 426: 58. The chisel is No. 17 943 in Ufuk Esin KSA. Room 70 lasted into EB III. 3.

³⁸ Hoard: Tarsus II, fig. 431:223 = Ufuk Esin KSA No. 17 980, toggle pin; fig. 430: 183 rolled head pin; fig. 432: 250, earrings; fig. 453:2 faience beads; Fig. 440: 113, boar's tusk pendant. Hematite weights: Tarsus II, p. 33, fig. 420: 118-128.

³⁹ Flat axe, Tarsus II, fig. 424: 18 = Ufuk Esin No. 17 926; daggers fig. 428: 99-101; chisels fig. 426: 57, 59, 60; pin fig. 431: 226. Mould Tarsus II, p. 305. Lead is used for repairs, cf. the lead sleeve in the shafthole of a stone hammer, fig. 417: 67, p. 273.

Innovation is represented by a plethora of red polished ware in West Anatolian shapes. This influx is sudden, and typical of the EB III.1-2 phases. We see it in bowls, plates, platters, tankards, depa, lentoids, jars and even in coarse ware vessels nicknamed "Copper Age ware" because of their plateau affinities. Some contexts (especially pits) have 95-99 % red wares, including the modernized version of red gritty ware. Prominent new types are red-polished bowls, well-fired and made of a reddish-buff clay with fine sandy temper, mostly still finished by hand although wheelmade specimens occur (Pl. 62, 1, 3). These bowls often are carinated and begin to have beaded rims.⁴⁰ Platters with straight rims are of diameters of up to 50 cm. Many show wheelmarks. Red bowls and platters average about 10-20 % of the inventory in EB III. 1 and 2 rooms and pits. One and two-handled tankards with flaring rims begin in EB III. 1. Most are red-polished, some are buff-smoothed, wheelmade.⁴¹ (Pl. 63, 1, 2). Red polished bell-shaped cups with bold loop-handles are attested for EB III. 1.⁴² (Pl. 62, 4). Typical Trojan depa also start appearing at this time in red-polished ware, with thick bases, handmade, coiled, or wheelmade. Some are black-or gray-polished.⁴³ (Pl. 63,3). From EB III. 1. comes the fragment of a fluted depas in burnished gray-buff fabric.⁴⁴ (Pl. 62, 6). This is an import of sturdy manufacture. Most of the depa and tankards are locally made.

In the course of EB III. 2-3 the wheelmade Tarsus depas becomes shorter and more capacious. It has curved or straight flaring walls. (Pl. 63, 4, 5) In the final stages, EB III. 6, the depas acquires a profiled base in imitation of the contemporary goblet.⁴⁵ (Pl. 63, 6).

The only buff ware hallmark of the EB III period is the wheelmade functional plate.⁴⁶ It appears suddenly in EB III. 1, continues to form 10 % on more of the inventory of the EB III.1-2 houses, and lasts through all phases of EB III in considerable quantity (Pl. 62, 5).

The West Anatolian Impact

The group of ceramic innovations which arrives suddenly in EB III.1 represents a change in eating and drinking customs. People now imbibe from two-handled tankards (the more popular vessel) and depa, and are served food in large bowls, on bright red platters, and on individual wheelmade utility plates. This style of feasting and its ceramic fashions are better known in West Anatolia, principally from Troy II, where the appearance of the repertoire and customs is also sudden. We know the EB III complex insufficiently outside of Troy, but note that its main ceramic traits can be found inland at Karataş near Elmalı and at Aphrodisias.⁴⁷ In the acropolis mound at the latter site stacks of up to 20 wheelmade plates lay collapsed in burnt rooms. The depas here goes through the full development, including a red fluted type which is part of the series represented in an earlier gray version at Tarsus (Pl. 62, 6). Such fluted depa belong in Southwest Anatolia, as also indicated by a red depas from the Pisidian region now in the Antalya Museum.⁴⁸ Other fluted gray vessels, such as a vessel from Tarsus of EB III.2-3 context⁴⁹, are of a thinner wheelmade variety seen in a smaller depas in the Afyon Museum. This class must imitate originals in precious metal.

