

ISSN 1301-7667



MERSİN ÜNİVERSİTESİ
KILIKIA ARKEOLOJİSİNİ ARAŞTIRMA MERKEZİ YAYINLARI



OLBA

II

(ÖZEL SAYI)
II.CİLT

I. Uluslararası Kilikia Arkeolojisi Sempozyumu
Bildirileri

MERSİN 1999



MERSİN ÜNİVERSİTESİ

KILIKIA ARKEOLOJİSİNİ ARAŞTIRMA MERKEZİ YAYINLARI - II

Editör

**Serra DURUGÖNÜL
Murat DURUKAN**

Correspondance addresses for sending articles to following volumes of Olba:

OLBA'nın bundan sonraki sayılarında yayınlanması istenen makaleler için yazışma adresi:

**Mersin Üniversitesi
Fen-Edebiyat Fakültesi
Arkeoloji Bölümü
Çiftlikköy Kampüsü MERSİN/TÜRKİYE**

e-mail: Kilikia@usa.net

Tel: 0.90 324 361 00 01 (10 hat) / 162

Fax: 0.90 324 361 00 46

**ISSN 1301-7667
MERSİN 1999**

İÇİNDEKİLER

Selim KAPUR	A Review of the Late Quaternary History of Anatolia253
M. Kemal SERTOK	Kuzey-Batı Dağlık Kilikya'da Yapılan Eski Madencilikle İlgili Bir Araştırma273
Norbert KARG	Tarsus and Anatolian Chronology in Retrospect283
Marie Henriette GATES	Kinet Höyük in Eastern Cilicia: A Case Study for Acculturation in Ancient Barbars303
Thomas MARKSTEINER	Überlegungen bezüglich einer strukturellen Verwandtschaft Achämenidenzeitlicher Gipfelbefestigungen des Südwestlichen Kleinasien313
Charles GATES	Kinet Höyük 1992-1997: The Achaemenid Persian and Hellenistic Periods323
Zeynep KUBAN	Bir Nekropolün Siyasi ve Kültürel Boyutu Limyra Örneği333
Turgut SANER	Karaman-Başdağ'da Hellenistik (?) Yapı Grubu345
Detlev WANNAGAT	Zur Säulenordnung des Zeustempels von Olba-Diokaisareia355
Levent ZOROĞLU	Kilikya Berenikesi'nin Yeri369
Tamer KORKUT	Die Pamphylisch-Kilikischen Kalkstein-Girlandenostotheken381
Bilal SÖĞÜT	Lamos'da Bulunan Bir Tapınak309
Marcello SPANU	Some Considerations on the Theatre of Elaiussa411

II

Melih ARSLAN	Roma Dönemi Kilikya Şehir Sikkelerinde Mithras Kültü425
Emanuela BORGIA	Research on Onomastics in the Areas of Korykos and Elaiussa Sebaste447
Richard BAYLISS	A Place of Permanence in the Cemetery at Flavias.....483
Ayşe AYDIN	Die Kirche II in Emirzeli499
Candan ÜLKÜ	Çukurova Bölgesi'nde (Kilikia) Devşirme Malzeme Kullanımı Üzerine Bir Araştırma514

TARSUS AND ANATOLIAN CHRONOLOGY IN RETROSPECT*

****Norbert KARG**

"Many authors have applied the traditional tripartite division of the EBA in Anatolia to the Keban area excavations. The question is, however, how, and on what basis should this division be made with respect to our region? Agreement has not yet been reached on the subject. Which cultural differences and developments provide the evidence for a division of the EBA into phases I, II and III? What do these phases mean in chronological terms? One may even discuss whether such a division is in fact necessary"¹.

This remarkable passage can be found in R. Duru's publication of the Değirmentepe Excavations of 1973, published in Ankara nearly 20 years ago. R. Duru did not, however, discuss the question, where this traditional tripartite system comes from, where it originates and where in Anatolia it was first applied. This paper will try to throw some light on those questions.

Unfortunately, neither in Anatolia nor in any other part of the Ancient Near East are we in such a good position as archaeologists of Palestine. In 1991, Helga Weippert, in an article called "Metallzeitalter und Kulturepochen", (Metal ages and cultural epochs), gave a detailed account of the development of the chronological system presently used in the Holy Land and adjacent regions, an article leaving few questions open². Here it can only be attempted to deal with some of the problems, clarified by H. Weippert for Palestine in such an exemplary way, in respect to Anatolian archaeology.

Leaving aside H. Schliemann's excavations at Troy from the last century and some smaller soundings, like Kusura, large scale scientific exploration of (Central) Anatolian prehistoric sites started with the Oriental Institute's excavations at Alişar Höyük in 1928, directed by Erich Schmidt and Hans Henning von der Osten. As a result of that epoch making undertaking - there is as yet no other well excavated and published site in Central Anatolia of comparable size - von der Osten presented the prehistoric sequence as follows:

* My studies concerning the cultural developments of Cilicia have been generously supported by a grant of the 'Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft' in 1994/1995 for which I would like to express my sincerest thanks. The present paper is a short draft of the introductory chapter of a work in preparation.

