



Fig. 4

SOME THOUGHTS ON THE INTERPRETATION OF ANATOLIA'S CULTURAL DEVELOPMENT

James Mellaart

Over the last thirty-five years the archaeological terminology for the successive periods of Anatolia's cultural development has been somewhat altered from the old sequence: Chalcolithic, Copper Age, Hittite and Phrygian periods. The old Chalcolithic or Late Chalcolithic of Alişar and Büyük Güllücek have been renamed Early Bronze I and the royal tombs at Alaca Höyük and Horoztepe now fall in Early Bronze III. This period is represented at Kültepe by a different culture with Intermediate (painted) ware, the predecessor of the Cappadocian or Alişar III ware (once called EBA), now reassigned to the early Karum period in the Middle Bronze Age. Alişar II that follows is Karum period, not "Hittite" in the historical sense denoting either the Old or the New Hittite period from c.1750-1175 B.C. The use of non-committal terms like Karum period (MB 1), MB2 (Old Hittite) and LBA for the period from 1500 onwards seem preferable for use throughout Anatolia, only part of which was ever Hatti territory. The fall of Hatti c.1175 B.C. has usually been taken as the end of the Late Bronze Age, a view that needs correction. The "Hittite Empire" may have disappeared but not its enemies in the west and south and there is good evidence from an ever increasing number of sites that the LBA did not end until c. 1000 B.C.

Our preoccupation with periodisation and terminology tends to make one underestimate the basic continuity of culture in favour of innovations, selected to "mark" a new period. Labelling periods is not enough; we need to gain some insight into what really happened. A comparison with the historical period is revealing; at Gordion e.g. a comparison between the buildings of the Phrygian 8th century destroyed by Cimmerian raids in 696 and those of the Archaic period of the 6th century show such continuity in planning, in spite of a gap in occupation, that to call the earlier "Phrygian" and the later "Persian" is evidently unreasonable. The cultural remains are clearly Phrygian in spite of a change in overlords. Elsewhere in Central Anatolia, pottery labelled as Phrygian seems to run on into the Hellenistic period, until gradually it is ousted. At Gordion, Phrygian grey ware was in vogue from the 9th century to the Roman period. Later records show that the Phrygians eventually became Christians in Early Byzantine times and

the Bible was translated into Phrygian. As the Phrygians probably arrived in Anatolia c. 1000 B.C. or somewhat later, we can trace them through a period of some 1500 years (or so). Conversions to Islam continued in more remote parts into the 13th and 14th centuries, adding another sizeable span of time of "phrygians" as "Byzantine Greeks" subjects becoming Turks. Those Phrygians then, newcomers from Macedonia, were first Phrygians under their own kings, then fell under the political domination of Lydia, Persia, Macedonia, the Galatians, Romans, Byzantines and finally Seljuk, Beylik and Ottoman Turks. When they came into Anatolia, they did not find an empty land, but people already there with a distinct LBA civilisation as the mixture of wheelmade LBA (so-called Hittite, but politically probably Arzawan) pottery with proto-Phrygian handmade intrusive wares at Gordion shows. Like so many cultures that of the Phrygians was essentially Anatolian, on which a number of innovations had been imposed; an original foreign dynasty of foreign tongue and burial habits and perhaps orgiastic tastes in the cult. The material side of the culture was unashamedly Anatolian in character, though sufficiently distinct from its predecessors to justify the term "Iron Age". In the absence of written records we cannot assess the strength of the Phrygian elements versus those of the old Luvian stratum; some of the royal names like Gordias and Midas and some of the non-royal ones like Arezastis quite clearly belong to pre-Phrygian stock.

