

ARKEOLOJİ BİLİMLERİ DERGİSİ

TURKISH JOURNAL OF
ARCHAEOLOGICAL SCIENCES

2021

ISSN 2822-2164





ISSN 2822-2164

Editörler / Editors

Güneş Duru Mimar Sinan Fine Arts University, Turkey
Mihriban Özbaşaran Istanbul University, Turkey

Yardımcı Editörler / Associate Editors

Brenna Hassett University College London, United Kingdom
Melis Uzdurum Ondokuz Mayıs University, Turkey
Sera Yelözer Istanbul University, Turkey
Fatma Kalkan Koç University, Turkey

Yazı İşleri Müdürü / Managing Editor

Varlık İndere

Yapım / Production

Zero Prodüksiyon Kitap-Yayın-Dağıtım San. Ltd. Şti.
Abdullah Sokak, No: 17, Taksim / Beyoğlu 34433 İstanbul - Türkiye
Tel: +90 (212) 244 7521 Fax: +90 (212) 244 3209
E.mail: info@zerobooksonline.com
www.zerobooksonline.com

Tasarım / Design
Adnan Elmasoğlu

Uygulama / Layout Design
Hülya Tokmak

Kapak Fotoğrafı / Cover Photo
Kapadokya volkan külü birikim kesiti / Accumulation of volcanic ash, Cappadocia, G. Duru.



Danışma Kurulu / Advisory Board

- Eşref Abay** Ege University, Turkey
Murat Akar Hatay Mustafa Kemal University, Turkey
Benjamin S. Arbuckle University of North Carolina, USA
Levent Atıcı University of Nevada, USA
Meriç Bakiler Mimar Sinan Fine Arts University, Turkey
Marion Benz Free University of Berlin, Germany
Rozalia Christidou CNRS, France
Çiler Çilingiroğlu Ege University, Turkey
Nüzhet Dalfes Istanbul Technical University (emeritus), Turkey
Caroline Douché National Museum of Natural History - Paris, France
Yılmaz Selim Erdal Hacettepe University, Turkey
Burçin Erdoğu Akdeniz University, Turkey
Müge Ergun ANAMED, Turkey
Metin Kartal Ankara University, Turkey
Nurcan Kayacan Istanbul University, Turkey
Moritz Kinzel German Archaeological Institute, Turkey
Elif Koparal Mimar Sinan Fine Arts University, Turkey
Susan M. Mentzer University of Tübingen, Germany
Natalie Munro University of Connecticut, USA
Gökhan Mustafaoğlu Ankara Hacı Bayram Veli University, Turkey
Rana Özbal Koç University, Turkey
Mehmet Somel Middle East Technical University, Turkey
Mary Stiner University of Arizona, USA
Georgia Tsartsidou Ephorate of Palaeoanthropology - Speleology, Greece



İçindekiler / Contents

- 1 Editörlerden
- 2 Note from the editors
- 3 **Trevor Watkins**
Can Prehistoric Archaeology be a Scientific Discipline?
- 22 **Moritz Kinzel**
Documenting Near Eastern Neolithic Architecture: Aspects of 2D and 3D Recording of Built Environments
- 42 **Yılmaz Selim Erdal, Turan Takaoglu**
Mortuary Behavior in Chalcolithic Anatolia: A View from Gülpınar
- 67 **Erkan Fidan**
Yüzey Araştırmalarında Disiplinlerarası Bir Çalışma: Tavşanlı Höyük
- 79 **Mehmet Bilgi Er, Asuman Günal Türkmenoğlu, Emine Hale Göktürk**
Raw Material Characteristics and Production Technology of Chalcolithic and Iron Age Değirmentepe Pottery (Malatya, Turkey)
- 95 **Tuna Şare Ağtürk, Kimberlee Sue Moran**
From Beazley to Forensic Labs: Investigating Ancient Fingerprints in Classical Archaeology
- 109 **Selin Gür**
Gender in the Analysis of Domestic Space: A Theoretical and Methodological Approach
- 121 **Thomas Zimmerman**
The Hand of Man – Oswald Spengler's Thoughts on Cultural Morphology and its Benefits for Current Archaeological Debates

135	Amaç ve Kapsam
136	Aims and Scope
137	Makale Gönderimi ve Yazım Kılavuzu
142	Submission and Style Guideline



Editörlerden

Dünyaya açılmamızı sağlayacak Arkeoloji Bilimleri Dergisi'nin ilk sayısı ile hepinize merhaba diyoruz.

Arkeoloji bir süredir geçmişin yorumlanmasında teknoloji ve doğa bilimleri ile yoğun iş birliği içinde yeni bir anlayışa evrilmekte. Üniversiteler, ilgili kurum ve enstitülerde her yeni gün açılmakta olan “Arkeoloji Bilimleri” bölümleri ve programları, geleneksel anlayışı yavaş yavaş terk ederek değişen yeni bilim iklimine adapte olmaya çalışmaktalar. Arkeoloji disiplininin geçmişi, geçmişte yaşayan insanların yaşam biçimlerini bütüncül bir şekilde anlamaya, hızla gelişen ve yaygınlaşan teknolojilerle her geçen on yılda daha fazla yaklaşıyor. Arkeolojik araştırmalar, sorgulama ve değerlendirme biçimleri, bu yeni bilim üretme biçimine dönüşüyor. Derginin editörleri olarak bizler, bu süreçte, bu dönüşüme katkı sağlayacak bir mecra oluşturma'nın önemli olduğu kanısındayız.

Amacımız arkeoloji içindeki arkeobotanik, arkeozooloji, alet ve bina teknolojileri, tarihlendirme, mikromorfoloji, biyoarkeoloji, jeokimyasal ve spektroskopik analizler, coğrafi bilgi sistemleri, iklim ve çevre modellemeleri gibi farklı uzmanlık alanlarının çeşitlenerek yaygınlaşmasına katkı sağlamak ve arkeolojide bilimsel yöntem ve analizlerin geliştirilmesi ve uygulanması üzerine çalışan bilim insanlarını bir araya getirmek. Elbette yeni ve özgün metodolojik ve kuramsal yaklaşımlar üzerine yapılan araştırmalara da yer vereceğiz. Destek, katkı ve ilginizi derginin seyri ve gelişimi adına çok önemli görüyoruz.

Güneş Duru & Mihriban Özbaşaran



Note from the editors

We would like to take this opportunity to introduce ourselves to the world, and say ‘hello’ to the archaeological media with the very first issue of our new archaeological journal: The Turkish Journal of Archaeological Sciences.

