

## KISALTMALAR

- AJA ..... American Journal of Archaeology  
 AO ..... Archiv Orientalni  
 CVA ..... Corpus Vasorum Antiquorum.  
 Desborough, Mycenaean V. R. d'A. Desborough, the Last Mycenaean and  
 Their Successors, Oxford 1964.  
 JHS ..... Journal of Hellenic Studies.  
 JKF ..... Jahrbuch für Kleinasiatische Forschung.  
 Katalog ..... Y. Boysal, Katalog der Vasen des Museums in Bodrum,  
 Ankara 1969 (baskıda).  
 KBO ..... Keilschrifttexte aus Boghazköi.  
 MDOG ..... Mitteilungen der Deutschen Orientgesellschaft.  
 MVAG ..... Mitteilungen der vorderasiatischen Gesellschaft.  
 Stubbings, Levant ..... Frank H. Stubbings, Mycenaean Pottery from the  
 Levant, Cambridge, 1951.  
 Troy ..... Carl W. Blegen, Cedric G. Boulter, John L. Caskey,  
 Marion Rawson, Troy, 1958.

<sup>11</sup> MDOG 53 (1954) s. 17-21.

<sup>12</sup> Clavis 13 (1949) s. 212 v. 5.

<sup>13</sup> Goetze, Kleinasiat. 2, s. 172.

<sup>14</sup> F. Sommer, op. cit. s. 377.

<sup>15</sup> B. Hrosvy, AO I (1909), s. 293 v. 4.

<sup>16</sup> D. Page, History and Hittite Hist. s. 13.

<sup>17</sup> JKF I (1926-27) s. 154-155 v. 1. n. 10.

<sup>18</sup> K. Boed, Grazijski, s. 70.

<sup>19</sup> Tavşanlıova kazılarında III. Bronz Çağı, s. 67-68 (1961) s. 67-68.

## NEW EXCAVATIONS IN CARIA

Yusuf BOYSAL

Recent excavations conducted at various sites belonging to the Mycenaean - Protogeometric periods in Caria have yielded some very important finds which can shed considerable light over such archaeologically and historically absence phases of this region as the second half of the second millenium and the beginning of the first millenium. These finds are also closely related with the problem of determining the territories of Arzawa and Ahhijawa. In this study our purpose is to review recent excavations made particularly at Müskebi, Çömlekçi and Dirmil, and evaluate the findings.

### M ü s k e b i (Ortakent)

We already described our finds in Müskebi village of Bodrum in 1962 and our work on the Mycenaean Necropolis nearby in our preliminary report 'Müskebi Kazısı 1963 Kısa Raporu'<sup>1</sup>. The excavations conducted by the author at this site were financed jointly by the Ministry of Education, Dil ve Tarih-Coğrafya Fakültesi of the University of Ankara, and the Archaeological Institute of Aegean University. These excavations continued four seasons during the period between 1963 - 1966, work generally starting about the beginning of September and lasting until the middle of October each year. Abdullah Yaylalı, Mehmet Eskiöğlü, Fahri Işık, Turgut Batur, students of the Archaeology Department of Ankara University also participated in the excavations.

Our excavations were continued to the gardens of Hüseyin Akgün and Hasan Canbakan of Müskebi and to the path dividing these two. This is in a valley at the foot of the Pazar Mountain approximately 1 Km. to the north from the center of the village<sup>2</sup>. The valley extends broadening as far as the sea. The Bodrum - Yalıkavak road is only 150 meters to our excavation site and it turns to the north there. As our work progressed we noticed that slightly sloping ground were chosen for the graves.

<sup>1</sup> G. Bass, AJA 67 (1963), pp. 353 ff. Y. Boysal, Belleten XXXI (1967), pp. 67 ff.

<sup>2</sup> Archaeology 17 (1964), pp. 235 ff.

# NEW EXCAVATIONS IN GARIA

R. V. YANBOYSALIK

Recent excavations conducted at various sites belonging to the Mycenaean - Hittite period in Garia have yielded some very important finds which cast considerable light over such archaeologically and historically important phases of this region as the second half of the second millennium and the beginning of the first millennium. These finds are also closely related with the problem of determining the territories of the Hittites and the Phrygians. In this study our purpose is to review recent excavations made particularly at Mäsközü, Çamlıca and Damlıca, and evaluate the findings.

(Received 1961)

**Mäsközü (Çamlıca)**  
We already described our finds in Mäsközü village of Bodrum in 1952 and our work on the Mycenaean necropolis nearby in our preliminary report Mäsközü Kazıları. The excavations conducted by the Ankara site were financed jointly by the Ministry of Education, Dil ve Tarih-Coğrafya Fakültesi of the University of Ankara, and the Archaeological Institute of Aegean University. These excavations continued four seasons during the period between 1955 - 1960, work generally starting about the beginning of September and lasting until the middle of October each year. Abdullah Yalçın, Mehmet Eskiözlü, Fahri İsk. Turut, Barut, students of the Archaeology Department of Ankara University also participated in the excavations.

Our excavations were continued to the gardens of Hüseyin Akın and Hasan Çankarın of Mäsközü and to the path dividing these two. This is in a valley at the foot of the Pazır Mountain approximately 1 Km. to the north from the center of the village.<sup>2</sup> The valley extends broadening as far as the sea. The Bodrum - Yalçın road is only 150 meters to our excavation site and it turns to the north there. As our work progressed we noticed that slightly sloping ground were chosen for the graves.

<sup>1</sup> Ö. Bas, AJA 67 (1957) pp. 252 ff. Y. Boyar, Bulletin XXXI (1957) pp. 67 ff.  
<sup>2</sup> Archaeology 17 (1964) pp. 252 ff.

From this point of view two regions on the slope of high ground, one along the east and west sides of Hasan Canbakan's oak plantation and the second the area of Hüseyin Akgün's house in the north-west part of his orchard, were both ideally situated for cemeteries. However, it was not possible to establish whether there was in fact a slope and, associated with it, a series of graves in any kind of order in the region of the path between the land of these two men. The continuous removal here of soil by the villagers has resulted in a confusing situation. For these reasons, therefore, it was impossible to outline the type and level of one group of the graves in this region. Letters have been assigned to each area in order to distinguish the three cemetery areas. A is the area of the path, B the orchard of Hüseyin Akgün and C is the west part of the oak-Plantation of Hasan Canbakan.

Area A : This section as was explained above, lies directly north-west of Müskebi, on the path leading to village orchards and fields. This area was much disturbed for reasons as given above; some tombs had been opened, collapsed and partially destroyed. It was easy for us to distinguish from the virgin soil, which is white, the sides of the trenches which had been cut when the search for tombs was made, on account of the colour of the soil which had been used to refill the inside of partially destroyed graves. Some tombs, when one looks at the profiles, are easily recognizable as pear -or oven- shaped (Pl. I, II). In this area are located tombs 1-5, 28 and 30-41.

Area B : (Pl. III) as was stated above, the tombs in this area came to light in a single row, on the east and south sides of the high ground on a steep slope in the north-west part of the orchard. In order to conform to the slope of the land, the tombs on the east side have their entrance facing east and those on the south side have it facing south. Thus, it may be said that no sort of tradition was employed in the use of an invariable direction for the orientation of the tombs and the siting of the entrance, and that in the construction of the cemetery an attempt was made to conform to the slope and nature of the ground. In this area (B), because the surface of the ground had not been deeply eroded, it was possible to come upon tombs which had not been disturbed. Graves were laid out in series, side by side, with an interval between them varying, usually, from two to three metres; these are graves 6-16, 18, 20, 21 and 43-47.