Just as the Phrygians are regarded a prime example of foreigners in Anatolia's Iron Age, so the Hittites, Luvians and Pala people, introduced Indo-European languages into Anatolia's Bronze Age. Originally thought to have arrived at the **end** of the Early Bronze Age ("c.1900 B.C.") they are now put much further back; the Hittites (Nesites to be correct) to the late fourth millennium and the Luvians at the transition from EB 2 to EB 3 c.2600/2500 B.C. The arrival of the speakers of Palaic can not yet be dated. Archaeologically these various peoples have merged so well into the Anatolian Early Bronze Age scene that but for their texts their presence would not have been detected. By the time they established dynasties in the second millennium B.C. they had been in Anatolia so long that apart from speech, religion and certain customs they had been absorbed by the earlier cultures. Without their tablets and seals the Assyrian merchants of the karum period would be likewise unrecognisable.

The more we learn about the material culture of the country, the more one is impressed by continuity, that in spite of innovations manifests itself almost everywhere. What at first sight looks like a cultural break, especially when accompanied by destruction, often in the light of further

evidence, seems less decisive, drastic or disastrous. Pottery as an indication of ethnic groups seems less and less reliable and though one can identify the pottery of various regions, e.g. the Cappadocian ware or the splendid vessels of the karum period at Kanesh, these were Nesite (Hittite) only in so far that these people used them; they may have been made by their Hattic speaking subjects. To be sure we would need texts dealing with potters' workshops. The same pottery is also used by the Assyrian merchants living in Central Anatolian karums, but it is not Assyrian pottery. Users and makers need not be the same and though can demonstrate influences, pottery cannot be used as an identity card. When one also remembers that in Anatolia pottery often imitates metal vessels, which because of their intrinsic value often have a wider range than strictly local types, the use of pottery for the reconstruction of political geography is greatly restricted except in the broadest terms.

The second millennium texts still used Hattic for religious and mythological texts, a clear indication that this pre-IE. language was still in use. In the more eastern parts of Anatolia Hurrian, equally non-IE. was in use throughout the Bronze Age and in Urartian lives on into the Iron age. The situation in Western Anatolia is not known, but there is no compelling reason why the non-IE language (s) should not have survived into the second millennium B.C. Luvian, the IE language, which probably came in around the middle of the third millennium B.C. clearly lived on well into the Iron Age, the Greco-Roman Period, and in parts like Isauria even into the Byzantine period.

If our archaeological indications (horse bones) are correctly interpreted as evidence for the first appearance of the "Hittites" between 3500 and 3000 B.C. and as Hattic has chronological priority, Hattic must have been spoken from at least the fourth millennium B.C. in central and northern Anatolia. There is no reason to suggest that it could not go back even further, into the İkiiztepe Chalcolithic, the earliest culture so far discovered in northcentral Anatolia.

In more southern terms this is contemporary with the Late Chalcolithic, at present dated between c.5500 and c.4000 B.C. (calibrated C 14 dating), the various members of which, be it in the northwest, southwest or south of Anatolia appear to develop into the Early Bronze Age.

Nobody disputes continuity from the Iron Age into the Greco-Roman-Byzantine period and I have argued for continuity between the Iron Age

and the Bronze age. If the Late Chalcolithic, as suggested, is the earlier stage of the Bronze Age tradition, where did it develop from? Comparisons of Early Chalcolithic painted pottery cultures like Hacilar, Çatal West, Can Hasan 2b or Mersin XVI with the predominantly dark burnished straw-tempered and rather heavy wares of the Late Chalcolithic did not favour continuity as the ceramic traditions are quite clearly somewhat dissimilar. More attention should perhaps have been paid to the monochrome wares that accompany the Early Chalcolithic painted wares; at Can Hasan and Mersin, these include apart from red and buff wares more brown and black pieces than in the west. Two recent Turkish digs, Kuruçay and Köşk, near Burdur and Niğde respectively, help to bridge the gap. There are obviously new elements in the Kuruçay Late Chalcolithic that lies on top of a burnt Hacilar I settlement, but the ceramic contrasts are not as pronounced as with the Beycesultan Late Chalcolithic series and some of the new shapes are still buff or red burnished and not all black. Perhaps some of the Hacilar women survived, but a case for continuity is certainly not particularly strong. At Köşk, on the other hand, pointillé, white filled decoration, a few shapes, boxes and rare and imported painted pieces all of Can Hasan 2b date fix levels II-III to an "Early Chalcolithic" date. Red, buff and jet black burnished pottery, rarely painted, but frequently decorated with relief figures of animals, trees, men and women predominates. A few of such pieces also occur at Can Hasan 2b and though overshadowed by painted pottery, relief decoration is attested in Hacilar VI-I, both in appliqué and in animal and, in Hacilar I, in anthropomorphic vessels.

