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ABSTRACT

Embodiment of the Halaf: Sixth Millennium Figurines from Northern Mesopotamia

Ellen Harriet Belcher

This dissertation answers the question, “What are Halaf figurines?” In response to that question, this study examines a corpus of anthropomorphic figurines from archaeological sites dating to the Halaf period (Sixth Millennium cal BCE) known from excavations in Turkey and Syria. Included in this dissertation is a detailed catalog of 197 figurine examples, both whole and fragmented, and analysis of their excavated contexts from seven Halaf sites in Turkey and nine sites in Syria.

The study also reviews and discusses existing literature on Halaf and figurine studies and examines and critiques modern biases, assumptions, and influences, especially as related to the interpretive concepts mother goddess and steatopygous. It proposes a different methodological approach to prehistoric figurines based upon morphology and typology rather than interpretation. It argues that this methodology of recording and analyzing figurine morphology, typology, and archaeological context brings the field closer to four points of human interaction in the object biographies of figurines including: conceptualization, making, use, and discard. This approach to the evidence, the dissertation suggests, can support theoretical ideas about how the lived body was conceptualized and adorned in the Halaf and allows consideration of ways that these embodied ideas and imagery were shared across settlements. A constructed typology consists of five overall types further divided by subtype and Halaf phase, based upon pose, technology, and morphology. Two appendices present the data associated with each figurine in catalog form. A final appendix presents the data condensed to 12 comparable elements.
The results of this research are that the typology of Syrian and Anatolian Halaf figurine assemblages are quite different. While the well-known seated clay figurines are indeed most plentiful, they come from only a very tight geographic area in northeast Syria and only from late Halaf contexts. Standing figurines, by contrast, are known from all areas and phases but occur in lesser numbers and in great variety. Analysis of the archaeological contexts reveals that nearly all the figurines in the corpus were isolated finds amidst unremarkable fill contexts. Therefore, it can be concluded that, when Halaf figurines were no longer needed or wanted by the community, they were discarded without special circumstances amongst regular domestic refuse.
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CHAPTER ONE: Introduction

Introduction

Across the Mesopotamian steppes and rain-fed plains, figurines were integral to village life during the sixth millennium BCE. Using available tools and techniques, artists designed and created diminutive representations of the human body in local clay or stone that were acquired, used, viewed, and eventually discarded by communities living in early villages. Eight millennia later, Halaf figurines have been excavated by archaeologists at sites in the modern countries of Syria, Turkey, and Iraq. In this dissertation, I catalog and analyze a subset of 197 anthropomorphic figurines from the Halaf cultural horizon from sixteen sites, which yielded 121 examples in Syria and 76 examples in Turkey.

This is the first ever analysis of the Halaf figurine corpus. In this dissertation I suggest that these figurines not only record shared typology, craft techniques, and artistic practices but also imagined conceptualizations of the Halaf body. This concept of the body is manifested within the constraints of locally available materials, skill sets, beliefs, practices, and ideologies. Recording, comparing, and analyzing each individual figurine example in this dissertation is not only a documentation of the shared practices of figurine makers and users in Halaf villages but also of the ideological milieu in which they observed and exchanged daily practices around the ornamentation, dress, manipulation, and performance of the lived body. Therefore in studying these diminutive representations of humans in stone and clay, this dissertation is also a gathering of the embodied possibilities and practices for those living in sixth millennium Northern Mesopotamia. These practices are here documented and analyzed through typology, technology and stratigraphy of each example known.
Scope of Research
The research conducted and presented in this dissertation has four foci:

1. Evaluate the state of research on Halaf figurines within the existing scholarship of Halaf studies, Ancient Near Eastern and prehistoric figurine studies as well as interpretive and theoretical studies of prehistoric embodied practices and symbolism, and propose a new way of interpreting prehistoric figurines based upon object biographies (Chapter Two);

2. Develop methodological approaches for comprehensively recording and cataloging figurine corpora; present a flexible and working typology for Halaf figurines; and create a system of weighing inconsistencies in stratigraphy, documentation, and diagnostics in typological analysis of a small corpus of objects (Chapter Three);

3. Catalog data related to 197 Halaf figurine examples from Syria and Turkey; examine and document the archaeological and regional contexts at sixteen sites where these figurines were found, using available documentation; and analyze figurine assemblages regionally and typologically within each region (Chapters Four and Five, Appendices A, B and C);

4. Quantify and present these figurines by type, weighted by stratigraphic and visual identifiers of each type; consider how the figurine morphology and technology relates to direct and indirect contact of peoples across the Halaf material culture tradition; theorize the nature of embodied social practices and ideologies that utilized figurines; and propose future research on figurines within adjacent regions and cultural phases (Chapter Six).

In this dissertation, I document Halaf figurines from Turkey and Syria at five key human interactions in their object biographies, conception, creation, use, discard, and excavation. This is accomplished by recording their visual, morphological, technological, and archaeological data and performing analysis using a typology created as part of this research. By discerning local and regional visual systems manifested in figurine morphology, I created a preliminary working Halaf figurine typology. The veracity of these types was tested by study and documentation of stylistic diagnostics and the known stratigraphic situation of each example. The result is a range of types, some strongly supported by high frequencies, good excavated context, and strongly recognizable visual features and others occurring in low numbers, poor archaeological context, and loosely similar to each other. Typology then provides evidence of a spectrum of direct to indirect interaction across the Halaf material culture tradition by mapping these types between
these two regions of the Halaf landscape. Spheres of interactions surrounding Halaf figurines function both regionally and chronologically. Some types continue through the early and late phases at many sites, and others are localized to one phase, sub-region or site.

The overall occurrence of 197 figurines at least sixteen different settlements in sixth millennium Syria and Turkey demonstrates that figurines were desired and perhaps in some places or times required objects in Halaf daily life. To us they can serve as surrogates of artistic practices around knowing and experiencing cultural belonging embodied by lived persons long ago. They are also surrogates of early Mesopotamian artistic conception, production, communication, and exchange of iconography about the body, some of which may have happened in ways unrecorded in the archaeological record. Therefore within bulk of this dissertation I present the full empirical evidence for sixth millennium artistic production and archaeological excavation of these figurines I also consider less tangible aspects of and embodied cultural belonging and social identity in the Halaf.

This dissertation is bounded by the occurrence of the Halaf, which is a material cultural tradition constructed by archaeological research in the twentieth century CE (Campbell 2007). It is generally accepted that The Halaf occurred in the Northern Mesopotamian foothills and upland plains in the sixth millennium BCE. The Halaf was not an ethnicity or an exclusive set of cultural practices, nor is there enough evidence to prove that it was an actual lived self-identity or cultural or social belonging to the exclusion of the others for peoples living in this time and place. The modern construct that is the Halaf is based upon archaeological, stylistic, and typological analyses, mainly of pottery, that show similarities in the material culture found within north Mesopotamia in the sixth millennium (Campbell 2007). Critical analyses of the chronological and regional boundaries placed upon the Halaf by archaeologists have been shown
to be bracketed by periods and regions that are archaeologically poorly understood (Campbell 1998; Campbell 2007; Campbell and Fletcher 2011). This research is bound by the confines of the Halaf, even though it is accepted as a somewhat arbitrary modern construct. However, it is important to state that there is no reason to assume that spheres of interaction, influence, and communication were confined to the modern geographical construct we call the Halaf. The borders of the Halaf are also bound by geographic borders of historical Mesopotamia, which in and of itself is an early modern to modern construct (Bahrani 1997, 1998). However arbitrary, these chronological and geographic borders are necessary for establishing a corpus for which stylistic and typology analysis makes practical sense.

In this dissertation I consider a subset of Halaf figurines within their archaeological, regional, stylistic, typological, and historiographical contexts. Each known figurine example is cataloged in a regional appendix organized by archaeological site. Figurines cited throughout this text are synched to their catalog entries by unique numbers to encourage reference to the full data on each example. The archaeological and regional context of each site assemblage is presented within Chapters Four and Five, corresponding to two sub-regions of northwestern Mesopotamia now encompassed by the modern countries of Turkey (Chapter Four, Appendix A) and Syria (Chapter Five, Appendix B). In these chapters, the reality of the availability and nature of an exact location of a findspot within the excavation (as available) for each is presented and considered.

---

1I acknowledge that using the term ‘Mesopotamia’ is problematic, given its recent colonial origins (Bahrani 2003: 13-49, 1998). This area roughly correlates to that of the Assyrian Empires (2nd-1st millenniums), but the term ‘Prehistoric Assyria’ would imply the Halaf were ancestral to the Assyrians, which could only be true in northern Iraq. The Halaf appears to be a shared material culture that was adopted, developed and adapted by exchange and communication amongst indigenous peoples living in settlements across a broad swath of landscape that is identified in this dissertation as ‘northern Mesopotamia’ as a geographic term.
The majority of the pages of this dissertation are devoted to, for the first time, documentation of this corpus and gathering all the known and attainable data on each of the 197 examples and their place of discovery within each archaeological operation. This documentation is necessary work and the foundation upon which any responsible typological analysis or theoretical interpretations must be rooted. Stratigraphic data and archaeological context must be a consideration in building an artifact typology, as is done in this dissertation. Over half of the figurines presented here are previously unpublished, and many do not have clearly documented archaeological findspots from data that I was able to access. Two thirds of these pages are devoted to this documentation to the fullest extent that availability of data will allow, and therein may be the most useful portions of this research, providing a reference for those interested in the nature, breadth, and occurrence of Halaf figurines.

Gathering the data and organizing the documentation for this project has been a difficult process. There is no mutually accepted methodology for documenting a regional and cultural corpus of figurines; there are no established standards for studying, documenting, or cataloging figurines. These problems are compounded by the lack of typology or full documentation of the Halaf figurine corpus up to the writing of this dissertation. Nor are there best practices that all archaeologists follow in recording and providing access to archaeological excavation data available to future researchers. In developing a method for documenting and studying these figurines, my work depends greatly upon methodology developed by scholars who cataloged museum figurine collections, principally Roger Moorey (2001, 2003), Peter Ucko (1963, 1968), and Elizabeth D. Van Buren (1930). My work also depends upon work published on other excavated prehistoric Near East single site figurine assemblages, principally Mary Voigt (1983, 1985, 2000), Lynn Meskell and Carolyn Nakamura (Meskell 2007; Meskell, Nakamura, King,
and Farid 2008; Nakamura and Meskell 2009) and Nadja Wrede (2003). I depended upon all of these works to build this methodological framework and these cataloging conventions, although none of them present comparative analysis of a figurine corpus from multiple sites within a single material cultural tradition.

It is necessary to lay out in this dissertation the available information on the nature, content, and location of the archaeological data (or lack thereof) from nineteen different archaeological teams and campaigns at sixteen different Halaf sites carried out from 1899 through 2011. There are a great many difficulties working with the artifacts and data created and collected by others over the course of 114 years, only a few of whom I had extensive communication with. Certainly archaeological excavation and recording techniques have changed considerably over this century, as has our understanding of prehistoric Mesopotamia. The diverse personalities brought different research agendas and cultural biases to the field to excavate these figurines. Some were intrigued by the visual messages they felt the figurines communicated, and they wrote about gendered possibilities for ritual roles in prehistoric society. Others did not apparently find figurines useful units of analysis for the purposes of scientific study of the origins, florescence, and eventual demise of Halaf cultural phenomena. Many simply did not have the post-excavation resources and support to fully study, document, and publish their figurine (or other small find) assemblages. These situations coupled with language barriers, travel challenges, governmental bureaucracy, and other modern inconveniences make comprehensive comparative analysis a difficult undertaking. In this dissertation I have attempted to be reflective and transparent regarding the nature, sources and lacunae of data. More on the methodology used for data collection and analysis can be found in Chapter Three.
**Figurines as Halaf Embodiment**

In the sixth millennium, across the Halaf region people moved their bodies from settlement to settlement and communicated with their neighbors and far away strangers. Anthropomorphic imagery was shared on objects, in verbal narratives, and through the performance and ornamentation of bodies. Figurines are evidence of this embodied communication; they record similar and different ways of conceptualizing, looking at, and representing the human body in the Halaf experience. These are expressions of Halaf personhood, an embodied community belonging. The human body essentially looked the same in sixth millennium Northern Mesopotamia as it does today; there is no reason to think that realistic depiction was the goal in human representation at that time. The conceptual process of figurine making and using reflects a constant *Redefining Realness* of the embodied experiences of Halaf individuals (Mock 2014). To us the figurines can serve as surrogates of those who innovated and shared artistic techniques of working clay and stone, as well as to the social practice, beliefs, and experiences of the lived body in the Halaf.

Figurines manifest individual and group choices around the evolving relationship to the human form that were informed by social practices of dressing, ornamenting, manipulating and thinking about the lived body. Therefore it is a working hypothesis of this study that the embodied iconography portrayed by these figurines was directly related to the treatment of the body in the Halaf. Treatments practiced upon living bodies can include covering with cloth and skin, jewelry and ornaments, painting, scarification and/or tattooing the skin surface, and manipulation of the bodily form through binding or other means.² There are also treatments of dead bodies that may have influenced or parallel figurine practices (Croucher 2012). On either or both living and dead bodies, treatments evident on figurines could have been practiced in daily

---

² Those who have used figurines as evidence for lived body treatments include Joyce 2008, Daems and Croucher 2007, Dames 2010, Croucher 2010a, and Campbell 2008.
life or at special times of ritual, ceremony, or performance or other community interactions. But these practices on actual human skin and garments do not survive in the archaeological record. What we are left with is secondary documentation in the form of anthropomorphic imagery, principally found on figurines but also via human remains, body ornaments, and pottery documentation. Thinking about these ephemeral practices alongside the evidence presented by these 197 figurines opens a view into ways Halaf conceived of and represented their embodied experience.

This dissertation represents preliminary steps toward documentation and understanding the full nature of the known corpus of Halaf figurines. In these pages I present the archaeological, historiographical, geographic, chronological, and theoretical background to a regional subset of the full corpus. I also present a framework studying prehistoric figurines by developing new methods of cataloging, typology, and interpretation. It is hoped that it will prove useful to future researchers as well as form a foundation for further study of this and other figurine corpora.

**Introduction to the Halaf**

The Halaf culture\(^3\) was named more than a century ago after one of the first sites where it was found. This material culture called Halaf was documented and developed over a century by archaeological excavation of the remains of village settlements in the geographical regions later known as Northern or upper Mesopotamia. Excavations and surveys have revealed the Halaf to be a culture that typically formed small communities in villages along river valleys, drainage areas, and steppes in the rainfall agriculture areas of Northern Mesopotamia.\(^4\) The geographic

---

\(^3\) The problematic use of the word *culture* is fully acknowledged and not fully mitigated by tacking on the terms *horizon* or *tradition*, but by using these qualifications I am attempting to acknowledge these problems.

\(^4\) The steppes are defined as above the isohyet of an average 200mm rainfall a year, where agriculture is possible without irrigation (Roaf 1996, 22).
spread of Halaf material culture expanded over time, and late Halaf pottery has been found from as far west as Cilicia in Turkey (at Mersin, see Garstang 1953), east to the border of Iran and Iraq (at Choga Mami, see Oates 1966, 1968, 1969), north as far as Lake Van in Turkey (at Tilkitepe, see Korfman 1982), and south as far as the Damascus basin in Syria (at Arjoune, see Campbell and Phillips 2003). Relative dating based upon ceramics excavated at these sites as well as absolute dating of organic samples subjected to radio carbon and AMS analysis have shown that this cultural horizon spans most of the entire sixth millennium BCE (cal). It has been suggested by a perceived homogeneous ceramic assemblage found through excavation and surface survey across a broad swath of northern Iraq and Syria and into southeastern Turkey that this might be the first pan-Mesopotamian culture (e.g., Watson 1983). At the beginning of the second decade of excavation and analysis of Halaf material culture, it is now apparent that there are many more local, regional, and chronological nuances and diversity to the material culture (Campbell 1992b, 1992c, 2007, Akkermans 2000).

The Halaf is positioned in a relative dating chronology in the middle of the Mesopotamian late Neolithic, which comprises cultures called Hassuna, Samarra, Halaf, and Ubaid after the eponymous type sites at which each was first discovered archaeologically (Tell Hassuna in Iraq; Samarra in Iraq; Tell Halaf in Syria and Tell al ‘Ubaid in Iraq). These cultures are still identified archaeologically by their distinctively decorated pottery and ceramic forms,

---

5 The Halaf is one cultural horizon, which is separated into two phases in this dissertation therefore the terms ‘early’ and ‘late’ are modifiers of the proper noun ‘Halaf’ and are not capitalized.
6 Of these sites, Halaf figurines have been found only at Chogha Mami.
7 The chronology in this dissertation is calibrated throughout in an uncalibrated relative chronology such that as found in most publications previous to this decade the Halaf occurs in the fifth millennium.
8 Within chronologies constructed from material culture of Anatolia and the Levant, the Halaf chronologically spans the middle and late Chalcolithic periods.
9 Type sites is a concept in which the excavated yield of a single site was supposed to encompass all of the types and diagnostic finds to be expected in the material culture of a cultural period. Because no cultural period is monolithic nor homogeneous, the concept of the type site or even a cluster of type sites cannot be sustained with archaeological empirical realities. For the latest discussion on the terminology of the Halaf, see Nieuwenhuyse, Bernbeck, Akkermans, and Rogasch, 2013.
which have been analyzed in a succession of comparative ceramic studies on which the relative chronology of the entire late Neolithic is based. These comparative ceramic studies used typological and stylistic analysis to create and define to the geographic and chronological nuances of culture (e.g., Akkermans 1993b, Campbell 1992c, Davidson 1977, Irving 2001, Rassmann 1996). Very recently new models for Halaf social structure have been proposed by several scholars (Nieuwenhuyse, Bernbeck, Akkermans, and Rogasch 2013). This dissertation is modeled upon these studies in that it is empirically rooted in analyses of one artifact class to theoretically reconstruct interaction, communication, and exchange of representational ideas. But figurines are much less ubiquitous than ceramic finds, are not found at all excavations, and are not normally found on archaeological surveys.\textsuperscript{10} While depending on these analyses to identify Halaf sites and levels, the models of interaction, communication, and exchange reconstructed in this dissertation are solely based on the figurine corpus.

During the time and place that we now call the Halaf, small groups of people, probably joined by extended family bonds, lived in small villages and hamlets across the upper Mesopotamian steppe. Hundreds of agrarian dependent settlements were clustered at habitable locations across the region and semi-nomadic and nomadic peoples passed between them according to seasonal rhythms carrying goods, ideas, materials, and skills (Bernbeck 2013; Rassmann 1996). Throughout the sixth millennium these small villages, as well as a few larger settlements, maintained flourishing communities that utilized increasingly sophisticated skills to manipulate local and imported raw materials into complex pottery, beads, pendants, seals, and figurines (Belcher 2011a). Comparative analysis of Halaf material culture, particularly of ceramics, suggests that throughout the cultural period there was a slow development toward

\textsuperscript{10} I know of only one anthropomorphic Halaf figurine found during the ongoing survey of the Harran plain but not yet published, (Dr. Nurettin Yardımcı, personal communication, 2007).
homogeneity of style and technology across the region, but there was also continual local innovation and experimentation in materials and finished objects.

While the Halaf can be considered a distinct entity defined by similar characteristics in material culture, there is no definitive checklist of normative Halaf markers for excavated settlement remains. There is no reason to suggest that those living in settlements that we now call Halaf self-identified as members of an exclusive ethnic or cultural group. Mainly based upon comparative studies of Halaf pottery motifs and styles, the scholarly narrative constructed over the past decade a homogeneous Halaf culture. This narrative can be found in the beginning pages of general texts on Mesopotamian archaeology and art history, which present images of compelling late Halaf finds from the earliest excavated sites. An accessible review that includes recent research and the entire diversity of the excavated assemblage of the Halaf does not yet exist. But new research and analysis has challenged the notion of a homogeneous tradition (Nieuwenhuyse, Bernbeck, Akkermans, and Rogasch 2013; Hole 2013).

Figurines are part of the constructed narrative of Halaf homogeneity. Late Halaf figurines often illustrate stories told by archaeologists about the Halaf along with complete polychrome painted vessels, intricately carved stone stamp seals, and amulets and round structures called tholoi. Narratives about the Halaf are often supplemented by interpretations of sixth millennium social practices, for example that figurines are evidence of mother goddess worship, that seals are evidence of centralized control, that advanced skills employed in polychrome pottery and exotic imported materials such as obsidian are evidence of ‘chiefdoms’ and elites controlling commodities. However, many of the illustrations that accompany these narratives are of essentially unstratified artifacts, including figurines, from early twentieth century excavations at Arpachiyah, Tell Halaf, and Chagar Bazar. These remain the most
accessible illustrations, and these artifacts are now typologically understood to date to the late sixth millennium, or the late Halaf phase. This dissertation does not seek to fully debunk and challenge the myth of a normative Halaf, though I believe it can and should be done through more artifact based comparative studies that are reflexive (Hodder 2003) and rooted in data such as this one. An accessible work on the Halaf with up to date information accessible to the more casual reader is also very much needed.

The Halaf social structure envisioned here is composed of groups within egalitarian structured settlements that had varying degrees of interaction at changing times and places within the millennium and landscape. There is little evidence for complex social structures such as chiefdoms, nor for centralized control of raw materials, production, or distribution of goods. Some Halaf settlements appear to have sprung up to take advantage of resources, such as rich agricultural land, access to water or raw material sources, or simply because the group felt belonging to a particular place was conducive to habitation. It seems that in some regions, such as the Khabur river headwaters triangle in Syria or the Tigris river flood plain in Iraq, were particularly supportive environments in the sixth millennium as many Halaf settlements have been discovered in these regions. But it is also true that these were particularly supportive environments for archaeologists in the twentieth century CE, which may skew our perception of a populated landscape in sixth millennium Northern Mesopotamia. The picture that emerges from a decade of survey and excavation of the Halaf landscape is of villages and hamlets, probably centered on kinship ties, clustered in certain areas (northwest Syria and northeast Iraq), and spread out in others (Anatolia, other parts of Iraq and Syria). Vagaries of the Halaf village subsistence strategies that depended upon rain-fed agriculture, pasturing quadrupeds, and access to raw materials for increasingly skilled and diverse craft making may have been some of the
factors influencing their choice of settlements. Some settlements may also have been seasonally occupied to take advantage of fishing, hunting, and foraging opportunities. Across the landscape were a few long-lasting settlements that were continuously occupied, perhaps serving as anchor sites that provided known and familiar places for stopovers, communication, and seasonal events (Akkermans and Schwartz 2003, 150). Clustering of figurine finds follow these same landscape patterns, especially for the late Halaf, where a large assemblage of similar figurines were found at sites in the upper Khabur and Mosul regions. Figurines from other regions and from the early Halaf are smaller in number and show typological diversity.

These settlements are identified by the style and types of pottery found there, which have been identified by archaeologists as made within a Halaf ceramic tradition. Pottery is a ubiquitous artifact that can be reliably found at every Mesopotamian site that dates to later than the seventh millennium. A century of ceramic analysis has produced an evolving Halaf typology, which each excavated pottery assemblage has further refined. This type of analysis is not yet fully established for other aspects of Halaf material culture. Some classes of artifacts, such as figurines are not so ubiquitous and do not have as rich a methodological tradition in archaeological scholarship. So the definitive identification of a Halaf settlement as well as the nature of spheres of interaction between settlements and the chronological development of the Halaf is through pottery analysis. The Halaf is therefore a construction created in modernity built up by principally by analysis of pottery collected at sites both through excavation and survey (Campbell 2007).

Many Halaf settlements appear to have accommodated year round occupations; a few appear to have been seasonal or transitory. Different structures were built, likely to provide housing for individuals or small groups as well as storage facilities to accommodate long term,
transitory lifestyles or temporary needs of humans, animals and accumulated harvests. One particular round structure, called *tholoi* by archaeologists, appears to have provided both housing and storage at different settlements. Rectangular structures made up of small storage rooms are also known, although tholoi were increasingly popular in the later phase. As mentioned before, interpersonal relations appear to have been communal in nature, with no convincing evidence for social stratification or an elite leadership. Egalitarianism probably also extended to inter-settlement community relationships, with mutual support extending to different modes of subsistence, craft skills, and raw materials exchanged within and between settlements. Many of these settlements, particularly in the late Halaf phase and in the Khabur and Mosul areas were situated close by, perhaps even within view of, each other. Most of them likely had residents who were skilled in creating utilitarian objects such as pots, stone tools, baskets, clothing, and structures. At many, perhaps not all, settlements there were likely also persons who possessed skill sets with which they created non-utilitarian seals, pendants, beads, figurines, and other decorative and symbolic objects. Archaeological evidence shows that there was a consistent desire for such objects throughout Halaf.

**Introduction to Halaf Figurines**

The figurines included in this dissertation were all excavated from archaeological assemblages originating in the modern countries of Syria and Turkey and found alongside ceramics and other material culture considered diagnostic for the Halaf. Up until the last few decades only Late Halaf figurines from Syria and Iraq had been reported in the archaeological literature. Assemblages of early Halaf and Anatolian Halaf figurines have been published only
But all of these examples have come to us from excavation reports or are stored unpublished in museum and excavation house storage. Any comparative or analytical considerations of these examples have appeared in these same publications—and no one yet has attempted to consider them together in a single work.

These figurines range from small to tiny; most are smaller than 10 centimeters tall and comfortably fit in the palm of a hand or could be held between two fingers. Most Halaf figurines are fashioned of clay, hand modeled using fingers and hand tools to pinch, mold, and scrape segments that were attached together, smoothed, and then decorated with incision or paint. A few figurines were created out of stone, using lithic tools to cut, grind, and polish the form in low relief and to incise details. Young adult female bodies are most often represented, but a few can be identified as males. On others, age and gender is not easily determined, some are only vaguely anthropomorphic and a few only represent a single human body part. Many show a partitioned body, with each part distinctly divided from other parts, often out of realistic proportion as we might think the body should be represented. On some, breasts, pubic areas, and eyes are enlarged and elaborately decorated, perhaps indicating significances in gendered or other symbolism. Many decorations are painted with incised stripes, appearing in certain body locales, especially the upper arms, lower legs, neck, shoulder, and breasts. These stripes can be accompanied by dots, sometimes within delineated areas around enlarged breasts and pubic areas. Some figurines are not decorated at all, and some may have lost their original decoration through exposure to the elements or soil, use, or even post-exavcation scrubbing or poor conditions at storage facilities.

---

12 Anatolian figurines were first published from Çavı Tarlası in Von Wickede and Herbordt 1988. Early Halaf figurines were first published from Tell Sabi Abyad in Akkermans 1987a. For a full publishing history of Halaf figurines, see Table 2.3, p. 52.
### EARLY HALAF

**Early Sixth mill.**

- **Anatolia (Turkey)**
  - Types: EH.2A, EH.5
  - ![Figurine](image)
  - ![Figurine](image)

- **Western Jazirah (Syria)**
  - Types: EH.2A, EH.4A
  - ![Figurine](image)
  - ![Figurine](image)

### LATE HALAF

**Late Sixth mill.**

- **Anatolia (Turkey)**
  - Types: EH.4A, EH.4B
  - ![Figurine](image)
  - ![Figurine](image)

- **Western Jazirah (Syria)**
  - Types: EH.2A, EH.4A
  - ![Figurine](image)
  - ![Figurine](image)

**Figure 1.1:** Comparative examples of Halaf figurine types (not to scale)

13 *Photos:* E. Belcher (a, i, j, k, q, r); S. Campbell (b, e, f, g, h, l, m); Tell Kurdu project (c); Fıstıklı Höyük project (d); http://www.sabi-abyad.nl (n); A. Fletcher ©Trustees of the British Museum (p); Miyake 1998: pl. 14.2 (o); Fortin 1999, 75 (s); Mattias 2003: Fig. 64 (t).
The entire corpus represents a Halaf imagining of the body in three dimensions that was both shared across great distances and locally bounded, changing over time and space. Typology is used in this dissertation to understand and organize the imagining, sharing, and local practices embedded in the physical forms left to us. The 197 examples presented and analyzed here are therefore organized within five types. Below is a list of types and occurrences within the entire corpus:

**Type 1**: Seated figurines — 97 (all late Halaf)
**Type 2**: Standing figurines — 63 (early Halaf-28, late Halaf-35)
**Type 3**: Figurine vessels — 4 (all late Halaf from Domuztepe, Turkey)
**Type 4**: Anthropomorphic seals — 10 (early Halaf-8, late Halaf-2)
**Type unknown**: Miscellaneous, unidentifiable fragments — 23 (Syria-6, Anatolia-12)

The typology constructed for this dissertation is structured around the pose represented in the figure and morphology (*Figure 1.1, p. 16*). Type 1 figurines are represented seated; all occur in the late Halaf (LH) phase and most can be localized to Syria (*Figure 1.1: k, p, q, r, s, t*), but a few early (EH) examples are also known. Type 2 figurines are represented in the standing pose; they occur slightly more often in the early (*Figure 1.1: a, n*) than the late phases (*Figure 1.1: i, j, u*). There is also a late Halaf Subtype LH.2B which are very flat figurines including anthropomorphic stone figurine-pendants (*Figure 1.1: f, g, h*). Type 3 are figurine vessels which are also represented in the standing pose, and occur only at Domuztepe (*Figure 1.1: l*).

Type 4 are figurine seals, which can also be called pendants they are more often found in early contexts (*Figure 1.1: c, d, e, o*) than in late contexts (*Figure 1.1: m*). Whereas some may not consider anthropomorphic seals and pendants ‘real’ figurines, the imagery they portray is similar to that of ‘traditional’ figurines. Therefore seals and pendants are included in this corpus because they

---

14 For the region covered in this dissertation, figurine vessels are only known at Domuztepe. Other Halaf figurine vessels are attested in Iraq, most notably from Yarim Tepe II.
appear to be within the same communities of practice and craft as clay figurines. Type unknown is a catch all category for examples that are unique and dissimilar from any other examples known in the corpus (Figure 1.1: b) or are too fragmented to assign to a type. There are just a handful of figurines in this category.

The corpus is not equally divided between types, regions, materials, or phases. Of the 197 examples examined and analyzed here, 42 are associated to the early Halaf phase, and 155 are assigned to the late Halaf phase. Halaf figurines known to have been excavated from seven sites in Turkey number 76 as opposed to 121 figurines from nine sites in Syria. More than 185 additional Halaf figurines are known to have been excavated from sites in Iraq. Figurines from Iraq are discussed as comparanda where appropriate in this dissertation, but a full treatment of the eastern portion of the Halaf figurine assemblages is outside the scope of this dissertation and I plan to use the methodology developed here to consider the Iraq examples in a future project.

All of the examples discussed in this dissertation are broken and fragmented in some way; none are in the state or shape originally created. Approximately 60% of the total corpus is currently extant less than two thirds of their original state and none remain pristine as they were originally made. It is obvious that these figurines were handled in ways that rubbed, broke, and chipped them, and at the end of their use-life they were discarded in ways that inflicted further damaged. Some clay figurines appear to have been baked, which appears to have provided some stabilization, but these too come to us fragmented and damaged. It appears that at all points in their object biographies these figurines were not handled carefully, and because these were small settlements, these rough handling practices must have been known at object conception. Heavy use and re-use or post-depositional processes (or a combination of both) or even excavation could result in fragmentation in the form of breaks, chips, and surface wear. Therefore,

\[15\text{For more on how seals and pendants fit the project definition of a figurine, see further discussion in Chapter 3.}\]
throughout the discussion in this dissertation, calling an object a *figurine* does not depend upon reconstruct-ability and completeness. Because none of these fragments fit together, each example is counted equally no matter what percentage of fragmentation it displays in its present state. Fragmentation did not seem to influence use or deposition in the Halaf either. Many fragmented figurines show wear and repair at the breaks demonstrating continued use. Complete or nearly complete figurines were discarded along with household garbage along with fragmented examples.

For the purposes of this dissertation, a simplified chronology is used. The early Halaf phase is roughly situated within the first half of the sixth millennium BCE.\(^{16}\) Figurines occur during this phase in great variety but much lesser numbers. Early Halaf figurines represent bodies most often in Type EH.2 standing poses; there are no known seated early Halaf figurines in this corpus. Generally, early Halaf figurines are less stylistically and technologically complex than later examples. Most are formed from unbaked clay, featuring decorative treatments (if any) of incision or punctation with tools or reeds or fingernails and infrequently with paint. Exceptions to this rule are eight examples of EH.4 figurine seals, which are quite complex in execution. Early Halaf figurines are rare finds, comprising less than a third of the corpus considered in this dissertation. As this dissertation shows, the known geographic extent of the occurrence of Early Halaf figurines is within a much smaller region (*Figure 1.2*, p. 21, blue circle) than that of late Halaf figurine finds. Early Halaf figurines are much more diverse

\(^{16}\) The dating of the Halaf along with all Mesopotamian prehistoric cultural periods has recently moved back one millennium. This reflects a general trend toward matching relative to absolute chronologies and recent innovations in calibration of dates from C\(^{14}\) & AMS samples. For more on Halaf absolute chronology see Campbell 2007 for more on the relative chronology used in this dissertation see Chapter 2.
typologically, generally not well known, and have only recently been made available in publications.¹⁷

For the purposes of this dissertation, the late Halaf phase roughly dates to the second half of the sixth millennium cal. BC. Figurines from this phase comprise over two thirds of the corpus considered in this dissertation, and they are much better published and known within Halaf studies. But the full range of their occurrence as well as their typological and regional variety is has not to date been discussed in Halaf literature. The general perception of Halaf figurines is that a single type of late Halaf figurine represents cultural homogeneity. This well-known figurine, Type LH.1A, has served as almost an icon for the Halaf in archaeological literature. Fashioned from clay in parts, this type represents the human figure in a seated pose, most often with knees drawn up tight against the stomach, and arms encircling and supporting large breasts (*Figure 1.1*: above: p, q, r, t, & variations k, s). As with many Halaf figurines, this figurine is formed as a conglomeration of separately made clay body parts attached together while still plastic, smoothed over, and painted, incised or appliquéd on lower legs, upper arms, waist, breasts, and head. Figurines of this type are nearly half of the examples considered in this dissertation. The analysis in this dissertation shows that this type is found at sites concentrated only in Khabur headwaters region of Syria, although examples are also known Iraq (*Figure 1.2*: blue circle).

At the same time that Type LH.1A figurines were dominant and prolific in this area, other types of figurines being made, used, and discarded in all regions represented varying degrees of departures from the pose of arms supporting breasts pose (*Figure 1.1*: i, j, k, m). One variation is concentrated at late Halaf Anatolian sites, where examples are represented in what is

¹⁷ A recently completed undergraduate thesis on early Halaf figurines from Tell Sabi Abyad II, Operation III was completed too late to be considered in this dissertation. See Arntz 2013.
interpreted as standing pose (Type 2B) in a severely abbreviated fashion, reduced to the outline of the suggestion of elbows with arms and breasts in low relief (*Figure 1.1*: c, d, e & early Halaf antecedent, l). The variation may be technologically based, because many of these figurines from this area are carved from stone, which is much more abundant in Anatolia (*Figure 1.1*: c, k and *Figure 1.2*: orange circle).

Comparative analysis and typological ordering of types and subtypes shows that figurine artists had the agency to create variations upon dominant types and poses. The variability of the representation within each type may be localized to certain regions and settlements, and possibly even to workshops or hands. In all their variation, figurines are visual surrogates for Halaf narratives about the body, gender, and other identity signifiers. This study theoretically links ideologies of embodied identity to figurine types and styles that together were communicated.

![Figure 1.2: Map of Halaf figurine occurrences by sub-period and types](image-url)
within and between settlements and regions in identifiable patterns. The patterns in body representation show that embodied identity was shared locally, regionally, and culturally. This does not mean that the Halaf should be defined as an ethnic group with cohesively shared practices. Rather I am suggesting that social interactions between these particular settlements were entangled in practices related to the body and/or its representation in imagery or narrative and that these entanglements are paralleled by visual representation on the figurines.

Halaf figurines do not present body parts in the same proportions as the lived human body, which serves as a starting place for more imaginative anthropomorphic representation. There is no reason to assume that realistic body proportions was ever a goal; figurines were rather used to communicating ideas and interpretations of the body employing the possibilities of clay and stone in the representation. Proportionally realistic bodies are a relatively recent trend in the long history of human representation, perhaps beginning in classical times (Stewart 1990). People living in Halaf settlements appear to have had a special interest in accentuating and enlarging body parts exhibiting female sexual difference and sexuality (see Appendix C, Column 5). Body parts that can be understood as biological female markers such as breasts and pudenda are often exaggerated and decorated out of proportion to the rest of the figurine body.

Biologically male gender markers are represented in ambiguous and nuanced ways. A single line of paint might represent a penis on a figurine with open legs, but this same type can also feature small flat breasts. Other figurines appear androgynous or sexless, neither gendered markers decipherable to the modern eye. Some bodily details go beyond the anthropomorphic; a few clearly anthropomorphic figurines appear to also incorporate zoomorphic features such as bovine ‘cow eyes’ or avian ‘bird beaks’ and headdresses. Some figurines suggest that there was intentional visual blurring of human–animal, male–female intersectionality by performative
means in the Halaf, possibly connected to practices with lived bodies using ornamentation, masks or costumes.\textsuperscript{18} Gender, animal, human, plant, spirit world intersectionality through visual means is further discussed in Chapter Six.

As mentioned, many Halaf figurines, LH.1A types most notably, were made in sections, representing dividual parts of the body that are attached together while the clay was still pliable. A few other figurines were created with holes for the insertion of a head, which could have been made of a different material and be movable, removable, and interchangeable. Partitioned is often how these figurines end their prehistoric object biographies, broken at attachment seams and vulnerable stress points, surviving in the archaeological record as fragments and fragmented. In fact there are no examples in this catalog that remain in the state they were originally produced and none are completely whole. All are scarred and damaged from episodes in object biographies, which certainly included human touch and handling but also rubbing of surfaces from display, tumbling against other objects and interactions with organic substances either from use or burial.

Breaks, wear, cracks, chips, and general damage are evident on all examples. The scars on the figurines tell of loss and damage that does not appear to be intentional; breaks are usually at vulnerable stress points and attachment seams.\textsuperscript{19} From studying the breaks, scars, and chips on these figurines, it seems that the intentionality of breakage may have occurred much earlier in the object biography of many figurines. That is, when they were made, they were designed to break. Although stabilization of objects made of clay must have been well known in Halaf pottery workshops, and some examples appear to have been baked, clay Halaf figurines were

\textsuperscript{18} Figurines that are clearly animal or do not have any identifiable anthropomorphic features or parts are not included in this dissertation.

\textsuperscript{19} I thank Megan O’Neil (personal communication May, 2014) for preliminary discussion about the use and meaning of the word scar when speaking of fragmentation of archaeological objects. I know of no other references to using the word scar as evidence of a place of detachment for archaeological objects.
fragile items. However, it does not appear that the figurines were treated as fragile objects. Utilization of figurines in daily life was rough enough even to break stone examples. There is also evidence that many broken and fragmented figurines continued to be used without prehistoric repair or reconstruction. It is possible the construction of these figurines in fragile materials and forms that would eventually fragment was quite possibly a conscious choice at the point of conception and making of a figurine.  

Consideration of figurines, including fragments, within their primary chronological, archaeological and regional contexts is a central theme in this dissertation that has not been the general practice of figurine studies. As Moorey (2001, ix) critiques,

Too often only well-preserved ancient Near Eastern terracottas find their way into publications, arranged like minor works of art in typological series. This detaches them from real life.

The structure of this dissertation connects figurines to ‘real life’ by cataloging them within their archaeological assemblages as excavated and in all states of survival. The stylistic and typological analysis that follows (in Chapter Six) is grounded archaeologically, within the time and space in which the figurines were made, used, and discarded.

The archaeological context for Halaf figurines is at best last use or last depositional process (Schiffer 1976). Acquisition of this data is dependent on the archeological techniques and recording systems of the original excavators of the sites (Table 3.13, 134). For sites excavated in the early twentieth century, figurines were found in the course of bulk removal of large quantities of settlement soils from deep soundings, which were later picked through for baksheesh-producing finds in wheel barrows or spoil heaps.  

---

20 On fragmentation and figurines, see Chapman 2000, Chapman and Gaydarska 2007, Talalay 1987. I discuss these and other sources on intentionality and fragmentation in Chapter Two.  
21 Baksheesh is Arabic for tip—on some excavations workmen were rewarded with tips for each small find, which were collected often at the expense of careful recording of associated archaeological assemblages and matrices. For
lateral exposures much more carefully and record find spots more meticulously, but these
techniques have yielded fewer figurines. Taken as a whole, the archaeological context of most
examples is within matrices associated with domestic debris, at the place of discard, either singly
or in small groups. There is very little archaeological evidence for any time in the object
biography of the figurines before discard as last use. None of the Halaf figurines were found in
contexts that can be called in situ at places of daily use, storage or production; they were all
found in unremarkable trash-filled contexts. Other parts of the object biographies must be
reconstructed from the figurines themselves and what is known and has been theorized from
other material culture. This method of analysis is similar to that used for the figurine
assemblage of Çatalhöyük, where the depositional contexts in which hundreds of figurines have
been found have (mostly) been interpreted as midden trash (Meskell, Nakamura, King, and Farid
2008; Martin and Meskell 2012).

Figurines are objects set apart from other more obviously utilitarian objects in
archaeological collections, reports, and analysis. Museum collections and archaeological report
generally collected and exhibit the most eye-catching and complete of their collections, often
elucidated with interesting but fabricated ideas of why they were treated with reverence in the
past. There is a collective notion that these are special objects and that by extension they
received special treatment. However the Halaf evidence counters that notion. Halaf figurines
show the same rough and tumble object biographies as the rest of the material culture artifacts
excavated. They were clearly well used, and when they were no longer of use they ended up in

---

more on this practice, see sections in this dissertation for Chagar Bazar (Chapter Five). It is likely that all pre-war
evacuations followed this practice.

22 This sort of archaeological context occurs usually as a result of structural collapse or a fire. One example is from
level six of Tell Sabi Abyad (which dates earlier than Halaf) where figurines were found swept into the corner of
rooms along with other small finds, in assemblages the excavators called archives, but they might have simply been
left behind and swept into a corner because they had no more use or meaning; see Verhoven 1999, Akkermans et al.
1995.
the same settlement soils as everything else, sometimes appearing in matrices with a higher
density of small finds. Morphological analysis shows intentionality in construction that often
provided for sitting or lying on a flat surface without support, and a few were pierced for
suspension on a cord. This piercing provided for hands-free object interaction although the
surfaces and fragmentation of examples show that they were often handled, caressed, and
rubbed, sometimes roughly. These are all examples of Halaf daily life evidenced by the
figurines, much more of which is discussed in further pages. That figurines were objects
interactive with daily life is Roger Moorey’s idea, whose work is an inspiration for the
methodology and analysis developed here.

These figurines are an early—but certainly not the first—instance of a long tradition that
lasted over many millennia. Moorey’s (2001, 2003) practical and thoughtful work on the broad
spectrum of Near Eastern figurines prioritizes full morphological documentation and analysis,
and my catalog methodology and analysis is based upon his. Moorey (2001, ix) describes the
length and breadth of Mesopotamian figurine production succinctly:

    The numerous miniature images of clay that have survived from the ancient Near East are
witness to perhaps the most important unknown in modern knowledge of the daily lives
of people in many parts of the region, from the earliest village communities soon after
10,000 BCE through to the time of the Achaemenid Persian Empire in the fifth to fourth
centuries BCE

Many features of Halaf figurines are universal figurine characteristics—known from
Mesopotamia and many other cultures and as such recognizable but not realistically proportioned
human body components with a particular emphasis on female represented biological features
and repeated body embellishments and ornamentation. Like many figurines, Halaf figurines
were not sturdily made and are often excavated fragmented, chipped, or broken amongst
domestic debris. And like many figurines worldwide, those of the Halaf were made by hand in
similar ways of locally plentiful materials. Practical study of figurines has been eloquently discussed and practiced by Moorey (2003), and this dissertation uses his methodology as a foundation.

As imaginative interpretations of anthropomorphic representation, figurines serve in modernity as powerful little visual icons for past peoples in scholarly and popular literature. It has long intrigued twentieth through twenty-first imaginations that figurines that look alike and are made in similar ways occur for no obvious functional reason within the material culture record of so many prehistoric cultures worldwide. In the scholarly and popular literature, proposals of figurine significance and meaning include female representations, self-portraits, statuettes, icons, mother goddesses, miniaturization, divine objects of/for worship, vehicles of magic and protection, coming of age teaching aids, toys, pornographic devices, embodiments of cosmology, cultural surrogates, wish objects, fertility supports and reproduction aids, gender markers, shrine indicators, practice pieces, cultural representations of the body, and daily household knick-knacks. There are many articles and books arguing for these and many more universal figurine meanings, purposes and functions. A debate continues over the validity of arriving at definitive and universal explanation and interpretation the figurine phenomenon across cultures worldwide (e.g., Gimbutas 1982; Lesure 2002, 2011). Nearly all of these interpretations are, however, purely conjecture, without any possibility for empirical support for or against.

There is no reason to think that figurines meant or were used for any one purpose, even within cultures, households, or in the hands of an individual person. A single figurine or fragment could well have had many uses, functions, and meanings throughout its object biography, depending on the circumstance and/or user. At issue with attempts to compare these
representations in an intra-cultural discourse over universal meanings of a prehistoric figurine tradition crossing millennia and thousands of miles, is the dependence of ‘greatest hits’ of available figurine visuals from each culture that fit prevailing interpretations rather than examples that assemblages that actually represent cultural corpora (Belcher and Croucher in press). However, the full record of many figurine assemblages within cultures is not available in accessible publications, especially for Mesopotamia. This dissertation is a step toward filling that lacuna for the Halaf.

This dissertation fills one small portion of these lacunae by recording this one cultural assemblage of figurines contextualized culturally, iconographically, socially, and archaeologically. The cultural and social construction of representation of the body in figurines is what is considered in this dissertation; the empirical evidence does not any provide more functional meaning than that. It is obvious that the meaning and significance of these objects was shared across space and time and that any connections with divine, spiritual, and other worlds was expressed through a Halaf view of anthropomorphic representation. But those beliefs left no archaeological record beyond the figurines, most of which were found broken amidst domestic debris. Isolation of complete figurines in sterile museum exhibit cases and professional photographs presents them in a radically different environment from the lived spaces in which they were viewed and used in Halaf daily life. In fact, the contexts and condition of the figurines suggest they were not kept separate from the general tumble of daily life, domestic refuse and detritus. This dissertation demonstrates that much can be deduced from

---

23 The same few Çatalhöyük figurines representing obese and/or pregnant women appear again and again without regional or chronological context as primeval examples of Ancient Near Eastern ‘mother goddesses.’ Essentially they serve as stand-ins in lieu of Mesopotamian examples, most of which are quite slim with flat stomachs and are not as popularly known or published. For example see Roaf 1996, 44-45.
thorough study and analysis of figurines without resorting to interpretative conjecture for which there is no evidence.

Table 1.1: Sites and Figurines discussed in this dissertation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Name</th>
<th>Halaf Phase(s)</th>
<th>#Figurines</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Museum[s]*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Chapter Four—Halaf Figurines from Anatolia (Turkey)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Sites</td>
<td>early-late Halaf</td>
<td>76 figurines</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Fistikli Höyük</td>
<td>early Halaf</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>Urfa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Tell Kurdu</td>
<td>early and late Halaf</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>[Hat], TK dig depot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Girikihaciyan</td>
<td>early and late Halaf</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>Diyar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Çavı Tarlaşı</td>
<td>late Halaf</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>Urfa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Domuztepe</td>
<td>early and late Halaf</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>Maraş, DT dig depot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Kerkuş Höyük</td>
<td>late Halaf</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>[Mardin]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Kazane Höyük</td>
<td>late Halaf</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>[Urfa]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Chapter Five—Halaf Figurines from the Western Jazirah (Syria)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Sites</td>
<td>early-late Halaf</td>
<td>121 figurines</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Tell Sabı Abyad</td>
<td>early Halaf</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Syria</td>
<td>[Raq, SAB depot]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Umm Qsier</td>
<td>early Halaf</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Syria</td>
<td>[Hass?]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Chagar Bazar</td>
<td>late Halaf</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Syria</td>
<td>BM., Alep, Ashm, Fitz, DezZ [recent excavations in Syria]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Tell Aqab</td>
<td>late Halaf</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Syria</td>
<td>Aleppo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Khirbet esh-Shenef</td>
<td>late Halaf</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Syria</td>
<td>[Raq]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Tell Kashkashok</td>
<td>late Halaf</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Syria</td>
<td>Alep, DezZ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Tell Halaf</td>
<td>late Halaf</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Syria</td>
<td>VAM, [Syria] [many destroyed]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Tell Arjoune</td>
<td>late Halaf</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Syria</td>
<td>[Homs?]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Tell Beydar</td>
<td>late Halaf</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Syria</td>
<td>DezZ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Museum names in [brackets] indicate inaccessible collections or figurines known only from publications and/or excavation archives. For abbreviations, see references.

This corpus is evidence of a shared understanding and imagination about the Halaf lived body translated into miniature with available materials and technologies. Figurines result from negotiation of the socially entangled, experiential body visually expressed with clay or stone. Therefore this is a study of the remaining record of socially embedded agency and intentionality governing the body in the Halaf. This is also a study of the evolution of local, regional, and
cultural consensus governing the practices and choices of individuals and groups interacting at all stages of the object biography of these figurines. Through gathering and analyzing this corpus, this study reconstructs a social network of practices related to conceptualizing, creating, using and discarding figurines and presents a model of these negotiated relationships within the embodied lived experience of the Halaf. The details of each site assemblage that compose this corpus are presented (Table 1.1, above).

Excavations in Iraq yielded the first Halaf figurines, which are also the least stratified, or documented within an archaeological findspot, these figurines are only mentioned and referred to in this dissertation as comparanda but not analyzed in depth. Information on Iraq Halaf figurines is offered as a reference, although assemblage details and numbers here are quite preliminary until this assemblage is further studied in detail. While I did study accessible examples of this regional assemblage in the course of my research, many are inaccessible to me at this time. Time and space do not allow for inclusion of detailed recording of these figurines in this dissertation. (Table 1.2, below). Therefore, although more Halaf settlements are known, excavations at only 24 Halaf sites yielded figurines, and a smaller subset of sixteen sites are discussed in this study.

| Table 1.2: Halaf sites and figurines in Iraq mentioned but not analyzed in dissertation |
|---------------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| **Halaf figurines from the Eastern Jazirah and Tigris-Mosul Area (Iraq)** | **9 sites** | **early-late Halaf** | **~ 183 figurines?** | **12 or more locations?** |
| 1 | Yarim Tepe I | early Halaf | 29[?] | Iraq | [IM], [RIA]? |
| 2 | Yarim Tepe II | early-late Halaf | 15[?] | Iraq | [IM], [RIA]? |
| 3 | Tell abu Dhahir | late Halaf | 1 | Iraq | [IM] |
| 4 | Yarim Tepe III | late Halaf | 20[?] | Iraq | [IM], [RIA]? |
| 5 | Choga Mami | late Halaf | 1 | Iraq | CU-AP |
| 6 | Arpachiyah | late Halaf | 52 | Iraq | Ashm, BM, IofA, [IM.] |
| 7 | Tepe Gawra | late Halaf | 58[?] | Iraq | UPM, UC-OI, [Dropsie], [IM] |
| 8 | Tell Hassan | late Halaf | 2 | Iraq | [IM] |
| 9 | Tell Hassuna | late Halaf | 5[?] | Iraq | [IM] |

* Museum names in [brackets] indicate inaccessible collections or figurines known only from publications and/or excavation archives. For abbreviations, see references.
North Mesopotamian Landscapes in Prehistory and Modernity.

For millennia, the rain-fed plains, river valleys, and cities of Northern Mesopotamia have supported the agricultural exploitation of the landscape by spreading out settlements to take full advantage of rainfall. In many areas, such as the Khabur headwaters, the Halaf has been described as a time of optimal resource expansion across the landscape (McCorriston 1992). It is possible that the end of the Halaf period coincided with a plateau of the limits of rainfall agriculture, perhaps exacerbated by climate events. In recent decades efforts to redirect water and harness power through hydroelectric dams have changed the strategies of archaeological recovery. Many sites discussed in this dissertation have been flooded, for example, Girikihacıyan and Çavı Tarlası in Turkey; Tell Hassan in Iraq and Tell Kashkashok in Syria are now under artificial lakes resulting in dams recently constructed along the Khabur, Tigris, and Euphrates Rivers. More dams are planned or are under construction along all of these rivers. Much smaller local efforts to redirect water into irrigation canals have facilitated intensified large-scale mono-crop farming throughout the region, some of which has also caused the destruction of some sites. For example, Tell Kurdu and Domuztepe are surrounded by large agricultural operations where bulldozers have at times damaged archaeological remains.

Today the rural areas of Northern Mesopotamia continue to be sparsely populated with small, agrarian villages internally fused by extended families and externally connected with other settlements by kinship, ethnic, or religious identities more than by geography. The internal social structures of these villages could be much the same as in prehistory as could the three-dimensional networks of communication that connect them across the landscape (Oka and Kusimba 2008). These routes are particularly well documented in the early second millennium during the Old Assyrian Period (Larson 1987). Research for this dissertation involved long
journeys across this region to sites, museums, and dig houses following some of these ancient routes.

Late nineteenth and early twentieth century accounts described Northern Mesopotamia as a dismal, empty land, crossed by ruthless battling tribes without intellectual nor creative match to the past peoples in Mesopotamian times (amongst many: Sykes 1907: 242, Layard 1887, von Oppenheim 1933). Others describe this land as a battlefield for Western control of its natural resources (Fitzgerald 1994). The growing modern cities in this region, such as Gaziantep, Şanlıurfa and Diyarbakır in Turkey and Qamishli, Deir ez-Zor and Hasseke in Syria and Erbil, Mosul and Kirkuk in Iraq are now central places within the landscape. These places now function as centralized collection points for agricultural products and minerals (including crude oil) and serve as postindustrial era manufacturing centers. Many of these cities emerged from historical empires as political centers of control and administration that in reality had minimal control over the sparsely settled landscape (Robinson 2000, D. Oates 2005). The political administration of these provinces now includes the Department of Antiquities and regional museums within which I conducted research for this dissertation.
The egalitarian small scale social structure of Halaf settlements thrived within this zone and developed loose connections by which they shared ideologies, materials, and artistic skills. Across this landscape in the sixth millennium communities formed mutually supportive networks of interactive exchanges perhaps facilitated by longer lasting settlements that provided stable way-stations, stopping-off places, and hubs between regions and villages. There was no overall cohesive political structure in the Halaf, but rather a need, desire, and ability for interaction and reciprocal exchange. While the settlements were always probably small, these hubs are now large sites because they were continuously inhabited over an extended period in the Halaf, but they did not necessarily accommodate large populations at any one time (Akkermans 2013; Bernbeck 2013).

24 Downloaded from http://maps.google.com/ April 2012
25 Other regional museums and offices not circled on this map do not hold collections of Halaf figurines. The national museums in Damascus, Ankara and Baghdad, which hold Halaf figurines, are outside the Halaf region and not on this map.
26 Ongoing wars and ethnic tensions in southeastern Turkey and Iraq have prevented research in this region.
Based upon comparative analysis of ceramics—from many more sites than those considered in this study—the Halaf landscape has been divided in different ways. Hijarah (1997) divided Halaf in northern Iraq into six regions. Davidson (1977) divided the ‘core’ area of the Halaf into four regions, Mosul, Sinjar, Khabur, and Balikh. Following Perkins (1949), Watson (1982) added areas outside of this ‘Halaf heartland’ of what she called ‘Halafian periphery’—north (Anatolia), east (Iran), west (of the middle Euphrates), and south (Hamrin and Mandali)—where so-called ‘imitation-Halaf’ or ‘Halaf-related’ ceramics were found. The figurine typologies are here considered to be within interconnected Halaf reciprocal networks and equal spheres of interaction rather than the binaries of core/periphery and real/imitation cultural models of the past. In this dissertation, I do not regard any region as ‘more Halaf’ than others.

With no focal point in this comparative study and a relatively small corpus, the typology can suggest an ordering of the landscape based upon comparison of each example against the other. A model of interaction sphere and reciprocal network across the Halaf landscape for figurines is therefore tested in this dissertation. Therefore what is suggested in the analysis is a reconstructed figurine-centric regional model of the Halaf, or using the terminology of Nakamura and Meskell (2009), a landscape of figurine worlds. The figurine landscape is different from that of other material culture classes, such as pottery or seals. Whereas the same raw materials—stone and clay—are employed in the making, the interaction sphere of figurine conceptualization and use was different from that of other material culture. Therefore study of pottery, seals, and architecture may suggest very similar needs and desires in the Halaf, figurine assemblages compared between Anatolia (Chapter Four, Appendix A) and Syria (Chapter Five, Appendix B) suggest related but distinctly different regional interaction spheres for figurines.
The social networks encircling figurine conception, consumption, materials manipulation, and manufacture are entangled with ideologies of gender, body image, and other identities. They, therefore, might show a different story than pottery. When the Halaf figurine typology constructed from less than 200 examples from just sixteen sites is laid upon a Halaf landscape constructed from statistical analysis of millions of pottery shards at hundreds of sites, it is difficult to map more than subtle patterns. There were certainly dominant preferences for certain types at certain regions and times. For example seated clay figurines, Types LH.1A and LH.1B, were certainly made and wanted in great quantities in the late Halaf Khabur region but not north in Anatolia. Concentrations of late Halaf flat standing figurines Type LH.2B along the extended Levantine corridor from Tell Arjoune to Domuztepe and into central Anatolia suggests that practices related to this type of figurine were shared in this area. As comparanda is identified within and outside of the Halaf landscape, an interaction sphere is further illuminated, which was supported by communication of ideologies, ephemeral imagery, and oral narratives influencing the conception and making of figurines. It is possible that reciprocal exchange of ideas and imagery related to figurines creates different patterns than that of pottery, lithics, or architecture, which are conceivably related to different social engagements and ideologies. Exchange of imagery, technology, and ideas about the body certainly flowed within and between settlements, communities, and region. These figurines reflect this communication as well as local traditions through their typological features.

Because of physical fragility and regionalization of typological styles, I do not think that the figurines themselves were exchanged within these networks. It is however entirely probable that imagery on and composed of ephemeral materials such as skin, felt, textiles, and wood did move from settlement to settlement in the form of portable protective amulets, keepsakes, and
decorative elements on textiles and/or human and animal bodies. These would not survive in the archaeological record. Certainly narratives, ideas, and social conventions related to body decoration, manipulation, and dress crossed the landscape with those travelling across regions and between settlements.

Because archaeological context is a cornerstone of this analysis, ‘unexcavated objects’ purchased from the antiquities market are not considered in this dissertation because they are devoid of archaeological context and therefore, as Moorey (2001, 4) states:  

Terracottas, like all artefacts, are best studied on the basis of excavated contexts in which they are found in meaningful relation to one another; but these are rare and even where they occur not always sufficiently well published for analysis. At the same time, it is accepted that exceptional individual examples of proven authenticity can be significant in elucidating imagery, if not use, which may in many cases be enduringly elusive. (4)

Many figurines identifiable as Halaf types regularly appear in museum collections, on Internet auction sites, and in antiquities dealers' catalogs. Illegally looted from archaeological sites, and in most cases illegally smuggled into Western countries, they can make no contribution to this contextualized study. However it is hoped that this study may prove useful for localizing the ongoing looting of Halaf sites.

Halaf figurines were mostly found in secondary or tertiary contexts—normally the place of ‘last use’ or discard rather than place of storage, use, or manufacture. Therefore archaeological context can only inform us of the last use (discard) and a terminus ante quem and locale for each example, which cannot be dated later than the stratigraphic date of its find spot.

---

27 Because a primary accomplishment of this dissertation is to create a typology of Halaf figurines anchored by their archaeological context in time and space, ‘unexcavated’ figurines cannot contribute usable data to this discussion. It is hoped that this typology will assist in identifying which geographic areas looted Halaf figurines have been obtained. Oscar Muscarella (2000) has written a useful guide to ethically incorporating ‘unexcavated objects’ into scholarship.

28 Since I began monitoring in 1999, the illicit market in Halaf figurines has been growing, with examples appearing on EBay and other websites with alarming frequency—these are often fragments made ‘whole’ with modern restorations. Most are type one figurines that can be sourced to northeastern Syria or northeastern Iraq. There is even an online guide to purchasing looted Halaf figurines. Collector Antiquities (21 Nov. 2005) “Real or Fake? Tell Halaf ‘Mother Goddess’ Figurines” http://www.collector-antiquities.com/172/
Because most figurines were not found in-situ at the place of use or display, the daily use of figurines cannot be determined from their findspots, which rather record the place of discard or abandonment. There is some evidence that a few Halaf figurines may have been deliberately placed together in what has been interpreted as caches, but is probably concentrations of figurines amongst other domestic debris, in, around, and under houses. Others were in archaeological contexts not as easy to discern, discovered in narrow vertical soundings at the lowest occupation levels under large strata of later settlement layers, or scooped out of the eroded bases of tells. The possible interpretations of this context will be suggested in Chapter Six.

The archeological evidence for the find spots of these figurines—in fill matrices amidst domestic areas and objects—suggests that they were part of mundane ritual practices (Renfrew 1994).29 Further evidence for this comes from the figurines themselves, which were designed to be displayed continually without human intervention. Halaf figurines were probably part of daily ideological practices connected with the living rather than the dead. Therefore the object biography is entangled with the lived body experience as well as the intentional individual actions related to the figurines embedded in the daily lives of each Halaf community.

The effects on small Ancient Near Eastern objects of craft-person/artist networks as well as individual and group agency, intentionality, and social constraints on modes of representation and iconography have been interpreted art historically as ‘local styles’ (see Winter 1976; Marcus 1996). Interpreting a group of small decorative objects exchanged amongst the Hopewell in what is now Tennessee; Caldwell (1964) proposed that human agency and intentionality of their manufacture and consumption is constrained within a social structure called interaction

29 Nakamura and Meskell have suggested the same for figurines at Çatalhöyük (2009: 206).
spheres. Exchange and communication of goods and ideas within interaction spheres was proposed as a model for stylistic interaction for late Neolithic Mesopotamia and the Halaf in particular by Norman Yoffee (1993). The networks and spheres of interaction within which technological and representation, style, technology, and materials are considered three dimensional because of entanglements with ideologies of embodiment and other identities. Both local styles and interaction spheres serve as models of reconstructing artistic networks and ideological communication from small decorative objects in this dissertation. Typology is used here as a tool to analyze and order the stylistic, technological, and iconographic patterns in this assemblage of figurines, which in turn informs a theory of a networked artistic response to embodiment in the Halaf. The three dimensional network of Halaf exchange is entangled not only with embodiment but also other communal ideas, technologies and iconographies—these concepts are also discussed in Chapter Six.

**Dissertation Structure**

The structure of the dissertation is in three parts; the first three chapters introduce the topic and methodology of this study and place it within existing archaeological, theoretical, figurine, and Halaf literature. The central two chapters present the archaeological context for each site’s figurine assemblage and regional practices. These chapters are organized by bipartite separation of the western Halaf landscape, which corresponds to the modern countries of Turkey and Syria. These chapters correspond to two appendices that present a catalog of all examples. The final chapter compares the figurine corpus typologically and considers the nature of social networks and interaction spheres based upon regional typologies. This chapter also suggests a

---

30 Meskell and Nakamura (2009) have proposed a somewhat similar model of social structures surrounding the reception and representation of Çatalhöyük ‘figurine worlds’.

31 With the caveat that the objects on which the theories of local styles and interaction spheres are based were prestige items created, and sometimes traded for elite consumption. Halaf figurines probably functioned as everyday objects in the same place they were made within egalitarian communities.
concept of interaction spheres related to social and cultural constellations of embodiment based upon the figurine evidence.

Chapter One, Introduction, presents a brief introduction to the Halaf culture and Halaf figurines. This chapter also provides maps and charts of the sites where figurines were found as well as a discussion of theoretical, geographical, typological, and technological considerations. This chapter also presents the methodology for studying and analyzing this corpus based upon models and scholarly discourse from figurine studies as well as typological, technological, stylistic, and archaeological analysis.

Chapter Two, Halaf Figurine Historiographies, places this study within a review of the relevant literature in Halaf studies, figurine studies, and embodiment and gender studies. In addition to discussing the key scholarship that has informed this study, it also looks at political, archaeological, and academic influences that have shaped the work of archaeologists and art historians writing on these topics.

Chapter Three, Halaf Figurine Methodologies, presents the methodology used for this study. The chapter begins with how the data was gathered and categorized and how the sample size and structure were determined and determiners for inclusion of examples into the corpus. This chapter reflects upon the construction of the typology, how the types were established and ordered, as well as how the data was collected and presented. Additionally this chapter presents antecedents of and influences on the methodology developed and used here. While the work of this dissertation is original, much of the data it presents and analyses is mainly the work of others; this chapter discusses the nature, challenges and solutions for working with such a data set. This chapter concludes with a discussion of Halaf relative and absolute chronology in
archaeological literature that are used to create a chronological framework for figurine context and comparative analysis.

In Chapter Four, Halaf Figurines from Anatolia (Turkey), I consider seventy-four figurines in their excavation contexts at seven sites in the plains and steppes of what is now southeastern Turkey. In this chapter and appendix, the figurines from Domuztepe (early and late Halaf twenty-two examples) and Tell Kurdu (early, late and post Halaf sixteen examples) in the eastern Cilician plains and foothills are presented. Figurines from the sites of Çavı Tarlası (late Halaf, fifteen examples), Kazane Höyük (late Halaf, one example), Fıstıklı Höyük (early Halaf, four examples) and Girikihacıyan (early and late Halaf, fourteen examples) clustered around the upper reaches of the Euphrates River are also discussed. The figurines from Kerkuşti Höyük (two examples) just south of Mardin are also presented here. With the exception of a few examples unavailable because of insurmountable bureaucratic hurdles, most of the examples in this chapter were studied in Turkish museums and dig houses in the course of this research. This catalog is integrated with the corresponding catalog of the individual figurines presented by site in Appendix A; both should be consulted together for a full documentation of this assemblage.

Chapter Five, Halaf Figurines from the Western Jazirah (Syria), examines the context for Halaf figurines from seven excavations located in what is now Syria. Included in this consideration are examples from Tell Beydar (late Halaf, one example), Tell Kashkashok (late Halaf, twenty-five examples), Tell Aqab (early and late Halaf, eleven examples), and Tell Halaf (late Halaf, twenty-eight examples) in the area of the Khabur river, and Chagar Bazar (late Halaf, forty examples) and Sabi Abyad (early Halaf, eight examples) in the Balikh river valley. Figurines from the site of Arjoune, (late Halaf, six examples) situated between Homs and the Lebanese Beqā Valley are also presented. Nearly all of the figurines chapter and appendix
presents research from hands-on examination. The information in this chapter is integrated with the corresponding catalog, presented in Appendix B; both should be consulted together for a full picture of this assemblage.

Chapter Six, Results, Further Considerations and Conclusions, presents analysis and findings from the study of figurines, including a full Halaf figurine typology and chronology, analytical discussion of artistic communication exchange and of imagery, iconography, and technology. This chapter presents theoretical conclusions arising from my study related to embodiment, gender, and fragmentation and makes suggestions for further research.
CHAPTER TWO: Halaf Figurine Historiographies

A corpus of artifacts excavated over a century requires some reflection on the methods and sources previously used to find, analyze, and explain them. During the past century, literature on the Halaf, figurines as well as modern archaeological theory and practice has refined our understanding of the phenomenon of Halaf figurines. There are also some long-lasting assumptions that remain stubbornly present in the discourse around the Halaf and its figurines. This literature is the foundation and filter through which Halaf figurines have been understood over time up to the writing of this dissertation. Past interpretations of Halaf figurines were constructed from a mix of influences in available published sources. Some were borrowed from other regions and artifact classes; others were influenced by biases and observations in modernity. Still others are complete theoretical inventions, and only a few based in evidence presented by the figurines themselves.

Halaf figurines are visual objects and, as such, occupy a place near the beginning of the long trajectory of the history of the art of the Middle East. As excavated small finds, these figurines contribute toward the understanding of craft production and identity in Neolithic Mesopotamia and the Ancient Near East. As unique, compelling objects of prehistoric anthropomorphic representation, they should also have a place in the wider discussion on prehistoric art and figurines, but, unfortunately, they are too obscure to appear in that scholarly or popular literature. Figurine studies do not always clearly negotiate the borders between scholarly and popular literature, the full spectrum between these genres has influenced the development of figurine analysis.
Archaeological theory has developed over this century, and our understandings of culture, gender, embodiment, personhood, and identity have drastically changed. In tandem with this, an understanding of how these ideas can be discerned from archaeological data is also developing. Theoretical concepts are directly applicable for interpreting the actions of conceptualizing, making, using, and discarding in the object biographies of Halaf figurines. Also important to a review of the literature on the Halaf and Halaf figurines is especially that which was written by Sir Max Mallowan, the excavator of Arpachiyah and Chagar Bazar. These writings are foundational and still greatly influence subsequent work on the Halaf and figurines from Syria and Turkey. Therefore, his work is used here as a case study of the origin of many interpretations of the Halaf and Halaf figurines still in circulation nearly a century later. Untangling the century-long scholarly construction of the phenomenon that is Halaf figurines and presenting an evidence-based response is a goal of this dissertation; this chapter presents the existing narrative and its sources.

**Halaf Figurine Sources**

This is the first stand-alone work on Halaf figurines. Therefore a historiography of sources on Halaf figurines is also a review of Halaf sources in general. The Halaf has been a developed scholarly construct created and refined over a century of archaeological excavation, reporting, and comparative ceramic analysis (Campbell 2007). Figurines are part of this construct, but they have in the past been tangential to a focus on ceramic evidence to define this archaeological culture and its phases. It is especially useful to look at the primary publications to consider how the concept of the Halaf developed over time, specifically as related to an understanding of figurines and the archaeological assemblages from which examples in the corpus were excavated.
There are three types of literature which provide a foundation to the study presented in this dissertation and to which this research responds:

1. Halaf archaeological site reports and analyses,
2. Figurine studies of prehistoric and Ancient Near Eastern corpuses, and
3. Archaeological theory, especially as related to the human body.

It is particularly useful to look at the Halaf literature chronologically by publication date to consider the development of the figurine corpus as it became available in print. Literature on Halaf figurines exists mainly in archaeological reports, but a few have also served to construct Halaf figurines as a scholarly concept resulting in some long-lasting interpretations. Figurine studies outside of the Halaf are also useful methodological and analytical models. This study is of anthropomorphic representation and is therefore grounded in body and gender theory. This chapter places the work of this dissertation within the context of existing research on these topics.

The construction of the Halaf as an archaeologically known culture in the twentieth century is almost exclusively built upon pottery analysis. Specifically, knowledge of the continuations and changes throughout the chronological and regional occurrence of the Halaf is mainly based upon pottery motifs and shapes. This is not exclusive to the Halaf; most pottery-producing cultural horizons are archaeologically defined by the analysis of the ceramics assemblages. Other material culture phenomena such as stone tools, human and animal remains, seals, ornaments, architecture, and other artifact classes are sidelined supporters to the Halaf construct. However, these other object classes have not been studied as to their chronological and regional occurrence with equal rigor. Therefore, the details in the constructed Halaf are specific to pottery – also a focus of most archaeological reports – and are largely untested by specifics from other phenomena.
Since the second half of the twentieth century, the use of statistics has greatly refined ceramic analysis and in turn refined the understanding of the Halaf. Nascent Halaf ceramic analysis was provided by Mallowan (1933, 1936, 1937; Mallowan and Rose 1935) and Perkins (1949). Statistical studies of Halaf ceramics began with LeBlanc and Watson (1973) and Davidson (1977), Davison and McKerrell (1976) and was much refined by Campbell (1992b) and Irving (2001). Faced with the sheer multitude of ceramic remains – sherds numbering in the millions reliably occurring in every excavation unit or survey of sixth millennium BCE settlements – sampling and statistical models are used to yield analytical results. Figurine finds from all Halaf sites number just a few hundred, a number which is tiny in scale compared to the thousands of examples of ceramics, lithics, or faunal remains from each site. There are many Halaf excavations that found just one or two figurines or never found any. Corpuses of other small finds exist on a much smaller scale, too; ground stone tools, bone tools, seals, and pendants can number in the tens or hundreds or, in the case of beads, perhaps just over a thousand at a single site. Such is the case for Domuztepe (Belcher forthcoming). There is therefore no reason to sample or statistically analyze the figurines in this dissertation; given the small scale of the corpus, each example can be studied and documented fully. The analysis in this dissertation is, however, inspired by ceramic studies in that they weigh results of statistical samples by known factors of archaeological circumstance. Therefore, in this dissertation I test the veracity of the typology developed for the analysis against stratigraphy, visual diagnostics, comparanda, and quantity of occurrence.

Halaf Historiographies
Halaf material culture is identified as confined within an area which is now situated inside the modern political borders of southeastern Turkey and northern Syria and Iraq. Lack of available synthetic studies on the Halaf means that, in order to gain an understanding of the
archaeological assemblages, chronology, and sub-regions, requires cobbling together a long reading list of site reports, dissertations, preliminary reports, conference publications, artifact specific analyses, museum and exhibition catalogs, excavation archives, websites, and interviews with archaeologists of unpublished sites. Figurines appear in some but not all of these publications, and only a handful present data related to their morphology or archaeological context. If any pages in these publications are devoted to figurines, they are concerned with interpretation of their function and meaning without much regard or direct reference to the morphology, material, or technology of Halaf figurines or their associated archaeological contexts or comparanda.

Halaf figurines were first discovered in great numbers in the early 1910-30s at Tell Halaf, Arpachiyah, Tepe Gawra, and Chagar Bazar in northern Iraq and Syria. Together, these early excavations still constitute more than one-third of the currently known corpus of late Halaf figurines. The excavation reports, which appeared in the 1930s-1950s, remain the most detailed considerations of Halaf figurines. Perhaps because the artifacts, archives, and publications from these excavations are more accessible in Western libraries and museums than those of later digs, they remain primary influences on the constructed narrative on the Halaf culture as well as its figurines. As a result, the narrative of The Halaf is deeply rooted in the biases, and assumptions of archaeologists in the first half of the twentieth century. This same narrative echoed without much reflection and was further refined through further ceramic analysis through the second half of the twentieth century. The work of the second half of the twentieth century continued to be mainly on late Halaf assemblages from sites in Iraq and Syria, which contributed one-third of the currently known figurine corpus. It is only in the past few decades that significant data from the

---

32 The most influential and often referenced of these studies remains that of Thomas Davidson’s (1977) unpublished dissertation, which, while based upon his excavations at Tell Aqab, did not feature the figurines from there. See Chapter Five for a critique of his conclusions in light of the figurine evidence.
early Halaf and Anatolian Halaf became available; however, it remains much less accessible than that of the first sites excavated.  

From these archaeological efforts, another one-third of the currently known figurine assemblage became available. Because of accessibility issues, attempts to synthesize the nature of occurrence in late Neolithic Mesopotamian cultures and the Halaf in particular have been criticized as heavily weighted to late Halaf assemblages from pre-war excavations (Campbell 2007).

The Halaf period is presented in publications as one with a widespread, monolithic culture featuring polychrome pottery, round tholoi architecture, geometrically carved stamp seals, and seated so-called mother-goddess clay figurines with arms encircling large breasts (here in the dissertation known as, Type LH.1A). All of these continue to be discussed as normative Halaf features, even though all of these traits were not found at every settlement site and most can be sourced only to the late Halaf in certain regions. Deviations from this normative cultural monolith, meaning anything outside these normative diagnostics for the Halaf, were suggested to be derivative imitations of the so-called true Halaf (Roaf 1996, 48-51; Watson 1983; but originating with Perkins 1949). However, as demonstrated by Table 2.3, p. 49, available publications of Anatolian and early Halaf assemblages (including figurines) did not even begin to appear until the late 1980s. I submit that the idea of a monolithic, normative Halaf in the mid-twentieth century is constructed on that which has been accessible and available on the Halaf in museums and publications. In order to gain a more complete understanding, it is critical to dig deeper.

33Delayed and/or cursory excavation reports published in obscure publications sometimes in languages other than English as well as the required deposit of all artifacts, including figurines, into museums in the source countries of Iraq, Syria, and Turkey in the 1960s-1970s have resulted in less accessibility than those excavated earlier.

34The construction of a normative Halaf figurine type is discussed later in this chapter.
A more diverse Halaf material culture began to be identified in the last decade of the twentieth century, when the archaeological focus necessarily left Iraq in the face of the two American invasions. Comparative studies continued the pattern of looking for comparanda in Iraq (Campbell 2007; Frankel 1979). The problem with all of these studies is that they simply built upon, without reflecting upon, the usefulness of the chronological phases that Mallowan had long before established at Arpachiyah (Mallowan and Rose 1935). A series of dissertations and subsequent publications included a growing set of data to finely define expected painted pottery motifs and forms to be found in the early, middle, late, and transitional Halaf phases (Campbell 1992c; Davidson 1977; Hijjarah 1997; Perkins 1949; LeBlanc and Watson 1973; Watson 1983). The main problem with all of these studies is that their conclusions do not question Arpachiyah as a type site35 for the Halaf, even though it is a poorly stratified site, excavated using antiquated techniques, which might not have early Halaf deposits (Campbell 2000). For a study of figurines, most of these comparative analyses are not useful, since so many of the sites considered did not yield figurines, and none of them seriously considered small finds as diagnostic and comparable artifacts.

35 The concept of a type site is in itself problematic. There cannot be one settlement that can define a cultural horizon by its material culture remains. If Arpachiyah is to be the Halaf type site this essentially means that, artifacts could be compared to those assemblages, as a way to judge their degree of Halaf-ness.
Table 2.3: Excavation and publication chronologies of Halaf sites with figurines

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Excavation Year(s)</th>
<th>Site Name</th>
<th>Figurines Chronology</th>
<th>Primary figurine Publication(s)</th>
<th>Publication type</th>
<th>Country</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1899, 1911-1913, 1927</td>
<td>Tell Halaf (Oppenheim)</td>
<td>Late Halaf</td>
<td>Von Oppenheim 1931 Schmidt &amp; Von Oppenheim 1943</td>
<td>Final Report</td>
<td>Syria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1932-1938</td>
<td>Tepe Gawra</td>
<td>Late Halaf, Ubaid</td>
<td>Speiser 1935 Tobler 1950</td>
<td>Final Report</td>
<td>Iraq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1933</td>
<td>Arpachiyah</td>
<td>Late Halaf, Ubaid</td>
<td>Mallowan &amp; Rose 1935</td>
<td>Final Report</td>
<td>Iraq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1934</td>
<td>Tell Kurdu</td>
<td>Late Halaf</td>
<td>Braidwood 1960</td>
<td>Final Report</td>
<td>Turkey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1934-5, 1938 (Mallowan)</td>
<td>Chagar Bazar</td>
<td>Early Halaf, Late Halaf, Ubaid</td>
<td>Mallowan 1936, 1946, 1947</td>
<td>Final Reports</td>
<td>Syria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1943-1944</td>
<td>Tell Hassuna</td>
<td>[Hassuna, Samarra], Late Halaf</td>
<td>Lloyd and Safar 1945</td>
<td>Final Report</td>
<td>Iraq</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Post WW II Excavations

| 1973-1976(?)      | Yarim Tepe II   | Late Halaf           | Merpert and Munchaev 1993a      | Preliminary Reports | Iraq |
| 1978-1980         | Tell Hassan     | Late Halaf,          | Fiorina 1985, 1987              | Preliminary reports | Iraq |
| 1983 – 1984       | Çavı Tarlası     | Late Halaf           | Von Wickede and Herbdort 1988   | Preliminary Reports | Turkey |
|                   |                 |                      | Von Wickede and Misir 1985      |                   |       |
| 1985-1986         | Tell abu Dhahir | Late Halaf           | Simpson 2007                    | Final Report       | Iraq   |
| 1986-1990         | Tell Kashkashok | Late Halaf           | Soulieman and Tarekji 1999      | unpublished        | Turkey |

Late 20th Century(1990s) – Early 21st Century Excavations

| 2005-2006 | Kerküşti Höyük | Late Halaf | Saraultn 2009a-b [Figurines unpublished] | unpublished | Turkey |
| 2006-2010 | Tell Halaf | Late Halaf | Becker 2009, 2012a-f | Preliminary reports | Syria |
| 1999-2010 | Chagar Bazar | Late Halaf | Tunca, Baghdo, & Cruells 2006 | Preliminary reports | Syria |
The nuances, discontinuities, and deviances of previous perceptions of the Halaf have only recently become debated (Campbell 2007; Nieuwenhuyse, Bernbeck, Akkermans, and Rogasch 2013). New ways of archaeologically considering the Halaf have resulted in a more nuanced understanding of the local and interregional variations of material culture over time. Archaeological discourse has recently recognized that ideas and social practices entangled with identity, gender, and the body influenced how objects were conceptualized, manufactured, and used (Bolger 2008; Croucher 2012; Joyce 2005). A fuller, finer-grained understanding of the Halaf has emerged as the result of new excavations of early Halaf settlements (Akkermans and Schwartz 2003, Campbell 2007, Cruells and Nieuwenhuyse 2004). This study is informed by these developments in its analysis of Halaf figurines, particularly since well stratified early Halaf figurines have only emerged in these last decades from excavations in Turkey and Syria (Table 2.3, p. 49).

Northern Mesopotamia was the focal point of study at the beginnings of archaeological discovery. The first Mesopotamian archaeologist, Austin Henry Layard, worked at Nineveh in 1845-47 and amazed the world with the monumental sculptures of the Assyrian Empire (Layard 1867). As Mallowan was later to discover (1933), Nineveh was an important settlement location in the prehistoric period as well, probably because, like most settlements included in this dissertation, it was situated at important byways and/or water sources. These locations grew to large tells from the debris of prehistoric through historic civilizations. Later ancient cultures historically documented robust systems of interaction and communication across this region (D. Oates 1968; Wilkinson and Tucker 1995; Robinson 2000). While the social stratification was different from that of the Halaf, perhaps the most comparable regional studies are those of the

---

36 Although Halaf levels were found, no Halaf figurines were published from the Nineveh sounding. This was confirmed by Renata Gut (1995), who restudied and published the prehistoric finds excavated by Mallowan.
Uruk/fourth millennium BCE (Algaze 1993) and the Old Assyrian/late second millennium BCE (Larson 1987). These later cultures and their documented interactions show modern Syria and Turkey to be historically both a destination for raw materials and finished goods as well as a pass-through region. During these later historical times, northern Mesopotamia is thought to have had complicated networks of local, regional, and inter-regional alliances and rivalries as well as far-off communications all of which crisscrossed the landscape (e.g., D. Oates 1968, Robinson 2000). The landscape geometry of travel routes, stopping-off points, destinations for interaction, permanent settlement, dangerous locales, and nomadic migrations appears to have been stable for millennia, something which is also documented by European travelers to the region in the last two centuries of the current era (Rassmann 1996).

**Halaf figurines and Ancient Near Eastern Art History and Archaeology**

Halaf figurines have not been given a space within the canon of Mesopotamian Art and Art History. This is despite the fact that the pose and gesture of the best known Halaf figurines – frontal facing, arms supporting breasts with hands clasped at the sternum (in this dissertation Type LH.1A), were visually referenced by later Mesopotamian figurines and small anthropomorphic objects for millennia (Badre 1980). The origins of this pose in prehistory and its relation to later Mesopotamian art in the late Halaf has been recognized by only a few scholars (Bahrani 2001, Moorey 2001). Many art historical surveys, if they consider any artistic processes before Greece and Rome at all, begin with what is dubbed civilization, which generally is considered to be dated to c 3100 BCE in Mesopotamia and Egypt. This date is also the starting point of many surveys of Mesopotamia, since the traditional checklist of a civilized society for which the urban revolution brought not only cities but also, in turn, the invention of

---

37 I should mention that Paleolithic figurines and cave paintings are often considered art. Therefore, the introductory art history student may be lurch from imagery from Paleolithic Europe to the early civilizations of Egypt and Mesopotamia tens of thousands of years later.
writing, monumental architecture, and art (Childe 1935, Wenke 1999). While many of these elements of the supposed beginning of civilization are now known to have existed well before the fourth millennium BCE and even before the Halaf period, for many authors, as famously stated long ago, [Art] History begins at Sumer (Kramer, 1957). With very few exceptions, art historical monographs begin with Mesopotamian art and that of the wider Near East with the conventional idea of civilization; only a few mention prehistoric figurines or feature Halaf or other prehistoric examples.

In his Art of the Ancient Near East Seton Lloyd accepted anthropomorphic prehistoric figurines as art but stated that nothing could be gained from the study and analysis of them because he found that they are not discernible by region or culture and that their original meaning cannot be understood (1961, 25). Eva Strommenger included examples of Halaf figurines in her 5000 Years of the Art of Mesopotamia (1964, 376, pl. 6) without comment and quickly moved on to later periods. Amiet (1977) mentioned several of prehistoric figurines inside and outside Mesopotamia briefly at the beginning of his Art of the Ancient Near East, and he stated that Halaf painted pottery “is one of the peaks of Eastern art…,” but he did not mention figurines. Moortgat’s 1969 Art of Ancient Mesopotamia begins with the fourth millennium Uruk culture. Roaf covers prehistoric periods, but, rather than Halaf figurines, he features figurines from Çatalhöyük (outside of Mesopotamia) together with examples from Mesopotamian Samarra and al ’Ubaid (1996, 42-56). In fact, the omission of Halaf materials from Mesopotamian art surveys may be rooted in links between art and social stratification, but the reasons may also be

38 In addition to hand-held prehistoric art objects, with which this dissertation is concerned, other objects are also known from settlements well before the 6th millennium BCE. Monumental architecture is known from Göbekli Tepe and Nevali Çori, and evidence of very large populations living together in complex settlements was found at Abu Hureyra, ‘Ain Ghazal, Çatalhöyük, and Çayönü to cite just a few well-known examples. See Matthews (2000) for a survey of these and many other prehistoric sites and Croucher and Belcher (in press) for a perspective of figurines from prehistoric Anatolia.
more mundane. It is possible that the omission of Halaf figurines in these monographs may not be based solely in connoisseurship. Publishable images of Halaf figurines are still not easily available (Table 2.3, p. 49). With access to British Museum images, Dominique Collon (1995, 41-55) did devote her first chapter to art before 3000 and, convincingly stated:

In the types of figurines produced by prehistoric cultures we have a window into their world. The figurines reflect not only the religious beliefs but also the conventions governing the representations of the human form – what in later context might be termed an artistic convention. (Collon 1995, 43)

These are the most popular and well-known monographic surveys, used as textbooks by decades of students of Mesopotamian art history. Yet, there is little to learn within their pages on Mesopotamian prehistoric art. In most of them, Halaf figurines and, indeed, all prehistoric art are either ignored or relegated to little more than footnotes in the first pages.

The most challenging mention appears in the most well-known work on ancient Near Eastern Art. In his popular Mesopotamian art textbook Henri Frankfort directly rejected these objects in the first pages of Art and Architecture of the Ancient Orient.

The prehistoric clay figurines of men and animals do not differ in character from similar artless objects found throughout Asia and Europe. A history of art may ignore them, since they cannot be considered the ancestors of Sumerian sculpture. But Sumerian architecture has antecedents in the prehistoric age. (1954, 1970 reprint, 18)

Therefore, according to Frankfort, Halaf figurines can never be worthy of art historical analysis because they do not possess the properties of so-called Art and therefore all look alike. In this dissertation I take up Frankfort’s challenge and seek to prove that typological and stratigraphic analysis of figurines can make a worthwhile contribution to not only Ancient Near Eastern studies but also to art history in general.

39 One early monographic survey (Goff 1963) does consider art objects, including many figurines and small finds from the seventh through the third millennia BCE within their prehistoric and historic contexts. However, it was written by a non-specialist, was poorly illustrated, and has since disappeared into obscurity. A useable and fully informed survey of the millennia of art of prehistoric Mesopotamia before 3100 BCE is yet to be written
By considering figurines within their prehistoric contexts rather than as a stepping stone to so-designated artful, monumental art, the work of this dissertation is in part to bring Halaf figurines into the art historical discourse. Halaf figurines are part of a long-lasting art form with similar imagery that begins much earlier in the Neolithic and continues well beyond the traditional end of ancient Mesopotamia (Moorey 2001, Van Buren 1930 and ND). Perhaps because most figurines are small and fashioned from pedestrian materials (clay and local stones) and are normally found broken in trash contexts, they have not been completely accepted into the Mesopotamian art historical canon. The full spectrum of the appearance of figurines across worldwide time and space begins with the earliest human representation in the Paleolithic to those that are still made today. These small objects were for many cultures a vital means for expression of the embodied every day; their frank and imaginative expressions of the body have not historically appealed to connoisseurs who prefer ancient art to be monumental, of precious materials, and controlled and commissioned by elites. Even for historical periods, figurines depicting daily life – mainly of women, children, and animals as well as men, structures, and vehicles – have traditionally been footnotes to monumental objects or those in precious materials made for and depicting the lifestyles of the royal and elite. This dissertation is in part a response to the general perception of prehistory and small finds in general as artless and also a rejection of the notion that cities, writing, and social hierarchy and monumentality were required for a community to have valued aesthetics and a shared socially embedded interest in depicting themselves and others.

**Prehistoric Bodies and Modern Interpretations**

When confronted with exaggerated biologically female body parts such as proportionally huge pubic triangles, vulvas, and breasts, which in modernity are strongly sexualized, archaeologists have interpreted them as evidence for and symbols of agricultural fertility,
pregnancy, and mother goddesses. The conceptual construction of the mother goddess as an interpretation of prehistoric female imagery is discussed further below – suffice it to say here that this is a concept borrowed from nineteenth-century views on prehistory, figurines, and other female imagery known to have existed before the Halaf in Paleolithic Europe, Crete, and other locations.40 The constructed narrative of Halaf figurines was therefore assembled from interpretations borrowed from unrelated prehistoric and ethnographic cultures mixed with modern assumptions regarding identity and social roles of women in modernity. This narrative was filtered through biases brought to the field by young archeologists, classically trained in the West, encountering Middle Eastern prehistoric and modern village social structures for the first time. Interpretations embedded in the normative narrative of Halaf figurines were definitively not based in observations and analysis of the figurines and their archaeological context. Those interpretations were, rather, seriously clouded by these obstructions (Figure 2.10, p. 87). As this dissertation presents different methodological ways of interpreting figurines, it is therefore important to critique what has gone before.

The foundation of this narrative was laid by Max Mallowan in his interpretations of Arpachiyah and Chagar Bazar and its figurines in the 1930s. Mallowan found that “…the general connexion [sic] of fertility with these figures and therefore of fertile child-bearing is beyond dispute” (Mallowan and Rose 1935, 79). To illustrate this interpretation, the Halaf figurines excavated from Chagar Bazar were published a year later sitting on objects which he said represented “birthing stools” but which are not documented to have been actually found with

40 In May 2014 of the 2,000 results in JSTOR on the search Mother Goddess and Figurines the earliest were from the 1870s and relate to Knossos, which is also cited by the earliest writers on Halaf figurines, Mallowan and Rose (1935), Mallowan (1936), and Schmidt (1940) as comparative materials.
the figurines (Mallowan 1936, 11, 19-20, pl. 1: 1-3). These stools were, however, deposited with the figurines in English museums after his return from the field (see CB-2, CB-3, CB-4). Decorations on the figurine bodies, he suggested, represented direct connections with the dress, tattoos, and bodily practices of the Kurdish people living around the area (Figure 2.4, below). Even stating that “…the Kurds with their bright and variegated garments and their pipe-stems incised with the geometric elements of T. Halaf pottery, exhibit themselves that fondness for colour which we naturally associate with mountain peoples” (Mallowan 1936, 19).

![Figure 2.4: Postcard from Şanlıurfa, Turkey, of Kurdish women, 1913 (unknown photographer)](image)

While these interpretations may read as quaint, outdated anecdotes from more than half a century ago, the constructed knowledge around Halaf figurines is surprisingly resistant to

---

41 Chagar Bazar figurines were deposited with these so-called stools in the Ashmolean Museum, British Museum, and Fitzwilliam Museum. While each of these figurines do, indeed, sit without support (albeit somewhat precariously). The excavation report illustrates figurines sitting on top of these, and states that figurines were “…found for the first time associated with models of circular stools.” (Mallowan 1936, 11). But there is no documentation of their findspot. All appear to have been excavated from the 1935 season, however, so they must have been found somewhere within the same ‘Area M’ or ‘Prehistoric Pit’ sounding. For more on the contexts at Chagar Bazar, see Chapter 5.
change. Mother goddesses, birthing devices, and fertility charms are still current interpretations in figurine discussions today in regards to these figurines (Goodison and Morris 1998). Yet, these interpretations are not connected to the evidence from the figurines and their archaeological contexts. These are simply baseless speculation from other cultures, modern times, other regions, and other disciplines. These interpretations are also steeped in biases of Western male privilege, colonialism, and racism. It important to be acutely aware of and reflexive of the sources on which these speculative interpretations are based, because they are still very much in play in current scholarly and popular literature today.

Biases and assumptions were carried by classically-educated, Occidental archaeologists to their field work into what they regarded as the Orient, along with their privilege and power. Interpretations of the artifacts they excavated were diffracted by their perceptions of the modern social roles of so-called oriental village life. The interpretive discourse of Halaf figurines is definitely flavored by direct connections between prehistory and modernity through an imposed iconography of the impregnated, fertile, and objectified female who was considered to be, in the terms of those times, oriental. As Bryan Turner found, the Orient and Occident binary appeared often in archaeologists’ discourse:

Discursive formations (or what we might more conventionally call ‘paradigms of interpretation’) are constructed around positive and negative contrasts or dichotomies. These polarities constitute knowledge of an object through differentiation (Foucault, 1972). Knowledge of an object is constituted by a series of interrogations in the form of an account that responds to a set of polarities. (2001, 65)

The literature of the Halaf considered here follows a straight trajectory, resulting in a century-long, mainly occidental and mostly male archaeological lineage of excavators and writers who conceptualized the meaning of bodies reflected in Halaf figurines. Mallowan led the charge.
Long-lasting interpretations of Halaf and other figurines are based upon these and other prevalent notions of the day. Even though it was one of the first Halaf excavations, the work of Mallowan on material culture from Arpachiyah still heavily influences the twentieth- and twenty-first-century construction of a Halaf culture. A powerful example of this is found in Mallowan’s introduction to Chapter 6, “Terracotta and Sun-Dried Clay Figurines,” in his report on the site of Arpachiyah:

The models of human figures are almost without exception females: they belong to that widespread series known as the ‘mother-goddesses’, and bear all the characteristics commonly associated with that type from Paleolithic times onward. …In all of them, prominence is given to certain features which these figures were obviously intended to emphasize; particularly the breasts, slender waist and pronounced navel, and the steatopygous rump – anatomical features which have at all times been regarded by the Oriental as connoting desirability and fertility in women. Most interesting is the consistent attitude in which these figures are represented; it is almost always the squatting position. The significance of the squatting position taken in conjunction with other characteristics, is highly suggestive: it is common practice in the Middle East and indeed many parts of the world for women to go through the process of childbirth in the squatting position, it is not unreasonable to suppose that this is the explanation of the prevailing attitude, though it cannot be denied that the failure to ever represent the child does not allow this argument to admit of proof. (Mallowan and Rose 1935, 79)

Mallowan words surmise foundational and still very much prevailing interpretations of the prehistoric body influenced by preconceptions in modernity. Among the issues and concepts that require response are the concepts of the so-termed Oriental desirability of fertility and fecundity; mother goddess worship; and non-Western “steatopygous” body types, gestures, postures, and even childbirth methods in the developing world.

These words cannot be dismissed as old and irrelevant today, Mallowan’s foundational interpretations need disentangling, because they still are repeated without reflection within Halaf studies. For example, up until the writing of this dissertation, the most dominant type of Halaf figurine was still called the mother-goddess type or simply mother goddesses. Each of Mallowan’s statements is deeply entangled with the early twentieth-century, civilized and
educated white male privilege perspective that he projected onto Halaf figurines through his Orientalist interpretation of the practices and appearances of women in the modern, historic, and prehistoric Middle East. These interpretations follow the available interpretations of his day, but they are based upon then-modern theories of primeval matriarchies and presumed social roles of women and their bodies in both prehistoric and modern village life in Mesopotamia. Many of these interpretations are still prevalent today (Bahrani 2001, 28-29).

Past interpretations of Halaf figurines are enmeshed in perceptions of the daily practices, dress, body ornamentation, and social roles of village women adjacent to their excavations and, indeed, women worldwide. Local women appeared at excavations with most of their bodies, including heads and faces, covered with ethnic garments (Figure 2.4, p. 56). This stood in stark contrast to non-Muslim, Western women who, during most of the twentieth century, appeared in public with large parts of their heads, faces, legs, and arms uncovered. When Halaf figurines were found, European male archaeologists were confronted with exaggerated and ornamented breasts, pudendas, labias, and buttocks, which, in most ‘civilized’ societies, are highly sexualized and normally covered from public view. Although it is not recorded in the literature, it is easy to imagine that exposure and accentuation these body parts was probably embarrassing, considered savage, backwards, or tribal. This is suggested by the constructed interpretations and descriptions that do not mention enormous and prominently decorated breasts and pudendas, deferring to vague interpretations of motherhood, divinity, and fertility. This is despite the fact that none of the figurines appears pregnant. Reflections upon interpretive and descriptive terms for prehistoric women have suggested that they are more based in modern gender constructs than those empirically proven in the past (Bahrani 2001, Gero and Conkey 1991, Nelson 1990). I

42 Accounts of the perceptions of village social structures and the roles of women are recounted in Christie 1946, Mallowan 1977, and Trümpler 1999, Von Oppenheim 1933, along with various archaeological reports.
suggest that what caused particular discomfort is the representation of female sexual agency and embodied social power that the imagery of Halaf figurines may convey. Overt display of sexuality was not generally practiced by women in mid twentieth-century England or in the Middle East. This overtly sexualized imagery was therefore neutralized and rendered harmless through interpretations which drew upon existing tropes of mother goddesses and fertility magic with descriptions employing colonialist and racist terms. Regrettably, this language is inexplicably still in use today in figurine studies without any reflection.

**Body Parts and Proportions**

In particular, the word *steatopygous* carries a historiography tainted by bias directly connected to the European colonialist and hegemonic relationship with the East. Mallowan (see quote above) was neither the first nor the last to use this word as a descriptive and typological term for prehistoric figurines. In fact, a search of the JSTOR database (searched March 2013) found 271 articles that utilize the term *steatopygous*, most of them describing prehistoric Mediterranean-area figurines. The first publications are on Knossos figurines (by Arthur Evans) and Egyptian figurines (by Flinders-Petrie) more than a century ago. The Arpachiyah publication (Mallowan and Rose 1935) is the eighty-first on the chronological list.43 This term continues to be in use to describe figurines that show out-of-proportion enlargements of [female] body parts despite the fact that for many examples, those of the Halaf included, it is not the buttocks that are oversized. The origin and correct usage of the term is described in the

---

43 The earliest references are to figurines from Crete, Egypt, and Malta, some using the figurines to discuss race, i.e., Flinders Petrie 1901. The latest reference describing figurines as steatopygous is 2010.
**Oxford English Dictionary (OED):**

*steatopyga, n.* Etymology: modern Latin, < Greek στεατ-, στέαρ fat, tallow + πῡγή rump, buttocks. *Physiol.* A protuberance of the buttocks, due to an abnormal accumulation of fat in and behind the hips and thighs, found (more markedly in women than in men) as a characteristic of certain peoples, esp. the Khoekhoe and San of South Africa. Also in extended use in *Archaeol.* with reference to figurines that display steatopyga.  

Therefore the term *steatopygous* is embedded with specific physical, racial/ist, ethnic, and historical etymology. While all of the usage citations in the *OED* date to after the time that an actual ‘Steatopygous’ woman was trafficked to England and France, circa 1810-1815, the *OED* cites etymological usage from Knossos in 1910; Aurignacian in the 1930s; and Greece, Crete, and Anatolia in the 1970s.

Nineteenth-century illustrations of steatopygous bodies do indeed visually parallel many prehistoric figurines with exaggerated body parts that in modernity are considered sexualized. These distorted illustrations are steeped in the Orientalist imagination of corporeal curiosities from dark lands which were in fact trafficked for the purpose of public display, titillation, and sexual slavery (*Figure 2.5, below*). One of the first so-called steatopygous prehistoric figurines found, the ‘Venus of Willendorf’ – which does have quite ample buttocks – was proposed to have served as Paleolithic pornography (Daniels 1981, 99-100).

