dissolving the mineral particles adhering. As a result, the walls of the jars gradually become impermeable.

**The Future**

Boys begin their apprenticeship at the age of twelve. The apprentices work in the outdoor workshops near the village. They do not join the vendors. Sometimes the Carrier is a young apprentice from the village. But during the vendeno the Carrier's job is the most he will be allowed to do. The boy Carrier watches the craftsmen at work and learns all about clay and the vending. If he is intelligent enough, he may become a Master, a full-fledged jar maker, but that will take him over ten years.

The vendemani, the craftsmen of the guild, work in the open to make the most of the sun which dries the clay. Consequently, they are constantly exposed to rain and humidity. They have difficulties in digging up the earth, and the clay they extract for the jars may sometimes prove to be inadequate after the first firing. Under such conditions, about 15,000 jars are made yearly by 35 to 35 groups of potters from Thraspmos. The whole of this output is bought up by the Cretan market, because the jars are needed for storing oil, wine and cereals. Until 1940, in the region around Thraspmos, people used to grow olives and cereals. Not much labor is required for the cultivation of olive trees throughout the major part of the year. Olives are picked and pressed during November and December. The ploughing and sowing of cereals is done in October and November. Harvesting and threshing were usually done only by the wives of the craftsmen of the guild. The craftsmen, therefore, used to spend the three summer months at the vendeno. During that period, they made more money than they would have made working in the fields. The working conditions of the vendeno, however, are harder than those of farm work. The craftsmen of the guild do not earn a whole year's living expenses during the vendeno. Upon returning to the village, they still have to work in the fields, or wait for the halcyon days of October (traditionally called "the little summer") to prepare some glazed pots. They will work on these in the proximity of the village, fire them in kilns, take them round the villages loaded on the pk animals, and try to sell them.

Before the time for the vendeno comes round again, they will also prepare jugs and pitchers, which they will sell to the villagers, who take them along for their personal use when they go to work in the fields.

After 1945, living conditions in general suffered a change, and so did the conditions of agricultural life. The cultivation of vines was introduced, requiring exacting, continuous and intensive care. At present, the cultivation of cereals has nearly been abandoned. The art of pottery making has also been abandoned. Only about ten Masters live in the village now, of whom only three work on jars. There still prevails all over the village a wonderful familiarity with the raw material, passed on from the old man to the child, from the Master to the farmer. One might say that the breath and pulse of the clay has become one with the people. On the other hand, one can't help feeling quite clearly that the art of pottery making will not be continued by any of the inhabitants of Thraspmos.

Among the Thraspmos Masters there is only one who has decided to make changes in his working conditions and increase his output. No other potter or jar maker ever considers the possibility of changing his working conditions or the kind of wares he produces. They have all resigned themselves to abandoning pottery; this is quite obvious since there are no children or young men learning the art any more. In the case of an art laden with such a long tradition, total obliteration is more probable than adaptation to new conditions. Besides, changes in technology are inconceivable to an artisan of the guild. Technical and aesthetic experimentation have no place in the vendeno. The jar is a human record; it is all there in the completed form: the clay, the kiln, the guild, the life of the craftsmen and that of the farmer, the life of an endless line of human beings.

There is hope of a change, a double change—in the techniques of ceramics, and in the public's response to new ceramic wares—resulting in a new balance of offer and demand. But is this possible in the case of traditional craftsmanship?
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The vessels as suggested by R. Hampe and R. Amiran, is not certain, but because the bowls are portaible, they could have been inserted into any convenient storage-container.

The consensus is that most of them were made at North Syrian sites, and an unfinished example excavated at Chatal Huyuk (information from A. Hoerth) confirms this site as one of the factory centers. In addition, the stratigraphical finds in North Syria, coupled in particular with the Hasanlu finds, establish definitively that the bowls were first made in the 8th century and continued to be made in the 7th century B.C. Moreover, when the bowls are found outside of North Syria, they yield to us valuable information about trade relations between this major artistic area and other cultures.

In 1964, a large number of fragmented ivory objects were excavated at Hasanlu in the Period IV Burned Building II (BB II), which was destroyed in the late 9th century B.C., probably by Urartians. These objects, consisting of pyxides (boxes), dishes, panelling, statues, and inlays, were originally in place on the second story of BB II. When the building was burned, the ivory and many other objects fell as the floors and walls collapsed. They were badly shattered and scattered over the north and east areas of BB II. There is hardly an intact ivory object; rather, there are hundreds of pieces, many too small or disfigured for us to be able to reconstruct to their original shape or to make joins. These ivory objects are now divided among the Iran Bastan Museum in Teheran, the University Museum in Philadelphia, and the Metropolitan Museum of Art, but photographs of most of them exist in the Hasanlu Project Files.

Beginning in 1966, and again in 1972, we began the formidable task of sorting the ivory fragments into categories of objects and motifs. Also, many fragments were either amorphous pieces beyond recognition or tainting parts of a body, garment, or chariot, that is, pieces in need of much additional puzzling over before they could be assigned to a specific category. One of these fragments (#1, 2 top, and 3 on this page) was a puzzle for some time because it had part of a wing tip, easily identifiable, and a strange inexplicable motif to its left. We assumed that the fragment, and another small isolated fragment consisting only of a wing tip (#1 and 2 bottom) but which clearly was related to the first fragment, were parts of a pyxide, several of which were found at Hasanlu. Both fragments have curved sides and the wings looked similar to those on the sphinxes that decorate the sides of these pyxides. Yet we know of no pyxides that had the strange motif to the left of the wing. One day in June, 1972, after having examined the photographs half a dozen times in the past, I suddenly realized what the strange motif was and immediately recognized the class of object to which the fragments belonged: the strange motif was part of a paw and claws, and the object was originally a lion bowl. Subsequent examination of the original two fragments in the University Museum confirmed this conclusion. Both pieces had an outer diameter of about 9 cm., providing further confirmation that the two fragments indeed came from the same object.