Area C : The tombs in this region occupied an area of sloping ground on the west side of the oak-plantation referred to above (Pl. IV). These tombs, like those in area B, were orientated according to the slope of the ground and arranged in series, side by side at fixed intervals. Here, however, because of the excessive erosion and disturbance in the majority of tombs, the upper part has been destroyed. For this reason, in the course of our work, only the lower part of the tombs could be recovered. At the same time, the roots of trees in the west part of the oak-plantation had caused as with Tomb 27, damage to certain tombs and consequently the breaking of the pottery in the tombs (pl. VII). As a result, it was here impossible to recover completely the ground measurements of the tombs and dromoi. Further, during our work in the north side of area (C) it was impossible to discover a cemetery. However, a few sherds and bones came to light. The presence of these sherds persuaded us to consider the following possibilities: that tombs were present in this area in the form that we know and have been destroyed in the course of time; that this area was the scene of a different kind of burial; or that some bones and broken pottery belonging to earlier burials were taken out when tombs were re-used and reburied here or simply thrown away. The tombs found in this area (C) are nos. 22-27, 29, 38 and 48.

Theoretically the Múskebi Mycenaean tombs consist of two parts: a dromos and a burial chamber. Between these a distinct entrance passage was also found. This type of grave is well known in places where Mycenaean culture has been studied<sup>3</sup>. In order to give a general idea of the plans of the Múskebi tombs, a section of grave no. 16 is attached (Pl. V).

Dromos (Pl. VI). The dromos in the Múskebi graves is in the form of a long thin trench leading steeply down into the burial chamber. In some cases however, where the dromos is not in a place where the terrain slopes, the trench shows little difference between its length and width, as in the case of tomb 39. The Dromoi situated on the sloping terrain, as the ones in the area A and B, get deeper towards the burial chamber and, due to the slope, attain this depth very easily. The dromos measurements of the various graves at Múskebi are:

<sup>3</sup> W. Tylour, *The Myceneans*, fig. 30. *Archaeologia* 82, fig. 9.

Tomb 16, dromos, length: 2.35 m.; width: 1.10 m.; height at door:  
1. 30 m.

Tomb 39, dromos, length: 2.05 m.; width: 1.53 m.; height at door:  
3.30 m.

(Here the dromos, which is at right angles to the floor, is in the shape  
of a hollow).

Tomb 43, dromos, length: 3.30 m.; width: 0.90 m.; height at door:  
1.50 m.

Tomb 44, dromos, length: 4.10 m.; width: 0.80 m.; height at door:  
1. 55m.

Entrance : The passage from the dromos to the burial chamber is through a deep hole which might be called a "door" (Pl. VI, Fig. 7). The average width of the entrance on the side of the dromos is 0.50-0.70 m.; height, 0.70-0.90 m. but in the case of some graves these measurements may be either greater or smaller. In general, the door gets slightly narrower towards the top causing a difference of 0.10-0.20 m. between the bottom and the top measurements. The distance between the dromos and the burial chamber varies between 0.50 and 0.70 m.; and in the entrance of some tombs this depth is greater.

After the corpse was placed in the grave, the entrance was closed with stones (Pl. VI, Fig. 6). The entrances that were not very long and wide were thus able to be closed by a single course of stones, placed one on top of the other; the deeper and the wider ones with a hole at the bottom were closed with several rows of stones of many sizes. These stones were not made into a special type of course for closing the entrance and were not worked but were collected from the neighbourhood. The average measurements of the stones are : 0.20 × 0.25 × 0.35 m. The entrance, like the burial chamber and the dromos, was plastered. In some cases, this entrance or opening has been closed with masonry in which the mortar is of the same quality as the plaster.

The burial chamber : The burial chamber was dug into earth, and thus consisted of an enclosed cavity. The floor of this cavity was in some cases rectangular, in others almost a circle. The ceiling itself was, roughly speaking, in the form of a dome. When the ground plan

of the tomb was rectangular, the four sides of the chamber continued perpendicular to the floor up to a certain height, where the perpendicularity was gradually lost and the chamber formed a low dome. When the ground-plan was circular or elliptical, the chamber took the shape of an oven.

In order to provide some idea of the dimensions of the Múskebi tombs, the measurements of some are given here :

Tomb 5 (Area A) : height 1.80 m., diameter of floor 1.75 m. Tomb 39 (Area A) : height 2.50 m., sides of floor 2.30 (east), 2.60 (west), 2.47 (north), 3.00 (south). Tomb 12 (Area B) : Floor, 2.40 × 1.80 m., height not established (owing to collapse of roof). Tomb 43 (Area B) : height 1.25 m.; floor 1.30 × 1.40 m. Tomb 46 (Area B) : (one of the smallest found) : height 0.85 m.; floor 0.75 × 0.65 m. Tomb 38 (Area C) : the exact height of the chamber could not be established owing to partial collapse of the ceiling; existing height 2.50 m.; diameter of floor (which is almost circular) *ca.* 3.40 m.

In general, floors in the tombs were noticeably hard and on some there is even a coating of plaster. On this hard area was observed a soft patch, varying in thickness between 0.10-0.15 m. and it was on this soft earth that the corpse was laid. From the point of view of colour this soft soil did not differ from the soil of the place where the tomb was located but it was distinguishable from it by its grainy nature which recalls that of fine sand.

In the tomb chamber, plaster was observed particularly on the surfaces at the sides. Essentially, as we have mentioned earlier, the dromos and entrance were, in most cases, plastered. The plaster was easily made by mixing the local earth with water and on present evidence no other material was added to the mixture. When the local earth is mixed with water, the fine grains agglutinate easily and well; for this reason the same earth, even today, is used as plaster in the surrounding villages. Most probably, the ceremonies over the corpse provided the time necessary for the plaster of the tomb chamber to dry out, if only partially.

In order to give some idea of the burial practice and other features in the Múskebi tombs, some details and observations of graves 6, 15, 22, 39 and 45 are given here as they were noted down during the course of excavation.

Tomb 6 (Area B) : Since the upper part (which resembles a dome) had collapsed, the earth inside the burial chamber was removed from above. The finds came to light 1 m. below the surface of the ground. As can be seen in the illustration, in the tomb was a skeleton, complete with skull; the only grave-object was a pyxis (Catalogue<sup>4</sup> pl. 25 no. 2) (Pl. VIII). The measurements of the floor, which was elliptical in shape, were 2 m. along the line of orientation of the skeleton and 1.70 m. from the stones in the door to the opposite side. The bones from this and the other tombs have been published by the anthropologist, Dr. Refakat Çiner, who took part in the 1963 campaign<sup>5</sup>.

Tomb 15 (Area B) : In front of the tomb was a dromos, 1.80 m. long, 1.10 m. wide with a hole 1 m. in diameter in front of the door. The upper part of the dromos is 0.15 m. wider than its floor. On the burial chamber side, the dromos wall is in the form of a rectangle with the entrance in the centre. The door is at a point 0.20 m. below the surface of the ground and 0.20 m. from the sides. Being 0.45 m. in length, the level of the door is about 0.20 m. below that of the dromos and at the same level as the floor of the burial chamber. The chamber was filled two-thirds full with earth, with one third empty. We started the work of emptying it from the top. First on the west side of the door, five pots were discovered in a group; it was seen that their tops were at a level 0.90 m. below the ceiling. Of these, two were jugs (Catalogue pl. 18 : 6,17:5), one was a bowl (Catalogue pl. 23:1), one a vase with three vertical handles (Catalogue, pl. 3:4) and one, a tall-bodied type of stirrup jar (Catalogue, pl. 8:2). Separately, on the east side of the door, was a pyxis (Catalogue, pl. 25:5). In front of the door, half a skull was found belonging to the body which had been placed in the tomb; a pile of bones was also found, scattered in an east-west line. The uppermost layer of bones was located 0.05-0.10 m. below the top of the pottery. On a majority of the bones there was a black discoloration; some were simply carbonized. Beside the bones a circle of gold in the form of a ring was found. The depth of the tomb was approximately 1.10 m.

