13

Anatolian Lead Figurines: A Stocktaking

Yağmur Heffron[1]

It is truly an honour to be dedicating this article to Bayan Gates, who introduced me to the ancient Near East, and Charles Bey, who taught me how to read images. I consider it a tremendous piece of luck to have had such extraordinary teachers, to whom I am ever grateful for continuing to inspire, encourage, and improve me. Close to finishing this article, I discovered that Kutlu Emre's seminal Anatolian Lead Figurines and Their Stone Moulds *was indeed very well known to Bayan Gates, or "Miss Marie-Henriette Carre at Yale University who went over the English text."*[2] *I would like to think this an auspicious detail in my choice of topic. Incidentally, the irony of presenting some of the most inelegant pieces of ancient Near Eastern art to two exceptionally graceful people, is not lost on me.*

Abstract

Anatolian lead figurines belong to a distinct category of small-scale mould-made objects attested throughout an extensive geography stretching from Troy in the northwest to Sippar in the southeast. Their notable concentration in Anatolia, particularly in early second millennium BC, is undoubtedly connected to Assyrian trade, which sets the historical background for stylistic and iconographic comparisons with the Syro-Mesopotamian milieux. To date, Anatolian lead figurines have been catalogued in great detail,[3] their production and place in the exchange networks put into consideration,[4] and their stylistic trends examined and classified.[5] Save for the earliest commentaries,[6] however, the iconography and symbolic significance of these remarkable objects have received little detailed discussion. Conse-

1 Department of History, University College London, Gower Street, London WC1E 6BT, UK.

2 Emre 1971, xii.

3 Emre 1971.

4 Canby 1965, 2003.

5 Marchetti 2003.

6 Emre 1969; 1970; 1971.

quently, the place of Anatolian lead figurines within the broader iconographic repertoire of religio-magical meaning remains underexplored. This article offers a vantage point for a more holistic treatment of Anatolian lead figurines by integrating previous efforts and formulating new interpretations.

Introduction

Anatolian lead figurines belong to a group of small-scale mould-made objects, coined as "trinkets,"[7] attested across an extensive geography as far northwest as Troy and as far southeast as Sippar.[8] The earliest known examples are dated to the third millennium BC.[9] During the first half of the second millennium BC, lead figurines and the stone moulds used in their manufacture display a notable concentration in south-central Anatolia.[10]

Their average dimensions (height *ca.* 5.5 cm, width *ca.* 2.5 cm) characterise lead figurines essentially as miniatures while their average thickness (*ca.* 0.3 cm) and flat, unworked backs indicate these were objects intended for frontal viewing. In addition to representational (mostly anthropomorphic, occasionally zoomorphic) figurines, the repertoire of mould-made lead trinkets includes a great variety of decorative geometric shapes, some certainly intended as items of personal adornment (pendants, earrings, pins or hair decoration), while others can be identified as stamp seals.[11]

Lead figurines were manufactured with the use of stone moulds (ranging between 5-9 cm in height; 3-5 cm in width; 1-2 cm in thickness), which are indicative of the relatively simple and inexpensive manufacture of mass-produced goods. The physical qualities of lead, an extremely malleable metal with a fairly low melting point (327.46 °C = 621.43 °F) and a high resistance to corrosion, are particularly well suited to small-scale metallurgy with a potentially sizeable output of easily affordable objects. Lead trinkets, therefore, can be described as modest items of popular consumption.

The wide geographic distribution and the temporal tenacity of lead trinkets likewise attest to the popularity of these objects, although differences of meaning and function would certainly have existed over time and space. Marchetti contextualises early trinket manufacture generally in terms of "Early Bronze Age urbanisation, probably in the area between southeastern Anatolia and northern

7 Canby 1965.

8 Emre 1971, 1.

9 Canby 2003, 171.

10 Emre 1971, 3.

11 Canby 1965, 44.

Mesopotamia,"[12] specifically "the marked increase in metallurgical production which took place in the Levant and Anatolia during Early Bronze IV."[13] By the MBA, trinket manufacture—now concerned solely with figurines rather than stamps, jewellery, and the like—concentrates in Anatolia, as northern Mesopotamia gradually ceases to be "a significant area of production."[14]

It is in the early second millennium BC that lead trinkets—mainly of the figurine variety—and moulds become highly conspicuous in the archaeological record of Anatolia, pointing to a surge of popularity in the region. The apparent intensification in the manufacture and circulation of lead figurines can be situated within the historical context of the *kārum* period, at a time when Assyrian mercantile activities in Anatolia place the region in close contact with the Syro-Mesopotamian milieux.[15] There is little doubt that the evidently intensified circulation of lead trinkets in Anatolia was a direct result of interregional contacts established by *kārum* period trade.[16] Once these contacts diminish by late 17th century BC,[17] so do lead figurines disappear from the archaeological record,[18] further confirming the direct link between trinket production and the *kārum* network. In fact the emergence of trinkets during the third millennium can likewise be contextualised with an earlier incarnation of a comparable system of interregional communication.[19] As to *why* such a peculiar class of object a) emerges in the first place; and b) proves so tenacious in the specific context of long-distance exchange, only to disappear once the systems of exchange are rearranged, deserves a closer examination. To this end, this article offers an exploration of the extent of multiple and sometimes overlapping uses to which lead figurines may have been put. Both in terms of craft production and symbolic meaning, it is important to acknowledge that lead figurines make up a particularly versatile group of objects, and appreciate the highly diverse "social lives,"[20] they certainly would have had. A detailed and

12 Marchetti 2003, 411.

13 Marchetti 2003, 391.

14 Marchetti 2003, 411.

15 See Michel 2011 for a recent overview of the *kārum* period; see also Kulakoğlu 2011 for Kültepe-Kaneš, centre of the Anatolian *kārum* network.

16 Emre 1969, 169-70.

17 According to Barjamovic, Hertel and Larsen's (2012) reappraisal of the *historical* chronology of the *kārum* period, Level Ib ends in 1690 BC (Middle Chronology), the point beyond which textual sources are no longer attested, and so Assyrian trade is assumed to have ended. Occupation in Kültepe's Lower Town continues for Level Ia, a final, atextual period of occupation, estimated to have ended in 1650 BC (Kulakoğlu 2014; 87).

18 Marchetti 2003, 412.

19 Canby 1965, 53; Marchetti 2003, 411.

20 After Appadurai 1986.

holistic examination of lead figurines from this perspective holds great potential to reflect previously unconsidered complexities of ideational exchange during the *kārum* period.

Archaeological Contexts

The known archaeological contexts of Anatolian lead figurines tend to be of lay characters, suggesting that the primary setting for the use of these objects was largely outside the public/official domain and instead belonged to the private/domestic sphere.[21] Published lead figurines from Kültepe-Kaneš, for instance, are all associated with residential areas, found *in situ* on floors, recovered from household debris,[22] or from street fill.[23] The distribution of lead figurines from Boğazköy (in its early second millennium BC incarnation as the modest-sized *kārum* Hattuš) also follows the same trend pointing towards a domestic use for lead figurines.[24] Likewise in Acemhöyük, find-spots are recorded within residential areas.[25]

Nonetheless, lead figurines were not entirely excluded from public/official settings. Three figurines from Alişar come from the so-called Complex I, a large structure divided into small compartments by thick walls without any detectable windows or doors. Based on the absence of fire installations, domestic utensils and other indicators of residential function, the excavators have interpreted this structure as a "community storehouse."[26] The find-spots of the Alişar figurines from Complex I are perhaps more indicative of a temporary context of storage than a final context of use, suggesting these objects were regulated commodities of exchange. Yet another Alişar figurine, representing a woman with a round headdress (presumably a goddess), was found in the foundations of the "palace" in M/11.[27] Such a location points to the well-attested ancient Near Eastern tradition of selecting magically potent objects and/or materials as foundation deposits for the purpose of consecrating a special building or providing it with a means of supernatural protection.[28] The Alişar foundation figurine belongs to a specialised context of use which, unlike an ordinary architectural space in which human activity took place, is inaccessible. Once deposited, the figurine could no longer

21 Heffron 2011, 223ff.

22 Emre 1971, 16.

23 Emre 1993, 171.

24 Boehmer 1979, 37-38.

25 Emre 1971, 7; N. Özgüç 1966, 26.

26 Schmidt 1931, 74ff, fig. 108; Emre 1971, 10.

27 Emre 1971, 24; Von der Osten 1937, 193, 456, fig. 512.

28 See Ellis 1968.

be handled, manipulated, or even seen—the end of the figurine's social life until its discovery by archaeologists. Nonetheless, although the single episode of ritual deposition may have removed the figurine from circulation, its magical efficacy was presumably thought to be continuous.

