

VII. SYRO/CILICIAN WARE AND KHABUR WARE COMPARED TO LPW

The following is a revised version of an article already published.¹⁰⁶² The three main painted styles in vogue throughout the first half of the 2nd Millennium are compared: Levantine Painted Ware, Syro/Cilician Ware and Khabur Ware.

The prevailing confusion concerning the classification and definitions of the various painted pottery styles of the period is caused by a certain degree of overlap evident in decorative elements as well as in the areas of distribution of the different styles/wares. It has often been claimed that there exists a relationship between Khabur Ware and Levantine Painted Ware as well as between Syro/Cilician Ware and Khabur Ware and between Syro/Cilician Ware and LPW. The issue has been discussed repeatedly since Amiran tentatively suggested that “MB IIA Levantine pottery” might have descended from Khabur Ware.¹⁰⁶³ The question inevitably involves chronology: which style was present first and could thus have influenced the other(s) or are they actually all contemporary local variations?

LEVANTINE PAINTED WARE

Levantine Painted Ware has been defined and described earlier, but to recapitulate, the vessel types are largely the basic closed, Middle Bronze Age types. The fabric may be relatively coarse in the case of amphorae and especially the dipper type of jugs, and a finer, often slipped and/or burnished surface is common in the case of more luxurious vessels such as the long-necked jugs and the juglets. The painted decoration is often bichrome, red and black, or monochrome red or reddish brown, and it consists of main decorative bands on the shoulder and/or on mid-body and additional decoration

bands together with optional extra decoration; concentric circles or spirals, triangles, crisscross bands, lozenges (relatively rare), band-zones and miscellaneous horizontal bands including wavy ones. A collarette, around the neck of the vessel, is a typical additional decorative element as are ticks on the rim and/or the handle.

KHABUR WARE (Fig. 104)

Khabur Ware was defined by M. Mallowan as the painted pottery of Level 1 at Chagar Bazar,¹⁰⁶⁴ and his definitions have since been refined and expanded in various ways. C. Hamlin published a comprehensive summary of the discussions of Khabur Ware in 1971¹⁰⁶⁵ and J.E. Frane updated it in her publication of the Khabur Ware from Tell Leilan in 1996.¹⁰⁶⁶

Khabur Ware occurs (hence its name) predominantly in the Khabur region, but it has been reported to exist from Dinkha Tepe in the east to Alalakh in the west.¹⁰⁶⁷ It consists mainly of wheel-made handleless jars, of which some have a somewhat globular body, with a relatively wide mouth, high neck and a flat base. The fabric of these jars ranges from coarse, buff clay to a finer creamy or pinkish variant which also has a better finish. The painted decoration is monochrome red to brownish or black on the upper part of the vessel or occasionally on the entire body and sometimes also with ticks on the rim applied in sets. The designs consist of horizontal bands, and on the shoulder of the jars one can also find hatched, cross-hatched or zigzag bands or similar triangles that may sometimes display dots or an occasional branch in between. When Hamlin discussed the pottery of Dinkha Tepe on the eastern fringe of the Khabur Ware distribution area,¹⁰⁶⁸ a

¹⁰⁶² BAGH 2003. Some of the content has also been incorporated into the previous chapters here.

¹⁰⁶³ AMIRAN 1969, 113, 118, pl. 35, also mentioned above in Chapter II about LPW.

¹⁰⁶⁴ MALLOWAN 1936, 12; 35–36 and, especially, IDEM 1937, 102–104, where the name Khabur Ware is first applied.

¹⁰⁶⁵ HAMLIN 1971, 18–26.

¹⁰⁶⁶ FRANE 1996, 1–25. OGUCHI 2000 concentrates on the so-called “late” Khabur Ware.

¹⁰⁶⁷ OGUCHI 1997, fig. 2 map. He does not, however, agree with the Alalakh identification of Khabur Ware except for four possible examples, *ibid.*, 215, no. 36. Cf. HEINZ 1992, 62 for the occurrence of Khabur Ware at Alalakh.

¹⁰⁶⁸ HAMLIN 1971, 124–131 and fig. 12; cf. also IDEM 1974, 126–129.

wider variety of painted motifs were also attributed to Khabur Ware, including simple birds,¹⁰⁶⁹ lozenges, small circles and “wheels”, vertical variations of “ladders”, etc.