<sup>4</sup> Y. Boysal, *Katalog der Vasen im Museum in Bodrum, Ankara* 1969.

<sup>5</sup> R. Çiner, *Antropoloji I*, No. 2, p. 57.

Area A Tomb 39 : one of the biggest of the Múskebi tombs. The bones in the tomb belonged to the skeletons of two persons. Of these, the one on the NW side had been burnt. The other on the south side, near to the edge, was unburnt. The skeletons were found at the level of the floor of the tomb. In tomb 39 were : one jug (Catalogue, pl. 19:3), one jar with three vertical handles (Catalogue, pl. 3:2), two kylikes (Catalogue, pl. 26:4,5) and one stirrup jar.

Area C Tomb 22 (Pl. VII, Fig. 9) : The dromos was found nearly intact. The door, however, was partially destroyed and the blocking-stones were not preserved. On the side of the dromos the tomb was two-thirds lost and on the other side one-third. Only the lower portion of the tomb and the finds there could be recovered. The ground-plan of the tomb was approximately rectangular and on the side where the pottery was laid out was 1.95 m. long; on the other side, however, it was 1.85 m. In the tomb, the sides begin to rise from the floor itself. The presence of plaster could not be established. Fragments of long-bones and teeth were found<sup>6</sup>. Three cups (Catalogue, pl. 21:3,4,6), one bowl (Catalogue, pl. 23:6), three horizontal-handled jars (Catalogue, pl. 5:1, 3, 4), two vertical-handled jars (Catalogue, pl. 1:3, 2:2) and two miscellaneous pots (Catalogue, pl. 31:2, 32:1) came to light in this tomb.

Area B, Tomb 45 : came to light complete. For the purpose of giving an idea of the slope of the ground at this point, the length of the dromos both horizontally from the point at which it starts and the actual length along the floor are given here : the former is 3.55 m. and the second 3.70 m. This area at present has a very gentle slope. After cleaning, the dromos was revealed intact; the sides were plastered and the floor was hard. On the outside the lower width of the door is 0.65 m, the upper 0.50 m. and the depth 0.60 m; the doorway was walled up (with stones). The entrance was plastered. The height of the tomb chamber was 1.60 m., the width of the floor (which is rectangular in plan) was 1.60 m. (from door to back) and the length 2.00 m. There was an unfilled space at the top of the chamber of 0.80 m. but the remainder of the tomb was filled with earth. The sides of the tomb chamber were sloped gently inwards

<sup>6</sup> Op. cit. p. 57.

to a height of 0.65 m. from the floor; thereafter the angle was increased in order to form the dome. The first find in the tomb, a stirrup Jar, was seen 1.10 m. below the ceiling (Catalogue, pl. 10:1). The distance between the chamber floor and the upper part of the stirrup jar was 0.45 m. At 0.20 m. below the stirrup jar four pots were found, laid out in a series, side by side, leading straight to the door. These pots consisted of : one single handled jug (Catalogue, pl. 17:7), a miniature pot with horizontal handles (Catalogue pl. 6:1), a second small jug (Catalogue pl. 17:8) and a globular stirrup jar (Catalogue pl. 12:1). The sixth find from the tomb, a single-handled cup, lay in the north-east corner of the chamber, to the right of the door and 0.15 m. below the first stirrup jar (Catalogue, pl. 21:1). The skeleton which was found in this tomb came from the exact middle of the side to the left of the doorway. The skeleton lay 1.45 m. below the top of the chamber. The skull had disintegrated. The long-bones were, on the whole, well-preserved. In addition, a weight made of baked-clay and similar objects were found in the tomb.

When the upper sections of the chambers were closed, we were not able to take photographs to show the location of the finds inside the tomb. However, we cleaned from the top those tombs where the upper section was collapsed and thus it was possible to take photographs which give the location of the objects found in them. Information concerning the location of skeletons, bones and pottery is given by tombs 6 (Pl. VIII), 11 (Pl. IX, Fig. 11), 13 (Pl. IX, 12), 16 (Pl. V), 22 (Pl. VII, Fig. 9) and 27 (Pl. VII, Fig. 8), photographs of which I give here. The location of materials found in tombs which are intact and well-preserved is shown by the drawings of tombs 32 and 34 (Pl. X, and Pl. XI).

### ÇÖMLEKÇİ

In the summer of 1967, we became extremely interested in the finds which we saw in the Bodrum Museum and which belonged to the Sub-Mycenaean period. We learnt from the Museum officials that the pottery had come sometime earlier from the village of Çömlekçi. In September we went to the village in company with the Director of the Bodrum Museum, Halûk Elbe, and we investigated the

area where the finds had come to light. The village of Çömlekçi lies approximately half-way between Milas and Bodrum, 2 km. to the east of the modern road, on a hill among olive groves. The finds were made in fields about two km. south of the village, in an area called Kadınören. Usually the soil of this region is hard and white but on the surface there is a layer, about 0.30-0.40 m. thick, which is cultivated and which is slightly different in colour. Here, in the fields of Halil İbrahim, two tombs came to light, opened; another tomb was found in another field further to the south. From the pottery which was discovered, it was learnt that these opened tombs belonged to the Sub-Mycenaean period; it was thus confirmed that the pottery mentioned above in the Bodrum Museum came from here.

After obtaining the necessary permission<sup>7</sup>, in August 1968, we began work in the necropolis in the Kadınören region to which we have briefly referred above. The excavation staff under the direction of Dr. Yusuf Boysal consisted of Çetin Şahin, archaeologist, Turgut Batur, archaeologist (who joined the excavations later) and five students. As a start to our work, we began by cleaning the tombs which had been opened the previous year by villagers in search of treasure. The letters A, B, C were given to the tombs in the field of Halil İbrahim. In tomb B a small basket-handled side-spouted jar was found during our cleaning operations. In the north-west corner of the same field we cleared out another tomb (D) which had already been opened and which seemed to be circular in plan.

This year's work was principally concerned with the south side of the same field and here nine tombs were discovered and opened (Pl. XII). Of these, nos. 1, 3, 4, 7 and 8 produced between one (tomb 3) and five (no. 8. Pl. XIII, Fig. 18) objects; nos. 2, 5 and 11 produced nothing. On the west of the area where we excavated, in a field belonging to a different owner, another tomb (Tomb 10, Pl. XVII) was found and dug. It was shaped like a well and was about 3 m. distant from tombs 7 and 8. The level of the ground where the tomb was found is about 1.50 m. higher than the level of the field where the cemetery described above is located. On the property of Enver Erkan,

<sup>7</sup> I here thank the General Directorate of Antiquities and Museums for this permission.

ca. 100 m. north of Tomb D, referred to above, we dug a circular-shaped tomb, lying beside Tomb E, which had been opened.

Tomb Types : On the basis of plan and shape, it is possible to distinguish two main types 1) rectangular, 2) circular.

1) Rectangular : Apart from the smallest examples of this type (Tombs 2 and 11) the walls were built of stone. The size of the stones were: along the face of the wall ca. 0.10 thick and 0.30 m. wide; inside the wall 0.30 m deep (on average). Thickness of wall : this varied between 0.35 m. 0.60 m. (Tomb 7) and 0.15-0.40 m. (Tomb 3). The same measurements are true for stones forming walls a single stone thick.

The tombs vary in size. The biggest (tomb 9) measures (at the inner face) 1.20 m. on the east, 1.37 m. on the west, 2.44 m. on the south and 2.64 m. on the north (Pl. XIV). In the best preserved section the height of the walls is 1.23 m. above the floor.

In one of the medium sized tombs (no. 1) the measurements are : 0.92 m. on the east, 0.98 m. on the west, 1.02 m. on the south and 1.11 m. on the north. The height of the wall where it was still intact was up to 0.80 m. high (Pl. XIII, Fig. 17).