It is striking that extant lead trinkets of known Anatolian provenience are not attested in burial contexts, whereas they have indeed been found in Old Assyrian, as well as Ur III period, graves in Aššur.[29] Miscellaneous lead objects, such as circlets, sheets and even vessels, on the other hand, are part of the funerary assemblage in various Anatolian sites during the Early and the Middle Bronze Ages.[30] There are two possible exceptions to this apparent rule of excluding representational lead objects from graves. One is a small, highly worn lead object[31] found inside a stone cist grave from the 17th century phase of the extramural cemetery at Ilıca near Afyon.[32] Although its form is vaguely reminiscent of the schematic so-called Anatolian idols of the EBA, its poor state of preservation makes it difficult to say conclusively whether it was intended as a figural representation or served simply as an ornament, counterweight, or similar. The second lead object from a funerary context is undoubtedly a figurine, albeit broken, recovered from a Level Ia pithos grave from Kültepe.[33] Seeing as this figurine has not been categorised as a funerary gift, but ascribed to the "filling of pithos grave Nr. 5," it may well be intrusive.

As for moulds, two from Kültepe are attributed to a metal workshop, one having been recovered in association with crucibles and other equipment for small-scale metallurgy.[34] The remaining three moulds were evidently part of ordinary household assemblages.[35]

Previous Research

Lead figurines first received scholarly interest as early as the mid-19th century and have generated discussion since.[36] J. V. Canby's "Early Bronze 'Trinket Moulds'"[37] is the first synthetic analysis of the stone moulds used in the production of lead trinkets, and by extension, the trinkets themselves. The key significance of Canby's

29 Moorey 1994, 295.

30 E.g. in Alişar, Akyurt 1998: 66.

31 Akyurt 1998, 47, fig. 57-h.

32 For the Ilıca cemetery, see Orthmann 1967.

33 Emre 1993, 174, fig. 5, pl. 33-2; see below also.

34 See Emre 1971, 16, with references.

35 See T. Özgüç 1950, 53-4; Emre 1971, 16.

36 See Emre 1971, 2-3 for a more detailed account of early research on lead figurines.

37 Canby 1965.

approach is that she evaluates trinket production in accordance with the wide geographic distribution and the large variety of styles of trinkets and trinket moulds. The circulation of both classes of object during the EBA certainly covered a considerable geographic span indicative of an extensive communication network along which these items travelled.[38] The further intensification of trinket production in the MBA is no doubt due to the flourishing of the *kārum* trade network, of which lead trinkets are rightly described as a hallmark.[39] Canby also draws attention to the conspicuous variety of Mesopotamian, Cilician, Central Anatolian and Aegean influences in the EBA trinket repertoire—a trait also true for the MBA.[40] What is also remarkable about this repertoire is that it can often be seen on a single one-part mould, the peculiarities of which have been noted by Canby:

> This [one-part] mould differs from the general [two-part] type in two ways which have a significant bearing on how and where it was used. First, in the unusually large number of negatives crowded on to the small surface; and second, in the variety of wares which could be made from the piece. Neither peculiarity would be easy to understand if the piece came from an urban metal shop. Both could be explained if the piece had belonged to an itinerant smith. The care taken to make frugal use of a stone which was not in itself valuable would be worthwhile to a travelling smith who wanted to economize on the weight and bulk of his luggage. The preference for a general variety over specialties in one line of objects would also suit an itinerant smith. The probability that lead which is simple to handle [...] was used in the mould lends further weight to this theory.[41]

Drawing on stylistic comparisons between the inventory of negatives with well-attested artistic traditions of the EBA, Canby thus makes a compelling case for the possible route taken by itinerant smiths who were presumably travelling with caravans going "from north Mesopotamia to Cilicia, north to the Halys region and down to the west part of the Konya plain, then up to the Troad."[42] This likely route is not dissimilar to that followed by Assyrian merchants of the *kārum* period.[43] Canby further notes, "most of the Anatolian areas visited contain rich silver

38 See also Bittel 1933, 39-40.

39 Moorey 1994, 295.

40 Emre 1971; Marchetti 2003.

41 Canby 1965, 52.

42 Canby 1965, 53.

43 Seeing as explicit references to Cilicia remains unattested in Kültepe texts, it is possible that 2nd millennium contacts between this region and central Anatolia (otherwise suggested, for instance, by the MBA pottery of Tatarlı Höyük, Éric Jean,

mines,"[44] suggesting a similarity of focus between third millennium BC exchange and the *kārum* period network. From a metallurgical perspective, the acquisition and working of silver are intimately linked with lead-working (see below), further supporting the idea that lead trinkets may well be a diagnostic by-product of long-distance trade in which silver was of prime importance. Having established the significance of lead figurines as popular objects of exchange across several culture zones—across which imagery and styles travelled from their places of origin into new contexts—Canby postulates that buyers of lead trinkets would have adopted and developed new and different tastes,[45] to which craftsmen responded by imitation[46] or hybridization.[47]

Thus emerges an attractive paradigm for contextualizing the manufacture and exchange of lead trinkets during the *kārum* period. The peculiar nature of EBA trinkets whose distribution seems to have relied significantly on itinerancy offers a plausible explanation for the veritable surge in the popularity of these items during the *kārum* period, when a highly complex trade network was in place. That being said, significant differences between the third and second millennium BC repertoires—not only of lead trinkets but also of stone moulds—are indicative of change in the patterns of manufacture and consumption.

A notable difference between the crowded moulds of the EBA and those from the *kārum* period is that the latter were used only for the production of figurines.[48] This significant reduction of variety, coupled with the use of entire moulds for single items, attests to a more specialised mode of production focusing perhaps on the particular tastes of a single market. Presumably the itinerant production of the late third millennium BC began to give way to (but was not necessarily replaced by) a more settled context of metallurgical activity. Archaeological evidence for on-site production of lead figurines in multi-purpose metal workshops at *kārum* period sites such as Kültepe and Acemhöyük is certainly indicative of such a change.

To date, Emre's *Anatolian Lead Figurines and Their Stone Moulds* remains the only detailed catalogue of all extant figurines and moulds available for study at the time of publication. This catalogue is particularly useful in providing the precise find-spots for excavated figurines and moulds, information which is not always available in the published excavation records themselves. The iconographic/

---

personal communication) may have continued outside, or at least peripheral to, the *kārum* network.

44 Canby 1965, 53-54.

45 Canby 1965, 52-53.

46 Canby 1965, 59.

47 Canby 1965, 51.

48 Canby 1965, 49, n.56.

stylistic classifications extend beyond figurine types to individual attributes (such as items of clothing, objects carried by the figures, or accompanying animals) of each type, establishing parallels and highlighting divergences on various levels.[49] While a small number of later finds have received some attention,[50] a considerable number of lead trinkets and moulds cited in preliminary excavation reports[51] or on museum display[52] illustrate the growing extent of finds awaiting comprehensive analysis. A renewed effort towards collecting new finds under an exhaustive catalogue is therefore much needed.

