Abstract
Achaemenids, which is the world’s biggest empire for more than 200 years between 550 and 331 BC. The main settlement is the territory, which is equal to Persian province today, in the northwest of Persia high plateau, Parsa, in the north of the Persian gulf. The major capitals such as Persepolis, Ecbatana, Susa, Behistun and Babylonia, and the inscriptions found in significant kingdom centers reveal that Achaemenid Kingdom is the heir to thousands-year history of Mesopotamia. We define Late Iron Age (LIA) as a period including the dates of the fall of Urartu and Achaemenid dynasty (645/625-330 BC). It consists of two phases; the first phase known Post-Urartian and Media (645/625-550 BC) and the second phase defined as Pers-Achaemenid domination (550-330 BC).
LIA ceramics show peculiar characteristics in surface processing, technic and form. The potteries are the products of a new tradition and culture. Urartu’s monochrome and shiny red lining ceramics give place to a new type of pottery which has got thick cream lining and which can be designed in different forms such as monochrome, bichrom and polychrome. However, we do not know much about the relationships between the end of one’s ceramic tradition and the other’s beginning because of few data between the fall of Urartu state and the period when dyed pottery rises with Achaemenid.
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1. INTRODUCTION
Occurring after the collapse of Urartu state in the late seventh century BC, which put its signature under important events in art and cultural shifts by founding the first political league in Eastern Anatolia in the mid-ninth century BC, our new culture-oriented research area consists of this region.

The borders of EAR with high mountains and geographical structure including plateaus; the roof of Turkey; include the southward area after covering Bayburt plane,
following South-Eastern Taurus around Maraş in South, the watershed between Kızılırmak and Euphrates in West, and Black Sea mountains in North. When the centers where pottery is found are considered, the biggest centers in Northern West are Erzincan/Altıntepe (Cimintepe I) and Erzurum/Mound Sos. The west borders of the material are Mound İmikuşağı and Küşkerbaba of Elazığ-Malatya Region. We can name Mound Yerlikavak and Çakmak within the borders of Kars in Northern East. Bajergeh in Southern East; the centers of Van/Usibiti and Van/Yeşililaç II comprise East border. Late Iron Age-centers are mostly found in the basin of Lake Van. Aforementioned region is situated in an area which is surrounded by Bitlis mountains mass in South, sedimentary and volcano mass in North, mount Nemrut and its lava in West.¹

Eastern Anatolia, Northwestern Persia and South Caucasus have not been researched enough. In this regard, there are different views on their chronology due to a lack of satisfying knowledge. The process LIA and cultural shift seem to be shaped by political events. At the beginning Urartu state has been collapsed and a Persia rooted-new power has dominated the region. As for the end, Persian sovereignty is destroyed and Hellenistic period which is a west-rooted, new and cultural process begins. Thanks to the definition of LIA, we understand the process when Urartu and Achaemenid were destroyed.²

2. THE POLITICAL STRUCTURE OF EASTERN ANATOLIA IN THE 7TH-4TH CENTURIES BC

To understand the political structure between the seventh and fourth centuries BC better, it is helpful to examine it under two subtitles as political structure of the 7th century BC and the 6th-4th centuries. Of all of them, the collapse of Urartu state in the 7th century and development process from the beginning to the end of Achaemenid Empire in the 6th-4th centuries BC are mentioned.³

2.1. THE POLITICAL STRUCTURE IN THE 7TH CENTURY BC

Cimmerians alter the political and cultural structure of Anatolia by launching raids into the powerful states of Anatolia; Urartu, Phrygia, Lydia and Ionia. As a result of these raids, Urartu go through serious troubles. After Cimmerian raids and death blow of the famous eighth campaign⁴ by Sargon II in 714 BC, the king of Assyria (721-705 BC); Rusa I, the king of Urartu, commits suicide (about 730-714 BC).⁵ Argisti II (about 714/713-685 BC) tries to prevent Cimmerian raids coming from the North; but he is overwhelmed in 707 BC. Then Rusa II (about 685-645 BC) abandons a part of his clans in Urartu lands by allying with Cimmerians against Assyria. The wars between these two states take until the 7th century BC. Between the 8th and the 6th centuries BC, Cimmerians begins to invade Anatolia by attacking urartu lands as a result of the influence by Scythians.⁶ Scythians begin to come to Asia Minor following Cimmerians. Rusa II also allies with Scythians and directs them to the Assyria borders. Urartu and Cimmerians are defeated by Assarhaddon in the region Supria around Diyarbakır in 673/672 BC.⁷ The collapse process of Urartu state starts after Rusa II.