One of the smallest tombs (Tomb 11) measures 0.45 m. on the east, 0.46 m. on the west, 0.36 m. on the north and 0.34 m. on the south. The height of the walls varied between 0.34-0.40 m. This tomb was found intact and the cover-stones were discovered *in situ* (Pl. XV. Fig. 20).

As in Tombs 3, 4, C and 9 (Pl. XIV), the floor in some tombs was covered with slabs while in others it was simply earth. Some of these rectangular tombs were divided into two levels by stone-slabs laid horizontally (Pl. XIII. Fig. 17) close to the floor.

In general the objects in the tombs came from the lower section. In the small tombs nos. 2 and 11, the walls were constructed of stone-slabs set vertically into the ground. In tomb 11 a course of small stones was added in order to raise the level of the east and south blocks.

In tomb 9 the skeleton was found on a layer of large stone slabs. This layer of stones covered only the upper half of the floor of the tomb (pl. XIV).

2) Circular Tombs : Three tombs of this type were found : one, which had been opened, in the fields of Halil İbrahim (Pl. XV. Fig. 21), two in the property of Enver Erkan. The upper parts of these had with time been eroded away and destroyed by ploughing. The height of the upper level of the walls as preserved above the ground varies between 0.30 m. and 0.60 m. No idea, therefore, can be given of the height of these circular tombs. The width, however, can be given as up to 3 m. As in other tombs, walls were built with roughly dressed stones. For finds, Tomb 6 was the richest; it produced a fibula and footed vase (Pl. XVI). Two others (Pl. XV. Fig. 21), both of them opened and destroyed, produced not a single object. From the preserved sections of the walls it was seen that the stone courses sloped progressively inwards towards the top and thus can be thought of as belonging to the type of tomb with a vaulted ceiling.

Tomb No. 11 which lies approximately 3 m. west of tombs 7 and 8 will be described here at length on account of its peculiar features. The tomb is well-shaped, the upper level is up to 1.50 m. higher than the level of the tombs in the fields of Halil İbrahim. Nevertheless, despite the loss, for this reason, of the cover-stones, we are of the opinion that the tomb has come out more or less complete. In plan the tomb is ellipse-shaped, broadening out towards the base. The diameter at the base is 1.27 m. max., 1.20 m. min.; at the top, 1.12 m. max. 0.95 m. min. In the upper part of the tomb sherds of a pointed-base amphora came to light. We cannot give, at the moment, a reason for their occurrence here and we have been unable to find the time to devote to the pottery. In our future researches we will come back to the problem of these sherds and will attempt to decide if they were put here at a later date or if they belong to the period of the tomb. At 1.05 m. depth and 0.35 m. below the neck of the tomb a few small bone fragments were encountered and 0.90 m. deeper a stone slab was found covering very nearly the whole floor. As in other tombs it was here that finds were made, below the stone slab (Catalogue, pl. 34 : 23 and pl. 35 : 6).

Burial practice : only in tomb no. 9 did a complete skeleton come to light : two skulls and apparently other human bones. For the moment we have no definite idea about the type of burial. In other tombs very few fragments of bone were encountered; in tombs 3,4 and 11 not a single piece of bone was found. In tomb 2 small bone fragments,

possibly burnt, were discovered. It would perhaps be better to call tomb 5 a "hearth" because there is no wall at the narrow front which faces east; this side is open (pl. XII. Fig. 16). To judge from the ashes and the presence of blackened stones, it is assumed that some operation connected with fire took place here. Various hypotheses come to mind. Was this place the scene of burial by cremation? Did any kind of act connected with fire take place here? In the coming years in our future work we believe the answers to this and similar questions will be found.

### ASSARLIK AND DIRMIL

Assarlık is in the neighbourhood of Bodrum where towards the end of the last century Mr. Newton and, later, W. B. Paton carried out researches. The area is in the vicinity of the modern Karatoprak near Myndos. The tombs which have been discovered here begin, on the evidence of the objects found, in the Sub-mycenaean phase and continue down to the Geometric period<sup>8</sup>. These tombs are essentially of the same type; some are rectangular (A, B), others circular in plan (D, E); others are distinguished one from the other by such minor differences as the presence of a dromos. One of these distinctions is the presence on the top of the tombs of a mound resembling a tumulus. In these tombs, as we have seen in earlier periods, burning and interment were both practised at the same time.

Of the discoveries at Assarlık, the objects found in tomb 'o' are possibly the oldest. Among these, there is a stirrup-jar, a pot which more than others possesses a special feature rather easier to date. I think that this vase, particularly from its raised conical base, could belong to a late date in the Sub-mycenaean phase. It makes very little difference, from the point of view of time, if this pot be assigned to the end of Sub-Mycenaean as Stubbings says<sup>9</sup> or to the transition from Sub-Mycenaean to Proto-Geometric as Desborough says<sup>10</sup>. To date this vase to the middle of the 11th century fits in with both views. The positive determination of the date of manufacture of the stirrup jar

<sup>8</sup> Stubbings, *Levant*, p. 23. V. R. d'A. Desborough, *Protogeometric Pottery*, p. 219.

<sup>9</sup> Stubbings, *Levant*, p. 23.

<sup>10</sup> V. R. d'A. Desborough, *Protogeometric Pottery*, p. 219.

and the askos which was found with it in the same tomb depends on the continuation of our work, begun last year, in the Çömlekçi necropolis and an increase in the number of finds made.

Now, however, we can say that among the Sub-Mycenaean finds from Çömlekçi there is no vase which attempts as conical a shape as the stirrup jar from Assarlık. The Çömlekçi necropolis now shows that in the Sub-Mycenaean phase in Caria the local pottery was in a position to produce special characteristics. Perhaps in that case, there is a real difference of opinion as to whether Desborough's Assarlık settlers came from Attica in the transition from Sub-Mycenaean to Protogeometric or in the early Protogeometric period and brought with this pottery the practice of cremation<sup>11</sup>. In the last few years, both at Müskebi and Çömlekçi, work has shown that in the region of the Carian coast there are settlements going back into earlier times and that their traditions passed over into later periods.

The Village of Dirmil lies about 20 km. north-west of Bodrum. Here in 1962 a tomb was discovered by the villagers (pl. XVIII-XX); the pottery from the tomb was taken to Bodrum. G. Bass<sup>12</sup> who was among the first to see the material and the site, presented to the archaeological world the first information concerning these finds. In 1963 Professor Ekrem Akurgal led an expedition which carried out cleaning inside the tomb and investigations in the vicinity<sup>13</sup>. This tomb which, on the basis of the previous finds (Catalogue pl. 37: 1, 3;

<sup>11</sup> Op. cit. pp. 220-221.

<sup>12</sup> AJA 67 (1963), pp. 357-361.

<sup>13</sup> During the excavations conducted at Dirmil in 1963 a rectangular pit of 1.40 m depth was discovered on the ground level of the tomb carved into the rock. The width of this pit on the dromos side is 1.40 m and its length is 1.85 m. However, the width gets less on higher levels, narrowing down to 0.92 m. on the dromos side and to 0.82 m on the other side. The clay sarcophagus placed in this pit measures 0.62m. x 1.70 m., with an inside depth of 0.55 m. The width of the stone wall that is set between the dromos and the tomb room, blocking its entrance, is 0.60 m. The height of the tomb room is 2.40 m., the width of its floor is 2.20 m. The opening that is on top of the tomb is about 1.00 m wide and it is blocked with stones. The width of the dromos is 0.90 m. It is not possible to determine the exact length. The tomb was built by carving three meters into the rock. Apparently the dromos extended a little further on and there it was terminated by a stone wall. Whether this wall was circling the whole tomb or it was built later for other purposes I am not able to say.

pl. 38: 1-4) and the skyphos found in the course of this work, belongs to the Protogeometric period and shows a strong resemblance to Tomb A which had been found much earlier at Assarlık<sup>14</sup>; this similarity is based on the rectangular ground plan, the presence of a dromos, the narrowing towards the top of the tomb-chamber, and finally on the building stones which recall the stone cap closing the top of the tomb. However, such features as the wall-technique and the presence of a rectangular pit lined with baked clay, which was found during the latest work below the floor level of the tomb and which took the place of a grave, make distinctions which are striking between the tombs (pl. XVIII).