Marchetti's examination of style and regional schools of production, which relies a great deal on Emre's catalogue, also presents previously unpublished finds from outside Anatolia.[53] In the light of this updated repertoire, Marchetti identifies several schools of production, based on distinct stylistic traits: The so-called "classic" and "elegant" groups attributed to workshops of Kültepe-Kaneš; the "Alişar group," "south-eastern Anatolian workshops," "Anatolian moulds of various styles," "the group with the 'master of animals' subject," "the 'Eblaite' and north-Syrian groups," and finally the "northern Mesopotamian workshops."[54] Admittedly, Marchetti's criteria for isolating distinct schools are not equally elucidated for each category, some being defined primarily on stylistic grounds, others grouped thematically. Nonetheless, the existence of regional workshops/schools, which developed their own stylistic trademarks and perhaps also thematic specialisations, is compelling. Significantly, Marchetti also attributes the flourishing of regional workshops to the "thriving commercial network" during the period corresponding to the *kārum* Ib phase of Kültepe-Kaneš; and consequently their decline to the collapse of the *kārum* network and the reformulation of trade patterns with the emergence of the Hittite state.[55] Again, the emphasis rests on the evident dependence of lead trinket manufacture on an interregional network of communication operating along a specific route and/or with specific goals of exchange.

Notably absent from all previous discussions is a focused and purposive evaluation of the symbolic meanings of lead figurine imagery, particularly of anthropomorphic figurines. As a general classification, Emre rightly ascribes a

---

49 See for example Emre 1971, 74-74, figs. 37-38 for typological charts for headdresses.

50 N. Özgüç 1976; Toklu 1976; Emre 1993.

51 E.g. Acemhöyük, see Öztan 2001; 2002; 2003; 2004; 2005; 2007; 2008; 2009.

52 A small collection comprising a stone mould and five figurines from Kaman Kalehöyük, for instance, can be seen at the site museum.

53 Marchetti 2003.

54 Marchetti 2003.

55 Marchetti 2003, 412.

protective function to lead figurines to do with domestic cults,[56] an interpretation also maintained by Bittel.[57] Emre also suggests a link between the divine beings represented by figurines and personal/family deities attested in Kültepe texts (e.g. "your god," "our god," "gods of our fathers").[58] This proposal does in fact tally with references to "figurine of the dead (made) of lead" (NU ÚŠ *ša* A.BAR),[59] which must belong to an associated constellation of ideas based on the protective and intermediary qualities of ancestors.[60]

While Emre's preliminary identifications of individual types have established a firm point of reference, they do require further exploration and discussion. The general understanding of the cast (!) of characters in lead figurine iconography as divine/protective beings is certainly valid, but their distinctive individual attributes remain underexplored. Were these high deities of a formal pantheon, or simply heroes of 'folk belief'? Did they hold a special significance in certain contexts and/or for particular people or groups? To what extent can the symbolism of lead figurines be deduced from the iconographic and stylistic parallels in other media, such as terracotta or metal figurines in the round, clay plaques, or cylinder seals? Can any figure be equated with specific divine beings named in contemporary texts or identified as the forerunners of divinities known from later sources? Are there plausible thematic links uniting lead figurines as representatives of a particular level of supernatural existence, natural phenomena, or urban society? How can their evident exclusion from burial contexts in Anatolia be interpreted? Ultimately, a considered and careful approach to the possible range of meanings for the symbolism of lead figurines is an essential step in accounting for the ubiquity of these items. The symbolic meanings attached to lead figurines must have been crucial to the boom in their popularity during the *kārum* period.

Preliminary identifications have of course been suggested for some of the more conspicuous characters of the lead figurine repertoire. Among single figures, Emre identifies the male deity holding a crook and in association with a caprid as the Mesopotamian god Amurru.[61] Whether the divine female often shown accompanying this god represents Amurru's Mesopotamian consort Ašartu, or else a local Anatolian goddess, however, is moot.[62] Otherwise, Emre's identifications remain

56 Emre 1971, 82.

57 Bittel 1976, 97.

58 Emre 1971, 82.

59 Moorey 1994, 295.

60 Marchetti (2003, 410) briefly mentions divinised royal ancestors of Old Syrian iconography but does not suggest a comparable identification for the divine types in Syro-Anatolian lead figurine imagery.

61 Emre 1971, 140-41.

62 Emre 1971, 141-42.

limited to *types*, such as the axe-bearing deity being described as a weather-god; or the figure with a scimitar ("sickle-like weapon") as a netherworld deity.[63] As for the popular theme of pairing a male figure wearing a horned conical hat with a female figure in an elaborate headdress, Bittel avoids naming names (see below) but concludes, "daß ein Götterpaar gemeint ist, darf als sicher gelten."[64] By extension, those couples accompanied by children are described as a "divine family,"[65] but the implications of child imagery within the lead figurine pantheon are not addressed. Is this a child-divinity, or a visual metaphor for human worshippers placing themselves under divine (or ancestral) protection? Or are we to read the "divine family" as a generic auspicious emblem for fertility, procreation, and generational continuity?

Much of the lead figurine identifications draw on the contemporary *kārum* period glyptic repertoire and its Syro-Mesopotamian parallels, as well as later Hittite art, highlighting notable similarities in the manner and divine attributes of each recognisable type. Marchetti also draws attention to another sphere of comparison: "In order to set the production of Syro-Anatolian lead figurines more satisfactorily in a historical perspective, it seems necessary to compare it with contemporary production of metal figurines and other forms of visual art."[66]

Ultimately, however, all discussions regarding the divine character and attributes of the various beings represented in the lead figurine repertoire echo Bittel's cautious warning: "Die Gottheiten mit bestimmten Namen zu benennen, wird man noch nicht wagen."[67] An in-depth discussion of the nature and implications of the lead figurine 'pantheon' is yet to be produced. Of particular interest for such a discussion are the potential shifts in meaning for given (stock-) themes represented by different but seemingly interchangeable characters. For the divine pair or the divine family, for example, the female element is variously represented by the nude Syrian type[68] or else dressed in an ankle-length or long, patterned skirt,[69] sometimes in clear imitation of the Mesopotamian flounced robe.[70] Such variations on what appears to be a single theme raise the question of whether these 'goddess' types are to be understood as wholly separate beings or different aspects of the same divine personality. A particularly challenging task for a detailed evaluation of the potential range of symbolic associations for individual

63 Emre 1971, 142-45.

64 Bittel 1976, 97.

65 Emre 1971, 65-66.

66 Marchetti 2003, 408.

67 Bittel 1976, 97.

68 Emre 1971, pl. III/2-3.

69 Emre 1971, pl. X/2-6.

70 Emre 1971, pl. XI/2.

types and themes is to differentiate between visual codes which may be conveying fundamental differences in meaning, and those which are simply the result of stylistic preference. Ultimately, this avenue of investigation ought to be situated within a rigorous interpretative framework exploring the range of functions for which lead figurines were intended. Whether these items were simply decorative items, apotropaic charms, or indeed both, will have a bearing on evaluating their underlying symbolism, which in all likelihood changed according to context. An equally significant point of consideration is the potential means by which lead trinket imagery may have travelled between different cultural zones as well as smaller pockets of regional tastes. To this end, a closer scrutiny of the context of craft production is necessary.