For the past couple of decades archaeology has been evolving in close cooperation with new technologies and the advances in the natural sciences towards new understandings and interpretations of the past. More and more newly established departments and programs in universities and other relevant institutions focus on “Archaeological Sciences” as they try to adapt to a changing climate, and gradually abandon older traditions. Rapidly developing technological, methodological and analytical advances move us closer to understanding the way of life in past communities in a holistic way. Archaeological research programs, and the many innovative new ways of testing, inquiring and evaluating these all converge into this new way of producing ‘science’. As the founding editors of the TJAS, we think it is important to have a medium that will contribute to this transformation.

Our goal is to contribute to the diversification and dissemination of different areas of expertise such as archaeobotany, archaeozoology, tool and building technologies, dating methods, micromorphology, bioarchaeology, geochemical and spectroscopic analyses, geographical information systems, climate and environmental modeling. We aim to bring scholars working on the development and application of scientific methods and analyses together in these volumes. We also seek to include in these pages recent advances in methodological and theoretical approaches. Your support, contributions and engagement with the archaeological science presented here are crucial to the progress and development of the journal.

Güneş Duru & Mihriban Özbaşaran

The Hand of Man – Oswald Spengler’s Thoughts on Cultural Morphology and its Benefits for Current Archaeological Debates

Thomas Zimmermann^a

Abstract

Oswald Spengler, a brilliant yet controversial philosopher of history, is probably best known for his seminal “Decline of the West”. In this book, Spengler boldly claimed to not only to contextualize world history, but also predict future developments on the basis of understanding cultures as cyclical entities with dynamics akin to those of organic beings. Misread, shunned, and finally subject to academic oblivion in the second half of the 20th century, aspects of cultural morphology are currently rediscovered by a variety of disciplines including palaeoanthropology, ancient history, and ancient Near Eastern studies as potentially powerful tools to review regional or supra-regional phenomena like crisis, change, and adaption from a different, “Spenglerian” angle. This contribution argues that aspects of morphological thought as outlined in the “Decline”, but also in his later works can be immensely beneficial to scrutinize the mechanisms of change and apotheosis—the original meaning of “decline” in Spengler’s work!—in prehistoric contexts. Case studies from archaeology are used as a backdrop to highlight the possibilities and limits of cultural morphology as a methodological baseline to engage in current archaeological debates.

Keywords: Near Eastern archaeology, philosophy, history, cultural morphology, Oswald Spengler

Özet

Parlak ama tartışmalı tarihçi-felsefeci Oswald Spengler, en çok, “Batı’nın Çöküşü” isimli meşhur kitabı ile bilinir. Spengler, bu eserde biyolojik varlıkların yaşam sürelerine benzeyen

^a Thomas Zimmermann, Assoc. Prof., Bilkent University, Faculty of Humanities and Letters, Department of Archaeology. 06800 Bilkent – Ankara.

zimmer@bilkent.edu.tr ; <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4937-2166>

Makale gönderim tarihi: 2.12.2020; Makale kabul tarihi: 27.01.2021

döngülerden oluşan dünyanın tarihini çok farklı bir gözle okunmakla kalmamış, gelecek ile ilgili öngörülerde de bulunmuştur. 20. yüzyılın ikinci yarısında, yüzeysel okunması nedeniyle akademik dünya tarafından aforoz edildikten sonra; kriz, değişim ve uyum ile ilgili fenomenlerin daha derinden anlaşılabilmesi ve “Spenglerian” bakış açısıyla değerlendirilebilmesi için, kültürel morfoloji yaklaşımının bazı kavramları bugün paleoantropoloji, eskiçağ tarihi ve eski Yakındoğu araştırmaları tarafından yeniden keşfediliyor. Bu makale, Spengler’in “Çöküş” ve “İnsan ve Teknik” adlı kitaplarında uygulanan morfolojik düşünce tarzından yola çıkarak, pre-historik dönemlerdeki değişim ve tamamlanma gibi kavramların daha kapsamlı anlaşılabilmesi için çok faydalı olacağını savunuyor ve arkeolojik tartışmalarda kültürel morfoloji yaklaşımının sunabileceği imkânları ve kısıtlılıkları daha net gösterebilmek için arkeolojiden bazı örnekler paylaşıyor.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Yakındoğu arkeolojisi, felsefe, tarih, kültürel morfoloji, Oswald Spengler

The Long Shadow – Spengler’s Work, its Reception, and Recent Reappraisal

The past century—an “age of extremes” indeed (Hobsbawn 1994)—does not necessarily count as a centennial depraved of controversial scholars. Still, Oswald Spengler obtains a particularly awkward position within the realm of modern historians and philosophers, since he dramatically challenged the conventional approaches to philosophy and history alike. The publication of the first edition of his monumental “Decline of the West (*Der Untergang des Abendlandes*)”¹ (Spengler 2007) could not have been timed—by coincidence or not—more appropriately: it was released on September 18, 1918, just a few weeks before the official ending of World War I (Fink and Rollinger 2018b, 1), with a title then being read like a gloomy epitaph on the yet unparalleled devastation and carnage having ravaged through Europe, leaving millions dead, displaced, injured and severely traumatized.

Oswald Spengler, who advocated an explicit “non-scientific”, holistic approach to “history, whose immanent language still has to be deciphered” (cf. Spengler 2007, 10; also see below) was convinced that the last surviving of world civilizations -their occidental, western derivative- was on the brink of fulfilment and would soon be succeeded by a nascent Asian civilization (Aksakal 2013, 283).

Spengler’s opus magnum, however, cannot be merely simplified as a resigned farewell to occidental civilization that once believed in never-ending progress and prosperity. Its depth and

¹ Spengler’s *opus magnum*, originally published in three separate volumes (two text volumes and one volume with indices), is referenced here after the reprint published by Albatros Publishers in 2007 (Spengler 2007). This complete edition in one single volume follows the 33.-47. revised edition of the first volume (published originally 1923) and the 31.-42. edition of the second volume (published 1922). All other sources were available to the author as original editions.

gravity lie in the unprecedented—and for his academic contemporaries outrageous—treatment of all cultures as fundamentally equal entities that rise, prosper and decline akin to the biological life cycle of living matter (Engels 2019, 3-4). In this utterly deterministic perspective, any nascent civilization inevitably bears the grain of demise, even in its seemingly most influential and flourishing period. This radical approach explicitly digresses from a common Eurocentric, nation-state-based, thus chauvinistic historiography (Christian 2015, 5; Sachsenmaier 2015, 71; Fink and Rollinger 2018b, 2-4) in favour of a system with cultures experiencing synchronized trajectories, but chronological offsets. The big merit acknowledged by eminent historians as Eduard Meyer lies in the abandonment of historical “monodimensionality” in favour of parallel cultural developments (Krebernik 2018, 240). Since no cultural cycle on the global timeline is in any sense “superior” to another, the “decline” is no judgemental label forced on a particular geographical, social or political body, but the inevitable “fulfilment”, or apotheosis of its life cycle—a term (*Vollendung*) that Spengler himself eventually used synonymously for his concept (cf. Engels 2018-2019, 17).

