

**TÜBA** **TÜBA-AR**  
Türkiye Bilimler Akademisi Arkeoloji Dergisi  
Turkish Academy of Sciences Journal of Archaeology

**2018**  
Özel Sayı  
ISSN: 1301-8566



ANKARA



TÜRKİYE BİLİMLER AKADEMİSİ

# TÜBA-AR

Türkiye Bilimler Akademisi Arkeoloji Dergisi  
Turkish Academy of Sciences Journal of Archaeology

2018 Özel Sayı  
Special Issue 2018

**TÜBA Arkeoloji (TÜBA-AR) Dergisi**  
TÜBA-AR uluslararası hakemli bir dergi olup TÜBİTAK ULAKBİM (SBVT) ve Avrupa İnsani Bilimler Referans İndeksi (ERIH PLUS) veritabanlarında taranmaktadır.

**TÜBA Journal of Archaeology (TÜBA-AR)**

TÜBA-AR is an international refereed journal and indexed in the TÜBİTAK ULAKBİM (SBVT) and The European Reference Index for the Humanities and the Social Sciences (ERIH PLUS) databases.

**Sahibi / Owner:**

Türkiye Bilimler Akademisi adına  
Prof. Dr. Ahmet Cevat ACAR  
(Başkan / President)

**Sorumlu Yazı İşleri Müdürü  
Managing Editor**

Prof. Dr. Ahmet Nuri YURDUSEV

**Basın ve Halkla İlişkiler  
Press & Public Relations**

Asiye KOMUT

**Grafik Tasarım / Graphic Design**

Fatih Akın ÖZDEMİR

**TÜBA-AR İletişim Asistanı  
Communication Assistant**

Cansu TOPRAK

**Baskı:** Sıfıraltı Yayıncılık ve Çocuklar için Üretimler San.tic.ltd.şti.

**Tel:** 0.312 222 72 74

**Sayı:** 2018 Özel Sayı (500 adet)

**Basıldığı Tarih:** 2018

**ISSN:** 1301-8566

**TÜBA-AR Yazışma Adresi  
Correspondence Address**

Türkiye Bilimler Akademisi  
Rabi Medresesi

Süleymaniye Mahallesi

Mimar Sinan Caddesi No: 24

34116 Fatih – İstanbul

Tel: 0212 513 4824

Faks: 0212 514 9996

E-posta: cansu.toprak@tuba.gov.tr

**Türkiye Bilimler Akademisi  
Turkish Academy of Sciences**

Piyade Sokak, No: 27, 06690

Çankaya- ANKARA

Tel: 0312 442 29 03

Faks: 0312 442 72 36

www.tuba.gov.tr

E-posta: tuba-ar@tuba.gov.tr

© Türkiye Bilimler Akademisi, 2018

© Turkish Academy of Sciences, 2018

(All rights reserved.)

Bu derginin tüm yayın hakları saklıdır.

Tanıtım için yapılacak kısa alıntılar dışında yayıncının yazılı izni olmaksızın hiçbir yolla çoğaltılamaz, CD ya da manyetik bant haline getirilemez.

(Kaynağı belirtilmemiş görseller,

makalelerin yazarlarına aittir.)

**TÜBA-AR YEREL VE SÜRELİ BİR YAYINDIR**

Kapak Fotoğrafi

Hakkari Steli, Erken Demir Çağı,

Veli Sevin

**TÜBA-AR  
TÜRKİYE BİLİMLER AKADEMİSİ ARKEOLOJİ DERGİSİ**

TÜBA-AR, Türkiye Bilimler Akademisi (TÜBA) tarafından yıllık olarak yayınlanan uluslararası hakemli bir dergidir. Derginin yayın politikası, kapsamı ve içeriği ile ilgili kararlar, Türkiye Bilimler Akademisi Konseyi tarafından belirlenen Yayın Kurulu tarafından alınır.

**DERGİNİN KAPSAMI VE YAYIN İLKELERİ**

TÜBA-AR dergisi ilke olarak, dönem ve coğrafi bölge sınırlaması olmadan arkeoloji ve arkeoloji ile bağlantılı tüm alanlarda yapılan yeni araştırma, yorum, değerlendirme ve yöntemleri kapsamaktadır. Dergi arkeoloji alanında yeni yapılan çalışmalara yer vermenin yanı sıra, bir bilim akademisi yayın organı olarak, arkeoloji ile bağlantılı olmak koşuluyla, sosyal bilimlerin tüm uzmanlık alanlarına açıktır; bu alanlarda gelişen yeni yorum, yaklaşım, analizlere yer veren bir forum oluşturma işlevini de yüklenmiştir.

Dergi, arkeoloji ile ilgili yeni açılımları kapsamlı olarak ele almak için belirli bir konuya odaklanmış yazıları “dosya” şeklinde kapsamına alabilir; bu amaçla çağrılı yazarların katkısının istenmesi ya da bu bağlamda gelen istekler Yayın Kurulu tarafından değerlendirir. Kazı ve yüzey araştırmaları da dahil olmak üzere, yeni yorum ve açılım getirmeyen, yalnızca malzeme tanıtımı içeren, ön rapor niteliğindeki yazılar dergi kapsamının dışındadır. Kültür tarihi açısından önemli bir yenilik getiren önemli buluntular “haber” olarak dergiye kabul edilebilir. Yazarlar dergiye makale gönderdiklerinde, söz konusu yazının daha önce, çeviri olarak bile başka bir yerde yayımlanmadığını ya da yayımlanmak üzere bir başka dergiye gönderilmemiş olduğunu kabul etmiş sayılırlar.

**TÜBA-AR  
TURKISH ACADEMY OF SCIENCES JOURNAL OF ARCHAEOLOGY**

TÜBA-AR is an internationally referenced journal, published annually by the Turkish Academy of Sciences (TÜBA). Decisions related to the publication policy, the coverage, and the contents of the journal are admitted by the Editorial Board, formed by the Council of the Turkish Academy of Sciences.

**COVERAGE AND PUBLICATION PRINCIPLES OF THE JOURNAL**

Principally, the TÜBA-AR journal covers all recent studies, comments, evaluations, and methods in archaeology, and in adjacent areas related to archaeology, without limitation to any periods or geographic regions. In addition to studies carried out in the field of archaeology, as a publication organ of an academy of science, the journal is open to all professional fields of the social sciences, provided that they are related to archaeology; it has also undertaken the function to create a forum covering recent interpretations, approaches, and analyses developing in these fields.

The journal may feature writings focused on a specific subject as a “file” in order to comprehensively cover new initiatives related to archaeology; and to this end, the Editorial Board decides whether contributions of invited writers are required, or evaluates any requests received in that context. Articles that do not introduce new interpretations and initiatives, but are rather in the form of a preliminary report containing only introductions to materials, including archaeological excavations and surface researches, are out of the scope of the journal. Important findings introducing significant innovations in terms of the cultural history can be accepted as pieces of “news”. When writers send articles to the journal, they are deemed to have agreed and undertaken that the article in question has not been published in any other journal, including its translations into any languages, and that it has not been submitted to any other journal for publication, including its translations.

# TÜBA-AR

## Türkiye Bilimler Akademisi Arkeoloji Dergisi Turkish Academy of Sciences Journal of Archaeology

### **Kurucu (Founder)**

Prof. Dr. Ufuk ESİN

### **Onursal Yayın Kurulu (Honorary Members of The Editorial Board)**

Prof. Dr. Refik DURU - Prof. Dr. Veli SEVİN

Prof. Dr. Önder BİLGİ

### **Yayın Kurulu Başkanı (Editor in Chief)**

Prof. Dr. Şevket DÖNMEZ

### **Editörler (Editors)**

Prof. Dr. Musa KADIOĞLU

Doç. Dr. Harun ÜRER

Dr. Öğr. Üyesi Dr. Haydar YALÇIN

Prof. Dr. Gocha R. TSETSKHLADZE

### **Yayın Kurulu (Editorial Board)**

Prof. Dr. Gülsün UMURTAK

Prof. Dr. Aynur ÖZFIRAT

Prof. Dr. Engin AKDENİZ

Prof. Dr. Yılmaz Selim ERDAL

Prof. Dr. Mehmet IŞIKLI

Prof. Dr. Şule PFEIFFER-TAŞ

Dr. Öğr. Üyesi Dr. Fethi Ahmet YÜKSEL

Dr. Öğr. Üyesi Dr. Aslıhan YURTSEVER BEYAZIT

### **Danışma Kurulu (Editorial Advisory Board)**

#### **Tarihöncesi Arkeolojisi (Prehistory)**

Prof. Dr. Harun TAŞKIRAN

Prof. Dr. Metin KARTAL

Doç. Dr. Bahattin ÇELİK

### **Protohistorya ve Önasya Arkeolojisi (Protohistory and Near Eastern Archaeology)**

Prof. Dr. Aliye ÖZTAN

Prof. Dr. Gülsün UMURTAK

Prof. Dr. Fikri KULAKOĞLU

Prof. Dr. Tayfun YILDIRIM

Prof. Dr. Aynur ÖZFIRAT

Prof. Dr. S. Yücel ŞENYURT

Prof. Dr. Engin AKDENİZ

Prof. Dr. İbrahim Tunç SİPAHİ

Prof. Dr. Vasıf ŞAHOĞLU

Prof. Dr. Özlem ÇEVİK

Prof. Dr. Mehmet IŞIKLI

Dr. Öğr. Üyesi Aslıhan YURTSEVER BEYAZIT

Dr. Öğr. Üyesi Çiğdem MANER

### **Klasik Arkeoloji (Classical Archaeology)**

Prof. Dr. Serra DURUGÖNÜL

Prof. Dr. Musa KADIOĞLU

Prof. Dr. Turgut HACI ZEYREK

Prof. Dr. Kutalmış GÖRKAY

Prof. Dr. Gül IŞIN

Prof. Dr. Zeynep ÇİZMELİ-ÖĞÜN

Prof. Dr. Gürcan POLAT

Prof. Dr. Ralf von den HOFF

Prof. Dr. Zeynep KOÇEL ERDEM

Prof. Dr. Sümer ATASOY

Doç. Dr. Veli KÖSE

Doç. Dr. Daniş BAYKAN

### **Karadeniz Arkeolojisi (Black Sea Archaeology)**

Prof. Dr. Gocha R. TSETSKHLADZE

Prof. Dr. Şevket DÖNMEZ

### **İran – Orta Asya Arkeolojisi (Iran – Central Asia Archaeology)**

Prof. Dr. Aiman DOSSYMBAYEVA

Doç. Dr. İbrahim ÇEŞMELİ

Doç. Dr. Anıl YILMAZ

Doç. Dr. Farshid İRAVANI GHADİM

### **Türk - İslam Arkeolojisi (Turkish - Islamic Archaeology)**

Prof. Dr. Bozkurt ERSOY

Prof. Dr. Hüseyin YURTTAŞ

Prof. Dr. Kenan BİLİCİ

Dr. Olcay AYDEMİR

Doç. Dr. Harun ÜRER

Dr. Öğr. Üyesi Dr. Rüstem BOZER

**Ortaçağ Arkeolojisi (Medieval Archaeology)**

Prof. Dr. Zeynep MERCANGÖZ Doç. Dr. Lale DOĞER  
Prof. Dr. Ayşe AYDIN Doç. Dr. V. Macit TEKİNALP  
Prof. Dr. Osman ERAVŞAR Doç. Dr. Emel Emine DÖNMEZ  
Doç. Dr. Ferudun ÖZGÜMÜŞ Dr. Öğr. Üyesi Dr. Ahmet Vefa ÇOBANOĞLU

**Sualtı Arkeolojisi (Underwater Archaeology)**

Dr. Öğr. Üyesi Hakan ÖNİZ

**Eskiçağ Tarihi (Ancient History)**

Prof. Dr. Mustafa Hamdi SAYAR Doç. Dr. Bülent ÖZTÜRK  
Prof. Dr. Turgut YİĞİT Dr. Öğr. Üyesi Salih KAYMAKÇI  
Prof. Dr. Turhan KAÇAR Dr. Öğr. Üyesi Özlem SİR GAVAZ  
Prof. Dr. Mustafa ADAK

**Hititoloji (Hittitology)**

Prof. Dr. Aygül SÜEL  
Doç. Dr. Hasan PEKER

**Mısırbilim (Egyptology)**

Doç. Dr. Hasan PEKER

**Arkeojeofizik (Archaeogeophysics)**

Prof. Dr. Selma KADIOĞLU Dr. Öğr. Üyesi Fethi Ahmet YÜKSEL

**Arkeojeoloji (Archaeogeology)**

Prof. Dr. Yusuf Kağan KADIOĞLU

**Arkeometalurji (Archaeometallurgy)**

Prof. Dr. Ünsal YALÇIN

**Arkeozooloji (Archaeozoology)**

Prof. Dr. Vedat ONAR Doç. Dr. Levent ATICI

**Arkeobotanik (Archaeobotanic)**

Doç. Dr. Evangelia PIŞKİN

**Antropoloji (Anthropology)**

Prof. Dr. Yılmaz Selim ERDAL Doç. Dr. Ömür Dilek ERDAL  
Prof. Dr. Ayla Sevim EROL

**Sosyoloji (Sociology)**

Prof. Dr. Kenan ÇAĞAN

**Kültürel Mirasın Korunması / Koruma Amaçlı Planlama  
(Protection of Cultural Heritage / Protection Planning Policies and Approaches)**

Doç. Dr. Kübra CİHANGİR ÇAMUR

# İÇİNDEKİLER / CONTENTS

|  |     |
|--|-----|
| Editörün Notu / Editor's Note .....  | 8   |
| Özel Sayı Editörlerinin Notu / Special Issue Editor's Note .....   | 10  |
| Geçmişten Bugüne Ölüm Olgusuna ve Ritüellere Bilimsel Yaklaşım.....<br><i>Scientific Approach on Death Phenomenon and Rituals from Past to Present</i><br>Umut PARLITI - Ahmet UHRİ  | 13  |
| A Consideration of Status And Wealth in the Lake Van Basin<br>According to the Early Iron Age Burials.....<br><i>Erken Demir Çağ Mezarları Işığında Van Gölü Havzası'nda<br/>Statü ve Varsıllık Üzerine Bir Değerlendirme</i><br>Aylin Ü. ERDEM  | 29  |
| Burial Customs Between the Late Chalcolithic and the<br>Early Bronze Age in the Shida Kartli Region of Georgia.....<br><i>Gürcistan Shida Kartli Bölgesinde Geç Kalkolitik ve<br/>İlk Tunç Çağ Ölü Gömme Geleneği</i><br>Elena ROVA  | 37  |
| Plovdag Necropolises' Funeral Rite .....   | 57  |
| <i>Plovdağ Nekropolünün Tunç Çağı Mezarları</i><br>Bakhlul IBRAGIMLI   |     |
| In the Light of New Evidence from the Erzurum Plain:<br>An Overview of Kura-Araxes Funerary Practices in Eastern Anatolia.....<br><i>Erzurum Ovası'ndan Yeni Kanıtlar Işığında Doğu Anadolu'daki<br/>Kura-Aras Ölü Gömme Uygulamalarına Genel Bir Bakış</i><br>Gülşah ALTUNKAYNAK - Mehmet IŞIKLI - Mustafa ERKMEN | 73  |
| The Collective Burial Kurgan of Uzun Rama .....  | 93  |
| <i>Uzun Rama Toplu Mezar Kurganı</i><br>Bakhtiyar JALİLOV  |     |
| Devret Höyük Ölü Gömme Gelenekleri ve Mezar Uygulamaları .....   | 107 |
| <i>Burial Customs and Grave Practices of Devret Höyük</i><br>Atıla TÜRKER - Ayşegül ŞARBAK - Mustafa Tolga ÇIRAK - Cahide Gizem TIRIL  |     |

|  |     |
|--|-----|
| Cenotaphs in the Bactria Margiana Archaeological Complex Domain:<br>A Case Study of Northeast Iran.....  | 139 |
| <i>Bactria Margiana Kültürel Kompleksi İçinde Anıt Mezarları:<br/>Kuzeydoğu İran'da Bir Çalışma</i><br>Farshid IRAVANI GHADIM - Hamed TAHMASEBI ZAVE   |     |
| <br>   |     |
| The Early Iron Age Cemeteries of the Lake Van Basin:<br>An Overview of Burial Tradition of Pre-Urartians.....  | 149 |
| <i>Van Gölü Havzası Erken Demir Çağ Mezarlıkları:<br/>Pre-Urartu Dönemi Gömü Anlayışının Genel Bir Değerlendirmesi</i><br>Aynur ÖZFIRAT  |     |
| <br>   |     |
| Reflections on Spatial and Structural Traits of Cemeteries:<br>The Case of Bronze and Iron Age Syunik, Armenia.....  | 187 |
| <i>Mezarlıkların Yapısal ve Mekansal Niteliklerine Yönelik Düşünceler:<br/>Ermenistan Syunik Bronz ve Demir Çağ Örneği</i><br>Hayk AVETİSYAN - Artak GNUNİ - Henrik DANİELYAN - Arsen BOBOKHYAN                                      |     |
| <br>   |     |
| Integrated Archaeo-Geophysical Survey on Volcanic Terrain:<br>The Case of Karmir Sar on Mount Aragats (Republic of Armenia) .....  | 197 |
| <i>Volkanik Arazi Üzerinde Bütünleşik Arkeojeofiziksel Araştırma:<br/>Alagöz Dağı'nda Bulunan Karmir Sar Tepesinin Durumu (Ermenistan Cumhuriyeti)</i><br>Harald von der OSTEN - Pavol HNILA - Alessandra GİLİBERT - Arsen BOBOKHYAN |     |

## EDİTÖRÜN NOTU

Assur yazılı belgelerinin konuşmaya başlaması ile MÖ 13. yüzyıldan 9. yüzyıl ortalarına değin ilk kez Öntarih (Protohistorya) Dönemi yaşamış olan Doğu Anadolu ve yakın çevresi, bu sürecin sonunda devletleşme aşamasına geçmiştir. Assur kaynaklarında Nairi, Uruatri ya da Urartu olarak anılan bölgelerin Öntarih Dönemi, Doğu Anadolu Erken Demir Çağı ile arkeolojik kimlik temelinde kronolojik olarak örtüşmektedir. Öntarih Dönemi'nin sona ermesine neden olan olay, MÖ 9. yüzyılın ilk yarısında Uruatri ve Nairi bölgeleri beylerinin Van Gölü'nün güneydoğu kıyısında bulunan, en güçlü siyasi organizasyon olduğunu düşündüğümüz, Tuşpa Beyliği ile tek bir devlet kurmak için birleşmiş olmalarıdır. Assur yazılı belgelerinden tarih, sosyo - ekonomik düzen, toplumsal yapılanma ile tarihsel coğrafya bilgilerine ulaşabildiğimiz Doğu Anadolu toplumlarının özellikle Van Gölü Havzası ile Elazığ - Malatya bölgeleri temelinde Erken Demir Çağı arkeolojik ve kronolojik kurgusu Charles Burney, Afif Erzen, Veli Sevin, Altan Çilingirođlu, Aynur Özfırat, Mehmet Işıklı, Aylin Ümit Erdem ve K. Bartl gibi araştırmacılar tarafından yapılmıştır. Bu yıldan itibaren, senede bir kez hazırlanacak olan Özel Sayı'nın ilkinde Ölü Gömme Gelenekleri temelinde Doğu Anadolu ve yakın çevresinin Geç Tunç-Erken Demir Çağı ile ilgili çok değerli yazılara yer verilmiştir.

