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In 1967 The Metropolitan Museum of Art acquired a bronze handle attachment in the form of a winged bull (Figures 1–4).\(^1\) It is one of a pair; the other attachment, its mate, exactly the same in all details and perhaps made from the same mould (Figure 5), is now in the collection of Norbert Schimmel. Both pieces were acquired in Tehran, according to the dealer from whom they were purchased.

Each attachment consists of the head, neck, and chest of a bull joined with the wings and tail of a bird, all cast as one unit. A ring, cast with the other parts, is situated at the rear of the bull; it holds a separately made loop handle which swings freely.

The eyes and brows of each bull are well modeled. The muzzle is delineated by two vertical grooves coming down from the inner corner of the eyes, and a horizontal groove above the nostrils. The nostrils are marked by two depressions, the mouth by a short groove. A hatched collar, or ruff, connects the mouth and ears on each side of the face. The horns project forward, curving initially outward, then inward, and finally outward again, forming an S curve. The ears are thrust forward under the horns at a slight decline. The forelock, placed below the horns, is rounded at the base and is decorated with simple vertical hatching in four levels. The stylized mane at the back of the neck is decorated with a herringbone pattern divided and bordered by incised dots framed within two grooves. The chest hair is decorated in the same fashion, and a lock of hair, resembling a tassel more than animal hair, hangs down on both sides of the mane. The wings and tail have a feather pattern but are otherwise plain, without hatching.

Both attachments were originally applied to the rim of a large cauldron by means of a rivet at each wing. These rivets were hammered through the wings and the underlying cauldron, a fragment of which is still attached. The bulls faced into the cauldron.

Winged bull attachments used as cauldron handles are found in several areas of the Near East. They occur at Gordion in Phrygia (ten); at Zincirli (one), Tell Rifa‘at (two), and possibly at Aleppo (one), in North Syria; at Toprakkale (four), Altintep (four), and Karmir Blur (one), in Urartu; at a site near Guschi (four) on the west shore of Lake Urmia, and at a site near Alishar (one) on the Araxes River, both sites in Northwest Iran\(^3\); an example in the British Museum is

1. Acc. no. 67.1016; wing span: 15.7 cm.; length from tail to horns: 13.9 cm.; height from chest to top of horns: 5.5 cm.; outer diameter of the loop handle: 9.3 cm.; weight of attachment without the ring: 1194 grams; weight of the loop handle: 192 grams.

FIGURES 1–4
Bull cauldron attachment, about 600 B.C., from Iran. The Metropolitan Museum of Art, gift of H. Dunscombe Colt, 67.106

FIGURES 6, 7 (OPPOSITE)
Bull cauldron attachment, from Amyclae. Athens National Museum, no. 7763
also reported to have been found near Lake Urmia.  

Similar bull attachments, some imported, some locally made, are known from the west: from the islands of Cyprus, Rhodes, and Samos; from Greek mainland sanctuaries, Olympia, Delphi, Athens, the Argive Heraeum, and from Amyclae (Figures 6–7).  

Finally, two bull attachments on a cauldron are said to have been found at Cumae in Italy and are now in Copenhagen.