Craft Production of Lead Figurines and Stone Moulds

Lead trinkets were produced using open or closed moulds, the latter being more common for single moulds with multiple negatives and requiring dowel holes drilled onto the casting surface. The shallow negatives on the casting surface are carved to an average depth of 0.3 cm, producing a rather two-dimensional effect for the finished product. Each negative is equipped with its own conical pour-channel fanning out to an average width of 1 cm at the edge of the mould. Canby reconstructs the casting of lead trinkets in two-part closed moulds as follows:

> [The closing half of a two-part mould] must have had corresponding holes which would have permitted it to be dowelled tightly against this [i.e. carved] surface while the metal was poured in and allowed to solidify. It would presumably have had the air vents missing on our piece and perhaps corresponding pour channels [...] It would have been otherwise flat since none of the objects to be cast from it required a back surface. During the casting operation the mould must have been propped up in a bed of sand or earth or held by the hand.[71]

This seems a fairly straightforward method easily followed in the context of itinerancy, but equally well suited to settled workshop production. Both modes were presumably current during the early second millennium BC. As noted above, the establishment of a complex and sophisticated trade network in the *kārum* period would have encouraged the activities of itinerant craftsmen, who presumably continued in this line of business from the third into the second millennium BC. A notable aspect of lead trinket production in the *kārum* period, however, is the

71 Canby 1965, 43.

presence of archaeologically detectable workshops pointing to on-site production. Not surprisingly, the most compelling evidence comes from Kültepe-Kaneš (see above), which, as the focal point of the *kārum* network, also seems to have established itself as a major centre of lead trinket production and/or distribution.[72]

Contemporary residents of Acemhöyük too appear to have engaged in the production of lead objects. Reports on several seasons mention lead circlets in contexts suggestive of metalworking, i.e. in association with fire installations, crucibles, blowpipes and moulds, as well as metal slag and fragments of bronze pins, weapons and other utensils.[73] No finished objects made of lead, however, are recorded for these contexts, which may be indicative of an auxiliary role for lead in more general metallurgical pursuits. The presence of lead in mixed metallurgical contexts could be indicative of its alloying with copper, for which Moorey presents "three possible reasons: to ease the filling of complex moulds; to lower the temperature to assist the casting of several objects from one melt; and to increase the weight available."[74] Another likely metallurgical pairing is of course between lead and silver, especially in Anatolia, rich in deposits of both.[75] In fact, the earliest metallurgical acquaintance with silver may well have taken place in the course of lead exploitation. At any rate, seeing as silver was one of the principal raw materials drawing Assyrians into Anatolia, it is by no means a coincidence that a small (side?) industry of lead trinket production flourished in the wider context of interregional exchange involving a considerable movement of silver from Anatolia into north Mesopotamia.

Canby, however, questions whether lead figurines in Anatolia were at all the products of local workshops, on the basis that they "look most foreign when compared to the full-bodied, sculptured quality of contemporary Anatolian arts".[76] Perhaps it is unfair to expect full compliance with canonical Anatolian traits from a category of objects with a veritable mixed background. While markedly un-Anatolian looking pieces are certainly part of the repertoire, the large ears, predominant flat noses, and round eyes of a considerable number of figurines are very much at home in Anatolian art.[77] Also, Canby's assertion that "the figurines [...] were found only in the houses of Assyrian merchants"[78] is inaccurate, as the

72 Also note that the number of published figurine moulds found in Kültepe-Kaneš exceeds the total number of moulds from contemporary settlements at Boğazköy, Alişar, Acemhöyük, and Konya-Karahöyük.

73 Öztan 2002, 42; 2004, 233; 2005, 93; 2006, 550ff; 2008, 516ff; 2009, 331.

74 Moorey 1994, 293.

75 Lehner and Yener 2015, 531.

76 Canby 2003, 173.

77 See, for instance, Emre 1971, pl. VI.

78 Canby 2003, 173.

ethnicity of house owners is not known for all cases, so trinket moulds cannot be conclusively assigned to one particular group. More importantly, Canby ignores the presence of lead figurines and moulds in workshops, which is clear evidence of on-site production. What seems crucial here is to distinguish one-part crowded moulds, which certainly do fit the model of travelling metal smiths; and two-part moulds for single figures better suited to but not exclusive to on-site production.

As the contextual associations of stone moulds in Kültepe and Acemhöyük show, the production of lead figurines belonged to a general sphere of metalworking, presumably carried out by professionals who also produced bronze tools and weaponry, and perhaps also worked with silver. It does not necessarily follow, however, that the production of the moulds for casting lead figurines was exclusively confined to this same sphere. Topçuoğlu, for instance, has drawn attention to the stylistic similarities between the manner in which details, particularly of dress, are rendered both for lead figurines and in contemporary cylinder seals.[79] The use of schematic linear patterns for figurines is well attested in the figurine tradition. In glyptic, Alexander attributes similar stylistic traits, such as herringbone or curvilinear patterns, to native Anatolian seals.[80]

Such parallels are not surprising, considering, as Topçuoğlu observes, that the craft skill of carving miniature negatives in stone is not only fundamental to seal-cutting but also used for trinket moulds, and may well have constituted a shared expertise between two spheres of production.[81] Insofar as the parallels between stone moulds and cylinder seals rest on the use of striations, it is important to note that while an Anatolian glyptic style developed gradually during the course of the *kārum* period as "designers grasped the nature of the cylinder seal, mastered its design problems, and introduced Anatolian themes and motifs," geometric patterning was already a well-established aspect of Anatolian art, stretching well back into the third millennium and attested in a variety of media,[82] including trinket moulds. It is not at all implausible that the pronounced use of geometric patterning entered seal-cutting via mould production, nor that the first Anatolian seal-cutters could originally have been trained in the manufacture of trinket moulds. This potential set of relationships introduces yet another context in which influences may have circulated between local and foreign traditions. Considering the transmission of styles and techniques specifically among cylinder seal engravers, Alexander postulates a vertical continuity from master to apprentice.[83]

79 Topçuoğlu 2013.

80 Alexander 1979, 576-77.

81 Topçuoğlu 2013.

82 Alexander 1979, 576.

83 Alexander 1979, 616-17.

The potential role of seal-cutters in the trinket industry, and *vice versa,* has significant implications not only for the organisation of production or in terms of visual influences, but also on the transmission of craft skills and canons of style. If (at least some) mould producers were also seal-cutters, this would ascribe moulds to the sphere of a stone-worker's craft, isolating it from that of figurines, a metal-worker's craft. In turn, the production of moulds and the production of cast figurines would be affected by any social, economic, perhaps even ethnic differences that may have existed between the two specialties. Separate traditions of production for moulds and trinkets would also introduce an extra link in the commercial chain ending with the consumer, thus affecting the market value of both moulds and figurines as commodities. Last but not least, as seal-cutters and metal-smiths would have been trained in and exposed to different iconographic traditions, canons, and conventions, whether a mould was produced by one or the other craft specialist could have significant bearing on the choice and rendering of images created. It is therefore crucial to hold trinket imagery against not only the background of contemporary glyptic traditions, but also to industries of metal and even clay, as proposed by Marchetti (see above). It is also significant that Marchetti attributes sandstone moulds to non-professional production,[84] suggesting that amateurs could also carve their own moulds (and presumably cast their own figurines).

As for the manufacture of lead figurines themselves, a sphere of craft production with which it shares notable traits is that of Old Babylonian terracotta plaques, a category of object also with third millennium BC antecedents that reached peak popularity in the first half of the second millennium BC. Although lead figurines belong principally to a Syro-Anatolian milieu and Old Babylonian plaques are very much a south Mesopotamian specialty, the technical, stylistic and thematic similarities between these two seemingly disparate ventures suggest a possible exchange of techniques and ideas between the two craft specialties. Terracotta plaques are flat slabs of fired clay with relief decoration on the front, and blank on the back. Though larger than lead figurines, they tend to be no bigger than the palm of a hand, and can easily be classified as miniatures. Cast into one-piece open moulds, terracotta plaques belong to the realm of mass production, using the readily available and highly versatile medium of clay, which becomes extremely durable once baked. Being thus highly suitable for the easy and inexpensive production of small-scale goods for popular consumption, the use of clay for making plaques is not unlike that of lead in trinket manufacture. In terms of archaeological context, Old Babylonian plaques are also firmly rooted in the private/domestic sphere, reinforcing their interpretation as objects of popular consumption in non-elite, non-officialised settings.