The term *steatopygous* has direct visual and etymological associations with the lived body of a woman trafficked from her African homeland. The entry in the *OED* was written at around the time that a young Khosian woman, Saartjie Baartman, performed for English and French audiences as the Hottentot Venus and whose remains were only recently returned to her South African homeland. The story of the life and exploitation of Saartjie Baartman has inspired scholars, filmmakers, and artists to create work reflecting on the facts of her life and her

---

exploitation, colonialist control, and the body image of modern women of color (Figure 2.5, below). 45

![Figure 2.5: Saartjie Baartman, known as the ‘Hottentot ‘Venus’](image)

*left:* Sebastien Coeure: The Hottentot Venus in the Salon of the Duchess of Berry, 1830
*center:* [Announcement] Liverpool, UK c1810;
*right:* Lyle Ashton Harris & Renee Valerie Cox Hottentot Venus 2000, performed 1995

45 For more on Saartjie Baartman, or the Hottentot Venus, see: Sadiah Qureshi (2004); S. Solly, Geo Moojen, and Bernth Lindfors (1985); McEvansoneya (2013); and the 2010 film *Vénus Noire* MK2 productions, directed by Abdellatif Kechiche. [http://www.mk2.com/venusnoire/](http://www.mk2.com/venusnoire/).

46 Downloaded from: Bridgeman Art Gallery online

47 Downloaded from: www.georgianlondon.com/saartjie-baartman-the-hottentot-venus

As noted by Philipp McEvansoneya, in nineteenth-century English-speaking Europe:

Baartman was exhibited as the “Hottentot Venus”, a striking conjunction. The term “Hottentot” was then employed in two ways: to label a southern African people now known properly as the Khoekhoe, and as a synonym for the lowest stage of human development and the basest form of existence and morals. (McEvansoneya 2013, 26) However, archaeologists and museum curators have not been reflexive the racist and colonialist origins of this the term. *Steatopygous* is still used as a descriptive and even typological term on exhibit labels and website descriptions, particularly Cycladic and Egyptian figurines, most of which, like Halaf figurines, do not feature particularly ample behinds. The racial undertones of the concept of the steatopygous Venus continue to resonate in popular culture and modern art, often linked to Baartman’s story. Embodiment of race and body proportions, for example, was recently discussed in juxtaposing the Baartman as the Hottentot Venus with Kara Walker’s recent exhibit *A Subtlety or Brown Baby* (Brooklyn, 2014) and Nicki Minaj’s controversial image on her *Anaconda* album cover (Hobsen 2014).

This term continues to be used in museum catalogs today.49 What is most puzzling about the use of the term in the morphological description of Halaf figurines, particularly those of the Type LH.1A figurine rarely occurs in the Arpachiyah assemblage. The few examples of this figurine type can be seen in Figure 2.6, above, 6, 7, 8, 10. Even more puzzling is that this type has very ample and often decorated breasts and thighs. Sometimes this type does not even have ample buttocks but rather features thick thighs and flat bases. As Moorey pointed out:

Ucko (1968, 169–71, 363) has cogently argued that there are no grounds for identifying the protrusion of buttocks on any category of prehistoric Near Eastern terracottas with *steatopygia* in the proper sense. This had been assumed in many older descriptions of these Halaf Period female figurines and in developmental schemes. Posture, obesity, method of manufacture or style of modeling may variously account for the protrusion of buttocks when it occurs on these female figurines. (Moorey 2001: 39)

Upon reflection on the etymology of the term, it is clear that *Steatopygous* should never be used as a term, ethnographically, archaeologically, or otherwise and should go the way of the now defunct term *Hottentot*, which was the colonialist term for Southern African women whose bodies were said to display this feature. I argue that we should refrain from using this term altogether when describing these figurines.

**Halaf Body Positions**

In the aforementioned quote, Mallowan interprets what he called the squatting pose of the figurines to be the preferred position for childbirth for village women in the developing world, citing the Bible and medical and ethnographic publications (Mallowan 1936, 79).\textsuperscript{50} Leaving aside the discussion of whether these figurine poses are seated, squatting, or kneeling to typological analysis, the question remains, can a pose represent a physical condition that is not visually represented? As Moorey suggested, seated figures physically offer a wide base which affords the stability for the form to stand without support. Most of the Halaf figurines studied for this project appear to have been created with unsupported stability as a requirement, though there are certainly other less practical reasons to depict a figure in this position. It is a key discovery of this dissertation research that the majority of figurines in the Halaf were designed to sit flat on a surface without support. This feature appears to have been desired for the majority of figurines perhaps so that they could be seen, interacted with, or simply passed by daily without handling.\textsuperscript{51} Perhaps the symbolism and functionality of the lived-body pose in the Halaf was secondary to the functionality of the figurine as an object.

\textsuperscript{50} Mallowan cited Buist (1919), an English gynecologist who published a one-page note which stated “This posture is almost exactly represented in a figure bought by the excavators from Ur, and it is highly probable that there is an Eastern strain in the line of tradition leading to the formal description of the hanging leg position.” He also cited Blackman’s (1927) study of the birthing methods of the ‘Fellahin’ in Egypt.

\textsuperscript{51} Some figurines that could not stand without support were pierced for suspension, which could have provided the same hands-free display possibilities, because they could be affixed to (for example) an architectural or natural element, a garment, a person, or an animal. For examples see DT-1 – DT-6 in Appendix A.
Later images of Mesopotamian figures squatting, kneeling, and sitting suggest that the seated position may be related to gendered social status and also relate to had socially embedded meanings work and/or offering roles (Pollock and Bernbeck 2000). According to their mortuary remains, kneeling and squatting seems to have been the preferred position of work for the women of Abu Hureyra, a settlement dating millennia earlier than the Halaf (Molleson 1994, here Figure 2.7, below). Neither the earlier nor the later data or the imagery suggest that the depictions of women in the position of squatting, kneeling, or sitting were intended to reference childbirth in Mesopotamia. Anyone who has spent time on an excavation in the Middle East or in a village anywhere in the developing world and observed male and female archaeological or other workers knows that squatting is a quite universal position for elimination, rest, and work.

**Figure 2.7: Reconstructed body positions of work and rest at Abu Hureyra (After Molleson 1994, 72)**

**Halaf Mother Goddesses?**

Interpretations of Halaf figurines are mainly found in primary publications of excavation reports on Halaf sites. Mother goddess interpretations by Mallowan appeared in the reports on the excavations of Arpachiyah and Chagar Bazar (Mallowan and Rose 1935, Mallowan 1936, 1937). Mallowan’s interpretations were echoed by Schmidt who published the prehistoric finds from Tell Halaf (1943) and by Tobler in his report on the excavations of prehistoric levels at Tepe Gawra (1950). Seton Lloyd reported the figurines at Tell Hassuna represented in the
“mother-goddess form” (Lloyd and Safer 1945, 209-210). Post-war Halaf site reports no longer attempted to assign functional interpretations to their figurine finds, perhaps a result of the scientific rigor that New Archaeology required but possibly also because of the brevity of the preliminary reports that have so far been produced (Table 2.3, p. 49). If there is any discussion of figurines at all in archaeological reports, discussions of mother goddesses have appeared in post-war publications and have become part of the typology given for all Halaf figurines without much consideration of its interpretive origins. The research within this dissertation cannot therefore prove or disprove the mother goddess-ness of Halaf figurines. It rather asks why such a baseless concept, which can only be founded on modern speculation, is still a major point of discussion in academic scholarship on figurines.

For the past century the term mother goddess has been applied, without reflection, to prehistoric figurines worldwide, despite the fact that not all of them are women and very few of them are represented pregnant. As one reference book on Near Eastern mythology explains, “…any goddess could become a ‘mother goddess’…” (Black and Green 1998, 132). The assumption is that female imagery, which in Mesopotamia is overwhelmingly on figurines, relates to a narrowly conceived role for women in Mesopotamian society for which there is no support beyond the Western male experience. The same work does not suggest a parallel assumption that all male images could be father-gods, although, practically, if many female deities are mothers, at least some of the male deities are fathers.

Only recently has the concept of the universal mother goddess itself and, by extension, the interpretation and functional meaning of figurines and ancient female imagery been historicized or significantly challenged (Bahrami 2001, Eller 2000, Goodison and Morris 1998, Meskell 1995). For Halaf in particular, mother goddess figurines has been conflated into a
morphological type, which in this dissertation is Type LH1.A, B, and perhaps C (Figure 1.1, p. 16). Site reports mention either that mother goddess types were found (cf: Watkins and Davidson 1981, 10) or lament that ‘mother goddesses’ are not amongst the figurines found at early Halaf sites (e.g., Bernbeck et al. 2003, Watson and LeBlanc 1990). What is puzzling is that slim young figures holding and presenting their large decorated breasts in this figurine type do not physically suggest motherhood or childbirth nor does any of their recorded find spots. This lasting interpretation of Halaf figurines is therefore not suggested by the appearance of the figurines themselves nor by their archaeological context but rather from outside influences on the archeological analysis and interpretation.

The first figurines discovered at Tell Halaf were associated with worship of the goddess of love (Schmidt 1943, 116) and compared to early figurines from Greece and Italy as well as to third millennium examples from Ur (Schmidt 1942, 213-14). Although excavated after Tell Halaf, Arpachiyah was published a decade earlier (Mallowan and Rose 1935). It utilized the few available published figurine studies and early twentieth-century ethnographic and medical documentation of village women giving birth in the squatting posture to arrive at the conclusion that they, too, represented mother goddesses. (Mallowan and Rose 1935, 79, 100).

In many ways, then these terracottas bring us in closer touch with the prehistoric peoples of Arpachiyah than any other class of object. We learn that they were a people worshipping the ‘mother-goddess’ and therefore had a cultural relationship both with India on the east and with Crete on the west; their faith in the efficacy of these fertility charms is shown both by the large numbers of figures and by the diversity of forms in which they chose to represent them. (Mallowan and Rose 1935, 81)

Mallowan suggested another theory, that the Tholoi had been dedicated to the mother goddess because many were found in the rubbish alongside them (Mallowan and Rose 1935, 79-80). He followed up this suggestion later by pointing out that at Yarim Tepe Halaf figurines might also

---

52 Mallowan was, of course, referring to publications that were available when he was preparing the Arpachiyah report in 1933-5. For his comparative references and ethnographic analogies, see Mallowan and Rose, 1935: 81-87.
be associated with Tholoi (Mallowan 1977, 93) He also suggested that dove figurines found alongside the figurines were attendants of the mother goddess (Mallowan and Rose 1935, 80, dove figurines on 84, fig. 46: 1, 3). All of these arguments for the mother goddess interpretation at Arpachiyah are conjecture based upon finds and features nearby to findspots of figurines, other cultures unrelated to the Halaf, or purely modern analogy. When reflecting later upon this interpretation, Mallowan stated:

Although we called these figurines ‘Mother Goddesses’ they may not have represented the Mother Goddess in person, but were perhaps dedicated to her by women in the expectation of the favor of the goddess during childbirth. Some were women of a certain age, others maidens. (Mallowan 1977, 92-3)

None of Mallowan’s interpretations are based on the figurines themselves, either from their appearance or their archaeological context, and so few of the figurines from Arpachiyah actually can be traced to specific contexts on the site (Campbell 2000). Tobler also thought that the early figurines from Tepe Gawra were “…basically religious in conception, and may be considered representations of the Mother Goddess common to many ancient and primitive cultures” (Tobler 1950, 163).

In fact, the mother goddess interpretation of Halaf figurines was front and center in the first appearances of the material culture in popular literature. The pages of the Illustrated London News announced the mother goddess figurines thusly, amidst the “Glories of Tell Halaf – A great discovery” (11/01/1930,. 760); similarly, it heralded Mother Goddess figurines from “An Iraq Civilization 6000 years ago” at Arpachiyah (9/16/32,. 436-7; reproduced here as Figure 2.8, below, right ) and “Trousered ‘Mother Goddesses’ Dressed Like Modern Kurds” found at Chagar Bazar (11/23/1935, 931). The cover of the 1937 BASOR (Speiser 1937) features a “Painted Mother Goddess Figurine, Halaf period” from Tepe Gawra (Figure 2.8, below, left).

However, the broken, faded figurines found in deep pits dated to obscure cultures thousands of
years before slightly better known Mesopotamian contexts did not fully capture the popular imagination. The mother goddess myth has appeared in both scholarly and popular literature (and that which lies in between).

The pairing of figurines with mother goddesses in the Halaf is an offshoot of a larger problem of the coupling of figurines and goddesses worldwide (Lesure 2002; Goodison and Morris 1998). This places imagery that suggests female power (or perhaps equality) in the prehistoric spiritual world rather than in the lived Halaf social structure. When interpreting figurines as mother goddesses, archaeologists are suggesting rarified sacred objects imbued with mysterious meaning. However, as this dissertation research shows, the conditions and archaeological contexts of Halaf figurines suggest that they were not special at all but rather handled and discarded in the same manner as many other household objects. At the end of their use-life, which previously had included plenty of rough handling that resulted in fragmentation, they were unceremoniously tumbled amongst other trash. Thousands of years later, they were found loose in unremarkable archaeological fill or in trash-filled contexts concentrated with artifacts. But this, too, did not fit the constructed narrative of Halaf figurines, by which their presence in these contexts by extension made them remarkable. An example of this is what is called the terracotta layer in the Chagar Bazar prehistoric pit which is also which is simply a rubbish filled context with many late Halaf artifacts (for more on this context, see Chapter 5). The dichotomy of figurines and mother goddesses is a stubbornly resilient concept in figurine scholarship even today and is also quite appealing to the general public.
For example, the reconstructed settlements at Çatalhöyük are almost always cited in literature on mother goddesses, as are the more complete and reconstructed figurines from prehistoric European contexts. The rise in popularity of the mother goddess and the concept of a primeval matriarchy in the prehistoric Near East and Europe parallels the feminist consciousness raising of Western women in the 1970s (Eller 2000, 56-8; Goodison and Morris 1998; Meskell 1995). In many publications, the ancestry of the reputed Goddess along with that of Çatalhöyük looks toward European examples as comparanda (Meskell 1998a), and that has particularly captured the imaginations of white, upper class, American and European women. The arguments of The Goddess movement are based on a strong binary between male and female roles in society, which those women have found empowering in the face of real oppression in their own twenty-first century world. There is no reason to think that these roles also existed in prehistory. The Halaf figurines and other figurines found amidst modern communities of non-
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53 These are well cataloged by Eller 2000, 116-156 and passim.
White peoples have not captured the imaginations in the same way. In addition to coming from archaeological contexts that are not as rich as those [re]constructed for Çatalhöyük (e.g., Meskell 2000, 1998a, 1998b), there may be other factors. Eller pointed out that the strong binary of female to male gender roles by The Goddess movement “…encourages sexism, it also encourages racism and classism [and] implicitly trivializes differences across cultures, over time and between individuals” (2000, 68-69).

While discussions of the Mother Goddess, the Great Goddess, and the Primeval Matriarchy are richly in modern works illustrated by prehistoric, Halaf figurines do not appear in this genre of literature. It has even been said that, given the wealth of recent scholarly literature, the deconstruction of “The goddess in archaeology is becoming a somewhat tired topic” (Meskell 2000a, 370). Many have blamed Gimbutas (1982, 1999) for perpetuating the myth of the universal Mother Goddess with archaeological images from outside of Mesopotamia curated for full effect (Meskell 2000, 1998b, 1995; Talalay 2000). This continues to be a compelling narrative that effectively popularizes female imagery in the Neolithic (Hutton 1997), Classical Greek (Talalay 1994), Ancient Anatolian (Anadolu-Okur 2005; Renda 1993), and museum collections of figurines among other agendas. Halaf figurines, in their fragmentary state are not normally called on to illustrate such literature, but they are part of it by association. It is not clear whether it will ever be possible to dissolve popular notions that figurines and, by extension, the bulk of prehistoric female archaeological imagery meant Mother Goddess or The Great Goddess or serve as proof of forgotten matriarchal social systems. It is probably not even worth

---

trying. Reproductions of prehistoric figurines appearing in new age bookstores and on t-shirts, candles, and jewelry extends their object and image biographies into the twenty-first century in new ways.

The Halaf figurines, exhibiting exaggerated sexualized body parts belong in the cluster of Ancient Near Eastern female imagery that, Bahrani argued (2001, 46-51), visually has little to do with divine birthing and maternity and much more to do with female sexual agency and power. My review of the interpretations of Halaf figurines above shows that overtly sexualized imagery was easier to explain away as based in cult or ritual in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries CE than to accept equality in the sex and gender social arenas of prehistory. These same explanations served to spark gender and sexual agency to some women who found this explanation empowering in the late twentieth century CE popular literature.

New Interpretations: Halaf Embodiment and Figurines
Whether or not Mother Goddess worship existed in the sixth millennium BCE or is laid bare as a construction of the nineteenth, twentieth, and twenty-first centuries CE, neither one resolves the more challenging and, in my opinion, more interesting questions of what the figurines might have meant and been meant for within Halaf communities. Halaf figurines present social, gendered, sexual, community entangled bodies of sixth millennium BCE villages. The evidence of these concepts that the corpus presents can and should be considered within daily life, keeping them with the lived social, cultural, and embodied contexts within which they were made, used, and discarded (Daems 2010, 152). As a modern analogy, Barbie® can be interpreted both as a toy and as a conceptual social symbol of how society looks at, thinks about, embellishes, decorates, and presents the embodied Western female. This embodied concept and representation is not at all realistically aligned with the biologically possible. What is represented is the conceptual female in the twentieth century. What is particularly interesting is
that, as the concept of the female and the audience for Barbie dolls changes over time and space, so does their representation.\textsuperscript{55} These miniature symbols in plastic and rubber reveal much about the way present-day conceptions of female bodies changes over time and are differently presented in different international markets, but that does not mean that it comes any closer to the real proportions of lived bodies (Urla and Swedlund 1995). If figurines are to be interpreted as toys – and it should be obvious to the reader that I do not think that they should be interpreted as any one thing – they are also embodied symbols of social belonging. Peter Ucko later admitted that his earlier conclusions in a pioneering study of prehistoric figurines that prehistoric figurines (Ucko 1968) were probably intended as dolls were ill-conceived and hasty, but he offered no other overarching function for them (1999). There is no clear evidence that figurines had specific meanings, use, and significance in prehistoric or historic societies exists, nor were universal or even common among cultures or even among settlements.

The idea of the body as a social concept and a culturally conceptualized entity has only recently entered theoretical literature. The concept of the socially defined body appeared first in sociological literature (Mauss 1973/Lyon 1997, Polhemus 1978). Sociologists further refined the concept in relation to the socially subscribed lived experience entangled within community and identity (Shilling 1994, Turner 1991). Others at the same time connected the body with gender and sexuality, defining gender as an embodied concept, socially rather than biologically ascribed, therefore closely connected with lived bodily acts (Butler 1993, Bynum 1995, Grosz 1994, Kampen 1996). In reviewing the “Archaeology of the Body” Rosemary Joyce found that “Archaeology, although coming late to this topic, has begun to make critical contributions to writing about the body.” (2005, 140). Figurines are embodied objects, for this dissertation not

\textsuperscript{55} D. Bailey analyzes Barbie Dolls as segmented anthropomorphisms but misses their social significance as lasting surrogates of modern Western body imagery (2005, 66-87).
only in that they do not just represent bodies in miniature, they are also documenting the concept of the body in the Halaf. In the visual conception of the body are also embodied concepts of identity, gender, and other community-defined belonging that played out on the lived and, by extension, the represented Halaf body. Therefore, the close associations between belonging and identity discussed in this dissertation are dependent upon this scholarship. Theoretical writings linking past lived bodies to archaeologically found material culture have inspired my own approach. This is found in reviews of archaeological literature meshed with that of other fields (Crossland 2010, Joyce 2005, Meskell 2000, Morris 1995) and edited volumes, articles, and books applying embodiment theory to specific material culture (Berns 1993; Borić and Robb 2008; Hamilakis, Pluciennick, Tarlow 2002; Joyce 2008; Rautman 2000). Embodiment theory has also been developed with Ancient Near Eastern and Mesopotamian material culture mostly in its application to gender (Asher-Greve 1985; Bahrani 2001; Bolger 2008) but also in relation to body modification, dress, and ornamentation (Croucher 2010a, 2010b, 2012; M. Marcus 1993, 1996; Winter 1996). All of these have influenced the premise of this dissertation that modern understanding can connect to the conceptions, definitions, and social entanglements of the lived body of the past through the embodied representations of the archaeologically known.

Rather than asking what figurines were and were for, within this dissertation I ask and answer the question, what was the visual concept of the body and how was it represented in the Halaf? Further, how can scholars –eight thousand years later – interpret what can be read as a symbolically and socially understood surrogate of the anthropomorphic in the form of these figurines? Such an inquiry starts with the body, I argue, which is a biological entity which modern humankind shares with the Halaf, but it is constructed through socially defined entanglements with identity. Halaf figurines are three dimensional miniaturizations of what
twenty-first century C.E. people can relate visually to their own lived bodies since the basic lived bodies of the Halaf are humanly the same as those of today. However, an overall understanding of what constitutes an understandable and acceptable human embodied representation is not completely obvious across time (Bynum 1995).

Each Halaf figurine example considered in this dissertation has (or can be demonstrated to have had) a human torso; many have or have had represented human limbs, heads, genitalia, eyes, noses, ears, mouths, necks, breasts, hands and feet. Within the definitively anthropomorphic, zoomorphic characteristics may be intentionally mixed into the imagery. Direct evidence of representation of intersectionality between animal and human features can be found on Ubaid figurines, many of which have either bird or reptile heads (Dames 2010, 2007). This intersectionality of body parts has been associated with mortuary evidence of cranial modification in the Halaf and Ubaid skulls that may have been done to make heads on living bodies appear more bird- or reptile-like (Dames and Croucher 2007; Molleson and Campbell 1995). It is even possible that Halaf figurine heads, particularly those from type LH.1A figurines may reference bird beaks and headdresses and/or suggest lived body practices of bird-like masks and headdresses.
Many have pondered on what could be considered anthropomorphic Halaf flower motifs connected to female bodies (Campbell 2010). Garfinkel has suggested that most prehistoric human representations should be interpreted as dancing (Garfinkel 1998, 2003). Figurine imagery records a combination of treatments from the lived and imagined body perhaps functioning as three-dimensional symbols of community-defined representations of gender, sexuality, kinship, age, ritual practices, and other ideologies. Connections between social identity and bodily practices of adornment, decoration, and alterations defined by local communities and regional groups are well recorded ethnographically (e.g., Fisher 1984, Rubin 1988). I suggest that similar bodily practices are documented on anthropomorphic representations such as figurines. Actions to form, decorate, and adorn figurines include incision, scoring, appliqué, binding, and cutting clay and stone. These are the same actions performed to embellish the surface and manipulate the form of lived bodies with body paints, tattoos, piercings, scarification, and other modifications (Croucher 2005). It is also possible that figurines were adorned with clothing, ornaments, and substances similar to those used on lived bodies. The lived, narrated, and imagined Halaf body was a medium for performativity of non-verbal communication of community belonging as well as what Croucher (2010b, 114) calls “...social constructions of beauty and aesthetics.” Together these ontological practices on and about the body during the Halaf form a combined world view of the body that bounded the choices of representative imagery, technology, materials, and style (Joyce 2008).

Analysis of technological, archaeological, and cultural context also cannot adequately serve to definitively answer interpretation questions of what these figurines were in daily society. Attempts at interpretations of figurines universally have suggested they were, to name a few examples, dolls or toys (Ucko 1968, 1996), wishing devices (Bromen-Morales 1990), self-
portraits (McDermott 1996), or teaching devices (Bailey 2005). Many have proposed that the figurines meant mother goddesses, matriarchies, oriental femininity, pornography, and fertility, to name a few overlapping interpretations. These embodied practices can be mapped in the depiction of the body on each figurine, reflecting the choices of the maker and consumer of each example. Because they were made by hand, although there was some standardization in manufacture, each figurine is unique. Features such as decoration of arms and legs, representations of hands, feet and heads suggest that there may have been some leeway in representation of some details, although poses and overall form remained consistent amongst types. By mapping these shared and individual features in the figurines across time and space, this dissertation is also mapping embodied practices and ideologies in sixth millennium BCE northern Mesopotamia.

Quantifying the occurrence of visual clues remaining in the figurines makes it possible to approach an understanding of the signifiers of shared ideas and imagination about embodiment in the Halaf. These ideas had real physical expression manifested by practices in body ornamentation and dress with organic substances worn as jewelry, clothing, enhancements, masks, and body paint which do not survive in the archaeological record. The figurines also suggest that bodily practices extended to actual body manipulation through tattooing, scarification, piercing, and head and torso binding. Repeated occurrence of certain features could be interpreted as signifiers of regional or local cultural belonging and identity. Laying out these figurine features typologically in turn also identifies community-defined, -perceived, and -understood messages about the body on a local and regional scale. The exact meaning of these embodied messages is not accessible today; it is only the patterns of communication and sharing that are definable. Many have suggested that ritual is the main purpose of figurines, that
goddesses and other deities are represented, that analysis should ask and answer questions related to prehistoric religious practices. But these questions of this realm are not answerable with the available evidence. It is possible, however, to reconstruct communication of the visual representation without speculating upon the unknowable original meaning.

Halaf figurines can be understood as a scene of display, an artifact and a surrogate of the Halaf lived body. These are the avenues of approach that represent a typology of the lived Halaf body, thus serving to us as surrogates to embodied practices not surviving in the archaeological record. Current theoretical research now considers the body as “…the site of lived experience, a social body, and the site of embodied agency…” more than “…a public legible surface” (Joyce 2005, 139). It is worthwhile to consider figurines within these theoretical constructs to theorize upon embodied social agency of the Halaf. It seems reasonable to take representation one step further and consider how these figurines can serve as surrogates for the Halaf lived body as a site of construction and expression of identity and belonging. The visual representations of decorated surfaces and manipulated profiles and proportions of the body can serve as a narration of the lived and imagined Halaf embodied personhood. Rosemary Joyce has stated that interpretation of the representative to real past body is a complex relationship that probably cannot be empirically proven (2005, 142). Therefore, these figurines should be considered as part of the lived and communally imagined and socially conceived Halaf body.

Like Barbie, the goal was not something that was biologically real or classically naturalistic, and why should it be? This dissertation attempts a fine-grained understanding of the visually represented, imagined, and conceived body in order to theorize how these figurines may have served as a model of gender, status, age, identity, and belonging in the embodied Halaf. Recognition of the problems of interpretation does not preclude suggesting daily practices within
which these figurines might have played a role. The catalog presents the data on which these and future suggestions could be made. This is not to say that figurines can definitively prove that those living in Halaf settlements were wearing masks or striped garments or tattooed their limbs, faces, and breasts or adorned their waists and pudendas with beads; but such actions are certainly possible. I cannot state definitively that there were certain situations, times, or places—important enough to document—that a Halaf woman or man assumed specific poses and either pulled her knees up to her stomach and supported decorated breasts with her arms or placed his hands on his open thighs and forward while wearing a headdress and other specific ornamentation. The Type LH.1A and LH.1B figurines suggest a distinct possibility that these situations really happened within the late Halaf communities which defined, received, and refined their entangled symbolism and meaning.

Other evidence of lived body practices include painted and incised decoration which suggests the use of animal and/or botanical fibers to create garments such as string skirts, strapped sandals, and breast containments and support. The en face and upward facing posture of many figurines might suggest oration or singing. These are contemplated here as working interpretive explanations particularly connected to materials and practices not surviving in the archaeological record. Given the ethnographic evidence, of course, there were many sensory experiences and substances related to the figurines not recoverable 8,000 years later (Berns 1993). The pristine silence and isolation of the original find spot, museum exhibit case, storage drawer, or catalog illustration has little to do with the original social interaction with these figurines surrounded in close quarters with objects of all sorts with people of all ages. Perhaps at times figurines were the nucleus of mundane ritual practices perhaps involving oils and other liquids, sounds and music, smoke, and food and other smells (Mauss 1967).
A fully embodied space involving corporeal senses and ephemeral materials has been suggested for interactions with Mesopotamian royal monuments by textual and ethnographic analogy by Irene Winter (1994). None of this is possible to demonstrate empirically for the Halaf, but there are Mesopotamian texts (Van Buren ND) relating to the performative aspects, both real and imagined, of later anthropomorphic figurines. These figurines from historic periods of Mesopotamia are tied to stories of human creation from clay by the deities at the opening of the *Enuma Elish* and other Mesopotamian literary accounts (Foster 1993). Historical figurines are, for example, documented as being carried, spoken to, listened to, and used as surrogates for royal personages (Bahrani 2003, Chapter 6) or sexual acts (Bahrani 2001, 50-55).

It is possible to speculate upon an expanded object biography of Halaf figurines in addition to their conception, making, use, and discard. During their prehistoric life spans they were probably also displayed, held, touched, caressed, kissed, smoked, dusted, covered, exposed, dripped on, knocked into, jostled, described, noticed, adored, spoken about, and spoken to in the course of mundane and special daily activities (*Table 3.4, p. 101*).

*Communicating and exchanging the Halaf body*

Dry farming, which characterizes the subsistence economy of this region does not sustain large-scale settlements. Even today, this countryside is scattered with small family-based hamlets across the plain clustered around water sources and situated along travel routes. The environmental constraints of the area encourage sparse settlement over the rain-fed plains and steppes for survival. Ancient documentation of this area reveals that settlements developed a loosely hierarchical structure based on family, tribal, and ethnic association which interacted by reciprocal arrangement with each other and with pastoral nomadic groups. Regional and provincial control was imposed upon these ancient antecedents by colonial powers, which are still struggling to maintain control of these areas. Archaeologists and other travelers to this
region in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries documented that the peoples living here were only tangentially controlled by far-away ruling powers. Shifting alliances of tribal groups based upon material interests of nomadic, pastoral, and settled peoples of this region figured largely in international battles for control of this region, including the two World Wars.  

Even today, as the ethnic homeland of the Kurdish people, this region continues to be only tenuously under the control of the three modern political states it crosses. In my travels through this region and in my conversations with current residents, I have witnessed countless examples of individuals with long-standing, cross-border ethnic (and economic) ties, which outweighed nationalist identifications. This was particularly true during the sanctions placed on Iraq between the two American Gulf Wars, when smuggling across all three borders was constant and was organized through ethnic ties.

From prehistoric times to today, habitation of this dry farming steppe is best accomplished in small villages and hamlets, which spread out across the rain-fed landscape, and through an incorporated and complex web of communication and exchange amongst all that live and travel through it. During the Halaf and other periods, within and outside these settlements were communities of like-minded artists, craft-people, and those who desired their products, all of whom were connected in ways that might have had little to do with geographic proximity. These groups and individuals shared their skills, materials, and imagery as well as their beliefs, ideologies, and symbolism. Sharing happened not only with the travel and exchange of objects – many of which do not survive in the archaeological record – but also by verbal narratives and the
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56 At the time of the revision this dissertation in Summer 2014, a group called ISIS, ISIL or IS seized control of parts of this area from the governments of Syria and Iraq and established what they are calling an Islamic Caliphate within just a few weeks.

57 Mallowan made direct reference to the Halaf as being ancestors of the Kurds (1977). Fromkin recounted that the Europeans who drew up modern Middle Eastern borders after World War I paid no attention to existing ethnic and tribal divisions but rather based their borders on ancient (colonial) provinces described in Greek and Latin texts (1989, 148-49).
decoration and adornment of their bodies, animals, and structures. These connections formed a loose symbiotic web of reciprocal interaction, which is recorded in similarities in the imagery, material, and construction of archaeological objects. It is conceivable these artisans interacted in person, perhaps at regional festivals, during raw material procurement, or at other times of year. The evidence of the figurines suggests that there was a spectrum of direct to indirect contact and communication. For example, in the Khabur headwaters in Syria (further discussed in Chapter 5), it seems that figurine makers and users had direct knowledge of and made very similar figurines to other late Halaf settlements quite nearby. However, in late Halaf settlements in Anatolia (further discussed in Chapter 4); there must have been indirect communication of imagery there and south into Syria, because they created quite different figurines.

Trade is a much discussed and hotly debated topic in archaeological literature; many of the discussions there are based upon models from modernity, complex societies, and imperial expansion. Specific to northern Mesopotamia, it has been suggested that this region has often been under the subjugation of a dominant trading power, based in what is now modern-day Iraq, which sought to tap material-rich areas now in northern Syria and southeastern Anatolia (Algaze 1993; Larson 1987; Fromkin 1989, 148-49; Fitzgerald 1994). These conceptual models show that the concept of trade implies that one entity holds the agency and power and the peoples living near the resources have little or no agency in the exchange; thus, trade routes radiate from a center of hegemonic power and control. More recent theories of communication and exchange reject the concept as colonialist in favor of a more multi-dimensional and reciprocal network of exchange of goods and ideas (Agbe-Davies and Bauer 2010; Oka and Kusimba 2008; Summerhayes 2001). Following this trend, I therefore choose to reject trade as a
viable concept in this dissertation in favor of more nuanced terms of exchange and communication.

Specific to the Halaf, there are a few studies related to exchange and communication of ideas, goods, and representation between settlements. A study of sealings found at Sabi Abyad concluded that the sealed goods may have been exchanged amongst communities that specialized in and traded goods within the Syrian Balikh valley in the sixth millennium BCE (Akkermans and Duistermaat 1997). Chemical sourcing of late Halaf painted pottery from a selection of sites in Syria and Iraq suggested that painted pottery was made at larger and traded to smaller settlements (Davison and McKerrell 1976, 1980). Comparative analysis of motifs and forms of ceramics from both excavation and survey has presented networks of communication and exchange based upon one material culture artifact class (Akkermans 1993b; Campbell 1992c, 1998; Davidson 1977; Irving 2001; Spatero and Fletcher 2010). Others have rationalized absolute dates between sites providing a chronological base for the models of exchange in the Halaf (Campbell 2007, Cruells and Nieuwenhuyse 2005, Akkermans 1991). This same comparative work is done here with figurines to identify patterns of exchange and communication through figurine typology and comparanda.

One model that could be applied to the late Neolithic cultures of northern Mesopotamia was developed by William Caldwell (1964) to explain the exchange of objects among the Hopewell tribes of southeastern North America. Developing an early World Systems theory, he proposed that connections between classes and faction may be better allied to settlements that were further away than those which were neighbors. This system, he proposed, is the way that artifacts traveled long distances between sites. Norman Yoffee has already suggested this model may well be a way to understand exchanges in late Neolithic Mesopotamia, including the Halaf
(Yoffee 1993). However, there is no reason to limit thinking to archaeologically found material culture when imagining what was communicated and exchanged between cultures, communities, settlements, and families. Transformative interactions surrounding imagery reinforced community and cultural assimilation such as verbal narratives and lived body decorations and manipulations is not found in the archaeological record. These are the most personal and lasting statements of belonging (or not belonging) and also are the most performative.

Marcel Mauss (1967) compiled ethnographically documented events and circumstances of beliefs and interactions surrounding the exchange, of objects, materials, ideas, and ideologies. His short study, *The Gift*, successfully proved that – at least from the documented ethnographic evidence – small-scale societies valued communal ideas, symbolism, and metaphor embedded in an object exchanged, given, acquired, or destroyed equally or more than the physical object itself. Many object exchanges, he stated, were permeated with magic, spiritual power, and promises and, as such, functioned as talismans, amulets, charms, and emblems as well as ornaments and trinkets (Mauss 1967, 10). The same objects could also have the multiple symbolism, meanings, power, and function for different users or at different times. Mauss provided examples of mundane objects that are not now recognizably sacred, powerful, or significant to the uninitiated as well as elaborately made objects rich with decoration and imagery that are intended for immediate destruction. In both of these extreme examples and in all of those in between, the objects – many made of materials that would not survive in the Mesopotamian archaeological record – are shown to be embedded with and reinforce community belonging, identity, and ideals.

Exchange of objects can serve to seal alliances or as memorials of life events such as births, deaths, coming of age, or marriages. The exchange and interaction itself is often
accompanied by elaborate performances in which body and structure adornment with textiles and organic materials as well as sound, smell, and tactile experiences (which do not survive in the archaeological record) play a large part in the exchange experience (Mauss 1967, 36-8). Some objects have spirit and can speak and demand care (Mauss 1967, 44). This is in keeping with anthropomorphic objects in the historical Ancient Near East. The objects themselves often belong not to the owner but to deities, ghosts, and groups such as families, clans, or houses; they are given names and personalities and are thought to have a soul in some cultures, attributes which are extended to the boxes and bags that hold them (Mauss 1967, 41).

In addition to sight, other senses are stimulated in the embodied ways, including taste, smell, and hearing as well as feelings and emotions during the performative act that may accompany interaction. Martin Wobst also used ethnographic observations to demonstrate that at places and events where different communities converge, they perform their community belonging and affiliation through elaborate dress, body decoration, and ornament (Wobst 1977). More recent theoretical discussions of the performativity of the body have reached the same conclusions, also through ethnographic examples for visualization (especially Fisher 1984). Goods and ideas exchanged have been theorized to have carried along visual and verbal conceptions of decorated and performative bodies, which in turn are entangled embodied concepts of gender, social position, and community belonging (Perry and Joyce 2001; Strathern 1988, 1993; Turner 1991). Evidence for the entanglements of these concepts in the Neolithic Ancient Near East has, for example, been demonstrated as being found in the treatment of the bodies of the dead (Croucher 2010b, 2012).
These suggestions have application to the way that imagery, symbolism, and body adornment was noticed and exchanged in the Halaf. This is not to say that the figurines themselves were exchanged, most of the clay examples were simply too fragile to travel, while stone figurines may have been robust enough to travel great distances. However, they are diverse enough to suggest that they might have been made locally. In addition to everyday performative body adornment which is elaborated in performance, the imagery and embodied iconography may have been exchanged in more perishable materials such as textiles, wood or actually painted on the bodies of humans and animals. Black and Green stated that Mesopotamian literature offers figurines created out of wood, textiles, and dough, though they did not provide citations to specific examples (1998, 81). A few more examples of different materials and representations of Mesopotamian figurines were cataloged some time ago from cuneiform sources (Van Buren ND). There are also many ethnographic examples of clothing, adornments, body decorations, amulets, and animal and house decorations that could easily translate into figurine decoration. A large pot found at Domuztepe suggests that houses were elaborately decorated or at least that the imagery of ornamented houses was in the iconographical repertoire of one Halaf community (for illustration see Campbell 2005).

58 Textiles includes a large range of objects probably made of fibers such as linen and wool in the sixth millennium but which did not survive the depositional environment. These could include decorated clothing, including shoes, headdresses or amulets made of cloth or felt, or carpets, blankets and matting.

59 It is certainly probable that these and other organic materials were used to create miniature anthropomorphic objects. See also Van Buren (ND) for cuneiform examples of figurine manufacture.
This dissertation confirms that, during the late Halaf, seated female figurines with arms supporting breasts were indeed popular. Nonetheless, these were not the only figurines made and used at all settlements; some had completely different figurines; others may not have had any at all. Nor was this shared interpretation of the female body rendered with shared technology. Regions, settlements, and groups and individuals developed their own techniques of figurine production, presumably based upon available materials and skills. It is my argument that these artistic skills were shared among artists who had contact with one another. The iconography of the body in the Halaf period was also passed by contact and may well have traveled within...
different milieus. It is also possible that this iconography physically traveled, perhaps upon media that is not preserved in the archaeological record such as reeds, cloth, felt, body paint, or tattoos. It is clear that the figurine played an immensely important role in the daily lives of the Halaf. Production and use of these objects was influenced by local, regional, and inter-regional choice and constraints as well as by shared but also iconographic and technological practices. These similarities fall short of standardization, as underlying homogeneities are mixed with conspicuously different local and regional stylistic solutions.

**Conclusions**

As discussed in this chapter, previous studies of Halaf figurines have followed that of most figurine studies in that the focus has been upon functional interpretation by applying analogies rather than depending upon morphological and contextual data. These interpretations document more about modern reactions to Halaf figurines than they represent an attempt to elucidate and understand the corpus. Biases, assumptions, and influences embedded in these studies show flaws not only in the result but also in the methodological approach to these assemblages. I argue that function is not a fruitful question to ask of these figurine data because the evidence cannot produce a single satisfactory answer. Previously, meanings and functions suggested for figurines in the Halaf have been based upon supposition, speculation, and analogy with no real relation to the corpus and its archaeological context. I’ve suggested a new approach, generating interpretation of these objects from a close comparative study of the figurines and their archaeological context. This approach allows a focus on the object biography of the figurine at four key points of human interaction in the Halaf: conceptualization, making, using, and discarding (*Figure 2.10, above*).

---

60 For a discussion of possible methods of imagery exchange, see Chapter 6.
61 Perhaps not all Halaf peoples; figurines were not found at every Halaf excavation. However, this negative evidence may be the accident of archeological recovery rather than of actual occurrence of figurines at these sites.
I have also argued that social entanglements of modernity have resulted in a skewed understanding of the corpus of Halaf figurines. These are based in human interaction during the discovery, description, interpretation, publication, and exhibit, in other words, during the modern object biography of the figurines. It is important to thoroughly reflect upon and critique the sources and embedded meanings of prevalent trends, terms, and methodologies that have been used to describe and interpret this corpus. Two of these terms, *mother goddess* and *steatopygous*, are key culturally loaded concepts still very much in use today despite the lack of evidential support from the figurines themselves. These were deconstructed in this chapter. Archaeologists cannot be solely faulted for questions and answers perpetuated over this century; they were working within their own assemblages and their own training, beliefs, and milieus with little else to go on (*Figure 2.10, above*).

A main source of these interpretations is the foundational writings on the Halaf by Mallowan through the publication of his work at Arpachiyah and Chagar Bazar. Using his work as a case study, I have discussed underlying historiography, assumptions, and bias which have continued to limit the analysis and interpretation of Halaf figurines today. These underlying biases and assumptions are more entangled with characterizations of village societies, female agency, artistic expression, sexuality, race, and class and are not at all rooted in the empirical data of figurines (*Figure 2.10, p. 87, above, diamond*). While intrigued with or accepting available meanings of the figurines they excavated, most archaeologists presumed that what they considered as non-utilitarian objects could not contribute to their overall analysis. Some did not find it worthwhile to publish reports of these objects in their resulting scientific reports – perhaps especially if they did not contain features hitherto thought to be normative Halaf. Without access to figurines other than the original types presented by Mallowan and his contemporaries and
without a usable typology, the myth of a normative Mother Goddess, ‘steatopygous’ type Halaf figurine continued into the twenty-first century.

The work of this dissertation therefore is to start at the beginning with the figurines themselves and to learn what they can elucidate about how they visually represent and identify the human in the Halaf.⁶² There is a story to be learned and told, one which the Halaf visually cut, carved, and molded into these figurines, and this dissertation focuses on the first steps of determining its structure and syntax. This is a way to respond to a century of telling stories about and around Halaf figurines without letting the evidence speak (Spivak 1988). The sources for this story are illustrated within the diamond of in Figure 2.10, p. 87, and my methodology for collecting and analyzing the figurines is laid out in the next chapter.

---

⁶² It bears repeating that, as I have discussed, Halaf is a modern term and constructed concept that must serve as of now as a stand-in for whatever shared identity was recognized by those who lived in the settlements which made, used, and discarded what is now understood as similar material culture.
CHAPTER THREE: Halaf Figurine Methodologies

The methodology used in this study presents a different way of looking at figurines. This approach is a mix of responses to and borrowings from previous figurine methodologies; only a few of which were constructed for Halaf figurines. Figurine methodology has not yet been established in the way that the methods used, for example, in the study of pottery, lithics, and human and animal remains, which can be found in several reference books, have been. Available methodologies for studying figurines have diverse objectives, are not well developed, and exist in a broad range of models. This chapter elucidates the method used to bring order to this corpus of figurines through a typology constructed for this purpose which is then integrated with archeological and theoretical analysis.

Regional scope

The Halaf is divided into three regions for the purposes of this dissertation, each of which is considered as an equal participant in the development of and change in figurines and in the conceptualization of the Halaf body over time and space. While there is great variety amongst the corpus, this tripartite regional approach is made with the suggestion that each these three regional assemblages are different from one another. The work of this dissertation is in codifying the stylistic, technological, chronological, and archaeological circumstances within two of the three regional assemblages of figurines. Once the nature of Anatolian and Syrian figurines is known, the inter-communication of imagery with the third Halaf region, Iraq, can become clearer as can possible connections west into central Anatolia and south into the Levant.

As discussed in Chapter Two, a model for a regional division of the Halaf is not something upon which scholars have universally agreed. For Halaf figurines, however, a

---

63 Each of these specializations has several textbooks to refer to for techniques and methodology for studying these artifact classes. All, for example, are covered in the Cambridge Manuals in Archaeology series.
tripartite ordering of northern Mesopotamia makes sense typologically. This dissertation tests the methodology and typology on the Syrian and Anatolian examples, leaving the portion of the corpus from Iraq as out-of-scope here. Figurines from sites in Iraq are certainly part of the Halaf corpus and, as such, will be the subject of future study which promises to further refine the methodology and typology. Therefore, this dissertation contains neither catalog entries nor detailed discussion of approximately 183 figurine examples excavated from nine sites in Iraq. These examples may be the best known examples, especially those from the sites of Arpachiyah, Tepe Gawra, and Yarim Tepe. This study has excluded them from the dissertation corpus and reserved them for a future project. The focus of this dissertation is of a lesser known entity, the Halaf figurine corpus in Syria and Anatolia. During the time of this dissertation research, the assemblages of Syria and Turkey were more accessible to me. I was unable to travel to Iraq when I was conducting this research; thus, first-hand study of many examples held in Iraqi museums was not possible. This dissertation therefore presents a Mesopotamian corpus that some might suggest lacks the presupposed core of Mesopotamia. However, as previously argued in the Introduction above, the material culture, including the figurines of the Halaf, cannot be placed within a core and periphery model. Therefore, the focus on the lesser-known regions of Halaf figurines is deliberate, intended to highlight preliminary work with the Iraqi regional corpus, and it suggests that the methodology used here as well as the typology and other analysis will work well with the material currently in Iraq.

*Previous Figurine Methodologies*

This documentation and analysis of a figurine assemblage within a specific cultural tradition has required a methodology that had not yet been developed when this project began.
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64 There is the possibility that figurine finds were found but not published from other Halaf sites, but most other Halaf sites were either identified through survey or date from the early Halaf when figurines were not as abundant.
Therefore, part of the work of this research was to develop a methodology, including a typology, and catalog schema with which to document and analyze the corpus. Many available frameworks for figurine analysis focus on functional interpretation as a primary goal and derive a strategy to extract a universal conceptual meaning for figurines. It is my opinion that this sort of strategy can never be satisfactorily employed, as the figurine evidence cannot empirically support any interpretations of meanings. The approach used in this thesis depends upon the methodological framework established by Ucko (1962, 1968), Voigt (1983), and especially Moorey (2001, 2003) amongst others. However, the aims of this thesis diverge drastically from the goals of these previous works in that I do not attempt to arrive at a final conclusion of an overall functional meaning for Halaf figurines.

Discussing figurine studies, Kuijt and Chesson have pointed out, “At the foundation of this literature are two deceptively simple questions: ‘What did figurines do?’ and ‘What did figurines mean?’ ” (2005, 154). I think that this is the wrong way to approach a study of a figurine corpus, because the answers cannot be found in the related empirical data. An archaeological object cannot do or mean anything without a relationship to human beings, and, within the documented biography of that object, this relationship is socially entangled and mutable. Halaf figurines are said to be part of a so-called ‘Figurine Tradition’ of small-scale, village-based communities. This approach has long prompted researchers to find universal meaning and functional purpose in figurine conceptualization, making, and usage (Lesure 2002, 2011). Chapter Two has already discussed studies that found the meaning and purpose of this prehistoric Figurine Tradition to be linked to the worship of supposed mother goddess deities. As previously mentioned in Chapter Two, this interpretation has been soundly debunked as a modern invention of prehistoric practices (e.g., Goodison and Morris 1998, Eller 2000, Bahrani
Recent work has reinforced the concept of a universal figurine tradition with shared meaning, suggesting that they might mean femaleness (Lesure 2002, 2011) or miniaturization (Bailey 1996; 2005, 153). Mary Voigt has suggested that this meaning may lie in breakage patterns (2000). However, nowhere is there an explanation of why figurines must have a single meaning or, except for Voigt, what the evidence might be which can determine one meaning over another. As common household objects of agricultural early villages (Lesure 2002), the figurines might even have seen their meaning and function changed daily or with each user. One consistent feature of figurines, as far as we can determine with in modern times is that each figurine meant the human body and that its function was to represent it for reasons and purposes which very well may not be knowable eight thousand years later.

From the beginning, when it was first excavated and published the Halaf figurines corpus was slotted into a broad range of previously published figurine traditions from Crete (Mallowan and Rose 1935, Mallowan 1936, Schmidt 1943). These traditions were assumed, even conflated, so that prehistoric figurines or the selected imagery of them in publications were bundled together as a single tradition, even though the regions from whence they derive had no contact. As non-utilitarian objects, figurines are said to have meaning and therefore require deep thought into that meaning and function in society. Richard Lesure, for example, has proposed four ways of thinking about figurines in order to understand their meaning (2002, fig. 1). Ucko’s monumental and ambitious study of the figurines of prehistoric Greece, Anatolia, Egypt, and Mesopotamia (1968) remains a classic in the field of figurine studies, though this study has been criticized by many – including the author himself (Ucko 1996) – for its overarching scope, lack of cultural specificity, and failure to recognize archaeological context (Oates 1970). Ucko

---

65 For a fuller discussion of the literature covering the Mother Goddess concept and its relation to figurines, see discussion in Chapter 2.
published a methodology for studying prehistoric figurines (1963) prior to his attempt to operationalize it in his own study – something which he was not fully able to do. Ucko’s methodology is used here as useful starting framework, but it requires modernization and flexibility. The stated purpose of his methodology is to analyze figurines in order to support interpretation of figurines’ function in society. This framework has also served as the basis for three recent studies of Near Eastern prehistoric figurines (Voigt 1983, McAdam 2003, Daems 2005).

The goal of the research and analysis conducted for this dissertation diverges from previous figurine studies in that there is no attempt to definitively prove or disprove a functional interpretation. The function of figurines, as interpreted in this dissertation, is to represent the human body, and it is the different and shared ways that this representation is conceived, made, used, and discarded that is ordered in the typology and catalog. These socially embedded functions can be visually confirmed, though with some examples here the ambiguity of the anthropomorphic nature of some objects is in itself an interpretation. Following the object biographies of this corpus also involves interpretation, but it is empirically based through the evidence of the figurines themselves and archaeological context. To determine what Halaf figurines (as a group and individually) were, are, and were made to do is what this dissertation presents, without imposing interpretive functionality that is fabricated outside of the evidence at hand. While certainly this dissertation is in many ways interpretive of the material, it uses a different methodology and seeks a different desired result from those presented by Ucko (1968).

The foundation of this dissertation and a primary contribution to the field is that it is the first rigorous and fine-grained examination, description, and analysis of each Halaf figurine

---

66 When the anthropomorphic representation of a figurine is visually ambiguous and is my own interpretation, this fact is mentioned in the catalog in order to be transparent.
known in the regions of Anatolia and Syria. Unlike ceramic, lithic, and other specialist studies, empirical studies of prehistoric Near Eastern figurines have influenced this methodology, Ucko (1968, Halaf figurines in chapters 7-8), Voigt (1993), and especially Moorey (2001, Halaf figurines, 38-41). Several useful figurine studies outside of prehistoric Mesopotamia have also been influential: Nakamura and Meskell on Çatalhöyük figurines (2009), Wrede on figurines from Uruk/Warka (2003), McAdam on figurines from Abu Salabikh (1993) and on Ubaid figurines (2003), Karvonen-Kannas on Seleucid and Parthian figurines from Babylon and Uruk (1995), and Van Buren on the figurines in the Yale Babylonian Collection (1930). All of these publications present figurine corpora bounded either by museum collections, single site assemblages, or general availability. All provide systems for recording and comparatively analyzing figurines morphologically and archaeologically based upon their particular situations.

**A Methodology for Studying Halaf Figurines**

As noted above, the research of this study has at its core the collection and analysis of figurine and archaeological data to gain a full understanding of Halaf figurines in Syria and Anatolia. The interpretation of the function of these figurines used here is that they represent conceptions of the body in Halaf society. The way that these objects expressed the embodied identity of Halaf peoples is entangled with personal and group choices in the conception, making, using, reusing, and eventual discard of them. The evidence that the figurines present of this human activity includes their morphology, size, material, technology of construction, marks of use, condition, and comparison to each other. Supporting evidence includes their archaeological context, stratigraphic location, publication, present location, and typology. This empirical evidence is presented in the catalog (*Appendices A* and *B*) and discussed at length in Chapters Four and Five. Taken together, this evidence is a foundation for interpreting human interactions with the figurines within the minds, hands, spaces, and social rhythms of those living
in the Halaf. This chapter explains the methodological systems of data gathering, 
documentation, and analysis used to reach these reconstructions.

Therefore, the focus of this study is on looking at the visual and archaeological evidence 
to document how morphological features as well as technological and stylistic figurine practices 
continued and/or diverged across Halaf time and space. The visual evidence is then supported by 
the archaeological and comparative data to arrive at a more holistic understanding of four stages 
of prehistoric human interaction in the object biography of Halaf figurines:

1. **CONCEPTUALIZATION** → visually recorded on a figurine
2. **MAKING** → visually recorded on a figurine
3. **USE** → visually recorded on a figurine’s last use recorded archaeologically
4. **DISCARD** → archaeologically recorded in an excavated context.

The intent is to allow the evidence of and related to the figurines, as well as the supporting data, 
to elucidate the corpus. The research sought regional, chronological, and Halaf-wide 
conventions in the representation of posture, gesture, proportion, manipulation, and decoration of 
the material to represent the whole body and individual parts. None of these figurines were 
found at the point of their conception, making, or use; excavations have found them at or near 
the place of discard. The evidence for the social and cultural context in which they were 
planned, made, used, stored, displayed, reused, or broken before their final discard is available 
from the figurine, and this dissertation documents this evidence. Archaeological context 
provides evidence for last use, the time when each figurine fell out of use and was no longer 
needed, wanted, or cared for. By documenting each of these processes with the available 
evidence, a fuller picture of the object biography of each figurine, site, and regional assemblage 
as well as the corpus as a whole is brought into sharper focus. While this approach may sound
basic to standard archaeological analysis, it has not always been the approach to archaeologically-known figurines.

Reflexivity is infused into methodological study of the corpus to determine what Halaf figurines are. First, in a morphological context this dissertation describes within the catalog (Appendices A and B) the present state of each example. Understanding Halaf figurines can only be extended to the examples that have currently been excavated in the state that they currently exist, i.e., broken, scattered, damaged, used, and used up. Excavation of Halaf figurines has found them at the point of last use; no Halaf figurines have been found within an archaeological context that can be interpreted as a place of conceptualization, creation, or use. They are all found at places of discard. Therefore, the archaeological data only records a time when and a place where they were no longer needed and had fallen into disuse. The strong pattern that emerges is that, at some point in their object biography, Halaf figurines were no longer wanted and eventually tumbled unceremoniously into trash-filled middens. There are clues in the figurines themselves that give information about their use such as wear, whether they can sit on a surface without support, or whether they are pierced for suspension. Archaeological context offers only clues to last use, that is, discard of the figurines after they were no longer wanted. It is important also to state that the 197 figurines considered here are probably only a small portion of all the figurines. This is a representative sample of those that were found in the last century. It is also a relatively small sample, when compared to the volume of ceramic, lithic, or bone objects found in excavations. Of Halaf small finds, figurines are less in number than seals, pendants, bone tools, or beads. This small size allows each example to be examined and documented fully in this dissertation, as opposed to ceramics, bones, or lithics, which are often sampled for examples deemed diagnostically significant.
Archaeological Style & Typological Methodologies

For this study I define style as the technological and representational choices within which artists and craftspeople have agency to conceive, create, and disseminate objects. It is the points of intersection and diversions from those socially constrained choices that can be discerned through typological analysis. Stylistic analysis of the morphological details from each example in this figurine assemblage provides the data from which typologies have been constructed as part of the work of this dissertation. Types and subtypes for Halaf figurines have been ordered based upon morphological and stylistic similarities and variations over space and time in these typologies. If typological influences known outside of the defined borders of the Halaf are directly related figurines types, these are discussed below as comparanda in the relevant regional chapters, but they are not included in the catalog, as they are not considered part of this Halaf corpus.⁶⁷

This dissertation depends heavily upon stylistic analysis which drives the typological arrangement. Debate and discussion over the use of style as a point of analysis contrasted with concepts of taxonomy, individual and group signatures, community traditions, and periodization amongst others are presented by the contributors to the edited volumes The Concept of Style (Lang 1997) and The Uses of Style in Archaeology (Conkey and Hastorf 1990). Typology and style – or any of the many terms naming the scholarly work of analytically ordering similarly created things – are tools for reconstructing the agency and intentionality of the makers and consumers of objects within socialized constraints. A premise of this study is that Halaf figurines are records of culture-specific treatments and decoration of the body in sixth millennium northern Mesopotamia. Therefore, the theoretical analysis of embodiment follows

---

⁶⁷ There are typological, stylistic, and technological connections to figurines east and west of Halaf cultural borders. For western connections to contemporary figurine assemblages found in Central Anatolia, see: Belcher (2007); for eastern connections to Iranian figurines see Daems (2005).
the empirical data so that it is grounded within this corpus. The typology functions to codify and organize differences and similarities in the way the body is visually represented in Halaf figurines. The organized corpus can then inform theoretical discussion on shared embodied cultural identity as well as regional and community belonging as represented on the figurines.

There is much discussion in archaeological literature debating typological analysis as an inductive or deductive method of analysis. This debate is summarized by Adams and Adams, who have rightly rejected it as unimportant to the archaeologists’ task of sorting artifacts to understand past lived behavior (1991, 265-325). As with the cultural periods, there is no reason to think that figurine types and subtypes consciously meant anything to those conceptualizing, making, and using figurines. Typology is also a traditional tool of art historians as well as archaeologists, though with them the work of typologies is often interchanged with style. Typology is simply used here as a practical tool for imposing order on and discerning patterns of similar methods of representation in artifacts in order to understand underlying social practices and spheres of interaction (Carr and Neitzel 1995).

**Use Evidence**

The figurines themselves offer evidence for their use. Judging from the fact that all of them were broken, chipped, worn, or fragmented, it appears that these figurines were used often in ways that were not gentle to their overall form. Most of these examples are small enough to hold in the hand, and rubbing at the breaks and on the surface suggests that they were handled often. Scratches on the base of LH.1A type and figurine vessel DT-12 suggest that they might have been picked up and placed on flat surfaces often. The fact that so many figurines feature a flat base on which they can sit or stand without support suggests that they were displayed, perhaps on a shelf and perhaps visible to all within the space without the direct interaction of holding.
Also allowing display and interaction without direct holding are figurines which also function as, pendants such as DT-1 through DT-9 and Type 4 figurine seal pendants. While these are called pendants, they could equally have been hung on a wall or other structure as well as on and about the human or animal body. The evidence for use of individual examples is found in the description, technology, and condition sections of each catalog record in Appendices A and B. It is equally probable that many other human actions of use and reuse of figurines occurred such as those which can be imagined from contemporary lived experiences with objects. These human interactions can be separated into intentional, unintentional, involving other substances, or disembodied thoughts. These lived interactions with figurines in the past do not leave traces on the object themselves but are equally embedded in the object biography. Suggestions for a few of such interactions have already been mentioned in Chapter Two and are presented in Table 3.4, below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intentional Touch</th>
<th>Interactions with Substances and Materials</th>
<th>Unintentional Interactions</th>
<th>Disembodied Interactions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Held</td>
<td>Passed through smoke</td>
<td>Noticed</td>
<td>Adored</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Touched</td>
<td>Dripped on</td>
<td>Ignored</td>
<td>Spoken about</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caressed</td>
<td>Dressed with cloth</td>
<td>Knocked into</td>
<td>Spoken to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kissed</td>
<td>Stuck by feathers</td>
<td>Knocked over</td>
<td>Described</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dusted</td>
<td>Doused by liquids</td>
<td>Jostled</td>
<td>Loved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covered</td>
<td>Stored with objects</td>
<td>Lost</td>
<td>Hated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exposed</td>
<td>Brushed by fur</td>
<td>Broken</td>
<td>Desired</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Displayed</td>
<td>Covered with hair</td>
<td>Chipped</td>
<td>Imagined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discarded</td>
<td>Decorated with flowers</td>
<td>Cracked</td>
<td>Remembered</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Research conducted for this Dissertation**

None of the situations in which the data were collected was ideal, and the documentation and circumstance of each site are different. This methodology was designed to be flexible, and, as such, it developed over time and related to each situation. This research covered the course of many years in many museums, dig houses, libraries, and archives, and each research visit had its own challenges and breakthroughs. Many of the figurines which were studied first-hand remain
unpublished and did not have any accompanying documentation of archaeological discovery available. Other published figurines were unavailable for examination. Some figurines could not be removed from exhibit cases and had to be studied under glass. For most examples, documentation and availability falls somewhere between these two extremes, and it was possible to visually examine and determine the archaeological findspot for the majority of the corpus. While the research attempted to be as comprehensive as possible, because of access issues there are several Halaf figurines that have not been included in this study. The methodology tested here, especially the typology, is flexible and transformable with the idea that it can be expanded and adjusted to accommodate further examples and assemblages. The methodological focus of this research is to find the comparable commonalities and to make an attempt to be as systematic and transparent as possible when the data were not available or are suspect. Therefore, after the figurines had been documented and cataloged (Chapters Four and Five, Appendices A and B), the visual and chronological strength of each type and subtype could be measured against comparanda and available archaeological data (Chapter Six). In this way, the data have been used to determine which figurine type can be considered truly diagnostic of early or late Halaf in either Turkey or Syria.

Defining and Documenting a Halaf Figurine Corpus

This dissertation documents a regional corpus of one artifact class. This is the type of study that is foundational in archaeology but is rarely undertaken for materials beyond pottery. It is important and neglected work in figurine studies. Without preliminary corpus work on the full nature and typology of figurines within cultural boundaries, how can it be possible to fully

---

68 There are several unpublished figurines from Sabi Abyad, Chagar Bazar, and Tell Halaf which I was unable to access. The next logical step in this research is to conduct the same research and analysis on the figurines from Halaf sites in Iraq.
understand anthropomorphic representation within cultural, regional horizons (Belcher and Croucher in press)?

Preliminary determination of sites to be included in this study was done by conducting secondary research on all published Halaf archaeological reports for mention of anthropomorphic figurines. This research in available publications identified 18 sites as yielding 150 figurines and fragments from Halaf excavations in Syria, Turkey, and Iraq. Permission was requested and in most cases granted from the original excavation directors or current rights-holders, museum curators, and departments of antiquities in locations that were then possible to travel to in Turkey, Syria, Europe, and the U.S.\textsuperscript{69} Several research trips to museums and excavations were made from 1999-2014 to study and collate collected information available on figurines.\textsuperscript{70} In some cases excavation archives were also available; these offered additional contextual and visual information not available in published reports.\textsuperscript{71} This work disproved initial assumptions that the illustrative nature of figurines would compel excavators to publish all of their examples. During the course of this research, many more figurines were found in storerooms, and a few more sites were added. By 2007 the potential Halaf corpus doubled in size. In order to restrict the corpus studied in this dissertation and because upon further study it became clear that the figurine assemblages from the three relevant regions are distinctly different, a decision was made to closely examine only examples from Syria and Turkey.\textsuperscript{72}

\textsuperscript{69} These individuals and institutions are thanked in the acknowledgments of this dissertation.

\textsuperscript{70} Dissertation research travel was in part supported by Columbia University through a CV Starr Dissertation Grant (UK and Syria in 1999-2000) and a Center for Mediterranean Studies Travel Scholarship (Turkey and Germany in 2002). Research was also supported by the CUNY Research Foundation and John Jay College through Faculty Research and Travel Grants (Turkey in 2006, 2008, 2010, 2011). Additional unsupported research trips were made to Philadelphia (2003), Syria (2001), and the U.K. (2014).

\textsuperscript{71} Available excavation archives which were consulted are listed in references at the end of this dissertation.

\textsuperscript{72} The approximately 183 figurine examples from Iraq require more time and consideration than is possible in this project and have been set aside for further research and future publication.
Methodologies of Figurine Technology

Halaf figurines were probably made in tandem with other community-based production systems along with other objects requiring similar technology, materials, and skills. Technological aspects of the production of a figurine were constrained by the availability of raw materials, the skills to work them, and socially constrained technological choices (Pfaffenberger 1988, 1992). Therefore, it is important to record technological details of the figurines in order to determine if typological styles are connected with technological styles of production.

One purpose of the technical analysis in this project is to record the condition of the figurines as they appear today, noting all variations of the color of the material and decoration with Munsell® Soil Color Charts (Greytag-Macbeth 2000) as well as the specific nature of the surface and core of the raw material. A description of the current condition of the figurine is recorded – including breaks, use-wear, and ancient and modern repair. The intention is to present a full description of each figurine as it appeared for examination (or has been published for those not available for hands-on study). While some broken figurines and fugitive painting may well be graphically and theoretically reconstructable, it is important to record the current state of the data analyzed. Nearly all figurine examples are broken or worn in some way; patterning of breakage as well as evidence of reuse of broken figurines and fragments have been noted in the catalog and are discussed in Chapter Five. Analysis of this type of data empirically informs hypotheses on the use, re-use, and final use of the figurines; patterns in this physical evidence can imply intentionality in these practices. Technological details can also have

---

73 Use of a Munsell for figurine description is contra Moorey (2001, xiii, and personal communication 1999) but very successfully incorporated into figurine description by McAdam (1993 and personal communication 1999). It is important to note that recording of the color of figurines can only be analyzed based on the current color of the artifact, which may be very different from the original state or even the intention of the maker either at creation or as a way to identify the pigment materials. Vagaries in manufacturing, use, and depositional and post-depositional processes can all contribute to destabilization of the color of archaeological artifacts. Twenty-first century existing color alone cannot be used to identify materials or the original colors on the figurines. One solution is to use scientific means such as Raman Spectroscopy to identify the minerals in the pigments on figurines and with that information identify the original colors used to decorate the figurines. This is the subject of a planned future study.
ideological significance; for example, body parts formed and attached separately and certain
decorations and ornamentation also had social and symbolic meanings with the Halaf lived body.

A second objective of technological description and analysis of the figurine corpus is to
determine the intentionality of design of the object as well as the sequence and steps of
manufacture (i.e., *chaîne opératoire*). These data have been collected from physical evidence
as well as conjecture, based on attachment scars and other clues in fragmented examples as
recorded in the catalog. Analysis focused upon testing the stability of the base of each figurine
to determine if it was designed to stand or sit without support; many examples appear to have
been specifically designed to do so, which is evidence of how they were used, displayed, and
viewed. Analysis also recorded the sequence of attachment of parts to create the whole as well
as marks of tools and fingers to smooth, burnish, and decorate the surface. Throughout the Halaf,
clay figurines appear to be compiled of individual parts, perhaps by a small family group. A few
figurines were designed to incorporate removable and interchangeable heads, which could have
been made separately from the figurine, perhaps by the use of ephemeral materials. The analysis
presents cases in which overall figurine types may have been shared across regions; there are
variations in the method use for manufacture. For example, the legs of one figurine were formed
in exactly the same way in the Khabur River in Syria, KK-14, as they were in that of another
figurine from the upper Euphrates in Turkey, ÇT-6, but the complete figurines are in different
sub-types. Technological parallels such as these suggest direct contact between the makers of
the figurines.

---

74 This approach to figurine analysis has been suggested for prehistoric Bulgarian figurines by Chapman and Gaydarska (2007, 171-184).
Halaf Figurine Parts and Fragments

Throughout this dissertation figurine refers to all examples, whole and fragmentary. The construction of many figurines is by individual parts, particularly those of the late Halaf, and that is often how they were eventually found. Figurines are records of how those living in the Halaf saw themselves and others, and they paid close attention to the representation and decoration of the body and all its parts. Therefore, this dissertation also pays close attention to the represented body and all its parts through formal description, drawing, and photography of each example. The catalog features drawings to illustrate each example because they are comparable to each other. The study of fragmented and segmentation at the manufacture of the figurine may indicate some intentionality in the eventual breakage of the figurine. Some have suggested that the breakage is intentional and symbolic (Chapman 2000; Chapman and Gaydarska 2007; Gaydarska et al. 2007). Others have suggested that legs or heads were broken off with the intention of sharing the parts with others (Talalay 1987; Verhoven 2007). For later periods it has been suggested that terracotta triangles represent women or had magical properties of female deities (Bahrani 2001, 50-51). Others have suggested that decorative motifs on figurines and pottery represented anthropomorphic parts with symbolic meaning (Ippoliti-Strika 1998). Or, as some have proposed, decoration may have gendered implications (Campbell 2010) or connections to the manipulation of lived body or interred mortuary remains (Croucher 2012, 2010a, 2010b).

The body parts depicted on these figurines are on a spectrum between grossly exaggerated or minimized, having little correlations to realistic human proportions as understood today. The materiality of the clay and stone encouraged imaginative renderings, and the Halaf figurine makers understood and used these properties to the fullest. Representing the human body in realistic scale was clearly not a concept desired in the Halaf. Many of the exaggerated parts are biologically representing female (i.e., breasts, pubic triangles), while males are depicted
with small breasts and only vaguely represented phalluses. As discussed earlier, the exaggerated biological and sexualized female body has influenced some to suggest that these figurines are depictions of mother goddess worship. While it is intriguing and possible that these figurines represent connections between the human and spiritual worlds, what can be empirically analyzed is the interest in corporeal parts by those that conceptualized, made, and used them. Many Halaf figurines were made in parts, attached to each other while still plastic, and that is how they often ended up, fragments broken at the attachments.

**Constructing a Halaf Figurine Typology**

The basic structuring of the corpus of 197 figurines rests on two ordering principles. The first is to present the figurines within their excavated and analyzed context, the findspot where they were excavated, and the possible place within the reconstructed Halaf settlement. The second is to place each example within a typology of figurines, which is a modern construction created specifically for the purposes of this research. These figurines already have been classified within archaeological reports, museum displays, and storage as well as in archaeological, artistic, and thematic surveys. They have been called Halaf from associated assemblages, called *small finds* based on dimensional characteristics or perceived non-utilitarian functions. Some reports and museum storage schemes have separated figurines by material. Most but not all have already been given the classification *figurine*, based upon morphological traits; some have also been called *mother goddesses* or tagged within classificatory structures of typologies created within the site assemblages. The use of the term *mother goddess* as a typological term in the literature is useful, as it is interpretable as examples of type LH.1A or type LH.1B or lack of these items in the excavated assemblages. Some site-based typologies have been based in interpretive classifications, stating that so-called mother goddess type figurines were found there, for example, at Tell Aqab (Watkins and Davidson 1980, 10) and Tell
Kashkashok (Souleiman and Tarekji 1999). The use of this term can be traced back to Mallowan (1935, 1936) and Schmidt (1943), who long ago published the only existing typologies for Halaf figurines.

The scholarly debate on constructing typologies has not yet been resolved, but relevant to this is the philosophical review on what constitutes a type as a unit of analysis and consistency in classification (Adams and Adams 1991; Whittaker, Caulkins, and Kamp 1998). The typology presented below could be criticized as lumped rather than split because the categories were expanded to be more inclusive rather than split into sub-categories. This approach is justified by the small sample size, but the system is designed to accommodate changes in the future. Much of the decision-making on classification of objects is based upon binary questions – yes/no questioning of the object – which graphically could be described as a decision tree. Some binaries are, for example, seated/standing, male/female, clay/stone, and broken/complete. All of these went into the virtual sorting of these examples of figurines/fragments here, so the categories broadened to fit all of the figurines in the structure. For example, the nuances and heterogeneity of standing and early Halaf figurines in many ways defy categorization. The seated late Halaf figurines overtly belong to their categories. However, in systematizing the diversity of the Halaf figurines typologically, it is easy to get bogged down in these yes/no binaries. In reality, a lot of grey areas exist between types, and many of them are fragmentary and thus missing information. In the Halaf, there was not just one way to depict the anthropomorphic; there were general tendencies and vague nuanced similarities representing visual choices. These choices have some restraints; some of them are technological, others social and/or regional, perhaps entangled with a visual expression of community belonging. While there is no easy way to codify all these variables, an overall simplified and flexible
typology was created to sort them and categorize most of them. Many of these types were recognized in past publications but not in the same categories presented below (Table 3.5, below). For example, while Schmidt was the first to interpret the LH.1B figurines as male, Mallowan did not recognize them as different from the LH.1A type, all of which he called the mother goddess type, a designation that stayed in descriptions for a long time after his publications appeared.

A constructed typology is presented here based upon the 197 examples analyzed in Chapters Four and Five and Appendices A and B, which are linked to the data elements presented in Appendix C (column 11). This typology is flexible, as recommended by Adams and Adams (1991), and will no doubt expand and split into subtypes when details of Halaf figurines from Iraq are considered against it. What is presented here is a working system of intersecting binaries into which these 197 examples are grouped, though for some examples the choice of group can be arbitrary and may unnecessarily be skewing the results. The overall types are separated by phase, either EH for early Halaf and LH for late Halaf. The typology created here is based purely on the morphology of the figurines. Therefore, figurines made of clay or stone are categorized together according to their overall morphological shape. There are three elements to the types corresponding to chronological phase, type, and subtype as illustrated

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>LH.1 female</th>
<th>LH.1 male</th>
<th>LH.2E Flat standing</th>
<th>Miscellaneous and variations</th>
<th>LH.3A Figurine vessels</th>
<th>LH/EH.4B/C</th>
<th>LH.2E Figurine pendants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Schmidt 1943, 100</td>
<td>Type A-B</td>
<td>Type C</td>
<td>Not found at TH</td>
<td>Not found at TH</td>
<td>Not found at TH</td>
<td>Not found</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mallowan and Rose 1935, 79-80, 92-93</td>
<td>Type 1 “Erect or Squatting, “steatopygous”</td>
<td>Type 3 “Fiddle Shaped” Worn as amulets</td>
<td>Type 4 variations “Steatopygous,” gaming pieces</td>
<td>Type 2 “Baked with hollow bodies”</td>
<td>Amulets type 10 Hand seals</td>
<td>Amulets type 12 “double axes”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>LH.1 female</th>
<th>LH.1 male</th>
<th>LH.2E Flat standing</th>
<th>Miscellaneous and variations</th>
<th>LH.3A Figurine vessels</th>
<th>LH/EH.4B/C</th>
<th>LH.2E Figurine pendants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
using the example of type LH.1A in Figure 3.11, below. In contrast with previous Halaf figurine typologies presented in Table 3.5, above, this typology does not depend on interpretation, therefore there is no mother goddess type in this schema. Nor is there a separation of figurines by materials, as is often done in archaeological reports (e.g., Mallowan and Rose 1935, Tobler 1950). I believe that the visual conception for a figurine is not fused to the material with which it was made but is dependent rather on imagery that travelled by a variety of means.

Figure 3.11: Visualization of the typology schema used in this dissertation

As this typology is constructed in the interest of understanding the commonalities and differences in the visual representation of the body, the focus is upon the overall morphology rather than the material. I believe that this focus brings the observer closer to the human interaction with the figurines in prehistory at the point of conception. The materiality of the figurine, I argue, is dependent on local and regional availability of materials with which and of
skills necessary to make them. As a pottery-producing cultural horizon, the Halaf had access to clay and the knowledge of how to work it at every settlement. Furthermore, the majority of figurines in this dissertation are made of clay, possibly made adjacent to pottery within the settlement. Access to stone and the ability to fashion it into figurines was more restricted to certain areas and perhaps certain settlements and even individuals.

The elements of this typology are flexible, and different combinations can be created by changing any of these three elements. The first element is the phase or date of the figurine, which can either be late (LH) or early (EH) or post Halaf (PH). This is a modifier to the overall type. The second element is morphologically fixed no matter what the phase. It is important to use this element as a marker of relative chronology and to bring the figurines within each phase together in order to understand the similarities and differences between the two Halaf phases. More types and subtypes can be added, and, in the context of this dissertation, as can be seen in the tables below, some types and subtypes are not found to be present in some phases. The typology can even be extended to other cultural regions or phases by the addition of other types and subtypes. However, every figurine must fit within one of these types or a new type needs to be created. For the two most numerous types in this assemblage, Type 1, seated figurines, and Type 2, Standing figurines, the type is based both on the overall morphology and pose represented by the figurine. However, the designation of the pose is interpretive and perhaps open to further discussion. For seated figurines, the pose is overtly represented by the bent legs, which often line up with the flat base so that the figurine itself is made to sit on a flat surface. While, as mentioned in Chapter Two, some have interpreted the pose of LH.1A figurines as squatting, for the purposes of this dissertation, these figurines are interpreted as seated. The pose represented in Type 2 figurines is more ambiguous and certainly open to further interpretation.
Most figurines called Type 2, standing figurines in this dissertation, do not have legs (which are essential features required for humans to stand up) represented at all. As can be seen in the Table 3.7, Type 2 figurines are decidedly different morphologically from those of Type 1, and in this typology this difference is labeled as Seated or Standing. The Halaf figurine makers and users may have had a different human action or condition than pose when choosing one type of figurine over another, but this is not discoverable from the evidence at hand.

The other types, Type 3 and Type 4, are also based upon the morphological shape of the figurine examples as well as on their traditionally viewed function in archaeological analysis. Type 3, figurine vessels, are hollow on the inside and, based upon the four examples in the corpus, all from Domuztepe, are made in the same way that a pot is made, but in anthropomorphic form. The nearly complete Domuztepe example, DT-12, is clearly represented standing on feet and legs, so it can also be called a standing figurine, but, because it is morphologically a vessel, it has been classified as Type 3. With the exception of subtype 4C, which represents a human hand, known in this corpus from a single example, DT-18, most Type 4 figurine seals could also be called standing figurines including subtypes 4A, representing a full standing figure with legs, and subtype 4B, representing a standing foot. However, because these examples are primarily morphologically considered seals, with piercings for suspension on a cord and incised sealing faces, they are classed as Type 4. All other figurine examples which for a variety of reasons expounded upon below do not fit with Types 1, 2, 3, or 4 are classified as Type unknown.

**Type 1 - Seated Halaf Figurines**

This study confirms that seated Halaf figurines are the most numerous in the late Halaf; almost half of this corpus (46%) is categorized as seated. Type 1 figurines were not found amongst early Halaf assemblages. All seated is known to have been found in early Halaf levels at
sites in Turkey or Syria. One-third of the total corpus (33%) is of the LH.1A type – seated females with arms supporting breasts. While this pose has been variously described as seated or squatting, it seems clear that they are solidly seated on their buttocks, which also forms a functional base for the object’s stability. In reality, it is probably impossible to hold such a pose for any length of time. Therefore, this type is called seated in this dissertation and typology. This type of figurine has knees bent at more than a 90-degree angle; the thighs can be close to touching the abdomen. The legs are set close together, and the pubic area is often obscured by the upper thighs. The lower legs feature flat shins, which are often painted with three to nine horizontal stripes which extend around the side of the calves. The toes are shown pointed and sometimes flare slightly forward, however, details of the foot are not represented. Some examples are decorated with strips of clay appliqué or painted stripes representing triple-strapped sandals. Many of these appliqués have broken off, some leaving attachment scars, so it is possible that more were originally represented with sandals. Many are painted with double lines between the lower waist and hips. The arms cross the upper torso, with hands placed against the sternum either next to each other or on top of each other.

For these type of figurines, one piece, comprised of a long neck, head and headdress, includes the clavicle area is attached to the upper torso before the arms were attached. The arms were attached to the torso before the breasts were attached as wet clay smoothed over the shoulder. Both the upper arms and neck area are often decorated with painted stripes. At the neck a single stripe is most common, crossing at the nape of the neck forming an X, although more stripes in the neck area do occur. The upper arms are also decorated with parallel stripes, mostly horizontal but sometimes vertical, numbering from two to six, although often they are worn and faded and difficult to detect in this area. Because the assemblage is large and diverse
in surface decoration, a pilot study was conducted to localize and list surface decorations observed on Chagar Bazar type 1A figurines *(Table 5.32, p. 269).*

Table 3.6: Type 1 Seated Figurines

*Note:* figurines accompanied by ← arrows, indicate that the example is illustrated in the images column.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPE</th>
<th>PHASE</th>
<th>Sub types Description</th>
<th>Number Examples</th>
<th>Images</th>
<th>Best examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TYPE 1</td>
<td>LATE HALAF</td>
<td>LH.1A Arms encircling breasts, hands clasped at sternum, knees bent, together</td>
<td>Anatolia: 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Syria: CB-1, CB-2, CB-3, CB-4, CB-5, CB-29, CB-31, CB-40, KK-1, KK-2, KK-8, TH-1, TH-2, Bey-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>LH.1A variation Some but not all features of LH.1A</td>
<td>Anatolia: 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Atatürk: TK-4, Syria: CB-22, CB-25, TH-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>LH.1B Arms extended down, hands on thighs, knees bent, apart.</td>
<td>Anatolia: none</td>
<td></td>
<td>Syria: CB-21, TA-1, KK-19, KK-20, TH-24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>LH.1C Legs hanging down below the base, requires support to sit.</td>
<td>Anatolia: 4</td>
<td></td>
<td>Atatürk: ÇT-6, ÇT-7, ÇT-8, KK-24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The surface decorations of Type LH.1A figurines lack the specificity necessary to definitively connect them to particular adornment practices on the lived body. There was a
special interest in portraying stripes on the lower legs, waist, neck, breasts, and arms. These
could represent tattoos, scarification, body paint, clothing, string, or fibers or a combination of
these. What can be said is that, during the late Halaf period in this particular region, these areas
of the body were consistently decorated on the figurines – perhaps paralleling body adornment
practices in the Halaf. All of these methods of skin decoration and manipulation methods could
certainly have been practiced at this time, but, of course, they do not survive in the
archaeological record beyond the imagery on the figurines here. These same decorations could
be of beads, pendants, and fibers, which are documented amongst the micro-artifacts of many
Halaf sites (Kansa et al. 2009). There is a chance that two figurines, GH-4 and GH-5, might be
earlier examples of a hitherto unknown EH.1A Type. However, given their unclear
archaeological contexts and for typological reasons, GH-4 has been assigned as EH.2A and GH-
5, assigned as LH.1A. One figurine, TK-4, is placed among the LH.1A variation type, although
the context in which it was found was very disturbed and it is not completely clear that it depicts
a seated anthropomorphic figurine. If these four outliers were removed, the seated figurine
typology would be much more starkly delineated as belonging only to the late Halaf phase.

Type LH.1B is a male figurine type, occurring in eight examples, all from late Halaf
levels at sites in Syria. This figurine type features the same slim torso, though some examples do
not appear to be pinched in at the waist. The torso in these figurines has flat-breast appliqués,
many of which have fallen off but have left attachment scars.\textsuperscript{75} There is little surface decoration
on these figurines; many of them simply feature a line between the open legs in the pubic area,
which is interpreted as a penis. The open legs are bent at a 90-degree angle, meaning that the
lower legs hang down, and that the figurines of this type would need to have some support to sit

\textsuperscript{75} The size and shape of the breasts is conjectured by the shape of the attachment scars as well as examples with
these sorts of breasts still attached (e.g., TK-15, TK-16, TK-17, ÇT-5).
on a flat surface. The arms are also open, with hands resting on upper thighs, a radically different
gesture than those of LH.1A figurines. This type of figurine can feature the same sort of head as
LH.1A figurines; in fact, two head fragments cannot be assigned to either type because they are
so fragmented.

A third type of seated figurine is type LH.1C; this mainly comes from sites in Turkey,
principally at Çavı Tarlası. Ten examples, representing 5% of the entire corpus, are known. This
type of figurine also features an open lap with legs bent at a 90-degree angle that hang well
below the buttocks. This type of figurine may have been designed to sit on a shelf or on a
supporting structure. The upper torso of this figurine type has arm stubs, probably serving as an
abbreviation of bent arms, and many of them have flat torsos though some feature modeled
breasts and all have closed legs so this type is interpreted as female, but it could also be male.
Many have holes in their necks for insertion of a removable head, but some feature attached
knob shaped heads with very little detail.

Surveying some of the literature from Iraqi finds shows that seated examples are also
attested there. Type LH.1A appears also at Yarim Tepe III (Merpert and Munchaev 1993c, 186,
fig. 9.17, upper row; 202, fig. 9.38: 1-2; 237, fig. 11.7: 2). This type is also found at Arpachiyah
(Mallowan and Rose 1935, fig. 45: 6-7, 10, 12). There are many examples of LH.1A variations
from Arpachiyah in more variety than those known from Anatolia and Syria, which, if analyzed,
may group together in a few new subtypes (Mallowan and Rose 1935, fig. 45, 13, 16; fig. 47, 2,
3, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 11, 12, 16, 17). Type LH.1B is also attested at Arpachiyah in a very fragmented
example (Mallowan and Rose 1935, fig. 45, 8). Another example of type LH.1C comes from Tell
Hassan in Iraq (Fiorina 1985).
Table 3.7: Type 2 Standing Figurines

*Note: figurines accompanied by ← arrows, indicate that the example is illustrated in the images column.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPE</th>
<th>PHASE</th>
<th>Sub types</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TYPE 2</td>
<td>LATE HALAF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STANDING FIGURINES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LH.2A</td>
<td>Anatolia: 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Syria: 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Anatolia: TK-7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Syria: CB-23, CB-38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LH.2B</td>
<td>Anatolia: 13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Syria: 8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Anatolia: ÇT-1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Syria: ÇT-2, ÇT-3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DT-1, DT-2, DT-3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DT-4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LH.2C</td>
<td>Anatolia: none</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Syria: 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>←CB-26, TH-20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LH.2D</td>
<td>Anatolia: 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Syria: none</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>←ÇT-9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LH.2E</td>
<td>Anatolia: 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Syria: 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>←DT-16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Anatolia: CB-27, CB-33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Types 2 and 3 - Standing Halaf Figurines and Figurine Vessels**

Nearly one-third of the corpus cataloged in this dissertation (31%) is designated as standing figurines. The standing figurine types possess less overt features and greater diversity, though with nuanced differences. Many of the standing Halaf examples come from early Halaf levels, but some types also continue into the late phase. Although all of the standing figurines have been placed into six categories, the examples within those categories do not closely resemble each other except in a few instances. This indicates that in the Halaf the representation of standing figures was much less standardized than was that used for seated types. While these figurines are called standing, most of them represent just the torso and upper body and no legs, which, of course, as noted above, are an essential element for standing in reality.

A total of 3% of the corpus in fact do stand on legs (Type 2E) including the figurine vessel DT-12, classified as type LH.3A. A few fragments of what appear to be legged standing figurines come from unknown contexts at Chagar Bazar and may not even be Halaf, and one stone example is exemplified by a unique bead-figurine from Domuztepe.

**Table 3.8: Type 3 Figurine Vessels**

*Note: figurines accompanied by ← arrows, indicate that the example is illustrated in the images column.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPE</th>
<th>PHASE</th>
<th>Sub types Description</th>
<th>Number Examples</th>
<th>Images</th>
<th>Best examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TYPE 3</td>
<td>EARLY HALAF</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIGURINE-VESSELS</td>
<td>LATE HALAF</td>
<td>LH.3A Standing on feet</td>
<td>Anatolia: 3, Syria: None</td>
<td>Anatolia: ←DT-12, DT-13, DT-14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The most numerous standing examples can be classified as type 2A (11%) and 2B (13%). Both have flat upper torsos, often featuring an abbreviated head, and arm stubs which
presumably are meant to represent bent elbows, perhaps implying that the arms are supporting breasts, which are rarely represented. Type 2A then transitions at the waist to a more rounded form at the bottom, featuring a round or oval base on which it stands without support. This type is particularly prevalent in the early Halaf phase (EH.2A), and the late examples (LH.2A) closely reference the earlier ones. Type 2B is completely flat overall, often featuring a violin or hourglass shape; Many of these examples are fashioned out of stone and can feature the incised outline of a pudenda, either triangular or square in shape, which is sometimes punctuated. Some examples feature incised lines at the neck and/or waist (e.g., DT-1, GH-1) but many are undecorated. Breasts are often implied by the bent arms, but they can also be appliqué. This type occurs equally in late and early Halaf levels, with many similar details occurring in various combinations within each phase.

Another standing figurine type, 2C, is somewhat enigmatic, often just representing a conical or cylindrical shape, very closely reminiscent of clay tokens and figurines such as those found in pre-Halaf levels at Tell Sabi Abyad (Akkermans and Verhoven 1995, fig. 14, 15). This type can be vaguely anthropomorphic, although some feature breasts and heads. They comprise just 3% of the total corpus, with more appearing in early Halaf levels. This type is closely connected to type 2D, which also has a flat torso but a rounded peg upper torso and/or head, this type occurs in just two early Halaf examples (1%) in this corpus, but it is well attested in Iraq.

While type EH.2D does not appear to occur in Syria and occurs only in early Halaf contexts in Anatolia, it is quite common in both early and late Halaf phases at the Iraqi site of Yarim Tepe II and III (Merpert and Munchaev 1993a: 142, fig. 8.10: 4; 161, fig 8.32: 1-9; Merpert and Munchaev 1993c: 186, fig. 9.17: bottom row; 203, fig 9.39: 1-6, fig 9.40: 1-5). A possible variation on EH.2D is also attested in what is probably to be considered late Halaf levels.
at Arpachiyah as well (Mallowan and Rose 1935, fig 47: 13-16). The famous figurine vessel from Yarim Tepe II (Merpert and Munchaev 1993a, 145, fig. 8.13: 1-3) is in a style different from the examples of LH.3A ones from Domuztepe in that it does not stand on feet. However, a zoomorphic vessel depicting a pig from Yarim Tepe II (Merpert and Munchaev 1993, figs 8.14-8.15) stands solidly on hooves and has a jar neck very similar to that of DT-12. Both are from the late Halaf phase.

Stone examples of LH.2B type may have some relationship to the so-called double-axe pendants at Arpachiyah (Mallowan and Rose 1935, pl. VI.b: A862, A864, A863, A865, A861, 860) and one stone figurine of this type with a large incised pubic triangle also comes from Arpachiyah (Mallowan and Rose 1935, pl. Xa: 920). However, there are many more examples of this type in clay found at Arpachiyah, but these have modeled breasts affixed to them; a few examples appear to be pregnant, and very few have incised pudendas (Mallowan and Rose 1935, fig. 45: 2, 3; fig. 46: 4, 5, 6, 7, 9; fig. 47: 1, 4, 8, 19, 20). Arpachiyah also yielded LH.2E types (Mallowan and Rose 1935, fig 45: 1; fig. 47: 23, 24) as well as several examples of LH.2A (Mallowan and Rose 1935, fig. 46: 8; fig 47: 21, 22).

Type 4 - Figurine Seal Pendants
Halaf anthropomorphic seals can represent the full human body or a just foot or hand, but they are a very small portion of the overall total (5.5%). The full-body representations consistently portray standing figures in both the early and late phases, though they appear to be more common in the early phase and are rendered differently in each phase. Hands and feet appear in both early and late contexts, though they are more common in early contexts. As a companion to this very preliminary classification on anthropomorphic seals, Denham’s dissertation should also be consulted for a full treatment of these and all other Halaf examples and types (2013). A survey of a few published examples from Iraq show foot-shaped seals are
also attested at Yarim Tepe II (Merpert and Munchaev 1993a, 151, fig. 8.20: 3) Type LH.4A is also attested at Arpachiyah (Mallowan and Rose, 1935, plate VII: b: 891).

*Table 3.9: Type 4, figurine-seal-pendants*

*Note: figurines accompanied by ✈ arrows, indicate that the example is illustrated in the images column.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPE</th>
<th>PHASE</th>
<th>Sub types Description</th>
<th>Number Examples</th>
<th>Images</th>
<th>Best examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| TYPE 4              | EARLY HALAF  | EH.4A  
                        | Full body represented, standing with splayed legs | Anatolia: 2  
                        |                     |  
                        |                     | Syria: 1  
                        |                     |  
                        |                 | Anatolia:  
                        |                     | ✈ FH-4  
                        |                     | ✈ TK-13  
                        |                     | Syria:  
                        |                     | ✈ UQ-1  
|                     |              | EH.4B  
                        | Representing a foot or boot | Anatolia: 5  
                        |                     |  
                        |                     | Syria: None  
                        |                 | Anatolia:  
                        |                     | ✈ TK-14  
                        |                     | ✈ DT-20  
|                     |              | EH.4C none  
| LATE HALAF          | LH.4A  
                        | Full body represented, standing with splayed legs | Anatolia: 1  
                        |                     |  
                        |                     | Syria: None  
                        |                 | Anatolia:  
                        |                     | ✈ ÇT-14  
|                     | LH.4B none  
|                     | LH.4C  
                        | Representing a hand with four fingers | Anatolia: 1  
                        |                     |  
                        |                     | Syria: None  
                        |                 | Anatolia:  
                        |                     | ✈ DT-18  

These objects represent the human body or human body parts in three dimensions, therefore they fit within the definition of figurine employed in this dissertation. It is quite possible that additional anthropomorphic seals were found amongst the assemblages of the sites examined here. If these objects were not published, I would not know about them, since anthropomorphic seals would have been stored with other seals and were not made accessible to me when I visited museums. Thus, the figurine-seal-pendants presented in this dissertation are more a representative sample than a comprehensive one. Other examples fit into other types,
particularly the LH.2B type figurines made of stone, and may well also have had a functional use as figurine-seal-PENDANTS similar to the much smaller examples presented in Table 3.9 above.

**Type - Unknown**

This category of figurine is not a type at all but rather encompasses all figurines that do not conform to the above types; it is therefore named “Type unknown.” This is a catch-all category of one-off, unique examples and (mostly) fragments. The figurines that are designated *EH.Type unknown* and *LH.Type unknown* are unique examples of figurines that cannot successfully be compared with others within the assemblage or be assigned to types in typology. Many of these figurines are head fragments which cannot be matched to figurine types (e.g., TK-3, DT-10, KK-22, KK-25, TA-10). Other examples of types of un-assignable fragments of figurine parts that cannot be visually identified with other known more complete examples are thus so categorized (e.g., TK-6, ÇT-10, TA-11, TH-18). The last category of figurines within this type is those for which no information is known because an image or description of the figurine remains unpublished, and I did not gain access to these examples. These examples are only known through mention of their existence either in publication or by personal communication, but nothing about their typology could be discerned from available evidence. All figurines within the corpus for which very little is known beyond mention are now in museums in Turkey (e.g., GH-9-GH-14, KerkH-2, KH-1). The total numbers and visual examples of those figurines which are categorized as Type unknown are presented in Table 3.10, below.
Table 3.10: Type Unknown figurines

*Note:* figurines accompanied by ← arrows, indicate that the example is illustrated in the images column.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPE</th>
<th>PHASE</th>
<th>Sub types Description</th>
<th>Number Examples</th>
<th>Images</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TYPE UNKNOWN</td>
<td>EARLY HALAF</td>
<td>E.H. Type unknown&lt;br&gt;Unique examples that do not match with other examples</td>
<td>Anatolia: 7</td>
<td>Anatolia: TK-3 ←TK-6 ←GH-6 ←DT-10&lt;br&gt;Syria: 1 ←TA-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Syria: 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LATE HALAF</td>
<td>L.H. Type unknown&lt;br&gt;Unique Examples that do not match with other examples</td>
<td>Anatolia: 12</td>
<td>Anatolia: CK-10 ←DT-11&lt;br&gt;Syria: CB-37 ←TA-11 ←KK-22 ←TH-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Syria: 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>POST HALAF</td>
<td>PH. Type unknown&lt;br&gt;Ubaid figurines out of scope</td>
<td>Anatolia: 2</td>
<td>Anatolia TK-11 ←TK-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Syria: none</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Gender and Materiality**

There are a few determinations that do not go into the typology here that might be found in those of others. This is because the development of this simplified typology depends upon the most dominant feature of the group of figurines which would distinguish those examples from those of another type. The typology is derived from a grouping of the figurines after they were
studied and cataloged and therefore came late in the project. In many ways it is the typology itself that is the main finding of this dissertation. In the development of the typology, I also developed a methodology and instrument for analysis that did not exist when I was studying these objects and creating a catalog. Therefore, due to the time constraints of the dissertation process, this methodological instrument of analysis may not be integrated into the analysis to an ideal extent. An attempt has been made to integrate the terminology of the typology into the analysis in this dissertation,

While gender and materiality are important to social practices embedded in figurine conception, making, use, and perhaps also discard, these are not factors in the working typology developed for this project. The typology is based upon morphological grouping, and, in the Halaf, gender and materiality has been found not to be factors that influence the overall shape of Halaf figurines. A practical reason for using morphology as an overall determination of figurine type is that this system allows most fragments to be assigned to types.

Therefore, in the typology used here, figurines of the same type can be of stone or clay if they are fashioned into the same shape regardless of the raw material or degree of technological effort used to make them. An example is Type LH/EH.2B, a fully flat figurine type, which exists in clay (early Halaf examples: FH-1, FH-3, TK-2, GH-1, SAB-1; late Halaf examples: ÇT-2, KeshS-1, TH-22) and in stone (late Halaf examples ÇT-1, DT-1, DT-2, DT-3, DT-4, DT-5, DT-6, DT-7, DT-8, DT-9, TH-21, Arj-1, Arj-2, Arj-3, Arj-4, Arj-5, Arj-6). Equally, figurines in the same type can visually represent either males or females or exhibit no visual markers with which to determine a represented gender. Therefore, although the overwhelming gender representation is female, there are a few examples of figurines with visual markers here interpreted as male indicators (see Appendix C, column 6).
These markers or visual indicators of biological gender are observed attached to or painted on the torso. Because so many examples are fragments and fragmented in ways that all or part of the torso is missing, gendered types would not work for the entire corpus. These indicators include breasts, public areas most times represented as triangles and sometimes decorated with painting; incision or punctuation; and penises, both appliqué and painted. In some examples, particularly those of Types 2, incisions might be interpreted as vulvas.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type 1A</th>
<th>Type 1B</th>
<th>Type 1C</th>
<th>Type 2A</th>
<th>Type 2B</th>
<th>Type 2C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female Indicators</td>
<td>Large Breasts</td>
<td>Pubic triangles</td>
<td>None observed</td>
<td>Breasts?</td>
<td>Incised vulva?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Indicators</td>
<td>None observed</td>
<td>Small breasts</td>
<td>None observed</td>
<td>Appliqué penis</td>
<td>Clay appliqué penis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morphological indicators possibly embedded with gendered meaning</td>
<td>Closed legs, arms supporting large breasts = female?</td>
<td>Open leg hands on knees = male?</td>
<td>Legs are closed = female?</td>
<td>Arm stubs indicating arms holding implied breasts = female?</td>
<td>None observed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared indicators</td>
<td>Similar painted, incised, or appliqué decoration at head, neck, arms, waist, legs, feet</td>
<td>None observed</td>
<td>No legs or feet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cataloging Conventions in Appendices A and B
All figurines available for hands-on study were measured with the same calipers to the tenth of a millimeter. The catalog records heights, widths, and thickness as well as measurements of notable features which are also localized e.g., back-of-head-to-nose or buttocks-to-toes. Published measurements were recorded for those figurines that were inaccessible, and in some cases estimates were made based upon scales provided in published illustrations. The research involved analyzing the figurines morphologically and describing representative and technological manufacturing details as well as noting characteristics of the raw material. If gender was represented and could be determined by biological markers (i.e., phallus, pudenda, breasts), it was noted within four categories – male, female, both, or
undeterminable. Stand-ability, handle-ability, hang-ability, and other clues of use and display were noted early on in this study as an important clue to functionality; these features are also noted in the catalog. As this research shows, many examples were specifically designed to sit or stand on a flat surface without support, while others were designed to be suspended from a cord or string. Nearly all examples were small enough to comfortably be held in a single hand when in use, and it was invaluable to experience that with many examples.

Because of the concern for recording the full object biography, the condition of the figurine including wear, damage, or breakage from use was also noted to determine if there were any patterns of damage or breakage. Attachment scars differ from breaks because they are structural failures at places where another piece of clay which was originally attached to the clay core or substrate is now detached and most often lost. Like other breaks, detachment probably happened as a result of stress on the object. These scars serve not only as clues for the reconstruction of the original complete shape of the figurines; they are also important indicators of the sequences of construction of each figurine. Attachment scars are most often found in the original place of breasts and at joints such as hips and arm sockets. Detached body parts were rarely found in the available excavated assemblages. Perhaps they were not recognized as figurine parts during excavation. Some have suggested that figurine parts were traded or shared and were deliberately deconstructed for that purpose. This has been suggested for Neolithic Greek figurines by Talalay (1987) and for pre-Halaf figurines from Tell Sabi Abyad by Verhoven (2007). These suggestions remain theoretical because there is no empirical evidence to support them other than that the parts are missing from the excavated figurine examples.