SYRO/CILICIAN WARE (Fig. 105)

Although she omitted to give it a name, M.V. Seton Williams described an individual group of pottery that occurred contemporaneously in Cilicia in the southeastern part of Turkey, and in the Amuq area of north Syria, and she repudiated any direct relationship between this and Khabur Ware.¹⁰⁷⁰ Tubb distinguished between LPW and Syro/Cilician Ware¹⁰⁷¹ and, with reference to the former confusion concerning the latter's identity, or relationship, with Khabur Ware, he completely rejected any connection between the two.¹⁰⁷² In contrast to LPW the painted decoration of Syro/Cilician Ware is found on open forms including carinated bowls, footed bowls and craters, and the only common type of closed vessel is the pitcher with a trefoil¹⁰⁷³ or bilobate-mouth.¹⁰⁷⁴ This category of jug is of a type that to a certain extent is shared with LPW – the vessel shape here otherwise termed “long-necked jug”, but not with Khabur Ware, which is characterised by its lack of vessels with handles. A significant variant of the pitcher is the “eye jug” with an “eye”, i.e. a small circle with a dot in the middle, painted below the rim on both sides. To this is often added a kind of “mouth” on the neck below the “eye”, one or more painted, sometimes slanting, lines at the attachment of the handle. Examples of painted amphorae existed¹⁰⁷⁵ and a Cilician variation of the jugs is the so-called teapot with a basket or loop handle and spout.¹⁰⁷⁶

The surface of the hand- or wheel-made¹⁰⁷⁷ vessel is smoothed or covered with an unburnished cream slip and the paint may, rarely, be bichrome;¹⁰⁷⁸ generally it is monochrome brownish to black. The painted decoration is confined to the shoulder and characterised by one, or on pitchers sometimes two, horizontal decorative bands, divided into metopes by vertical lines or entirely filled in with vertical lines to form a more or less broad ladder. Alternatively, three or more oblique lines may slant towards each other, forming standing Vs, i.e. chevrons, or being connected to zigzags as is also seen on Khabur Ware. Every alternate metope may be filled in with simple crosses, “butterflies” or “hourglasses” (as also on Khabur Ware), i.e., the upper and lower part or left and right part of the crosses filled in with dots or solid colour. On the pitchers especially, more naturalistic motifs of birds or other animals¹⁰⁷⁹ are also found between the vertical lines. Cross-hatched (standing) triangles are additionally among the elements that are seen together with other components, and this is actually the most obvious decorative element observed in all three painted decoration styles. What Tubb labelled “a type of dotted rosette”, i.e. a larger dot with smaller dots around it or alternatively some kind of wheel,¹⁰⁸⁰ can also be applied between the vertical lines of the decoration band. The rim of the pitcher will frequently display ticks and the handle is mostly decorated with small horizontal or oblique lines all the way down (ticks) with a vertical line in the middle and ending in a tassel below the handle.¹⁰⁸¹ Ticks are furthermore found on the handles and rims of other vessel types. New sub-styles have been devised, such as the earlier-mentioned Monochrome Painted Cream Ware at Tel Dan¹⁰⁸² and Common Painted

¹⁰⁶⁹ For the animal motifs, cf. POSTGATE, OATES and OATES 1997, 53 mentioning that although this is mainly a feature found on late Khabur Ware it also existed on the early Khabur Ware.

¹⁰⁷⁰ SETON WILLIAMS 1953, 57, where she lists the names that had previously been applied to this style.

¹⁰⁷¹ TUBB 1983, 50–52 (‘Amuq/Cilician’).

¹⁰⁷² *Ibid.*, 55.

¹⁰⁷³ IDEM 1981, 403.

¹⁰⁷⁴ GATES 2000, 85.

¹⁰⁷⁵ GARSTANG 1956, nos. 887–889 (and 1044–45 dated to LB); GATES 2000, fig. 6.9.

¹⁰⁷⁶ SETON WILLIAMS 1953, fig. 2.6; 10 (Mersin); GOLDMAN 1956, nos. 868–875 (Tarsus) and most likely GATES 2000, fig. 6.10 (Kinet Höyük).