84 Marchetti 2003, 403.

Admittedly, both the formal and contextual similarities between lead figurines and terracotta plaques can be explained simply by similar methods of manufacture being used for a similar purpose of producing inexpensive items for popular consumption, without necessarily predicating that the two industries were in contact. Certain stylistic and thematic parallels, however, do raise the possibility of transfer of ideas between the two. Canby has already noted the parallels between Anatolian lead figurines and terracotta plaques.[85] In particular, the frontal male-female pairs in lead figurine iconography are highly similar to those of the plaque repertoire. Both in lead and on terracotta plaques, this well-attested duo is characterised by a rigid, formal posture, with no apparent interaction but clearly intended to be read as a single iconographic unit. While some lead figurines showing the so-called divine pair appear rather clumsy in comparison to their counterparts in clay,[86] there are also neat examples in which the rendering of the flounced robe and other details are so similar to terracotta plaques[87] that one wonders if the craftsman was working from a model! Another notable parallel with plaque imagery is the nude female, a long-standing favourite across the ancient Near East. The manner in which she emerges in the lead figurine repertoire is of a distinctly Syrian type, which suggests an alternative route she may have followed from the medium of clay to that of lead. Emre has also suggested a parallel between a partial Kültepe figurine showing an unusual variation on the 'divine family' theme (it comprises only one 'parent' who also happens to be male and holds his 'children' at an awkward position),[88] and two terracotta plaques showing a presumably divine female figure holding a small child across each shoulder.[89] The overall subject matter of these plaques, however, is far too complex[90] to postulate a convincing link with the typical motif of children being held by or associated with divine characters of the lead figurine repertoire.

It is important to acknowledge that the quintessential tradition of Syrian plaques,[91] though with palpable origins in the Old Babylonian production technology of open moulds,[92] has its own set of symbolic meanings and ritual function quite separate from those of Old Babylonian plaques. According to Moorey, "As

85 Canby 1965, 49, n.56.

86 Compare Emre 1971, pl. X-4 with Barrelet 1968, pl. LXXVII-790.

87 Compare Emre 1971, pl. XI-2 with Woolley and Mallowan 1976, pl. 82-161.

88 "In contrast to the goddesses who usually hold their children at waist level, the god's hands are at breast level and he carries the little girls by holding and supporting the soles of their feet" (Emre 1993, 174).

89 Van Buren 1933-34; see also Opficius 1961, 252.

90 See Black and Green 1992, 234.

91 See Badre 1980.

92 Moorey 2003, 34.

[the technology of open moulds] was used there almost exclusively for nude female images, without any sign of the wide range of motifs produced with it in Babylonia, this would appear to have been no more than a technological transfer."[93] The singular focus of Syrian plaque imagery is indeed conspicuous, suggesting a deliberate singularity of focus on female symbolism, meaningful perhaps in the context of "popular rituals of women"[94] but at any rate quite distinct from the varied apotropaic repertoire of protective/auspicious beings[95] on Babylonian plaques. The link, therefore, between Syrian plaques and lead trinkets, as represented by the typical nude female, may well have been established as a separate line of contact.

Considering the Social Lives of Lead Figurines and Stone Moulds

The single most important aspect of lead trinkets to be acknowledged is their sheer versatility of use and associated meaning. The following discussion explores some of the categories under which they would have functioned as commodities, based on the understanding that "a commodity is a thoroughly socialised thing."[96] More specifically, Appadurai defines a commodity as "*any thing intended for exchange*,"[97] a definition to which lead trinkets fit particularly well not only in their inherent characteristics, but also the wider context of interregional circulation within which they existed. The term "trinket," coined by Canby and used throughout this article, is particularly apt for lead figurines because it conveys an ambiguity, an open-endedness of purpose in keeping with the versatility of this class of artefact. It would be erroneous to expect a rigid set of predetermined functions from lead trinkets, which could easily be put to a great variety of uses. This is primarily due to the physical qualities of lead itself, lending itself to a wide range of purposes, attested both archaeologically and in texts.[98]

Some of the more 'practical' uses of lead trinkets are immediately obvious. On one side of a mould purchased in İzmir is the negative of a pair of small tweezers[99] attesting to the use of stone moulds for manufacturing small implements. Quite a few of the abstract geometric patterns inside square or circular frames would have been intended to produce stamp seals.[100] While some of the linear patterns

93 Moorey 2003, 34.

94 Moorey 2003, 23.

95 Assante 2002, 8.

96 Appadurai 1986, 3.

97 Appadurai 1986, 9, italics original.

98 Moorey 1994, 121.

99 Canby 1965, pl. IX-c.

100 Canby 1965, 43ff.

on these seal designs were used much more widely than the confines of Anatolia and Cilicia, Canby stresses that "their use on metal seals is a characteristic Anatolian phenomenon."[101] Trinket moulds also produced spindle whorls,[102] again with good Anatolian parallels in clay.[103] Equally frequently, abstract geometric designs carved on trinket moulds were intended to produce jewellery or ornaments such as pins, earrings or pendants,[104] with parallels in gold and silver at Ur, Tell Brak, and Mari.[105] As for figural pendants, these represented various animals including a lion, a caprid (?), stylised double-headed bovines or birds atop a quadruple spiral.[106] A beak-spouted vessel, handle no doubt intended as a pendant loop, attested on two moulds,[107] is a faithful replica of EBA types.[108] Beak-spouted pitchers remain an Anatolian favourite also throughout the second millennium BC, during which period they are also conspicuous in religious iconography as libation vessels.[109] It is likely that the choice of beak-spouted pitchers as pendants was related to the use of actual vessels in ritual settings, perhaps identifying the wearer as a devout libation-pourer, or as someone who has taken part in a sacred ceremony and/or been to a sacred location. The circulation of lead trinkets in pilgrimage (?) markets is certainly an attractive possibility[110] in keeping both with the role of itinerancy in their production and circulation, as well as with the amuletic character of the lead trinket repertoire as a whole.

As for anthropomorphic imagery, the term "figurine" is useful as a descriptive category, but does not necessarily indicate *precise* function. While it is fairly clear that a stamp seal is for sealing, a whorl for spinning, and jewellery for wearing, what does one *actually do* with a lead figurine? As apotropaia, miniatures such as lead figurines would have been very well suited to being worn on one's person. Just as non-representational ornaments in precious metals were imitated in the trinket repertoire, figurines could also have been inexpensive alternatives to gold pendants mentioned in *kārum* period texts. In a Kültepe letter (Kt 2001/k 325a-b), for instance, a certain Ziki, who happens to be an *ugbabtum* priestess, is mentioned

101 Canby 1965, 43, with references.

102 Emre 1971, 45.

103 Canby 1965, 48, n. 52-54.

104 Canby 1965, 44.

105 Aruz 2003, 258; see Emre 1971, pl. II-1.

106 Canby 1965, 42; Emre 1971, 46-48.

107 Emre 1971, 48, nos. 37, 38.

108 Canby 1965, 46, fig. 1.

109 N. Özgüç 1965, 13ff, pl. XXIV 71, 73; see also Müller-Karpe 2002, 258, figs. 1, 3.

110 I was struck by this idea on a visit to the Scottish National Museum in Edinburgh when I encountered an AD 14th century stone mould for a "pilgrim's badge" of St. Andrew on display there.

as the owner of "jewellery in the shape of a gold figurine of a deity" (DINGIR*li ša* KÙ.GI *ša* a-bi$_4$-*ša šu-ku-ta-ša*).[111] The practice of fashioning divine images as gold pendants is also attested for the Hittite period.[112] An immediate problem is that lead figurines are not equipped with loops or hooks to indicate they were worn as pendants. An alternative means of wearing lead figurines on one's person would have been to sew them onto clothing, as suggested by Van Buren.[113] This possibility is firmly refuted by Emre, however, on account of the rudimentary 'platforms' on which many of the lead figurines stand indicate that these objects were intended to rest on or against a surface.[114] The most compelling example for this is a Kültepe mould showing a winged god standing on a 'table,' the back legs of which extend diagonally outwards.[115] Such an awkward rendering of this simple form disagrees with the skilful way in which the figure itself has been depicted. Presumably once the figurine was cast, the table legs were meant to be bent—easy to do with lead—to form an actual table which could thus stand firmly on a surface, bending the figure at the ankles would then allow it to stand upright.