While Sarduri III is mentioned in Assyrian inscriptions, the other kings’ names are not present. Scientists generally accepted that Rusa, the son of Erimen, was the last king of Urartu and that his kingdom ended by the Median invasion in 585 BC. How long Sarduri IV
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who is defined as the ruler of Tuspa remained on the throne is unknown. After this king, kings’ names are briefly noted on Urartu inscriptions, vows and seals. The name “Rusa, the son of Rusa” is present on two impressions of seal found in Karmir Blur, but there is nothing about the king’s title on inscriptions. For this reason, that Rusa IV is a king or a prince from king family is not clearly known.\(^8\)

While some researchers say that Scythians terminated Urartu state, some claim that the state was terminated by Medes or both (map 1).\(^9\) The last information about Urartu is available in Babylonia Chronicles (609 BC). The chronics inform that Scythians came to Urartu’s region in the 7th century BC and dominated Urartu lands in upper basin Tigris. In addition, another tablet, which is the continuation of this text and which tells the events happening in 608-605 BC, refers to a campaign on Bit-Hanunya, a province of Urartu state, by an army in command of Babylonia King Nabopolassar.\(^10\) From this data, Ch. A. Burney-D. M. Lang think that Urartu state has continued its existence until this date.\(^11\) Believing that Urartu is not a geographical term, R. Rollinger finds\(^12\) a great Mede invasion in Chronicles a bit exaggerated because there are no archeological remains belonging to Meds, and makes the collapse date of the state longer till the mid-6th century BC.\(^13\) However, S. Kroll indicates that not Urartu state but a geographical region is meant by “Uraştu”.\(^14\) Piotrovsky has an idea that Sarduri III, Sarduri IV, Rusa III and Rusa IV were the last Urartu kings and, from the fact that barbs belonging to Scythians were once found in Karmir-Blur he thinks that Urartu centers in North were destroyed by merging of Scythians and other nomadic tribes around 590-585 in the early 6th century BC.\(^15\) As for I. M. Diakonoff, he claims this destroying was caused by Medes.\(^16\) With reference to the fact that Scythian barbs were found in Urartu centers such as Ayanis, Anzaf, Çavustepe and Toprakkale, some comments that Scythians invaded these regions were made. Some assert that the aforementioned barbs might belong to the hired soldiers serving for Urartu army.\(^17\) S. Kroll states that by the destroying of Bastam, Urartu state also entered in the process of collapsing, and came to end between 640 and 625 BC.\(^18\) M. Salvini, however, indicates that the state was destroyed as from 643 BC when Urartu inscriptions were no longer seen.\(^19\) From all of these, because of hiatus in mounds and the absence of written sources after 640s BC, we believe that Urartu collapsed toward the end of the 7th century.

\(^12\) Rollinger 2007: 8 ff.
\(^13\) Rollinger 2008: 61.
\(^15\) Piotrovsky 1969: 205 ff.
\(^16\) Diakonoff 1985: 125 ff.
\(^17\) Van Loon 1966: 25.
\(^18\) Kroll 1984: 151-170.
2.2. THE POLITICAL STRUCTURE IN THE 6TH-4TH CENTURIES BC

We encounter Medes in the Assyrian cuneiform scripts for the first time after the mid-9th century BC. Median state was established in the northwest of Persia plateau, in the south of the Caspian Sea. The legend that a person named Hanasiruka lived in “a king city” called Sagbita and ruled more than 1200 cities is narrated. Thus, Medes are thought to be a settled community not nomad. Medes are ruled not by kings but “feudal lords”. They are called king in Babylonian Chronics in 615 BC. There were no courts in the excavations in Median centers, and no archives were encountered to obtain information about bureaucracy system or religious beliefs of the kingdom. In recent researches, it is emphasized that Kerkenes in Yozgat is not a Mede castle but a Phryg habitation. Any settlement traces belonging to Meds were not found in EAR, too.

Toward the mid-7th century BC Assyria state and Medes come face to face. Kyaksares (625-585 BC), the king of Mede, allies with Nabu-apal-usur (Nabopolassor) who occupies Babylonia. In 612 BC Medes capture the capital of Babylonia and Scythia Empire, Niniveh. Following this event, Assyria Empire succeeds to continue its existence until 609 BC.

Since 590 BC Medes have control over Anatolia as well as Kızılırmak. In 585 BC a peace treaty is concluded between the king of Med Kyaksares (625-585 BC) and the king of Lydia Alyattes (611-561 BC). According to the treaty, Mesopotamia, Syria and Palestine belong to Babylonia Kingdom; Median Kingdom owns the lands from upper Tigris and Euphrates to Kızılırmak. The name “Urartu” is never used in Kysaksares period. Even though the name “Urartu” is seen in new Babylonian documents (609 BC) and in Dareios’ (521-486 BC) records, who is the king of Persia; it is said to mean a kind of region as a geographical concept.