---

76 Voigt (1983) has proposed that figurine use can be determined from breakage patterns, but patterns don’t seem easily determinable for Halaf figurines.
77 I have not seen this term used in any publication; it is possible that this dissertation is the first use of attachment scar as an analytical term in figurine studies.
The production of figurines in segments suggests some intentionality or at least awareness that the figurines would finally break into those same parts. Ceramic production was highly skilled in the Halaf; stabilization of clay objects at high temperatures in kilns was certainly available at most if not all Halaf settlements. However, many of the clay figurines in this dissertation were sun-dried, meaning they were fragile, friable, and impermanent objects, particularly when handled. Others were fired, such as most from Chagar Bazar (Alexandra Fletcher, personal communication, 2014) but were also fragile enough to be broken. Production of clay figurines constructed from representational body parts was a conscious and deliberate practice in the Halaf, handling and storage resulted in fragmentation at vulnerable locations and stress points. This use continued after damage and took its toll on stone figurines as well. Therefore, many examples are broken at the neck, elbow, or feet, and wear at some of these breaks indicates that many of these figurine fragments had value and usefulness after damage and breakage.

A mundane but useful contribution of this dissertation is a record – when possible – of all known numbers and current locations associated with each figurine. This is an aspect of comparative studies that is all too often omitted or difficult to obtain, but it is essential for facilitating hands-on consultation. Over half this corpus is already published in primary and/or comparative studies, museum numbers and locations are often not noted, were perhaps not known, or have changed since publication. Each example is also given a dissertation number so that it is uniquely identified within the dissertation and can be easily cross-referenced to other publications. The publication history of each example is also noted in the catalog. This dissertation is intended to be a synthetic work that starts a conversation in Halaf studies about the

---

78 Some clay figurine heads are not attached at the neck, but are rather part of a larger piece including shoulders and neck.
usability of figurines and other small finds as archaeological diagnostics that are typologically variable. Therefore, this research directly facilitates additional analysis of figurines in the future.\textsuperscript{79}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Catalog field</th>
<th>Explanation and source of data within field</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Dissertation Number</td>
<td>Unique number assigned to each figurine. Please see references for site abbreviations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Museum Number, Excavation Number, Other Number</td>
<td>Records the current location of the figurine example and all numbers associated with it from the field recording to museum cataloging. All numbers including those of former museums since superseded by new numbers are recorded when available. These numbers are often found written on the figurine or bags and tags physically associated with it and are sometimes found in published reports or excavation archives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Type</td>
<td>The type of figurine incorporating phase, type, and subtype to which this figurine is assigned in this dissertation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Date</td>
<td>Halaf phase to which this figurine is assigned in this dissertation, stated either by stratigraphy, typology, or hypothesis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Findspot</td>
<td>Reported excavation season year, level, excavation unit, locus, and lot of where the figurine was found.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Archaeological Context</td>
<td>Interpretation of the above findspot, association with built or other features, further discussed in the relevant locations in Chapters 4 or 5.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Drawing, Photograph</td>
<td>Unless otherwise noted, the drawings and photographs were made by the author with permission of the rights holders. Photographs and drawings by others as noted are reproduced with their permission. These images are not to scale with each other, but millimeter scales are incorporated when available.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Description</td>
<td>This includes a description of the figurine example, beginning with the overall morphological shape, gender when discernible by biological markers of sexual difference, and representation of all bodily elements from the head downward. The last part of the description is dedicated to the surface decoration and stability of standing or sitting on a flat surface with or without support. When conjecture is used in the description because of missing fragments, the description or plural is placed in [brackets].</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Size</td>
<td>The length, width, and thickness of all examples are presented to the tenth of a millimeter as generally read on the same set of calipers throughout the study period. If the figurine was not available for hands-on measurement, estimations are placed in [brackets].</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Technology</td>
<td>This includes a description of visual observations relating to the making and use of the figurine. This description begins with a statement of the rare material and a Munsell color reading of the surface, core, and paint when available and overall manipulation of the material (e.g., baked, unbaked, assembled, cut, ground). The last part of the technical description considers evidence for use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Condition</td>
<td>Description of the current condition of the figurine as observed including modern repairs if any.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Comparanda</td>
<td>This is a statement of any similar examples of figurines elsewhere in the corpus. If a figurine is an example of a well-established type, such as LH.1A figurines, they are not offered as comparanda with each other unless there is a certain compelling aspect of the examples that visually or technologically link them to each other.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Publication</td>
<td>Recording of all known instances of publication of the particular figurine example. Full citations to publications can be found in the References Consulted section of this dissertation. Note is made if a figurine is unpublished.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{79} This information may sadly be needed to document and track down figurines missing, threatened, or already destroyed by the presently continuing conflict in Syria.
Distinction is made in this study between excavated and archaeological context in order to clearly divide modern from ancient practices and depositional processes. *Findspot* information is found in site archives and museum and excavation catalogs and reports. This documentation is associated with each example according to the internal recording system of the excavation. Individual site recording systems differ and describe a particular location in terms of lot, locus, depth from the surface, and/or trench name. *Archaeological context* is the place of disposition of the figurine translated by archaeological analysis into past structures, spaces, associated features, and cultural period dates, mostly in publications. This information comes mainly from an analysis of archaeological reports but can also come from communication from excavators and the study of excavation archives. It is important to record both types of information because, although a site may be published and analyzed, all figurine exemplars are rarely included. Publications of excavations often do not go beyond find-spot in preliminary site reports. In making this distinction, this dissertation attempts to be transparent about directly accessed data which were collected and analyzed through study and those which were obtained from a secondary source.

**Dating Figurines**

A figurine that is type unknown cannot have a typological date; if it does not appear to fit with its reported stratigraphic date, it gets a hypothetical date. When figurine is not visually strong in its type and if it is without a stratigraphic date or does not appear to fit typologically with its reported one, it gets a hypothetical date. There are three dating strategies for the figurines cataloged in this thesis; each figurine is given one of these types of dates.

**Stratigraphic date:** This is the date of the context within which the figurine was found reported by the excavators; it is the strongest type of dating. The assignment of this date to a figurine acknowledges that this example typologically fits with this date. 

*100 figurines are assigned this type of date in this dissertation.*
**Typological date:** This is the date assigned to the figurine because its morphological features typologically fit within the subtype of others which have been stratigraphically dated. These examples may not have a documented findspot, or the typological evidence strongly disputes the date of the reported findspot.

86 figurines are assigned this type of date in this dissertation.

**Hypothetical date:** This date is assigned to figurines for which the findspot and archaeological context is unknown and which is a unique example which cannot be given a subtype. This type of date is also assigned to those figurines which do not appear to fit with the archaeological context reported by the excavators or which cannot be fit into the typology constructed for this thesis.

11 figurines are assigned this type of date in this dissertation.

The dating phases can be found at the upper right of each catalog entry. Each figurine is placed within one of these Halaf phases in Appendices A and B based either upon stratigraphy, typology, or hypothesis:

**Early Halaf:** This phase is roughly dated to the first half of the sixth millennium BCE. In this dissertation, this phase is inclusive of early and middle Halaf.

42 figurines are associated with the early Halaf phase in this dissertation.

**Late Halaf:** This phase is roughly dated to the second half of the sixth millennium BCE. In this dissertation, this phase is inclusive of late Halaf and Halaf Ubaid Tradition.

153 figurines are associated with the late Halaf phase in this dissertation.

**Post Halaf:** This designation is given to any figurines which date later than the Halaf, including the Ubaid and all other cultural periods afterward.

2 figurines are associated with post Halaf phases in this dissertation.

In the methodological analysis of Halaf figurines presented in this dissertation, these two factors – type of dating and actual phasing – have a symbiotic relationship with each other as well as with a third factor, typology. The diagnostic strength of a type or subtype is based in part on the strength of its chronology. Therefore, if a type is dated by stratigraphy in significant numbers, it can be said to be a diagnostic type for a Halaf phase. Furthermore, if a chronologically strong type of figurine is found, it can be either an early or late Halaf diagnostic for the excavation area. Type 1 seated figurines in the late Halaf (or Type LH.1A, LH.1B, and LH.1C) are examples of a
diagnostic Halaf figurine type. Another example are Type 2 flat standing figurines, but this encompasses only those rendered in stone (or Type LH.2B), which are only known from well-stratified late Halaf contexts. If either of these are found in excavation, they indicate Late Halaf activity. For the early Halaf, Type EH.2A, standing or kneeling figurines with rounded bases and flat upper bodies, might be an example of the early Halaf, but these are also found in pre-Halaf settlement levels (Collet 1996), so they cannot be considered exclusively diagnostic for the early Halaf.

**Chronology of Halaf Figurines**

The relative and absolute chronology of late Neolithic cultures in northern Mesopotamia has been much debated and discussed since the first stratified excavation of the sounding at Nineveh (Mallowan 1933; Gut 1995). Excavation and recording techniques have become more rigorous over the century, and these techniques and strategies can be grouped into six categories for the Halaf sites (*Table 3.13, p. 134*). The programs of excavation, recording, post excavation processing, analysis, and publication differ with each dig, and many are related to the training, capabilities, and country of origin of the excavation director amongst many other factors. Much has been written on the proper goals of and methods for conducting archaeology. The historiography of this on-going, and endless debate is well summarized by Trigger:

> Most archaeologists continue to regard archaeology as a means to study human behaviour and cultural change in the past, although they are far from agreed about what is involved in doing so. (1989, 371)

Indeed this fact has real consequences for a comparative study such as this one, and the most difficult aspect to rectify is the creation of an operational relative and comparable absolute chronology. It is no wonder that many figurine studies have relied upon descriptions of figurines as objects in isolation from their archaeological or invented functional evidence, given that comparisons of stratigraphic and chronological context are so difficult to negotiate (i.e., Ucko
Further, available absolute dates – which are theoretically comparable across sites – do not directly correlate with the find spots of any figurine examples. Therefore, a simplified chronology using a hybrid approach which considers both typology and depositional context is used here with two phases, early Halaf and late Halaf.

Chronological challenges specific to this assemblage must be stated at the outset. The 18 Halaf sites bearing figurines were all excavated at different times and under different archaeological methodologies. Each employed new and existing internal and external dating structures in its analysis to varying degrees using absolute dating or relative ceramic comparison. Multiyear projects which dug large exposures such as those at Domuztepe, Yarim Tepe I, II, III, and Sabi Abyad are the exception rather than the norm. Many excavations exposed just a few trenches over a couple of seasons and lacked the resources to produce final reports or absolute dates. This was often because they were rescue excavations or supported Ph.D. dissertations (e.g., Kazane Höyük, Çavı Tarlası, Tell Aqab, Tell Kashkashok, Kerkuşt Höyük) (Table 3.13, row 5-6). Other excavations dug deep and narrow soundings within which Halaf levels contained figurines, but the few horizontal meters exposure did not produce chronologically or stratigraphically anchoring associated assemblages or architectural features (e.g., Tepe Gawra, Chagar Bazar, Tell Aqab). Other excavations were not as concerned with recording a stratigraphic record and an archaeological context of small finds and randomly opened trenches across the tell in promising areas (e.g., Tell Halaf, Arpachiyah).

The first decades of excavation of Halaf figurines, those at Tell Halaf (1911-13, 1927), Tepe Gawra (1932-38), Arpachiyah (1933), and Chagar Bazar (1934-5 and 1938), were

---

80 While the upper levels 1-10 at Tepe Gawra were excavated by wholesale stripping off settlement levels on the tepe, by the time the prehistoric levels were reached, the excavation was essentially a sounding. These Halaf levels (17-20) were supplemented by two soundings into lower areas in the eroded sides of the tell, called Area A and the
accomplished by quick excavations of deep soundings into the tops and sides of tells with close to one hundred workmen and only a handful of trained archaeologists, who were rarely present to record the findspots of the figurines first-hand at the location they were found. These excavations still provided the basis of relative chronology for Mesopotamian prehistory, but the recorded findspots of many figurines from these excavations are quite vague, the predictable result of wholesale removal of large amounts of settlement soils. Many of these examples were in fact not found in the course of excavation but rather by picking through excavated soils in a basket, wheelbarrow, or spoil heap. These figurines appear to have been assigned to the levels either by conjecture or hearsay rather than in the field at the findspot. While the technique of the sounding should theoretically produce sealed levels, typologically identifiable Halaf figurines are published at all levels of these sites suggesting that levels were mixed in excavation or by erosion (Table 3.13, below, first row).

Post-war excavations employed more modern techniques of excavation, with a focus on lateral excavations concentrating on sites offering prehistoric architectural remains directly under the surface. The figurines from these sites are difficult to associate with a findspot because they are generally associated with an architectural level, though rarely with a built feature. Most likely they are associated with the fill surrounding an architectural feature and probably post-date it. The sites excavated and recorded mainly by architectural level in (Table 3.13, below, row 2). A combination of both techniques was employed at a few later excavations where soundings with arbitrary levels were more carefully excavated. For some sites the location of the soundings excavated may have been an eroded area (Tell Aqab) or, because the sequence of occupation was brief (Girikihacryan), typologically similar figurines were found in every level (Table 3.13,

---

NE Base, which also yielded (earlier?) Halaf material culture. For an explanation of the excavation and recording strategy of Tepe Gawra see Peasnall and Rothman (2003).
The most recent excavations are also the most comprehensive, offering complex stratigraphic sequences and large lateral and horizontal exposures excavated by large teams over many years. However, the complex artifact assemblages and recording systems mean that published data can be slow to appear. At the completion of this dissertation in 2013, all of these excavations are essentially publication projects, since none are still actively working in the field (Table 3.13, below, row 6) (e.g., Fıstıklı Höyük, Tell Kurdu, Domuztepe, Tell Sabi Abyad, Chagar Bazar, and Tell Halaf). Forthcoming reports from these excavations should assist in filling out knowledge of Halaf comparative chronology.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Excavation Strategy</th>
<th>Sites in Iraq, Turkey, Syria</th>
<th>Chronological Contexts available?</th>
<th>Absolute Dating available?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Soundings with arbitrary levels, which may have been established post-excavation</td>
<td>Tell Halaf (1920s), Arpachiyah, Chagar Bazar (1930s), Tepe Gawra,</td>
<td>Not recorded, nor published. Finds often from spoil heaps.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Lateral excavation by architectural level</td>
<td>Yarim Tepe I-III, Tell Hassuna, Çavı Tarlası</td>
<td>Not generally published, mixed deposits</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Lateral excavation by arbitrary measured levels</td>
<td>Tell Aqab, Girikihacıyan, Tell Aqab</td>
<td>Yes, though found in mixed deposits</td>
<td>Yes, though questionable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Halaf Pit</td>
<td>Choga Mami</td>
<td>Associated with single event</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Rescue Excavations</td>
<td>Tell abu Dhahir, Tell Hassan, Tell Kashkashok, Kerkuşti Höyük</td>
<td>Contexts not always published, mixed deposits</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Excavation by settlement levels</td>
<td>Fıstıklı Höyük, Kazane Höyük, Tell Kurdu, Tell Sabi Abyad, Chagar Bazar (2000s), Tell Halaf (2000s), Domuztepe</td>
<td>Yes, stratigraphic level available and sometimes laterally located findspot. But final reports slow to appear</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Recent innovations in calibrating of $^{14}$C (radiocarbon) and AMS (Accelerator Mass Spectrometry) dates have facilitated fine-grained gradation of more accurate absolute dates than those that have been available in the past (Bowman 1990; radiocarbon CONTEXT database).

---

81 All excavations in Syria had their last seasons in 2010, and the uprising is continuing in that country. The Domuztepe team had their final excavation season in 2011. Therefore, as of 2013 it appears that there are no open Halaf excavations in Turkey, Syria, or Iraq.
Bayesian analysis has been particularly helpful in absolute chronological comparative analysis (Banning 2007). However, there has been less innovation in creating cogent holistic relative dating studies that include scientific and archaeological constructions which take into account the gaps in evidence (Manning 2007). In this dissertation dates supported by absolute means are stated as [date] cal BC and relative dates supported by stratigraphy or relative means are stated as [date or millennium] BCE.

These innovations have been skillfully and usefully incorporated with Halaf historiographical, stratigraphic, and ceramic analysis by Stuart Campbell, and the chronological framework of this dissertation is based on his most recent reckoning of Halaf chronological issues (2007). This chronology is scaled specifically to Halaf figurines, which have their own specific issues. As Campbell states:

Different phenomena may relate to different aspects of material culture…. because they are related to different social stimuli. They will certainly vary with the scale of the project because the relevant phenomena are simply those that are relevant at that scale… we need to isolate process of social change and place them in contexts of time and space. (2007, 132-133)

For the Halaf figurine phenomenon, a significant problem is that the assignment of their time and space, as provided by the available well-stratified contexts for all examples, rests on a very small and scattered data set compared to that for pottery. A large majority of the figurine assemblage comes from a time before implementation of modern fieldwork techniques, and only a few figurines can be associated with recorded findspots. Assemblages from Syria and Turkey are slightly better contextualized because most of them were excavated in the second half of the twentieth century when more rigorous techniques were employed, but there are few directly associated absolute dates. The specific findspots are not always found in available resources, so documentation is limited to stratigraphic levels and/or general excavation units. Sealed and
secure datable contexts are simply not the norm for Halaf figurines, which are commonly found singly or in groups loose in the fill of settlement debris. Therefore, fine-grained chronological analysis exclusively of the Halaf figurine assemblage is simply not possible.

Given the vagaries and available data, what is feasible for a figurine chronology is a simplified structure of two broad early and late Halaf phases. The goal is to be grounded with well-stratified examples; however, it is unavoidable for all comparative studies like this one that they must necessarily rely on the recording systems, strategies, and data as reported by others. This project began with the lofty goal of comparing hundreds of figurines solidly anchored in minutely documented, excavated contexts, but the reality is that this goal can never be realized given the available data. Deep introspection into the entire assemblage in an attempt to arrive at a fine-grained chronology of Halaf figurines would potentially generate more questions than answers.

When the few well-recorded and well documented figurine assemblages are used as comparanda, stratigraphy and chronology of other figurine assemblages are called into question. For example, at Tell Aqab (*Chapter 4*), late Halaf type 1A figurines were found in all levels, including those said to be middle and early Halaf. Some Amuq E (normally correlated to Ubaid) trenches at Tell Kurdu yielded figurines that typologically resemble early Halaf examples (*Chapter 4*). Unfortunately, the sample size and associated data sets are not large enough to statistically weighted reliable and unreliable contexts. Overall, the questions that arise as to the stratigraphy of sites foundational this study are those that have not been asked previously because no one has looked at the figurines comparatively before.

Given these challenges to creating any fine-grained analysis of dating, this study uses a bipartite chronological division of the period. The framework here is two Halaf phases: Early
Halaf (which includes the phase designated elsewhere as Middle Halaf) and Late Halaf (which includes that called the Halaf Ubaid Transition or ‘HUT’). The relative chronology is worked out amidst known site chronologies in Table 3.15, below. This two-phased chronology used for this dissertation organizes Halaf figurines into early and late groups roughly contemporary within several hundred years either in the first half or the second half of the sixth millennium BCE. There is no definite dividing line between the late and early Halaf, which, like the cultural period itself is an archaeological construct. In this binary chronological construct an either/or situation is set up, when, indeed, the context of some figurines may chronologically span both early and late or extend beyond the beginning or end.

Previous chronological constructs have created phases called pre-Halaf, proto-Halaf, transitional-Halaf, middle-Halaf, and Halaf Ubaid Transitional, resulting in published discussions of Halaf chronology that cover periods back to the seventh and well into the fifth millennium (calibrated). A solution to the transitional issue between the early and late Halaf was presented long ago by Mallowan (Mallowan and Rose 1935), who proposed a middle Halaf phase to organize his finds from Arpachiyah, most of which cannot be localized to stratigraphic findspots. Davidson followed Mallowan’s tripartite chronology imposing middle Halaf on his Tell Aqab trench levels physically above early and below late Halaf without identifying stylistic changes in the ceramics to support a different phase (1977, Campbell 1996). There are no discernible diagnostic changes to figurines in the mid-sixth millennium either, so the few examples with findspots in so-called middle Halaf levels are part of the early phase in this dissertation. The Halaf Ubaid Transitional (HUT) phase is similarly difficult to define.

---

82 For example, Campbell (2007) included discussion of Ubaid levels; Cruells and Nieuwenhuys (2004) covered a much longer period than the proto Halaf.
83 Analysis of unpublished Tell Aqab figurines along with their recorded findspot on tags in the Aleppo museum reveals that typologically late Halaf figurines were found in every level, suggesting these were mixed levels.
stylistically given the material culture (Irving 2001, Campbell and Fletcher 2010). The figurines which are said to be from HUT contexts are not discernible from those of the late Halaf, so these are encompassed under the late Halaf phase in this dissertation. Many Ubaid-level figurines are indeed very different from Halaf (e.g., TK-11, TK-12, and Daems 2007; McAdams 2003). For figurines there is a definite change in style and perhaps also in iconography after the end of the Halaf.

The chronological chart that ends this chapter (Table 3.15) presents a constructed, bipartite early/late Halaf relative chronology. This chart is based on the comparative work of others, dependent mainly on ceramic evidence (Watkins and Campbell 1987; Copeland and Hours 1987; Miyake 1998; Cruells and Nieuwenhuyse 2004; Campbell 2007; Oates 1982; Thissen 2006; Ehrich 1992, fig 2-3, as well as individual site reports). This study does not seek to challenge the conclusions of these studies on overall Halaf chronology but rather to reckon them to a simplified chronology to support the figurine data available. This structure of early/late Halaf will therefore allow clustering of technological and typological styles and consideration of connections to the pre-Halaf and post-Halaf cultural periods. An additional chronological charts includes absolute chronology for Anatolia (Table 4.17 p. 150) but this data is not currently available for Syria.

A Preliminary Chronology of Halaf Figurines

The chronological binary of early or late Halaf works well for this figurine assemblage; therefore, it follows Campbell’s aforementioned recommendation that chronologies should fit the artifact phenomena for which they are constructed. Typologically arranged, the figurine examples begin to define a Halaf figurine chronology, in either early or late Halaf phases (Table

---

84 Campbell points out that the Halaf as a coherent entity with a solid beginning middle and end is itself a modern construction (2007, 104-105). Others have lamented the “terrifying complexity of Halaf chronology” (Cruells and Nieuwenhuyse 2005, 49).
There are considerably more late Halaf examples (47 for Anatolia, and 109 for Syria) than early phase examples (30 for Anatolia and 12 for Syria). Some typological characteristics can now be known as diagnostic of one phase or another. For example, Type 1, seated figurines, were not found in any early Halaf phases; all occur in the late Halaf at the sites considered in this dissertation.

With the exception of two figurines from Anatolia, one unavailable for study, GH-5, and a visually ambiguous, not well dated variation, TK-4, all LH.1A and LH.1B figurines are from Syria comprising 84 examples. Most sub-types of Type 2, standing figurines, occur in both early and late phases (Table 3.14, row 2). This type can now be considered a continuous general Halaf type, which is difficult to place into a chronological phase without stratigraphic evidence. Type 3, figurine vessels, also only occur in the late Halaf phase and only at Domuztepe (Table 3.14, row 3), though there are comparanda found at late Halaf sites in Iraq. Therefore, it can be suggested that figurine vessels are diagnostic types only for the late Halaf period. Type 4, seal pendant figurines, occur in only ten examples in this dissertation. All but one, UQ-1, come from Anatolian sites (Table 3.14, row 4), though exemplars are also known from Iraq. Seals representing feet are mostly dated to the early Halaf, EH.4B, with a single exception of DT-19 dating to a late Halaf level. Hand seals LH.4C might be dated only to the late Halaf, but the evidence for that rests on a single example, DT-18. Full body seal representations, EH/LH.4A are represented by three examples in the early Halaf, FH-4, TK-13, and UQ-1. A single example, a surface find at Çavı Tarlası, ÇT-14, is assigned to the late Halaf, but it could well be early Halaf, although no other figurines from the site appear to be from that phase.

---

85 It is possible that there are more anthropomorphic seals, which were not presented to me at museums, as I asked to look at figurines in my research request. However, I have presented all anthropomorphic figurine seal pendants known from publication. For a more comprehensive examination of Halaf seals, see Denham (2013).
Table 3.14: Chronological chart of Halaf figurine types

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Type</th>
<th>Early Halaf occurrences by region and sub-types</th>
<th>Late Halaf occurrences by region and sub-types</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type 1 seated figurines</strong></td>
<td><strong>None</strong></td>
<td><strong>LH.1A most Syria, (Anatolia, 2 examples)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Type LH.1B Syria only</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Type LH.1C most Anatolia (Syria, 2 examples)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type 2 standing figurines</strong></td>
<td>EH.2A Syria and Anatolia EH.2B Syria and Anatolia EH.2C Syria and Anatolia EH.2D Syria and Anatolia EH.2E <strong>none</strong></td>
<td>LH.2A Syria only LH.2B Syria and Anatolia LH.2C Syria only LH.2D Anatolia only LH.2E Syria and Anatolia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type 3 figurine vessels</strong></td>
<td><strong>None</strong></td>
<td><strong>LH.3A Anatolia (DT only)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type 4 figurine seal pendants</strong></td>
<td>EH.4A Syria and Anatolia EH.4B Anatolia only EH.4C <strong>none</strong></td>
<td><strong>LH.1A Anatolia (ÇT-14, 1 example)</strong> LH.4B Anatolia (DT-19, 1 example) LH.4C Anatolia (DT-18, 1 example)**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Conclusion**

This chapter has presented a new methodology for studying a cultural corpus of figurines using the artifacts themselves and their archaeological context as the influence for interpretation. A simplified means of handling the excavation contexts and circumstances of each sites figurine assemblage and associated chronological data is presented. For the first time, a typology of Halaf figurines was presented and described. The following chapters put this methodology into practice with two regional corpora of figurines. The typology constructed and presented here will be used to consider stratigraphic claims of excavators as well as prehistoric connections and shared influences across settlements at the point of conception, making use and discard of figurines. Finally the data collected using this method will be considered together in the final chapter to consider issues of fragmentation, gender, intersectionality and embodied identity.
### Table 3.15: Relative chronology of key Halaf sites considered in this dissertation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Upper Balikh and Khabur region</th>
<th>Upper Euphrates/Tigris Region</th>
<th>Cilicia</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tell Sabi Abyad &amp; Balikh</td>
<td>Tell Halaf</td>
<td>Chagar Bazar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hammam et Turkman</td>
<td>old 4-5</td>
<td>Ubaid</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**LATE HALAF**
- **Halaf III**
  - Halaf-Ubaid Transitional (HUT)
  - Halaf IIIB- Traditional Late Halaf

**EARLY HALAF**
- **Sabi Abyad**
  - **Halaf IIIA** 1
  - **Middle Halaf** 2
  - **Halaf IA-B** 3

**Hassuna Ia**
- **Transitional, Proto Halaf, Pre-Halaf, Samarra,**
  - Proto Halaf 4-5-6
  - Pre Halaf 8-11

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Halif IIIA</strong></th>
<th><strong>Middle Halaf</strong></th>
<th><strong>EARLY HALAF</strong></th>
<th><strong>Hassuna Ia</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>old painted palace</td>
<td>new area B &amp; under historic</td>
<td>new CB III-V</td>
<td>Proto Halaf alt-mono-chrome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>old 6-9 AC</td>
<td>new</td>
<td>old 10-12 Halaf</td>
<td>13-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HUT</td>
<td>Late Halaf</td>
<td>Middle Halaf</td>
<td>TKK II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TKK III &amp; TKK I</td>
<td>1-</td>
<td>IIx IIIa or late Halaf</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2a-b</td>
<td>3-4</td>
<td>IIIb</td>
<td>Amuq C north mound</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>IIIc</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>IV</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** Some sites in this chronology have levels which have been fixed by absolute dates. These dates are charted in absolute chronology tables for each region in the relevant chapters. For an overview of the absolute and relative dating of the Halaf, see Campbell(2007).
CHAPTER FOUR: Halaf Figurines from Anatolia (Turkey)

This chapter examines the archaeological and typological circumstances of seventy-four figurines found at ten Anatolian Halaf settlements during the excavation of seven sites (Fıstıklı Höyük, Tell Kurdu, Girikhiacıyan, Çavı Tarlası, Domuztepe, Kerkuştu Höyük, and Kazane Höyük) in Turkey, all situated in the southeast of the country. These figurines represent the full chronological spectrum of the Halaf in Anatolia. Four early Halaf settlements (Fıstıklı Höyük, Girikhiacıyan, Tell Kurdu, and Domuztepe) yielded 30 figurines. Six late Halaf settlements (Tell Kurdu, Domuztepe, Çavı Tarlası, Kerkuştu Höyük, and Kazane Höyük), yielded 46 figurines. While the total number of figurines is lower than that of sites in Syria or Iraq, Anatolian Halaf figurine examples show a range of local and regional choices in representing the Anatolian Halaf body that were different but nonetheless related to those in other parts of the Halaf world.

Taken as a regional corpus, these choices of representation of the body in figurine form appear in large part to have been constricted by the ideologies of each community. However, there is also evidence of shared practices across regions, as some are similar to those found Syria and Iraq. There is great variety within the assemblages from each settlement, not only typologically but also in materials and technology, perhaps indicating a degree of individual agency in representational choice not as prevalent in other Halaf regions. While connections of typological and iconographical elements and material are shared with figurines found across the Halaf phenomenon, the Anatolian figurines hold together as a regional corpus as well. There are also representational connections to figurines found in regions further west into central Anatolia at sites beyond the scope of this project.

Excavation at many sites revealed more than one settlement, the number ten for settlements separates chronologically different settlements showing figurines and other material culture from the early or late phase. It is also probable that within each phase, there were contemporary but physically distinct settlements.
Introduction to the Anatolian Halaf

Halaf settlements have long been identified in Anatolia, but in the last 20 years archaeological research has flourished in this region especially now that modern conflicts have closed Iraq and Syria to foreign researchers. Halaf pottery was first found at sites now located in Turkey, for example Sakçe Gözü in 1908 and 1911 (Garstang 1908, du Plat Taylor et al. 1950) and Yunus Tepe near Carchemish in 1912 (Woolley 1934). Despite these early discoveries, when the first synthetic studies of the Halaf appeared in the 1960s and 1970s, Anatolian Halaf material culture was presented as imitative of what was perceived to be true Halaf known from Northern Syria and Iraq. Anatolian Halaf figurines record a variety of ways of conceiving and representing the body, but there is no reason to consider them imitative, derivative, or peripheral to ways of conceptualizing and representing Halaf bodies further south or east. When the Anatolian corpus is examined in its entirety against that of modern day Iraq and Turkey, regional relationships and influences, at least through the lens of the figurines, appear to be much more reciprocal than previously supposed. Given that cultural horizons and regions are modern ideas imposed upon prehistory created from material culture evidence, it is necessary to be mindful that the Halaf as defined today did not in itself provide identity to those living in sixth millennium BCE northern Mesopotamia. Therefore, all claims of a so-called true center or heartland and a periphery as a lesser derivative should be rejected in favor of a view of the Halaf which incorporates egalitarian exchange of ideas, imagery, and technology. These concepts surrounding figurine practices range between from shared or locally based, but none are less Halaf than others.

The so-called heartland of Mesopotamia – today’s Iraq, sometimes extending into Syria – is a scholarly construction not only for the Halaf but also for the Uruk, Akkadian, Assyrian, and

---

87 Patty Jo Watson expanded upon the theory of the ‘Halaf Heartland’ originally presented by Perkins (1949) in her synthesis on the Halaf culture based on Halaf material culture known at that time. (Watson 1983).
cultures amongst others. Anatolia has been traditionally viewed as culturally subservient to and for some, not a part of Mesopotamia. Material culture connections to Mesopotamia are often labeled as the result of colonization and trade rather than reciprocal networking and communication.⁸⁸ Such one-way communication models are based on a center-periphery approach that defines more sophisticated Mesopotamians based in Iraq and (often but not always) Syria dominating receptive peoples in Anatolia who presumably had no cultural agency. And yet for all these periods, including the Halaf, archaeological research has revealed fully developed societies in Anatolia for thousands of years.

Scholarly fascination with trade routes from the Mesopotamian center to receptive peoples at its peripheries is probably more a result of twentieth-century archaeological focus on Iraq and analogies to modern colonialism than of ancient realities. Cultures such as that known as the Halaf are in themselves scholarly constructions, reflecting modern needs for chronological and geographical boundaries (Campbell 2007). There is no reason to think that sixth millennium BCE communication to the west stopped at Domuztepe or to the east stopped at the modern Iran/Iraq border. In fact the typological and technological sixth millennium BCE figurine evidence proves the contrary (Belcher 2007, Daems 2005).

My inquiry into prehistoric exchange of body imagery, adornment, and technology across Anatolia has lasted nearly two decades, and extends beyond the traditional cultural borders of Mesopotamia. My research has also extended beyond figurines into implements of adornment and ornamentation of the body such as beads and pendants and technological practice (Belcher, 2010). The Anatolian examples in this dissertation are exemplars of a complicated structure of

⁸⁸For Iraq as the center of power and Mesopotamian culture and Anatolia as periphery after the Halaf (amongst many others) see the following: for the Uruk cultural period (fourth millennium BCE) see Algaze 1993; for the Akkadian cultural period (third millennium BCE) see Liverani and Mario, ed. 1993; for the Old Assyrian culture (second millennium BCE) see Larson, Morgens, and Trolle 1976; for the Neo-Assyrian culture (first millennium BCE), see Liverani and Mario, 1995.
exchange of ideas and imagery which may not bear mapping into discernible patterns. Anatolian figurine assemblages show much more diversity than those known from further east and south; perhaps there was more local agency and freedom of choice regarding the creation and use of figurines in this region.

**Introduction to Anatolian Halaf Figurines**

The Anatolian corpus of Halaf figurines shows regional and local agency and freedom of choice in body representation guided in part by conventions distinctly Halaf. These distinctions may have also been driven by the materials choices and figurine practices outside Mesopotamia. Uniquely Halaf stylistic and technological traits are evident in these figurines, many comparable to examples found at nearby and faraway sites. Not all of these figurines are recognizably Halaf in the traditional way that the term *Halaf* is identified by Syrian and Iraqi examples, which have been the only published exemplars of Halaf figurines until quite recently (see Table 4.16, p. 149). The 76 figurines from Anatolian Halaf settlements show great variety in the ways that they represent the Halaf body and the materials and techniques used to create them. This and following sections should be read alongside Appendix A, where each figurine example is documented.

With the exception of TK-4, a possible (without strong visual recognition) variant of the type, there are no known Turkish sites that yielded late Halaf 1A and 1B seated type figurines, which are dominant at Syrian and Iraq sites and bear three dimensional upper torsos (Chapter 5, Appendix A). There are no type 1 seated figurines known from early Halaf Turkey or Syria. One seated late Halaf type, LH.1C seated type figurines is known from Turkish sites (e.g., ÇT-6, ÇT-7, ÇT-8). These have flat upper torsos and arm stubs and dangling legs of which several fragments have been found (e.g., GH-7, GH-8, GH-12, ÇT-11, ÇT-12, ÇT-13). Because this
type has the same flat upper torso as many LH.2B standing types, it is difficult to determine the overall pose of upper torso fragments (e.g., GH-4, ÇT-3).89

Standing figurines, type 2, are particularly abundant at Anatolian sites, thirty-two throughout and eighteen each in the early and late Halaf phases. Anatolian sites yielded a variety of clay standing figurines (e.g., TK-5, TK-7, TK-9, TK-10, GH-3, ÇT-2, ÇT-4, ÇT-5, ÇT-9, DT-16, KerkH-1) of different types, including type 3, clay vessels, known only at Domuztepe, (e.g., DT-12, DT-13, DT-14, DT-15). There is also a somewhat ambiguous standing or kneeling pose, type EH2.A represented in early Halaf examples (e.g., TK-1, TK-4, TK-8) that does not appear to have been carried into the late phase but that has many parallels in pre-Halaf phases known from Tell Sabi Abyad in Syria (e.g., Collet 1996). In the Early Halaf seal-pendant-figurines, type EH.4, are known as: type EH.4A, full body (FH-4, TK-13) and, EH.4B, foot, (TK-14, DT-18). In the late Halaf, seal-pendant-figurines are represented by single examples of: type LH.4A, a full body (ÇT-14), type LH.4C, a hand (DT-17), and LH.4B, a foot, (DT-19).

The LH/EH.2B, flat, standing figurine type is quite prevalent in Anatolia; it often features an hourglass or somewhat triangular shape and incised details. Material availability is probably why so many of these figurines are fashioned from stone, and the stone examples may have influenced the flatness and incisions on the clay examples. Stone figurines with minimal detail in low relief on flat form can be easy to make if stone-working skills are resident in the community. This type, such as the EH.2B figurines, is commonly found in clay in the early Halaf phase (e.g., FH-1, FH-3,TK-2, TK-7, GH-1), and late Halaf, LH.2B examples are more commonly found in stone, (ÇT-1), The most distinctive examples of LH.2B figurines are from Domuztepe, where they are also pierced for suspension, so here they are described as pendant/figurines (e.g., DT-1, DT-2, DT-3, DT-4, DT-5, DT-6). Examples also exist in clay at

89 For an explanation of Halaf figurine types developed for this dissertation, see Chapter Three.
Çavı Tarlası (ÇT-2, ÇT-4), where hybrid type examples – here designated as seated LH.1C figurines – have three dimensional lower bodies (ÇT-6, ÇT-7).

This type of figurine is also found outside of Anatolia, in Syria (Appendix B) at Sabi Abyad (SAB-1), Khirbet esh-Shenef (KeshS-1), Tell Halaf (TH-21, TH-22), Tell Arjoune (Arj-1 – Arj-6). Type LH.2B is also attested in Iraq, i.e., at Tepe Gawra (Tobler 1950, pl. XCV:e1) and Yarim Tepe I, II, III (Merpert and Munchaev 1987, 1993a, b, c). This type of figurine was called a *fiddle* or *violin* figurine by Mallowan, based upon late Halaf figurines found at Arpachiyah (e.g., Mallowan and Rose 1935, pl.Xa: 920, fig. 52.3). There are also connections of this type of figurine to slightly later figurines from Central Anatolia (Belcher 2007) as well as West Anatolian types from the late Chacolithic (Takaoğlu 2005). This is just one example of the complex interregional relationships suggested from the morphological, technological, stylistic, and typological discussion of Halaf figurines that follow.

**Anatolian Landscapes and Halaf Regions**

Certainly the research and structure of this dissertation is heavily influenced by modern political borders, as was the nature of excavation on either side of the Turkish/Syrian/Iraqi borders. The formidable mountain ranges of the Taurus and Zagros form a natural border of northern Mesopotamia. There is no real border between Halaf regions; a continuous steppe is crossed by major river valleys with little delineation between the north Syrian and Iraqi and south Turkish uplands (*Figure 4.12, p. 148*). Current political borders, drawn up at the end of World War I, are invisible lines across open plains, dotted with tells bearing prehistoric remains, many of which are yet to be excavated. Unfortunately, there are regional gaps of archaeological exploration, Halaf excavations at the intersections between these countries, which have mainly been explored by surface survey. The in-between places such as the plains south of Mardin and the Harran plain (Yardımıç 2004) extend the landscape without impediment into the Balikh and
Khabur plains of Syria. As a result of the gaps in knowledge of Halaf figurines at the border, the Anatolian examples hold together as a coherent group separate from those known from Syria and Iraq. This is true even for Syrian examples known from Tell Halaf, Sabi Abyad, and Chagar Bazar, which are quite close to the border.

Figure 4.12: Map of Anatolian sites discussed in this chapter

Halaf sites have long been known to exist in Anatolia. The first known Halaf material culture was found in the course of excavations at Sakçe Gözü (Garstang 1908), Carchemish/Nebi Yunus (Woolley 1934), Tilki Tepe (Korfmann 1962), Mersin (Garstang 1950), and Tell Turlu (Breniquet 1987 - but excavated in 1967); however, none of these sites report figurine finds. Assemblages of Halaf Figurines were discovered at seven Anatolian Halaf settlements, reports of all of which were published in the last third of the twentieth century: Tell Kurdu, Fıstıklı Höyük, Girikihacıyan, Çavı Tarlası, and Domuztepe. The particulars on each individual figurine known

---

to be excavated from Anatolian Halaf and related sites can be found in Appendix A of this dissertation.

Table 4.16: Anatolian Halaf sites with figurines, excavation, publication dates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Figurines</th>
<th>Excavation Date(s)</th>
<th>Publication of Figurines’ Date(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Girikihacıyan</td>
<td>Tigris/ Ergani</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1995-2011</td>
<td>Belcher, forthcoming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domuztepe</td>
<td>Amanus/ Cilicia</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2005, 2006</td>
<td>Figurines not yet fully published</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kazane Höyük</td>
<td>Euphrates</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2005, 2006</td>
<td>Figurines not yet fully published</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kerkuştı Höyük</td>
<td>Mardin/ Khabur</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2005, 2006</td>
<td>Saraltın 2009a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7 sites 4 regions 76 figurines 1968-2011 1988-2013

**Chronology of Anatolian Halaf Figurines**

The early Halaf figurines occur within a relatively tight chronological phase, comparing the absolute dates (Table 4.17, p. 150). However, early Halaf typological traits occur in levels at some sites such as Tell Kurdu and Girikihacıyan which have been designated by the excavators as belonging to the late phases of the Halaf. All of the figurines excavated from Halaf Anatolian sites were single finds within matrices likely resulting from multiple domestic discard activities amidst ambiguous lenses containing multitudes of small finds such as pottery lithics and similar materials. One of the issues with using typology to date isolated figurine finds within mixed, contaminated, unclear, or unpublished contexts is that there is great variation of figurine stylistic types, materials, and technology in Halaf Anatolia.
Table 4.17: Relative and absolute chronology of sites considered in this chapter

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Early Halaf Phase</th>
<th>Late Halaf</th>
<th>Overlay and underlay of Halaf Levels</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FH</td>
<td>Euphrates</td>
<td>IIIc-b: 5850-5815 cal BC</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>Parthian/Roman overlay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>IIIb-a: 5880-5750 cal BC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GH</td>
<td>Tigris/Ergani</td>
<td>“Halafian” 5740-5660 cal BC &amp; 5900-5780 cal BC *t.a.q</td>
<td>“epi-Halafian” 5340-5520 cal BC *t.p.q</td>
<td>None?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TK</td>
<td>Amuq</td>
<td>Amuq C: 5850-5700 cal BC</td>
<td>Amuq D – Amuq E</td>
<td>20th-century agricultural disturbance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KH</td>
<td>Euphrates</td>
<td>IV “KH Halaf”</td>
<td>Va-b</td>
<td>Roman overlay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Halaf</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DT</td>
<td>Amanus/Cilicia</td>
<td>Op I ditch: 5800 cal BC</td>
<td>A3 - upper architecture,</td>
<td>Byzantine graveyard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A1 Op II: 5675-5630 cal BC</td>
<td>Death Pit</td>
<td>overlay (Op I)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>cut into side of tell</td>
<td>A2 - Op I: 5590-5525 cal BC</td>
<td>Transitional and Ceramic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Burnt structure, Death Pit</td>
<td>Neolithic underlay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ÇT</td>
<td>Euphrates</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>1, 2a-b, 3 [4, 5]</td>
<td>Bronze Age overlay?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No absolute dates published</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KZ</td>
<td>Mardin/Khabur</td>
<td>Level II 5803-5885 cal BC</td>
<td>Level III 5794 – 5114 cal BC</td>
<td>Bronze Age overlay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Level III 6342 – 5927 cal BC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 sites</td>
<td>Early Halaf = 5900-5700 cal BC</td>
<td>Late Halaf = 5675-5520 cal BC</td>
<td>6 late Halaf settlements with figurines</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 early Halaf settlements with figurines</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Preliminary Discussion:

The figurines found in Halaf sites in Turkey present a repertoire and visually represented conversation around the body different from that of the rest of the Halaf world. However, that repertoire, while in a distinctive Anatolian style, is recognizable as a Halaf style as well. There were probably many reasons for this difference, and most of those presented here can only be by conjecture. Some individual figurines only vaguely compare to those known from Halaf Syria and Iraq. Nonetheless, they give important insight into what may have been important – such as gesture, pose, body profiles, and emphasis on isolated body parts – in the transmittal of body imagery during this time. In the Anatolian Halaf region, there may have been autonomy in the making of figurines. The social and cultural influences within which Anatolian Halaf figurines were created appear to be influenced not only by the Halaf cultural horizon but also by the practices of other cultures, material availability, local skill sets, and community needs.

91 For the absolute and relative dating strategies of Fistıklı Höyük see Bernbeck, Pollock, et al. (2003), 19-21.
92 Uncalibrated dates taken from Bernbeck, Pollock, and Coursey (1999, 128, Table 3), calibrated July 2012 using CalPal http://www.calpal-online.de/cgi-bin/quickcal.pl
The excavations at Fıstıklı Höyük were conducted by Reinhard Bernbeck and Susan Pollock in 1999 and 2000. At that time they were affiliated with SUNY, Binghamton. Archaeologists calculated that they had excavated 14% of the total Halaf occupation in these excavations, estimated at 0.5 hectares, of the site (Bernbeck et al. 2002, 2003). This site was one of many comprising larger project (TAÇDAM) to rescue cultural heritage before the construction of the Carchemish Dam, which was at one time planned to flood this area of the Euphrates River. This fertile area, just north of the Syrian border and east on the Euphrates River, is today concentrated with villages close to the city of Biracek, which is a major river crossing (Bernbeck, et al. 2003, 13-14). The river may well have served as a prehistoric north-south passageway to other Halaf settlements to the northeast (Kazane Höyük, Çavı Tarlastı), to the northwest (Tell Turlu and Domuztepe), and south (Nebi Yunus). This small site, comprising just half a hectare is thought to have been occupied by a seasonally mobile small population, similar to contemporaneous early Halaf settlements excavated in Syria and Turkey (Bernbeck, et al. 2003, 11).

The excavators state that the purpose for the investigation of this site was to expose the short stratigraphic sequences of the occupation layers in this site, testing the hypothesis that “complex mobility” was a part of the Halaf cultural horizon (Bernbeck et al. 2003, 11). The stated hope was that excavations might demonstrate that a degree of mobility existed in the Halaf lifestyle (Bernbeck et al. 2003, 2). The excavators cite the work of Akkermans and Duistermaat (1997), who first proposed existence of nomadic economies in the Halaf based on their analysis of sealings found in the pre-Halaf Burnt Village of Tell Sabi Abyad (level 6).

93 Completed in 2000, the Carchemish Dam’s inundation area was modified, and this site was not flooded.
Excavation of Fıstıklı Höyük Figurines

The stratigraphy of Fıstıklı Höyük is divided into seven phases, the upper levels (I-II) date to the Parthian and Roman periods but was mixed with Halaf artifacts; no figurines were found in these levels. No figurines were found in the lowest level, IV, either, which may be the remains of nomadic occupation. Three figurines were all found in level III, which has been subdivided into four sub-phases and has been interpreted as being continuously occupied for 250 years. Excavations yielded built features including tholoi, cell-plan buildings, earth works, and ovens. Though the figurines are found nearby in the fill, they cannot be directly associated with any of these structures. The context of the anthropomorphic seal FH-4 is ambiguously described as a trash context in a peripheral area of the site and thus cannot be placed into the stratigraphic sequencing (Table 4.18, below) nor be laterally located on the site plan in presently available publications (Figure 4.13, below).

Table 4.18: Site distribution of figurines from Fıstıklı Höyük

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Excavation Information</th>
<th>Material culture</th>
<th>Figurines</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IIIx</td>
<td>Very little found in level</td>
<td>A hiatus?</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IIIa</td>
<td>Unit I locus 52</td>
<td>Earthwork II=IIIa portion of Tholos V</td>
<td>FH-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unit H, locus 22</td>
<td>Oven with door</td>
<td>FH-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IIIb</td>
<td>Unit K, level IV, locus 78</td>
<td>C¹⁴ sample taken very close to figurine =5790-5660 cal BC⁹⁴ trash pit</td>
<td>FH-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IIIc</td>
<td>Very small exposure</td>
<td>Continuity with other level III settlements</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>Very small exposure</td>
<td>Nomadic camping?</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Undetermined area beyond trenches</td>
<td>FH-4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: higher numbered phases are the lowest levels

Ceramic analysis as well as absolute dating associates the Halaf levels of Fıstıklı Höyük to Tell Sabi Abyad, level III (Bernbeck et. al. 2003, 22-23). The absolute dates of the early Halaf at Fıstıklı post-date published absolute dates of Halaf levels at Sabi Abyad by 50-100 years (Campbell 2007). However, pottery analysis compares very closely to level III at Sabi Abyad

⁹⁴ From Bernbeck, Pollock, et al. 2003 Table 4, the context of this is erroneously stated as surface, but in Table 3 the location of K4 is placed within this unit.
The excavators suggest the chronological gap can be explained by stylistic connections delayed by several decades to the north (Bernbeck et al. 2003, 10), which seems unlikely given the close proximity between the two sites.

Figure 4.13: Contour plan of Fıstıklı Höyük with figurines findspots inserted, (after Bernbeck and Pollock 2004, drawings by author)

**Figurines from Fıstıklı Höyük**

Animal and human figurines were found during the 2000 excavation season only. These included three anthropomorphic figurines rendered in standing poses, EH 2.A and EH 2.C. The two EH.2A types can be identified as female from the appliqué breasts or the remains of breast attachment scars (FH-1, FH-3). Another can be identified as male from a penis attachment scar (FH-2). The figurines from Fıstıklı suggest a variety of figurine styles were in production in this particular time and place. FH-1 is very carefully made with incision and appliqué decorating the female form at the breasts and waist. FH-3 is similar, though in a highly fragmented state, and, as only images were available to me for study, it is difficult to detect the details on this example. FH-2 appears to have been more quickly made, exhibiting a rough, unsmoothed surface. An
attachment scar at the pelvis indicates here, too, was an appliqué, perhaps representing a penis. For this figurine perhaps the idea and the making of the figurine was more important than its use after it had dried? It seems that this figurine would not have stood up to a lot of use. It is significant that it stands on its base without support; its use may have been different from FH-1 and FH-3, which would have needed support to stand.

Figure 4.14: Fıstıklı Höyük figurines in the Şanlıurfa museum FH-1, FH-2, front and back view (photos, E. Belcher)

Figure 4.15: Fıstıklı Höyük anthropomorphic seal, figurine fragment FH-4, FH-3 (roughly to scale, not found in Urfa museum, downloaded from Bernbeck et al., ND)\(^95\)

An anthropomorphic pendant-seal, FH-4, was found in an area peripheral to the site, and the findspot is not described by the excavators in available publications. While I was not able to study this first hand, images show that this is a very complex, carefully made stone object. While the nature of construction of this seal, notched in its overall form and incised with parallel lines

\(^95\) Bernbeck et al. (ND) was available when these photos were downloaded in 2010. As of August 2013, the website was no longer online.
on the presumed sealing face as well as the shank perforation for suspension, shows that this object was made within the craft traditions of other Halaf seals; the imagery shows that this was a well-known and shared body image.

**Fıstıklı Höyük Discussion**

The assemblage of figurines here shows an interesting range of types and materials and a crucial and unique view of early Halaf anthropomorphic imagery in the upper Euphrates region. Represented types at Fıstıklı are standing flat figures, EH.2B (FH-1, FH-3); standing flat/round figures, EH.2A (FH-2); and anthropomorphic seals, EH.4A (FH-4). Examples FH-1 and FH-3 provide a possible bridge from the slightly later Early Halaf example from Tell Sabi Abyad (particularly SAB-1) and those from Girikihacıyan (e.g., GH-1) and Tell Kurdu (TK-6). These same types may be antecedents to late Halaf examples from nearby clay examples from Çavı Tarlası (ÇT-2 –ÇT-5) and those of stone from Çavı Tarlası (ÇT-1) and Domuztepe (DT-1 – DT-5).

A figurine seal (FH-4) comes from a poor context and is quite similar to a late Halaf example at Çavı Tarlası (ÇT-14). Similar but not identical examples are also known from early Halaf sites, Umm Qseir (UQ-1) and Tell Kurdu (TK-13). This shows a shared knowledge and use of imagery across this wide region only hinted at in other material culture. This seal must have been part of shared practices that required such an exactly similar image. Each of these figurines is made in roughly the same style, but they are rendered in different materials and sizes and have slight typological differences. While at least two of the figurines, FH-1, FH-3, do bear some resemblance to a figurine found at early Halaf Sabi Abyad, SAB-1, however it is associated with a context later than that of the Fıstıklı figurines (see Chapter 5 and Appendix B). These same figurines, FH-1 and FH-2, are closer in style and technique to Anatolian examples from Tell Kurdu (TK-2, TK-7).
The excavators lament that the type of figurines found at this site are not “typical Halaf types” (Bernbeck et al. 2003, 60). However, as this dissertation shows, there are no typical Halaf figurines, particularly for the Early Halaf. The Fıstıklı figurines show that there was some communication with contemporary settlements in Anatolia at Girikihacıyan, Çavı Tarlası, and Tell Kurdu. Nonetheless, most of the figurines do not show close visual comparison, suggesting an indirect connection, perhaps a sharing of body representation and the associated ideologies through oral or secondary imagery. Fıstıklı Höyük is geographically close to Tell Sabi Abyad, to which excavators have compared other artifact assemblages, but these figurine assemblages are quite different from each other, therefore only SAB-1 is listed as comparanda in Appendix A.

While they are a very small sample, the figurines from Fıstıklı show some connections west to Tell Kurdu, as well as to later figurines from Çavı Tarlası, and Girikihacıyan. While certainly the full breadth of the early Halaf figurine production is yet to be known and there is only a small corpus with which to work, the examples from Fıstıklı show also individuality in figurine-making and possibly in conception and use as well. Further, within and amongst the fill of the architecture where these figurines were found, none in a remarkable context is distinguished by anything but midden remains. So the discard of these figurines amongst regular domestic trash is consistent with all other Halaf sites.

In their publication of this assemblage, the excavators compare figurines to Tell Aqab (Davidson and Watkins 1981, 8, Fig. 3) (a late Halaf example, here TA-1); Tell Kurdu (Yener et. al. 2000, Fig. 17, no. 5) (here TK-10); (Yener et. Al. 2000, Fig. 16, no. 6, 7); Tell Sabi Abyad (Akkermans and Verhoven 1995, Fig. 15, 13) (here SAB-1), (Collet 1996, Figs. 6.1, 6.2, p. 403) (pre-Halaf examples); Umm Qseir (Miyake 1998a, Fig. 32, No. 7, 8, 10 which are early Halaf zoomorphic vessel fragments).

For specific comparanda from these sites to specific Fıstikli figurines, see Appendix A.
The outline of the anthropomorphic shape that dominates all of these forms is created by bent arms, stub head, and cinched waist and is shared by all four of the figurines from Fistıklı, though in three-dimensional forms each is created with different techniques and materials. This anthropomorphic outline, which is also shared with the aforementioned comparanda, may have been reciprocally communicated on secondary objects or surfaces, painted or tattooed on human or animal skin, or rendered onto other ephemeral materials such as wood and textiles. It is quite conceivable that this imagery could have travelled along with nomadic groups, with whom, the excavators of Tell Kurdu propose, the prehistoric inhabitants interacted.
Tell Kurdu

The site of Tell Kurdu is in the Amuq Plain, near the modern Turkish city of Antakya (Hatay). Excavations have revealed settlements dating to the early Halaf (Amuq C), late Halaf (Amuq D), and Ubaid (Amuq E). Two archaeological campaigns were undertaken at this mound, both by the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago but separated by four decades. The 1938 publications were included in a publication covering work throughout the entire Amuq plain (Braidwood and Braidwood 1960). Only preliminary reports for the later seasons have so far appeared in print (Table 4.19, above), but the early Halaf (Amuq C) excavations carried out in 1999 and 2001 are completed, and I have written the chapter on the figurines (Belcher in press). Publication of the excavation and finds from the later phases late Halaf through Ubaid finds (Amuq D-E) found in excavations in 1996, 1998, and 1999 are planned for the near future.

Table 4.19: Tell Kurdu excavation seasons

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Excavation year</th>
<th>Publication</th>
<th>Excavation Strategy</th>
<th>Phases recovered</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1938</td>
<td>Braidwood &amp; Braidwood 1960</td>
<td>4 stratigraphic trenches (Amuq E) (north &amp; south mounds)</td>
<td>TK-15, TK-16, TK-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>Yener and Wilkinson 1999</td>
<td>Ubaid (south mound) (Amuq E)</td>
<td>TK-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>Yener et al. 2000b</td>
<td>Ubaid &amp; Halaf (Amuq E-D-C) including trenches with mixed levels (north &amp; south mounds)</td>
<td>TK-1, TK-2, TK-3, TK-4, TK-7, TK-8, TK-9, TK-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Ozbal and Gerritsen et al. 2004; Belcher, in press</td>
<td>Early Halaf (north mound) (Amuq C)</td>
<td>TK-5, TK-6, TK-13, TK-14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tell Kurdu Excavations and the Context of the Figurines

The first excavations were carried out by Robert and Linda Braidwood for two weeks in 1938 as part of their much larger Amuq plains investigations, for which the site was number 94 in their survey (Braidwood and Braidwood, 1960). Four trenches were opened during these brief investigations (Table 4.20), only Trench 1, on the southern mound, yielded figurines (TK-...
15, TK-16, TK-17) which were said to have been found in an Amuq E (Ubaid) context (Braidwood and Braidwood 1960, 204, Figure 4.16, right). These figurines look very similar to Halaf figurines, so they have been included in this dissertation despite the lack of good contextual information.

![Figure 4.16: Tell Kurdu figurine findspots right 1996-1999, left 1938. After Yener et. al. 2000, fig. 1 and Braidwood and Braidwood 1960 fig. 13.](image)

University of Chicago Oriental Institute excavations returned to the Amuq many decades later under the directorship of Ashlihan Yener, who resumed the project as a survey of the general area in 1995 (Yener et al. 1996a) and directed excavations at Tell Kurdu in 1996, 1998, and 1999 (Figure 4.16, above left). Brief investigation of the Tell Kurdu mound was carried out in 1996, when a sounding was dug during this season at the edge of the southern mound in the general vicinity of the Braidwoods’ trench I and at the edge of a recent bulldozer cut (Yener et al. 1997). Amongst the findings in this sounding was one figurine head fragment (TK-11). Full scale
excavations of Tell Kurdu began in 1998, concentrating on the Ubaid (Amuq E) deposits on the southern mound. That season of excavations found another figurine head (TK-12) from Trench 2 or Trench 11 adjacent to the 1996 sounding (Yener et al. 2000). Both of these figurines typologically appear to be in the Ubaid style and were found amongst recognizable Amuq E material culture, according to the reports. They are included here for comparative purposes and are, for the purposes of this dissertation called ‘post-Halaf’.

Larger scale excavations that took place the following year in 1999 exposed many trenches dating to all levels. Trench 13 revealed mixed contexts which were determined to have been created by recent bulldozing of the top of the southern mound and was opened as the likely location of the Braidwoods’ Trench II, into the west saddle between two mounds (Yener et al. 2000). This trench yielded figurines which were typologically identifiable early and late Halaf types, confirming that the jumbled contexts came from both settlements (TK-4, TK-7). More figurines were found in a context (Trench 14) identified by the excavators as early Amuq E. However, these figurines are typologically similar to early Halaf examples (TK-1, TK-3, TK-8, TK-10). Trench 12 on the north mound revealed an Amuq C or early Halaf settlement in this season, and one figurine (TK-2) was found there during the 1999 season.

In 2001 a team directed by Rana Özbal and Fokke Gerritsen returned to Tell Kurdu. The focus of excavations shifted to the Amuq C remains on the north mound, and trenches opened revealed a single contiguous settlement from that phase. Seven trenches were opened in the an area that had been briefly explored in 1999, exposing a series of multi-roomed buildings separated by narrow alleys, an arrangement of buildings more akin to central Anatolian than to Mesopotamian village planning (Özbal and Gerritsen 2004, 40). While many rooms, buildings, and streets were identified through careful excavation of this area, none of the Amuq C figurines,
with the exception of TK-5, can be definitively associated directly with these features. Rather they were found as isolated finds within fill not far above these features but not specifically within them stratigraphically. Some were also found in the plow zone, as this settlement appeared not far under the surface; however, this area did any other prehistoric levels different from than Amuq C, and the figurines found in the upper levels of these trenches fit well into early Halaf typologies.

Relative and Absolute Dating of Tell Kurdu

The absolute dating of the Amuq C levels of Tell Kurdu places this settlement in the first half of the sixth millennium BCE, is on par with the early Halaf phase. Specifically, AMS Radiocarbon ($^{14}$C) dates from samples collected during the 2001 season fix this level to between

---

99 The methodology for the excavations dictated that in order for an excavation lot to be associated with the floor of a building, it needed to be within 10cm above the floor (Özbal, personal communication).
5870 to 5720 cal. BC.\textsuperscript{100} The typology of the figurines from these excavations (TK-2, TK-5, TK-6, TK-13) comfortably fit in that chronological range. Further confirmation of a solidly early Halaf date is found in the comparanda of an anthropomorphic seal found in the Amuq C level (TK-13) which closes matches one found at the early Halaf site of Umm Qseir on the Khabur River in Syria (UQ-1) and another from Fıstkılı Höyük (FH-4).

The excavators point out that at the end of excavations they had not yet exposed the depth of the Amuq C levels at Tell Kurdu and that it is suspected that there are earlier early Halaf levels underneath (Özbal and Gerritsen et al. 2004, 51). These data contradict earlier assumptions that Amuq C should correlate to Late Halaf sites (Özbal and Gerritsen et al. 2004 cite Akkermans 1993, 132; Braidwood and Braidwood 1960, 137; Davidson 1977, 265-72; Matthews 2000, 101; Watkins and Campbell 1987, 439). Relative chronology presented by the excavators based on material culture comparanda connect east to Balikh IIIC (early Halaf levels at Sabi Abyad) and westward to Can Hassan I, level IIB, and Mersin/Yumuktepe levels XXIV-XXV (Özbal and Gerritsen 2004, n. 5). In particular, large amounts of Dark Faced Burnished Ware (DFBW) in all variations were found. Though there was a low incidence of painted wares, those that were found in this level had correlations of both motif and form type to known Halaf types in Northern Iraq and Syria. Conclusions made from a study of the pottery suggest that Tell Kurdu was within the cultural horizon of the classic Halaf but had many local and regional variations, the most prominent of which was DFBW (Diebold 2004, 54-55). The absolute dating of samples collected across the breadth of the 2001 excavations also supported the material culture indications that the entire settlement exposed can be considered contemporaneous, at least to a range of 250 years (Özbal and Gerritsen 2004, 51-52).

\textsuperscript{100}Özbal, Gerritsen et. al. (2004, 50, 75); Campbell 2007
Table 4.20: Site distribution of Tell Kurdu figurines

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trench</th>
<th>Figurines</th>
<th>Reported Context</th>
<th>Typological date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 (1938)</td>
<td>TK-15, TK-16, TK-17</td>
<td>Amuq E – South Mound</td>
<td>Early Halaf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sounding (1996)</td>
<td>TK-11</td>
<td>Amuq E – South Mound</td>
<td>Ubaid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 or 11</td>
<td>TK-12</td>
<td>Amuq E – South Mound</td>
<td>Ubaid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>TK-2</td>
<td>Amuq C – North Mound</td>
<td>Early Halaf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>TK-4, TK-7</td>
<td>Bulldozer Dump of Amuq C, D, E Between North/South Mounds</td>
<td>Late Halaf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>TK-1, TK-3, TK-8, TK-10</td>
<td>Early Amuq E – South Mound</td>
<td>Early Halaf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>TK-5, TK-14</td>
<td>Amuq C – North Mound</td>
<td>Early Halaf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>TK-13</td>
<td>Amuq C – North Mound</td>
<td>Early Halaf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>TK-6</td>
<td>Amuq C – North Mound</td>
<td>Early Halaf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surface</td>
<td>TK-9</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>Early Halaf</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The absolute dating of the earliest levels excavated at Tell Kurdu leaves plenty of chronological space within the sixth millennium BCE for later Halaf phases, presumably encompassing Amuq D and probably a portion of the Amuq E contexts. No excavations reported Amuq D material culture at Tell Kurdu, though figurines appear to typologically date to the late Halaf, which corresponds to Amuq D. Examples from Trench 13, which was a mixed and disturbed context, have a vaguely late Halaf look and feel (TK-4, TK-7). Several figurines are reported from Amuq E contexts, mainly located on the south mound and from the 1938 and 1996-99 seasons.

**Tell Kurdu Figurines Discussion**

These figurines can be separated by context and also by typology into two rough chronological groups. Two figurine head fragments (TK-11, TK-12) from the area of Trenches 2 or 11 and the 1996 sounding typologically shows similarities to post-Halaf types in their distinctively Ubaid elongated heads (Daems and Croucher 2007). Therefore, they confirm other material culture indications from this context as late Amuq E and are included in this dissertation because I am uncertain of relationship of the Amuq phasing to the Halaf. Figurines from Trench 14 were assigned an early Amuq E context but fit more comfortably into the early Halaf typological repertoire (TK-1, TK-3, TK-8, TK-10). The figurines found in Trench I from the
1938 excavations were also assigned to Amuq E but also fit easily into early Halaf type EH.2A, TK-14, TK-15, TK-16, and TK-17. For early Halaf figurines proposed see Figure 4.19; for late Halaf figurines proposed see Figure 4.18. Therefore, from a purely figurine-centric point of view, the later chronology of Tell Kurdu remains an open question, especially since these later levels are not yet grounded in published absolute dates.

The figurines found within the Amuq C levels on the north mound may support a further earlier dating of the lowest levels of the south mound as well. Figurines from the lowest levels of Step Trench 14 (south mound) are typologically similar to early Halaf figurines from Tell Sabi Abyad as well as to those from Tell Kurdu Amuq C levels, thus, they have been assigned this phase typologically. An anthropomorphic seal, also stratigraphically early Halaf (TK-13), is a close to exact match to a seal found on the Khabur Umm Qseir (UQ-1). Later figurine assemblages to which TK-11 and TK-12 (from the south mound) both typologically and stratigraphically belong show parallels to Ubaid examples from Mesopotamia (McAdam 2003, Daems 2010).

Figure 4.18: late Halaf and post Halaf figurines from Tell Kurdu (not to scale)
Upper row: Typologically late Halaf figurines TK-7, TK-4
Lower row: Stratigraphically post Halaf/Ubaid figurine heads, TK-11
(photos by E. Belcher)
The figurine assemblage from Tell Kurdu suggests a reconsideration of the trenches on the south mound, which are said to be exclusively Ubaid in date, as the lowest levels, particularly in the Step Trench 14, appear to have yielded figurines that are typologically early Halaf in my analysis. The existence of late Halaf at Tell Kurdu (presumably correlated to Amuq D) is suggested by a few figurines, TK-4, TK-7 (Figure 4.18 upper row), which can be typologically associated with the late Halaf phase, but these were found within matrices created by modern bulldozers (Trench 13). While Ubaid-type figurines, TK-11 and TK-12, have been found in trenches associated with Amuq E (Figure 4.18 lower row), figurines that look very much like early Halaf types (see Figure 4.19, lower two rows) were found in the lowest levels of those trenches TK-1, TK-3, TK-8, TK-9, and TK-10 and as surface finds. These figurines include examples of EH.2A types such as TK-1, TK-8, TK-10, TK-15, TK-16, and TK-17 and an example of an EH.2C, TK-9. All of these similar to stratigraphically secure early Halaf figurines at Tell Kurdu as well as at Fistıklı Höyük and Tell Sabi Abyad.¹⁰¹ From the figurine evidence alone, analysis therefore suggests that Tell Kurdu was settled continuously or at least at points throughout the entire sixth millennium BCE and into the fifth as well. Future comprehensive publication of the excavated assemblages will hopefully elucidate the archaeological contexts and associated assemblages of these figurines further.

¹⁰¹ For specific comparanda, please see the Tell Kurdu section of the catalog, Appendix A.
Figure 4.19: Early Halaf figurines from Tell Kurdu,
Upper 2 rows: Securely dated to Amuq C and early Halaf TK-2, TK-6, TK-5, TK-13, TK14
Lower 2 rows: Typologically suggesting an early Halaf date, TK-10, TK-8, TK-9, TK-3, TK-1
(Photos, drawings: TK-13, TK-14 courtesy Tell Kurdu Project, all others: E. Belcher)
The site of Girikihacıyan is in the Diyarbakir province of Turkey, situated north of the city of Diyarbakır in the Ergam plain of the upper Tigris river. Nearby to the site of Çayönü, this site was discovered during a survey by the Prehistory Department of Istanbul University and the Chicago Oriental Institute Prehistoric Research Project in 1963 and excavated in 1968 and 1970. While the excavations were headed by Halet Çambel and Robert Braidwood, Patty Jo Watson directed the excavations with the assistance of Charles Redman and Steven LeBlanc. Systematic surface collections and test excavations were carried out in 1968 to test a new field method. This technique of rigorously and systematically sampling the entire small circular mound proved to be a good way to identify clustering of artifacts (Redmond and Watson 1970), but it did not yield any figurines. Excavations were carried out for two years in 1968 and 1970 (Watson and LeBlanc 1990, figs 2.1 and 2.2). A final excavation report was finally published twenty years later (Watson and Le Blanc 1990). The conclusions of the excavators were that the settlement had been quite small; two occupation levels identified by the ceramic tempers which were assigned to a phases they termed ‘epi-Halafian’ and ‘post-Halafian’ (Watson and LeBlanc 1990, 40). It has been proposed that, based upon the published pottery data, the settlement should be re-assigned to the early Halaf phase (Campbell 1992a). This reassignment to the early Halaf was further confirmed Roger Matthews’s analysis of the absolute dating of the lowest levels (2001, 104). From a figurine-centric view of the site, based upon the typology, I find that it is possible that the site settlements should actually be dated to early and late Halaf.

**Excavation of Girikihacıyan**

The levels of the site were established through excavation based on arbitrary spits of soil removed, 10 to 15 centimeters at a time across each trench. Central and Southern areas of the mound were identified as later occupation called epi-Halafian, identified by the prevalence of
chaff-tempered ware, stratigraphically found to be quite shallow in depth (LeBlanc 1971, 15). Operation A revealed a stone tholoi with entry way with Tholos I best preserved, featuring a stone foundation under four layers of mud floors (location of GH-2). Hearths existing in many of these led the excavators to suggest that at this settlement tholoi should be considered dwellings. An earlier settlement, called late Halaf by the excavators, appears to cover nearly the entire site. The phasing was identified by the ceramic wares, which are grit-tempered plain and painted. The phasing of the site based upon ware is, however, not supported by the publication of pottery forms, motifs and temper, which shows that the same ware types were found in all levels (Watson and LeBlanc 1990, 41-80).

Stratigraphic information, including publication of trench sections (Watson and LeBlanc 1990, 23-40) does not show any reason to suggest anything but continuous occupation throughout the site and even similar prehistoric activity in each excavation unit. According to LeBlanc, “[t]here appears to be no difference from the lowest excavation units to the top, except for a few upper levels of the later occupation” (1971, 15). So it is puzzling that in the final report, the excavators insisted on the presence of two phases of occupation. Therefore, the figurines from this site, when possible, are considered here by typological analysis alone. Because typological evidence of those figurines for which images are available suggests that both late and early Halaf is represented, internal stratigraphy is used to assign figurines to early or late phase, according to their position in the trenches when typological analysis was not possible.

LeBlanc (1973) proposed by statistical analysis that the vessel shapes of Girikihacıyan painted pottery are closely similar to those of six other Halaf sites, which are used in the excavation reports as comparanda. The main reason for assigning the late Halaf phase to the
levels excavated at the site was the percentage of occurrence of certain shaped bowls, which compared well to late Halaf forms from Arpachiyah (Watson and LeBlanc 1990, 1-4). However of the six additional sites, Arpachiyah and Banahilk (Iraq), Chagar Bazar and Tell Halaf (Syria), and Tilkitepe and Tell Turlu (Turkey), only Arpachiyah, Chagar Bazar, and Tell Halaf yielded figurines, with few examples directly comparable to those of Girikihacıyan.

Although the Girikihacıyan report was published in 1990, it was likely written decades before without further revision (Campbell 1992a), at a time that no other early Halaf or Anatolian figurine comparanda were available from publications (Table 4.16, p. 149). Therefore, it is not surprising that the figurines were not considered as diagnostic material culture and were not fully treated in the report. In addition to pointing out the lack of comparison from the 1970s-1980s publications of the sites of Yarim Tepe, Campbell suggested out that reliance upon comparisons of Iraqi Halaf sites did not apply to the local variations of vessel shapes in the Anatolian Halaf, which he suggested should date to early rather than late Halaf (Campbell 1992a). Indeed, the figurine evidence supports Campbell’s suggestion, with comparanda found in early Halaf examples from Tell Kurdu and Fistıklı Höyük as well as from Yarim Tepe I and II but not further east to the Mosul area, which does not provide early Halaf examples. However, there are a few figurines that, based only upon the published illustrations and not from personal examination, appear to be late Halaf types.
Table 4.21: Site distribution of Girikihacıyan figurines\textsuperscript{102}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Square W2S5 (E2 in 1968 excav.)</th>
<th>‘operation A’</th>
<th>Square E4N2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>level 3, GH-7 leg fragment</td>
<td>level 1-4 (dump)</td>
<td>level 1-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>level 4, GH-10 lower/base fragment</td>
<td>level 3-5 upper floor house 1</td>
<td>level 3 fill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>level 5, GH-9 torso fragment</td>
<td>level 7-9 lower floor house 1</td>
<td>GH-8 leg fragment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>level 8, GH-13 limb fragment</td>
<td>GH-2 standing figure level 8-9 basal levels house 1</td>
<td>level 3-5 upper round house 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chaff tempered ceramics ▲</td>
<td>level 10-11 pits 1, 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>grit tempered ceramics ▼</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gritty filled, backfill above undisturbed fill level 9-14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>level 15-16 removal of 1968</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>level 17 dump: GH-14 arm fragment (?)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>level 18 dump level 19 tholos 8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GH-6 torso and head level 20 tholos 8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GH-11 torso fragment GH-12 leg fragment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>level 21 tholos 8 basal level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>level 22 tholos 8, basal level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GH-4 upper torso fragment level 23 fill, mud walled house</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GH-3 standing figure GH-5 seated figure fragment level 24: mud walled house plaster floor?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sounding in SE corner of W2S5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>level 25 -31 dump level 32 dump: GH-1 standing figure level 38 dump: C\textsubscript{14} date = 6805 ± 45BP\textsuperscript{103}</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C\textsubscript{14} date = 6805 ± 45BP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>More cultural deposit below</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Girikihacıyan Figurines and Archaeological Context

While the excavators are quite detailed about their numbering system for objects and levels (Watson and LeBlanc 1990, 22-23), it is difficult to figure out the exact findspot or

\textsuperscript{102} Information on W2S5 from Watson and LeBlanc (1990, 23, Table 2.7, Table 3.1, 31-33. Fig. 6.18). Information on Operation A from Watson and LeBlanc (1990, 35-40, figs 3.2 - 3.7). Published information did not provide a clear level where late and epi-Halafian pottery changed in Operation A. Information on E5N2 is from Watson and Leblanc (1990, 18, fig 2.7, and 25; Table 3.2, 33). The excavators do not provide information on the level where the temper of the ceramics changes from chaff to grit. \textit{Note}: Levels are unique to each square/unit with correlation between units provided by the excavators is the presence/absence of chaff/grit-tempered pottery

\textsuperscript{103} The C14 date from WSS2 level 38 was published as 6805 ±45 BP = 4855 ± 45bc (Watson and LeBlanc 1990, 39, 64). Roger Matthews (2000, 104) believed that this date should be read as Middle Halaf/early Halaf.
archaeological context of the figurines or precisely what they all look like from available data. Publication of section drawings of square W2S5, where most of the figurines were found, is not specific to the exact location of the figurines within the square. From analysis of the section drawings, it is clear that this area was a dumping area in use for a long time, resulting in ash and charcoal deposits as well as mud brick debris, pits, and plaster debris, or at least directly adjacent to it in the section (Watson and Le Blanc 1990, figs. 2.8-2.11). Therefore I can conclude that figurines in this trench were deposited within midden trash-filled matrices associated with fire installations and probably other domestic activities.

Sixteen figurines were found in the course of excavations, two of which are zoomorphic (LeBlanc 1971, 65) and fourteen of which are anthropomorphic and are considered here (from Watson and LeBlanc 1990, Table on 14-20). The bulk of the anthropomorphic figurines (12 of the 14 in total) in addition to animal figurines were found in W2S5, a trench dug as a sounding to establish stratigraphic levels in the 1970 season (Watson and LeBlanc 1990, 20). From this trench, in the upper levels (associated with chaff-tempered pottery) was one LH.1C type leg fragment GH-7 as well as GH-9, GH-10, and GH-13, fragments of unknown types. All of these are assigned to the late Halaf in Appendix A. From the lower levels of W2S5 are standing figures GH-1, an EH.2B type, and GH-3 and GH-4, both EH.2A type. GH-5 appears to be LH.1A type despite the lower level, while GH-6, GH-11, GH-12, GH-13, and GH-14 are of unknown types. With one exception (GH-5) each of these have been assigned to the early Halaf in the catalog entries in Appendix A given their findspot in the lower levels of the trench. The published illustration of GH-5 appears to show that it is a fragment of a type LH.1A

Typologically, GH-1 could equally be called a type LH.2B figurine, but, because it is documented to have been found in the lowest levels of excavation, it was assigned an early Halaf date.
figurine. Its appearance in this lower level suggests that some of the figurines in these levels may also be late Halaf.

One figurine was found in Operation A, GH-2, a standing figurine fragment, which from the illustration appears to be EH.2D type. Finally, in square E4N2, GH-8, a leg fragment of a LH.1C type figurine, was found. None of these figurines were available to me for examination, although I was able to view the exhibit in the Diyarbakır museum (Figure 4.20, above). Some examples do not have published images, and I rely solely on description or mention of them and associated findspot in the published report. Therefore the typological assignments to these figurines here should be considered speculative and preliminary.\textsuperscript{105}

\textsuperscript{105} I was unable to handle any of the Girikihacıyan figurines which are now stored and on exhibit at the Diyarbakır Museum. A few were on exhibit there in 2001 (Figure 4.20). Others are known to me through the illustrations and/or descriptions in the final report of the excavation (Watson and LeBlanc 1990).
It is important to make the distinction that the overall chronological divisions between early and late Halaf at Girikihacıyan presented in Table 4.21 (above) are formed without much evidence. The typology and methodology established in this dissertation requires that figurines must be either late or early Halaf, with no provision for a generic or general Halaf designation. The simplified chronology used in this dissertation was intended to provide for vagaries in the data, as a more complex chronological system would not function for the relative chronology. Nonetheless, this is the one site in the dissertation for which even the simplified early/late Halaf binary does not work with the chronological markers provided by the excavators and morphology of the figurines or with the available information from the trenches. There is no clear delineation indicating changes in activity or settlement in the aforementioned published section drawings of each trench. Therefore, the dating of each figurine is based solely on typology somewhat supported by relative position of the figurines in the trenches (see Table 4.21). Figurines in upper levels must be arguably later than those from the lower levels, although much of the area excavated could be mixed from successive dumping and pit-digging, therefore some of these the figurines might considered to come from mixed contexts. What can be said is that there is no indication that there are any special contexts for these figurines, which simply appear to have been thrown out with the trash.

**Girikihacıyan Figurines Discussion**

Two bent leg fragments, GH-7 and GH-8, are type LH.1C figurines, types that can also be found at Chagar Bazar, Çavı Tarlası, and Tell Kashkashok. The lower torso fragment of a LH.1A figurine, GH-5, further supports a connection to those and other Khabur sites in the late Halaf. Early Halaf types EH.2A, EH.2B, and EH.2D are represented by GH-1, GH-2, GH-3, and GH-4, which suggests communication across the early Halaf interaction sphere, as these types are also found at Tell Kurdu, Tell Sabi Abyad, and Fıstıklı Höyük. Eastward to Iraq, comparison
could be made to some types, particularly the EH.2D types at Yarim Tepe II and Yarim Tepe III, similar to GH-2. The figurines’ analysis, in so far as it can be carried out given the limitations of access, therefore concurs with others that at least most of the excavated assemblage can be placed in the early Halaf phase. However, as mentioned above, it is difficult to confidently reach this conclusion without the technological and full visual analysis possible only through hands-on study.

Although the chronology of the figurines cannot be stratigraphically verified with available data and the typology is also not secure, as I was unable to handle these figurines. Given the publication of the section drawings and the findspots of each example within the excavation unit, it is possible to say that, at this site as well, these figurines cannot be associated with any special matrix or depositional process. The data published by the excavators make it quite clear that at their deposition, these figurines were not treated any differently from other materials and were tumbled into the general fill. It did not seem to matter if the example was almost complete (GH-1, GH-2) or a small fragment, the evidence from Girikihacıyan is that at the end of their use life, figurines were given no special treatment beyond that of any other artifact.
Çavı Tarlası

Çavı Tarlası is located in the Sanlıurfa region of southeastern Turkey near the City of Siverek and the villages of Azıklı and Nusaybin, which were accessible from the E99 road north of Şanlıurfa on the east side of the Euphrates. The site is now flooded by a lake filled after the completion of the Atatürk dam, which was the impetus for these rescue excavations. Çavı Tarlası was a low mound measuring 14 by 120 meters, with settlement soils reaching at least 3.5 to 5 meters deep. Although some finds indicate later occupations, the published accounts of the excavations of this site identify it as exclusively Halaf. Figurines, pottery, and other finds indicate that all five occupation levels exposed can be assigned to the late Halaf phase (Irving 2001).

The site was systematically surface-collected in 1982 within a ten-grid of squares as a project auxiliary to the nearby Hasseke Höyük excavations (von Wickede and Herbordt 1988, 6). Two rescue excavation seasons, during which figurines were found, followed in 1983 (von Wickede 1984a) and 1984 (von Wickede and Mısır 1985). These excavations were directed by Alwo von Wickede and Şanlıurfa museum director Adnan Misir with Susanne Herbordt as field director. This was a rescue excavation, with a goal of recovering as much archaeological knowledge of the site as possible before the completion of the dam and the inundation of the Euphrates, which flooded this and many other sites.

Excavation of Çavı Tarlası

As part of the excavation methodology, the site was separated into levels based upon architectural phases, which proved to be overlapping and continuous. Most squares were not excavated to most levels; only one twenty-meter-square area –Squares L19, L20, M19, and M20 – was opened to all architectural levels. This area, extended by squares L21 and M21, was the main area of excavation (von Wickede and Herbordt 1988, abb. 2). This short review of the
archaeology will start at the earliest levels, which were excavated in the 1984 (second and last) season, and move upward through the stratigraphy to the surface. Only a sounding in square L21 reached level 5, revealing a pit and floor and small round storage structure (von Wickede and Herbordt 1988, 9); no figurines are reported to have been found in this phase. Level 4 revealed continuously overlapping levels of architectural constructions; two tholoi and another circular structure with a semicircular wall and a rectangular space with building foundations 60 cm thick with two to three courses of stones. No figurines were reported to have been found in this phase either.

All of the figurines found at Çavı Tarlası were found in levels 3-1, with the findspots of several figurines reported to be between levels (Figure 4.21). Perhaps these were isolated finds within a matrix of ambiguous fill not directly associated with architectural features or associated with features that continued into later levels. The excavators were specific that the character of the building materials changed between levels 1 and 2 (von Wickede and Misir 1985, 104), but, as there is a lot of overlap and just a few centimeters between levels, it is difficult to imagine that the fill in which these figurines were found could be completely distinguishable one level from another. Photos of excavations show very thin layers of architectural features just below the surface (von Wickede and Herbordt 1988, taf. 3). As with the earlier levels, architectural plans of excavated areas show overlapping architectural features and continuous building programs without hiatus.

Level 3 was destroyed by fire, perhaps it was leveling activity and immediate rebuilding of level 2b that made it difficult for the excavators to distinguish between these levels and therefore assign isolated finds in the fill to one or other. One figurine, ÇT-9, was from level 2b. One figurine, ÇT-12, is from either 2a or 2b. Level 3 excavations yielded figurines ÇT-4 and
ÇT-6, which come from either levels 2 or 3; ÇT-3, ÇT-4, and ÇT-10 were found in level 3. What may have been the antechamber of a destroyed tholos, a rectangular structure (no. 8) which ran north into the unexcavated area was assigned to a slightly later 2a level. Level 2 also revealed three round structures and remains of two rectangular structures beside a round building (no. 12) with a hearth and rectangular antechamber. One figurine, ÇT-8, may be assigned to either level 2a or 1. Level 1 was just below the surface and within the plow zone. This much damaged level yielded a round structure five meters in diameter (no. 7). East of that were two other buildings (nos. 9 and 14), which also had fireplaces, ovens, and kilns. Two Roman coins in this level show that it was disturbed with later activities (von Wickede and Herbordt 1988, taf. 8, 1-2). Excavations of level 1 yielded many figurines, ÇT-2, ÇT-5, ÇT-7, ÇT-11, and ÇT-13. Two figurines, ÇT-14 and ÇT-15, were reported as surface finds. All levels are reported to have yielded red and black pottery painted with geometric patterns as well as trees and bucrania (von Wickede and Herbordt 1988, taf. 6, 7), as well as chaff-tempered cooking pots and black burnished wares. (von Wickede and Misır 1985, 105).

Çavı Tarlası Figurines and Archaeological Context
Excavators reported finding 20 clay figurine fragments and two stone “idols” during the 1983 and 1984 seasons (von Wickede and Misır 1985, 105). Twelve clay and one stone anthropomorphic figurines and one anthropomorphic stamp seal was studied at the Şanlıurfa Museum during the summer of 2001. One figurine, ÇT-15, was not found in the museum but is included here from the published report. Another figurine obviously dates to a later period and is not included in this study (von Wickede 1984b, 117, tafs. 27 and 2). The additional six reported figurines may have been zoomorphic and/or are stored elsewhere than in the museum’s collections. A seal/pendant/figurine, ÇT-15, representing a stylized anthropomorphic image, is also included here as a figurine. The distribution of figurines, considered laterally within the
survey/excavation grid shows they were found in nearly every square opened up to the later Levels 3-1, but only two can be located to a specific findspot (Table 4.22, p. 180 and Figure 4.21, below).

![Figure 4.21: Çavı Tarlası figurine findspots/areas laterally transposed over architectural plan (after von Wickede and Herbordt 1988, 10, abb. 2)](image)

Emphasis in the excavation reports and field recording extant in the Şanlıurfa museum was on reporting settlement levels by square and buildings rather than reporting the findspots of individual finds. Only two figurines, ÇT-1 and ÇT-6, have their findspots mentioned in the reports. It is possible that for the other figurines there was little to remark upon as to the associated assemblages, soil matrices, or features nearby the findspot. It is conceivable to assume that the Çavı Tarlası figurines were among the many isolated finds tumbled into the fill
in and around destroyed buildings. All of these figurines can be stratigraphically dated to the late Halaf, as the architectural levels appear to be in contiguous succession without any hiatus between them. Assignment of each figurine to an architectural level was deduced from matching the published reports on each square to the square number found with each figurine in the Şanlıurfa museum. Some squares exposed architecture associated only with a single level, so figurines from those squares are assumed to be from that same level. This is true for squares in which excavations stopped at level 1 which was just short of one meter in depth from the surface including P20 (ÇT-2, ÇT-5), N20 (ÇT-7, ÇT-13) and O20 (ÇT-11). A rectangular trench was dug in 1983 through the L20-22 area of the grid (von Wickede and Herbordt 1988, 10, abb. 2 upper left corner); the small area opened within L21-22 exposed only level 2b architecture (von Wickede and Herbordt 1988, abb. 2). While it is possible that that the figurines found there (ÇT-12, ÇT-9) may have come from matrices above, they have been assigned levels 1-2b, since neither their specific findspots nor the figurines themselves are published. One figurine and one anthropomorphic seal were found on the surface of the site, and these are laterally associated with areas without much architecture in the levels directly underneath; they are therefore associated with the late Halaf typologically (ÇT-13, ÇT-15).

Many of the figurines were found within the 4 adjacent squares of L19-20 and M19-20. Based on the systematic survey carried out in 1982, this area was chosen because a high concentration of Halaf artifacts was noticed on the surface (von Wickede and Herbordt 1988, 7). The 1984 season broadened the area of excavation, with the result that figurines were found in almost every lateral square. However, the relative chronological relationships are not known, as the stratigraphic placement or depth of findspot is published for only two objects.

---

106 The trench numbers are noted with the figurines that are in storage at the Şanlıurfa Museum. Trenches were also sometimes noted on the excavation defter/notebooks on file with the museum.
Of the five figurines found within this 20-meter area, only two can be localized to a particular location within the square they were found (ÇT-1, ÇT-6), both in Level 3. Most of the figurines were found during the second excavation season, with only a couple found during the previous 1982 surface survey. Indeed, the buildings at Levels 3-1 were thought by the excavators to be successive and continual occupations of the site. It may be that these areas can be considered dwelling areas. Certainly a concentration of Halaf Pottery was found in this area (von Wickede 1984b, Abb. 21a). However, the pottery published and those on display at the Şanlıurfa museum suggest that the site may be linked to a longer chronological range than the publications indicate.

Table 4.22: Site distribution of figurines from Çavı Tarlası

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Square</th>
<th>Figurines</th>
<th>Architectural Features</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(surface)</td>
<td>L23</td>
<td>ÇT-13</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O22</td>
<td>ÇT-15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 1</td>
<td>P20</td>
<td>ÇT-2, ÇT-5</td>
<td>[Continuation of Tholos 10?]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N20</td>
<td>ÇT-7, ÇT-13</td>
<td>[Tholos 9 &amp; Tholos 14]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>O20</td>
<td>ÇT-11</td>
<td>[Silo 15 and tholos 10?]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 1-2a-b</td>
<td>L21</td>
<td>ÇT-12, ÇT-9</td>
<td>[Tholos 2?]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 1 or 2</td>
<td>M20</td>
<td>ÇT-8</td>
<td>Main excavation area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[Buildings 8, 17, Tholos 7]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 2 or 3</td>
<td>M19</td>
<td>ÇT-3</td>
<td>Main excavation area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>L-M 19-20</td>
<td>ÇT-4</td>
<td>Main excavation area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 2b or 3</td>
<td>L20</td>
<td>ÇT-10</td>
<td>Main excavation area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[Tholos 3 or 1]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 3</td>
<td>ÇT-6</td>
<td>Main excavation area</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N of Tholos 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>L19</td>
<td>ÇT-1</td>
<td>Main excavation area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SW opening to Dromos of Tholos 13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** Architectural features in brackets, [], existed within the square; it is not known if they are to be directly associated with the figurines. Features in **bold** directly relate to figurine findspots.

**Çavı Tarlası Figurines Discussion**

The figurine assemblage from Çavı Tarlası is quite important for an understanding of the late Halaf in Anatolia. While it is also the first published Halaf assemblage from Anatolia, it has not received proper attention from those looking for comparanda for late Halaf figurines at other sites. The tight excavation area, which indicates a single continuous settlement without hiatus that probably lasted a few generations, and the figurine finds place the time period solidly in the
late Halaf phase. It seems from looking at the assemblage as a whole that social practices entangled with the figurines did not change with the building levels, since their types and technology are interchangeable from levels 1 through 3. One noticeable feature of many of these examples is holes for the addition of heads (ÇT-2, ÇT-3, ÇT-4, and ÇT-15). This is an extension of a long-lived tradition observed also in early Halaf figurines at Tell Sabi Abyad (SAB-1) as well as in those from pre-Halaf level 6 (Collett 1996) but found much earlier at Çatalhöyük (Nakamura and Meskell 2009). Finished neck holes are also found in late Halaf figurine examples, including figurine vessels from Yarim Tepe II (Munchaev, Merpert and Bader 1981: 26, figs. X-XI) and Arpachiyah (Mallowan and Rose 1935, fig. 45.12). The feature of interchangeable heads on Halaf figurines is further discussed in Chapter 6.

Another notable feature in the Çavı Tarlası figurine assemblage is the prevalence of type LH.1C figurines. This type is a quite general category of all late Halaf seated figurines with legs rendered in a 90-degree angle so that they cannot sit on a flat surface without support under the
base, or perhaps at the edge, such as that provided by a shelf. Seven figurines are this type including a complete example, ČT-6, an upper body fragment, ČT-3, lower body, and ČT-7, ČT-8, ČT-11, ČT-12, and ČT-13, leg fragments. At Çavı Tarlası, the LH.1C type is rendered with a flat upper body with a knob-like head (or a hole for the insertion of a head) and stubs to represent arms bent at the elbow in outline, but not modeled in three dimensions. If represented at all (not, for example, on ČT-6), the breasts are molded from the same clay as the torso in low relief (ČT-3), so that the upper body is more reminiscent of standing type LH.2B. Thus, this type of figurine might be thought of as a hybrid representation of both types. Since the overall form is seated, these are classified as LH.1C rather than as another type (Figure 4.22, above). There is some indication of a connection to sites in Syria, where LH.1C figurines with hanging legs have a much more three dimensional upper body similar to LH.1A types (e.g., KK-24). However, most other examples are leg fragments similar to those from Çavı Tarlası with 90-degree or wider angle bends at the knee that suggest LH.1C types without providing enough information about what they fully looked like (GH-8, TA-9). The upper bodies of the LH.1C type figurines at Çavı Tarlası seem closer in comparison to the upper bodies of standing figurine types LH.2B (ČT-2, ČT-4). The low modeling, sparse details, and arm stubs may well be influenced by figurines rendered in stone for which examples at Çavı Tarlası (ČT-1, ČT-14) and contemporary Domuztepe (DT-1, DT-2, DT-3, DT-4, DT-5, and DT-6) suggest that flat and sparsely detailed stone figurines were made.

One of the most exciting connections between Çavı Tarlası and the Khabur is not typological but rather technological in nature. In two figurines I observed a unique way of constructing conically shaped legs. This involved rolling a slab of clay around itself so that the spiral is visible at the top of the leg and actually looks sort of like a knee. This type of
construction was used for figurine ÇT-6 and for a figurine from Tell Kashkashok TKK-14. This very specific technique suggests a direct connection and communication between the two makers and/or users of these figurines. One had either seen or heard of the other’s technique or observed a secondary object perhaps made of ephemeral materials for which the rolled slab was a practice for representing bent legs.
Domuztepe

The site of Domuztepe is located 30 kilometers north of the city of Kahramanmaraş in Southeastern Turkey. The excavations have been conducted under the direction of Elizabeth Carter of UCLA (until 2000), Stuart Campbell of Manchester University, UK, and Alexandra Fletcher, British Museum (until 2011). Work on this site began with a systematic survey of the site in 1995, and excavations began in 1996 and continued through 2011. This work revealed a deep deposit of late Neolithic and of late Halaf (levels C-9 – C-4) and early Halaf (levels C4 – C3) contiguous settlements. Recent excavations have found transitional pre-Halaf levels (level C-2), and ceramic Neolithic (level C-1) settlement remains directly under the Halaf levels. A sounding in Operation I in 2011 revealed that underlying these deposits are earlier levels, much more extensive and deeper than the Halaf deposits (Campbell 2011). The 22 anthropomorphic figurines from Domuztepe presented in this dissertation date to the late and early Halaf phases of the site (Table 4.23, p. 188).

Excavations of Domuztepe

Most of the Domuztepe stratigraphic sequence is known from excavations in Operation I, which were the main focus of the excavations of 1995-2011. Excavations and surveys across the tell during specific seasons also found Halaf remains all other operations (Figure 4.23, below).

---

107 At the writing of this dissertation, three phasing sequences (anchored by four absolute dates) are known for Domuztepe. The earliest prehistoric level of A phasing is Halaf from Operation II (early Halaf), and there are two later (late Halaf) phases. The C phasing is more nuanced and is more of a relative chronology based upon a range of material culture and stratigraphic data. This phasing starts with the earliest known level, the Ceramic Neolithic and moves upward through eight later phases which include an earlier Halaf phase. I thank Simon Denham and Alexandra Fletcher for providing the data required to follow the new C phasing in this dissertation. The previous A phasing has been commonly used in publications to date and covers some but not all of the Halaf phases. An interim B phasing was for a time in use on site but does not appear in publications. Because the site is no longer under excavation, it seems that, at time of the writing of this dissertation, that the C sequence may be the final phasing sequence and is therefore appropriate for use in this dissertation. See Table 3.15, p. 151 for a reckoning of these three phasing sequences and chronological data on Domuztepe.

108 The last season of the Manchester University excavations was 2011. Further excavations since that time have been planned and possibly carried out by at Turkish team of excavators, but the results of those campaigns are not yet available in published form.
However, with the exception of one foot-shaped seal found in early Halaf Operation II\(^{109}\) (DT-20) and some surface finds, all anthropomorphic figurines were found in Operation I. Over much of Operation I is an overlay of a Byzantine graveyard and a few late pits, which cut into and in some places disturbed the late Halaf settlement remains. Late Roman occupation was excavated in 2004 and 2005 in Operation VII, the highest part of the mound, and also appears to be present on the western slope of the mound.\(^{110}\) These trenches exposed a thin-walled complex building and 300 Constantine-era coins (Campbell 2005, Campbell et al. 1999).

**Figure 4.23:** View of Domuztepe from the East

Plans are underway to produce a series of final reports on Halaf Domuztepe (Campbell and Carter, forthcoming) as well as the Roman and ceramic Neolithic settlements. Additional articles and dissertations have been produced featuring specific aspects of the site (Belcher 2011; Carter 2010; Gauld, Campbell and Carter 2005; Croucher 2005b; Gearey et al. 2011; Healey 2000; Irving 2001; Kansa et al. 2009; ). This section is also dependent on my personal experience as an excavator and specialist on figurines, beads, and pendants at Domuztepe since 1998, in the course of which I was present at the discovery of most of these figurines. Much of

---

\(^{109}\) Operation II is stratigraphically dated to phases C4 or A1, which can be relatively dated to Halaf IIA (Campbell 2007 and personal communication), which in the simplified chronology used in this dissertation is early Halaf.

\(^{110}\) The Roman architecture appears to have been built directly over of Halaf remains. (Campbell 2005).
the data collected during seasons 1995-2000 are also available on an open-access web-based database (Open Context).

Operation I can be described as a mixed-use area in prehistoric times. Excavation of specific areas exposed large, small and ephemeral architectural features which are interpreted as domestic, storage, communal, and public structures with large open spaces in between. Activities amidst these structures may have been related to ritual, work, fire, and mortuary preparations. These structures existed amongst constant human activity focused upon manipulation of this area by digging into and building up of the surfaces of the open spaces. The features resulting from
these activities include earthworks built of native and foreign soil matrices and dug features such as wells, ditches, and pits containing random or intentionally compiled fill. The intentionality and chronological relationships of the features in Operation I are still being theorized and analyzed and are not yet fully published.  

Figure 4.25: Domuztepe phase C-9 features, Operation I
left: cluster of small tholoi right: large rectangular structures
(photos and drawing courtesy of Stuart Campbell)

Domuztepe Figurines and Archaeological Context
The highest levels of Operation I produced a large, multi-roomed structure and a nearby cluster of small tholoi, all built of stone (Figure 4.25, above). These were found to be situated right below the surface and within the plow-zone, and as a result were heavily damaged and did not offer sealed deposits. This level is the C-9 phase and the latest prehistoric levels so far found which are relatively dated to traditional late Halaf IIB (Campbell 2007). Many figurines were found in this level, particularly the stone figurine pendants, of which many examples are documented at Domuztepe (DT-1, DT-2, DT-3, DT-5, DT-8, DT-15). Further excavation of this level in 2004 found a unique figurine-vessel, DT-12.  

111 I thank Stuart Campbell for sharing his emerging analysis on Operation I site formation processes both in and out of the field. Much of my contextual discussion of the Domuztepe figurines is based upon these discussions, though any errors or discrepancies are my misunderstandings and memory lapses related to an increasingly complex stratigraphic sequence.

