

## THE COMPLEXITY OF THE PROCESS OF CIVILIZATION

### Ancient Anatolia as a Case in Point

Oral SANDER

Civilization is a complex whole. This is more so if we understand it as "an ideal state of human culture characterized by complete absence of barbarism and a rational, optimum utilization of physical, cultural, spiritual and human resources, and perfect adjustment of the individual within the social framework." (*Websters Third International Dictionary*). Despite the vehement claims of racists, there is neither such a thing as a unique, integrating and superior civilization, nor is it possible to find the exact origins of man's material and spiritual products in the depths of history. From the first appearance of the *Homo Sapiens* onwards, the development of civilization has been on a continuous line.

If we compare this process to a tree, we cannot say with certainty whether a given branch has grown from a particular root, nor would it be possible to claim that a certain root has found its way into the soil due to the growth of a particular branch. In other words, in a highly complex structure such as civilization, the individual parts cannot easily be extracted from the whole. Every single root as well as all the roots combined together are responsible for the growth of each branch and of the whole tree. This is, of course, not to say that the Aztec civilization of America had necessarily any direct connection with the process of civilization in Europe. But, I think that in the case of geographic regions where contact between numerous peoples has been shown to have occurred, to trace the exact origins of human products and to attempt at a clarification of every individual thread of development, is a meaningless and absurd endeavour. Furthermore, given the historically unifying effects of certain geographic areas, the historian is at a loss in determi-

ning the exact and concrete contributions of individual races to the entire process of civilization in one of these regions. Thus, civilization cannot be in the monopoly of a race or nation, but develops thanks to the contributions of different human groups.

Dr. Yaman Örs apparently concurs with this line of thought when he states that "... *no society could have been born or developed if it had not come under the influence of older, and especially neighbouring contemporaneous communities and civilizations.*"

The Anatolian Peninsula, together with its geological-geographic extensions (i.e. the Aegean Islands) is a region where this statement holds particularly true. Dr. Örs remarks more specifically that "... *without the ancient Greek society there could have been no western civilization as we know it today... The ancient Greek society (in turn,) developed under the influence of Minoan (Cretan), Egyptian and Mesopotamian civilizations... (Besides) the beginning of the historical process called Greek civilization was in Western Anatolia and the neighbouring islands rather than in the Greek Peninsula and archipelago.*" (Örs, 1974:101-3)

This statement must be considered within a broader context. The continuous line of the development of civilization, the impossibility of finding the exact origins of human products and of rigid categorization of individual civilizations are nowhere more clearly witnessed than in the Mediterranean region which comprises the lands and peoples around the Mediterranean Sea: Southern Europe, North Africa, the South-Western part of Asia and Asia Minor. In this geographic-historical region, Asia Minor or Anatolia occupies a unique position in that it is perhaps the only principal peninsula on earth which stretches in the east-west direction. This feature must be primarily responsible for the age-old *cliches* that the Anatolian Peninsula has been a "passage-way" for numerous migration waves from and into Europe, and that it is the westernmost elongation of the Asian Continent. Like all other *cliches*, they reveal only half of the truth. The Anatolian Peninsula, an integral part of the Mediterranean, clearly shows the integrating effects of the region. As a result of this and despite the existence of different cultures that found access into Anatolia, we observe the emergence of a remarkable unity. This is why Anatolia should not be considered only as the westernmost part of Asia and as a "beaten track",

but also as an integral part of the Mediterranean. Besides, South European countries are also Mediterranean countries, and Egypt, Libya, Tunisia and Algeria clearly reveal more Mediterranean rather than typical African characteristics.

The Anatolian Peninsula is situated on the crossroads of the eastern Mediterranean and has witnessed many invasions from nearly all directions since pre-historic times. The periodic invasions from Mesopotamia carried many elements of the region even to the Aegean shores of Anatolia. Some of the tribes found a new home and settled here on the fertile soil of the Peninsula, while others forced their way into Europe through the Aegean Sea and Thrace. But the fact remains that all those that settled adapted themselves to the prevailing conditions of the region. This was due to the assimilating capacity of the Mediterranean and Anatolia, integrating various and sometimes contradictory cultures. (*Akurgal*, 1971: 30) This feature has transformed Anatolia into a land where different cultures, religions and races have melted to form a "mosaic" rather than a region where we can find an easily identifiable civilization with roots traceable into specific origins. It thus seems safe to say that Anatolia should not be considered only as a "bridge" between Asia and Europe, but as a "melting pot" where numerous peoples with different cultures and experiences have merged together to form what I would call a "texture of interdependent civilizations".