The types of EB III vessels vary a bit according to region. The chronology and interpretation of these differences, and the comparison with Aegean occurrences of tankards and depa need not detain us here.⁵⁰ The origin of the new style vessels and customs is somewhere in West Anatolia, and the sites asso-

⁴⁰ Tarsus II, fig. 264: 400-402, 405.

⁴¹ Tarsus II, p. 141, No. 468 (red polished handmade); fig. 265: 472 red wheelmade; pp. 141-142, No. 471 buff wheelmade.

⁴² Tarsus II, p. 142; fig. 266: 488, 489.

⁴³ Tarsus II, fig. 265: 484.

⁴⁴ Tarsus II, fig. 285: 722.

⁴⁵ Tarsus II, fig. 266: 507.

⁴⁶ Tarsus II, fig. 265: 412-413, 417, 418.

⁴⁷ Karataş: M. J. Mellink in *American Journal of Archaeology* 69, 1965, 250 and 71, 1967, 258-263. Aphrodisias: M. Joukowsky, *Prehistoric Aphrodisias I*, Providence-Louvain 1986, p. 89, complex V, units 270 and 273; depa pp. 390-391.

⁴⁸ *American Journal of Archaeology* 72, 1968, pl. 54, fig. 4 (Antalya Museum); fig. 3 (Aphrodisias).

⁴⁹ Tarsus II, fig. 285: 735.

⁵⁰ Cf. M. J. Mellink in Gerald Cadogan, editor, *The End of the Early Bronze Age in the Aegean*, Leiden, 1986, pp. 139-152, and the chapter on Anatolian chronology in the forthcoming new edition of R. W. Ehrich, ed., *Chronologies in Old World Archaeology* (Chicago 1989).

ciated with them are architecturally and technologically distinctive. We see a glimpse of megaroid building in Tarsus EB III.2, but the area excavated had no good evidence for the first buildings erected after the destruction of the EB II town. Many of the typical EB III storage pits antedate the III. 2 phase. Tarsus EB III was reorganized, probably refortified⁵¹, and it assimilated the people and benefits that came with the West Anatolian impact.

Connections with the Central Plateau

As Tahsin Özgüç has described, some of the ceramic fashions of EB III appear on the central plateau and at Kültepe. One- and two-handled tankards came from a jar burial near Acemhöyük⁵² in typical manufacture paralleled at Tarsus and the sites of the Southwest. The mound at Kültepe in EB levels 12 and 13 has local adaptations of this type of vessel.⁵³ A rare depas makes it to Kültepe in tall slender form, with flaring rim, and is locally modified in level 12 as a rounded, two-handled cup with central red bands.⁵⁴ Wheelmade truncated conical depa of Tarsus EB III. 2-3 type occur in Kültepe levels 11b-12. Wheelmade bowls, again showing some local adaptation in profile, start in level 13.⁵⁵ This is a clear instance of plateau contact with the coastal world of EB III Cilicia, but not a wholesale adoption of the new style of wining and dining. Analogous contacts with the South and West bring an occasional depas to sites in the Halys bend and the Sakarya valley.

There is a peculiar backlash of Anatolian ceramic fashion in Tarsus. The group labelled "Copper Age ware"⁵⁶ is a somewhat primitive accompaniment of the new EB III era at Gözlü Kule. It is a hand-made, low fired, mottled, heavy fabric with grit, sand and some chaff temper, burnished over a thick red slip. The most typical shape is the dipper (Pl. 62, 2); very common are mottled bowls, small jars, and large jars with horizontal loop handles.⁵⁷ These simple vessels, which resemble central Anatolian EB II wares, begin to appear at the start of Tarsus EB III. 1; some of the pits which have debris from this level contained large quantities of this ware. Its abundance shows that it is locally made, but it is an oddly primitive element brought in with the elegant (and often wheelmade) serving and drinking vessels. Its technical features have their best parallels on the plateau as well as in the Southwest. This component does not belong to Troy.