4. For a discussion of examples found in Greece and the Aegean see: Amandry, “Chaudrons,” pp. 242 ff., pp. 249 ff.; P. Amandry, “Objets Orientaux en Grèce,” Syria 35 (1958) pp. 73 ff.; “Grèce et Orient,” Études D’Archéologie Classique (Paris, 1958) p. 9; U. Jantzen, Griechische Griefenkessel (Berlin, 1955) p. 50, pl. 60, 3; E. Kunze, “Verkannter orientalischer Kesselschmuck aus dem argivischen Heraion,” Reinecke Festschrift (Mainz, 1950) pp. 96 ff.; H. Herrmann, Die Kessel der orientalisierenden Zeit (Berlin, 1966) pp. 114 ff., 129. (This volume reached me when this manuscript was basically completed.) An attachment from Idalion, H. Catling, Cypriote Bronzeswork in the Mycenaean World (Oxford, 1964) pp. 154–155, pl. 21, e, seems to me to be eighth- or seventh-century B.C. in date; it may also be a Greek copy. Catling sees a resemblance to Urartian examples but believes it to be late Mycenaean in date; see also E. Gjerstad et al., Swedish Cyprus Expedition (Stockholm, 1935) II, p. 540, no. 250, pl. clxix, nos. 14, 15; p. 602 and p. 624 where the object is said to be from Period 3, late Cypriote III. For another series of Cypriote bull attachments see V. Karageorghis, “Chronique des Fouilles à Chypre en 1966,” Bulletin de Correspondance Hellénique 91, 1 (1967) p. 345, p. 344 and fig. 149. Each handle has three bulls, a feature not known in the Near East, to my knowledge. The example cited here from Amyclae has not hitherto been published. It is in the National Museum in Athens, no. 7763; it is 6 cm. in height. I am indebted to Dr. George Donfas for permission to publish the object in this Journal.
Bull attachments seem to have been manufactured in the eighth and early seventh centuries B.C. Some of the earliest examples that can be dated without much controversy are ten attachments (five pairs) found at Gordion. One pair was found on a cauldron (Figure 8, no. 3) and a pair on each of two dinoi (Figure 9), all three vessels from the King’s Tomb, Tumulus MM, which is dated to the last third of the eighth century B.C. A pair was found on a cauldron in Tumulus W also dated to the last third of the eighth century; and another pair was recovered on a cauldron from the debris of the Phrygian city destroyed by the Kimmerians in the early seventh century B.C. (Figure 10).5

The two examples, a pair, from Tell Rifa‘at in North Syria (Figure 11) were found in what appears to be a late eighth- or early seventh-century B.C. context.3 All the examples from Urartu—except the one from Karmir Blur—are from the eighth century; the examples from northwest Iran presumably also belong to this period.5

A stylistic analysis of the bull attachments found in the various areas of the Near East yields evidence that enables us to conclude that there were basically two different groups manufactured.

All of the bull attachments found in Urartu, except the one from Karmir Blur, and those from northwest Iran form an easily recognizable group that has been called Urartian by several scholars (Figure 8, no. 1; Figure 12). The Urartian group shares certain characteristics in common, although one notes that each at-
**FIGURE 10**
Bull cauldron attachment from Gordion, 7055 B1398, from the burned Phrygian city, early vii century B.C. University Museum, Philadelphia

**FIGURE 9**
Dinos from Gordion, Tumulus MM, 4789 B803, viii century B.C. One of the two dinoi found in the tomb. University Museum, Philadelphia

**FIGURE 11**
Bull cauldron attachment from Tell Rifa‘at, North Syria, viii–vii century B.C. Courtesy of M. V. Seton-Williams

**FIGURE 12**
Bull cauldron attachment from Toprakkale, Urartu, viii century B.C. Copyright British Museum
tachment or unit of attachments exhibits individuality. The examples from this group consist of a head and neck joined at a right angle onto a separately-made wing and tail apparatus, which is sometimes decorated with a herringbone pattern. The ears of the bull stick out horizontally from the head and the horns are spread wide apart, curving outward and then upward; often there is an engraved or raised decorated ring at the base of each horn. A ruff decorated with stylized spiral curls passes around the neck from ear to ear. (The four examples from the site near Guschi have separately-made horns that do not have a ring at the base; none of these examples has a ruff.) A rectangular forelock between the horns continues over the head onto the back of the neck; it is decorated on the forehead and on the neck with two levels of spiral curls. There are usually heavy eyebrows, which are sometimes decorated with a herringbone pattern; and two vertical grooves down the muzzle and across the nose are found on most of the examples (the bulls from Altintepe do not have vertical grooves and they do not have a ring at the base of the horns). The four attachments from Toprakkale have, in addition, a hook-like motif extending out from the vertical muzzle (Figure 12).

The attachments of the Urartian group never have a ring at the rear to hold a free-swinging handle and it is presumed that the attachment itself served as a handle. Moreover, bulls of the Urartian type always face outward from the cauldron, toward the viewer, rather than into the vessel. Apparently, in all cases four bulls were placed on a cauldron.