¹⁰⁷⁷ SETON WILLIAMS 1953, 58 claimed that most examples were hand-made *contra* HEINZ 1992, 54.

¹⁰⁷⁸ SETON WILLIAMS 1953, 58; HEINZ 1992, 54; TUBB 1983, 52; and from Kinet Höyük GATES 2000, figs. 6.3 and 6.6 (6.5 and 6.10 are drawn as bichrome, but not described as such).

¹⁰⁷⁹ TUBB 1981, 404 claims that even examples of fish exist.

¹⁰⁸⁰ For example Fig. 99e from Qatna.

¹⁰⁸¹ TUBB 1983 does not seem to stress the importance of this otherwise very characteristic attribute, but in TUBB 1981, 404–405 it is referred to as “a branch-like motif on the body below the point of [handle] attachment”. It often looks more like the painted version of bast or the like twisted around the handle and the ends of the bast-strings made into a tassel below the handle.

¹⁰⁸² ILAN 1996b, 162.

Painted ware:	Levantine Painted ware	Syro/Cilician ware	Khabur ware
Comparisons:			
Open forms	Practically none	Carinated bowls Footed bowls Craters	Craters?
Closed forms	Amphorae Handleless jars Long-necked jug Short-necked jug Dipper jug Juglets	<u>Pitcher</u> (long-necked jug) (Short-necked jug) (Juglets w. stepped-rim)	(Amphorae) <u>Handleless jars</u>
Manufacture	Wheel-made (fast)	Hand-/wheel-made	Wheel-made
Surface treatment	Slip / no slip Burnished	Cream slip, smoothed Not burnished	Smoothed
Decoration: Colour(s)	MC red <u>BC red and black</u>	MC brown-black (Rarely BC)	MC red-brown-black (Very rarely BC)
Place of decoration	Shoulder / upper body Complete body	Shoulder	Shoulder / upper body Complete body
Designs	<u>Concentric circles</u> Triangles, BC/solid Triangles, crisscross Crisscross band Band-zone(s) Misc. horizontal bands (Butterfly / hourglass) (Ladder band) <u>Collarette</u> Ticks on rim Ticks on handle	Dotted rosette Triangles, crisscross Crisscross band Butterfly / hourglass Ladder band Metope w. cross Oblique/vertical lines Chevrons Ticks on rim (bowls) Ticks on handle <i>“Tassel” below handle</i>	Small circles with dot or “wheel” Triangles, crisscross Crisscross band Misc. horizontal bands (Metope w. cross) Ticks on rim (in groups)

_____ Common Characteristic () Rare or not exactly belonging

Abbreviations: BC: bichrome; MC: monochrome; w.: with

Tab. 5 A comparison between the main characteristics of the three major groups of painted wares of the first half of the 2nd Millennium in the Near East

Ware in Syria;¹⁰⁸³ both have strong ties to Syro/Cilician Ware and stress the issue of regional differences and variations.

The main characteristics of the three major groups of painted wares of the first half of the 2nd Millennium in the Near East have been compared in Tab. 5.

Evidence suggested by the Tell el-Dab^a painted pottery of the MB IIA and B

Levantine Painted Ware from Tell el-Dab^a is the core of the present study, and it was predominantly this

type of painted pottery that reached Egypt during the late Middle Kingdom, while few vessels from a slightly later context at Tell el-Dab^a appear to be related to Syro/Cilician Ware.

The evidence from Tell el-Dab^a reflects a chronological sequence of the painted wares that reached the site. From about the time of the late reign of Senwosret I and Amenemhat II from early to middle Dynasty XII the first few Middle Bronze Age types of pottery appeared at Tell el-Dab^a, notably jugs painted with simple red band-zones from Area R/I, str.