One small bowl sherd from a late EB II fill at Tarsus, West of room 81, is of the painted Cappadocian family (Pl. 62, 7). This comes from the shoulder of a bowl with a knob on the blunt carination. Armağan Öktü assigned it to the class of Çıradere ware, correlating with Kültepe mound level 13.⁵⁸ The developed Cappadocian ware is conspicuous by its absence at Tarsus.

Syrian Connections

a. *Metallic Ware.* Spiral-burnished clinky wares continue to appear in Tarsus EB III contexts. Alabastron-shaped gray bottles of a new, gradually more slender profile occur in great numbers (Pl. 64, 1, 2).

They begin to appear in late III. 2 and continue through EB III. 3-8 into MB I. Gray spiral-burnished bottles of good fabric seem to be imports (Pl. 64, 2); in the course of EB III. 4-8, imitations in buff, gray and red-slipped gritty ware are made at Tarsus.⁵⁹

For Kültepe Tahsin Özgüç has shown the occurrence of this type of slender gray alabastron in EB III levels 13, 12, and 11b.⁶⁰ The correlation is with Tilmen Hüyük level IIIId⁶¹ and Gedikli III⁶² across the

⁵¹ What may the base of a fortification wall is discussed by H. Goldman in Tarsus II, pp. 8 and 348, fig. 458f.

⁵² Ancient Anatolia figs. 3-34 and 35.

⁵³ Ancient Anatolia figs. 3-31 to 33.

⁵⁴ Ancient Anatolia, tall depas fig. 3-27; cup with red bands fig. 3-26, illustration 3-16 and 17.

⁵⁵ Ancient Anatolia fig. 3-24.

⁵⁶ Tarsus II, pp. 160-162.

⁵⁷ Tarsus II, fig. 285: 691; fig. 354: 705, p. 161.

⁵⁸ Tarsus II, p. 163; fig. 285: 744. Armağan Öktü, *Die Intermediate-Keramik in Kleinasien*, München 1973, p. 132 note 2.

⁵⁹ Tarsus II, fig. 268: 617, here Pl. 64, 2 import, fig. 268: 614 and 615, local.

⁶⁰ Ancient Anatolia, level 13: ill. 3-4 and 5; figs. 3-6 and 7; level 12: ill. 3.3; level 11b: ill. 3-6 and 7.

⁶¹ U. Bahadır Alkım, *Orientalia* 33, 1964, p. 505 fig. 9.

⁶² Handan Alkım, VIII. Türk Tarih Kongresi I, 1979, p. 140, figs. 26-27.

Amanus, and with many sites in the Euphrates and Khabur valleys.⁶³ Clay analysis may some day confirm the origin of the Tarsus gray bottles, but they must have come via the Gedikli area. At Gedikli, these new style Syrian perfume bottles appear as gifts in the cremation cemetery along with Tarsus type EB III.2-3 depa, tankards, and pitchers with cutaway neck.⁶⁴ The latter three shapes show the close connections this area maintained with Cilicia in the Tarsus III. 2 stage, perhaps not immediately at the time of the West Anatolian influx, but in the phase when the earlier Syrian contacts were reestablishing themselves and for a long period. The depa and tankards in the cremation cemetery of Gedikli indicate a special interaction between Cilicia and the sites across the northern Amanus. The lack of information on the burial customs of EB III Tarsus (and the greater West Anatolian area in EB III) puts a restraint on judging the nature of these interrelations.