** Dr. Norbert KARG, Bilkent Üniversitesi, Arkeoloji-S. Tarihi Böl. Ankara/TÜRKİYE.

¹R. Duru, Keban Project Değirmentepe Excavations 1973, Ankara 1979, 105.

²H. Weippert, ZDPV 107 (1991) 1 - 23.

Mound Levels 19 - 12 : Chalcolithic (= Alişar 0)

Mound Levels 11 - 7 : 'Copper Age'

Mound Levels 6 - 5 : Early Bronze Age

With a few modifications, this scheme was also adopted by K. Bittel in various publications, although he retained von der Osten's earlier set of Roman numbers:

Alişar 0, Ia, Ib, Alişar III, followed by Alişar II, an Old Hittite level (cf. K. Bittel 1934: 13).

K. Bittel, however, called Levels Ia - Ib, comprised of Mound 14 - Mound 7 (i.e. von der Osten's Chalcolithic (later) and Copper Age) Early Bronze Age (K. Bittel 1950: 16).

This chronological scheme, either in its original form or modified by K. Bittel remained in use until ca 1954, when Hetty Goldman's, 'The Relative Chronology of Southeastern Anatolia', a contribution to Robert W. Ehrich's 'Relative Chronologies in Old World Archaeology' appeared, causing a drastic change in the concept of Anatolian chronology.

Following Erich Schmidt's and Hans Henning von der Osten's activities in Alişar Höyük, parallel to the University of Cincinnati's excavations at Troy and John Garstang's dig here at Mersin-Yumuktepe, Hetty Goldman, on behalf of Bryn Mawr College, had carried out seven seasons at the site of Gözlükule, situated in the neighbouring city of Tarsus, well known to a wider western public as the city of St Paul.

Between 1934 and 1939 five seasons of excavations took place there, complemented by two shorter campaigns in the years 1947 and 1948. Although the main reason for digging the site might have been the exploration of the 1st Millennium and Roman levels, a good proportion of the expedition's activities, especially in the post-war campaigns, was devoted to the (so called) Bronze Age levels, here understood as approximately the period from the beginning of the 3rd until the end of the 2nd Millennium, or, more precisely, until the so-called 'Seevölkersturm', the advent of the "Sea Peoples".

When H. Goldman published the chapter on (Southern) Anatolia in Ehrich's *Chronologies* the final publication of Tarsus II must nearly have been completed, since it appeared as early as 1956.

The excavations at Tarsus resulted in the following chronological scheme: There was a Neolithic period "after 5000 B.C."; a "Chalcolithic" up to ca. 3000 B.C., followed the Early Bronze Age, here for the first time in Turkey subdivided into three phases, EB I, II, and III, lasting from ca. 3000 - 2100 B.C.³. What

³ See below, note 21.

succeeds is a Middle Bronze Age Transitional from ca. 2100 - 1900/1850 and a MB *floruit* until ca. 1650 B.C. The next phase, called Late Bronze Age is likewise subdivided into two major periods, LB I and II, the latter further into IIa, ca. 1450 - 1225 and IIb, ca. 1225 - 1100 B.C. (Tarsus II: 64).

Those subdivisions of the "Bronze Age" are, according to Goldman, based on differences in pottery technology, but there were also changes in architecture used to mark those chronological distinctions.

Let me briefly summarize the stratigraphy, or better, touch some details of the stratigraphy which seem to be important. We have only to look at Area A, where most of the earlier remains had been uncovered, since Area B was dug down only to the level of the Hittite Empire Period 'Temple'.

EB I

What has later been named EB I⁴ starts at a level of ca. *27.00m and lasts until *20.00m. Between *27.00m and *26.50m a new type of pottery begins to appear, the so called 'red gritty or sandy ware', although the 'chaff tempered 'chalcolithic' wares still continue. Likewise characteristic is the first appearance of the Cilician form of the Anatolian pitcher with steep rising spout, as well as the occurrence of a few sherds of shallow bowls with spiral reserved slip decoration on the inside. H. Goldman also reports "the first appearance of bronze" (Goldman 1956: 9).

At ca. *23.50m the area excavated had reached the size of ca. 7.50 by 8.50m² (Goldman 1956: 9) and was interpreted as a "street" (Goldman 1956: 9-10) or courtyard.

For comparison the sizes of trenches at the 'Amuq sites: 'Amuq H was excavated in two trenches at Tall Judaidah and Tall Tayinat of approximately 170m², Amuq F, dug at Tall Judaidah and Çatal Höyük totals 139m²; when we talk about Amuq G we mean a trench of 167m² at Tall Judaidah.

EB II

Strata which have been labelled EB II range from ca. *20.50/20.00m to ca. *12.00/11.50m, separated from the preceding by a layer of clay for levelling purposes. At ca. *20.00m the area investigated had extended to ca. 20.50m by 10.00m (Goldman 1956: 12). There is another street, now running East - West, domestic architecture, and, after a fire which ended the *17.50/17.00m level, an irregularly saw tooth shaped fortification wall was erected.

⁴ The term "Bronze" Age, not exactly defined by H. Goldman, Tarsus II, 9, should be used in the way proposed by Hall and Steadman 1991, 224.

Noteworthy is the early appearance of so called 'light clay corrugated ware' at a depth of *18.60m. This type of pottery, clearly Syrian in origin, is known from the Amuq sites in Phases I - J.