A second group of attachments is formed by the other examples found in the Near East and referred to above. This group shares certain characteristics in common and, like the Urartian group, the individual examples or pairs exhibit individuality and differ one from the other in stylistic details. In this group the head of the bull and a plain, undecorated wing and tail—more like a T-shaped plaque in some cases—are cast together as one unit. In most examples there is a fixed ring, cast with the rest, at the rear of the head or neck for the purpose of inserting a free-swinging handle. Usually there is a round or triangular-shaped forelock on the forehead of the bull. Only two bulls were placed on a cauldron.

The bulls on the large cauldron from Tumulus MM at Gordion have a ring at the rear with a free-swinging loop handle in situ (Figure 8, no. 3). The forelocks are triangular in shape, decorated with incisions that repeat the triangle several times. The bulls on the smaller dinoi (Figure 9) also have a ring at the rear, but they hold a different type of handle than that found on the cauldron, one that could be grasped by a single person. The forelocks on the bulls are round, and, unlike those on the cauldron, they are undecorated. In addition to the shapes and decoration of the forelocks, the bulls from the cauldron and the dinoi differ in other respects as well. One of the bulls on one of the dinoi has a long muzzle, the other a slightly shorter one; all have long attenuated wings and tails. The difference in proportion among the bull heads certainly implies that each was manufactured in a separate one-piece mould. The bulls on the cauldron are more naturalistic in style, and they have short wings and tails. Their eyes bulge and are surrounded by thick swellings or ridges.

The bull attachments on the cauldron from Tumulus W represent a unique and interesting type, inasmuch as cast and beaten bronze were combined to form the head. Moreover, the head was riveted onto the separately-made wing and tail apparatus. In this respect one is reminded of the Urartian examples where, as has been noted, the head is made separately from the wings and tail. They are unlike the latter examples, however, both in style and in the fact that they have a round forelock and a ring behind the bull's head for the insertion of a free-swinging handle.

The bulls on the cauldron from the burned Phrygian level on the city mound (Figure 10) are quite small. They do not have a ring at the rear for a handle; their forelocks are round. These bull attachments differ from the others of the group in size and because they lack a rear ring, a feature unknown on any other attachment of this group found in the Near East.

All of the attachments from Gordion were applied

7. Apparently representing a continuation of that motif from the III and II millennia B.C. when animals were often represented with triangular forelocks, viz. T. Özgüç, M. Akok, "Objects from Horoztepe," Belleten 21 (Ankara, 1957) p. 214, figs. 10, 27; H. Kosay, Les Fouilles d'Alaca Höyük (Ankara, 1951) pls. 70, fig. 2, 72, fig. 1, 73, fig. 2.
8. A.J.A. 64 (1960) pp. 231–232, pl. 55, fig. 11, published upside down. I have seen photographs of this attachment in the University Museum. On p. 230, "two cauldrons, each with bull attachments," are mentioned; this seems to be an error.
to the cauldron in pairs and they face outward from the vessel.

The problems inherent in describing any of the pairs from Gordion as having been either locally made, and typically “Phrygian,” or as having been imported from a particular area in the Near East are evident when one considers the stylistic variety of these bull attachments, and the fact that four different types come from the same site.

M. van Loon has recently suggested that the bull attachments on the cauldron found in Tumulus MM were locally made. He sees some relationship in style between these bulls and a lion carved in stone that was found in the Phrygian level of the city mound. However, although the eyes of both the bronze bulls and the stone lion are similar, the creatures have different types of forelocks, and the lion has more linear decoration on the eyes and head, as well as on the forelock. I would therefore reserve judgement at present on the nature of Phrygian-style bull attachments. In this context, however, it should be kept in mind that Gordion had a major bronze industry, and it would not offend the archaeological evidence from that site if one accepts the possibility that all or some of the attachments were local products.