Tarsus has other types of metallic wares in rarer imports. Fragments of a trefoil pitcher of a fine clinky fabric (Pl. 64, 3 a,b) are at least as early as EB III.3, a fragile piece that travelled a long way.⁶⁵ Other sherds are of sturdier fabric and belong to vessels larger than the alabastra.⁶⁶

b. Buff wheelmade wares

Syrian and Amuq prototypes are imitated in the wheelmade simple and footed goblets which appear in Tarsus from about the end of EB III. 2 on.⁶⁷ They merge with late depas profiles into buff wheelmade hybrids which continue to the end of EB III and into MB I (Pl. 63, 7 a,b). Rilled goblets of Syrian type turn up both in Tarsus and in Kültepe as early as EB II as imports.⁶⁸ These handleless goblets are the normal drinking cup in the Syrian repertoire; in the depas phase at Tarsus handles are attached to such chalices, rarely just one, mostly two. The production is local.⁶⁹ The earliest EB III goblets at Tarsus have flat, concave, disc, ring, or low pedestal bases; the later ones are made with profiled pedestal bases. Room 30, at the end of EB III, still has a variety of types which continue into MB (Pl. 63, 8,9).

c. Export of depa

In the Amuq, a single imported depas of Tarsus III. 6 type is known from phase J, a wheelmade, footed cup with depas handles. The fabric is gray-buff, slipped and burnished to a dark finish.⁷⁰ At this time gray wheelmade alabastra also turn up in the Amuq. The easternmost depas known so far is a large red-burnished specimen from a shaft grave of level III at Selenkahiye on the Syrian Euphrates.⁷¹ This one has a round base and is uncanonical. With a height of 22.9 cm. it is completely unlike the small goblet series and attempts to emulate the oldfashioned tall depas of the Trojan series. At Selenkahiye, the level in question again yielded Syrian ring-burnished bottles.

d. Seals and Sealings

The EB III period at Tarsus yielded the earliest cylinder seals from the site in the form of frit or faience bead-cylinders with herringbone patterns in three registers.⁷² (Pl. 64, 4 a,b). These come from early contexts, III. 1; one of them was found in the same pit-complex as a stamp seal with figural animal handle,⁷³ (Pl. 64., 5 a,b). The stamp seal is of a bright green glazed steatite or composite material (turquoise?), and has the design of a lizard, and a bull standing over a prostrate human figure. This is an import from the Levant, related to First Intermediate Period figural stamp seals from Egypt, as Hetty Gold-

⁶³ Extensively discussed by H. Kühne, *Die Keramik vom Tell Chuera*, Berlin 1976, pp. 36-38 and 63-66, fig., 65; pl. 42: 1-3.

⁶⁴ Handan Alkım, VIII. Türk Tarih Kongresi I, 1979, figs. 28-31; *Belleten* XXX, 1966, figs. 33-34.

⁶⁵ Tarsus II, p. 163; fig. 285: 741. Room 35, 9.54-9.69 m. floor and in East wall of room 55.

⁶⁶ Tarsus II, p. 163, fig. 284: 739.

⁶⁷ Tarsus II, p. 144.

⁶⁸ Kültepe, *Ancient Anatolia* fig. 3-20; ill. 3-12 and 13; level 14. Tarsus II, fig. 248: 240.

⁶⁹ Tarsus II, fig. 266: 508, 511, 512, 466.

⁷⁰ OIP 61, fig. 349, p. 450-451.

⁷¹ M. van Loon, *Annales Archéologiques Arabes Syriennes* 18, 1968, p. 27 I thank Professor Van Loon for providing special information.

⁷² Tarsus II, fig. 393: 20 and 21.

⁷³ Tarsus II, fig. 393: 25, pp. 234 and 238. Intrusions 38/189-181-185.

man pointed out. The cylinders suggest a Levantine origin, also. The stamp seal continued in use at Tarsus in EB III. One metal stalk seal⁷⁴ comes from recycled walling material and may be an heirloom from EB II, but from the pit with the green stamp seal came a much thumbprinted clay sealing with the impression of a square stamp seal,⁷⁵ proof of sealing practice in this early EB III period (Pl. 64, 6).

The other sealings found at Tarsus come from room 30 in an EB III. 6 context with evidence for use of cylinder seals of ornamental and representational type.⁷⁶ Some of the seal designs, and most of the pottery in this storeroom betrays a strong dependence on Syrian forms, as a prelude to increasing Syrian contacts in the MB era.