2018 Özel Sayımızı hızlı ve nitelikli bir şekilde yayınlamamıza olanak sağlayan TÜBA Başkanı Prof.Dr. Ahmet Cevat Acar'a, Editör, Yayın ve Danışma kurullarındaki değerli hocalarım ile meslektaşlarıma teşekkürlerimi sunuyorum. Özel Sayı'nın editörlüğünü yapan kıymetli meslektaşlarım Prof.Dr. Aynur Özfırat, Prof.Dr. Mehmet Işıklı ve Dr. Öğr. Üyesi Bülent Genç'e, teknik ve bürokratik işlerini başarı ile tamamlayan Fatih Akın Özdemir, Asiye Komut ve Cansu Toprak'a çok teşekkür ederim.

Arkeolojik kazıların sonsuza kadar devam etmesi dileđi ile.

Prof. Dr. Şevket DÖNMEZ  
TÜBA-AR Yayın Kurulu Başkanı

## EDITOR'S NOTE

With the vocalization of Assyrian written sources, Eastern Anatolia and its vicinity that lived through the Protohistory from 13<sup>th</sup> to 9<sup>th</sup> century BC for the first time, had gone into the process of the state formation. The Protohistory of the regions which were mentioned as Nairi, Uruatri or Urartu in Assyrian sources, chronologically coincides with the Eastern Anatolian Early Iron Age in the basis of archaeological identity. The event that ended the Protohistory in the region was the unification of the lords of Uruatri and Nairi with the Tušpa Principality which is thought to be the strongest political organization on the southeastern shore of Lake Van, in order to establish a unified nation. The Early Iron Age archaeological and chronological construction of the Eastern Anatolian peoples especially on the basis of Lake Van Basin and Malatya-Elazığ regions, whose history, socio-economic order, social structure and historical geography we know from the Assyrian written sources, were concluded by the scholars such as Charles Burney, Afif Erzen, Veli Sevin, Altan Çilingirođlu, Aynur Özfırat, Mehmet Işıklı, Aylin Ümit Erdem and K. Bartl. In this first Special Issue which will be issued yearly starting with this year we include valuable articles related to the Late Bronze-Early Iron Age of the Eastern Anatolia and its vicinity on the basis of the Burial Traditions.

We would like to thank Prof. Dr. Ahmet Cevat Acar, Chairman of TÜBA whom enabled us to publish our Special Issue expeditiously and with quality and also to my fellow scholars and colleagues in the Editorial, Publication and Advisory Boards. I would also like to thank to the editors of this Special Issue, my colleagues Prof. Dr. Aynur Özfırat, Prof. Dr. Mehmet Işıklı and Dr. Bülent Genç; and Fatih Akın Özdemir, Asiye Komut and Cansu Toprak who concluded the technical and bureaucratic work successfully.

With the hope of archaeological excavations to last forever.

Prof. Dr. Şevket DÖNMEZ  
TÜBA-AR Chairman of the Editorial Board

# ÖZEL SAYI EDITÖRLERİNİN NOTU

**Changes and Developments in Burial Customs in Eastern Anatolia-Southern Caucasus and its Vicinity from the Late Chalcolithic Period to the Late Iron Age, Proceedings of the Session organized at European Association of Archaeologists (EAA) 20th Annual Meeting (İstanbul, 10-14 September 2014), Eds. A. Özfırat, M. Işıklı, B. Genç.**

İnsan, yaşam döngüsünün özünü oluşturan öğrenme yetisiyle, önce gelenekler adı verilen kurallar ve davranışlar bütününi elde eder. Nesilde nesile aktarılan gelenekler ve davranışların başında toplumsal dinamikler gelmektedir. Bu geleneklerin törensel boyutta uygulananları arasında olan ölü gömme gelenekleri ve ritüeller ön sırada gelmektedir. Ölüm olgusunu kurumsallaştıran gelenekler, inançlar, ritüeller ve törenler ilgili oldukları toplulukların geride bıraktığı en önemli izlerdir. İnsanın geçmişini araştıran arkeoloji bilimi için bu alan inanılmaz bir zenginlik içermektedir. Kazılan her mezar, her mezarlık alanı arkeologların önünde antik çağ topluluklarını anlayabilmek için açılan büyük bir kapıdır. Bu kapıdan ilgili toplulukların sosyal yapısından beslenme alışkanlıklarına değin hemen her konuda bilgiye ulaşmak mümkündür. Anadolu toprakları zengin bir potansiyele sahip olmasına rağmen ölü gömme geleneklerine ilişkin araştırmalar açısından o kadar şanslı değildir. Ülkemizde farklı dönemlere dair kazısı sistemli olarak yapılmış nekropol alanlarının sayısı beklenenin çok altındadır.

Yukarıda sıralanan nedenlerden ötürü ölüm ve onunla ilgili olgular bu güne değin arkeoloji dünyasında çok sayıda çalışmaya konu olmuştur. Konu popülerliğini hiçbir dönemde yitirmez. Bu tür çalışmalardan biri 10-14 Eylül 2014 tarihinde İstanbul'da Avrupa Arkeologlar Birliğinin 20. yıllık toplantısı kapsamında gerçekleştirilen bir oturumdur: Changes and Developments in Burial Customs in Eastern Anatolia-Southern Caucasus and its Vicinity from the Late Chalcolithic Period to the Late Iron Age. Toplantı kapsamında ülkemizde arkeolojik araştırmalar açısından yeterince bilinmeyen Doğu Anadolu ve komşusu Güney Kafkasya ölü gömme gelenekleri açısından analiz edilmeye çalışılmıştır. Prof. A. Özfırat, Prof. Dr. Ş. Dönmez ve Prof. Dr. M. Işıklı koordinatörlüğünde gerçekleştirilen bu oturumda sözlü ve poster bildiriler sunulmuştur.

“Verba volant scripta manent” yani “Söz uçar, yazı kalır” atasözüne sadık kalarak TÜBA-AR Dergisi bu özel sayısını Prof. Dr. A. Özfırat, Prof. Dr. M. Işıklı ve Dr. Öğretim Üyesi B. Genç editörlüğünde bu oturumda sunulan bazı bildiriler ve bu kapsamda dahil ettiğimiz diğer makalelere ayırmıştır. U. Parlıtı ve A. Uhri “Geçmişten bugüne ölüm olgusuna ve ritüellere bilimsel yaklaşım” başlıklı yazılarında ölüm olgusunu ve ölüm ile bağlantılı ritüellerin geçmişten günümüze nasıl evrildiğini, bir diğer deyişle ölüm olgusu ve ritüellerin teorik çatısı ele almıştır. H. Arab, arkeolojik verilere dayanarak Elymais’de görülen ölü gömme tekniğindeki değişimler, defin yöntemleri ve dini inançların Zerdüştlük eğilimlerine göre ne ölçüde değiştiğini tartışır. A. Erdem, Erken Demir Çağ’da Doğu Anadolu’nun sosyo-politik yapısındaki bazı değişimleri

mezarlardan elde edilen verilere dayanarak karşılaştırmaktadır. E. Rova, Gürcistan’ın Shida Kartli Bölgesi’nde Geç Kalkolitik Dönemden İlk Tunç Çağı’nın sonuna değin ölü gömme geleneklerinin gelişimini komşu bölgeler Güney Kafkasya ve Türkiye Yukarı Fırat Havzası’ndaki çağdaşlarıyla karşılaştırarak incelemiştir. B. İbrahimli, Plovdağ Nekropolü’nde MÖ 3. binyılın sonlarından MÖ 2. binyılın ortalarına kadar süren gömü geleneğini ve inşa tekniklerini makalesinde ele almıştır. G. Altunkaynak, M. Işıklı ve M. Erkmek, makalelerinde 2016 ve 2017 yıllarında Erzurum Ovası’ndaki Alaybeyi Höyük’te TANAP (Trans-Anadolu Doğal Gaz Boru Hattı) Projesi kapsamında yapılan kurtarma kazılarında tespit edilen, bir grup Kura-Aras mezarı üzerinden kültürün Doğu Anadolu yaylasındaki gömü geleneğini analiz etmektedirler. B. Jalilov, Erken Tunç Çağı’na ait Uzun Rama kurganı üzerinden bölgenin mezar ve gömü geleneklerini inceler. A. Türker, A. Şarbak, M. T. Çırak ve C. G. Tırıl, yazılarında Devret Höyük’te 2013 yılında gerçekleştirilen kurtarma kazılarında, yerleşim içinde, Erken Tunç Çağı’na tarihlenen mezarları ele almaktadırlar. F. I. Ghadim ve H. T. Zave makalelerinde, MÖ 2.300-1.500 yıllarına tarihlenen Bactria Margiana Arkeoloji Kompleksini ve yeni bir mezar uygulaması olarak bu grupların inanç sistemine ışık tutabilecek bir girişim olan Kuzeydoğu İran’da yeni bir defin türünü tartışır. A. Özfırat, Erken Demir Çağ (pre-Urartu) sürecinde Van Gölü Havzası ölü gömme geleneklerini ve Urartu içindeki sürecini kaleme almıştır. H. Avetisyan, A. Gnuni, H. Danielyan ve A. Bobokhyan, makalelerinde Syunik bulguları temelinde Tunç ve Demir Çağı’nda Ermenistan’daki mezarlıkların mekânsal dağılım ve yapısal özelliği ile ilgili problemleri ele almışlardır. H. Osten, P. Hnila, A. Gilibert ve A. Bobokhyan, ise makalelerinde Karmir Sar’da sürdürülen arkeolojik keşifleri, vişap (ejderha taşı) olarak bilinen megalitik yapılar da dâhil olmak üzere, arazi üzerinde bulunan tarih öncesi unsurların tespiti ve bunların haritasını çıkarılarak yorumlanması üzerine odaklanmaktadır.

TÜBA-AR’ın bu özel sayısının yayımlanmasını sağlayan Türkiye Bilimler Akademisi Başkanı Prof. Dr. Ahmet Cevat Acar ve Yayın Kurulu Başkanı Prof. Dr. Şevket Dönmez’e verdikleri destekten dolayı sonsuz teşekkürlerimizi sunarız. Emeklerini bizlerle paylaşan TÜBA-AR değerli çalışanları Cansu Toprak ve Fatih Akın Özdemir’e özenli çalışmalarını için teşekkür etmek yetersiz kalır. Edisyon sürecinde bizlerden yardımlarını esirgemeyen Umut Parlıtı’ya ayrıca teşekkür ederiz. Son olarak, Avrupa Arkeologlar Birliği-European Association of Archaeologists’e (EAA) elinizdeki bu yayının gerçekleşmesine neden olan toplantıyı düzenlememize olanak sağladığı için teşekkür etmek isteriz.

**Prof. Dr. Aynur ÖZFIRAT**  
**Prof. Dr. Mehmet IŞIKLI**  
**Dr. Öğr. Üyesi Bülent GENÇ**

## SPECIAL ISSUE EDITOR'S NOTE

**Changes and Developments in Burial Customs in Eastern Anatolia-Southern Caucasus and its Vicinity from the Late Chalcolithic Period to the Late Iron Age, Proceedings of the Session organized at European Association of Archaeologists (EAA) 20th Annual Meeting (İstanbul, 10-14 September 2014), Eds. A. Özfırat, M. Işıklı, B. Genç.**

Human, with the learning ability that constitutes the core of the circle of life, first acquires the sum of rules and behaviors that we call traditions. Social dynamics are the foremost of the traditions and behaviors which are transferred from generation to generation. Chief among these traditions which are implemented in a ritualistic fashion is the burial traditions and customs. The traditions, beliefs, rituals and ceremonies that institutionalize the concept of death are the most important traces that the people which they belonged to left behind. For the field of archaeology that investigates the past of the mankind, this topic contains an immense value. Every grave and graveyard excavated is a door opened in front of the archaeologists for their understanding of the ancient civilizations. From this gateway it is possible to reach the information ranging from the social structure to the feeding habits of the said civilizations. Even though the Anatolia, like many other field of archaeology, has a great luck and potential in this topic, it is not so lucky considering the research on the field. The number of the systematic archaeological excavations of necropoleis of differing periods are quite lower than expected.

Because of the reasons we have mentioned above, death and the concepts related to death had been the topics ranging from articles to symposiums in the world of archaeology. The topic has never lost its appeal. One such study is a session that was ran as a part of the 20th Annual Meeting of the European Association of Archaeologists in 10-14 September 2014: Changes and Developments in Burial Customs in Eastern Anatolia-Southern Caucasus and its Vicinity from the Late Chalcolithic Period to the Late Iron Age. In the scope of the session, burial traditions of Eastern Anatolia and its neighbor Southern Caucasus which were not well known in archaeological research were tried to be analyzed. In this special session ran in coordination of Prof. A. Özfırat, Prof. Dr. Ş. Dönmez and Prof. Dr. M. Işıklı, verbal and poster presentations were given.

In accordance to the adage of “Verba volant scripta manent” which means “words fly away, written words remain” TÜBA-AR has reserved this special issue to the papers given in this session in the editorship of Prof. Dr. A. Özfırat, Prof. Dr. M. Işıklı and Dr. B. Genç. In their paper titled “A Scientific Approach to the Concept of Death and Rituals from Past to Today” U. Parılı and A. Uhri have discussed the concept of death and the evolution of the rituals related to death from past to this day in other words the theoretical framework of death and the related rituals. In his paper H. Arab discusses the changes in the burial tradition, inhumation practices and religious beliefs in accordance to Zoroastrianism in Elymais in accordance with the archaeological data. In his paper A.

Erdem comparatively discusses the changes in socio-political structure of Eastern Anatolia in Early Iron Age according the archaeological data derived from the graves. The paper which evaluates the development of burial traditions of the Shida Kartli region of Georgia from the Late Chalcolithic Period to the end of the Early Bronze Age with their comparison with their contemporaries in Southern Caucasus and Upper Euphrates Basin in Turkey belongs to E. Rova. B. İbrahimli, in his article discusses the burial tradition and construction techniques in Plovdiv Necropolis in Azerbaijan from the end of 4th Millennium BC to the mid-2nd Millennium BC. In their articles G. Altunkaynak, M. Işıklı and M. Erkmen analyze the Kura-Araxes Culture's burial traditions in Eastern Anatolian Plateau through a group of Kura-Araxes graves that were unearthed in the salvage excavations implemented in the scope of TANAP (Trans-Anatolian Natural Gas Pipeline) in Alabeyli Höyük, located in Erzurum Plain in 2016 and 2017. B. Javilov examines the graves and burial traditions of the Early Bronze Age of Nahchevan through the Uzun Rama Kurgan in his article named “Uzun Rama Mass Burial Kurgan”. In their article, A. Türker, A. Şarbak, M. T. Çırak and G. Tırtıl discusses the salvage excavation of 2013 and the graves in the settlement dated to the Early Bronze Age in Devret Höyük. F. I. Ghadim and H. T. Zave in their article discuss in their article the Northeastern Iran through the Bactria Margiana Archaeological Complex dated to 2.300-1.500 BC and a new burial type that can illuminate the belief system of the population groups living here. In her article A. Özfırat, describes the burial traditions of the cults in the Van Basin in Early Iron Age (pre-Urartian) and the process in Urartian Period. H. Avetisyan, A. Gnuni, H. Danielyan and A. Bobokhyan in their article named “Thoughts on the Location and the Structural Properties of the Cemeteries: Syunik: Armenia Example in Bronze and Iron Ages” examine the localization and structural properties of the Bronze and Iron Age cemeteries of Armenia through the example of Syunik. H. Osten, P. Hnila, A. Gilibert and A. Bobokhyan in their article focus on the discoveries in Karmir Sar located in Alagöz Mountain of Armenia, detection, mapping and evaluation of the pre-historic elements including the megalithic structures known as Vishap (“Dragon Stone”).

In the completion of this work we would like to thank Prof. Dr. Ahmet Cevat ACAR the chairman of Turkish Academy of Sciences and Prof. Dr. Şevket DÖNMEZ the chief editor of TÜBA-AR for their valuable support. We cannot thank enough to the valuable personnel of TUBA-AR, Cansu TOPRAK and Fatih Akın ÖZDEMİR for their meticulous work. We also would like to thank Umut PARILTI whom did not deny us his support. And last but not the least we would like to thank European Association of Archaeologists (EAA) for organising the event that enabled us to compile this publication.

