



Review of *Western Asiatic Jewellery* by K R Maxwell-Hyslop  
Methuen Co., London 1970. £10. 00

PRENTISS S. DE JESUS

*Western Asiatic Jewellery* is a nicely illustrated, well-arranged and concise book. Each chapter deals with a specific period and area, such that it is possible through the neatly organized bibliography to see just how deeply the author has gone into the subject. No doubt we benefit from her personal observations and first-hand experience in dealing with this type of material. New photographs of old material is particularly welcome.

Criticisms of this study come hard since the author states in her preface that this book is a general survey which naturally involves "much compression and (she is) conscious of many lacunae". In spite of these lacunae she has touched upon a very much ignored area of archaeological material. In the following paragraphs I shall add a few comments which I feel pertinent to the subject, not so much as a criticism but as a contribution to the enormous task which the author has undertaken.

Mrs Maxwell-Hyslop's chronological table is a traditional one, and although any table of this sort comes under fire from someone one may feel that this particular table gives dates which are a bit low, especially for the early periods. Enough evidence on Carbon-14 analyses calibrated with bristle-cone pine warrant even a fractional raising of the absolute date scale (cf. Renfrew, *PPS*, 1970, pp. 186-7). One should think of the beginning of Troy as being at least 3000 BC, placing the advent of the Anatolian Early Bronze Age around the middle of the Third Millennium.

In Chapter One the author deals with the Early Dynastic Period of Mesopotamia. She refers abundantly to the published reports of Ur. Although she mentions pins throughout this study Paul Jacobstal's book on Greek Near Eastern pins is curiously not mentioned in her bibliography. One might mention here that the racquet pins from Ur (p. 4) have a few parallels. One from Geoy Tepe in Azerbaijan came from K 3 phase which may be in the second half of the Second millennium, using the author's chronology (cf. *Excavations in Azerbaijan* 1948, p. 29, no. 1204). Another (undated) example comes from Tal Aswad in the Habur region (cf. Mallowan, *Iraq* IX, 1947, pl. LIII, no. 32).

The use of carnelian as an ornament is common occurrence in the Near East and Mesopotamia. One might point out a copper toggle pin from Chagar Bazar V now at the British Museum which can be dated roughly to the middle of the Third Millennium. Two carnelian beads are still imbedded in the corrosion (British Museum no. 1935/12. 7. 503). Another toggle pin also from Chagar Bazar V depicts two birds and has carnelian clinging to it (cf. Mallowan, *Iraq*, 1936, fig. 8. (2) ).

In her comparison to Mari Jewellery the author could have set the record straight by pointing out the inconsistencies of the so-called "Ur-treasure." André Parrot has misinterpreted this find. Sir Max Mallowan did indicate that certain "straight shanked" pins were more at home in Northern Syria than Ur (cf. Mallowan, *Biblioteca Orientalia* XXVI 1/2, 1969, p. 88). More specifically, it is the mushroom-headed toggle pins which do not at this period go any farther south than Mari. This pin type is common to Northern Syria, Cilicia, the Amuq Plain and the Islahiye Plain. This northern element in the "Ur treasure" would seem to cancel out the idea that the group was a tribute from Ur to the King of Mari (cf. Parrot, *Le trésor d'Ur*, 1968, p. 47).

Typically Sumerian-type toggle pins appear at Tell Chuera during this same period, though North Syrian and Anatolian types do not appear in Sumer. Two common Sumerian types are the globular and mushroom pins, perforated and bent at right angles to the shank. These bent types appear at Tell Chuera (cf. Moortgat, *Tell Chuera*, 1965, Abb. 30), and there are close parallels at the "A" cemetery at Kish (cf. Mackay, *Report on the Excavations* ..., 1925, pls. 2 and 19, and pls. 40 and 58), at Ur (cf. Woolley, *Ur Excavations II*, 1962, no. 231), at Til Barsib (cf. Dunand, *Til Barsib*, 1936, pl. 30 no. 4 and p. 107), at Amarna near Carchemish (cf. Woolley, *AAA VI*, pl. 24 and p. 52), at Tell Hammam (cf. *AAA VI*, 1914, pl. 21 c) and at Carshemish (cf. *Carchemish III*, Barnett, 1952, pl. 61 a).