\* \* \*

The main impact of Anatolia on the new settlers can be found in its general tendency of peaceful co-existence. Between the seventh and second millennium, there were various settlements in Anatolia which showed regional characteristics instead of a homogeneous culture comprising the whole of the Peninsula. These settlements (*Çatalhöyük*, *Hacılar*, *Horoztepe*, *Alacahöyük*, *Tilkitepe* to mention only a few) had a high level of culture of different types. Among them the most advanced civilization of the Neolithic period was that of *Çatalhöyük*. A series of excavations showed no traces of open violence and destruction in the settlement, and in other Neolithic settlements in Anatolia. There was seemingly little class distinction between rich and poor with no evidence of a hierarchical organization and no trace of mas-

sacre was established in the excavations so far. Among the many hundreds of skeletons unearthed, not a single one has been found that showed signs of violent death. (*Fromm*, 1973: 212-3).

A series of excavations further revealed that the Anatolian people had a matriarchal social structure, the woman having apparently played a dominant though not domineering role until the third millenium. Fromm has made this evaluation: "*The fact that these Neolithic villages in Anatolia had a matriarchal (matricentric) structure, adds a great deal more evidence to the hypothesis that Neolithic society, at least in Anatolia, was an essentially unaggressive and peaceful society. The reason for this lies in the spirit of affirmation of life and lack of destructiveness which... was an essential trait of all matriarchal societies.*" (*Fromm*, 1973: 217) Thus, those tribes which arrived in Anatolia after the third millenium found themselves in such an environment and were affected by it. As I shall discuss later, the *Hittites*, an originally barbarian and patriarchal people foreign to Anatolia, invaded the territory of the *Hattian* people of Anatolian origin and founded a high civilization much affected by the peaceful culture already existing there. It was perhaps not mere coincidence that the *Kadesh Treaty*, the first written peace treaty in history, was signed in 1286 B.C. between the Hittite King Hattusilis III and Egyptian Pharaoh Ramses II. This unprecedented event, which began an era of centuries-long peace in Anatolia, clearly reveals the peaceful influence of the Peninsula on such a warrior people as the Hittites and, furthermore, marks its feature of intergrating various and even contradictory cultures, as Akurgal forcefully stresses. (*Akurgal*, 1971: 30) Thus, since their arrival in Anatolia, the Hittites adapted their total pattern of behaviour to the dominant conditions of the Peninsula.

In 2300 B.C., that is three hundred years before the arrival of the Hittites, an Indo-European people speaking the *Luvian* dialect occupied the entire south-western Anatolia from the shores of the Marmara Sea down to the gulf of Iskenderun (*Alexandretta*). This powerful thrust of the Luvians brought with it an unprecedented destruction which the peaceful Anatolian people had not witnessed before and which deprived the Anatolian people of its prosperity for at least a hundred years. Only the central and northern Anatolia managed to escape from this

calamity. In about 2200 B.C., when contacts were established between these regions and the Luvian-dominated Southwest, profitable trade relations were formed with *Cilicia* and north Syrian markets which resulted in the recovery of Anatolia's previous prosperity. Under these circumstances the focus of attention moved once more to central Anatolia and particularly to the site of Kültepe (*Kanesh*). This development was also important due to the introduction of writing to the Peninsula by the literate Assyrian traders. (Lloyd, 1967: 38). Thus, historical periods started in Anatolia with the sole exception of the western shores of the Peninsula bordering the Aegean.

When the Kültepe inscriptions were deciphered it became clear that peoples both of the Asian and Indo-European origins lived in Anatolia and that the latter, including the Hittites, were in a minority. (*Alkim*, 1969: 149) In other words, the Assyrians, Hittites and other foreigners had not found themselves in a cultural "vacuum" when they settled in Anatolia. On the contrary, they were greatly influenced by highly developed city communities with their prominent Anatolian characteristics and deep-rooted traditions. The most important aspect of Kültepe is, in the words of Lloyd, that "*it once more emphasizes the existence of an authentic Anatolian culture persisting through the vicissitudes of migration and political change.*" (Lloyd, 1967:53) This is still more evidence that the new settlers of Anatolia had been influenced by or adapted themselves to the prevailing conditions of the region.