Likewise, very "early" appears what has been called 'light clay miniature lug ware'.

In Tarsus this ware has been found in elevations ranging from *18.00 / 18.50m - *13.00m, which means that this very distinctive class of pottery must have remained unaltered for a period represented by a cultural deposit of five meters.

This class of pottery - two specimens have also been found at Mersin (J. Garstang 1953: Fig. 122) - is better known from the South Central Anatolian plateau extending north as far as Acemhöyük as shown recently by Aliye Öztan⁵ and earlier surveys of James Mellaart⁶, where it has been called "Metallic ware"⁷.

The occurrence of the so called 'Brittle Orange Ware' (BOW), in Tarsus named 'red gritty cross stitch incised' ware, is likewise a characteristic of what has been termed "EB II". Three complete examples and several sherds have been found⁸. The only level indicated for one of those pieces is for T47.128, from Room 119, *16.00m, i.e. roughly in the middle of the "EB II" sequence. Numerous parallels for those pots are known. It must be good enough to remind that the 'red gritty' fabric in combination with the typical 'cross stitch' incised decoration does not appear *earlier* than Amuq I, which, according to M. Mellink (Mellink 1989: 322) - and one can agree with that statement - is later than Tarsus "EB II"⁹. The numerous examples found at Tilmen Höyük and Gedikli, where this pottery class seems to have originated, were labeled EB III by U.B. Alkim and Handan Alkim. BOW sherds found at Tall Brak, mentioned by M. Mellink (TÖA 322), in what has to be called an 'Ur III' context, clearly support a later date than the term "EB II" for

⁵ A. Özten, A Group of Early Bronze Age Pottery from the Konya and Niğde Region, in: K. Emre et al (eds), TÖA, Ankara 1989, 407 - 418.

⁶ J. Mellaart, Early Cultures on the South Anatolian Plateau II, AnSt 13 (1963) 199-236.

⁷ As reported by A. Öztan, op. cit., 408 - 409, sherds of this class of pottery were found in the deep sounding at Acemhöyük in Levels VIII - X. In level VIII, the latest one, they were associated with fragments of alabaster idols of the specific Kültepe type, indicating a date at the very end of the EBA/IIIrd Mill. In Kültepe those idols occur in a religious building of Level 11a-c, the latest of the 'EB III' levels. Cf. T. Özgüç, Alabaster Idols and Statuettes from Kültepe, in: M. Frangipane - H. Hauptmann - M. Liverani - P. Matthiae - M. Mellink (eds.), *Between the Rivers and Over the Mountains, Archaeologica Anatolica et Mesopotamica Alba Palmieri Dedicata*, Rom 1993, 509 - 515, esp. 514.

⁸ Tarsus II, 109 - 110.122-123. Fig. 255: 279 - 282. Cf. M. Mellink, TÖA 322.

⁹ I also support the view of M. Mellink that (at least) the end of the "Tarsus EB II" period overlaps with the Akkadian period. Cf. M. Mellink 1993, 506.

the Tarsus ones tries to insinuate. They clearly corroborate, in contrast, the evidence from Amuq Phase I¹⁰.

EB III

The deposit from 12.00 - 9.00m has been termed EB III, divided into two subphases.

Typical pottery shapes of those levels are one handled large bowls with inverted rims (Tarsus II: Pl. 267), multiple vessels, eventually a result of intensive contact to Cyprus (Tarsus II: Pl. 278), but of course, above all, one and two handled tankards in many variations; a form often found in Troy, but likewise appearing on the central plateau, in the Southeast (Titriş, Gedikli) and in Northern Syria¹¹.

H. Goldman has likewise published four examples of 'Syrian bottles' (Tarsus II: Pl. 268, 614 - 616), an elongated, alabastron shaped vessel with double rim, made out of gray "metallic ware". This type had a wide distribution throughout the Near East and "outstanding chronological significance" (M. Korfmann 1982: 292). Of special importance in Anatolia are the examples found in Kültepe¹², Sos Höyük/Erzurum¹³ and a silver bottle from the 'Eskiyapar treasure' in North Central Anatolia¹⁴. Without ignoring the animated discussion concerning this very distinctive pottery type one will not refrain to concede that, outside Anatolia, there is no better archaeological context for the 'Syrian' bottle than at Tall Brak, where it occurs in a building of a clear Middle to Late Akkadian date, i.e. the time of Naram-Sin or later¹⁵, an observation earlier made at Tall Huwairah/"Chuera" (W. Orthmann 1963: 85).

¹⁰ OIP 61, 370.406. Fig. 310, 17-119, Pl. 87,2. Cf. K. Fielden, *Tell Brak 1976: The Pottery*, Iraq 39 (1977) 249, Pl. 13, 13a-b. - D. Oates, *The Excavations at Tell Brak, 1976*, Iraq 39 (1977) 233 - 244, esp. 240.244.).