Chapter Two deals with the Sargonid Period of Mesopotamia. In the introduction to this section the author sketches out some background to metal work and trade. It has long since been recognized that the metalwork of the Sargonid Period was of a lower quality than that of the Early Dynastic period. It has always been thought that this retrogression in metalworking was due to the lack of tin and copper supplies. Actually, the lack of tin does not enter into the question significantly since well made implements can be cast with pure copper. The poorer quality tools and weapons of the Sargonid period should be equated with the interruption of copper supplies but even more so with

the availability of the smiths themselves. One has the impression while looking at Sargonid metal-work that it was not done by proper smiths but by people who did their best to imitate their work, while not possessing the technical know-how of shaft-hole casting and other skills common to a regular smith's repertoire. This may enhance Childe's theory of the travelling or captive smith (cf. Childe, *Man Makes Himself*, 1965, p. 176).

In discussing the pins from Brak, Mrs Maxwell-Hyslop mentions that they are all of copper. This is in fact not so. A small silver toggle pin now at the British Museum (no. BM 125737/1937/12. 11. 13) was found at the Third Dynasty Ur levels and published by Mallowan in his report (cf. Mallowan, *Iraq* IX, 1947, pl. XXXII (2)). A racquet pin from Tell Aswad in the same area as Brak finds a good parallel at Geoy Tepe in Azerbaijan (cf. Burton-Brown, *Excavations in Azerbaijan* 1948, 1951, fig. 29 no. 1204), and there is a slightly different and undated one from Byblos (cf. Dunand, *Fouilles de Byblos*, Tome II, pl. CV no. 6452). The racquet pin is indeed a rare type but the evidence on its distribution is so fragmentary that one would incline not to agree with the author in her suggestion that it was "exported" to Vadjalik in the Talish area. The examples known to Western scholars are usually those cited by Schaeffer (cf. Schaeffer, *Stratigraphie Comparée*, 1948, pl. LXI). The Vadjalik pins are actually quite different, although they may be generally classified as racquet pins. This is a case where the conveniency of a label can be misleading. Even so, one would need many more examples of racquet pins before one could think of any movement of this type in the way of exportation.

The opposite is true of the so-called rolled-headed or scroll-headed pins. They are common and appear at Mersin as early as Level XXII and as late as the Hittite cemetery at Gordion. No distribution of this pin type suggest any recognizable diffusion.

Although many or most Sumerian metallurgical techniques seem to have come from farther East (ie. Suse, cf. J Deshayes, *Outils de Bronze*, 1960, Tome I, pp. 408-9) new techniques in jewellery is an area which seems typically Sumerian. One of the most sophisticated techniques is granulation. The author's discussion of the diffusion of the granulation technique is a lucid one. She is probably right in saying that the granulation technique was introduced from Sumer to other parts of the Near East, at least our present knowledge suggests this.

Chapter Three of Mrs Maxwell-Hyslop's book deals with "Anatolia 2500-2000 BC" choosing as her type sites: Alaca, Troy, Poliochni, Tarsus and Kara-

taş. The beginning of this chapter deals with some of the chronological problems, and although the author does not resolve any of them she does suggest some working patterns. One may, however, disagree with her in her discussion of Troy II in relation to Sumerian (ie. Sargonid) goldwork. She quotes Mallowan who calls for "a lag of a century for the diffusion of Mesopotamian metal objects." One hardly feels that a diffusion of this type can really be applied here. One of the characteristics of metal objects is their 'ability' to travel great distances in short periods of time. Again this may lend support to the theory of the travelling smith. One should not, then, call for an alternation of dates on the premise that it takes a certain number of years for metal forms and techniques to be transmitted from one area to another. That there had been a long-existing contact between Mesopotamia and Anatolia as well as other parts of the Near East and Eastern Europe has been pointed out by Mr Mellaart (cf. Mellaart, *The Chalcolithic and Early Bronze Ages*, Beirut 1966, pp. 163, 167-9). These contacts were extensive during the period EBA I-II. The metal trade was as far-reaching as any at this stage. In fact, the advent of the Early Bronze Age in Anatolia marked the rise of active international trade. Metal objects, unlike other artifacts, seem to have been able to cross cultural lines and establish themselves with great ease.