112 This figurine-vessel was found in an eroding baulk left standing for years between excavation units. The level of the findspot and the fabric of the ceramic both date it to the late A-3 or C-9/ phase (Campbell 2004, 4).
Sometime before these structures were in use, the area was an open area within which various materials were discarded, but, other than some ovens and hearths, no structures were built. The settlement-phase C-8 left behind a jumble of trash deposits with lenses of burning, plaster and general refuse, amidst which many small finds were tumbled, although only one seal/pendant/figurine in the shape of a human hand was found, DT-18. Like most of the figurines at Domuztepe, it was an isolated find amidst what appears to be many dumping episodes in this open area, either related to domestic structures nearby but unexcavated or related to daily domestic activities. The lack of structures in this area may be related to community memory of what this area was utilized for in the earlier level.
The next earlier phase, C-7, resulted from a community event related to mortuary activities during which, for a few weeks, a large pit full of disarticulated secondary burials of humans (Croucher 2012) and animals (Kansa et al. 2009) was constructed and filled in. This feature is called the Death Pit after the mortuary remains found within it, and its creation and deposits relate to that short-lived activity. After digging the pit into earlier C-6 and C-5 settlement phases, archaeologists found that the one-meter deep hole served as a deposition area for disarticulated animal bones. A dog pelt was placed in the bottom of the pit. This was left for a short time and then the edges of the pit were lined with deliberate patterns of disarticulated human and animal bones and plaster-lined baskets, presumably holding other human and animal remains. Found among these bones were several worked bone tools such as awls and needles, which may have served to fasten cloth or animal skin packages of human and animal body parts (Figure 4.26, left). Several loose beads were found among the death-pit fill, perhaps lost from the clothing of those carrying, preparing, and depositing the contents.

Analysis of the Death Pit and the artifacts found in and around it is ongoing and forthcoming in publication (Carter and Campbell forthcoming). It is generally accepted that the placement of human and animal bones in this pit was intentional, planned, and probably involved considerable portions of the community during a specific and short amount of time (Campbell ND). However, the archaeological context of a few figurines which are said to be related to this feature is caught up in a continuing debate amongst the excavation team (myself included). At issue is the intentionality of all material culture resulting from Death Pit activities and exactly where the matrices resulting from these activities were located in the archaeological excavation. The questions at issue include:

---

114 This debate is largely unpublished. For analysis of specific classes of artifacts found in this general area see Kansa et al. (2009), Healey (2011), Irving and Heywood (2004). Hopefully future publication of the late Halaf levels at Domuztepe will present some resolution of this debate (Carter and Campbell forthcoming).
1. Is the composition of the fill matrix and the artifact assemblages in the Death Pit and related activity areas intentional or accidental?

2. Which of the physically nearby loci of soil matrices are related to human activities focused upon constructing and remembering the Death Pit? Which belong to unrelated activities chronologically later and earlier?

Portions of the debate relate to specific figurines, and analysis of them could potentially contribute to answers. Compounding the confusion is that an excavation strategy within the Death Pit area, including 100% recovery of micro-artifacts through floatation and careful triangulation of the exact position of each artifact, does not match strategies in other excavation areas. The modern intentionality of archaeologists to document all deposits related to a perceived symbolic activity because they are potentially meaningful should not be confused with intentionality of past human activities in the deposition of artifacts. Analysis of the figurines is helpful in untangling the two phenomena.

An enigmatic bead/pendant/figurine, possibly unfinished and unique amongst examples known in the Halaf (DT-16) came not from the Death Pit itself but rather from the western slope adjacent to it. This context is certainly related to Death Pit activities, as this area, which slopes down to an undistinguishable edge of the pit, was found to consist of matrices similar to that of the Death Pit filling and capping material. Perhaps this figurine-bead\textsuperscript{115} was carried by chance or intention within the ashy fill that thickly covered this area which yielded many artifacts amongst partial human remains. It can be interpreted as a staging or preparation area, probably at times quite sodden with substances related to mortuary procedures and water used potentially to wash them and the stench away.

\textsuperscript{115}This is called a bead because the axis of the hole and partial holes are parallel to the bulk of the material of the object, therefore the ends of the perforations are at the base and top of the figurine. This is opposed to a pendant, for which perforation and axis of the hole is perpendicular to the face and back of the object, as with DT-1 and others of this type at Domuztepe. For more on bead and pendant typology at Domuztepe see Belcher in Carter and Campbell (forthcoming).
The presence of liquids and sodden matrices is well documented in the Death Pit and may have had a symbolic as well as a practical reason. It is certain to have affected the sensory experience of those involved in and nearby these activities (Croucher 2012). This particular figurine, which is only vaguely anthropomorphic in its unfinished and broken state, unfortunately does not have direct parallels in either typology or material to any other known Halaf figurines. It may well represent experimentation, as execution of such a difficult muti-piercing would have been quite a feat if successful. Clear silicates and other hard stones are documented in the form of beads, seals, and pendants in this particular matrix as well as elsewhere in all late Halaf levels. Raw material has been identified nearby on the hillsides around the site. It is probable that this artifact got scooped up with other materials with matrices carried into the area from other locations because it had been (broken and) discarded elsewhere or was lost by an individual in the course of the carrying and preparation of Death Pit materials.

A second figurine, DT-1, was found in a post hole sunk into the Death Pit from above. Vertically aligned packed soil matrices indicate that perhaps a plank or similar flat wide object was sunk into this location which potentially formed an above-ground super structure to mark the pit at a later time. This marker must have been of organic materials such as wood, since no trace remained in the excavated matrix. The context of this figurine is not the Death Pit but rather a narrow hole dug into earlier levels presumably to insert this marker, perhaps during phase C-9. Its presence in the bottom of the pit may well represent an intentional and deliberate deposit, perhaps in relation to community remembering of the Death Pit itself but dating to a much later time. There is also the possibility that the figurine simply fell into the hole or was transported amongst debris within the fill (as its head is broken off), but both possibilities must have

---

116 I was an excavation supervisor for portions of the Death Pit during the 1997, 1998, and 1999 excavation seasons. My discussion of the context of both of these figurines is from direct observation. See also Stuart Campbell (ND).
happened well after the construction of the Death Pit. The typology of this figurine, a LH.2B type, fits well with other aforementioned figurines of the same type also from the C-9 phase. Figurines of this same type assigned to pre-Death Pit earlier phases were found loose in the soil in mixed lots, so they are not securely dated to these earlier phases. One exception is DT-4, which stratigraphically can be placed in phase C-6, but which also has quite distinctly different features, only the deep notches representing bent arms are shared with DT-1.

A group of figurines has been said to be found in the “area nearby” the Death Pit or to be associated to its activities by virtue of the group’s perceived parallel symbolism (Gauld, Campbell, and Carter 2003). These figurines were not in reality found in excavated contexts directly related to or dating to the time of the Death Pit. Some of these examples were found physically adjacent to the edge of the pit but are associated with the earlier settlement layers into which it was cut; others were found nowhere near it. This group includes figurines which date earlier (DT-5, DT-11, DT-19) or later (DT-2, DT-3, DT-18) and were found in deposits having nothing to do with human activities related to the Death Pit. It must be remembered that this was a pit dug into and disturbing earlier settlement remains, so therefore, although objects may have been found nearby the Death Pit in the physical plan of modern excavations, stratigraphically their occurrence could be decades apart. This is also true of a silver bead published as found near the Death Pit (Gauld, Campbell, and Carter 2003, 125) but in reality associated with the earlier levels. The Death Pit activities actually sealed the deposit associated with this bead, meaning that AMS absolute dating of samples in the Death Pit provides a solid terminus ante quem for the earliest known human use of native silver in the world (Yener et al. forthcoming). These figurines found near the Death Pit were not found within the distinctive matrices resulting from the construction of the Death Pit but were found in earlier deposits. From that same level is
DT-11, also from earlier levels into which those scooping out the depression for the Death Pit cut.

It has been suggested that other figurines portray symbolism perceived as similar in meaning to that of activities related to the Death Pit (Gauld, Campbell, and Carter 2003). The aforementioned DT-1 is potentially associated but during a later phase of the site, perhaps as part of social memory of what happened previously in that location. In fact, as mentioned above, DT-1, DT-2, and DT-3, cited and illustrated in this dissertation, are securely dated to the later C-9 phase of the site. Despite the fact these specimens are not stratigraphically associated, the proposers of this theory further attempted to establish a connection between the Death Pit and figurine activities. The authors have suggested that the fragmentation of Domuztepe figurines and those featuring single body parts (citing DT-11, DT-19, DT-18) echoes practices of the disarticulation of human and animal bodies into parts in the Death Pit (Gauld, Campbell, and Carter 2003, 122-123). This is an example of archaeologists allowing biases, assumptions, and perceptions that figurines are special objects found in special contexts as a reason to ignore known empirical evidence to the contrary. Therefore, this article associates a perceived special meaning of figurines with a documented special activity which, arguably, was deeply entangled with community meaning and symbolism but which stratigraphically is a phenomenon chronologically separated from these figurines by generations. The Death Pit was the result of activity that probably took only a few weeks sometime around 5575 cal BC (Campbell ND). All other figurines are separated by over a century and generations chronologically on either side of this event (Table 4.23, p. 188). This is especially true of LH.2B type figurines, most occurring in the latest phases of the site.
Activities related to the Death Pit radically manipulated not only dead bodies but also previous deposits in this open area both by scooping into them and dumping prepared and unprepared fill littered with debris and possibly carried from elsewhere on the mound, but only one figurine, DT-16 (not published by Gauld, Campbell, and Carter 2003), can be confidently associated with this activity. Human and animal part internments as well as spillover of Death Pit capping and fill matrices together provide evidence for liquids, waterlogged soils, and ash which also serve to delineate and seal earlier deposits in so far as they can be isolated from what might be called regular deposits. The immediate area to the east of the Death Pit appears to have been an open debris-strewn area both before and after the short-lived Death Pit activities, but the other areas do not. Therefore, the previous publication of figurines DT-1, DT-2, DT-3, DT-4, DT-6, and DT-11 as somehow related to Death Pit activities stratigraphically, ritually, or through collective memory and fragmentation because some of them are missing their head (or are complete without delineated heads) is not supported by the evidence. (contra. Gauld, Campbell, and Carter 2003, 122, 125, 128, fig. 14, fig. 18).

Figure 4.26: left: The Death Pit (early A-3), right: Red Terrace (A-2 – A-1)
(Composite photo courtesy Eric Kansa, Drawing courtesy Stuart Campbell)
As mentioned above, activities associated with the Death Pit cut into and disturbed earlier open-area and midden contexts of the C-6 and C-5 phases (formerly known as A-2, see Figure 4.26, right). The next phase of the site is documented south of the Death Pit, consisting of a series of ephemeral structures called the Burnt Structure, assigned to the C-6 phase. The remains and contents of these structures were preserved by roof collapse as the result of a fire. This area, which has not yet been completely excavated, is interpreted as a storage and work area. Many large vessels were smashed in situ when the roof collapsed in the fire. Also found in this area was a deposit of partially completed obsidian beads. These bead blanks indicate that stone working, probably including the softer stone figurine pendants, was carried out at Domuztepe using batched processes and considerable community shared skills and materials (Belcher 2011). One more LH.2B type pendant/figurine, DT-4, can be associated with this level. The complex incisions on the face of this figurine are similar to that observed on the sealing faces of stamp seals, which suggests that it may also have been used for the same impression or stamping purposes as seals (Denham 2103).

The C-5 phase and the end of the A2 (late Halaf) phase coincide with the last activity of a feature called the Red Terrace, which was a built earthwork consisting of a red clay matrix carried from off the mound. This feature was built up by small deposits over a very long period and was found to be without architectural features and without a large number of artifact finds. Hearths and ovens and refuse-filled pits suggest this may have been used for open-area cooking. The Red Terrace is thought to be a community-built earthwork constructed by the carrying of small amounts of matrices from elsewhere without interruption for up to 500 years. It seems that individuals may have carried small containers of these blocky, friable materials to replenish continually a wide strip of open area through the late and early Halaf Domuztepe spanning
phases, C-5-C-3. A uniquely suggestively shaped pebble, DT-11, incised to accentuate its phallic shape is associated with the C-5 phase earlier but in the immediate area of the Death Pit, just off the Red Terrace (see Figure 4.26). Also found in the C-5 level are two more LH.2B type figurine pendants, DT-6 and DT-7. Another LH.2B type figurine fragment, DT-9, is associated with the C-5 phase, but it was found in a different location on the mound in Operation IV.

Contemporary with the Red Terrace (Phase C-3), an adjacent earthwork was created with a series of deep scoops into another open area. This feature is called The Ditch and runs east-west and cuts the earliest Red Terrace. The Ditch was found to have gleyed and waterlogged soils found to be full of artifacts, including early Halaf pottery, which served to date it (Geary et al. 2011). The waterlogged nature of the Ditch suggests that a possible purpose of the Red Terrace may have been to serve as a dryer surface at the edges of the soggy ditch. Liquids and waterlogged materials would drain through this blocky, friable, and distinctive matrix. The
Ditch also lasted a long time and was frequently extended by further scooping into earlier deposits. Eventually it was covered over by a lateral buildup of the Red Terrace.

**Table 4.24: Types of figurines by phase from Domuztepe**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Late Halaf Operation I</td>
<td>DT-1, DT-2, DT-3, DT-4, DT-5, DT-6, DT-7, DT-9, DT-16</td>
<td>DT-18 (hand) DT-19 (foot)</td>
<td>DT-11</td>
<td>DT-12, DT-14, DT-15</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>phases C-9 – C-5</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late Halaf Operation IV</td>
<td>DT-8</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>phase C-5</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Halaf Operation II</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>DT-20 (foot)</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>phase C-4</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Halaf Operation I</td>
<td>DT-17 (ceramic)</td>
<td>DT-21 (foot) DT-22 (foot)</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>DT-13</td>
<td>DT-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>phase C-3</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figurines from the ditch include DT-10, a distinctive, possibly male figurine head of hard baked ceramic, once featuring eyes inlaid with an unknown material. This figurine head has no other Halaf comparanda, so it is impossible to speculate upon what the body of the figurine may have looked like. Also from the ditch is a foot fragment from a ceramic figurine vessel, DT-13, indicating the possibility that these were also made in the early Halaf. It is equally possible that this item may have fallen into the ditch from late Halaf levels above. Also from the Ditch, typologically belonging to the early Halaf, are several foot- or boot-stamp seal pendants (DT-21, DT-22) as well as a vaguely anthropomorphic re-cut and incised ceramic sherd made into a pendant (DT-17). Domuztepe Figurine/Pendants (Type LH.2B).
The most common figurine type at Domuztepe are the figurine pendants, rendered in type LH.2B, which, with the exception of DT-17,\textsuperscript{117} are all from late Halaf levels (Table 4.24, above and Figure 4.28, below). While there are no legs indicated, the stance represented is an upright one, so these figurines are interpreted as standing. It is actually common for standing Halaf figurines not to represent legs (with the notable exception of figurine vessel DT-12) and for seated figurines to feature them, as, for example, in LH.1A/B/C examples. There are actually several similarities between the LH.1A figurines and these Domuztepe examples of LH.2B. For example, the notched pointed arms I interpret as the same pose of bent arms supporting breasts (which are implied rather than represented in the LH.2B examples) as seen on the LH.1A figurines, translated into the flatter medium of stone. In particular, DT-1 has similar decorative elements such as a large pubic triangle, and multiple belts at the waist, and a chevron necklace crossing in the back, which can be found painted onto clay seated examples from the Khabur (see Chapter 5, Appendix B). Examples DT-1 and DT-2 provide recognition by analogy that DT-3, DT-4, DT-5, DT-6, and fragments DT-7, DT-8, DT-9 can also be understood as anthropomorphic figurines.

All the figurines in of this type are cut, notched, ground and polished, incised, and pierced onto soft stone (probably all serpentinite). Some also have some features incised. The back face is generally flat and not as finished and polished as the front, which is slightly convex. The features are represented in low relief and by incision. One (DT-2) still has its head intact, which also serves as a shank for suspension; others originally had heads which have broken off (DT-1, DT-3). Still others have a very schematic head (DT-5) or were not represented with a head at all (DT-4, DT-6). The diversity of these examples, all made within a generation or two,

\textsuperscript{117} It is not completely clear that this object represents an anthropomorphic form and thus should be called a figurine or not. It is certainly different from the other figurine pendants, and its possible dating to the early Halaf does not disprove the findings that at Domuztepe all 2B type figurines date to the late Halaf.
show that there was a wide spectrum of representation and details and stones used in the making of these specimens (*Figure 4.28, below*). Perhaps choice of the details in representation was up to the personal decision of the maker and/or user, as here the overall general form and holes for suspension were the only needed consistencies. Some are more clearly anthropomorphic than others, but all are clearly part of the same type, with variations.

*Figure 4.28: Type LH.2B pendant-figurines, DT-1 – DT-6 (not to scale, photos S. Campbell)*

*Figure 4.29: Figurine (of ephemeral materials?) used as a seal at Sabi Abyad. (Found at tell Sabi Abyad level 6 known as the Burnt Village, from Akkermans and Duistermaat 1996, Fig. 5)*
It is easy to imagine other types of objects of materials that would not survive in the archaeological record that could have taken on this same general form and had holes for suspension. These theoretical other or secondary objects could have represented these same forms and details with paint, carving, or weaving or by cutting into cloth, wood, skin, or other surfaces and materials. These secondary objects, made of cheap materials, could have been avenues for transmitting iconography of human representation across great distances, attached to or carried by humans and animals in bags or on the skin. There is extant proof that this type of figurine made of ephemeral materials existed in pre-Halaf level 6 Tell Sabi Abyad, because it was impressed into clay sealing an open vessel. This evidence also supports the suggestion that the LH.2B type figurines may also have been used as seals, particularly DT-4, which bears incisions similar to objects traditionally described as Halaf seals (see also Denham 2013).

Figure 4.30: Figurine pendants from Canhasan I (top row) and Aphrodisias (lower row) Photos by author at Museum of Anatolian Civilizations, Ankara,118 and at the Aphrodisias museum.119

118 These figurines are CAN/62/169 and CAN/62/106; see French 1963, pl. IId and French 2010.119 See also Joukowsky (1986, figs. 197, 198, 207, 207) for other views of these same figurines.
As mentioned, close comparanda are not found in Mesopotamia for this particular sub-type of stone figurine pendants. Within the Halaf corpus, they are unique to Domuztepe, although the general type LH.2B occurs in many figurine assemblages at Halaf sites as described above in Chapter 3. The Domuztepe examples are somewhat similar in representation to figurines from Çavı Tarlası (e.g., ÇT-1), Arpachiyah (Mallowan and Rose 1935, fig. 52, 3; pl X, a920), Tepe Gawra (Tobler 1950 CLIII, 2), and Yarim Tepe II (Merpert and Munchaev 1987, fig. 12 1, 2). Much closer comparanda come from central Anatolia, particularly from Canhasan (French 2010), where similar figurine pendants were found.120 Ceramics from Canhasan level 2B are contemporary with those known from A-3 late Halaf Domuztepe (Irving 2001). Comparanda are also found much further east at Aphrodisas, where figurines were found in the Pekmez prehistoric sounding. These figurines are erroneously dated to Early Bronze through a complicated web of comparanda, several key examples of which were purchased on the market, some of which can be seen at the Ashmolean Museum (Figure 4.31, p. 202).121 Refik Duru, comparing pottery from the Aphrodisias sounding with that excavated from Kuruçay, has proposed that these lowest levels should be considered early Chalcolithic (1994, 104, 118). Similarity of these two Aphrodisias figurines with those from Canhasan I and late Halaf Domuztepe supports Duru’s chronology.

120 Another shell pendant of this type was found at Canhasan, level 2A, house 6, see French (1963, pl. IId).
121 These figurines were found in the lowest level of the Aphrodisias Pekmez Trench 2, originally excavated and published by Barbara Kadish (1969) and re-published by Martha Joukowsky (1986), who dated them to Late Chalcolithic I, perhaps because these figurines were erroneously compared to early Bronze Age types (16). These two figurines (here illustrated as Figure 4.30, p. 210) were called Kilia type (her type b, see p. 204) after a drawing by D.H. French (1969, 98, fig. 91), in which he reconstructed a broken figurine as an Early Bronze age Cycladic figurine (Joukowsky 1986, 204). This figurine is essentially unstratified, but comes from (was purchased at?) Hanaytepe, near Troy, originally published upside down as a flower by Schliemann (1880, 712, no. 1551) and now on exhibit in the Ashmolean museum (illustrated in this dissertation as Figure 4.31, above. To prove association with the early Bronze Age, these figurines were also compared to a looted Cycladic figurine in the Guennol Collection, based upon the evidence of the heads, which are not extant on either of the Pekmez Trench 2 examples and is a modern reconstruction on the unexcavated Guennol comparanda (Joukowsky 1986, 217-221). For more on the Killia type and other unstratified examples see Lamb (1932), Caskey (1972). For an earlier discussion of this comparison, see Belcher (2007).
All of this subtype of Domuztepe figurines are pierced for suspension. They could have served as pendants, but string wear at all of the holes and a positioning of holes at both sides of one (DT-5) suggest that they were tightly fastened to something, perhaps affixed to garments or household textiles hung on walls. Wear at the broken edges suggests that these were still in use after breakage. A few fragments (DT-7, DT-8, DT-9) of figurines of this type are pierced, presumably after breakage, suggesting that even in fragmentary form they still had use and meaning (Figure 4.33, left). A comparable figurine from Canhasan I (Figure 4.30, right) is also pierced with what appears to be repair holes. It is more likely that the secondary piercings in Domuztepe examples came about because LH.2B figurines at Domuztepe, even in fragmentary state, needed to be pierced, even though their original shape is not obvious. Two less fragmentary examples also show re-piercing: DT-1, may be a re-piercing after the head broke off, but it may be no accident that the piercing is at the location of a vagina (Figure 4.33, below). The difficult-to-achieve and quite risky bent-channel piercing on DT-2 may be a secondary piercing after the upper shank broke off (Figure 4.32, below).
There may well be significance to the feature of two parallel holes on some of these figurines, evident on DT-4 and DT-5. Perhaps these double piercings represent eyes and/or breasts and/or have a practical, functional reason for the practice. The question is whether these double holes can be interpreted as visual markers of anthropomorphic, or perhaps zoomorphic (which also feature two eyes), or perhaps an intersectional living being with two eyes. It is interesting to note partial or whole drilled piercings to represent eyes on anthropomorphic
figurine head fragment DT-10 but also on zoomorphic pendants from Domuztepe as well as round dots representing eyes on heads or masks in pottery motifs (Figure 4.37, p. 209, right, ).

Excavations at Domuztepe yielded an assemblage of flat oblong stone objects with parallel double piercings, which might also be considered as anthropomorphic figurines, but only the possibility is mentioned here in this dissertation (Figure 4.34, below).

Two other vaguely anthropomorphic pierced objects are considered pendant figurines with reservations and come from other levels and areas. One was found on the western slope of the Death Pit (DT-16) and is perhaps better described as a bead-figurine, because the axis of the piercings are parallel with the imagery of the object. This object appears to have been broken during this quite challenging piercing, of which there were two attempts. Because this object is unfinished, presumably because the piercings damaged the overall form, it is difficult to determine what the intended object may have looked like. There are no comparanda to this figurine-bead, though the rendering of the short segmented legs and feet are reminiscent of Samarran figurines found at Tell es Sawaan (Oates 1978, pl. 1b).

122 http://opencontext.org/subjects/202_DT_Spatial / DT# 187 http://opencontext.org/subjects/15239_DT_Spatial
123 http://opencontext.org/subjects/14799_DT_Spatial
124 http://opencontext.org/subjects/15017_DT_Spatial
A second object has a piercing axis perpendicular to the design and so can be called a pendant figurine. This was found in the Ditch, so it should date to the early Halaf, level B-1 or C-3/4. This vague anthropomorphic shape, cut, ground, incised, and pierced from a ceramic sherd, may not even be intentional. While pottery sherds are commonly repurposed by grinding and chipping to form scrapers and sherd roundels (or pot discs), which are sometimes pierced, comparanda of ceramic sherd incised pendants have not been found, and this example may be unique (Figure 4.35, below).

![Figure 4.35: Enigmatic ceramic and quartz figurine-pendants, types unknown DT-17 photo, E. Belcher; DT-16 photo, S. Campbell](image)

With the exception of the latter two examples, all of the figurine-pendants at Domuztepe show clear connections to Central Anatolia but also record material procurement and skill sets local to Domuztepe (Belcher 2011). The imagery incised onto some, particularly DT-1, has several features also painted onto other Halaf figurines including large pubic triangles, triple belts at the waist, and neck lines that form a chevron on the front upper chest and cross in the back, perhaps representing a counterweighted necklace, or a garment that crossed and wrapped in the back (see also: CB-3, TA-3, KK-13 amongst many others). Another feature that appears on DT-1 and also on Khabur LH.1A examples is double or triple lines at the waist/hip area, perhaps representing a belt (see also CB-1, CB-3, CB-9, CB-12, KK-13, TH-2). Perhaps it is not possible to be sure what these decorations on the figurines represent – possibly jewelry, fibers, garments,
tattoos, or body paint; the important issue is that here it appears on both on DT-1 and LH.1A figurines from the Khabur region of Syria. In addition, so does the pose of the arms bent at the elbow and supporting breasts (implied rather than fully represented in the LH.2B figurines at Domuztepe). All of these suggest indirect contact of those conceiving, making, and using figurines in both of these areas. Indirect contact, as previously discussed in Chapters 2 and 3, could take the form of shared habitual embodied practices in dress, body adornment, or gesture or narratives about such practices or secondary objects of ephemeral materials representing these practices. Therefore, the represented ideas in these two assemblages are similar, but the figurines can look quite different though be connected by isolated factors in their iconography.

**Miscellaneous Stone and Clay Figurines from Domuztepe**

Two other anthropomorphic figurines found at Domuztepe do not fit into the other figurine types (*Figure 4.36*). One is a naturally occurring large pebble that was incised to accentuate its phallic shape when placed one way, this object represents male genitalia; when placed another way, it resembles a seated human. It is likely that the creator of this object was more inspired by the resemblance of the original form of the sandstone to a body part than outside influences. The archaeological context of this figurine, within a general, mixed-fill matrix of an open area into which the Death Pit was cut (level A-2) does not offer any additional information as to its functional use. The multimodality of the object in that it is overtly male sexed in one direction and possibly female sexed in another (compared to LH.1A type figurines from the Khabur) is interesting and compelling. The gender interpretation somewhere on the intersex spectrum of male/female derives from two different analogies.
Male gender is interpreted by biological sex marker of an erect phallus, and female gender is interpreted by performative means by analogy with seated female figurines from the Khabur region. However, few seated figurines are not overtly gendered female by biological markers in the Anatolian late Halaf as opposed to the Khabur. Further, given that very little was done to alter the overall natural shape of this object in its making, it might well be, I suggest, that it was the phallic shape alone which drove the making and use of this figurine and that the dual-gender interpretation was not intentional. There are several other phallic-shaped models from contemporary sites in Anatolia which exhibit more effort from the maker but no detectable dual-sex intentions.\textsuperscript{125}

\textsuperscript{125} Amongst others, phallic-shaped models or figurines are known from Kuruçay (Duru 1994) and Aphrodisias (Joukowsky 1986). The often-cited, and possibly one-off example of a dual-sex figurine from Tepe Sarab, now in the Royal Ontario Museum, Toronto, (Broman Morales 1990, frontispiece) cannot be associated with late Halaf Domuztepe either regionally or chronologically.
A figurine head fragment found in the artifact-rich early Halaf Ditch, DT-10, is also without direct Halaf comparanda. The neck area shows clearly that it broke off a larger object, but, without comparanda figurines with similar attached heads, it is impossible to know to which type of figurine it originally belonged. Wavy incisions along the side of the face may represent a beard, perhaps indicating that the figurine might be considered male, but they could also represent the use of a mask or perhaps a cloth, perhaps deliberately skewing the gender markers.\(^\text{126}\) As discussed above in previous chapters, the conceptualization of figurines was certainly inspired by observation of lived body practices, but there is no reason to assume that figurine makers felt bound to portray the Halaf body realistically in clay or stone. Rather, these materials were creatively used to visually interpret the body in new ways, influenced by lived practices. Therefore it is quite conceivable that figurines could have both male and female gendered markers. For many figurines gender is depicted not with biological sex markers like DT-11 (see Appendix C, Column 4) but by performative means (Appendix C, Column 5). It is possible that these uses of masks, costumes, and performance in daily or special events at Domuztepe influenced the intersectional possibilities exhibited in this head fragment. The drilled out eyes must have once held inlay of an undetermined material, further suggesting the use of masks at Domuztepe. This head is one of just a few known in the Halaf that offers detailed depiction of faces and heads, all of which vary in detail and representation. Three female-bodied figurines from Chagar Bazar (CB-29, CB-30, CB-31) feature painting on the lower side of the face perhaps representing a beard, cloth, tattoo, or body paint and further support the possibilities that masks were worn in the Halaf. Motifs on pottery also found in the Ditch at Domuztepe further suggest that masks and headdresses were an aspect of community practice (Figure 4.37).

\(^{126}\) For evidence of representations of bearded female bodied figures in historical Mesopotamia see McCaffrey 2002.
The deeply-drilled eye sockets on DT-10 are very similar to one of the Domuztepe pottery motifs.\textsuperscript{127}

\textit{Figure 4.37:} Domuztepe pottery motifs representing dancing masked figures and masks (photos S. Campbell)

The many figurines with holes for the insertion of heads at the neck, not known at Domuztepe but found at Çavı Tarlası, Yarim Tepe II, Tell Sabi Abyad, and Arpachiyah, further reinforce the representation of masks or masks with headdresses represented on figurines and probably reflecting actual Halaf practices. For more on masks and masking, please see further discussion on this topic in Chapter 6.

**Domuztepe Figurine-Vessels**

A unique anthropomorphic pot (DT-12) was found during baulk removal in Operation I during the 2004 season at Domuztepe. This vessel may have been complete at deposition and

\textsuperscript{127} Sampling for scientific testing from the remaining material in the eye sockets is planned for a future Domuztepe study season.
may have broken as a result of post-depositional processes in the soil. Because it was found in the baulk, the other pieces and its overall context were not secured. This vessel is found in pieces, so its construction could be analyzed in detail (Figure 4.39, p. 211).

This vessel – like all Halaf figurine vessels – is does not have any direct parallels known to me; however, there are figurine vessels known from both east and west of Domuztepe. This figure stands squarely on her feet, which serve as the base of the vessel on which it stands without support. The right foot is slightly upturned as if the figure is walking, and the thin arm[s] hang down to the side with splayed hands resting on hip[s] with the fingers delineated with paint, only the right side of the upper torso is still extant. At the ankles, knees, and upper thighs and hips, bands of three parallel lines crossed with diagonal lines are painted. These may represent a
garment, body painting, tattooing, or strings of beads. Beads have been found in nearly every context at Domuztepe, perhaps fallen from similar body ornaments. The overall form of the figure is stocky and short, with small pert breasts modeled on the middle chest. Around the wide rim of the vessel, very little painting remains; however, an eye and the traces of a red wash on the side of the face can be detected, but these remain only faintly. (*Figure 4.38, above*) This vessel was made from shaping thin slabs of clay into parts which were then pieced together while still plastic, similar to the method of construction most similar to that of LH.1A/B/C figurines known, not from Domuztepe but from sites further east.

![Figure 4.39: DT-12 during conservation](Photo, S. Campbell)

As with the Late Halaf type 1 figurines, it is possible to imagine a construction process of batched making and assembly of different body parts to create more than one figurine amongst a group of makers. The unmistakable definite foot fragment of a second standing figurine vessel
(DT-13) was found in the C-3/early Halaf phase. Two additional possible fragments, DT-14 and DT-15, were found in the same C-9 level dating to the late Halaf. The technological features of DT-12 include ceramic fabric, pigment, and slab construction known from late Halaf local pottery production at Domuztepe; in fact, it is quite typical (Figure 4.39, above). Wear on the soles of the feet and the sides of the thighs and hips (Figure 4.38, p. 210) shows that DT-12 was used in vessel-like ways, handled around the middle with one or two hands and picked up and set down often on its base/feet, perhaps for the purpose of drinking or pouring liquids (Stuart Campbell, personal communication). It is tempting to speculate that the pouring or drinking from this vessel may have been a shared experience, one embedded with symbolic meaning.

Certainly before the red wash and dark red and grey pigments faded from use and from depositional processes (the findspot was very close to the plow zone in a cultivated area), the striking details of the painted figure would have been visible from short and medium distances, similar to two-handled chalices utilized in many symbolic group activities today.

Three more fragments of figurine vessels have been found in the course of excavations, indicating that more standing figurine vessels existed at Domuztepe. There is also a possibility that two of them, DT-14 and DT-15 (Figure 4.40), are pottery spouts or handles or could have been part of zoomorphic vessels, which have been found at several Halaf sites but not yet at Domuztepe. The body sherds now missing from DT-12 may have eroded out of the one-meter-wide baulk in which it lay without discovery for many years and were not recognized as anthropomorphic in normal pot sherd processing. It is therefore possible that other figurine

---

128 This object was found during a season when I was not present at Domuztepe, and during that same year it was inventoried into the Kahramamaraş Museum. As a result, I was unable to spend much time directly studying and recording it. Information on this object presented here is mainly based on the personal communication of observations by Stuart Campbell, who spent more time studying it before, after, and during excavation, conservation, and recording.

129 Zoomorphic vessels occur at many sites including Arpachiyah, Umm Qseir, Yarim Tepe II, Tell Hassuna, Chagar Bazar, and Tepe Gawra. Zoomorphic vessels from level IV, Hacilar, include a boar standing on four hooves and legs, see Mellaart (1961, 66, fig. 27-2).
vessels had been created and used at Domuztepe, but their diagnostically human parts have not yet been found.

Figure 4.40: Possible foot and leg fragments of figurine vessels from Domuztepe DT-14, DT-15 (photos courtesy of Stuart Campbell) [DT-13 not pictured]

Figurine-vessels are known within the Halaf cultural horizon at several sites in Iraq including Yarim Tepe II, Tell Hassuna, and Arpachiyah. A figurine vessel was found at Yarim Tepe, apparently discarded when complete in the same way as that which occurred at Domuztepe.\(^{130}\) This vessel also represents a woman in a standing position with bent arms; however, the legs and feet are not represented. The position of the arms is also different from DT-12. The Yarim Tepe II example’s arms are bent at the elbow with hands grasping the breasts, while the Domuztepe example’s thin arms are at the sides. However, both represent hands and fingers, something which is unusual for Halaf figurines. Both examples are rendered in locally common ceramic fabric, paint, motifs, and technology but appear to have been quite carefully made. Both examples also represent beaded ornaments or punctuation scarification, dotted tattoos, and/or spotted garments at the pudenda and upper thigh area as well as elsewhere on the body. The head on the Yarim Tepe II example must have been a separate item which functioned also as a vessel top or stopper, similar to an example excavated from Arpachiyah (Figure 4.41, right). An example from Tell Hassuna (Figure 4.41, center) presents a face on the

\(^{130}\) For more on this vessel from Yarim Tepe II see Merpert and Munchaev (1987, pl. VII), Merpert, Munchaev, and Bader (1981, 41, fig. XI), and further analysis from Campbell (2008).
rim of the vessel, similar to DT-12, but it is possible to imagine a stopper or vessel top that could also visually function as a headdress.

Figure 4.41: Anthropomorphic figurine-vessels from Halaf sites in Iraq
Left to right: Yarim Tepe II (photo, S. Campbell); Tell Hassuna (from Lloyd and Safer 1945, pl. I), and Arpachiyah (photo, A. Fletcher ©The Trustees of the British Museum).

Figurine vessels are also known from Central Anatolian settlements that are roughly contemporary with the Halaf including Çatalhöyük West (Gibson and Last 2003), Köşk Höyük (Renda, Pekin, and Uzunoglu 1993, 62), Hacilar,¹³¹ and Canhasan I (French 2010, figs., 31, 1-2, here Figure 4.42). However, these figurines are not very close comparanda to DT-12-DT-15 or to each other. In western Anatolia figurine vessels have also been found at late Neolithic sites, some of which are earlier than Domuztepe, for example, at Topçepe (Özdogan & Dede 1998, pl. 1) and Ulucak Höyük (Çilingiroğlu, Çevik, and Çilingiroğlu 2012, fig. 9). Notably, none of these figurine vessels are similar to each other. It seems that the concept and perhaps the symbolic

¹³¹ The majority of complete anthropomorphic vessels claimed to be from Hacilar are, in fact, from the antiquities market see Aitken, Moorey, and Ucko (1971) and for examples see Renda, Pekin, and Uzunoglu (1993, 68-69, cat. entry A74), but two unpublished excavated rim sherds with faces are on display at the museum of Anatolian Civilizations, Ankara. For parallels to prehistoric figurine vessels from Thrace and the Balkans, see Naumov (2008).
meaning and ritual use of figurine vessels was widely communicated across prehistoric Anatolia, though the objects themselves were created within local ceramic traditions, imaginations, and skill sets rather than according to an idea connected with preconceived imagery (Belcher 2007, Naumov 2008).

Fragments of figurine vessel feet found at Canhasan I (Figure 4.42, below) present a possible close comparison, showing that this settlement also had figurine-vessels that stood on what appear to be human feet. Unfortunately, there is no evidence as to what these figurines may have looked like above the ankles. These also could be the feet of zoomorphic vessels, of which a few examples are known to stand on feet and legs. This comparison is yet another instance in which figurine makers in settlements at Domuztepe and Canhasan I level 2b appear to have been in close, perhaps direct contact with each other and may also have shared conceptual ideas, use, and discard practices as well.

![Figure 4.42: Standing Figurine-Vessel foot fragments from Canhasan I, level 2b (after French 2010, figs. 31, 1, 2)](image)

**Domuztepe Figurine-Pendant-Seals**

Several foot seal pendants (DT-19, DT-20, DT-21, DT-22) and one hand seal pendant (DT-18) were found during the course of excavations at Domuztepe (Figure 4.43). The hand seal was found in late Halaf level C-8. The foot or boot seals were found in early Halaf levels C-
5 through C-3 which are contemporaneous with boot/foot-shaped seal/pendant/figurines at Tell Kurdu TK-14. Admittedly, some of the examples, DT-19 and DT-20, are perhaps only vaguely foot-like in overall form. These take a variety of forms, materials, and incision patterns on the seal face, all of which are typical for Halaf seals at Domuztepe and elsewhere (Denham 2013). The criss-crossing incision on the seal faces, particularly of DT-19, DT-22, and DT-18, are quite reminiscent of incisions also on figurine DT-4, which might also be considered an anthropomorphic seal.

All of the piercings on these seals, like the Domuztepe type LH.2B figurines, exhibit string wear at the piercing, indicating that they were closely tied to something, perhaps a garment, or on a wall textile. Simon Denham has presented evidence for how seals may have been used in Halaf Mesopotamia, so I do not attempt to reproduce his efforts here (Denham 2013). It is interesting to note that, unlike zoomorphic seals, which can be shaped as hooves, paws, or animal heads
(e.g., Mallowan 1933, pl. IV, fig. 51), anthropomorphic seals feature only hands and feet but never human heads. Isolation of body parts is a feature of Halaf anthropomorphic treatment including treatment of the dead (Croucher 2012), suggesting that certain body parts had symbolic and separate identity and meaning. For more on isolation, separation, and dividuality of body parts in Halaf figurines see the discussion in Chapter 6.

**Domuztepe Figurines Discussion**

The twenty-two figurines from Domuztepe present a diverse typology and advanced understanding of materials and the skills to work them. The prolific figurine makers at Domuztepe produced a diverse assemblage of artifacts, showing that a strong skill set of working with a range of materials was resident in the community. The figurines are reminiscent of figurines from other Halaf sites, with which their makers probably had indirect contact, with the imagery travelling by indirect means. That is, conceptual ideas, ways of making and using figurines in other places, travelled by secondary means, for example, orally or on ephemeral materials. Much closer, perhaps even direct contact is evident in Central Anatolia at the settlement at Canhasan I. By direct contact, I am suggesting that there is the possibility that conceptual ideas were communicated by primary means, direct interaction between those making and using figurines, who may have seen examples of figurine-pendants, figurine-seals, and figurine-vessels elsewhere. Certainly producing and using these double-duty artifacts was shared between these sites during the late Halaf phase.

The figurines found at Domuztepe comprise an intriguing array of different types and materials. Most represented in the assemblage are nine examples of LH.2B, flat standing figurine/pendants, and five of type EH/LH.4B/C, hand and feet figurine/seal/pendants, but each exhibit individuality in the making. Only the seals can be said to be similar to examples known from other Halaf sites; while similar pendant/figurines are not known from any other Halaf sites,
similar examples are found at Canhasan I. Four examples of figurine/vessels bear some similarity to figurine/vessels known from Halaf sites in Iraq but are also quite similar to examples from Canhasan I. The rest of the figurines, DT-10, DT-11, DT-16, and DT-17, are one-off unique examples without any comparanda found so far elsewhere in the known Halaf or contemporary central Anatolian horizons and are thus classified in the miscellaneous typological category. Each of the Domuztepe examples shows vague similarities to Halaf figurines such as in their poses or decorative details, but they also show a lot of individuality and innovation. It appears that the figurine conceivers, makers, users, and discarders at Domuztepe were not bound by existing social practices in their decision-making. Free reign in individual figurine-making appears to be the norm, with the limits imposed only by existing skills sets and the need for secondary functionality of double-duty objects. For example, LH.2B figurine/pendants could be incised in different ways, but they needed to have a hole for suspension. Similarly, LH.3B figurine vessels could be represented on walking feet, but they needed also to have a wide rim for pouring the substances that they held.
Kerkuşti Höyük

Kerkuşti Höyük (KerkH) is a small mound on the west bank of the Kocadere River, which is a tributary of the Euphrates, located in the plains below the modern city of Mardin. This site was first dug in 1981 by the Mardin museum, which removed a Roman mosaic but did not explore the prehistoric remains. The site was excavated again as a rescue project when there was a plan to widen the Şanlıurfa-Viraşehir highway, an action that would cut through and destroy the site. Excavations took place at the same time as road construction, and, due to budget constraints, only three squares containing Halaf remains were opened in two short seasons, which took place in September 2005 and September 2006. First and second millennium settlements were found to overlay, and in some places disturb the prehistoric settlements. Based upon the evidence of the painted ceramics, the prehistoric phases of the site were continuously occupied from the early Halaf through to Halaf-Ubaid transitional periods, according to the excavators. Different architectural styles in the different levels which they found suggested a long and changing population settlement structure (Erim 2007, Sarıaltın 2009a).

Figure 4.44: A figurine fragment from Kerkuşti Höyük (KerkH-1) (From: Sarıaltın 2009b)

Two human figurine fragments were found in the late Halaf levels, an illustration of KerkH-1, an LH.2B standing figurine fragment, is available (Sarialtı 2009b, Figure 4.44);
KerkH-2 remains unpublished and unavailable. Both have presumably been deposited at the Mardin museum, but I was unable to study the originals and thus was unable to determine their archaeological contexts. The excavators compare these figurine fragments (Saraltın 2009b) to late Halaf Yarim Tepe II (Merpert and Munchaev 1993, 145, 8.13 and 161, fig. 8.32.3). I concur with this comparison given that KerkH-1 appears to be in the same stylistic tradition as the figurine vessel from Yarim Tepe II, especially in the way that the public triangle is decorated, perhaps representing beading of the pudenda, as may also be represented on figurine vessel DT-12. The morphological shape of the figurine can also be compared to stone LH.2B types from Domuztepe DT-1 through DT-9 and Çavıt Tarlası ÇT-1, which also has clay examples in the same type, ÇT-2 and ÇT-3. It is particularly interesting to note that, while this is just a single example from Kerkuşti Höyük and although the site is geographically quite close, there are no comparisons that can be made to figurines from late Halaf sites in the Khabur headwaters area in Syria (see Chapter 5, Appendix B). This fragment can be compared also to SAB-1 from Sabi Abyad, just southwest of the site, which, however, is dated to the early Halaf.

It would be interesting to know if either fragment shows evidence that it originally had a hole for insertion of a head, which would further suggest communication of figurine practices to the aforementioned sites of Tell Sabi Abyad, Çavıt Tarlası, and Yarim Tepe. Future hands-on study of the Kerkuşti examples as well as better knowledge of their archaeological context would be needed for further discussion. This work is particularly important given these are the only known examples Halaf figurines this far East in Anatolia.
Kazane Höyük

The site of Kazane Höyük is a large Third Millennium BCE site, with adjacent Halaf settlement layers which were discovered during a 1992 survey. On the southeast of the site directly under the surface, Halaf remains were found, which at places were cut by third millennium foundations (Creekmores, 136, n. 6). The Halaf was excavated in two separate campaigns. Early campaigns were carried out in 1996, 1997, and 1998 by Reinhard Bernbeck and Susan Pollock. These revealed a large rock-built tholoi with a dromos and smaller rectangular pisé and mud brick architecture, all associated with late Halaf material culture. While a few small finds were uncovered, including sherd roundels and stamp seals, no figurines are reported from these excavations. (Corsey, Bernbeck, and Pollock nd; Bernbeck, Pollock, and Coursey 1999). Absolute dating by radiocarbon analysis was established on samples from the 1996 season, which give a range of 5200-4500 BCE uncalibrated, 5900-5350 cal BC (Bernbeck, Pollock, and Coursey 1999, 128, table 3).

Subsequent excavation took place in 2004, directed by Sue Ann McCarty, and these exposed additional late Halaf structures adjacent to the earlier architecture (Creekmores 2008, 73, n. 35). Much of this architecture was cut by the Third Millennium BCE architecture (Creekmores 2008, 136, n. 6). During these excavations, a clay figurine fragment, KZ-1, in the shape of a torso was found (McCarty, forthcoming and personal communication 2010). However, neither this figurine fragment nor the archaeological context in which it was found has so far been published or made available to me. With no further information available, I only mention this here as another location where at least one Halaf figurine is known to have been made, used, discarded, and excavated.
Anatolian Halaf Figurines, Conclusions
Unlike the figurine assemblage found in Syria (discussed in the next chapter), the
Anatolian Halaf figurine assemblage is quite diverse. Each site presents figurine assemblages, a
majority of which show a large degree of innovative and unique examples, with only a few
examples that are directly comparable to others in Anatolia or to those of the larger Halaf
horizon. Regional figurine worlds of the Syrian and Anatolian Halaf were very different in
typology and probably only participated in indirect contact with each other. It seems also that
there was only indirect contact between Anatolian Halaf sites in Turkey as well, at least within
the interaction spheres of figurine conceptualization and making and perhaps in practices of
figurine use as well.

There is, however, a similar pattern across all Anatolian sites in evidence for the discard
of these figurines, and this pattern, as the next chapter will show, is also shared with Syrian sites.
The findspots of all Anatolian figurines are midden contexts. Figurines were not found together,
nor were they found carefully deposited in a context that was different from any other fill matrix.
The findspots of these figurines were so unremarkable that they are often not mentioned or
recorded in any of the publications. Even in the most carefully excavated areas, including areas
that I personally excavated and was present at the finding of a figurine, not much can be said of
the surrounding assemblage and matrix. These figurines cannot be said to be more than isolated
finds tumbled into dirt with other artifacts and lenses of plaster, ash, ceramic sherds, and bone as
well as other small finds. Presumably, this fill came from normal daily activities, and thus it is
here interpreted as domestic, even though at many sites the findspots are not directly associated
with architectural features.
CHAPTER FIVE: Halaf Figurines From The Western Jazirah (Syria)

Introduction to Halaf Figurines from Syria

One-hundred-and-twenty-one Halaf figurines have been found in Syria, representing one-third of approximately 350 Halaf figurines so far known. This chapter presents and discusses the archaeological context of all examples which were excavated deposited alongside Halaf pottery at eight excavations within the modern borders of Syria (see map, Figure 5.45, p. 225). Four late Halaf settlements (Chagar Bazar, Tell Halaf, Tell Aqab, and Tell Kashkashok) were situated in a very tight cluster in the northeastern corner of the modern state of Syria near the border with Turkey, also known as the Khabur triangle or Khabur headwaters area. Excavations of these settlements yielded a great many late Halaf figurines. The Syrian Jazirah is an area that includes the Khabur triangle as well as the Balikh river valley, where figurines were found at Tell Sabi Abyad and Khirbet esh-Shenef and the middle Khabur where a figurine was found at Umm Qsier. The eighth Halaf excavation in Syria that has yielded figurines is Tell Arjoune, located further south, near the border with Lebanon. This chapter presents the circumstances of the excavation and discovery of each of these figurines and compares each figurine assemblage with the others. This chapter should be read in tandem with the catalog in Appendix B, which presents the data for each individual figurine example from Syria and to which this chapter often refers. More than half of the examples presented in this chapter are unpublished and therefore previously unknown (Table 5.26, p.233). This chapter presents research that clears up a general lack of understanding of the quantity and typology of figurines within their regional archaeological contexts.

For the most part, this is a tightly analogous corpus, showing similarities typologically, technologically, and contextually across the individual site figurine assemblages. Most of the figurines discussed in this chapter are also very tightly bound regionally; only 16 examples come
from outside the Khabur headwaters region in northwestern Syria. The Khabur headwaters area proves to be a nucleus of late Halaf seated-type LH.1 figurines, of which 86 are documented in this dissertation as found at sites within this small area. This more figurines than are known to have been found anywhere else in the Halaf interaction sphere (Table 5.27, p. 235). These are the figurines that are often used to illustrate aspects of the Halaf material culture (i.e., Akkermans and Schwartz 2003), these same type of figurines in turn influenced future excavators’ expectations for Halaf figurine finds and the narrative about the Halaf in general. As this dissertation shows, type 1 figurines are not dominant at Anatolian Halaf sites, even though some are quite close to the Syrian border, and, when they do appear, they look quite different from the Khabur examples. I suspect that future analysis of Iraqi examples will prove the same.

The excavated assemblages from these same sites – particularly Tell Aqab and Chagar Bazar – have also served as exemplars for the establishment in the 1970s-1980s of a periodization and diagnostic understanding of the Halaf (LeBlanc and Watson 1973, Davidson and McKerrell 1976, Watson 1983). However, the work on those sites from that period relied almost exclusively on ceramics to establish a framework of understanding of the Halaf material culture, and little is known about the other finds from these sites. Internally stratified figurine finds were not considered at all within this chronological framework, except for passing mention that mother goddess-type figurines, as the authors identified them, were found amidst the Halaf figurines often with few or no specific examples provided (e.g., Davidson and Watkins 1981, Watson 1983 after Mallowan and Rose 1935, Mallowan 1936). It is almost as if the presence of figurines in the excavations shows a presence of mother goddesses as a diagnostic trait of Halaf culture.
Only twelve examples of early Halaf figurines are known from Syria. This small group is comprised of early Halaf levels at Sabi Abyad and a single example from Umm Qseir. Both of these assemblages come from well-stratified contexts. An additional two early Halaf figurines are known from Tell Aqab, identified as early typologically, but they were found in late Halaf contexts. As analysis below shows, figurine findspots at Tell Aqab suggest that the stratigraphic levels were disturbed and/or mixed. Certainly there is early Halaf material culture at Tell Aqab, and, although these figurines are not as securely stratified as those of Tell Sabi Abyad, they are typologically comparable to each other. With the exception of one seal pendant, type EH.4A, all of the early Halaf examples from Syria are Type 2 standing figurines. All Sub Types, EH.2A, EH.2B, EH.2C, and EH.2D are represented by only a very few available examples.
The remaining 109 examples from Syria date to the late Halaf phase either by stratigraphy or typology (see Appendix B). During the late Halaf, there appears to have been an intensive and prolific demand for figurines at many settlements, especially in the Khabur River headwaters area in the northeastern corner of the modern Syrian border. Settlements were tightly clustered within this small, well-watered area, and those living in them must have been in close communication. There are 105 examples of late Halaf figurines recorded here from the Khabur sites Chagar Bazar, Tell Aqab, Tell Kashkashok, Tell Halaf, and Tell Beydar. A majority is quite similar to each other, which suggests that direct sharing imagery and techniques took place. However, there also appear to be features localized to specific settlements or even individuals, an observation which will be further discussed below. It is certainly possible, living just a day’s walk from each other, that those conceiving, making, using, and discarding figurines were directly familiar from first-hand observation of practices at other nearby settlements. Certainly similar practices were in play across all five settlements, which apparently needed these figurines in great quantities. The large quantity of remarkably similar figurines of Sub Types LH.1A and LH.1B, many of which can be confirmed as found in a late Halaf context, confirms that these are diagnostic indicators of late Halaf levels.

A handful of late Halaf Type 2 standing figurines are also known from sites in the Khabur (11 total), but many are unstratified finds and some are hypothetically dated late Halaf (Appendix B). Only Sub Type LH.2B is a possibility as a possible diagnostic type, but this possibility hangs on only two examples from secure late Halaf contexts in the Khabur. However, this sub type is further supported by the Tell Arjoune assemblage, from which six more examples were found, and by a single fragment from Khirbet esh-Shenef, all securely stratified to late Halaf levels.

---

132 Of course, it is also possible that excavators simply got lucky and excavated in areas where figurines were to be found at these sites.
Halaf levels. Further confirmation of this type as a diagnostic indicator comes from Anatolian sites, especially Domuztepe, arguably situated in the same Levantine corridor as Tell Arjoune (see Chapter 4, Appendix A). However, as mentioned in Chapter 4, figurines very similar to Type LH.2B which are also known from central and western Anatolia and from both earlier and later cultural phases. Thus, while LH.2B figurines can be posited to be late Halaf indicators, similar early Halaf EH.2B are also known from well stratified contexts (e.g., TK-2, GH-1, and SAB-1). More on the diagnostic and stratigraphic strengths and weaknesses of individual types will be discussed in Chapter 6 after the archaeological context of each assemblage known in Syria is examined further in this chapter.

Late Halaf figurines from the Khabur triangle, as mentioned, populate the bulk of the Syrian corpus in this chapter. These same examples are the basis upon which a normative figurine style was constructed in Halaf studies. While this dissertation confirms that LH.1A is the most common overall type, it also shows that these examples were found within a constricted time and place, centered in late Halaf settlements in the Khabur headwaters triangle. This normative Halaf figurine construct was also called the mother goddess type (here called Type LH1.A and LH1.B), and it has its roots in the presentation of the first Halaf figurines, which were found at Tell Halaf (Oppenheim 1908, 1930, 1933; Schmidt 1943). This construct was further reinforced by the presentation of a great number of what were called ‘mother goddess type’ figurines from the Area M sounding also known as the ‘Prehistoric Pit’ 1935 excavations at Chagar Bazar (Mallowan 1936). This construct of the normative Halaf figurine was further perpetuated without reflection by the description – but not full publication or illustration of – so-called mother goddess type figurines from Tell Aqab (Davidson and Watkins 1981, 10) and Tell Kashkashok (Souleiman and Tarekji 1999, 48).
Therefore, the assemblage of figurines from settlements in the Syria is especially important to the historiography and development of expectations for Halaf figurines since they were first excavated, and that identity has been perpetuated in modern scholarship. As this dissertation demonstrates, there was no one, normative Halaf figurine style. Rather, it seems that there was a particular time and place, centered in late Halaf settlements in the Khabur headwaters triangle of northwestern Syria, when and where figurines of this specific type were made, used, discarded, and excavated in greater numbers than elsewhere. 133 Whereas previously other figurines not of the so-called mother goddess type might have been thought to be peripheral or imitative of the perception of normative Halaf figurines (i.e., Bernbeck et al. 2003), their difference can now be attributed to their origins in a different time and place. Taken as a whole corpus, the figurines from Syria or even from the late Halaf Khabur triangle sites are not only of this one type. This chapter and the corresponding catalog in Appendix B show that, while in lesser numbers, many different figurine types were conceived of, made, used, and discarded. This diversity demonstrates a more complex relationship to body imagery and identity rooted in local practices as well as regional intercommunication.

**Syrian Halaf Figurine Chronology and Landscapes**

Beyond the northern flows and headwater regions of the Balikh and Khabur, figurines were found at only one site outside this area in Syria, Tell Arjoune. In addition to being conceived, created, used, and discarded very close to each other geographically – with the exception of Tell Sabi Abyad and Umm Qseir, all the figurines discussed in this chapter date to the late Halaf phase. Although Tell Aqab and Chagar Bazar are documented by ceramic phasing to have had early Halaf settlements under the late Halaf levels, the figurines from these sites are

133 It is equally proven in this dissertation that, during the twentieth century CE, late Halaf settlements in the Khabur headwaters area were intensively explored in excavations that yielded many figurines.
all typologically or stratigraphically dated to the late Halaf. Tell Aqab is the only site that is reported to have Ubaid settlement overlays directly above the Halaf, but no figurines are known to come from those levels (Table 5.25).

**Table 5.25: Archaeological over/under layers, regions, and phases of Halaf settlements and number of figurines**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site number examples</th>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Halaf Phase(s)</th>
<th>Underlay</th>
<th>Overlay</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tell Sabi Abyad 8 figurines</td>
<td>SAB</td>
<td>Balikh</td>
<td>Early</td>
<td>proto-Halaf/transitional pre-Halaf early ceramic Neolithic</td>
<td>Bronze age (middle Assyrian)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Umm Qseir 1 figurine</td>
<td>UQ</td>
<td>Khabur</td>
<td>Early</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>Roman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khirbet esh Shenef 1 figurine</td>
<td>KesS</td>
<td>Balikh</td>
<td>Late</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chagar Bazar 40 figurines</td>
<td>CB</td>
<td>Khabur</td>
<td>early – late</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>Bronze Age</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tell Aqab 11 figurines</td>
<td>TA</td>
<td>Khabur</td>
<td>early – late</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>Ubaid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tell Kashkashok 25 figurines</td>
<td>KK</td>
<td>Khabur</td>
<td>Late</td>
<td>‘Altmonochrome’</td>
<td>Nin V, 2nd-1st mill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tell Halaf 28 figurines</td>
<td>TH</td>
<td>Khabur</td>
<td>Late</td>
<td>‘Altmonochrome’</td>
<td>Nin V, 2nd-1st mill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tell Beydar 1 figurine</td>
<td>TBey</td>
<td>Khabur</td>
<td>3rd mill.</td>
<td>No Halaf - found in 3rd mill. Level</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tell Arjoune 6 figurines</td>
<td>Arj</td>
<td>Homs</td>
<td>Late</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>Hellenistic</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Therefore, only Sabi Abyad and Tell Aqab have contiguous settlements either before or after that could potentially have mixed with Halaf levels. The Tell Kashkashok assemblage is not supported by stratigraphic documentation, so some confusion arises about the few figurine fragments without comparanda which may either be Halaf or third millennium (Ninevite V). A single example at Tell Beydar was found out of context in sealed third millennium levels. It may have been collected elsewhere, carried onto the mound, and re-deposited in wall fill, as Halaf occupation has be found nearby but not on the tell. Otherwise, the Syrian examples found in the remains of Halaf settlements were either sealed by much later settlements or had no overlay beyond graves or pits. These settlements were abandoned for a millennium or more until they were settled again on top of the ruins of long-forgotten Halaf villages. With a single exception at Tell Sabi Abyad, the early-to-late Halaf villages appear to have been the first settlements on
these locations, although Tell Halaf settlers may have encountered the ruins of seventh millennium settlements in selected places on the mound (Table 5.25, p. 229).

The Halaf finds in this region had previously been thought of as a relatively homogeneous ceramic assemblage, but this has been challenged by those who suggest that there are detectable local variations (Akkermans and Schwartz 2003, 115). The figurine assemblage presented here, however, is not fully conversant in the full extent of the Syrian Halaf, since figurines were not found at every known Halaf site. Therefore, large areas of Syria known to be occupied in the Halaf are not included in this dissertation because figurines were not found there. This includes many Halaf sites west of the Balikh valley. These lacunae must exist either because the communities in those areas did not make or use figurines or because the excavators of those sites did not excavate in areas where figurines can be found. It is appealing to suggest that figurines were not integral to Halaf community life in these areas. However, an argument for a disinterest in figurines amongst Halaf peoples in these times and regions would be based upon archaeological accidents of non-discovery rather than data. There are a few common features of sites where figurines were not found. Some excavations exposed very small Halaf levels (Tell Yunus, Hama, Ras Shamra, Shams ed-Din); other sites appeared to be very small occupations perhaps for specific purposes (Umm Qseir, Amarna, Damishliyya, Boueid II). There are a few lateral excavations where figurines could have been expected to be found, such as Tell Halula, where material culture such as tholoi and thick domestic debris scattered by many small finds inexplicably did not include figurines, according to available publications. Excavations at Tell el Kerkh focused on burials, and figurines are not known to be amongst grave goods during the Halaf period. Some of these sites are in central-west Syria; perhaps the Halaf peoples of this

---

134 For brief descriptions of these sites and citations to publications about them, please see Akkermans and Schwartz 2003, 99-154, and Nieuwenhuyse, Bernbeck, Akkermans and Rogasch 2013. In those same pages are convincing
region did not engage in social practices requiring figurines. However, figurines were found south of this area at Tell Arjoune and north of this area in Anatolia.

As mentioned, a few Halaf excavations outside of the Khabur headwaters in Syria, yielded figurine finds, however, but these are small in number and are not similar to Khabur examples typologically. An anthropomorphic seal was found in early Halaf levels of Umm Qsier (UQ-1). Late Halaf levels of Tell Arjoune yielded stone figurines (Arj-1 through Arj-6). Both site assemblages are much closer to Anatolian comparanda or those from further east, indicating that the communication of technology and imagery may have existed in networks different from those of the Khabur and Balikh headwaters.

In modern times upper Syria is part of the ethnic homeland of the Kurds, cut by border lines drawn during continued European colonialism after the First World War (Eskander 2001). The border that defines the northwestern quadrant of the modern state of Syria does not follow natural boundaries except at the corner of Iraq, Syria, and Turkey, where the Tigris river flows into Iraq past Cizre (Turkey) and ’Ain Dwar (Syria). Communication and interaction in sixth millennium Syria, it has been suggested, was based upon the need for cooperative substance strategies of symbiotic groups in a fragile, variable, and changeable settled landscape (Akkermans and Schwartz 2003, 99-154; McCorriston 1992). It is not surprising to find loosely similar style and technology between Syrian examples and those of Çavı Tarlası and Fıstıklı Höyük to the north in Turkey. Iraqi sites offering comparative examples include Yarim Tepe I, II, and III, also in the Jazirah just east of the border, as well as sites further east in the Mosul-Tigris region, particularly Tepe Gawra, Tell Hassan, and Tell Hassuna. It is remarkable to find such a coherent and tightly similar corpus of figurines at late Halaf sites in the Khabur

arguments for considering smaller Halaf sites as intentional part-time or transient settlements used for hunting, herding, foraging, or other seasonally- and locally-based subsistence strategies. For specific sites and regions in sixth millennium Syria see also Hole and Johnson 1986/7, McCorriston 1992.
headwaters. This corner of Syria appears to have been the location of intense, very local exchange and communication in the sixth millennium. Intense communication and exchange between settlements has been proposed for this area based upon pre-Halaf seals and sealings (Akkermans and Duistermaat, 1996) as well as upon late Halaf pottery (Davidson and McKerrell 1976). Preliminary review of figurine assemblages in the Mosul-Tigris area does not suggest such a typological cohesion; neither do the sites along the upper Euphrates in Anatolia (see Chapter 4).

The bulk of known Syrian Halaf figurines were made and used in the passageway between the Tigris and the Anatolian region. There is evidence for very long-lasting typological styles. For example, a late Halaf figurine from Khirbet esh-Shenef, KesS-1, shows close affinity to an early Halaf figurine from Sabi Abyad, SAB-1, and late Halaf figurines from Anatolia. Other early Halaf figurines from Tell Sabi Abyad show typological continuities from pre-Halaf figurines (Collett 1996). As already mentioned, Late Halaf figurines from the Khabur headwaters region form a very tight typological and technological assemblage. However, this type does not appear to have been in demand just north in the nearby foothills of Anatolia or south near the mouth of the Beqqā valley at Tell Arjoune.

Excavation of Halaf Figurines in Syria

The history of the discovery of Halaf figurines in Syria covers the entire history of Halaf archaeological investigation, from the first discovered Halaf figurine excavated at Tell Halaf in 1899, TH-1, to the ongoing excavations at Tell Sabi Abyad and the recently resumed excavations at Tell Halaf and Chagar Bazar (on hiatus after 2010).\(^{135}\) The majority of the figurines considered in this chapter were found in limited lateral soundings into the pertinent tell, and

\(^{135}\) At this writing (2014) these excavations were on hiatus due to the escalating civil unrest in Syria. Publication of all Halaf figurines from these recent excavations, however, was not fully available at that time.
quickly scooped out in a matter of days or weeks (Tell Halaf, Chagar Bazar, Tell Aqab, Khirbet esh Shenef, Tell Kashkashok, Tell Arjoune, Umm Qseir). Only one assemblage comes from a lateral exposure of Halaf settlement levels over many years of excavation, that from Tell Sabi Abyad.

Table 5.26: Excavation & publication dates of Halaf sites with figurines in Syria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Excavation Dates</th>
<th>Primary Publication Dates (of Figurines)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tell Halaf</td>
<td>1899, 1911-1912, 1929</td>
<td>Oppenheim 1931 &amp; 1933</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1999-2010</td>
<td>Cruells et al. 2006, 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="http://www.sumer_akkad.ugent.be/node/23">www.sumer_akkad.ugent.be/node/23</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tell Aqab</td>
<td>1975-1976</td>
<td>Davidson, 1977 (no figurines mentioned)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Davidson and Watkins 1980 (only 1 figurine published)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirbet esh-Shenef</td>
<td>1991</td>
<td>Akkermans and Wittmann 1993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tell Beydar</td>
<td>1992-1994</td>
<td>Lebeau (ed) 1997 (when figurine was found)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NE mound</td>
<td>1986</td>
<td>Akkermans 1987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Umm Qseir</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>Tsuneki and Miyake 1998</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Approximately half of Syrian Halaf figurines are published, though many without information about their findspot or stratigraphic level (Table 5.26, p. 233). During the course of my research in Syria and the United Kingdom, many more unpublished examples were found, and some published examples were not accessible in museums visited. Most of the figurines recently excavated from Tell Halaf, Chagar Bazar, and Tell Sabi Abyad are not yet published – although a few examples are available on websites and preliminarily publications. The full assemblage of figurines excavated from Syrian Halaf sites is presented in this chapter for the first time.

---

time; however, I have included accompanying information such as archaeological context only as it is available or able to be reconstructed from accompanying documentation.

This information varies by site and even between examples. It could often only be determined by piecing together information from various sources. It is interesting to note that, when the figurines are analyzed within their excavated contexts, the results challenge the stratigraphic claims of archaeologists. For example, although early and late Halaf finds were said to have been found at Tell Kashkashok, most of the figurines are types which can be securely dated belong only to the late Halaf typologically. These same types of late Halaf figurines were found in the earliest through latest levels of Chagar Bazar and Tell Aqab, which suggests that erosion, disturbance, or excavation mixed up material culture and deposits from different chronological levels. These discrepancies just show that pottery should not be the only chronological indicator of stratigraphy. It is equally important to document levels and findspots for figurines and all small finds in excavation reports and archives to allow for further analysis by others in the future.

Typology of Halaf Figurines from Syria

Complete – or nearly complete – examples of Type LH.1A figurines from Chagar Bazar and Tell Kashkashok in particular have been featured in a series of museum exhibitions on the archaeology of Syria (Trümpler 2001, Fortin 1999, Cluzen et. al. 1993, Roualt and Masetti-Roualt 1993). Imagery of these particular figurines has come to be regarded as representative of the Syrian Halaf as well as the Halaf in general. Perhaps because these are the few available good quality photographs, they are often found reproduced in synthetic works on the region (e.g., Akkermans and Schwartz 2003). There are also several examples of related figurine types LH.1B, here interpreted as seated males as well as LH.1C seated females with flat torsos and hanging legs. Seated females supporting large breasts with bent arms and seated males with
open legs and hands resting on thighs (Types LH.1A, B) were made in large quantities and are by far the dominant category of figurines in the region (Table 5.27, below). These same figurines also form the largest group within the Halaf figurine corpus as a whole. As this dissertation demonstrates, Syria – or specifically the Khabur triangle – is the nucleus for this type of figurine. Only the Type LH.1C figurines are found in Anatolia, which may be the origin of this variant. While outside the regional scope of this dissertation, LH.1A, 1B, and 1C type Halaf figurines from sites in Iraq appear in much lower percentages of the total excavated figurine assemblage.\(^{137}\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Late Halaf Sites</th>
<th>LH.1A Female seated</th>
<th>LH.1B Male Seated</th>
<th>LH.1C Hanging legs seated</th>
<th>Type 2 Standing</th>
<th>All</th>
<th>Other &amp; Unknown fragments</th>
<th>Figurines found in concentrations?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tell Halaf</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yes?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chagar Bazar</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tell Aqab</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>No?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirbet esh-Shenef</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tell Beydar</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tell Kashkashok</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Yes?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tell Arjoune</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>No?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Examples from Syria of early Halaf figurines, while small in number, are significant contributions to existing knowledge of early Halaf figurines (Table 5.28, p. 236). The most prolific site for figurines is Tell Sabi Abyad. Excavations there found a significant corpus of early Halaf figurines as well as pre-Halaf figurines. This dissertation considers only the eight Halaf figurines available from publications, which is a much smaller corpus than that which was excavated from early Halaf contexts. However, the rest of the corpus is not yet available in publications (several now available in Arntz 2013). Another example comes from Umm Qseir.

\(^{137}\) Research on Halaf figurines in Iraq is a planned future project. At this preliminary phase, it seems that occurrence of Type LH.1A/1B/1C types tapers off moving eastwards, with the largest number of this type appearing at Yarim Tepe II and III, located in the Singar and closest to the Khabur triangle. See reprints of articles by the excavators edited by Yoffee and Clark (1993) for examples.
where an anthropomorphic seal, UQ-1, was found. Although there are only a few, the early Halaf examples from Syria, presented here for the first time together, give insight into the types and styles of figurines during this phase. Perhaps the most important aspect to notice is that seated poses are much less popular during this phase and are quite different than the more numerous and familiar Type LH1 figurines. While it is debatable if much can be said from these few examples, it seems that there are much closer connections to Anatolian sites, many of which yielded the same types. This very small sample indicates there might be closer connections between early Halaf figurines and pre-Halaf ones rather than between the former and late Halaf types. A full understanding of early Halaf typology awaits analysis of examples in Iraq.  

Table 5.28: Early Halaf Syrian figurines typology and general contexts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Early Halaf Sites</th>
<th>Type 1 Seated</th>
<th>EH.2A Standing</th>
<th>EH.2B Standing</th>
<th>EH.2C Standing</th>
<th>EH.2D Standing</th>
<th>Figurine-seals</th>
<th>Figurines found in concentrations?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sabi Abyad</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Umm Qseir</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tell Aqab</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL=12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Studying Syrian Halaf Figurines**

Most of the Halaf figurines studied here were excavated in Syria before the 1960s and many were exported to through legal division between archaeologists and departments of antiquities. The beginnings of this study took place in London (British Museum and Institute of Archaeology, UCL), Cambridge (Museum of Anthropology and Archaeology and Fitzwilliam Museum), and Oxford (Ashmolean Museum) during the fall of 1999. I returned to study

138 It is particularly difficult to make conclusions about regional and chronological connections for early Halaf figurines given that there are only a few sites known with figurine assemblages which can be compared. The connections to pre-Halaf types is solely based upon the figurine assemblages from Sabi Abyad, in particular those found in the so-named burnt village or level 6. These are pre-Halaf and out of the scope of this dissertation (Collet 1996). For early Halaf figurines in Iraq, available examples come from Yarim Tepe I and II (Yoffee and Clark 1993) and perhaps Tell Hassuna (Lloyd and Safer 1945).
figurines in some of these museums in 2009 and 2014. Research in Syria occurred in the Deir ez-Zor and Aleppo museums in 2000; in the Damascus, Aleppo, Raqqa, and Hasseke museums; and in the excavation house of Sabi Abyad in 2001. While the curators did everything they could to facilitate my study, study conditions were unavoidably difficult and sometimes rushed in the Syrian Museums. As a result, some data is incomplete or missing from those examples in the catalog. I was unable to return to Syria to collate my previously collected data or to study figurines found in the recent excavations of Sabi Abyad, Chagar Bazar, or Tell Halaf. Therefore, the most recently excavated examples are included here only from published reports and excavation websites, if available.

My hope is that the figurines stored in Syria and the many staff members responsible for their care and protection who so graciously assisted with my research are safe. Despite valiant efforts by the Syrian Directorate General of Archaeology and Museums (DGAM) and the international community, at the time of completion of this dissertation in 2014, the people, archaeology, and cultural heritage including the safety and protection of archaeological sites and museum collections was extremely uncertain and in peril. This is particularly true for the collections of the two archaeological museums in Aleppo and Deir ez-Zor, where I conducted most of my research. Perhaps the details in this chapter and the accompanying catalog presented in Appendix B can assist in the reconstruction when the ongoing war is finally over.
Tell Sabi Abyad

Sabi Abyad is a conglomeration of mounds situated along the Balikh river valley, 15 kilometers south of the Syrian-Turkish border (crossing at Tell Abyad). The excavations began in 1986 (Akkermans 1987a, 1989/90) and continued through 2010, after which a civil war in Syria put foreign research on pause. The location of the early Halaf settlements at this location is on Sabi Abyad tell I, which is also the largest with dimensions of 240 x 170 meters and a height of five to ten meters above the present plain. This mound is actually a conglomeration of four tells on which the remains of separate settlements merged into one large mound of occupation debris, no doubt accelerated by the building and eventual collapse of a monumental Middle Assyrian (second millennium BCE, Bronze Age) constructed on top of and cut into the ruins of the sixth millennium settlements (Figure 5.46, p. 239). Excavations on other mounds were also undertaken over the decades. Researchers at Tell Sabi Abyad II found a PPNB (Pre-Pottery Neolithic B) settlement (Verhoven and Akkermans 2000; Akkermans, Brüning, Huigens, and Nieuwenhuyse 2014), and recent excavations of Tell Sabi Abyad III exposed an early pottery seventh millennium settlement in 2010 (www.sabi-abyad.nl).

The Excavation of Tell Sabi Abyad Figurines

One figurine, SAB-1, comes from the first year of excavation (1986) in the northeastern section of the mound; the remaining seven early Halaf figurines were found in the southern section of the mound during the 1986 (Operation I) and 1988 (Operation II) seasons. These figurines are discussed in this section and cataloged in Appendix B. Further excavation of the mound in the Operation IV during the years 1989-1999 found pre-Halaf settlements containing figurines (Collet 2006) cut by a large Bronze Age structure, but these are too early to be included here. In the past decade, Akkermans discovered more Early Halaf settlements with figurines but
they are not yet published. Excavation of early Halaf levels on other parts of the mound in 1999-2009 did yield many early Halaf figurines, particularly in Operation III, where levels were found to be contemporaneous with Operation I level, but these excavations and finds remain unpublished (Arntz 2013).¹³⁹

![Site plan of Sabi Abyad, Tell I, with findspots of figurines indicated. Early Halaf exposures circled, grey=unpublished, red=published](http://www.sabi-abyad.nl/)

Figure 5.46: Site plan of Sabi Abyad, Tell I, with findspots of figurines indicated. Early Halaf exposures circled, grey=unpublished, red=published¹⁴⁰

The remains of an early Halaf occupation of approximately three meters thick was found to be directly accessible from the surface in most of the area of Operation I, although the

¹³⁹ A B.A. thesis by Monique Arntz (2013) discusses early Halaf figurines from these seasons. It became available in the Summer of 2013, too late to include these examples in this dissertation. This and her future work on this corpus promises to shed an entirely new light on the understanding of the nature of early Halaf figurines.

western-most trenches were disturbed by the Middle Assyrian palace. Reporting on the work in the 1988 season, Akkermans described a loose conglomeration of structures, including tholoi, which could accommodate four to five extended households totaling no more than 50 people at any one time (Akkermans 1993/1994, 257-8; Akkermans, Brüning, Huigens, and Nieuwenhuyse 2014).

The following decade of excavations in Operation I revealed that, below the cultural deposits of Early Halaf (levels 1-3), were cultural deposits of proto-Halaf (levels 4-6), and pre-Halaf (levels 6-8), and a very early ceramic Neolithic occupation in the lowest levels. A recent publication of the chronology of the site divided the stratigraphy into sequences, A-D, with A being the earliest level, B corresponding to the proto- and pre-Halaf levels, and C and D corresponding to early and middle Halaf levels (Plicht, Akkermans, Nieuwenhuyse, Kaneda, and Russell 2011). This dissertation considers only figurines from sequence C-D Six figurines were excavated from early Halaf levels 1-3 in 1988, and one figurine was found in level 3 excavations in 1993 (Collet 1996, 409). At the completion of this dissertation in May 2013, this was the latest available information on figurines from the early Halaf levels at tell I.

Early Halaf levels were explored briefly in the first season in 1986, on the northwestern area of the mound in or near an area later named Operation II. Early Halaf material culture continued to be found in the south-central (Operation I) and north-eastern (Operation III) areas of the mound in subsequent 1988-1999 seasons (Figure 5.46, p. 239). While it seems certain that the early Halaf settlement levels exposed in Operation II are different from those found elsewhere in the mound, transitions between the early Halaf settlement levels of Operations II and III are not yet explained. Fine-grained stratigraphic and ceramic analysis together with absolute dates concluded that this area should be considered slightly later than those found in
Operations I and II. The findspot of SAB-1 is now presented by the excavators as traditional early Halaf phased to the end of Sabi Abyad level 1. Chronologically earlier are the early Halaf figurines from the 1988 (SAB-2, SAB-3, SAB-4, SAB-5, SAB-6) and 1993 (SAB-7) seasons, which were found in a different area of Sabi Abyad I and are internally stratified to architectural level 3 (Cruells and Nieuwenhuyse 2004, Table 2). Level 3 in Operation I is directly above pre-Halaf level 6, the Burnt Village, where many figurines were found (Akkermans and Verhoven 1995).

Contexts related to ash and fire installations have recently been identified as a possible trend for figurine deposition at early Halaf Sabi Abyad (Arntz 2013). At least two other examples discussed here, SAB-2 and SAB-8, are also associated with fire installations or the resulting refuse. Therefore, there might be some level of intentionality in the connection of fire or burning and the deposition of the figurines. It is equally possible that figurines found in pits like this were randomly deposited amidst ash lenses mixed with other household byproducts and waste. Comparable information on soil matrices of excavated contexts are rarely detailed in archaeological reports, especially when the deposition is determined to be random fill or midden (Stein 1987). Ash concentrations are easily noticed in the course of excavation but may only be noted in publication as evidence of distinctive or ritual depositional activities. As a result, it is difficult to know if the ash associated with SAB-1 is noted because it is exceptional or if it is noted because the figurine was found there. Without data on other soil matrices, it is difficult to know if ash is an anomaly reflecting a special deposition practice or just a dumping of waste products and unwanted objects which can be found over the entire site. Ash production must have been quite prolific in the course of many village activities, and the result must have needed to be discarded quite often.
The Archaeological Context of the Early Halaf Figurines from Tell Sabi Abyad

Figurine SAB-1 was found in an ash-filled, six-meter-wide pit scooped out from level 1; this pit cut into the accumulated debris of levels 2-3. The excavation area (square T4), located on the north eastern area of the mound, is reported by the excavators to have revealed layers of eroded occupation debris. Architectural remains were not found in these excavations, thus this area was preliminarily interpreted as a marginal area, perhaps used for unspecified work activities requiring only ephemeral structures or none at all over a relatively short amount of time (Akkermans 1987a, 12). This specific has not been archaeologically explored again since the initial 1986 season. The two fragments of the figurine was found at two different levels amongst other pit debris, worn and broken in two but restorable to complete. The excavators interpreted the pit in trench T4 thusly:

> It seems very unlikely that this pit was used as a fireplace or that it was deliberately dug for the purpose of ash dumping; more probably it was originally dug for some specific reason (e.g. to obtain clay for mud brick production) and was used as an ash-dump at a later stage. (Akkermans 1989, 21)

Available information does not reveal if SAB-1 was deposited in the pit intentionally or if it was purposefully broken or fractured in use or by post-depositional process that churned the debris in the pit. Many other small finds make up the associated assemblage within the pit including a fragment of a grinding slab, a pierced stone, and a bone spatula fragment. The ashes found within this pit may well have come from Oven A, which was found immediately adjacent to the pit (Akkermans 1989, 21-22).

---

141 Later exposures in Operation II appear to have found architecture (see Figure 5.46), but it is not clear if this is the exact location of 1986 excavations.
142 This figurine was in a travelling exhibit when I visited Syria, so I was unable to conduct a hands-on study. For the exhibit catalog see Fortin (1999).


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sequence</th>
<th>Phases Stratigraphy</th>
<th>Levels Absolute Dates</th>
<th>Features and Assemblages</th>
<th>Context Figurines</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>—</td>
<td>‘traditional’ Early Halaf Balikh IIIC</td>
<td>Op. II 5850 cal BC*</td>
<td>Northeast mound No architecture found</td>
<td>Ashy pit adjacent to oven, SAB-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-D</td>
<td>Early Halaf Levels 3-1 Balikh IIIB 5950 cal BC*</td>
<td>Op. I, Level 1 5951-5768 cal BC</td>
<td>debris and pits</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Op. I, Level 2 5959-5818 cal BC</td>
<td></td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Op. I, Level 3 5977-5818 cal BC</td>
<td>2 well-preserved rectangular buildings building 1=14 rooms storage vessels and small unbaked objects</td>
<td>Building 1 – room 11: SAB-3, SAB-4, SAB-5, SAB-6, SAB-7 Oven - SAB-2 Ash pit adjacent to oven SAB-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hiatus Levels below not considered in this dissertation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Halaf transitional or proto-Halaf Levels 7-4 Balikh IIIA 6100 cal BC*</td>
<td>Level 4 5979–5889 cal BC 5954-5664 cal BC</td>
<td>small rectangular buttressed building w/oven tholos w/antechamber - building with very small storage rooms</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Level 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Level 6</td>
<td>Burnt Village</td>
<td>Many Figurines Verhoven and Akkermans (1995, fig.15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pre-Halaf Levels 11-8 Balikh IIC</td>
<td>Level 8 6074-5883 cal BC 6077-5976 cal BC</td>
<td></td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Earliest Pottery Neolithic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Contexts related to ash and fire installations have recently been identified as a possible trend for figurine deposition at early Halaf Sabi Abyad (Arntz 2013). At least two other examples discussed here, SAB-2 and SAB-8, are also associated with fire installations or the resulting refuse. Therefore, there might be some level of intentionality in the connection of fire or burning and the deposition of the figurines. It is equally possible that figurines found in pits like this were randomly deposited amidst ash lenses mixed with other household byproducts and waste. Comparable information on soil matrices of excavated contexts are rarely detailed in

---

143 Calibrated BC dates from Akkermans (1991), calibrated BC dates with * from Cruells and Nieuwenhuyse (2004, Table 2).
archaeological reports, especially when the deposition is determined to be random fill or midden (Stein 1987). Ash concentrations are easily noticed in the course of excavation but may only be noted in publication as evidence of distinctive or ritual depositional activities. As a result, it is difficult to know if the ash associated with SAB-1 is noted because it is exceptional or if it is noted because the figurine was found there. Without data on other soil matrices, it is difficult to know if ash is an anomaly reflecting a special deposition practice or just a dumping of waste products and unwanted objects which can be found over the entire site. Ash production must have been quite prolific in the course of many village activities, and the result must have needed to be discarded quite often.

Many of the early Halaf figurines found in the 1988 excavations, SAB-3, SAB-4, SAB-5, SAB-6, and SAB-7, were found in the same context, room number 11 of a multi-roomed structure in architectural level 3 of the Operation III excavations on the southeastern area of the mound (Collet 1996). All 14 rooms in this building were five meters wide or smaller surrounded by thick mud brick walls featuring buttresses on the outer walls linked by a series of narrow doorways and with at least three outdoor entrances. Many of the rooms in this building had no means of entrance visible from the extant remaining walls; they were probably accessed through an egress located higher up on the walls which is no longer extant. Because of the construction of the walls and the un-inhabitable tiny size of the rooms, the excavators concluded that this building must have had second story (Akkermans and LeMiére 1992, 14).
Figurines were not the only small finds found deposited in this room; a pile of objects was described by the excavators:

Another in-situ find appeared in room 11: here a pile of unbaked clay objects of all sorts were found on the floor, including some very stylized human and animal figurines, miniature vessels, balls, rectangular plaquettes, disks and cones (fig. 17). One fragment shows traces of a stamp seal impression. (Akkermans and LeMiére 1992, 15)

Room 11 is located in a corner of the building constructed with two interior passage ways through the north and east walls and an outside entrance on the west wall (Figure 5.47). The deposit of these objects all together is a possible continuation of pre-Halaf depositional practices found directly below these levels, dating from many centuries earlier. Similar concentrations of objects, which the excavators called “archives,” were found in three specific rooms within the Burnt Village of Sabi Abyad level 6. Similar to building II in level 3, in the Burnt Village very few small finds were found outside of the object archives. An example for comparison is the description of one archive in room 6 of building II in pre-Halaf levels (out of scope for this dissertation), which was thusly described: “…hundreds of small objects of all kinds, e.g. ceramics, stone bowls and axes, bone implements, labrets, and clay figurines of both women and
animals.” (Akkermans and Verhoven 1996, 13). It was concluded that Burnt Village (pre-Halaf) objects were intentionally removed from circulation and stored in what these archives – which also included many sealings – to record the completion of exchange practices which were open to the community at large. This may have included figurines as well (Akkermans and Verhoven 1996, 22-23). While it is earlier than the scope of this dissertation, the example of the level 6 Burnt Village is a useful comparison to later contexts because these so called archives were sealed by a quick and large conflagration event. It has been suggested that this fire was planned and intentional; therefore, the discard of figurines and other items together in specific locations is also suggested to be intentional (Verhoven 1999). However, it is equally possible that these objects were swept to the side of the room because they had no further use or meaning to the residents, who knew that they were about to be destroyed and lost forever.

Both the typology and manufacture of the level 3 figurines as well as their final disposition appears to parallel pre-Halaf practices. Although there was just a single sealing found alongside the early Halaf figurines in room 11 of building II in level 3, would it be appropriate to designate this deposit as another intentional archive? The fragile nature and lack of features on these figurines might suggest that they were intended for a single or short-term use. If they were also swept in a corner and left to be covered by fill and debris, perhaps deliberate deposition is indicated, but this does not strongly suggest that the action was embedded with meaning or memory. These objects may have simply fallen out of use and then discarded. The early Halaf level 3 figurine concentration in room 11 of building II existed within fill that must have been developed and disturbed over a long period. However, both deposition examples, from pre-Halaf Burnt Village level 6 and room 11 in level 3, suggest that
there were designated spaces and perhaps also certain times of year in which figurines were
discarded, and these practices continued through many generations and at different households.

Sabi Abyad Figurines, Discussion

The figurines from Operation I are vaguely anthropomorphic; in addition to being quickly
made, they all represent type 2 standing figurines. Three figurines, SAB-2, SAB-3, and SAB-4,
are Sub Type EH.2C. 144 This columnar shape is quite similar to the amorphous pillar shape
known from seventh millennium sites, as, can be seen of figurines from Tell Bouqras (Lohof
1989) and Tell Kashkashok II (Matsutani 1991, pl. 68, 1-3). Examples from pre-Halaf levels at
Sabi Abyad are also known (Collet 1996). Three examples of Sub Type EH.2A, SAB-5, SAB-6,
and SAB-8, demonstrate flat upper torsos and more rounded lower bases. These can also be
compared to pre-Halaf examples from Tell Sabi Abyad as well as to examples from Tell Kurdu
(e.g., TK-1) and Tell Aqab (TA-7, TA-8). One other figurine, SAB-7, is Type EH.2D and is also
similar to examples from Tell Kurdu, TK-1 and TK-8, and Girikihaciyan, GH-2, as well as those
excavated from the Burnt Village level 6 (e.g., Akkermans and Verhoven 1995, fig. 15, 1-3, 7-9).

The practices related to early Halaf figurines from levels 1-3 show interesting
connections to those known from the earlier level 6 at Sabi Abyad (see Collet 1996). Very few
differences are distinguishable between figurines from each phase, showing a gradual and local
transition into the Halaf at Sabi Abyad. The few early Halaf figurines would fit well with the
proto- and pre-Halaf examples from earlier levels and vice-versa. The continuations show that
long-lasting stylistic, technological, and depositional figurine traditions passed through
generations over hundreds of years, at least at Sabi Abyad.

144 The full description of this type and all others has been previously discussed in Chapter 3.
The chronologically latest Halaf figurine, SAB-1, appears to have existed within a milieu totally different from those dated slightly earlier and found in Operation I. This figurine has been classified as Type EH.2B, but it is morphologically different from the few other examples known of this type in the early Halaf phase. One feature diverging SAB-1 from other examples is the great care that was taken to represent and accentuate the female form with both incision and paint. These details connect SAB-1 closer to stylistic traditions in Anatolia and to later figurine traditions, but no earlier examples have been found. This figurine can be directly compared with KesS-1, dated to the late Halaf but geographically nearby, perhaps demonstrating even longer-lasting traditions. It is even possible that the Khirbet esh-Shenef figurine was kept or curated as an early Halaf heirloom object in late Halaf time. The arm stubs on SAB-1, which on Type EH.2B and LH.2B figurines are interpreted as having bent elbows, implying but not representing arms encircling and hands clasped between implied breasts, is known in late Halaf Anatolian examples from Çavı Tarlası, ÇT-1 through ÇT-6, and Domuztepe, DT-1 through DT-9, and early Halaf examples from Fıstıklı Höyük, FH-1 and FH-3, and Tell Kurdu, TK-2. Also shared with figurines from Çavı Tarlası is a hole in the neck for removable, interchangeable, and/or revolving heads on dowel-like necks. No heads that can be separated have been reported at Sabi Abyad, but many more examples of neck-holes on figurines for removable heads were found in pre-Halaf levels (Collet 1996). The double belt and oversized pubic triangle is featured on many standing Halaf figurines, especially in the late Half, as is the case, for example, on DT-1.

It is impossible to make general conclusions about early Halaf figurines in Syria based solely upon the small sample available from Tell Sabi Abyad, so at present this assemblage should be considered more as a case study. The early Halaf figurines from Operation I of Sabi Abyad show a long and local figurine tradition, with many practices surrounding their
manufacture, use, and discard unchanging or gradually evolving over many millennia. This the same trajectory advocated by the excavators in their study of other material culture. However, a single example of what is frequently classified as a Traditional Early Halaf figurine from the latest Neolithic levels of Tell Sabi Abyad appears to be part of a figurine tradition which was shared across regions, possibly linked to ideological practices and beliefs related to the body, and which travelled along a north-south trajectory rather than east-west. However, until other examples that can be demonstrated to be chronologically contemporary to these figurines at Tell Sabi Abyad are extant, all conclusions about their place within the wider early Halaf figurine world remain conjecture.
Umm Qseir

The site of Umm Qseir is located on the left bank of middle Khabur river basin, just 13 kilometers south of Hasseke. The site has been identified as middle Halaf, which in the working chronology of this dissertation is early Halaf. Excavations were undertaken first by a team from Yale University and CUNY in 1986-1987; the final report did not mention any figurines found (Hole and Johnson 1986-7).\(^{145}\) Excavations were resumed in 1996 by a team from the University of Tsukuba, Japan. Excavation of the west mound reached the conclusion that the site resulted from year-round settlement occurring only for a few years during the middle phase of the Halaf cultural horizon (Miyake 1998, 19). Stratigraphic interruptions in the occupation revealed that the close proximity to the river resulted in many flooding events (Tsuneki 1998, 25).

Figure 5.48: Anthropomorphic pendant-seal from Umm Qseir
(from Tsuneki 1998, 121, pl. 14.2)

A single anthropomorphic seal-figurine-pendant (UQ-1) was found in Phase 1a (Figure 5.48, above). This was an isolated find within midden fill unassociated with any settlement features. This was one of three seal-pendants, all associated with level 1. The specific findspot for this seal was reported as in the lower sandy-brown layer directly above virgin soil in square G-4 (Tsuneki 1998, 108-109). A top plan of the excavation area in the phase 1a level shows a

---

\(^{145}\) Confirmed by personal communication with Frank Hole in 2001.
heavily pitted area with no built features (Tsuneki 1998, 31, fig. 12). While four animal
figurines were found in the same level and vicinity, there were no anthropomorphic figurines
discovered in these excavations. The excavator speculated that the absence of anthropomorphic
figurines may be attributed to the middle Halaf association of the site (Tsuneki 1998, 120).

This example serves as the sole figurine from the Khabur river basin securely dated to the
early Halaf phase. As this dissertation demonstrates, during the early phase (which, as already
noted, includes the period which is conventionally known as middle Halaf), there were many
fewer figurines known to have been made and used. Seals in anthropomorphic forms, including
foot seals, are one type in this early phase Halaf. This example, UQ-1, is classified as Type
EH.4A and is quite similar to the two other early Halaf seals, TK-13 and FH-4, classified in this
dissertation as Type EH.4A. It is possible that this type of anthropomorphic form is a precursor
to later Anatolian figurine pendants dating to the late Halaf phase (see, for example, DT-1
through DT-4), some of which could also be considered seals. An anthropomorphic seal from
late Halaf Çavı Tarlası, ÇT-14, Type LH.4A, is somewhat similar. Looser stylistic connections
can be made to late Halaf figurine-pendants of the LH.2B type, particularly the incised examples
from Domuztepe, e.g., DT-1 and DT-4, which conceivably could have been utilized as larger
seals. While called a seal, UQ-1 and comparable seals are not known definitively to have
functioned as seals, as sealings with these same designs have not been found, as Tsuneki has
pointed out (1998, 109). There is, however, a single example of a pre-Halaf anthropomorphic
sealing from Sabi Abyad, but it looks very different from UQ-1 (Akkermans and Duistermaat
1996, fig. 5). Therefore, anthropomorphic seals like UQ-1 may well have solely been used as
figurine-pendants without any association with commodities or administration.
Chagar Bazar

Chagar Bazar is situated in the Jazirah plains west of the Khabur river. This location has been documented as an important crossroads during the Roman period, and the same was probably true for the prehistoric period as well (Curtis 1982, 79). Today it lies 25 kilometers south of the modern town of Amuda, an important crossing point between Turkey and Syria, and 40 kilometers southwest from Qamishli at the eastern branch of the Khabur river drainage area. Excavations took place under the direction of Max Mallowan in 1934-1935 and 1937. As with many pre-war excavations, the strategy at Chagar Bazar was to dig as quickly as possible over a short period of time, employing as many local workmen as possible. The team of archaeologists numbered between three and four, meaning that the recording of figurines to their findspots found by over a hundred workmen was not possible or even attempted. Accounts of the excavation of what was called the Prehistoric Pit in Area M, where many figurines were recovered, were published by Mallowan the next year (1936) and written up for a popular audience by Mallowan (1977, 110-125) and his wife, Agatha Christie (1946, 72-175).

Figure 5.49: Type LH.1A figurine found in the Prehistoric Pit level 8 called the “terracotta deposit” (photo: A. Fletcher ©Trustees of the British Museum)
A reflexive study of the Halaf figurines from Chagar Bazar is both needed and difficult to accomplish, and this is just a preliminary attempt focusing on figurines only. Thirty-seven Halaf figurines are known to have been found during the three seasons of excavations undertaken in 1935, 1936, and 1937 by Mallowan. An additional unknown number, said to be several, of Halaf figurines were found in recent excavations undertaken in 1999-2010 by Liege and Barcelona Universities (Anna Gomez-Bach, personal communication 2014). Three figurines from these excavations are presented here, CB-30, CB-31 and CB-40. Therefore, an astonishing number of more than forty Halaf figurines are so far known to have been excavated from Chagar Bazar, many more than those which are known from other sites in the Halaf horizon.

Because the majority of the available figurines come from the earlier excavations, the focus of this section is on the known archaeological context of those 37 figurines. Unfortunately, Mallowan’s reports on the site focus upon figurine interpretation rather than findspot or archaeological context (Mallowan 1936, 1937, 1941, 1977). This assemblage, however, is supported by documentation in museum records, excavation archives, and notations on the figurines themselves that allows for a fuller reconstruction of the excavated situation of each example. Here for the first time, the full assemblage of figurines from Mallowan’s excavations are presented together and, to the extent possible, within their associated archaeological context or at least within their archaeological level.

Full consultation of all documentation in the course of this research reveals that recording of findspots took the form of some combination of publication, handwritten registration notebook, or writing on the figurine itself. However, none of these methods do more than record operation area and level. This is understandable, given that each season employed large groups of workmen and a handful of trained staff (Mallowan 1977, McMahon 1999). In addition, there
are many examples for which a later historic stratigraphic level is recorded but which are clearly Halaf typologically. The bulk of Halaf figurines were found in the first season, within nearly every level of the deep sounding in area M, also known as The Prehistoric Pit. This area was dug incredibly quickly by hundreds of workmen during two months, mid-March to mid-May 1935 (Mallowan 1936, 5).

Excavations of prehistoric figurines during the subsequent 1936 and 1937 seasons are much less documented. Those presented here are thought to be Halaf typologically or are said to be prehistoric, but much less can be said of their findspots or associated assemblages. The dating of these examples to the Halaf, if it cannot be done typologically, is therefore recorded here as hypothetical (Appendix A). The second and third seasons are reported as excavating settlements dating to periods millennia later than the Halaf. The presence of Halaf figurines amongst the finds for these seasons remains unexplained (Mallowan 1937, 1947).

This study of Chagar Bazar figurines is strongly based on typological evidence from the figurines which Mallowan excavated themselves as well as a reflexive study and assessment of their presentation and interpretation in the resulting publications. Since so many examples are Type LH.1A, however, typology can be relied upon to strongly suggest that many figurines are late Halaf. These claims are anchored by many typologically late Halaf figurines which are also stratigraphically late Halaf and found in Area M, late Halaf levels 6 – 11. Eleven figurines are recorded as found in level 8, identified by Mallowan as a “terracotta deposit,” but it is probably better to describe this as an artifact-rich thick deposit at late Halaf levels. The figurines documented as found in this area therefore strengthen the dating of unstratified LH.1A and LH.1B Type figurines from Area M as well as those from other areas of the mound.
What can be said from a study of these figurines is that there were at least two different late Halaf settlements excavated by Mallowan in areas he called Area M and Site A.C. (*Figure 5.50*); possibly there were others documented in areas excavated in 1937. Certainly there is one more settlement area documented by recent excavations in an area called Chantier F at the northern slope of the tell, which indicates continuous occupation through all phases, proto-Halaf to late Halaf and from which one late Halaf figurine is so far available, CB-40 (Cruells et al. 2014). Although these early Halaf levels have now been discovered, there is so far no available evidence of early Halaf settlements at Chagar Bazar that engaged with figurines.

*Figure 5.50*: Plan of Mallowan's excavations of Chagar Bazar, 1934-5 and 1936. Areas known to yield Halaf figurines are indicated (after Mallowan 1941, Fig. 2).
The Excavations of Area M or the Prehistoric Pit, 1935

Area M is located on the northwestern edge of the huge mound of Chagar Bazar and is the highest summit of the tell (Curtis 1982, 79). Its excavation was completed during the 1934-1935 season, but the excavation of the pit itself took place in the Spring of 1935. This location for a deep sounding – also called The Prehistoric Pit- was chosen in hopes that it would yield the longest and most complete stratigraphic sequence, similar to that found in the bottom of the deep sounding at Nineveh, an excavation which Mallowan had supervised a few years before (Mallowan 1933). “The deep prehistoric deposits could also further refine his sub-phasing and cultural interpretations of the Halaf developed from excavations at Arpachiyah the previous year.” (Curtis 1982, 80).

Table 5.30: Figurines from 1936, 1937, 2001-2010 Chagar Bazar seasons

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Season</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>LH.1A Figurines</th>
<th>LH.1B Figurines</th>
<th>Other Figurines</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Second, 1936</td>
<td>“Site AC”</td>
<td>CB-20</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second, 1936</td>
<td>Unknown findspots</td>
<td>CB-17</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>CB-19, CB-23, CB-28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third, 1937</td>
<td>Unknown findspots</td>
<td>CB-13, CB-18</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>CB-28, CB-37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liège/ Barcelona excavations 2001-2010</td>
<td>Chantier F</td>
<td>CB-40</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Like the Nineveh sounding, which Mallowan had recently dug (Mallowan 1933), the Chagar Bazar area M Prehistoric Pit was excavated quickly with a huge number of workmen and little direct supervision. In the course of eight weeks, over 100 workmen dug through a sounding to a depth of 22.6 meters, ending at virgin soil (Mallowan 1936, 8, Figure 5.52, 258). Mallowan interpreted the resulting stratigraphic sequence to yield 15 sealed occupation levels of which he identified the lower 10 as prehistoric (Mallowan 1937, 28).
As mentioned above, the majority of the Halaf figurines were found in these 1935 Area M excavations, all identifiable by type as late Halaf, but they were found in nearly every level (Table 5.31, p. 265). Mallowan stated his understanding of these eroded settlement layers thusly:

We therefore selected the NW. end… where the sides of the mound were denuded and we might consequently avoid doing unnecessary damage to building levels in the course of excavations. Consequently we had to expect incoherent ground-plans, since we had deliberately chosen to work in an area where buildings were likely to have been destroyed; but, on the other hand, walls and floors were still sufficiently well preserved to enable us to make clear lines of demarcation between all the main occupation levels. (Mallowan 1936, 7-8)

Each of the levels presented in the publication unfortunately cannot be said to feature sealed occupation remains; at best they could be considered mixed or disturbed. The complications of cultural and natural site formation processes and the nature of disturbance to settlement remains was not generally incorporated into the practice of archaeology until almost fifty years after Chagar Bazar was excavated (Schiffer 1972). Working within the contemporary understandings
of settlement debris of his day, Mallowan (expressed above) expected levels of occupation to precede each other in orderly flat stratigraphic layers in chronological succession, despite the fact that he knew that he was digging in an eroded and disturbed area. The 1935 excavations exposed many graves and buildings in this area which, according to the published section drawing, deeply cut into lower, earlier levels, disturbing the “clear lines of demarcation between occupation levels” expected by Mallowan.