¹¹ H. Hürüymaz, *Uşak Arkeoloji Müzesinden Bir Grup "Depas Amphikypellon"*, in: A. Erkanal et al. (eds.), *I.M. Akyurt - B. Devam Anı Kitabı*, Istanbul 1995, 177-188. - H. Alkim, 8. *TTK*, Ankara 1976/1979, 135 - 142, Pl. 91-92. - E. Strommenger - P. Spanos, *Zu den Beziehungen zwischen Nordwestanatolien und Nordsyrien / Nordmesopotamien im III. Jahrtausend vor Christus*, NÖA, Ankara 1993, 572 - 578, Pl. 104, 1.

¹² T. Özgüç, *New Observations on the Relationship of Kültepe with Southeast Anatolia and North Syria during the Third Millennium B.C.*, in: J.V. Canby et al. (eds.), *Ancient Anatolia (= Fs M. Mellink)*, Madison, Wisconsin, 1986, 31- 47.

¹³ A. Sagona, *Excavations at Sos Höyük, 1995: Second Preliminary Report*, *AnSt* 46 (1996) 44 Fig. 10, 9.

¹⁴ T. Özgüç - R. Temizer, *The Eskiyapar Treasure*, NÖA, 613 - 628, Pl. 116, 1.

¹⁵ D. Oates - J. Oates, *Iraq* 53 (1991) 144, Pl. 30e.

The most striking feature of the Tarsus "EB III" levels, is of course, the architecture. H. Goldman and others have claimed to recognize buildings of the well known 'Megaron' type, and, in connection with the occurrence of the double handled beaker, have postulated a strong influence, not say "invasion", from Northwest Anatolia, *vulgo*: Troy. Unlike the Trojan megara, however, the Tarsus ones are not freestanding. One must not necessarily believe in migration or invasion from the Northwest. Not only do more and more depata appear in many sites all over Anatolia (see above, Hürülmaz 1995: 177-188), especially also the Southeast, and North Syria, in a recent study on the megaron building type by Kjell Werner¹⁶ the so-called megaron buildings from Tarsus have not been included.

MB and LBA

I don't want to go into any details concerning the 'Middle Bronze' and 'Late Bronze' Ages, especially since D. Slane has re-examined the IInd Millennium strata and rearranged the whole material in a continuous sequence, differing radically from the divisions "found" by H. Goldman¹⁷. At *9.00m a burnt layer can be observed marking the advent of the 'Middle Bronze Age'. M. Mellink describes the break in ceramic tradition as drastic as the physical demolition (Tarsus II: 164).

The 'Late Bronze' Age was divided by H. Goldmn into LB I, LB IIa and LB IIb.

After the stratigraphy of the Bronze Age levels from Tarsus had been published in 1956, and the contributions by H. Goldman and M. Mellink based upon had appeared in R.W. Ehrich's 'Chronologies (1954 and 1965), the 'Tripartite System' from Tarsus immediately replaced the previous suggestions for the classification of the archaeo-logical material, especially from the IIIrd Mill., disregarding Cilicia's peculiar geographic position. The Taurus chain, separating the Cilician plains (Çukurova) from Central Anatolia, forms a barrier which could not be surmounted easily in antiquity, thus causing differences in cultural developments on both sides of the mountains. As we know from the IInd and Ist Mill. BC history as well as classical antiquity, the medieval period, until the beginnings of modern times, Kizzuwatna/Cilicia always tried to keep a high degree

¹⁶ Kj. Werner, *The Megaron During the Aegean and Anatolian Bronze Age*, SIMA 108, Gothenburg 1993

¹⁷ D.A. Slane, *Middle and Late Bronze Age architecture and pottery in Gözlı Kule, Tarsus: A new analysis*, Ph.D., Bryn Mawr 1987

of independence from the powers governing the Central Anatolian plateau¹⁸. In the periods of interest here, it is only in very last centuries(?) or decades of the IIIrd Mill. that contacts between North Syria and Cilicia on one hand and Central Anatolia on the other begin to play a role more than marginal¹⁹.

After H. Goldman's contribution to COWA (1954) and the publication of the Tarsus stratigraphy (1956), the next major work to deal with Anatolian chronology was W. Orthmann's famous dissertation 'Die Keramik der Frühen Bronzezeit aus Inneranatolien' ('The Early Bronze Age Pottery from Central Anatolia'), appeared 1963²⁰, a work that has not been superseded since then.

This study is the an attempt to press all the Central Anatolian pre - IInd - Millennium pottery into the "new"²¹, magic tripartite Tarsus frame of the Early Bronze Age, starting with "EB I". At that time many scholars were still convinced that true Chalcolithic or Neolithic cultures did not exist in Central Anatolia. The question, whether a chronological framework, eventually valid for one site in Cilicia might be (successfully?) adapted to the Central Plateau was not even discussed. A concession to the traditional system developed at Alişar Höyük was the equation (Alişar) Chalcolithic = "EB I". This "EB I" (= Chalcolithic) period includes Alişar M 19 - M 12, Alaca Höyük 9 - 14, and all the (pre-IInd Mill.) material from Büyük Güllücek²².

Orthmann assigned to EB II the Levels 14 and 13 at Kültepe, Alişar Mound 11 - 8 and 14 - 13 Terrace, and also, reluctantly, sherds from Büyükkaya. (Orthmann 1963: 73) In comparison to the heavy stratum claimed for "EB II" in Tarsus this seems to be fairly modest.