To decipher the internal and external dynamics that set one cycle into motion and nudge it towards the tipping point, Oswald Spengler employed sources, disciplines, and methodologies as diverse as human evolution, religious studies, psychology, musicology, and linguistics to formulate his grand historical exegesis (Aksakal 2013, 283). After all, the “Decline” constitutes the last serious attempt to write a holistic, universal history of humankind. Needless to say, such a bold approach stirred up very mixed responses from the relevant academic units: Spengler’s (nowadays challenged) historical model of only eight major “cultures”, with three of them scrutinized in detail and labelled “Apollonian”, “Faustian” and “Magian” (for general outline cf. Spengler 2007, 234-281; cf. also Gunter 2018, 189), already triggered, with the backdrop of a growing political radicalization in the wake of the post-World War convulsions, vivid debates in the early 1920s (Schröter 1922; Fink and Rollinger 2018b, 2-3).

His ardent criticism of National Socialist racial politics² and “Führer” euphoria³, presented in his work titled “*Jahre der Entscheidung*” (Spengler 1933, published in English as “The Hour of Decision” (Spengler 1934)) ostracized him for good in the early Hitler regime, after initially having been elected senator for the German Academy in 1933 (Kidd 2012, 21-22; Engels 2019, 4-6). He predicted, not without a scent of clairvoyance, the catastrophic downfall of the

² “But in speaking of race, it is not intended in the sense which it is the fashion among anti-Semites in Europe and America to use it today. Darwinistically, materially. Race purity is a grotesque word in view of the fact that for centuries all stocks and species have been mixed [...]” (Spengler 1934, 219).

³ “The levelling out of brains is complete: one meets ‘in the mass’, wills ‘in the mass’, thinks ‘in the mass’. Those who do not think with it, who think for themselves, are felt to be enemies” (Spengler 1934, 200).

“Reich” in not more than ten years shortly before he died of a heart attack in Munich on May 8, 1936 (Engels 2019, 6).

Another cataclysmic world war, destroying the lives of millions not even half a century after cannons were silenced in 1918, and the succeeding ideological and geographical divide between different world systems striving for supremacy seemed to have rendered Spengler's reading of world history anachronistic and obsolete at last. His legacy was only sporadically subject to discussion and largely restricted to specialized academic studies, without any major repercussion in mass media or the general public (cf. Zumbini 1976; Fisch 1985; exceptions like the monograph authored by Armin Baltzer (1956) prove the rule). In Turkey, Spengler's “fatalist” approach, which is surprisingly compatible with traditional Ottoman historiography and the likewise cyclical Islamic “*Weltanschauung*” (cf. Fisch 1985)⁴, was sure enough at odds with a positivist, pro-Western historical agenda as endorsed by Arnold J. Toynbee, which was enthusiastically embraced by the political left in the early days of the Turkish Republic (Aksakal 2013, 284-285). He found, however, a small but devoted readership amongst conservative intellectuals who handpicked the passages from Spengler's works critical of occidental superiority, to back their national conservative, at most Islamic and anti-Western sentiment (Aksakal 2013, 290-297).

It was not until rather recently, however, that the apparent crisis of (western) liberal democracies, the distinct rise of authoritarian regimes, and violent clashes in urban centres fuelled by intercultural tensions triggered a renaissance in the critical acclaim of Spenglerian thought—not necessarily limited to a sarcastic acknowledgement of his most dismal predictions (cf. Glaser 2019).

An ever-growing output of both academic compilations and monographic contributions especially since the past two decades not only reviews the reception of Spengler in different political and academic environments (cf. Demandt 2017; Strasser 2018; Engels et al. 2018; Fink and Rollinger 2018a for more recent contributions). Some also succeed in adapting cultural morphology to current historical debates, while simultaneously performing the challenging, however beneficial balancing act to point out obvious errors and misconceptions in Spengler's original contributions without discarding the whole of his approach (cf. Engels 2018). That

⁴ It would be exciting to explore further whether Islamic scholars like Ibn Khaldun, who likewise advocated a worldview with cyclic successions of civilizations (Alataş 2015; Önder and Ulaşan 2018), had a profound influence on Oswald Spengler's reasoning. The at first sight striking similarities, however, lose much of their obviousness when being scrutinized further: Unlike Spengler, Ibn Khaldun argues that every society experiences similar challenges; that aside, technology, a major concern for Spengler, plays a rather marginal role for Ibn Khaldun, while the effect of external attacks, a decisive issue for Ibn Khaldun, is negligible for Spengler (Önder and Ulaşan 2018, 247-250).

aside; a variety of contributions boldly goes beyond the mere historical contextualization of Spengler's reading of history, and actively attempts to apply aspects of Spenglerian thought to a variety of ancient historical and current affairs debates (cf. Engels 2014). The windfall of this output for intimately related disciplines like paleoanthropology, ancient Near Eastern studies, and prehistoric archaeology seems to be still rather modest. However, a number of studies already embarked on the adventure of reconciling cultural morphology with archaeological or anthropological data, proving that certain aspects of Spengler's approach are far from being fringe broodings of a cultural pessimist, but well worth considering indeed.

“Nature Should be Treated Scientifically; History Should be Written as Poetry” – A Selection of Recent Spenglerian Approaches in Archaeological and Anthropological Contributions

Elite gift exchange, ritualized gift-giving and the accumulation of wealth in pre- and early historic times is a rewarding topic treated in numerous contributions (for Late Bronze Age source texts cf. Cochavi-Rainey and Lilyquist 1999 with references, e.g., Doğan and Michailidou 2008; Kelder 2009) ever since its profound socio-political dimension was defined by scholars like Bronislaw Malinowski (esp. 1920, 1953) and Marcel Mauss (1950). A broadly set cross-cultural, cross-chronological comparative approach, as presented by Ann Gunter (2018), is using Spenglerian cultural synchronisms as a backdrop. Her essay can be read indeed as a fruitful alternative to more conventional studies, given the relative scarcity of diachronic and cross-spatial comparative studies in our field (Smith 2012; Gunter 2018, 191). Gunter's evaluation of the Neo-Assyrian and Inca empires' elite heritage—divided in time and space, but fatally united in morphologically determined mechanisms of status enhancement—beautifully highlights the role of state control and high culture formation processes with special reference to a chronologically indifferent consumption of aesthetic values (Gunter 2018, 198-201).