Persia introduce its existence in Achaemenids period although it has got a long past. Achaemenids, which is the world’s biggest empire for more than 200 years between 550 and
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331 BC, change many people’s destiny and the flow of history by reigning in a wide territory from Aegean to Indus Region and from Egypt to Caucasus. The main settlement is the territory, which is equal to Persian province today, in the northwest of Persia high plateau, Parsa, in the north of the Persian gulf. The major capitals such as Persepolis, Ecbatana, Susa, Behistun and Babylonia, and the inscriptions found in significant kingdom centers reveal that Achaemenid Kingdom is the heir to thousands-year history of Mesopotamia. Teispes, Kyros’s great-grandfather, is the grandchild of Akamenes who names Achaemenid dynasty. Being faithful to Astyages, Persian prince Kambyses is replaced by his son Kyros II (559-530 BC) in Astyages period (585-550 BC), who dominates Eastern Anatolia as well as Persia, Zagros and Kızılırmak.  

Kyros II revolts against Astyages impairing Median state and misruling. After winning the war in 550 BC, they become a great power in Asia Minor.  

Kyros II, the king of Anshan from Achaemenid dynasty in Persia, makes conquest attempts. As a result of these wars, he establishes the kingdom built by various people under the only king’s control and called the first world empire of history. Kyros II firstly conquers Ecbatana, the city of Median dynasty; Susa, the capital of Elam dynasty; and Babylon, the capital of Babylonia Empire. Then the whole Anatolia is involved in Persia borders when he defeats Kroisos, the king of Lydia, in 547 BC.  

At this time, Anatolia gains a new artistic and cultural perspective. Thinking of military and economy, Persians build “Royal Road” interconnecting Susa and Sardes. Thus, Persepolis, Pasargade, Ecbatana and Susa become important centers of Achaemenid Empire. Because of its rooted-historical past, Babylon is made a capital of culture.  

To rule wide territory, the king of Persia Kyros II uses satrapy, which is firstly used by Assyrians, and makes the regime into monarchy. Since 547 BC we learn that “viceroyalties” are constituted in Anatolia from Herodootos, Ksenophon and ancient written sources. Kyros sends his most reliable soldiers to Empire provinces. Thanks to the satraps he sends to these centers, he both provides the region with safety and collects tax from the countries under his control. According to C. Tuplin, there are commanders named Kiliarkhos in the leadership of the force called khoraand commanders named Phrouarkhos as the leader of the force at the back. These forces are generally divided into two. In Kyros and Kambyses periods (530-522 BC), the taxes taken from the dominated-countries are not collected in accordance with specific rules. Anatolia is divided into five satrapies as İauma (Ion), Sparda (Sardeis), Daskyleion, Kilikia and Armenia, which are also thought to exist in Kyros II period.  

At this time, much is not known about the distribution of satrapies in Anatolia. Darius I (522-486 BC) makes a variety of arrangements in satrapies. Behistun inscription, the founding inscription of Susa, royal reliefs in the entrance of Persepolis and Persepolis Wall tablets give information about satrapies. He reorganizes the state by ending

29 Herodotos V: 52-59.  
32 Ksenophon VIII. 6. 9; Tuplin 1988: 67.  
34 Sevin 1982: 268 ff.
the feudal regime of the Empire.  He separates the empire territory into 20 satrapies. 23 satrapies are present in Behistun inscription by Darius I (map 2).

“Khsatrapavan” Greeks call “satrapes” means the protector of kingdom. The satraps, who are native noblemen, are like little kings ruling smaller territory. The satraps are charged with keeping the province under control, enabling communication, and protect the king’s interests. Their most significant duty is to keep the obtained finance safe. Apart from determined taxes, there are feeding the king’s army, providing soldiers for the army, and also animal payments. Moreover, there are controllers who inform the king, who are called “the king’s eyes”, and who check the satraps every year. The satrapies are identified considering people not geography. In other words, rather than the names of regions, a kind of grouping is formed based on the people living there. At this point, we mean not Ionia but Ionians, not Caria but Carians, and not Lykia but Lykians. The satrapies do not keep their first-planned situation. Depending on political conjuncture, they vary in number and region. Persians give the name “Paktyike-Armenia” to the satrapy in Eastern Anatolia.

After Alexander the great invades Anatolia, defeats Persian army controlled by Spithridates, the satrap of Sardes in Granikos in 334 BC, and dominates all the territory, LIA period in Eastern Anatolia comes to an end and a new period begins. As for the period beginning with the conquest by İskender, it is defined as “Part”, “Seleukid”, “Post-Achaemenid” or “Hellenistic”.

R. Dyson achieves the first study on LIA chronology in accordance with Hasanlu layers in Northwestern Persia. It shows that Iron III, which is the last iron age of Persia and which is claimed to rise following a transition phase of LIA, dates back between 750/700 and
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420 BC. Iron III is made of two phases, IIIA and IIIB. IIIB dates back to 750/700-600 BC and IIIA dates back to 600-420 BC.\(^{43}\)

The study on the exact chronology in Persia is achieved by P. R. S. Moorey by linking the historical chronology of Mesopotamia with that of Elam. According to the results of mound, necropolis and survey researches, Persia chronology is following:

Iron III is involved in 800-400 BC and Iron IV is involved in 400-150 BC.\(^{44}\)

According to the results of survey researches carried out around Southern Caucasus, Horom excavations in Armenia, and the Mountain Alagöz; P. Avetisian, R. Badaljan and A. Smith present the following chronology for Southern Caucasus (Armenia region): Dating back to 800-500 BC, Middle Iron Age is divided into two within itself, Urartu period (800-600 BC) and post-urartu and Achaemenid period (600-500 BC).\(^{45}\)

The results of Mound Büyüktepe and Sos excavations and survey researches around Erzurum/Bayburt reveal the following chronology by A. Sagona:\(^{46}\)

According to this chronology, LIA, equal to Sos IIIB structure, is involved between 800/750 and 300. From aforementioned dates, LIA around Erzurum is very different from the chronologies offered for Van region and Southern Caucasus. Urartu and Achaemenid period are presented together.

