

yerel bir atelyenin eserleri olabilirler²⁵. Fakat yapan sanatkâr, mutla-ka diğer Doğu Yunan eserlerini görmüş ve onların tesirinde kalmış olmalıdır. Bu arada, eserlerde Doğu geleneğinin ve tesirinin daha fazla olduğu, bunun yanında sanatkârın kendi fantazisini de kattığı görülmektedir.

Eserleri daha derin bir inceleme yapmadan, teker teker ve kesin olarak tarihlenememizin sakıncalı ve hatalı olacağı kanaatindeyiz. Fakat şunu rahatlıkla söyleyebiliriz ki; İ.Ö. 7. yy.ın ikinci yarısının başlarından itibaren görülmeye başlayan bu stil ve modanın Batı Anadolu'daki yerel bir atelyeye gelebilmesi için bir zaman geçmiş olması lâzımdır. Şimdilik, elimizdeki eser grubunu İ.Ö. 7. yy.ın üçüncü çeyreğine tarihlenemiz mümkün olabilir.

Yazımızın sonunu şu görüşümüzle bitirmek isteriz: Tanıtmaya çalıştığımız bu eser grubu, Anadolu'nun daha iç kısımlarında da şimdiye kadar bilmediğimiz bazı yerel Doğu Yunan atelyelerinin bulunabileceğine işaret etmektedirler. Bu düşüncelerimizin, yapılmakta olan ve ileride yapılacak araştırmalarla ışığa kavuşturulacağı ümidini taşımaktayız.

25 Her ne kadar çok kesin değilse de, daha önce de belirttiğimiz gibi (dipnot 1), eser grubunun Çavdarhisar (*Aizanoi*) civarında bulunmuş olduğunun söylenmesi bizim bu görüşümüze biraz daha dayanak olmakta ve kuvvetlendirmektedir.

AN EAST GREEK OINOCHOE AND SOME EAST GREEK VASE
FRAGMENTS FROM THE ORIENTALIZING PERIOD, IN THE
ISTANBUL ARCHAEOLOGICAL MUSEUMS

ALPAY PASINLI

In 1974 an East Greek oinochoe was purchased by our museum¹. This trefoil-mouthed, cylindrical-necked and spherical-bodied vase attracted my attention both because of its period and because of the peculiarity of the figures on its surface. I thought it would be worthwhile to study this work and acquaint other archaeologists with it².

The oinochoe, as it came to us, was in a very bad state of restoration; it was composed of many broken fragments, badly assembled. Besides the fact that it was badly restored, the vase, upon closer examination, had a peculiarity about it that caught my attention. Namely, although the vase appeared to be whole, all of the neck and some fragments on the body did not belong to it, since both the clay composing them and the characteristics of the figures on them were different. Once these differences were established, I understood that, in place of the missing neck on the vase's body, a neck from another East Greek vase had been attached, and the vase had been completed by putting fragments of other East Greek vases in place of the missing parts. Faced with this situation, I took the vase to the museum atelier to have the foreign frag-

1. The individual who sold the oinochoe to the museum said that it came from Çavdarhisar (*Aizanoi*), 54 km. southwest of Kütahya.

2. This article, by its brevity, will serve more as an introduction, but I plan to publish a more detailed and in-depth article on these important works in the near future.

It is my very pleasant duty here to express deep thanks to Ord.Prof.Dr. Ekrem Akurgal, who examined the groups of works, encouraged me to publish my article on them, and offered invaluable suggestions, and to Prof.Dr.Baki Ögün, whose advice was of great help. Moreover, I would like to thank Necati Dolunay, Director of the Istanbul Archaeological Museums, for giving me permission to prepare this article and for his unqualified support of my work. I also owe a debt of thanks to my wife and colleague, Sevinç Pasirli, who made the drawings and gave me much help in the preparation of my article. My gratitude goes also to Ronald Matz, who read and corrected the translation of the article. My thanks, too, to Şükri Birkan, Museum Photographer, who photographed the objects.

ments removed and to have the work restored in a proper fashion. The vase was completely dissembled, the neck and other fragments not belonging to it were separated, and the oinochoe was restored once again³.