Nevertheless, the published results present a section drawing of the Prehistoric Pit with fifteen flat occupation layers neatly separated by dotted lines (Mallowan 1936, fig. 2, here Figure 5.52). And on the dotted lines of late Halaf levels 7 and 8, are Type LH.1A figurines depicted sitting in their proper stratigraphic context (blue circle), despite the fact that figurines of the same type were found also in levels 1, 4, 5, and 12 (marked in red). The numbers and types of figurines found outside of Halaf levels are marked on Figure 5.52 and can be found in Table 5.31. An

Figure 5.52: Area M or The Prehistoric Pit at Chagar Bazar
red=late Halaf figurine finds by type & level;
blue=Halaf figurines noted in illustration (after Mallowan 1936, fig. 2)
additional number of figurines typologically identifiable as late Halaf are unstratified finds with no supporting documentation of their findspot, but, given the excavation year, they must have come from somewhere in Area M (Figure 5.53, p. 260).

The finds associated with each Prehistoric Pit level – including the figurines – indicate that the stratigraphy was mixed, either by contamination or the result of a very fast, largely unsupervised and overpopulated excavation. Typologically identifiable figurines and other Halaf material culture were found in nearly every level, indicating that none can be considered sealed levels. Even if the levels were sealed, given the staffing levels and recording techniques, it would be difficult to imagine how stratigraphic integrity could have been maintained during excavations. In the course of a few short weeks, settlement soils were removed quickly and without supervision of an archaeologist; small finds (including figurines) were often recovered by picking through the spoil heaps. Mallowan assigned these finds the context of “TROB” or to the levels that were under excavation on that day or spoil heap location. The schematic section of the pit exhibits cemetery finds and structures in this area which may well explain the jumble of cultural periods found, particularly in levels 1-7. Disturbance from grave digging and clearing for deep architectural foundations may explain why a chronologically much later cylinder seal and incised pottery are illustrated along with a Type LH.1A figurine in level 7 (circled in blue). Typologically identifiable late Halaf figurines found in levels further above and below are indicated by red squares (Figure 5.52, p. 258). Typological and stratigraphic evidence of the figurines alone does not support any early Halaf figurine practices evident in area M or in any other location of Chagar Bazar.
Area E – re-Excavation of the Prehistoric Pit 1999-2001

In 1999 the Prehistoric Pit opened to re-excavation and cutting in of this excavation area by a team from Barcelona, which labeled the Prehistoric Pit/Area M as Area E (Cruells 2006). The goal was to reexamine the context and stratigraphy of the Prehistoric Pit by opening up a new sounding and cutting back its sections. Several figurines were found in this area (Cruells personal communication 2000). However, only one figurine was published in the subsequent preliminary report of the excavations from the opening of Mallowan’s area M, as noted, called in the later excavations Area E. This figurine is CB-30. One other figurine, CB-31, is possibly from this area, though its context is not available. Excavations found many occupation layers of late, middle, and early Halaf, but no early Halaf figurines are reported in publications (McMahon, Tunca, and Bagdoo 2001, 203-4; Cruells et al. 2006).
Excavations Elsewhere on the Mound in 1936, 1937

Mallowan reported finding many typologically identifiable late Halaf examples amongst the 23 figurines he recovered during excavations in 1936 (Mallowan 1937, 94). However, the corresponding publication on these excavations reports settlement areas and graves with corresponding pottery which was not associated with phases earlier than the Ninevite V-Jemdat Nasr period which corresponds to the fourth through third Millennium, (un-calibrated).

Excavations focused upon three areas of excavation on different parts of the tell, called site B.D., site A.B., and site A.C. (Figure 5.50). Mallowan reports employing 150 workmen (p. 91), who must have been working at these disparate areas across the site, presumably with very little supervision. Certainly some of the figurines found during the 1936 excavations are securely Halaf Type LH.1A (e.g., CB-20, CB-17). Since CB-20 is said to be from site A.C., its typology leads to the suggestion that a late Halaf settlement can be found there. Others are included in the catalog because they were labeled by Mallowan as ‘prehistoric’ or appear from the illustrations or direct observation to be so – without further typological or stratigraphy support, these are hypothetically dated late Halaf. Very little information on the findspot of these figurines is available either from the published report or from excavation archives deposited in the British Museum (Mallowan 1937, 1947).

Liege/Barcelona Excavations 2001-2010

Starting with the 2001 season, the Liege/Barcelona team also opened excavations on the northwest slope of the mound, called Area F. Although they cannot offer further data into archaeological context at this time, the remarkably well-preserved surface painting on CB-31 and CB-40 offers new perspectives on Type LH.1A figurine decoration. The final publication of the

146 Digitized copies of additional excavation archives have recently appeared on the internet (https://sites.google.com/site/themallowanarchive/). However these do not document excavation or registration of any of the figurines presented here.
results of the Barcelona team should give important further insight into this prolific center for figurine production and use at Halaf Chagar Bazar.

Figure 5.54: Probably Halaf figurines without documented findspots from 1936 and 1937 excavations photos E. Belcher left to right CB-27, CB-38, CB-26 ©Trustees of the British Museum; CB-23 ©Museum of Anthropology and Archaeology, Cambridge; CB-20 ©Ashmolean Museum, Oxford University.

Archaeological Context of Figurines from Chagar Bazar 1935, 1936, 1937 Excavations

Given the ratio of workmen to archaeologists on Mallowan’s excavations and the speed with which may levels were excavated, not all of the figurines found at Chagar Bazar have exact find spots. Many are published as having the findspot called “dump.” This means that they were found by workmen and sharp-eyed boys looking through wheelbarrows, buckets, and spoil heaps of removed soil for finds that were later picked through for baksheesh payment.\(^{147}\) While the baksheesh method proved very effective for recovery of small finds such as figurines during quick and overpopulated excavation efforts, archaeological context was often a casualty of such a system. While the findspot and levels of many figurines is noted in either the associated publication or in excavation notebooks in the excavation archives deposited in the British

\(^{147}\) For an economic analysis of labor contracts and baksheesh payments at this site based upon data from the 1938 (third) season, see Barmby and Dolton (2006). During that year, Mallowan kept trenches open and under excavation at Chagar Bazar while at the same time as beginning large scale excavations at Tell Brak, presumably following the same practices in labor management and compensation at both sites for his entire time excavating in Syria.
Museum, many are not so noted. Some figurines bear writing in pencil or pen on them with notations of level or location. It is helpful that Mallowan worked in different areas on the mound during the 1935, 1936, and 1937 seasons so that at least the general location of origin can be inferred by narrowing down the examples by date. Figurines known to be excavated in a certain year can therefore be located only to the trenches that were open that year. However, it is equally possible that Halaf figurines found in the exposed and eroding sections of Area M or its spoil heaps may well have been presented by workmen to and accepted by Mallowan for baksheesh rewards during the 1936 or 1937 seasons. Many figurines remained in these sections six decades later when the Barcelona team cut back the sides of Area M during their excavations 1999-2000 (Cruells 2006).

Most of the figurines discussed in this dissertation come from the 1935 (first) season, during which only Area M also known as the Prehistoric Pit, containing thick deposits of Halaf occupation layers, was under excavation. Division of finds between the Syrian antiquities authority and Mallowan in that same year allowed him to return to England with many figurines which were subsequently deposited into several museums or given to private supporters. Therefore, all figurines with 1935 museum acquisition dates must have been excavated from Area M and are given that findspot in the catalog in Appendix B. All of the figurines published in the report from this campaign, which quickly appeared the next year (Mallowan 1936), are also associated with Area M. This area was not reopened until 1999, when it was renamed Chantier E by the Liege/Barcelona team (Cruells et al. 2006), so therefore no figurines subsequently found in later seasons during Mallowan’s excavations could have come from Area M. One figurine from the Barcelona excavations is published as coming from Chantier E, CB-30. One additional example excavated by the Barcelona team, CB-31, the contexts of which are
not yet published, may also have come from this same area (*Table 5.31*). One example, CB-40, comes from more recent excavations in Chantier F, just north of the Prehistoric Pit.

A total of 11 figurines are reported as found in Area M level 8. So many figurines were found in this level, which, as noted above, Mallowan called a “terracotta deposit” (Mallowan 1936), that it is more likely that this was an area and level dating to the late Halaf where many small finds were discarded, including figurines. There is record, either in the publication or excavation archives, that suggests that these figurines were actually found deposited together. It is more likely that the thick deposit of late Halaf level 5 was rich in artifacts and that, in those days of excavation, many figurines were found. The figurines from level 8 do not appear to be different from LH.1A figurines found (out of context mainly and as isolated finds) in other levels. The level 8 figurines do serve an important purpose in this dissertation, however. Because they are both typologically and stratigraphically late Halaf, they serve as a check and balance to LH.1 figurines in other levels as well as to figurines for which findspots are unrecorded, such as those from Tell Kashkashok. The figurine concentration in level 8 therefore contributes strength to Type LH.1A as a diagnostic indicator of late Halaf, at least in the Khabur (*Table 5.31*).

The second season took place in 1936, during which Mallowan opened up trenches in three different locations on the tell, while at the same time conducting a survey of the Balikh valley. Just over twenty anthropomorphic figurines were reported as excavated in the second season at Chagar Bazar, very few of which have their findspots reported in either the publication or the excavation archives (*Table 5.30, p. 256*). However, figurines published in the report on that season (Mallowan 1937) should have been found in one of these three operations, none of which are reported to have Halaf occupation.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leige/Barcelona Levels</th>
<th>Mallowan's Levels</th>
<th>Type LH.1A Figurines</th>
<th>Type LH.1B Figurines</th>
<th>Other types of Figurines</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>from Cruells (2006, 139, Tab. 10.6)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[2-3rd mill]</td>
<td>Area M Level 1</td>
<td>CB-13</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[3rd – 4th mill]</td>
<td>Area M Levels 4-5</td>
<td>CB-2, CB-5, CB-14, CB-25</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>CB-26, CB-27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CB IV</td>
<td>Area M Level 6</td>
<td>CB-39</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chan. E: levels 8-6 Late Halaf</td>
<td>Area M Level 7</td>
<td>CB-30?</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Area M Level 8 “terracotta deposit”</td>
<td>CB-1, CB-2, CB-3, CB-4, CB-8, CB-9, CB-11, CB-15, CB-22, CB-24, CB-29</td>
<td>----</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Area M Levels 9-11</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Area M Level 12</td>
<td>CB-7</td>
<td>CB-4, CB-21</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CB II</td>
<td>Area M Level 13-14</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chan. E: levels 14-13 Early Halaf</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CB I</td>
<td>Area M Level 15</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chan. E: level 15 Proto Halaf</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liege/Barcelona Excavations</td>
<td>Chantier E, unit 5.3</td>
<td>CB-30,</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Possibly Chan. E?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CB-31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1935 excavations Unknown levels Area M</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>CB-10, CB-12, CB-16, CB-17, CB-18, CB-25, CB-35, CB-38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown season unknown area</td>
<td>CB-6, CB-40</td>
<td>CB-10</td>
<td>CB-12, CB-23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The third and final season took place in 1937 in tandem with large-scale excavations at Tell Brak, 20 miles away, an effort which also focused on settlements dated much later than Halaf. Neither excavation was reported upon until nearly a decade after cessation of digging (Mallowan 1947). Two unmistakable LH.1A figurine fragments came from this season (Table 5.30). This includes one figurine, CB-18, which is cataloged at the Deir ez-Zor museum as found at Tell Brak. Mallowan does report finding “sealing wax red pottery” under the Eye
Temple at Brak, indicating to him that Halaf settlement remains lay underneath (Mallowan 1947, 44-45). However, no other Halaf small finds are reported as coming from Tell Brak during Mallowan’s excavations. It may be that, at some point between the excavation and the deposit of the finds in the museum, some materials from Tell Brak and Chagar Bazar became intermingled. It is assumed that this figurine came from the 1937 excavations of Chagar Bazar. In 2001, Chantier F was opened on the northern slope of the mound, north of Chantier E excavations. All Halaf phases are reported to have been discovered in this step trench, but, though Type LH.1A figurines were found (Cruells et al. 2014, 473), only one of them is published, CB-40.

**Chagar Bazar Figurines, Discussion**

The Chagar Bazar collection includes a large assemblage of figurines, many of which are supported by stratigraphy. While the dominate type was the LH.1A (*Figure 5.55, Figure 5.56 below*) and, to a lesser extent, LH.1B, at least a fifth of the Halaf figurines were rendered in a completely different type, most of them in a standing pose. Future research into the full nature of Chagar Bazar assemblages will be greatly benefitted by the publication and documentation of figurines excavated from the recent Liége/Barcelona excavations, which, unlike those excavated by Mallowan, should be accompanied by careful stratification. Further reporting on these excavations and future study of the examples found is eagerly awaited.

*Figure 5.55: selected Heads, necks of LH.1A figurines from Chagar Bazar
Upper row: CB-3, CB-15, Lower row: CB-29, CB-20, CB-31, CB-40*
The great numbers of LH.1A seated-female type of clay figurines allow for further comparison of aspects of their manufacture. Initial visual observation suggests that there are clays and treatments of the surface that are similar to other specific examples. For example, CB-12, CB-35, and CB-39 are made of a similar fabric – here meaning the color, feel, observed density, and inclusions in the clay. Colors of pigment are also similar for certain examples. Further analysis beyond visual comparison such as scientific testing of these materials for elemental similarities would be needed before anything further can be said about this observation.
What is remarkable about these many Type LH.1 figurines at Chagar Bazar is that, while they can be said to be much the same, there is also great variety in the surface decoration. The painted decoration is often rendered in stripes and concentrated at the arms and lower legs, neck, shoulders, and (if extant) head and headdress (Figure 5.55, Figure 5.56, Figure 5:57, above). At this preliminary phase of analysis, a chart has been made of the locations of observed surface decorations to highlight the potential for further analysis (Table 5.32, below). It seems that in some body locations such as the arms, legs, shoulders, and heads, there was some consistency in stripes and other painting. In other locations such as the breasts, stomach, and feet there may have been more freedom in decoration. Perhaps what these figurines present is the difference between community shared embodied social practices and individual choice.

The variety in painted decoration as well as in overall typologies shows that even at one site and within one type present in the assemblage, there were a range of possibilities in figurines. Several figurines may have been decorated at one time, though that is no longer visible perhaps as a result of faded pigments from all manner of post-depositional processes; it is possible that scientific analysis may bring out fugitive painting on the surface. Future work may lead to an ability to ask when those socially embedded practices and individual choices occurred. Was it during the conception, making, using, or discarding of figurines or a range of places in their object biographies? Further analysis may give insight into the choice, agency, and intentionality of the makers and users of these figurines.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Colors</th>
<th>Head Face</th>
<th>Neck Chest Stripes</th>
<th>Breasts</th>
<th>Stomach Abdomen</th>
<th>Pubic Area</th>
<th>Hips Belt Stripes</th>
<th>Arms Stripes</th>
<th>Calves Stripes</th>
<th>Foot Shoe Sandal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CB-1</td>
<td>1 color broken off</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5 rayed stripes</td>
<td>3 stripes</td>
<td>painted solid</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6 bisect. by 1 vertical</td>
<td>painted stripes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CB-3</td>
<td>3 colors head-dress, eyes</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2 horiz. stripes</td>
<td>none visible</td>
<td>none visible</td>
<td>none visible</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>none visible</td>
<td>solid paint</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CB-4</td>
<td>1 color broken off</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3 wavy vert. stripes</td>
<td>none visible</td>
<td>painted solid</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2 around wrists</td>
<td>solid paint</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CB-5</td>
<td>none visible broken off</td>
<td>none visible</td>
<td>none visible</td>
<td>none visible</td>
<td>none visible</td>
<td>none visible</td>
<td>none visible</td>
<td>none visible</td>
<td>appliqué</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CB-7</td>
<td>2 colors</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>rayed?</td>
<td>none visible</td>
<td>painted solid</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>continu. stripe</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CB-8</td>
<td>1 color head-dress</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>light wash</td>
<td>none visible</td>
<td>none visible</td>
<td>none visible</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>broken off</td>
<td>broken off</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CB-9</td>
<td>2 colors broken off</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>light wash</td>
<td>navel punct.</td>
<td>light wash</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>none visible</td>
<td>triangle w/ vert. stripe</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CB-10</td>
<td>1 color broken off</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>broken off</td>
<td>none visible</td>
<td>1 very wide</td>
<td>3 lower 4 vert. upper</td>
<td>broken off</td>
<td>broken off</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CB-11</td>
<td>1 color broken off</td>
<td>broken off</td>
<td>broken off</td>
<td>none visible</td>
<td>distinct solid triangle</td>
<td>none visible</td>
<td>6 bisect. by 1 vertical</td>
<td>continu. stripe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CB-12</td>
<td>1 color broken off</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>broken off</td>
<td>broken off</td>
<td>paint</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>broken off</td>
<td>faint stripes</td>
<td>broken off</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CB-13</td>
<td>1 color broken off</td>
<td>broken off</td>
<td>broken off</td>
<td>none visible</td>
<td>painted solid</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>broken off</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>continu. stripe</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CB-14</td>
<td>1 color broken off</td>
<td>broken off</td>
<td>broken off</td>
<td>none visible</td>
<td>none visible</td>
<td>broken off</td>
<td>1 ankle</td>
<td>ankle stripe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CB-15</td>
<td>1 color head-dress</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2 vert 1 horiz</td>
<td>broken off</td>
<td>broken off</td>
<td>broken off</td>
<td>2 extant</td>
<td>broken off</td>
<td>broken off</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CB-20</td>
<td>2 colors eyes</td>
<td>2 with dots</td>
<td>broken off</td>
<td>arched stripe</td>
<td>broken off</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>broken off</td>
<td>broken off</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CB-21</td>
<td>1 color stripes head dress</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>clay appliqué discs</td>
<td>2 vert. stripes</td>
<td>vertical stripe</td>
<td>1 waist</td>
<td>vert. upper</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>continu. stripe</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CB-29</td>
<td>1 color? head-dress, cheeks</td>
<td>solid paint neck</td>
<td>circle or solid paint?</td>
<td>none visible</td>
<td>none visible</td>
<td>none visible</td>
<td>wash upper 4 lower</td>
<td>4?</td>
<td>appliqué</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CB-31</td>
<td>3 colors eyes, striped cheeks</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>dots 4 rayed stripes</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>3 with dots</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>7 upper 2 wrist</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>painted vertical stripes,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CB-40</td>
<td>2 or 3 colors head-dress, eyes, cheeks</td>
<td>6 neck shoulders</td>
<td>broken off</td>
<td>broken off</td>
<td>broken off</td>
<td>3 upper arms</td>
<td>broken off</td>
<td>broken off</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Tell Aqab

Introduction to Tell Aqab

The site of Tell Aqab is situated in the north central Khabur River headwaters area of the Jezirah in northeastern Syria, 15 kilometers north of Chagar Bazar and six kilometers south of the modern town of Amuda near a small water source that seasonally flows through the Wadi Dara into the Khabur. The site is reported to have risen 9.5 meters above the present plain. From a surface survey, a long, well stratified sequence of occupation was found to run through all phases of the Halaf, and artifacts from the Ubaid phase appeared on the top of the tell (Davidson, 1977). Excavations were undertaken by the University of Edinburgh in two brief seasons in 1975 and 1976 co-directed by Trevor Watkins and Thomas E. Davidson, who deposited their finds in the Aleppo Museum.

This was the first post-war excavation to expose all phases of the Halaf within a stratigraphic sequence on one mound. Work focused upon removal of archaeological assemblages in vertical soundings for stratigraphic analysis rather than on lateral exposures of features for settlement analysis in much the same fashion as Mallowan opened stratigraphic soundings at Nineveh in 1931-2 and at Chagar Bazar in 1935 (Mallowan 1933, 1936). This was the doctoral research of Davidson; a report on the excavations and ceramic analysis appeared in his dissertation one year later (Davidson 1977, 110-168). Different results appeared in an article a few years later (Davidson and Watkins 1980). The separate works contain different information on the excavations, and it is necessary to consult both together with the data stored with the figurines in order to establish their stratigraphic placement and archaeological context. Although the excavators reported finding “mother goddess type figurines,” only one, TA-1, is published in their report (Davidson and Watkins 1980, 10, fig. 3.7). Of the fourteen figurines and fragments found in the Aleppo Museum, three were determined to not be
anthropomorphic; the data presented in this section and the corresponding catalog of 11 figurines in Appendix B combine information presented in these publications together with the field data found alongside the figurines in the museum.

Tell Aqab is a particularly important Halaf site because so much of Halaf studies has depended upon the conclusions from these excavations to build and reinforce the scholarly construct that is known as the Halaf culture. In particular, this site has been used to reinforce the phasing of the Halaf, particularly the existence of the Middle Halaf and Halaf-Ubaid Transitional phases, both of which are not utilized in the chronology of this dissertation. Figurines were not found at Tell Aqab from either of these phases (see Figure 5.58, p. 274). Davidson’s dissertation was the first work to present the full chronological range of Halaf ceramics, and it was the major source for the oft-cited and seminal essay by Patty Jo Watson, “The Halafian Culture: A Review and Synthesis,” which synthesized Halaf studies based upon this work. Samples taken from the ceramic assemblage as well as some mud bricks and figurine TA-1 were analyzed by neutron activation which suggested long-distance trade of the late Halaf painted ceramics but not the mud bricks or figurines (Davidson 1981, Davidson and McKerrell 1983). Beyond these publications, no one has examined the small finds from Tell Aqab. The analysis presented here is only for figurines found during ten days of excavation during the 1975 season, as that is all that can be found in the storeroom at the Aleppo Museum. Excavation reports suggest that contexts producing figurines continued to be excavated in the following 1976 season, so it is certainly

---

None of the Tell Aqab figurines appeared to have been accessioned into the Aleppo museum. When I saw them in 2001, they did not have museum numbers recorded on or with the figurines. These figurines were in the Aleppo Museum storeroom in the box marked Tell Aqab apparently in the state in which they were deposited in the museum by the excavators at the end of their excavation. Mold was present on the slips of papers recording excavation information, and I was granted permission to replace these with re-written tags on new paper with permanent pen and clean bags. I studied additional clay fragments of objects in the Aleppo Museum: excavation numbers TA 1, TA 2, and TA 50 are clay rods painted with stripes, and TA 15 is a hollow clay [drinking?] tube painted with stripes. My photos, notes, and drawings of them are available upon request.
possible that more figurines were found in this season. Attempts to gain access to excavation archives or artifact records from the excavation directors were unsuccessful.

**The Excavations of Tell Aqab**

The stated intention of the excavators of this area was to establish the stratigraphy of the site by sampling with a sounding, identifying layers by comparison of the entire excavated assemblages, primarily to those of Arpachiyah and, to a lesser extent, Chagar Bazar (Davidson 1977, Davidson and Watkins 1980). However, the resulting comparative analysis to date considers only the ceramic finds. The ceramic comparisons were restricted to pottery excavated at Arpachiyah and Chagar Bazar without reflection upon the chronological framework already established by Mallowan. Excavations during these seasons focused on three connected trenches – S1, S2, and S3 (Davidson 1977), later termed T1, T2, and T3 (Davidson and Watkins 1980) – which formed a step trench down the north slope. The excavators reported to have sampled from 12 meters total of deposits along the northern slope of the tell (Davidson and Watkins 1980, 3), but the section drawing of the excavations shows the soundings were not so deep (Figure 5.58, p. 274). A fourth trench, S4/T4, was excavated on southern slope and yielded Ubaid material culture but no figurines (Davidson and Watkins 1980). No figurines are known to have been found in the Middle Halaf levels of lower S2/T2 and upper S3/T3. This section will therefore focus on the contexts which yielded the eleven figurines from the 1975 season: the late Halaf lower levels of S1/T1 and upper levels of S2/T2 and the early Halaf levels in lower S4/T3.

The figurines stored in the Aleppo museum still had tags which appeared to have been field-recorded at the time of discovery. Unfortunately, field recording practices are not explained in available reports, so much of the data recorded on these tags cannot be utilized in this analysis. However, the field-recorded level for each figurine is quite useful for determining the general context of each example if not the exact findspot. All information gathered from
these tags is presented here for future reference (*Table 5.34, p. 277*). In an attempt to determine the site distribution of the figurines, the level of each example is extrapolated based upon the published datum point at the summit of the tell. An overlay of the information on the field tags to the published section drawing of the excavation shows that all figurines from the 1975 season were found within three meters of accumulation between 1.2 meters-4.23 meters from the datum (see *Figure 5.58, p. 274*).

The interconnected trenches were cut into the northern slope; upper trenches 1 and 2 measured 10 x 4 meters laterally, but they appear to have been quite shallow, together less than five meters in depth. The lowest trench, 3, was narrower due to logistical issues presented by the topography of the mound. This trench was also the deepest, reaching virgin soil after digging through the earliest material dated by the excavators as early Halaf. As mentioned before, no figurines are associated with the Ubaid or so-called Halaf Ubaid Transition (HUT) in upper trenches 1 and 4. Nine figurines can be stratigraphically placed within what the excavators designated as the late Halaf phase in lower trench 1 and upper trench 2 (see *Table 5.34, p. 277*). Two additional figurines can be stratigraphically placed in what the excavators designated as the early Halaf phase in lower trench 2 and trench 3. However, typological analysis of the figurines reveals an unmistakable late Halaf example in the lowest level, TA-3, and possibly early Halaf examples in the upper levels. Therefore, these could not have been completely sealed deposits. Thus, these excavated contexts should probably be interpreted as mixed accumulations of settlement debris resulting from millennia of erosion and other disturbances\textsuperscript{149} into which the excavators dug these trenches.

\textsuperscript{149} Given the well-known fertility of the Khabur headwaters in ancient to modern times, it is also likely that this gentle slope may have been under cultivation since (and/or during) the sixth millennium. Therefore, much of this step trench could have been disturbed by repeated plowing and other agricultural landscape manipulations.
Archeological Context of Tell Aqab Figurines

Given the information available (Davidson 1977, Davidson and Watkins 1980), it is difficult to connect each figurine example to a findspot or to understand the archaeological context. According to the excavators:

As with the mother goddess figurines, most types of non-utilitarian polished stone objects were recovered only from late and transitional contexts at Tell Aqab… (Davidson and Watkins 1981, 10)

This statement may be interpreted to mean that anthropomorphic figurines were only found in trench 1 and the upper level of trench 2 and that all the figurines found were all LH.1A or LH.1B mother goddess types (Table 5.35, p. 278). As mentioned above, figurine findspot and levels from field records reconciled with the published datum point shows that no figurines can be associated with transitional levels in trench 1 (at least for the 1975 season). Five of the
anthropomorphic figurines studied at the Aleppo museum, TA-1, TA-2, TA-4, TA-5, and TA-6, are easily recognizable as LH.1A and LH.1B, formerly known as mother goddess types, and, according to the levels on their tags, they came from late Halaf context. However, one LH.1A figurine, TA-3, was found in trench 3 at the lowest level of excavation, said to be an early Halaf context. There are also Type EH.2A figurines clearly representing standing poses, TA-7 and TA-8, that cannot be interpreted as the so-called mother goddess types. Typologically, these standing figurines could well belong to the early Halaf period, as they are similar with figurines from that phase found at Tell Kurdu and Sabi Abyad, but they were found in late Halaf context in trenches 1 and 2.

Limb fragments TA-9, TA-10, and TA-11 may not have been initially recognized as anthropomorphic figurine fragments by the excavators. TA-9 compares well to Type LH.1C figurines at Çavı Tarlası, and its field recorded level suggests that it may have been found in the late Halaf tholos fill in trench 2. TA-11, if it is a figurine leg, must have belonged to a LH.1A figurine, and its level records it in a late Halaf context. Arm fragment TA-10 could have come from an early Halaf standing figurine, although it appears to have been found adjacent to a late Halaf example, TA-3, in the lowest early Halaf levels of trench 3. For a juxtaposition of the possible contexts, lateral stratigraphic distribution of the figurines from the 1975 season to their types see Table 5.34, p. 277. Trench 2 was expanded to fully expose a large tholos with an attached dromos, and, according to the excavators, many small finds including figurines were found in the black ashy fill of this architectural feature. It appears from the field notations that many figurines, some clearly Type LH.1A, were found in this context (see Table 5.34, p. 277). It
is also probable that additional figurines were found in this same context, which was fully exposed in the 1976 season.\footnote{No figurines from the 1976 Tell Aqab season were found at the Aleppo Museum.}

\begin{table}[h]
\centering
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|}
\hline
Trenches & Finds and Features & Anthropomorphic Figurines \\
\hline
T4/S4 & Upper levels: Ubaid [Ubaid graves, rectangular buildings, baked clay animal figurines, mostly sheep] Lower levels – transitional & No figurines reported or known. (Davidson & Watkins 1981, 10) \\
Dug into south surface of mound & & \\
\hline
T1/S1 & level 1: northern Ubaid bent clay nails graves with Ubaid pots levels 2-3 transitional levels Massive stones—foundation of circular structure level 4 late Halaf begins below 1.15m (Davidson 1977, 141) & No figurines known \\
Upper step trench, north slope & & \\
\hline
T2/S2 & level 1 late Halaf 5 m dia. pisé tholos with dromos filled with black ashy matrix rich in small finds, including figurines, stone & TA-1, TA-2, TA-4, TA-5, TA-6, TA-7, TA-9, TA-11 \\
8x10 m & level 2-4 so-called middle Halaf begins below 2.6 m (Davidson 1977, 120) & No figurines known \\
Middle step & & \\
trench, north slope & & \\
\hline
T3/S3 & level 1 so-called middle Halaf change in pottery level 2-4 early Halaf begins below 3.11m (Davidson 1997, 120) Earliest pottery in lowest 3 levels of this trench & TA-3, TA-10 \\
Lowest step & & \\
trench, north slope & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\caption{Archeological contexts and site distribution of TA figurines}
\end{table}

I have made attempts to reconcile the field notations on the tags and bags stored with the figurines as they were deposited in the Aleppo museum (Table 5.34) with the archaeological stratigraphy, excavated assemblages, and features in published and unpublished reports of the site (Table 5.33). These reports do not offer a small find catalog, explanation of the field recording system, or correlations of the field notation system to archaeological contexts and stratigraphy.\footnote{Attempts to locate and gain access to the excavation archives were not successful.} Only one figurine, TA-1, is published, and the publication does not provide an archeological context or findspot.
Table 5.34: Field notations with TA figurines in Aleppo Museum

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Figurine</th>
<th>Season/day ND=day not noted</th>
<th>Letter [excavator’s initial?]</th>
<th>depth</th>
<th>Number inside Δ [=locus?]</th>
<th>figurine Typological Date</th>
<th>Possible Archaeological context</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TA-1</td>
<td>1975/ND</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>1.22m</td>
<td>80[152]</td>
<td>Late Halaf 1B</td>
<td>Same context Upper fill of large tholos &amp; dromos T2?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TA-4</td>
<td>1975/ND</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>1.23m</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>Late Halaf 1A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TA-2</td>
<td>1975/ND</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>1.23m</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>Late Halaf 1A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TA-7</td>
<td>1975/Sept 17</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>1.24m</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>Early Halaf 2A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TA-9</td>
<td>1975/Sept 13</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>1.60m</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>Late Halaf 1C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TA-8</td>
<td>1975/ND</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>2.1m</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Early Halaf 2A</td>
<td>Same context Lower T2?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TA-5</td>
<td>1975/Sept 17</td>
<td>TW</td>
<td>2.12m</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>Late Halaf 1A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TA-6</td>
<td>1975/ND</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>2.1m</td>
<td>46 or 47</td>
<td>Late Halaf 1A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TA-11</td>
<td>1975/ND</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>2.1m</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Late Halaf</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Middle Halaf below Depth of 2.6m, T2-T3
Early Halaf below Depth of 3.11m T3, Only (Davidson 1977, 120)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Figurine</th>
<th>Season/day</th>
<th>Letter</th>
<th>depth</th>
<th>Number inside Δ</th>
<th>figurine Typological Date</th>
<th>Possible Archaeological context</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TA-10</td>
<td>1975/Sept 15</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>4.17m</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Early? Halaf</td>
<td>Same context Upper T3?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TA-3</td>
<td>1975/Sept 18</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>4.23m</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>Late Halaf 1A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The bags and tags stored with each figurine record find dates, initials, level, and locus numbers. Presumably the levels recorded were all taken from the published “Internal Datum 100m Nominal” (*Figure 5.58, p. 274*). If this is true, the presence of TA-3, which is clearly an LH.1A figurine fragment in the lowest levels excavated calls into question the excavator’s claim that the context of these levels are sealed early Halaf contexts. It is certainly conceivable that erosion and slope wash may have caused later phased artifacts to tumble along with developed soils into the fields at the base of the tell. The presence of possibly early Halaf figurines, TA 7 and TA-8, in the trenches above suggests that there may have been further disturbance to this side of the tell, perhaps from agricultural or other human interventions.

---

\[152\] This number was written inside a triangle on Tell Aqab tags which are interpreted here as recording internally assigned numbers of the features or soil matrices in which the figurines were found, here called locus, although publications of the site do not mention locus numbers or list any numbers of this sort. It is equally possible that the excavators were following the British system of archaeological recording, which would mean that the numbers inside the triangles are small find numbers (Alexandra Fletcher, personal communication, 2014).

\[153\] Written on the tag of TA-1 “area of ashy lenses” the findspot level and locus number of this figurine indicates that the excavator S was probably just coming down onto the fill of the Tholos in this trench early in the first season. This feature was fully exposed in the 1976 season.
### Table 5.35: Tell Aqab figurines by type and fragmentation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Complete figurines</th>
<th>Figurine torso fragments</th>
<th>Head fragments</th>
<th>Limb fragments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type LH.1B Seated male</td>
<td>TA-1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type LH.1A Seated female</td>
<td></td>
<td>TA-2, TA-3, TA-6</td>
<td>TA-5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type LH.1A or B fragments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>TA-4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LH.1C fragments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>TA-9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type EH.2A Standing</td>
<td></td>
<td>TA-7, TA-8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type unknown misc. Fragments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>TA-10, TA-11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Tell Aqab figurines, discussion**

Stylistically, most of the figurines of Tell Aqab can be typologically assigned to the late Halaf phase. Figurines TA-1, TA-2, TA-4, TA-5, TA-6, and TA-9 are also found within late Halaf levels, so the stratigraphic data and typology are in synch for these six figurines. Two standing figurines, TA-7 and TA-8, are tentatively assigned typologically to the early Halaf because they compare well with examples from Tell Sabi Abyad and Tell Kurdu, although these were recorded as found in late Halaf levels. Two fragments are recorded as found in early Halaf, TA-10, and late Halaf, TA-11, contexts; however, both are too fragmentary to assign them to types. However, an indisputably LH.1A figurine, TA-3, was found directly below this level at the basal levels of excavation. The typological evidence from the Tell Aqab figurines suggests that a complete re-examination of the stratigraphy of Tell Aqab should be done. Without basic information on the recording systems of Tell Aqab and access to materials from their second season, though, such a re-examination would be difficult.
Khirbet esh-Shenef

Excavations of Khirbet esh-Shenef

The small site of Khirbet esh-Shenef is situated in the Balikh river valley, close to Tell Sabi Abyad. Excavations directed by Peter Akkermans in 1988 and 1991 revealed a small cluster of structures, the result of a single occupation dated c5600-5500 cal BC (Akkermans and Schwartz 2003, 119). The excavators expressed the belief that Khirbet esh-Shenef was a small settlement; perhaps one extended family of around 10-15 inhabitants during a brief period of time, probably no more than 25 years. During this time, some structures were used only briefly (Akkermans 1993, 133-134). Two levels were identified within the later stratigraphic sequence of the architecture, the figurine was found in level 3A/B, the latest occupation, which featured pottery comparable to the so-called Halaf-Ubaid Transitional, (HUT) the very last phase of the Halaf (Akkermans and Wittman 1992).154

A Halaf Figurine at Khirbet esh-Shenef

One example, a lower torso fragment of a standing figurine, was found during the course of excavations at Khirbet esh Shenef, KeshS-1. It was found in the debris outside building IX, named the Rechteckgebäude because was comprised of a series of connected rectangular rooms (Akkermans and Wittmann 1993, 160). This building has been absolutely dated with two date ranges 5740-5610 cal BC and 5602-5574 cal BC155, placing it at the end of the late Halaf. Presumably the debris layers outside this building can also be dated to around that time. While the context of this figurine is securely in the very late Halaf, the authors rightly pointed out that typologically this figurine fragment is extremely similar to the early Halaf figurine, SAB-1. That example belongs to the settlement which, according to Akkermans (1993, 1996), had long come

155 The dates of the Rechteckgebäude XI are from Akkermans and Wittmann 1993, 161 abb. 161.
to an end at early Halaf Sabi Abyad before Khirbet esh-Shenef was occupied (Akkermans and Wittmann 1993, 160).

This standing figurine, with its rectangular base, painted herringbone design on the back, and large decorated pudenda on the front, is quite distinct. Within the Halaf corpus, this particular type is unique to these two examples (SAB-1, KesSh-1), which inexplicably are very far apart chronologically but very close geographically. It is possible that this was a long-lasting typological style localized to the Balikh, representing female imagery that was locally in demand for many centuries. It is equally possible that this figurine or figurine fragment could have been curated or held over generations as an heirloom from earlier times.
Tell Kashkashok

Excavations at Tell Kashkashok

The cluster of sites known as Tell Kashkashok I-IV is four separate tells which are 25 kilometers northwest of the modern city of Haseke in northwestern Syria on either side of the wadi el-Awenji, a tributary of the Khabur river. The name comes from a small, remote village adjacent to these tells along the Derbassia road from Haseke. An international campaign excavated Tell Kashkashok I-IV between 1986-1991 as a rescue project in advance of the completion of the Barrage du Habour, a dam that flooded the upper Khabur river basin, including all of these sites (Souleiman and Tarekji 1993, Bounni 1990). Tell Kashkashok II was dated to the proto-Hassuna through Hassuna period and yielded three anthropomorphic figurines (Matsutani 1991, pl. 68, 1-3). The complex of tells was dominated by the massive Tell Kashkashok III. Excavations by Antoine Souleiman reported several noncontiguous settlements on that tell of different dates, Assyrian, Ninevite V/Early Dynastic, Akkadian, Ubaid, and Halaf. Tell Kashkashok IV was briefly explored by a Yale University team, which found Ubaid occupations but no Halaf. The much smaller Tell I was also excavated by Souleiman, where he found a thick layer of successive Halaf occupations, into which at least one Assyrian tomb was dug (Figure 5.60, below).

Tell Kashkashok I is also known as Tell Nass, a small mound situated west of the river which yielded Halaf settlement layers with no overlay. However, the excavations were not well documented due to the lack of technology, trained staff, and time remaining before the inundation. As a result, very few in-situ photographs and no drawings or recordings of exact

156The figurines from Tell Kashkashok II were studied by me in 2001 at the Haseke Department of Antiquities, but these are now outside of the chronological scope of this dissertation.
locations of specific finds are available in either published or unpublished form (Arimura, personal email communication 2012). What is available is a general recording of where figurines and other finds were found by grid and locus number (Table 5.38, below).

Figure 5.60: map of Tell Kashkashok I-IV
Tell Kashkashok I circled (after Breniquet 1993, 169)

Table 5.36: Tell Kashkashok I material culture
(based on Soulieman and Tarekji 1999)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KK I Phase</th>
<th>Ceramics</th>
<th>Other features and artifact assemblages</th>
<th>Figurines</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Phase I (earliest)</td>
<td>Lustrous; red and black paints; crosses, hatching, bent and wavy lines and circles; floral designs on vases</td>
<td>Layers of ash; Stone tools, clay balls, and basalt jars and bowls. Many roomed houses</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase II</td>
<td>Fine lustrous, but not glossy. monochrome, bichrome, red and black, some unpainted; vases, plates, pots, and cups; Motifs: floral including rosettes of 3 and 4 petals, fish, and bucrania. Lines, and zigzags</td>
<td></td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase III (latest)</td>
<td>Motifs: floral including more sophisticated and beautiful’ rosettes; giraffes, zebras, fish; Maltese cross, crossed/hatched lines, diamonds, squares, and ovals; large ceramic jar, with running gazelles and zebras</td>
<td>Basalt pestles, grinding stones; stamp seals; Graves of children in fetal position (no grave goods)</td>
<td>‘Mother goddess’ figurines found in this level.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Three archaeological levels are reported from Tell Kashkashok I, IIIA-B, and IIA – all featuring material culture that appears to be late Halaf (Arimura, personal email communication 2012). Now situated either under or in the marshy areas near the barrage lake at different seasons, Tell I was a low mound, 1.3 meters tall and 25 meters square in dimension. Discussing a three-part Halaf phasing of Tell I, Souleiman described it as “…un centre important de civilisation de l’époque de Halaf au VIᵉ millénaire av. J.-C., dans la region de la Djéziré Syrienne.” The description of finds in all three phases could comfortably fit within the late Halaf and offers no diagnostic indicators of early Halaf. Excavators compared their assemblage but not specific finds to sites yielding early and late Halaf as well as Ubaid material culture including of Yarim Tepe, Umm Qseir, Chagar Bazar, Hammam el-Turkman, Sabi Abyad, Damishliah, Tell Khazne, and Shams el Din (Souleiman and Tarekji 1999). With only less than a meter-and-a-half of occupation debris, it is likely that these three levels were probably successive and overlapping and together did not have a long duration. The excavations of this tell took place in 1986-1988, while Antoine Souleiman was simultaneously directing excavations of Kashkashok III.

Archaeological Context of Tell Kashkashok Figurines

It is impossible to determine from available documentation which Tell Kashkashok figurines came from which Halaf levels on either Tell I or Tell III. There are also rumors of unrecorded Halaf deposits in the general area between tells which also yielded figurines. It is possible that the Halaf finds from Tell I and III and elsewhere may have been mixed prior to registration in the field or at the Aleppo museum after deposit. At least six Halaf figurines are published as coming from Tell III (Table 5.37, below). No information was available at this
writing regarding the excavations of Halaf levels at Tell Kashkashok III.\textsuperscript{157} Close to half of the 25 Tell Kashkashok late Halaf figurines cataloged here in Appendix B and found in the Aleppo and Deir ez-Zor museums must have been found at Tell Kashkashok I. The third and latest phase is described as the level where mother goddess figurines were found in publication (Souleiman and Tarekji 1999), but unpublished documentation records them in at least two of these levels.

\begin{center}
\textit{Table 5.37: Published provenance of selected Tell Kashkashok figurines}
\end{center}

\begin{tabular}{|l|l|l|l|}
\hline
Exhibition & Tell Kashkashok I & Tell Kashkashok III & Specific Tell not noted \\
\hline
Bre\textit{n}iquet 1993 \textit{L’Eufra\textit{t}e et il Tempo... Rimini} & Cat 69/Alep 1290/ KK-25 & Cat 213/Alep 1282/90 Kl KK-5 & \\
& Cat 70/Alep 1117/ KK-23 & Cat 214/Alep 1118/ 90 Kl 24 KK-14 & \\
& Cat 71/Alep 1288/90 Ki 3 KK-24 & Cat 215/Alep 1281 KK-2 & \\
\hline
Soulieman & Tarekji, In Cluzen 1993 \textit{Syrie M\textit{\'{e}}moire et civilisation... Paris} & & \\
& Cat 69/Alep 1290/ KK-25 & Cat 264/Alep 1117/ KK-23 & \\
& Cat 70/Alep 1117/ KK-23 & Cat 265/DezZ 13542/90Kl KK-5 & \\
& Cat 71/Alep 1288/90 Ki 3 KK-24 & & \\
& Cat 72/Alep 1289/90 Ki 23 KK-8 & & \\
\hline
& & Cat 20.2/DezZ 13543/ KK-5 & \\
& & Cat 20.3/DezZ 13548/ KK-4 & \\
& & Cat 20.4/DezZ 13544/ KK-3 & \\
\hline
Bonatzt, Kühne, and Mahmoud 1998 Deir ez-Zor Museum Catalog & Cat 20.1/DezZ 13546/ KK-1 & Cat 264/Alep 1117/ KK-23 & \\
& Cat 20.2/DezZ 13543/ KK-5 & & \\
& Cat 20.3/DezZ 13548/ KK-4 & & \\
& Cat 20.4/DezZ 13544/ KK-3 & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

\textsuperscript{157}There is plenty of hearsay and rumors over the issues of whether Halaf figurines are associated with Tell Kashkashok III proper. One archaeologist reports that trenches only reached ‘Ubaid levels and did not find Halaf figurines at Kashkashok III (Frank Hole email communication, 2000); the dig driver reported finding a group of Halaf figurines between Kashkashok I and III during a few hours of unsupervised digging, which, he reported, included KK-23 (Abu Abdul, Aleppo Museum, personal communication July 16, 2000); another archaeologist reported finding a Halaf figurine on the remaining surface of Kashkashok III when visiting the site with Dr. Souleiman long after the lake had formed (Neiwenhuise personal communication 2001). It is probable that late Halaf figurines were (still are?) accessible just below the surface in various unspecified locations near and on Kashkashok III but may not have been found during official, supervised excavations on the tell.
Perhaps the other half of this assemblage came from the Halaf levels from Tell III, possibly on the same days. Tell Kashkashok I records show that more than ten Halaf figurines are recorded as found during excavation of this small tell. Unpublished excavation notes record six examples as isolated finds and three found in groups of two or more. These were recorded as found in levels IIIA-B and level IIA. Unfortunately, it is impossible with the documentation available to me to determine exactly which ten figurines to which these records refer or even if all of the recorded figurines are anthropomorphic. In addition to the figurines featured in the catalog entries (Cluzen 1993, see also Table 5.37, below), at least one of these figurines, KK-23, was reported to have been found off Tell I together with unspecified others.

Table 5.38: Findspots of unspecified figurines at Tell Kashkashok I

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findspot</th>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Animal or Human Figurines</th>
<th>Human figurines</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grid 33</td>
<td>Locus 62</td>
<td>IIIB</td>
<td>1 male figurine 1 “foot-shaped pottery”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grid 34</td>
<td>Locus 94</td>
<td>IIIA</td>
<td>half broken figurine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grid 42</td>
<td>Locus 31</td>
<td>IIIA</td>
<td>1 human figurine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Locus 49</td>
<td>IIIB</td>
<td>human figurines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grid 51</td>
<td>Locus 91</td>
<td>IIIA</td>
<td>2 complete figurines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Locus 97</td>
<td>IIIA</td>
<td>Figurines (unknown quantity)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Locus 115</td>
<td>IIIB</td>
<td>1 figurine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grid 60</td>
<td>Locus 106</td>
<td>IIA</td>
<td>1 male figurine</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The provenance of the 24 figurines I studied from Tell Kashkashok are therefore presumed to be from more than one late Halaf settlement, from Tell I and III and possibly places in between. The clear and indisputable late Halaf typology of most of the examples, which are LH.1A, LH.1B, or LH.1C, are assumed to have been roughly contemporaneous to each other and come from settlements that were within a brief walk of each other. Those who conceived, made,
used, and discarded these figurines must have been in daily contact with each other if they did not physically live together. The figurines themselves suggest that similar practices were in play by those engaging with these examples, which, at least for the LH.1A/B/C examples, are quite similar to each other. Therefore, based upon the figurine data alone and in the absence of any other excavation documentation or data, all examples are given the simplified designation Tell Kashkashok or KK-# in Appendix B.

However, despite the large number of examples, the provenance of all Tell Kashkashok examples will continue to be confusing and questionable.\(^{158}\) It is hoped that more information on the excavations becomes available and that a final report can ultimately be published.\(^{159}\) There are some specific issues with documentation of many examples. While some figurines have field numbers and are variously marked K1, Ki, or KK, many do not have recorded excavation numbers. An additional four figurines, cataloged in the Aleppo Museum as coming from Tell Kashkashok I and III and marked K1 and KK, are clearly not typologically recognizable as Halaf and have no comparanda from any other Halaf site. These should probably be assigned to the Bronze Age/Ninevite V levels and as such are not considered here.\(^{160}\) In the end, since both Halaf settlements of Tell Kashkashok III and I, where very typologically similar figurines were deposited, were situated less than 200 meters from each other and in close communication, it is even possible that figurines were carried between these two locations either in the sixth 

\(^{158}\) The provenance of the group claimed found by Abu Abdul is especially in doubt, particularly because the one example said to be from the group, KK-23 features modern reconstructions of a headdress and left foot (first documented less than two years after excavation (Cluzen 1993). It is also distressing to note that several figurines appearing on the antiquities market are quite similar to Tell Kashkashok examples.

\(^{159}\) After the death of Antione Soulieman in 2012, the final publication of Tell Kashkashok I (Soulieman and Arimura, forthcoming) and Tell Kashkashok III (Quenet and Soulieman forthcoming), which were reported to be close to completion, are now in limbo (Makoto Arimura personal communication email August 1, 2012).

\(^{160}\) Of course, it is possible that these are unique examples of Halaf figurines, but, without documentation of their findspot, they have been removed from consideration in this dissertation. These unpublished figurine examples have the museum numbers: Aleppo \(\text{\guillemotright}10674\); Aleppo \(\text{\guillemotright}0666\); Aleppo \(\text{\guillemotright}10674\), and Aleppo \(\text{\guillemotright}1390\), of which I have notes and drawings in my files. Typological dating of these objects is further hindered by the lack of synthetic published works on figurines from the Ninevite V period for comparative purposes, as well as a lack of information on the excavation of these levels at Tell Kashkashok I.
millennium and/or in the course of the twentieth-century excavations. For the purposes of this dissertation, typologically recognizable Halaf figurines and a few examples that might be Halaf are presented here and in Appendix B based on their characteristics. Without further documentation regarding contextual information, that they come from conglomeration of mounds collectively known as Tell Kashkashok is all that can be said about the archaeological context at this time.

The Halaf Figurines from Tell Kashkashok

The 25 Halaf figurines considered here and in Appendix B were found and studied at the Aleppo Museum and Deir ez-Zor museums in 2000. The bulk of these figurines remain unpublished, although a few examples have appeared in the catalogs of recent exhibitions of Syrian Antiquities (Table 5.37, p. 284). All of the examples studied were quite dirty, exhibiting surface stains and many concretions, possibly indicating depositional damage consistent with alluvial and irrigated soils. Most appeared to be decorated, some with more than one pigment; however, much of the painting is fugitive, friable, or lost possibly resulting from flooding, mold, staining from depositional, or post-excavation processes. Indications from coloring and the nature of the surface and dark cores observed at breaks suggest that many of the Tell Kashkashok figurines were baked and are quite solid as a result. Certainly they were not fired at the high temperatures of Halaf ceramics, but they appear to have been treated by some sort of pyrotechnic process beyond air or sun drying as a finishing step in the manufacture process. The baking may be the reason that the figurines in the assemblage from Tell

---

161 Because of the lack of available documentation, it is not known if I saw the full assemblage of Halaf figurines from these sites. In 2001 all of the examples I studied were on exhibit in the Aleppo and Der ez-Zor museums. There may have been additional examples in storage.

162 These figurines may never have been properly cleaned after excavation. As mentioned before, the basement of the Aleppo museum was not the ideal storage area and was subject to flooding, resulting in damage to artifacts observed particularly to the Tell Aqab figurines.
Kashkashok are less fragmented and had a greater rate of survival than those of many other sites and survived depositional situations that only damaged the surfaces.

Table 5.39: Tell Kashkashok figurines by type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Figurine type</th>
<th>Complete torso examples</th>
<th>Upper fragments</th>
<th>Lower fragments</th>
<th>Head fragment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LH.1A</td>
<td>KK-1, KK-2, KK-3, KK-4, KK-5, KK-6, KK-7, KK-8, KK-9, KK-11, KK-13, KK-14, KK-18, KK-23</td>
<td>KK-10, KK-15, KK-16, KK-17</td>
<td>KK-12</td>
<td>KK-22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seated female</td>
<td>KK-6, KK-7, KK-8, KK-9, KK-11, KK-13, KK-14, KK-18, KK-23</td>
<td>KK-10, KK-15, KK-16, KK-17</td>
<td>KK-12</td>
<td>KK-22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LH.1C</td>
<td>KK-24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seated female, hanging legs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N= 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LH.1B</td>
<td>KK-19, KK-20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seated Male</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LH.1A or LH.1B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown type</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Possibly not Halaf</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>KK-25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tell Kashkashok Figurines Discussion

While fine-grained archaeological analysis of this assemblage of figurines is not possible for lack of archaeological documentation, comparative typological, stylistic, and technological analysis shows this large assemblage to be quite similar. With only less than one-and-a-half meters of archaeological remains of the Halaf occupation, it is more likely that there was continuous settlement at this tell over a relatively short period of time during the late Halaf period. Typologically, stylistically, and technologically the figurines I studied can be securely dated to the late Halaf phase (Table 5.39, above). Several examples show close affinities to late Halaf figurines from nearby Chagar Bazar (e.g., CB-1, CB-2, CB-5, CB-8) and Tell Aqab (e.g., TA-1) as well as to those further away from Çavı Tarlası (i.e., ÇT-6). The figurine assemblage from Tell Kashkashok mainly consists of seated female figurines in both complete and fragmented examples, though many show imaginative variations such as the construction of legs from rolling on KK-14, which is a trait shared with ÇT-6, and a incised pubic triangle on KK-16.
There is also what might be called elements of a local style evident from LH1.A/B/C Kashkashok figurines. Most of the torsos are quite long and thin; the breasts are quite high on the body, lifted and separated by tightly attached arms with the hands and wrists occupying a wide portion of the sternum. These proportional differences suggest that a more fine-grained study of details and body proportions of assemblages between sites (further than what is discussed here) would provide fruitful further analysis.

Figure 5.61: Figurines from Tell Kashkashok
left to right: KK-24, KK-23, KK-8 (photos from Fortin 1999, 74-75)

Figure 5.62: Tell Kashkashok figurines in the Aleppo Museum
Upper row: KK-9, KK-24, KK-18
Lower row: KK-8, KK-6, KK-7, KK-14
(note, photo is inverted)
Tell Halaf

The Excavations of Tell Halaf

Tell Halaf is the location of one of first Mesopotamian excavations to discover prehistoric remains. Directed by Baron Max Freiherr von Oppenheim, this was also the first location where Halaf figurines were found. From a wealthy banking family, Oppenheim had a career that spanned archaeology, railroad building, diplomatic service, espionage, and ethnographic study of modern nomads (Teichmann and Völger 2001). The location of Tell Halaf, at the border of Syria and Turkey, was an important passing-through point between Iraq and Turkey from the arid lands of Syria into the Anatolian Steppe and within the fertile areas of the Khabur headwaters. It is probable that these natural routes were utilized in prehistoric times; Tell Halaf, situated near a major spring, is positioned as a natural stopping place for both people and animals. It has been established that this area was a very fertile and agriculturally productive area (McCorriston 1992, Akahane 1998). It appears to have been an ideal location for habitation throughout the sixth millennium, when separate Halaf settlements flourished across the entire mound (Martin 2012a). In modern times, the location allowed Oppenheim to pursue all of his occupations – archaeological and beyond – while based there. In his account of the excavations, which took place for four years over a 29-year period, Oppenheim described the area as filled with tribes of many different ethnicities and shifting alliances with Western powers in constant conflict with each other, requiring constant negotiations with local sheikhs (Oppenheim 1933, 1939). Despite

164 Since 2006, Lutz Martin has directed new excavations at Tell Halaf, which have shed further light on Oppenheim’s excavations as well as provided much new material, including Halaf figurines in area B on the northern slope. Unfortunately, I was unable to study those figurines in Syria before completing this dissertation, but I have included those available from publications and the Tell Halaf excavations website.
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the ongoing local and international conflicts which twice interrupted excavations, an impressive complex of second and first millennia BCE monumental architecture at some locations was built directly over the ruins of Halaf settlements. The indications from all excavation campaigns are that Halaf settlement debris is to be found across the entire site. This was recognized by Oppenheim as well:

All of the hill, the ground close under the buildings of the Kapara time was interspersed with painted pottery, obsidian and flint, and still further down to some extent with self-colored pottery also. This fact was established not only during the actual digging, but also through trial sections reaching down to the rock, trial shafts, and very extensive depth-digging in the north-west of the temple-palace. The whole citadel area must therefore have been inhabited in oldest times by the Painted Pottery folk. (Oppenheim 1933, 85)

Re-excavation of prehistoric areas by Jorge Becker as part of the Vorderasiatisches Museum (VAM) Excavations 2006-2010 confirmed that prehistoric remains are to be found across the mound but from distinct settlements concentrated on what used to be four separate mounds that became filled in with later settlement debris (Becker 2009).

The site was first visited by Oppenheim in 1899, while he was in the Foreign Service supervising the building of the Berlin to Baghdad railroad, which passed near the tell. On this first visit, a few soundings were dug on the southwestern section of the mound, which yielded Syro-Hittite palace sculptures. No prehistoric finds were reported, but it is possible that TH-1 was found in that year (Myres 1909, Oppenheim 1908). A permit was secured for excavations which took place in 1911, 1912, and 1913. World War I halted excavations, and in its aftermath mounting tensions and battles amongst leaders of local tribes prevented a resumption of excavations. During the intervening years, the dig house was destroyed in a battle in 1926, although Halaf figurines were not recorded as destroyed in its collapse. When Oppenheim
finally resumed work in 1929 increasing local and international tensions limited excavations to a single final season.

Following the 1929 season, Oppenheim carried out a multi-year promotional campaign of his archaeological work at Tell Halaf and of the museum and foundation which he established to support and display its finds. This campaign included a film news reel (Cholidis and Stern 2004), several articles in the *Illustrated London News* and the *New York Times*, and publication of his personal account of his research on Tell Halaf, published in 1931 (English trans. 1933). Oppenheim reported that he had plans to re-open excavations, which proved impossible given the political tensions building up to another World War (Melka 1973). In 2006 a team of German archaeologists, led by Lutz Martin of the Vorderasiatsches Museum, reopened excavations (Baghdo, Martin et al. 2009) until political unrest in Syria put their research on hold after the 2010 season.

As was Oppenheim’s intention, these excavations dug out major sculptural and architectural remains of the palace of Kapara, a Syro-Hittite ruler, and, as Oppenheim described it, “Our deep digging brought up painted pottery everywhere under the Kapara buildings” (Oppenheim 1933, 87).165 The same was true under most areas across the mound, especially immediately north of the Kapara citadel, where a step trench was cut into the steep, eroded northern slope. This trench was opened in the 1911-13 excavations, extended in 1929, and re-investigated in 2006-2010. While many of the figurines were found in this step trench, a significant number were also found in other soundings under historical levels, though the locations of some soundings cannot be determined from the related publications (*Figure 5.63, p. 294* and *Table 5.41, p. 297*). The source of information for the later excavations is a preliminary

---

165 This was confirmed by a sounding north of the so-called Scorpion Tower, Becker, Jörg, “2007 Report: Area B – ‘West-palast’ and northern slope” downloaded 2012 from: [http://www.grabung-halaf.de](http://www.grabung-halaf.de)
publication of the first seasons of excavations (Baghdo, Martin et al. 2009) and a website for the excavations (www.grabung-halaf.de) with future published reports forthcoming.

**The Destruction of the Tell Halaf Museum**

Nearly half of the figurines published as excavated by Oppenheim were lost in the American bombing of Berlin in November 1943. Once it was safe to do so, German archaeologists re-excavated Tell Halaf artifacts from the ruins of the museum after the bombing and rescued what they could. These artifacts were damaged not only from the very hot jet fuel fire but also from the water used to extinguish the fire. As a result, the basalt statues exploded from the heat as well as from the expansion of the water when it froze. However, many of the figurines were vitrified in the hot fire (*Figure 5.64, p. 295*) but also therefore preserved from the water (Druppel and Lehmann 2009). Some figurines, published less than a year before (Schmidt 1943) were permanently lost.

*Table 5.40: Present condition of Tell Halaf figurines from von Oppenheim’s excavations*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Published Oppenheim and Schmidt 1943</th>
<th>Unpublished</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Presumably lost in 1943 bombing</td>
<td>TH-1, Th-4, TH-5, TH-7, TH-8, TH-17, TH-19, TH-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burned &amp; damaged in 1943 bombing</td>
<td>TH-13, TH-14, TH-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not burned/damaged in 1943 bombing</td>
<td>TH-2, TH-3 (accessioned into VAM) TH-9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Archeological Context of Tell Halaf Figurines

Nineteen Halaf figurines are known to have been found during Oppenheim’s excavations (TH-1 through TH-19). Surprisingly for such an early excavation, the findspot or at least general area of finding is recorded in publication (Oppenheim 1933 and Schmidt 1942). Many of them were found directly under historical structures, which are easily identified on the map of excavations (Figure 5.63, above). An additional four Halaf figurines (TH-20 through TH-23) are published as found in 2007 excavations (Becker 2009). An additional five figurines (TH-24 through TH-28) were found in the Northern step trench area 6718 in the 2010 excavations and were published on the excavation website (http://www.grabung-halaf.de). While it is not explicitly stated in the preliminary online report, it is possible that this last group of figurines were found within general proximity to each other.
Figure 5.64: Tell Halaf figurines in the Vorderasiatisches Museum

*top row:* TH-3 front and right views, TH-9 front and right views *2nd row:* TH-2, TH-12; 
*3rd row:* TH-13 front, base and top views; *bottom row:* TH-14 front, base views and TH-15 front view

[photos by author taken with permission at the VAM study room, Sept. 2002]
Describing the figurines found in the “painted pottery period” under the monumental twelfth-century CE palace, Oppenheim stated:

There were also terracotta statuettes of women; these were painted over and very like those that have been found in southern Mesopotamia, likewise along with painted pottery under the Sumerian layers from historical times. (1933, 36)

Anthropomorphic imagery also appears on late Halaf pottery found at Tell Halaf. This includes rows of dancing women (Oppenheim 1933, 210, pl. LIII: 17, 18), which are also known at Domuztepe, and single figures engaged in unknown activities (Oppenheim 1933, 210 pl. LIII: 11, 12). Recognizable late Halaf figurine types are found in every excavation area opened by Oppenheim. While Tell Halaf may well have early Halaf material culture, all the figurines so far published appear typologically to be of the late Halaf phase. The 2007 excavations also found ceramic evidence for early Halaf (called middle Halaf or Halaf II by the excavator) within the Area B step trench. Stone figurines recently found in a sounding in area A, TH-20 and TH-21, appear to be typologically closer to Ubaid figurine types such as those known as the gaming pieces from Tepe Gawra level 14-16 (Tobler 1950), although late Halaf pottery was also found in association with their find spots (Becker 2009).

While all figurines found at Tell Halaf can be dated to the late Halaf, pottery analysis indicates that there are probably earlier levels as well. Unfortunately, the findspots of the figurines and their associated assemblages are not recorded well enough to determine if any of the figurines were found in earlier levels (*Table 5.41, below*). Earlier than the “level of painted pottery” is a level called “alt [old] monochrome” by the excavators, although no figurines are published as coming from those levels, which have been suggested to be very early pre-Halaf in date, similar to the earliest pottery from Tell Sabi Abyad (Akkermans 1989, 127-129). While the

---

166 A stone figurine purchased by the British Museum and said to be from Tell Halaf, BM registration number 1920.12.11.412, could be of an unknown early Halaf style but is not included here because of its uncertain origins.
majority of the figurines so far excavated from Tell Halaf can be typologically securely dated late Halaf, TH-19 might fit with early Halaf typologies.

Table 5.41: Site distribution of figurines from Tell Halaf
(from: Oppenheim and Oppenheim and Schmidt 1943, 100; Becker 2009, 2012)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Season, findspot, new excav. areas</th>
<th>LH.1A</th>
<th>LH.1B</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Area B – Step Trench in Northern Slope</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1911-13 sounding - perhaps in this area?</td>
<td>TH-3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1929 (N/S trench) D2/IV3 on site plan</td>
<td>TH-6, TH-9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1929 ‘sounding’ – perhaps in this area?</td>
<td>TH-10, TH-11, TH-19</td>
<td>TH-17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007 Northern Step Trench square 6718</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010 Northern Step Trench</td>
<td>TH-24</td>
<td>TH-25, TH-26, TH-27, TH-28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Area A – under “West Palace”</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1929 area east of the temple palace, lower debris</td>
<td>TH-14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1929 soundings under south gate tower</td>
<td>TH-7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006 sounding near Hilani and Scorpion Tower square 6112 &amp; area 6113</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>TH-21, TH-22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Area C- under “North Palace”</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1929 two meters under elongated building “North Palace” B2/VI2 on site plan</td>
<td>TH-13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007 Surface find, area C</td>
<td>TH-23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Area D –“Cultroom”</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1912-13”Cultroom” west of dighouse</td>
<td>TH-8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unknown &amp; unpublished context</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1911-13 unknown location</td>
<td>TH-2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>TH-1, TH-15</td>
<td></td>
<td>TH-18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The current excavator of Tell Halaf prehistoric levels has reported finding “5.5-6.0 m thick levels of settlement of the Halaf period which encompasses all stages of the Halaf culture” (Becker 2012b). The excavator has also been careful to point out that, although Halaf material culture appears to be under much of the historical levels across the mound, there’s evidence of probably five or more separate Halaf settlements (Becker 2012a, fig 2). While these settlements

---

167 See Baghdo, Martin et.al 2009, 11 abb. 1-3 and 98: 10-1 for maps of the areas and new excavations superimposed upon Oppenheim’s 1913 site plan
may not have been inhabited at the same time, the figurines are very similar late Halaf types across the entire site.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Complete &amp; full torso figurines</th>
<th>Upper torso</th>
<th>Lower torso &amp; base</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LH.1A</td>
<td>TH-1, TH-2, TH-3, TH-4, TH-5, TH-9, TH-19</td>
<td>TH-6, TH-7, TH-8, TH-10, TH-11, TH-24</td>
<td>TH-12, TH-13, TH-14, TH-15, TH-16, TH-23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LH.1B</td>
<td>TH-25</td>
<td>TH-27</td>
<td>TH-17, TH-25, TH-26, TH-28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LH.2B</td>
<td>TH-21, TH-22</td>
<td></td>
<td>TH-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LH.2C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Misc: fragments</td>
<td></td>
<td>TH-18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tell Halaf Figurines Discussion

The figurines found at Tell Halaf show again that, during the late Halaf phase, type LH.1A and 1B figurines were very popular in the Khabur headwaters region. A particularly interesting aspect of the assemblage is the many LH.1B figurines found there during both campaigns (Table 5.42, above). Only a handful of these types are known from other nearby sites (e.g., CB-21, TA-1, KK-19). It would be interesting to learn if the examples recently excavated from the 2010 season (TH-24, TH-25, TH-26, TH-27, TH-28) have similar findspots, since several are of LH.1B types.

The LH.1A type figurines, of which nineteen were found at Tell Halaf, are similar in nature to those of Chagar Bazar in that they are all similarly made, but they exhibit some variation in the decoration. For example, at least one figurine, TH-8, bears a unique decoration on a form similar to all the others. Another figurine, TH-19, appears to have been made without breasts and with only arm stubs. From the photographs, it appears that the surfaces of these figurines were in remarkable states of preservation when excavated. As a result, it is possible to see that parallel stripes were favored especially along the shoulders and calves and on the breasts and that the torsos were much shorter than the elongated torsos of Tell Aqab Type LH.1A
figurines. The decoration of the examples excavated by von Oppenheim seem more consistent with each other – as does the formation of the limbs, breasts, and heads – than it does with that on the assemblage at Chagar Bazar, for example. However, photographs of figurines found in 2010 appear to show different patterns of decoration, consisting of solid areas of pigment.

Three standing figurines, all made from stone, are confirmed by publication of their context to be late Halaf phase. These show the same variability one to the other and to those from other Halaf sites. For example, compare Type LH.2C figurine TH-20 with CB-26, which only vaguely shares the same form. Similarly LH.2B figurines TH-21 and TH-22 are vaguely in the same general shape as late Halaf figurines from Tell Arjoune (Arj-1 through Arj-6) or those from Anatolia such DT-1 through DT-9 or ÇT-1. This is further confirmation that inspiration and visual sources for standing figurines may be responses to secondary imagery transmitted on ephemeral two dimensional objects of skin, textiles, wood which may have travelled great distances. It is also possible that these figurines are responses rendered in stone of LH.1A type figurines. TH-20 bears the belt around the waist; TH-21 could be imagined as an amorphous outline of a LH.1A figurine viewed straight on and flattened; TH-22 bears one extant arm stub inferring arms bent at the elbow. It is equally possible that all the figurines were responses in clay and stone to lived body practices as well.
Tell Beydar

*Excavation of a Halaf Figurine at Tell Beydar*

The European Union archaeological team at Tell Beydar discovered a nearly complete Halaf figurine in Bronze Age settlement levels during its 1994 excavations. The findspot is reported to be immediately south of an internal fortification wall associated with the upper city. The figurine was found within a compacted soil matrix, probably a floor or surface amidst ceramics confidently dated to the Early Jezirah IIIa. This context is sealed by floor 7654, which is later in date and covers the figurine findspot as well as the adjacent fortification wall. All indications suggest that this figurine, or at least the matrix within which it was found, was intentionally buried within these inner fortifications or “glassie” of the upper town (*Figure 5.65, p. 301*). The general area of the findspot has been interpreted by the excavators as possibly a domestic or craft production area. No Halaf occupation has been found on Tell Beydar after 16 seasons of excavation, though virgin soil has not yet been reached. The excavators have found a handful of Halaf sherds and two Halaf stamp seals during the course of these excavations, which they suggest may have been carried amidst alluvial mud from a nearby wadi used to prepare mud brick structures (Marc Lebeau, email personal communication April 3, 2010).

It is also possible that the inclusion of the late Halaf figurine (as well as the stamp seals) had a perceived apotropaic effect, connecting to ancestral objects dating thousands of years earlier that were brought to the Bronze Age settlement and intentionally deposited within the floor. The figurine itself is well in keeping with the types and technology of late Halaf figurines in the Upper Khabur region. Comparisons can be readily made with LH.1A figurines from nearby Khabur headwaters sites of Tell Aqab, Tell Kashkashok, Tell Halaf, and Chagar Bazar (e.g., CB-1, TA-3, KK-23, TH-1).
Figure 5.65: Bey-1 and findspot on plan.

_in photo_ Early Jezirah IIIa “Glassie” Fortification Wall
(Photos and plan by François Renel courtesy of Marc LeBeau)
Tell Arjoune

The site of Tell Arjoune overlooks the Orontes river south of Homs lake in a location that is the northern end of the Beqā  valley which extends into Lebanon. In a few trenches, I, V, and VII, Halaf material culture was excavated. However, it is not clear if the occupants of the settlement were in contact with Halaf peoples to the north or whether this should be considered a Halaf settlement outright. While many elements of the material culture found within contexts associated with the figurines found there are late Halaf, there are also elements of the material culture comparable to contemporaneous settlements excavated further west into Lebanon situated in the Beqā  valley (Parr 2003, 1). The site was excavated auxiliary to the Institute of Archaeology, University of London, excavations of Tell Nebi Mend, directed by Peter Parr, Tell Arjoune is a very small tell situated quite close to the enormous Tell Nebi Mend, which was explored briefly with just a few trenches yielding late Halaf material culture.

For this dissertation, Tell Arjoune represents the southwestern extent of Halaf figurines, and for Halaf studies in general it presents evidence of important sixth millennium connections to the Levant, especially to Ras Shamra (Bernbeck 2004), but the prehistoric sounding there did not yield late Halaf figurines (Contesen 1992). However, the six figurines found in trench V can be only tenuously connected conceptually, stylistically, and technologically to Halaf figurine practices known from sites further north discussed in this chapter and dissertation.

Archaeological Context of the Figurines

The six late Halaf figurines known from this site were all found in association with several other Halaf material culture artifacts in Trench V, Area B. This was a grid of adjacent squares excavated in the center of a cluster of mounds that appear to have eroded into a single, low-lying mound during post-Halaf periods (Marfoe, Parr and Phillips 2003, 12-13, fig. 4). At the center of the erosion debris, trench V was excavated in 1979 when work laterally exposed a
series of large and small amorphous and eroded Halaf pits cut by later third millennium and
Persian/Hellenistic graves (Marfoe, Parr and Phillips 2003, 16-19, figs. 8-9). Bernbeck suggests
that, given the size and amorphous shapes of these pits, this area might better be interpreted as a
work area (Bernbeck 2004, 72). It is important to note that none of the figurines have the same
exact findspot. Each was found in a different excavation square, amongst the rest of the fill;
none of which suggests deliberate deposition or group deposits. (Marfoe, Parr and Phillips 2003).

Whatever the original prehistoric use or uses of this open area, excavations revealed a
tumbled deposition of ceramic, lithic, and small find artifacts, many of which can be associated
with the late Halaf phase. Additional late Halaf artifacts were found in trench VII within
operation A; however, no figurines were found in those excavations. Averages of samples from
Trenches V and VII offer two absolute date ranges, 5600-5430 and 5580-5390 cal BC
confirming the ceramic analysis which places this settlement (or pit deposition) in the Late
Halaf. There are also parallels ceramic traditions in the Beqā valley as well as Ras Shamra
IVB,168 suggesting a Levantine western regional Halaf tradition (Campbell 2003, 31-36).

Campbell connects only one ceramic assemblage that also yielded figurines, that from the site of
Domuztepe. Certainly the LH.2B figurines from there show parallels, especially DT-1, which,
like Arj-1, has a pudenda delineated by incision. An additional parallel can be made to DT-11,
which, like all of the Arjoune figurines, is also made from a pebble.

**Figurines from Tell Arjoune, Discussion**
The six figurines excavated from Tell Arjoune were all fashioned from naturally
occurring flat pebbles; some have quite tenuous connections to anthropomorphic forms –
especially Arj-3, Arj-4, Arj-5, and Arj-6. While they may be simple geometric forms, the
vaguely human features encourage their inclusion in this study. The Arjoune figurines suggest

---

168 No figurines are known to come from this level at Ras Shamra (Contenson 1992).
that there was an indirect method of communicating human representation during this time, which became mixed with the skill set and practices of making small objects at that settlement. Animal figurines (Mathias 2003, 10-11, fig. 64) show that, while representation in clay was practiced at Arjoune during the late Halaf phase, anthropomorphic representation was carried out in stone. This material choice is an interesting connection to settlements directly north of Arjoune in the Levantine corridor. Domuztepe, for example, has yielded only stone figurines. Mathias pointed out Yarmokian pebble figurine comparanda outside the Halaf horizon examples, those from Shar’ah Hagolan and Byblos (Mathias 2003, 169) to which can now be added many more examples (Garfinkel and Miller 2002).

However, there are also remnants of Halaf figurine representation practices on the Arjoune examples (Figure 5.66, p. 305). These figurines have reduced the essential Halaf human form to just a few lines on flat pebbles. The eyes are represented by simple lines (Arj-1, Arj-3, Arj-4, Arj-6), with the most elaborate example, Arj-1, offering a pupil and iris surrounded by long lashes. These are the same lines as the brush strokes representing eyes on seated clay female figurines of the LH.1A type found at Chagar Bazar, Tell Aqab, and Tell Halaf, (e.g., CB-3, TA-4, TH-1). Hair is represented on the back of the figurines with more lines (Arj-1, Arj-2) similar to the figurine vessel from Yarim Tepe II (Merpert and Munchaev 1987, pl. VII, here - Figure 4.41, p. 214) The double line at the waist or hips, also seen on many LH.1A type examples (e.g., Figure 5.49, p. 225), is also represented (Arj-5). The pubic area, an important element for humans (females?) represented in late Halaf standing figurines is represented here by a punctuated fringed square on Arj-1, a single line on Arj-6, and possibly the notches on Arj-3. This is not to say that the abilities of the figurine-makers were inferior to those who chose to create more naturalistic anthropomorphic clay figurines further north. The concept of
embodiment that visually worked for the purposes of those at Tell Arjoune is evidently different from that of other settlements. These elements suggest that the ideas, beliefs, and social practices related to these visual examples of the body at Arjoune may have been communicated – from Halaf regions further north as well as from non-Halaf regions potentially by ephemeral representations of imagery – perhaps in cloth, leather, or oral narratives.

Figure 5.66: Anthropomorphic figurines from Tell Arjoune, Trench V
(Not to scale) Upper row, l-r- Arj-1, Arj-2; lower row l-r- Arj-3, Arj-4, Arj-5, Arj-6
(after Mathias 2003, fig. 64)

Conclusions: Halaf Figurines from the Western Jazirah
The figurines from the Syrian sites show a complex relationship of agency and stylistic choice amongst those who conceptualized, created, and consumed figurines during the Halaf. There are not enough early Halaf examples available from this region to understand figurine development in the first half of the sixth millennium cal BC. The majority of the few available early Halaf examples from Tell Sabi Abyad show more typological connections to earlier pre-
Halaf examples than to those of the late Halaf. However, a single but well known example, SAB-1, serves as an antecedent to late Halaf standing types.

The Khabur headwater sites provide a chronologically and regionally concentrated and large corpus of examples from the late Halaf, most typologically belonging to the seated groups LH.1A and (a few examples of) LH.1B and LH.1C. In this one region at this one time, the prolific flourishing of figurine making, use, and disposal and the subsequent excavation of LH.1A and related LH.1B and LH.1C type figurines resulted in a critical mass which allows for further conjecture. It is possible to suggest, from a gathering of all available examples of LH.1A/B figurines here, that overall form and assembly of these types was a standardized process. The overall shape and construction was the same within these types (Figure 6.68, p. 328). However, individual agency and choice appear to have flourished in the details and finishing steps of the making. It is difficult to assign comparanda to many examples of this type of figurine in Appendix B. According to the level of detail in the comparative analysis, all or none of the LH.1A or LH.1B figurines have direct comparanda. For example, one may have a specific number of stripes in a certain location, another may have similar foot decoration or formation. The combinations of form and decoration for each example can be said to be unique or similar to all other examples. Therefore although it is argued here that these are a tight typological group of figurines, strongly recognizable for their similarity to each other, they are not assigned many comparanda in the catalog. At this preliminary stage of research, only directly comparable details are cited as comparanda between individual examples (Appendix B).

These examples exhibit variations in the way that body appendages (breasts, arms, legs, heads) are formed and decorated. It may even be possible from this evidence to conjecture that certain examples show similar decorative practices employed by the same individual or group.
hand(s). Evidence for individual choice can be extended to technological details. There are groups of figurines with similar fabrics and pigments, which may also be from the same location or time. Perhaps scientific analysis could further confirm or disprove that the clays and pigments are similar, a suggestion now based purely on visual clues of materials changed by eight millennia of depositional processes as well as improper storage and restoration practices. Together, the examples of this type offer a possibility of deeper analysis, an opportunity for which only the decorative details for Chagar Bazar serve as a preliminary case study here. I hope to expand upon this analysis in future research and expand the investigation with examples from Iraq.

While several typologically late Halaf figurines can be localized to findspots in levels claimed by the excavators to be middle or early Halaf in date, I conclude that these are markers of unsealed and disturbed levels rather than instances of the LH 1A and B types occurring much earlier. Many of these figurines, particularly those from tell Aqab, Chagar Bazar, and Tell Halaf come from step trenches dug into steep, eroded slopes on the sides of tells or from soundings very quickly dug with minimal stratigraphic recording. In the same region, preliminary reports from more recent excavations at Tell Kashkashok and Tell Halaf as well as new investigations at Chagar Bazar are said to have found occupations earlier than late Halaf, but all of the available figurines (of which stratigraphic findspots are not yet known) are typologically late Halaf. Future publication of these assemblages within their excavated context is eagerly awaited.

So far there is no indication of what early Halaf figurines looked like in the Khabur headwaters region or, indeed, of whether figurine making was practiced at all in this particular area during the early sixth millennium during this phase. The assemblages at Tell Sabi Abyad show that, immediately west of this region and at Yarim Tepe I just to the east, figurine-making
and usage were very popular before and during this same time period. For now, the Sabi Abyad examples and the single seal from Umm Qsier suggest that, at least at those settlements, standing figurines were the norm in the Early Halaf phase. A few and various late Halaf standing examples are attested within the Khabur headwaters, and outside of this region standing figurines appear to be the norm for late Halaf figurines, at least at Tell Arjoune and Khirbet esh-Shenef and in Anatolia (see Chapter 4). Future analysis of the standing types, of which many more examples come from Iraq, may eventually show that standing figurines, particularly types EH/LH.2A, EH/LH.2B, and EH/LH.4A are much more ubiquitous though less numerous than those of LH.1A/B/C throughout the early through late Halaf horizon. The assemblage from Syria provides important examples that suggest this trend.

One explicit commonality is that all figurines discussed in this chapter is that they were found in unremarkable assemblages and matrices. Most appear to have been isolated finds in trash matrices. Like the figurines found in Anatolia, during the Halaf phases in Syria, when figurines were no longer wanted, it seems to have been perfectly acceptable to discard them along with other household trash.
CHAPTER SIX: Results, Further Considerations and Conclusions

This dissertation has presented the details and archaeological circumstances of a corpus 197 Halaf figurine examples from sites in Syria and Turkey. The corpus of figurines analyzed here represents approximately half of the entire known assemblage numerically, two-thirds of it regionally, and a good representative sample typologically. Previous chapters have placed this corpus within relevant literature, presented a methodology and typology, and applied it to these two regional assemblages. Appendices A and B present catalog entries for each figurine example and Appendix C presents twelve abbreviated variables of analysis for each example. This chapter presents an overall analysis of the corpus as it can be analyzed using typology, archaeological context, fragmentation, embodim theory, gender, and interregional exchange. While this chapter refers to the analysis and data presented in Chapters Four and Five and the corresponding Appendices A and B, the main source of data presented here can be referenced in Appendix C, which serves as the source data for the statistics and comparative percentages presented in this chapter.

As has been argued in this dissertation, these figurines are informed by the lived practices of those living in the Halaf communities where they were made, used, and discarded. This chapter discusses evidence of those practices within the entire corpus. Figurines are often suggested as gendered objects, and this chapter presents analysis of the representation of sexual difference in this corpus. This section focuses on recognizable biological sex indicators featured on figurine torsos to analyze the gendered intersectionality of represented breasts and genital regions which are interpreted here to identify a figurine as male, female, neither, or both. A section of this chapter suggests a model for future analysis to connect gendered and embodied practices using figurine and archaeological evidence.
This chapter also examines the evidence for figurine heads or lack thereof in this corpus as a response to publications examining the supposed headless nature of Halaf figurines. Further discussion on this topic examines evidence from the figurines and other material culture suggesting the performative use of masks in the Halaf, which, some evidence suggests, may have been used to visually intersect between genders and human/animal worlds. Of course, all of the above comparisons, data collection, and analysis are impeded and informed by the fragmentary nature of the examples. Thus, this chapter also analyses fragmentation of the figurines in this corpus. The end of a project of a comparative analysis which has never been done before naturally calls out for and points to possibilities for further research and the need for refinement and expansion of methodology and analysis. Ending this chapter and dissertation is a wrap-up of the key conclusions about figurines as well as a formulation of key questions for future work and analysis.

**Prehistoric and Modern Influences, Interpretation and Practice**

Another key contribution of this research lies in its reflexivity over the manner in which the study of prehistoric figurines as a discipline has been practiced over time. It was necessary to consider and evaluate the method and goals of the ways that figurines have been reported upon and interpreted over nearly a century of Halaf scholarship. As mentioned in Chapter 2 and presented again here (*Figure 6.67, below*), previous goals of finding universal function for figurines cannot be allied with empirical figurine data. Figurines in the Halaf and other times and places had object biographies influenced by embodied and lived social practices and ideologies which negotiated symbolism and practicalities with representation of the human body and its parts. These figurine practices were mutable and adaptable as the figurine was conceived, made, used, reused, and eventually discarded and may have differed with each individual interaction. Previous figurine methodologies allowed modern influences, biases, and
assumptions to influence interpretations which, frankly, had nothing to do with the empirical figurine or archaeological evidence. As illustrated in the outer borders of Figure 6.67, below, questions were being asked and answered around the edges of figurine corpora, without considering the evidence it presents. The analysis of this dissertation has attempted to move closer to the figurine data without preconceptions or assumptions by looking at four points in the object biographies\(^{169}\) of these figurines at the times when they interacted with those living in Halaf settlements at points of: 1) Conception, 2) Making, 3) Use, and 4) Discard.

By conducting some of the analysis of prehistoric practices illustrated in the diamond of Figure 6.67, below, I hope to approach an understanding of how these objects interacted with peoples in the landscape and settlements of sixth millennium Northern Mesopotamia. In the Halaf, figurines occurred amongst lived practices and embodied ideologies. These practices are entangled in the daily life of Halaf villages and were locally, regionally, or inter-regionally shared. Imagery seen on figurines may have integrated with the daily experience of textiles and skin and in verbal narrative, all of which do not survive in the archaeological record. At the first point of human interaction, conceptualization of how to represent the human form was informed by socially embodied practices which evolved, shifted, or remained constant over time and space. Halaf figurines were made within communities of art and craft, dependent upon the acquisition of clay, minerals, technology, and the skills necessary to create them and the preferences and needs of those who used them. These hands, settlement spaces, and landscapes were integral to their making during the period when they held and displayed embedded social meaning. Through typological, technological, and contextual analysis I have attempted to

\(^{169}\) For object biographies see (amongst others) Gosden and Marshall (1999), Strathern (1990), Appadurai (1986).
visualize these prehistoric practices in this dissertation (Figure 6.67 below).

Figure 6.67: Human action and conceptions in the object biography of Halaf Figurines (repeated from chapter 2, Figure 2.10, p. 87)

Key:
Outer square – Existing publications and interpretations in the twentieth and twenty-first centuries CE
Diamond – Evidence of human interactions in the sixth millennium BCE
Inner square – sixth millennium BCE community engagement and social entanglements

Agency, intentionality and social stimuli can also be added to the constellation within which Halaf figurines functioned in prehistory and function in modernity. The lens of modern interpretations of representations of women’s bodies as well as colonialist views of modern peoples travelling through the lands from which Halaf figurines were excavated have also influenced the way they were published, for example. Visualizing this constellation of practice interpretation (Figure 6.67 above), the auras of influences and practices can be separated into
three levels radiating out from Halaf figurines. Furthest out are the unconscious and wide-ranging influences, socially embedded stimuli which are connected to the figurines through negotiated relationships of modern social practice. Questions that have been asked and answered by archaeologists on the outskirts of the prehistoric evidence of Halaf figurines include those about mother goddesses, the roles of women and their bodies in small-scale societies, and ritual practices. However, these questions cannot be asked and answered based on the evidence itself. Scholars have been asking the wrong questions of Halaf figurine and archaeological evidence: those lines of inquiry do not bring closer the understanding of the practices of making, using, and discarding figurines in the Halaf. In this dissertation I have endeavored to ask and answer different questions.

In the figure above, the inner square closest to the figurines (represented by a white oval) is the milieu of practices negotiated directly with the figurines throughout their prehistoric object biographies. Some of these practices can be directly documented from close study of figurines – others must be theorized from what evidence is available. These distinctions are not necessarily rigid; interconnected relationships can exist between the past and the present and change over time and space – there is no reason to assume that the influences are one directional, exclusive. Theorizing the features of intentionality and social framework of the practices around the figurines can lead to building an understanding of the negotiated relationship of the embodied lived experience in the Halaf.

Materials would have had to have been procured in order to make these figurines, and likely these actions were connected to regional and local interactions. Certain body parts probably were embedded with meaning; perhaps this influenced the choices in proportion or decoration on the figurines. Maybe they were related to shared narratives about bodies or to
certain mythologies. These aspects of daily, performative, and lived practices probably all had some influence on the conception, making, and use of Halaf figurines. However, the archaeological record is not extensive enough to identify them.

Assessing a Halaf Figurines Typology

Perhaps the biggest contribution that this dissertation makes to the field of Halaf studies is in creating a useable typology for Halaf figurines. The typology constructed for this dissertation has allowed the figurines to be compared with each other within their regional context. This section brings the figurines together typologically to determine the viability of the types and subtypes as diagnostic markers of early Halaf (Table 6.3) or late Halaf (Table 6.4).

Table 6.43: Early Halaf figurines by region and type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>EH.1 n=0</th>
<th>EH.2 n=18</th>
<th>EH.3 n=0</th>
<th>EH.4 n=7</th>
<th>EH unknown n=5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anatolia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Halaf</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total=30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fistikli Höyük</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>FH-1, FH-2, FH-3</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>FH-4</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 EH figurines</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 EH figurines</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girikihacıyan</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>GH-1, GH-2, GH-3, GH-4</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>GH-6, GH-11, GH-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 EH figurines</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domuztepe</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>DT-17</td>
<td></td>
<td>DT-19, DT-20, DT-21, DT-22</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 EH figurines</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syria</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Halaf</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total=12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sabi Abyad</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>SAB-1, SAB-2, SAB-3, SAB-4, SAB-5, SAB-6, SAB-7, SAB-8</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 EH figurines</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Umm Qseir</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>UQ-1</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 EH figurine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tell Aqab</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>TA-7, TA-8</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>TA-10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
All 197 figurines are presented first by region and type, and then subtypes are discussed as visually and diagnostically viable, as tested by dating methods. For the Early Halaf the majority of examples were found to be Type 2, Standing Figurines. Standing figurines also occur in the late Halaf, but by far the majority of figurines during this phase are the Type 1, Seated. However, the majority of examples of Type LH.1A and B figurines are concentrated at sites in the upper Khabur headwaters area in Syria. In the Anatolian Halaf, Type 2, Standing Figurines, are more numerous than the seated type. Halaf standing figurines, Type 2 in this dissertation, are wider-ranging in time and space and ambiguous in representation. Some Type 2 figurines are barely recognizable as anthropomorphic at all, and few of them display visual markers of sexual difference understandable today. It has been quite difficult to visually recognise some standing figurines examples as Subtypes A, B, C, D, E established in the typology. It appears that it was generally less important to make standing figurines morphologically overt and visually recognizable from each other.\textsuperscript{170} Perhaps in retrospect, some examples of Type 2 Subtypes are not strongly viable as clearly recognizable in analysis. As mentioned in Chapter 3, even the designation of the term \textit{standing} to Type 2 figurines is an interpretative device to label morphological difference, especially since many do not visually represent legs and feet. For Type 2 figurines, distinction in pose, gender, and morphological difference appears not to have been a main goal for Halaf figurine makers. Perhaps ambiguity was intentional for this type of figurines. There may even be a few early Halaf examples, that could be interpreted as figurines of humans, plants, or animal hybrids (e.g., SAB-2, SAB-3, TK-4, TK-6, TK-9).

\textsuperscript{170} This is not to say that the concept of typology was within the minds of people living in the Halaf. However, grouping of visually similar objects together with cognitive associations with sources and significance of the imagery must have been understood by those making and using these figurines and certainly influenced their conception.
Table 6.44: Late Halaf figurines by region and type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Late Halaf n=46</th>
<th>LH.1 n=11</th>
<th>LH.2 n=18</th>
<th>LH.3 n=4</th>
<th>LH.4 n=2</th>
<th>LH unknown n=11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tell Kurdu</td>
<td></td>
<td>TK-4</td>
<td>TK-7</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>TK-11, TK-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 LH figurines</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 PH figurines</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girikihaciyyan</td>
<td></td>
<td>GH-5, GH-7, GH-8</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>GH-9, GH-10, GH-13, GH-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 LH figurines</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Çavi Tarlası</td>
<td></td>
<td>ÇT-3, ÇT-6, ÇT-7, ÇT-8, ÇT-11, ÇT-12, ÇT-13</td>
<td>ÇT-1, ÇT-2, ÇT-4, ÇT-5, ÇT-9, ÇT-15</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>ÇT-14</td>
<td>ÇT-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 LH figurines</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domuztepe</td>
<td></td>
<td>none</td>
<td>DT-1, DT-2,</td>
<td>DT-12, DT-13, DT-14, DT-15</td>
<td>DT-18</td>
<td>DT-10, DT11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 LH figurines</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DT-3, DT-4, DT-5, DT-6, DT-7, DT-8, DT-9, DT-16</td>
<td>DT-10, DT-11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kerküsti Höyük</td>
<td></td>
<td>none</td>
<td>KerkH-1</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>KerkH-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 LH figurines</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kazane Höyük</td>
<td></td>
<td>none</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>TH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 LH figurine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syria</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late Halaf n=109</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 LH figurines</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tell Aqab</td>
<td></td>
<td>TA-1, TA-2,</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>TA-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 LH figurines</td>
<td></td>
<td>TA-3, TA-4, TA-5, TA-6, TA-9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khirbet esh-Shenef</td>
<td></td>
<td>none</td>
<td>KeshS-1</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 LH figurine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>n=1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 LH figurines</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 LH figurines</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tell Beydar</td>
<td></td>
<td>Bey-1</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 LH figurine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tell Arjoune</td>
<td></td>
<td>none</td>
<td>Arj-1, Arj-2, Arj-3, Arj-4, Arj-5, Arj-6</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 LH figurines</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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A tightly defined time and place is now established for the most numerous types of figurines, LH.1A and LH.1B. Those classified as Type 1, Seated Figurines, are overtly similar in morphology; they are clearly seated and easily distinguishable from each other. It seems to have been important for this type of figurine to be visually distinctive in a very recognizable way. While it is tempting to state that the makers of Type 1 figurines were more restricted by social practices in their choices, it must also be remembered that these figurines come from a very tight geographical area and chronological time, in the late Halaf upper Khabur area settlements only. There are no early Halaf antecedents to Type 1 figurines; preliminary research indicates that they are not found in the Ubaid or Uruk figurine repertoires from the immediately following millennia (e.g., McAdam 2003, Wrede 2003). However, females supporting breasts with arms and hands clasped at the sternum occur frequently in historical Mesopotamian figurine typologies. However, these later female figurines are represented in overtly standing poses (e.g., Asher-Greve 1985, Badre 1980, Bahrani 2001, Karvonen-Kannas 1995 and Van Buren 1930).

Ambiguities in visually identifiable differences between of Type 2 figurines suggest that the subtypes should be further tested by their stratigraphic contexts (Table 6.45, below). As mentioned in Chapter Three, all examples in this dissertation have been assigned either early, late or post Halaf phase dates by stratigraphic, typological, or hypothetical means. Figurines dated by stratigraphy are the strongest candidates for diagnostic subtypes, while those dated by typology and hypothesis are weak candidates. Subtype 2A has many examples and is supported by stratigraphic dating. With the single exception of KeshS-1, this subtype might be considered diagnostic for the early Halaf. Type 2A is also well attested from pre Halaf levels at Tell Sabi Abyad (Collet 1996). Subtype 2C and Subtype 2D occur in lesser numbers in these regions but
have some stratigraphic support. Subtype 2E in particular is quite rare and has no support from stratigraphic dating; these examples should probably be subsumed into one of the other subtypes.

Subtype 2B is the most visually distinctive and long-lasting style of the standing figurines. It occurs in both early and late Halaf and, as mentioned in Chapter 4, in adjacent regions. If any figurine type occurs in all regions and phases of the Halaf, it is Subtype EH.2B and Subtype LH.2B, though these do not appear in the same quantity as Type 1 figurines. This is a flat, almost two dimensional figurine with details in low relief and incision, known in examples formed from both clay (e.g., SAB-1, TK-2, GH-1, ÇT-2, ÇT-4, KerH-1) and stone (e.g., ÇT-1, DT-1 through DT-9). It is easy to imagine the simple lines and forms of these figurines transmitted from across great distances in other materials not recoverable in the archaeological record. These two-dimensional shapes could also have been drawn, incised, or painted on a wall, floor, or animal or human skin. As discussed in Chapter Four, figurines of this same shape are known from contemporaneous sites in central and western Anatolia. Chapter Three cited examples from Halaf sites in Iraq. Perhaps the messaging understood from the imagery of the Type 2B figurines required visually stronger delineation than that of types 2A, 2C, 2D, and 2E. This subtype is also strongly supported by all known examples stratigraphically dated to the Halaf (Table 6.45 below).

Type 3, Seal-Pendant Figurines, and Type 4, Figurine Vessels, were all found at Anatolian sites. With the single exception of ÇT-14, a surface find, all of examples in these two types are stratigraphically dated in recent excavations. Little can be said about the typology of Halaf figurine vessels, as the only evidence comes from Domuztepe, comprised of one complete example, DT-12, and three ambiguous fragments possibly of the same type of figurine vessel, DT-13, DT-14, and DT-15. As stated in Chapter Four, the full Halaf cultural horizon, including
known examples from Iraq, most Halaf figurine vessels appear to be local subtypes, or often unique items showing only vague similarities with each other. Given this, it is particularly remarkable that the Domuztepe offers four examples, possibly of very similar figurine vessels with close similarities to examples from Canhasan in central Anatolia, outside the Halaf regional area.

Table 6.45: Dating strategies for Type 2 standing figurines by subtype

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type 2 Standing subtypes</th>
<th>Type 2A</th>
<th>Type 2B</th>
<th>Type 2C</th>
<th>Type 2D</th>
<th>Type 2E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stratigraphic date</strong></td>
<td>EH: FH-2, TK-1, TK-5, TK-8, TK-10, SAB-5, SAB-6, SAB-8</td>
<td>EH: FH-1, FH-2, GH-1, DT-17, SAB-1</td>
<td>EH: FH-1, FH-2, GH-1, DT-17, SAB-1</td>
<td>EH: TK-9, SAB-2, SAB-3, SAB-4</td>
<td>EH: SAB-7, LH: ÇT-9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hypothetical date</strong></td>
<td>LH: CB-19</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>LH: CB-28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although the Type 4 Seal-Pendant Figurines in this dissertation should be understood as a small representative sample of other unknown examples in this region, perhaps something can be learned from their typological occurrence. It is possible that Type 4A, Full-body Figurines, connect to Type 2B figurines visually. The pinched-in waist decorated by incision, arm stubs, and flat shape may be theoretically linked to Type 2B by the aforementioned secondary materials and imagery. Four Subtype 4A examples are known from Anatolia; FH-4 is a surface find at an early Halaf site, and ÇT-14 is a surface find from a late Halaf site. Both TK-13 and UQ-1 are stratigraphically dated to the early Halaf. More stratigraphically dated examples are needed before Subtype 4A can be called diagnostic of early or late Halaf. A single example of Subtype
LH.4C, DT-18, is stratigraphically dated, but more examples would be needed in order to state that hand seals are diagnostic to the late Halaf. Of the examples of Subtype 4B, Foot or Boot Seals, most are stratigraphically dated to the early Halaf, all from Domuztepe, DT-19, DT-20, DT-21, and DT-22. Another example, TK-14, is typologically dated but was found in the top soil directly above an early Halaf occupation. A single late Halaf example, DT-18, is stratigraphically dated in a well-sealed context. Though the evidence is scant, perhaps it can be stated that Subtype 3B, Foot or Boot Seals, should be expected in both early and late Halaf contexts.

**Halaf Figurines as Trash: Archaeological Contexts and Findspots**

Archaeological context has been defined in this dissertation as the relationship of the figurine to the excavated remains of the Halaf settlement and the matrices resulting from the depositional actions of the people who lived in that settlement. Archaeological context is arrived at through analysis of the findspot of the figurine together with related finds, features, and matrices. This information and analysis has been presented in Chapters Four and Five. As reported in each of these chapters’ conclusions, it seems that most archaeologists found nothing remarkable worth recording of the archaeological context of Halaf figurines. From analysis of the contexts of all 197 Halaf figurines in this dissertation, it can now be said that most were isolated finds, found loose in the soil amidst undefined lenses of trash deposits (*Appendix C, column 7*). Only a handful can be associated with human constructed features, and none of those features, including pits, were created especially for the deposit of the figurines. Contextual analysis in this dissertation demonstrates that at the end of their use life, Halaf figurines were simply thrown away with the trash.