Spengler's “Romanticist essentialism” (Høyrup 2018, 221)⁵ may not stand the test of historical and prehistoric data accumulated since the second half of the 20th century; it remains, however, particularly inspiring in its cross-cultural diversity, especially considering his thoughts on the diachronic morphological mechanisms of emerging early scientific thought, as prominently represented in ancient mathematics. Whereas other historians of science apply a probably no less “essentialist” one-track view of the evolution of numbers and formula from ancient Near Eastern origins until today, the plurality of mathematics within a cultural entity at a certain

⁵ This expression, eventually coined by Jens Høyrup, implies that certain aspects of Spengler's train of thought are explicitly deterministic, as to say inherent Platonism, hence advancing towards a unchangeable goal. They, however breathe the spirit of a holistic, however likewise deterministic approach to nature, culture and civilization, which might be best circumscribed as “romanticism” (cf. Høyrup 2018, 221).

stage of its “Spenglerian wheel of destiny” is considered a stimulating counterweight (Høyrup 2018, 221-223).

Spengler's primary concern was to review—and forecast—the fate of cultural entities in an advanced stage of cultural and political complexity. A larger part of his work is therefore devoted to historical periods, empires, and nation-states, with written sources and contemporary historiographies as the backbone for their morphological autopsy. His considerations on early, prehistoric periods of human agency, albeit no less important to him, remained partly fragmentary, and are partly anachronistic in argumentation and scope. After initial scrutiny, and peeling off the layers of confirmed erroneous thought, certain facets of Spengler's grand morphological model reveals itself to be once more a fruitful arena to enrich current archaeological debates. In this context, his later (Spengler 1931, 1932) and also posthumously published work (Spengler 1965, 1966) is of particular interest, since it balances his underlying—and much-criticized—pessimistic view on world history at large with an alternative anthropological narrative, defining technology and its modern application as the pinnacle of humankind's cognitive and cultural evolution (Kidd 2012, 19-20).

Talking of which, Spengler's staunch opposition to the principles of Darwinian evolution and his persistent refusal to acknowledge a timescale extending over eventually millions of years to allow for the emergence of distinct human physical and mental features are sure enough a wrong and fruitless track. This cul-de-sac emerges due to our physical incapability to experience the geological *longue durée* of things (cf. Sloterdijk 2007, 18-19), and is advocated nowadays only by religious zealots and related tribal agglomerations of ill-informed creationism.

Spengler's rejection of evolution as the fundamental principle of nature—a rejection eventually coherent with the still meagre and dissonant (palaeo)anthropological database as of 100 years ago (Jöris 2018a, 103)—remains a major, in the light of his revolutionary reading of early, prehistorical human agency as presented in “Man and Technics” (Spengler 1932), however pardonable flaw. Clearly ahead of his times is the emphasis of environmental changes for shaping and enhancing the individual haptic and cognitive abilities of humans (Jöris 2018a, 103, 2018b, 11)—or ethology through the backdoor, as one might muse at that point, given Spengler's clear-cut opposition to pure Darwinian thought. Spengler's extensive deliberations on the role of the hand as the key to excel in a given environment, to interact with it, and eventually trigger changes that defy refined adaptations to enter a new “step” is a historical-philosophical framework that can be—and actually is—tapped by experts in the field of Pleistocene archaeology and Palaeoanthropology to put their own research into a more comprehensive perspective (cf. Jöris 2018a, 2018b).

Considerations involving morphological mechanisms, however, are not limited to a critical reappraisal of Spenglerian thought, or a cursory re-reading to extract the remaining value for

current debates⁶ on a general level. Göbekli Tepe, for instance, being in the bright spotlight ever since its mass media-fuelled elevation to a primordial temple site at the “zero point of history”, offers an ideal arena for rethinking its emergence, scope, and actual place within a post-Pleistocene society using a “Spenglerian” frame of reference.

The Last Glorious Fortress, or Cultural Morphology in Action – The Case of Göbekli Tepe

The site, located in the district of Şanlıurfa, Turkey, as a widely visible flattened peak embedded in the Germuş mountains ridge, rose to prominence after late field director Klaus Schmidt reevaluated the lithic material retrieved from a much earlier survey in this region (Benedict 1980; Dietrich et al. 2015) and recognized the significance of this site being primarily an early Holocene site, promising new insights into the earliest sedentary communities in this region (Schmidt 1995, 1998, 2000). The expectations were dramatically surpassed by the features unearthed already in the first field season, jointly organized by the Orient Department of the German Archaeological Institute and the local museum at Şanlıurfa (Schmidt 2000; Dietrich et al. 2015): the excavations revealed large circular or oval structures adorned with limestone pillars, many of them plain, but some decorated in high and low relief, amongst other sculptured elements. Most of them comprise architectural elements of buildings labelled “A”-“D” from “building level III” (but see Clare 2020, 85-86; Clare and Kinzel 2020, 32-33 for a probably necessary revision of Klaus Schmidt’s stratigraphic assessment) which became the most iconic and still best-known features of the site (recent conspectus in Clare et al. 2019)—with an avalanche of pseudoscientific pulp in the wake of the first official broadcasts and publications that keeps distorting the view of this place and its cultural embedding (Zimmermann 2021).

Already Klaus Schmidt—and Harald Hauptmann as the initial project director back in the 1990s—pointed to the explicitly male, aggressive, and gloomy character of the site’s iconography, which to an overwhelming degree consists of male teeth-gnashing carnivores and depictions of other potentially venomous creatures like scorpions and snakes (Schmidt 2009; Hodder and Meskell 2011; Dietrich 2017); a place, therefore, that rather renders the impression of a nightmarish panopticon to trigger responses like fear and disgust rather than awe-inspiring contemplation. The popular media, however, keeps perpetuating the narrative of an all-accessible, communal place of peaceful worship, foreshadowing the dawn of monotheistic belief systems and therefore being the cradle of modern Abrahamic faiths (Zimmermann 2021, 145-146).

