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Abstract

The recent discovery in Georgia of two Kura-Araxes zoomorphic vessels with possible analogues in Anatolia and in the Aegean opens up the intriguing possibility that the diffusion of these containers for the ritual consumption of alcoholic beverages followed a corridor crossing in EW direction the northern sector of the Near East.

1. The “Northern Corridor”

There is little doubt that Near Eastern archaeology profoundly changed in the course of the last thirty years. Starting from the First Gulf War, in the early 1990s, the traditional core of archaeological research, the Mesopotamian alluvium, has been plagued by a situation of almost continuous political instability and conflict. The persisting crisis that affects Syria and part of Iraq and the difficult – or worsening – conditions of work in neighbouring countries such as Iran and Turkey have forced many international archaeological expeditions to abandon field research in a large part of what we used to identify as the “Near East”.

On the other hand, new possibilities of field research have opened up in regions that, until recently, had been neglected by western researchers, which have, as a consequence, become the focus of intensive investigation. This is the case of the new independent states which occupy the territories of the Central Asian and Caucasian Republics of the former Soviet Union. The Southern Caucasus (Georgia, Armenia and Azerbaijan), in particular, attracted the attention of numerous Near Eastern archaeologists previously working in areas, like Upper Mesopotamia and Anatolia, which in the course of their history had deep and continuous contacts with this region located at the northern limit of the Near East.¹

Typically, intense field research in new, or relatively unexplored regions causes researchers interest to focus on long-distance relations, “trade” and exchange of raw materials, artefacts, technologies, and ideas, as opposed to the internal development dynamics of each individual area.² Within this general framework, we have recently drawn attention on the existence, within the Near East, of what we may call the “Northern Corridor”, i.e. a network of connections which crosses the northern portion of the Near East in East-West direction, and is largely independent from, even if not completely alien to, the “Levantine Corridor” which connects Iran and the Indus valley with the Mediterranean Sea via Mesopotamia and Syria. As becomes increasingly evident, the Southern Caucasus plays a crucial role in this “Northern Corridor”, which connects Northern Iran and the Southern Caspian area with Anatolia and parts of Northern Mesopotamia and continues, beyond these, towards the shores of the Aegean Sea to the west and towards Central Asia to the east.³

The existence of the “Northern Corridor” at least since the end of the 5th millennium BC (Late Chalcolithic period) and its continuation throughout the Bronze Age is suggested not only by the circulation of exotic materials (especially metals), but also by the presence, in the Southern Caucasus, in Anatolia and in the Aegean, of a number of artefacts types and cultural practices, which show a basic similarity with each other, and set these regions apart from the better known traditions of Mesopotamia and the Syro-Levantine region.

A case at issue is the diffusion of a series of characteristic items – weapons but also parade standards and different types of ornaments –,⁴ which are apparently connected with a warlike symbolism, and characterise a sort of warrior aristocracy, whose concept apparently originated and developed in the 4th millennium BC between the Caucasus and Anatolia,

¹ For a discussion of this recent phenomenon and its implications, see Rova, Tonussi 2017; Rova, Gilibert 2018; Rova forthcoming a.
² In our case, this is well represented by work by the late Andrew Sherrat (Sherrat 2004) and by Toby Wilkinson (Wilkinson 2014) about the complex network of long-distance connections which crosses Eurasia and the Near East in particular during the Bronze Age.
³ Rova forthcoming a, especially § 5 and 6.
⁴ This phenomenon is the topic of the PhD research of the first author, which will be extensively discussed in her dissertation. See, in the meanwhile, Dall’Armellina 2017; forthcoming.
and spread from here toward mainland Europe and in particular towards the Aegean area.

The appearance in Anatolia and in the Caucasus between the mid-4th and the mid-3rd millennium BC of “royal tombs” with a marked “warrior” connotation, which can be considered as one of the first examples of heroisation of the deceased, is also part of the same phenomenon. Later on, in the 2nd millennium, monumental tombs with an extraordinary funerary equipment, again characterised by a strong presence of weapons, are found in the Southern Caucasus, in particular in southern Georgia and in northern Armenia with the Trialeti culture. Some of the weapons found inside these tombs, for example the so-called “rippers” (or long swords), are also attested in the shaft graves of the A and B circles at Mycenaean, which are also considered the expression of a hierarchical social structure dominated by a military aristocracy.

In this article we would like to present what, in our opinion, may be another element of a long series of commonalities, which travelled along the “Northern Corridor”: zoomorphic vessels for the ritual consumption of liquids. Our reflections are inspired by the recent discovery, at Aradetis Orgora in Georgia, of a couple of zoomorphic vessels of the Kura-Araxes period, which most probably contained wine. It is a pleasure for us to dedicate them to Giorgio and Marilyn, precious friends of the “Georgian-Italian Shida Kartli Archaeological Project”, and in particular to Marilyn, who witnessed the discovery of the Aradetis Orgora vessels and first described them.

2. The two vessels from Aradetis Orgora

Two unique zoomorphic vessels of the Kura-Araxes period were found in 2015 during the third excavation season of the “Georgian-Italian Shida Kartli Archaeological Project” at the Main Mound (Dedoplis Gora) of the Aradetis Orgora/Doghlauri complex. This is one of the most important archaeological sites of the Shida Kartli region of Georgia, occupied almost without interruption from the end of the 4th millennium BC to the 6th century AD.

