

FRAGMENT OF A LION STATUE FOUND IN
THE LATE PHASE (Ib) OF THE
COLONY PERIOD

Dr. TAHSİN ÖZGÜÇ

During excavations in 1954 at the Karum Kaneş carried on in squares -Z-aa/26-27 of the plan, some large vessels were found in situ on the floor of a workshop in square aa/27 in level Ib. One of the stones used as supports for these vessels was seen to be part of the lower jaw of a lion statue. This fragment, which is now in the Ankara Archaeological Museum (inventory No. Kt.f/K 231), is of the widely used indigenous Kaneş basalt (Fig. 1-3). It constitutes about half of the lower jaw. The height of the jaw from its lower edge to the top of the teeth is 11.8 cm. The tongue, which is in relief, protrudes from the mouth along the jaw to within 1 cm. of its lower edge (Fig. 1). The inside of the mouth, the tongue, and the two sides of the jaw exhibit good workmanship. The under-side of the jaw. While it has been made slightly concave, is unworked. The tongue, represented as adhering to the inside of the mouth and to the jaw, has a width of 7 cm. over the teeth and of 6.5 cm. at its narrowest point. It is widest at its two ends and narrows in slight curves towards its middle. The space of 8 cm. between the tongue and the canine, which is broken off at the base, contains six rectangular teeth indicated by short straight lines. Their upper and lower parts are not indicated. The teeth are on a very slight projection of the jaw. While the other teeth are never wider than 1 cm., the base of the canine has a width of 10 cm. This shows the relatively large size of the canines and thus the necessarily wide opening of the mouth. That the mouth of the statue was open is of course immediately evident from the position of the base of the canine and from the extension of the tongue into the mouth. The five molars on the side of the jaw are shown by the same technique as the incisors (Fig. 2-3). There is, however, a slight concavity on the side of the jaw, whereas the front part is quite flat. The distance from the canine

to the further side of the last molar is 7 cm. On the side of the jaw there is an indication of the lip by a projection between two slightly deepened lines below the molars. Of the six incisors which can be assumed to have been on the other side of the tongue only one has been preserved. The jaw is slightly rounded at the corner without any sharp edge. The distance from the corner to the tongue is 16 cm. Since we also know the width of the tongue, we can easily calculate the width of the whole jaw (approximately 40 cm.). We see from the preceding description that the head of the lion to which our jaw fragment belonged must have been larger than any others of Hittite origin known to us, and that the incisors and molars, and especially the tongue, are very small in proportion to the jaw and to the canines.

Among the lion statues of the Late-Hittite and of the Imperial Period there are none with jaws as large as the one under discussion. Also, there is no example of a precisely similar representation of the incisors and molars and of the tongue. In view of the characteristics we have discussed, the preserved fragment of the Kaneş lion is amply sufficient to distinguish it from the lions found at Boğazköy, Alacahöyük¹, Karkemiş, Malatya, Havuzköy², etc. Nevertheless, these differences in detail can in no way constitute a proof that the lion is not of Hittite origin. The representation of the tongue as protruding from the mouth and adhering to the jaw is not surprising, since it is familiar to us from other Hittite lion³. The protruding tongue can already be observed in the Old Phase of the Colony period, i.e. in the second level of the Karum Kaneş, in pottery lion rhyta⁴ and on cylinder seal impressions in the native style.

We have elsewhere discussed some conclusions relative to the dating of level Ib which we arrived at by a consideration of the strati-

¹ The flat jaw of the Alacahöyük lion, which has a closed mouth, is, compared with all others, the most similar to the Kültepe jaw.

² For instance, the incisors and molars of the Havuzköy lion are, in comparison with those of ours, in slight relief.

³ Ekrem Akurgal, *Spaethethitische Bildkunst*, Ankara 1949, s. 55-57 and 71.

⁴ Tahsin ve Nimet Özgüç, *Kültepe Kazısı Raporu* 1949, Ankara 1953, s. 88ff. (Nimet Özgüç). In order to facilitate the comparison, we are also publishing a red lion rhyton found in a house rich in tablets in square V/23 of level II (Fig. 4). The large canines of this lion, the exaggerated opening of its mouth, its molars, and especially its adhering tongue, which reaches far back into the mouth, strengthen our conviction of the Anatolian origin of the basalt statue.

graphy and small finds only⁵. Very recently, Dr. Kemal Balkan has shown that the Ib tablets are contemporary with Samsi-Adad I⁶. Our lion jaw fragment was, as we have seen, re-used in level Ib, which is contemporary with Samsi-Adad I, and cannot therefore be later than the Ib house in which it was discovered and the vessel it was supporting, while it is of course possible that it is of an earlier date. We are not in a position to establish whether our fragment was taken from the destroyed building level II, but we can say definitely that it must belong to one of the oldest Anatolian statues. To establish this has been our main purpose in publishing this communication. The newly discovered jaw-fragment shows us that statuary works of large size were created in Inner-Anatolia long before the period of the Hittite Empire, and that the artists of the Boğazköy-Yazılıkaya-Alacahöyük reliefs had models going back 3 or 4 centuries. It is a further addition to the documents and studies⁷ showing that the Hittite style was already developing in the Colony period. The differences in detail between the new find and the lions of later periods can be explained by the long lapse of time that intervened between them. We can now better understand the presence at the site of its discovery of the re-used relief found in 1952 in level IVa of Boğazköy⁸.

It is of course impossible to re-construct the head and body of the lion from the preserved jaw-fragment. We are also unable to say where and how this lion was used. But we can accept that its use was the same as that of later lions, and that it served either for a portal or as the base of a statue. I myself am inclined to favor the first hypothesis. Since in squares Z-aa/26-27 there are no buildings of a size proportionate to this lion, it is highly probable that the fragment was brought there from some other part of the karum.

⁵ Kültepe Kazısı 1949, s. XII; *Belleten* 65, s. 106 ff.

⁶ This work on the tablets of levels Ib and II is now in print.

⁷ Considering only the evidence of the archaeological documents: Anadolu Damga Mühürleri, in *Dil ve Tarih-Coğrafya Fakültesi Dergisi* II, s. 76 ff. (Nimet Özgüç); *Arkeoloji Araştırmaları*, No. 2, Ankara Üniversitesi, Dil ve Tarih-Coğrafya Fakültesi Yayınları, No. 47, s. 73 ff. (N. Özgüç); *MDOG* 77, s. 24 (K. Bittel); Tahsin Özgüç, *Kültepe Kazısı Raporu 1948*, s. 102; *The Illustrated London News*, Ja. 14. 1950, s. 69; *Hethiter und Proto-Hattier*, *Historia* I, s. 267 ff. (K. Bittel); *Kültepe Kazısı 1949*, s. 70-73; *Belleten* 65, s. 121 and 66, s. 297 (Nimet Özgüç).

⁸ *MDOG* 86, s. 25, Abb. 9a-b.