This ill-informed legacy of open-air sanctuaries loses further credibility when considering the fact that the prominent circular buildings were all roofed and entrenched, being hidden from

⁶ For a comprehensive overview on archaeological theories, reasoning and thought cf. Trigger 2003, 2014.

plain sight and therefore by no means widely visible landmarks but reclusive gathering spots (Banning 2011; Dietrich and Notroff 2015; Kodaş 2015; Kurapkat 2012, 2015).

The de facto absence of women in the artistic world of Göbekli Tepe, except a pornographic sketch of a naked female in the (later, or partly contemporary? See Clare 2020, 85-86) rectangular structure of “building level II” (space 38) (Dietrich et al. 2016; Hodder and Meskell 2011, 239; 241) is profoundly contrasting the ever-presence of ithyphallic renderings of mammals, little statuettes of males with erect penises and many other variations of male reproductive organs hewn into rock (Peters and Schmidt 2004, 204-205; Becker et al. 2012, 35). Therefore, the community that was actively using these structures for many centuries and formerly thought to be the founding fathers of institutionalized religion is now labelled a group resembling more and more a staunch secret society, performing some potentially wacky coming-of-age rituals in shadowy subterranean cult spaces (Dietrich 2017).

So, how to read all this within the frame of cultural morphology?

The artefact assemblages retrieved from Göbekli Tepe testify, together with the accumulated zoological remains, to a post-Pleistocene hunter-gatherer community being present at the spot for many centuries (Schmidt 1995, 1998, 2000). Until further notice, there is no unambiguous evidence for the domestication of plants or animals from neither the third nor the second occupation phase (Peters and Schmidt 2004). Recent evidence for domestic structures, some of them known from the initial fieldwork but never prominently presented (Clare 2020, 83-84), testifies to an early Neolithic village that emerged besides the popular ritual buildings. The overall character of the material culture, however, betrays a community dependent on hunting and gathering all along.

The complexity of Epipalaeolithic and Early Holocene nomadic societies, their ancestral heritage, rich mythology, and ability to create monumental works of art (with the towering wooden sculpture from Shigir, Southern Russia, now dated to 9600 cal BCE as one outstanding example) is a subject that rose to reinvigorated prominence in recent years (Arnold 1996; Sassaman 2004; Hoffecker and Hoffecker 2018; for Shigir cf. Zhilin et al. 2018; Bobrov in press). Their dispersal over vast, untamed patches of land, their immediate, occasionally dramatic exposure to climatic and environmental fancy (see also Spengler 2007, 593-595) eventually shaped a mindset and cognitive abilities referred to in Spengler's “*Der Mensch und die Technik*” (1931): the essential human, still untouched and untamed by Faustian technology, struggling to cope with the hardships and challenges of a changing early Holocene environment, and contextualize them through a staunch anachronistic celebration of his predatory legacy (Spengler 1931, 18-20).

The plot thickens that Göbekli Tepe, together with the ever-growing number of contemporary sites in the region bearing similar or identical features (Çelik 2011, 2016; Moetz and Çelik 2012), marks the apogee and gradual apotheosis of a historical cycle, hence the condensed cultural legacy of an epoch peopled by Late Pleistocene mobile hunters and gatherers. The monuments of Göbekli Tepe—and other sites still awaiting archaeological excavation—may therefore mark their fulfillment and decline, accompanied by a desperate perpetuation and glorification of past legacy and lore; literally the last stand of dwindling hunter and gatherer communities before ostracizing, or gradually assimilating them into the world of the Early Neolithic—a world with a very different economy, ecology, and iconography (Zimmermann 2020, 14-15). Such an alternative, “Spenglerian” interpretation, understanding Göbekli Tepe not as the exceedingly popular “zero point in history”, but as the awe-inspiring “last stand” of a declining tribal migratory society might still be an isolated voice. A voice, however, that starts getting amplified in most recent contributions devoted to put places like Göbekli Tepe into a larger cultural-historical context (cf. Clare and Kinzel 2020, 65). Was then, at the end, staunch conservatism -and the desire to preserve a way of life that was doomed to fade- the driving force of this innovative Upper Mesopotamian *Spätzeit* hunter-gatherers that spawned such amazing monuments? The Harran plain with its ample evidence for sites with T-shaped steles (cf. Moetz and Çelik 2012) might then be understood as the final retreat for hunter-gatherer bands to perpetuate their conservatism. Spengler, not necessarily known as a flamboyant character, would probably entertain the idea of a wry smile in that case.

“History is Direction, But Nature is Extension” – Concluding Remarks

All previous considerations do by all means not claim to present a *deus-ex-machina* model for explaining the variety of phenomena mentioned in the text. Spengler's monumental oeuvre underwent—and still has to undergo—a rigid scrutiny to rectify his proven misconceptions that undoubtedly permeate his works (Engels 2018). His conceptual framework, however, is much too valuable and inspiring to be hijacked by modern apologetics of far-right ideologies. Nor should it be shunned, or even cancelled, by equally ardent block leaders from the opposite political spectrum—liberal only by name, but stuck in the straightjacket of post-modern arbitrariness.

Approached with an open, critical mind, “Spengler's long shadow” might—*mutatis mutandis*—turn out to be a beneficial guiding light, allowing for a fresh, alternative interpretation of pre- and early historic phenomena in a contextual frame where traditional methodologies would soon meet their limits. Other cases that seem ripe to test Spenglerian hypotheses, like the fate of Early Bronze Age elites, or the renaissance of “Hittite” legacies in the Early Iron Age, might then well be in focus for future studies.

Acknowledgements

The final version of this essay was submitted in February 2021. I am indebted to István Aranyosi, Bilkent University, for having proofread the text. I would also like to thank the two anonymous reviewers for their immensely valuable comments and suggestions.