The bull attachment from Karmir Blur in Urartu has its head and thin wings and tail cast in one unit; it has a ring at the back and it faced outward from the cauldron. In lieu of the usual type of forelock, round or triangular, there is a small round depression. This attachment is closer in style and in technique of manufacture to the Gordion examples, in particular to the pair on the dinos, than to any of the others found in Urartu and in northwest Iran. Although the attachment was found in the debris of the city, which was destroyed about 600 B.C., it is probable that the object was made sometime before that date, and was imported into Karmir Blur from another area.

All the bull attachments from North Syria are likewise cast in one unit with a ring at the rear, and, like those from Gordion, each has individuality in style, both in the manner of sculpting the head and in the representation of the forelock.

A close parallel in form and proportion is to be seen between the pair of attachments from Tell Rifa’at (Figure 11) and an example found at Olympia. Perhaps a cultural relationship exists between the two pieces, and if we conclude that the Tell Rifa’at examples were indeed locally made we may then conclude that the Olympia attachment came from North Syria. It may also be of some importance to note here that in addition to stylistic similarities, both attachments faced into the cauldron, reminding us of the well-known siren attachments that also faced into the cauldron. These siren attachments consist of the body of a male or female cast together with the wing and tail apparatus; they also have rings at the rear to hold free-swinging loop handles. These features relate them in general to the bull attachments of the Near Eastern group under discussion, but not to the Urartian examples discussed above. A growing number of scholars are accepting the conclusion that the siren attachments were manufactured in North Syria—and not in Urartu, as had previously been suggested. Since the two bull attachments from North Syrian Tell Rifa’at faced into the cauldron, just like the North Syrian sirens, we may consider the suggestion that the former attachments were made locally in North Syria; needless to say, one cannot push this thought too far. It would not necessarily follow that the bull attachments

9. *Urartian Art*, p. 105, note 119; see also Herrmann, *Die Kessel*, pp. 122, 128; he prefers a North Syrian origin for the Tumulus MM bulls but accepts the possibility that the bulls on the dinos were locally made.
10. *AJA* 62 (1957) pl. 21, fig. 4.
12. For a brief discussion of the date for the destruction of Karmir Blur see my article “A Fibula from Hasanlu,” *AJA* 69 (1965) p. 237 and notes 34 to 36.
13. Herrmann, *Die Kessel*, p. 129, comes to the same conclusion; he compares the attachment to his North Syrian group.

14. For a good photograph of the Olympia example, see Herrmann, *Die Kessel*, pl. 42; see also *Urartian Art*, p. 106.
17. Note, however, that the Tell Rifa’at attachments do not have the typical herringbone decoration found on the sirens—and also on some of the Urartian bull attachments. Compare Amandry’s comments regarding the position of the attachments on the cauldron, "Chaudrons," p. 247.
from Zincirli and Aleppo were not themselves locally made: the diversity of culture in the North Syrian cities would allow for a variety in the position of the bulls on the cauldron.

Tentatively, I would recognize a North Syrian center (or centers) in addition to a tentative Phrygian center for the manufacturing of Near Eastern bull attachments.

The two well-known bull attachments on the cauldron from Cumae, now in Copenhagen, have a ring and loop handle at the back and they face outward from the cauldron (Figure 8, no. 2). The bulls have short wings and tails and a round forelock. They are differentiated from the other bulls of this group in that their wings and tails have scalloped edges and are decorated with a herringbone pattern; they also have very short thick necks and large decorated ridges around each eye that overlap slightly onto the forelock. 18

Another bull attachment that should be mentioned is an example formerly in the Clausen and Brummer collections. 19 It was cast in one unit with a ring at the rear and it faced into the cauldron. The bull has a long neck, short and thick upright ears, and no decoration on the head; there seems to be a round forelock on the forehead. The wings and tail are plain, with no feather pattern. Unfortunately the object did not come from a controlled excavation, and hence nothing is known about its provenience.