V. Sevin ve E. Konyar-K. Köroğlu have achieved the last study for EAR Van region Iron Age. V. Sevin presents the following chronology in the light of ceramics and graves coming from Early Iron Age centers, Castle Yeşilahç II, Mound Castle Van, and Mound Karagündüz LIA:

MIA is limited to Urartu period and dates back to 800-625 BC while early and LIA are made of two phases.\(^{47}\) According to the layer in Castle Van-Yeşilahç II, Mound Karagündüz and Mound Castle Van; Post-Urartu/Achaemenid period follows MIA (Urartu) layer (625-450 BC), and Iron Age of the region ends with LIA (450-330 BC).\(^{48}\)

K. Köroğlu-E. Konyar reveal a different perspective on EAR Iron Ages. K. Köroğlu-E. Konyar note that antiques obtained from necropolis Dilkaya, Karagündüz and Yoncatepe and related Mounds Dilkaya, Karagündüz and Castle Van do not sort together, that there are no EIA architectural layer in Mounts, and from the fact that the concept of dromos, alcove, and especially adjoining room resembles Urartu rock tombs with multi-room; that these centers and antiques require to date back to Urartu period.\(^{49}\)

When the approaches shown by the researchers are accepted, the fact that the process of EIA cannot be documented in archeology will remain a big problem. The chronology suggested by K. Köroğlu-E. Konyar is as follows:

According to this chronology, LIA is given to 600-330 BC when Achaemenid dynasty capturing EAR after the fall of Urartu state comes to end.

As understood from all of these, Post-Urartu, over the beginning of Achaemenic period V. Sevin suggests 625-450 BC for Eastern Anatolia and as for Northwestern Persia R. Dyson suggests 600-420 BC. However, for the end of Iron Age V. Sevin emphasizes 330 BC, and R. Dyson emphasizes 420 BC. On the other hand, P. R. S. Moorey, who divides Persia Iron Age into four, claims that Iron Age (Iron IV 400-150 BC) ends in 150 BC.\(^{50}\) We regard


\(^{44}\) Moorey 1975: 12.


\(^{46}\) See: Sagona-Sagona 2003: 104, Tablo 1.; In addition to see: Sagona 2000: 329-373.

\(^{47}\) See: Sevin 2004: 179-203.


LIA as the period including the fall of Urartu and Achaemenid dynasty (645/625-330 BC) (Tableau).

### Tableau: Comparative Chronology Tableau.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BC</th>
<th>VAN REGION</th>
<th>N. WEST IRAN</th>
<th>TRANS CaUCASIA</th>
<th>EREZERIUM REGION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1500</td>
<td>Early Bronze Age</td>
<td>Early Bronze Age</td>
<td>Early Bronze Age</td>
<td>Early Bronze Age</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1450</td>
<td>Early Iron Age I</td>
<td>Transition Period</td>
<td>Early Iron Age I</td>
<td>Early Iron Age II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1250</td>
<td>Early Iron Age II</td>
<td>Iron II</td>
<td>Early Iron Age I</td>
<td>Early Iron Age</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1100</td>
<td>Middle Iron Age</td>
<td>Transition Period</td>
<td>Middle Iron Age</td>
<td>Early Iron Age</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>800</td>
<td>Post-Urartu, Achaemenid</td>
<td>Iron IIIA</td>
<td>Post-Urartu, Achaemenid</td>
<td>Late Iron Age</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500</td>
<td>Late Iron Age</td>
<td></td>
<td>Late Iron Age</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>330</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. CULTURAL STRUCTURE AND EVALUATION

For Eastern Anatolia, a large part of archeologic excavations and researches which begin in the 19th century are densely seen around Van to determine Urartu works and especially inscriptions. The first determination works in Lake Van Basinrise with F. E. Schulz on behalf of French European Researches in 1827. The aim of F. E. Schulz is to check the information about Castle Van and its environment built by Semiramis, the queen of Babylonia, which is noted by Armenia historian Khoroneli Moses in the 5th century AD. Then visiting the region, A. H. Layard publishes trilingual inscription (Babylonia, Persia Proto-Mede) belonging to Kserkses (485-5-465 BC) the king of Persia in the south of Castle Van in 1853 (Image).