After the restoration in the atelier, we found ourselves confronted with the following objects:

- a- An East Greek oinochoe body,
- b- The neck of another East Greek oinochoe and a shoulder fragment belonging to the neck,
- c- A fragment of another East Greek vase,
- d- A great number of little fragments of no special importance⁴.

An attempt will now be made to present these objects, to date them and to ascertain the differences between them and other contemporary East Greek works.

a- THE OINOCHOE BODY (Inv.No. 74.236 ç.ç.) (Pl. I, 1; II, 1-2; III, 1; Fig. 1)

It was composed of broken fragments, was restored, and the missing neck, handle and some parts of the body were re-made with plaster (Pl. I, 1; II, 1).

The body is a slightly-flattened sphere, the belly is fat, and it has a round low base. As it is missing from the neck up, we can say nothing definite in this regard, but it is possible that it had a cylindrical neck and a trefoil mouth. A very small part remains of the handle on the shoulder, and judging by this it can be assumed that it had a wide vertical ribbon handle. The measurements of this oinochoe, which I have described in brief, are as follows:

Height from base to bottom of neck	: 19	cm.
Height after restoration	: 30	cm.
Maximum diameter of body	: 25	cm.
Diameter of base	: 12,4	cm.
Width of handle	: 5,5	cm.

3. I would like to here thank Muhittin Uysal, of the museum restorators, who restored the vase with great care.

4. Almost all these vase fragments are quite small, and have no decorations or special characteristics. Therefore I did not consider it necessary to include them in the article.

It is composed of fine-grained, light buff-colored clay. The surface is covered with light buff-colored slip⁵. A horizontal band extending roughly around the middle of the body separates the body in two. There is a figured scene on the upper part, and the bottom part of the body is decorated with parallel horizontal bands (Pl. I, 1). Various shades of brown and, in some places, shades of purple were used in the decoration.

On the upper part is a metope, whose upper and vertical borders are formed by meander bands; the horizontal band extending around the middle of the body forms its lower border (Fig. 1). Within the metope is a scene in the Eastern tradition, composed of a central floral motif of spiral and palmette leaves; on either side of the floral motif fantastic creatures are represented. The metope extends to either side of the handle. On the handle, of which there remains only a small part, is located a large X mark within a quadrangle frame, both of which are brown in color.

Horizontal parallel bands extend around the belly. Between two dark brown bands there are two narrower reddish-brown bands. The upper brown band, as mentioned above, forms the bottom border of the metope. Below these bands on the belly there is a space, followed by a repetition of parallel bands: one reddish-brown band between two dark brown bands. The outer surface of the base is painted brown as well.

Turning again to the figured scene on the upper part, let us now examine the representations in detail.

In the central part of the metope is a design composed of stylized plants and geometric motifs (Pl. II, 2). This combination of stylized plants forms a central motif and covers a large area of the metope. The main motif in the center consists of double spiral and palmette leaves. The double spirals emerge from a single body and extend symmetrically to the sides and upwards; the palmette leaves emerge from between the spirals. These rather wide spirals have interiors decorated with dots, and tips which are voluted. The upward-rising spirals join together at the top, forming between them a heart-shaped space inside which a dark

5. To ensure that the colors on the objects are unambiguous I used the Munsell Catalog (*Munsell Soil Color Charts*, Baltimore, Maryland, 1971). However, the color numbers (except for Inv.No.74.237, of which no drawing is shown) are not given in the text as it seemed more appropriate to list them under the drawings.

brown stylized floral motif is drawn. This floral motif is composed of double bows, one on top of other, which face upwards. The contours of the palmette leaves emerging from between the spirals are drawn in brown, and the leaves are shown alternately painted purple and left reserved.

In this way we often see stylized floral design used as the central motif in animal friezes in East Greek pottery⁶. Painters borrowed the spiral, the lotus and other flowers from the East and made new and more complicated motifs from these⁷.