References

- Aksakal, H. 2013. 'A Useful Fellow'. Oswald Spengler in Turkish Conservative Thought. Z. Gasimov, C. A. Lemke Duque (Eds.), *Oswald Spengler als europäisches Phänomen. Der Transfer der Kultur- und Geschichtsmorphologie im Europa der Zwischenkriegszeit 1919-1939*, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 283-298.
- Alataş, S. F. 2015. *Applying Ibn Khaldun. The Recovery of a Lost Tradition in Sociology*. London/New York: Routledge.
- Arnold, J. E. 1996. The Archaeology of Complex Hunter-Gatherers. *Journal of Archaeological Method and Theory* 3, 77-126.
- Baltzer, A. 1956. *Untergang oder Vollendung. Spenglers Bedeutung für die Gegenwart*. Göttingen: Elsner.
- Banning, E. B. 2011. So Fair a House. Göbekli Tepe and the Identification of Temples in the Pre-Pottery Neolithic of the Near East. *Current Anthropology* 52, 619-660.
- Becker, N., Dietrich, O., Götzelt, T., Köksal-Schmidt, Ç., Notroff, J., Schmidt, K. 2012. Materialien zur Deutung der zentralen Pfeilerpaare des Göbekli Tepe und weiterer Orte des obermesopotamischen Neolithikums. *Zeitschrift für Orient-Archäologie* 5, 14-43.
- Benedict, P. 1980. Survey work in southeastern Anatolia. H. Çambel, R. Braidwood (Eds.), *Istanbul ve Chicago Üniversiteleri Karma Projesi. Güneydoğu Anadolu Tarihöncesi Araştırmaları. The Joint Istanbul – Chicago Universities Prehistoric Research in Southeastern Anatolia*, Istanbul: Istanbul University, 151-191.
- Bobrov, V. in press. Shigir Idol: Origin of Monumental Sculpture and Ideas about the Ways of Preservation of the Representational Tradition. *Quaternary International*. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.quaint.2020.08.041>
- Christian, D. 2015. Introduction and Overview. D. Christian (Ed.), *Introducing World History, to 10.000 BCE. The Cambridge World History*, Volume 1, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1-38.
- Clare, L. 2020. Göbekli Tepe. A Brief Summary of Research at a New World Heritage site (2015-2019). *e-Forschungsberichte* 2, 81-88. <https://doi.org/10.34780/efb.v0i2.1012>
- Clare, L., Kinzel, M. 2020. Response to Comments by Ian Hodder and Christian Jeunesse, with Notes on a Potential Upper Mesopotamian "Late PPNA Hunter-Crisis". A. B. Gebauer, L. Sørensen, A. Teather, A. C. Valera (Eds.), *Monumentalising Life in the Neolithic. Narratives of Change and Continuity*, Oxford & Philadelphia: Oxbow, 61-68.
- Clare, L., Tuna Yüncü, Z., Uludağ, C. 2019. Göbekli Tepe. N. Ertürk, Ö. Karakul Türk (Eds.), *UNESCO World Heritage in Turkey 2019*, Ankara: UNESCO Türkiye Milli Komisyonu, 522-547.
- Cochavi-Rainey, Z., Lilyquist, C. 1999. *Royal Gifts in the Late Bronze Age Fourteenth to Thirteenth Centuries B.C.E.: Selected Texts Recording Gifts to Royal Personages*. Studies by the Department of Bible and Ancient Near East, Volume XIII, Beer-Sheva: Ben Gurion University of the Negev Press.

- Çelik, B. 2011. Karahan Tepe: A New Cultural Centre in the Urfa area in Turkey. *Documenta Praehistorica* 38, 241-253.
- Çelik, B. 2016. A Small-Scale Cult Centre in Southeast Turkey: Harbetsuvan Tepesi. *Documenta Praehistorica* 43, 421-428.
- Demandt, A. 2017. *Untergänge des Abendlandes. Studien zu Oswald Spengler*. Köln: Böhlau.
- Dietrich, O. 2017. Cooperative Action of Hunter-Gatherers in the Early Neolithic Near East. A View from Göbekli Tepe. *The Tepe Telegrams*. News & Notes from the Göbekli Tepe Research Staff. <https://tepetelegrams.wordpress.com/2017/06/01/cooperative-action-of-hunter-gatherers-in-the-early-neolithic-near-east-a-view-from-gobekli-tepe/> [accessed: 20.11.2020]
- Dietrich, O., Notroff, J. 2015. A Sanctuary, or So Fair a House? In Defense of an Archaeology of Cult at Pre-Pottery Neolithic Göbekli Tepe. N. Laneri (Ed.), *Defining the Sacred. Approaches to the Archaeology of Religion in the Near East*, Oxford/Philadelphia: Oxbow, 75-89.
- Dietrich, O., Notroff, J., Schmidt, K. 2015. Göbekli Tepe. Ein exzeptioneller Fundplatz des frühesten Neolithikums auf dem Weg zum Weltkulturerbe. Ü. Yalçın, H.-D. Bienert (Eds.), *Anatolien – Brücke der Kulturen. Aktuelle Forschungen und Perspektiven in den deutsch-türkischen Altertumswissenschaften*, Bochum & Bonn: Deutsches Bergbau-Museum, 91-109.
- Dietrich, O., Notroff, J., Clare, L., Hübner, C., Köksal-Schmidt, Ç., Schmidt, K. 2016. Göbekli Tepe, Anlage H. Ein Vorbericht beim Ausgrabungsstand von 2014. Ü. Yalçın (Ed.), *Anatolian Metal VII. Anatolien und seine Nachbarn vor 10.000 Jahren*, Bochum: Deutsches Bergbaumuseum, 53-69.
- Doğan, I. B., Michailidou, A. 2008. Trading in Prehistory and Protohistory: Perspectives from the Eastern Aegean and Beyond. Ch. Papageorgiadou, A. Giannikouri (Eds.), *Sailing in the Aegean, Readings on the Economy and Trade Routes*, Athens: MEΛETHMATA, 17-53.
- Engels, D. 2014. *Auf dem Weg ins Imperium. Die Krise der Europäischen Union und der Untergang der Römischen Republik. Historische Parallelen*. Berlin: Europa Verlag.
- Engels, D. 2018. Spengler im 21. Jahrhundert. Überlegungen und Perspektiven zu einer Überarbeitung der Spengler'schen Kulturmorphologie. S. Fink, R. Rollinger (Eds.), *Oswald Spenglers Kulturmorphologie. Eine multiperspektivische Annäherung*, Wiesbaden: Springer, 453-487.
- Engels, D. 2018-2019. Von der Einsamkeit des Spenglerianers. *Journal of the Oswald Spengler Society* 1, 13-18.
- Engels, D. 2019. Oswald Spengler and the Decline of the West. M. Sedgwick (Ed.), *Key Thinkers of the Radical Right. Behind the New Threat to Liberal Democracy*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 3-21.
- Engels, D., Otte, M., Thöndl, M. 2018. (Eds.) *Der lange Schatten Spenglers. Einhundert Jahre Untergang des Abendlandes*. Lüdinghausen: Manuscriptum.
- Fink, S., Rollinger, R. 2018a. (Eds.) *Oswald Spenglers Kulturmorphologie. Eine multiperspektivische Annäherung*. Wiesbaden: Springer.
- Fink, S., Rollinger, R. 2018b. Einleitung. Oswald Spenglers Kulturmorphologie – eine multiperspektivische Annäherung. S. Fink, R. Rollinger (Eds.), *Oswald Spenglers Kulturmorphologie. Eine multiperspektivische Annäherung*, Wiesbaden: Springer, 1-7.
- Fisch, J. 1985. Kausalität und Physiognomik. Zyklische Geschichtsmodelle bei Ibn Haldun und Oswald Spengler. *Archiv für Kulturgeschichte* 67, 263-309.