¹⁰⁸³ NIGRO 1998, 288 and IDEM 2002a, 312. To group the Ebla “LPW” jugs mentioned previously with this ware makes much

more sense. Cf. also EINWAG 1998, 142–144 who tentatively posited a largely identical “*Mittelsyrische Bemalte Ware*”.

e–c. At the very end of Dynasty XII the more luxurious class of bichrome jugs etc. are found in Area F/I, str. d/2. Together with these, the whole range of MB types of plain jugs, jars, amphorae etc. now enters the scene properly and continues with all the burnished etc. variants while the fancy LPW painted types are in decline after the beginning of the Dynasty XIII.¹⁰⁸⁴ Other more simple types of painted pottery take over, such as red burnished jugs with black bands, and, more notably, a jug with a close resemblance to the Syro/Cilician family was found in an offering pit outside a tomb (Fig. 25A) in Area A/II from the end of Dynasty XIII, str. E/3, that has been equated with the end of MB IIB.¹⁰⁸⁵

With str. E/1 and the Hyksos period proper there came a change in many categories of imports to Tell el-Dab^a as well as in the locally-made pottery,¹⁰⁸⁶ and an increase in locally-produced painted Tell el Yahudiyeh juglets is significant¹⁰⁸⁷ at the same time as the prevalence of imports of painted juglets with stepped rim and decoration that has many affinities with Syro/Cilician pottery. From this same period, an interesting example of a globular juglet with black spiral decoration seems to be a local variation¹⁰⁸⁸ of a type that started as part of the LPW repertoire¹⁰⁸⁹ in MB IIA and continued mainly in the form of stepped-rim juglets in the Levant¹⁰⁹⁰ in MB IIA/B–B.

To sum up, at Tell el-Dab^a Syro/Cilician types of pottery and the related, painted stepped-rim juglets, take over from the MB IIA-related LPW towards and into the MB IIB period. Even when some of the groups of painted pottery are represented by relatively few examples, the evidence from Tell el-Dab^a thus suggests that Syro/Cilician pottery either entered Egypt later than LPW – if the two are in fact contemporary in the Levant – and remained in use longer. Or Syro/Cilician is actually a ware developing only after the flourishing of LPW. Khabur Ware types are not directly present at Tell el-Dab^a, but the proposed connection between Khabur Ware and both

LPW and Syro/Cilician demands the taking into account of Khabur Ware as well. One of the stepped-rim juglets from Tell el-Dab^a is decorated with triangles filled in with oblique lines on the shoulder (Fig. 25b), which is a common pattern among Khabur Ware and would possibly demonstrate rather the relationship between Syro/Cilician and Khabur Ware decoration.

Levantine sites with more than one style of painted Middle Bronze Age pottery

Tubb claimed that LPW and Syro/Cilician Ware had been found together at one place only, in T. 1 in Qatna, which he took as proof that the two wares were contemporary, but otherwise were mutually exclusive.¹⁰⁹¹ The Tell el-Dab^a material would tentatively suggest otherwise, and finds from other sites appear to support the Tell el-Dab^a sequence.

The material from Qatna T. 1 is thus of interest and other sites exist with material that relates to more than one style only, predominantly LPW and Syro/Cilician sites with material of chronological significance are Ras Shamra, Sukas, Tweini, Kinet Höyük, Tel Dan, Tel Bia and Tel al Rimah.

Qatna Tomb 1 was dealt with in the main text and it was concluded that all of the painted pottery from T. 1 is mainly related to Syro/Cilician pottery with local Syrian inspiration. At Ras Shamra several examples of LPW – mainly band-painted dipper types or juglets, often bichrome¹⁰⁹² – and some Syro/Cilician¹⁰⁹³ and Syro/Cilician *style* jugs were found, but unfortunately without any indications of clear inter-relations.

The multiple tomb at Tell Sukas contained LPW and painted pottery of mixed LPW and Syro/Cilician style. The painted pottery (Fig. 82) compared in many respects to LPW from southern sites such as Aphek and Megiddo, while the plain juglets from Sukas are of the common type from the northern coastal area. The long-necked jug from Tweini¹⁰⁹⁴ pro-

¹⁰⁸⁴ BIETAK 1991, 31–47 with an overview of the stratigraphy of Tell el-Dab^a and the different MB imports. Cf. also BIETAK 2001, fig. 7 and ASTON 2004, 102–165.

¹⁰⁸⁵ Cf. MÜLLER 2008.II, 327–328 for the context.