**Prof. Dr. Aynur ÖZFIRAT**  
**Prof. Dr. Mehmet IŞIKLI**  
**Assist. Prof. Bülent GENÇ**

# THE EARLY IRON AGE CEMETERIES OF THE LAKE VAN BASIN: AN OVERVIEW OF BURIAL TRADITION OF PRE-URARTIANS

## VAN GÖLÜ HAVZASI ERKEN DEMİR ÇAĞ MEZARLIKLARI: PRE-URARTU DÖNEMİ GÖMÜ ANLAYIŞININ GENEL BİR DEĞERLENDİRMESİ

### Makale Bilgisi

Başvuru: 29 Eylül 2018

Hakem Değerlendirmesi: 1 Ekim 2018

Kabul: 30 Ekim 2018

DOI Numarası:10.22520/tubaar.2018.os.01.009

### Article Info

Received: September 29, 2018

Peer Review: October 1, 2018

Accepted: October 30, 2018

DOI Number: 10.22520/tubaar.2018.os.01.009

Aynur ÖZFIRAT \*

**Keywords:** Nairi, Uruatri, Early Iron Age, pre-Urartu, Urartu, Lake Van Basin, Eastern Anatolia, Grave

**Anahtar Kelimeler:** Nairi, Uruatri, Erken Demir Çağ, pre-Urartu, Urartu, Van Gölü Havzası, Doğu Anadolu, Mezar

### ABSTRACT

*The aim of this article is to evaluation of the burial tradition of pre-Urartians in the basin of Lake Van. After the Middle Bronze Age, which had a strong pastoral character, and towards the end of the Late Bronze Age, new pottery, architectural and metallurgical traditions, new settlement pattern and new burial customs emerged in the highland of eastern Anatolia in the Early Iron Age. One of the most remarkable changes is the settlement system, great numbers of fortresses and their cemeteries in the highlands and foothills have been recorded in eastern Anatolia which is also the case southern Caucasia and northwestern Iran. A ruling elite together with a hierarchical social structure and the steps towards the sedentary life started to form around the socio-economic centers, a lifeway between pastoralism and sedentary had taken place in the whole region. Lake Van Basin is the most investigated area, excavations at cemeteries of Ernis (Ünseli) Karagündüz, Yoncatepe, Dilkaya, and a great number of cemeteries which is mainly connected with the highland fortresses found in the survey represent the Early Iron Age burial tradition in the basin. The graves and stelae from Hakkari are quite remarkable finds of the pre-Urartian elite, or the rulers of Uruatri and Nairi lands. This paper also emphasizes the role of Early Iron Age investigations in the basin which is important for the foundation period of the Urartian Kingdom as well as understanding the local polities of pre-Urartians.*

\* Prof. Dr., Mardin Artuklu Üniversitesi, Edebiyat Fakültesi, Arkeoloji Bölümü, Kampüs Yerleşkesi, 47200 Artuklu-Mardin.  
E-posta: aynurozfirat@gmail.com

**ÖZET**

*Makalede Van Gölü Havzasında Erken Demir Çağ (pre-Urartu) gömü anlayışının genel bir değerlendirmesi yapılmıştır. Doğu Anadolu yüksek yaylasında, pastoral karakteri oldukça güçlü olan Orta Tunç Çağı'nın ardından, Son Tunç Çağı içinde gelişerek dönemin sonunda ortaya çıkan yeni çanak çömlek, metal, mimari, yerleşim sistemi ve gömü geleneği Erken Demir Çağı'nı temsil eder. Bu dönemin yenilikleri arasında en dikkat çekici olanlarından biri yerleşim sistemidir. Doğu Anadolu bölgesinde, Güney Kafkasya ve Kuzeybatı İran'da olduğu gibi yüksek alanlarda ve dağ eteklerinde çok sayıda kale ve mezarlık ortaya çıkar. Hiyerarşik bir yapıya sahip yönetici sınıf ve yerleşik yaşama doğru atılan adımlar sosyo-ekonomik merkezler etrafında toplanma şeklinde kendisini gösterir. Tüm bölgede pastoralizm ve sedentar hayat arasında bir yaşam tarzı görülür. Van Gölü havzası bu dönem gömü geleneği için en fazla araştırma yapılmış alandır. Ernis (Ünseli) Karagündüz, Yoncatepe ve Dilkaya kazıları ile yüzey araştırmasında bulunmuş ve genellikle yüksek alanlarda ve dağ eteklerinde yer alan çok sayıdaki kale-mezarlık havzada Erken Demir Çağ gömü geleneğini temsil eder. Hakkari mezarları ve stelleri ise pre-Urartu ya da Uruatri ve Nairi ülkeleri yönetici sınıfı için oldukça dikkat çekici bulgulardır. Makalede ayrıca, havzadaki Erken Demir Çağ araştırmaları, pre-Urartu yerel güçlerini anlamının yanısıra Urartu Krallığı kuruluş evresi içindeki etkileri açısından da ele alınmıştır.*

## INTRODUCTION

Archaeological information on the cemetery of Early Iron Age (EIA, c. 1300/1200-900 BC) in the highland of eastern Anatolia comes only from the excavations at cemeteries of Hakkari, Lake Van basin and some in northeastern Anatolia. Burial context was a significant element of the pre-Urartian landscape. A large number of EIA fortresses and their cemeteries in the highlands and foothills have been recorded in eastern Anatolia which is also the case southern Transcaucasia and northwestern Iran. The cemeteries which are located at the major fortresses or settlement complexes contain hundreds of graves.

Radical changes came up towards the end of the Middle Bronze Age (MBA, c. 2300/2200-1500 BC) which has strong pastoral character associated with wide range of highland cemeteries with no considerable settlement traces, new culture being formed in the Late Bronze-Early Iron Age (LBA-EIA) in these vast grazing lands of the highland of eastern Anatolia. The characteristics of the EIA in the region are the emergence of highland fortresses-cemeteries; chamber graves and multiple burials; the disappearance of the 'Araxes painted ware' of the MBA; the appearance of new monochrome pottery (grooved ware); and the iron weapons-ornaments. A large number of the fortresses and cemeteries of pre-Urartians found widespread on the high pastures, foothills and lower areas imply the existence of a considerable population. A ruling elite together with a hierarchical social structure and the steps towards the sedentary life started to form around the socio-economic centers, as indicated by the large number of fortresses-cemeteries and fortress-cities. On the other hand, semi-nomadism and transhumanism based on animal husbandry survived. It seems that, in the EIA, a lifeway between pastoralism and sedentary had taken place in the region. Basically, there were no major changes in the socioeconomic system based on animal husbandry and transhumance in the Urartian Kingdom as shown by some of the highland fortresses of pre-Urartians and seasonal settlements have been used in Urartian period.


Landscape of pre-Urartians appears to have shared a common culture and by numerous local polities, which could be named as fortress-state, small kingdom, chiefdom or regional confederacies in tribal structure. State formation of these small highland polities marked by the appearance of local states centered in major fortresses or fortress-cities with urban character. Hakkari chamber graves and stelae of EIA is the most prominent evidence of this strong ruling elite. Highland of eastern Anatolia, southern Caucasia and northwestern Iran were divided among a great number of local polities in the

EIA according to written sources. Assyrian epigraphic records starting from king Shalmanasar I (1274-1244 BC) reported under the name of Nairi and Uruatri lands ruled by the kings or chiefdoms reaching in the number to 60 and afterward Urartian written sources give information about these independent local polities. Many kings, countries, cities, fortresses and people of these territorial highland polities of pre-Urartian landscape are mentioned in the Assyrian and Urartian texts. Information on the territories of these local states or small kingdoms in eastern Anatolia is extremely limited. It seems that the region was divided into numerous geographical small units ruled by a central fortress-city. EIA is also accepted as a period in the basin of Lake Van that these small kingdoms prepared the foundations of the Urartian Kingdom. Later, central fortresses-cities of these local polities or local fortress-states of pre-Urartians became provinces or major cities of Urartu.

## CEMETERIES

Highland of eastern Anatolia is characterized by high plateaus with the great range of high volcanoes of Bingöl, Nemrut, Süphan, Aladağ, Tendürek and Ağrı. Lake Van is a depression basin surrounded by these volcanoes and Mt Southern Taurus. It has a special role in the region not only for its geography and also being the central area of the Urartian Kingdom. The main feature of this high and extensive volcanic terrain is fertile pastures which is better suited for animal husbandry than for agriculture. River valleys-plains and the highland pastures have been the living spaces between these high mountain ranges. As well as the archaeological sites concentrated in the lowlands which include river valleys-plains, the fortresses-cemeteries situated on the mountain slopes and highlands create the settlement system of the region in the EIA-MIA. Although the highland of eastern Anatolia having a homogeneous culture, it is divided three geographical and cultural sub-regions which is mainly identified by the burial tradition, pottery, metal and chronology: Lake Van basin, Northeastern Anatolia (Mt. Ağrı and Erzurum Kars Plateau) and Mt Southern Taurus-Hakkari (Fig. 1). The chronological and archaeological distinctions of sub regions are clearly seen in the pottery and grave types. The monochrome pottery tradition of EIA in eastern Anatolia which is also known as 'Grooved or Nairi ware' shows a homogeneous character with its regional variations, from the Upper Euphrates in the west, to the southern Caucasus in the east, to the behind of Mt Southern Taurus in the Upper Tigris Valley in the south<sup>1</sup>. This monochrome pottery

<sup>1</sup> Grooved ware have been continued decreasingly into the Urartian Period (Middle Iron Age) with some changing in form and technic as suggested by Sevin 1986: Sevin 285-286; 1989: 453-454; Sevin 1995: 26-3; Sevin 1996: 445; Sevin 2005a: 380, Harita 2;



Figür 1: Highland of Eastern Anatolia: Bronze-Iron Age Sites and Burial Traditions of Early Iron Age / *Doğu Anadolu Yüksek Yaylası: Tunç-Demir Çağ Yerleşimleri ve Erken Demir Çağ Mezar Gelenekleri.*

which is mainly decorated with grooves, notches and triangles dominated the eastern Anatolia with variations in color in sub-regions, such as, black burnished ware in northeastern Anatolia, pinkish-buff, red slipped and red-brown wares in the basin of Lake Van, red-brown ware in Upper Euphrates Valley.

The most striking difference between sub-regions were seen in the burial traditions, northeastern Anatolia was in the borders of kurgans-cromlechs and the related cultures. On the contrary, Lake Van basin and Hakkari remains outside of the kurgan zone. Kurgans-cromlechs are a few, only to the north of basin, there are some on the slopes of Süphan and Tendürek and Aladağ volcanoes which were geographically connected to Mt Ağrı and at the same time to a large barrier separating Lake Van basin and northeast Anatolia. In spite of a large number of kurgan cemeteries found in northeastern Anatolia, investigations are limited. Except for the Mt. Ağrı-Bozkurt kurgan cemetery, the cemeteries of Köprüküy, Ani, Küçük Çatma and Gökçekaynak were short term excavations and there is insufficient data (Fig. 1)<sup>2</sup>. Chamber graves and

stelae from Hakkari are quite remarkable discoveries of the EIA in the region, and also they are discussed in this article due to their connection with the basin (Fig. 1). Lake Van Basin is the most investigated area for the EIA burial tradition represented by stone lined and chamber graves. Excavations of the EIA cemeteries in the basin of Lake Van were carried out at first at Ernis (Evditepe and Alacahan) on the northern shore of lake, mound-cemetery at Dilkaya on the southeastern shore of lake, mound-cemetery at Karagündüz on the eastern shore of Lake Erçek and finally cemetery at Yonca Tepe on the eastern slope of Mt Ereğ overlooking to the Van Plain (Figs. 1-2).

### Ernis-Ünseli


The settlement complex at Ernis (the town of Ünseli) is located at a small coastal plain between the plains of Muradiye and Erciş on the northeastern shore of Lake Van (Figs. 1-3). This small coastal plain (former Kanikan) is sheltered area bordered from south by the shore of Lake Van and from the other directions by the Mt Esruk. It contains settlements which cover separate units in a vast area within a long time, related to each other. Settlements at Ernis span from the EBA-Kura-Araxes to the LIA-Achaemenid periods, except for an interruption in the

Sevin 2015: 91-92; Erdem 2009; Erdem 2012; Özfirat 2018.

For the Upper Tigris Valley material see Brancato 2017; Guardicci 2012, 2016; Okse 2014; Okse *et al.* 2014.

<sup>2</sup> Özfirat 2014a; Özfirat 2014b; Özfirat In press a.

## THE EARLY IRON AGE CEMETERIES OF THE LAKE VAN BASIN: AN OVERVIEW OF BURIAL TRADITION OF PRE-URARTIANS

**SURVEY SITES**

|        |                                |
|--------|--------------------------------|
| L66/1  | Tıkızlı                        |
| L68/1  | Yukarı Göçmez                  |
| L73/1  | Tahttepe-Somkaya               |
| M66/1  | Nurettin                       |
| M66/2  | Okçuhan                        |
| M66/3  | Toptepe/Dereboğazi-Hasretpınar |
| M66/6  | Kırkgöze                       |
| M66/7  | Çaygeldi                       |
| M66/8  | Elmakaya                       |
| M67/1  | Düzceli                        |
| M67/2  | Grebudo-Doğansu                |
| M68/1  | Konakbey                       |
| M68/3  | Bağdıran-Patnos                |
| M68/5  | Gönlüaçık                      |
| M68/6  | Esenbel                        |
| M68/7  | Büyük Taştepe-Çaputlu          |
| M68/10 | Şato Çeşmesi-Köseler           |
| M68/14 | Duluz                          |
| M68/16 | Akçaören                       |
| M68/18 | Kamışlı                        |
| M68/19 | Gavurkale-Tepeli               |
| M69/1  | Ganiyi Neso-Duracak            |

|        |                          |
|--------|--------------------------|
| M69/4  | Meydantepe-Meydan        |
| M69/9  | Toptepe-Kocapınar        |
| M69/13 | Develi                   |
| M69/14 | Hazinetepe-Orta Damla    |
| M70/1  | İn Mevkii-Şehirpazar     |
| M70/2  | İt Kalesi-Çakırbey       |
| M70/5  | Köşkköprü-İncesu         |
| M70/6  | Kengerkor-Uncular        |
| M70/12 | Şekerbulak-Evbeyli       |
| M71/3  | Tırmıklı                 |
| M71/5  | Bakırtas                 |
| M71/6  | Zirçilitaş-Topraklı      |
| M71/7  | Teketaş-Deredam          |
| M72/3  | Büyük Gir-Avcıbaşı       |
| M72/7  | Yukarı Mutlu             |
| M72/9  | Hacı İbrahim-Aşağı Çanak |
| M73/7  | Çubuklu                  |
| N63/1  | Graaver-Sürügüden        |
| N63/2  | Gre Mezra-Sürügüden      |
| N63/3  | Yıllankale-Sürügüden     |
| N66/3  | Segran-Burcukaya         |
| N66/4  | Yuvadamlı                |
| N67/3  | Haydarkale-Develik       |
| N68/1  | Dizginkale               |

|        |                         |
|--------|-------------------------|
| N69/7  | Mino-Bayramlı           |
| N69/8  | Zınarizer-Bayramlı      |
| N70/7  | Aliler-Tutumlu          |
| N71/5  | Üzerliktepe-Ovapınar    |
| N71/6  | Çolpan                  |
| N71/8  | Beyaztaş-Yukarı Gölalan |
| N73/1  | Eski Karakol-Dorutay    |
| N73/6  | Aşağı Koçkırın          |
| N73/7  | Hato Göleti-Çubuklu     |
| 070/5  | Siyahtaş-Aşit           |
| 070/8  | Kıratlı                 |
| 070/11 | Çiğyesor-Alabayır       |
| 070/12 | Ağazik-Alabayır         |
| 070/13 | Keklikbulak-Şahbağı     |
| 070/17 | Gülsünler               |
| 071/1  | Abdullah Çeşmesi-Erçek  |
| 072/1  | Harabekale-Yatıksirt    |
| 072/10 | Kırkbulak-Boğazkesen    |
| 073/1  | Dağdeviren              |
| 073/2  | Şehitlik/Usobiti-Saray  |
| 073/4  | Şehitler-Tepedam        |
| P70/4  | Eski Norgüh-Yolaşan     |
| P70/9  | Otbiçer-Gürpınar        |
| P70/12 | Kurubaş-Ayazpınar       |


Figür 2: Sites of EIA in the Basin of Lake Van: Survey and Excavations / Van Gölü Havzası Erken Demir Çağ Yerleşimleri: Yüzey Araştırması ve Kazılar.

MBA (Figs. 3-4): Kura-Araxes settlement at Evditepe; EIA fortresses-cemeteries at Evditepe and Alacahan; Urartian road station (?) and a cult building at Yukarı Keçikırın; small LIA (Achaemenid) fortress at Aşağı Keçikırın.

First excavation at Evditepe (Varşak Tepe) cemetery was undertaken during the First World War by N. J. Marr, then a short trip in 1938 by K. Lake. The cemeteries at Evditepe and Alacahan which named as Ernis excavated

by A. Erzen and E. Bilgiç in 1962-1964. V. Sevin (1997) and author (2002-2008) conducted surveys at the site. Records of A. Erzen and E. Bilgiç excavations and their findings in the museums of Van and Anatolian Civilizations together with material from our survey were studied by V. Sevin<sup>3</sup>. The information on cemeteries at Evditepe and Alacahan excavated by A. Erzen and E.

<sup>3</sup> Sevin's study based on the excavation reports given to him by A. Erzen and materials in Van and Ankara Anatolian Civilizations museums with survey material.



Drawings and Photos: Sevin Archiv

Figür 3: Ernis-Ünseli Settlement Complex / Ernis-Ünseli Yerleşim Kompleksi.

Bilgiç is limited to a few published excavation reports. The number of the graves and their finds, detail on locations and types of the graves are largely in the dark. There were finds from 8 or 9 graves from Evditepe and 4 graves from Alacahan according to records of the Van Museum while more graves were excavated, and since the finds in the Anatolian Civilizations Museum were largely recorded as Ernis it is impossible to separate two different cemeteries.