Pottery is still being stamped occasionally in Tarsus EB III.⁷⁷ The practice differs somewhat from that of EB II in that friezes of cylinder seals are now appearing on jars, long after this fashion was introduced in Syria and the Euphrates valley. The Levant continues the practice into EB III.⁷⁸ An Anatolian specialty is the use of stamp-cylinders to mark pottery with stamp and frieze designs combined, e.g. on a typical red gritty bowl of EB III.6 (Pl. 60, 5a, b). The combination of cylinder and stamp impressions occurs once at Mersin⁷⁹ and once in the preserved record of Troy II.⁸⁰

General

In the relationship of Tarsus to Anatolia we see three major phases. Initially Tarsus and Mersin have a strong Anatolian component in their material culture. This probably is due to the substance of a population dating back to the aceramic period, maintaining links with the plateau as well as the East. Obsidian is the mainstay of Anatolian trade and exchange.

After a strong Syrian and North Mesopotamian linkage in the Chalcolithic period, a second genuine Anatolian element makes itself noticeable at the beginning of EB. The origin of the new ceramic indicators is to be sought in the northern Taurus and the adjoining plateau, the same general area of Neolithic contacts. The technological strength of the newly intensified connection may be in the metal resources of the Taurus, Bolkarmaden among them. In EB I-II Tarsus, the balance between East and West is reflected in the material inventory of the houses. In EB II, trade across the Amanus is evident, as is seaborne contact with Cyprus; this is the Early Dynastic III period in Mesopotamia and Syria.

The third major Anatolian impact on Tarsus comes from the West in EB III. It is hard to read the events that took place before a contingent of new settlers joined the survivors in the partially destroyed EB II.9 town. Yet the ceramic record makes it clear that a koine of West Anatolian pottery, best known from Troy II, makes its appearance now also at Tarsus, and merges with the surviving EB II traditions.

The geographical range of the world to which EB III Tarsus belonged was expanded considerably in Anatolia itself. Ships must have maintained contacts with the West coast and the Aegean; overland routes now were not restricted to the passages through the Taurus such as the Cilician Gates and the Gökusu (Kalykadnos) valley; Northern Lycia, Pisidia, and the Maeander valley (Aphrodisias) betray the same EB III hallmarks; inland routes provide communications among the growing towns of the western plateau. Ceramically the fashions of the West are not copied wholesale in central Anatolia, but incidental imports and imitations occur frequently enough to provide synchronisms and confirm a measure of contact also evident in metal artefacts. In general a widening of horizons is to be noted, and a certain aggressive overtone of the new traders and rulers, as evident in destructions of Aegean sites, of Troy II itself, of Aphrodisias⁸¹, and in the raid on Tarsus EB II. 9.

⁷⁴ Tarsus II, fig. 393: 23.

⁷⁵ Tarsus II, fig. 398: 8.

⁷⁶ Tarsus II, fig. 398: 1-7.

⁷⁷ Tarsus II, fig. 397: 5-12.

⁷⁸ A. Ben Tor, *Cylinder Seals of Third Millennium Palestine*, BASOR Supplement 22, 1978, pp. 97-99.

⁷⁹ J. Garstang, *Liverpool Annals of Archaeology and Anthropology* 26, 1939, pl. 75: 17 and pl. 81: 8. *Prehistoric Mersin*, Oxford 1953, fig. 150: 17.

⁸⁰ H. Schmidt, *Schliemann's Sammlung trojanischer Altertümer*, Berlin 1902, No. 2552.

⁸¹ M. Joukowsky, *Prehistoric Aphrodisias I*, Providence-Louvain 1986, pp. 170, 175.