The "international" language of the time in Anatolia was *Akkadian (Babylonian)*. But more locally there was *Hattian*, the indigenous language of central Anatolia. (Lloyd, 1967:54) The Hattian language, which was entirely different from the Asian, Near Eastern and Indo-European ones, distinguishes itself by numerous prefixes (*Akurgal*, 1971: 14) and those people speaking the language are generally called the *Proto-Hittites*.

\* \* \*

The Hittites were first seen in Anatolia in the second millennium. Their origin is not quite clear. Some claim that they came from the North-East, while others from the North-West. There is, however, unanimity in that when they ventured into Anatolia from somewhere north of the Peninsula, they were barbarian

and patriarchal. Only after the impact of the peaceful, civilized and matriarchal culture of the region did they begin to worship the Anatolian mother goddess *Kubaba*, which emphasizes the matriarchal social structure of the region, and to penetrate into the Anatolian life without destruction, a very rare if not unique event by the time and thereafter.

The native Anatolians (*Hattians*) intermingled with the newcomers without much friction, and the more flexible *Neshian* (*Hittite*) replaced the Hattian language. In short, the assimilatory effect of Anatolia once more had the upper hand of the newcomer and the Hittites entered into the "texture of civilizations" of the region, inheriting an abundance of traditions. Seton Lloyd has the following to say on the topic: "*What we do in fact watch is the assimilation by the Hittites of Anatolian traditions and practices. We see in their art and architecture, in their religion and iconography, many elements which are not of their own creation, but which emphasize their loyalty to principles adopted before their arrival. If we seek for qualities and predilections which may specifically be attributed to their own national heredity, we shall find them most obviously in their undoubted genius for military and political organization, in their talent for administration and their ambitious imperialism.*" (Lloyd, 1967: 56) The last national heredity must have been curbed down somewhat by their new environment as the *Kadesh* Treaty demonstrates.

The Hittites established such a strong political and military unity in Anatolia that until 1200 B.c. no migration wave and no conquering army managed to pass through the Peninsula. The Babylonians, Assyrians and Egyptians failed to conquer Anatolia from the East. During their rule the Hittite Kingdom was surrounded by barbarian Europe (including the Greek Peninsula) from the West, by primitive tribes from the North, by the Babylonians and Assyrians from the East and by Syria, Egypt and the *Minoeans* from the South. These peoples were all influenced by the high Hittite civilization through periodic interactions.

The study of the *Kültepe* (*Kanesh*) inscriptions reveal that when the Hittites founded their kingdom in Anatolia, eight different languages were actually spoken in the region, two of which—Hittite and Akkadian—were used by the Hittite Kings for their official documents. These eight languages were as follows: (i)

*Hittite*: a language of the Indo-European family; (ii) *Hattian*: a language neither Indo-European nor Semitic, but peculiar to the native peoples of Anatolia; (iii) *Luwian*: closely related to Hittite, it was subdivided into several dialects, of which one was the "hieroglyphic language and another developed into the *Lycian* of the classical period; (iv) *Palaic*: like Hittite and Luwian it belongs to the Indo-European family and was spoken by the Palaic people who are believed to have lived around Kastamonu (*Paphlagonia*); (v) *Hurrian*: an agglomerative language which has no connection with the Indo-European family, but closely related to the language of the Kingdom of *Urartu* established in eastern Anatolia in the first millenium B.C.; (vi) *the Aryan Language of the Rulers of Mitanni*, who lived in south-eastern Anatolia; (vii) *Akkadian*: the Semitic language of Babylonia and Assyria which was widely used for diplomatic correspondence and documents of international character, a custom followed by the Hittite kings in their dealings with their southern and eastern neighbours; (viii) *Sumerian*: the oldest language of lower Mesopotamia which was intensively studied in Boğazköy (*Hattusas*). (Gurney, 1976: 117-26).

It can be deduced from this classification and from previous explanations that the Hittites were only one of several peoples who lived in Anatolia during this period. But however numerous the Anatolian peoples might have been, they nevertheless identified themselves with the native Hatti culture and perpetuated their Anatolian heritage. As a matter of fact, the word "Hittite" was derived or modernized from "Hatti". Thus, it must be safe to state that the Hittite civilization came into being as a result of long interaction between the native Hatti civilization on the one hand Indo-European on the other, with Anatolia serving again as a decisive "melting-pot." (Akurgal, 1971: 19-20).