Several decades ago, Alan Sullivan proposed that by expanding the concepts of inference and evidence it is possible to “…construct a model that specifies how information about the past
is transmitted to the present via material remains” (1978, 192). While Sullivan’s ultimate goal of using his model to map every artifact along with all its specific past circumstances and behavior is probably never going to be possible, his model offers a useful way to consider context more broadly given the nature of the data for Halaf figurines. Sullivan’s article was written well before the concept of object biographies were developed in archaeological literature (Godsen and Marshall 1999). Although it has not been recognized as such, Sullivan certainly was writing about the biography of objects when describing Interactive, Depositional or Discard contexts (see Table 6.46 below). These contexts are interrelated. As Sullivan points out, “…it must be remembered that items or surfaces in [which] depositional discard or archaeological context have participated, at least one is an interactive context. Otherwise they never would have been involved in a behavioral system.” (Sullivan 1978, 196).

In this model, interactive context is the place of active use of the object, including actions relating to its creation. A theme of this dissertation has been interaction between Halaf people and figurines throughout the figurines’ use life, but within Sullivan’s model interactive context applies only to the points of making and use. For Halaf figurines this context is not recognizable from archaeological context but is rather recorded on the figurines in the form of tool marks, fingerprints, wear, and fragmentation. Depositional context is placed by Sullivan at the point of storage in an object’s biography. He points out that “Prior to discard, most items and surfaces most of the time are [in] depositional context” (Sullivan 1978, 197). Halaf figurines are not found in contexts that can be interpreted as intentional storage, but many were intentionally made to sit on a flat surface or hang from a cord. Therefore, depositional context is documented on the figurines themselves by their flat bases or by their piercings for suspension on a cord. These suggest intentionality at the point of conception and making for how the figurines were
stored and displayed (Appendix C column 12). The discard context, according to Sullivan, occurs at the point when the object is of no longer of any use. At these points objects can often get caught up in general refuse within general fill. This is overwhelmingly true for Halaf figurines, for which the evidence shows that they received no special treatment at final disposition. Halaf figurines were not treated differently from other finds at the end of their prehistoric use-life, as they are normally found amidst a mixed artifact assemblage in many contexts. Sullivan points out that in the discard context, objects get typically broken, burned, and otherwise damaged (Sullivan 1978, 197). However, it appears that rough handling resulting in fragmentation, burning, and damage occurred with Halaf figurines before discard and was often followed by reuse. For Sullivan the final context to be considered in what is now called an object biography is archaeological context. This is the point of excavation and also the time of recovery of the artifact and all previous contexts. At the point of discovery of a Halaf figurine and the recording of its findspot, all other contexts become part of the archaeological record.

Only 10% of the total figurines analyzed in this dissertation can be said to be deposited together (discard context, left column in Table 6.46 below). At Girikihacriyan the contexts of two pairs of figurines, GH-3 and GH-5, GH-11 and GH-12, are similarly associated with the fill of two different structures, but these figurines are not specifically reported as found together. At Sabi Abyad, a concentration of figurines was found in the corner of room 11, building II, SAB-3, SAB-4, SAB-5, SAB-6, and SAB-7. While, as discussed in Chapter Five, much has been made of the so-called Terracotta Deposit in level 8 of Area M, dubbed the Prehistoric Pit, which was excavated in the 1935 season of the Chagar Bazar excavations, only eleven out of forty-one Halaf figurines known from this site are recorded as associated with this group. These are CB-1, CB-2, CB-3, CB-4, CB-8, CB-9, CB-11, CB-15, CB-22, CB-24, and CB-29.
Table 6.46: Contexts for Halaf figurines

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interactive Context</th>
<th>Depositional Context</th>
<th>Discard Context (last use)</th>
<th>Archeological Context</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Appendix C column 13 notes</td>
<td>Appendix C column 12 display</td>
<td></td>
<td>Appendix C column 7 context</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finger prints</td>
<td>Use - wear or delib. damage</td>
<td>Stable on base without support</td>
<td>Pierced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=3</td>
<td>n=10</td>
<td>n=82</td>
<td>n=21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13 figurines = 6% 103 figurines = 52% 197 figurines excavated = 100%
Only twenty-one figurines, 11% of the total analyzed in this dissertation, can be associated with a human-built feature, and none of these features appear to have been created with the purpose of depositing figurines (Discard Context, right column, Table 6.46 above). Seven figurines, TK-5, GH-2, SAB-3, SAB-4, SAB-5, SAB-6, and SAB-7, are reported to have been found in or on floors of structures. Seven figurines, GH-3, GH-5, GH-6, GH-11, GH-12, ÇT-1, and TH-20 are reported as associated with the fill of structures. One figurine, SAB-2, was found in an oven. Four figurines, DT-9, DT-10, SAB-1, and SAB-8, are reported to have been found in trash and/or ash-filled pits. Two figurines, DT-1 and DT-16, are associated with intentional deposits connected with preparation for and memory after a symbolic and ritual event, but their presence in these matrices is interpreted as unintentional.171

The remaining one-hundred-and-fifty-seven figurines, 79% of the total figurines analyzed in this dissertation, were reported as isolated finds in the fill or are interpreted to be so for lack of documentation (Archaeological Context, Table 6.46 above). Given the available data of the assemblages as presented in Chapters Four and Five, it is reasonable to suggest that for most Halaf figurines the final deposition, which also represents the last prehistoric use in their object biography, was anything but special. Discarding a Halaf figurine was a mundane event, if it can be said to have been an event at all, and cannot be isolated from the last use and discard of many other items. For whatever reason, at some point figurines were no longer useful nor wanted in Halaf settlements after which time they were tossed into the trash without apparent ceremony.

Figurines, like most Halaf material culture, are found in tumbled trash contexts comprised of developed soils, building collapse, and activity debris amidst lenses of ash, plaster, and other community-created substances mixed in with ceramics, stone tools, bone, and other small finds. Perhaps most challenging to preconceived notions of how figurines were treated at

171 I personally excavated both of these figurine examples at Domuztepe.
last use and deposited amidst trash contexts is that examples demonstrating a spectrum of quality of manufacture and fragmentation are found to have been discarded. Further, no distinction can be made between the excavated contexts of complex, unique, and nearly complete figurines in which much time was invested in the making (e.g., TK-13, DT-1, DT-12, CB-3, TA-1) and unremarkable, broken-up fragments (e.g., TK-3, ÇT-10, CB-16, TA-7, TH-18). It seems that most times it was completely acceptable to simply lose figurines in whatever state they were at the end of their prehistoric use life amongst many other objects in the accumulating and shifting general settlement debris.

As discussed in Chapter Two, figurines have long been thought to have had special social meaning, and, by extension, their dispositional contexts were expected to be created through ritual and thus rich with symbolism (Figure 6.67, p. 312, right lower corner). The archaeological evidence from Halaf figurines, however, does not support this assumption. Further afield at Çatalhöyük, archaeologists also found figurines in the trash (Meskell, Nakamura, King, and Farid 2008). I suggest that if the archaeological contexts were analyzed and reported without preconceptions and assumptions of what their finders think they should look like, it might be possible to find similar depositional practices for other figurines in Mesopotamia as well as in other cultural regions. These depositional practices can suggest how figurines may have been incorporated into practices earlier in their object biographies.

Sullivan’s model for theoretically reconstructing places and practice of use within his interactive and depositional contexts can continue to be of value. Hands-on study identified that only 13 figurines, 6% of the total, had distinctive marks of making or use, although, arguably, fragmentation in itself marks use. Study and recording of physical evidence for figurine
One-hundred-and-three figurines bear evidence that they were made with features that provided a method of storage or display (Sullivan’s depositional context). Of that number, eighty-two, 41% of the total number of figurines studied in this research, have a flat base on which they can stably sit or stand on a flat surface without support. Another twenty-one figurine examples, 11% of the total corpus studied here, are pierced for suspension. This means that 52% of figurines in this corpus could have sat on a flat surface or hung on a person, animal, or structures either in an interactive or depositional context indefinitely. Therefore, more than half of these figurines did not need to be held or touched to be interacted with and used and might have been viewed constantly in the course of daily travels through Halaf settlements.

**Halaf Figurine Fragmentation**

The vast majority of Halaf figurines, 174 examples, 88%, were made of clay. These were made of separate segments, attached to each other while the clay was still plastic and smoothed over before drying and the application of surface decoration. This is the way they are often found, as fragmented objects, broken along attachment seams into their constituent parts. Stone figurines, of which there are just 23 examples, 11%, are divided into segments graphically by deeply notching the flat form at the neck and under arms to isolate different zones of the body. The notching also destabilizes the structure of stone figurines, creating points that are vulnerable to breakage from use or depositional processes. Figurines are one of many artifact classes that demonstrate that there was a deep knowledge of a range of materials and shared skills of craftspeople living and working in Halaf communities. Potters and stone workers

---

172 More scientific methodologies are needed for ways to identify patterns in the manufacture of figurines, including analysis of raw materials (stones, clays, pigments). A study of evidence for the making of the figurines did not follow a specific method for the dissertation and as such was haphazard. Therefore, this small number should not be construed as anything beyond a need to develop a better system for analyzing figurine manufacture. It should be also noted that not all figurines were available to me for hands-on study.
shared processes of material procurement and learning communities which together skillfully acquired, stored, prepared, and worked the clay and stone to create these figurines.

Generally Type LH.1A or LH.1B figurines incorporate nine clay elements fused together when still plastic to create a figurine followed by a tenth step of decorating the figurine. Because the clay had to remain plastic, these figurines needed to have their parts made and assembled within a few days or weeks. While ethnographic parallels have not yet been identified, it is possible to suggest that LH.1A, LH.1B figurines might be constructed by family groups, with each member creating a part. For these figurines the body is indeed represented as a sum of its parts. Some parts are not represented, such as hands and feet, although some feature three-strapped sandals with clay appliqué or paint (Appendix C, notes). Other body parts such as the breasts, arms and lower legs are very prominent and decorated with striped patterns. Often a strap or possibly a beaded strand is featured in double lines around the waist and hip area, sometimes surrounding the neck, crossing at the back with a chevron or X design. It is evident that, within the practices of making this type of figurine, there was a degree of choice between the maker and user. Perhaps this process was one of negotiation between technological, artisanal or personal style, and the need or want for certain features for specific reasons. In other words, perhaps this sort of figurine could be bespoke, a figurine could be personally requested to display certain characteristics (Figure 6.68, below).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Fragment less than 2/3 original figurine</th>
<th>Complete at least 2/3 original figurine</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Early Halaf</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late Halaf</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post Halaf</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total: 197</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>or 100%</td>
<td>or</td>
<td>or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.47: Fragmentation of Halaf figurines from Syria and Turkey
Other figurines are also comprised of segments. For example, Type EH.2A has a flat segment for the upper torso and a segment for the rounded lower torso, originally joined – and eventually broken – at the intersection of the two parts. Appliqué, breasts, limbs, and heads are most often broken off figurines, because they are structurally the most vulnerable elements. Although, as mentioned above, many were designed sit or stand on a flat surface without human intervention, Halaf figurines were handled often and apparently eventually broke from that use.

Of the 197 specimens examined in this dissertation, 59% are currently extant as fragments, defined here as less than two-thirds of their original state (*Table 6.47, above and Appendix C, column 3*).

The breaking of most of archaeological objects is generally assumed to mark the end of an object’s biography. Nonetheless, as mentioned above, when Halaf figurines were discarded, they could be in any state from complete to fragment. The truth is that very few archaeological artifacts are found in their pristine original state, and it is possible that modern sensibilities have
been placed upon interpretations of fragmentation of the figurines (*Table 6.47, above*). Given their fragile construction and material, it is not surprising that the figurines were chipped, worn, and broken both through use and post depositional processes. As part of daily practice amongst Halaf communities, figurines appear to have been heavily handled just like pots, stone tools, animal remains, and other objects. Given the evidence, it is possible that figurine fragmentation was predictable and was expected to happen. Therefore, the agency in the breaking did not rest only with the user who eventually broke the figurine but also with the maker.

**Embodiment of the Halaf: Figurines and Lived Practices**

It has been repeated again and again in this dissertation that the figurines presented and analyzed here can be understood as a record of lived body practices in the Halaf. Of course, lived body practices in prehistory do not in themselves survive into the present time and can only be theoretically reconstructed. For some prehistoric cultures, grave goods provide clues to lived body practices. However, for most of the Halaf, burying the dead with adornments was apparently not a community practice (Croucher 2012). However, given the imaginative ways that Halaf figurines portray the human body, it is perhaps difficult to envision how the decorations on figurines might translate to lived body practices of the past. A few suggestions are presented here in *Table 6.48, below*. Certainly practices that influenced imagery on figurines were specific to the body, probably extending to tattooing, scarification, paint, clothing, and jewelry. On the figurines these are translated into paint, washes, and incision as well as overall form. This chapter examines the locations on the figurine bodies that were decorated or accentuated as well as those that were diminished and omitted.
Table 6.48: Figurine and body practices: adornment and manipulation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Figurine Adornment</th>
<th>Lived Body Adornment</th>
<th>Figurine Manipulation</th>
<th>Lived Body Manipulation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Head</td>
<td>top of head clay appliqué</td>
<td>headdress and/or long hair knot</td>
<td>elongated head</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Face</td>
<td>large “cow” eyes, painted lower jaw, animal-like features</td>
<td>painting or tattoo masking</td>
<td>very long nose, sunken eye sockets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neck &amp; shoulders</td>
<td>painted stripe at neck, crossing at back</td>
<td>necklace with counterweight</td>
<td>elongated neck hole for head at neck appliqué on shoulders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pudenda</td>
<td>punctuated or painted pubic area incised pudenda outline</td>
<td>beaded or dyed pubic hair, garment, tattooing or scarification around pudenda</td>
<td>very large pubic area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arms</td>
<td>stripes painted on arms</td>
<td>painting, tattoo, bracelets, scarification</td>
<td>separate parts added onto torso</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breasts</td>
<td>painted solid, striped or rayed design</td>
<td>tattoo, painting, string garment, beaded?</td>
<td>separate enlarged parts added onto torso</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waist &amp; hips</td>
<td>double stripe around hips</td>
<td>beaded string belt</td>
<td>very slim waist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legs</td>
<td>stripes painted on lower legs</td>
<td>tattoo or painting, garment anklets</td>
<td>separate parts added onto torso</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feet</td>
<td>painting, appliqué</td>
<td>sandals, shoes, painting, tattoos, scarification</td>
<td>pointed feet</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Heads and Headless-ness

There has been a particular interest and debate over the presence, absence, and intentionality of figurine heads and fragmentation in the Halaf and other prehistoric figurines. Recent articles have mistakenly called Halaf figurines “headless” (Gauld, Carter, and Campbell 2003; Verhoven 2007). Some have suggested that figurine heads were intentionally removed as a means of ritual killing of the object (Daems 2005; Verhoven 2007). While the intentionality of breakage can never be fully known, given the fragmented state of most of the examples examined, it seems likely that during daily use figurines naturally broke at a particularly vulnerable structural areas of their manufacture. A tally of the evidence for heads indicates that, indeed, most of the figurines were constructed to have heads but that many have broken off.
Rather than interpreting figurines found without heads as headless, when there are so many figurines missing their original heads in the corpus through fragmentation, questions about what the original heads were and where they are should be asked.

A phenomenon that appears to be unique to Halaf figurines is that some are designed to accommodate removable, replaceable, and potentially revolving heads. This feature is especially evident at the late Halaf site at Çavı Tarlası, but there is one example from early Halaf Sabi Abyad. Holes in the neck for insertion of a head are also known from sites in Iraq such as a figurine vessel from Yarim Tepe II and examples from Arpachiyah (Figure 6.69, above). These heads could have been made of organic or non-organic materials, were perhaps interchangeable, and did not necessarily need to be human heads or lifelike at all. It is even possible that they have gone unrecognized in the archaeological record, though it is more likely that they were made of materials that did not survive depositional processes. In fact there is some evidence that

173 Yarim Tepe vessel photo by Stuart Campbell; Arpachiyah figurines photos by Alexandra Fletcher, ©Trustees of the British Museum; SAB-1 photo from www.sabi-abyad.nl; all other photos by author.
it is the head area where imagery outside the anthropomorphic form were represented and that the head was a location to express human/animal and human/plant hybridity in the Halaf, as further discussed below.

**Table 6.49: Evidence for and against Halaf figurine heads**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Head Fragment Type</th>
<th>Type 1 Seated</th>
<th>Type 2-3 Standing</th>
<th>Type 4 &amp; Unknown</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Made without heads “headless”</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>TK-3, FH-4, TK-17, SAB-5 DT-4, DT-6, TH-22</td>
<td>TK-14, DT-18, DT-19, DT-20, DT-21</td>
<td>12 or 6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holes in neck for insertion of heads</td>
<td>ÇT-3</td>
<td>ÇT-2, ÇT-4, SAB-1, SAB-2</td>
<td></td>
<td>5 or 2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head fragments detached from torso</td>
<td>CB-15, TA-4, TA-5</td>
<td>TK-6, TK-11, TK-12, Arj-4</td>
<td>DT-10, KK-22, KK-25</td>
<td>10 or 5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heads intact, including partially intact heads</td>
<td>ÇT-6, CB-2, CB-3,CB-8, CB-20, CB-22, CB-31, CB-40, TA-1, KK-1, KK-2,KK-3, KK-4, KK-10, KK-13, KK-14, KK-17, KK-23, TH-1, TH-2, TH-4, TH-6, TH-7, TH-10, TH-11, TH-26,</td>
<td>FH-1, FH-2, FH-3, FH-4, TK-9, TK-10, TK-13, GH-4, ÇT-1, ÇT-14, DT-2, DT-5, DT-12, SAB-4, CB-19, CB-26, CB-29, CB-38, TH-21, Arj-1, Arj-3, Arj-6</td>
<td>DT-11, DT-17, TH-18, UQ-1</td>
<td>52 or 26%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Certainly there is no reason that animal heads couldn’t be part of the repertoire of heads which could be made of animal or plant matter. Interchangeable, rotate-able heads of different materials and representations changed figurines from static to kinetic objects, which perhaps performed different functions. There is parallel evidence for the isolation and isolated treatment
of actual human heads in the Halaf. Mortuary evidence from several Halaf sites suggests the widespread burial of disarticulated skulls, crania and mandibles of both humans and animals. The best documented evidence is from Domuztepe, but this practice may also have occurred at Tepe Gawra and Arpachiyah amongst other settlements (Croucher 2012).

As discussed in Chapter Four, the Death Pit was found to be full of disarticulated bodies, where the body parts (or remains of them) were arranged around the head. Surrounding the Death Pit were isolated burials of skulls, crania, and mandibles, both human and animal. One early Halaf pottery motif seems to illustrate the gruesome scene of the removal of a head, and other pottery motifs offer floating disembodied heads, suggesting that at least at Domuztepe real and imagined heads were separated and individual in the mortuary and representational record (Figure 6.70, above).

174 Photos and drawings courtesy of Stuart Campbell.
Masking and Performing Human/Animal/Plant Worlds and Male/Female

While this is a dissertation about anthropomorphic figurines, there is some evidence that the line between human and animal may have been more fluid in the past. As with all agrarian-based small settlements, animals were an integral part of the diurnal patterns of Halaf life. Animal remains were certainly constituents of the tumbled assemblages in which these figurines were found (Kansa et al. 2009). Animal remains are also known to have been carefully placed amongst human in mortuary contexts in the Halaf and other Neolithic cultural contexts (Croucher 2012). These examples provide evidence of what Boyd described as “…discussions of how the relationships between human communities and animals came together in the world of lived experience” (2006, 174). However, at the same time, communities of practices represented by anthropomorphic figurines may have blurred the boundaries between human and animal by performative means.

Modern expectations of a realistic human form representing a biologically gendered body are also challenged by these figurines performativity. It must be remembered that, although these figurines represent the human body, they are not bound by realities within the lived human skin, because they are made of clay and stone informed by community imagination, materials, knowledge, and technical skills. These figurines are connected to the human body which is in a sense realistic in that there is a general practice to represent two arms, two legs, two breasts, navels, and sexual organs on a recognizably human torso. In the Halaf, the head was the mixing area where human/animal and male/female binaries and perhaps human/plant separations were diversified and queered about the head.175 Unfortunately, extant intact heads are consistent lacunae in the Halaf figurine assemblage.

175 The head as a scene of display of connection beyond the human world can also be said of the Ubaid period, from which there are more figurine heads to support this proposition, e.g., Daems 2010, Daems and Croucher 2007, McAdam 2003. See also TK-11, TK-12.
As has already been discussed, the evidence for the original presence of figurine heads is much more robust than the actual presence of figurine heads in the Halaf archaeological record (Table 6.49; Appendix C, column 8). Type LH.1A or LH1.B figurine heads that are more intact generally feature ridge-shaped high headdresses and bovine eyes as well as pinched-out noses that resemble bird beaks (e.g., CB-3, CB-8, CB-15, CB-22, CB-29, CB-31, CB-40, TA-1, TA-4, TA-5, KK-1, KK-2, KK-4, KK-10, KK-17, TH-1, TH-2, TH-28; see also TK-6). There are also several figurines that have intact featureless, peg-shaped heads, some of which have the potential to accommodate heads or headdresses of other materials (e.g., FH-1, FH-2, FH-4, TK-9, TK-10, TK-13, TK-17, TK-18, GH-2, GH-6, ÇT-1, ÇT-6, DT-2, DT-5, DT-6, DT-11, CB-19, CB-26, TH-21, TH-22). The ridges on top of the heads of LH.1A or LH1B figurines may also have functioned to accommodate headdresses of some sort. Two figurines, DT-10 and CB-38, feature deep drilled holes which may have supported inlay but also resemble hollow-eyed masks. The sides of the face of DT-10 are incised to perhaps represent curly hair, suggesting either a beard or a furry animal face, or both. Other figurines, such as CB-31 and CB-40, suggest masking. On these two examples, the body is biologically identifiable as female while the facial painting suggests a thick beard or dark fur, perhaps featured on a mask.
There is support for masking and representative intersectionality between the human and animal worlds on heads painted on pottery. These motifs appear to represent humans dancing or otherwise performing wearing animal or plant masks and headdresses (*Figure 6.71, above*). More research is needed into performative possible representations among the human, animal, and plant worlds in Mesopotamian prehistory. Preliminary evidence of head representation as presented here seems to suggest that heads were a bodily location of performativity and permeability among anthropomorphic, zoomorphic, and botanical representation. Heads are mutable and queered in the Halaf, and the evidence suggests that there might have been lived community practices that performed these mixed worlds through the use of masks and elaborate headdresses.

*Figure 6.72: late Halaf animal head pendants from Domuztepe* 176

Also from Domuztepe are three dimensional animal head pendants rendered in stone; these may also represent animal masks and headdresses (*Figure 6.72, above*). 177 Like the Type LH.2A stone figurines and the Type 4 Seal-Pendant Figurines, these are also pierced for suspension on a cord. They also feature deep hollow eyes which sometimes function as the piercing. Isolated human parts are represented on Halaf figurine seals, here known as Type 5, but only as hands and feet; no complete figurine representing only an anthropomorphic head or

176 Left and center photos by Stuart Campbell *center*: downloaded from http://ne-lithics.org/domuztepe/?page_id=81, right photo by author.
177 Stone animal head pendants are also known from Tell Kurdu (Belcher in press) and Arpachiyah (Mallowan and Rose 1935) amongst other Halaf sites.
face is yet known. The pottery motifs of floating disembodied human heads found at Domuztepe (Figure 6.70, above) are without comparanda and may represent masks. Therefore, there may be a connection between the isolated, removable heads and the use of masks and headdresses in performative ways at the intersection between the anthropomorphic and zoomorphic. Perhaps it was particularly important to emphasize the eyes and pointed noses, perhaps because these features were shared and were functionally important for interaction, survival, and function as well as scenes of display for emotional expression and artistic representation in the animal and human worlds (Miracle and Borić 2008).

**Sexing the Halaf: Gender and Figurines**

A developed understanding and changed view of gender in archaeology has emerged over the past few decades. The literature responsible for this emergence has been critically reviewed in several recent works (Croucher 2012, 155-202; Joyce 2008; Morris 1995). Gender can no longer be analyzed as a binary structure that is constrained by genitalia and other biological markers but is a performative act (Butler 1993). Many studies implementing multi-variant, queered approaches to gender and social structures have flooded into all fields, including archaeology, and have changed the way gender is regarded. Understanding the negotiated construction of embodied gender performativity expressed on prehistoric figurines is a challenge (Joyce 2005, 2008; Perry and Joyce 2001). Gendered identity expressed through performative means has been successfully analyzed incorporating figurine data with other material culture along with mortuary remains (Croucher 2008, 2012 Daems 2008, Daems and Croucher 2007).

Certainly there are other symbolic markers of gender and social constructs embedded with the Halaf figurines presented in previous chapters which express male, female, and unsexed examples. Seventy examples, 37% of the items cataloged, are designated female, indicated by highly performative representations of incised, painted, and punctated public areas and large
modeled breasts (*Table 6.50, p. 339*). These features are especially overtly oversized in the late Halaf, when performatively expressing femaleness seems to have become important. Of course, pubic hair is a human feature that is not necessarily female or male, but the pubic area is not known to be paired with a penis on Halaf figurines. Nonetheless, while the female pudenda are one of the largest and most prominent features of so many Halaf figurines, this has been largely ignored in archaeological reports that describe their features. It has only been recently that this portion of the female anatomy been realistically portrayed in art (Saltz 2002). By the second-half of the sixth millennium it was an exaggerated feature of the constructed imagery of female – perhaps relating to overt female sexual agency during this time. A large pudendum is a regular feature of figurines later through third-millennium Mesopotamia (Badre 1980, Spycket 1992) and is said to be the origin of the cuneiform sign for woman. In later Mesopotamian imagery and literature the vulva became a more common symbol for femininity and female sexuality (Bahra 2001, 70-95). In Halaf Mesopotamia, the vulva, if it can be interpreted as such on a few figurines, is mainly found in the early Halaf phase (*Appendix C, column 5*).

Just five percent of the corpus of Halaf figurines from Turkey and Syria can be called male based upon biologically identifiable markers of sexual difference (*Table 6.50, below*). Male gendered markers are much less overt in representation and smaller in number, at least in that which is understandable of Halaf masculine performativity eight millennia later, which necessarily must have some basis in biological markers of sex. Only one early Halaf figurine is called male, FH-2, which is a Type EH.2A Standing Figurine, exhibiting an attachment scar where a clay appliqué penis may have been affixed to the lower torso. Nine late Halaf figurines are considered male; all are examples of the LH.1B type, which displays a painted line representing a penis on some examples between open legs. This type, found alongside LH.1A
Figurines in Syria, also features breasts, but they are very flat, clay appliqué circles as opposed to the large modeled breasts smoothed over the shoulder of LH.1A and other late Halaf female figures. It is interesting that, for the Halaf, breasts, albeit formed using a different technology than that for those of the female, are included in the representative performativity of the masculine in some types. Of course, biologically, men do have breasts; perhaps for the Halaf breasts were also a representative factor of the anthropomorphic, a way to visually portray being human.

The male Type LH.1B figurines may blur markers of sexual difference by including breasts across performative gender boundaries; there is just one example from this corpus of a figurine that can be considered to represent both male and female. It is possible that this was simply an opportunistic object inspired by the original phallic shape of the pebble from which DT-11 was only slightly altered with incision to delineate the head of the penis, as well as a schematic head of a seated figure. While many more of double-gendered figurines might be expected to exist, given the often-cited example from eighth-millennium Tepe Sarab (Bromen-Morales 1990, pl. 6: d, e, f, g), it is not as clear that dual genders were explicitly represented in any significant numbers in Near Eastern prehistory. For the Halaf corpus examined in this dissertation, there is just the one example, DT-11, though unsexed figurines could also represent

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male &amp; Female</th>
<th>Unsexed including hand, foot seals</th>
<th>Unknown fragments or no data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Early Halaf</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late Halaf</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post Halaf</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total &amp; Percentage</strong></td>
<td><strong>10 or 5%</strong></td>
<td><strong>73 or 37%</strong></td>
<td><strong>1 or 0.5%</strong></td>
<td><strong>44 or 23%</strong></td>
<td><strong>32 or 16%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 6.50: Sexing Halaf figurines
(See also Appendix C, columns 3, 4)*
two or more genders. But it is but a single example of the manipulation of an already suggestively shaped pebble.

The figurines identified as *unsexed* are quite common in the corpus; these are figurines for which no biological markers exist to identify male or female or on which both sexes are observed. Examples counted as unsexed must have an extant torso. Fragments missing the torso, which for the modern observer is the readable location of markers of biological sexual difference, are designated *unknown*. Nearly a quarter of the corpus, 23% of these figurines, does not display any sex markers and thus cannot be gendered. These unsexed examples are equally distributed between early and late Halaf phases and include seals which represent hands and feet. While these figurines do not display gender markers as they are commonly understood today, any portion of their form may have communicated gender performativity in the Halaf community in a way which is lost today. It is equally possible; however, that gender was simply not a factor needing representation in these figurines, many of which are represented in standing poses. As Naomi Hamilton states, “Sexless figures may well reflect an absence of sex as a structuring feature of society” (2000, 17). These figurines may simply have been made to convey the embodied imagery in gender-neutral ways.

**Communication and Contact**

Cultural or community understandings of visual signifiers that are shared within a wide-ranging group are connected by various kinds of belonging and memory. Examples of affiliations that may exist in this region of influence include those of origin, place, sexual difference, age, ability, and ethnicity as well as communities of lived and learned embodied practices. This imagery could be carried in the conversations, dress, and ornamentation of peoples as they travelled across the landscape and be indirectly translated into figurine conception and making, perhaps through observation and conversation.
Table 6.51: Model for direct and indirect contact between Halaf figurine communities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Figurine Practice/Evidence</th>
<th>Type of Analysis</th>
<th>EVIDENCE FOR DIRECT CONTACT</th>
<th>EVIDENCE FOR INDIRECT CONTACT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1</strong> Object Biography</td>
<td>Theoretical Analysis</td>
<td>Closely shared practices in conceiving, making, using, discarding figurines</td>
<td>Loosely shared practices of conceiving, making, using and discarding figurines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2</strong> Conceptualization</td>
<td>Theoretical Analysis</td>
<td>Figurines directly seen by users/makers</td>
<td>Figurines not seen by users/makers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3</strong> Lived body practices</td>
<td>Theoretical Analysis</td>
<td>Figurine visuals reinforced directly by daily lived embodied practices probably also shared within and between settlements.</td>
<td>Figurine visuals not reinforced directly by daily lived embodied practices. Translated orally/visually through secondary objects, narratives, travelers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4</strong> Manufacture</td>
<td>Theoretical Analysis</td>
<td>Individual choice, local, regional practices exist in distinct bodily locations on figurines. Regional and cultural conventions supersede local, individual practices.</td>
<td>Individual choice, local, other regional practices can co-exist anywhere on figurine, including in materials used and morphology.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5</strong> Morphology</td>
<td>Empirical Analysis</td>
<td>Similar in overall morphology, technology, materials</td>
<td>Some parts of morphology are similar but other aspects, technology, materials different</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>6</strong> Visuality</td>
<td>Empirical Analysis</td>
<td>Overtly anthropomorphic, sexed, detailed, decorated, shows little intersectionality, subtypes are visually recognizable.</td>
<td>Ambiguously anthropomorphic, sexed detailed, decorated or shows intersectionality. Subtypes are difficult to visually recognize.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>7</strong> Typology</td>
<td>Empirical Analysis</td>
<td>Many examples of the same type or subtype</td>
<td>Few examples of same type or subtype, diverse typology.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>8</strong> Decoration</td>
<td>Empirical Analysis</td>
<td>Similarity in decoration at the same bodily locations</td>
<td>Decoration in the same bodily locations but rendered differently</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>9</strong> Materiality</td>
<td>Empirical Analysis</td>
<td>Material, dimensional representation similar</td>
<td>Outline is same, dimensional representation is different</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>10</strong> Chronology</td>
<td>Empirical Analysis</td>
<td>Practices chronologically, spatially same within a single settlement</td>
<td>Practices chronologically spatially (socially?) separate within a single settlement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>11</strong> Geography</td>
<td>Empirical Analysis</td>
<td>Settlements geographically close</td>
<td>Settlements geographically far apart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>12</strong> Discard</td>
<td>Empirical Analysis</td>
<td>Archaeological context is similar across sites.</td>
<td>Archaeological context is different across sites.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is a possibility that direct contact, as suggested in Chapter Five, may have occurred between settlements in the upper Khabur headwaters regions. These settlements are so close and the figurines so similar in the late Halaf that residents of different settlements may have directly known how figurines were made, used, and displayed at other settlements.
Communication of figurine imagery, as as has previously been suggested, could have involved secondary objects and narratives that do not survive in the archaeological record. It has been suggested that textiles and skin may have carried imagery of essentialized shapes of figurines. As an illustration of how imagery could be exchanged, the outline of a Type LH.2A figurine, DT-1, is super-imposed upon that of a Type LH.1A figurine, CB-4, to suggest that these figurines are in many ways similar in their essentialised basic outline (Figure 6.73, above). When compared side to side, LH.2B and LH.1A figurines can look similar in outline and may represent the same pose and perhaps have the same significance and symbolism. This geometric shape may have also been known from other materials, something worn on clothing, skin, or objects painted or attached to animals or houses. Perhaps this imagery was noticed, acquired, carried, and later disseminated by those travelling through Halaf communities.
Suggestions for Future Research

As mentioned throughout this dissertation, the Halaf figurines corpus cannot be completely understood until the examples from Iraq are also studied. Now that a methodology and typology has been established and tested with the examples from Syria and Turkey, expanding this research into Halaf Iraq is the obvious next step. Comparisons made in Chapter Four suggest expanding this research into Central Anatolia; comparisons in Chapter Five suggest that further research into Levantine examples is warranted. Both chapters suggest that figurines of the early Halaf phase are quite similar to if not indistinguishable from those of earlier pre-Halaf levels (Collet 1996). Late Halaf figurines do not appear, however, have much in common with figurines dated directly after the Halaf in the Ubaid culture (McAdam 2003). All of these directions of expansion of the research area show potential. Now that this corpus has been organized, this work is easier and possible.

These figurines are records of how the Halaf looked at themselves and others, and they serve as an expression of a communal view on being anthropomorphic in sixth-millennium northern Mesopotamia. Another subject for further research is incorporating Halaf ornaments and pottery motifs with a study of body ornamentation. Such research could record and localize on the body the places and types of ornamentation, decoration, and their manipulation on figurines, expanding upon what has been done here with the Chagar Bazar assemblage in Chapter Five. Halaf ornaments which may have actually been made to be used in, on, and about the body include seals, beads, bone tools, and pendants. These are artifacts that are understudied in the archaeological record despite their potential to elucidate prehistoric practices of the lived and decorated body. Expanding research into by other media and artifacts, could potentially explore how personhood and social identity was represented by the body in the Halaf.
As stated previously, at the completion of this dissertation as of the fall of 2013, there were no more ongoing excavations of Halaf sites. All Turkish field projects presented in Chapter Three have ceased for various reasons. Ongoing conflicts in Syria and Iraq not only closed scientific excavations in those countries but have left sites unprotected from looting. The ongoing security and preservation of Halaf figurines stored in museums in Syria and Iraq is currently quite uncertain. It is unclear when either of these regions will stabilize enough to allow archaeological and museum research to resume. Given these modern realities, it is more important than ever to turn from excavation to analysis and publication of what has already been excavated and was once stored in these museums. As publications become available, more comparative studies will develop a more holistic and reflexive understanding of the settlement, regional, and cultural contexts in which these figurines were conceptualized, made, used, discarded, and eventually excavated and published.

One small contribution that this dissertation makes is to the protection and future recovery of Halaf archaeological heritage in that it proves unequivocally that no Type LH.1A or LH.1B are known from Halaf sites in Turkey. Therefore, figurines of this type that continue to appear in private collections and museums in Turkey must have been looted from Syrian or Iraqi sites and cannot be sourced within Turkey (Figure 6.74, below).178 Further research on stylistic and technical variations within these types in Syria and Iraq could further localize looted Halaf figurines to specific sites, regions, or countries. I hope that the catalog of this dissertation will prove useful for identifying specific figurines that were once in the Aleppo and Deir ez-Zor museums but are now possibly missing due to ongoing conflicts in those areas of Syria.

---

178 The Kadir Has University Museum in Istanbul has many type LH.1A and LH.1B figurines on display, several of them partially or wholly modern fakes or reconstructions. Three examples were also observed in the Gaziantep Glass Museum (Figure 6.74).
Conclusions

At its very beginning, the research of this dissertation project started with the goal of learning intentional functionality from the evidence of the figurines and their archaeological context as promised in the methodology of Ucko (1963, 1968) and Voigt (1983, 2000). Soon after the evidence of the corpus was examined, it was obvious that a different methodology was needed. The methodology established and used here allows for mutable functionality throughout the object biography of the Halaf figurines and brings them closer to the prehistoric hands of those that conceived, made, used, and discarded them. The universal function of these figurines is that they represent being human, an idea conceptually and physically entangled in the daily lives of those who lived in Halaf communities. The evidence shows that figurines were integrated into daily activities and lived experiences in Halaf settlements. Just as their excavated findspots reveal them to have been tumbled amongst lost and unwanted objects and waste byproducts, fragmentation suggests figurines were integrated amongst these same materials when used and stored for reuse in active living spaces. Despite what may have been suggested in
the past, Halaf figurines were not special, rarified objects but must have been well integrated into mundane activities.

This corpus of 197 examples is now organized by typology and understood within its archaeological contexts. Future research can use and expand upon this methodology, and the typology can be used to study and analyze approximately 183 additional examples found in Iraq. The work of this dissertation has presented the specifics, breadth, and variability of the typology and archaeological context of Halaf figurines. This study shows the refracted vision and expression of the body in Halaf society, and it has pinned its representation to specific times and places. People living in the upper Khabur river drainage area at the end of the sixth millennium, for example, thought it was necessary to overtly and repeatedly express female sexual difference in a seated pose. By contrast, people living in the upper Euphrates and Balkh River valleys several centuries earlier visually expressed the concepts of anthropomorphic and sexual difference ambiguously. These figurines were devices for expressing lived, embodied, community belonging which was socially and regionally entangled with materiality, skill sets, and identity. By mapping and typologically ordering these figurines, this study contributes to a better understanding of the Halaf culture and how its members viewed themselves and their lived bodies.

Halaf figurines may well have been conceived alongside other embodied community activities, such as festivals, ritual activities, or mundane daily household procedures. They may well have been made alongside other clay and stone objects such as vessels, spindle whorls, pendants, seals, and beads, perhaps at certain times of year when by-products or extra hands from these other processes could be utilized for figurine making. Indications from the figurines themselves are that they were well-used and used often – and not gently so or with special
reverence. As mentioned above, it is even possible that it was known early on in the process from conception through making and use that they would become broken. Breakage did not seem to influence use, reuse, or final disposition. Eventually, for reasons that remain unknowable, figurines were no longer wanted and were simply thrown away amidst other trash. Current scholarship may seem to want these figurines to have had special handling throughout their use lives because it has been conceived that they were symbolic and had meaning, perhaps because modern researchers identify with their anthropological nature. However, indications from the empirical evidence of the figurines and archaeological data are that they were objects embedded in the everyday, perhaps imbued with meaning but used and discarded in mundane ways. This is, as aforementioned, the way that P. R. S. Moorey interpreted figurines, as *Idols of the People* (2003) and objects of the everyday. At least for Halaf figurines, it appears that he was correct in his interpretation.

People living in Halaf settlements passed by figurines sitting on surfaces, hanging from cords, perhaps even affixed to their person. Their hands came into contact with these figurines often, made them, held them, and then threw them away. They breathed onto them, dusted them, spoke to them, and perhaps interacted with them employing smoke, liquids, smells, or other materials in their daily practices. Children and animals no doubt jostled them, knocked into them, or even knocked them over and broke them. A few were re-pierced for further use, but none appear to have been repaired. When discarded, they were deposited alongside objects and substances of everyday living only rarely within built features or alongside each other. The figurines appear to have been conceived, made, used, and discarded by and for the living. Finally the figurines were tossed away, broken amidst shifting and accumulating domestic
debris, to be found eight millennia later, cataloged, stored, displayed, published, and presented and analyzed in this dissertation.
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</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>KH</td>
<td>Kazane Höyük (Euphrates, Turkey)</td>
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Dam: Syrian National Archaeological Museum, Damascus, Syria
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APPENDIX A: Catalog of Halaf Figurines from Anatolia (Turkey)

*Museum Abbreviations and Locations used in this Appendix:*

Diyar: Diyarbakır Archaeological Museum, Turkey
Hat: Hatay Archaeological Museum, Antakya, Turkey
Mard: Mardin Archaeological Museum, Turkey
Maraş: Kahramanmaraş Archaeological Museum, Turkey
Urfa: Şanlıurfa Archaeological Museum, Turkey

*Site Abbreviations used in this Appendix and Modern Locations*

ÇT: Çavı Tarlası (Euphrates, Turkey)
DT: Domuztepe (Cilicia, Amanus, Turkey)
FH: Fıstıklı Höyük (Euphrates, Turkey)
GH: Girikihacıyan (Tigris, Turkey)
KerkH: Kerkuşti Höyük (Mardin, Turkey)
KH: Kazane Höyük (Euphrates, Turkey)
TK: Tell Kurdu (Hatay, Turkey)
**Fıstıklı Höyük Figurines**

**FH-1**

*Museum:* Urfa, Etüdlik 6499  
*Excav. no:* 6499  
*Findspot:* 2000 season, Unit I, Locus 52 R  
*Type:* EH.2B  
*Stratigraphic Date:* early Halaf

*Description:* [Standing] figure with flat body, peg head and rounded arm-stubs representing arms bent at elbow. Incised with lines: two lines around waist and one diagonal line at right shoulder. One short vertical incision on back represents spine.

*Length:* 26.1mm  
*Width:* 23.8mm at arms, 15mm at waist.

*Technology:* Baked clay, 10YR 4/1 a dark grey surface. Very carefully made and finished from a flat clay slab with clay appliqué [breasts] attached to holes on chest, surface smoothed, then incised and scratched.

*Condition:* Broken off diagonally at waist, missing lower body. Breasts also broken off. May have been deliberately battered at left scapula.

*Comparanda:* FH-3, ÇT-1, ÇT-4; (TK-7, GH-1 have similar breast holes), SAB-1.

*Publications:* Bernbeck, Pollock and Bucak, 2002 150, fig. 5b  
Bernbeck, et. al. 2003: 59-60, fig. 37b.  
Bernbeck, et. al. 2002: 35, fig. 8c.

*Photos:* E. Belcher with permission, Şanlıurfa museum
**FH-2**

*Museum: Urfa, Enventarlık FH 11*  
*Excav. no:* FH8366  
*Type:* EH.2A  
*Findspot:* 2000 season, Level IIIb, Unit K, Locus 78  
*Stratigraphic Date:* early Halaf

*Description:* Standing male figure with flattened torso and pointed head, outstretched wing-like arms gesturing upward. An attachment scar at mid torso remains from a lost clay appliqué, perhaps once representing a penis? Stands without support on flat base, leaning forward.

*Length:* 59mm  
*Width:* 50.4mm at base, 28.9mm at waist  
*Thick:* 57.3mm at chest, 57.4mm at base.

*Technology:* Clay with mineral and vegetable inclusions, 10YR 7/1 a light grey surface, quickly made with surface left rough, fingerprints of maker evident. Head added to torso and base flattened when still plastic.

*Condition:* Complete, broken on right arm (modern repair) chipped at top of head and arms.

*Comparanda:* TK-10

*Publications:* Bernbeck, et. al. 2003: 59-60, fig. 37a  
Bernbeck, et. al. 2002: 35, fig. 8c, top.

*Photos:* E. Belcher with permission, Şanlıurfa museum
**FH-3**

*Museum:* Excavation storage?  
*Excav. No:* 9900  
*Type:* EH.2B  
*Findspot:* 2000 season, Trench H, locus 122  
*Stratigraphic Date:* early Halaf

*Description:* Fragment of standing figurine, flat torso with rounded arm-stump[s] representing arm[s] bent at elbow[s]. Traces of attachment scar show evidence of appliqué breast[s], (now lost). Traces of incision[s] remain around waist at front.

*Length:* [25]mm  
*Width:* [15]mm  

*Technology:* Clay pinched and form, surface appears left rough.

*Condition:* Broken off head and right side, left torso only extant, broken off below waist.

*Publication:* Bernbeck, et al. 2003: 59-60, fig. 37c  
Bernbeck, et al. 2002: 35, fig. 8c, lower right.  
Bernbeck et al. ND (photo downloaded from there)

*Comparanda:* FH-1, TK-6, ÇT-1, ÇT-4, SAB-1

*Note:* This figurine was not found at the Ürfa Museum in 2002, description from photograph.

*Photos:* Bernbeck et al. ND

*Drawing:* from Bernbeck et al. 2003
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FH-4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Museum: Urfa?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excav. No: unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type: EH.4A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Typological date: late Halaf?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown findspot</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Description:* Standing figure with arms bent and hands resting on chest. Head does not appear to have been represented. Arms bent at elbows, represented by notching. Wide thighs and pointed toes. Series of parallel lines and crossing lines incised over sealing face.

*Size unknown*

*Technology:* Stone, black, serpentinite? Cut, ground and incised.

*Condition:* Appears to be chipped and dirty, but otherwise complete.

*Comparanda:* ČT-14, TK-13, UQ-1

*Publication:* Bernbeck, Pollack and Bucak 2001, 150; fig 5: c.  
Bernbeck, et. al. 2002: 35, fig. 8a, upper row, middle.  
Bernbeck et. al. ND (photo downloaded from there)

*Note:* This seal was not found in the Urfa Museum in 2002, description from photograph.

*Photo:* Bernbeck et. al. ND
Tell Kurdu Figurines

TK-1
Location: Excavation storage  
Excav. No: TK 4963  
Type: EH.2A  

Findspot: 1999 season, trench 14, Locus 131, 
Typological date: early Halaf
Archaeological context: Earliest of the Amuq E levels (step trench)

**Description:** Standing or kneeling figure. Flat upper torso with arm stubs rounded at waist, upper body leaning slightly forward. Bell shaped lower torso, protruding in the front. Pose may represent kneeling posture.

**Length:** 47.8mm  
**Width:** 27.8mm at arms, 21.2mm at waist, 24.2mm at base

**Technology:** Clay, 10YR 7/2: a light grey surface, smoother on front than back, may have been covered with slip.

**Condition:** Broken off at neck; missing head and front left base, damaged at base edges over all, with modern repairs evident. Very friable surface.

**Comparanda:** GH-3, SAB-8

**Publication:** Yener et. al. 2000, 112, fig 17: 3. (erroneously listed as TK 1964)

**Photos:** E. Belcher, with permission Tell Kurdu Project
TK-2

Location: Excavation storage Excav. No: TK 3003 Type: EH.2A
Findsport: 1999 season, Trench 12, locus 03, lot 24 Stratigraphic Date: early Halaf
Archaeological Context: Eastern extent of excavation of a series of structures and streets, fully exposed in 2001 (Özbal 2006 fig. 3:8).

Description: Standing female figurine fragment with hourglass profile. Very thin in profile. Flat torso with arm stub[s], pinched waist and flaring out hips. Public area represented by incised square with punctuations, representing hair. Does not have a flat base to stand on but lays on flat back.

Length: 38.1mm
Width: 29.2mm
Thickness: 9.8mm

Technology: Very fine clay, 10YR 4/1, a very dark grey surface. Pinched flattened, incised and punctuated with a stick or reed. Rough surface, either as originally created or from depositional processes.

Condition: Broken off at shoulders, missing head, neck and upper right torso and arm stub.

Comparanda: DT-1, ÇT-10 has similar punctated pudenda;
SAB (pre Halaf) Collet 1996, 6.2 f, i, g; Yarim Tepe II, Merpert and Munchaev, 1987: fig. 12
Publication: Belcher, in press B
Photos: E. Belcher, with permission of Tell Kurdu Project
TK-3

Location: Excavation Storage  Excav. No: TK 4982  
Findspot: 1999 season, Trench 14, locus 53, lot 140

Type: LH.Type unknown
Hypothetical date: early Halaf

Archaeological Context: Earliest of the Amuq E stratigraphic levels, east of wall 56, near the bulldozer cut (Yener et. al. 2000 100, fig. 5).

Description: Upper torso fragment of standing figurine. Flattened torso with rounded edges and arm stubs. Lack of attachment scar suggests it never had a neck or shoulders. An ambiguous fragment that may not be human. Lays on back without support.

Length: 25.1mm
Width: 19.8mm at arm stubs
Thick: 15.9mm

Technology: Clay, 10YR 7/2 a light gray surface, molded from a single lump of clay with smoothed surface.

Condition: Broken off above waist, missing lower torso. Slight polishing around shoulders from use.

Unpublished

Photo: E. Belcher, with permission Tell Kurdu Project
TK-4

Location: Excavation storage  
Excav. No: TK 2851  
Type: LH.1A variation

Findspot: 1999 season, Trench 13, Locus 006, Lot 017  
Typological date: late Halaf

Archaeological context: Modern bulldozer dump of soil from top of tell resulting mix of Amuq C (early Halaf) Amuq D (late Halaf) and Amuq E (‘Ubaid) material culture

Description: Seated figurine rendered without much anthropomorphic detail in torso. Thick torso with fat rolls represented on sides. Flat chest with no signs of breast attachments. Back is concave with protruding buttocks. Painted with stripes, one wide stripe across upper thighs; two vertical stripes on either side of back connect to a horizontal stripe. Four diagonal, rayed stripes painted on chest. Sits on base without support.

Length: 34.3mm  
Width: 29.1mm  
Thick: 24.4mm at legs, 15mm at chest

Technology: Clay with very few inclusions, lightly baked, 10YR 7/2 a light gray surface, Legs appear to have been formed separately and attached to torso while still plastic, surface smoothed then painted with 10R 5/4 a weak red paint.

Condition: Broken at chest, broken off at legs, missing upper body or neck and head, lower legs.

Comparanda: DT-16 (a standing figurine with same lumpy undefined torso)

Publication:  
Photos: E. Belcher, with permission Tell Kurdu Project
**TK-5**

*Location:* Hat?  
*Excav. No:* TK 7862  
*Type:* EH.2A

*Findspot:* 2001 season, Trench 23, Locus 42, lot 85  
*Stratigraphic Date:* early Halaf

*Archaeological context:* Amuq C settlement, multiple overlying floors in Room 36, Area E, ‘Main Phase’ of buildings (Özbal 2006: 60, fig. 3.8 and 369, appendix I).

*Description:* Figurine fragment of lower torso/base. Bell shaped lower torso with flaring out at base. Center of base is deeply concave. Surface punctuated with fingernail impressions. A deeper incision at edge of base may represent a vulva. Stands on base without support.

*Length:* 18.4mm  
*Width:* 23mm at base

*Technology:* Clay, 2.5Y 4/1 a dark grey surface, rolled, pinched. Bottom poked in with finger. Incised with fingernail or reed.

*Condition:* Broken off above waist, missing upper body and head.

*Comparanda:* TK-10, TA-7, TA-8  
SAB pre-Halaf, Collet 1996, Fig. 6.3.5-8

*Publication:* Belcher, in press.
**TK-6**

*Location:* Hat?  
*Excav. No:* TK7257  
*Type:* EH. Type unknown

*Findspot:* 2001 season, Amuq C, Trench 26, Locus 1, Lot 5  
*Stratigraphic Date:* early Halaf

*Archaeological context:* Found in plow-zone above the ‘main phase’ of Amuq C settlement

*Description:* Figurine fragment of head and neck. Rounded head, longitudinally pinched out nose, pressed in eye sockets, pinched out ears, smoothed elongated neck. Back of head is slightly flattened to allow figurine to lay flat? Pinched out nose shows some wear. Incised outline of eyes and pupils in eye sockets, which may be intended to look like cowrie shells. Ears are represented by modeling.

*Length:* 30mm

*Width:* 21.8mm ear to ear, 13mm at neck

*Thick:* 23mm at nose, 13.3mm at neck

*Technology:* Clay, lightly fired, 7.5YR 7/4 a pink surface, ears probably separately constructed and then attached, surface carefully smoothed, then eyes incised, may also have had eye inlays.

*Condition:* Broken off at neck, missing body.

*Publication:* Özbal et. al. 2004, 84; fig 13: 12.  
Belcher, in press
TK-7

Location: Excavation storage    Excav. No: TK 3689    Type: LH.2A
Findspot: 1999 season, trench 13, locus 005    Typological date: late Halaf?
Archaeological context: Modern bulldozer dump of soil from top of tell resulting mix of Amuq
C (early Halaf) Amuq D (late Halaf) and Amuq E (Ubaid) material culture

Description: Standing female figurine, with flaring out circular base and flat upper body. Holes
surrounded by attachment scars on chest indicate that appliqué breasts were once attached, which
may have been made of a different material. Stands on base and lies on back without support.

Length: 66.5mm
Width: 49mm at arms, 26.3mm at waist, 36.5mm at base
Thick: 32.7mm at base, 2mm at chest

Technology: Clay, surface 7.5Y 7/3 a pink. Formed out of a single lump, smoothed, with head
and breasts attached. Round concave base is probably finger impressed.

Condition: Chipped at base, surface roughened and stained, possibly post-depositional, broken
off at neck, missing head and breasts.

Comparanda: GK-1, GH-2, CB-23 (FH-1 has similar breast holes)

Unpublished

Photos: E. Belcher, with permission, Tell Kurdu Project.
TK-8

**Location:** Excavation storage  
**Excav. No:** TK 3105  
**Type:** EH.2A

**Findspot:** 1999 season, Trench 14, locus 10, lot 17  
**Typological Date:** early Halaf?

**Archaeological context:** Earliest of the Amuq E levels (step trench)

---

**Description:** Kneeling figurine, flat upper body and flaring out base, which is oval in plan. Leaning forward, with a tool scrape at front base, possibly representing a vulva. Base is deeply concave. Incised by fingernail or tool a few times over surface. Burnished on one side. Stands without support on base.

**Length:** 29.7mm  
**Width:** 26.6mm at arms  
**Thick:** 16.3 at base

**Technology:** Clay, lightly baked with very fine inclusions 7.5YR 3/1 a very dark grey surface.

**Condition:** Back is rougher, possibly post-depositional damage. Broken off at neck, missing head.

**Publication:** Yener et. al. 2000, 112, 17: 2

**Photos:** E. Belcher, with permission, Tell Kurdu Project.
**TK-9**

*Location:* Excavation storage  
*Excav. No:* TK 2962  
*Type:* EH.2C  
*Findspot:* 1999 season, surface find  
*Typological Date:* early Halaf

**Description:** Standing female figurine, conically shaped body. Stuck on breasts and nose, pointed head. Back is slightly flatter than rounded front, but does not lay on back without rolling. Base is slightly convex and oval in plan. Diagonal tool mark on back. Figure could also represent an animal with breasts as front legs, although they do not show signs of wear.

*Length:* 42.1mm  
*Width:* 20.1mm at base  
*Thick:* 15.8mm at breasts

*Technology:* Clay, lightly baked 10YR 4/1 a dark grey surface. Pinched out of clay blob, rolled and with breasts and nose stuck on, eyes appliqué and incised. Surface left somewhat rough or became that way from post-depositional processes.

*Condition:* Complete, chipped at left eye and left lower back.

*Unpublished*

*Photos:* E. Belcher, with permission, Tell Kurdu project.
**TK-10**

*Location:* Excavation storage  
*Excav. No:* TK 4501  
*Type:* EH.2A

*Findspot:* 1999 season, Trench 14, Locus 33, lot 83  
*Typological Date:* early Halaf?

*Archaeological context:* Earliest of the Amuq E levels (step trench)

*Description:* Standing figurine, conical form, slightly flattened upper body. Arms represented by stubs, pointy peg like head. Punctuated at chest and upper back with a round blunt reed or similar tool, perhaps representing beaded necklace?

*Length:* 26.8mm  
*Width:* 14.2mm at arms  
*Thick:* 10.4mm at base

*Technology:* Clay, lightly baked, 2.5YR 7/4 a light reddish brown surface. Pinched out, with head added on shoulders.

*Condition:* Complete, with head broken off and reattached (modern repair).

*Comparanda:* FH-2

*Publication:* Yener et. al. 2000: 112-113, fig 17: 5.

*Photos:* E. Belcher, with permission, Tell Kurdu Project
TK-11

Museum: Hat  Excav. No: unknown  Type: PH. Type unknown
Findspot: 1996 season, sounding.  Stratigraphic date: Post Halaf/Ubaid
Archaeological Context: Clay and ash lenses above archeological levels. C14 date in this trench = 4800BCE. This trench is adjacent to a bulldozer cut into the southeastern slope of the mound.

Description: Figurine head fragment. Pointed top of head, nose pinched out, head leaning forward. Eyes represented as coffee bean or cowrie shell shaped.

Size unknown

Technology: Clay, pinched and smoothed, with stuck on eyes.

Condition: Broken off at neck, body.

Comparanda: TK-11

Yener et. al. 1999a: fig. 5.
Yener et. al. 2000 p. 202-203, fig. 22.1

Note: I briefly saw and photographed this example during a 1999 visit to the excavations but was unable to study it after deposit of it into the Hatay Museum
**TK-12**

*Location*: Excavation storage  
*Excav. No*: TK2666  
*Type*: PH. Type unknown  

*Findspot*: 1999 season, trench 2 or trench 11\(^{179}\), locus 005, lot 17  

*Stratigraphic Date*: Post Halaf/Ubaid  

*Archeological Context*: These trenches yielded ceramics associated with Amuq E.

---

**Description**: Figurine head with high pointed headdress, slightly protruding nose, stuck on cowrie shaped eyes. Head leans slightly back, with eyes appearing to look upward.

*Length*: 40.8mm  
*Width*: 17.8  
*Thick*: 18.1mm at nose

*Technology*: clay, lightly baked, pinched out of clay blob, smoothed and burnished with eyes stuck on.

*Condition*: broken at neck, missing body

*Comparanda*: TK-11


*Photos*: E. Belcher, with permission, Tell Kurdu Project.

---

\(^{179}\) Yener and Edens et. al. 1999, 201-202 describes the tholos in which this figurine was found as “…7m in diameter with triangular internal buttresses.” But it was found to be filled with Ubaid (Amuq E) pottery indicating the fill is later than the architectural feature. The style of this figurine is consistent with the Ubaid tradition. Note that other human figurines in the same style are said to have been found in this trench. This figurine is published as coming from both trench 2 (Yener 1999, 2, fig. 6) and trench 11 (Yener, Edens et al 2000, 202). Both trenches were adjacent to each other and yielded Amuq E material culture. (see figure 3.15)
TK-13

Location: Hat?  Excav. No: K 7648  Type: EH.4A
Findspot: 2001 season, trench 15, locus 49, lot 95  Stratigraphic Date: Early Halaf
Archaeological context: Found loose in fill directly above ‘main phase’ of Amuq C settlement

Description: Standing human form with Arms and legs splayed, and high pointed head. Diagonal lines incised over legs, single horizontal line deeply incised at waist. Had shank for suspension on the back, which is now broken.

Length: 16.5mm
Width: 9.5mm
Thick: 5.5mm
Piercing Diameter: 2mm

Technology: Stone, grey blue [Serpentine?]  

Condition: Right foot and back perforated shank broken off, otherwise complete.

Comparanda: FH-4, ÇT-14, UQ-1

Publications: Özbal 2004 97, fig 3:22 (image taken from there)  
Özbal, Gerritsen et al: 60, fig. 13: 3;  
Tell Kurdu Newsletter 2, p.3;

Drawing: Mücella Erdal kıran courtesy,Tell Kurdu Project.

Photos: courtesy of the Tell Kurdu Project
**TK-14**

*Museum:* Hat  
*Excav. No:* TK6245  
*Type:* EH.4B

*Findspot:* 2001 season, trench 23, locus 1, lot 16  
*Typological Date:* early Halaf

*Archaeological context:* Found in plow zone above the ‘main phase’ of Amuq C settlement

---

**Description:** Foot shaped seal with delineated ankle and foot. Pierced through top of ankle. Base or ‘sole’ of the foot is incised with crossing diagonal parallel lines.

*Length:* [20mm]  
*Width:* [18mm]

**Technology:** Stone, dark grey [serpentine?], Cut, ground, polished, pierced, incised.

**Condition:** Complete

**Comparanda:** DT-22  
Arpachiyah, Mallowan & Rose 1935, Fig. 51.17

**Publication:** *Tell Kurdu Newsletter*, 2001  
Belcher, in press.

**Drawing:** Mücella Erdalkıran, courtesy of Rana Özbal
**TK-15**

*Location:* Unknown  
*Excav. no.* K17  
*Type:* EH.2A  

*Findspot:* 1938 season, Trench I at 1-1.5m (Amuq E)  
*Hypothetical date:* early Halaf

*Description:* Standing figure with rounded base, flat upper torso with appliqué clay stuck on breasts. Cinched in waist and flat arm stubs, probably representing bent arms.

*Condition:* Broken off at neck, missing head, looks to be also missing breasts.

*Publication:* Braidwood and Braidwood 1960, 204, 562, fig 160:12, plate 50: 1 (image from there)
TK-16

Location unknown Excav. no.: K32 Type: EH.2A
Findspot: 1938 season Trench I, at 2-2.5m (Amuq E) Hypothetical date: early Halaf

Description: Standing figure with rounded inverted base, square and flat upper torso with only slight protrusion representing arms. Stuck on appliqué flat breasts. Pointed head and thick neck.

Condition: Missing left breast, otherwise complete?

Publication: Braidwood and Braidwood 1960, 204, 562, fig 160: 13, plate 50: 2
(illustration from this source)
**TK-17**

*Location unknown*  
*field no:* K31  
*Type:* EH.2A  
*Findspot:* 1938 season, Trench I at 2-2.5m (Amuq E)  
*Hypothetical date:* early Halaf

![Standing figure with round inverted base and flat upper torso. Cinched in waist and arms represented as bent by flat rounded stubs. Stuck on appliqué clay breasts.](image)

*Description:* Standing figure with round inverted base and flat upper torso. Cinched in waist and arms represented as bent by flat rounded stubs. Stuck on appliqué clay breasts.

*Condition:* Broken off at neck, missing head, left breast, otherwise complete?

*Publication:* Braidwood and Braidwood 1960, 204, 654, fig. 160: 14, plate 50: 3 (Illustration source from there)
Girikihacıyan Figurines

**GH-1**

*Museum:* Diyar 1069, GK70-51  
*Excav. No.:* W2S5, 32-1  
*Type:* EH.2B

*Findspot:* 1970 season, square W2S5, level 32  
*Stratigraphic Date:* early Halaf

*Archeological context:* One of the lowest levels excavated, a fill of mixed deposit within a matrix of ash and charcoal (see Watson and Le Blanc 22-23, 31: figs. 2.8-2.11, table 3.1.)

*Description:* Standing female figure with flat hourglass torso, stuck on breasts (now broken off, attachment scars visible). Incised with lines: two double lines around waist, not extending around to the back, two double diagonal lines on either side of lower torso represent pubic triangle. Appears to stand on base or lay on back without support.

*Height:* [approx 10mm]  
*Width:* [approx 50mm]

*Technology:* Clay, lightly baked, 5Y 7/2 a light gray surface, formed in two parts, flattened and smoothed then incised (with double incision tool) and appliquéd

*Condition:* Head broken off at neck, chipped over edges of lower torso, appliqué breasts broken off, attachment scars remaining.

*Comparanda:* TK-7, ÇT-1, CB-23, SAB-1  
(FH-1 has similar breast holes, DT-1 has similar incised triangle)  
Yarim Tepe II (Merpert and Munchaev 1987, fig. 12 1, 2)


**GH 2**

*Museum:* Diyar?  
*Excav. No.* A7-6  
*Type:* EH.2D

*Findspot:* Area A, level 7  
*Typological Date:* early Halaf

*Archaeological Context:* within fill associated with lower floor on stone foundations of House 1, a tholos with dromos antechamber (Watson and Leblanc 1990: 37-38; 28, fig 2.15) may be associated with fill between floors?

---

*Description:* Standing figure with triangular torso lower torso. Double incised line[s] around waist, single diagonal incisions at hips representing pubic triangle. Upper torso and/or head broken off. Probably stands on base without support.

*Length:* [approx. 20mm]  
*Width:* [approx. 15mm]

*Technology:* Clay, formed from a single lump, pinched, smoothed and incised.

*Condition:* broken above waist or neck, missing head and/or upper body.

*Comparanda:* SAB-7, Yarim Tepe I, II (Merpert and Munchaev 1993 figs. 8. 10:4 and 8.32: 1-9)

*Publication:* Watson and Le Blanc 1990: fig 6.21.3

*Drawing:* after Watson and LeBlanc fig 6.21.3.

*Note:* figurine not seen at Diyarbakır museum
**GH-3**

*Museum*: Diyar 1067T  *Excav. no.:* W2S5, 23-8  *Reg.no: *GK70-50  *Type: EH.2A*

*Findspot*: 1970 season, square W2S5, level 23  *Typological Date*: early Halaf

*Archaeological Context*: Fill of mud-walled house with plaster floor (Watson and Le Blanc 1990: 22-23, 32-33, figs. 2.9-2.11, 3.1, table 3.1.). Same context as **GH-5**

![Image of GH-3](image)

*Description*: Standing female figure with rounded columnar lower torso. Flat upper torso with arm stubs, stuck on breasts (now broken off). Punctuation on lower stomach represents navel. Appears to have been designed to stand without support on base

*Height*: 58.5mm  
*Width*: 24.2mm  
*Thick*: 34.1mm

*Technology*: Clay, 2.5YR 4/1 dark reddish grey surface. Pinched out clay with breasts and head stuck-on. Appears to have been burnished and polished, possibly from use.

*Condition*: Broken off at neck, chipped or broken around base. Missing head and neck.

*Comparanda*: TK-1, ÇT-5


*Photos*: E. Belcher (of back) on exhibit in the Diyarbakır museum in 2001
GH-4

*Museum:* Diyar?

*Excav. No.:* W2S5, 22-7

*Type:* EH.2A

*Findspot:* 1970 season, Square W2S5, level 22

*Typological Date:* early Halaf?

*Archaeological context:* Level of base of Tholos 8, (see Watson and Leblanc 1990:22-23, 24,32-33, figs. 2.8-2.11, 3.1, table 3.1.)

*Description:* Upper torso of female figure, with slight arm-stubs representing arms bent at elbow. Breasts formed onto center of chest.

*Height:* [approx. 32.5mm]

*Width:* [approx. 35mm]

*Technology:* Clay, pinched, formed and smoothed.

*Condition:* Broken off at neck and waist; missing head, lower torso. Right side chipped.

*Comparanda:* FH-3, ÇT-4, ÇT-5


*Note:* Not seen at Diyarbakir museum.
**GH-5**

*Museum: Diyar?  Excav. No.: W2S5, 23-7  Type: LH.1A*

*Findspot: 1970 season, square W2S5(sounding), level 23  Typological Date: Late Halaf*

*Archaeological Context: Fill of mud-walled house with plaster floor (Watson and Le Blanc 1990: 22-23, 32-33, figs. 2.9-2.11, 3.1, table 3.1). Same context as GH-3.*

*Description:* Lower torso fragment of seated female. Well-formed buttocks. Appears to be incised with two (incised?) diagonal lines on hip[s] and at waist probably once forming a pubic triangle.

*Height:* [approx 35mm]

*Width:* [approx. 41mm]

*Technology:* Clay, this section made separately by pinching, joined to upper torso and legs when wet, surface then smoothed and incised.

*Condition:* Broken off at waist and thighs; missing legs and upper torso.


*Note:* Not seen at Diyarbakir museum.
**GH-6**

*Museum:* Diyar?  
*Excav. No.:* W2S5, 19-3  
*Type:* EH. Type unknown  

*Findspot:* 1970 season, square W2S5 level 19  
*Hypothetical date:* early Halaf

*Archaeological context:* Fill of tholos 8, associated with grit-tempered ceramics, ‘Halafian’. (Watson and Leblanc 22-23, 31-32, figs. 2.8-2.11, 3.1, table 3.1).

---

**Description:** Standing figure with pointed head and coffee bean eye[s]. Very difficult to distinguish from published drawings the original form of this figurine. Could be a fragment of an animal figurine.

**Height:** [approx. 48mm]  
**Width:** [approx. 28mm]

**Technology:** Clay, possibly formed from one portion, with appliqué eyes added on.

**Condition:** Very broken up, especially on left side, difficult to distinguish, missing arms, legs and front of torso.

**Comparanda:** Coffee bean eyes appear on earlier figurines from Choga Mami (Oates 1969)

**Publication:** Watson and LeBlanc 1990, fig. 6.21.8  
**Drawing:** E. Belcher after Watson and LeBlanc 1990, fig. 6.21.8

**Note:** Not seen at Diyarbakir museum.
GH-7


*Findspot:* 1968 season, square W2S5 level 3  *Stratigraphic Date:* late Halaf

*Archaeological Context:* Pit filled dump, associated with chaff tempered ceramics (Watson and Leblanc 1990: 23, 31-32, figs. 2.8-2.11, 3.1, table. 3.1).

*Description:* Left leg fragment of a seated figurine. Bent at knee with articulated foot. Attachment scars show that leg[s] as originally attached to the figurine would have hung below the base of the original figurine.

*Length:* [approx. 39mm]
*Width:* [approx. 38.1mm]
*Thickness:* [approx. 30mm]

*Technology:* Clay, 10YR 6/2 light brownish grey on surface, formed and pinched, possibly in two pieces joined and then smoothed [attached to torso at hip.]

*Condition:* Fragment, broken off above thigh. Break at knee, modern repair.

*Comparanda:* GH- 8, ÇT-11, ÇT-12


*Drawing:* after Watson and LeBlanc 1990, fig. 6.21.1.

*Note:* Not seen at Diyarbakir museum.
**GH-8**

*Museum:* Diyar 1065  *Excav. No.:* E4N2, 3-1  *Reg. no:* GK70-48  *Type:* LH1.C

*Findspot:* 1970 season, square E4N2, level 3  *Stratigraphic Date:* late Halaf

*Archaeological Context:* ‘Halafian’ first level of grit-tempered ceramics, level 1 of round house 4, upper fill, in area of hearth, (Watson and Leblanc 1990 32-33, fig. 2.7, table 3.2).

*Description:* Seated figurine leg fragment. Bent knee and articulated foot.

*Height:* 39.9mm  
*Width:* 30mm

*Technology:* Clay, 3.5YR 6/2 a weak red on surface, pinched and formed, and then attached to torso while wet.

*Condition:* Fragment, broken off at thigh, attachment scar visible.

*Comparanda:* GH-7, ÇT-11, ÇT-12


*Drawing:* after Watson and LeBlanc, fig. 6.21.2.

**GH-9**

*Museum:* Dıyar?  
*Excav. No:* unknown W2S5, 5-?  
*Type:* LH. Type unknown.  
*Findspot:* 1968 season, square W2S5, level 5  
*Stratigraphic Date:* late Halaf  
*Archaeological context:* fill and pits, lowest level of chaff tempered ceramics (see Watson and Leblanc 1990: 23-24, figs. 2.8-2.11, table 3.1.)  

*Description:* “Fragment of torso on rounded base: waist (with possibly navel) and arms.”  

*Diameter:* 22mm  

*Publication:* Mentioned, Watson and LeBlanc 1989: 105, table 6.18

---

**GH-10**

*Museum:* Dıyar?  
*Excav. No:* W2S5, 4-?  
*Type:* LH. Type unknown.  
*Findspot unknown:* 1968 season, square W2S5, level 4  
*Stratigraphic Date:* late Halaf  
*Archaeological context:* Fill, cut by pits, associated with chaff-tempered ceramics, ‘epi-Halafian’  

*Description:* “Base or pedestal of figurine, lightly baked, 22mm in diameter.”  

*Publication:* Mentioned, Watson and LeBlanc 1989: 105, table 6.18

---

**GH-11**

*Museum:* Dıyar?  
*Excav. No:* W2S5, 20-4  
*Type:* EH. Type unknown.  
*Findspot:* 1970 season, square W2S5 level 20  
*Stratigraphic Date:* early Halaf?  
*Archaeological context:* lower fill of tholos 8, associated with grit-tempered ceramics, same context as GH-12 (see Watson and Leblanc 1990 23-24, figs. 2.8-2.11, 3.1, table 3.1.)  

*Description:* “Torso fragment.”  

*Publication:* Mentioned, Watson and LeBlanc 1990: 105, table 6.18

---

**GH-12**

*Museum:* Dıyar?  
*Excav. No:* W2S5, 20-4  
*Type:* EH. Type unknown.  
*Findspot:* 1970 season, square W2S5, level 20  
*Stratigraphic Date:* early Halaf  
*Archaeological context:* lower fill of tholos 8, associated with grit-tempered ceramics, ‘Halafian’ same context as GH-11 (see Watson and Leblanc 1990 23-24, figs. 2.8-2.11, 3.1, table 3.1.)  

*Description:* “Human leg fragment.”  

GH-13

*Museum:* Diyar?  
*Excav. No.:* W2S5, 8-?  
*Type:* LH.Type unknown.

*Findspot:* 1968 season, square W2S5 level 8  
*Stratigraphic Date:* late Halaf

*Archaeological context:* fill, uppermost level of grit tempered ceramics (see Watson and Leblanc 1990, 23-24, figs. 2.8-2.11, 3.1, table 3.1.)

*Description:* “Clay leg or phallus.”


GH-14

*Museum:* Diyar?  
*Excav. No:* W2S5, 17-4  
*Type:* EH.Type unknown

*Findspot:* 1970 season, square W2S5, level 17  
*Stratigraphic Date:* early Halaf

*Archaeological context:* dump, associated with grit tempered ceramics. (see Watson and Leblanc 1990: 23-24, figs. 2.8-2.11, 3.1, table 3.1.)

*Description:* “Possible arm fragment”

Çavı Tarlası Figurines

**CT-1**

*Museum:* Urfa L19: 4  
*Excav. No:* ÇT 84-2  
*Type:* LH.2B

*Findspot:* 1984 season, level 3, square L19, “bereich 25”  
*Stratigraphic Date:* late Halaf

*Archaeological context:* Found at the break of southwestern wall of roomed antechamber (or dromos) of Tholos 13 together with a late Halaf style circular stamp seal. (see von Wickede and Herbort 1988: 25, 11 abb. 3)

*Description:* Upper torso and head of standing figure. Flat front and back and rounded sides. Head represented by knob and arms by round stubs. Incised with thin lines 4 parallel diagonal lines from right shoulder across chest and stomach, one extending over to left hip. Some random incisions may be scratches.

*Length:* 51.9mm  
*Width:* 42.5mm at arms; 34.2 at waist  
*Thick:* 17.5 at waist; 15.2 at chest; 11.1 at head

*Technology:* Stone [limestone?], 2.5Y 8/2 a pale yellow on surface, cut, ground, polished, incised.

*Condition:* Broken at waist, missing lower body. Damage (modern?) to back surface.

*Comparanda:* FH-1, FH-3, DT-1

*Publication:* Von Wickede and Herbordt 1988: abb. 5:1
CT-2

*Museum no:* Ürfa P20.1 *Excav. No:* ÇT 84-3 *Type:* LH.2B

*Findspot:* 1984 season, Level 1 Square P20. *Stratigraphic Date:* late Halaf

*Description:* Upper torso of standing female. Torso flat on back and slightly rounded on front. Pointed breasts, sloping shoulders taper out to Arms abbreviated to pointed stubs (wing shaped). Hole at neck may have accommodated a removable/movable and interchangeable neck and head. Probably stood on base without support, but now base is broken.

*Length:* 58.6mm
*Width:* 67mm at arms, 43.5mm at base, 40.5mm at waist
*Thick:* 54.3mm neck to upper chest, 24.5mm at breasts, 18.2mm at break
*Other:* 13.5mm diameter of hole at neck, 33.7mm depth of hole at neck

*Technology:* clay, 10YR 7/4 a very pale brown surface, 7.5YR 4/1 a dark grey core Pinched and well smoothed, flecks of burned mica temper and tool marks visible on surface.

*Condition:* Grey on front and top of calves perhaps from exposure to smoke. Stands without support and lays on back, though may be broken off at base, chip off right arm. Worn on tips of breasts.

*Comparanda:* ÇT-3, ÇT-4, DT-1, GH-1, SAB-1

*Publications:* von Wickede and Misir 1985:109, resim 7
von Wickede and Herbordt 1988: tafel 5:1
CT-3

Museum no: Urfa M19  
Excav. No: CT 84-5  
Type: LH.1C

Findspot: 1984 season, square M19, Levels 2 or 3  
Stratigraphic Date: late Halaf

Archaeological context: Main building and excavation activity of site.

Description: Upper torso of female. Molded front with pointed breasts, arms and shoulders reduced to flap or wing-like protrusions. Flat, slightly concave back. Holes vertically pierced through neck and waist of torso to accommodate removable head and lower body? Hole at neck is conical and smooth, hole at waist is rough and may be a break. Lays flat on back without rolling.

Length: 39.4mm  
Width: 55.6mm at arms, 34.2mm at breast, 24.2mm at waist/break  
Thick: 26.9mm at breasts, 16.5mm at neck, 16.2mm at waist/break  
Other: 14.2mm diameter of hole; 36.8mm depth of hole

Technology: clay, baked (or burned) 2.5YR /1 a reddish black surface, covered with vegetable and mineral inclusions which were burned off. Pinched out and smoothed, breasts pinched out breasts while plastic.

Condition: Broken at waist? Broken off tips of breasts. Chipped off right shoulder and right arm. Polish around shoulders from wear. Hole at neck chipped and worn. Back appears rubbed and worn, possibly from use

Comparanda: CT-2  
Unpublished
CT-4

*Museum no:* Urfa LF:39  
*Excav. no:* ÇT 84-23  
*Type:* LH.2B

*Findspot:* 1984 season, squares L-M 19-20, level 2 or 3  
*Stratigraphic Date:* late Halaf

*Archaeological context:* This is the main area of buildings and of archeological excavation

*Description:* Upper torso of female figurine with flattened torso, modeled on front with pointed breasts, well smoothed. Navel 34mm deep impressed in belly. Hole in neck may have accommodated a neck. Lays flat on back without rolling.

*Length:* 37.2mm  
*Width:* 38.1mm at arms, 23mm at waist  
*Thick:* 13mm at navel, 18.5mm at breasts, 13.5mm at neck  
*Other:* 75mm diameter hole, 34mm deep hole

*Technology:* clay, 7.5YR 4/1 a dark grey surface, 10YR 5/3 a brown core Pinched out of clay, breasts added on and smoothed over when wet. Then baked and/or slightly burned. Small pebble-like grit and chaff temper on surface, which may have been intentional.

*Condition:* Broken at waist, missing lower body, chipped at neck and right arm and on other edges.

*Comparanda:* FH-1, ÇT-2, ÇT-3

*Publication:* von Wickede and Herbordt 1988: tafel 5:3
**CT-5**

*Museum:* Urfa  
*Excav no:* ÇT 84-7  
*Type:* LH.2A

*Findspot:* 1984 season, P20:2, Level 1  
*Stratigraphic Date:* late Halaf

*Archaeological context:* Area and level of Tholos 10. (von Wickede and Herbordt 1988, 16)

*Description:* Small standing female, skirted. Flat upper torso tapers out to rounded lower, skirted torso. Head represented by a knob, arms by flaps or flat stubs. Round breasts stuck onto torso while still wet and before baking. Painted, now worn off in a difficult to reconstruct pattern. May have been painted with 3 horizontal stripes on each side, perhaps extending from each breast extending downward vertically. Perhaps there was one vertical stripe on the back of the head and neck.

*Length:* 26.3mm,

*Width:* 20.6mm at arms; 13mm at waist, 16.6 at break

*Technology:* clay, baked, 7.5YR 7/6 a reddish yellow surface, 7.5YR 8/1 a white core, 5YR 3/1 a very dark grey paint on torso, 5YR 5/4 a reddish brown paint on upper chest and back. Pinched and formed out of clay, breasts formed separately and appliquéd on smoothed, then painted.

*Condition:* Broken off at waist and neck, missing lower body and head, breasts partially chipped off, paint worn off in parts.

*Comparanda:* GH-3

*Unpublished*
CT-6

Museum: Urfa  
Excav. No: ÇT 84-18  
Type: LH.1C

Findspot: 1984 season, square L20, level 3  
Stratigraphic Date: late Halaf

Archaeological context: North of Tholos 3 (see von Wickede and Herbordt 1988 11, abb. 3; 28)

Description: Seated figure, sex not clearly indicated. Bent legs with extended thighs, lower legs extended below knees. Flat upper torso with head represented by knob and arms represented by stubs. Rounded waist, flat back.

Length: 48.8mm
Width: 24.5mm at arms, 10.5mm at waist, 10.4mm at head
Thick: 9.9mm at chest, 20.7mm knees to buttocks

Technology: Clay, baked, 10YR 6/3 a pale brown surface with mica temper. Pinched out of clay, legs constructed as rolled slabs, attached at hips and scraped on surface when wet with a tool (marks still visible).

Condition: Complete, worn at top of head, tops of thighs. Polish from use on upper back between 'arms'. Grey on front and top of calves perhaps from exposure to smoke or fire.

Comparanda: KK-14 (similar construction of the legs)

Publication: von Wickede and Herbordt 1988: tafel 5:2
CT-7

Museum no: Urfa N20  Excav. no: ÇT 84-10  Type: LH1 C
Findspot: 1984 Season, square N20, level 1  Stratigraphic Date: late Halaf
Archaeological context: Area and level of small tholoi 9 and 14 and hearth 0.17. (see von Wickede and Herbordt 1988 10, abb 2)

Description: Lower torso of seated female (?) Thighs extended at a right angle, knees bent with lower legs hanging below torso. Legs have a kind of rubbery appearance from wet forming and smoothing. Attachment of legs is visible in crotch area. Painted, with a wide horizontal stripes across pubic area and upper thighs in a rough triangular form. Three stripes across back (one fragmentary at break). Diagonal striped across back and front of lower legs, also on feet.

Length: 60mm, 28.9mm buttocks to break
Width: 20.9mm at waist, 28.7mm at hips, 26.8 at knees, 20.7mm at feet

Technology: Clay, 10YR 8/2 very pale brown surface, 10YR 7/1 a light grey core with very small vegetable inclusions Modeled legs attached to torso when still wet, smoothed and painted with 10YR 6/6 a reddish yellow paint.

Condition: Fragment, broken off at waist. Polished on sides from use

Publications: von Wickede and Herbordt 1988: tafel 5: 4
CT-8
Museum: Urfa Excav. No: ÇT 84-36 Type: LH.1C
Findspot: 1984 season, square M20: 1, Level 2a or 1 Stratigraphic Date: late Halaf
Archaeological context: square contained level 2a buildings 8 and 17 as well as level 1 tholos 7 (see von Wickede and Herbordt 1988 10, abb 2)

Description: Fragment of left hip and upper leg of female figurine. Thigh extended at right angle, knee bent. Hip area very flat, back slightly concave. Underside of thigh is arched and flattened. Traces of painting, pattern difficult to reconstruct. Pubic area incised with triangle outline.

Length: 44.6mm
Width: 28.1mm hip to break, 20.8mm at knee
Thick: 57.7mm back to knee, 20.3 at waist

Technology: Clay, baked, 10YR 6/4 a light yellow brown surface, 7.5YR 2.5/1 a black core. Formed out of 1 or 2 lumps of clay, attached when still wet then smoothed and incised in pubic area, and painted with 5YR 4/3 a reddish brown paint, 2.5YR 3/1 a dark reddish grey different paint wash on thighs.


Unpublished
CT-9

Museum: Urfa  
Excav. No: ÇT 83-32  
Type: LH.2D

Findspot: 1983 season, Level 2b, square L21, sounding  
Typological Date: Late Halaf

Archeological Context: Fill within ante-chamber or dromos of Tholos 2 (see von Wickede 1984a 191, 195 abb. 3)

Description: Lower torso fragment of standing (?) female figure. Rounded torso and back, oval in section, below, fragment of pubic triangle, upper line may have circumvented hips. Profile flares out at hips to accommodate legs, now lost, incised with 4 lines at chest - unusual for Halaf figurines - one incision around waist. Navel represented by punctuation, pubic triangle by incised lines.

Length: 37.2mm
Width: 18.8mm at chest incisions, 18.9mm at waist
Thick: 15.2mm at waist, 13.5mm at chest.

Technology: clay, 10YR 3/1 very dark grey surface. rolled, pinched, smoothed and incised out of wet clay, which was then lightly baked or sun dried.

Condition: broken off at chest, and pubic area, missing head and limbs, shiny from use all over, some chipping at breaks.

Unpublished
CT-10

*Museum:* Urfa L20: 10  
*Excav. No:* ÇT 84-37  
*Type:* LH. Type unknown

*Findspot:* 1984 season, square L20: 10, level 2 or 3  
*Stratigraphic Date:* late Halaf

*Context:* area of either tholos 3 or tholos 1 (von Wickede and Herbort 1988 abb 3 or abb 4)

*Description:* Left lower torso fragment of standing (?) female figure. Left side of pubic area, represented by incised line at thigh and punctuations.

*Height:* 3.26mm  
*Width:* 27.8mm  
*Average diameter of punctuations:* 1.6mm

*Technology:* Clay, 7.5YR 6/6 a reddish-yellow surface and 10YR 2/1 a black core. Chaff on surface has been smoothed over before incision. Punctuations and incised lines appear to have been created with a pointed stick. Charred core.

*Condition:* Fragment of lower torso and pubic area.

*Comparanda:* CB-28, TK-2 has similar punctated pudenda

*Unpublished*
CT-11
Museum: Urfa 020:5  Excav. No: CT 84-38  
Findspot: Square 1984 season, O20: 5, level 1 
Stratigraphic Date: late Halaf
Archaeological context: Possibly associated with level 1 architecture, silo 15 and tholos 10? (see von Wickede and Herbort 1988 10, abb. 2: 16-17.)

Description: Right leg fragment, bent at knee, articulated flexed foot. Knee is very carefully represented.

Length: 41.7mm (knee to toe) 
Width: 91.6mm (lower leg), 16.4mm (thigh) 
Thick: 47.3mm (thigh to toe), 37.1mm (knee to thigh)

Technology: Clay, 7.5YR 6/4 a light brown surface, 7.5 2.5/1 a black core. Made from a single piece, pinched, formed and smoothed. Appear to be some brush marks on the inner thigh.

Condition: Fragment, missing the rest of body, attachment scar on inner right side. Wear on sole of foot.

Comparanda: GH-7, GH-8, CT-12

Unpublished
CT-12

*Museum:* Urfa  
*Excav. No:* ÇT 84-23  
*Other no:* L21: 14  
*Type:* LH.1 C

*Findspot:* Square L21 small trench exposing Tholos 2, level 2 a-b  
*Stratigraphic Date:* late Halaf

*Archaeological context:* Area of Tholos 2 (see von Wickede and Heribort 1988 15: abb 4)

*Description:* Left leg of figure, including foot. Thigh extended, knee bent and foot slightly extended from lower leg hanging down and smoothed over.

*Length:* 46.1mm (foot to upper thigh)  
*Width:* 17.8mm (thigh at break) 14.4mm (at knee) 7.1 (at foot)  
*Thick:* 31.6mm (knee to thigh), 13.8mm (at foot)

*Technology:* Clay, baked with small mineral inclusions, 7.5YR 7/4 a pink surface, 7.5YR 2.5/1 a black core. Pinched out of a lump of clay, smoothed and attached to torso when still plastic. Attachment scar on inner thigh shows where it would have been attached to torso and other leg. Green quartz-like pebble (6.6mm large) is embedded in core at break. Rubbing and wear on bottom of foot

*Condition:* Fragment, missing rest of body.

*Comparanda:* GH-7, GH-8, ÇT-11

*Unpublished*
**CT-13**

*Museum:* Urfa  
*Excav. No:* CT 84-39  
*Other no:* N20:2  
*Type:* LH.1 C

*Findspot:* 1984 Season, square N20, level 1  
*Stratigraphic Date:* late Halaf

*Archaeological context:* Area of tholos 9 and tholos 14, level 1 (see von Wickede and Herfort 1988 10 abb. 2.)

**Description:** Right lower leg fragment with articulated foot. Faint traces of paint on surface, which appear to have once been wide vertical stripes.

**Length:** 26.2mm  
**Width:** 9.6mm at top, 2.2mm at toe.

**Technology:** Clay, 7.5YR 8/6 a reddish yellow surface decorated with 2.5YR 5/6 a red paint.

**Condition:** Fragment, broken off at knee. Missing rest of body.

*Unpublished*
CT-14

*Museum:* Urfa  
*Excav. No:* ÇT 82-6  
*Type:* LH.4A

*Findspot:* 1982 season, L 23, surface find  
*Typological Date:* late Halaf

*Description:* Anthropomorphic stamp seal of standing female figure with arm stubs and splayed legs, four incisions around waist

*Technology:* Stone [Serpentine?], black-blue, carved and polished, left rough on back.

*Condition:* Complete

*Comparanda:* FH-4, TK-13, UQ-1

*Publications:* von Wickede 1984: abb. 23: 2, tafel 25: 3
**Description:** Torso fragment of standing figurine, with hole in neck for insertion of head. Arm sub[s] of which only the right survives.

**Technology:** Clay, painted with stripes on front torso.

**Condition:** Broken top and bottom, missing lower torso and right upper torso, shoulder and arm.

**Publication:** von Wickede 1984: 128-9 abb. 23: 3 (drawing from there)
**Domuztepe Figurines**

**DT-1**

*Museum:* Maraş  
*Excav no:* dt1793  
*Type:* LH.2B  
*Findspot:* 1999 season, Op I, lot 2646, C-9 phase  
*Stratigraphic Date:* late Halaf  
*Archaeological context:* Small pit or post hole adjacent but probably postdating the ‘death pit’.

**Description:** Figurine pendant with a human profile. Rounded raised shoulders, ending in points representing elbows of bent arms. Elongated triangular lower body, with flat base (stands up without support). Incised with two horizontal lines at waist, two diagonal lines at hips, representing pubic triangle. Hole is at end of incised triangle at base, representing vulva? Two diagonal lines from neck represent V on upper back, perhaps representing a counterweighted necklace. Flat on back, convex and polished on front. String wear indicates it was hung upside down, if used as a necklace pendant it would have been viewed right side up when held by wearer. Flat base allows it to stand without support.

*Length:* 33.1mm  
*Width:* 21mm  
*Thick:* 5.5mm

**Technology:** Stone, pink-orange brown surface, Quartz. Ground, polished and incised on front, back is not as polished.

**Condition:** Broken at neck, missing head, otherwise complete.

**Comparanda:** TK-2, ÇT-1, ÇT-2, DT-2, DT-3  
Canhasan level 2b CAN/62/169 and CAN/62/106 French 1963: pl IId  
Aphrodisias Pekmez: 79/18/456 (fig. 1598a-3), 79/18/155(fig. 1598e 2-5)

**Publication:** Gauld, Campbell and Carter 2003, fig. 12a, erroneously described as ‘headless’

**Online data record:** [http://opencontext.org/subjects/13864_DT_Spatial](http://opencontext.org/subjects/13864_DT_Spatial)

**Drawings, photos:** Courtesy S. Campbell, Domuztepe Project
**DT-2**

*Museum No:* Excavation storage  
*Excav. No:* dt212  
*Type:* LH.2B  
*Findspot:* 1996 season, op I, lot 613, C-9 phase  
*Stratigraphic Date:* late Halaf

*Description:* Head and upper torso fragment of a figurine pendant. Hands not articulated but position of arms infers that they are clasped at the chest. Barrel-shaped head which is pierced in with an L-shaped hole, perhaps after a shank above the head had broken off? Sloping shoulders represented in low relief, inner arms are represented by incision. Back is quite flat.

*Length:* 15mm  
*Width:* 12mm  
*Thick:* 3mm

*Technology:* Black stone, serpentine, cut incised, polished and pierced.

*Condition:* Broken off below waist, missing lower body. Head is possibly a re-piercing after shank broke off?

*Comparanda:* DT-1, DT-4, DT-5, DT-6

*Publication:* Gauld, Campbell and Carter 2003, fig 18

*Online data record:* [http://opencontext.org/subjects/15262_DT_Spatial](http://opencontext.org/subjects/15262_DT_Spatial)

*Drawings, photos:* Courtesy S. Campbell, Domuztepe Project
**DT-3**

*Museum:* Maraş Etudluk  \hspace{1cm} *Excav. No:* dt1788  \hspace{1cm} *Type:* LH.2B

*Findspot:* 1999 season, Op I, lot 2582, C-9 phase  \hspace{1cm} *Stratigraphic Date:* late Halaf

*Description:* Pendant figurine with bent arms. Lower body is inverted elongated triangle with a curved base. Pierced at base, with 2 incised horizontal lines above, possibly representing vulva and public triangle.

*Length:* 20.5mm  
*Width:* 15.8mm  
*Thick:* 3.1mm

*Technology:* Stone, blue-black serpentine, carved, notched, ground, polished, pierced and incised.

*Condition:* Broken off at shoulders, missing neck and head. Large chip off corner of base. Base was reconstructed (with white plaster?) in the Kahramanmaraş museum

*Comparanda:* DT-1, DT-2

*Publication:* Gauld, Campbell and Carter 2003, fig 12b, erroneously described as ‘headless’

*Online data record:* [http://opencontext.org/media/160_DT_Res](http://opencontext.org/media/160_DT_Res)

*Drawings, photos:* Courtesy S. Campbell, Domuztepe Project
**DT-4**

*Museum:* Maraş  
*Excav. No:* dt6560  
*Type:* LH.2B  
*Findspot:* 2009 Season, Op I, lot 4848, C-6 phase  
*Stratigraphic Date:* late Halaf

*Description:* Figurine pendant of a figure with bent arms represented by notched appendages. Incised on front with parallel lines, horizontal on arms and torso, vertical at base and top, crossed by seemingly random diagonal lines over. Pierced with two large holes at shoulders, which could represent either breasts or eyes. Incised lines over all suggest that this object may also have been used as a seal.

*Technology:* Stone, blue-green serpentinite, carved, notched, ground, polished, pierced and incised.

*Condition:* Complete, some scratching and slight chips on edges.

*Publication:* [http://www.domuztepe.org/?page_id=98](http://www.domuztepe.org/?page_id=98)  
Campbell 2009  
Denham 2013 DZ-103

*Photo:* Courtesy S. Campbell, Domuztepe Project

*Drawing:* S. Denham
**DT-5**

*Museum:* Maraş  
*Excav. No:* dt352  
*Findspot:* 1996 season, Op I, lot 1212, C-9 phase  
*Type:* LH.2B  
*Stratigraphic Date:* late Halaf

*Description:* Pentagonal figurine pendant representing standing figure with bent arms. Edges are incised on sides and top but not at base, similar to fringe or thread. Very low incision of matching inverted arcs on front represent schematized bent arms. Pierced with two asymmetrical holes at apex and one hole at base.

*Length:* 47.1mm  
*Width:* 35.6mm  
*Thick:* 2.5mm  
*Diameter of holes:* 20, 20mm at apex, 28 at base.

*Technology:* Serpentine, black brown serpentinite, back surface left rougher than front, which is ground, pierced and incised.

*Condition:* Complete, slight scratching on front.

*Unpublished*

*Online data record:*  
[http://opencontext.org/subjects/15397_DT_Spatial](http://opencontext.org/subjects/15397_DT_Spatial)

*Drawings, photos:* Courtesy S. Campbell, Domuztepe Project
**DT-6**

*Museum:* Maraş  
*Excav. No:* dt1784  
*Type:* LH.2B  
*Findspot:* 1999 season, Op I, lot 2581, C-5 phase  
*Stratigraphic Date:* late Halaf

**Description:** Standing schematic figurine, deeply notched to represent bent arms. Upper edge is round, representing shoulders? Bottom is flat with suspension hole just above it. Seen from bottom then triangular body, rounded shoulders. There is no separate head, neck or feet articulated. Pierced for suspension at base. If suspended from pierced hole, which shows string wear, it would have been viewed upside down. Flat but very narrow base allows it to stand without support.

*Height:* 26mm  
*Width:* 22.4mm  
*Thick:* 33mm

**Technology:** Stone, grey black serpentine, cut, notched, ground, polished and pierced.  
**Condition:** Complete

**Publication:** Gauld, Campbell and Carter 2003, fig 12 erroneously described as ‘headless’

**Online data record:** [http://opencontext.org/subjects/13855_DT_Spatial](http://opencontext.org/subjects/13855_DT_Spatial)

**Drawings, photos:** Courtesy S. Campbell, Domuztepe Project
**DT-7**

*Museum:* Excavation storage  
*Excav. No:* dt1109  
*Type:* LH.2B  

*Findspot:* 1999 season, Op I, lot 1894, C-5 phase  
*Stratigraphic Date:* late Halaf  

*Archaeological Context:* Found loose in a mixed lot of fill context.

---

*Description:* Small fragment of flat figurine-ponnant, shoulder and part of upper arm only extant. Deeply incised on at underarms both sides to delineate arm[s]. Rounded Bi-conically pierced at top of rounded shoulder, possibly after break. Edge is beveled. String-wear at top of hole.

*Length:* 27mm  
*Width:* 18.3mm  
*Thick:* 33mm  
*Diameter of hole:* 33mm

*Technology:* Stone, serpentine, blue-grey with white veining, carved, ground polished and incised, then pierced.

*Condition:* Fragment, broken above elbow and at shoulder, missing rest of body.  
*Online data record:* [http://opencontext.org/subjects/14276_DT_Spatial](http://opencontext.org/subjects/14276_DT_Spatial)  
*Photos:* Courtesy S. Campbell, Domuztepe project
DT-8

Museum: Excavation storage  
Excav. No: dt599  
Type: LH.2B

Findspot: 1997 season Op I lot 1705, C-9 phase  
Stratigraphic Date: late Halaf

Archaeological Context: Found loose in the soil of a contiguous lot of fill matrix.

Description: Arm fragment of a figurine pendant? Triangular in shape. Rounded edges, more finished on one face, indicating it was the front.

Length: 15.1mm  
Width: 12mm

Technology: Stone, dark grey (serpentine?)

Condition: Fragment, missing most of original figurine

Online data record:  http://opencontext.org/subjects/14875_DT_Spatial

Unpublished
**DT-9**

*Museum:* Excavation storage  
*Excav. No:* dt 496  
*Type:* LH.2B

*Findspot:* 1997 season, Op IV lot 1501, C-5 phase  
*Stratigraphic Date:* late Halaf

*Archaeological Context:* Loose fill within and below the plow zone, modern intrusions, including a Byzantine or Roman Coin\(^{180}\) found in this lot.\(^{181}\)

*Description:* lower torso fragment of a standing pendant figurine. Smooth and polished with smooth beveled edge on front, flatter and less polished on back. Bi-conically pierced off center at bottom edge.

*Length:* 40mm  
*Width:* 40mm

*Technology:* Stone, grey green serpentinite, cut ground, polished pierced.

*Condition:* broken at waist, missing upper half. Damaged surfaces, probably from plow. Some battering of left lower edge, perhaps from prehistoric use?

*Online data record:* [http://opencontext.org/media/1937_DT_Res](http://opencontext.org/media/1937_DT_Res)

*Drawing:* B. Campbell, Domuztepe Project

*Photos:* S. Campbell, Domuztepe Project

---

\(^{180}\) Data record for the coin: [http://opencontext.org/subjects/14765_DT_Spatial](http://opencontext.org/subjects/14765_DT_Spatial)

**DT-10**

*Museum:* Maraş  
*Excav. No:* dt4753  
*Type:* EH.Type unknown  

*Findspot:* 2005 season, Op I, lot 3980, C-3 phase  
*Stratigraphic Date:* early Halaf  

*Archaeological Context:* from the “ditch”, which was a feature created by successive scooping across a lateral east west direction, and filled with wet loamy soil.

*Description:* Figurine head fragment, perhaps of a male. Deeply drilled eyes, which probably once held inlay. Large squared nose. Deeply incised lines defining headdress and wavy lines on side of face, perhaps representing a facial hair? Jutting chin is left smooth. Traces of red paint on headdress and back of head.

*Length:* 28mm  
*Width:* 20.7mm  
*Thick:* 17.8 at chin to back of head  
*Diameter of eyes:* 4mm

*Technology:* Clay, with vegetable and mineral inclusions, very well fired. Pinched, modeled, smoothed incised then painted after incision with a red wash. Tool marks visible under low magnification.

*Condition:* Broken off at lower neck, missing inlay, though traces still remain inside holes, appearing to be a resinous material which may have been material to attach inlay. Only traces of paint remain, heavily damaged by depositional staining. Under low magnification, left side appears more worn than right side.