Tarsus provided the EB III newcomers with a Syrian connection. The Amanus Gates were still open, and the most explicit ceramic evidence comes from Gedikli, where West Anatolian tankards, depa and pitchers were used in the settlement and deposited as tombgifts in the cremation cemetery. This is the easternmost case of West Anatolian koine traits. Some of the depa are made in the brickred ware of the Islahiye plain. The interaction is intensive and one wonders whether cremation burial is by now making its way to the west.

Although the diagnosis of contact and trade is largely based on ceramic evidence, we must be prepared to look for other data of substantial exchange and trade. Precious metals are used liberally in this era, as we know better from Troy than from Tarsus. Tin is accessible. Textiles and linen may already have been a potential export of Cilicia. Finished artefacts (weapons, tools, jewelry, metal vessels) will have made their way back and forth among the EB III centers. Tarsus is importing faience and frit objects; its EB III.2 merchants were using hematite weights of international type. Cylinder seals are becoming known and stamp-cylinders enjoy a vogue which reaches as far as the Aegean. Sealing practices appear in storage rooms.

All of this is taking place on the fringe of the literate world of the Akkadian and neo-Sumerian period. It is difficult to project legendary history of Sargon and Naramsin into the archaeological record of Anatolia. The discovery of an EB III jar burial near Acemhöyük with red polished West Anatolian tankards shows that this site (Burushanda?) was in touch with the EB III world of Tarsus and the West. Tarsus itself had merchants who must have travelled to places where they could see scribes and monuments. In its traditional role as an Anatolian outpost with a long lasting Syrian connection, Tarsus had much to offer to the newcomers from the Aegean and the West. It had a horizon of its own, with a touch of cosmopolitanism. Its population may have been bi- or multilingual from early times on. In the MB Age of Tarsus the pendulum will again swing toward more Syrian involvement, and after an equilibrium was reached, Cilicia was ready to share the interests of the Old Hittite kingdom as a historical partner.

On the plateau, Kanish in EB III maintained its own direct channels to North Syria and North Mesopotamia, as Tahsin Özgüç has revealed in the course of his campaigns on the city mound. One of the questions which remain puzzling is the amount of interaction between the dynamic forces of the EB III West and the rise of the proto-Hittite cities on the plateau. If we narrow our perspective once more to ceramics, it seems that the reshaping of the central Anatolian EB Age pottery into the wheelmade, sharpened repertoire of the Karum IV-II periods could not have taken place without some input from the West. Tahsin Özgüç was the first to analyze the various strains represented in the making of MB pottery at Kanish.⁸² West Anatolian strains now deserve special scrutiny, since their EB III development covers considerable territory along the south coast as well. Ceramic phenomena will again be partial clues to other developments. The crucial areas will be the Konya Plain and Cappadocia. One wonders about the provenance of the human substance that filled the large suburbs developing around the city mounds of Konya Karahöyük, Acemhöyük and Kanish. Akkadian campaigns and Anatolian rivalries could have contributed to fusion or forced movements

As in the past, better insight will come from Kanish. We shall learn more about the nature and tempo of the transition from EB III to MB I through future excavations of the lowest Karum levels and the relevant strata on the city mound of Kanish. The test trenches so far have given us a clear prelude to the international aspects of Kanish in the later third millennium B.C. All Anatolian excavators and historians will continue to look to Kanish with great expectations, and with profound gratitude to Tahsin Özgüç whose pioneering work at Kanish as well as other sites have given Anatolian archaeology a new historical perspective.

⁸² Tahsin Özgüç and Nimet Özgüç, *Kultepe Kazısı Raporu 1949*, Ankara 1953, pp. 208-217. Kutlu Emre, *Anadolu-Anatolia* 7 (1963) pp. 87-99.

Abbreviations:

Ancient Anatolia

Tahsin Özgüç, "New Observations on the Relationship of Kültepe with Southeast Anatolia and North Syria during the Third Millennium B.C." pp. 31-47 in: *Ancient Anatolia. Aspects of Change and Cultural Development*, ed. J.V. Canby, E. Porada, B.S. Ridgway, T. Stech, U. of Wisconsin Press 1980.