What is significant in the new Köşk material is that its dark burnished ware looks ancestral to the Late Chalcolithic of the Konya Plain, only found stratified in Can Hasan I. Pending confirmation, Köşk looks like a missing link between the Çatal Hüyük neolithic and the Can Hasan I-Konya Plain Late Chalcolithic. A publication of the important site of Can Hasan will not come amiss and ought to clarify relations between Çatal Hüyük and Köşk on opposite ends of the Konya Plain by its location half way in between, and having links with both.

If future excavations can establish an undoubted link between the neolithic and late Chalcolithic cultures a continuous Anatolian sequence of cultural development from the Late Palaeolithic to the time of the arrival of the Turks can be demonstrated something that even in the Ancient Near East is rather uncommon. The arrival of new elements over this vast spectrum of time rarely seems to have adversely affected the local cultures, possessed of great power of absorption, and the various waves of

immigrants soon reached a **modus vivandi** with the local populations without undue animosity; the land was rich, the climate pleasant, the women fertile, and the country was vast, offering an almost limitless potentiality, for trade, mineral exploitation and development to those who came from less well endowed regions: be it the bleak Pontic Steppes (in the case of the IE speaking Hittites, Luvians, Palaic speakers and no doubt others, not yet known), the Balkan Peninsula (in the case of Phrygians, Mysians, Bithynians, etc), or the congested Mycenaean mainland of Greece which spawned the Aeolic, Ionian and Doric colonisation. Colonisation follows in the wake of Alexander of Macedon's conquest by the Roman Republic, more rapacious than its predecessors, and Sassanian Persians and Arabs followed in search of conquest for new lands or glory. All those willing to stay were easily absorbed and accommodated, together with Slavs and Petchenegs, Caucasians, Varangians, Normans etc. The ease with which Sultan Alparslan the Seljuk ruler of Iran defeated the Byzantine Emperor Romanus Diogenes at the battle of Malazgirt in 1071 A.D. revealed the unsuspected weakness of Byzantium, which was exploited by Suleyman b. Kutulmuş a cadet princeling of the Seljuk house and his emirs looking for new territories to feed their Türkmen followers and their herds. A conquest of Anatolia was never envisaged; it fell into their lap and was eagerly exploited -it was an accident-, kismet, and within a couple of years the Seljuks reached the Aegean coast, assisted in many cases by the local population, weary of Byzantine oppression both in taxes and military service. Outnumbered by the local population five to one on the land, and ten to one in the towns the Seljuk Turks nevertheless soon dominated the Anatolian plateau, guided by a spirit of tolerance towards their new subjects which was afterwards inherited by the rulers of the Ottoman Empire, but which did not embrace their own Türkmen followers, troublesome to the Seljuks, and much more so to their successors. There must have been a great amount of intermarriage between the Türkmen nomads and the local Anatolian population, both settled and pastoral, to account for the fact that motifs already known from wallpaintings at Çatal Hüyük have managed to survive in Anatolian kilims as late as the 18th-19th centuries A.D. As the preservors of ancient Anatolian traditions, all newcomers to the country from the Hittites to the Turks, deserve great praise-they could have destroyed, but they chose not to- and instead enriched an already venerable cultural Anatolian tradition.