*Comparanda:* CB-40 has similar facial decoration on cheeks, forehead.
Online data record: http://www.domuztepe.org/?page_id=81DT 9
Drawings, photos: Courtesy S. Campbell, Domuztepe Project

DT-11

Museum: Maraş          Excav. No: dt3591          Type: LH.Type unknown
Findspot: 2002 season, Op. I, lot 3192, C-5 phase         Stratigraphic Date: late Halaf

Description: Phallus with scrotum, rounded top, long shaft graduating to thicker at base with two uneven testicles. Incised around tip of penis head and testicles. Viewed another direction, looks similar to a seated female figurine. Sits unsupported on base

Height: 87.8mm
Width: 27.6mm-35mm
Thick: 80.4mm at base; 26.8mm at tip

Technology: Sandstone, 10YR 7/3-7/4 a very pale brown surface, left rough. Probably worked from an existing pebble already naturally suggesting shape.

Condition: Complete, chipped off right testicle, and on back, possibly from pounding from use as a tool?

Publication: Gauld, Campbell and Carter 2003, fig 15.
Photos: Courtesy S. Campbell, Domuztepe Project
**DT-12**

*Museum:* Maraş  
*Excav. No:* dt4174  
*Findspot:* 2004 season, Op I, lot 3165, C-9 phase  
*Type:* LH.3A  
*Stratigraphic Date:* Late Halaf  
*Archaeological context:* Directly below the surface within the plow zone, baulk 24 removal

*Description:* Anthropomorphic vessel representing a standing or walking female. Flaring neck represents head, faint painted details remain, including left eye and hair or headdress. Wide shoulders with thin molded arms molded along sides, bent at elbow, hands with articulated fingers outstretched under small pointed appliqué breasts attached to center of chest. Wide rounded square torso attached to thick legs and small rounded feet. Right toe end of foot slightly up, giving the impression that the figure is walking. Decorated with painted horizontal bands of two horizontal lines intersected with parallel diagonal lines, resembling a net or knotted string, three bands at ankle, two bands each at knees and hips. Parallel chevrons at pubic area, ending at...
hip bands, perhaps representing clothing, jewelry, body paint or tattooing. Stands on both feet without support.

*Height:* 1900mm  
*Width:* 964mm  
*Thick:* 568mm  
*Painted bands thicknesses:* 63mm at ankles, 53mm at knees, 53mm at hips  
*Height of jar neck:* 50mm

*Technology:* Ceramic, 7.5 YR 7/3 a pink surface with a black core, with 7.5 YR 3/1 a black paint (now fugitive) Formed out of several pieces of slab-formed, perhaps parts were made in a mold. Appears to be low fired ceramic, a ware commonly found at late Halaf Domuztepe

*Condition:* Found in many pieces, modern reconstruction with many portions, particularly on the back, missing.

*Comparanda:* DT-13, DT-14, DT-15,  
Yarim Tepe II (Merpert and Munchaev 1987, pl. VII, VIII: 1981, Merpert, Munchaev and Bader 1981, 41, fig XI)  
Canhassan I (French 2010 figs 31: 1, 2)

*Publications:* Campbell 2004: 4, cover.  
Carter and Campbell 2005: 315-316; fig. 10, 11 top

*Drawings, Photos* S. Campbell, Domuztepe Project
**DT-13**

*Museum:* Excavation storage  
*Excav. No:* dt5389  
*Type:* LH.3A  

*Stratigraphic Date:* early Halaf

---

*Description:* Foot fragment of a figurine vessel. Painted with a wash over front of foot and ankle.

*Height:* 34.1mm  
*Length:* 68.5mm heel to toe  
*Width:* 40.6mm at ankle, 19.5mm at toe  
*Thick:* 8.5mm vessel thickness.

*Technology:* Clay, red burnished ceramic 10YR 7/3 a very pale brown surface, Inside shows build-up of clay suggesting that this portion was created on a mold? Painted with 10YR 5/4 a weak red paint wash. This ceramic ware is a common fabric type at Domuztepe.

*Condition:* Fragment, broken at base and ankle, missing sole of foot and rest of body. Wear evident at toe and heel.

*Comparanda:* DT-12, DT-14

*Unpublished*
**DT-14**

*Museum:* Excavation storage  
*Excav. No:* dt1187  
*Type:* LH.3A  
*Stratigraphic Date:* late Halaf?

*Description:* Fragment of a modeled form, possibly a figurine. Fragment is in the shape of a hammer or a foot, Original shape unknown. Has an attachment scar at upper break. Painted on one side, some sides smoothed and curved, with others left rough. It is also possible that this could be a jar handle or similar fragment from a different ceramic item.

*Length:* 43.8mm, 25.4 resting on a surface  
*Width:* 29mm  
*Thick:* 13mm  

*Technology:* Clay, 7.5YR 7/4 a pink surface painted with a 5 YR 5/4 a reddish brown paint. Fired ceramic.

*Condition:* broken at both ends, worn.

*Online data record:* [http://opencontext.org/subjects/14352_DT_Spatial](http://opencontext.org/subjects/14352_DT_Spatial)

*Unpublished*

*Drawing, Photos* S. Campbell, Domuztepe Project
DT-15

*Museum:* Excavation storage  
*Excav. No:* dt1454  
*Type:* LH.3A

*Findspot:* 1998 season, Op I, lot 1831, C-9 phase  
*Stratigraphic Date:* late Halaf

*Archaeological Context:* Loose fill surrounding cluster of small tholoi

*Description:* Possible fragment of leg or other portion of a figurine vessel. A protrusion mid shaft of hollow tube-like structure may represent a knee or elbow. Painted in one thin (3mm) and one wide stripe at lower break. It is also possible that this could be the leg of a zoomorphic pot.

*Length:* 60mm  
*Width:* 30mm

*Technology:* Clay, Halaf painted ware, 7.5 YR 8/3-light yellow orange surface, painted with two bands of dark reddish grey.

*Online data record:* [http://opencontext.org/subjects/14604_DT_Spatial](http://opencontext.org/subjects/14604_DT_Spatial)

*Drawing:* B. Campbell, Domuztepe excavation project.

*Unpublished*

*Photos:* S. Campbell, Domuztepe excavation project
DT-16

Museum: Maraş Etulük    Excav. No: dt1902    Type: LH.2E
Findspot: 1998 season, Op I, lot 1921, early C-7 phase    Stratigraphic Date: late Halaf
Archaeological Context: Spillover onto the western slope of the Death Pit, consisting of ashy fill which caps the death pit, integrated with many small finds.

Description: Bead, pendant or practice piece fragment. May be unfinished, or a fragment of an unknown original shape. Two piercings, one complete on long side, one incomplete on shorter side. Some grooves and incisions, and corners rounded from grinding and polishing. At one angle, it resembles human legs and feet.

Length: 18.8mm
Width 19.2mm
Thick: 13.8mm

Technology: Clear quartz with bits of calcite throughout, which was cut, ground and incised from an irregularly shaped lump. Two attempts at piercings, unfinished, probably because of a break during second piercing.

Comparanda: CB-33, TK-4 (a seated figurine with same lumpy undefined torso)
Online data record: http://opencontext.org/subjects/14259_DT_Spatial

Unpublished

Photos, drawing: Courtesy S. Campbell, Domuztepe Project

Note: while this was accepted to the Etulük collection, it is actually in the excavation storage.
DT-17

Museum: Excavation storage  
Excav. No: dt4259  
Type: EH.2B

Findspot: 2004 season Op I, lot 3702, “Ditch”, C-3 phase  
Stratigraphic Date: early Halaf

Description: Pendant of head and shoulders, flat topped head pierced at center. On front, traces of paint on either side of hole, perhaps representing eyes. Successive incisions, most vertical on a slight diagonal from mid-face to chest. Double parallel incisions at neck. Front side is flatter than back.

Height: 18.2mm  
Width: at shoulders, 173; at neck, 10.4mm; at top of head, 14.4mm  
Thick: 8.9mm  
Diameter of hole: 1.7mm

Technology: Limestone 7.5YR 8/2 a pinkish white surface, which is cut (or broken), smoothed, incised and conically pierced. Painted with 5YR 4/1 a dark grey paint, probably before painting and piercing.

Condition: Worn, including on edges which may or may not be breaks. Chipped on left shoulder. This might be complete.

Unpublished

Photo: E. Belcher
**DT-18**

*Museum:* Maraş 6.10.95  
*Excav. No:* dt171  
*Type:* LH.4C  

*Findspot:* 1995 season, sounding, lot 540  
*Stratigraphic Date:* late Halaf  

*Archaeological Context:* found loose in soil, phase C-8

*Description:* Flat notched pendant, notches appear to delineate three fingers and a thumb. Pierced through the ‘wrist’ which also serves as a shank for suspension on a cord. Incised design of parallel crossing diagonal lines across palm and inside fingers.

*Length:* 19.5mm  
*Width:* 10.84  
*Thick:* 2.75mm

*Technology:* Stone, black, serpentinite.

*Condition:* Complete

*Publication:* Gauld, Campbell and Carter 2003, fig. 21 bottom  
Carter 2010, 172, fig. 6: 1  
Denham 2013, number DZ-012

*Drawing:* Domuztepe Project

*Photos, drawings:* Courtesy S. Campbell, Domuztepe Project
DT-19

Museum: Maras
Excav. No: dt1822
Type: EH.4B
Findspot: 1999 season, Operation I, lot 2719, phase C-5
Stratigraphic Date: late Halaf

Description: Foot-shaped pendant seal, formed by a domelike shape, pierced at apex. Flat sealing face incised with crossing horizontal, vertical and diagonal parallel lines.

Length: 20.27mm
Width: 10.05mm
Thick: 11.65mm

Technology: Stone, serpentinite, black with white mottling.
Condition: Complete

Comparanda: YT II (Merpert and Munchaev, 1993, fig. 8.20-3)

Publications: Carter 2010, 172, fig. 6.3. (drawing from there)
Denham 2013, number DZ-049

Drawing: Domuztepe Project

Photos: Courtesy S. Campbell, Domuztepe Project
**DT-20**

*Museum*: Maraş  
*Excav. No*: dt303  
*Type*: EH.4B  

*Findspot*: 1996 season, Op II, lot 848, phase C-4  
*Stratigraphic Date*: early Halaf  

*Archaeological Context*: SE Base of mound excavations, found loose in fill.

*Description*: Quadrangle shaped conical seal, vaguely in the shape of a foot. Pierced at apex. Incised design of parallel diagonal lines bisected with a central line. At thicker end of incised surface, more short incisions may represent toes.

*Length*: [12mm]  
*Width*: [11mm]  
*Thick*: [5mm]

*Technology*: Stone, light blue green [apatite?], Cut, ground, polished, pierced and incised.

*Publication*: Carter 2010, 172-73, fig 6.2 (Illustration source from there)  
Denham 2013, number DZ-020

*Drawings, photos*: Courtesy S. Campbell, Domuztepe Project
DT-21
Museum: Maraş
Excav. No: dt4746
Type: EH.4B

Findspot: 2005 season, Operation I, Lot 3980, phase C-3
Stratigraphic Date: early Halaf

Description: Foot shaped pendant stamp seal. Ankle and foot represented with narrow heel and wide toes delineated. At ‘sole’ a flat surface incised with single line central line crossed with zig zag lines. At wider part shorter lines at edge may delineate toes.

Length: 17.03mm
Width: 15.92mm
Thick: 7.58mm

Technology: Stone, Red [hematite?]

Condition: Complete

Comparanda: TK-14

Publication: Denham 2013, number DZ-085

Drawing, Photos: S. Campbell, Domuztepe Project
**DT-22**

*Archaeological Context:* found loose in the soil, phase C-3

*Description:* Foot shaped stamp seal. Rounded ankle and foot with pointed toe and heel. Pierced at top of ‘ankle’. At base or ‘sole’ of foot, flat surface is incised with crossing diagonal parallel lines.

*Length:* 16.72mm  
*Width:* 18.47mm  
*Thick:* 6.4mm

*Technology:* Stone, grey serpentine, cut, ground polished, incised and pierced.

*Comparanda:* TK-14

*Publication:* Denham 2013, number DZ-090

*Drawings, Photos:* S. Campbell, Domuztepe project.
Kerkuşti Höyük Figurines

KerkH-1
Museum: Mard?  Excav. No: unknown  Type: LH.2B
Findspot unknown  Stratigraphic Date: late Halaf

Description: Figurine torso fragment of flat figurine, lower torso only remaining. Slim waist with outline expanding out at hips and edges of pubic triangle. Painted in a brownish red paint, one thick stripe around waist. Thick single or double line delineating the pubic triangle, dotted within triangle, suggesting a decorated pudenda? Incision follows outline of triangle. Appears to be another thick painted line running perpendicular to outer upper thigh.

Size unknown

Technology: Clay, possibly fired, molded, smoothed, incised and painted.

Photo: from Sarıaltun 2009a

KerkH-2
Museum: Mard?  Excav. No: unknown  Type : LH.Type unknown
Findspot unknown  Stratigraphic Date: late Halaf

Description: Figurine torso fragment.
Kazane Höyük Figurine

**KH-1**

*Museum:* Urfa  
*Excav. No:* unknown  
*Type:* LH. Type unknown  
*Stratigraphic Date:* late Halaf

*Findspot unknown*

*Description:* Figurine torso fragment

---

182 For more information on this figurine fragment see McCarty forthcoming.
APPENDIX B: Catalog of Halaf Figurines from the Western Jazirah (Syria)

*Museum Abbreviations Used in this Appendix and Locations:*

- Ash: Ashmolean Museum, Oxford, UK
- Alep: Aleppo Archaeological Museum, Syria
- BM: British Museum, London, UK
- DezZ: Deir ez-Zor Archaeological Museum, Syria
- Fitz: Fitzwilliam Museum, Cambridge, UK
- Homs: Homs Archaeological Museum, Homs, Syria
- IofA: Institute of Archaeology, University of London, UK
- McD: McDonald Archaeological Institute, Cambridge University, UK
- MAA: Museum of Archaeology and Anthropology, Cambridge University, UK
- Raq: Raqqa Archaeological Museum, Syria
- THmus: Tell Halaf Museum, Berlin (destroyed in November 1943)

*Site Abbreviations and Modern Locations*

- Arj: Arjoune (Orontes, Homs, Syria)
- Bey: Tell Beydar (Khabur, Syria)
- CB: Chagar Bazar (Balikh, Syria)
- KeshS: Khirbet esh-Shenef (Balikh, Syria)
- KK: Tell Kashkashok (Khabur, Syria)
- TA: Tell Aqab (Khabur, Syria)
- TH: Tell Halaf (Khabur, Syria)
- SAB: Tell Sabi Abyad (Balikh, Syria)
- UQ: Umm Qseir (Khabur, Syria)
Tell Sabi Abyad

SAB-1

Museum: Raq 76  
Excav. No: SAB 86-H1  
Type: EH.2B

Findspot: 1986 season, NE mound, square T4, Stratum 1  
Stratigraphic Date: early Halaf

Archaeological context: Found in an ash-filled pit cut into earlier debris levels. The lower half was found 30cm below the upper half in the pit.

Description: Standing female figure, with hole between shoulders to accommodate neck and head. Flat arm stub-protrusions, large conical breasts attached. Slim waist, with four horizontal lines incised around it’s circumference. Flat lower torso, square in plan, with very large pubic triangle incised, only upper thighs of legs represented. Painted with black paint, dots on breasts, solidly on pubic triangle and in a herringbone pattern under two parallel vertical lines. Lower part is polished by handling. Appears to stand without support on base

Length: [63]mm
Width: [30]mm
Thick: [20]mm

Technology: Clay, pinched, flattened and formed, incised then painted.

Condition: Complete, paint has flaked off the surface, wear on sides from handling.

Comparanda: FH-1, FH-3, GH-1, ÇT-2

Note: I was unable to study this figurine while I was in Syria as it was in a travelling exhibit (Fortin 1999)

Publications:  
Fortin 1999, 272, cat. no: 266.  
ESEA, pl. 3  
Roualt and Masetti-Roualt 1993, 433 cat no. 94, ill., 258.  
(shown with lower torso attached to upper torso backwards.)  
Akkermans 1989/90: 296
Akkermans 1989, 287, 293, pl. VIII: 3 (illustration from this source)
Akkermans 1987b, 33, pl. IV: 2
Akkermans 1987a, 12, 23, fig. 12

**SAB-2**

*Museum:* Raq?

*Excav. No:* F93-12

*Type:* EH.2C

*Findspot:* 1988 season Level 3, found in oven CC

*Stratigraphic Date:* early Halaf

*Description:* Flattened cylindrical torso fragment with protrusion at chest or face, perhaps representing a nose and eye sockets. Small hole pierced at neck or top of head, perhaps for the insertion of a head or headdress?

*Length:* [41]mm

*Width:* [15]mm

*Thick:* [14]mm

*Condition:* Complete?

*Publication:* Collet 1996, 409, fig 6.3: 9 (illustration from this source)
**SAB-3**

*Museum:* Raq?  
*Excav. No:* SAB 88 O-89e  
*Type:* EH.2C  

*Findspot:* 1988 season, level 3, building I, Room 11  
*Stratigraphic Date:* early Halaf

*Description:* Skirted, lower torso fragment, flattened, oval in plan. Flares out in front at base, perhaps representing feet and probably stabilizing figurine so that it can stand on flat base.

*Length:* [40]mm  
*Width:* [28]mm  
*Thick:* [14]mm  

*Publication:* Collet 1996, 409, fig. 6.3: 11 (illustration from this source)
**SAB-4**

*Museum:* Raqqa?  
*Excav. No:* SAB 88 O-89a  
*Type:* EH.2C  
*Findspot:* 1988 season, level 3, building I, room 11  
*Stratigraphic Date:* early Halaf

*Description:* Long cylindrical torso, slight arm stubs represent shoulders or arms, another bump represents head. Base slightly flairs out at the front, perhaps representing feet? Does not appear to have a flat base.

*Length:* [10.7]mm  
*Width:* [33]mm

*Condition:* Complete, but chipped at top and bottom?

*Publication:* Collet 1996 p. 409, fig. 6.3: 13 (illustration from this source)  
Akkermans and Le Mière, 1992, fig. 17: 12.
Description: Upper flat torso fragment with protruding shoulders or arm stubs with pinched in waist.

Length: [45]mm
Width: [31]mm
Thick: [19]mm

Comparanda: TK-3

Publication: Collet 1996, 409, fig 6.3: 10 (illustration from this source)
**SAB-6**

*Museum:* Raq?  
*Excav. No:* SAB88 O-89b  
*Type:* EH.2A  

*Findspot:* 1988 season, level 3, building 1, room 11  
*Stratigraphic Date:* early Halaf

*Description:* Standing figure with straight columnar lower torso, flatter upper torso. Slight pinched out arm or shoulder protrusions. Does not appear to have flat base.

*Length:* [69]mm  
*Width:* [32]mm  
*Thick:* [18]mm  

*Condition:* Broken off at neck.

*Comparanda:* TK-5, TK-10, TA-7, TA-8

Collet 1996 p. 409, fig. 6.3.12 (illustration from this source)
**SAB-7**

*Museum:* Raq?

*Excav. No:* SAB88 o-89c

*Type:* EH.2D

*Findspot:* 1988 season, level 3, building I, room 11

*Stratigraphic Date:* early Halaf

*Description:* Lower torso fragment of kneeling figure. Wide hips broken at base. Incised with two lines around waist or neck.

*Length:* [33]mm

*Width:* [43]mm

*Thick:* [22]mm

*Condition:* Broken at waist and base

*Comparanda:* TK-1, TK-8, GH-2

SAB pre Halaf level 6, Akkermans and Verhoven 1995, fig. 15: 1-3, 7-9

*Publications:* Akkermans and le Miére 1992 fig. 17: 11.

Collet 1996, 409, fig. 6.3: 14 (illustration from this source)
**SAB-8**

*Museum*: Raq?

*Excav. No*: F93-2

*Type*: EH.2A

*Findspot*: Level 3, found in ash pit DC

*Stratigraphic date*: early Halaf

*Description*: lower torso of kneeling figure, protrusion at base, representing feet or knees.

*Length*: [29]mm

*Width*: [43]mm at base

*Condition*: Broken off at neck or waist.

*Comparanda*: TK-1

*Publication*: Collet 1996, Fig. 6.3.15 (illustration from this source)
Umm Qseir

**UQ-1**

- **Museum**: Hass?
- **Excav. No**: unknown
- **Findspot**: 1996 season, square G4, loose in fill
- **Type**: EH.4A
- **Stratigraphic Date**: early Halaf

*Description*: Small stone pendant-seal-figurine of standing figure with bent arms, extended legs and head defined by carving and incision. Pierced perpendicular to head with hole for suspension. Deep notching separates legs and arms from overall form, which is rounded on one face and ground flat on the other then incised by diagonally parallel incisions on arms, and crossing parallel incisions on the legs. The head is undecorated.

- **Height**: [20mm]
- **Width**: [10.7mm]
- **Thick**: [4.8mm]

*Technology*: Stone, white (limestone?), carved, ground and polished, notched, pierced and incised.

*Condition*: Broken off right lower leg, otherwise complete.


(illustration from this source)

*Comparanda*: TK-13, FH-4, ÇT-14
Chagar Bazar

CB-1

Museum: Alep M7658 and 1661    Excav. No: T552    Type: LH.1A

Findspot: 1935 season, Area M, level 8, ‘figurine deposit’    Stratigraphic Date: late Halaf

Archaeological Context: Level 8 figurine group concentration.

Description: Seated female, arms supporting pointed breasts sitting high on chest, hands meet at sternum. Long slim torso, tapering inward at chest, flaring outward at hips. Wide calves, with bent knees and flat calves clasped together, pointed toe[s].

Painted with parallel stripes: three horizontal stripes on upper chest, extending around shoulders but not to back, ten stripes on each front of each arm, five rayed stripes on each breast, three short horizontal stripes between ribs on stomach. Calves are painted with six horizontal stripes each bisected by a vertical line from knee to ankle. Pubic area painted, with two parallel horizontal stripes extending from behind legs around back at hips. Sits on pinched-in flat base without support.

Height: 86.3mm
Width: 50mm at arms, 28mm at waist, 47.5mm at hips, 24.9mm at toes
Thick: 21mm at waist, 29.4mm at breasts, 42.7mm at legs

Technology: Clay, lightly baked with small vegetable and mineral inclusions, 2.5YR 5/6 a light red on surface. Torso, legs joined, arms and breasts added on pinched on bottom while still plastic. Painted with 10R 4/4 a weak red paint.

Condition: Broken off at neck, missing head. Broken off right toe (modern reconstruction). Some chipping over all, possibly chipped in baking.

Publication: Mallowan 1936: 8, 21, 86, fig. 5:4 (in fig 5: 6 figurine is represented without decoration sitting on a disc)
CB-2

Museum: Fitz ANE.7.1948   Excav. No: T564   Type: LH.1A
Findspot: 1934-5 season, Area M, levels 7-8   Stratigraphic Date: late Halaf
Archaeological Context: Level 8 figurine concentration?

Description: Seated female, arms encircling small stuck-on conical breasts, hands clasped at sternum, knees pulled up to stomach. Peg head, with pinched nose and eye sockets. Slim torso tapering out at hips and arms. Flat base allows figurine to sit without support.

Note: Photographed sitting on top of) clay disc ANE.56.1966 (Mallowan 1935, fig 5: 7). This disc was deposited in the museum with CB-6.

Length: 64.1mm
Width: 37.1mm at arms, 29.9mm at legs, 21.2mm at waist, 8.9mm at head
Thick: 10.9mm at head, 14.2mm at stomach, 26.2mm at knees, 33.3mm at toes

Technology: Clay, 7.5YR 5/3 a dull brown surface, 7.5YR 4/1-3/1 a brownish gray to brownish black burned or stained surface areas. Made in parts which were added together and seams smoothed over when still plastic.

Condition: broken off top of head, head, upper front and right side burned in antiquity. Some surface cracking on sides and back. Some wear on front of knees and sides. Signs of scraping with tool over surface.

Publication: Mallowan 1936, 21; fig. 5: 7
Noted also in Mallowan 1935 excavation notebook, p.9

Museum catalog record:

http://www.fitzmuseum.cam.ac.uk/opac/search/cataloguedetail.html?&priref=87540&_func=xsit&_limit=10

Photos: downloaded from museum website 2007 ©Fitzwilliam Museum, Cambridge
Provenience: A. L. Reckitt was a financial supporter of the Chagar Bazar Excavations (Mallowan 1936, 1). This figurine was given to him by Mallowan for his collections and was later donated to the Fitzwilliam Museum. (provenience also available on catalog record: www.fitzmuseum.cam.ac.uk/opac).
CB-3

Museum: Ashm 1936.90  
Excav. no: T545  
Type: LH.1A  

Findspot: 1935 season, Area M, level 8 ‘figurine deposit  
Stratigraphic Date: late Halaf  
Archaeological Context: Level 8 figurine concentration.

Description: Seated female figurine, arms encircling breasts and knee[s] drawn up to stomach. Neck slightly narrows at head, with pinched nose and hollows for eye sockets. High flat and headdress or hair squared at top. Hands attached to each other between large pointed breasts. Slim flat torso tapering wider at hips, buttocks. Pointed toe[s] extend below base, so that figurine
would need supporting device to sit upright, falls backwards when placed on a surface because
the legs hang down. It does sit without support on ‘stool’ deposited with it in the Ashmolean
Museum which may not be from the same archaeological context.

Carefully painted in two colors. Top and back of the headdress painted dark reddish grey, front
of headdress left unpainted. Very large bovine type eyes painted on either side of nose. Outline
of eye in red, pupil and lashes in reddish grey. 5-8 lashes top and bottom of each eye. Three
chevrons at upper chest alternating red, grey, red extending across clavicle and toward each other
at the back, but not connecting. Three horizontal stripes alternating red, grey, red on upper arms
and shoulders. Two red horizontal stripes on upper breasts, traces of a stripe on left calf, though
too fragmentary to reconstruct. Painted solidly with red on toe[s], perhaps representing shoes.

Length: 12.2mm toes to head, 84.3m from surface when seated.
Width: 522 at arms, 220 at waist, 10 at head

Technology: clay 10YR 7/3 a very pale brown surface. Head, limbs and breasts very carefully
formed and attached to torso while still wet. Very carefully smoothed surface, then covered with
7.5YR 7/2, a pinkish gray slip, then painted with stripes 2.5YR 4/6 – 2.5YR 5/6, a red paint
stripes and 2.5YR 4/1 a dark reddish-grey paint.

Condition: Figurine once broken in two at upper torso, modern repair restoration to whole. Left
leg broken off at upper thigh. Large chips off lower back, both sides of head dress. Figurine
appears to have been in contact with fire or burning on the left hip [after leg broken off and chip
taken off lower back] and left elbow. Some (post depositional?) staining on the lower stomach
and between crotch area, extending onto break.

Publications: Moorey 2004: 17
Moorey 2003, pl. I.
Moorey 1987: pl. 16
Ucko 1968:345, fig 179 (but reconstructed as complete with two extant legs),
Goff 1963: fig. 120;
Mallowan 1936: 19, 21, pl. I: 3, fig. 5:2

gsea&sec=&dtn=15&sfn=Object,Accession%20Number%28s%29,Period,Materia
l,Region&cpa=1&rpos=0&key=halaf

Photo: E. Belcher, with permission ©Ashmolean Museum, Oxford University
**CB-4**

*Museum:* BM125381 and 1935.12.7 366  
*Excav. No:* T548  
*Type:* LH.1A

*Findspot:* 1935 season, Area M, level 8, ‘figurine deposit’  
*Stratigraphic Date:* Late Halaf

*Archaeological Context:* Level 8 figurine concentration.

*Description:* Seated female figurine, arms encircling breasts, hand[s clasped at sternum]. Very thin torso and flat back (lays on back without rolling). Arms sweep down from shoulder supporting the breasts which jut out very erect. Slim lower torso tapers out to wide thighs. Lower torso very flat, with buttocks not represented with end of spine and feet on same plane to create very flat base. Legs are pulled up to stomach and knees together with tops of thighs abbreviated and shins shown flat and wide with pointed feet, separated.

Painted with stripes and washes in same grey-brown paint traces on front upper chest of a stripe around lower neck. [worn on upper back so no sign of counterweight] Two or 3 stripes around upper arms. 3 stripes around wrist[s]. Solid circles around tips of breasts; 3 vertical wavy lines each on tops of breasts (=stretch marks?). Lower abdomen and pubic area painted with a solid wash, spilling onto the tops of thighs extending around back in a double stripe loose girdle. 3 stripes around tips of feet-ankles

*Length:* [80]

*Technology:* Clay, buff colored, very fine with few very small mineral inclusions. Torso formed, with arms, breasts and legs attached while still plastic. Breasts attached directly to chest and not over shoulders. Painted with a grey-black paint, now fugitive.

*Condition:* Broken off at neck, missing head, wear visible at this break. Broken off at left wrist, missing right hand. Broken at left shoulder, modern reattachment. Large break at right lower torso with diagonal crack, front and back, modern repair. Chip off inner left leg. Very worn, paint coming off in several area.

*Publications:* Mallowan 1936: 21, fig 5: 3 (described as “markings in red paint”)  
Mallowan 1935 Chagar Bazar notebook p. 6 (described as “Painted jet black”).:  
Collon 1995: 46, fig 24 left;  
Reade 1991: 17, fig 16.  
Trümpler 2001
Museum catalog record:
http://www.britishmuseum.org/research/collection_online/collection_object_details.aspx?
onobjectId=388838&partId=1&place=33840&object=22722|22727&matcult=15934&page=1

Photos: A. Fletcher ©Trustees of the British Museum
Description: Seated female, arms supporting breast[s], hands clasped at sternum, right over left. Long large breast[s] Knees bent and pulled up to stomach, quite close to arms. Pointed toes, decorated with clay appliqué representing shoes or sandals. Very smooth surface, possibly burnished. Painted, only slight traces remain on right arm, right foot at break at neck. Has a very flat base, on which it can sit without support, though leaning backwards. Very flat back on which it can lay without rolling.
**Note:** Figurine is cataloged together with a clay disc, 1936.167 B said to be for it to sit on. On which it does sits securely without support. (see photo above)

**Length:** 56mm  
**Width:** 14.7mm at neck break, 44mm at arms, 24.4mm at waist, 36.6 at thighs  
**Thick:** 35.7mm at toes to back, 26.6mm back to breast[s], 11.9mm at neck break

**Technology:** Baked Clay, very fine with some tiny inclusions, 10YR 7/3 a very pale brown surface and core (at breaks). Formed in parts attached to the slim torso. [Head] attached to neck, arms and breast[s] attached at shoulder and chest, legs and buttocks attached to base. Legs pulled around to attach to each other at the inner thigh while leather hard, stress marks at join. Covered with clay appliqué strip[s] at toes attachment scars visible. Originally painted with 5YR 5/4 a reddish brown (with stripes?) only traces remain on right leg and arm.

**Condition:** Broken at neck, chest missing head, left breast, some clay appliqués broken off toes, attachment scars remain. Otherwise complete.

**Comparanda:** Bey-1

**Publication:** Mallowan 1936: 21, fig. 5: 5  
Mallowan, *Chagar Bazar 1935 notebook*, (p. 5).

**Museum catalog record:** Recorded as “Mother Goddess, Goddess, Figurine, Stool”  

**Photos:** E. Belcher, with permission ©Museum of Archaeology and Anthropology, Cambridge University
CB-6

Museum: Fitz ANE.55.1966  Excav. No: F207 [?]
Findspot unknown

Type: LH.1A
Typological Date: late Halaf

Description: Seated female figure with knees bent and drawn up to stomach, pointed toes. Arms encircling pointed breasts with hands clasped at sternum. Slim torso, and flat back tapering out at hips and shoulders. Flat base allows it to sit without support.

Note: said to have been found with a clay disc, now Fitz. ANE.56.1966, which was photographed under CB-2 by museum.

Length: 64.2mm
Width: 30.4mm at shoulders, 32.2mm at hips
Thick: 28.7mm at knees, 29.2mm at toes

Technology: clay, 10YR 7/2 a dull yellow orange surface. Limbs and [head] attached to torso while still plastic.

Condition: Modern restorations of head, breasts and parts of legs.

Unpublished

CB-7

*Museum*: Alep M7668 and 3713  
*Excav. No*: T55  
*Type*: LH.1A  
*Findspot*: 1935 season, Area M, level 12, at 18.60m  
*Typological Date*: late Halaf

*Description*: Seated female with arm[s] encircling [breasts], hand[s] clasped at sternum. Knees bent, drawn up and together, pointed toe[s] apart. Very slim, flat torso, leaning backward slightly. Painted with wide stripes: one stripe around neck, three stripes on upper arm[s] with two upper stripes extending around to back. Remnants of paint suggest that breasts may have been painted with rayed design. Single stripe around waist, three horizontal stripes below each knee, extending to outer thighs. Pubic area painted. Sits on base without support.

*Length*: 62.4mm, 55.9mm seated  
*Width*: 11.1mm at neck, 34.6mm at arms, 22.1mm at waist, 30.5mm at hips  
*Thick*: 17.1mm at arms, 11.3mm at waist, 33.6mm butt to toe.

*Technology*: Clay, lightly baked 7.5YR 7/3 a pink surface. Flat slab-like torso formed with lower legs, arms, breasts and head attached when still plastic. Surface was then smoothed and painted 7.5YR 5/4 a brown paint on arms and legs; 7.5YR 3/1 a very dark grey paint on neck.

*Condition*: Broken off at neck, left upper arm and lower right leg. Missing head and neck, right lower arm, breasts, and right foot.

*Unpublished*
CB-8
Museum: Alep M7659 and 1662  
Excav. No: T568  
Type: LH.1A  
Findspot: 1935 season, Area M, level 8, 'terracotta deposit'  
Stratigraphic Date: late Halaf  
Archaeological Context: Level 8 figurine concentration.

Description: Female figurine, arm[s] encircling breast[s], hand[s] clasped at sternum. Wearing headdress of appliqué clay coil, pinched nose, pointy breast[s]. Slim, long torso. Painted with stripes: traces of two stripes on upper chest, shoulder and two stripes on arm[s].

Length: 71.2mm  
Width: 13mm at headdress, 39mm at arms, 21.2mm at waist

Technology: Clay, burned (during deposition?) 10YR 3/1, A very dark gray surface. Very slim torso formed, neck and head, legs, arms and breasts attached when still plastic. Leg attachment scars show that finger impression was made to attach legs. Breasts were attached over arms at armpit. Painted with a now fugitive paint, and only slightly darker in color.

Condition: broken off right arm and chest, at thigh attachments. Missing right lower arm and breast, both legs. Appears burned, possibly from depositional damage?

Publication: Mallowan 1936, fig. 5: 8
CB-9
Museum: Alep M7669 and 2714 Excav. No: T562 Type: LH.1A
Findspot: 1935 season, Area M, level 8, ‘terracotta deposit’ Stratigraphic Date: late Halaf
Archaeological Context: level 8 figurine concentration

Description: Seated female figurine, knees bent and drawn up, clasped together with feet apart. Arm[s] supporting pointed breast[s], hand[s] clasped at sternum. Slim torso with a slight stomach. Single punctuation on stomach, representing navel. Painted with a dark wash over leg, hip and thigh. A lighter wash painted over stomach breast. Painted with stripes: one around right wrist, very faint stripes on arm[s]. Three stripes around hip and joining to one stripe around stomach area. Inverted triangle with stripe ending at apex on foot, representing shoes or sandals. Sits on base without support.

Length: 90.7mm
Width: 43.2mm at arms, 31.3mm at waist, 48.5mm at hips
Thick: 55mm butt to toe, 26.3mm at breast, 16.2mm at waist

Technology: Clay, baked, with very small vegetable inclusions, 10YR 7/3 a very pale brown surface. Torso, [head] and arm[s] and legs attached to each other when still plastic, surface carefully smoothed and then painted, 2.5 YR a reddish brown wash and 10R 5/4 a red paint on feet (perhaps originally the same color but lighter and worn on other stripes).

Condition: Broken off left side, possibly intentionally smashed in antiquity. Missing head and neck, left breast, left arm, left leg and upper back.

Unpublished
**CB-10**

*Museum:* Alep 7667 and 3712  
*Excav. No:* T558  
*Type:* LH.1A  
*Findspot:* 1935 season, Area M. level unknown  
*Typological Date:* late Halaf

![Image of a seated female figurine](image)

*Description:* Seated female figurine with arms supporting [breasts] Painted with stripes: four distinct vertical stripes on arm[s] ending in three horizontal stripes over shoulder and at elbow. One wide stripe around waist, extending around back.

*Length:* 55.3mm  
*Width:* 14.7mm at neck, 42mm at arm, 23.2mm at waist, 57.5mm at hips  
*Thick:* 29.5mm at waist, 31mm at buttocks

*Technology:* Clay, baked, with fine vegetable and mineral inclusions 5Y 8/2 a pale yellow surface. Torso, arms legs and head formed separately and joined when plastic, buttocks pinched out to insure stability in sitting without support. Surface smoothed and painted with 5Y 4/2 an olive gray paint.

*Condition:* Broken off breasts, left arm, head and legs. Large chip off lower back in center.

*Unpublished* (Recorded in Mallowan’s 1935 excavation notebook)
**CB-11**

*Museum:* Alep 1662 and M3766  
*Excav No:* T554  
*Type:* LH.1A

*Findspot:* 1935 season, Area M, level 8 ‘figurine deposit’  
*Stratigraphic Date:* late Halaf

*Archaeological Context:* Level 8 figurine concentration

---

*Description:* Seated female lower torso and legs fragment. Flat torso widening at hips and large thighs. Bent knees drawn up and clasped, toes apart. A finger-sized space between thighs may be a break, though may have accommodated a peg. Painted solid triangular pubic area. Painted with six thin horizontal stripes on each calf bisected by a single vertical stripe down the middle. Burnished over all, especially visible on the left side. Sits on base, without support.

*Length:* 80mm, 61.8mm seated  
*Width:* 34.7mm at waist, 45.6mm at hips, 30mm at toes  
*Thick:* 46.1mm knees to back, 23.9mm stomach to back, 53.6mm butt to toes

*Technology:* Clay, baked, 7.5YR 6/4 a light brown on surface. Torso, legs and other extremities formed separately and joined when still plastic. (though may have been built around a core) Surface smoothed, painted with 10R 4/4 a weak red paint and finally burnished.

*Condition:* Originally published with an upper torso attached by what appears to be a modern join. Upper portion now lost. Broken off below chest, missing upper torso, head, arms and breasts. Chip off left foot. Broken in many pieces, probably during excavation, modern joins visible.

*Note:* Published as much more complete figurine, if original publication is correct, then hands may have been attached to upper thigh, although attachment scar is not visible and legs are clearly close together at the knees.

*Publication:* Mallowan 1936: 21, fig. 5:1
**CB-12**

*Museum*: Ashm 1936.91  
*Excav. No*: T550  
*Type*: LH.1A  
*Findspot*: 1935 season, Area M, level unknown.  
*Typological Date*: late Halaf

**Description**: Seated female figure, [arms encircling breasts] knee[s] drawn up to stomach. Slim torso which shows attachment scars from lost breasts and hands. Painted in stripes, one stripe around neck, forming chevron at upper chest. Fugitive horizontal stripes on lower front leg. Thick stripe around entire torso at waist. Paint also evident at pubic area. Would require a support to sit; toes are lower than base.

*Length*: 71.7mm  
*Width*: 37.4mm at hips, 35.3mm at upper arms  
*Thick*: 43.3mm buttocks to foot

**Technology**: Clay, baked, 10YR 8/2 a white surface. Torso constructed from clay with [limbs, head and breasts] added on while plastic, only attachment scars remain of many attachments. Surface smoothed and painted with stripes, 10YR 3/2 a very dark grayish brown paint.

**Condition**: Broken off head, arms, left leg, breasts. Chipped on front right foot.

**Comparanda**: Similar paint and fabric to CB-35, CB-39

**Publications**: Ucko 1968: 359, 490 pl. LVII,  
Moorey 2004: 18  
(not published in Mallowan 1936)

**Museum catalog record**:  

**Photos**: E. Belcher, with permission ©Ashmolean Museum, Oxford University
**CB-13**

*Museum:* DezZ 7889 (former Alep 7889)  
*Excav. No:* E198  
*Type:* LH.1A  
*Findspot:* 1937 excavations, Level 1  
*Typological Date:* late Halaf

---

**Description:** Lower torso of seated figurine, knees drawn up to stomach. Legs in a very open position with well smoothed surface. Painted on pubic area and some traces of stripes on right leg, single a faint stripe around the waist, thicker on back. (paint is reconstructed in drawing) Sits on base without support

**Length:** 40.3mm  
**Width:** 25.2mm at waist, 39.2mm at hips  
**Thick:** 16.4mm at waist, 39.1mm at hips

**Technology:** Clay, very fine with some vegetable inclusions, lightly baked, 5YR 7/6 a reddish yellow surface. Break indicates that lower torso and legs may have been modeled separately and attached when plastic. Surface was smoothed and painted 2.5YR 5/6 a red paint on left calf and 5YR 3/1 a very dark grey paint on pubic area.

**Condition:** Broken off at upper waist and left leg. Small chip at right toes.

CB-14

*Museum:* Alep M7670 and 3767  
*Excav. No:* T563  
*Type:* LH.1A  

*Findspot:* 1935 season, Area M, level 4-5  

*Typological Date:* late Halaf

---

**Description:** Seated female, with bent knees pulled up to stomach, with slim torso and flat back. Flat base and back of legs with pointed toe[s]. [Arms encircling breasts.] Painted with a single stripe around ankle[s]. A hole at base between legs may have accommodated a peg. Sits on base without support, leaning backwards.

**Length:** 50mm  
**Height:** 39.3mm from base on surface  
**Width:** 27 at waist, 48.1 at hips, 45.8 at knees  
**Thick:** 62.4 butt to toe, 27.2 at waist.

**Technology:** Clay, with fine inclusions, baked, 7.5YR 7/4 a pink surface with 7.5YR 5/1 a grey core. Rounded torso attached to legs, [neck, head arms, breasts] while still plastic. Diagonal tool marks on waist and hips. Surface smoothed and painted 7.5YR 3/1 a very dark grey.

**Condition:** Broken off above waist, lower right leg. Missing upper body and head, right lower leg. Missing upper body and head, right lower leg.

*Unpublished* (Mentioned in Mallowan’s 1935 excavation notebook)
CB-15

*Museum*: BM 125384 and 1935 1207,371  
*Excav. No*: T567  
*Type*: LH.1A  
*Findspot*: 1935 season, Area M, level 8 'terracotta deposit',  
*Typological Date*: late Halaf  
*Archaeological Context*: Level 8 figurine concentration  

*Description*: Upper torso fragment, head and right arm of female figure. Detached breast broken and reattached but modern glue has failed. Painted with stripes, one around neck and lower face forming chevron at front neck; 1 around shoulder[s] and, chest and 3 stripes around upper arm[s]. Head is long and thin, pinched in eye sockets and long nose. Headdress is an added on coil, representing a turban, which is painted with vertical stripes. Breast[s] painted with single stripe around periphery and two vertical stripes along front.

*Length*: 44.0mm  
*Width*: 37.8mm arm to shoulder, 14.5mm at turban  
*Thick*: 15.2mm at face, 17mm at arm

*Technology*: Clay, baked and possibly burned, 2.5Y 2.5/1 a black surface with a 5YR 6/4 a light reddish brown core. Head and neck added on to torso. Breast[s] added on after arm[s], surface was smoothed and painted with pigment that is now 2.5YR 4/1 a dark reddish grey.

*Condition*: Broken off at chest and left torso, broken off breast[s]. Missing lower torso left arm and legs. Burned

*Comparanda*: Very similar head, painting, fabric and burning as CB-29

*Publication*: Mallowan 1936, 21; fig. 5: 11 (drawn without stripes or breast).

*Photos*: E. Belcher, with permission ©Trustees of the British Museum
Description: Upper torso fragment of [seated] female figurine. Attachment scars show that the [arms] encircled [breasts]. Flat slim torso and back. A small hole in core of figurine may have once had a rod.

Length: 40.1mm
Width: 53.2mm at arms, 30mm at waist
Thick: 17.5mm at arms, 15.5mm at waist, 9.6mm at neck.

Technology: Formed of fine clay which was baked, 2.5Y 8/2 a pale yellow surface formed in one piece as a slim torso onto which [head, breasts, arms and lower torso and legs] were affixed while still plastic, only attachment scars remain. missing were attached while still plastic. Once painted, only a trace remains on back neck of paint 10R 7/4 a pale red.

Condition: Torso fragment, broken off breasts

unpublished

Photos: E. Belcher, with permission ©Trustees of the British Museum
CB-17

*Museum unknown*  
*Excav. No: unknown*  
*Type: LH.1A*

*Findspot: 1936 season, location unknown*  
*Typological Date: late Halaf*

*Description:* Seated female figurine torso fragment.

*Size unknown*

*Publication:* Mallowan 1937, fig. 9: 5-7 (Illustration from this source)
**CB-18**

*Museum:* DezZ 5899  *Excav. No:* TB 9065  
*Type:* LH.1A  
*Findspot unknown:* 1937 season?  
*Typological Date:* late Halaf  

*Note:* this figurine is registered as from Tell Brak, but it must come from Chagar Bazar.

*Description:* Upper torso fragment of [seated] female figurine with arms encircling [breasts], hands clasped at sternum. With slim torso and flat back, punctuation on stomach represents navel.

*Length:* 40.6  
*Width:* 47.5 at arms, 22.5 at waist.

*Technology:* Clay, baked (burned, possibly during deposition) 2.5Y 3/1 very dark gray surface. Attachment scars indicate that upper and lower torso were formed separately and joined while still plastic to [legs, head and neck], arms. [Breasts] were attached over arms. Fingerprint on right shoulder.

*Condition:* broken off at neck and waist, chest. Missing head, breasts, lower torso and legs. Some areas are shiny from handling. Some areas appear burned or stained.

*Note:* there is no record in Tell Brak publications of Halaf figurines from, although Halaf pottery has been found in the vicinity.  *Excav. number was written on figurine.*

*Unpublished*
CB-19
Museum: unknown  Excav. No: A735  Type: LH.2A
Findspot: 1936 season, sounding at 3 meters, location unknown  Hypothetical Date: late Halaf?

Description: Standing figure with knobbed head, arm stubs, stuck-on appliqué breasts. Torso is flat and flares out at base, legs are not representing, giving the appearance of wearing a skirt.

Size unknown

Technology: clay, black

Publication:  Mallowan 1937, 128, fig. 9: 1-2 (illustration and description from this source) (presented as two views of same figurine, but drawings appear to be different figurines)
CB-20

Museum: Ashm 1937.180  
Excav. No: A738 CB  
Findspot: 1936 season, ‘Site A.C.’  
Type: LH.1A  
Typological Date: late Halaf

Description: Upper torso and head fragment of seated female figure. Narrow head with pinched nose. Arm(s) encircling (breasts) with hand attached to sternum. Painted with vertical stripes on sides of face, representing eyelashes? Thick band around neck including the back, with a ring of dots directly below. Three horizontal stripes on remaining left upper arm, six stripes on right arm, with a vertical stripe on hand. Remnants of vertical stripes on remaining portion of right breast. Arched stripe on stomach, presumably once extended around hips to back, below the break. Flat back,

Length: 48.2mm  
Width: 40.7mm at arms, 23.4mm at waist, 8.1mm at head (break)  
Thick: 24.8mm arm to back, 18.5mm at stomach, 12mm back of head to nose

Technology: Clay, baked, 7.5YR 7/6 a reddish yellow surface, with a 10YR 4/1 a dark grey core. Arm[s], head, [breasts], [lower torso and legs] added to torso while still plastic. Surface smoothed and painted, 10YR 8/3 a very pale brown slip on back of head, 5YR 5/3 a reddish brown paint of stripes and spots on head, arms, toso.

Condition: Broken off below waist, lower left arm, breasts. Damage and chipping over all, large chip off upper right back.

Publication: Mallowan 1937: 128, fig. 9:11;
Moorey 2004: 20 (photo from Moorey)

*Museum catalog record:*


*Photo:* E. Belcher, with permission ©Ashmolean Museum, Oxford.
CB-21

Museum: BM 125382 & 1935,1207.368  
Excav. No: T600  
Findspot: 1935 season, Area M, level 12, at 18.20 meters  
Type: LH.1B  
Typological Date: late Halaf

Description: Seated male figure with long, flat torso. Flat appliqué breasts attached to chest. Legs far apart, exposing pubic area, bent at knees. Legs end at pointed toes that are lower than flat base. Extant shoulders and upper arms indicate that arms would have stretched forward, hands probably once attached to thighs. Covered with a light colored slip and painted in stripes. Two horizontal stripes above breasts, two vertical stripes below breasts, one horizontal stripe around waist, one stripe between legs (indicating penis?) continues around back to waist band. Calve[s] painted with 7 stripes. Breasts are flat clay appliqués 5mm in diameter. Would require a small support to sit on base.

Length: 59.7mm
Width: 45mm at arms, 37.1mm at legs, 10.2mm between legs

Technology: Clay, lightly baked, 10YR 8/2 a white surface. Breasts, legs and probably arms and head were formed separately figurine is smoothed and painted.

Condition: Broken at lower neck, upper arms, right upper thigh, missing head, lower arms, right leg. Chipped at breaks, front left thigh, right side of foot.

Comparanda: Similar torso stripes to KK-20

Publications: Mallowan 1936 fig. 5:10  
Ucko 1968: 359, 489, pl. LVI

Museum catalog record: http://www.britishmuseum.org/research/collection_online/collection_object_details.aspx?objectId=388837&partId=1&searchText=125382&page=1

Photos: color photo E. Belcher, taken on exhibit ©Trustees of the British Museum  
black and white photo downloaded with permission ©Trustees of the British Museum
CB-22
Museum: Alep M3657 Excav. No: T566 Type: LH.1A variation
Findspot: 1935 season, Area M, level 8 ‘terracotta deposit’ Stratigraphic Date: late Halaf
Archaeological Context: Level 8 figurine concentration

Description: Seated figure of no discernible gender, with long torso and no arms. Ribbon of clay attached to head representing headdress, nose pinched, with impressed eye sockets. Knees drawn up to stomach and together, pointed feet are apart. A variation on the seated [female] pose. Sits without support, leaning backward.

Length: 51.1mm;
Height from surface when seated: 45mm
Width: 9.1mm at head, 10.5mm at waist, 17.5mm at hips, 12.1mm at toes
Thick: 20mm toes to butt, 9.1mm at face

Technology: Clay, lightly baked, 7.5YR 7/4 a pink surface. Nose pinched, legs and headdress added on while still plastic.

Condition: Complete, chip off right toe, surface has depositional staining (may have been deposited together with vegetable matter?)

Comparanda: CB-24, CB-25

Publication: Mallowan 1936 fig. 5:9
CB-23
Museum: MAA 67-151A Excav. No: unknown Type: LH.2A
Findspot unknown Typological date: late Halaf
Written on figurine ‘HS Sandwich room’
Archaeological Context: Break location of workmen?

Description: Standing figure, with flat torso flaring out at base and arms stubs, wide neck. No indication of legs or breasts, perhaps skirted. The torso is somewhat bent, giving the appearance of leaning over. Base has a small hollow of finger-mark with a lip around periphery, slightly flaring at back. Base is not flat, so figure requires a small support to stand without falling.

Length: 56.2mm
Width: 34.2mm at arms, 25.4mm at base, 19.4mm at waist
Thick: 12.8mm at head, 15.6mm at chest, 18.6mm at base

Technology: Clay, baked with fine mineral inclusions and some straw temper 10YR 8/2 a very pale brown surface on front 10YR 5/3 a pale brown staining on the back. A large white inclusion visible at the break at the neck. Formed out of single lump, [head] added on while plastic, smoothed and covered with thin whitish slip.

Condition: Broken off at neck, chipped off right arm stub on back. Slightly stained on back side perhaps from depositional processes?

Comparanda: TK-7, GH-1

Unpublished

Photo: E. Belcher, with permission ©Museum of Archaeology and Anthropology, Cambridge University.
**CB-24**

*Museum*: BM 1935,1207.376  
*Excav. No*: T573  
*Type*: LH.1A variation  
*Findspot*: 1935 season, Area M, level 8 ‘figurine deposit’  
*Stratigraphic Date*: late Halaf  
*Archaeological Context*: Level 8 figurine concentration

*Description*: Seated figure with very slim peg-like upper torso, widening and rounded at hips. Bent knee[s] drawn up to stomach. No evidence that breasts or arms were ever attached. Slight diagonal tool marks on back. Although legs are broken, flat base and probably once sat without support.

*Length*: 30.5mm  
*Width*: 17.9mm  
*Thick*: 15.2mm

*Technology*: Clay, pinched to form torso, legs added on when still plastic, surface smoothed.

*Condition*: broken off left let at hip, right leg below knee, broken off head at neck. Very shiny from handling

*Comparanda*: CB-22, CB-25

*Unpublished*

*Museum catalog record*:  

*Photo*: E. Belcher, with permission @Trustees of the British Museum
**CB-25**

*Museum:* BM 1935, 1207.375  
*Excav. no:* T571  
*Type:* LH.1A variation  
*Findspot:* 1935 season, Area M level unknown  
*Typological Date:* late Halaf

*Description:* Seated figurine with abbreviated upper torso which does not show attachment scars for arms or breasts. Upper torso may incorporate head as pinching at break may represent nose. Leg[s] bent with knee[s] pulled up to stomach, flattened front of calve[s], pointed toe[s]. Leg[s] appear to have been originally open. Rounded back with slim upper torso widening at hips and buttocks. Sits on base without support.

*Length:* 4.22mm  
*Width:* 2.54mm at hips; 1.09mm at head  
*Thick:* 2.96mm buttocks to toes

*Technology:* Clay, baked, 7.5YR N4/0 a dark grey surface. Torso formed with leg[s] attached when still plastic.

*Condition:* Broken off at neck, right thigh, missing neck, head, left leg. Large chips off left side of torso, left side of thigh.

*Unpublished*  

*Comparanda:* CB-22, CB-24

*Photo:* E. Belcher, with permission ©Trustees of the British Museum
**Description:** Columnar fragment of long figurine neck, head and headdress. Pinched out nose and flattened headdress. Tool marks diagonally around neck may represent loose cloth?

**Length:** 43.1mm  
**Width:** 16.8mm at headdress, 12 at neck  
**Thick:** 137 at base, 12.5 at nose

**Technology:** Clay, 7.5YR 4/0 a dark gray surface, probably made from one piece of clay, though headdress may have been formed separately and attached while still plastic.

**Condition:** Broken off at base.

**Publication:** Mallowan 1936, fig 5: 12


**Photo:** E. Belcher, with permission ©Trustees of the British Museum
**Description:** Lower torso fragment of standing female figure. With incised and punctuated public triangle, incision representing vulva. Slim torso with punctuation representing navel. Well-formed upper legs. Traces of paint remaining on upper right thigh, left stomach with no discernible pattern.

**Length:** 47.0mm  
**Width:** 32.4mm at hips, 24.8mm at waist  
**Thick:** 19.5mm hips to buttocks, 13mm at waist

**Technology:** clay, baked, very clean clay, 5YR 7/4 a pink surface, 10YR 3/1 a very dark grey staining or paint on left side and thigh, 5YR 6/6 a reddish yellow spots of paint or staining on front of right thigh. Formed out of single lump of clay. Smoothed, painted and incised.

**Condition:** Broken off at chest, legs. Missing upper torso, limbs, head. Chipped at left waist. Rough vertical tool marks on back. Chipped on left buttock

**Unpublished**

**Museum catalog record:**  

**Photos:** E. Belcher, with permission ©Trustees of the British Museum
**CB-28**

*Museum Unknown*  
*Excav. No: A702*  
*Findspot: 1936 excavations, unknown location*  
*Type: LH.2E*  
*Hypothetical Date: late Halaf*

*Description:* Fragment of standing female figure with slim waist and represented hips and thighs. Incised pubic triangle, possibly with vulva represented. Navel indicated by punctuation.

*Size unknown*

*Condition:* broken at lower chest, left thigh, right knee. Missing upper body, lower legs.

*Comparanda:* Ç'T-10

*Publication:* Mallowan 1937: fig 9.13 (illustration and description from this source)
**CB-29**

*Museum:* BM 125380  
*Excav. No:* T574  
*Type:* LH.1A  
*Findspot:* 1935 season, Area M, level 8 ‘terracotta deposit’  
*Stratigraphic Date:* late Halaf  
*Archaeological Context:* Level 8, figurine concentration

*Description:* Very large seated female figure with arm[s] encircling breasts, knees bent and pulled up to stomach. Large headdress attached to the head, formed with a thick clay coil. Face pinched, to form eye sockets and pointed [nose], sloping broad shoulders onto which arm[s] are attached which end in hands clasped at sternum, left over right long large breast[s] attached to chest, only right attachment scar remains. All attached to a slim torso which flairs out slightly at
back base, perhaps to assure the figure can stand without support, giving the impression from the side that figure is sitting on a cushion or pillow. Leg[s] attached to base at hip and wide thighs, with thin knees extending upward, close to stomach. Legs have flat calves, which do not appear to have been painted, ending in pointed toe[s] with clay appliqué shoe[s] traces of one strip of appliqué on outside of right foot. Very wide flat base allowing it to sit on surface without support.

Some very faint paint traces remaining. On left arm it appears that the layer of paint chipped off probably a result of burning. Traces of thick vertical stripes curving around the headress, A wide wash around the lower face, neck and shoulders only extending around the back at the neck. A wash on the left (extant) upper arm, perhaps extending from the shoulder. But on the left upper arm, a definite stripe goes around the bicep. No other surface decoration visible but evidence on the right arm suggests that the pigment could have chipped off when the figurine was burned. Burning is especially evident at the lower half of the figurine.

**Length:** 170mm  
**Width:** 35.1mm at headdress, 20.1mm at head, 85.5mm at arm[s], 68.4mm at hips, 67.4 at base  
**Thick:** 35.1mm nose to back of head, 55.1mm back to breast[s], 81.8mm buttocks to toe[s].

**Technology:** Clay, 7.5YR 6/4 a light brown surface on right arm, 2.5YR 5/4-4/4 a reddish brown surface on left upper arm, 2.5YR N3 a very dark grey on left breast. baked after sections were added to torso while still plastic, not as successful a construction, perhaps because of it’s large size and weight. May have been burned at some point, making it quite brittle. Appears to have been covered overall with clay slip 2.7mm thick, which has chipped off at places. Painted in stripes with 2.5YR 3/6 a red pigment (on neck and arms) to 2.5YR4/4 a reddish brown pigment (on headdress). May have been the same red paint with color changed due to burning and oxidation.

**Condition:** Burned and broken, many modern repairs, detailed in museum conservation report 4 Sept. 2009, available from catalog record below. Missing nose, left arm and breast, right leg. Damaged on left calf.

**Comparanda:** Very similar fabric, burning, breast shape as CB-15

**Publication:** Mallowan 1936, 29;Plate I: 1-2

**Museum catalog record (and conservation report):**  

**Photos:** E. Belcher, with permission ©Trustees of the British Museum
**CB-30**

*Museum:* Alep?  
*Excav. No:* CB 1354  
*Type:* LH.1A  
*Findspot:* 1999-2001 seasons, Chantier E, unit 5.3  
*Stratigraphic Date:* late Halaf  
*Archaeological context:* Late Halaf level in cutting back section of 1935 Area M ‘pit’

*Description:* Fragment of a seated female figure. Lower torso and legs only extant.

*Height:* [19]mm  
*Width:* [15]mm

*Condition:* Broken off at waist, upper torso missing.

*Publication:* Cruells 2006 82, 86, pl. 4.1d (image from this source)


CB-31

Museum: Alep?  
Exca. No: Unknown  
Findspot: Chantier E? Liege/Barcelona excavations  
Type: LH.1A  
Typological Date: late Halaf

Description: Seated female figure, arms encircling breast[s] hand[s] clasped between breasts. Knees bent and pulled up to stomach. Painted in two or three colors with stripes and dots. Horizontal stripes on headdress, cow-like eye with large lashes on sides of head, wide stripe below, perhaps representing a beard or veil? Three darker stripes around neck, interspersed with lighter colored dots. Seven stripes around upper arm[s], in two colors; Two stripes on hand[s]. Breasts decorated with dot at nipple area surrounded by 4 stripes in a rayed design. Four stripes on calve[s], at feet 6 vertical stripes ending at a toes and horizontal stripe at ankle[s].

Length: [80mm]

Technology: Clay, buff colored with dark core at break. Compiled in sections while joined when still plastic, smoothed and painted.

Condition: Broken at left hip, arm, headdress. Missing left leg and arm, right portion of headdress.

**CB-32**

*Museum:* Ashm 1936.92  
*Excav. No:* unknown  
*Type:* LH.1A  
*Findspot:* 1935 season, Area M, unknown level  
*Typological Date:* late Halaf

**Description:** figurine torso fragment very broken. Sits on base without support. Small portions of limbs remain showing that the [arms] were once clasped at the [chest] supporting [breasts]. Evidence for construction is from attachment scars on upper torso. Lower torso is slightly more intact, back flares out at base, giving the impression that the figure may be sitting on a cushion and creates a stable base on which it can sit on a surface without support. Also lays on back without rolling.

*Length:* 64.9mm; 65.4mm seated on surface  
*Width:* 43.8mm at hips; 31mm at waist (at break); 38.4mm at arm break to torso  
*Thick:* 38.4mm at base; 35.5mm at back to leg break; 29.8mm at back to arm break

**Technology:** Clay, baked, 5YR 5/6 a reddish yellow to 5YR 4/2 a dark reddish gray surface, which appears very burned. Quite dense clay, similar to Body parts adhered to the torso, smoothed over, flat base creates a flare or lip at the buttocks. Some ancient tool scraping evident on right side of base.

**Condition:** Heavily broken over all, with many modern repairs. Broken off head, shoulders, core of upper torso and left upper arm remain, the rest of the upper body broken off. Lower back and right outer thigh remain, the rest of the lower torso broken off showing a very dense clay core.

**Comparanda:** Similar fabric to CB-33

**Publication:** Moorey 2001, p. 38, no: 19

**Museum catalog record:**


**Photo:** E. Belcher, with permission ©Ashmolean Museum, Oxford University
**CB-33**

*Museum:* BM 1935.1207,387  
*Excav. No:* T557  
*Type:* LH.2E  

*Findspot:* 1935 season, Area M, level unknown  
*Typological Date:* late Halaf

**Description:** Standing figure lower fragment. Feet and lower legs extant. Feet end in a rounded flat toe facing forward, delineated by a line in between. Rounded legs visible mainly from the base, since damaged on surface. Difficult to reconstruct what this figurine type may have originally been part of.

*Length:* 38mm  
*Width:* 44.2mm at base  
*Thick:* 29.8mm toe to heel

*Technology:* Clay, baked 5YR 6/4 a light reddish brown surface, 7.5YR 5/1 a gray core. A very dense and hard clay. Some dark red wash traces evident on the front.

*Condition:* Fragment, very broken up broken off below knees, upper body missing, back surface broken off, extant only at base, large chip off left outer leg. Well-worn all over all including at breaks.

*Comparanda:* DT-16, similar fabric to CB-32  
*Unpublished:* (Mentioned, Mallowan 1935 Chagar Bazar Notebook p. 7)  
*Photo:* E. Belcher, with permission ©Trustees of the British Museum
CB-34

Museum: BM 1935,1207.396  Excav. No: unknown  Type LH.1A
Findspot: 1935 season, Area M, Prehistoric Pit, levels 6-7  Stratigraphic date: late Halaf
Written on figurine: ‘M vii-viii’ (interpreted as location and levels found)

Description: Left figurine leg fragment, very pointed toes, with attachment scar at one end. Some damage on inner thigh, appears to be attachment scar where it may have been attached to the right leg. Very carefully made with very smooth burnished surface, painted with two horizontal stripes, one thick midway down shaft (knee?) ending at attachment scar on inner thigh, and one at the break (upper thigh?).

Length: 57.8mm
Width: 17mm at break; 5.2mm at ‘toe’

Technology: Clay, baked, 7.5YR 7/4 a pink surface 5YR 7/3 a pink core painted with 7.5YR 6/6 a reddish yellow. Formed of one rod of clay, carefully slipped and burnished, then painted with stripes.

Condition: Fragment in very good condition. Damage on one side (inner thigh?). Break at thigh is an attachment scar, must have been attached to a larger object, presumably a figurine.

Comparanda: TA-11

Unpublished

Museum catalog record:
(cataloged as a nail)

Comparanda: TA-11
Similar fabric and paint to CB-3 which has similar toes

Photo E. Belcher, with permission ©Trustees of the British Museum
**CB-35**

*Museum: BM 1935,1207.399  Excav. No: unknown  Type: LH.Type unknown*  
*Findspot: 1935 excavations, Area M, level unknown  Typological date: late Halaf*

*Description:* Figurine leg fragment, slightly tapering from thigh to toe, but otherwise straight, finely made, burnished, painted with a stripe mid shaft (at knee?). Flat at toe, perhaps allowing original form to stand, although difficult to determine the type this figurine originally was from this fragment.

*Length:* 47mm  
*Width:* 17mm  

*Technology:* Clay, baked 10YR 8/2 a very pale brown surface same in core. Surface carefully vertically burnished parallel to the length of the shaft and then painted with 5YR 4/2 a dark reddish gray to 4/4 reddish brown stripe.

*Condition:* Broken off at thigh and inner thigh, missing rest of body.

*Comparanda:* Similar fabric and paint to CB-12, CB-39  

*Unpublished*

*Museum catalog record:*  
(cataloged as a wall cone)

*Photo:* E. Belcher, with permission ©Trustees of the British Museum
CB-36

Museum: MAA 1936.168 Excav. No: T540 Type: LH.1A
Findspot: level IX “name of E Hill. C.” on sticker attached ‘4’ Typological date: late Halaf

Description: Lower half fragment of a seated female figure. Slim torso, oval in plan, legs, bent at the knees which are touching each other. Thighs are a 45% angle up from the stomach. Slight flare of lower calf to pointed [toes]. No remaining traces of decoration on surface. Appears to have been exposed to heat, fire or ash over all, including at break which has discolored the surface, except at the back base. Overall feeling of figurine is square, with very flat sides of base and thigh, and very flat back, squared edge to the back and sides of base. Sits squarely on base without support though remaining torso suggests it may have been leaning backwards.

Length: 38.8mm
Width: 32.6mm at torso break (waist), 41.8mm at base (thighs)
Thick: 19.7mm at torso break (waist), 35.7mm back to knees, 42mm back of base (buttocks) to toes (extant)

Technology: legs added onto torso when still wet, which were pinched together to be attached at inner thigh. 7.5YR 6/4 a pink surface visible only on the base and at breaks. Most of surface discolored, perhaps by burning, 7.5YR 5/1 a gray to 7.5YR4/1 a dark gray. Core at break in left inner foot has a large hole, perhaps this is why this large chip broke off? Also could be a very thick build-up in this area.

Condition: broken off at waist, missing upper body, head and arms, chipped and scratched over all particularly on base. Large chip off left inner foot, right toes broken off. Somewhat dirty with residual soil remaining between legs. Quite worn surface, including at break and appears to have been exposed to burning, including at breaks.

Publication: Ucko 1968, 490, pl. LVIII
Photo: E. Belcher, with permission ©Museum of Archaeology and Anthropology, Cambridge University

183 This note appears on card from MAA museum catalog, also in the MAA online catalog, record can be found by searching: http://maa.cam.ac.uk/maa/category/collections-2/catalogue/
CB-37


Findspot: 1937 season, T.C. Trial Trench?  Hypothetical Date: late Halaf?

Description: An unidentifiable fragment cataloged as human. Could be a breast fragment of a larger figurine? Tapered in middle, rounded at one end, which appears to be finished and blunted. At other end is a break and a knob, perhaps portion of an arm? Back is unfinished a very flat, front is rounded.

Length: 32.1mm
Width: 17.3mm at ‘arm’ 14.2mm at ‘base’
Thick: 11.4mm at ‘top’; 14.5mm at ‘base’

Technology: clay, baked 10YR 4/1 a dark grey surface, possibly burned, similar clay to CB-29

Condition: fragment

Museum Catalog Record:
Available by searching http://maa.cam.ac.uk/maa/category/collections-2/catalogue/

Photo: E. Belcher, with permission ©Museum of Archaeology and Anthropology, Cambridge University
**CB-38**

*Museum:* BM 125386 and 1935,1207.373  
*Excav. No.*: T570  
*Findspot:* 1935 excavations, Area M, unknown level  
*Type:* LH.2A  
*Typological Date:* late Halaf

*Description:* Standing figure with very large drilled holes representing eyes and mouth. Pinched nose in between eyes. Very flat head, and somewhat flattened upper torso with a round cylindrical lower torso, flaring out at bottom. Flat arm stubs at sides, perhaps representing bent arms. It is possible that the eyes and mouth were intended for inlay.

*Length:* 2.62mm  
*Width:* 17.8mm  
*Thick:* 13mm

*Technology:* Clay, baked, 10YR 4/1 a dark gray surface. May have at one time contained inlay inside some or all of the deeply drilled holes? Parallel drill striations visible inside the holes.

*Comparanda:* similar clay to CB-26, CB-26

*Condition:* Some surface wear but otherwise appears to be complete.

*Unpublished*


*Photo:* E. Belcher, with permission ©Trustees of the British Museum.
**CB-39**

*Museum:* BM 1935,1207.393  
*Excav. No:* unknown  
*Type:* LH.1A  

*Findspot:* 1935 season, Area M, level 6  
*Stratigraphic Date:* late Halaf  

*Written on figurine ‘M.VI’* (interpreted as area and level)

---

**Description:** Upper torso fragment of female figure. Painted with stripes in two colors or one color faded to two. Remains stripes on remaining surface on upper body, five dark grey stripes around shoulder and lower neck, two middle stripes form chevron at chest and fully circle neck. Faint remains of stripes in same paint around upper arm[s]. Stripe in same color arches over stomach/leg attachment area, connecting to double stripe around hip[s] which has faded to reddish yellow.

*Length:* 64.7  
*Width:* 49.6mm at arms 34.3mm at waist (break)  
*Thick:* 22.2mm at chest; 24.8mm 1at waist

**Technology:** Clay, baked with coarse sandy inclusions, 7.5YR 8/2 a pinkish-white surface 5YR 7/1 a light grey core. Pinched and formed, with [head, lower torso, limbs and breasts] attached to this torso. Attachment scars indicate arms once attached at armpit and breasts on chest. Painted with stripes, 5YR 7/6 a reddish yellow paint at hips, painted with 5YR 4/1 a dark grey paint at shoulders.
**Condition:** Broken off at neck, below waist and arms. Missing head, arms, breasts, lower torso and legs. Battered on back and right side. Has a course and somewhat friable surface.

**Comparanda:** Similar clay and paint to CB-12, CB-35
Similar striped decoration patterns to CB-1, CB-3, CB-10

**Unpublished**

**Museum catalog record:**

http://www.britishmuseum.org/research/collection_online/collection_object_details.aspx?objectId=389409&partId=1&searchText=1935.1207.393%09&page=1

**Photo:** E. Belcher, with permission ©The Trustees of the British Museum.
**CB-40**

*Museum:* Alep?  
*Excav. No:* unknown  
*Type:* LH.1A  
*Typological Date:* late Halaf

*Description:* Seated female figurine, [arms supporting breasts]. High headdress represented by clay appliqué attached to back of head, pinched out nose, pinched in large hollow eyesockets painted with very large bovine like eyes with many lashes. Dark painted mask, face paint or face cloth represented above and outside eyes and covering sides of lower face, cheeks. Painted with polychrome parallel stripes, alternating red and black, Five stripes around neck and shoulders [crossing in chevron on upper back], unknown number of stripes on arms, of which only the upper part remains. 4 stripes painted around waist and hips.

*Length:* [13mm] base to headdress  
*Width:* [9mm] shoulder to shoulder  
*Thick:* [4mm] headdress to nose

*Comparanda:* DT-10 has similar facial decoration on cheeks, forehead; CB-1, CB-3 have similar painting.

*Publication:* Cruells et. al. 2014, 474-5, pl. 42.6E (black and white photo from this source)

*Photos:* courtesy of Walter Cruells ©Chagar Bazar Project, (color photos)  
Universitat Autonoma de Barcelona, Seminari d’Arqueologia, Prehistorica del Proxim Orient
Tell Aqab

TA-1

Museum: Alep (no number)  Excav. No: TA 108  Type: LH.1B
Findspot: 1975 season, “area of ashy lenses” at 1.22m [locus] 80  
Stratigraphic Date: Late Halaf

Archeological context: Upper ashy fill of large tholos in lower trench 1? Late Halaf level

Description: Seated figure, possibly male, with flat thin torso with small flat, round breasts. Separated legs bent at the knees, wide thighs, open legs revealing pubic area but no genitals represented. Rounded arms with hands resting on knees, and inner thighs. Narrow head and sloping shoulders. Flat buttocks and flat back, tapering in toward neck with shoulder blades represented. Slight traces of reddish paint on arms, eyes, possible chevron on back. Clay ribbon appliqués on feet, and on head representing sandals and headdress? Would need support under buttocks to sit.

Length: 73.6mm  
Width: 48.4mm at arms, 39.4mm at thighs, 34mm at feet, 22mm at waist, 11.6mm at headdress  
Thick: 36.8mm buttocks to toe, 32.4mm back to knees, 17.8mm back to chest, 15.2mm nose to neck

Technology: clay, baked and covered with light clay slip: 10YR 7/3 to 7/4: a very pale brown surface. Limbs and head attached to torso core, headdress breasts and foot appliqués attached when still plastic.
**Condition:** Complete but chipped at nose, right headdress and left toes. Some slight damage or wear on buttocks, and headdress.

**Comparanda:** KK-19  
Head similar to TA-5, KK-10

**Publication:** Davidson and Watkins, 1981: 10, fig. 3:7

**Photo:** E. Belcher, with permission ©Aleppo Museum
**TA-2**

*Museum:* Alep (no number)  
*Excav. No:* TA 27  
*Type:* LH.1A

*Findspot:* 1975 season, at 1.23m, [locus] 88  
*Stratigraphic Date:* late Halaf

*Archaeological context:* Upper ashy fill of large tholos in lower trench 1? Late Halaf level

*Description:* Seated female figure, slim upper torso leaning slightly forward, extant upper right arm shows forward reach. Right extant knee bent and pulled up toward chest, rounded, wide thigh and flattened at calf with slight bulging at pointed foot. Very smooth surface, with slight staining, no evidence of painting. Flat back and base, sits on base without support.

*Length:* 46.6mm  
*Width:* 34mm at arms, 32.9mm at hips (base), 19.4mm at waist

*Technology:* Clay, lightly baked, 10YR 7/3 a very pale brown on surface. Torso, legs, lower torso, arms formed separately and attached and adjusted when still plastic. Attachment scars visible where parts have broken off.

*Condition:* Broken off front of chest (missing breasts), left hip, lower right arm, left arm, head, neck. Chipped at bottom of feet and at breaks. Broken in two at mid torso, modern repair. May have been broken with pick during excavation.  
*Unpublished*
TA-3

Museum: Alep (no number)  
Excav. No: TA 78  
Type: LH.1A

Findspot: 1975 season, found on Sept. 18 by T, at 4.23m, [locus] 45

Typological Date: late Halaf

Archaeological context: Trench 3, early Halaf level, possibly found adjacent to TA-10

Description: Lower torso and legs fragment of seated figure. Legs together, pointed toes, knees tucked up toward missing chest. Rounded back at extant base, probably the rest of back was flat. Smoothed surface over all. Staining indicates possibility that there was once a wash over upper thighs. Sits on base without support, but may also have accommodated peg between legs.

Length: 23.2mm
Width: 27.5mm at hips
Thick: 35.3mm buttocks to toes

Technology: Clay, with large mineral inclusions, 10YR 7/3: a very pale brown surface. Visible seam shows that stomach and torso were formed separately and then attached to each other and legs while still plastic. No painting visible, though staining on the upper thighs may indicate fugitive washes.

Condition: Broken at right side and hip; missing upper torso. Found broken in two, modern repair.

Unpublished
**TA-4**

*Museum:* Alep (no number)  
*Excav. No:* TA 28  
*Type:* LH.1A or LH.1B

*Findspot:* 1975 season, by S at 1.23m, [locus] 87  
*Stratigraphic Date:* late Halaf

*Archeological Context:* Upper ashy fill of large tholos in lower trench 1? Late Halaf level

*Description:* Head, neck and shoulders fragment. Headdress represented by pinched ridge on back of head. Pinched out nose and pressed in eye sockets. Flat or slightly concave upper chest with shoulders leaning forward slightly. Flat back of head with upper back curving outward slightly at break. Covered with a light slip. Painted dark grey large eyes represented by two horizontal lines with 3 upper and lower lashes. A slightly lighter grey paint used for single line around the front neck dangling down the back and crossing with an X at upper back.

*Length:* 23.5mm  
*Width:* 23.8mm at shoulders, 6mm between eyes  
*Thick:* 79mm at nose, 79 at chest

*Technology:* Clay, lightly baked 2.5Y 8/2 a pale yellow surface, Pinched and smoothed, some tool marks visible. Possibly formed over a clay core? Painted 2.5Y 4/1 a dark grey paint on eyes and 2.5Y 7/1 a light grey paint on neck.

*Condition:* Fragment, broken at neck, chest, missing body.

*Unpublished*

*Photo:* E. Belcher, with permission ©Aleppo Museum
TA-5

Museum: Alep (no number)  
Excav. No: TA 87  
Type: LH.1A or LH.1B  

Findspot: 1975 season found on Sept. 17th TW at 2.12m, [locus] 105  
Archaeological Context: Trench 2, late Halaf level  
Stratigraphic Date: late Halaf  


Length: 36.2mm  
Width: 17.3mm at ‘shoulders’; 11.1mm at headdress

Technology: Clay, lightly baked with mineral inclusions 7.5YR 3/1 a very dark gray surface. Head and lower back were formed in one piece, and breasts and headdress attached while plastic. Lower body possibly formed separately and joined. Carefully smoothed over surface. Attachment scars visible where breasts broke off.

Condition: Fragment. Broken at chest, shoulders; missing lower body, arms, right part of headdress. Possibly intentional damage on right side.

Comparanda: Head similar to TA-1, TA-5, KK-10

Unpublished
**TA-6**

*Museum*: Alep (no unknown)  
*Excav. No*: TA 49  
*Type*: LH.1A  
*Findspot*: 1975 season, at 2.1m, [locus] 46 or 47?  
*Stratigraphic Date*: late Halaf  
*Archaeological context*: Trench 2, late Halaf level

*Description*: Torso fragment of upper torso with upper arms. Rounded torso with upper arms stretching outward. Damage to chest shows possible breast attachments. Surface not smooth or finished.

*Length*: 29.5mm  
*Width*: 32.9mm at arms, 23mm at waist

*Technology*: Clay, with mineral inclusions, 10YR 7/3 a very pale brown surface. Possibly this is the type of torso core onto which attachments of head, limbs, base and breasts would be added. Surface is left rough and several fingerprints are visible on sides and neck. Perhaps this is an unfinished figurine torso component?

*Condition*: Fragment. Broken at waist, neck and shoulders, upper chest; missing arms, head, neck and shoulder, breasts. Chipped over all, especially at breaks and on chest.

*Unpublished*
TA-7

Museum: Alep (no number)  Excav. No: TA 86  Type: EH.2A
Findspot: 1975 season on Sept. 17, Sat 1.24, [locus] 91.  Typological Date: early Halaf
Archaeological context: Trench 1, Late Halaf level

Description: Lower torso and base fragment, bell and hourglass shape with pinched in waist and flaring lower torso and shoulders. Base is circular in plan. Upper body flattens out. Flat back, concave base. Surface left rough. May have been slipped but damaged from storage, finger deeply impressed on base. Stands without support.

Length: 26.5mm
Width: 21mm at base, 17.8mm at upper break, 12.2mm at waist
Thick: 19 at base, 13.5 stomach to back.

Technology: Clay, 10YR 5/2 a grayish brown surface. Pinched and rolled out of one lump, Upper potion may have been formed separately and attached. May have been slipped on surface, but difficult to determine because of condition.

Condition: lumpy, damaged surface, covered by dirt, mold and staining, probably result of floods in museum storage area. 184

Comparanda: TK-5, TK-10, SAB-6, TA-8

Unpublished

184 The Aleppo museum had long had a problem with flooding because it was built over a river bed. At my last visit in October, 2001, a move to a larger facility better suited for storage and display of archaeological objects was said to be imminent. A government building in the Aleppo citadel area had been identified in 2001, however I believe that this building was heavily burned and gutted in early 2013.
TA-8

Museum: Alep (no number)  Excav. No: TA 32  Type: EH.2A
Findspot: 1975 season, Sat 2.1m, [locus] 10  Typological Date: early Halaf
Archaeological Context: Trench 2, Late Halaf level

Description: Torso and base fragment of standing figurine. Hourglass shape, with flat base and flattened upper torso. May have been covered in slip. At top break, edges are very worn from continued use after breakage. May also have functioned as a jar stopper? Stands on base without support.

Length: 41.2mm
Width: 8.6 diameter of base, 38.4 diameter of top, 33 diameter of middle

Technology: Clay with some mineral inclusions, 7.5YR 7/4 a reddish yellow surface with 7.5YR 7/1 a light grey core. May have been formed from two lumps of clay. Base is very flat and smooth, possible string-cut. Surface is smoothed while still wet.

Condition: Broken at top, missing upper portion. Rough top chipped and worn down, from use?

Comparanda: TK-5, TK-10, SAB-6, TA-7

Unpublished
TA-9
Museum: Alep (no number)  Excav. No: TA 102  Type: LH.1C
Findspot: 1975 season on Sept. 13, S at 1.60m [locus] 93  Stratigraphic Date: late Halaf
Archaeological context: Trench 2, tholos fill? Late Halaf level

Description: Right leg fragment. Rounded and pinched out and smoothed. Bent at ankle and triangular foot is represented. Traces of painting, of toe and a band on upper calf, no pattern discernable. Probably once attached to a seated figurine hanging down below base, therefore would not have sat without support.

Length: 34mm
Width: 10.8mm at break, 74mm at foot, 27mm at toe
Thickness: 10.5mm at break, 74mm at foot

Technology: Clay, sunbaked with sand inclusions, 5YR 7/3 a pink surface. This portion attached to torso, attachment scar at break. Smoothed and painted, 2.5YR 7/6 a light red paint.

Condition: Chipped at break, missing the rest of body. Much of the paint has worn off.

Unpublished
**TA-10.**

*Museum:* Alep (no number)  
*Excav. No:* TA 67  
*Type:* EH.Type unknown

*Findspot:* 1975 season on Sept. 15, Sat 4.17m [locus] 14  
*Stratigraphic Date:* early Halaf

*Archaeological context:* Trench 3, Early Halaf level

*Description:* Fragment of left arm, curved and rounded, tapering at one end. Attachment scar at larger end, otherwise smoothed surface. May have been attached to a standing figurine. Equally could be attached to a seated figurine or not be a fragment from an anthropomorphic form at all.

*Note:* If this is a figurine fragment, it is probably an arm fragment, no early Halaf figurines appear here with similar arms. This is similar to arms on Halaf LH.1A type figurines. Without further evidence, it has been assigned a stratigraphic date of early Halaf.

*Length:* 33.9mm  
*Width:* 14.3mm wider end diameter, 73mm narrower end diameter

*Technology:* clay with mineral particles, 10YR 7/3 a very pale brown surface. Rolled and made slightly squared in section, curved and smoothed. Attachment scar at one end indicates that this was limb was made separately and attached to torso while still plastic.

*Condition:* Chipped at breaks but not showing wear over surface or breaks. Missing rest of body.

*Unpublished*
**TA-11**

**Museum:** Alep (no number)  
**Excav. No:** TA 31  
**Type:** LH. Type unknown

**Findspot:** 1975 season, at 2.1m [locus] 4  
**Stratigraphic Date:** Late Halaf

**Archaeological context:** Trench 2, late Halaf level

*Description:* Leg fragment. Tapered to a point at toe, attachment scar at break shows that it was attached at an angle. Longitudinal faceted ridges show careful burnishing of surface with a tool. Painted with five horizontal stripes. If this was attached to a figurine, it would have been a very large one. The facets prevent the object from rolling when placed on a flat surface.

*Note:* Given the size of this fragment, if it is a figurine leg, the figurine would be very large.

**Length:** 60.8mm  
**Width:** 20.2 at break; 12.8 at toe

*Technology:* Clay 5YR 7/6 to 7/8, a reddish yellow surface with 7.5YR 8/4 a pink core. Formed by rolling and shaping a rod, smoothing then burnishing the surface with a tool, then painted in stripes with 7.5YR 3/1 a very dark grey paint.

*Condition:* Attachment scar shows it was attached to body, now missing. Wear at toes.

*Comparanda:* CB-34

*Unpublished*
Khirbet Esh-Shenef

KeshS-1

Museum: Raq?  
Excav. No: unknown  
Type: LH.2A  
Findspot: 1991 season square G7, level 3A/B, outside building IX  
Stratigraphic Date: late Halaf

Archaeological context: Amidst debris outside of rechteckgebäude

Description: Cube-shaped lower torso fragment, with flat base. Buff surface decorated with lustrous red paint. Pubic triangle on front with line representing vulva and dots representing pubic hair. On back, two herringbone designs, similar to ‘tree’ motifs on Halaf pottery. Appears to stand on its flat base without support.

Length: [50mm]  
Width: [40mm]  
Thick: [30mm]  

Technology: Clay

Condition: Fragment, broken off at waist, right side.

Comparanda: SAB-1, KK-18 (similarly shaped pubic triangle)

Publication: Akkermans and Wittmann 1993, 160; 158 abb 11c (illustration from this source)
Tell Kashkashok

**KK-1**

*Museum:* DezZ 12543, former Alep M1116 and 1282  
*Excav. No:* 90 KL 24  
*Type:* LH.1A  
*Findspot unknown*  
*Typological Date:* late Halaf

**Description:** Seated female, arms encircling breasts, knees pulled up together to stomach, with tall thin and pinched head and headdress, deeply impressed eye sockets. Large asymmetrical hanging breasts attached at shoulder. Hands attached at sternum. Torso is long and slim with a very flat back extending down to base with no buttocks represented. Painted dark grey wash on headdress, and red stripes on thigh[s], of which only slight traces remain. Sits on flat base and lies on flat back without support.

*Length:* 74.3mm, 26.1mm shoulders to top of head  
*Width:* 45.5mm at arms, 33.6mm at hips, 22.6mm at waist, 8.2mm at head  
*Thick:* 41.4mm buttocks to legs, 29.1mm back to left breast, 12.4mm nose to back of head

*Technology:* Clay, baked, 10YR 7/4 a very pale brown surface. Head, limbs and breasts formed separately and added onto torso while plastic. Seams of arms are visible on back. Surface smoothed and painted 10YR 3/1 a very dark gray paint on headdress, 2.5YR 5/6 a red paint on right calf. Sits on base and on back without support.

*Condition:* Complete. Break at neck and broken off right breast (modern reattachment).

*Comparanda:* KK-2

*Publications:* Bonatz, Kühne and Mahmoud, 1998: 46, cat no. 20 (first on readers’ left)  
[published as from Tell Kashkashok III as 13543]
**KK-2**

*Museum: Alep 1281*  
*Excav. No: unknown*  
*Findspot unknown*  
*Type: LH.1A*  
*Typological Date: Late Halaf*  

*Description:* Seated female figure, arms encircling [breasts which are no longer extant]. Hands clasped at neck. Long head and neck with pinched nose and upward looking face. Bent knees drawn up to stomach, conical lower legs with knees together and feet apart, flat shins. Thin torso, widening at shoulder and hips, rounded back. Fragment of clay appliqué visible on back of pinched headdress. Surface is somewhat rough, on right side some excess clay is visible, partially smoothed over hips and sides. Toes pinched and smoothed to a point. When viewed from the front the legs and torso appear to form a Maltese cross motif. Sits on flat base without support. Rolls when placed on back.

*Length:* 45.3mm; 37.8mm surface to head when seated:  
*Width:* 25.5mm at arms; 23.8mm at hips, 14.3mm at waist, 4.3mm at head  
*Thick:* 24.8mm buttocks to toes; 15.4mm at arms, 6.9mm back of head to nose

*Technology:* Clay, 10YR 8/3 a very pale brown surface. Torso formed with head, limbs joined onto it them smoothed while plastic, attachment seam visible on stomach. On right side, excess clay is visible, showing that it was used to smooth over attachment at hips. No surface decoration visible.

*Condition:* Breasts broken off (?), scraped on back left shoulder (from use?) and a portion of the headdress chipped off, otherwise complete.

*Comparanda:* KK-1

[published as from Tell Kashkashok III]
KK-3

Museum: DezZ 12544 (formerly Alep 1203) Excav. No: 113/1993 Type: LH.1A
Findspot unknown Typological Date: late Halaf

Description: Seated female with arms encircling pointy, conical breasts. Hands attached at sternum. Bent knees pulled up together to stomach, with lower conical legs extended forward, pointy feet apart. Slim torso, widening at hips and shoulders. Painted with very faint traces remaining: 3 stripes on torso and right side, 1 stripe each around upper arms, 2 stripes on chest above breasts. Possibly a different pigment on feet and right side. Sits on base without support – legs are extended to form part of the base.

Length: 52.2mm
Width: 39.5mm at arms, 24.1mm at hips, 17.2 at waist, 9.1mm at head
Thick: 38.3mm toes to buttocks, 23.2mm breasts to back

Technology: Clay, lightly baked, 7.5YR 8/4 a pink surface; 7.5YR 7/1 a light grey core at break. Torso formed, with limbs head and breast added on while still plastic. Surface smoothed and painted 10YR 5/1 a grey paint on chest and shoulders, and: 2.5YR 5/4 a reddish brown paint extant in patches on right side and feet.

Condition: Broken at head, chest. Missing upper head. Chipped on right breast. Stained dark over portions of surface, perhaps from depositional processes.

Comparanda: KK-4

Publication: Bonatz, Kühne and Mahmoud, 1998: 36, cat no: 20 –as museum no. 13544 (group photo, furthest to reader’s right) [published as from Tell Kashkashok III]
**KK-4**

*Museum:* DezZ 12548 (formerly Alep 1208)  
*Excav. No:* 90 KI 24  
*Type:* LH.1A  
*Findspot unknown*  
*Typological Date:* late Halaf

**Description:** Very small seated female figure, arms encircling very small breasts, hands attached off center of chest. Nose represented with a vertical pinched ridge, high flat headdress attached. Knees are bent and drawn up together to stomach. Conical lower legs ending in articulated pointed feet. Hunched and rounded back. Arms and legs are asymmetrical, figurine sits on flat base leaning to right. Originally painted, traces remain only on wrists.

**Length:** 28.1mm  
**Width:** 16.7mm, 15.9mm at hips, 15.8mm at arms, 13.2mm at waist, 4.9mm at arms  
**Thick:** 16.4mm, buttocks to legs, 12.5mm arms to back, 6.3mm at back of head to nose

**Technology:** Clay, 2.5YR 7/6 a light red on surface. Possibly arms and legs added onto torso and head, squished together while still plastic. Surface smoothed and painted with 2.5YR 5/4 a reddish brown paint, which is still extant only on wrists.

**Condition:** complete, but covered with substance, possibly from depositional processes.

**Comparanda:** KK-3

**Publications:** Bonatz, Kühne and Mahmoud, 1998: 36, cat no. 20 – published as 12548 (group photo, 3rd from reader’s left).  
[published as from Tell Kashkashok III]
**KK-5**

*Museum:* DezZ 12542 (formerly Alep 1282)  *Excav. No:* unknown  *Type:* LH.1A  
*Findspot unknown*  
*Typological Date:* late Halaf

*Description:* Seated female figure, Arms encircling pendulous breasts. Hands cross under breasts. Knees bent, drawn together up to torso. Lower conical legs apart, pointed toes. Photos indicate some traces of painting on wrists, breasts and legs?

*Length:* [60mm]  
*Width:* [30mm]

*Technology:* clay  
*Condition:* Broken off head, otherwise complete

*Note:* this figurine was in a travelling exhibition (Fortin 1999) during my research in Deir ez-Zor, so was not studied in Syria in 2000-01.

*Publications:*  
Akkermans and Schwartz 2003, 143 fig. 4.26 (readers’ left)  
Bonatz, Kühne and Mahmoud, 1998: 36, cat no. 20 (2nd from readers’ right).  
[published as Deir ezZor 13543]  
Cluzen, 1993: 48, cat no. 72  
Fortin 1999: 271 cat no 264/5
**KK-6**

*Museum:* Alep 1205  *written on fig.:‘KK5’ (more worn off)  
Type: LH.1A

*Findspot unknown*  
*Typological Date:* late Halaf

*Description:* Seated female figure, arms encircling breasts, knees drawn up together, pointed feet far apart. Hands overlap, right over left between breasts at sternum. Thin torso tapering out at shoulder[s] and hips. Some traces of paint or staining on stomach (no discernible pattern). Base has a hole that could accommodate a peg. Falls backward from base when placed on a surface without support.

*Length:* 53.2mm; 44.5mm seated  
*Width:* 38.2mm at toes, 37.4mm at arms, 31.8mm at hips, 18.5mm at waist  
*Thick:* 20mm at breasts, 14.5mm at waist, 31.8mm at waist

*Technology:* Clay, baked with fine vegetable and mineral temper 2.5Y 8/3 a pale yellow surface, which is somewhat friable. [Head] breasts and limbs attached to torso while plastic. Legs and base probably formed together. Tool marks on back and buttocks and toes, perhaps indicating carving of that area with blade. Surface left rough. Traces of paint or post-depositional staining on stomach with 5YR 4/1 a dark gray paint or wash.

*Condition:* Broken off neck, missing head. Large chip off right shoulder and back. Surface appears rough and stained, perhaps from depositional processes.

*Unpublished*
**KK-7**

*Museum:* Alep 1210  
*Excav. No:* unknown  
*Type:* LH.1A  
*Typological Date:* late Halaf

*Findspot unknown*

*Description:* Seated female, arms encircling [breasts]. Hands attached at upper chest. knees drawn up to stomach together. Conical lower legs together with[feet] slightly apart. Slim, short torso tapering out at hips and shoulders. Very flat base. Painted with stripes around lower arms and legs, extending over to hips. (only traces remain, covered by depositional staining) Sits on flat base and lays on flat back without support.

*Length:* 35.2mm, 48.4mm seated  
*Width:* 37.8mm at arms, 31mm at hips, 22.1mm at waist  
*Thick:* 35.2mm butt to toes, 19.2mm at arms, 15.2mm at waist

*Technology:* Clay, 5YR 7/6 a reddish yellow surface with some mineral inclusions visible with 5 YR 6/1 a grey core. Torso formed with arms, then [breasts], legs and base attached while still plastic. Attachment locations visible on right breast, outer thighs, and stomach. Painted with stripes, now very faint (reconstructed in drawing and too faint to Munsell). Traces of fingerprints on right breast and brush marks on left arm

*Condition:* Broken at neck, chest, lower left leg. Right foot reattached (modern repair). Missing head, breasts, lower left leg, right bottom of foot. Stained over-all, probably from depositional effects. Drawing somewhat reconstructive of the painting under the stains.

*Unpublished*
**KK-8**

*Museum:* Alep M1389  
*Excav. No:* 90 KL 29  
*Findspot unknown*  
*Type:* LH.1A  
*Typological Date:* late Halaf

**Description:** Seated female, arms encircling high breasts with attached at between breasts, right over left. Knees bent and drawn up to stomach with a small gap between legs. Conical lower legs taper into pointed feet set apart. Slim torso tapering out slightly at hips and shoulders. Painted with stripes on lower arms and legs, extending over to hips, only traces remain. Sits on base without support, slightly leaning right.

**Length:** 41mm; 36.3 seated  
**Width:** 25.9mm at arms; 14.6mm at waist; 23.5mm at hips  
**Thickness:** 24.4mm butt to toes; 19.2mm at breasts; 11.6mm at waist

**Technology:** Clay, quite fine with very few inclusions, 10YR 7/4 a very pale brown surface. Torso formed with arms, then breast and legs and base together attached while still plastic. Seams and surface smoothed. Painted with stripes 7.5YR 4/9 a dark grey, now very faint (reconstructed in drawing).

**Condition:** Broken at neck, missing head, otherwise complete. Large scrape off back at right shoulder. Surface somewhat rough, perhaps from depositional processes.

**Comparanda:** KK-9

**Publications:** Fortin 1999 75 cat no. 72 (photo from this source)

**Photo:** E. Belcher with permission, Aleppo Museum (image inverted)
KK-9
Museum: Alep 1207  Excav. No: 90KL(23?)  Type: LH.1A
Findspot unknown  Typological Date: late Halaf

Description: Seated female figure with arms encircling triangular shaped breasts set close together, hands attached between and under breasts at sternum. Slim torso, widening at shoulder and hips. Bent knees, drawn up together to stomach. Feet apart.
Sits without support on flat base and lays flat on back without rolling.

Length: 66.2mm, 61.3mm seated
Width: 47.4mm at arms, 37mm at hips, 22.5mm at waist
Thick: 37.9mm butt to toes, 27.5mm back to breasts, 15.6mm at waist

Technology: Clay lightly baked, 10YR 8/4 a very pale brown surface with 10YR 5/1 a gray core. Either covered with depositional staining or a wash/slip. Possibly once painted with stripes on breasts and arms, too faint to discern.

Condition: Broken at left hip, and left breast, (modern reattachment). Broken off at neck, and right lower leg, missing head and right shin/foot. Chipped off left knee.

Comparanda: KK-8

Unpublished

Photo: E. Belcher, with permission, Aleppo Museum (image inverted)
**KK-10**

*Museum:* Alep1206  
*Excav. No:* 90K1 23  
*Type:* LH.1A  
*Typological Date:* late Halaf

*Findspot unknown*

**Description:** Upper torso and head fragment of female figure, arms encircling full, conical breasts, hands attached at sternum. Thin long head and neck with attached flat, tall headdress and pinched nose. Slim torso and flat back. Very slight traces of paint on upper chest and right eyeocket.

*Length:* 75.4mm  
*Width:* 55.4mm at arms, 10.6mm at head  
*Thick:* 29.7mm at breasts, 16.3mm headdress to nose

**Technology:** Clay, lightly baked, 7.5YR 7/3 a pink surface with 7.5YR 8/3 a pink core. Head, arms, then breasts added onto torso when plastic. Surface smoothed and possibly painted, traces are difficult to discern.

**Condition:** Broken at left arm and breast (modern repair). Broken off at upper waist, missing lower body and legs.

**Comparanda:** Head similar to TA-1, TA-5  
Breasts similar to KK-15

**Unpublished**

**Photo:** E. Belcher with permission, Aleppo Museum (image inverted)
**KK-11**

*Museum: Alep 1761*  
*Excav. No: 90K1*  
*Type: LH.1A*  
*Typological Date: late Halaf*

*Findspot unknown*

*Description:* Seated female figure, conical shaped legs with knees slightly apart, conical lower legs, rounded shins and pointed feet set apart. Sits on flat base without support.

*Length:* 57mm, 52.5mm seated  
*Width:* 38.7mm at hips, 36.8mm at arms, 25.2mm at waist  
*Thick:* 39.5mm butt to toes, 20.3mm at arm[s], 15.8mm at waist

*Technology:* Clay, with fine vegetable and mineral temper 10YR 7/3 a very pale brown on surface. Torso formed with [arms, breasts] legs and [head] added on when still plastic. Breaks at seams on this figurine show progression of construction.

*Condition:* Broken off at left shoulder, right arm socket, neck, chest. Missing head, neck, breasts, and arms. Chipped off left knee. Wear on toes, and scrape off back.

*Unpublished*
**KK-12**

- **Museum:** Alep 1759
- **Excav. No:** unknown
- **Type:** LH.1A
- **Typological Date:** late Halaf
- **Findspot unknown**

**Description:** Lower torso and legs fragment of seated figure. Left leg slightly smaller than right. Bent knees, pulled up to stomach, conical lower legs and pointed toes, which are slightly asymmetrical. Sits on flat base without support.

**Length:** 28mm, 27.5mm seated on surface  
**Width:** 36.8mm  
**Thick:** 38.5mm butt to toe, 13.6mm waist at break

**Technology:** Made in parts, torso and legs and attached when still plastic. Seam of attachment visible at outer legs where they were joined to torso. Surface left rough in outer leg area.

**Condition:** Broken at waist. Missing upper body. Chipped on underside of left leg.

**Unpublished**
**Description:** Torso and head of a large seated female figure. Covered with a thick white slip and painted with a red paint in stripes, single horizontal stripe on high flat headdress. and two stripes representing eyes painted eyes on either side of pinched nose. Two stripes around neck, forming chevron at back. Four parallel stripes and part of a fifth extant over upper right arm, two extant on left. Two stripes around lower torso and hips visible on back. Traces of painting on back of headdress of an indiscernible design. Attachment scars visible for arms, breasts and legs. Probably once sat on base without support but it is now broken.