#### NEW MYCENAEAN FINDS ALONG THE AEGEAN COAST

As has become known, in 1963 Mycenaean pottery came to light in an area in front of the church of St. John at Selçuk<sup>15</sup>. It is most probable, if one considers the quantity and good condition of the objects recovered, that they came from a tomb. Generally speaking, the first to publish this pottery have agreed on this point<sup>16</sup>. Although Machteld Mellink reports that human bones were found together with this pottery in her publication of the work, no such reference is made by Hakkı Gültekin who followed the work at the church of St. John or by the then Director of the Ephesus Museum Musa, Baran. It is possible on the basis of shape and decoration safely to assign these vases to Mycenaean III A 2 e and especially the ones which are pictured here.

Of these, the krater (pl. XXII) which is decorated with a stylized octopus or argonaut resembles piriform shape no. 7 (Furumark) and is assigned on grounds of shape to the III A 2 phase<sup>17</sup>. The pattern on this krater also independently confirms that this pot belongs to this phase<sup>18</sup>. The globular pilgrim jar (pl. XXI, Fig. 28) can also

<sup>14</sup> JHS VIII, p. 67, fig. 3.

<sup>15</sup> Arkeoloji Dergisi, XIII-2 (1964), pp. 125-133. AJA 68 (1964), pp. 157-158, pl. 50, 11-12.

<sup>16</sup> See footnote 15 and AJA 72 (1968) p. 52.

<sup>17</sup> A. Furumark, Mycenaean Pottery, fig. 44. CVA. Great Britain I, British Museum I, pl. 6, fig. 9 and 7.

<sup>18</sup> A. Furumark, Mycenaean Pottery, fig. 50, 11-13.

be assigned in the same way to III A 2<sup>19</sup>. The jar or bottle (pl. XXI. Fig. 27) should belong to III A 2 e on the basis of the form of the spirals<sup>20</sup>. The other vases, like those which I have discussed above, belong to III A 2. One of these is a jar<sup>21</sup> with three vertical handles, found in fragments; features such as the form of the spirals which are drawn like the tentacles of an octopus (as can be restored), the depth of the shoulder zone, the restriction of the handles to the upper body and the fact that they do not bulge out below, all are marks of the III A 2 phase.

These vases, found at Ephesus by chance during work in front of the Church of St. John, most probably are tomb objects; they indicate that there had been a single-period burial, or, less probably, a re-used tomb without a long interval of time between the burials. Stylistic distinctions which would show important chronological differences in this pottery are present. There is in this tomb not a single find which we call "local" and so we are able to say that the tomb belonged to an important person. This fact shows that the workmanship of "local" pottery and the value given to it was low. It cannot be said that at this time there was no local pottery in the region since at Bayraklı we know that local pottery of the second millenium was found<sup>22</sup>.

Here we would like to touch briefly upon two Mycenaean sherds found on Gavurtepe hüyük. 1 km. southeast of Alaşehir<sup>23</sup>. One of these two sherds is a small fragment of an open vessel while the other comes from a closed vase. It is difficult to restore the decoration of the small fragment (Pl. XXIII, Fig. 32) and to determine either the way up it goes or the shape of the pot<sup>24</sup>. The second find (Pl. XXIII, Fig. 31) must, on the basis of its profile and the pattern of lines of varying

<sup>19</sup> Op. cit. Fig. 5, 188. CVA. Great Britain I, British Museum I, pl. 24, 37. W. Tylour, *The Myceneans*, pl. 1.

<sup>20</sup> A. Furumark, *Mycenaean Pottery*, Fig. 62, 49, No. 10-14 and 21.

<sup>21</sup> *Arkeoloji Dergisi*, XIII-2 (1964) p. 130, No. 2.

<sup>22</sup> E. Akurgal, *Bayraklı*, pl. VIII, fig. b.

<sup>23</sup> Among fragments brought to me by one of my former students, Recep Meriç, which he collected at Gavurtepe in Alaşehir. I discovered two that showed a Mycenaean character.

<sup>24</sup> This fragment measures 2 x 2.5 cm. The clay is buff, the slip is light beige, the decorations are dark brown. The fragment is too small to determine its place in the whole piece, and therefore I am not very sure if it is printed here the right way up.

width, be a fragment from the shoulder of a piriform jar with three handles<sup>25</sup>. This piece can, from its pattern of Wavy Line, safely be dated to Mycenaean III A 2 (1400-1300 BC)<sup>26</sup>.

I have dwelt briefly on these finds from Gavurtepe; they are in themselves not important. However, the fact that they were found on the surface of a mound together with other objects belonging to the second millennium of Anatolia has a separate significance and it is necessary to discuss them from this point of view. Among the material collected from this same site, there were examples recalling the second millennium pottery of Bayraklı, the Late Bronze Age pottery of Troy and Yortan pottery. Essentially, therefore, Alaşehir, from its geographical situation, had the potential for coming into easy contact with the known urban and cultural zones.

It is within the bounds of possibility that the Hittites came into contact with the centres in the west of Anatolia. Alaşehir is located 170 km. from the coast, in the valley of the upper Gediz; from a geographical point of view it has the advantage that it is a stopping place on the road from the plains of the west coast to the plateau of the interior. On the other hand, from the topography of the country, it is difficult to move across Western Anatolia from north to south; the upper valley of the Gediz, however, provides an easy means of communication between Alaşehir, Akhisar and Balıkesir and between Alaşehir, Buldan and Denizli. The Akhisar region could therefore probably be thought of as within Assuva or Arzawa.

On the other hand, settlement sites in Western Anatolia where Mycenaean pottery has been found are few. Until now settlement sites with Mycenaean pottery have been only Miletus and Troy; otherwise finds have been sporadic or from tombs. Although it is reported that Mycenaean finds were made at Milas by the Swedish excavators no publication of this material has yet appeared and therefore we have no information on it.

At Beycesultan and Bayraklı so little Mycenaean pottery has been found from the excavations that it might be thought of as non-existent. Mellaart<sup>27</sup> reports that among the thousands of local sherds

<sup>25</sup> This fragment measures 6.8 × 6 cm. The clay is brown, the slip is light brown, and the decorations are dark red.

<sup>26</sup> A. Furumark, *Mycenaean Pottery*, fig. 58, No. 45, 1.

<sup>27</sup> *Anatolian Studies*, XVIII, p. 192 footnote 11.

only a single piece of Mycenaean was encountered. At Bayraklı, J. Cook<sup>28</sup> says that a few pieces of Mycenaean pottery were found.

At Çerkes Sultaniye near Manisa, a piriform jar with three vertical handles has been found and is now in the Manisa Museum<sup>29</sup>. On the shoulder zone of this vase<sup>30</sup> is a net pattern (Pl. XXII, Fig. 30); Hanfmann and Waldbaum date this jar to Myc. IIIB<sup>31</sup>.

Hanfmann and Waldbaum<sup>32</sup> have published, along with other finds of the Sub-Mycenaean period in the depot at Eskihisar (Stratonikeia), a stirrup jar belonging to the Sub-Mycenaean phase. Until now we have not been able to find the opportunity to see this vase; it should probably be dated to Myc. III C on the basis of the bands which cover the whole body and of the width of the base. Without personal first hand observation, however, we are not in a position to determine to what extent a pot of this phase (IIIC) exhibits features of Sub-Mycenaean<sup>33</sup>.