In fact, stylized floral designs produced in this manner by the combination of spiral and palmette leaves are Eastern motifs, and are designs which can be frequently encountered in every kind of work in

6. Many examples of this motif could be given, but it will suffice to list several of the closest:

- a) E. Akurgal, *Die Kunst Anatoliens von Homer bis Alexander*, Berlin, 1961, p.178, in fig. 125, the stylized plant motif on the shoulder fragment of a vase found in Bayraklı (Ancient Smyrna) is also composed of thick spirals with dotted centers, and palmette leaves.
- b) G. Jacopi, *Clara Rhodos*, IV, Rodi, 1931, p.353, in fig. 391, in the center on the metope on the upper part of the body of an oinochoe found in Camirus Necropol, there is a central floral motif. This floral motif, too, is made up of thick spirals with dotted centers, and palmette leaves. The vase described in this article bears the same floral motif, only it is doubled and symmetrical.
- c) K.F. Kinch, *Fouilles de Vroulia*, Berlin, 1914, in figs.87 c and e, and in fig.96, the stylized floral motifs show similarities.
- d) W. Schiering, *Werkstätten orientalisierender Keramik auf Rhodos*, Berlin, 1957, supplement 8, fig.3.
- e) At the present time there is a 7th century East Greek *dinos* in the Los Angeles County Museum of Art, said to have been found in the region of Lydia. The central floral motif in the middle of the animal-frieze on this *dinos* closely resembles that on the body of the oinochoe under discussion. The representation on this *dinos* is also composed of thick spirals with dotted centers, and palmette leaves emerging from between them. The palmette leaves, as well, resemble those on the oinochoe, by being painted alternately in two colors, but it is not known what colors were used. The photograph of this *dinos* was published in a sales catalog (of M.Yeganeh, Postfach 701270, 6 Frankfurt am Main, W. Germany), but we have only a photocopy of the page on which it appeared. Therefore the characteristics of this *dinos* and the peculiarities of its representations cannot be ascertained to any great extent. I would like to thank Dr.Coşkun Özgünel, who provided the photocopy and offered many helpful suggestions.

7. E. Haspela, *Eski Yunan Boyalı Keramiği* (Translated by A.Akarca), Istanbul, 1946,

Phrygian, Urartian, Hittite, Assyrian, Phoenician and Mesopotamian art. We can see, for example, these kinds of floral designs on an orthostat⁸ from Sakçagözü in the Aramaean style, on the reliefs in a room-shaped grave⁹ in Tamassos (Cyprus), on a Phoenician vase¹⁰ found in Cyprus, and on an ivory pyxis fragment¹¹ found in the Palace of Nimrud.

On both sides of this stylized floral design in the center, there is a symmetrical spiral motif. These motifs are shaped like snails, and their tips point downwards. The interiors of these motifs are likewise filled with dots, and their bodies and pointed ends are connected by bands which have broken meanders in their interiors. Between these snail motifs and the stylized floral group in the center, there is on either side a filling ornament. Above the double spiral are located concentric triangles. The painter arranged this entire floral group and the filling ornaments symmetrically. However, inasmuch as the designs were drawn freehand, the dimensions do not conform to one another. In any case, most of the designs on the righthand side of the vase are effaced, and there are missing fragments as well. But it is possible, from some of the traces of point, to complete the motifs to a certain degree.

After the combination of decorations which occupy the middle of the metope on the upper part of the vase's body, and which consist of stylized floral and filling motifs, there is also represented symmetrically on either side a fantastic creature (Fig. 1). On the left side there is a winged mixed creature (Pl. III, 1). This figure, which at first sight appears to be a sphinx, is in fact not a sphinx, since sphinxes are female creatures with women's faces and lion's legs and tail¹². As for the creature here, shown in profile, it has a woman's head, is winged, the front part of its body is a lion and the back part is a goat. In other words, it was made by combining the front part of a sphinx with the back part of a goat. The front and hind legs are shown in an open position. The face and neck part was made in the *reserved technique*, with the outer contours

8. E. Akurgal, *The Birth of Greek Art*, London, 1968, p.58, pl.15a; H.Th. Bossert, *Altanatolien. Kunst und Handwerk in Kleinasien von den Anfängen bis zum völligen Aufgehen der griechischen Kultur*, Berlin, 1942, p.225, fig.885.