The two vessels were lying, close to a Kura-Araxes jar, on the burnt floor of a large rectangular room with rounded corners delimited by a 20-30 cm wide wall of yellowish clay, whose size, supported by soil micromorphological analysis, suggests that it was not a normal domestic unit, but most probably a sort of village shrine (fig. 1: a, b). The room belongs to Phase 4a of the local Kura-Araxes sequence, the absolute date of which falls between the end of the 31st and the end of the 30th century BC. In terms of material culture and relative chronology, Phase 4 belongs to the (late) Kura-Araxes II phase.

After reconstruction, the two vessels are quite similar to each other, differing only in few minor details (fig. 2: a, b). The first one (2414-M-2) was nearly complete, missing only the head (fig. 2: a, d), while the second (2434-M-5 + 2414-C-3) was recomposed and integrated from several fragments (fig. 2: b, e).

As restored, the second vessel is ca 19.5 cm high, 25 cm long and 18 cm wide. What remains of the first one (i.e., without the head) is 13.2 cm high and 19.6 cm long; its width at the widest part of the body is 13.0 cm. We can thus suppose that both vessels were originally nearly 20 cm high, while their length varied between 20 and 25 and their width between 13 and 18 cm, with the body of the second one being not only slightly larger, but also of flatter proportions.

Both vessels are mineral-tempered and exhibit a reddish-brown burnished surface. Their body is

---

5 This is the case of the very rich kurgans of the North-Caucasian Maikop culture of the 4th millennium (Sagona 2017, 152-171), of the “royal tomb” of Arslantepe (Palumbi 2004), of the Alacahöyük cemetery in the second half of the 3rd millennium (Ark 1937; Kosay, Hakok 1966), and of the contemporary kurgans of the Early Kurgan (Martqopi, Bedeni) period in Georgia (Makharadze et al. 2016). For the heroisation of the deceased, see Hansen 2013.

6 Kufin 1941.

7 Abramishvili 2001; Dall’Armellina 2017; forthcoming.

8 Karo 1930.


10 Gagoshidze, Rova 2018a; 2018b.


12 For radiocarbon dates, see Passerini et al. 2016; for further discussion, also Kvavadze et al. 2019.

13 Rova 2014, 52-55.

14 The vessels are presently stored in the Dedoplis Mindori (Queen’s field) fund of the Georgian National Museum in Tbilisi. Their museum inventory numbers are 27-977;11926 and 27-977;11927. One of them has recently been displayed at the exhibitions: “Georgia, cradle of viticulture” (Bordeaux, La Cité du Vin, 31 July 2017 - 5 November 2017) and “Gold und Wein. Georgiens älteste Schätze” (Archaeologisches Museum Frankfurt, 6 October 2018 - 10 February 2019); cf. Lordkipanidze 2017, 83; Giemsch, Hansen 2018, 304 f., no. 142.

15 One fragment (2414-C-3, corresponding to the figure’s feet) was recovered separately from, and at a slightly higher level, than the remaining ones. Its fabric is also slightly different from those of the other fragments: it is lighter in colour and contains some brownish chamotte, while the other fragments contain only whitish mineral inclusions. It cannot be totally excluded, therefore, that it originally belonged to a third vessel, similar to the other ones.

16 The fabric of the second vessel is described in the previous note. As far as it can be seen from the surface and the break on the neck, the fabric of the first vessel contains some chamotte and some small pebbles.

17 The surface of the second vessel is partially abraded and shows traces of heavy burning, possibly due to the fire event which caused the destruction of the building. The smooth red surface of
hollow, with an access hole in the back. It is squat and oval in shape, with a low crest in the middle of the back, and rests on three small feet (two in the front and one in the back). The solid ceramic neck rises vertically on a convex breast; it terminates in a flattened head. Only the head of the second vessel is preserved: it widens from the solid oval-section neck into a somewhat flattened triangle with a slightly curved top.

The head (fig. 2: c) shows stylised animal/human features: the sides suggest schematic ears and the nose is represented by an elongated clay pellet. The eyes are slightly recessed, with pupils represented by small protruding dots in the centre. Faint traces of the original painted decoration are preserved: a thin dark reddish band runs along the top of the head and continues on its back, one (or two?) black band(s) run around the neck, which is surrounded at the base by a wider band of lighter reddish colour. The feet of the first vessel are roughly conical, while those of the second one are formed more accurately and convey the impression that the figure is standing on its tiptoes.

As indicated by the slight ridge that, on the first vessel, extends from the side of the neck along the body to the hole in the back, the body was made in two parts. The legs were attached later. It is not clear when the neck was made but, since it is solid and therefore much heavier than any part of the body, it would have been difficult to attach after the body was constructed. In addition, if, as it seems, it functioned as a handle for the vessel, the presence of a join at its junction with the body would have presumably weakened it.

Paleontological analyses conducted on three samples (two from the first, and one from the second vessel) highlighted the presence, in all of them, not only of numerous pollen grains of common grapevine (Vitis vinifera), but also of pollen from vineyard weeds and plants – e.g. walnut and hazelnut – which are usually grown close to the vineyards and, among non-pollen palynomorphs, of large amounts of vine starch, Vitis epidermis, and hairs of the tiny Drosophila flies, which typically fly around grapes and wine during the first stage of its production, and easily fall into the large vessels where wine is usually placed. All these elements characterise the spectra obtained from modern wine and from sediments collected in ancient wine containers of different periods. It can therefore be concluded that both vessels must have contained wine.

Although their precise use (for libation, drinking, or pouring the liquid into another drinking vessel) is unclear, their peculiar shape, their context of discovery and their presumed content strongly suggest that the Aradets Orgora items were connected with ritual practices.