*The Chronology of Western Anatolia in the Second Half of the Second Millennium and a General Survey of the Problems.*

The appearance of the Achaeans in the eastern Aegean, the western campaigns of the Hittite kings, the Trojan war, the destruction of Troy, the coming of the Phrygians to Anatolia, the appearance of the Dorians in Western Anatolia, events of extreme importance such as these caused a convulsion which affected Western Anatolia in the second half of the second millennium BC. Of these the Achaeans, the Dorians, the destruction of Troy are the immediate concern of my investigations here and I would like to digress slightly on these subjects.

The date of the Mycenaean finds on Rhodes extends as far back as Myc. II<sup>34</sup>. Moreover, it is clear that pottery with Mycenaean characteristics was made on the island in Myc. IIB<sup>35</sup>. The oldest Myce-

<sup>28</sup> JHS LXXII, p. 105, fig. 10.

<sup>29</sup> I went to Sultanhisar to see the place where this pot was found, but there was nothing else there which could be of the same period.

<sup>30</sup> The pot is 17 cm in height and 15,2 cm in width.

<sup>31</sup> AJA 72 (1968), p. 52.

<sup>32</sup> Op. cit. pp. 51 ff.

<sup>33</sup> I went to Stratonikeia to see this pot, but the museum was closed.

<sup>34</sup> Stubbings, *Levant*, p. 8. A. Furumark, *Mycenaean Pottery*, form 30, 32, 104, 143.

<sup>35</sup> Op. cit.

naean pottery appearing on Cos, at the same time or just later than on Rhodes, belongs to Myc. II-III A 1<sup>36</sup>. At Troy the appearance of imported Mycenaean pottery goes back further<sup>37</sup>.

The Mycenaean and Cretan finds from the latest excavations at Miletus have brought greater understanding and have made obvious the dominance of the first phase of Cretan pottery. It is clear that the range of this earlier pottery covers MM III to LM I, i. e. ca. 1600 B. C.<sup>38</sup>. The earlier pottery was found on a house (no. 1) floor beside the Athena Temple. The publication says that, at this level, Cretan, local, and in a small quantity, Mycenaean pottery came to light<sup>39</sup>. Since the finds are relatively few in number there is a reasonable probability that these early pieces represent imports. A sharp increase in Mycenaean pottery at Miletus is noticed on the floor of house 2<sup>40</sup>. The pieces recovered on this level are dated to IIIA 1 onwards. At Miletus, therefore, if the Cretan finds are left to one side, the first pieces of Mycenaean pottery, in quantity and date, point more or less to Rhodes. As is known, at Miletus there is also a Mycenaean necropolis at Değirmentepe<sup>41</sup>.

Mycenaean objects appear in Troy VI and VII. The city of Troy saw two great destructions, one at the end of the Troy VI culture i. e. VIIh, the other at the beginning of Troy VII, i. e. VIIa. The first of these was brought about, according to the excavators of Troy, by an earthquake; the second, it is agreed, is the destruction by the hand of the Achaeans during the Trojan war, as is recounted by Homer<sup>42</sup>. This view remains unchanged by the latest results. According to J. L. Caskey, there is no evidence that the destruction in Troy VIIa is the work of the Achaeans. Yet, indications which would make it necessary to associate the destruction with some other cause have not been found<sup>43</sup>. Perhaps, for this reason, Matz<sup>44</sup> in dis-

<sup>36</sup> Stubbings, *Levant*, p. 21.

<sup>37</sup> According to Stubbings this date goes back LHI (*Levant*, p. 22). The Excavators of Troy accept VI d, as the beginning (Troy III, p. 16).

<sup>38</sup> *Istanbul Mitteilungen* 7 (1957) pp. 117 & 118; No. 9/10 (1959/60), p. 43.

<sup>39</sup> *Op. cit.* p. 119, fig. 7.

<sup>40</sup> *Op. cit.* No. 9/10 (1959/60), pl. 42-46.

<sup>41</sup> G. Kleiner, *Alt-Milet*, (1966), p. 11.

<sup>42</sup> *Troy IV*, p. 13.

<sup>43</sup> *AJA LII* (1948), p. 122.

<sup>44</sup> F. Matz, *Kreta, Mykene, Troja*, p. 145.

puting the cause of the destruction of Troy VIIa refers to a northern people. Cook<sup>45</sup> on the other hand connects the destruction of Troy with the Hittites and Tudhalias IV who overthrew the Assuwan league in the last years of the Empire. The date of the destruction, 1325-1275 B. C., which is proposed by the excavators for Troy VIIIh, which is seen as the first of the series of catastrophes, is generally accepted<sup>46</sup>. In dating Troy VIIa, the position changes: a series of rather different dates has been suggested for the time of the Trojan War. The first reason for these differing dates is, in my opinion, that results which are arrived at by way of archaeological evidence are not considered individually alongside the written sources. In Eratosthenes' account which relies partly on tradition, partly on Spartan king-lists, the Trojan war is dated to the year 1183 B. C. An inscription from Paros (the Parian Marble) dates it to the year 1209 B. C.<sup>47</sup>. Some scholars, bearing this evidence in mind, date the destruction of Troy at the end of Troy VII a to the years around 1200 B. C.; others put it earlier than 1200 B. C. J. Berard<sup>48</sup> was the first to draw attention, at the same time providing evidence, to the possibility that the destruction of Troy could have been much earlier. Berard discussed points such as, 1) from a cultural point of view Troy VIIa is a continuation of Troy VI, 2) Myc. IIIC pottery is found in Troy VIIb, 3) Troy VIIa which succeeds Troy VIIh does not have the appearance of a long-lived settlement, 4) and moreover it has the peculiarity of being a single building level and no rebuilding can be distinguished, so it cannot have lasted more than one generation. Relying on all these points he advances an extremely early date for the destruction of Troy. Berard in his article in *Historia I* firmly refuses to accept that the end of Troy VII a and the destruction of Troy can be as late as the early decades of the thirteenth century; he places his emphasis on the first decades of the fourteenth century and the end of the fifteenth, suggesting that they have strong connections<sup>49</sup>.

<sup>45</sup> J. Cook, *The Greeks in Ionia and the East*, p. 19.

<sup>46</sup> Troy IV, P. 12. Caskey, *AJA LII* (1948), p. 121.

<sup>47</sup> G. Mylonas, *Ancient Mycenae*, p. 15 footnote 44.

<sup>48</sup> J. Berard, *Notes sur la stratigraphie et la chronologie de Troie au Bronze Recent*, *Historia I* (1950), pp. 351 & 362.

<sup>49</sup> See also Mylonas, *Ancient Mycenae for the date of the Sack of Troy according to J. Berard*.

It is not my intention here to enter into these disputes. I would say, however, that it is necessary to raise the chronology of the Trojan War, not placing it in the 1200's but to a slightly earlier date, on the basis of Furumark's chronology of Mycenaean pottery. Mycenaean pottery belonging to the IIIC phase was not found in Troy VI and VIIa<sup>50</sup>; therefore, the Trojan war must have caused a convulsion before *ca.* 1230 BC. at a time when IIIB pottery had come to an end. To return to Berard's proposal—he relies on Caskey's suggestion and accepts<sup>51</sup> that IIIC pottery was found in Troy VIIb 2 together with *Buckelkeramik*; he brings, as I have said above, the Trojan War to a date earlier than this. Nevertheless, in the last excavations, it was established that IIIC pottery occurred in Troy VIIb 1 and therefore the time-gap between VIIa and IIIC is considerably reduced<sup>52</sup>.

It could also be added that there are those who accept that Myc. IIIB continues down to 1200 BC<sup>53</sup>. Of these, Taylour puts the Trojan War at 1260-1250 B. C.; this proposal for the Trojan War keeps open the date of 1230 B. C. for the end of IIIB and is therefore in agreement with any date which could be proposed<sup>54</sup>. Furthermore this proposal of Taylour's for the Trojan War conforms with the results of the latest excavations at Troy<sup>55</sup>. These suggestions have been adopted by several scholars<sup>56</sup>. As I have said above, it has been established that Myc. IIIC pottery is not found in Troy VIIa; it is therefore necessary that the Trojan War ran its course in the years before 1230 B. C., the point at which, on Furumark's chronology, Myc. IIIC pottery began to appear.