9. H.Th.Bossert, *Altsyrien. Altesten die Kulturen des Mittelmeer Kreises*, Tübingen, 1951, pl.8, fig.22.

10. M.O. Richter, "On a Phoenician Vase found in Cyprus", *JHS*, V (1884), pp.102-103.

11. D. Harden, *The Phoenicians*, London, 1963, pl.62.

12. A. Erhat, *Mitoloji Sözlüğü*, Istanbul, 1972, p.335.

only outlined. Its hair, which extends to its back, is shown by a thick brown line. It has a long pointed nose, raised upwards in an exaggerated manner¹³. Its eye is represented by a rather large open circle. The front part of its body is somewhat fat, and the breast portion is shown by a thick brown line.

This mixed creature whose legs are in an open position stands facing the stylized floral combination in the center. Its left leg, which is stepping forward, is very long and out of proportion compared with its other legs. There is no movement in the leg; it has the shape of a straight stick. The place where this leg extends from the body is contrary to anatomy by being higher than normal. The artist positioned this leg carelessly and haphazardly. The outer contours of these front legs are drawn in brown and their interiors are painted in purple. The back part of this creature, which, as mentioned before, has the shape of a goat, has a more anatomical structure and is more successful as compared with the front of the body. A somewhat large wing rises upwards from the front part of the fantastic creature's body. This wing is painted purple and its details are shown reserved. The area from the back of the wing to the rump is painted brown and is separated from the rump by a narrow portion left reserved. The rump portion and the outer contour of the hindmost leg are drawn in dark brown and their interiors are painted purple. The artist was not able to fit this leg into the metope; the leg breaks the horizontal metope frame. As for the other hind leg, a large portion of it is effaced. As is clear from the traces of paint, the outer contours were drawn in dark brown and the interior was left reserved.

A somewhat large lotus flower is situated on the head of the fantastic creature. The central part of the flower was made in the *reserved technique*, and the other parts were painted purple. This lotus flower must have been made for two purposes: It can be seen both as a filling decoration and as a hat placed on the creature's head.

Right in front of the winged creature there are also masses of dots used as a filling motif.

13. In February 1976, in Istanbul, Ord.Prof.Dr. E.Akurgal held a conference entitled "Bayraklı (Ancient Smyrna) Excavations" (one in the series of conferences arranged by the Touring and Automobile Club of Turkey) during which he showed an East Greek vase from Bayraklı bearing this shape of face and up-turned nose. Prof. Akurgal places this nose type in North Ionia.

Turning now to the righthand side of the stylized floral combination, it is seen that a large portion on this side of the metope is missing. The parts which do remain have lost their paint. On the extreme right, at the end of the metope, there are a tail with a lozenge-shaped end and a rump section stylized in a thick spiral. These are both painted dark brown and belong to a creature whose identity is not absolutely certain (Pl. II, 1; Fig. 1). This type of tail is seen and recognized on almost every East Greek vase. However the rump stylization in the shape of a spiral is rarely encountered. In my opinion this must be a seated animal or fantastic creature: a winged lion, a griffin or some similiar creature. Figures seated in this way were used extensively on East Greek works and generally seated griffins are seen¹⁴.

The mixed fantastic creatures in the scene on the upper part of the oinochoe's body are representations in the Eastern tradition¹⁵. East Greek vase painters preferred the wild and fantastic animals of the East and created together with these new imaginary creatures, all of which were used extensively on vases¹⁶.

b- THE OINOCHOE NECK AND SHOULDER FRAGMENT

— The Oinochoe Neck (Inv.No.74.235 ç.ç.) (Pl. III, 2; IV, 1-2; Fig.2)

It has a wide trefoil mouth and a cylindrical neck (Pl. III, 2). Its clay is light buff-colored and contains fine-grained sand. It is composed of many broken fragments put together. The back part of the mouth and some missing fragments were restored with plaster.

Measurements : Height	:	11,5 cm.
Diameter of neck	:	8,5 cm.
Thickness	:	0,7 cm.

14. On the East Greek work shown in footnote 6a is found a winged seated griffin. It might be said that this griffin bears similarities both in its tail shape and in its manner of sitting; P.F. Arias-M. Hirmer, *A History of Greek Vase Painting*, London, 1962, in fig.26, the tail and the way of sitting of the winged seated griffin in a frieze on the shoulder of a Rhodian oinochoe also can be likened to those on the vase under discussion.