**Length:** 121.2mm  
**Width:** 59.6mm at arms, 50.3mm at hips, 38mm at waist, 22.3mm at head  
**Thick:** 26.4mm chest to back, 26.3mm pubic area to buttocks, 23.5mm headdress to nose

**Technology:** Clay, 7.5YR 7/4 a pink surface with fine vegetable inclusions and 10YR 6/4 a light yellowish brown core. Torso built up in layers of clay, smoothed over at back, where top lamination has chipped off. Attachment scars show that arms and breasts were added onto the torso, and legs together with front part of base were added onto bottom. Surface covered with thick slip and painted in many places with same 10R 4/3 a weak red paint

**Condition:** Broken at arm sockets, hips, chest. Missing arms, legs, breasts. Chip off left back.

**Comparanda:** KK-17

**Unpublished**
**KK-14**

*Museum:* Alep M1118  
*Excav. No:* 90 Kl 24  
*Type:* LH.1A  
*Typological Date:* late Halaf

*Findspot unknown*

*Description:* Seated female figurine, very small arms encircling very high-set conical breasts. Hands attached between breasts at sternum, right over left. Head is pinched at nose, flat on back. Elongated, slim flat torso slightly to the left punctuation on stomach represents navel. Bent knees pulled up together at stomach. Cone shaped legs created by rolling slabs of clay ending in pointed toes. Concave base, (impressed by a thumb?) Painted with stripes, two parallel stripes on chest, two stripes extant on upper breast[s]. Two stripes on upper arm[s]. 2 lines around stomach and hips, extending around the back. Calves are painted with five horizontal stripes. Sits on base, leaning right.

*Length:* 61.6mm, 55mm seated  
*Width:* 5.4mm at head, 23.6mm at arms, 28.9mm at legs  
*Thick:* 8.8mm back of head to nose, 17.5mm back to breasts, 13.2mm at waist

*Technology:* Clay, 10YR 8/3 a very pale brown surface, limbs, breasts and head added to torso while still plastic, surface smoothed and painted. Legs were formed separately, by rolling slabs to form a cone. Seams of attachment clearly visible. Some incision on navel area. Painted all over with 7.5YR 4/1 a dark grey.

*Condition:* Broken off top of head and right shoulder. Missing right arm and top of head. Some scratching on right side of back.

*Comparanda:* ÇT-6 (legs created in the same way)

*Publication:* Rouault and Rouault, 1993: 449, fig 214

*Photo:* E. Belcher, with permission ©Aleppo Museum
**KK-15**

*Museum*: Alep 1760  
*Excav. No*: 90 K1  
*Findspot unknown*  
*Type*: LH.1A  
*Typological Date*: late Halaf

*Description*: Right arm, chest and breast fragment of a female figurine. Breast is full and conical, encircled by rounded arm. Painted with stripes, 3 stripes around upper arm[s], one around nipple area of breast[s].

*Length*: 25.3mm  
*Width*: 32.3mm  
*Thick*: 20mm

*Technology*: Clay, baked, with white mineral inclusions 5YR/76 a reddish yellow surface. Breast then arm added onto [torso] while still plastic, surface smoothed and painted with 10R 4/3 a weak red paint.

*Condition*: Broken off in middle of torso, missing rest of body, head, limbs.

*Comparanda*: KK-10

*Unpublished*
KK-16

Museum: Alep1211  
Excav. No: ‘90 Kl’ ‘KK’  
Findspot unknown  
Type: LH.1A  
Typological Date: late Halaf

Description: Upper torso fragment of a female seated figurine. Covered in a slip and painted in stripes, two stripes on upper chest, extending around to back forming a chevron. Three stripes extant on upper arm[s].

Length: 51.8mm  
Width: 57.4mm at arms, 14.1mm at neck, 30mm at ribs  
Thick: 20.5mm at chest, 20.7mm at ribs

Technology: Clay, baked 2.5Y 8/1 a white surface with 5YR 8/4 a pink core. [breasts, arms, legs and head] added onto torso while still plastic. Surface smoothed, slipped and painted with 2.5YR 6/6 a light red paint. Attachment scars visible where parts have detached.

Condition: Broken left side (modern repair), broken off at neck, arms, upper torso. Missing lower body, head, limbs, chest and part of back.

Unpublished
KK-17

Museum: Alep 1763   Excav. No: unknown   Type: LH.1A
Findspot unknown   Typological Date: late Halaf

Description: Upper torso and head fragment of [seated] female figurine. Arm[s] encircling [breasts] clasped at sternum. Pinched face, looking upward, head with flat headdress. Slim torso and flat back. Painted in stripes (very faint, reconstructed in drawing) with traces on headdress and eyes. Traces of two stripes around neck, side of face. Three stripes extant around upper arm[s] one stripe around wrist[s]. Bit of paint appears to represent mouth, but is probably a trace of a stripe.

Length: 71.3mm
Width: 53.6mm at arms, 21mm at waist, 14.6mm at head
Thick: 28.2mm at waist, 27.3mm at arms, 17.3mm at nose

Technology: Clay, 10YR 8/2 a very pale brown surface, Limb[s, breasts] and head attached to torso while still plastic. Surface smoothed and covered with a 5YR 8/3 a pink wash or slip and painted with a 7.5YR 3/2 a very dark gray paint.

Condition: Broken off below waist, below left upper arm, missing lower torso and legs and lower right arm.

Comparanda: KK-13

Unpublished
**KK-18**

*Museum:* Alep 1200  
*Excav. No:* 90 KL 35  
*Type:* LH.1A  
*Typological Date:* late Halaf

*Findspot unknown*

*Description:* Seated large female figure, knee[s] bent, and pulled up to stomach, slightly apart. [Arms encircling] breast[s] which are set high on torso. Pointed toe[s] apart with clay appliqué representing sandal[s]. Slim torso with punctuation to represent navel. Incised pubic triangle and vulva, punctuated to represent hair. Another punctuation represents a navel, set high on the torso. Sits on flat base without support.

*Length:* 11.3mm, 11.2mm seated  
*Width:* 57.3mm at arms, 43mm at waist, 30mm at hips  
*Thick:* 70mm buttocks to toes, 40mm at breasts, 27.1mm at waist toes 28.4  
*Other:* 18.4mm height of pubic triangle

*Technology:* clay 10YR 7/3 a very pale brown surface with 19YR 6/2 a light brownish gray core. Parts made separately then attached when wet, then incised. Attachment scars evident where parts detached. Incised, and punctuated at pubic area, clay appliqué at foot to represent sandal[s].

*Condition:* Broken off at neck, left leg at thigh and at both shoulders, missing head, arms, right breast and left leg.

*Comparanda:* KesS-1 (similar shaped pubic triangle)

*Unpublished*

*Photo:* E. Belcher with permission, ©Aleppo Museum (image inverted)
**KK-19**

*Museum:* Alep 1209  
*Written on figurine:* ‘K.K’  
*Type:* LH.1B  
*Typological Date:* late Halaf

*Findspot unknown*

*Description:* Seated male figurine, with hands upon thighs, legs bent at the knees and spread apart. Thin flat torso with flat, stuck-on clay appliqué breast[s] set high on the torso. Lower legs form teardrop shape in plan. No representation of genitals in pubic area. Viewed upside down, it appears similar in profile to a mouflon or bull-head Halaf pottery motifs. Requires support to sit on base.

*Length:* 70.9mm; 63.2mm seated  
*Width:* 57.2mm at arms; 41.7 at legs; 21.3 at waist; 11.8mm neck  
*Thick:* 356 buttocks to toes, 161 at chest, 158 at stomach  
*Other:* diameter of breast 6.1mm

*Technology:* Clay, baked, 7.5YR 7/3 a pink surface with 7.5YR 6/2 a pinkish gray core. [Head], neck, limbs and breast[s] made separately and added onto torso while plastic. Seams smoothed but surface left rough. No paint or other decoration visible.

*Condition:* Broken at neck, chest. Broken at right wrist, left upper arm, (modern repairs). Missing head, left breast.

*Comparanda:* TA-1

*Unpublished*

*Photo:* E. Belcher with permission, ©Aleppo Museum
**KK-20**

*Museum:* Alep 1758  
*Excav. No:* unknown  
*Type:* LH.1B  
*Typological Date:* late Halaf

*Findspot unknown*

Description: Seated male figure, [with hands on thighs], knee[s] bent and legs wide open. Slim torso with flat, small stuck-on breast[s] placed high on chest. Built up clay between legs may represent genitals. Pointed toe[s] with slight indication of shoes. Painted with stripes in different pigments, one stripe around neck, three vertical stripes on stomach, one stripe around waist, ending in chevron at buttocks. Rounded back. Sits on base, leaning backward without support.

Length: 62.3mm, 54.5 seated  
*Width:* 39.7mm at arms, 37.8mm at hips, 23.5mm at waist  
*Thick:* 45mm buttocks to toes, 16.6mm at waist, 13.5mm at chest  
*Other:* dia of breast[s]: 7mm

Technology: Clay with coarse vegetable and mineral inclusions, baked 2.5YR 8/2 a pinkish white surface. [head, arms] breast[s] and leg[s] added to torso while plastic. Surface smoothed and painted, with 5YR 7/4 a pink wash on stomach, and stripes in 10R 4/4 a weak red paint on stomach and neck and in 10R 4/3 a weak red paint on hips.

Condition: Broken off at arm sockets, right thigh and neck. Missing head, arms, right leg, and left breast.

Comparanda: Similar painting on torso to CB-21

Unpublished
KK-21
Museum: Alep 1762
Findspot unknown

Written on figurine: ‘KI’
Type: LH.1A
Typological Date: late Halaf

Description: Upper torso fragment. Flat torso with a horizontal incision or scrape on chest. A diagonal incision at left hip area may be part of a pubic triangle.

Length: 86.9mm
Width: 71.2mm at arms, 68.9mm at base, 56.4mm at waist

Technology: Clay, baked, 5YR 7/3 a pink surface and 10YR 7/3 a pale brown core. This may be a torso core, onto which all other elements were attached when plastic. Surface smoothed, incised and may have been painted with thin washes, on front (a white) and back (a reddish color). Attachment scars of detached breasts and other parts are visible.

Condition: fragment, scrape on chest may be an attachment scar of [hands arms and breasts]. Missing limbs, head, buttocks, breasts. Covered with a white stain, possibly from depositional processes.

Unpublished
**KK-22**

*Museum:* Alep 1280  
*written on fig.:‘90 11’*  
*Type:* LH.Type unknown

*Findspot unknown* [may not be from Halaf excavations?]  
*Hypothetical Date:* late Halaf

---

**Description:** Figurine head, with conical headdress and five clay appliqué decoration on head, some incised or punctuated. Cowrie shell eyes represented in clay. Pinched out nose.

**Length:** 23.8mm  
**Width:** 17.8  
**Thick:** 28.1 nose to headdress

**Technology:** Clay, baked 5YR 5/2 a reddish grey surface. Likely pinched and rolled from single piece of clay, with surface smoothed and appliqué added while still plastic. Note that the neck area is very smooth and may not be a break. Perhaps this was a removable head?

**Condition:** Fragment, missing body, possible modern reconstructions in parts. Appears to have been burned in several places.

**Note:** this head is unique, impossible to know what type of figurine to which it would have been attached, or even if it is Halaf.

**Unpublished**
KK-23

Museum: Alep 1117       Excav. No: unknown       Type: LH.1A
Findspot unknown\(^{185}\)      Typological Date: late Halaf

Description: Seated female figure, with arms encircling pendulous breasts. Left hand overlaps right at sternum. Circular hat or headdress on pinched head with rounded nose, looking up. Sloping shoulders and slim torso. Knees pulled up to slim torso, flat lower legs ending in pointed feet. Appliqué strips of clay extant on left foot, representing sandals. Appears to sit on base without support.

Length: [63mm]
Width/Thick: [40, 50mm]

Condition: Complete, except for chipped off clay appliqué on right foot. Upper head, headdress and right foot appear to be modern reconstructions.

Note: This figurine was in a travelling exhibition (Fortin 1999) during my research in Syria, so therefore was not studied directly.

See also: different photograph figure 4.48

Publications: Akkermans and Schwartz 2003: 143 fig. 4.26 (right)
Fortin, 1999: 75, cat. no. 72 (color photograph)
Institut du Mond Arabe, 1993:
Rouault and Masetti-Rouault 1993: no. 70 or 71
Cluzen 1993: no. 71


---

\(^{185}\) The driver for the excavation team, Abu Abdul claims that he found this and many other figurines when excavating in the shade of his car, which was parked between Tell Kashkashok tells II and III. (Abu Abdul, personal communication, Aleppo Museum, 16 July 2000)
Description: Seated female figure, arms encircling hanging breasts. Thin torso and hips, knees bent with flat thighs creating lap, [lower legs] hanging down. At base, a hole between legs could have accommodated a peg, base decorated with fingernail or reed marks. Flat back and well-formed buttocks. Depending on original length of lower legs, probably did not sit without support as legs would have hung down well below base.

Length: 72.2mm
Width: 44mm at arms, 38.6mm at hips, 28.3 at waist
Thick: 59.8mm buttocks to knees, 32.5mm at breasts, 17.5mm at waist

Technology: Clay, 5YR 7/2 a pinkish gray slip over a 5YR 6/6 reddish yellow surface (visible where the slip flaked off). Torso formed, head, arms then breasts legs formed into thick coils and added on with bent legs while still plastic. Surface smoothed, slipped and punctuated on base.


Publication: Cluzen 1993, 46, 74-75 cat. no. 71.
Akkermans and Schwartz, fig. 4.26 (center)

Photos: E. Belcher with permission, ©Aleppo Museum (picture inverted)
KK-25

*Museum:* Alep 1290  
*Excav. No:* unknown  
*Type:* LH.Type unknown  
*Hypothetical Date:* late Halaf(?)

Findspot unknown

Description: Head fragment of figurine, with eyes, nose, ears and mouth represented. Pointed head with cap, headdress or hair represented, long braid down back.

Length: [30]mm  
*Width:* [20]mm  
*Thick:* [20]mm

*Technology:* Clay, molded from single lump.

*Publication:* Cluzen 1993: 73, cat. no. 69 (illustration source from there)

*Note:* although this source dates this figurine to the late Halaf, this figurine type could very well be dated to the third millennium.
Tell Halaf

**TH-1**

*Museum: THmus-destroyed?* 
*Excav. No: unknown* 
*Type: LH.1A*

*Findspot: Early excavations possibly 1899 soundings?* 
*Typological Date: late Halaf*

![Image of the artefact]

*Description:* Seated female figure with arms encircling breasts. Pinched head with attached flat headdress, long neck with sloping shoulders with full hanging breasts attached to them. Rounded arms encircling breasts, hands attached at center under breasts. Slim waist tapered from shoulders tapering out to hips. Knees bent with thighs pulled up to stomach, flat shins with pointed toes with triangular clay appliqué, representing shoes? Flat back and base. Painted (polychrome?) with stripes. Large eyes represented by ovals between horizontal lines with large lashes. Two stripes around neck, forming chevrons on upper chest, stripes around upper arms and shins, extending around bent legs to sides of thighs. Vertical stripes on breasts, and possibly on lower arms. Clay appliqué attached to feet, probably representing shoes. Appears to sit without support.

*Height: [83mm]*

*Technology:* Clay, created in components and painted with stripes.

*Publications:* Schmidt 1943: 99, 100, taf. CV 1, 2. (illustration from this source) 
Description: Seated female figure, arms encircling breasts. Pinched head with flat back, and attached flat headdress. Head tilted slightly back so that face is looking upwards. Conical pointed breasts stuck onto chest. Slim waist tapering in from shoulder and out at hips. Legs are bent at knees with thighs pulled up to stomach. Lower legs are somewhat conical, pointed at toes. Covered with a red wash, and painted with stripes (now faded). Six stripes around upper arms, one around neck forming chevron on upper chest, one around waist dropping down to buttocks on lower back, four on shin extending around to thigh. Breasts painted with rayed design. Base has a deep depression between legs which could have accommodated a peg. Flat back and base. Sits on base without support.

Length: 57mm
Width: 35.2mm at arms, 30.2mm at thighs, 14mm at waist
Thick: 27.2mm to toes, 17.5mm at breasts, 11.4mm at waist

Technology: Clay, very fine, 7.5YR 7/2 a pinkish gray surface. Torso formed, arms, legs, head joined while still plastic, burnished (especially on lower legs, which are longitudinally burnished), painted with stripes in 10R 5/4 a weak red paint.

Condition: Complete, paint has worn off and is reconstructed in the drawing.

Vorderasiatisches Museum, 1962: 45, abb 10;
Schmidt 1943: 4-5, pl. CV: 4-5;
Von Oppenheim, 1933: 213-14, pl. LVI:3;

Photograph: E. Belcher with permission, VAM ©Von Oppenheim Foundation
**TH-3**

_Museum:_ VAM 12518  
_Excav. No:_ unknown  
_Type:_ LH.1A  
_Findspot:_ 1911-13 excavations, soundings in the outer city.  
_Typological Date:_ late Halaf

*Description:* Seated female figure with arms encircling breasts. Sloping shoulders with rounded arms, encircling breasts, hands attached at center of stomach below breasts. Breasts are conical and attached to shoulder. Slim waist, tapering out at arms and hips. Legs are bent at knee with wide smooth thighs, pulled up to stomach. Lower legs and knees are close together, apart at pointed feet. Painted with stripes, now worn and reconstructed in the drawing. Five longitudinal rayed stripes on breasts, five faint stripes around arms, six horizontal stripes on shins extending around to thighs. Attachment scars show clay appliqué was once on feet (similar to TH-1?) but has broken off. Slightly rounded back and flat base, Sits on base without support.

*Length:* 60.2mm  
*Width:* 46.8mm at arms, 42.4mm at hips, 22.7mm at waist  
*Thick:* 43.6mm at toes, 21.6mm at waist

*Technology:* Clay, 10YR 7/4 a very pale brown surface. Arms and breasts, legs and base added onto torso when still plastic. Clay appliqué added to toes. Surface smoothed and painted, 10R 4/4 a weak red paint.

*Condition:* Broken at neck, missing head, chipped at ends of toes, slight damage to shins, otherwise complete

*Publications:* Schmidt 1943: 100, pl. CV: 6: 2  
Cholidis and Martin 2002: abb. 26, right.

*Photos:* E. Belcher with permission ©Vorderasiatisches Museum
**TH-4**

Museum: THmus, destroyed?  
Excav. No: unknown  
Findspot: 1929 excavations, deep sounding  
Type: LH.1A  
Typological Date: late Halaf

Description: Seated female, arms encircling breasts. Pinched head, sloping shoulders, rounded arms with hands affixed between conical, full breasts. Slim waist, tapering out at shoulders and at hips. Legs bent at knees with wide thighs pulled up to stomach. Conical lower legs with pointed toes. Painted with chevrons on upper chest (around neck?) stripe around waist? Stripes around arms and on shins extending around to thighs on bent legs. Appears to sit on base without support.

Size unknown

Technology: Clay, created in components and painted with stripes.

Condition: Broken off at top of head, otherwise complete before lost in Nov. 1943 bombing.

Publication:  
Oppenheim 1933: 213-14, pl.LVI:3;  
Schmidt 1943: 99 - 100, pl. CV: 3. (Illustration from this source)
**TH-5**

*Museum:* THmus-destroyed?  
*Excav. No:* unknown  
*Type:* LH.1A  
*Findspot:* 1929 excavations, deep sounding  
*Typological Date:* late Halaf

![Image of a seated female figure](image)

**Description:** Seated female figure, with arm(s) encircling breasts. Rounded arm(s) encircling full breasts hanging from sloping shoulders. Thin waist tapering from shoulders and out to hips. Legs bent at knee with wide thighs pulled up to stomach. Lower legs are flat at front with pointed toes. Painted with stripes around upper arm(s), longitudinal stripes on lower arm. Six stripes on shins, extending around to thighs. Stripes on breasts? Appears to sit without support on base.

*Size unknown*

**Technology:** Clay, created in components and painted with stripes.

**Condition:** Broken at left upper arm, neck, missing head, left arm before lost in the Nov. 1943 bombing.

**Publications:** Schmidt 1943: 100, pl. CV: 10. (Illustration from this source)
**TH-6**

*Museum:* THmus-destroyed?  
*Excav. No:* unknown  
*Type:* LH.1A  

*Findspot:* 1929 excavations, N/S trench on N slope, D 3/IV 3 on map  

*Typological Date:* Late Halaf

![Image of TH-6 figurine]

*Description:* Upper torso of [seated] female figure, arms[s] encircling breasts. Head is pinched with long neck, sloping shoulders and rounded arm[s] encircling breasts. Articulated hand[s] attached to inside of full hanging breasts attached at shoulders. Slim waist and flat back. Painted with stripes, forming double chevron at chest, rayed design on breasts, stripes around middle arm. Appliqué clay dots on shoulders and upper arms.

*Length:* [73]

*Technology:* Clay, created in components and painted with stripes, clay appliqué dots added to shoulders.

*Condition:* Broken at upper head right shoulder, upper waist, missing headdress, right arm, lower torso and legs. Lost in Nov. 1943 bombing.

*Publications:* Oppenheim 1933: 213-14, pl. LVI: 5;  
Von Oppenheim 1931, 187-88, taf 56: 5  
Schmidt 1943: 99-100, pl. CV 7-8. (Image from this source)

*Note:* Appliqué clay dots on shoulders have not been observed on any other Halaf period figurines. Although they are known from Samarran figurines from Chogha Mami (Oates 1969, pl. xxx:c). These are however known on very late Ubaid figurines in a very different style.
**TH-7**

*Museum: THmus-destroyed?  Excav. No: unknown  Type: LH.1A*  
*Findspot: 1929 excavations, soundings under foundations  Typological Date: Late Halaf*  
*Archaeological Context: under palace south gate*

*Description:* Upper Torso and head fragment of [seated] female figure, arms encircling breasts. Pinched head with sloping shoulders, arms encircling full breasts hanging from shoulders, with hands affixed between them, left over right. Slim waist, tapering in from shoulders. Flat back? Painted with stripes forming chevrons on upper chest (going around to back of neck?). Stripes around arms, along breasts. Stripe around waist?

*Technology:* Clay, created in components and painted with stripes.

*Condition:* Broken at upper head, mid torso, missing top of head and lower torso, chipped off at right elbow. Lost in Nov. 1943 bombing.

*Publication:* Schmidt, 1943: 100, pl.CV: 12.
**TH-8**

*Museum:* THmus-destroyed?  
*Excav. No:* unknown  
*Type:* LH.1A  
*Findspot:* 1929 excavations, west of dig house, near 'cultroom'.  
*Typological Date:* late Halaf

![Image](image-url)

*Description:* Upper torso fragment of [seated] figure with arm[s] encircling breast[s]. Sloping shoulders, rounded arms, hand[s] attached between breast[s]. Slim waist. Painted with stripes, forming chevron on upper chest, stripes around arms.

*Size unknown*

*Technology:* Clay, constructed in components and then painted with stripes.

*Condition:* Fragment, broken off at neck, left arm below shoulder, left breast, mid torso. Missing head, right arm. Lost in Nov. 1943 bombing

*Comparanda:* Similar painted shoulders, chest to TH-11

*Publication:* Schmidt 1943: 100, pl. CV: 15. (illustration from there)
**TH-9**

*Museum:* VOppF, on deposit at VAM  
*Excav. no:* unknown  
*Type:* LH.1A

*Findspot:* 1929 excavations, N/S trench through N slope, D2/IV3 on map

*Typological Date:* Late Halaf

*Description:* Fragment of seated figure. With sloping shoulders, arm[s] encircling breasts. Slim torso. Leg[s] are bent at knee[s], with thighs pulled up against chest. Flat back and base. Legs are constructed by building up a composite of clay layers, visible at the breaks and not completely smoothed, especially at the base. Smoothed surface, but now damaged from salt deposit, no traces of paint. Sits without support on flat base.

*Length:* 66.6mm  
*Width:* 49.2mm at hips, 38.5mm at arms, 31.8mm at waist  
*Thickness:* 49.4mm toe to buttocks, 22.6mm stomach to back

*Technology:* Clay with sandy inclusions, 5YR 6/8 a reddish yellow surface. Legs and base, arms and breasts added onto torso while still plastic. Surface was smoothed with layers of slip, a composite of clay layers is visible on legs.

*Condition:* Broken at shoulders, right arm, left leg, chest. Missing left shoulder and arm, right arm, left leg below knee. Chipped on back, toe and at breaks.

*Publication:* Schmidt 1943: 100, pl. CV: 11

*Photos:* E. Belcher with permission ©Vorderasiatisches Museum
**TH-10**

Museum: THmus-destroyed?  
Excav. No: unknown  
Findspot: 1929 sounding  
Type: LH.1A  
Typological Date: late Halaf

*Description:* Upper torso fragment. Portion of thin neck, shoulders and slim torso tapering out at shoulders and hips. Painted with stripes, , chevron at neck? Damaged in several places

*Size unknown.*

*Technology:* Clay, created in components and painted with stripes.

*Condition:* Broken at neck, shoulders, chest, base. Missing head, arms, breasts, legs below buttocks. Lost in Nov. 1943 bombing.

*Publication:* Schmidt 1943:100, pl. CV:14 (illustration from this source)
**TH-11**

*Museum*: THmus-destroyed?  
*Excav. No*: unknown  
*Type*: LH.1A  
*Findspot*: 1929 sounding  
*Typological Date*: Late Halaf

*Description*: Upper torso fragment. Sloping shoulders and rounded upper arms. Slim torso with attachment scars where breasts broke off. Painted in stripes, two on right shoulder and around neck forming a chevron between [breasts].

*Size unknown*

*Technology*: Clay, created in components and painted with stripes.

*Condition*: Broken at neck, arms below shoulders, chest, broken off below waist. Missing head, arms, breasts, lower torso and legs. Lost in Nov. 1943 bombing?

*Comparanda*: Similar painted shoulders, chest to TH-8

*Publication*: Schmidt, 1943: 100, pl. CV: 13. (illustration from this source).
**TH-12**

*Museum:* VonOppF, on deposit at VAM  
*Excav. No:* unknown  
*Type:* LH.1A  
*Typological Date:* Late Halaf

*Findspot unknown*

**Description:** Lower torso fragment of seated female figure. Slim waist tapering out at hips. Knees bent, together and pulled up to stomach with toes apart. Toes are stubby and pinched out, squared and slightly upturned. Painted with stripes, one wide stripe across abdomen, Five or six horizontal stripes on shins extending to thighs. Flat base and back, sits on base without support.

*Length:* 45.3mm  
*Width:* 47.5mm at legs, 22.2mm at waist  
*Thickness:* 46.3mm

*Technology:* clay, very fine with sand and vegetable inclusions, 10YR 7/4 a very pale brown surface, painted with 2.5Y 4/2 a dark grayish brown paint.

*Condition:* Broken off at waist, missing upper body, chipped at knees, worn at toes. Burning from Nov. 1943 bombing visible on stomach, right leg and back.

*Unpublished*

*Comparanda:* Similar upturned toes to TH-12

*Photos:* E. Belcher with permission, VAM ©von Oppenheim Foundation
**TH-13**

*Museum:* VOppF, on deposit at VAM  
*Excav. No:* unknown  
*Type:* LH.1A  
*Findspot:* 1929 excavations, 2 m below elongated building, B2/VI 2.

*Typological Date:* Late Halaf

*Description:* Lower torso fragment of seated figure. Slim waist tapering out to hips. Legs bent at the knees, slightly apart and pulled up to stomach. Shins slightly convex, tapering to pointed toes. Flat back and base, where an opening may have provided a place to insert a peg. Painted with six stripes each on shins extending around to thighs. Sits on base without support.

*Length:* 27.2mm  
*Width:* 34.1mm  
*Thick:* 36.7mm

*Technology:* Clay, fine with vegetable temper, 7.5YR 7/3 a pink surface. Legs added onto torso while still plastic, smoothed and painted with 2.5YR 4/1 a dark reddish gray paint.

*Condition:* Broken off at waist, missing upper body. Chipped at right knee (a excavator's pick break?). Chipped off left toe. Burned on back and base from Nov. 1943 bombing.

*Publication:* Schmidt, 1943: 100, pl. CV:17

*Comparanda:* Similar upturned toes to TH-12

*Photos:* E. Belcher with permission, VAM ©von Oppenheim Foundation
**TH-14**

*Museum:* VOppF, on deposit at VAM  
*Excav. No:* unknown  
*Type:* LH.1A  
*Findspot:* 1929 excavations, from an area east of the “temple-palace”  
*Typological Date:* Late Halaf

*Description:* Lower torso fragment of seated figure. Slim waist, tapering out at hips, with flat back with a pinched in hollow in small of back. Legs bent at knees, with knees together, convex shins and pointed toes apart. Painted with five or six horizontal stripes on shins, extending over thighs, only traces remain between the legs. A hole between legs may have allowed a peg from attachment, however, sits on flat base without support.

*Length:* 33.9  
*Width:* 42  
*Thick:* 41.7

*Technology:* Clay, fine with sand inclusions, 2.5YR 6/6 a light red surface. Flat base shows pinching in for attachment of legs when plastic. Legs and torso were attached to each other when plastic, surface smoothed and painted with10R 4/4 a weak red paint.


*Publication:* Schmidt, 1943: 100, pl. CV: 16.  
*Photo:* E. Belcher with permission, VAM ©von Oppenheim Foundation
**TH-15**

*Museum:* VOppF, on deposit at VAM  
*Excav. No:* unknown  
*Type:* LH.1A  
*Findspot unknown*  
*.Regular Date:* Late Halaf

*Description:* Lower torso fragment of a seated female figure. Slim waist, tapering out to hips, flat back pinched in at small of the back. Legs bent at the knees, which are together with left knee slightly lower than the other. Conical shaped lower legs, flattened shins, tapering down to pointy toes. Flat base, with evidence of legs pulled together when still plastic. Painted with four to six stripes on calves, only barely visible. Sits on flat base without support.

*Length:* 24.3mm  
*Width:* 32.8mm  
*Thick:* 35mm

*Technology:* Clay, lightly baked, 7.5YR 6/4 a light brown surface. Torso and legs attached when still plastic, surface smoothed and painted, 10YR 4/1 a dark grey paint.

*Condition:* Broken off above waist, missing upper body, chipped off left toe. Heavily burned on back and base from November, 1943 bombing.

*Unpublished*

*Photo:* E. Belcher with permission, VAM ©von Oppenheim Foundation
**TH-16**

*Museum*: VOppF, on deposit at VAM  
*Excav. No*: unknown  
*Type*: LH.1A  
*Typological Date*: late Halaf

*Findspot unknown*

*Description*: Lower torso fragment of seated female figure. Slim waist, leg[s] bent at knee[s] which may have been set apart. Shin[s] are convex with pointed toe[s]. Painted with six stripes on shin[s], extending around to thigh[s]. Sits on base without support.

*Length*: 30.8  
*Width*: 42.4  
*Thick*: 39.7

*Technology*: Clay, lightly baked, 10YR 7/3 a very pale brown surface, leg[s] and torso joined while still plastic, surface smoothed and painted with 10R 6/6 a pale red paint.

*Condition*: Broken off above waist, right thigh, missing upper torso, right leg. Chipped off left knee, under left leg at toes. Burned from November, 1943 bombing.

*Unpublished*

*Comparanda*: Similar stripes on TH-17

*Photos*: E. Belcher with permission, VAM ©von Oppenheim Foundation
### TH-17

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Museum</th>
<th>THmus-destroyed?</th>
<th>Excav. No: unknown</th>
<th>Type: LH.1B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Findspot</td>
<td>1929 sounding</td>
<td></td>
<td>Typological Date: late Halaf</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Description:** Lower torso and legs fragment of seated figurine. Legs are bent at knees, which are open and apart, pointed toes. Painted, with stripes on shins. A vertical stripe between legs represents penis. Appears to sit without support.

**Technology:** Clay, created in components and painted with stripes.

**Condition:** Broken off at thighs, torso, upper body missing. Lost in Nov. 1943 bombing.

**Comparanda:** Similar Stripes on TH-16

**Publication:** Schmidt 1943: 100, pl. CV: 18 (illustration from this source).
**TH-18**

*Museum:* VOppF, on deposit at VAM  
*Excav. No:* unknown  
*Type:* LH. Type unknown  
*Findspot unknown*  
*Hypothetical date:* late Halaf

*Description:* Fragment, a lump, possibly the neck and back of a human figure. Mostly interior fragment with one possible outside edge. May also be fragment of an animal figurine?

*Length:* 34.5  
*Width:* 31.1  
*Thick:* 23.6

*Technology:* Clay with fine sand and small mineral inclusions, 10YR 6/3 a pale brown surface. The same sort of clay used in other TH figurines.

*Condition:* very rough and broken, impossible to reconstruct this fragment. Surface is rough and burned, probably from Nov. 1943 bombing.

*Unpublished*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>TH-19</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Museum:</strong> THmus, destroyed?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findspot:</strong> 1929 sounding</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Description:** Very small seated or kneeling (female?) figure, with arm stubs. Legs bent at knees which are pulled up closely to stomach. Appears to sit on base without support.

**Size unknown**

**Technology:** Clay, created in components.

**Condition:** Head broken off at neck, otherwise appears complete. Lost in Nov. 1943 bombing.

**Publication:** Schmidt 1943: 100, pl. CV: 9. (Illustration from this source)
**TH-20**

*Museum:* Syria  
*Excav. No:* TH07B-0082  
*Type:* LH.2C  

*Findspot:* 2007 season, Area 6718, FS B68 Northern step trench  
*Archaeological context:* Round building 2 (a tholos)  
*Stratigraphic Date:* late Halaf

![Image of TH-20 artifact](image_url)

*Description:* Standing figure with roll or belt around waist. Flaring out at base, and narrow at break. May not be a anthropomorphic figure at all, could be a jar stopper? Appears to stand on base without support.

*Length:* [43]mm  
*Width:* [35]mm  
*Thick:* [18]mm

*Technology:* Stone, calcite, carved and polished.

*Condition:* Broken off at base and upper torso missing base [arms?] and head. Diagonal crack or scratch across upper left quadrant.

*Publication:* Becker 2009 31-33, abb. 3-7.1 (Illustration from this source)
TH-21

Museum: Syria  Excav. No: TH07B-0032  Type: LH.2B
Findspot: 2006 season, area 6113, F5 B50  Stratigraphic Date: late Halaf or Ubaid
Archaeological Context: sounding adjacent to Iron Age Hilani and the ‘Scorpion Tower.

Description: Standing figure with arms and hips somewhat lumpily represented. Very flat in profile. Incised with two partial holes in head, representing eyes. May have a flat base, as seems to flare out at the base.

Length: [43]mm
Width: [46]mm
Thick: [28]mm

Technology: Stone, limestone, carved, polished and incised with holes.

Publication: Becker 2009 31-33, abb. 3-7.2 (Illustration from this source)
**TH-22**

*Museum:* Syria  
*Excav. No:* TH07B-0033  
*Type:* LH.2B  
*Stratigraphic Date:* late Halaf

*Findspot:* 2007 season, area 6112, FS B33, west side of sounding near prehistoric levels  
*Archaeological context:* soundings under ‘scorpion tower’

*Description:* Standing figure with triangular arm stub[s] attached to sides. Painted with red-brown pigments zig zags on upper torso, two stripes on waist. Rounded base

*Technology:* clay, painted with stripes.

*Comparanda:* KesS-1; SAB-1

*Condition:* Head, neck and right arm broken off.

*Publication:* Becker 2009 31-33, abb. 3-7.3 (Illustration from this source)
**TH-23**

**Museum:** Syria  
**Excav. No:** TH07C-0134  
**Findspot:** 2007 season, Surface find from survey of area C  
**Type:** LH.1A  
**Typological Date:** late Halaf

*Description:* lower torso and leg fragment of a seated female figurine.

*Length:* [40]mm  
*Width:* [30]mm  
*Thick:* [25]mm

*Condition:* Broken off at waist, missing upper body

*Technology:* Clay

*Publication:* Becker 2009, 31-33 abb 3-7.4 (Illustration from this source)
Figure A.75: Tell Halaf figurines from 2010 season, step trench cut into northern slope left to right, upper row TH-24, TH-25, TH-26, lower row TH-27, TH-28

**TH-24**

*Museum:* Syria  
*Excav. No:* unknown  
*Findspot:* 2010 season, Area B, step trench cut into Northern slope  
*Type:* LH.1A  
*Stratigraphic Date:* late Halaf  
*Description:* Upper torso fragment of a [seated] female figurine.  
*Publication:* Becker 2012d fig 1. (photo from this source see Figure A.75)

**TH-25**

*Museum:* Syria  
*Excav. No:* unknown  
*Findspot:* 2010 season, Area B, step trench cut into Northern slope  
*Type:* LH.1B  
*Stratigraphic Date:* late Halaf

---

186 Downloaded 2012 from: [http://www.grabung-halaf.de](http://www.grabung-halaf.de)
Description: Seated male with [arms] resting on thigh[s]. Flat appliqué breasts stuck-on to slim torso. Lower leg[s] painted with 4 horizontal stripes.

Publication: Becker 2012d fig. 1 (photo from this source see Figure A.75)

**TH-26**

*Museum:* Syria  
*Excav. No:* unknown  
*Type:* LH.1B  

*Findspot:* 2010 season, Area B, step trench cut into Northern slope  

*Stratigraphic Date:* late Halaf

Description: Upper torso and head fragment of a [seated male] figure with applique breasts. Painted with a red wash.

Publication: Becker 2012d fig. 1 (photo from this source see: Figure A.75)

**TH-27**

*Museum:* Syria  
*Excav. No:* unknown  
*Type:* LH.1B  

*Findspot:* 2010 season, Area B, step trench cut into Northern slope  

*Stratigraphic Date:* late Halaf

Description: Lower torso fragment of a seated male figure. Painted with 4 or 5 stripes on the front calves.

Publication: Becker 2012d fig. 1 (photo from this source see Figure A.75)

**TH-28**

*Museum:* Syria  
*Excav. No:* unknown  
*Type:* LH.1B  

*Findspot:* 2010 season, Area B, step trench cut into Northern slope  

*Stratigraphic Date:* late Halaf

Description: Lower torso fragment of a seated male figure. Painted with 4 or 5 stripes on the front calve[s].

Publication: Becker 2012d fig. 1 (photo from this source see Figure A.75)
Tell Beydar

**Bey-1**

*Museum:* DezZ 12479  *Excav. inventory no:* 94-122  *field no:* 7654.M1 G94  *Type:* LH.1A

*Findspot:* 1994 season, found on Sept. 1, Chantier G square 100.039d at 372.56m  *Typological Date:* late Halaf

*Archaeological Context:* within a layer of compact soil, perhaps a 3rd millennium floor. 187

![Image of a seated female figurine](image)

*Description:* Seated female, knees drawn up to stomach, arms encircling breasts, which hang from attachments at shoulders. Hands joined between breasts, left over right. Slim waist, flat back and base. Painted with three horizontal brown stripes, 3.2mm wide, across front calves and ankle. Pointed feet have clay appliqués on sides, representing sandals. Traces of paint also on neck and feet. Sits on flat base and lays on flat back without support

*Length:* 46.8mm  
*Width:* 11.8mm at head, 33.9mm at arms, 18.6 at waist, 22.6mm at feet.  
*Thick:* 27.3mm

*Technology:* Clay, 5YR 7/4 a pink surface and 10YR 7/2 a light grey core. Formed in parts  
Painted on legs with 7.5YR 6/3 a light brown and on neck 2.5YR 6/6 a light red.

*Condition:* Missing head otherwise complete. Chipped off tip of left breast, mid-buttocks, right hip and side of right knee.

*Comparanda:* CB-5

*Publication:* Lebeau and Souleiman 1997, 169, 174 pl. I: 3

---

187 "The ceramic retrieved from that compact layer/floor is definitely Early Jezirah IIIa (c 2575-2475 BC)" (Marc Lebeau, personal email communication 4/3/2010)
Tell Arjoune

**Arj-1**

*Museum: Homs*  
*Excav. No: 458*  
*Type: LH.2B*

Stratigraphic Date: late Halaf

*Description:* Standing female figure fashioned from a natural pebble. Features incised and punctated, eyes by drill surrounded by circle (from drill?) enclosed by incised square (right) and triangle (left) surrounded with long lashes, pubic area represented by incised square enclosing punctation with vertical incisions under. On back vertical incisions appear to represent hair, a thin rectangle perhaps representing buttocks? May stand on flat base?

*Length:* [120]mm  
*Width:* [55]mm

*Technology:* Stone, natural flat pebble, incised on both sides, punctuated on front, perhaps ground on to create flat base?

*Comparanda:* DT1, DT-3  
Similar eyes to CB-3, CB-20, CB-40  
Similar pubic square to TK-2  
Similar hair on back to Arj-2, Arj-3

*Publication:* Mathias 2003: 169, fig. 64: 1, pl. VII: 1 (Illustration from this source)

---

188 All of the figurines presented here are reported to have been deposited in the Homs museum (Parr 2003 viii). However I became aware of these examples after my research trips to Syria, so all of this information is from the publication (Mathais 2003).
**Arj-2**

*Museum:* Homs  
*Excav. No:* 459  
*Type:* LH.2B  

*Findspot:* 1979 season, Tr. V, Sq. 112.2  
*Stratigraphic Date:* late Halaf

*Description:* Fragment of [standing female figure?] fashioned from a natural flat pebble. Incised with vertical lines, perhaps representing hair? Depression at base appears to be a chip.

*Length:* [40]mm  
*Width:* [60]mm

*Technology:* Stone, natural occurring pebble.

*Comparanda:* Similar hair on back to Arj-1, Arj-3

*Publication:* Mathais 2003: 169, fig 64: 2, pl. VII: 2 (Illustration from this source)
**Arj-3**

*Museum*: Homs  
*Excav. No*: 526  
*Type*: LH.2B  
*Findspot*: 1979 Season, Tr. V, Sq. 112.2  
*Stratigraphic Date*: late Halaf

*Description*: Standing triangle shaped figure fashioned from a flat natural occurring pebble. Incised and punctuated to represent features. Two eyes punctated at either side near apex of triangle. Vertical crossing incisions on back to represent hair.

*Length*: [25]mm  
*Width*: [30]mm

*Technology*: Stone, natural occurring pebble, incised and punctated.

*Condition*: Complete?

*Comparanda*: Similar hair on back to Arj-1, Arj-2

*Publication*: Mathais 2003: 169, fig 64: 3, pl. VII: 1 (Illustration from this source)
**Arj-4**

*Museum:* Homs  
*Excav. No:* 487  
*Type:* LH.2B

*Findspot:* 1979 season, Tr. V, Sq. 310.1  
*Stratigraphic Date:* late Halaf

*Description:* Fragment of upper portion of a standing figure incised on edges near top with two parallel horizontal lines, representing eyes? This example is only tenuously anthropomorphic. Appears to have had lower portion broken off.

*Size unknown*

*Technology:* Stone, natural occurring pebble, incised

*Publication:* Mathais 2003: 169, fig 64: 4, pl VII: 3. (Illustration from this source)
**Ari-5**

*Museum:* Homs  
*Excav. No:* 520  
*Type:* LH.2B  
*Findspot:* 1979 season, Tr. V Sq. 115.3  
*Stratigraphic Date:* late Halaf

*Description:* Fragment of lower portion of a standing figure. Two incised parallel line represent belt around waist, two diagonal incisions between them on left side. Appears to have had upper portion broken off.

*Size unknown*

*Publication:* Mathais 2003: 169, fig 64: 5, pl. VII: 4. (Illustration from this source)
**Arj-6**

*Museum:* Homs  
*Excav. No:* 504  
*Type:* LH.2B  
*Findspot:* 1979 Season, Tr. V, Sq. 115.3  
*Stratigraphic Date:* late Halaf

*Description:* Standing figure, from a natural occurring pebble. Incised, two parallel horizontal lines on either side of upper portion, representing eyes, one vertical line at center of base, representing vulva?

*Publication:* Mathais 2003: 169, fig 64: 6, pl. VII: 2h. (Illustration from this source)
APPENDIX C: Figurine Corpus in Twelve Elements

Site Abbreviations used in this Appendix and Modern Locations

Arj: Arjoune (Orontes, Homs, Syria)
CB: Chagar Bazar (Balikh, Syria)
ČT: Çavı Tarlası (Euphrates, Turkey)
Bey: Tell Beydar (Khabur, Syria)
DT: Domuztepe (Cilicia, Amanus, Turkey)
FH: Fıstıklı Höyük (Euphrates, Turkey)
GH: Girikihacıyan (Tigris, Turkey)
KeshS: Khirbet esh-Shenef (Balikh, Syria)
KerkH: Kerkuşti Höyük (Mardin, Turkey)
KK: Tell Kashkashok (Khabur, Syria)
KH: Kazane Höyük (Euphrates, Turkey)
SAB: Tell Sabi Abyad (Balikh, Syria)
TA: Tell Aqab (Khabur, Syria)
TH: Tell Halaf (Khabur, Syria)
TK: Tell Kurdu (Hatay, Turkey)
UQ: Umm Qseir (Khabur, Syria)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Fragment (less 2/3 original)</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Gender Indicator</th>
<th>Breasts Evidence</th>
<th>Archaeol Context</th>
<th>Head Evidence</th>
<th>Surface Decoration</th>
<th>Decoration Location</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Display</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FH-1</td>
<td>EH</td>
<td>fragment</td>
<td>female</td>
<td>breasts</td>
<td>loose in fill</td>
<td>head</td>
<td>incised lines</td>
<td>waist</td>
<td>EH.2B</td>
<td>broken base</td>
<td></td>
<td>deliberate damaged?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FH-2</td>
<td>EH</td>
<td>complete</td>
<td>male</td>
<td>penis attachment scar</td>
<td>loose in fill</td>
<td>head</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>EH.2A</td>
<td>stable on base</td>
<td>rubbing and wear</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FH-3</td>
<td>EH</td>
<td>fragment</td>
<td>female</td>
<td>breasts</td>
<td>loose in fill</td>
<td>broken off at neck</td>
<td>incised line</td>
<td>waist</td>
<td>EH.2B</td>
<td>broken base</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FH-4</td>
<td>EH</td>
<td>complete</td>
<td>not sexed</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>loose in fill</td>
<td>headless</td>
<td>incised lines</td>
<td>sealing face</td>
<td>EH.4A</td>
<td>pierced</td>
<td>stone seal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TK-1</td>
<td>EH</td>
<td>complete</td>
<td>not sexed</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>loose in fill</td>
<td>broken off at neck</td>
<td>incised lines</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>EH.2A</td>
<td>stable on base</td>
<td>kneeling?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TK-2</td>
<td>EH</td>
<td>complete</td>
<td>female</td>
<td>pubic square</td>
<td>loose in fill</td>
<td>Neck broken off</td>
<td>incised lines, punctuation</td>
<td>pubic area</td>
<td>EH.2A</td>
<td>needs support</td>
<td>May have been pierced?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TK-3</td>
<td>EH</td>
<td>fragment</td>
<td>not sexed</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>loose in fill</td>
<td>headless</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>EH. unknown</td>
<td>broken base</td>
<td>animal figurine?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TK-4</td>
<td>LH</td>
<td>complete</td>
<td>not sexed</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>loose in fill</td>
<td>upper torso broken off</td>
<td>painted stripes</td>
<td>neck, waist, back</td>
<td>LH.1A variation</td>
<td>stable on base</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TK-5</td>
<td>EH</td>
<td>fragment</td>
<td>female</td>
<td>vulva</td>
<td>upper torso broken off</td>
<td>upper torso broken off</td>
<td>fingernail and reed marks</td>
<td>all over</td>
<td>EH.2A</td>
<td>stable on base</td>
<td>Concave base</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TK-6</td>
<td>EH</td>
<td>fragment</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>torso missing</td>
<td>loose in fill</td>
<td>head fragment</td>
<td>incised lines, appliqué</td>
<td>eyes, nose, ears</td>
<td>EH. unknown</td>
<td>broken base</td>
<td>Bird-like form</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TK-7</td>
<td>LH</td>
<td>complete</td>
<td>female</td>
<td>breasts</td>
<td>loose in fill</td>
<td>broken off at neck</td>
<td>appliqué</td>
<td>breasts</td>
<td>LH.2A</td>
<td>stable on base</td>
<td>Concave base</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Phase</td>
<td>Fragment (less 2/3 original)</td>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>Gender Indicator</td>
<td>Breasts Evidence</td>
<td>Archaeol Context</td>
<td>Head Evidence</td>
<td>Surface Decoration</td>
<td>Decoration Location</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Display</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TK-8</td>
<td>EH</td>
<td>complete</td>
<td>female</td>
<td>vulva</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>loose in fill</td>
<td>broken off at neck</td>
<td>fingernail or reed marks</td>
<td>all over</td>
<td>EH.2A</td>
<td>stable on base</td>
<td>kneeling?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TK-9</td>
<td>EH</td>
<td>complete</td>
<td>female</td>
<td>breasts</td>
<td>appliquéd breasts</td>
<td>surface</td>
<td>head</td>
<td>appliqué, incised lines</td>
<td>nose, eyes</td>
<td>EH.2C</td>
<td>stable on base</td>
<td>animal figurine?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TK-10</td>
<td>EH</td>
<td>complete</td>
<td>not sexed</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>loose in fill</td>
<td>head</td>
<td>punctuation</td>
<td>chest</td>
<td>EH.2A</td>
<td>stable on base</td>
<td>beaded necklace?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TK-11</td>
<td>PH</td>
<td>fragment</td>
<td>torso missing</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>torso broken off</td>
<td>loose in fill</td>
<td>head fragment</td>
<td>appliquéd eyes</td>
<td>PH. unknown</td>
<td>broken base</td>
<td>coffee bean eyes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TK-12</td>
<td>PH</td>
<td>fragment</td>
<td>torso missing</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>torso broken off</td>
<td>loose in fill</td>
<td>head fragment</td>
<td>appliquéd eyes</td>
<td>PH. unknown</td>
<td>broken base</td>
<td>coffee bean eyes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TK-13</td>
<td>EH</td>
<td>complete</td>
<td>not sexed</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>loose in fill</td>
<td>head</td>
<td>incised lines</td>
<td>sealing face</td>
<td>EH.4A</td>
<td>pierced</td>
<td>stone seal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TK-14</td>
<td>EH</td>
<td>complete</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>loose in fill</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>incised lines</td>
<td>sealing face</td>
<td>EH.4B</td>
<td>pierced</td>
<td>stone seal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TK-15</td>
<td>EH</td>
<td>complete</td>
<td>female</td>
<td>breasts</td>
<td>appliquéd breasts</td>
<td>loose in fill</td>
<td>broken off at neck</td>
<td>appliquéd breasts</td>
<td>EH.2A</td>
<td>stable on base</td>
<td>concave base?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TK-16</td>
<td>EH</td>
<td>complete</td>
<td>female</td>
<td>breasts</td>
<td>appliquéd breasts</td>
<td>loose in fill</td>
<td>head</td>
<td>appliquéd breasts</td>
<td>EH.2A</td>
<td>stable on base</td>
<td>concave base?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TK-17</td>
<td>EH</td>
<td>complete</td>
<td>female</td>
<td>breasts</td>
<td>appliquéd breasts</td>
<td>loose in fill</td>
<td>broken off at neck</td>
<td>appliquéd breasts</td>
<td>EH.2A</td>
<td>stable on base</td>
<td>concave base?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GH-1</td>
<td>EH</td>
<td>complete</td>
<td>female</td>
<td>breasts</td>
<td>appliquéd attachment scars</td>
<td>loose in fill</td>
<td>broken off at neck</td>
<td>incised lines</td>
<td>pubic area, waist</td>
<td>EH.2B</td>
<td>needs support</td>
<td>hourglass shape</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GH-2</td>
<td>EH</td>
<td>complete</td>
<td>female</td>
<td>pubic triangle</td>
<td>upper torso broken off</td>
<td>loose in fill</td>
<td>broken off at neck</td>
<td>incised lines</td>
<td>pubic area, waist</td>
<td>EH.2D</td>
<td>stable on base</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GH-3</td>
<td>EH</td>
<td>complete</td>
<td>female</td>
<td>breasts</td>
<td>modeled breasts</td>
<td>with GH-5</td>
<td>broken off at neck</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>EH.2A</td>
<td>broken base</td>
<td>arm stubs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GH-4</td>
<td>EH</td>
<td>fragment</td>
<td>female</td>
<td>breasts</td>
<td>modeled breasts</td>
<td>loose in fill</td>
<td>broken off at neck</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>EH.2A</td>
<td>broken base</td>
<td>arm stubs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Phase</td>
<td>Fragment (less 2/3 original)</td>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>Gender Indicator</td>
<td>Breasts Evidence</td>
<td>Archaeol Context</td>
<td>Head Evidence</td>
<td>Surface Decoration</td>
<td>Decoration Location</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Display</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GH-5</td>
<td>EH</td>
<td>fragment</td>
<td>female</td>
<td>pubic triangle</td>
<td>upper torso</td>
<td>with GH-3</td>
<td>upper torso</td>
<td>incised lines</td>
<td>pubic area, waist</td>
<td>EH.1A</td>
<td>stable on base</td>
<td>coffee bean eyes animal figurine?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GH-6</td>
<td>EH</td>
<td>complete</td>
<td>not sexed</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>loose in fill</td>
<td>head</td>
<td>appliqué</td>
<td>eyes</td>
<td>EH. unknown broken base</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GH-7</td>
<td>LH</td>
<td>fragment</td>
<td>torso missing</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>loose in fill</td>
<td>upper torso</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>LH.1C needs support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GH-8</td>
<td>LH</td>
<td>fragment</td>
<td>torso missing</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>loose in fill</td>
<td>upper torso</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>LH.1C needs support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GH-9</td>
<td>LH</td>
<td>fragment</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>loose in fill</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>unknown LH. unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GH-10</td>
<td>EH</td>
<td>fragment</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>loose in fill</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>unknown LH. unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GH-11</td>
<td>LH</td>
<td>fragment</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>loose in fill</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>unknown LH. unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GH-12</td>
<td>EH</td>
<td>fragment</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>loose in fill</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>unknown LH. unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GH-13</td>
<td>LH</td>
<td>fragment</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>loose in fill</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>unknown LH. unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GH-14</td>
<td>EH</td>
<td>fragment</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>loose in fill</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>unknown LH. unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ÇT 1</td>
<td>LH</td>
<td>complete</td>
<td>not sexed</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>tholos</td>
<td>head</td>
<td>incised lines</td>
<td>waist, torso</td>
<td>LH.2B stable on base</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ÇT 2</td>
<td>LH</td>
<td>fragment</td>
<td>female</td>
<td>breasts, molded</td>
<td>loose in fill</td>
<td>neck hole</td>
<td>punctuation</td>
<td>navel</td>
<td>LH.2B stable on base</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Phase</td>
<td>Fragment (less 2/3 original)</td>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>Gender Indicator</td>
<td>Breasts Evidence</td>
<td>Archaeol Context</td>
<td>Head Evidence</td>
<td>Surface Decoration</td>
<td>Decoration Location</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Display</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ÇT 3</td>
<td>LH</td>
<td>fragment</td>
<td>female</td>
<td>breasts</td>
<td>modeled breasts</td>
<td>loose in fill</td>
<td>neck hole</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>L.H.1C</td>
<td>broken base</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ÇT-4</td>
<td>LH</td>
<td>fragment</td>
<td>female</td>
<td>breasts</td>
<td>modeled breasts</td>
<td>loose in fill</td>
<td>neck hole</td>
<td>punctuation</td>
<td>navel</td>
<td>L.H.2B</td>
<td>broken base</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ÇT-5</td>
<td>LH</td>
<td>fragment</td>
<td>female</td>
<td>breasts</td>
<td>appliqué breasts</td>
<td>loose in fill</td>
<td>head</td>
<td>painted stripes</td>
<td>torso sides, neck back</td>
<td>L.H.2A</td>
<td>broken base</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ÇT-6</td>
<td>LH</td>
<td>complete</td>
<td>not sexed</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>tholos</td>
<td>head</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>L.H.1C</td>
<td>needs support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ÇT-7</td>
<td>LH</td>
<td>fragment</td>
<td>female</td>
<td>pubic triangle</td>
<td>upper torso broken off</td>
<td>loose in fill</td>
<td>upper torso broken off</td>
<td>painted stripes</td>
<td>pubic area, lower back, legs</td>
<td>L.H.1C</td>
<td>needs support</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ÇT-8</td>
<td>LH</td>
<td>fragment</td>
<td>female</td>
<td>pubic triangle</td>
<td>upper torso broken off</td>
<td>loose in fill</td>
<td>upper torso broken off</td>
<td>incised lines, painted wash</td>
<td>pubic area</td>
<td>L.H.1C</td>
<td>needs support</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ÇT-9</td>
<td>LH</td>
<td>fragment</td>
<td>female</td>
<td>pubic triangle</td>
<td>upper torso broken off</td>
<td>loose in fill</td>
<td>upper torso broken off</td>
<td>incised lines, punctuation</td>
<td>pubic area, waist, navel</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>broken base</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ÇT-10</td>
<td>LH</td>
<td>fragment</td>
<td>female</td>
<td>pubic triangle</td>
<td>upper torso broken off</td>
<td>loose in fill</td>
<td>upper torso broken off</td>
<td>incised lines, punctuation</td>
<td>pubic area</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>broken base</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ÇT-11</td>
<td>LH</td>
<td>fragment</td>
<td>torso missing</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>upper torso broken off</td>
<td>loose in fill</td>
<td>upper torso broken off</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>L.H.1C</td>
<td>needs support</td>
<td>wear on sole of foot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ÇT-12</td>
<td>LH</td>
<td>fragment</td>
<td>torso missing</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>upper torso broken off</td>
<td>loose in fill</td>
<td>upper torso broken off</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>L.H.1C</td>
<td>needs support</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>593</td>
<td>LH fragment</td>
<td>torso missing</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>upper torso broken off</td>
<td>loose in fill</td>
<td>upper torso broken off</td>
<td>painted wash</td>
<td>leg</td>
<td>LH.1C</td>
<td>needs support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>594</td>
<td>LH complete</td>
<td>female breasts modeled breasts</td>
<td>surface</td>
<td>head</td>
<td>incised</td>
<td>sealing face</td>
<td>LH.4A</td>
<td>pierced</td>
<td>stone seal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>595</td>
<td>LH fragment</td>
<td>not sexed none</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>surface</td>
<td>neck hole</td>
<td>painted, stripes</td>
<td>waist</td>
<td>LH.2B</td>
<td>broken base</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>596</td>
<td>LH complete female pubic triangle</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>loose in fill</td>
<td>broken off at neck</td>
<td>incised lines</td>
<td>pubic area, waist, neck</td>
<td>LH.2B</td>
<td>stable on base &amp; pierced</td>
<td>stone pendant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>597</td>
<td>LH fragment not sexed none</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>loose in fill</td>
<td>head</td>
<td>incised lines</td>
<td>arms</td>
<td>LH.2B</td>
<td>pierced</td>
<td>stone pendant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>598</td>
<td>LH complete female pubic triangle</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>loose in fill</td>
<td>broken off at neck</td>
<td>incised lines</td>
<td>waist, pubic area</td>
<td>LH.2B</td>
<td>pierced</td>
<td>stone pendant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>599</td>
<td>LH? complete not sexed none</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>loose in fill</td>
<td>headless</td>
<td>incised lines</td>
<td>all over front</td>
<td>LH.2B</td>
<td>pierced</td>
<td>stone pendant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>600</td>
<td>LH complete not sexed none</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>loose in fill</td>
<td>head</td>
<td>incised lines</td>
<td>edge, front</td>
<td>LH.2B</td>
<td>pierced</td>
<td>stone pendant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>601</td>
<td>LH complete not sexed none</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>loose in fill</td>
<td>headless</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>LH.2B</td>
<td>pierced</td>
<td>stone pendant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>602</td>
<td>LH fragment torso missing unknown</td>
<td>upper torso broken off</td>
<td>loose in fill</td>
<td>upper torso broken off</td>
<td>incised lines</td>
<td>arms</td>
<td>LH.2B</td>
<td>pierced</td>
<td>stone pendant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>603</td>
<td>LH fragment torso missing unknown</td>
<td>upper torso broken off</td>
<td>loose in fill</td>
<td>upper torso broken off</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>LH.2B</td>
<td>pierced</td>
<td>stone pendant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>604</td>
<td>LH fragment not sexed none</td>
<td>upper torso broken off</td>
<td>loose in fill</td>
<td>upper torso broken off</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>LH.2B</td>
<td>pierced</td>
<td>stone pendant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Phase</td>
<td>Fragment (less 2/3 original)</td>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>Gender Indicator</td>
<td>Breasts Evidence</td>
<td>Archaeol Context</td>
<td>Head Evidence</td>
<td>Surface Decoration</td>
<td>Decoration Location</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Display</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DT-10</td>
<td>LH</td>
<td>fragment</td>
<td>torso missing</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>upper torso broken off</td>
<td>loose in fill</td>
<td>head fragment</td>
<td>incised lines, drilling, appliqué</td>
<td>hair, eyes, nose</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>broken base</td>
<td>head frag.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DT-11</td>
<td>LH</td>
<td>complete</td>
<td>male/female</td>
<td>penis, breasts</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>loose in fill</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>incised line</td>
<td>penis</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>stable on base</td>
<td>stone phallus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DT-12</td>
<td>LH</td>
<td>complete</td>
<td>female</td>
<td>pubic triangle, breasts</td>
<td>modeled breasts</td>
<td>loose in fill</td>
<td>head</td>
<td>painted stripes and details</td>
<td>ankles, knees, waist, pubic area, face</td>
<td>LH.3A</td>
<td>stable on base</td>
<td>figurine vessel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DT-13</td>
<td>EH</td>
<td>fragment</td>
<td>torso missing</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>upper torso broken off</td>
<td>loose in fill</td>
<td>upper torso broken off</td>
<td>painted wash</td>
<td>foot</td>
<td>EH.3A</td>
<td>stable on base</td>
<td>figurine vessel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DT-14</td>
<td>LH</td>
<td>fragment</td>
<td>torso missing</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>upper torso broken off</td>
<td>loose in fill</td>
<td>upper torso broken off</td>
<td>painted wash</td>
<td>foot</td>
<td>LH.3A</td>
<td>stable on feet</td>
<td>figurine vessel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DT-15</td>
<td>LH</td>
<td>fragment</td>
<td>torso missing</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>upper torso broken off</td>
<td>loose in fill</td>
<td>upper torso broken off</td>
<td>painted</td>
<td>leg</td>
<td>LH.3A</td>
<td>broken base</td>
<td>figurine vessel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DT-16</td>
<td>LH</td>
<td>complete</td>
<td>not sexed</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>death pit</td>
<td>head</td>
<td>painted and incised</td>
<td>all over front</td>
<td>LH.2E</td>
<td>pierced</td>
<td>stone bead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DT-17</td>
<td>EH</td>
<td>complete?</td>
<td>not sexed</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>loose in fill</td>
<td>head</td>
<td>painted lines</td>
<td>sealing face</td>
<td>EH.2B</td>
<td>pierced</td>
<td>stone pendant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DT-18</td>
<td>LH</td>
<td>complete</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>loose in fill</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>incised lines</td>
<td>sealing face</td>
<td>LH.4C</td>
<td>pierced</td>
<td>stone seal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DT-19</td>
<td>LH</td>
<td>complete</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>loose in fill</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>incised lines</td>
<td>sealing face</td>
<td>LH.4B</td>
<td>pierced</td>
<td>stone seal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DT-20</td>
<td>EH</td>
<td>complete</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>loose in fill</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>incised lines</td>
<td>sealing face</td>
<td>EH.4B</td>
<td>pierced</td>
<td>stone seal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Phase</td>
<td>Gender Indicator</td>
<td>Breasts Evidence</td>
<td>Archaeol Context</td>
<td>Head Evidence</td>
<td>Surface Decoration</td>
<td>Decoration Location</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Display</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DT-21</td>
<td>EH</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>loose in fill</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>incised lines</td>
<td>sealing face</td>
<td>EH 4B</td>
<td>pierced</td>
<td>stone seal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DT-22</td>
<td>EH</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>loose in fill</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>incised lines</td>
<td>sealing face</td>
<td>EH 4B</td>
<td>pierced</td>
<td>stone seal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KerkH-1</td>
<td>LH</td>
<td>female</td>
<td>public triangle</td>
<td>upper torso</td>
<td>broken off</td>
<td>painted and incised</td>
<td>all over</td>
<td>L.H.2B</td>
<td>broken</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KerkH-2</td>
<td>LH</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KH-1</td>
<td>LH</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAB-1</td>
<td>EH</td>
<td>female</td>
<td>modeled breasts</td>
<td>pit</td>
<td>neck hole</td>
<td>painted and incised</td>
<td>all over</td>
<td>EH.2A</td>
<td>stable on base</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAB-2</td>
<td>EH</td>
<td>not sexed</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>oven</td>
<td>neck hole</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>EH.2C</td>
<td>broken base</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAB-3</td>
<td>EH</td>
<td>not sexed</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>upper torso</td>
<td>room 11 group</td>
<td>headless</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>EH.2C</td>
<td>stable on base</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAB-4</td>
<td>EH</td>
<td>not sexed</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>room 11 group</td>
<td>head</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>EH.2C</td>
<td>needs support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAB-5</td>
<td>EH</td>
<td>not sexed</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>room 11 group</td>
<td>headless</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>EH.2A</td>
<td>broken base</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAB-6</td>
<td>EH</td>
<td>not sexed</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>room 11 group</td>
<td>broken off</td>
<td>at neck</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>EH.2A</td>
<td>needs support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAB-7</td>
<td>EH</td>
<td>not sexed</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>room 11 group</td>
<td>upper torso</td>
<td>incised lines</td>
<td>waist</td>
<td>EH.2D</td>
<td>broken base</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAB-8</td>
<td>EH</td>
<td>not sexed</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>upper torso</td>
<td>loose in fill</td>
<td>upper torso</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>EH 2D</td>
<td>stable on base</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UQ-1</td>
<td>EH</td>
<td>not sexed</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>loose in fill</td>
<td>head</td>
<td>incised lines</td>
<td>sealing face</td>
<td>EH.4A</td>
<td>pierced</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

595
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CB-1</td>
<td>LH</td>
<td>complete</td>
<td>female</td>
<td>breasts</td>
<td>modeled breasts</td>
<td>level 8 group</td>
<td>broken off at neck</td>
<td>painted stripes</td>
<td>all over</td>
<td>LH.1A</td>
<td>stable on base</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CB-2</td>
<td>LH</td>
<td>complete</td>
<td>female</td>
<td>breasts</td>
<td>modeled breasts</td>
<td>level 8 group</td>
<td>head</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>LH.1A</td>
<td>stable on base</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CB-3</td>
<td>LH</td>
<td>complete</td>
<td>female</td>
<td>breasts</td>
<td>modeled breasts</td>
<td>level 8 group</td>
<td>head</td>
<td>painted stripes, three colors</td>
<td>all over, eyes</td>
<td>LH.1A</td>
<td>stable on base</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CB-4</td>
<td>LH</td>
<td>complete</td>
<td>female</td>
<td>breasts</td>
<td>modeled breasts</td>
<td>level 8 group</td>
<td>broken off at neck</td>
<td>painted stripes and wash</td>
<td>breasts, arms, legs, pubic area</td>
<td>LH.1A</td>
<td>stable on base</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CB-5</td>
<td>LH</td>
<td>complete</td>
<td>female</td>
<td>breasts</td>
<td>modeled breasts</td>
<td>loose in fill</td>
<td>broken off at neck</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>LH.1A</td>
<td>stable on base</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CB-6</td>
<td>LH</td>
<td>complete</td>
<td>female</td>
<td>breasts</td>
<td>modeled breasts</td>
<td>loose in fill</td>
<td>broken off at neck</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>LH.1A</td>
<td>stable on base</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CB-7</td>
<td>LH</td>
<td>complete</td>
<td>female</td>
<td>breasts</td>
<td>attachment scars</td>
<td>loose in fill</td>
<td>broken off at neck</td>
<td>painted stripes</td>
<td>arms, waist, legs</td>
<td>LH.1A</td>
<td>stable on base</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CB-8</td>
<td>LH</td>
<td>fragment</td>
<td>female</td>
<td>breasts</td>
<td>modeled breasts</td>
<td>level 8 group</td>
<td>head</td>
<td>painted stripes</td>
<td>arms, neck</td>
<td>LH.1A</td>
<td>broken base</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CB-9</td>
<td>LH</td>
<td>fragment</td>
<td>female</td>
<td>breasts</td>
<td>modeled breasts</td>
<td>level 8 group</td>
<td>broken off at neck</td>
<td>painted stripes, wash, punctuatio n</td>
<td>arms, stomach, feet</td>
<td>LH.1A</td>
<td>stable on base</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CB-10</td>
<td>LH</td>
<td>fragment</td>
<td>female</td>
<td>breasts</td>
<td>attachment scars</td>
<td>loose in fill</td>
<td>broken off at neck</td>
<td>painted stripes</td>
<td>arms, neck, waist</td>
<td>LH.1A</td>
<td>stable on base</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CB-11</td>
<td>LH</td>
<td>fragment</td>
<td>female</td>
<td>pubic triangle</td>
<td>upper torso broken off</td>
<td>level 8 group</td>
<td>upper torso broken off</td>
<td>painted stripes, wash</td>
<td>pubic area, calves</td>
<td>LH.1A</td>
<td>stable on base</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Phase</td>
<td>Fragment (less 2/3 original)</td>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>Gender Indicator</td>
<td>Breasts Evidence</td>
<td>Archaeol Context</td>
<td>Head Evidence</td>
<td>Surface Decoration</td>
<td>Decoration Location</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Display</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CB-12</td>
<td>LH</td>
<td>fragment</td>
<td>female</td>
<td>breasts</td>
<td>attachment scars</td>
<td>loose in fill</td>
<td>broken off at neck</td>
<td>painted stripes</td>
<td>neck, waist</td>
<td>L.H.1A</td>
<td>stable on base</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CB-13</td>
<td>LH</td>
<td>fragment</td>
<td>female</td>
<td>pubic triangle</td>
<td>upper torso broken off</td>
<td>loose in fill</td>
<td>upper torso broken off</td>
<td>painted stripes, wash</td>
<td>pubic area, calves</td>
<td>L.H.1A</td>
<td>stable on base</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CB-14</td>
<td>LH</td>
<td>fragment</td>
<td>female</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>upper torso broken off</td>
<td>loose in fill</td>
<td>upper torso broken off</td>
<td>painted stripes</td>
<td>ankle</td>
<td>L.H.1A</td>
<td>stable on base</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CB-15</td>
<td>LH</td>
<td>fragment</td>
<td>female</td>
<td>breasts</td>
<td>modeled breasts</td>
<td>level 8 group</td>
<td>head</td>
<td>painted stripes</td>
<td>head, headdress, neck, arm, breasts</td>
<td>L.H.1A</td>
<td>broken base</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CB-16</td>
<td>LH</td>
<td>fragment</td>
<td>female</td>
<td>breasts</td>
<td>attachment scars</td>
<td>loose in fill</td>
<td>broken off at neck</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>L.H.1A</td>
<td>broken base</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CB-17</td>
<td>LH</td>
<td>fragment</td>
<td>female</td>
<td>breasts</td>
<td>modeled breasts</td>
<td>loose in fill</td>
<td>broken off at neck</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>L.H.1A</td>
<td>stable on base</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CB-18</td>
<td>LH</td>
<td>fragment</td>
<td>female</td>
<td>breasts</td>
<td>attachment scars</td>
<td>loose in fill</td>
<td>broken off at neck</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>L.H.1A</td>
<td>broken base</td>
<td>fingerprin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CB-19</td>
<td>LH</td>
<td>complete</td>
<td>female</td>
<td>breasts</td>
<td>modeled breasts</td>
<td>loose in fill</td>
<td>head</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>L.H.2A</td>
<td>stable on base</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CB-20</td>
<td>LH</td>
<td>fragment</td>
<td>female</td>
<td>breasts</td>
<td>attachment scars</td>
<td>loose in fill</td>
<td>head</td>
<td>painted stripes and dots</td>
<td>all over</td>
<td>L.H.1A</td>
<td>broken base</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CB-21</td>
<td>LH</td>
<td>complete</td>
<td>male</td>
<td>penis</td>
<td>appliqué breasts</td>
<td>loose in fill</td>
<td>broken off at neck</td>
<td>stripes</td>
<td>neck, torso, calves</td>
<td>L.H.1B</td>
<td>needs support</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Phase</td>
<td>Fragment (less 2/3 original)</td>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>Gender Indicator</td>
<td>Breasts Evidence</td>
<td>Archaeol Context</td>
<td>Head Evidence</td>
<td>Surface Decoration</td>
<td>Decoration Location</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Display</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CB-22</td>
<td>LH</td>
<td>complete</td>
<td>not sexed</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>level 8 group</td>
<td>head</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>LH.1A variation</td>
<td>stable on base</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CB-23</td>
<td>LH</td>
<td>complete</td>
<td>not sexed</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>loose in fill</td>
<td>broken off at neck</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>LH.2A</td>
<td>stable on base</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CB-24</td>
<td>LH</td>
<td>complete</td>
<td>not sexed</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>level 8 group</td>
<td>broken off at neck</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>LH.1A variation</td>
<td>stable on base</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CB-25</td>
<td>LH</td>
<td>fragment</td>
<td>not sexed</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>loose in fill</td>
<td>broken off at neck</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>LH.1A</td>
<td>stable on base</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CB-26</td>
<td>LH</td>
<td>complete</td>
<td>not sexed</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>loose in fill</td>
<td>head</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>LH.2C</td>
<td>broken base</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CB-27</td>
<td>LH</td>
<td>fragment</td>
<td>female</td>
<td>pubic triangle</td>
<td>upper torso broken off</td>
<td>loose in fill</td>
<td>upper torso broken off</td>
<td>incised lines, punctuation</td>
<td>pubic area, navel</td>
<td>LH.2E</td>
<td>broken base</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CB-28</td>
<td>LH</td>
<td>fragment</td>
<td>female</td>
<td>pubic triangle</td>
<td>upper torso broken off</td>
<td>loose in fill</td>
<td>upper torso broken off</td>
<td>incised lines</td>
<td>pubic area</td>
<td>LH.2E</td>
<td>broken base</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CB-29</td>
<td>LH</td>
<td>fragment</td>
<td>female</td>
<td>breasts</td>
<td>modeled breasts</td>
<td>level 8 group</td>
<td>head</td>
<td>painted stripes</td>
<td>head, headdress, neck, arm, breasts</td>
<td>LH.1A</td>
<td>stable on base</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CB-30</td>
<td>LH</td>
<td>fragment</td>
<td>female</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>upper torso broken off</td>
<td>loose in fill</td>
<td>upper torso broken off</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>LH.1A</td>
<td>stable on base</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CB-31</td>
<td>LH</td>
<td>complete</td>
<td>female</td>
<td>breasts</td>
<td>modeled breasts</td>
<td>loose in fill</td>
<td>head</td>
<td>painted stripes dots 2colors</td>
<td>all over</td>
<td>LH.1A</td>
<td>stable on base</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Phase</td>
<td>Fragment (less 2/3 original)</td>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>Gender Indicator</td>
<td>Breasts Evidence</td>
<td>Archaeol Context</td>
<td>Head Evidence</td>
<td>Surface Decoration</td>
<td>Decoration Location</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Display</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CB-32</td>
<td>LH</td>
<td>fragment</td>
<td>female</td>
<td>breasts</td>
<td>modeled breasts</td>
<td>loose in fill</td>
<td>upper torso broken off</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>LH.1A</td>
<td>stable on base</td>
<td>tool marks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CB-33</td>
<td>LH</td>
<td>fragment</td>
<td>torso broken off</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>loose in fill</td>
<td>upper torso broken off</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>LH.2E</td>
<td>stable on base</td>
<td>stands on feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CB-34</td>
<td>LH</td>
<td>fragment</td>
<td>torso broken off</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>loose in fill</td>
<td>torso broken off</td>
<td>painted stripe</td>
<td>lower leg</td>
<td>LH.1A</td>
<td>fragment</td>
<td>leg fragment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CB-35</td>
<td>LH</td>
<td>fragment</td>
<td>torso broken off</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>loose in fill</td>
<td>torso broken off</td>
<td>painted stripe and burnishing</td>
<td>lower leg</td>
<td>LH. unknown</td>
<td>fragment</td>
<td>may not be a figurine leg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CB-36</td>
<td>LH</td>
<td>fragment</td>
<td>female</td>
<td>type</td>
<td>upper torso broken off</td>
<td>loose in fill</td>
<td>upper torso broken off</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>LH.1A</td>
<td>fragment</td>
<td>may not be a figurine fragment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CB-37</td>
<td>LH</td>
<td>fragment</td>
<td>female</td>
<td>breast</td>
<td>molded breasts</td>
<td>loose in fill</td>
<td>headless?</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>LH. unknown</td>
<td>fragment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CB-38</td>
<td>LH</td>
<td>complete</td>
<td>unsexed</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>loose in fill</td>
<td>head</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>LH.2A</td>
<td>stable on base</td>
<td>may have held inlay?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CB-39</td>
<td>LH</td>
<td>fragment</td>
<td>female</td>
<td>breast attachment scars and type</td>
<td>attachment scars</td>
<td>loose in fill</td>
<td>broken off at neck</td>
<td>painted stripes</td>
<td>neck, shoulder, hips, waist</td>
<td>LH.1A</td>
<td>broken off base</td>
<td>possibly deliberate battered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CB-40</td>
<td>LH</td>
<td>fragment</td>
<td>female</td>
<td>breast attachment scars and type</td>
<td>attachment scars</td>
<td>loose in fill</td>
<td>head</td>
<td>painted stripes, wash of 3 different colors</td>
<td>face, eyes, neck, shoulder hips waist</td>
<td>LH.1A</td>
<td>broken off at base</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fragment (less 2/3 original)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Gender Indicator</td>
<td>Breasts Evidence</td>
<td>Archaeol Context</td>
<td>Head Evidence</td>
<td>Surface Decoration</td>
<td>Decoration Location</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Display</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TA-1</td>
<td>LH</td>
<td>complete</td>
<td>male</td>
<td>breasts and type</td>
<td>appliquéd breasts</td>
<td>loose in fill</td>
<td>head</td>
<td>appliquéd feet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TA-2</td>
<td>LH</td>
<td>fragment</td>
<td>female</td>
<td>breasts</td>
<td>attachment scars</td>
<td>loose in fill</td>
<td>broken off</td>
<td>none</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>LH.1B needs support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TA-3</td>
<td>LH</td>
<td>fragment</td>
<td>female</td>
<td>type</td>
<td>upper torso, broken off</td>
<td>loose in fill</td>
<td>head fragment</td>
<td>painted wash</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>stable on base</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TA-4</td>
<td>LH</td>
<td>fragment</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>type</td>
<td>upper torso, broken off</td>
<td>loose in fill</td>
<td>head fragment</td>
<td>painted lines, face, neck</td>
<td>LH.1A or 1B</td>
<td>broken base</td>
<td>LH 1A head fragment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TA-5</td>
<td>LH</td>
<td>fragment</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>type</td>
<td>upper torso, broken off</td>
<td>loose in fill</td>
<td>head fragment</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>LH.1A or 1B</td>
<td>broken base</td>
<td>LH 1A head fragment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TA-6</td>
<td>LH</td>
<td>fragment</td>
<td>female</td>
<td>breasts</td>
<td>attachment scars</td>
<td>loose in fill</td>
<td>broken off</td>
<td>none</td>
<td></td>
<td>LH.1A</td>
<td>broken base</td>
<td>fingerprint, unfinished?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TA-7</td>
<td>EH</td>
<td>fragment</td>
<td>not sexed</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>upper torso, broken off</td>
<td>loose in fill</td>
<td>upper torso</td>
<td>none</td>
<td></td>
<td>EH.2A</td>
<td>stable on base</td>
<td>fingerprint</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TA-8</td>
<td>EH</td>
<td>fragment</td>
<td>not sexed</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>loose in fill</td>
<td>upper torso</td>
<td>broken off</td>
<td>none</td>
<td></td>
<td>EH.2A</td>
<td>stable on base</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TA-9</td>
<td>LH</td>
<td>fragment</td>
<td>torso missing</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>upper torso, broken off</td>
<td>loose in fill</td>
<td>upper torso</td>
<td>hanging legs, LH.1C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>needs support</td>
<td>leg fragment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TA-10</td>
<td>EH</td>
<td>fragment</td>
<td>torso missing</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>upper torso, broken off</td>
<td>loose in fill</td>
<td>upper torso</td>
<td>none</td>
<td></td>
<td>EH. unknown</td>
<td>broken base</td>
<td>arm fragment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Phase</td>
<td>Fragment (less 2/3 original)</td>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>Gender Indicator</td>
<td>Breasts Evidence</td>
<td>Archaeol Context</td>
<td>Head Evidence</td>
<td>Surface Decoration</td>
<td>Decoration Location</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Display</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TA-11</td>
<td>EH</td>
<td>fragment</td>
<td>torso missing</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>upper torso broken off</td>
<td>loose in fill</td>
<td>upper torso broken off</td>
<td>painted stripes</td>
<td>legs</td>
<td>EH</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>broken base ?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KeshS-1</td>
<td>LH</td>
<td>fragment</td>
<td>female</td>
<td>pubic triangle</td>
<td>upper torso broken off</td>
<td>loose in fill</td>
<td>upper torso broken off</td>
<td>painted stripes and dots</td>
<td>pubic area and back</td>
<td>EH.2A</td>
<td></td>
<td>stable on base</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KK-1</td>
<td>LH</td>
<td>complete</td>
<td>female</td>
<td>breasts</td>
<td>modeled breasts</td>
<td>loose in fill</td>
<td>head</td>
<td>painted stripes, wash</td>
<td>head, headdress, legs</td>
<td>LH.1A</td>
<td></td>
<td>stable on base</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KK-2</td>
<td>LH</td>
<td>complete</td>
<td>female</td>
<td>breasts</td>
<td>attachment scars</td>
<td>loose in fill</td>
<td>head</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>neck, torso, feet</td>
<td>LH.1A</td>
<td></td>
<td>stable on base</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KK-3</td>
<td>LH</td>
<td>complete</td>
<td>female</td>
<td>breasts</td>
<td>modeled breasts</td>
<td>loose in fill</td>
<td>head</td>
<td>painted stripes</td>
<td>head, headdress, legs</td>
<td>LH.1A</td>
<td></td>
<td>stable on base</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KK-4</td>
<td>LH</td>
<td>complete</td>
<td>female</td>
<td>breasts</td>
<td>modeled breasts</td>
<td>loose in fill</td>
<td>head</td>
<td>painted stripes</td>
<td>wrists</td>
<td>LH.1A</td>
<td></td>
<td>stable on base</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KK-5</td>
<td>LH</td>
<td>complete</td>
<td>female</td>
<td>breasts</td>
<td>modeled breasts</td>
<td>loose in fill</td>
<td>broken off at neck</td>
<td>painted stripes</td>
<td>wrists, breasts, legs</td>
<td>LH.1A</td>
<td></td>
<td>stable on base</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KK-6</td>
<td>LH</td>
<td>complete</td>
<td>female</td>
<td>breasts</td>
<td>modeled breasts</td>
<td>loose in fill</td>
<td>broken off at neck</td>
<td>painted wash</td>
<td>stomach</td>
<td>LH.1A</td>
<td></td>
<td>stable on base</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KK-7</td>
<td>LH</td>
<td>complete</td>
<td>female</td>
<td>breasts</td>
<td>modeled breasts</td>
<td>loose in fill</td>
<td>broken off at neck</td>
<td>painted stripes</td>
<td>arms, legs</td>
<td>LH.1A</td>
<td></td>
<td>stable on base</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KK-8</td>
<td>LH</td>
<td>complete</td>
<td>female</td>
<td>breasts</td>
<td>modeled breasts</td>
<td>loose in fill</td>
<td>broken off at neck</td>
<td>painted stripes</td>
<td>arms, legs</td>
<td>LH.1A</td>
<td></td>
<td>stable on base</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Phase</td>
<td>Fragment (less 2/3 original)</td>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>Gender Indicator</td>
<td>Breasts Evidence</td>
<td>Archaeol Context</td>
<td>Head Evidence</td>
<td>Surface Decoration</td>
<td>Decoration Location</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Display</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KK-9</td>
<td>LH</td>
<td>complete</td>
<td>female</td>
<td>breasts</td>
<td>modeled breasts</td>
<td>loose in fill</td>
<td>broken off at neck</td>
<td>painted stripes</td>
<td>breasts, arms,</td>
<td>LH.1A</td>
<td>stable on base</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KK-10</td>
<td>LH</td>
<td>fragment</td>
<td>female</td>
<td>breasts</td>
<td>modeled breasts</td>
<td>loose in fill</td>
<td>head</td>
<td>painted?</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>LH.1A</td>
<td>broken base</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KK-11</td>
<td>LH</td>
<td>fragment</td>
<td>female</td>
<td>breasts</td>
<td>attachment scars</td>
<td>loose in fill</td>
<td>broken off at neck</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>LH.1A</td>
<td>stable on base</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KK-12</td>
<td>LH</td>
<td>fragment</td>
<td>female</td>
<td>pose</td>
<td>upper torso broken off</td>
<td>loose in fill</td>
<td>upper torso broken off</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>LH.1A</td>
<td>stable on base</td>
<td>wear on toes and scrape off back</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KK-13</td>
<td>LH</td>
<td>fragment</td>
<td>female</td>
<td>breasts</td>
<td>attachment scars</td>
<td>loose in fill</td>
<td>head</td>
<td>painted stripes, wash</td>
<td>neck, arms, waist, hair</td>
<td>LH.1A</td>
<td>broken base</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KK-14</td>
<td>LH</td>
<td>complete</td>
<td>female</td>
<td>breasts</td>
<td>modeled breasts</td>
<td>loose in fill</td>
<td>head</td>
<td>painted stripes</td>
<td>neck, breasts, waist, calves</td>
<td>LH.1A</td>
<td>stable on base</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KK-15</td>
<td>LH</td>
<td>fragment</td>
<td>female</td>
<td>breasts</td>
<td>modeled breast[s]</td>
<td>loose in fill</td>
<td>upper torso broken off</td>
<td>painted stripes</td>
<td>arm, breast</td>
<td>LH.1A</td>
<td>broken base</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KK-16</td>
<td>LH</td>
<td>fragment</td>
<td>female</td>
<td>breasts</td>
<td>attachment scars</td>
<td>loose in fill</td>
<td>broken off at neck</td>
<td>painted stripes</td>
<td>neck, arms</td>
<td>LH.1A</td>
<td>broken base</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KK-17</td>
<td>LH</td>
<td>fragment</td>
<td>female</td>
<td>breasts</td>
<td>attachment scars</td>
<td>loose in fill</td>
<td>head</td>
<td>painted stripes</td>
<td>head, arm</td>
<td>LH.1A</td>
<td>broken base</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KK-18</td>
<td>LH</td>
<td>fragment</td>
<td>female</td>
<td>breasts</td>
<td>modeled breasts</td>
<td>loose in fill</td>
<td>broken off at neck</td>
<td>incised lines, punctuation appliqué</td>
<td>pubic area, navel, feet</td>
<td>LH.1A</td>
<td>stable on base</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Phase</td>
<td>Fragment (less 2/3 original)</td>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>Gender Indicator</td>
<td>Breasts Evidence</td>
<td>Archaeol Context</td>
<td>Head Evidence</td>
<td>Surface Decoration</td>
<td>Decoration Location</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Display</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>KK-19</strong></td>
<td>LH</td>
<td>complete</td>
<td>male</td>
<td>pose, breasts</td>
<td>appliqué breasts</td>
<td>loose in fill</td>
<td>broken off at neck</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>LH.1B</td>
<td></td>
<td>needs support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>KK-20</strong></td>
<td>LH</td>
<td>complete</td>
<td>male</td>
<td>pose, breasts</td>
<td>appliqué breasts</td>
<td>loose in fill</td>
<td>broken off at neck</td>
<td>painted stripes</td>
<td>neck, torso, waist</td>
<td>LH.1B</td>
<td></td>
<td>needs support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>KK-21</strong></td>
<td>LH</td>
<td>fragment</td>
<td>female</td>
<td>breasts</td>
<td>modeled breasts</td>
<td>loose in fill</td>
<td>broken off at neck</td>
<td>painted wash</td>
<td>torso</td>
<td>LH.1A</td>
<td>broken base</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>KK-22</strong></td>
<td>LH?</td>
<td>fragment</td>
<td>torso missing</td>
<td>upper torso broken off</td>
<td>loose in fill</td>
<td>head fragment</td>
<td>appliqué</td>
<td>eyes, nose, hair</td>
<td>L.H. unknown</td>
<td>broken base</td>
<td>head fragment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>KK-23</strong></td>
<td>LH</td>
<td>complete</td>
<td>female</td>
<td>breasts</td>
<td>modeled breasts</td>
<td>loose in fill</td>
<td>head</td>
<td>painted stripes, appliqué</td>
<td>arms, legs, foot</td>
<td>LH.1A</td>
<td>stable on base</td>
<td>head modern addition?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>KK-24</strong></td>
<td>LH</td>
<td>complete</td>
<td>female</td>
<td>breasts</td>
<td>modeled breasts</td>
<td>loose in fill</td>
<td>broken off at neck</td>
<td>painted wash, punctuated</td>
<td>paint over all base punctate</td>
<td>LH.1C</td>
<td></td>
<td>needs support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>KK-25</strong></td>
<td>LH?</td>
<td>fragment</td>
<td>torso missing</td>
<td>upper torso broken off</td>
<td>loose in fill</td>
<td>head fragment</td>
<td>appliqué</td>
<td>hair</td>
<td>L.H. unknown</td>
<td>broken base</td>
<td>head fragment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TH-1</strong></td>
<td>LH</td>
<td>complete</td>
<td>female</td>
<td>breasts</td>
<td>modeled breasts</td>
<td>loose in fill</td>
<td>head</td>
<td>painted stripes, appliqué</td>
<td>face, neck, breasts, arms, waist, legs, feet</td>
<td>LH.1A</td>
<td>stable on base</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TH-2</strong></td>
<td>LH</td>
<td>complete</td>
<td>female</td>
<td>breasts</td>
<td>modeled breasts</td>
<td>loose in fill</td>
<td>head</td>
<td>painted stripes</td>
<td>neck, breasts, arms, waist, legs</td>
<td>LH.1A</td>
<td>stable on base</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TH-3</strong></td>
<td>LH</td>
<td>complete</td>
<td>female</td>
<td>breasts</td>
<td>modeled breasts</td>
<td>loose in fill</td>
<td>broken off at neck</td>
<td>painted stripes, appliqué</td>
<td>breasts, arms, pubic area, legs, feet</td>
<td>LH.1A</td>
<td>stable on base</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Phase</td>
<td>Fragment (less 2/3 original)</td>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>Gender Indicator</td>
<td>Breasts Evidence</td>
<td>Archaeol Context</td>
<td>Head Evidence</td>
<td>Surface Decoration</td>
<td>Decoration Location</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Display</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TH-4</td>
<td>LH</td>
<td>complete</td>
<td>female breasts</td>
<td>modeled breasts</td>
<td>loose in fill</td>
<td>head</td>
<td>painted stripes</td>
<td>neck, waist, arms, legs</td>
<td>LH.1A</td>
<td>stable on base</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TH-5</td>
<td>LH</td>
<td>complete</td>
<td>female breasts</td>
<td>modeled breasts</td>
<td>loose in fill</td>
<td>broken off at neck</td>
<td>painted stripes</td>
<td>arms, breasts, legs</td>
<td>LH.1A</td>
<td>stable on base</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TH-6</td>
<td>LH</td>
<td>fragment</td>
<td>female breasts</td>
<td>modeled breasts</td>
<td>loose in fill</td>
<td>head</td>
<td>painted stripes, appliqué</td>
<td>neck, breasts, arms</td>
<td>LH.1A</td>
<td>broken base</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TH-7</td>
<td>LH</td>
<td>fragment</td>
<td>female breasts</td>
<td>modeled breasts</td>
<td>loose in fill</td>
<td>head</td>
<td>painted stripes</td>
<td>neck, breasts, arms, waist</td>
<td>LH.1A</td>
<td>broken base</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TH-8</td>
<td>LH</td>
<td>fragment</td>
<td>female breasts</td>
<td>modeled breasts</td>
<td>loose in fill</td>
<td>broken off at neck</td>
<td>painted stripes</td>
<td>neck, arms</td>
<td>LH.1A</td>
<td>broken base</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TH-9</td>
<td>LH</td>
<td>fragment</td>
<td>female breasts</td>
<td>attachment scars</td>
<td>loose in fill</td>
<td>broken off at neck</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>LH.1A</td>
<td>stable on base</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TH-10</td>
<td>LH</td>
<td>fragment</td>
<td>female breasts</td>
<td>attachment scars</td>
<td>loose in fill</td>
<td>head</td>
<td>painted stripes</td>
<td>neck,</td>
<td>LH.1A</td>
<td>broken base</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TH-11</td>
<td>LH</td>
<td>fragment</td>
<td>female breasts</td>
<td>attachment scars</td>
<td>loose in fill</td>
<td>head</td>
<td>painted stripes</td>
<td>neck</td>
<td>LH.1A</td>
<td>broken base</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TH-12</td>
<td>LH</td>
<td>fragment</td>
<td>female type</td>
<td>upper torso broken off</td>
<td>loose in fill</td>
<td>upper torso broken off</td>
<td>painted stripes</td>
<td>stomach, legs</td>
<td>LH.1A</td>
<td>broken base</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TH-13</td>
<td>LH</td>
<td>fragment</td>
<td>female type</td>
<td>upper torso broken off</td>
<td>loose in fill</td>
<td>upper torso broken off</td>
<td>painted stripes</td>
<td>legs</td>
<td>LH.1A</td>
<td>stable on base</td>
<td>peg hole at base</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Phase</td>
<td>Fragment (less 2/3 original)</td>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>Gender Indicator</td>
<td>Breasts Evidence</td>
<td>Archaeol Context</td>
<td>Head Evidence</td>
<td>Surface Decoration</td>
<td>Decoration Location</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Display</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TH-14</td>
<td>LH</td>
<td>fragment</td>
<td>female</td>
<td>type</td>
<td>upper torso broken off</td>
<td>loose in fill</td>
<td>upper torso broken off</td>
<td>painted stripes</td>
<td>legs</td>
<td>LH.1A</td>
<td>stable on base</td>
<td>peg hole at base</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TH-15</td>
<td>LH</td>
<td>fragment</td>
<td>female</td>
<td>type</td>
<td>upper torso broken off</td>
<td>loose in fill</td>
<td>upper torso broken off</td>
<td>painted stripes</td>
<td>legs</td>
<td>LH.1A</td>
<td>stable on base</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TH-16</td>
<td>LH</td>
<td>fragment</td>
<td>female</td>
<td>type</td>
<td>upper torso broken off</td>
<td>loose in fill</td>
<td>upper torso broken off</td>
<td>painted stripes</td>
<td>legs</td>
<td>LH.1A</td>
<td>stable on base</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TH-17</td>
<td>LH</td>
<td>fragment</td>
<td>male</td>
<td>penis</td>
<td>upper torso broken off</td>
<td>loose in fill</td>
<td>upper torso broken off</td>
<td>painted stripes</td>
<td>pubic area, legs</td>
<td>LH.1B</td>
<td>stable on base</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TH-18</td>
<td>LH?</td>
<td>fragment</td>
<td>not sexed</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>loose in fill</td>
<td>upper torso broken off</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>L.H. unknown</td>
<td>broken base</td>
<td>jar stopper?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TH-19</td>
<td>EH?</td>
<td>complete</td>
<td>female</td>
<td>type</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>loose in fill</td>
<td>broken off at neck</td>
<td>none?</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>EH.1A variation</td>
<td>stable on base</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TH-20</td>
<td>LH</td>
<td>complete?</td>
<td>not sexed</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>tholos</td>
<td>broken off at neck</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>L.H.2C</td>
<td>stable on base</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TH-21</td>
<td>LH</td>
<td>complete</td>
<td>not sexed</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>loose in fill</td>
<td>head</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>L.H.2B</td>
<td>stable on base?</td>
<td>stone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Phase</td>
<td>Fragment (less 2/3 original)</td>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>Gender Indicator</td>
<td>Breasts Evidence</td>
<td>Archaeol Context</td>
<td>Head Evidence</td>
<td>Surface Decoration</td>
<td>Decoration Location</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Display</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TH-22</td>
<td>LH</td>
<td>complete</td>
<td>not sexed</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>loose in fill</td>
<td>headless</td>
<td>painted stripes</td>
<td>neck, waist</td>
<td>LH.2B</td>
<td></td>
<td>needs support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TH-23</td>
<td>LH</td>
<td>complete</td>
<td>female</td>
<td>type</td>
<td>upper torso broken off</td>
<td>surface</td>
<td>upper torso broken off</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>LH.1A</td>
<td></td>
<td>stable on base</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TH-24</td>
<td>LH</td>
<td>fragment</td>
<td>female</td>
<td>breasts</td>
<td>molded breasts</td>
<td>loose in fill</td>
<td>broken off at neck</td>
<td>painted wash</td>
<td>all over</td>
<td>LH.1A</td>
<td></td>
<td>broken base</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TH-25</td>
<td>LH</td>
<td>fragment</td>
<td>male</td>
<td>pose, breasts</td>
<td>appliqué breasts</td>
<td>loose in fill</td>
<td>broken off at neck</td>
<td>painted wash</td>
<td>torso</td>
<td>LH.1B</td>
<td></td>
<td>needs support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TH-26</td>
<td>LH</td>
<td>fragment</td>
<td>male</td>
<td>breasts</td>
<td>appliqué breasts</td>
<td>loose in fill</td>
<td>head</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>LH.1B</td>
<td></td>
<td>needs support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TH-27</td>
<td>LH</td>
<td>fragment</td>
<td>male</td>
<td>type</td>
<td>upper torso broken off</td>
<td>loose in fill</td>
<td>upper torso broken off</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>LH.1B</td>
<td></td>
<td>needs support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TH-28</td>
<td>LH</td>
<td>fragment</td>
<td>male</td>
<td>type</td>
<td>upper torso broken off</td>
<td>loose in fill</td>
<td>upper torso broken off</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>LH.1B</td>
<td></td>
<td>needs support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bey-1</td>
<td>LH</td>
<td>complete</td>
<td>female</td>
<td>breasts</td>
<td>modeled breasts</td>
<td>Third mill. fill</td>
<td>broken off at neck</td>
<td>painted stripes, appliqué</td>
<td>neck, legs, feet</td>
<td>LH.1A</td>
<td></td>
<td>stable on base</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arj-1</td>
<td>LH</td>
<td>complete</td>
<td>female</td>
<td>Pubic square</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>loose in fill</td>
<td>head</td>
<td>incised lines, punctuation</td>
<td>eyes, pubic area, hair</td>
<td>LH.2B</td>
<td></td>
<td>needs support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arj-2</td>
<td>LH</td>
<td>fragment</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>upper torso broken off</td>
<td>loose in fill</td>
<td>upper torso broken off</td>
<td>incised lines</td>
<td>hair</td>
<td>LH.2B</td>
<td></td>
<td>needs support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Phase</td>
<td>Fragment (less 2/3 original)</td>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>Gender Indicator</td>
<td>Breasts Evidence</td>
<td>Archaeol Context</td>
<td>Head Evidence</td>
<td>Surface Decoration</td>
<td>Decoration Location</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Display</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arj-3</td>
<td>LH</td>
<td>complete</td>
<td>not sexed</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>loose in fill</td>
<td>head</td>
<td>incised lines</td>
<td>eyes, hair, edge of base</td>
<td>LH.2B</td>
<td>needs support</td>
<td>stone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arj-4</td>
<td>LH</td>
<td>fragment</td>
<td>not sexed</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>loose in fill</td>
<td>head</td>
<td>incised lines</td>
<td>eyes</td>
<td>LH.2B</td>
<td>needs support</td>
<td>stone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arj-5</td>
<td>LH</td>
<td>fragment</td>
<td>not sexed</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>upper torso broken off</td>
<td>loose in fill</td>
<td>upper torso broken off</td>
<td>incised lines</td>
<td>waist</td>
<td>LH.2B</td>
<td>needs support</td>
<td>stone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arj-6</td>
<td>LH</td>
<td>female</td>
<td>vulva</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>loose in fill</td>
<td>head</td>
<td>incised lines</td>
<td>eyes, pubic area</td>
<td>LH.2B</td>
<td>needs support</td>
<td>stone</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>