51 Schulz 1828: 160-188.
52 Layard 1853: 394.

“A great god is Ahuramazda, the greatest of gods, who created this earth, who created that sky, who created man, who created happiness for man, who made Xerxes king, one king for all, one ruler for all. I am Xerxes, the great king, the king of kings, king of all kinds of peoples with all kinds of origins, king of this earth great and wide, the son of king Darius, the Achaemenid.

King Xerxes says: King Darius, my father, by the grace of Ahuramazda built much that was good, and he gave orders to dig this niche out, but because he did not make an inscription, I ordered this inscription to be made. May Ahuramazda and the other gods protect me, my kingdom, and what I have made..”
H. H. Von Der Osten publishes Castle Van ceramics in 1952. He divides Urartu ceramics into two types, monochrome and dyed. He names Urartu ceramics with the only color and shiny red liner “Rote Ware” and focuses on its similarity to Hittite ceramics. Calling the ceramics with coloring material “Bemalte Ware”, he dates them to the older times than the ceramics with shiny red liner. He claims that both ceramics are used together and tries to base this opinion on the fact that Toprakkale is made capital in 714 BC and there are no any dyed wares. This opinion suggested by H. H. Von Der Osten, as mentioned on the following pages, is also supported by K. Emre later.

Since Chalcolithic period, dyed ceramics in basin Van have been found in Mound Van/Tilkitepe and Mound Van/Yılantaş in the north of Van. They are pieces reflecting the characteristics of Halaf culture and Ubaid type. Rather since the early 2nd millennium BC, Habur culture, which is seen from Northern Mesopotamia and partly Valley Fırat to Malatya-Elazığ region, and Elazığ-Malatya dyed products, which effect on a small area from Altınova to Malatya, reflect other early-dyed pottery cultures in the region.

Dominating Anatolia after the falling of Urartu which establishes the first state in Eastern Anatolia, and which keeps up with a developed cultural level in art, architecture, religion and life; Achaemenid Empire directly affects the history of Anatolia. Because of the lack of researches on this period which is important to Eastern Anatolia archeology, some questions cannot be illuminated. With the fall of Urartu state expanding in the lands of Eastern Anatolia, a new kind of pottery with dye ornament rises. The pottery seen in the area where Achaemenid Empire spread is characterized with cream lining and dye ornaments. We consider LIA as the period including the fall of Urartu and Achaemenid dynasty (645/625-330 BC). LIA is also examined into two phases; the first phase (645/625-550 BC) identified as post-urartu and the second phase represented by Mede and Persia-Achaemenid domination (550-330 BC).

Urartu settle in mounds and castles. Giving importance to self-defence, Uratu make some amendments on high hills consisting of huge rock mass and make them larger; then
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they become professional at building castles, palaces and temples here. Urartu castles have
got two properties in topography. The castles in the first group are built on chain of lying
mountains to the plain. They are Bastam in Western Iran, Çavuştepe in Lake Van Basin, and
Upper Castle Anzaf. The castles in the second group, as seen in Altintepe and Castle Van, are
built on a high hill in plain. When we examine the properties of places of LIA centers, we
see that 38 percent of the centers occur in the mounds of plains, 29 percent occur on natural
bedrock mass or level area, 33 percent occur in castles. The important detail here is that local
community mostly inhabits in previous times and prefers especially the areas in Urartu
period. Because Achaemenid domination begins shortly after the fall of Urartu, lasting and
non-damaged Urartu buildings or partly-damaged buildings are used, are restored and settled.
Because 33 percent of these settlements are made of castles, we understand that sheltered
areas are preferred in LIA as in Urartu.

LIA ceramics show peculiar characteristics in surface processing, technic and form. The
potteries are the products of a new tradition and culture. Urartu’s monochrome and shiny
red lining ceramics give place to a new type of pottery which has got thick cream lining and
which can be designed in different forms such as monochrome, bichrom and polychrome.
However, we do not know much about the relationships between the end of one’s ceramic
tradition and the other’s beginning because of few data between the fall of Urartu state and
the period when dyed pottery rises with Achaemenid. Overlaid on the cream, light brown,
brown or red-crust products, a cream-color thick liner is one of the characteristics of LIA
ceramics. On the ceramics, as well as red tile, light and dark brown and scarcely black dye;
thin and thick strip lines, zigzag, parallel and inclined lines are mostly used. The main
characters of the ceramic are dye ornaments in triangle and festoon. The ceramic is called
“Triangle Ware” due to hanging triangles on the pottery, and is called “Festoon Ware” due
to hemicycles next to strip or closed arc pattern. The ornaments are monochrome, bichrom or
polychrome. “Omphalos Phiale” with thin wall, smooth surface and shine is created
meticulously. There is no any wheel trace in the surfaces of the bowls called “Tulip Bowl”
and made in high quality. EAR potteries are involved in “Non-Classic/Western Triangle
Ware”. They usually have got thin wall, thin and middle sand and they are middle baked.
However, it can be said that there are local differences in terms of technic and form in
Malatya-Elazığ, Northeastern Anatolia and Lake Van Basin. Although Northwestern Iran,
Southern Caucasus, Middle Black Sea and Middle Anatolia have a cultural unity; they can
differ from each other in ornaments, surface processing and types of bowls. In other words,
we can say that the ceramics have morphological and stylistic similarities and that the forms
are generally the same even if they differ in detail. In addition, the manufacturing of the
potteries in local workshops makes some regional differentials possible.