Considering both the overall dimensions of the vessels’ hollow body, and the location of the access hole, we may suppose that they may have contained less than half a litre of liquid. The position of the access hole makes it almost impossible to fill them in another way than by immersing the vessel into a larger container; an operation which could be easily accomplished by holding it by the solid animal’s neck. The hole is located relatively high on the back side of the animal’s body – so that it is theoretically possible that the half-filled vessel could be set down on a flat surface without the liquid flowing out of it – but too low for the vessel to be drained without lifting it by the neck, which would have likely provoked accidental spilling of its content. More probably, therefore, the vessel was drained just after filling it, first by lifting and then by tilting it, thus producing a stream of liquid which could be directed either toward the soil (in the case of a libation) or directly into the drinker’s mouth, or into another drinking vessel, such as a cup or a mug.

In the present state of knowledge, the two vessels from Aradets Orgora are unparalleled within the published Kura-Araxes corpus, in spite of their unquestionably Kura-Araxes fabric, colour and surface treatment, and of the fact that the stylised facial traits represented on the second vessel do not appear out of place in the Kura-Araxes period, as well, as they recall the numerous anthropomorphic or zoomorphic figures that decorate contemporary hearths and andirons or pottery vessels.

On the other hand, their hollow body connects them with six vessels with a globular body and a pedestal in the form of human feet, fragments of which were recently discovered at Arslantepe/Malatya in Level VI B1, which is roughly contemporary with Kura-Araxes Phase 4 at Aradets Orgora. Unlike the vessels from Aradets Orgora, these are provided with two access holes, one on the “head” and the other at the end of one of the two “arms”, and have therefore been described by the excavators as “rhyta”. They were found in a hut (A 789) located near the eastern corner of a large public building (Building 36), in an

---

16. The other vessel is covered by a net of microscopic cracks, which are characteristic of the Kura-Araxes ceramics. A small part of the upper body on the right side is darkened by fire.

17. The hole on the first vessel, which is the only one which is preserved, is oval-shaped, 2.0 cm wide and has a flange around it on the interior only.

18. For detailed discussion of the palynological evidence, see Kvaradze et al. 2019.

19. Smogorzewska 2004. For the Shida Kartli region see, for instance, a four-legged prop of hearth the form of a turtle shell with a round back from Kvatskhela (Javakhishvili, Glonti 1962, 32, pl. IV, nos. 336, 337).


21. Frangipane 2012, 115, fig. 3; 2014, fig. 12; Palumbi et al. 2017, 92.
area which was probably used for ceremonial and ritual activities, as demonstrated by the presence, a.o., of a wood-lined basin. Although their contents have unfortunately not been analysed, the excavators supposed that they were used for the consumption or libation of some type of liquid (maybe an alcoholic beverage), in a ritual context.²³

The general shape of the Aradetis Orgora vessels, their ovoid and slightly flattened body and their long neck were possibly inspired by water birds such as swans and geese. Images of birds are not alien to the Kura-Araxes iconographic repertoire, and in fact occur rather frequently in the decoration of Kura-Araxes vessels,²⁴ but vessels of this shape are unique in the Southern Caucasus, at least in this period. Interestingly enough, however, as we will argue below, they bear a distinctive resemblance to some Early Bronze Age vessels from two regions of the “Northern Corridor”: Anatolia and the Aegean.

3. The tradition of zoomorphic vessels in the ancient Near East and in the Eastern Mediterranean

Animal-shaped vessels in pottery, metal, stone, and other materials were produced in many ancient cultures all over the world, and continue being occasionally produced to this day. They can be very different from each other both in their shape and in their use, and obviously not all of them can be traced to one and the same origin. However, as the volume accompanying the recent exhibition “Animal-Shaped Vessels from the Ancient World: Feasting with Gods, Heroes, and Kings”²⁵ well highlights, these fascinating objects, which in many cases are unique pieces, show widespread affinities.

Although they have always attracted scholars’ and collectors’ curiosity, and are therefore well represented in museums and private collections, they are relatively rare within the relevant assemblages, and often represent isolated finds. Both their elaborate shape and the contexts of discovery indicate that they were not intended for everyday use, but for special, ritual occasions. As already suggested by their same morphology, by iconographic sources and by ethnographic analogies, and most recently also confirmed by scientific analyses (chemical analysis of organic residues, palynological analyses etc.) carried out by “biological archaeologists” on ancient specimens, most of them were intended to contain liquids, in particular alcoholic beverages.

Despite the wide variety of animals represented,²⁶ there is also, in the Old World at least, a clear preference for certain species, in primis lions and bulls,²⁷ rams, stags and other horned animals, but also, interestingly enough, birds and, more rarely but still significantly, hedgehogs/pigs.

Finally, although a considerable number of zoomorphic vessels of all periods are made of pottery and, as a consequence, cannot be considered elite objects reserved to the wealthiest sectors of the population, one can observe, starting at least from the beginning of 2nd millennium BC, the development of special zoomorphic vessels made of precious materials (most often metals), which clearly play the role of status symbols and, more specifically, appear to belong to the paraphernalia of the ruling elite.