¹⁰⁸⁶ BIETAK, *op. cit.* and elaborated in BIETAK, FORSTNER-MÜLLER and MLINAR 2001. Cf. also ASTON 2004.

¹⁰⁸⁷ BIETAK 1984b, fig. 15 shows examples of pTeY juglets, cf. Figs. 27–28 here.

¹⁰⁸⁸ The fabric of the juglet, TD115/4481, has been identified as Egyptian marl clay II C, BADER 2001, no. 348.

¹⁰⁸⁹ For example Fig. 38a, b (Aphek) and Fig. 85d–f (Ras Shamra).

¹⁰⁹⁰ For example Figs. 59c–g; 60d (Ginosar and Kefar Szold) and Fig. 65f, g (Tel Dan).

¹⁰⁹¹ TUBB 1983, 54.

¹⁰⁹² Most examples are shown SCHAEFFER 1949, fig. 130 with some other painted juglets, Fig. 84 here.

¹⁰⁹³ Fig. 83a, b.

¹⁰⁹⁴ Fig. 83a.

vides, as stated in the main text, a link between LPW and Syro/Cilician pottery. The globular body shape is typical for a LPW long-necked jug, but the rim is up-drawn as on a Syro/Cilician pitcher and with a stylized 'eye' executed as a circle with a cross.

The excavations of the so-called East Terrace building at Kinet Höyük produced a number of painted vessels from its two building phases (Fig. 87). They all generally belong to the Syro/Cilician style including good examples of eye jugs. As at Tell Sukas, however, there are also examples with a kind of "mixed decoration" with collarettes and bichrome decoration. The date seems to be relatively late, i.e. MB IIB, which, together with the evidence from Ebla would show that Syro/Cilician style pottery, at least in its different "mixed" varieties, existed beyond the MB IIA.

Owing to the location of Tel Dan, in the northern end of the Hula Valley at the foot of Mount Hermon, influences from both the south and the north show up clearly in the pottery, apparent in the repertoire of painted MB pottery with examples of LPW as well as vessels with a close relationship to Syro/Cilician Ware. The latter in general occur later.

Tel Bia/Tuttul has not been among the sites directly studied in the main text, but it is of importance for the conclusions especially concerning Khabur Ware. Its geographical location in the Balih Valley in Syria makes it feasible that Khabur Ware could have reached the site from the east¹⁰⁹⁵ and Syro/Cilician from the west. In view of the small number of painted vessels found at the site, B. Einwag proposed that they were all imports.¹⁰⁹⁶ The sequence of painted pottery¹⁰⁹⁷ started with one so-called Hama beaker from *Keramikkomplex* 1 of Hama J date, i.e., the Early Bronze Age. Two other painted bowls also originate from this context.¹⁰⁹⁸ In the later *Keramikkomplex* 6, a complete Khabur jar, a Khabur shoulder fragment and two misc. sherds,¹⁰⁹⁹ possibly also Khabur Ware, came to light. This context is dated to the time before Shamshi Adad I, and according to Einwag it is

the first proof that Khabur Ware appears earlier than Shamsi Adad I.¹¹⁰⁰ Epigraphic evidence dated the overlaying *Keramikkomplex* 7 to the time of Shamsi Adad's son Jasmah Adad, and from here three fragments might possibly be assigned to (late?) Khabur Ware. Of greater interest is one fragment that, due to both design and fabric, must be identified as Syro/Cilician pottery, together with the base of a jug with a ring base having a crisscross pattern and a Tell el Yahudiyeh Ware (TeY) shoulder fragment.¹¹⁰¹ The jug base with crisscross decoration may tentatively be identified as Common Painted Ware, but this type of decoration on the lower body is uncommon in either of the classes. The TeY fragment belongs to a piriform 1 jug(let),¹¹⁰² a type that occurs at Tell el-Dab'a from str. G to E/2, i.e. the first half of Dynasty XIII and later than the greater part of LPW, which is in accordance with the date of Syro/Cilician given from that site.