\*  
\* \*

The people called *Achaean* by *Homer* established in the western coast of Anatolia a series of trade colonies in 1500 B.C., and tried to penetrate into the Peninsula. *Homer*'s "Iliada" can be considered as a poetic description of these partly successful campaigns. Anatolia was opened to Achaean extension only after the collapse of the Trojan Kingdom and, in addition, of the Hittite Kingdom by the *Phrygian* invasion. Thus, in 1200

B.C. the Achaeans forced their way into the southern and south-western coasts of Anatolia and established strong colonies a long time before the the *Dorian invasion of the Greek Peninsula* which, in turn, forced further Achaean migrations to Anatolia. (*Akurgal*, 1971: 25; *Mansel*, 1963: 82-85).

The Achaeans first appear in history as a result of an intermingling between the native peoples of the Greek Peninsula from the third millenium and those tribes which ventured into the area from the North in the second millenium. Their culture had witnessed sporadic alterations until 1600 B.C. after which they came under the Cretan influence. (*Mansel*, 1963: 57) The Achaeans ceased to be a political entity because of the Dorian invasion in the eleventh century and thus their civilization in the Greek Peninsula was destroyed. Those who stayed intermingled with the newcomers and the rest set sail to the Anatolian coast. (It is an interesting point that the Dorians which called themselves "Helen" were the first people to use this word). (*Dettore*, 1966: 95, 99).

The latter were called *Ionians* in Anatolia and established a high civilization in their new home until 500 B.C. Even after this date and although superiority in the field of arts was transferred to Athens, Ionians still maintained its preponderance in science. (*Mansel*, 1963: 85-87). At the beginning of the sixth century B.C. Anatolia was dominated by the Persians but the Ionian cities retained their autonomy.

Thus, it is safe to state that the Ionian cities in Anatolia and the Dorians of the Greek Peninsula were two different entities. But the Western opinion which has a strong tendency to consider as "Greek" everything civilized and humane in Ancient Western Anatolia, evaluates the *Dorian and Ionian* civilizations as parts of a single entity. This mistaken view apparently stems from two sources: *First* .the Western intellectual tries to find the origins of "Western civilization" and everything noteworthy in it only in the Ancient Greek society which, I think, is a futile endeavour in view of the complexity of the process of civilization. *Secondly*, he draws unbreakable links between language and race, and thus considers the peoples speaking the Greek language as Greeks despite the fact that language itself is not a reliable criteria in finding the identity of a race. Dr. Örs adds clarity to



the subject with the following evaluation: "*Arabic was the official, religious, scientific, in short, general language of the Islamic world. Now, can we call the Islamic society an Arabic civilization? There are Iranians, Turks, Berbers and other peoples making the social edifice of that society. Jews contributed to it, especially in the scientific fields. We are then quite unjustified when we call it an Arabic civilization, a mistake made rather frequently. We find the same attitude in case of the ancient Greek society.*" Referring to Arnold Toynbee, he goes on that "*the ancient Greeks were a seafaring people, who, through their mariners, spread their own language and "put it into currency" all around the Mediterranean. So? Were all the peoples speaking this language Greeks? Greek was mainly the mythological, literary, philosophical and scientific language of an important part of the Mediterranean area, but the people who used it in these domains were not necessarily Greeks.*" (Örs, 1974: 105).

The *Phrygians*, a people of indo-European origin, ventured into Anatolia in 1200 B.C. and settled in the central region with *Gordion* as their famous capital. Most of the Phrygian cities were destroyed by the *Cimmerian* invasion in the beginning of the seventh century. The Cimmerians, who were Indo-European nomads, did not settle on the Phrygian soil. Towards the end of the century, the western Phrygia was occupied by the *Lydians* and eventually the Phrygian independence was put an end by the Persian occupation in 546 B.C. (Metzger, 1969:57; Menderes, 1977: 41)

The *Lydians* occupying most of the Phrygian territory lived between the Meander and Hermos rivers and were ruled by the Hittites. They were not much affected by the invasions from Thrace which destroyed the Hittite Kingdom in 1200 B.C. Later they formed an independent kingdom under *Giges* but fell under Persian rule in 546 B.C. According to *Herodotus*, the Heracles Dynasty of Micaean origin came to the Lydian capital of *Sardes* in 1200 B.C. It is possible that these were the Achaeans venturing into western Anatolia in search of new territories after destroying Troy. But the fact remains that the Lydians spoke a language closely related to Hittite. (Menderes, 1977: 34) According to another theory, Lydians were in fact related to the Hit-

tites and composed of several tribes which forced their way into Anatolia from the Straits. (*Ünsal*, 1960).