The EIA settlements of Ernis are fortresses-cemeteries at Evditepe and Alacahan (Figs. 4-7). Evditepe fortress-cemetery is situated on a low rocky at the southern edge of plain and on the shore of lake (former Varşak Tepe)<sup>4</sup>. Early Bronze Age-Kura-Araxes settlement and a fortress of EIA lies on a rocky surrounding EIA cemetery. This large cemetery covers an area of approximately 1 km. K. and S. Lake, which gave information on the first excavation at the cemetery of Evditepe-Varşak Tepe by Marr, report that more than 500 graves were excavated<sup>5</sup>. The investigation of Marr, excavation of Varşak Tepe and the other settlements on the plain were only reported in the visit of Lake's. Later, in the excavations of Erzen and Bilgiç 20 graves excavated out of 100 around the fortress at Evditepe<sup>6</sup>. Alacahan fortress-cemetery is located on the north western edge on the plain and on a rocky hill extending to the lake<sup>7</sup>. The fortress overlooks the plain and the lake, and the cemetery located at the western and southwestern slopes. 6 tombs are excavated by Erzen and Bilgiç at Alacahan. But, the number of the graves and their finds, detail locations and types of the graves are largely in the dark. There were only finds 8 or 9 graves from Evditepe and 4 graves from Alacahan according to records of the museums.

The graves of Ernis divided into three groups according to the ones excavated by Erzen and Bilgiç and the ones examined by Sevin in survey (Figs. 5-7): Stone lined graves, chamber graves and chamber graves with cromlech. They built in roughly or regular rectangular plan with uncut stones and covered by heavy roof stones. Outline of graves are oval at the floor level, narrows to its edges. The walls are built into a false arch, the roof was sealed by heavy cover stones. All of them have multiple burials. The relation between the burial tradition, small finds and pottery cannot be determined because of the lack of systematic records of excavation.

<sup>4</sup> Özfirat 2013; Özfirat In press b; Sevin 1987; Sevin 1996; Sevin 2003; Sevin 2005; Sevin 2014.

<sup>5</sup> Korfmann 1982: 188-189.

<sup>6</sup> Erzen 1963: 542; Erzen 1964: 570-572; Erzen/Bilgiç/Boysal/Öğün 1962 (1964): 20; 1963 (1965): 34. For detailed information for the cemetery see Sevin 1987; Sevin 1996; Sevin 2005a; Sevin 2014.

<sup>7</sup> Bilgiç 1964: 20; Bilgiç 1964: 570-572; Erzen/Bilgiç/Boysal/Öğün 1963 (1965): 34; Sevin 2014; Marro/Özfirat 2004; Özfirat 2013.

Stone-lined graves are the most common ones and comprise the first group (Fig. 7: 1-4). The entrance to the graves was provided by removing one of the cover stones. But, in one of the graves (No 7 and possibly No 6) there is an entrance space on one of the narrow sides, and additionally a step leading to the inside of the grave 6. The skeletons were found superimposed one upon another, separated by layers of earth. In one of the graves (No 8) 40 to 50 pieces, in two of them over 30 pieces and in another one of them around 80 pieces of pottery were found. Dimensions of graves are No 6 (3.85 x 1.25 m, at the ends 0.70 m), No 7 (width 1.70 m, at the ends 0.65 m); No 8 (1.30 m height); No 3 (1.10 x 0.65 m) in Evditepe. Stone-lined graves are divided into two types in Alacahan cemetery, first one are three tombs and one of these are rectangular in plan, approximately in 1.00 x 1.50 x 1.50 m in dimensions. No iron objects could have been recovered and only ten pieces of pottery were found in these graves, no information about skeletons. Second type of stone lined graves are square planned and 0.50-0.60 m in height. It suggest that it can be children's graves.

Chamber graves constitute the second group (Figs. 6; 7). They show differences in planning and burial tradition to the first group. Chamber graves can be classified in two groups, as with dromos and simple entrance, they are longer and higher than the stone lined tombs. The entrance to chambers is a low door on the narrow sides, and to some have a simple shaft dromos and in one example (no 4) the burial chamber is reached by the steps. The bodies were gathered on a pile on the floor by the back wall of the grave. Again, different from the first group, there are no iron objects found in these graves. One of these tombs (Evditepe No 4) had fifteen and the second one (Evditepe no 5) had sixteen pieces of pottery. Dimensions of graves are No 4 (4.50 x 1.30 m, at the ends 0.70 m, height 1.25); No 5 (4.20 x 1.10 m, at the ends 0.50 m); some of the grave which is investigated in survey are those: M2 (4,60 x 1,20 x 1.00 m); M15 (4,60 x 1,50 x 1.00 m, height of dromos 0.60 m, Fig 6: 1); M20 (3,70 x 1,40 x 1.40 m, height of dromos 0.50 m). The original height of both chambers and dromoi were not determined. A chamber grave with dromos in Alacahan has a rectangular plan 6.60 x 3.25 x 2.80 m. This large burial chamber has a stepped entrance. The roof were covered by pebble stones in shape of a herringbone pattern at the top. Dimensions of some of the grave in Alacahan which is investigated in survey are those (Fig. 7: 2-3): M2 (2.50 x 1.20 x 1.00 m); M3 (3.20 x 1.20 x 1.30 m), M4 (3.30 x 1.80 x 1.90 m, Fig. 7: 3). Their original height and if they have dromos were not determined.


Graves with cromlech are the third group, they are located on the northern edge of the cemetery. In one of them, in an approximately 12 m wide cromlech there are two graves in north-south direction<sup>8</sup>. One of the graves are

<sup>8</sup> Sevin 2014: Çiz. 7




Figür 4: Ernis-Ünseli Evditepe Fortress and Cemetery General View / *Ernis-Ünseli Evditepe Kale ve Mezarlık Genel Görünüm.*

THE EARLY IRON AGE CEMETERIES OF THE LAKE VAN BASIN: AN OVERVIEW OF BURIAL TRADITION OF PRE-URARTIANS




Figür 5: Ernis-Ünseli, Evditepe Graves / *Ernis-Ünseli, Evditepe Mezarları.*



Figür 6: Ernis-Ünseli, Evditepe Graves / *Ernis-Ünseli, Evditepe Mezarları.*

THE EARLY IRON AGE CEMETERIES OF THE LAKE VAN BASIN: AN OVERVIEW OF BURIAL TRADITION OF PRE-URARTIANS



Figür 7: Ernis-Ünseli, Alacahan Fortress and Graves / Ernis-Ünseli, Alacahan Kalesi ve Mezarları.

partially covered with two heavy cover stones. Because they were only investigated in the survey we have no information about their graves goods.

The grave goods are around two hundred of pottery, around thirty ceremonial weapons such as iron daggers, mace heads and axes (Fig. 5: 5) and ornaments such as bracelets, needles, rings and beads<sup>9</sup>. The only bronze pieces are a ring-circle and a bracelet<sup>10</sup>.

The fortresses-cemeteries at Evditepe and Alacahan show characteristics of EIA by their building technic and irregular plan based on topography were made of uncut or roughly shaped stones and by the remains of extensive cemetery and by their pottery (Figs. 3-4, 7: 1). In chronological sequence of Ernis, stone lined and chamber graves respectively represent early phase where iron ceremonial-ornamental grave goods and pinkish-buff were intensively found. They were built roughly rectangular in layout with irregular walls. Chamber graves with dromos contains latest phase, red slipped ware and bowls with thick rims appear first in these graves. The chamber graves built with more regular rectangular plan and walls in layout, their height increased and dromos arisen. 270 pottery were studied by Sevin from the cemeteries of Erzen and Bilgiç excavations, they can be separated into pinkish-buff ware, red slipped ware and red-brown ware. The pottery of excavations and survey in Evditepe and Alacahan fortresses-cemeteries have contemporary properties. However, because of the insufficiency of the excavation documents and the recording of some other pottery under the name of Ernis it is hard to separate the evidence<sup>11</sup>. EIA is the largest

<sup>9</sup> There is a confusion for Ernis iron artefacts: The bronze hilted iron sword which was published by Belli/Konyar in the EIA finds of Evditepe cemetery is a typical Late Urartian (7<sup>th</sup> century BC) weapon (Belli 2001: 148, Fig. 6; Belli/Konyar 2003a: cover photo, upper left, 111, Fig. 38/3; pl. 25; Belli/Konyar 2003b: 187-189, Figs. 22: 3, 23); besides the origin of this is nor Ernis. The find spot of it which was delivered to us during the excavation of Van-Altintepe (Tuşpa) Urartian cemetery was mentioned as Kalecik (070/9) near Van, see Marro/Özfirat 2004: Fn 6; Sevin 2014: Fn 12. For the Ernis metals see Sevin 1987; Sevin 2003; Sevin 2005a.

Besides some of the iron artefacts with origins defined as Evditepe by Belli/Konyar (Belli 2001: 148, Figs. 6-9; Belli/Konyar 2003a: 110-112, Figs. 36-39, pl. 23-26; 2003b: 179-194, Figs. 17-27) have brought to Van Museum by purchase or grant. Therefore the argument that they originated from Ernis is baseless, see Marro/Özfirat 2004: Fn 6; Sevin 2005a: Fn 6-7.

<sup>10</sup> Sevin (2005a: 362) suggests that the bronze is used scarcely at the beginning of EIA, even so this situation is quite interesting, it may be because some of the bronze objects haven't been recorded in excavation documents. It is reported that bronze objects are much fewer than the iron ones, Erzen/Bilgiç/Boysal/Öğün 1963 (1965): 34; Bilgiç 1964: 22.

<sup>11</sup> 270 pottery were studied by Sevin from the Erzen and Bilgiç excavation, 236 of them in the Van Museum and 30 from Anatolian Civilizations Museum, see Sevin 1996; 2004; 2005.

group in the pottery which we have collected on the fortress at Evditepe, contemporary with the cemetery. No pottery was found on the fortress at Alacahan, some EIA potsherds were only found from the cemetery.

Pre-Urartian settlements at Evditepe and Alacahan which is known as Ernis in the literature might suggested to be the part of the same settlement due to their closeness and being contemporary fortress-cemeteries. Even though a large citadel and a lower city that will support the population of these cemeteries were not found, Ernis can be seen as the most populated settlement on the northern shore of lake dated to the EIA when the cemetery enclosing a large area is considered. Major fortresses which is mainly located in settlement complexes that cover long periods, along with citadels, lower cities, cemeteries and mounds such as Ernis, suggest that the region was divided into numerous small units ruled by a central city in the EIA. Ernis (Evditepe and Alacahan) can be considered a central fortress-city of a small local polity on the northern shore of basin in Uruatri lands by its remarkable fortresses-cemeteries of pre-Urartian and Urartian structures on the neighboring hill (Yukarı Keçikıran) and by its location. The fortresses and some cemeteries that was located on the surrounding foothills and highlands, and around the plains of Muradiye and Erciş can be considered as the seasonal or permanent fortresses built for the territorial control of the pastures and agricultural lands of this central fortress. The northern shore of Lake Van is the most fertile area of the basin in terms of pastures and agricultural lands and also it is situated on the crossroad of main routes of the basin. It is surrounded by the volcanoes of Süphan to the west and Aladağ and Tendürek to the north which also function as a large barrier separating the Lake Van basin and northeastern Anatolia. The plains of Muradiye, Erciş and Patnos and large rivers going through them like Bağdışan-Murat, Ilıca (Zilan), Deliçay and Bendimahi lie in this great range of volcanoes. The limited agricultural lands in the basin of Lake Van are mostly in these plains and river valleys. The largest and richest pastures of eastern Anatolia are located on surrounding volcanoes. The northeastern shore of lake is the crossroad of main routes from the Van Plain to the northwards the Araxes Valley - southern Transcaucasia - northwestern Iran, to the westwards the Upper Euphrates Valley and Erzurum region.

## Karagündüz

Karagündüz mound and cemetery (Karagündüz village) is located on the eastern shore of Lake Erçek at the point where the Memedik River (Büyük Çaylak, Özalp) flows (Figs. 1-2, 8). The mound situated on the shoreline, the EIA cemetery lies 1.5 km east of the mound within a

wide alluvial plain of the Memedik River. The area is also one of the richest pastureland and wetland in the basin. The site was in the middle of these fertile plain which covers an area of 80 km, today, and the mound appears to be an island because of the rising water level of lake. The Memedik River valley, on the western edge Karagündüz located, is also one of the most important route going to Iran in the basin through Van, Özalp and Saray. The mound heavily destructed by the rising of water of lake and village of Karagündüz which lies mainly on the mound. Excavations of both mound and cemetery were carried out between 1992 and 1999 by V. Sevin and Van Museum<sup>12</sup>. The sequence of mound spans from the Early Bronze Age (Kura-Araxes) to the Medieval Age in 7 levels. Earlier levels are still unknown because of the excavation didn't reach under the level of Late Kura-Araxes (7). Karagündüz mound has brought out to light almost uninterrupted occupation of which the most important architectural layers are those of the Kura-Araxes (Level 7) and Urartu (Level 4). Even though the architectural remains of MBA-EIA (Levels 6-5) and Late Iron Age (LIA, Achaemenid) are very weak, pottery of EIA (Level 5) and LIA (Level 3) are remarkable.

The EIA level 5 at the mound represented only by some earthen pits showing characteristics of a temporary settlement. A radiocarbon dating from this level gives a date of calibrated 1092-956 BC. This pre-Urartian level 5, even though it was either weak architectural remains clearly separate from the Urartian level 4a-4b by its pottery. The pottery of level 5 is the same those in the cemetery, pinkish-buff and red slipped wares are the most common groups.

In the EIA cemetery, eight chamber graves (K1-K8, K10) and a simple inhumation of an infant (K9) were excavated (Figs. 9-13). The chamber graves are divided into two group: chambers graves and chamber graves with dromos. They are rectangular in plan and the walls are built into a false arch roofed by large stones. Entrance to the burial chambers was provided by a simple door (width varies between 0.50 and 0.60 m) covered with a vertical slab on the narrow side or from the simple shaft dromos. Some of the burial chambers were reached by steps and some were not. Some graves have sections included for additional space for the burials, these are the earthen pits (K1, K2) on the ground or the holes (K6-7, K10) dug on the side walls of the chambers. All of graves contain multiple burials, the number of inhumations varies from twenty to one hundred six which belong to women, men, children and infants wrapped in a textile or dressed. The bodies were in the hocker position, when new bodies were added, the remains of earlier skeletons

were pushed toward the back of the chamber creating a pile of older skeletons and burial gifts, and only the last body in each tomb was found in its original position, right in front of the entrance. Cremation was found only in the grave K5 together with inhumations, forty four bodies, and burnt bones of an infant were encountered in the northeastern corner of chamber, not buried in an urn, but possibly wrapped in a textile. Among the grave goods, a bowl with open rim and a high or shallow necked pot for each body, near the head are invariable, in bowls, generally the pieces belonging to sheep or goats and in pots the liquid residues were uncovered (Figs. 10, 12). In the grave K6-7, other than the food left in the vessels, bones belonging to sheep and goats were found. Additionally, three hearths found next to graves K3, K5 and K10, probably sacrificed animals were cooked of the during funeral ceremony in these hearths. Sevin also suggest that all these evidence and so many pots in the graves may indicate that the feast included all the people who attended the funeral ceremony<sup>13</sup>. As shown by some pieces, in order to light the dark burial chambers, terracotta lamps were used.

The chamber graves which is the first group of the cemetery (K2, K4, K6-7) are lower compared to those in the second group. The main feature of these graves are roughly rectangular in shape and a low and simple door which is covered with a vertical slab on the narrow sides. Grave K2 which is the smallest and most irregular one, reaches only 0.70 m in height, its length between are 2.50 and 2.70 m (Fig. 9, 10). The entrance is 0.53 m wide, from here by a corridor-like part the main room in 2.30 m in diameter is accessed, in this elliptic second part were largely dug into the ground and it's walls were not supported by the masonry. In the northeastern end of chamber an earthen pit (1.2 m diameter and 0.45 m depth), in which were found burials and grave goods. Thirty one bodies are found in the chamber. The grave K2 is separated from the others by its architectural features, it can be suggest that it is a transitional grave type from stone lined to chamber grave by the reason of its primitive chamber. It has features of stone lined by its being very shallow and with its flat roof covering heavy stones, and also has characteristic of chamber grave by its door. Dimensions of the grave K4 are 1.75 x 1.15 x 1.50 m. The last tomb in this group K6-7 is 1.30 x 335 x 1.50 m in dimensions (Fig. 9, 11). There is a separate hole (K7) dug on the ground level in the southeastern corner of the main chamber (K6). This hole used as an additional space for the bodies was dug into the ground and has a diameter of 2.00 m. Forty one bodies were found in both chamber. A radiocarbon result (with 1 sigma confidence) yielded a calibrated date range of 1250-1120 BC for grave K6.



<sup>12</sup> Sevin/Kavaklı 1996; Sevin 1999; Sevin 2003; Sevin 2004; Sevin 2005a.

<sup>13</sup> Sevin 1999: 162.




Figür 8: Karagündüz Mound and Cemetery General View / Karagündüz Höyük ve Mezarlık Genel Görünüm

THE EARLY IRON AGE CEMETERIES OF THE LAKE VAN BASIN: AN OVERVIEW OF BURIAL TRADITION OF PRE-URARTIANS



Drawings and Photos: Sevin Archive

Figür 9: Karagündüz Cemetery / Karagündüz Mezarlığı.



Figür 10: Karagündüz Graves K1 and K2 / Karagündüz K1 ve K2 Mezarları.