The Alaca jewellery is often put into context with the Pontic material and, more specifically, with Trialeti. The author does the same. One feels, however, that this traditional parallel could be expanded upon. Apparently she does not agree with Professor T. Özgüç's view that the parallels between the Central Plateau sites of the Early Bronze Age, Alaca in particular, have been over-emphasized. In Professor Özgüç's view, "The similarity between some objects from Caucasian tombs and those from Alaca höyük and Horoztepe... is not the result of a direct and ethnic connection. These relations have been rather exaggerated from the beginning; now the objects from Anatolia are increasing in numbers, but the number of parallels with the Maikop-Kuban finds is not growing. This resemblance is about of the same nature as the similarities between some of the weapons and jewellery of Troy II and those of Alaca höyük. In each case the resemblances are due to trade and, in my opinion, not to migrations." (cf. Özgüç, *Anatolia* VII, 1963, pp. 16-17).

All resemblances are not, however, due to trade alone. One can see, for example, in the double-spiral pin that its distribution is too far-reaching to be the result of an exportation or importation. Much ink has already flowed on this subject (cf. Huot, *Syria*, Tome XLVI, 1969, pp. 57-93; Goldman, *Tarsus* II, 1956, fig. 431 nos. 207, 208, 209; Bernabo-Brea, *Poliochni*, 1964, pl. LXX-

VI(e)). Although one may not agree with the general conclusions offered by Mr Huot one cannot fail to see the value of this particular artifact. Its absence in certain areas of the Near East, for example Mesopotamia and Palestine, can help us to work out relations between the Tepe Hisar culture, the Pontic coast, the Balkans (cf. Comsa, *Dacia* NS IX, 1965, pp. 361 ff.) and Anatolia. The fact that this artifact and others in similar context are of metal constitutes an important point. The agencies which govern the propagation and diffusion of metal artifacts are certainly at work here, if for the moment we have failed to understand fully their nature.

Hammer-headed pins are also a unique type appearing at Alaca which has chronological importance. The author discusses only briefly this type (cf. p. 42(f) and p. 46). One might take this opportunity to list the following parallels:

Troy IIg: Blegen, *Troy I*, 1950, fig. 357, no. 37-528

Alishar II: Schmidt, *Alishar*, 1932, fig. 201, no. 1442

Cyprus: Jacobstal, *Greek Pins*, 1956, p. 141, cf. notes 2, 3, 4

Ahlatlibel: Kosay, *TTAED* II, 1934, p. 77 nos. 580 and 355

Caucasus: Hancar, *ESA*, 1938, pp. 113-182

Cyprus: Gjerstad *et al*, *Swedish Cyprus Exp.*, 1934, pl. XXIV no. 137

Tepe Gawra: Tobler, *Tepe Gawra*, 1950, pl. XCII (6)

To deal with the Trojan material alone is in itself a lengthy, if not grueling task. In the space allotted herself Mrs Maxwell-Hyslop in fact does justice to the Trojan material. One statement, however, of doubtful validity is when she states, "... Troy was one of the main suppliers of (silver) to the Anatolian traders and Assyrian merchants settled at Kultepe" (p. 59). One cannot really say that the quantity of silver is very great at any Anatolian site at this period, though at Troy it is the most abundant. No doubt silver was traded but probably on a very small scale. Anatolian settlements more likely had their own sources, since native silver and silver ores are common to many areas of Anatolia, not only to the regions under Trojan influence.

In support of her chronology Mrs Maxwell-Hyslop refers to parallels between the Troy II seal impression and Karahöyük seals (pp. 59-60). One does not feel, however, that they are very close parallels, though admittedly they are similar in spirit and execution. The spiraliform design of the Trojan impression could have parental antecedents in Anatolia as well as in the Aegean. Girations on Konya EB II painted pottery are suggestive of running spirals

or swirling spiralfirm designs found in later sealings at Karahöyük (cf. Alp, *Zylinder - und Stempelsiegel aus Karahöyük bei Konya*, 1968, no. 190, and examples from Phaistos, Levi, *Annuario*, 1958, figs. 158, 159, 212, 215, 216). One should feel free to suspect that the Trojan impression has closer parallels with seals earlier than the presently-known Karahöyük examples and that the latter are a continuation of earlier styles.

The recent finds by Raci Temizer at the EBA site of Eskiyapar are worthy of mention here. The hoard of gold and silver jewellery presently on display at the Ankara Museum offers interesting parallels with the Alaca material as well as some Trojan pieces.