The length of the larger fragment is 4.1 cm.; of the smaller, 2.5 cm. Both were carefully polished on the interior and rim. The lion's paw and claws are very stylized and neatly carved by a master artist. Extant are three claws, the uppermost placed at an angle to the others, each with two sets of wrinkles; traces of gold foil still exist, suggesting that the whole bowl originally may have been overlaid with gold. The claws are separated a bit from an "hourglass" wing, which once held inlays; the markings of a hollow drill are visible in both wing fragments.

As mentioned above, two other lion bowls have been found at Hasanlu. One, the only example known in Egyptian Blue, is complete; it also came from BB II's second story but was found fallen into the anteroom at the northern end of the building. The other, in two fragments and of stone, was found out of context in the upper fill but is also certainly from Period IV. Both have been published and are well known. Our fragment now adds another example. Thus there are now three lion bowls, each of a different material, that have been excavated from 9th-century Hasanlu. The University Museum may count itself fortunate because it has fragments of two of these bowls, the stone and ivory ones; while the most beautiful and complete example, of Egyptian Blue, is in the Iran Bastan Museum in Teheran.

As a consequence the Egyptian Blue bowl from Hasanlu, a statetile bowl from Ashur, and an ivory fragment from Sams have the same basic construction motifs, the Has- lanlu ivory fragment can easily be reconstructed. We have, then, the forepart of a lion with its wings missing, grasping the upper sides of a bowl; a tube behind the lion passed through its body and emptied into the polished interior. Two winged creatures, possibly sphinxes, were symmetrically placed on the side opposite the right wing of one sphinx; #1 and #2 bottom, the right wing of the other. Whether the bottom of the frame is plain, or, as I, Samos bowl, had a hand like the Egyptian Blue bowl, of course, cannot now be established.

To be sure, we cannot positively reconstruct the winged creatures specifically into sphinxes (cf. #5, 7, or birds (cf. #6); we assign them this identity because their wings are the same as those on the sphinxes adorning the pyxides (#4). And it is concluded that they faced outward, from the side, in the manner of a lion. The Egyptian Blue bowl and Ashur sphinxes faced out (the Samos birds, on the other hand, faced to the side; information from B. Freyer-Schaubur). The ivory bowl is definitely very close to the Egyptian Blue example even though the wings and claws are rendered differently: after all, the former was carved, the latter cast. But both bowls have a lion whose claws are not overlaid with gold and whose upper claw is set off at an angle; both have the two symmetrical placed sphinxes; and both were covered with gold. The ivory bowl is also quite close to the Samos example, especially in the carving of the claws with the double set of wrinkles and the offset upper claw. Here, however, the claws overlap the winged creatures, clearly birds, and the wings are solid, decorated in a conventional incised fashion. The Ashur bowl also has the lion and two sphinxes but is not so finely carved as the Hasanlu ivory bowl; the paws and claws, and the wings are cruder in execution.

Parenthetically, it is of interest to note that the prominent offset position of the upper claw of the Has- lanlu lions is the same as that on a lion executed in relief on a bronze beaker from Iran, and also on lions depicted in ivory said to have been found at Ziviyeh, in western Iran.

The Ashur bowl was found out of context and has no stylistic or art reference upon which to base a chronology, but a 9th- or early 8th-century date is probable. The ivory example from Samos was found associated with material dated to the first quarter of the 7th century B.C., according to H. Walter and B. Freyer-Schaubur. But it is indeed possible, judging from the Hasanlu evidence, that this bowl may have been in use for some time, perhaps a hundred or more years, before it was deposited in its sanctuary where it was found, a situation not unique for Oriental objects found on Sams. It does not follow, of course, that the 9th-century date of the Has- lanlu Egyptian Blue and ivory examples must date the similar bowls from Ashur and Samos. In the case of the Egyptian Blue, but one cannot exclude the possibility that all the bowls under discussion were manufactured within a relatively short period of time. It should be noted that there are several other bowls with similar decoration but which are not close enough to bring in as parallels to the Hasanlu example. An unpublished fragment of a stone bowl excavated at Chatal
Hiyûk, now in the Oriental Institute and kindly shown to me by Alfred Hoehn, has an indugud-type bird facing out with tucked-up legs and with carved zig-zag wings; nothing else is preserved. But on a complete lion bowl in the Rockwell Nelson Gallery of Art in Kansas City there are two of these Indugud birds, exactly the same as on the Chatal Hiyûk fragment; the base is decorated with a floral motif. And on a bowl purchased by the Louvre there are two birds opposite the tube end, but no lion, and with a hand at the base. These bowls are of some interest to us here because they have winged creatures carved on the sides.

Every archaeologist knows that a fragment of a given object may turn out to be of some importance and may be reconstructed to its original form mentally and on paper. Potsherds become pots; fragments of ivory, pyxides; pieces of fresco, a whole wall scene. And, while the fragment often remains essentially unassuming, its archaeological and historical value can be as great as if the object were completely preserved.

Two fragmentary lion bowls have now been excavated at Hsanlu and reconstructed on paper, giving the interested scholar some idea of their original appearance. These reconstructions prove very neatly that the many hours devoted to examining and reexamining fragments are time well spent.
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