The chamber graves with dromos constitute of the second group of cemetery (K1, K3, K5, K8, K10). These graves built more regular in plan and building technic, the chamber is lower than the dromos which is on their narrow sides. Simple shaft dromoi are sometimes a simple pit (K3, K8), sometimes a pit partly (K10) or completely (K1, K5) surrounded by stone walls which is separated from the grave by a low and simple door covered with a vertical slab, reached by the one or a few steps to chambers in some graves. Dimensions of dromoi are varies between from 0.50 to 0.65 m, except for 1.50 x 1.50 (K1), 1.30 x 1.15 (K8), 1.00 x 1.10 (K5). The grave K1 is the largest one grave in the cemetery, its dimensions are 2.10 x 4.20 x 2.50 m, dromos 1.50 x 1.50 m (Figs. 9-10). Entrance to the chamber provided by a more regular door and two steps. Differently, there is a large niche (1.15 x 0.95 x 0.45 m.) in the middle of the south long wall of the grave, creating a protrusion of 0.20 m into the chamber. At the eastern end of the tomb there is a pit (0.30 x 0.40 m) for the burials. Dimensions of other graves of this group are: K3 (1.75 x 3.30 x 2.30 m), K5 (length is 3.20 m, 1.30 m wide in the southern end and 1.50 m wide in the northern end, height is 1.20 m), (Figs. 9, 11). Grave K8 has one hundred six bodies, its length is 4.30 m, 1.64 m wide in the middle, 1.25 m wide in the eastern end and 1.45 m wide in the western end, height is 2.50 m (Figs. 9, 12). The grave K10 has dimensions in 2.42 x 1.85 x 1.50 m. On the middle of northeastern wall of the chamber, in the level of floor there is a separate hole dug into the ground for the additional burials (0.63 X 0.72 m).

The grave goods contain mainly hundreds of vessels and large quantities of beads, ceremonial weapons and ornaments (Fig. 10, 12-13). Beads were used largely for necklaces, pin-pendants and amulets. Most of beads are made from semi-precious stones, agate and cornelian or from glass and frit, examples in bronze, bone, antimony, rocky crystal and faience are less used, one made from sea-shell. Iron bracelets, armllets, anklets and rings, iron and bronze pins and earrings, gold earring constitute other ornaments. Bronze ornaments are very few compared to iron, these are small disk, one pair of earrings with frit beads, rings and pins. Ceremonial weapons are only made in iron, no bronze used, these are daggers, spear-heads and mace-heads. Other objects of iron are knives, staffs and chains, and two stone seals. Pottery consist of two groups, pinkish buff ware and red slipped ware (Figs. 10, 12-13). Pinkish buff ware is the majority in these vessels numbering 553 which found all of the graves. Red slipped ware are seen in the second group of graves, it has two subgroups: Thin and patchily red slipped ware which is derived from pinkish buff ware; and thick and bright burnished red slipped ware. Jars with ribbed shoulder and jugs with trefoil rims in thick and bright burnished red slipped ware are the closest forms to

Uartian examples (Fig. 13) and, in the same way, bowls with rounded bodies and thick rimmed vessels that can mostly be seen in grave K1 found only in the second group of graves (chamber tombs with dromos). The lack of both these characteristics in the first group of graves proves the chronological differences between two groups of graves. The jug with trefoil rim found in the simple pit grave K9 is the closest to the Uartian examples. The thick and bright burnished red slipped ware with metallic surface in the chamber tomb with dromos (second group) quite resembles to the Uartian pottery characteristics in technic and shape. However, the thin and patchily red slipped ware which are the earlier examples are different with their more mat surface. Red slip was applied irregularly over the pinkish buff ware in these vessels, which is indicated earlier examples. The higher intensity of iron and the much lesser bronze in the first group of graves, only a ring (K4) and a hook (K6); the increase of the number of bronze finds with the number of iron in the second group of graves are most of the remarkable differences between two groups of graves.

The chronological sequence of Karagündüz is divided into two phase based on pottery, finds and architectural features. The chamber graves (first group: K2, K4, K6-7) represent early phase, those in the chamber graves with dromos (second group: K1, K3, K5, K8, K10) and a simple pit grave (K9) are in the late phase. According to architectural features and finds, the earliest grave is K2, the latest one is grave K1 in the cemetery. The most striking architectural differences between two groups are that the first group of graves were built with a more irregular lay out and built with a smaller in size with a lower height. Graves K2 and K4 were partially destroyed during the construction of graves K1 and K3, this stratigraphic situation also provides a relative chronology between two groups of graves. Although some clear differentiations between two groups of graves in architecture, pottery and bronze ornaments, and also there is a continuity of burial tradition, iron ornaments-weapons and pinkish buff ware which are still main grave goods in both phases.

Cemetery at Karagündüz was used during the EIA as it was shown by the early and late phases of the graves. The EIA level (5) at the mound of Karagündüz has a weak architecture just as the other mounds in the region, the pottery of this layer shows contemporary characteristics with the cemetery. Karagündüz level 5 is a temporary settlement, people were most probably living in tents, moving seasonally. It can be suggest that the people buried in the cemetery which lies in the middle of the richest grazing pastures of the region and the Memedik River valley were members of a tribe with a pastoral lifestyle.



Drawings and Photos: Sevin Archive

Figür 11: Karagündüz Graves K5 and K6-7 / Karagündüz K5 ve K6-7 Mezarları.

## THE EARLY IRON AGE CEMETERIES OF THE LAKE VAN BASIN: AN OVERVIEW OF BURIAL TRADITION OF PRE-URARTIANS



Figür 12: Karagündüz Grave K8 / Karagündüz K8 Mezarı.



Figür 13: Karagündüz Cemetery Pottery, Beads, Seals and Metal Finds / Karagündüz Mezarlığı Çanak Çömlek, Boncuklar, Mühürler ve Metal Buluntular.

## Yoncatepe

Yoncatepe building complex and cemetery (Yukarı Bakraçlı village) located on the western slope of mountains Erek and Varak surrounding on the eastern side of the Van Plain (Figs. 1-2, 14). The site is situated on this high slope overlooking all the plain and lake, and on the route of small lake in Keşiş (Turna) yaylası which is the richest pastureland and water source in the basin. The Urartian building complex is situated on the highest section of the settlement, some buildings which is defined lower settlement lies at the northern skirt of it, the EIA cemetery lies at the northern skirt of the building complex. Excavations were carried out between 1997 and 2009 by O. Belli and Van Museum<sup>14</sup>.

Eight chamber graves were excavated in the cemetery (Fig. 14). The chamber graves are divided into two groups: chambers tombs (M2, M5, M6, M9) and chamber tombs with dromos (M1, M3, M4, M8). They are rectangular or roughly rectangular in plan and the walls are built into a false arch roofed by large stones. Dimensions of graves are: M1 (two sections, length 1.20 and height 1.70, 2.40 x 1.80 x 1.50 m), M2 (4.20 x 1.20 x 1.20 m), M3 (5.95 x 1.54 x 2.10 m), M4 (5.95 x 1.54 x 2.10 m), M4 (two chambers 1.20 x 0.85, 1.60 x 1.85, height 1.70 m), M5 (1.00 x 2.20 x 1.95 m); M6 (two chambers and a section, 5.95 x 1.60 m, 2.75 x 1.30, height 2.50, section 2.60 x 1.98 x 1.83 m, because of the height difference between the units the height of grave reaches 4.20 m). Although, the walls of graves built with stones, some of the burial chambers fully or partially were built into the ground. Entrance to the graves are provided by removing one of the roof stones on the narrow sides or by dromos which is separated from the chamber by a low and simple door covered with a vertical slab. Some of the chambers are reached by the one or a few steps (M3, M4, M5, M6). In the grave M9 (4.00 x 2.30 m at the ends 1.80 m, existing height 1.70 m) the burial chamber shows difference in architectural features by its regular door (0.60 x 0.70 m, lintel is 0.90 m) on the northern long wall. Yoncatepe graves mostly have various units, some has multiple rooms (M1, M4, M6, M8). These separate units inside the tombs were covered by the vertical slabs just like their entrances. In these tombs M8 has an irregular plan and a construction technique, it is dug into the ground has three different chambers and a spherical section in its complex plan. At the east of the chamber (M8I: 1.85 x 2.45 m) reached by dromos (1.00 x 1.05 m) there is a section M8II (length 1.55, height 0.70 m), at the south another section M8II (length 1.30, height 1.20 m) with another section one M8III (length 2.20 m). Another distinction is that the presence of the niches in the M8

tomb. In some tombs there are earthen pits on the ground of the chambers or the room shaped large holes on the side walls (M1, M6, M8), these holes dug into the earth constructed for additional space reach up to 1.50 m in depth (M1).

Dromoi were shaped a deep shaft surrounded by slabs, they are 1.20 x 1.00 m in average dimensions, the deepest being 1.70 m (M1). The graves contain multiple burials, the number of inhumations are thirty eight (M6) and forty (M2). The bodies were in the hocker position, only the last body was found in its original position (entrance of M3, M9), the remains of earlier skeletons were pushed toward the back of the chamber creating a pile of older skeletons and gifts. A large number of dog skeletons and bones of sheep and cattle were encountered in the chambers and entrances, especially in the grave M6, one and two dog skeletons were found *insitu* respectively in the graves of M5 and M4.

The grave goods are mainly vessels, iron ceremonial weapons and ornaments, beads, and a small amount of bronze ornaments (Fig. 14). Ceremonial iron weapons are daggers, knives. Iron ornaments are pins, bracelets, rings and mace heads. A few bronze ornaments are rings, pins, earrings, two fibulae and an arrowhead. Beads of necklaces made of various stones, agate, carnelian, glass and frit. Other ornaments are one pair of gold earrings and pendant, and antimony buttons in a small quantity. Pottery is mainly pinkish buff ware which is variation of grooved ware in the basin and its painted samples (M3), second group is red slipped ware which is found in lesser numbers mainly in the graves of M5 and M6.

## Dilkaya

Dilkaya mound and cemetery (Dilkaya village) is located on the eastern shore of Lake Van at the point where the Güzelsu (Hoşap) River flows (Figs. 1-2, 15). The mound situated on the shoreline, the EIA cemetery lies 200 m north of the mound, it is heavily destroyed by water of the lake. Güzelsu River valley, on the western edge where Dilkaya is located, is one of the main route reaching Iran through Van, Gürpınar and Hakkari in the basin. Excavations both mound and cemetery were carried out between 1984 and 1991 by A. Çilingiroğlu<sup>15</sup>. The sequence of mound spans from the Early Bronze Age II (Kura-Araxes) to the Medieval Age in five levels. The EIA level IIb (11-10 centuries BC) no architectural remains, only pottery was found which is same those in the cemetery.


<sup>14</sup> Belli/Konyar 2001; Belli/Konyar 2003a: 116-119; Belli/Tozko-paran 2005; Belli 2009; Konyar 2005: Fig. 8.

<sup>15</sup> Çilingiroğlu 1991; Çilingiroğlu 1993; 2012; Sağlamtimur 1984.



Figür 14: Yoncatepe Graves M2, M3 and M6 / Yoncatepe M2, M3 ve M6 Mezarları.

## THE EARLY IRON AGE CEMETERIES OF THE LAKE VAN BASIN: AN OVERVIEW OF BURIAL TRADITION OF PRE-URARTIANS



Figür 15: Dilkaya General Views of Mound and Cemetery, Chamber Grave 1 and Grave 84 / *Dilkaya Höyük ve Mezarlık Genel Görünüm, Oda Mezar 1 ve Mezar 84.*

Dilkaya cemetery belong to EIA, Urartu and Medieval Ages. Two chamber graves and some stone cist graves dates to the EIA which has inhumation burials, only in chamber grave 2 inhumation and cremation burial seen together (Fig. 15). Chamber graves have partially been destroyed, they probably had been robbed in ancient times, this is the reason why the finds from both these graves doesn't represent the whole inventories of chamber graves 1 and 2 and except for the hocker burial that was found in the chamber grave 1 no skeleton or finds found *in-situ*. Chamber grave 1 is rectangular in plan with semi-circle simple shaft dromos which is separated from the chamber by a small door covered with a vertical slab, two steps leading to the inside of the grave. The walls built into a false arch and the roof was covered by large stones. The dimensions of grave are 2.40 m and 4.60 m and height is 1.65 m. It contains multiple burials, the number of inhumations are eleven, and one body was in a hocker position in the northeastern corner of grave. The grave goods were only six vessels. Chamber grave 2 has oval plan, the walls are partly destroyed, thus it is undetermined whether the grave has a dromos and roofed by large stones or not. The diameter of grave is 1.75 m, and height is 1.70 m. At least thirty bodies and traces of cremation were found in the grave. The grave goods were bronze bracelets, iron mace-head, stone beads and potsherds that the tomb was used until the Urartian period.

In the stone cist graves, No 84 is roughly rectangular in plan covered by slabs, dimensions are 0.70 x 1.10 m. The grave had been robbed in ancient times. It contains eight bodies, they were pushed toward the southern part of the grave, and those in the northern part were found in hocker position, right in front of the entrance. The grave good was only an iron pin. No 91 were divided two parts, bodies were hocker position. The grave good were one vessel and iron knife. No 88, dimensions are 2.50 x 2.75 m, and it has two bodies.

The EIA cemetery at Dilkaya is dated to the end of the EIA, to the 11-10 centuries BC as in the level IIb of mound.

## Hakkari


Hakkari stelae and two chamber graves (M1-M2) is located in the city center of Hakkari (Figs. 1, 16-18). The excavation carried out between 1997 and 2000 by Prof. Dr. V. Sevin and Museum of Van<sup>16</sup>. The city of Hakkari lies within the graben of mountains where at the convergence point of Mt Southern Taurus and Mt Zagros. Katramas Çay Stream, a branch of the Great Zap River, flows by the south of the city located in the basin of Great Zap.

In the excavation discovered thirteen stelae and two chamber graves (M1-M2) in the city center of Hakkari. Stelae were found with their original positions on the western slope of fortress at Hakkari (Mir Fortress), (Fig. 16). Thirteen stelae erected side by side at the outskirts of the western cliff of the fortress, eleven of them male, two of them are most probably female figurines. They sculpted from local stones of limestone, their techniques are the bas-relief, the bas-relief and engraving, and linear. The main theme is a frontal view of the upper part of a human body which all are naked. The main figures of male stelae are a warrior together with a number of symbolic objects, weapons, tents, human and animal figures, their height are between 0.81 m and 1.42 m. Two female stelae have distinctive features with their linear technic and lack of weapons and other symbols, their height are 1.10 m and 3.30 m.

Hakkari chamber grave M1 is located at the western slope of Hakkari fortress and 19.00 m north of the stelae (Figs. 16-17). It contains multiple burials, at least 75 individuals were found in the grave. It is not possible to discern the exact number individuals, to define burial rite and architectural features since the grave was largely destroyed. Chamber grave M1 has irregular plan looking primitive, it is roughly rectangular in lay out, on southern and southeastern walls partially the bedrock was utilized. The length of the tomb is 3.00 m, its width is 1.20 m in the southern and 0.70 m in the northern end, the existing height of the wall is 2.00 m. The walls must have been built into a false arch and the roof was sealed by large cover stones. The totally destroyed northern section is the narrowest part of the tomb and it is not fully determined if there is an entrance here. Therefore, it is uncertain whether the grave has an entrance or not, probably, the entrance to the chamber was provided by removing one of the stones that cover it. In the grave, scattered amongst the grave goods, were numerous animal bones, these are the remains of the food that were left here as a burial ceremony. Since there is a heavy destruction in the grave, the finds do not represent all the inventory of the tomb and no skeletons and finds are *in-situ*. The grave goods included two bronze daggers, obsidian arrowheads, bronze and bone pins, gold, silver and bronze earrings, bronze and bone rings, fragments of bronze bracelets ?, mainly bronze, frit, stone (mostly agate), a few glass and shell beads, bone, stone and terracotta amulets, bone and stone spindle whorl, bronze hair rings and astragals (Fig. 17). Pottery was the main goods in the grave, these vessels of almost 700 in number are mostly pinkish red-brown ware, a small number of Khabur ware and Van-Urmia ware (Araxes painted ware), (Fig. 17).

<sup>16</sup> Sevin 2005b; Sevin 2015.

THE EARLY IRON AGE CEMETERIES OF THE LAKE VAN BASIN: AN OVERVIEW OF BURIAL TRADITION OF PRE-URARTIANS



Drawings and Photos: Sevin Archive; Sevin 2005b

Figür 16: Hakkari Stelae and Graves / *Hakkari Stelleri ve Mezarları*.

Hakkari chamber grave M2 located to the north of fortress (Figs. 16, 18), approximately 1 km. It is rectangular in plan, 4.10 x 1.60 m in dimensions and height is 2.10 m, width is 1.60 m on the floor and 1.00 m uppermost of the walls. The walls are built into a false arch, the roof was covered by large stones. The entrance to the grave was provided by removing one of the stones that cover it and there is a step leading to the inside on the southern wall of the chamber. There are also small holes scattered all over the walls, with their purposes undetermined. Chamber grave has multiple burials, eleven bodies were found. Bodies were piled up in front of the northern short wall across the entrance, back of the tomb, probably creating more space for the new bodies. Probably, the skeletons were stacked in two layers, but since they were at least partially destroyed neither skeletons nor any finds were *in-situ*. The grave goods are iron dagger, iron bracelets, bronze blades, bronze pins, bronze pectoral, stone objects, gold and silver discs, bone spindle whorl, cornaline, bronze and stone beads and amulets (Fig. 18). Pottery was the main goods in the grave number around 200 pinkish red-brown ware (Fig. 18).

In chronological sequence of Hakkari, the oldest group of the pottery is Khabur ware in the grave M1 (Fig. 17) which is related to northern Mesopotamia-Syria and it is dated approximately between 1.800-1.700 BC (Period 2)<sup>17</sup>. The presence of Khabur ware in Hakkari is quite remarkable, it also found eastwards in Dinkha Tepe IV and Hasanlu VI in southwest of Lake Urmia which proves the political and economic relations between Mesopotamia and Zagros regions at the beginning of second millennium BC. Since Khabur ware was found in a chamber grave (M1) in Hakkari, adjacent to the stelae can be considered as a reflection of a long range tin trade which can be associated with these stelae. Accordingly, the first burials of grave M1 belong to trade system at the period of Old Assyrian and Old Babylonian and it is clearly much earlier from the stelae which are dated 1450-1000 BC. King Samsi-Adad I expanded Assyrian borders to the Rania Plain which is located 150 km south of Hakkari and conquered the city of Susarra (Şemşara) here. It might suggest that the warriors depicted in the Hakkari stelae are not them, their ancestors should be the ones who were in the control of this trade. The absence of Late Khabur ware should point out the breaking of the trade between Hakkari and Mesopotamia. The end of the Old Babylonian kingdom and the rise of the Hittite kingdom in central Anatolia should have been caused crises and changes in the trade systems. It is not clear that how these changes effected southern Urmia and Hakkari regions which were owing to their location on the long range trade route between east and Assyrian Kingdom.