When we evaluate the obtained material in Eastern Anatolia Region in general, it is
pretty difficult to find a group of pottery depending on an architectural layer. When
considered from this point of view, it is difficult to define a group of materials, whose
stratigraphy is problematic and which is sometimes disputable, in the direction of the aims
above. In this respect, although potteries stemming from Van/Karagündüz and Van Castle
Mound are considered as layer material, it is impossible to refer to a definable architecture in
the areas where the material stems in both mounds. In these mounds the contexts from which
the material stems are usually limited to bases and holes dig into these bases. However,
recent studies in Mound Castle Van in 2010 raise promising developments to reach new data

57 Yiğitpaşa 2010b.
60 Yiğitpaşa 2009; 2010a; 2010b.
about the stratigraphy of this material and antiques. On Urartu architecture found in the excavation season in the mound in 1989-1991, the traces of a stone-based later structure are determined. In this respect, a late phase of LIA or Urartu layer occurs. With the developing studies in this field, it is certain that the problem will be more clarified.\(^{61}\)

LIA layers in a majority of regional mounds are greatly damaged and are in utter disorder. Therefore, architectural structures and layer relationship between architectural structures and pottery cannot be completely revealed. Moreover, the issues such as general plan and form of settlements cannot be solved. From this pottery and small collectivity of finding stemming from castle without stratigraphy, a period-settlement and graves; it is quite difficult to reveal cultural shift and more importantly to determine the chronology of this cultural shift.

The first samples of apadanas in Persia are detected in Hasanlu V (Iron Age I) between 1500-1200 BC. S. Razmjoue D. Huff state that the rising of Medes in the region coincides with\(^{62}\) the rising of apadanas and thus that Achaemenid apadanas stem not from Urartu architecture but from Median architecture.\(^{63}\)

From mural paintings at the bottom of adobe walls put up on stone-based walls, T. Özgüç emphasizes that the inner side of Erzincan/Altintepe apadana is decorated with mural paintings and that it looks like the samples in Armenia/Arin Berd, dating back to Urartu period.\(^{64}\) Then considering that the apadana is approximately 2 meters higher than temple yard, that the apanda is built in the east of southern wall of the temple, the idea that Altintepe is the satrapy center of the East, and discovering dyed ceramics; researchers propose that the apadana belongs to Achaemenids (Picture).\(^{65}\)

\begin{center}
Picture: Altintepe/Cimintepe I, Architectural Plan. Published: (Karaosmanoğlu at al. 2005)
\end{center}

M. Karaosmanoğlu states in the second period excavations that the 6 m. length joining wall, which is put up with stones from the northern corner of the apadana whose eastern wall is preserved to the wall of temple yard, is hurriedly built. After this wall of density 2.75 m. is put up on the stone base of southeastern corner of the temple yard; the southern yard wall,

\(^{61}\) Van Castle Mound 2010 excavation season knowledge. I would like to express my gratitude to Prof. Dr. Kemalettin Köröglu and Assoc. Prof. Erkan Konyar.


\(^{64}\) Özgüç 1966: 45 ff.

which enables the entrance to the temple, occurs to be demolished. With making longer of western wall of the yard and combining with the expanded apadana wall, the entrance from west to yard is blocked and the front wall of the yard is pulled down. It points out that the wall in the direction of northwest belongs to the older time than the expanding of the structure, in other words that the structure is made of two phases and in the first phase, the southern entrance of the temple yard is also open. As a result, considering the fact that the apadana in the first phase combines with the main sewer passing through under the palace rooms and that Urartu ceramics are obtained here, it is stated that the temple and palace are built together. In the second phase, it is thought that the temple continues to function after the expanded apadana and some changes in yard. It is indicated that the only data about the dating of the expanded apadana are mural paintings referring to Urartu period.

There are similarities between Erebuni/Arin Berd dated to Achaemenid period and Erzincan/Altintepe apadana. Rising in Darius I period (522-486), the samples of Achaemenid apadana palaces are discovered in the centers such as Persepolis, Pasargadai and Susa. There is an apadana with 3 yards, 2 entrances, 36 columns inside and 36 outside in the palace in Susa, one of the Achaemenid capitals. There are bulls with glazed brick wings in the first yard, winged red dragons are portrayed in the second yard, and there are 2 sphinxes in the last yard. A palace in Pasargadai, Great Kyros mausoleum built on 6 step pyramidal platforms and in the entrance of 30 column-apadana, the reliefs portraying the king and servants are seen. In 450X300 m palace in Persepolis, the last capital of the Empire, some reliefs portray various committees giving presents in square-shaped apadana. Achaemenid kings have it made on the slopes up in these palaces.