- Glaser, D. 2019. Rache üben durch Recht behalten. Weltherrschaft der Konzerne statt Weltzivilgesellschaft. Neues zu Oswald Spengler, dem hellsichtigen Propheten universaler Friedlosigkeit. *Junge Freiheit* 17/19, 19. April 2019, 19.
- Gunter, A. 2018. Wealth Objects and Royal Gift-Giving in the Neo-Assyrian and Incan Empires. S. Fink, R. Rollinger (Eds.), *Oswald Spenglers Kulturmorphologie. Eine multiperspektivische Annäherung*, Wiesbaden: Springer, 187-205.
- Hobsbawn, E. 1994. *Age of Extremes. The Short Twentieth Century, 1914-1991*. London: Michel Joseph.
- Hodder, I., Meskell, L. 2011. A 'Curious and Sometimes a Trifle Macabre Artistry'. Some Aspects of Symbolism in Neolithic Turkey. *Current Anthropology* 52, 235-263.
- Hoffecker, J. F., Hoffecker, I. T. 2018. The Structural and Functional Complexity of Hunter-Gatherer Technology. *Journal of Archaeological Method and Theory* 25, 202-225.
- Høyrup, J. 2018. Spengler and Mathematics in a Mesopotamian Mirror. S. Fink, R. Rollinger (Eds.), *Oswald Spenglers Kulturmorphologie. Eine multiperspektivische Annäherung*, Wiesbaden: Springer, 207-221.
- Jöris, O. 2018a. Oswald Spenglers Blick auf das Menschsein: Ein Abriss der „Weltgeschichte“ in drei Stufen. Zu seiner Schrift *Der Mensch und die Technik: Beitrag zu einer Philosophie des Lebens*. D. Engels, M. Otte, M. Thöndl (Eds.), *Der lange Schatten Oswald Spenglers: einhundert Jahre Untergang des Abendlandes*, Lüdinghausen: Manuscriptum, 103-125.
- Jöris, O. 2018b. Der Mensch und das Verhalten. Beitrag zu einer "Philosophie" der Menschwerdung. S. Fink, R. Rollinger (Eds.), *Oswald Spenglers Kulturmorphologie. Eine multiperspektivische Annäherung*, Wiesbaden: Springer, 11-51.
- Kelder, J. M. 2009. Royal Gift Exchange Between Mycenae and Egypt: Olives as 'Greeting Gifts' in the Late Bronze Age Eastern Mediterranean. *American Journal of Archaeology* 113, 339-352.
- Kidd, I. J. 2012. Oswald Spengler, Technology, and Human Nature. *The European Legacy* 17, 19-31
- Kodaş, E. 2015. Piliers au PPNA final – PPNB Ancient au Nord du Proche-Orient: élément Symbolique ou Système Architectural? G. Rodriguez, H. Marchesi (Eds.), *Statues-menhirs et pierres levées du Néolithique à aujourd'hui*, Saint-Pons-de-Thomières: Maraval, 103-113.
- Krebernik, M. 2018. Sprache, Stadt und Schrift in Oswald Spenglers Geschichtskonzeption. S. Fink, R. Rollinger (Eds.), *Oswald Spenglers Kulturmorphologie. Eine multiperspektivische Annäherung*, Wiesbaden: Springer, 225-251.
- Kurapkat, D. 2012. A Roof under One's Feet: Early Neolithic Roof Constructions at Göbekli Tepe, Southeastern Turkey, R. Carvais et al. (Eds.), *Nuts & Bolts of Construction History. Culture, Technology and Society*, Vol. 3, Paris: Picard, 157-165.
- Kurapkat, D. 2015. *Frühneolithische Sondergebäude auf dem Göbekli Tepe in Obermesopotamien und vergleichbare Bauten in Vorderasien*. Unpublished Dissertation. Berlin: Technische Universität D83.
- Malinowski, B. 1920. Kula; the Circulating Exchange of Valuables in the Archipelagoes of Eastern New Guinea. *Man* 51, 97-105.
- Malinowski, B. 1953. *Argonauts of the Western Pacific. An Account of Native Enterprise and Adventure in the Archipelagoes of Melanesian New Guinea*. New York: E. P. Dutton.
- Mauss, M. 1950. *Essai sur le don*. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France.
- Moetz, F. K., Çelik, B. 2012. T-shaped Pillar Sites in the Landscape around Urfa. R. Matthews, J. Curtis (Eds.), *Proceedings of the 7th International Congress on the Archaeology of the Ancient Near*