Khabur ware is followed by Late Van-Urmia ware which is a sub group of the Araxes painted ware culture in the grave M1 (Fig. 17)<sup>18</sup>. Araxes painted ware appeared on the western shores of the Lake Urmia, southern Caucasia and the highland of eastern Anatolia during the MBA-LBA with some regional variations<sup>19</sup>. This change in the pottery is considered an evidence of a significant breaking point, a new beginning. The latest phase which was proposed for the Araxes painted ware is c. 1650-1400/1300 BC<sup>4</sup>. It seems that the pottery of LBA is represented by polychrome painted ware of Van-Urmia tradition in the basin of lakes Van and western part of Urmia. Van-Urmia ware of the grave M1 shows trade relationship with the region of western and southern part of Lake Urmia.

Pinkish red-brown ware represents last phase which is the largest group in the grave M1 (Fig. 17)<sup>20</sup>. A part of this group is contemporary with the Araxes painted ware and the other part of them is related to the transition period to the grave M2. Khabur and Araxes painted wares are not local groups, but pinkish red-brown ware shows strong local character. While some fragments of the pinkish red-brown ware, on which we don't have too much information, were similar to the LBA-EIA pottery of eastern Anatolia other forms and such as crescent, snake and ibex reliefs evidence a local character. Additionally, it can be said that it is in limited relation with the region of western Urmia. In the extensive excavations and surveys made in the basin of Lake Van no pinkish red-brown ware has been found until now. Their intensive presence in the graves of Hakkari point towards their widespread use in this region and even a new zone that can be called as the northern Zagros culture. In the grave M1, a fragment of grooved ware bowl is typical of the eastern Anatolia EIA. The emergence of grooved ware dated in the second half of or end of 13<sup>th</sup> century in eastern Anatolia; similarly, two small pieces resembling iron studs or wires uncovered in the grave M1 proves that the EIA I period was reached.

Grave M1 is used for c. 300 years, from the end of first quarter of second millennium BC to the third quarter of same millennium showing the relationships with a wide region. The warriors described in the EIA stelae and the period when chamber grave M1 was in use is partially coincide with. It is remarkable that in the grave M1, there are no weapons or object which were depicted in the stelae of Hakkari, although the pottery shows that partly used in the a same period. It seems that the owners of this grave to share it with their ancestors as shown by the earlier pottery of Khabur ware which provides us a *terminus post*


<sup>17</sup> Özfirat 2002a; Sevin 2015: 72-73.

<sup>18</sup> Özfirat 2002b; Sevin 2015: 73-79.


<sup>19</sup> Özfirat 2001; Özfirat 2018.

<sup>20</sup> Sevin 2015: 53-72; Özfirat 2018.

THE EARLY IRON AGE CEMETERIES OF THE LAKE VAN BASIN: AN OVERVIEW OF BURIAL TRADITION OF PRE-URARTIANS



Figür 17: Hakkari Grave M1 / Hakkari M1 Mezarı.



Figür 18: Hakkari Grave M2 / Hakkari M2 Mezarı.

*quem* for the grave M1. The radio-carbon analysis on the human bones of the grave M1 also give the dates of 1885-1745, 1995-1690, 1950-1835 and 2030-1780 BC. Even though it is represented with small number of potsherds the grooved ware presents a *terminus ante quem* for the grave M1. Accordingly, the grave M1 is dated to the LBA-EIA I in eastern Anatolia chronology. Pinkish red-brown ware of the grave M2 belongs to the later phase of this group, some continuity in forms and decoration shows that there is not a large time gap between the two tombs. It seems that with the end of usage of the grave M1 in the beginning of EIA, grave M2 started to be used just after. This transition is more of a continuation rather than an interruption. This also makes us think that both people buried in two graves could be ethnically be related, but it is not possible to further comment only by the archaeological evidence. Grave M2 was used for a short timeframe. The small number of finds and the number of bodies limited to eleven is the evidence of that. It should most probably be used from the last centuries of second millennium BC to the beginning of first millennium BC. Along with the changes of pottery, the large number of iron finds which in the grave M1 lacks evidences of this later phase. Accordingly, grave M2 is dated to the later phase of EIA chronology, to EIA II. At this last stage the owners of the grave gives an outlook of total isolation, there is no traces with neighboring regions contrary to their ancestors in those grave M1.

The mountainous and isolated geographic characteristics of the Hakkari region makes it harder to ascertain the typological and chronological development and to reach archaeological and cultural evaluation. There is no settlement traces with the characteristics of mound or sedentary settlement in our survey cooperated with the excavation. In throughout the history this region must have been the homeland of semi-nomadic peoples in pastoral characteristic that sustain themselves with animal husbandry and trade. It is possible that these semi-nomadic groups moved seasonally between Mt Zagros and the region southern part of Caspian Sea. Aside the strong local character, the chiefdoms of Hakkari region that by the first centuries of second millennium BC established relations with Mesopotamia and dominated the ore trade that spans from central Asia to Assyria, can be considered as a mountain dynasty with a nomadic characteristics. The stelae on which some ruling elites are described and graves of Hakkari appear to belong to a local dynasty of the EIA kingdom. These powerful people might have been small local kings or chiefdoms, together with royal women in Nairi land during the period of pre-Urartians. The possible relation between stelae which is dated *c.* 1450-1000 BC and the chamber grave M1 where many people were buried shows that they might be gravestones for their dead ancestors. But this context might be considered thought that these stelae were not

gravestones but more related to the cult of ancestors and its funerary rites. There should have been other graves in this area but reaching exact conclusion is difficult since the whole area haven't been excavate, but the presence of so many burials in a single grave (M1) and its close proximity of the stelae suggests us a cemetery in the area.

## DISCUSSION-SUMMARY

The common features of EIA cemeteries in the Lake Van Basin are the chamber graves, high number of the iron items and the grooved pottery (Fig. 19). Most of the cemeteries which are located on the rich pastures of the highlands and foothills belong to MBA-EIA in the basin. Information of MBA-LBA burial tradition is limited to these cemeteries which has only been investigated in survey. There is no settlement traces of MBA-LBA, graves are mainly stone lined or simple earthen pit graves and a few very shallow kurgans with single inhumation burial together with Van-Urmiya ware (Araxes painted ware) (Fig. 19).

To the contrary, settlement system of the EIA defined by the highland fortresses-cemeteries in the whole region, some of the EIA fortresses and cemeteries located in the lowlands (river valleys-plains) despite weak levels or gaps from the MBA to the EIA in the mounds. The EIA highland fortresses-cemeteries were investigated only in survey in the region (Fig. 20). Large cemeteries which is sometimes containing over one hundred separate graves are mainly in direct association with contemporary fortresses. Excavations at cemeteries of Ernis, Dilkaya and Karagündüz located in lowlands, except for Yoncatepe. Cemeteries at Ernis (Evditepe-Alacahan) directly connected with contemporary fortresses, cemeteries at Dilkaya and Karagündüz associated with mounds, cemetery at Yoncatepe adjacent to an Urartian structure complex. No related settlement traces to the Hakkari graves were found, fortress of Hakkari, in whose outskirts the stelae and the Grave M1 were located, belongs to the Middle Ages. Even though the levels of the Karagündüz 5 and Dilkaya IIB had weak architectural evidence their pottery shows contemporary features with the cemeteries. In both cases when we compare population of these pre-Urartian cemeteries and some of the cemeteries investigated in survey, the remains of the settlement are scanty, they do not appear to be connected to a permanent settlement, probably they belong to nomadic or seminomadic tribes. It seems that the population of cemeteries at Hakkari, Karagündüz, Dilkaya and Yoncatepe were not sedentary, probably they were moving seasonally and living in tents with their flocks indicating pastoralism as shown by the descriptions of on the stelae of Hakkari. Pastoralist lifeway is also indicated by fortresses-cemeteries which are located on the rich grazing pastures of

the highlands and foothills in the basin. Otherwise, such as Ernis (Evditepe-Alacahan), Aliler-Tutumlu (N70/7), Gönlüaçık (M68/5) and a large number of highland or lowland cemeteries have associated with contemporary fortresses (Fig. 2, 20)<sup>21</sup>. It seems that, fortified cities or major fortresses of rulers of small local polities or ruling elite of the pre-Urartians surrounded by rich pastures and seasonal or permanent settlements-fortresses built for the territorial control of the pastures and agricultural lands. This settlement pattern indicates the existence of nomadic and semi-nomadic groups beside the sedentary ones.

Chronological sequence of the EIA based mainly on these cemeteries since the mounds have substantially thin layers between the MBA and EIA in the region. Excavations at mounds of Karagündüz 6-5, Van Fortress mound IV-III, Tilki Tepe O, Dilkaya IIB and those in survey had found thin levels of the MBA-EIA, they mainly settled during the EBA-Kura-Araxes and MIA-Urartu (Fig. 20). Due to lack of insufficient stratigraphical context, only the evidence from cemeteries can provide data for both chronology and material of the EIA in the basin. The chronology of the EIA in the basin of Lake Van were defined in two phases by Sevin based on evidences of excavations at Ernis, Karagündüz and Hakkari, EIA I, c. 1300-1100 BC and EIA II (1100-850/800 BC)<sup>22</sup>. The polychrome painted pottery of MBA (Araxes painted ware) seems to have continued up to the 1400-1300 BC, at least around in the basin of Lake Van. EIA I started from the middle 13<sup>th</sup> century BC and EIA II which follows this period probably during the 10<sup>th</sup> and 9<sup>th</sup> centuries BC when the kingdom of Urartu was founded with Tuşpa as its capital, 850-800 BC. Actually, it is difficult to determine the exact time span between two phases, but development of pre-Urartians and process of preparing the foundation of the kingdom of Urartu seems to have been ended in the last centuries of 2<sup>nd</sup> millennium BC and at the beginning of the 1<sup>st</sup> millennium BC.

The cemeteries of Lake Van basin and Hakkari contain stone lined, chamber graves and chamber graves with dromos developing from one another. Common features of the graves are those: The graves lies at 0.70-1.50 m below the surface. They constructed with stones dug into the earth and built into a false arch roofed by large stones. Burial tradition is multiple burials, they were inhumation burials with one or two cremation. The bodies were in the hocker position, when the new bodies were added, the remains of earlier skeletons and burial gifts were pushed toward the back of the chamber creating a pile. The early phase (EIA I) of graves are stone lined and chamber

graves. They respectively represent early phase, iron ceremonial weapons-ornaments and pinkish-buff ware intensively found in these graves, no red slipped ware was encountered. The late phase (EIA II) represented by chamber graves with dromos, pinkish-buff ware, red slipped ware, increasing of bronze and cremation. On the other hand, pinkish-buff ware and iron weapons-ornaments were most common grave goods during both phases. Bronze was found only in ornaments and in a small number of compared to iron artefacts, similarly, red slipped ware is much lesser amount compared to pinkish buff ware. Burial architecture and grave goods indicate continuity in two phases. The early phase (EIA I) comprise chamber graves of Karagündüz (first group) and stone lined and chamber graves of Ernis (first group). The earlier graves are stone lined which is only known from first group of Ernis, they were roughly rectangular in plan and irregular construction, the height of walls was low, one and a half meters. The walls were built into a false arch covered by large slabs, and entered by raising one of the cover stones. Chamber graves seems as a transitional type between stone lined and chamber graves with dromos, Karagündüz grave K2 is the most remarkable and earlier example of this phase by its primitive chamber. Their distinctive characteristics from stone lined are their more regular construction, higher walls, a low and simple door on one of the narrow sides with one or two steps leading to the inside of in some graves. According to C14 dates taken from chamber grave K6-7 in Karagündüz goes back as far as the last quarter of second millennium BC. But, the chamber grave tradition must be much earlier in the region, Hakkari M1 is used for c. 300 years, from the end of first quarter of the second millennium BC to the third quarter of same millennium. Although Hakkari grave M1 shows an irregular construction and primitive looking, it can be accept in transitional phase from stone lined to chamber grave as Karagündüz K2.

In the second phase (EIA II) chamber graves with dromos, red slipped ware, jugs with trefoil rims and ribbed on the shoulders, bowls and jars with thick rims in the forms appear first, groove decoration decreases, the usage of bronze increases and cremation appears. Construction of graves were more regular and detailed. They were entered through a simple or shaft dromos is separated from the chamber by a door, with steps leading to the inside of the some graves, height of chamber walls increased and niches on the walls were seen. The characteristics of Urartian kingdom start to arise as shown by these new features. But, no classical Urartian artifacts were found in these graves such as bronze belts, weapons, fragments of furniture, beads, seals and red polished ware (Biainili or Palace ware). Second groups of Ernis and Karagündüz, Dilkaya, Yoncatepe and Hakkari M2 comprise this phase. Karagündüz K1 is

<sup>21</sup> Evditepe, Aliler, Gönlüaçık and most of the EIA lowland fortresses have stratigraphical sequence from the Early Bronze Age (Kura-Araxes) to the Late Iron Age (Achaemenid), except for gaps in the Post-Urartu and in the MBA in some cases.

<sup>22</sup> Sevin 1999; 2003; 2004; 2005a; Özfırat 2018.

## THE EARLY IRON AGE CEMETERIES OF THE LAKE VAN BASIN: AN OVERVIEW OF BURIAL TRADITION OF PRE-URARTIANS

| BC   | Chronology                | Key Sites   | Archaeological Features  |
|------|---------------------------|---|--|
| 400  | Pers-Achaemenid           | Karagündüz mound 3<br>Van fortress mound II a2<br><br>Survey<br>Aşağı Keçikıran, Aşağı Elmalık, Aşağı Mutlu fortresses<br>Sazlıkyanı-Sivritepe (Alabayır) settlement<br>Eski Norgüh fortresses ? Settlement   | Lowland Small fortresses, Settlements-Mounds<br>Triangle ware<br>Cream slipped ware<br>Red slipped ware<br>Red-brown ware  |
| 500  | Late Iron Age             | Karagündüz mound 4c<br>Van fortress mound II a1<br>Çavuştepe fortress<br><br>Survey<br>Yeşilaliç II, Gelenge, Alikelle, Kartavin, Gavurkale fortresses  | Highland fortresses<br>Cream slipped ware<br>Red slipped ware<br>Red-brown ware  |
| 600  | Post Urartu-Med ?         |   |  |
| 600  | Middle Iron Age<br>Urartu | Karagündüz mound 4a-b<br>Van fortress and mound II b-c<br>Dilkaya mound IIA<br>Çavuştepe fortress<br>Ayanis fortress<br>Aznavurtepe-Giriktepe fortress-settlement<br><br>Survey<br>Körzül, Kancıklı fortresses<br>Gülsünler, Bağdısan-Aznavurtepe mounds<br>Yukarı Keçikıran road station-cult building<br>Dedeli cemetery  | Monumental fortresses, Settlements-Mounds<br>Rock-cut tombs, Chamber graves<br>Inhumation, Cremation-Urne<br>Bronze ornaments, weapons, tools etc<br>Iron weapons<br>Red polished ware (Biainili-Palace Ware)<br>Red slipped ware<br>Red-brown ware                                    |
| 900  | Early Iron Age II         | Karagündüz mound 5<br>Van fortress mound III<br>Dilkaya mound IIB<br>Ernis second group of graves<br>Karagündüz second group of graves K1, K3, K5, K8, K10<br>Dilkaya graves 1, 2, 84, 88, 91<br>Yoncatepe graves M1, M3, M5, M6<br>Hakkari grave M2<br><br>Survey<br>Gülsünler, Bağdısan-Aznavurtepe mounds<br>Siyahtaş, Alliler, Dedeli, Gönüaçık, Esenler, Okçuhan, Elmakaya, Çaygeldi, Yılkalesi, Haydarkelsi fortresses and cemeteries | Highland fortresses<br>Lowland fortresses (less)<br>Chamber graves with dromos<br>Stone cists (a few)<br>Inhumation, Cremation no urne (a few)<br>Bronze ornaments<br>Iron weapons and ornaments<br>Pinkish-buff ware<br>Thick and bright burnished red slipped ware<br>Red-brown ware |
| 1000 |                           |   |  |
| 1100 | Early Iron Age            |   |  |
| 1200 | Early Iron Age I          | Karagündüz mound 5<br>Van fortress mound III<br>Ernis first group of graves<br>Karagündüz first group of graves K2, K4, K6-7<br>Dilkaya grave 1<br>Hakkari grave M1<br><br>Survey<br>Gülsünler, Bağdısan-Aznavurtepe mounds<br>Siyahtaş, Alliler, Dedeli, Gönüaçık, Esenler, Okçuhan, Elmakaya, Çaygeldi, Yılkalesi, Haydarkelsi fortresses and cemeteries  | Highland fortresses<br>Lowland fortresses (less)<br>Stone lined graves, Chamber graves<br>Inhumation<br>Bronze ornaments (a few)<br>Iron weapons and ornaments<br>Pinkish-buff ware<br>Thin and patchily red slipped ware<br>Red-brown ware  |
| 1300 |                           |   |  |
| 1400 | Late Bronze Age           | Karagündüz mound 6<br>Van fortress mound IV<br>Hakkari grave M1<br><br>Survey<br>Gülsünler mound<br>Gönüaçık, Nurettin, Elmakaya, Çaygeldi, Yuvadami, Eriklik cemeteries<br>Yılkalesi, Haydarkelsi, Eski Norgüh fortresses ? Settlement   | Highland Cemeteries<br>Simple earthen pit graves, Stone lined graves<br>Kurgans (a few, in the northern part of basin)<br>Araxes painted ware  |
|      | Middle Bronze Age         |   |  |

## Lake Van Basin

(Designed by A. Özfirat based on Sevin 2005: Tablo 1)

Figür 19: Iron Age Archaeological Chronology of Lake Van Basin / Van Gölü Havzası Demir Çağ Arkeolojik Kronoloji.