Tell el Rimah is another site not dealt with in the main text, but again it is of importance for the chronology issues. According to statements by C. Postgate and D. Oates and J. Oates,¹¹⁰³ Tell al Rimah provides an excellent sequence for second millennium northern Mesopotamia in general, and for Khabur Ware in particular. This is due largely to the epigraphic evidence from the site, and the pottery has also been compared to the material from Tel Brak.¹¹⁰⁴ They conclude that the earliest examples of Khabur Ware "cannot be earlier than ca. 1950 BC [...] and more likely to date from the 19th century".¹¹⁰⁵ At Rimah Khabur Ware is found in pre-Temple contexts and therefore predates the time of Shamsi-Adad as was the case at Tel Bia.¹¹⁰⁶ An even earlier date for the occurrence of Khabur Ware has, however, been suggested by the excavations of Tell Mozan, ancient Urkeš – a main site in the Khabur area. Here it was first stated that few examples of Khabur Ware appeared in the later part of the subdivided stratum C 6 Tell Mozan.¹¹⁰⁷ Subsequently individual examples

¹⁰⁹⁵ OGUCHI 1998, 124 and the distribution map *ibid.* fig. 1.

¹⁰⁹⁶ EINWAG 1998, 71.

¹⁰⁹⁷ *Ibid.*, 71–73.

¹⁰⁹⁸ *Ibid.*, fig. 40.8–10 (no. 9 being the Hama beaker).

¹⁰⁹⁹ *Ibid.*, fig. 51.4–5; 8–9.

¹¹⁰⁰ *Ibid.*, 137. The dating and definition of *Keramikkomplexe* 1–7 are described *ibid.*, 54–57.

¹¹⁰¹ *Ibid.*, fig. 58.5 together with all of the painted fragments from *Keramikkomplex* 7: nos. 1–3 the three (late) Khabur Ware (?) fragments, no. 4 the jug base and no. 6 the Syro/Cilician fragment.

¹¹⁰² BIETAK 1991, fig. 12.

¹¹⁰³ POSTGATE, OATES and OATES 1997, 51–53.

¹¹⁰⁴ OATES, OATES and McDONALD 1997, 61–67.

¹¹⁰⁵ POSTGATE, OATES and OATES 1997, 53.

¹¹⁰⁶ Exactly how the arguments trace the origin of Khabur Ware as far back as around 1900 BC or even 1950 BC is not completely clear when the different dates of Shamsi-Adad are considered according to high, middle or low Mesopotamian chronology. Cf. for example the discussions and references by WARBURTON 2000.

¹¹⁰⁷ DOHMANN-PFÄLZNER and PFÄLZNER 2001, 105.

of Khabur Ware also appeared as early as str. C 7, which made the excavators conclude that a likely date for the first Khabur Ware could be as early as the 21st century BC.¹¹⁰⁸ Even so, the former suggestion by Amiran that Khabur Ware could be the ancestor of LPW cannot be proven.

Conclusions

It seems evident that influence was exerted by one painted pottery style of the early 2nd millennium on the other, but the evidence gained from the various sites mentioned would at first glance seem to point in different directions. It must furthermore be emphasized that we are frequently dealing with few and/or debatable examples and new material may alter the picture. Within each of the three main styles, sub-styles existed that may be local and/or chronological variations. Khabur Ware features various different decoration designs outside its main distribution zone and it has been divided into an early and a late type.¹¹⁰⁹ As stated above, some local traditions of painted pottery, related to Syro/Cilician Ware, have been defined in Inner Syria and at Tel Dan by Nigro and Ilan respectively and special shapes exist such as the “teapot”, being a Cilician variation. It has been suggested by the present author that LPW may have included an early band-painted “Byblos” jug and that during LPW’s main period of circulation, a simpler, often monochrome style co-existed with a more luxurious, often bichrome one. Certain traits of LPW decoration continued to exist on MB IIB juglets and in the case of stepped-rim juglets, LPW and Syro/Cilician decoration styles are often mixed, as exhibited by the beautiful example from Ginosar¹¹¹⁰ with spirals between horizontal lines (LPW) interspersed with primitive animals (Syro/Cilician) and with a branch-like motif on the shoulder (also Syro/Cilician). At the same time the painted stepped-rim juglets may also display decoration that is characteristic of Khabur Ware.