KSA

Ufuk Esin, *Kuantitatif Spektral Analiz Yardımıyla Anadolu'da Başlangıcından Asur Kolonileri Çağına Kadar Bakır ve Tunç Madenciliği*, İstanbul 1969.

OIP 61

Robert J. Braidwood and Linda S. Braidwood, *Excavations in the Plain of Antioch I. The earlier Assemblages. Phases A-J*. Oriental Institute Publications volume 61. Chicago 1960.

Tarsus II

Hetty Goldman, *Excavations at Gözlü Kule TARSUS. II. From the Neolithic through the Bronze Age*. Princeton 1956.

ILLUSTRATIONS

Plate 58

- Fig. 1 Light-slipped chaff-faced jar rim. Level 28-27 m. Early EB I.
 Fig. 2 a and b. Spiral-slipped light clay wheelmade bowl fragments. Level 25-20 m. EB I. Cf. Tarsus II, fig. 236: 50-52.
 Fig. 3, a and b. Red gritty pitcher fragment. Max. pres. H. 0.057 m. Level 28-27 m. Early EB I. Tarsus II, fig. 237: 55.
 Fig. 4 Comb-patterned jar fragments, red ware, Level 23-22.50 m. EB I.

Plate 59

- Fig. 1 Reserved slip light clay pitcher with suspension holes. H. 0.15 m. Room 93. EB II late. Tarsus II, fig. 348: 203.
 Fig. 2 Reserved slip pitcher. H. 0.16 m. Room 115. EB II. 1-2. Tarsus II, fig. 248: 202.
 Fig. 3 Corrugated light ware cup. H. 0.104 m. Room 113. EB II. 1. Tarsus II, fig. 245: 178.
 Fig. 4 Corrugated light ware cups, bases. Dia. 0.03-0.05 m. EB II early. Tarsus II, fig. 245: 180-184.
 Fig. 5 Light ware bowl. Dia. 0.12 m. Room 115. EB II. 1-2. Tarsus II, fig. 245: 155.
 Fig. 6 Lead bottle fragment. Pres. H. 0.015. Level 19.97 m. EB II early.

Plate 60

- Fig. 1 Red gritty pitcher. H. 0.153 m. Floor room 112. EB II. 3. Tarsus II, fig. 249: 214.
 Fig. 2 Red gritty pitcher. H. 0.26 m. Room 115, in pithos EB II. 2. Tarsus II, fig. 249: 211.
 Fig. 3 Red gritty pitcher spouts. Left EB III. 1, Tarsus II, fig. 250: 225. Right: intrusion 38/108. EB III later.
 Fig. 4 Red gritty multiple jar. Max. H. 0.126. Intrusion 38/176. EB III. 1. Tarsus II, fig. 278: 621.
 Fig. 5 a and b. Red gritty bowl. Dia. 0.225 m. Room 45, level 9.60. EB III. 5. Tarsus II, fig. 354: 433 and fig. 397: 6.

Plate 61

- Fig. 1 Konya-Taurus ware jar. H. 0.15 m. Room 112, EB II. Tarsus II, fig. 247: 191.
 Fig. 2 Gedikli ware jar. H. 0.145. Room 112 burnt debris. EB II. 2. Tarsus II, fig. 255: 279.
 Fig. 3 Cypriote Red-Black streak burnished ware bottle fragment. Rim Dia. 0.04 m. Enclosure area, EB II. 7. Tarsus II, fig. 263: 373.
 Fig. 4 Gedikli ware pedestalled jar. H. 0.21. Room 119, level 16.00. EB II. 4. Tarsus II, fig. 255: 280.
 Fig. 5 a, b Syrian Spiral-burnished jar fragments. Rim Dia. ca. 0.14. Room 119, level 16.00. Tarsus II, fig. 263: 369.

Plate 62

- Fig. 1 Red polished flaring bowl. Dia. 0.26 m. In wall substance. EB III. 1. Tarsus II, p. 137, No. 426.