*The Sea Peoples*: They appear in Egypt for the first time in 1225 B. C. Usually it is explained that they came from the North, causing destruction in Anatolia, Syria and Palestine. These invaders, who

<sup>50</sup> Troy IV z. 12.

<sup>51</sup> *Historia* I, pp. 359 & 360.

<sup>52</sup> Troy IV, p. 145. Desborough, *Last Mycenaean*, p. 164.

<sup>53</sup> W. Taylour, *The Myceneans*, p. 57.

<sup>54</sup> *Op. cit.* p. 57.

<sup>55</sup> Troy IV. p. 12.

<sup>56</sup> E. Akurgal, *Die Kunst Anatoliens*, p. 2; *The Art of Hittites*, p. 75; *Phrygische Kunst*, p. 116. J. Cook, *The Greeks in Ionia and the East*, p. 19. Welster, *From Mycenae to Homer*, p. 153. Desborough, *Last Mycenaean*, p. 146.

came and went without stopping for any length of time, occur in the Egyptian records as "Sea Peoples"<sup>57</sup>. Whether or not these Sea Peoples were connected with the destruction of the Hittites is a question which lies outside the scope of my subject. I would only touch upon matters that concern Western Anatolia<sup>58</sup>. Achaean names are found among the Sea Peoples appearing in Egypt<sup>59</sup>. This situation inclines me to the view that among the waves of Sea Peoples who had greater effect on Anatolia than on Greece were possibly persons of Achaean origin, from the islands or Western Anatolia.

If the M $\ddot{u}$ skebi necropolis is seen as belonging to a city of Ahhiyava, the position of the site in the time of the Sea Peoples may be interpreted as follows: at the end of IIIB there is a reduction, in comparison with previous phases, of the number of pots in the M $\ddot{u}$ skebi Tombs, and in the IIIC phase this reduction is even more clearly visible. Several pots belonging to the last phase have been dated to IIIC 1. On this evidence the complete abandonment of the M $\ddot{u}$ skebi tombs falls a little later than 1230 B. C. On the basis of this result, the loss of importance of M $\ddot{u}$ skebi occurs at that time when the Sea Peoples appear in Egypt, roughly speaking in 1225 B. C.; this year, 1225 B. C. is the date of the first appearance of the Sea Peoples in Egypt. In Egyptian chronology this date may be reduced 10 years<sup>60</sup>. The appearance in the south of Sea Peoples happens in waves. However, I do not wish to associate the abandonment of the M $\ddot{u}$ skebi necropolis directly with the Sea Peoples but I would like to see some connection with the changes and movement in the Aegean world and particularly in the Peloponnese at this time, i. e. at the end of IIIB<sup>61</sup>.

### AHHIJAVA

Before moving on to the question of Ahhiyava, I would like to emphasize the value, in this context, of the M $\ddot{u}$ skebi finds.

<sup>57</sup> F. Matz, Kreta, Mykene, Troja, p. 145. W. Taylour, *The Myceneans*, p. 174. A. Goetze, *Kleinnasien*, pp. 184 & 185. Bittel, *Grundzüge*, p. 73.

<sup>58</sup> A. Goetze, *Kleinasien*, pp. 184 & 185. K. Bittel, *Grundzüge*, pp. 73 ff.

<sup>59</sup> F. Matz, Kreta, Mykene, Troja, p. 144. W. Taylour, *The Myceneans*, p. 174.

<sup>60</sup> W. Taylour, *The Myceneans*, s. 174.

<sup>61</sup> Desborough & Hammond, *The End of the Mycenaean Civilization and the Dark Age*, pp. 3 ff.

The Müskebi material, dating from the end of the fifteenth century B. C. to ca. 1200 B. C. provides evidence of the presence, in this region, of a settlement<sup>62</sup>. The beginning date on which we have agreed could be a little too early. However keeping all the possibilities in mind, I would, nevertheless, accept the date I have suggested above for the beginning of Müskebi<sup>63</sup>. In discussing the phase to which the early finds from Müskebi belong, one sees that if the pieces imported from Rhodes are put on one side, these finds show a connection between locally produced pottery and the pottery of Rhodes. This being so, the area which is formed by what are later called the twelve Dorian islands and the West Anatolian coast opposite becomes a single entity as regards Mycenaean material.

The Müskebi pottery, generally speaking, bears the hallmarks of Rhodian Mycenaean. Rhodian pottery shapes, both general and specific (e. g. braziers with tripod feet and pierced body) are to be seen at Müskebi<sup>64</sup>. At the same time, there is a strong resemblance in quality and technique. However, up until now, in our researches, we have been unable to determine how much came from Rhodes and which of the pots were made at Müskebi. The prime reason for this is the close resemblance between the pottery of Rhodes and of Müskebi itself. As yet I have not had the good fortune to study personally Rhodian pottery in its own setting. When there is the possibility, I will perhaps be able to speak definitively on the subject. In my book "Katalog der Vasen des Museums in Bodrum", I made comparisons between the Müskebi and Rhodian pottery and the resemblance was clearly visible.

In the Mycenaean pottery at Müskebi there is no vase which could from any point of view be considered different and therefore

<sup>62</sup> See Y. Boysal, *Katalog der Vasen des Museums in Bodrum*, 1969; the earliest finds were discovered in Tomb No. 18 (III A : 1 : kylix, Op. cit. pl. XXVII, 1), in tomb 34 (II : kylix, Op. cit. pl. XXVI, 3), tomb 39 (II B/III A : 1 : kylix, Op. cit. pl. XXVI, 3 and pl. XXVI, 4).

<sup>63</sup> As seen in footnote 62, all the pottery that can be assigned to the earliest period are of the kylix type. No other pots of the same period were discovered. Consequently I accepted the latest date given to the kylixes as the beginning date of the tombs at Müskebi.

<sup>64</sup> *Bulleten XXXI*, No. 121 (January 1967), p. 82, fig. 12 & 13. Boysal, *Katalog*, pl. XXXI 1 & 4.

be called "local". Every vase exhibits shapes and forms which are popular and widespread in the Mycenaean area. On this evidence, with the coming of those who made Mycenaean pottery, the old inhabitants of the district either withdrew from the coast into the interior or the local workshops stopped making local pottery because of the superior quality of Mycenaean pottery. We can, however, say with certainty that the possessors of Mycenaean objects, in coming here, were not the first inhabitants of these shores. Information is at hand concerning the settlement of this region in the third millennium and in the first half of the second. The jug in the Bodrum Museum published by Vermeule<sup>65</sup> and the pottery from Stratonikeia<sup>66</sup>, are objects belonging to the Early Bronze Age of the region.

Most of the pottery found in the tombs at Múskebi belong to Mycenaean III A 2; III B follows this in quantity. IIIA 1 and III C finds are relatively few<sup>67</sup>. On this evidence both the phase of the first Mycenaean pots at Múskebi and the last one, from the point of view of finds, are undistinguished. III A 2 (1400-1300 B. C.) seems to have been the most thickly populated period at Múskebi; it was the time when Mycenaean objects were most numerous and widespread in the eastern Mediterranean area. If one observes the pottery which could belong to III A 2 or late III B it is impossible to accept that the conditions in the fourteenth century did not continue to the middle (at least) of the thirteenth. Múskebi's loss of importance, thus, coincides approximately with the period of Aegean migrations and of the Sea Peoples. It is naturally difficult, as we have said above, to see a direct association between the situation discovered at Múskebi and the aftermath of the Sea Peoples, the Aegean migrations and the Trojan War. However, it is possible that this situation did not exist at Múskebi. There is perhaps a recollection, here, of the western campaigns of the Hittites; in light of what I have said here, let us now turn briefly to the question of Ahhijava.