\* \* \*

In the east of the Anatolian Peninsula, in roughly the same period lived the *Urartians*. The first mention of this people (who called themselves *Biainili*) is found in the Assyrian inscriptions of the 13th century B.C. They lived in the region of Lake Van and apparently founded a loose federation comprising small principedoms in the 13th and 12th centuries. In 900 B.C. a strong Urartu state was established. Continuously at war with the Assyrians, the Urartians were later exposed to *Cimmerian* and *Medes* invasions, and finally their state was destroyed by another nomadic and Indo-European people, the *Scythians*.

The principal God of the Urartians was *Haldi*. As all their inscriptions began with reference to their God, some scholars were led to speak of a "Haldi Civilization" and even to claim, by drawing similarities with the Armenian word *Haldik*, that they were the ancestors of Armenians. Some further believed that *Haldiye*, a province mentioned in the Byzantian sources, had corresponded to the Urartu territory. But it has been shown that the *Haldiye* province stretched between Trabzon and Batum where Urartians had not lived. As a matter of fact, Urartian is an agglomerative language whereas Armenian is undoubtedly an Indo-European one. (*Balkan*, 1978) Furthermore, after the *Scythians* and *Medes* had destroyed the Urartu Kingdom in 612 B.C., the latter was replaced geographically by the Armenians, an Indo-European people of whose extraction there is no clear record. (*Lloyd*, 1967:109) Thus, with the fall of the Urartians and the appearance of the Armenians and also other tribes in the region, the connection with the Urartians was cut off. (*Metzger*, 1969: 13-14) As stated previously, the language of the Urartians was closely related to that of the *Hurrians* who lived in the area south of Lake Van after 2200 B.C.

Between the Meander river and lake Köyceğiz, that is, to the south of the Lydians, we see the *Carians*. According to ancient Greek sources the *Carians* originally lived in the Aegean islands from where they were forced to migrate to Anatolia as a result of Dorian invasion. But modern archeological findings

have shown no evidence of Carian existence in these islands. Moreover, the early culture of the Aegean islands clearly reveals Cretan and Minoean characteristics and no trace of Carian influence. In fact, it does not seem to be justifiable to state that the Carians lived in any other place than Anatolia. The Carians themselves had expressed, according to George Bean, that "*they had always lived on the mainland and had always been called Carians, and they advanced their own evidence: there was at Mylasa an ancient sanctuary of Carian Zeus, to which, besides Carians, only Mysians and Lydians were admitted; these, they claimed, were historically akin to themselves, and had never been other than mainlanders. Scholars today are much inclined to believe that in this matter the Carians were in the right.*" (Bean, 1971:17) In Homer's *Iliad*, the Carians appear as allies of the Trojans against the Achaeans. Of the successive waves of migration from Greece to Anatolia after the Trojan war, that of the Dorians was the last and southernmost. But this Greek colonization touched only the coast, and the interior remained Carian. The Carian language has not been deciphered so far and whether the language is Indo-European or not is yet disputed. (Bean, 1971:20) Thus, there is strong evidence that the Carians, together with Mysians, Lydians and Lycians, were basically Anatolian peoples resisting the invaders from the Greek Peninsula as the Trojan coalition clearly suggests.

The *Lycians* as the seafaring people of Anatolia fought against the Egyptians in the war of Kadesh as an ally of the Hittites, and later against the Achaeans side by side with the Trojans, both for the obvious purpose of defending Anatolia against foreign invaders. Their country lied between the gulfs of Antalya and Fethiye. According to archeological excavations the earliest settlements in this region dates back to the second millenium. Philological studies, on the other hand, have revealed the names of certain settlements with ND, NT and SS endings which is peculiar to Anatolia and which belong to the third millenium. The Greek colonists witnessed strong resistance by the Lycians who later lived under the sovereignty of the Persians, Macedonians, Romans and then Byzantines. (Anday, 1977: 28-29) There was a time when the Lycians were considered as relatives of the Hittites and their language, Lycian, as related to Neshian. Nevertheless, based on a different version of the Greek alphabet,

Lycian has not yet been deciphered. The most consistent theory is probably the one which emphasizes its relation to the Luwian language. (*Anday, 1977: 29-30*).