Since then no study of comparable size and quality has appeared, and, since the scheme applied by Orthmann harmonized perfectly with the one already established at Tarsus, this tripartite system, now also introduced to Central Anatolia, was given more space in the following editions of Ehrlich's

¹⁸ A. Erzen, Kilikien bis zum Ende der Perserherrschaft, (Diss.) Leipzig - Borna 1940. - P. Desideri - A.M. Jasink, Cilicia. Dall'età di Kizzuwatna alla conquista macedone, Turin 1990. - Cl. Mutafian, La Cilicie au carrefour des empires, Paris 1988

¹⁹ R. Kontani, Relations between Kültepe and Northern Syria during the Third Millennium B.C., BAOM 16 (1995) 109 - 142. Mellink 1989: 319 - 331, esp. 326. T. Özgüç, op. cit., 36-37.

²⁰ W. Orthmann, Die Keramik der Frühen Bronzezeit aus Inneranatolien, Berlin 1963 (=IstF 24).

²¹ A fully developed threefold system, dividing even the Middle and Late Bronze Age into three "equal" parts, worked out by Cl.F.A. Schaeffer in his 'Stratigraphie comparée' from 1948, seems not to have had major effects on the discussion of Anatolian chronology. A similar division can be found in L. Orlin 1970, 219.

²² However, Orthmann, op.cit. 67, is suspicious that the Büyük Güllücek pottery might be earlier than the "developed chalcolithic pottery of the Alişar type" and Yazırhöyük III - IV.

'Chronologies'²³, from where it spread to all parts of this country, without regard to whether or not they can be synchronized with Cilicia.

With the start of the rescue activities in the Keban region excavators working there, with one notable exception, felt obliged to make use of the Tarsus system in that area (cf. recently: K. Schmidt 1996: 7), and, together with the dam constructors it moved down the Euphrates, although in the "Lower Euphrates" valley the fourfold system widely used in neighbouring regions might be easier to work with.

The situation in Anatolia parallels the one we have to cope with in Lower Mesopotamia. After a series of extremely successful excavation campaigns in an area located at the periphery of Babylonia proper, the Diyala region, a chronological scheme was set up - likewise showing strong tendencies towards tripartition - which then immediately was transmitted to the "rest" of the country and beyond, where its applicability is somehow limited. The following statement of P.R.S. Moorey is likewise valid in regard to Anatolia: "Study of the early historic period in Mesopotamia is increasingly hampered by arid discussions of classificatory systems, which are rapidly becoming barriers rather than gateways to understanding"²⁴. However, in Mesopotamia conditions are less dramatic since the Diyala region is not separated from other parts of Babylonia by mountain chains as difficult as the Taurus.

For Anatolia, the role played by the Diyala region in Mesopotamia nowadays is fulfilled by areas much more peripheral in their relation to the centre, Cilicia and the Troad.

Since tripartite systems obviously have not had a strong tradition in Asia Minor before the Tarsus excavations were published it seems to be rewarding to trace the origins of this particular approach towards 'chronology'.

Eutresis: Before H. Goldman started her epoch making excavations at Tarsus she had already dug a major prehistoric site in Greece, Eutresis in Boeotia, from 1924 to 1927, published in 1931²⁵. The chronological framework applied at Eutresis shows already the tripartite division of what has to be regarded as the equivalent of the Anatolian/Cilician Early Bronze Age, namely Early Helladic I - III. The "Middle Helladic" remains at Eutresis never gained the importance of the IIIrd Mill. material.

Yet, Eutresis can by no ways claim to be the birthplace of our 'magic system of tripartition', as it was once called by M. Mellink, or of the broader EB/EH I - III, MB/MH I-II, LB I, IIa, IIb or LH I - III arrangement.

²³ R.W. Ehrich (ed.), *Chronologies in Old World Archaeology* (= COWA), Chicago ²1965, ³1992

²⁴ *Iraq* 41 (1979) 119.

²⁵ H. Goldman, *Excavations at Eutresis in Boeotia*, Cambridge, Mass., 1931.

Aigina: Whether the synchronisms between Crete and the Greek mainland are as strong as Blegen and Wace believed is a question Aegean archaeologists may discuss and should not bother us here further.

Obviously, on the Greek mainland itself the tripartite system as elaborated by Wace and Blegen for the first time, is not as undisputed as it might seem from outside. It is not my intention to dive into those problems at length here, and a few remarks may be enough.

When Raimund Wünsche published the pottery from the famous site of Aigina³¹ - a most prestigious excavation in Greece carried out by various teams from Munich since the last century - he came to the following conclusion:

"Und in der Keramik selbst gab sich für Ägina "the complete break in continuity of civilization", zwischen Früh- und Mittelhelladikum, wie seit Blegen in fast allen Publikationen behauptet, nicht zu erkennen". ("And in the corpus of pottery itself, "the complete break in continuity of civilization", between the Early and Middle Helladic periods, as postulated since Blegen's times in nearly all publications, could not be observed". (Wünsche 1977: 16).

He then continues to comment on the stratigraphy of Lerna, where likewise no interruption of cultural continuity is visible between Early Helladic III and Middle Helladic, whereas Early Helladic III is separated from the preceding levels by a strong destruction horizon³². One of the conclusions of this important contribution reads as follows: "During the whole Early and Middle Helladic periods there can be observed only one distinctive cultural turning point which must be placed between the Early Helladic II and the Early Helladic III periods, according to the terminology presently in use (R. Wünsche 1977: 91)³³.