On the basis of the explanations made above, the excavations that have been carried out in western Anatolia and the material that has come to hand have clearly brought out the presence of settle-

<sup>65</sup> *Archaeology* 17 (1967), pp. 245 ff.

<sup>66</sup> The Museum at Bodrum contains several pots brought from Stratonikeia.

<sup>67</sup> See Boysal, *Katalog*.

ments of the Mycenaean period in the coastal strip stretching south. At Miletus the material that has been recovered has attracted attention and the presence of a Mycenaean settlement has been emphasized. The excavations that were carried out at Miletus after the Second World War have revealed in no uncertain manner the Mycenaean settlement under the city. The Müskebi materials, which I have sought above to introduce in various aspects, came to the forefront of this question. As is known, the Achaeans are possibly the masters of the country Ahhijava whose name occurs in Hittite documents. The word 'Ahhijava' is thought to occur for the first time in the Hittite texts of the age of Suppiluliuma<sup>68</sup>. By the term 'country' the Hittites meant 'kingdom'<sup>69</sup>. Among the texts in which 'Ahhijava' is found only in one does the form 'Ahhija' occur<sup>70</sup>. Scholars have sought the country 'Ahhijava' or 'Ahhija' in various places along the Aegean and Mediterranean coasts as well as on the islands. Forer was among the first to turn to this problem and in 1924 published an article "Vorhomerische Griechen in der Keilschrifttexten von Boğazköy", in which he accepted that by name "Ahhijava" is meant Greece of the Mycenaean period<sup>71</sup>. Kretschmer<sup>72</sup> located Ahhijava in Cilicia. Goetze<sup>73</sup> sought the area in North-west Anatolia, Sommer<sup>74</sup> on the south coast of Anatolia. Today the most widely accepted proposal is that of Hrozný. In an article "Hethiter und Griechen", this scholar by relying on archaeological documents and place names accepted that Ahhijava could be Rhodes<sup>75</sup>. Following Hrozný, Page<sup>76</sup> and Caratelli<sup>77</sup> have agreed with this suggestion which on modern discoveries is the most suitable site for Ahhijava. In making this suggestion, Caratelli relied on Mycenaean finds on Rhodes and on a seal which came to light at Lindos and which bears the sign of a (great)

<sup>68</sup> F. Sommer, *Die Ahhijawa æ Urkunden*, pp. 298 ff.

<sup>69</sup> Goetze, *Kleinasien*, p. 183.

<sup>70</sup> KBO VI, 27 Vs. II 5.

<sup>71</sup> MDOG 63 (1924) pp. 1 æ 22.

<sup>72</sup> Clotta 13 (1924) pp. 212 ff.

<sup>73</sup> Goetze, *Kleiasien*, p. 172.

<sup>74</sup> F. Sommer, *Op. cit.* p. 327.

<sup>75</sup> B. Hrozný, *AO I* (1929), pp. 323 ff.

<sup>76</sup> D. Page, *History and Homeric Iliad*, p. 15.

<sup>77</sup> JKF I (1950 æ 51), pp. 158 æ 161 and footnote 9.

king. I would only add that the views of Bittel<sup>78</sup> who gathered together the work and discoveries made up to the Second World War and put forward southern Ionia as Ahhijava have gained support as the result of new finds. In the Hittite texts, the city referred to as "Milawanda" or 'Milawata' is understood to have lain within Ahhijava's sphere of influence. According to one tablet, a prince, a member of the royal family, lived in this city<sup>79</sup>. As is known, some scholars accept that Milawanda was located at Miletus.

I offer here an interpretation of one of the Hittite texts which I thought would be a help in determining the connections between Arzawa and Ahhijava and the location of Ahhijava. Thanks to the help of the Hittitologist, Hayri Ertem, a summary of this text, when the original is compared with the translation, may be given as follows : Mursili, on his way to Arzawa in company with the sons of the King of Arzawa escapes to a place which is on the sea. One of the sons returns to Arzawa, fights against the King of the Hittites and on losing takes refuge with the King of Ahhijava. At the request of Mursili II the king of Ahhijava surrenders to him the refugee<sup>80</sup>.

Since it is interpreted as approachable by boat, Ahhijava could be reached by sea from Arzawa but at the same time it was not a distant place. On the other hand if a prince who seeks refuge with the King of Ahhijava himself can be surrendered, it must signify that the King of Ahhijava did not wish to spoil his relations with the Hittites. It can be assumed that the Hittite forces which were withdrawn by the Hittites were at no great distance from the borders of Ahhijava.

If all these possibilities and the documents of material culture which we have discussed above are brought together, it is seen that with Rhodes as the centre, Ahhijava is located within the area of the other islands and the coasts of Caria and forms a single zone which takes in Southern Ionia.

<sup>78</sup> K. Bittel, *Grundzüge*, p. 70.

<sup>79</sup> Tavagalava letter. See Sommer, *op. cit.* pp. 2 ff.

<sup>80</sup> MVAG 38 (1933), pp. 66 ff.

## ERKEN DEVİR ANADOLU - TÜRK MİMARİSİNDE TÜRBE BİÇİMLERİ

M. OLUŞ ARIK

İslâm âleminde anıt kavramının en etkili şekilde gerçekleştiği yapılar türbelerdir diyebiliriz. Bununla beraber türbeler başlı başına bir konu olarak ele alınıp, doğru ve tam bir şekilde tahlil ve tasnif edilmemişlerdir<sup>1</sup>. Bu, muhakkak ki, uzun ve zahmetli bir iştir. Türbeler başka yapı türlerinden hem sayıca daha çok, hem de (şehir mezarlık, yol, köy, tepe.. gibi) daha dağınık yerlerde yapılmışlardır. Ayrıca türbeler, lokal gelenek, istek ve zevkin âmil olduğu özel seçim ve eğilimlere daha çok açık kapı bırakan bir yapı türü sayılabilir. Belki de bu yüzden öbür yapılardan daha çok çeşitlilik gösteriyorlar.

Biz burada Anadolu'daki "erken devir" türbelerini, sadece form yönünden ve genel olarak gözden geçireceğiz. "Erken devir" deyi mi, kestirme bir ifadeyle, Anadolu - Türk mimarî tarihinde, XVI. yüzyıl ikinci yarısından itibaren billûrlaşan klâsik Osmanlı mimarisine varana kadarki süre anlamında kullanılmıştır.

### TÜRBELERİN MENŞEİ HAKKINDA :

Anıtsal mezar fikri aslında islâm doktrini ile bağdaşmasa gerektir. Muhtemelen bu yüzden, İslâm kültürünün temelini atıldığı bölgelerde X. yüzyıla kadar pek ender türbeye rastlanıyor. X. yüzyıldan itibaren anıt-mezar yapısının "moda" haline gelmesi olayı ise, Horasan ve Türkistan taraflarında ortaya çıkıyor. Bununla beraber, günümüze kalan en eski türbe Abbasîlerin merkezinde yapılmıştır : IX. yüzyıl ikinci yarısından, Samarrâ'da Kubbet-üs-Süleybiye. Halife el-Muntasır için böyle bir anıt-kabir yapılması annesinin hıristiyan asıllı olmasıyla bağlı görülür<sup>2</sup>. Eser form bakımından da, yakın doğu hris-

<sup>1</sup> 1962 Martında tamamladığımız Anadolu türbeleriyle ilgili doktora çalışması böylece hâlâ önemini muhafaza etmektedir. Burada bir bölümünü sunduğumuz bu çalışmayı, biraz genişleterek Anadolu türbelerinin tam kataloğu ile birlikte yayınlıyacağız.

<sup>2</sup> K. Otto-Dorn, Kunst des Islam, Baden Baden 1964, s. 71 - 72 ve Anm. 43.