All the rock centers discovered in Eastern Anatolia and in the region around there dominated by Urartu state seem to belong to the aforementioned state. K. Koroğlu states that all the past in the region is believed to result from Urartu because of its advanced skill in mining and especially stonemasonry, and because of the lack of reliable stratigraphic data about pre-Urartu and post-Urartu. B. Öğün and N. Çevik classify grave plans by multi-room or single-room. However, K. Koroğlu indicates in his recent article that they require to date back to the later times, considering some characteristics such as over 40 rock centers, its plans, dimensions, the number of room, doors and interior fittings. He informs that rock grave Small Horhor is like a copy of the grave Persia/Dareios I, type of plan and dimensions in other single-room graves resemble to some rock graves in Phrygia and Kilikia region, and thus that they need to be associated to the cultures dominating the whole Anatolia in post Urartu Persia, Hellenistic and Rome times.
4. EVALUATION AND CONCLUSION

Achaemenid Empire, which dominates Anatolia for over 200 years after the fall of Urartu state, plays a very important role in the shaping of Anatolia by affecting its culture and history directly. Achaemenid period (LIA) “Triangle Ware” and “Festoon Ware” are documented to exist in a vast number of regions including Eastern Anatolia, Iran, Azerbaijan, Northeastern Azerbaijan, Nachcevan, Georgia and Northern Pakistan. Found in different geographies although they look alike in general, the potteries differ from each other in their peculiar local characteristics and the style of making.

That Achaemenids possess this vast geography dominated by themselves has an impact on the spreading of this new pottery culture rising in LIA. As a result of evaluations on pottery, 13 main forms are identified. In this respect, we can say that Eastern Anatolia LIA ceramics reflect a monotonic pottery tradition. However, there are some attempts to get rid of this monotony with the help of the unicolor, bicolor and tricolor ornaments. 46 different ornaments on the ceramics we examine give information about ornament diversity. As for decoration, ceramicists deal with various themes such as geometric, herbal, human and animal figure. While some prove careful and attentive labor, some are made carelessly and randomly. We can say that there is no any change in the technology, form and ornament of the obtained ceramics till now. According to liner characteristics, 6 wares are determined in the ceramics within the scope of the thesis, as Brick-Brown Wares, Cream Crust-Crust colored Lined Wares, Cream Lined Wares, Brick Lined Wares, Black Lined Wares and Grey Lined Wares.

When LIA potteries of culture regions spreading to Achaemenid geography and near Eastern Anatolia centres are evaluated in general, it is understood that they have got a homogeneous cultural structure. It is quite normal that the region under the sway of Achaemenid has got a cultural unity. The potteries in North-western Iran, ‘Triangle Ware’ and ‘Festoon Ware’ found in Central Anatolia, Central Black Sea, Lake Van Basin in Eastern Anatolia Region, North-eastern Anatolia Zone and Elazığ-Malatya region reflect a similar character in typology and wares category. However, as mentioned before, it is understood that they locally differ from each other in sense of pottery. If we accept the producing
tradition of pottery and that pottery is a kind of material produced rather in local workshops, this is normal. The centres where LIA dye ornamental ceramics of Eastern Anatolia are obtained spread on a large geographical area. On the other hand, when it is examined in terms of clay, lining, supplement, baking, forms, surface treatments, types of dye and ornament properties; it is confirmed that they do not differ, that they have got unity and that they do not greatly differ in local production.

Even though especially the layer of Karagündüz LIA has got a wealthy collection of pottery, it is so interesting that any architectural remnants cannot be found. The findings of this material, which is not In situ are not enough to enlighten lots of issues chronologically and stratigraphically. When considered from this point of view, the group of pottery itself is more important source of information to enlighten the issue of style critic. In Erzincan/Altintepe and Elazığ/İmikuşağı, dyed LIA pottery is obtained as well as architectural remnants. A trace of wall; an architectural structure; is also in Castle Van Mound in 2010, but similarly in these centres, architectural remnants and architecture-pottery relationship cannot be noticeably followed. In this regard, pottery densely found definitely requires the existence of a modern layer, too. When we look at the issue from this point, it is helpful to take into consideration that there might be a character of settlement except for traditional in the layers where such a kind of pottery is densely found at least in Lake Van Basin. Moreover, that few potteries are found in these centres is not enough to explain the origin of pottery.

The other architectural works are castle, apadana, civil architecture, and rock tombs found in Eastern Anatolia. Earring from Mound Castle Van, and from Mound Imikuşağı bead, disc, spatula, knife, reaping hook, a head of animal and a few antiques of lion maxilla are obtained.