Chapter Four deals with the period between Gudea and the end of the Third Dynasty of Ur. The author gives a brief run-down of the significant finds from Warka, Nippur, Ur and Ashur. This section is mainly descriptive. A great number of the lapis lazuli objects came out of graves of this period, especially from the Ur graves. The author points this out at the end of the chapter (p. 77) indicating that there are connections with the East, namely Eastern Iran. The presence of silver also suggests that there may have been direct contacts with Western Iran. Silver deposits are known in that area as well as on the Iranian Central Plateau. These finds contrast with the relative austerity of the Sargonid period. The pomp and wealth of palacial life seem to have been somewhat repressed under Sargon. No doubt the wealth acquired by the king was limited. Disruption of the trade routes from the North and East affected the prosperity of the Mesopotamian peoples, and what little Sargon had was used in making up his army and consolidating his frontiers. Wealth was not long in coming, for under Sargon's successors, Manishtusu and Naram Sin, contacts were extended and great fortunes were amassed. Naram Sin was not only the self-proclaimed "King of the Four Quarters" but also the most outstanding of all pillagers. This wealth which according to documents (cf. Kramer, *The Sumerians*, 1970, pp. 62-3) was concentrated in Naram Sin's palace was but a temporary acquisition, for not long afterwards it fell into the hands of the invading Gutí.

What is striking about the Akkadian metalwork and, later, jewellery is its poor technique for the former and for the latter the lack of any characteristics which may be termed "Akkadian". As suggested above, one suspects that the smiths responsible for metalwork of this period have fled elsewhere. The rise of powerful city states in other parts of the Near East would have been a calling for specialized persons such as smiths.

Chapter Five treats the Isin-Larsa period. The author points out the heavy Iranian influence on Sumerian jewellery at this time. Tepe Giyan and Susa are considered here, and we understand that at this time a network of far-reaching trade routes are being laid. Mesopotamia provided the catalyst for a preponderant Iranian influence which carried itself over into Western Asia, especially during the Larsa period and the First Babylonian Dynasty.

Chapter Six discusses the Assyrian Colony Period in Anatolia. The author gives a quick run-down of the significant jewellery pieces. She does not point out, however, that the number is surprisingly low. There is a conspicuous lack of precious jewellery, for in spite of the international character of the Karum the merchants do not seem to have desired great wealth but rather a conservative and comfortable way of life. This would seem to indicate that the measure of wealth was of a different order. Instead of vast amounts of silver and gold objects, which was probably passed on to Assyria anyway, one suspects that the Assyrian merchants preferred items such as tapestries, wooden furniture and other materials which have not survived. (cf. Garelli, *Assyriens en Cappadoce*, 1963, pp. 284-317 and Orlin, L., *Assyrian Colonies*, Hague 1970, pp. 57-8).

Where in Anatolia during the first half of the Second millennium the quantity of jewellery is limited in Palestine and Syria it is the contrary. In fact, Palestine and North Syria provide us with some of the finest and most imaginative pieces of jewellery and metalwork of this period. The author's suggestions in Chapter Seven relating to the possibility that the metalwork from these areas are steeped in Sumerian technique are valid (p. 108-9). Earlier and Eastern influences and traditions are carried through into these pieces, such as the crescents from the Ajjul Cemetery, granulation and the socketed axe (cf. Deshayes, *Outils...* Vol. I, pp. 183-4, type E).

Chapter Eight differs from the rest of the book in the sense that it deals with the textual evidence as well as the archaeological evidence during the third quarter of the Second millennium. The author traces the evolution of certain motifs commonly found during this period, namely the star, sun disk with rays, the crescent and others. Detailed descriptions of dress and deities' attributes are included in this chapter.

Chapter Nine touches briefly on Jewellery from Iran in the "Mid-Second Millennium BC". The type sites selected are: Dinkha Tepe, Gök tepe, Giyan, Daylaman and Amlash. The author points out the difficulty in understanding fully the jewellery from this period. More stratified finds are necessary to in-

ter-relate archaeological contexts, otherwise a certain amount of guessing, perhaps inaccurate, is the alternative.

The author has curiously left out reference to Luristan in this chapter. One could point out that some studies of Lur jewellery have been done. For example, André Godard's *L'Art de l'Iran* (Paris 1962) treats the very characteristic disked pins (pp. 30–81) while a few other works deal with other artifacts and chronological problems of the area, ie. PRS Moorey, *Iran IX*, 1971, pp. 113–29, *Iran VII*, 1969, pp. 131–153; P Calmeyer, *Datierbare Bronzen*, Berlin 1969; H Thrane, *Archaeology* Vol. 23, no. 1, 1970, pp. 26–35.