Scholars generally agree that these commonalities can be explained by the fact that zoomorphic vessels combine the social power of their contents (alcoholic beverages) and of the occasions in which they were consumed (feasts as communal events which shape and reinforce social relationships),²⁸ and the ambivalent fascination of human beings for animals, which are perceived as “other” but not completely alien, as objects of subjugation but, at the same time, as bearers of mysterious and potentially dangerous powers. It was probably believed that the act of filling the vessel with liquid somehow re-animated the animal, and allowed to transfer its vital essence and qualities to those who drank the fluid which flowed out of it.²⁹

The tradition of zoomorphic vessels was especially well attested during the Bronze Age in the Near East and in the Eastern Mediterranean,³⁰ from which it spread, during the Iron Age and the Hellenistic and Roman periods, to large parts of Eurasia.³¹

Items not only show a large morphological variety, but were also clearly used in different ways and, according to their different uses, had a stable or an unstable base, were equipped with one or two openings or with one or no handle, etc. They have accordingly been classified in different, not always

²³ Palumbo et al. 2017, 92.
²⁴ See Sagona 1984, part III, passim.
²⁵ Ebbinghaus 2018.
²⁶ Along with containers in the shape of entire animals, vessels in the shape of animal parts, most often of animal heads, and sometimes also of animal protomes are also frequently attested. Although they are clearly part of the same widespread phenomenon, we will not discuss these groups of finds in detail in the following, as they cannot be directly related with the Aradetis Orgora vessels.
²⁷ In fact, their strength and aggressive behaviour made these two animals ubiquitous symbols of power in many civilisations.
²⁸ Dieterle 2018.
²⁹ Patton 2018.
³⁰ For a general synthesis, besides Koehl 2018, see also Koehl 2013. General studies on the topic can be found in Tuchelt 1962 and Koehl 2006 (with a focus on Bronze Age Aegean).
³¹ Ebbington 2018, chapters III-VII; Tuchelt 1962.
consistent ways by the various researchers, and are known under different names (rhyta, \textsuperscript{52} BIBRU,\textsuperscript{53} askoi\textsuperscript{54}) in the different scholarly traditions. We will not consider these aspects, for which we refer to previous literature,\textsuperscript{55} in the following discussion, but will concentrate on the general distribution of the zoomorphic vessels category instead.

In the Near East, containers in the shape of an animal first appear in the Neolithic period,\textsuperscript{56} and remain sporadically attested, in its different regions, throughout the Chalcolithic.\textsuperscript{57} Evidence from Uruk-period Mesopotamia\textsuperscript{58} is especially interesting in this respect, as not only vessels, both in stone and in pottery, in form of different animals are known from sites in various regions of the Late Uruk “koiné” (Khafajah Susa, Jebel Aruda), but similar items are also depicted, among other offers and cultic paraphernalia, on the upper register of the famous Warka vase,\textsuperscript{59} which confirms that they played a role in the emerging centrally organised religion of the first urban centres.

After the Uruk period, however, the tradition of animal-shaped vessels almost disappears from the south-Mesopotamian alluvium and becomes rather rare in the rest of Mesopotamia as well. From about 3000 BC, the main focus of distribution of this category of objects apparently shifts westwards, toward Anatolia but especially toward the East Mediterranean Aegean area, where their tradition continues down to the end of the Bronze Age. In the Aegean, zoomorphic vessels give rise to the specific class of vessels known as rhyta, whose distinctive feature is the presence of two different openings, a larger and a smaller one.\textsuperscript{60}

In the 2\textsuperscript{nd} millennium, however, an equally important focus of the distribution of zoomorphic vessels is the Anatolian mainland. Here, they are present in large numbers already during the Assyrian colony period,\textsuperscript{61} and continue being attested, with examples in precious metals and abundant textual evidence attesting their important ritual function, until the fall of the Hittite Kingdom.\textsuperscript{62}

While trying to explain the origin of Hittite zoomorphic vessels, scholars have until now tentatively advocated possible Mesopotamian influences in addition to original creation\textsuperscript{63}. Similarly, the origins of the widespread fashion of such vessels in the later Achaemenid period has been connected to Mesopotamian influences coupled with an indigenous tradition dating back to the early 1\textsuperscript{st} millennium in North-Western Iran.\textsuperscript{64}

Material from the Southern Caucasus has not been included in the Harvard exhibition, although recent literature highlights the presence of an enduring tradition of wine-drinking containers, including a number of animal-shaped ones, in the region.\textsuperscript{65} In facts, the Southern Caucasus appears as an empty spot on the distribution maps which illustrate the Harvard exhibition catalogue. The Aradetis Orgora vessels offer us the opportunity to integrate this region and its connections with the neighbouring ones in the discussion of the ancient distribution of zoomorphic vessels.

4. ZOOMORPHIC VESSELS ALONG THE “NORTHERN CORRIDOR” IN THE EARLY BRONZE AGE

Although the two vessels from Aradetis Orgora are approximately contemporary with the Uruk specimens discussed above, they are very different, in all respects, from them. Early Bronze Age Anatolia, the nearest western neighbour of the Southern Caucasus,\textsuperscript{66} provides some more convincing parallels. Zoomorphic vessels are in fact present in this region since the Neolithic\textsuperscript{67}, but their number significantly increases in the Early Bronze Age.

An item from Demirchüyük-Sariket in the north-western part of the region\textsuperscript{68} dates to the very beginning of the 3\textsuperscript{rd} millennium: while it proves the existence in the area of this category of finds, it is admittedly not particularly similar to the Georgian specimens. More

\textsuperscript{52} Strictu sensu, the term rhyton (which derives from the Greek verb ἄφω, to flow) refers to vessels provided with two different openings, and its use should be limited to them (Koehl 2006), although numerous scholars apply it to other types of animal-shaped – or otherwise complex – vessels as well.