15. These mixed creatures were representations very much liked and used in the East, in Mesopotamian, Assyrian, Phrygian and Urartian art. It is possible to give countless examples, but we can point out a Ziwiyé work of the 8th century which bears a large number of mixed creatures of various kinds: see R. Ghirshman, *Perse*, Paris, 1963, p.313, fig.379. Here can be seen many kinds of creatures on a gold pectoral.

16. A Lane, *Greek Pottery*, London, 1947, p. 30; E. Haspels, *op.cit.*, p. 38.

Its surface is covered with light buff-colored slip, upon which are reddish-brown decorations. Within the indentations on either side of the mouth are horizontal meander bands between double parallel lines (Pl. III, 2; IV. 2). A band, the width of a finger, and in the form of fish scales with a dot in the center of each, extends around the juncture of the mouth and neck. Below this band, and parallel to it, stretches a thin horizontal band. After this there is located an animal-frieze. Under the frieze extend three parallel horizontal bands, the inner one of which is narrower than the outer two.

In the center of the neck frieze are two symmetrically represented wild goats grazing face to face. There is, as well, the figure of a horselike animal behind either goat. Behind the horses is located a stylized floral motif (Fig. 2).

The wild goats in the center are shown grazing antithetically (face to face) (Pl. IV, 1). They have rather pointed faces, are without beards and have long arched horns. Their bodies are shown in *silhouette technique* and are painted brown. Their heads are shown reserved and their eyes are indicated by large open circles. There are some small reserved areas on their legs and breasts. The goats are pictured in profile, with only one front and hind leg visible on each. The righthand goat has a short tail, the lefthand one is tailless. The head of the lefthand goat is narrower than the other's. The goats' rumps and hind legs are shown in a strange abnormal fashion.

East Greek artists preferred to show in their works various animals lined up one behind the other, and among these animals figured mainly wild goats and spotted deer¹⁷. This animal-frieze style, which originated a little before the middle of the 7th century B.C., is called the "Wild Goat Style"¹⁸.

If we compare the wild goats here on the neck with goat figures on other East Greek vases, we see that the former are very different. Goat figures both in Anatolian works and on typical Rhodian East Greek vases are much better-proportioned, have a dynamic and anatomical st-

17 R.S. Folsom, *Handbook of Greek Pottery*, London, 1967, p. 29; Haspels, *op.cit.*, p.53.

18 R.M. Cook, *Greek Painted Pottery*, London, 1966, pp. 118 ff; E. Haspels, *op.cit.*, p.53.

ructure, and are shown in greater detail¹⁹. The goats seen on the neck here are represented with less care and skill.

There is an animal figure (Fig.2) –most probably that of a horse behind each of the goats shown face to face. These horse-like animals are shown with their mouths resting on the rumps of the goats in front of them. Perhaps they are biting the rumps of the goats, in which case, instead of being horses, they might equally be other wild animals whose identity remains to be ascertained. The bodies of the horse-like animals are painted brown, and their heads and front legs (as well as the neck of the animal on the left) are shown in the *reserved technique*. The outer contours of the figures were first drawn in brown and then their interiors were painted with a diluted light brown.

The head and back part of the body of the horse on the right have been effaced(Pl.IV,2). As can be seen from the traces of paint, its face was shown reserved and its neck was painted brown. There is a thin reserved area at the place where the neck joins the body. Inasmuch as this figure's back part is effaced, it is unclear how it appeared previously. There is a small triangular shape above the rump, which might be(?) its tail.

The face of the horse on the left can be seen very clearly (Pl. III, 2). Its head and neck are shown reserved, with only the outer contours being drawn. Its eye is shown quite large and is represented by a circle with a dot in the center²⁰. Its mouth is shown by a thick straight line. Both horse-like figures –as the goats in front of them– are shown in profile, with only one front and hind leg visible on each. These hind legs are so short as almost not to exist, and the animals are seen as if crouching on them. The neck of these horse-like animals are quite thick in comparison with their bodies. Their bodies, too, are not proportional,

19. To see the differences in representations of wild goats, compare the figures in the following: E. Homann-Wedeking, *Grecia Arcaica*, Milano, 1967, p.53; E. Akurgal, *Die Kunst Anatoliens von Homer bis Alexander*, Berlin, 1961, p.199, figs.126–127; P.E. Arias-M. Hirmer, *op.cit.*, fig.26; K.F. Kinch, *op.cit.*, col.198, fig.79; G.Jacopi, *Clara Rhodos*, VI-VII, Rodi, 1933, figs. 92–94; R.M. Cook, *op.cit.*, pl.31c.