He is likewise convinced that in Aigina an uninterrupted, continuous development in pottery production can be observed between Early Helladic III and the Middle Helladic period (Wünsche 1977: 92), resulting in a new terminology, especially for the Middle Helladic period, which according to him, has to start with the destruction of the Early Helladic II civilisation (Wünsche 1977: 94 - 95) This view seems to have gained more and more ground in recent years without, however, having resulted in a general revision of an outdated terminology³⁴.

³¹ R. Wünsche, Studien zur äginetischen Keramik der frühen und mittleren Bronzezeit, München - Berlin 1977

³² R. Wünsche 1977, 16: "Dies führt uns zu der Grabung von Lerna, wo sich in der Stratigraphie ebenfalls kein Bruch zwischen FH. III und MH. findet, andererseits dort die FH. III - Epoche vom vorausgehenden Frühhelladikum durch eine starke Brand- und Zerstörungsschicht getrennt wird".

³³ Cf. J. Rutter 1983 and 1995, 654.

³⁴ J.E. Coleman, COWA 1992

Western Anatolia: Returning from this inevitable excursus into the homeland of Cilicia's 'tripartite system' to Anatolia proper, we realize that for many decades only few scholars have attempted to scrutinize the scheme laid out first by H. Goldman and canonized later by W. Orthmann and others.

In a contribution to the X. Türk Tarih Kongresi (1986), which has been widely ignored since then, J. Seeher³⁵, dealing especially with the relations between painted and incised pottery groups of Western Anatolia, was, i.a., able to demonstrate that 'true' chalcolithic painted pottery never really developed a tradition of its own in Northwest Anatolia, always remaining a more or less intrusive element, that means, a chalcolithic period of its own, unmistakably separated from preceding Neolithic, does not exist in that area.

The conclusion of his study sounds fairly clear: "So bleibt als Fazit festzuhalten, daß die Dreistufengliederung Neolithikum - Chalkolithikum - Bronzezeit zumindest in West-anatolien grundsätzlich an den archäologischen Tatsachen vorbeigeht" ("Thus, we have to conclude that at least for Western Anatolia, the tripartite division of Neolithic - Chalcolithic - Early Bronze Age radically ignores the archaeological facts")³⁶. The uninterrupted continuity in pottery 'styles' of West-, Central-, and Eastern Anatolia, as opposed to Tarsus, has recently also been stressed by M. Mellink (TÖA 321).

While this is a rather general statement, other authors have expressed more specific views in recent years.

Northern Anatolia: Outstanding importance for the discussion of the chronological system of the Central Anatolian Early Bronze Age has to be credited to the recent publication of the Dündartepe material by Laurens Thissen³⁷, affecting "Bronze Age" chronology directly. The site had been excavated by Tahsin and Nimet Özgüç as early as 1940 - 1941, but was never adequately published.

Comparing pottery from Dündartepe, İkiztepe, Alışar Höyük, Alaca Höyük and Yazır Höyük - previously all included in Orthmann's Early Bronze Age repertoire - to ceramic assemblages from the Balkans, Varna, Karanovo, Cernavoda III - II, Anza and Vinča, Thissen succeeded in liberating the early levels of the above mentioned sites plus all of the (pre-Hittite) Büyük Güllücek material from the bonds of the tripartite "Korakou - Eutresis - Tarsus system".

³⁵ J. Seeher, *Der Übergang vom Neolithikum zum Chalkolithikum in Nordwestanatolien*, X. TTK, Ankara 1986, Ankara 1990, 57 - 64.

³⁶ J. Seeher 1990, 64. Cf. also J. Mellaart, *AnSt* 14 (1964) 114.

³⁷ L. Thissen, *New Insights in Balkan-Anatolian Connections in the Late Chalcolithic: Old Evidence from the Turkish Black Sea Littoral*, *AnSt* 43 (1993) 207 - 237. For earlier reports see M. Korfmann et al., *Bibliographie* 73; W. Orthmann, 1963: 45 - 47, Pl. 65-66.

He also drew attention to two Karanovo VI/Gumelnitsa figurines from Alishar Höyük³⁸. While Orthmann had positioned the "early" levels (9 - 14) at Alaca Höyük, characterized by incised, excised or pointillé decoration - amongst the typical shapes only the 'fruit stands' should be mentioned (Orthmann 1963: Pl. 40) - into his "Chalkolithikum" (= "FBZ. 1"; Orthmann 1963, 34 - 35.), according to Thissen, those, together with the Büyük Güllücek complex and İkiztepe I have to be paralleled with Karanovo IV and Vinča B₂ - C₂, approximately at the end of the Vth Mill. BCE.

Alishar M 19 - M 15, as well as the Gelveri material³⁹ should be placed towards the middle of the IVth Mill. B.C., contemporary with Karanovo V, while Alishar M 14 - M 12, Alaca Höyük "Later Chalcolithic", İkiztepe I C and Yazırhöyük, running parallel with Karanovo VI and Vinča D, fill the second half of the IV. Mill. (Thissen 1993: 218 - 222).