\textsuperscript{53} This term is generally used for Hittite zoomorphic vessels, as it often appears on Hittite texts mentioning such items. However, it derives from an Akkadian word (meaning “bird”); it has therefore been proposed to use it as a general term for Near Eastern zoomorphic vessels (Koehl 2013).

\textsuperscript{54} Askos (literally “wineskin”) is used by classical archaeologists to describe any squat or flattened vessel with an off-centre spout (Koehl 2018, 52). The term is traditionally used to define Bronze Age Aegean and North-West Anatolian zoomorphic vessels of similar proportions (Misch 1992).

\textsuperscript{55} See Koehl 2013, 2018 with further literature.

\textsuperscript{56} E.g. at Bouqras, in Syria, but also at Hacilar in Anatolia and at Arpaçay in Northern Mesopotamia (Kohi 2018, 47-48).

\textsuperscript{57} Koehl 2018, 48-49.

\textsuperscript{58} Koehl 2013, 239-240; 2018, 50-52.

\textsuperscript{59} See Bahrami 2002.

\textsuperscript{60} Koehl 2006; see also Koehl 2013; 2018, 52-54, 64-65, 75-83.

\textsuperscript{51} Kulakoğlu, Kanhal 2010, passim.

\textsuperscript{52} Koehl 2013, 2018, 59-63, 66-71. Zoomorphic vessels in 2\textsuperscript{nd} millennium Anatolia are discussed in § 3. below, with further relevant literature,

\textsuperscript{53} Koehl 2018, 59-60.

\textsuperscript{54} Ebbingtion 2018, 106 ff., 121-124, 144.

\textsuperscript{55} Lordkipanidze 2017; Giemsch, Hansen 2018; see also Kvatvadze et al. 2019.

\textsuperscript{56} For a recent overview of the relations between the two regions in the 4\textsuperscript{th} and 3\textsuperscript{rd} millennium BC, see Rova forthcoming b.

\textsuperscript{57} See above, § 2. It may also be interesting to observe, in this respect, that vaguely zoomorphic askoi and zoomorphic vessels are also sporadically attested in the Neolithic and Chalcolithic cultures of Greece and the Balkans (Misch 1992, 14-36).

\textsuperscript{58} Korfmann 1980, 10, pl. 13, fig. 1-3; cf. Tonussi 2007, 275, 283, pl. 15, cat. CZ20-2.
interesting analogies are offered by the so-called *askoi* of the North-West Anatolian “*Yortan* culture” (fig. 3a, b). These vessels are not properly in the shape of an animal, but some of them clearly evoke the figure of a bird. They have a posteriorly elongated piriform body and a long neck, open at the top, that reminds one of a bird’s beak, and are equipped with a handle on the back. Interestingly enough, they have three small conical feet, which are very similar to those of the vessels from Aradetis Orgora. This particular type of *askos* can be attributed to the first half of the millennium (EBA I-II); it reaches the West-Anatolian coast and partly spreads to the Aegean islands (Lemnos, Chios, Lesbos) as well.51

Zoomorphic vessels provided with three small feet are quite common in Western Anatolia in a slightly later period: for instance, several of them come from Troy II and III (fig. 3: c, d, e). The shape of these vessels has evident similarities with the *Yortan askoi* (they have a globular or piriform body, an opening at the top of the neck, and a handle on top of the back). However, in this case we are not simply dealing with vessels in the form of birds, as in fact they have a sort of zoomorphic protome on the back side, opposite to the neck, in place of the bird’s tail. It is difficult to establish the different animal species which inspired these compositions, although Schliemann tentatively identified pigs, rams, and moles. A similar item was also found at Boz Höyük.53

The cemetery at Karataş-Semayük yielded another three-footed zoomorphic vase.54 It is rather small and perhaps represents a mole; unfortunately, the pouring spout is not preserved, but there is a large handle on the back of the animal. A further tripod vase, originally probably with a zoomorphic protome but now mutilated, was found in the Early Bronze Age levels of Aphrodisias (fig. 3: g). Another example, similar in shape to the previous one, comes from Poliochini on the island of Lemnos (fig. 3: f).56 It has the shape of a pig with three small feet in the lower part of the body. Its last reconstruction suggests that it was provided with a neck (with a hole on the top) and with a handle on the upper part of the body.

Interestingly, a similar ovoid-shaped vessel was found in a sounding dug into the Early Bronze Age levels at Alacahöyük in Central Anatolia.57 The vase is not well preserved (it misses the head), but has an ovoid body, four conical legs and a tail. Further north in the same region, another find comes from Karaoğlan.58 Central Anatolia, a still poorly known region at the crossroads of different communication corridors, may in fact represent the missing link between the West-Anatolian examples and some isolated mid-late 3rd millennium items from Northern Mesopotamia – Kurban Höyük (fig. 3: h).59 Tell Brak (fig. 3: i)60 –, which M. Tonussi already interpreted, some years ago, as possible imitations of Anatolian types.61 If this were really the case, we should assume that similar zoomorphic vessels were in fact widespread, during the second half of the 3rd millennium, over the whole of Anatolia.62

On the other hand, during the Early Bronze Age zoomorphic vessels are also widely attested in the Aegean region. Most specimens come from Crete, where they occur in *tholos* tombs from the beginning of the 3rd until the end of the 3rd-beginning of the 2nd millennium, when this type of burial began to decline.63 The Cretan vessel have different forms and sizes (most common are those in the shape of the bull, which were particularly appreciated on the island),64 the oldest specimens, which date to the EM I-II periods,65 however, are often in the shape of birds and somehow resemble the West-Anatolian *askoi*; they are also characterised by the presence of three or four low conical feet (fig. 3: j-l). The Cretan vessels have been variously classified as *askoi* or *rhyta*,