20. This method of representing eyes by a somewhat large circle with a dot in a center is encountered on Protoattic vases. In the Protoattic Period, eyes of humans, animals and other mixed creatures were generally represented in this way. See: P.E. Arias - M. Hirmer, *op.cit.*, pl.2 (the figures on a Protoattic amphora belonging to the 7th century B.C.) and E. Akurgal, *The Birth of Greek Art*, London, 1968, p. 177, pl. 51 (the figures on a Protoattic krater from the beginning of the 7th century B.C.).

and were made in a very unskillful and abnormal fashion. In the Protoattic Period, and even in the Geometric Period, horse representations were not this much out of proportion²¹.

There is no filling ornament in the empty spaces among the figures. Contrary to the tradition in other East Greek pottery, this painter did not refrain from, or fear to, leave empty spaces. The figures on the neck of the oinochoe bear in every way purely local characteristics.

— The Shoulder Fragment (Inv.No.74.235A ç.ç.) (Pl. V, 1):

It is a fragment of the shoulder part of the same vase to which the neck above (Inv.No.74.235 ç.ç.) belongs. It is composed of two broken fragments put together.

Measurements : Length	:	8	cm.
Width	:	8,1	cm.
Thickness	:	0,5	cm.

On the upper part of this fragment, there is a thick band composed of fish scales with a dot in the center of each (just as on the neck). This fish-scale band is double-rowed on the neck, but has three rows here. It may be assumed that there was an animal frieze below the band, from the fact that we see a wild goat figure here. It is represented with raised head and legs in a stepping position. Its head was made reserved and its body is shown painted brown in the *silhouette technique*. The front part of the head is missing. Its eye is shown as a large circle and it has a long horn. Although this wild goat figure was made in the same technique as the figures on the neck, we can say that it is more successful than them.

c- VASE FRAGMENT (Inv.No.74.237 ç.ç.) (Pl. V, 2)

This is a shoulder fragment belonging to another vase. It is composed of two broken fragments put together.

Measurements : Length	:	7	cm.
Width	:	4,5	cm.
Thickness	:	0,5	cm.

21. Animal figures in the Geometric and Protoattic Periods are unquestionably narrower, more elongated, thin and stick-like, but despite this their body parts are more proportional. See the horse figures in the following: E. Buschor, *Griechische Vasen*, München, 1969, fig. 15 (Geometric Krater), figs. 43 and 44 (Protoattic Amphorae); R.M. Cook, *op.cit.*, pl. 14B (Protoattic Krater).

It is made of well-fired, very fine beige-colored clay. The surface is covered with light buff-colored slip (Munsell, 10 YR 6/3-4), and the decorations are painted in brown (Munsell, 5 YR 3/2). A wild goat figure is seen on the fragment. It is a quite slim and agile-looking goat with open legs. Its head was made in the *reserved technique* and its body was made in the *silhouette technique*; some details on its body were indicated reserved. The goat's face—especially in the mouth and nose area—is quite slim. Its eye is represented by a somewhat large circle with a dot in the middle. It has a narrow curved beard hanging downward. The head is separated from the neck by a reserved area. Its neck is quite long and arched. There is a thin reserved area on the breast section. Its front legs are opened quite wide. The legs resemble thin sticks and in relation to the body are very short and without movement. The legs emerge from the breast section most abnormally. It is as if the painter had difficulty in fitting the legs in here. The goat's body, too, is thin and elongated. Only the upper part of the hind legs remains; the other part is missing. The hind legs are separated from one another by a reserved area. In comparison with the front legs they are fuller and fatter.

In front of the goat figure there appears an animal tail and one hind leg. It is unclear what kind of animal this is, but it is possibly a lion or a griffin. The empty areas outside the figures are filled with hooked swastikas.