It should be understood from the preceding comments that because of the stylistic variety of the excavated attachments, one is not in a position at present to speak dogmatically about a specific area or city in the Near East where the examples from Cumae and the Brummer collection may have originated; and I would add here in this context examples from Samos and Amyclae, and some examples from Olympia and the Argive Heraeum. 20 Surely one must think of more

18. Herrmann, Die Kessel, pp. 122, 128, calls the Copenhagen attachments North Syrian; van Loon, Urartian Art, p. 106, calls them Cypriote; Young, AIA 62 (1958) p. 151, note 25, says they may be Phrygian.

19. The Catalogue of the E. Brummer Collection, Sotheby’s, London, November 16–17, 1964, pp. 66–67, no. 160; it is said to have come from Anatolia and is “probably... Phrygian.” Herrmann, Die Kessel, pp. 128–129, calls it North Syrian.

20. See notes 18 and 19. I find it difficult to come to a strong conclusion about the place of manufacture of most of the bull attachments found in the Greek sanctuaries. Thus, for example, I am not fully convinced that the bull attachments from Olympia illustrated in Die Kessel, pls. 43, 45–50, 51; those from Delphi, P. Perdrixet, Fouilles de Delph (Paris, 1908) V, pp. 76–77, nos. 327, 328, 330–332; Syria 35 (1958) pl. 5, d, pl. 6, c; and examples from Samos, Die Kessel, pl. 52, 2, p. 129, note 46, are Near Eastern imports. These attachments could very well be good Greek copies of imported examples. Many have a head without a wing and tail apparatus, or they have only a triangular plate; few, if any, have forelocks. Compare the comments by Herrmann, Die Kessel, pp. 124 ff., 128–129, who appreciates the problem and comes to a different conclusion than the one expressed here. I also find it difficult to
arrive at a definite conclusion about the example from Idalion, Catling, Cypriote Bronzework, pl. 21, e; an example from Delphi, FdD, V, p. 79, no. 329, pl. 14, 2; and an example from Argos, C. Waldstein, The Argive Heraeum (Cambridge, Mass., 1905) II, pl. 75, no. 25. However, I would suggest that the attachments from Amyclae (Figure 7); one from Samos, Griech. Giebenkessel, pl. 60, 3; one from Olympia, Die Kessel, pl. 42; and one from Argos, Argive Heraeum, II, pl. 75, no. 23 (Herrmann, Die Kessel, p. 129, Amandry, “Chaudrons,” p. 249, Kunze, Reinecke Festschrift, p. 98, agree that this latter piece is an import) are genuine imported pieces from the Near East. In any event, whether a given attachment is Greek or Near Eastern in origin of manufacture is an academic question: what is established in either case is that the Greeks came in contact with and used oriental objects in the eighth–seventh centuries B.C. Note that there does not seem to be a single bull attachment in the Greek world that belongs to the Urartian group. If this statement holds up against future examination of the bull attachments by classical scholars—a deed which is very necessary given the inadequate publication and reproduction of many examples—it would be a significant fact in any discussion of oriental influences on Greek culture; see Amandry, Syria 35 (1958) p. 78; Die Kessel, p. 128; Urartian Art, p. 106. For a different type of animal handle in Greece, see N. R. Oakeshott, “Horned-head Vase Handles,” Journal of Hellenic Studies 86 (1966) pp. 114 ff.


FIGURE 14
been placed in their original position. It is therefore suggested that one may not make use of the position of the ears on the Tehran bulls as a parallel for the ear position on our attachments.

The forelock of Achaemenid bulls is usually decorated with spiral curls and is rounded at the lower border. The chest is also decorated with spiral curls, and so is the ruff that connects the mouth and the ear on each side. The spiral-curl forelock and ruff, the heavy eyes and brows, and the veining of the muzzle remind us of the earlier Urartian bulls found on the attachments discussed above, and we may conclude that there is some Urartian influence to be seen here.

One also notes some general parallels between these Achaemenid bull heads and our bronze bulls: the round forelock, stylized chest hair, muzzle decoration, and the ruff connecting the mouth and ears. Yet there are differences in the position of the ears, the curve of the horns, and in the more elaborate stylization of the hair decoration to be seen on the Archaemenid bulls when compared to our bronze examples. These latter features might have some bearing on chronology, apparently suggesting an earlier stage for the bronze attachments.