---

51 For a general overview of the culture, see Kiamil 1980.
53 Misch 1992, 72.
54 Schliemann 1881, 294, no. 160; 375, nos. 333, 334; 376, nos. 335, 337; 377, no. 333. Cf. also Podzuweit 1979.
57 Kadish 1969, 57, table 25, fig. 12.
58 The object was found, in very fragmentary conditions, in space 650 of Megaron 605. For an extensive discussion of its context, parallels and possible use, see Cultraro 2005.
59 Köjay, Akok 1966, 204-205, table 55, fig. 15; Tonussi 2007, 278, cat. C/VZ1.
61 Algaze 1990, 399, pl. 154.
62 Oates et al. 2001, 168-169, 434-435, figs. 202-203, 382-386; cf. Tonussi 2007, 274-275, 278-280, pls. 14-15, cat. C/VZ4-9. The vessels are very fragmentary, one of them had three feet, while the others had four. They apparently represented rams or bulls.
64 Cf. the distribution map Tonussi 2007, 276-277.
65 Kohl 2018, 52-53. They generally do not belong to the burial goods, but were probably used during special ceremonies in honour of the deceased that included the ritual consumption of food and beverages. In fact, other suggestive ceramics types (such as cups and pitchers) and animal remains were found associated with them.
66 For the complete catalogue, see Koehl 2006, 71-72.
67 Examples come from Lebena (one in the shape of a bird and one in the shape of a bull: Koehl 2018, 53-53, fig. 7.27.3; see also Misch 1992, 83-84, figs. 62, 65), Koumasa (two bird-shaped ones from Tholos A, and one with bird’s body and the head of a ram from area AB: Koehl 2006, 75-76, pls. 3-4, figs. 26, 29; see Misch 1992, 83-84, figs. 63, 66) and Platanos (a bird-shaped vessel from Tholos B [MMI B] and one with a bird-shaped body with bovine features and horns from Tholos G: Koehl 2006, 75-76, pls. 3-4, figs. 28, 30).
since many of them are provided with two different openings, one on the animal’s snout and the other on the back or close to the tail, an innovation which apparently originated there.66

Askoi/rhyta in the shape of, or vaguely reminiscent of, different animals, in particular birds, are also found in the Cyclades,67 in mainland Greece,68 and even in Cyprus.69 Most of them are later than the earliest Cretan examples and date in the second half or around the end of the 3rd millennium, but the chronology of many of them is in fact uncertain. In many cases, they show some affinities with, or they occur together with, West-Anatolian types, a fact that at the very least suggests the existence of continuing connections with this region.

5. **ZOOMORPHIC VESSELS ALONG THE “NORTHERN CORRIDOR” IN THE MIDDLE-LATE BRONZE AND EARLY IRON AGES: A CONTINUING TRADITION?**

The tradition of zoomorphic containers finds a good breeding ground in 2nd millennium Anatolia. Most famous for the earlier Middle Bronze Age are the numerous examples from Kültepe-Kanesh, which were apparently used in domestic ritual activities.70 They have very different shapes and represent many species of animals – lions, birds, horned quadrapeds, hedgehogs or wild boars, etc. – it is possible to divide them into two categories: vessels in the shape of complete animals (fig. 4: a, b), which continue the older tradition, and animal-head vessels, which represent an innovation.71

Zoomorphic vessels continue in use, in Anatolia, during the Old Kingdom period (17th-16th century BC), as proved, e.g., by the two large-size bulls from Buyukkale displayed at the Museum of Anatolian Civilizations at Ankara (fig. 4: c).72 For this time, we have the first evidence that similar containers were also produced in precious metals, namely in the form of a silver stag-shaped vessel from Shaft Grave IV at Mycenae (fig. 4: e).73 This has no local parallels, but its shape is very close to that of ceramic items from Kültepe. Metallurgical analysis confirmed that its silver came from the Taurus Mountains and, therefore, it was an import from Anatolia, an exotic object that probably reached Mycenae as a “royal gift”.74

For the later Hittite Empire period, archaeological evidence is joined for the first time by textual sources. Besides items in pottery, which continue the earlier tradition of vessels in the shape of an entire animal, the former now includes items in precious metals in the shape of an animal head or terminating in the forepart of an animal, such as the famous vessels from the Norbert Schimmel collection now in the Metropolitan Museum of Art of New York, in the shape of a stag and respectively of a bull (fig. 4: d).75

These items have been identified with the vessels mentioned as BIBRU in contemporary Hittite texts, from which we learn that they were special drinking vessels for gods and kings. Indeed, the Hittites used this term for both zoomorphic and non-zoomorphic containers of different shapes and materials (metal, exotic stones, but also wood).76 They were used for different types of rituals, one of which, “god-drinking”, has especially attracted scholars’ attention.77 Various texts report that, during some special ceremonies, the king, or in some cases the royal couple, “drank the god (or the goddess)”.78 According to some Hittitologists, the texts simply refers to a toast in honour of the divinity. Other scholars, however, believe that the expression refers to ingesting some of the deity’s power and/or establishing a close and direct contact with him/her through the medium of his/her sacred animal. More specifically, the act of pouring a liquid into the animal-shaped container and draining it from the latter would have been equal to “defying” it by “passing through the god”. “God-drinking” was often performed with alcoholic beverages (wine or beer), and it can be presumed that the intoxicating