North Central Anatolia: Even more radical views were brought forward by H. Parzinger, whose proposals for a re-evaluation of the relevant Central Anatolian pottery go far beyond Thissen's. In 1993, contemporary with Thissen's work on Düdartepe, Parzinger had studied the pottery from Büyükkaya⁴⁰ known since the early 50s⁴¹, once hesitantly classified as "EB II" by Orthmann (1963: 45 and 73).

With proper caution he postulated a chronological horizon connecting Vinça A, Karanovo III, Yarımurgaz 0, Iıypınar V, Kanlıtaş and İkiztepe B II 6-3 with Büyük Güllücek, placing them at the beginning of the "Middle Chalcolithic" (Parzinger 1993: 218. Cf. Seeher 1990: 64). Later than Büyük Güllücek he puts the Büyükkaya material, contemporary with Yazılıkaya D I and Yarıkkaya 5, equating Karanovo IV, corresponding to the mature phase of the "Middle Chalcolithic", while Alaca Höyük 14 - 9, Alishar Höyük M 14 - M 12 and Yazır Höyük best represent the "Late Chalcolithic" (Parzinger 1993: 229. Synchronistische Tabelle.) The massive layers of Alishar M 19 - M 15 span the whole of the "Middle Chalcolithic", although he is convinced that occupation at the site must have started much earlier (Parzinger 1993: 218. Cf also J. Yakar 1991: Fig. 126a)

Until very recently all the archaeological assemblages mentioned above were still part of the Cilician "EBA I", a concept which now seems more and more

³⁸ L. Thissen 1993, 217 with reference to OIP 30, 78; Fig. 85 c506 and e1940.

³⁹ U. Esin, Gelveri - Ein Beispiel für die kulturellen Beziehungen zwischen Zentralanatolien und Südosteuropa während des Chalkolithikums, *Anatolica* 19 (1993) 47 - 56.

⁴⁰ H. Parzinger, Zur Zeitstellung der Büyükkaya-Ware: Bemerkungen zur vorbronzezeitlichen Kulturfolge Zentralanatoliens, *Anatolica* 19 (1993) 211 - 229.

⁴¹ R. Hachmann, Vorhethitische Funde von Büyükkaya, in: K. Bittel (ed.), *Boğazköy III. Funde aus den Grabungen 1952 - 1955*, Berlin 1957, 58 - 62.

to loose ground (Cf. also Parzinger 1997: 414 - 417). A considerably higher date for the earlier levels of Alişar had already been proposed by von der Osten in 1952 (Or 22, 336 - 338), unfortunately not accepted at this time (Cf. Orthmann 1963: 95).

The present situation has best been described by R. Gorny⁴² in 1995: "With material traditionally called EB I now being pushed further back into prehistory, we are bereft of a clear ceramic corpus for the EB I period and new candidates for that period are being proposed from the so-called EB II or "Copper Age" materials (Gorny 1995: 78)⁴³.

It remains a question whether we should look actually for material to fill up such a "missing" period, i.e., if we definitely should feel obliged to find something just to fulfill the demands of a system when we are not sure whether it really serves our own needs.

If I were to summarize this paper in a single sentence, I would like to say: the answer to Refik Duru's question, quoted at the beginning, is no.

⁴² R. Gorny, The Alishar Regional Project 1994, *Anatolica* 21 (1995) 65 - 100.

⁴³ One should not necessarily repeat the error of some Mesopotamian archaeologists who felt an obligation to fill an alleged "lacunae" in the likewise tripartite system of the Early Dynastic period of (Lower) Mesopotamia, created by H. Frankfort within and for the Diyala region. The strange effects of those attempts on Mesopotamian chronology can easily be observed in E. Porada et al., *COWA* 1992, 107. Cf. D.M. Matthews, *The Early Glyptic of Tell Brak, Fribourg and Göttingen* 1997, 31.

- M.E. Hall - S.R. Steadman, 1991 Tin and Anatolia: Another Look, JMA 4,1 (1991) 217 - 234.
- B. Hrouda, 1967 Forschungs- und Ausgrabungsergebnisse in Syrien seit 1960, MDOG 98 (1967) 46-54.
- H. Hüryılmaz, 1995 Uşak Arkeoloji Müzesinden Bir Grup "Depas Amphikypellon", in: A. Erkanal et al, eds., I.M. Akyurt - B. Devam Anı Kitabı, Istanbul 1995, 177-188.
- R. Kontani, 1995 Relations between Kültepe and Northern Syria during the Third Millennium B.C., BAOM 16 (1995) 109 - 142.
- M. Korfmann, 1983 Red Cross Bowl. Angeblicher Leittyp für Troja V, in: R.M. Boehmer - H. Hauptmann (eds.), Beiträge zur Altertumskunde Kleinasiens, Festschrift für K. Bittel, Mainz 1983, 291 - 297.
- M. Korfmann et al., 1994 Anatolien in der Frühen und Mittleren Bronzezeit, Teil I, Frühbronzezeit, TAVO Beih., Reihe B 73/1, Wiesbaden 1994
- J. Mellaart, 1974 Western Anatolia, Beycesultan and the Hittites, in: E. Akurgal - U.B. Alkım (eds.), Mansel'e Armağan - Mélanges Mansel, Ankara 1974, 493 - 526.
- M. Mellink, 1962 The Prehistory of Syro-Cilicia, BiOr 19 (1962) 219 - 226.
- M. Mellink, 1989 Anatolian Foreign Relations of Tarsus in the Early Bronze Age, in: K. Emre et al. (eds.), TÖA, Ankara (1989) 319-331.
- M. Mellink, 1992 Anatolian Chronology, in: R.W. Ehrich (ed.), Chronologies in Old World