Some other parallels for the bull heads of our attachments exist both in pre-Achaemenid and apparently also in early Achaemenid art. The head of the silver bull handle in the British Museum (Figure 13), dated by Jacobsthal and Amandry to the first half of the fifth century B.C., but perhaps actually a little earlier, has inward-curving horns, ears projecting forward under the horns, a hatched ruff, and a round forelock with decoration similar to that on the forelock and mane of our bulls; its wings are also decorated with a plain feather pattern.

Finally, we would call attention to some features on our bulls that remind us of the Urartian bronze bull attachments: a forelock decorated in zones, a decorated ruff at the side of the head, and linear muzzle decoration.

In the Tehran Museum there is a bronze cauldron attachment in the form of a winged griffin (Figures 15, 16). The head and upper part of the griffin is cast in one piece with the wings and tail, and with the ring for holding a free-swinging handle which is now missing. The wings and tail are decorated with a plain feather pattern and there is a hatched area on the chest that apparently represents hair. A characteristic griffin-knob exists at the crown of the head from which a crest extends down to the middle of the back; the mouth is closed. The griffin faced into the cauldron. This latter feature, and the plain feather pattern on the wings and either provincial Achaemenid or post-Achaemenid in date, where the ears were placed forward under the horns.

25. I wish to thank Dr. Neghaban for sending me photographs of this attachment.
tail, the stylized hatched chest hair, the general proportions, the technique of manufacture, as well as the fact that the griffin was found in Iran, relate this attachment to those in the Metropolitan Museum and the Schimmel collection.

The specific provenience in Iran of this griffin is not known, but Ghirshman has suggested that it came from Luristan and dated it to the eighth-seventh centuries B.C. Actually, there is no proof for a Luristan provenience, nor is the griffin related stylistically to typical "Luristan" bronzes.

A bronze eagle attachment (there is no evidence for calling it a griffin) found many years ago on the Acropolis at Athens is closely paralleled by the Tehran griffin. The eagle has all its components cast together in one unit, including the ring (which rests on a plinth) for a separate free-swinging handle. Moreover, the bird faced into the cauldron. The attachment was apparently imported from the Near East (or else it is a good local copy!), but the style is not clear enough to warrant any statement about a specific provenience. Surely one need not call the eagle attachment "Iranian" simply because of the Iranian provenience of the Tehran griffin; I prefer to call it simply a Near Eastern attachment (see below).

We are now in a position to present some conclusions concerning the chronological and historical position of the attachments in the Metropolitan Museum and the Schimmel collection. When we compare them to the bull attachments from the various areas in the Near East it will be seen that there is no relationship with the Urartian group. On the other hand there is a definite relationship with the other examples cited in this study, the examples I call Near Eastern. However, I have stressed that among each of the pairs or individual pieces within this group, even with those found within one cultural area, there are notable differences. These are expressed in the form of decorative detail—some face into the cauldron, others face outward; some have round, others have triangular forelocks; some have a plain feather pattern on the wings and tail, others are undecorated—and also in the manner in which the heads and neck were sculpted. These differences prevent not only a strong conclusion about a specific cultural and stylistic relationship of each of these attachments to one another, but also a conclusion about a direct link between any given one of the examples and ours. In other words, we may conclude either that the Iranian artisans who manufactured our attachments were generally influenced by various bull attachments and cauldrons from several areas with which they came in contact, or that they were influenced by attachments and cauldrons from one particular source that is at present unknown to us.

The parallels in style that, I believe, exist between our bulls and the heads of the bulls on the handle in the British Museum (Figure 13) seem to suggest that both may have been manufactured somewhere in western Iran within a relatively short period of time. At the same time the stylistic parallels that exist with the Urartian bull heads (Figure 12) seem to suggest a date not too far removed from the time when the latter were made. It was also suggested that the parallels existing with the Achaemenid bull heads were not close enough to conclude that our attachments are contemporary, but rather to suggest an earlier date. All these comments add up to a conclusion that our attachments were made sometime between the late eighth and the second half of the sixth centuries B.C. It is plausible, therefore, to state that our attachments were made somewhere in western Iran in the seventh century B.C., perhaps even as late as the early sixth century B.C.