At Tell el-Dab^a and at Dan, the first appearance of Syro/Cilician-related vessels unmistakably occurs later than LPW. It may, however, be argued that both sites are outside the main distribution area and that Syro/Cilician Ware, prevailing longer than LPW, did not reach remote destinations till well into its lifes-

pan. Closer to the area of origin, we find that the material from Ras Shamra, which is not conclusive in respect of chronology, includes both LPW and examples of Syro/Cilician vessels as well as vessels that seem to combine the two styles. They do not occur in the same contexts, but again there seems to be a tendency of Syro/Cilician (style) vessels to appear in later contexts than LPW. It has been noted, on the other hand, that at Sukas T. IV, LPW and vessels which may be connected to the Syro/Cilician style of pottery are found at the same level, but here together with a chisel-shaped axe, possibly indicating that we are late in the LPW sequence.¹¹¹¹ The tomb at Tweini contained a perfect LPW jug, which, for its rim, must, however, be classified as Syro/Cilician. The same tomb contained a duckbill axe, and a safe connection between the jug and the axe would thus exemplify the early appearance of a Syro/Cilician jug related to LPW during MB IIA. In opposition to this, Gates claims to have found MB IIB-LB material in the same context as numerous examples of Syro/Cilician vessels, in which case it must at least be concluded that Syro/Cilician survived much longer than LPW. Parallels from the Royal Tombs at Ebla that may be classified as Common Painted Ware also indicate a “late” date for the material. At the same time, the bichrome etc. Syro/Cilician vessels with parallels at Sukas do point towards a connection between this ware and LPW.

The red burnished, long-necked jug with black decoration from T. 1 at Qatna may be related to the later appearance of red burnished vessels in the southern Levant and at Tell el-Dab^a (cf. above) and may consequently point towards a relatively late date for the other painted vessels from the tomb as well. The finds will consequently not contradict the postulated later appearance of Syro/Cilician pottery.

Khabur Ware is associated with the onset of the Middle Bronze Age¹¹¹² as is the case of LPW and it would also seem to have appeared before Syro/Cilician pottery, indicated by the evidence from Tel Bia. More problematic is the dating of the first occurrence of Khabur Ware before Shamsi-Adad – but how long before? D. and J. Oates with the Rimah and Brak material could go as far back as 1900 or 1950 BC, which would coincide with the first examples of LPW

¹¹⁰⁸ IDEM 2002, 154.

¹¹⁰⁹ HROUDA 1957, 33–35 and a chronological table p. 45; a more recent review by OGUCHI 2000, 103 and fig. 6.

¹¹¹⁰ EPSTEIN 1974, fig. 14.5; pl. VII.1–2. Fig. 59f here.

¹¹¹¹ I.e. str. d/1 of Tell el-Dab^a rather than str. d/2 and thus into Dynasty XIII, cf. the main text above.

¹¹¹² Cf. for example FRANE 1996, 158.

(i.e. at least the monochrome red-painted jugs from Area R/I at Tell el-Dab^ca). This coincides with Mallowan's conclusions from Chagar Bazar where it was confined to Level 1 and dated to ca. 1900-1600 BC according to the cuneiform tablets found in that level.¹¹¹³ The upper limit is provided by white-on-black Nuzi Ware that appears in levels above Khabur Ware.¹¹¹⁴

If this early date for the first occurrence of Khabur Ware is followed, which would be most consistent with a relatively high chronology, it would suggest that LPW and Khabur Ware developed at about the same time, probably from the preceding EB tradi-

tions, and both affected the evolution of Syro/Cilician Ware, which appears as a link between Khabur Ware and LPW. The subsequent first appearance of Syro/Cilician, i.e. post LPW and Khabur Ware, at least at marginal sites, points in this direction, but again it may also be part of the general distribution pattern with, for example, connections between Tell el-Dab^ca and areas in the Levant further north and north-east, increasing from and during the MB IIB. Syro/Cilician and Khabur Ware both survived longer than LPW (except for some elements mainly on juglets), which may also explain why Syro/Cilician related vessels occur later than LPW.

¹¹¹³ MALLOWAN 1937, 104.

¹¹¹⁴ POSTGATE, OATES and OATES 1997, 54–55.