- Archaeology (=COWA), Chicago
²1965/1971, 101-131; ³1992, 207 - 219.
- M. Mellink, 1993
The Anatolian South Coast in the Early Bronze Age: the Cilician Perspective, in: M. Frangipane et al. (eds.), *Between the Rivers and over the Mountains, Archaeologica Anatolica et Mesopotamica Alba Palmieri Dedicata*, Rom 1993, 495 - 508.
- Cl. Mutafian, 1988
La Cilicie au carrefour des empires, Paris 1988
- R.A. McNeil, 1975
Helladic Prehistory Through the Looking Glass, *Historia* 24 (1975) 385 - 401.
- D. Oates, 1977
The Excavations at Tell Brak, 1976, Iraq 39 (1977) 233 - 244.
- D. Oates - J. Oates, 1991
Excavations at Tell Brak 1990-91, Iraq 53 (1991) 127 - 145.
- L.L. Orlin, 1970
Assyrian Colonies in Cappadocia, The Hague 1970
- W. Orthmann, 1963
Die Keramik der Frühen Bronzezeit aus Inner-anatolien, *IstF* 24, Berlin 1963
- H.H. von der Osten, 1953
Die urartäische Töpferei aus Van und die Möglichkeiten ihrer Einordnung in die anatolische Keramik II, *Or* 22 (1953) 329 - 354.
- T. Özgüç, 1986
New Observations on the Relationship of Kültepe with Southeast Anatolia and North Syria during the Third Millennium B.C., in: J.V. Canby et al. (eds.), *Ancient Anatolia: (= Fs M. Mellink)*, Madison, Wisconsin, 1986, 31- 47.

- A. Özten, 1989 A Group of Early Bronze Age Pottery from the Konya and Niğde Region, in: K. Emre et al. (eds.), TÖA, Ankara 1989, 407 - 418.
- H. Parzinger, 1993 Zur Zeitstellung der Büyükkaya-Ware: Bemerkungen zur vorbronzezeitlichen Kulturfolge Zentralanatoliens, *Anatolica* 19 (1993) 211 - 229.
- H. Parzinger, 1997 Review of R.W. Ehrich, *COWA* 31992, *Germania* 75 (1997) 414 - 417.
- J. Rutter, 1983 Fine Gray-Burnished Pottery of the Early Helladic III Period. The Ancestry of Gray Minyan, *Hesperia* 52 (1983) 327 - 353.
- J. Rutter, 1995 The Pottery of Lerna IV, Princeton, NJ, 1995
- Cl.F.A. Schaeffer, 1948 *Stratigraphie Comparée et Chronologie de l'Asie Occidentale (III^e et II^e millénaires)*, London 1948
- K. Schmidt, 1996 Norşuntepe. Kleinfunde I. *Archaeologia Euphratica* I, Mainz 1996
- J. Seeher, 1990 Der Übergang vom Neolithikum zum Chalkolithikum in Nordwestanatolien, X. TTK Ankara 1986, Ankara 1990, 57 - 64.
- D.A. Slane, 1987 Middle and Late Bronze Age architecture and pottery in Gözlü Kule, Tarsus: A new analysis, Ph.D. Bryn Mawr 1987
- Sh.R. Steadman, 1995 Prehistoric Regional Interaction in Anatolia and the Balkans: An Overview, *BASOR* 299/300 (1995) 13 - 32.

- Sh.R. Steadman, 1996
Isolation or Interaction: Prehistoric Cilicia and the Fourth Millennium Uruk Expansion, *JMA* 9/2 (1996) 131 - 165.
- D. Sürenhagen, 1990
Ausgrabungen in Tall Mullā Matar 1989, *MDOG* 122 (1990) 125 - 152.
- D. Symington, 1986
Remarks on the Tarsus Late Bronze Age Pottery in the Adana Museum, III. Araştırma Sonuçları Toplantısı (Ankara 20-24 Mayıs 1985), Ankara 1986, 279 - 285.
- Tarsus II
= Goldman 1956
- L. Thissen, 1993
New Insights in Balkan - Anatolian Connections in the Late Chalcolithic: Old Evidence from the Turkish Black Sea Littoral, *AnSt* 43 (1993) 207 - 237.
- A.J.B. Wace - C.W. Blegen, 1918
The Pre-Mycenean Pottery of the Mainland, *BSA* 22 (1916-1918) 175-188.
- H. Weippert, 1991
Metallzeitalter und Kulturepochen, *ZDPV* 107 (1991) 1 - 23.
- R. Wünsche, 1977
Studien zur äginetischen Keramik der frühen und mittleren Bronzezeit, München - Berlin 1977
- J. Yakar, 1991
Prehistoric Anatolia, Tel Aviv 1991