Behind the wild goat is seen a vertical meander band, only a small part of which remains. This must be a metope frame. Thus it can be understood that there were figures of animals, lined up one behind the other, in a metope.

This vase fragment is different in character from the works noted above, with regard to clay, slip and the decorations it bears. It must be the product of another atelier or craftsman.

CONCLUSION

We have thus before us a group of works which are different from the East Greek works found in Rhodes and West Anatolia, to which we have up to now been acquainted. Although these resemble the Rhodian works, there are still some distinct differences between them, and the group under discussion bears representations which are most closely

connected to the Eastern tradition. Both Rhodian and West Anatolian East Greek *oinochoi* bear quite clear and similiar features: Generally they are oval-bodied, their handles are shaped in triple sections, and behind the rim of most of them, where the handle joins the rim, there is a spool. There are some examples which resemble the present oinochoe (in figure 1) in shape, although not exactly²². These are, however, rare. Even if we find partial similarities in form, there are differences in the characteristics of the decorations. For example, in Rhodian and west Anatolian East greek works, the slip on the surface is generally lighter in color; a cream color close to white. As for the present vase, a buff-colored dark slip (close to the color of clay) was used on it. Apart from this, on the other East Greek vases there are generally two or more figured friezes. As for the body of the present oinochoe, there is a figured metope on it, and this figured scene completely covers the upper half of the body. As for the bottom section of the body, it is decorated with parallel horizontal bands in the tradition of the Geometric Period. These types of oinochoe with a single metope are rarely encountered²³. On other East Greek vases, animal-friezes are rarely encountered on the necks, which are generally decorated with geometric motifs, such as cables and meanders, and animal representations are made more anatomical and detailed. As for the present works under discussion, it is clear that little importance was given to the drawing of body parts and details of the figures. The painter placed more importance on the general appearance of the composition than on individual characteristics of the figures. Another point that catches one's attention is the fact that, in the present group of works (except for the shoulder fragment in (Pl.V,2) filling motifs were not employed, or were employed to such a small degree as to be minimal. There are some filling motifs on the oinochoe body such as concentric triangles, quadrangles and masses of dots, but these occupy a very small part of the decorated area and differ from filling motifs on other East Greek works. In East Greek works known up to the present time, all variety of filling motifs²⁴ (such as flower and leaf

22. R.M. Cook, *op. cit.*, pl. 30A; E. Boschor, *op. cit.*, fig. 60

23. An example is an oinochoe found in Camirus Necropol, which is similar in that it also has a single metope which is covered with a figured scene (see the oinochoe shown in footnote 6b).

24. For filling motifs on "East Greek Vases" see: R.S. Folsom, *op.cit.*, pp.47-51 and pp. 75-80.

rosettes, swastikas, half-concentric circles and lozenges) were used lavishly and abundantly together, as if the artists didn't want to leave any empty spaces on the vases.

In view of these differences, it can be stated with certainty that the group of works under discussion do not belong to Rhodes but that they are, rather, the works of a local Anatolian atelier. In my opinion these may be works of a local atelier from further within West Anatolia²⁵. The artist who made these, however, certainly must have seen other East Greek works and been influenced by them. At the same time it can be seen that the Eastern tradition and its influence are more pronounced in these works, and that the artist employed his own fantasy together with them.

I am of the opinion that it would be unwise and erroneous to conclusively date these works one by one without studying them in more depth. It can be stated with confidence, however, that, in order for this style and mode (starting from the beginning of the 7th century B.C.) to reach a local atelier in West Anatolia, some time had to pass. For the present, it seems reasonable to date these works to the third quarter of the 7th century B.C.

I would like to conclude by saying that this group of works which I have attempted to describe points to the possibility that some local East Greek ateliers, unknown up to now, could have existed also further within West Anatolia. I hope that present and future research will show these suggestions to be true.

25. The fact that this group of works, as indicated above (footnote 1), is said to have been found in the vicinity of Çavdarhisar (*Aizanoi*) (although this cannot be stated with absolute certainty), lends even greater support and strength to my proposal.



1



1



2



1



2



1



2



1



2