Figür 20: Iron Age Relative Chronology of Lake Van Basin Sites / Van Gölü Havzası Yerleşimleri Görelî Kronoloji.

the latest example, closest to Urartian chamber graves by its architecture and grave goods. While Hakkari M2 has no a dromos, with its highly developed architecture and grave goods it can be included in the second phase. Even though Yoncatepe graves defined in the second phase here, it has its problems, since there is no exact definition in the publications. It is separated according to red slipped ware which was found in most of the graves and their grave architecture<sup>23</sup>. The additional spaces for the burials found in Karagündüz and Yoncatepe graves suggested as the prototypes of the multi-chambered Urartian tombs<sup>24</sup>. They were found at Karagündüz as holes or earthen pits, in those at Yoncatepe are much larger and deeper that some can even be considered as separate chambers. These multi-chambered graves of Yoncatepe should be considered as the latest phase of grave architecture.

The burial practice of the EIA is multiple burial in the basin. Bodies were mainly inhumated by wrapping them in a textile or dressing them in Karagündüz. The bodies were in the hocker position when new bodies were added, the remains of earlier skeletons were pushed toward the back of the chamber creating a pile. Only the last body in each tomb was found in its original position, right in front of the entrance. In some cases, the skeletons were found superimposed one upon another, separated by layers of earth as seen in the stone lined graves of Ernis and probably in Hakkari M2. Cremation was found in a small quantities, not buried in urns in Karagündüz grave K5 and Dilkaya chamber grave 2. The existence of both inhumation and cremation in the same grave and only the last body kept its original position creating a pile of older skeletons at the back of the grave are also characteristics of the Urartian graves<sup>25</sup>.

<sup>23</sup> It suggested that, cemeteries of Yoncatepe, Karagündüz and Dilkaya must be belong to the Urartian period based on two bronze fibulae found in the Yoncatepe grave M3, an arrowhead from the grave M6 (see Konyar 2005; Koroğlu/Konyar 2005; Koroğlu/Konyar 2008). Published material of Yoncatepe contains a large number of pinkish buff ware and the lesser number of red slipped ware found just like in Karagündüz and Dilkaya which is typical EIA pottery of the region as pointed out by Sevin (2014: 359-360). The well-known EIA elements of the basin of Lake Van and southern Caucasus such as grooved ware, iron artefacts, beads and limited using of bronze, burial tradition and architecture of the graves, makes the EIA dating of Yoncatepe graves undisputable. Explanation of this confusion can be long term usage of the Yoncatepe graves M3, M5 and M6 into MIA-Urartu. The large Urartian structure complex adjacent to the cemetery is an evidence to continuity of the EIA-MIA in Yoncatepe.

During EIA or in the earlier periods such as Hakkari Grave M1, the long term usage of the chamber graves with multiple burials common in the basin of Lake Van, as seen in some of the chamber graves of Karagündüz and Dilkaya.

<sup>24</sup> Sevin 1999: 161.

<sup>25</sup> Sevin 1999: 161-162.

In the grave goods of Karagündüz, a bowl and a pot for each body, near the head are remarkable, generally, in bowls the bone pieces of sheep or goats and in pots the liquid residuals were found, apart from these, the bones of sheep and goats were existed in the grave K6-7. Since the hearths were located next to graves in Karagündüz cemetery and existing animal bones in the graves, it is suggest that sacrificed animals were cooked of the during funeral ceremony and the feast organized which is included all the people who attendance of all the people who participated to the ceremony.

Pottery was the main grave goods, the monochrome pottery tradition which is also known as Grooved or Nairi ware can be divided in three group in the basin of Lake Van: Pinkish-buff ware, red slipped ware and red-brown ware. Pinkish-buff ware is main group of pottery and it is occurred during the whole period together with red-brown ware. Red slipped ware is in lesser amount, in 200 vessels found in the grave K8 only 3 of them are red slipped ware, and in 112 vessels in the grave K1 only 20 are red slipped ware which are mostly thick and bright burnished red slipped ware in Karagündüz cemetery. Pinkish-buff ware is divided into two subgroups: Earlier one is thin and patchily red slipped ware which is derived from the pinkish-buff ware; and late one is thick and bright burnished red slipped ware. The distinctive feature of thick and bright burnished red slipped ware is representation of transition phase to MIA-Urartu and it is prototype of Urartian red polished ware (Palace or Biainili ware). Thick and bright burnished red slipped ware does not demonstrate the same features as the classical red polished ware of the kingdom of Urartu, Because of its different technique and shape. But some of the features compare with the characteristics of Urartian red polished ware, such as thick slip and shiny surface. It has also some closer forms in those Urartian pottery which is also appeared in red-brown ware, such as round bodies with thick rims or carinated bowls with simple or everted rims, jugs with trefoil rims and ribbed on the shoulders, decreasing grooves, disappearing string-hole lugs and triangular-ledge handles as seen in the late phase graves of Karagündüz. Urartian red polished ware must have been derived from red slipped ware of the EIA which is developed from pinkish-buff ware. The most remarkable feature of the EIA pottery in the basin is distribution of groups, while red-brown ware existed in the whole region, pinkish buff ware and red slipped ware were found only eastern shore of Lake Van basin showing strong local character which later became the central area of the Urartian Kingdom.

## CONCLUSION

The cemeteries and burial traditions of the pre-Urartians in the basin of Lake Van shows a cultural unity and continuity in the Urartians in some features. The eastern shoreline of Lake Van where the cemeteries of Ernis, Karagündüz, Dilkaya and Yoncatepe are located has also special importance because of being the central area of the Urartian Kingdom. The results of EIA investigations in the basin, which represents the establishment dynamics of the Urartian Kingdom, is important for the foundation phase of the Urartian Kingdom as well as understanding the small local polities of pre-Urartians. Evidences of the late phase (EIA II) indicate some of the characteristics of the kingdom of Urartu started to appear strongly, such as, red slipped ware, chamber graves, burial custom, cremation, bronze ornaments and beads which are remarkable characteristics of the Urartu. These features show that the process of preparing the foundation of the Urartian Kingdom came to the end. Describing all these evidences Sevin suggest that, the characteristics of the Urartian Kingdom were based mostly on the local traditions of the pre-Urartians in eastern shore of the basin of Lake Van, which later became the center of the Urartian Kingdom, and ‘it is possible to say that some, at least, of the eight nations or tribes mentioned in the Assyrian royal annals followed a pastoral lifestyle. The cemeteries of Karagunduz, Ernis and Dilkaya may very well belong to such tribes’<sup>26</sup>, ‘it is necessary to accept that the necropoleis of Karagündüz, Ernis and even Dilkaya are the cemeteries of the people known to the Assyrians as the Uruatri’<sup>27</sup>. The graves and stelae from Hakkari are significant evidences of the pre-Urartian elite, or the rulers of Uruatri and Nairi lands.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The author would like to thank Turkish Ministry of Culture and Tourism, General Directorate for Monuments and Museums supporting to our fieldworks in the region. Our investigations also was supported by TÜBİTAK (The Scientific and Technical Research Council of Turkey, Projects No SBB-CNRS-2011 and SBB-105K063), Turkish Historical Society, University of Van (2002-FED-093) and University of Mustafa Kemal (1101M0115/158) projects. Actually, this article based on studies of Prof. Dr. Veli Sevin, I worked at the excavations of Karagündüz, Hakkari and surveys in the region which are directed by him. Except for his publications, he shared all the material and unpublished information. I would like warmly thank to him for all and his studies in the region.

<sup>26</sup> Sevin 1999: 163.

<sup>27</sup> Sevin/Kavaklı 1996: 58.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- BELLİ, O. 2001  
“An Early Iron Age Cemetery in the Van Region: Ernis-Evditepe”, *İstanbul University's Contributions to Archaeology in Turkey (1932-2000)*, (Ed. O. Belli), İstanbul University Rectorate Publication No. 4285, İstanbul: 145-156.
- BELLİ, O., KONYAR, E. 2001  
“Excavations at Van-Yoncatepe Fortress and Necropolis”, *Tel Aviv* 28-2: 169-212.
- BELLİ, O., KONYAR, E. 2003a  
*Doğu Anadolu Bölgesinde Erken Demir Çağı Kale ve Nekropollerini/Early Iron Age Fortresses and Necropolises in East Anatolia*, Arkeoloji ve Sanat Yayınları, İstanbul.
- BELLİ, O., KONYAR, E. 2003b  
“Ernis-Evditepe: The Largest Early Iron Age Necropolis in Eastern Anatolia”, *Tel Aviv* 30-2: 167-202.
- BELLİ, O., TOZKOPARAN, M. 2005  
“2003 Yılı Van-Yoncatepe Kalesi ve Nekropolü Kazısı”, *26. Kazı Sonuçları Toplantısı-1* (Konya 24-28 Mayıs 2004), T.C. Kültür ve Turizm Bakanlığı, Kültür Varlıkları ve Müzeler Genel Müdürlüğü, Ankara: 189-202.
- BELLİ, O. 2009  
“2007 Yılı Van-Yoncatepe Sarayı, Nekropolü ve Kenti Kazıları”, *30. Kazı Sonuçları Toplantısı-1* (Ankara 26-30 Mayıs 2008), T.C. Kültür ve Turizm Bakanlığı, Kültür Varlıkları ve Müzeler Genel Müdürlüğü, Ankara: 423-448.
- BILGIÇ, E. 1964  
“Van and Its Environments”, *Anatolian Studies* XIV: 22-23.
- BRANCATO, R. 2017  
*Settlement Patterns and Political Landscapes in the Upper Tigris River Valley*, Studies on the Ancient Near East and the Mediterranean (SANEM 2), Arbor Sapientiae Editore, Roma.
- ÇİLİNGİROĞLU, A. 1991  
“The Early Iron age at Dilkaya”, *Anatolian Iron Ages 2: The Proceedings of the Second Anatolian Iron Ages Colloquium held at İzmir, 4-8 May 1987*, (Eds.) A. Çilingiroğlu, D. H. French, British Institute at Ankara 13, Oxford: 29-38.

ÇİLİNGİROĞLU, A. 1993

“Van-Dilkaya Höyüğü Kazıları Kapanış”, *XIV. Kazı Sonuçları Toplantısı-I* (Ankara, 25-29 Mayıs 1992), T.C. Kültür ve Turizm Bakanlığı, Kültür Varlıkları ve Müzeler Genel Müdürlüğü, Ankara: 469-491.

ÇİLİNGİROĞLU, A. 2012

“Dilkaya Höyüğü”, *Ege Üniversitesi Arkeoloji Kazıları*, (Eds. A. Çilingiroğlu, Z. Mercangöz, Gürcan Polat, İzmir: 77-94.

ERDEM, Ü. A. 2009

“Van Gölü Havzası’nda Bulunan Demir Çağ Yivli Çanak Çömleğinin Urartu Kalelerindeki Varlığı”, *Altan Çilingiroğlu’na Armağan: Yukarı Deniz’in Kıyısında Urartu Krallığı’na Adanmış Bir Hayat* (Eds. H. Sağlamtimur / E. Abay / Z. Derin et. al) İstanbul: 299-307.

ERDEM, Ü. A. 2012

“Regional Variations in Iron Age Grooved Pottery in Eastern Anatolia”, *Anatolian Iron Ages 7: The Proceedings of the Seventh Anatolian Iron Ages Colloquium Held at Edirne, 19–24 April 2010* (Eds. A. Çilingiroğlu / A. Sagona) Leuven: 113–130.

ERZEN, A. 1963

“Ünseli (Ernis) Mezarlığı“ *Belleten XXVII-107*: 542.

ERZEN, A. 1964

“Toprakkale, Çavuştepe ve Ünseli (Ernis) Mezarlığı”, *Belleten XXVIII-111*: 568-572.

ERZEN, A./BİLGİÇ, E./BOYSAL, Y./ÖĞÜN, B. 1962 (1964)

“Toprakkale ve Çavuştepe Kazıları Raporu (1962)”, *Türk Arkeoloji Dergisi XII-1*: 20.

ERZEN, A./BİLGİÇ, E./BOYSAL, Y./ÖĞÜN, B. 1963 (1965)

“Van Çevresi 1963 Çalışmaları”, *Türk Arkeoloji Dergisi XII-2*: 34-36.

GUARDİCCİ, G. 2012

“Nairi Ware: La produzione ceramica in Anatolia sud-orientale fra l’Eta del Bronzo Tardo e l’Eta del Ferro Medio”, *Studi di Archeologia del Vicino Oriente: Scritti degli allievi fiorentini per Paolo Emilio Pecorella*, (Ed) S. Mazzoni, Firenze University Press, Firenze: 245–274.

GUARDİCCİ, G. 2016

“Phase IVA and IVB: The Early and Middle Iron Age”, *Hirbemerdon Tepe Archaeological Project 2003-2013 Final Report: Chronology and Material Culture* (Ed. N. Laneri). Bologna: 95-98.

KONYAR, E. 2005

“Grooved Pottery of the Van Lake Basin: A Stratigraphical and Chronological Assessment”, *Colloquium Anatolicum IV*: 105-128.

KORFMANN, M. 1982

*Tilkitepe: Die ersten Ansätze prähistorischer Forschung in der ostlichen Türkei*, Istanbuler Mitteilungen Beiheft 26: Tübingen.

KÖROĞLU, K./ E. KONYAR 2005

“Van Gölü Havzası’nda Erken Demir Çağ Problemi”, *Arkeoloji ve Sanat* 119: 25-38.

KÖROĞLU, K./ E. KONYAR 2008

“Comments on the Early/Middle Iron Age Chronology of Lake Van Basin”, *Ancient Near Eastern Studies* 14: 123-135.

MARRO, C./ÖZFIRAT, A. 2004

“Pre-classical Survey in Eastern Turkey. Second Preliminary Report: The Erciş Region”, *Anatolia Antiqua XII*: 227-265.

ÖKSE, T. A. / GÖRMÜŞ, A. 2014

“Demir Çağında Salat Tepe”, *Scripta: Arkeolojiyle Geçen Bir Yaşam İçin Yazılar, Veli Sevin’e Armağan-Essays in Honour of Veli Sevin, A Life Immersed in Archaeology*, (Ed.) A. Özfirat, Ege Yayınları, İstanbul: 233–256.

ÖKSE, T. A., ERDOĞAN N., GÖRMÜŞ, A. AND ATAY E. 2014

*Ilisu Barajı İnşaat Sahası Kurtarma Projesi I: Demir Çağı - Salvage Project of the Construction Area of the Ilisu Dam I: The Iron Age*. Mardin.

ÖZFIRAT, A. 2001

*Doğu Anadolu Yayla Kültürleri (MÖ II. Binyıl)*, (With summary in English) İstanbul.

ÖZFIRAT, A.2002a

“Khabur Ware from Hakkari”, *Ancient Near Eastern Studies XXXIX*, 2002: 141-151.

ÖZFIRAT, A.2002b

“Van-Urmia painted pottery from Hakkari”, *Archäologische Mitteilungen aus Iran und Turan* 34, 2002: 209-228.

ÖZFIRAT, A. 2013

“Survey on the settlements of Late Bronze Age/ Early Iron Age in the north shore of Lake Van Basin”, *Austausch und Kulturkontakt im Südkaukasus und Seinen Angrenzenden Regionen Spätbronze-Früheisenzeit*, (Eds. A. Mehnert, G. Mehnert, S. Reinhold), Martin-Luther Universtät Halle-Wittenberg, Zentrums für Archäologie und Kulturgeschichte des Schwarzmeerraumes 22, Beier & Beran Verlag, Langenweißbach: 237-249.

ÖZFIRAT, A. 2014a

“Ağrı Dağı ve Van Gölü Havzası YüzeY Araştırması, (Muş-Bitlis-Van-Ağrı-Iğdır İlleri ve İlçeleri)”, *Mustafa Kemal Üniversitesi, Fen-Edebiyat Fakültesi, Arkeoloji Bölümü Kazı ve Araştırma Projeleri*, (Eds.) A. Özfirat, N. Coşkun), Mustafa Kemal Üniversitesi Yayınları 51, Antakya: 17-43.

ÖZFIRAT, A. 2014b

“Bozkurt Kurgan Mezarlığı Kazısı”, *Mustafa Kemal Üniversitesi, Fen-Edebiyat Fakültesi, Arkeoloji Bölümü Kazı ve Araştırma Projeleri*, (Eds.) A. Özfirat, N. Coşkun, Mustafa Kemal Üniversitesi Yayınları 51, Antakya: 45-70.

ÖZFIRAT, A. 2018

“Nairi Ware: Late Bronze-Early Iron Age Pottery Tradition in the Lake Van Basin”, *Context and Connection: Studies on the Archaeology of the Ancient Near East in Honour of Antonio Sagona*, Eds. A. Batmaz, G. Bédianashvili, A. Michalewicz, A. Robinson, *Orientalia Lovaniensia Analecta* 268, Leuven-Paris-Bristol, CT. Peeters: 161-174.

ÖZFIRAT, A. In press a

“Kurgans of Eastern Anatolia: From at the end of Kura-Araxes to Urartu”, *Constructing Kurgans: Burial mounds and Funerary customs in the Caucasus, northwestern Iran and eastern Anatolia during the Bronze and Iron Age*, International Workshop, Frenze, 29-30 March 2018).

ÖZFIRAT, A. In press b

“A Settlement Complex at Ernis (Ünseli) on the northern shore of Lake Van: From the Early Bronze (Kura-Araxes) to the Late Iron Age (Achaemenid)”, *South Caucasus and Beyond*, (Ed.) M. Cultraro.