If this dating is generally correct, the attachments would be among the latest in the series of bull attachments discussed in this study. I would also venture to suggest that Ghirshman's dating of the griffin in Tehran to the eighth-seventh centuries be accepted, with the provision that the seventh century B.C. may be more likely.

A date in the late seventh century B.C. for the attachments would mean that they were manufactured during the time that the Medes were in political control of western Iran. This naturally raises the possibility that the attachments represent examples of Median art. Such a conclusion is cautiously stated as an "intelligent guess," for we have no archaeological (i.e., scientifically excavated) material that we can claim as examples of Median art. Our knowledge of this art is at present

26. _The Arts of Ancient Iran_, pp. 80, 295, fig. 353, also p. 432; there is no evidence to support the suggestion that the piece was of "Urartian workmanship."

27. A. de Rudder, _Bronzes Trouvés sur l'Acropole d'Athènes_ (Paris, 1896) p. 197, no. 538, fig. 177; for a better photograph now see _Die Kessel_, pp. 70, 136, pl. 58; Herrmann suggests that the attachment is Assyrian.
based on archaeological inference, and the evidence exists only in the form of isolated objects gathered together by art historians or archaeologists, such, for example, as presented in this study. Objects have been called “Median” on the basis of stylistic analysis and historical conclusions, as I have done above, and while this is indeed viable, one must continuously be aware of the limitations of the methods employed.

The nature of Median art will become better understood only from a study of objects found in situ by archaeologists; it cannot be understood if one is limited to a study of non-excavated material.


29. After this study had been completed I was shown photographs of some bronze objects, which allegedly came from the Lake Van area in eastern Turkey. The objects include fragments of a boss or shield, fragments of a helmet, and a fragment of a quiver. The human and animal decoration on these objects does seem to be Urartian.

Among the objects there is a pair of goat attachments and a pair of ibex attachments. In each case the whole animal is represented and the front and rear legs rest on a single plinth. Apparently each pair was attached to a cauldron. These animals are similar to some attachments found in Greece, viz. *Die Kessel*, pp. 63, Kunze, *Reinecke Festchrift*, p. 18, 1, 2, 4, and *Olympia Bericht*, V (Berlin, 1956) p. 81, note 11; “Chaudrons,” pl. 29, 2. In addition to these objects the cache (?) contained three winged bull attachments, all of which have the head and the wing and tail apparatus cast in one unit; the latter in all three cases is plain and undecorated. The bulls faced outward from the cauldron. Two of the heads seem to be exactly the same in all details: round forelock ending in a raised ridge, forward-projecting ears and horns, the latter of which are short, and heavy eyes. Yet they differ in that their wings and tails are of different proportions, and only one has a fixed ring, in the form of a long spool, at the back of the neck. The other attachment is in a different style: thin wing and tail apparatus, and outward-curving horns. I cannot tell from the photograph if there is a forelock. There are no ears present, and there is no ring for a handle. It is obvious that these attachments are not like the Urartian examples described above. Certain possible conclusions follow from a study of this group: 1) since they are objects belonging to a dealer, one may not accept without reservations the claim that they form a single cache; 2) the group does represent a single find from Urartu, but the bull attachments were imported and not locally made (like the example from Karmir Blur, above); or 3) the attachments were indeed made in Urartu along with the other objects. If the third conclusion is correct, then it would seem that the ideas expressed in this study—that there is a division between Urartian and Near Eastern bull attachments, based on stylistic and technical differences—is not valid. And therefore one is left with some confusion both about the nature of Urartian bull attachments and the origin or place of manufacture of those examples found in the Aegean and the Near East. The problem rests until archaeologists excavate similar bulls in good contexts or, luckily, find a mould; one cannot solve the problem with objects from the antiquities market. However, I believe the second possibility best explains the situation—that the bull attachments were imported into Urartu.