- Fig. 2 Dipper of Copper Age ware. Room 72, floor 10.65 m. level. EB III. 2 EB II. 2. Dia. 0.112 m. Tarsus II, fig. 354: 705.
- Fig. 3 Red polished carinated bowl. Dia. rim 0.20 m. Intrusion 38/149. EB III. 1. Tarsus II, p. 136, No. 403.
- Fig. 4 Bell-shaped cup, handmade. Dia. 0.12 m. Under room 72, level 11.30 m. EB III. 1. Tarsus II, fig. 266: 489.
- Fig. 5 Wheelmade plate. Dia. 0.24 m. Room 95, unburnt fill. EB III. 1. Tarsus II, fig. 261: 341.
- Fig. 6 Fluted gray polished depas fragment. Dia. base 0.035. Room 90, 12.35-11.75 m. level. EB III. 1. Tarsus II, fig. 285: 722.
- Fig. 7 Çıradere ware sherd. Max. pres. W. 0.033. W of Room 81, under 11.40 floor. EB III. 1 or latest EB II. Tarsus II, fig. 285: 744.

Plate 63

- Fig. 1 One handled tankard, handmade, gray burnished. H. 0.096 m. Intrusion 38/100. EB III. 1. Tarsus II, fig. 356: 470.
- Fig. 2 Two-handled tankard, wheelmade, red-orange smoothed. H. 0.168. Below room 75. EB III. 1. Tarsus II, fig. 356: 471.
- Fig. 3 Thick-walled depas, coiled, gray burnished. H. 0.017. Intrusion 38/124. EB III. 1. Tarsus II, fig. 265: 484.
- Fig. 4 Squat depas, wheelmade, light red slipped and burnished. H. 0.103 m. Room 46, 10.32 floor. EB III. 3. Tarsus II, fig. 266: 494.
- Fig. 5 Flaring depas, wheelmade, red slipped burnished. H. 0.117 m. Room 46, 10.32 m. floor. EB III. 3. Tarsus II, fig. 266: 507.
- Fig. 6 Footed depas, wheelmade, light brown burnished. H. 0.129 m. Room 35, level 8.95 m. EB III. 6. Tarsus II, fig. 266: 508.
- Fig. 7 a and b. Upper: late footed depas-goblet. Pres. H. 0.07 m. Level 8.40. MB I. Buff wheelmade ware. Lower: late depas-goblet. Pres. H. 0.04 m. Level 8.45 m. MB I. Buff wheelmade ware.
- Fig. 8 Buff wheelmade chalice. H. 0.086. Room 30. EB III. 6. Tarsus II, fig. 268: 518.
- Fig. 9 Buff wheelmade chalice. H. 0.079 m. Room. 30. EB III. 6. Tarsus II, fig. 268: 516.

Plate 64

- Fig. 1 Gray alabastron low burnished, wheelmade. H. Pres. 0.20. Intrusion 38/124. EB III. 1. Tarsus II, p. 156, No. 617.
- Fig. 2 Gray spiral-burnished alabastron. H. 0.145 m. East of rooms 70-75, level 10.65 floor. EB III. 2 late. Tarsus II, fig. 268: 617.
- Fig. 3 a and b Fragments of metallic ware trefoil pitcher. Room 35 and wall of room 55., EB III. 3-4. Tarsus II, fig. 285: 741.
- Fig. 4 Frit or faience bead-cylinders. Left. H. 0.025; right H. 0.032. Left: room 79, 11.65 m. level, EB III. 1. Right: Intrusion 38/189, EB III. 1. Tarsus II, fig. 393: 20 and 21.
- Fig. 5 a and b. Light green stamp seal. D. 0.022. Animal handle broken off. Intrusion 38/181-185-189. EB III. 1. Tarsus II, fig. 393: 25 a, b.
- Fig. 6 Seal impression on clay stopper or fastening. Max. pres. W. Intrusion 38/189. EB III. 1. Tarsus II, fig. 398: 8.