66 Kohl 2018, 52-53.
70 Koehl 2018, 59-63. For a large selection of zoomorphic vessels from Kültepe the reader is referred to Kulakoğlu, Kanhal 2010, cat. 191 ff.
71 Animal-head vessels were not pierced, and were apparently used as drinking cups. Those in the shape of complete animals mostly have two holes: one on the upper part of the animal’s body and the other near its mouth or nostrils: they might have been used for pouring libations or for filling other drinking vessels or, according to Koehl, for drinking directly from them through drinking tubes (Kulakoğlu, Kanhal 2010; see also Koehl 2013, 240-241).
72 Koehl 2018, 60 ff., figs. 2.26-27.
73 Schleemann 1878, 257-260.
74 Koehl 1995, 62-64.
75 Güterbock 1981:83; 1989; cf. also Emre, Çinaroğlu 1993. Three bronze vessels in the shape of a bull’s head come from the Klinik-Kastamonu hoard, which according to the excavators possibly originated from a sacked Hittite temple (Emre, Çinaroğlu 1993, 677, nos. 1-5, figs. 1-4, pls. 127-129). Similar vessels are also known in the shape of a human fist. For a complete inventory of Hittite metal items, see Reeves 2003.
76 Koehl 2013, 241-243; Koehl 2018, 66-71; on BIBRU in general, see also the recent contribution by Heffron 2014.
77 For a history of the question and for the different interpretations of this expression, see, a.o., Güterbock 1998, 121-129; Haas 1994, 520 ff.; Heffron 2014; Vedeen, in Ebbinghaus 1918, 68-69.
78 One or more deities are called into question: “He drinks the Sun-goddess of the Earth” (Kub 30.23 iii 19) or “He drinks thrice: the goddess Katatña, the Sun-god and the Protective Deity of the king” (IBoT 1.29 obv. 27).
character of these contributed to the effectiveness of the ritual. In fact, these Hittite text may shed light on the meaning of a much older tradition, which may go back even to the Kura-Araxes vessels from Aradetis Orgora.

During the Middle and Late Bronze Age, a parallel tradition of zoomorphic vessels of different types and shapes continues and further develops also in the Aegean region, in Crete (fig. 4: f, g) as well as on the Greek islands and on the mainland,79 and beyond it. By the Late Bronze Age, the presence of this class of containers is in fact generalised all over the Eastern Mediterranean.80 We will not dwell here on their morphological development and on the complex patterns of interconnections they highlight, which have been already sufficiently analysed by different scholars.81 We would simply like to call attention to the fact that, although each region developed specific types and variants, similarities with Anatolian vessels remain particularly strong, and point to continuing influences and interchange. Just to make one example, it seems probable that the Minoan bull-head *rhylton* was inspired by the Anatolian bull-head cups of the Karum period.82 In other words, zoomorphic vessels and, presumably, ideas and rituals connected with them continued to circulate widely through the western part of the “Northern Corridor”.

However, what about the eastern part of this? Although the tradition of wine-drinking and wine-drinking vessels clearly continued uninterrupted in the Southern Caucasus,83 zoomorphic vessels do not seem to be attested for most of the 2nd millennium in this region. For the Middle Bronze Age, this may be due to the fact that very few settlements of this period have been found, and might be easily changed by future discoveries. It is interesting to observe, in this respect, that one of the objects lying on the banqueting table depicted on the second register of the famous silver vessel from Karashamb (Trialeti culture of Armenia) may in fact be a Hittite-type animal-head vessel.84 On the other hand, they appear to be virtually absent during the Late Bronze Age, when both settlements and cemeteries are plentiful, as well.

Be that as it may, zoomorphic vessels reappear in considerable numbers in the region in the early 1st millennium BC. Several examples come, for instance, from two rich cremation burials from Treli Gorebi (fig. 4: h), which should date approximately in the 8th century BC.85 Roughly contemporary examples come from Azerbaijan86 and still others from the Talysh region on the mountains close to the shore of the Caspian Sea, on both sides of the present border between Azerbaijan and Iran.87 They represent rings of a chain which connects the examples from Eastern Georgia with those from North-Western Iran, best represented by the finds from the cemetery of Marlik,88 which date between the late 2nd and the early 1st millennium. These are peculiar one-opening vessels that represent different types of animals (bulls, horses, leopards, deer, rams, bears etc.) in a rather stylised form (fig. 4: i).

It is admittedly difficult to hypothesise a direct connection between this renewed fashion for zoomorphic vessels at the eastern limit of the “Northern Corridor” and the earlier tradition which, we assumed, spread during the Early Bronze Age from the Southern Caucasus in western direction towards Anatolia and the Aegean; we can limit ourselves to observe that in both cases they seemed to have travelled along an east-west oriented network of interrelations, in which the Southern Caucasus was undoubtedly involved.

6. Conclusions

Zoomorphic vessels are diffused over a wide range of cultures, and obviously not all of them have the same origin and necessarily belong to the same network of interregional exchanges and communications. However, the discovery of the two Kura-Araxes vessels from Aradetis Orgora opens up the intriguing possibility to trace an hitherto overlooked early route of diffusion of this category of finds from the Southern Caucasus through Northern Anatolia toward the Aegean, i.e. via the “Northern Corridor”, which would date back at least to the late 4th millennium BC.