We cannot mention dyed pottery tradition in Urartu period because of not encountering dyed ceramics in Urartu layers, castles and tombs. We see that there are different dyed pieces of pottery which represents the new culture on Urartu layer of later times. Thus we see that there is a relationship between the range of ceramics and the regions dominated by Persia. Under strict political regime of Achaemenid kingdom, we can think that the opportunity of reaching the farthest places is provided to join all these regions. The aforementioned ceramic can be said to center in especially Persian satrapy regions. The views on the chronology of “Triangle Ware” reveal that the ceramics must stem from Achaemenid period. However, some studies show that these materials may belong to post-Achaemenid period. Nevertheless, when we consider the archeological data in our hand, we suggest that the mentioned pottery must date back to Achaemenid period.

Ruling Anatolia after the falling of Urartu which establishes the first state in Eastern Anatolia, and which keeps up with a developed cultural level in art, architecture, religion and life; Achaemenid Empire directly affects the history of Anatolia. Because of few researches on this period, which is important to Eastern Anatolia archeology, some questions cannot be illuminated. Although a vast number of LIA ceramics are found in archeological excavations and survey researches, any study on all of these have not been carried out so far. Paying attention to the development of pottery in the centers discovered in EAR, some attempts are made to enlighten unknown facts. However, in the center like Karagündüz and Mound Castle Van where this material is found, the potteries cannot be collected considering a specific architecture or layer. The antiques of this material which is not In situ are very few to
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enlighten lots of subjects in stratigraphy and chronology. When viewed from this aspect, the pottery itself is more significant source of information to enlighten the subject.

The technology of period can be learnt from changes in characteristics such as the technology of pottery, form and ornament besides from the settlement where it is produced, the trend of the period, commercial relations and the interaction with neighbor cultures, the consumed food. In this context, a dating can be relatively achieved both between the layers of the same settlement and between different settlements.

S. Kroll groups Bastam ceramics in early and late.\(^80\) L. D. Levine states that there is no any dyed product both in Hill Agrap and in Bastam, but Urartu ceramics with red-liner is found in both and that Hasanlu IIIB nearly seems to be modern with its early layers. In addition, he thinks that there is a parallelism between Post-Urartu Bastam and Hasanlu IIIA in these centers. Thus he indicates that another cluster of ceramics temporarily restricted by the materials belonging to Hasanlu IV ceramics, Post-Urartu Bastam and upper Hasanlu IIIB is seen and the existence of the same situation Ziwiye and Zendan. A vast scale parallelism between these centers and the group of Urartu points out that all sites share the repertoire of different specific figures following themselves. He explains that there is no any dyed products in this period and that Urartu ceramics are replaced by un-dyed camelhair products in Bastam.\(^81\) S. Kroll states that the ceramics of Castle Yeşilalıç II stem from “Redish Ware” rising in Post-Urartian period, that they are made imitating Urartu ceramics with red liner in terms of both surface and paste characteristics; in other words, they are imitation samples. When considered from this point of view, V. Sevin\(^82\) says that they look like “Media” or “Post Urartian”. In addition, the same researcher indicates that “Media” ceramics which are thought to develop after the collapse of Urartu state are not discovered in Karagündüz.\(^83\) And the researcher has an idea that an “imitation” process of Urartu ceramic tradition occurs and that LIA dye-ornamental ceramics are not encountered within this process.\(^84\) Median ceramic is discovered only in Mound Tille in South Eastern Anatolia. A number of in situ ceramics are found in the layers dated to Post Neo-Assyria and Neo Assyria.\(^85\) A number of Median ceramics are encountered in Bastam and Arin Berd in Iran.\(^86\) Agreeing with the suggestion by S. Kroll and V. Sevin, A. Özfırat says that Yeşilalıç II, Bajergeh, Gavurkale, Ziyarettepe, Kuli, Kartavın, Castles Kafir, Palarut and Zincirkale are situated on very high hills which are difficult to reach, and he dates them from MIA to LIA. The potteries and architectures of these centers are said to have the characteristics of both periods. Most scientists whose views are respected above deal with this issue. However, despite the existence of a complex stratigraphy, lack of architecture, and the hypothetically accuracy of a proof based on survey research; we believe that it cannot be possible due to a lack of archeological data. The first phase of LIA defined as Post-Urartian and Media (645/625-550 BC) still keeps being “Dark Age” to the whole Eastern Anatolia.

Because of the increase in the number of excavation and survey researches in Eastern Anatolia Region, based on the issued “Triangle Ware” and “Festoon Ware”, more than in Western Iran are obtained in number. Especially because Mound Van/Karagündüz situated on the road connecting Eastern Anatolia to Persia and Erzincan/Saztepe (Cimintepe II) in Northeastern Anatolia are located near 19. satrapy center, we think that here can be a ceramic production center.

\(^{80}\) Kroll 1976; 151 ff.
\(^{81}\) Levine 1987a: 233-234.
\(^{82}\) Sevin et al. 2000: 856.
\(^{83}\) Sevin et al. 1998: 576-577.
\(^{85}\) French: 336, 341; Picture 4.
\(^{86}\) Kroll 1979: 231; Picture 2, no 12.
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