Chapter Ten covers the Kassite period and part of the Assyrian period. The origin and history of the Kassite rule in Babylonia still remains somewhat of an archaeological problem. Mrs Maxwell-Hyslop points this out in the first part of this chapter and attempts to isolate a Kassite style in pointing out the possibility of a Caucasian origin.

Regarding the Ashur material, the author indicates the Egyptian influence, perhaps via Syria. This is evidenced by cloisonné inlay, pectorals and the use of lapis lazuli (pp. 167–8). She gives a fairly complete survey of the jewellery found in the Ashur tombs (pp. 169–77), her detailed descriptions being very helpful.

Chapter Eleven treats Assyria and Iran from the 12th to the 7th centuries. The author writes a good historical summary of the period before dealing with the material. She incorporates references to written documents. In dealing with Iran she treats as her type sites: Susa, Sialk Cemetery A, Giyan tombs of Period I, Khurvin, Hasanlu and Marlik. One could add here that a good summary of the Marlik material is also found in *Archeologie vivante*, Paris 1968, pp. 59–62.

Chapter Twelve is consecrated to Urartu from the 9th to the 7th centuries. The author suggests Iranian and Assyrian link for Urartian jewellery. Even though after the reign of Shalmaneser III Urartian art took on regional characteristics (cf. van Loon, *Urartian Art*, Istanbul, 1966, p. 9) its association with the Assyrian culture had been much too close in the past for it to shake the basic ideals of earlier Assyrian artistic tradition. The hostility of the two states did not seem to produce a rejection on either side of their cultural similarities (cf. *ibid.*, pp. 172–4). In fact, Urartian art seems to have been truer to Assyrian tradition than Assyria itself and projects it through the succeeding Median and Persian periods. This chapter ends inconclusively on the spread of Urartian artistic achievement into Transcaucasia. More work by

Western scholars is needed in the latter region to allow for legitimate parallels. In passing, reference can be made to Sulimirsky's treatment of the problem in *Prehistoric Russia* (Dublin 1970, pp. 398-402) and van Loon's discussion in *Urartian Art* (*ibid.*, pp. 175-77). Mr Sulimirsky has also provided ample bibliography for a beginning study of this region (cf. "Late Bronze Age and Earliest Iron Age in USSR," in *Bul. of the Inst. of Arch.*, London, nos. 8 and 9, 1970, pp. 133-137).

Chapter Thirteen restricts itself to Northwest Iran of the 8th to the 7th centuries. One could actually see this part easily incorporated to the previous chapter. Here the author concentrates admirably on the treasure of Ziweye. The quality of the author's scholarship is shown here at its best. She has abundant references to parallels, and we find it hard to disagree with her interpretations. She also writes short summaries of the finds from Ghafantlu and Amlash.

Chapter Fourteen is entitled "Palestine and Syria: Twelfth to Sixth Centuries BC". The author states that it is impossible to treat this material in one chapter. She does, however, offer a starting point by summarizing finds from Tell Fara, Megiddo, Beth Shemesh, Al Mina and Alalakh.

Chapter Fifteen deals with Assyria and Iran from the 9th to the 7th centuries. The abundant treatment of the subjects belies the author's predilection for and competence in this particular period. She illustrates a great portion of the material she discusses and makes very constructive analogies between recovered jewellery and representations on Assyrian reliefs. One may, however, feel free to challenge the author's unmitigated acceptance of D Storonach's study of Near Eastern fibulae (p. 260). The latter states that they are diffused by the Mycenaeans and implies that they are of Mediterranean origin (cf. *Iraq* XXI, 1959, p. 181). An Early Bronze Age fibula fragment was found at Alishar by Schmidt who insists on its stratigraphical position (cf. *Alishar*, 1932, fig. 271 no. 462 and p. 208). An Early Bronze Age II example from Tarsus (cf. *Tarsus*, 1956, fig. 430, no. 244) may also be one of the first Anatolian prototypes. Apart from these Anatolian precedences one may accept the above-mentioned diffusion patterns.

In conclusion, this book is proposed to be a general survey of the material and problems, and the author has more than succeeded in her goal. It is in itself a gem packed with useful information and is an indispensable handbook from which all future study of Near Eastern jewellery must start.