The use of zoomorphic vessels may have spread together with the tradition of ritual consumption of wine, and their origins may ultimately lie in the Southern Caucasus, a region where viticulture and

83 Unfortunately, these graves are still partially unpublished (see Sagona 2017, 418); for images of individual vessels, see Miron, Orthmann 1995, cat. nos. 381, 382; Gamba&schidze et al. 2001; Lordkipanidze 2017, 86).
84 A number of them are exhibited at the National Museum of History of Azerbaijan in Baku, where the second author of this article could recently see them.
85 Some of these vessels, which probably come from graves, are discussed in the recent dissertation by Mathias Haze (Haze 2018, 288-291) who tentatively dates them to the end of the 2nd - early 1st millennium BC (1000-800 BC ca).
86 Ne`haban 1996, 117-120, pls. 36-38; see Ebbington 2018, 120-124.
wine-making are first attested in the Neolithic period and have since then played an important role both in the agricultural economy and in the cultural identity of the local population.99

The idea of zoomorphic vessels, particularly in the shape of birds, may have travelled through the connections (possibly stimulated by the developing exchange in metal ores and objects) between the Kura-Araxes communities – or their mid/late 3rd millennium successors – and their still poorly known Central Anatolian neighbours.90 Via the Yortan culture of North-Western Anatolia and the site of Troy, it may have spread to Western Anatolia and found a sea outlet to the Aegean coast and the islands.

In Anatolia the tradition of zoomorphic vessels probably lingered during the second half of the 3rd millennium – as suggested by sparse finds from different areas, but in particular from its northern part – and was then revived at the time of the Assyrian colonies, when Central Anatolia was deeply involved in the Middle Bronze Age network of international relations. In this period, it may have intercepted the contemporary traditions of zoomorphic and other ritual vessels from the Aegean and from Mesopotamia, and intermingled with them, giving rise to the tradition of Hittite BIBRU vessels.

This phase probably witnessed the transformation of a ritual, which had originally developed in the contest of egalitarian communities who presumably practiced communal feasting and/or libations within individual households or in simple village shrines, into the Hittite practice of “god-drinking”, which not by chance appears to be restricted almost exclusively to the royal couple. From the point of view of material culture, this change is signalled by the appearance of BIBRU containers in precious materials, which also played a role in contemporary diplomatic exchanges.

Finally, although evidence for the 2nd millennium is hitherto lacking, it is not totally excluded that in the Southern Caucasus, at the opposite end of the “Northern Corridor”, the local tradition of communalism and wine-drinking through animal-shaped containers remained alive, and that it may in the future be possible to relate it with the remarkable revival of zoomorphic vessels that characterises Eastern Georgia, Azerbaijan and North-West Iran during the first centuries of the 1st millennium BC. The latter, in its turn, may be considered one of the factors (together with the Mesopotamian tradition of animal-headed cups) which explains the later vogue of zoomorphic drinking vessels throughout the Achaemenid empire.

In conclusion, zoomorphic vessels represent another case where the inclusion of data from the Southern Caucasus may allow, in the future, to redefine the network of interregional connections crossing the Near East and the Eastern Mediterranean by focusing on specific wares, objects, ideas and traditions travelling along the “Northern Corridor”, of which this region constitutes a crucial node.
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Fig. 1. a) Aradetis Orgora, Field B, plan of the Kura-Araxes sub-phase 4a occupation; b) view of the finding spot of the zoomorphic vessels, from S (Georgian-Italian Shida Kartli Archaeological Project).
Fig. 2. a) Photo of the first zoomorphic vessel (2414-M-2) after restoration; b) photo of the second zoomorphic vessel (2434-M-5 + 2414-C-3) after restoration; c) detail of the head of the second zoomorphic vessel (2434-M-5) before restoration; d) drawing of the first zoomorphic vessel (2414-M-2); e) drawing of the fragments of the second zoomorphic vessel: 2434-M-5 (above) and 2414-C-3 (below) before restoration (Georgian-Italian Shida Kartli Archaeological Project).
Fig. 3. a, b) Yortan type vases (after Kiamil 1980, figs. 72-73); c, d, e) animal-shaped “tripod-vessels” from Troy (after Schliemann 1881, nos. 333, 335, 338); f) fragment of zoomorphic vessel from Aphrodisias (after Kadish 1969, pl. 25, fig. 12); g) reconstruction of the pig-shaped vessel from Poliochni (after Cullarzo 2005, fig. 4); h) zoomorphic vessel from Kurban Höyük (after Algaze 1990, pl. 154a); i) fragmentary zoomorphic vessel from Tell Brak (after Oates et al. 2001, 435 cat. 383); j, k) zoomorphic askoi from Lebena Tomb II (Alexiou, Warren 2004, pl. 107 a, c); l) zoomorphic rhyton from Kumasa (Koehl 2006, pls. 1, 2).
Fig. 4. a, b) Zoomorphic vessels from Kültepe Kanesh (after Kulakoğlu, Kanhal 2010, figs. 207, 209); c) Two bull BIBRU from Hattusa (after Koehl 2018, fig. 2.27); d) Hittite vessel in form of a stag (MET museum Public Domain https://www.metmuseum.org/art/collection/search/327399); e) Silver stag from Mycenae (after Koehl 2018, fig. 2.22); f, g) Late Minoan rhyta (after Koehl 2006, cat. 43, 24); h) Iron Age zoomorphic vessel from Treli, Georgia (after Lordkipanidze 2017, 96); i) Iron Age vessel in the form of a bull from Marlik (Iran) (after Tuchelt 1962, fig. 2).