From a production point of view, for those figurines with an interactive aspect there would have been an intermediate period of latency after initial casting and before final display. If the figurine were to be transported prior to sale or use, it would be far easier to keep it in this stage. Did the saleability or value of figurines diminish once they were modified and thus no longer in mint condition? Was the manipulation of the figurine the final stage of its production process and accordingly carried out by the metal-smith, or did it mark the beginning of its use life, meant for the consumer to perform? Did the transformation of a flat figurine into a freestanding piece hold any symbolic value? From a functional point of view, once set up, freestanding lead figurines (especially those standing on tables!) could easily receive offerings. Miniature cult scenes arranged inside clay vessels[116] are certainly part of the contemporary repertoire of ritual objects. More importantly, if lead figurines were intended to be propped up against a vertical surface or made to stand upright by means of a fold-out platform, this suggests that the primary relationship of these objects were not to a *person* wearing them, but to a *setting* in which they were placed. As small, portable objects, lead figurines could easily have been moved from one place to another, creating *ad hoc* ritual settings and/or apotropaic zones according to the desires and needs of their owners.

111 Albayrak 2004, 11.

112 Darga 1992.

113 Van Buren 1954, 110.

114 Emre 1971, 82; see, for instance, Emre 1971, pl. X, 2a-c.

115 Emre 1971, XV 1a-b.

116 See T. Özgüç 1994 and 1999.

On the protective function of lead figurines, Emre has intuitively raised the question whether the raw material of lead itself may have been significant.[117] There is in fact compelling evidence from Hittite texts to support this postulation. The inherent magical quality attributed to lead seems to have served specially to seal channels communicating with the underworld so as to prevent undesirable forces from reaching the world above. In other words, lead was regarded as an apotropaic material through which evil forces could not pass. An incantation (KUB 33.66 obv ii 9 ff) gives a long list of the various evils to be trapped inside a bronze cauldron sealed with lead:

> *a-ru-ni-ma* URUDU-*aš pal-ḫa-eš ki-an-da-*[*ri*] *iš-tap-pu-ul-li-iš-mi-it* A.GAR5-*aš nu-kán* [*i-da-a-lu*] *an-da da-iš ta-ar-pí-in da-iš pár*ʾ-[ ]*da-iš e-eš-ḫar da-iš ḫa-pa-an-zi d*[*a-iš*] DIRIG *da-iš iš-ḫa-aḫ-ru da-iš* [...] *da-iš lúm*ʾ*-pa-an da-iš kam-ma-ra-*[*an da-iš*] *ḫur-di da-iš i-na-an d*[*a-iš*]
>
> In the sea copper (=bronze?) cauldrons are set. Their lids (are of) lead. And [evil(?)] he put therein, the evil demon (*tarpin*) he put, [...] he put, bloodshed he put, *hapanzi* he p[ut], sorrow he put, tears he put, [...] he put, grief he put, fog (?) [he put], cursing (?) he put, disease he p[ut].[118]

It is worth noting that included in the list of evils in this text is *tarpiš*, a demon comparable to the Mesopotamian *šēdu*, whose counterpart *lamassu* in turn corresponds to Hittite *annariš*.[119] Like *lamassu* and *šēdu* in Mesopotamia, Hittite *annariš* and *tarpiš* are often referred to as a pair, in which case they tend to be viewed as benevolent; when *tarpiš* appears alone, however, he does so as a malevolent demon, which is also how *šēdu* is perceived singly.[120] The reference to *tarpiš* therefore further highlights the apotropaic quality of lead, which evidently kept away not only generic maladies such as plague and bloodshed, but also the more precise, personalised agents of evil. A similar passage comes from the *Telipinu Myth* (KUB 17 rev IV 14-19):

> *ḫa-a-aš-ta* LÚNI.DUH 7 GIŠIG *a-ap-pa ḫu-it-ti-ia-at* 7 GIŠ*ḫa-at-ta-lu*
> *kat-ta-an da-an-ku-i ták-ni-i* ZABAR *pal-ḫi ar-ta iš-tap-pu-ul-li-iš-me-et*
> A.GAR$_5$-*aš za-ak-ki-iš-me-iš* AN.BAR-*aš ku-it an-da-an pa-iz-zi na-aš-ta*
> *nam-ma ša-ra-a Ú-UL ú-iz-zi an-da-da-an ḫar-ak-zi*
> *Ù ŠA* d*Te-li-pí-nu kar-pí-in kar-di-mi-ia-at-ta-an*
> *wa-aš-du-ul ša-a-u-ar an-da e-ep-du na-at a-ap-pa le-e ú-iz-zi*

117 Emre 1971, 81.

118 Hoffner 1968, 65.

119 Hoffner 1968, 64.

120 Hoffner 1968, 64.

> The Gatekeeper opened seven doors, he drew back seven bolts.
> Beneath the black earth bronze cauldrons are set, their lids
> (Are of) lead, their latches (are of) iron, that which goes inside, it
> Henceforth does not come up, inside it vanishes
> And the wrath of Telipinu, the cause of anger,
> The sin, the fury, let it (=the cauldrons) hold inside! And it shall not come back again.[121]

The Hattic origin of the *Telipinu Myth* is a strong indication that the belief in apotropaic qualities of lead was already in existence in Anatolia before the myth was committed to writing by Hittite scribes. In other words, such a belief would have been contemporary with the lead figurines of the early second millennium BC. If so, the widespread practice of depositing lead circlets in Anatolian graves in the second millennium BC could also be considered as an act of magical significance, presumably in order to filter undesirable netherworld forces which would have been given unintended release through the digging of a grave, or more simply to ensure that the dead remained clear of the world of the living. The deposition of the Alişar figurine in the 'palace' foundations (see above) also belongs to the same constellation of ideas linking lead to magical protection.

As a highly versatile metal, the commodity value of lead itself as a raw material is also significant. Even as cast objects, the value of lead trinkets would have been determined to a great extent by the ever-present possibility of being melted down and recycled into a completely new and different existence. Especially small-scale objects would have had permanent latency as raw material. In other words, the social lives of lead trinkets could have been a complex series of multiple 'reincarnations.' The potential currency value for lead trinkets in and of themselves was recognised by Canby, who suggests these items may well have been "more negotiable if shaped into trinkets."[122]

Although not equally as versatile as lead trinkets, the moulds used in their manufacture would also have been meaningful in a wide range of contexts. For the purposes of the modern scholar, trinket moulds have principally served to examine the production technology for lead figurines.[123] In this respect, the contrast between the crowded moulds Canby attributes to itinerant metal-working and those with single figures is but one example of how different modes of production can provide crucial information otherwise unattainable from the products themselves. Marchetti's observation, for instance, that the preference of softer

121 Translation from transliteration in Mazoyer 2003, 51.

122 Canby 1965, 53.

123 See Opitz 1933.

stone for moulds may be linked to amateur (or occasional) production[124] could not have been made by studying the figurines alone. The social life of moulds was not, however, confined solely to their primary function as production equipment. Indeed, Marchetti has already noted that moulds travelled as widely as the figurines, seeing as moulds carved in the characteristic traits of one workshop/group can be encountered much farther afield.[125] The presence of at least two moulds from Kültepe-Kaneš in storage rooms[126] with no association to metal production is also significant in this regard, suggesting that moulds may have been treated as merchandise. One of these moulds was found in a Level Ib house storeroom[127] and the other evidently kept alongside the tablet archive of the house owner,[128] suggesting that the mould may have been considered an object of considerable value and importance.