To the east of the Lycians, native Anatolian peoples lived in independent small states in *Cappadocia* ever since the pre-historic times. There are sites such as Kültepe dating from the stone age. As understood from the coalition formed against the Assyrian King *Naramsin*, there was at least seventeen small kingdoms in 2300 B.C. (*Andolfato and Zucchi, 1971:67*) There is very little information about Cappadocia after the collapse of the Hitites and up to the sixth century B.C. when the region merged into the Lydian Kingdom. It fell in 350 B.C. to the Persians and then to Alexander the Great. Although some form of autonomy was maintained, the Cappadocian states became a province of the Roman Empire in 17 A.D. (*Giovannini, 1971: 68*) Until the end of the fourth century A.D., it revealed native, Persian and Semitic influences on the one hand, and Greco-Roman on the other. (*Thierry, 1971: 129*).

The Macedonian King Alexander the Great initiated a series of campaigns for the purpose of creating a world-state by uniting the East and the West. In reality, even before Alexander Anatolia had been in continuous contact with the East. After his campaigns a mixture of civilization of both Greek and Asian origins emanated as a result of the interreaction of eastern and western cultures. It is for this reason that Anatolia's cultural history has been so complex, incredibly rich and indisputably great. (*Akurgal, 1971: 29*).

In 197 B.C., after settling accounts with Carthage in the West and getting increasingly stronger, the *Roman Empire* came into contact with Anatolia. In 133 B.C. the Romans annexed *Pergamum* upon the will of its last king *Attalos III*. As a reaction against this Western enlargement in Anatolia, *Mitradates Eupator IV*, the King of Pontus, attacked western Anatolia and put an end to Roman dominance in 88 B.C. Two years later, however, the rebellion was suppressed and Anatolia once again was dominated by the Romans. Upon the will of the last king of *Bytania, Nikomedes III*, this territory was unified with that of Pontus and, became a Roman province. When the last Hellenistic Kingdom of Egypt was conquered by *Octavianus*, Rome enlarged its territory to cover nearly all the eastern Mediterranean.

The *Pontus* state was established in 298 B.C. and ceased to exist after two centuries as a result of Roman occupation of Anatolia. Despite the fact that Alexander the Great had never entered the Pontus territory (stretching between the Black Sea and the Caucasian Mountain sin the north and east, and Cappadocia and Paphlagonia in the south and west) during his campaigns in Anatolia, the Pontus Kings themselves accepted the Roman suzerainty, but maintained their autonomy. (*Goloğlu*, 1973: 48, 74) There lived in the Pontus state a multitude of peoples of Asian and Anatolian origins. (*Goloğlu*, 1973:78) According to some historians the Pontus kings belonged to the Persian Dynasty, while others claim that they were native princes. *Goloğlu*, referring to *Alfred Duggan*, states that the Pontus kings "had no connection whatsoever with the Greeks. "They considered themselves as Anatolians, strove for Anatolian integrity and independence, and formed a national army from the native peoples due to their lack of confidence to Greek mercenaries. The Pontus kings, however, admired the Greek culture and for this reason opened the gates of their palaces to numerous Greek thinkers and artists. Thus, Greek culture, together with its trade, expanded in the area and eastern and western cultures intermingled once again on the Anatolian soil . (*Goloğlu*, 1973: 102-3)

*Constantine* was the first Roman Emperor to recognize Christianity by announcing in 313 A. D. that the new religion was not restricted. *Teodisius* accepted Christianity as the official religion in 395 A.D. This had a detrimental effect in Anatolia as far as culture is concerned, because from then on the Romans began to break down the idols in Anatolia thus depriving the Peninsula of the products of a 2000 years old civilization.

*Sabahattin Eyüboğlu* states that "the Hittites, Phrygians, Greeks, Persians, Romans, and Byzantines conquered Anatolia with the result that they had become Anatolians" (*Eyüboğlu*, 9) rather than Anatolia becoming anything else but itself. A study of Anatolia's long history reveals, apart from others, two outstanding features: *First*, Numerous peoples which lived in Anatolia have nearly always adapted their pattern of behaviour to the prevailing conditions of the Peninsula and thus created a cultural history with such richness and complexity that it is nearly impossible to determine the exact and concrete contributions of

individual races to the entire process of civilization of the region. *Secondly*, throughout its long history, Anatolia has experienced periodic foreign domination with detrimental effects on its prosperity. Consequently, those who lived in Anatolia nearly always united against foreign domination.

For the last thousand years the Turks have been living in Anatolia. In the course of this time we have intermingled with the Anatolian texture on interdependent civilizations and greatly influenced them. In return, Anatolia imprinted an everlasting impact on us. This is the principal reason why Anatolia, with all its material as well as spiritual richness, is ours.