SAĞLAMTİMUR, H. 1984

*Van-Dilkaya Kazılarında Çıkan Demir Çağ Çanak Çömleği*, Yüksek Lisans Tezi, T.C. Ege Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, İzmir.

SEVİN, V. 1986

“Malatya-Elazığ-Bingöl İlleri YüzeY Araştırması, 1985”, *IV. Araştırma Sonuçları Toplantısı* (Ankara 26-30 Mayıs 1986), T.C. Kültür ve Turizm Bakanlığı, Kültür Varlıkları ve Müzeler Genel Müdürlüğü, Ankara: 279-300.

SEVİN, V. 1989

“Elazığ-Bingöl YüzeY Araştırması, 1987”, *VI. Araştırma Sonuçları Toplantısı* (Ankara 23-27 Mayıs 1986), T.C. Kültür ve Turizm Bakanlığı, Kültür Varlıkları ve Müzeler Genel Müdürlüğü, Ankara: 451-500.

SEVİN, V. 1987

“Urartu Oda-Mezar Mimarisinin Kökeni Üzerine Bazı Görüşler”, *24-27 Nisan 1984 tarihleri arasında İzmir’de yapılan I. Anadolu Demir Çağları Sempozyumu’na sunulan bildiriler -Papers presented to the I. Anatolian Iron Ages Symposium, held in İzmir, 24-27 April 1984*, (Ed.) A. Çilingiroğlu, Ege Üniversitesi, Edebiyat Fakültesi 13, İzmir: 35-22.

SEVİN, V. 1995

İmikuşağı I, Türk Tarih Kurumu, Ankara.

SEVİN, V. 1996

“Van/Ernis (Ünseli) Nekropolü Erken Demir Çağ Çanak Çömlekleri”, *Anadolu Araştırmaları: Prof. Dr. Afif Erzen’e Armağan XIV*, İstanbul: 439-467.

SEVİN, V. 1999

“The origins of the Urartians in the light of the Van/ Karagündüz excavations”, *Anatolian Iron Ages 4: The Proceedings of the Fourth Anatolian Iron Ages Colloquium held at Mersin, 19-23 May 1997*, (Eds.) A. Çilingiroğlu and R. J. Matthews, *Anatolian Studies* 49, London: 159-164.

SEVİN, V. 2003

“The Early Iron Age in the Van Region”, *Archaeology in the Borderlands: Investigations in Caucasia and Beyond*, (Eds. A. T. Smith / K. Rubinson) Los Angeles: 180-191.

SEVİN, V. 2004

“Pastoral Tribes and Early Settlements of the Van Region, Eastern Anatolia”, *A View From the Highlands: Archaeological Studies in Honour of Charles Burney* (Ed. A. Sagona) Ancient Near East Studies Supplement Herent: 179-203.

SEVİN, V. 2005a

“Son Tunç/Erken Demir Çağ Van Bölgesi Kronolojisi: Kökeni Aranan Bir Devlet-Urartu”, *Bellekten* LXVIII-252: 355-400.

SEVİN, V. 2005b

*Hakkari Taşları I: Çıplak Savaşçıların Gizemi*. İstanbul.

SEVİN, V. 2014

“Van/Ernis-Evditepe ve Alacahan Mezarlık ve Yerleşimleri Işığında Kimi Düşünceler: Demir Çağlar Sorunu”, *Armağan Erkanal'a Armağan: Anadolu Kültürlerine Bir Bakış - Compiled in Honor of Armağan Erkanal: Some Observations on Anatolia Cultures*, (Eds. N. Çınardalı-Karaarslan *et al.*) Ankara: 355-367.

SEVİN, V. 2015

*Hakkari Taşları II: Gizemin Peşinde*. Ankara.

SEVİN, V./KAVAKLI E. 1996

*Bir Erken Demir Çağı Nekropolü Van - Karagündüz. An Early Iron Age Necropolis*. İstanbul.

## TÜBA-AR GENEL YAZIM KURALLARI

TÜBA-AR, Türkiye Bilimler Akademisi (TÜBA) tarafından yıllık olarak yayımlanan uluslararası süreli bir dergidir. Derginin yayın politikası, kapsamı ve içeriği ile ilgili kararlar (Türkiye Bilimler Akademisi –TÜBA) Akademi Konseyi tarafından belirlenen Yayın Kurulu tarafından alınır.

### DERGİNİN KAPSAMI

TÜBA-AR dergisi ilke olarak, dönem ve coğrafi bölge sınırlaması olmadan arkeoloji ve arkeoloji ile bağlantılı tüm alanlarda yapılan yeni araştırma, yorum, değerlendirme ve yöntemleri kapsamaktadır. Dergi arkeoloji alanında yeni yapılan çalışmalara yer vermenin yanı sıra, bir bilim akademisi yayın organı olarak arkeoloji ile bağlantılı olmak koşulu ile kültürel miras yönetimi, koruma, doğa, fen ve diğer sosyal bilim alanları ile ilgili tüm uzmanlık alanlarında yeni yorum, yaklaşım, analizlere açıktır; bu alanlarda bir forum oluşturma işlevini de yüklenmiştir.

Kazı ve yüzey araştırmaları da dahil olmak üzere yeni yorum ve açılım getirmeyen, yalnızca malzeme tanıtımı içeren, kazı ön rapor niteliğindeki yazılar dergi kapsamının dışındadır. Ancak, kültür tarihi açısından önemli bir yenilik getiren, özgün buluntular “haber” olarak dergiye kabul edilebilir.

### YAYIN İLKELERİ

Dergide basılmak için verilen yazılar Türkçe, İngilizce, Almanca ya da Fransızca olabilir; Türkçe yazılara İngilizce, diğer dillerde yazılmış olanlara da Türkçe ve İngilizce bir özet eklenmesi gerekmektedir. Resim alt yazıları, biri Türkçe olmak üzere mutlaka çift dilde yazılmalıdır. Anahtar sözcükler ve özetler ise, İngilizce ve Türkçe olan yazılarda Türkçe ve İngilizce olarak çift dilde, diğer dillerde yazılan makalelerde makale dilinin yanı sıra Türkçe ve İngilizce olarak üç dilde verilmelidir.

Yazarlar dergiye gönderdikleri makalenin özgün olduğunu, başka bir dilde dahi olsa makalenin daha önce yayımlanmadığını ya da yayımlanmak üzere bir başka dergiye gönderilmemiş olduğunu kabul etmiş sayılırlar.

TÜBA-AR hakemli bir yayındır. Gelen yazıların önkabulü üzerine yayın kurulu görüş bildirir ve hakem önerir. Her yazı en az iki hakeme gönderilir. Hakemlerin önerileri, eleştiri ve düzeltmeleri yazara hakem adı gizlenerek yollanır; yazarlar hakem görüşüne uymayı kabul etmek yükümlülüğündedir. Yazarların, gerekçe göstererek görüşlerinde ısrarcı olmaları durumunda yayın kurulu yeni bir değerlendirme yapar.

Hakem görüşleri doğrultusunda yayın kurulu tarafından basılabilir kararı verilen yazılar, yazı düzeni, yazım kuralları, kaynakça, görsel malzeme ile yazının ilişkilendirilmesi gibi konular da dahil olmak üzere gözden geçirildikten sonra, önemli bir aksaklık bulunmaz ise son gözden geçirme yayın koordinatörü tarafından yapılır.

### YAZIM KURALLARI

Makaleler: Makale metni bilgisayar ortamında yazılmalıdır. Başlık iki kademeli kullanılabilir ve ikinci satıra yazılan başlık ‘alt başlık’ olarak değerlendirilir. Sayfa sayısı için belirli bir sınır bulunmamakla beraber üst sınır 50000 vuruş olarak kabul edilmektedir. Makaleler iki aşamalı olarak teslim edilmelidir; ilk olarak hakeme gönderilecek şekilde tek dosyada metin, kaynakça, düşük çözünürlükte görseller ve resim alt yazıları, ikinci aşamada, makalenin kabulünden sonra ise ayrı dosyalar halinde olmak üzere metin, kaynakça, yüksek çözünürlükte görseller ve resim alt yazıları olarak teslim edilmelidir. Metin, ‘microsoft word’ kelime işlem programında yazılmalıdır. Metin içindeki birinci derece başlıklar büyük harf bold, ikinci derece başlıklar büyük harf normal, üçüncü derece başlıklar sözcük ilk harfleri büyük olmak üzere küçük harf bold, dördüncü kademe başlıklar sözcük ilk harfleri büyük olmak üzere küçük harf ve italik yazılmalıdır.

Örnek yazılım:  
 INTRODUCTION  
 CULTURAL STAGES  
 North-Central Anatolia  
 İkiztepe

Metin içinde geçen yabancı sözcük ve terimler, örneğin 'in situ' italik olarak yazılmalıdır. Metin içinde Milattan Önce, Milattan Sonra gibi çok alışlagelmiş kısaltmalar dışında kısaltma kullanılmamalı ve açık yazılmalıdır. Ancak metinde çok sık geçen adlamalar, ilk olarak açık yazılıp yanında kısaltması parantez içinde belirtildikten sonra kısaltma olarak kullanılmaya devam edilebilir; örneğin Maden Tetkik Arama (MTA). Geçerli bazı kısaltmalar:

Milattan Önce'nin kısaltması: MÖ ve tarihten önce; örneğin MÖ 475

Milattan Sonra'nın kısaltması: MS ve tarihten önce; örneğin MS 456

Günümüzden önce: GÖ

Uyarlanmış (kalibre) tarihler: cal. M.Ö.; örneğin cal. MÖ 475

Belirli bazı dönem adları kısaltılabilir; örneğin Erken Tunç Çağı, ETÇ; Geç Demir Çağı, GDC

Bölge adlarının ilk harfleri büyük yazılmalı; örneğin İç Anadolu, Orta Amerika, Güneydoğu Anadolu, Orta Asya, Yakın Doğu gibi. Aynı şekilde yer, coğrafya ve kurum adlarının da ilk harfleri büyük yazılır; örneğin Avrupa, Akdeniz Bölgesi, Barbaros Bulvarı, Kızılırmak, Fırat Nehri, İstanbul Üniversitesi, Türk Tarih Kurumu gibi.

Görseller: Resimler dijital olmalıdır. Görsellerin yüksek çözünürlükte ve imaj boyutunun büyük olması gerekmektedir. Genelde 20 sayfalık bir metin için 6-8 resim sayfasına girecek şekilde tercihen 15 resim üst sınırdır. Yazı hangi dilde olursa olsun resim alt yazıları biri Türkçe olmak üzere mutlaka çift dilde yazılmalıdır. Görsellerde ve metin içi göndermelerinde tek bir numaralandırma uygulanmalıdır. Fotoğraf, resim, Çiz. hepsi Res.1,2,3... / Fig. 1,2,3... olarak sıralanmalı ve metnin sonunda verilmelidir. Tablo-çizelgeler, görsellerden ayrı olarak Çizelge 1,2,3... / Table 1,2,3... olarak numaralandırılmalı ve metin sonunda verilmelidir.

Her türlü görsel malzemenin sayfa mizanpajında rahat kullanılabilmesi için, yatay ya da dikey A4 normun oranlarına uygun olması gerekmektedir.

Yazara/yazarlara ait olmayan görsellerin kaynağı belirtilmeli, yayım için telif hakkı anlaşması gerektiren googleearth gibi görseller kullanılmamalıdır.

Dipnotlar: Dipnotlar aşağıdaki örneklerdeki gibi olmalıdır;  
 Özgüç 1978, Garstang/Gurney 1959; Forlanini 2007: 151.

Kaynakçada verilen tüm kaynaklara metinde gönderme yapılmalıdır.

Kaynakça yazım kuralları aşağıdaki gibidir:

Makale:

ALKIM, U.B. 1979.

"İkiztepe Kazısı 1978 Çalışmaları", Belleten XLIII/72: 890-892.

Kitap Bölümü:

HAMSHERE, J.D. 1987.

"Data Sources in Historical Geography", Historical Geography: Progress and Prospect (Ed. M. Pacione). London: 46-69.

Kitap:

HAZENBOS, J. 2003.

The Organisation of the Anatolian Local Cults During the 13th Century B.C. Leiden.

BRYER, A/WINFIELD, D. 1985.

Byzantine Monuments and Topography of Pontus. Washington.

## **PUBLICATION RULES**

TÜBA-AR (Turkish Academy of Sciences, Journal of Archaeology) is an international periodical that is published annually by Turkish Academy of Sciences. The Editorial Board appointed by the TUBA Academy Council makes the decisions as to the publication policy, extent and content of the journal (Turkish Academy of Sciences - TÜBA).

## **SCOPE OF THE JOURNAL**

The journal TÜBA-AR principally involves new research, comment, evaluation and methods conducted in the field of archaeology and in archaeology-related fields without any periodic and geographic area restriction. The journal includes newly conducted studies in the field of archaeology, but as a science academy house organ, it is also open to new comments, approaches and analyses in the areas of expertise like cultural heritage management, protection, nature, science and other fields of social science as long as these areas are related to the archaeology.

Excavational working paper-like reports which only offer a material advertisement or lack of new comments and initiatives about excavation and surface research lie beyond the scope of the journal. However, unique findings that break new ground in terms of cultural history can be accepted to the journal as “news.”

## **EDITORIAL PRINCIPLES**

The manuscripts may be in Turkish, English, German or French; for Turkish manuscripts an English summary must be added and for the manuscripts that are written in other languages, both a Turkish and an English summary must be provided. The official subtitles must certainly be written in two different languages, one of which is to be Turkish. The keywords and summaries for English and Turkish manuscripts must be offered in Turkish and English; the manuscripts written in other languages must be provided in Turkish and English, as well, apart from the source language of the manuscripts.

The authors are assumed to acknowledge that the manuscripts they write for the journal are authentic and have never been published previously even in another language or have not been submitted for publication elsewhere.

TÜBA-AR is a refereed journal. The editorial board expresses an opinion about the preliminary acceptance of the manuscripts and hand it over to the referees. The manuscripts are referred to at least two referees. The suggestions, criticism and corrections made by the referees are redirected to the authors provided that the referees' names remain anonymous; the authors are obliged to take referees' consult. In case the authors are insistent upon their own manuscripts, the editorial board re-evaluates them.

In accordance with the referees' opinions, the manuscripts cleared for publication by the editorial board are reviewed for their format, spelling rules, references and visual materials; the final assessment is conducted by the editorial coordinator provided there is no crucial defect.

## **SPELLING RULES**

Articles: The articles should be prepared in computer environment. Titles up two lines are allowed; the first line as the ‘Title’ and the second line as the ‘Sub-Title.’ Although there is no exact limit on the length of the articles, the average length should not exceed 50000 characters. The articles should be delivered in two phases: first, in a single file, with references and low-resolution illustrations and image subtitles, then in the second phase, once they are cleared for publication, they should be presented in separate files with the text itself, references, high-resolution illustrations and image subtitles. The texts should be prepared in a Microsoft Word processing format. The titles in the texts should be written in bold capitals, the subtitles in capitals, third degree titles in bold, in lower case except for the first letter of the words, and the fourth degree titles in italics, in lower case except for the first letter of the words.

Example:

INTRODUCTION

CULTURAL STAGES

North-Central Anatolia

Ikiztepe

Foreign words and terms found in the texts like “in situ” should be written in italics. Except for the conventional abbreviations like “Before Christ” and “Anno Domini” the abbreviations should not be used and the term should be written in full length. However, frequently-used expressions should first be written in full length with the abbreviations in parentheses, then the abbreviated forms can be used for the rest of the text; for example, General Directorate of Mineral Research and Exploration (MTA). Valid abbreviations:

Abbreviated form of Before Christ: BC and the date, e.g. 475 BC

Abbreviated form of Anno Domini: AD and the date, e.g. AD 456

Before present: BP

Calibrated dates: cal. BC; e.g. cal. 475 BC

Certain period names can be abbreviated; for example, Early Bronze Age, EBA; Late Iron Age (LIA)

The first letter of region names should be in capitals; for example, Central Anatolia, Central America, South-east Anatolia, Central Asia, Near East, etc. Similarly, the first letter of place names, geographic and institutional names is in capitals; e.g. Europe, Mediterranean Region, Barbaros Bulvarı, Kızılırmak, Euphrates, Istanbul University, Turkish Historical Society, etc.

Illustrations: The visuals should be in digital format. They should be in high-resolution and the image size should be large. The maximum image number should be 15 in the way that 6-8 images should be selected for print for a 20-page text. No matter what the language of the text is, one of the image subtitles should definitely be in two different languages, one of which is to be Turkish. All the illustrations and intra-textual references should be numbered in the same format. Pictures, images, drawings, etc. should be numbered as Pic.1,2,3..... /Fig. 1,2,3... and given at the end of the text. Apart from the illustrations, tables-charts should be numbered as Chart 1,2,3.../Table 1,2,3.... and given at the end of the text.

Every kind of illustrations, whether in horizontal or vertical form, should be suitable for A4 format sizes in order to be used comfortably in the page lay-out.

All the illustrations that may or may not belong to the author should be credited and the ones that require a copyright agreement like googleearth should not be used.

Footnotes: The footnotes should be given as in the examples:

Özgüç 1978, Garstang/Gurney 1959; Forlanini 2007: 151

All the resources presented in the references should make a reference within the text.

Rules for Reference List:

Article:

ALKIM, U.B. 1979.

“İkiztepe Kazısı 1978 Çalışmaları”, Belleten XLIII/72: 890-892.

Book Section:

HAMSHERE, J.D. 1987.

“Data Sources in Historical Geography”, Historical Geography: Progress and Prospect (Ed. M. Pacione). London: 46-69.

Book:

HAZENBOS, J. 2003.

The Organisation of the Anatolian Local Cults During the 13th Century B.C. Leiden.

BRYER, A/WINFIELD, D. 1985.

Byzantine Monuments and Topography of Pontus. Washington.

ISSN: 1301-8566



9 771301 856139