It is safe to assume that, in addition to moulds that travelled as part of the professional equipment of itinerant metal-smiths, there would have been moulds which travelled as items of trade. In most part, the commodity value of stone moulds within exchange circuits were presumably determined by their principal consumers, namely metal-smiths. From the latter's perspective, important considerations would have been the weight and durability of the stone, and the variety and quality of the carved negatives. If catering for a conservative market, the smith's preference would have been towards well-established themes in familiar styles. Alternatively, demand for more exotic trinkets would have rendered 'foreign' moulds more desirable. Ready-made, rather than self-produced, moulds could also have been exchanged as style guides or become style guides in the context of exchange. It is also likely that moulds became curios in and of themselves, being traded for sheer novelty value, and may even have even come to acquire magico-symbolic associations of their own. Two stone moulds from Old Assyrian levels in Aššur, associated with a temple context,[129] suggest these objects may have held a votive value. Perhaps they were dedicated by metal-smiths or merchants as thanks offerings after a successful Anatolian journey?

Finally, moulds would easily have made construction material in the form of spolia, as was evidently the case for a broken sandstone mould recycled for a Level III wall of the lower town at Acemhöyük.[130]

---

124 Marchetti 2003, 403.

125 Marchetti 2003, 411.

126 Emre 1971, 16-17.

127 Emre 1971, fig. 9.

128 Emre 1971, fig. 3.

129 Andrae 1922, 84, pl. 29, pl. 55a-b.

130 N. Özgüç 1976, 552.

Conclusion

Anatolian lead figurines and their stone moulds remain as intriguing as ever, and will no doubt continue to generate scholarly interest not simply in and of themselves, but as unique indicators of change and continuity in imagery, magico-religious practices, and artisanal production in a complex network of interregional connections. The sheer versatility of lead miniatures; the range of stylistic and iconographic influences they display; and their multi-faceted contexts of production, use, and meaning make these objects a highly valuable source for *kārum* period studies as a whole. In utilising such a source, it is vital to recognise the wide extent to which lead trinkets and trinket moulds could have had multiple uses, circulating within a complex world of long-distance trade and cross-cultural exchange, their commodity values shifting and adapting to different phases of their social lives. The production of cast lead miniatures is uniquely tied to hybridities of skill, style, and meaning.

It is quite striking that the lead trinket industry in Anatolia, despite its evidently multifarious nature, appears to have failed to survive beyond the *kārum* system of exchange. Just as the beginnings of this particular strand of image production can be ascribed to interregional links between north Mesopotamia and the Anatolian plateau in the late third millennium BC, so can its end be attributed to that of the *kārum* network. In this respect the production, use, and circulation of lead figurines could very well be contextualised in terms of the dynamics of mechanical reproduction of images as discussed by D. Wengrow, who traces the origin of hybrid beings in iconography to the development of mechanical technologies of image (re-)production.[131]

While Wengrow's focus rests particularly on the emergence of fantastical combination creatures ("monsters") at the cusp of urbanism, the underlying principles of his model are also applicable to the production of lead figurines. Wengrow identifies seals as the fundamental technical means which allowed, for the first time, the effortless creation of identical images *ad infinitum*. Although relatively more complex, the production of lead miniatures also operates on a similar principle in that it too allows continuous (re)production. More to the point is the emphasis on the "links between large scale distributions of images and the growth of commercial and political networks."[132] Another pertinent drive for the creation and dissemination of hybrid images are "periods of intensified exposure to outside influence,"[133] which tallies well with the peculiarities of *kārum* period trade within which lead trinkets circulated. A closer examination of the circumstances of the

131 Wengrow 2014.

132 Wengrow 2014, 16, 60.

133 Wengrow 2014, 54.

manufacture, exchange, use, meanings, and the final disappearance of *kārum* period lead trinkets can and ought to be treated as part of greater diachronic trends of change beyond the immediate confines of the early second millennium. The potential of this class of objects to offer new solutions to old problems and raise new questions is by no means exhausted, and awaits renewed interest and rigour.

Acknowledgements

This article began life many years ago, but took its present form during the Anniversary Fellowship I held at the McDonald Institute for Archaeological Research, University of Cambridge, between 2013-2015. As always, I would like to thank Nicholas Postgate for suffering numerous early drafts *ca.* 2009, and my co-editors, Emre Şerifoğlu and Eric Jean, for helping me tidy up the current version, *ca.* 2014. I am also grateful to İlgi Gerçek for looking over the Hittite.

REFERENCES

Akyurt, İ.M., *M.Ö. 2. Binde Anadolu'da Ölü Gömme Adetleri.* Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu, 1998.

Albayrak, İ., "'She Will Live, Eat and Be Anointed Together with Them' *ušbat aklat u paššsat ištīšunu*" in *Assyria and Beyond: Studies Presented to Mogens Trolle Larsen*, ed. by J. G. Dercksen, 9-20. Leiden: Nederlands Instituut voor het Nabije Oosten, 2004.

Alexander, R.L., "Native Group Cylinder Seal Engravers of Karum Kanish Level II." *Belleten* 43 (1979): 573-618.

Andrae, W., *Die archaischen Ischtar-Tempel in Assur.* Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, 1922.

Appadurai, A., "Introduction: Commodities and the Politics of Value" in *The Social Life of Things*, ed. by A. Appadurai, 3-63. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986.

Aruz, J., "Mould for Jewelry, Seals, and Amulets" in *Art of the First Cities: The Third Millennium BC from the Mediterranean to the Indus*, ed. by J. Aruz and R. Wallenfels, 257-58. New York: Metropolitan Museum of Art, 2003.

Assante, J., "Style and Replication in 'Old Babylonian' Terracotta Plaques: Strategies for Entrapping the Power of Images" in *Ex Mesopotamia et Syria Lux: Festschrift für Manfried Dietrich zu seinem 65. Gebrurtstag* (AOAT 281), ed. by O. Loretz, K. A. Metzler, and H. Schaudig, 1-29. Münster: Ugarit-Verlag, 2002.

———. "The Lead Inlays of Tukulti-Ninurta I: Pornography as Imperial Strategy" in *Ancient Near Eastern Art in Context: Studies in Honor of Irene J. Winter by Her Students*, ed. by J. Cheng and M. H. Feldman, 369-407. Leiden: Brill, 2007.

Badre, L., *Les figurines anthropomorphes en terra cuite à l'Age du Bronze en Syrie.* Paris: Paul Geuthner, 1980.

Barjamovic, G., T. Hertel and M. T. Larsen, *Ups and Downs at Kanesh: Chronology, History and Society in the Old Assyrian Period.* Leiden: Nederlands Instituut voor het Nabije Oosten, 2012.

Barrelet, M.-T., *Figurines et reliefs en terre cuite de la Mésopotamie antique I: Potiers, termes de métier, procédés de fabrication et production.* Paris: Paul Geuthner, 1968.

Bittel, K., *Prähistorische Forschung in Kleinasien* (*Istanbuler Forschungen* 6). Istanbul: Universum-druckerei, 1934.

———. *Die Hethiter: Die Kunst Anatoliens vom Ende des 3. bis zum Anfang des 1. Jahrtausends vor Christus.* München: Beck, 1976.

Black, J. and A. Green, *Gods, Demons and Symbols of Ancient Mesopotamia.* London: The British Museum, 1992.

Boehmer, R. M., *Die Kleinfunde aus der Unterstadt von Boğazköy: Grabungskampagnen 1970-1978* (*Boğazköy-Hattuša* 10). Berlin: Gebr. Mann, 1979.

Canby, J. V., "Early Bronze 'Trinket' Moulds." *Iraq* 27/1 (1965): 42-61.

———. "A Figurine from Urkesh: A 'Darling' from Troy to Mesopotamia." *Iraq* 65 (2003): 171-73.

Darga, M., *Hitit Sanatı*. İstanbul: Akbank Kültür ve Sanat Kitapları, 1992.

Ellis, R.S., *Foundation Deposits in Ancient Mesopotamia*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1968.

Emre, K., "Kültepe Menşeli Yeni bir Kalıp." *Belleten* 33 (1969): 163-170.

———. "Eine neue Gussform aus Kültepe." *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie* 60 (1970): 134-147.

———. *Anadolu Kurşun Figürinleri ve Taş Kalıpları / Anatolian Lead Figurines and Their Stone Moulds.* Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu, 1971.

———. "New Lead Figurines and Moulds from Kültepe and Kızılhamza" in *Aspects of Art And Iconography: Anatolia and Its Neighbours. Studies in Honor of Nimet Özgüç*, ed. by M. J. Mellink, E. Porada and T. Özgüç, 169-77. Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu, 1993.

Heffron, Y., *Household Rituals in Middle Bronze Age Anatolia: An Archaeological-Textual Study.* Unpublished PhD Thesis, University of Cambridge, 2011.

Hoffner, H.A., "Hittite *tarpiš* and Hebrew *terāphîm*." *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 27/1 (1968): 61-68.

Kulakoğlu, F., "Kültepe-Kaneš: A Second Millennium BCE Trading Center on the Central Plateau" in *The Oxford Handbook of Ancient* Anatolia, ed. by S. Steadman and G. McMahon, 1012-1030. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011.

———. "Kanesh after the Assyrian Colony Period: Current Research at Kültepe and the Question of the End of the Bronze Age Settlement" in *Current Research at Kültepe-Kanesh: An Interdisciplinary and Integrative Approach to Trade Networks, Internationalism, and Identity*, ed. by L. Atıcı, F. Kulakoğlu, G. Barjamovic, A Fairbairn, 85-94. Atlanta, Lockwood Press, 2014.

Lehner, J.W. and K.A. Yener, "Organization and Specialization of Early Mining and Metal Technologies in Anatolia" in *Archaeometallurgy in Global Perspective: Methods and Syntheses*, ed. by B.W. Roberts and C.P. Thorton, 529-557, New York: Springer, 2015.

Mazoyer, M., *Télipinu: le dieu au marécage: Essai sur les mythes fondateurs du Royaume hittite.* Paris: L'Harmattan, 2003.

Marchetti, N., "Workshops, Trading Routes and Divine Figures: On the Early Middle Bronze II Syro-Anatolian Lead Figurines." *Orientalia NS* 72 (2003): 390-420.

Michel, C., "The *Kārum* Period on the Plateau" in *The Oxford Handbook of Ancient Anatolia*, ed. by S. Steadman and G. McMahon, 313-36. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011.

Moorey, P.R.S., *Ancient Mesopotamian Materials and Industries: The Archaeological Evidence.* Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1994.

———. *Idols of the People: Miniature Images of Clay in the Ancient Near East.* Oxford. Oxford University Press, 2003.

Müller-Karpe, A., "Die Keramik des Mittleren und Jüngeren hethitischen Reiches" in *Die Hethiter und ihr Reich*, 256-63. Bonn: Kunst- und Ausstellungshalle der Bundesrepublik Deutschland GmbH, 2002.

Opficius, R., *Das Altbabylonische Terrakottarelief.* Berlin: De Gruyter, 1961.
Opitz, D., "Altorientalische Gußformen" in *Aus fünf Jahrtausenden morgenlandischer Kultur: Festschrift Max Freiherrn von Oppenheim zum 70 Geburtstage, gewidmet von Freunden und Mitarbeitern* (*AfO* Beiband I), 179-215. Berlin, 1933.
Orthmann, W., *Das Gräberfeld bei Ilıca*. Wiesbaden: F. Steiner, 1967.
Özgüç, N., *Kültepe Mühür Baskılarında Anadolu Grubu / The Anatollian Group of Cylinder Seal Impressions from Kültepe.* Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu, 1965.
———. "Acemhöyük Kazıları / Excavations at Acemhöyük." *Anadolu / Anatolia* 10 (1966): 1-52.
———. "An Ivory Box and Stone Mould from Acemhöyük." *Belleten* 40 (1976): 555-60.
Özgüç, T., *Türk Tarih Kurumu Tarafından Yapılan Kültepe Kazısı Raporu 1948*. Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu, 1950.
———. "A Figurine of a God from Anatolia in the Hermitage Museum in Leningrad" in *Florilegium Anatolicum: Mélanges offerts* à *E. Laroche*, 291-96. Paris: Éditions E. de Boccard, 1979.
———. "A Cult Vessel Discovered at Kanish" in *Beiträge zur altorientalischen Archäologie und Altertumskunde: Festschrift für Barthel Hrouda zum 65. Geburtstag*, ed. by P. Calmeyer and B. Hrouda, 221-27. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag, 1994.
———. "Vases Used for Ritual Purposes from Eskiyapar" *Essays on Ancient Anatolia* (*BMECCJ* 11), ed. T. Mikasa, 1-22. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag, 1999.
Öztan, A., "1998-1999 Acemhöyük Kazıları." *Kazı Sonuçları Toplantısı* 22/1 (2001) 119-128.
———. "2000 Yılı Acemhöyük Kazıları." *Kazı Sonuçları Toplantısı* 23/2 (2002): 327-34.
———. "2001 Yılı Acemhöyük Kazıları." *Kazı Sonuçları Toplantısı* 24/1(2003): 39-48.
———. "2002 Yılı Acemhöyük Kazıları." *Kazı Sonuçları Toplantısı* 25/1 (2004): 231-38.
———. "2003 Yılı Acemhöyük Kazıları." *Kazı Sonuçları Toplantısı* 26/2 (2005): 91-104.
———. "2005 Yılı Acemhöyük Kazıları." *Kazı Sonuçları Toplantısı* 28/2 (2007): 549-60.
———. "2006 Yılı Acemhöyük Kazıları." *Kazı Sonuçları Toplantısı* 29/3 (2008): 515-24.
———. "2007 Yılı Acemhöyük Kazıları." *Kazı Sonuçları Toplantısı* 30/3 (2009): 329-42.
Schmidt, E.F., *Anatolia through the Ages: Discoveries at the Alişar Mound 1927-29* (OIC 11). Chicago: The Oriental Institute, 1931.
Toklu, G., "Acemhöyük'te Bulunan Bir Kurşun Figürin Grubu." *Belleten* 40 (1976): 561-564.
Topçuoğlu, O., "A Look behind the Scenes: Seal Carvers of Ancient Kanesh as Artists and Artisans." Paper delivered at the 1st Kültepe International Meeting, Kayseri, September 2013.
Van Buren, E.D., "A Clay Relief in the Iraq Museum." *Archiv für Orientforschung* 9 (1933-34): 165-71.
———. "Seals of the Second Half of the Layard Collection." *Orientalia* 23 (1954): 97-113.
Von der Osten, H.H., *The Alişar Hüyük: Seasons of 1930-1932* (OIP 29). Chicago: The Oriental Institute, 1937.

Wengrow, D., *The Origin of Monsters: Image and Cognition in the First Age of Mechanical Reproduction.* Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2014.

Woolley, L. and M. Mallowan, *Ur Excavations VII: The Old Babylonian Period*, ed. by T. C. Mitchell. London: The British Museum.