- East 12 April – 16 April 2010, the British Museum and UCL, London. Volume 1. *Mega-cities & Mega-sites. The Archaeology of Consumption & Disposal Landscape, Transport & Communication*, Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 695-709.
- Önder, M., Ulaşan, F. 2018. Ibn Khaldun's Cyclical Theory on the Rise and Fall of Sovereign Powers: The Case of Ottoman Empire. *Adam Akademi* 8, 231-266.
- Peters, J., Schmidt, K. 2004. Animals in the Symbolic World of Pre-Pottery Neolithic Göbekli Tepe, South Eastern Turkey: A Preliminary Assessment. *Anthropozoologica* 39, 179-218.
- Sachsenmaier, D. 2015. The Evolution of World Histories. D. Christian (Ed.), *Introducing World History, to 10.000 BCE. The Cambridge World History*, Volume 1. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 56-83.
- Sassaman, K. E. 2004. Complex Hunter-Gatherers in Evolution and History: A North American Perspective. *Journal of Archaeological Research* 12, 227-280.
- Schmidt, K. 1995. Investigations in the Upper Mesopotamian Early Neolithic: Göbekli Tepe and Gürcütepe. *Neo-Lithics* 2/95, 9-10.
- Schmidt, K. 1998. Frühneolithische Tempel. Ein Forschungsbericht zum präkeramischen Neolithikum Obermesopotamiens. *Mitteilungen der Deutschen Orient-Gesellschaft* 130, 17-49.
- Schmidt, K. 2000. Göbeklitepe, Southeastern Turkey. A Preliminary Report on the 1995-1999 Excavations. *Paléorient* 26, 45-54.
- Schmidt, K. 2009. Göbekli Tepe – eine apokalyptische Bilderwelt aus der Steinzeit. *Antike Welt* 4, 45-52.
- Schröter, M. 1922. Der Streit um Spengler. Kritik seiner Kritiker. München: C. H. Beck.
- Sloterdijk, P. 2007. *Gottes Eifer. Vom Kampf der drei Weltreligionen*. Frankfurt/M.: Verlag der Weltreligionen.
- Smith, M. E. 2012. *The Comparative Archaeology of Complex Societies*. Cambridge: Cambridge Archaeology Press.
- Spengler, O. 1931. *Der Mensch und die Technik. Beitrag zu einer Philosophie des Lebens*. München: C. H. Beck.
- Spengler, O. 1932. *Man and Technics. A Contribution to a Philosophy of Life*. London/New York: George Allen & Unwin. Alfred A. Knopf.
- Spengler, O. 1933. *Jahre der Entscheidung. Erster Teil. Deutschland und die weltgeschichtliche Entwicklung*. München: C. H. Beck.
- Spengler, O. 1934. *The Hour of Decision. Part One: Germany and World-Historical Evolution*. London: George Allen and Unwin Ltd.
- Spengler, O. 1965. *Urfragen. Fragmente aus dem Nachlass*. A. Koktanek (Ed.), München: C. H. Beck.
- Spengler, O. 1966. *Frühzeit der Weltgeschichte: Fragmente aus dem Nachlass*. A. M. Koktanek, M. Schröter (Eds.), München: C. H. Beck.
- Spengler, O. 2007. *Der Untergang des Abendlandes. Umriss einer Morphologie der Weltgeschichte*. Düsseldorf: Albatros.
- Strasser, P. 2018. *Spenglers Visionen. Hundert Jahre Untergang des Abendlandes*. Wien: Braumüller.
- Trigger, B. 2003. *Understanding Early Civilizations*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Trigger, B. 2014. *A History of Archaeological Thought*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Zhilin, M., Savchenko, S., Hansen, S., Heussner, K.-U., Terberger, T. 2018.** Early Art in the Ural: New Research on the Wooden Sculpture from Shigir. *Antiquity* 92, 334-350.
- Zimmermann, T. 2020.** Ein Untergang im Morgenland? Göbeklitepe als Fallstudie für die Vollendung und das Verlöschen einer späteiszeitlichen Jäger- und Sammlerkultur. *Journal of the Oswald Spengler Society* 3, 7-25.
- Zimmermann, T. 2021.** Spacetravelling in the Garden of Eden – Göbekli Tepe, or the Challenge to Communicate Prehistoric Archaeology in a Shark Pond of Post-Modern Trivialities. L. Peschke (Ed.), *Let's Write About Science! Case Studies and Best Practises of Science Popularisation and Storytelling*, Frankfurt: Peter Lang, 136-154.
- Zumbini, F. 1976.** Über Spengler und Nietzsche. *Nietzsche-Studien* 5, 194-254.



Amaç ve Kapsam

Arkeoloji bir süredir geçmişin yorumlanmasında teknoloji ve doğa bilimleri, mühendislik ve bilgisayar teknolojileri ile yoğun iş birliği içinde yeni bir anlayışa evrilmektedir. Üniversiteler, ilgili kurum ya da enstitülerde yeni açılmakta olan “Arkeoloji Bilimleri” bölümleri ve programları, geleneksel anlayışı terk ederek değişen yeni bilim iklimine adapte olmaya çalışmaktadır. Bilimsel analizlerden elde edilen sonuçların arkeolojik bağlam ile birlikte ele alınması, arkeolojik materyallerin, yerleşmelerin ve çevrenin yorumlanmasında yeni bakış açıları doğurmaktadır.

Türkiye’de de doğa bilimleri ile iş birliği içindeki çalışmaların olduğu kazı ve araştırma projelerinin sayısı her geçen gün artmakta, yeni uzmanlar yetişmektedir. Bu nedenle Arkeoloji Bilimleri Dergisi, Türkiye’de arkeolojinin bu yeni ivmenin bir parçası olmasına ve arkeoloji içindeki arkeobotanik, arkeozooloji, alet teknolojileri, tarihlendirme, mikromorfoloji, biyoarkeoloji, jeokimyasal ve spektroskopik analizler, Coğrafi Bilgi Sistemleri, iklim ve çevre modellemeleri gibi uzmanlık alanlarının çeşitlenerek yaygınlaşmasına katkı sağlamayı amaçlamaktadır. Derginin ana çizgisi arkeolojik yorumlamaya katkı sağlayan yeni anlayışlara, disiplinlerarası yaklaşımlara, yeni metot ve kuram önerilerine, analiz sonuçlarına öncelik vermek olarak planlanmıştır.

Arkeoloji Bilimleri Dergisi uluslararası hakemli bir dergidir. Dergi, Ege Yayınları tarafından çevrimiçi olarak yayınlanmaktadır. Kazı raporlarına, tasnif ve tanıma dayalı çalışmalara, buluntu katalogları ve özgün olmayan derleme yazılarına öncelik verilmeyecektir.



Aims and Scope

Archaeology is being transformed by the integration of innovative methodologies and scientific analyses into archaeological research. With the establishment of new departments, institutes, and programs focusing on “Archaeological Sciences”, archaeology has moved beyond the traditional approaches of the discipline. When placed within their archaeological context, studies can provide novel insights and new interpretive perspectives to the study of archaeological materials, settlements and landscapes.

In Turkey, the number of interdisciplinary excavation and research projects incorporating scientific techniques is on the rise. A growing number of researchers are being trained in a broad range of scientific fields including but not limited to archaeobotany, archaeozoology, tool technologies, dating methods, micromorphology, bioarchaeology, geochemical and spectroscopic analysis, Geographical Information Systems, and climate and environmental modeling. The Turkish Journal of Archaeological Sciences aims to situate Turkish archaeology within this new paradigm and to diversify and disseminate scientific research in archaeology. New methods, analytical techniques and interdisciplinary initiatives that contribute to archaeological interpretations and theoretical perspectives fall within the scope of the journal. The Turkish Journal of Archaeological Sciences is an international peer-reviewed journal. The journal is published online by Ege Yayınları in Turkey. Excavation reports and manuscripts focusing on the description, classification, and cataloging of finds do not fall within the scope of the journal.



Makale Gönderimi ve Yazım Kılavuzu

** Please see below for English*

Makale Kabul Kriterleri

Makalelerin konu aldığı çalışmalar, Arkeoloji Bilimleri Dergisi'nin amaçları ve kapsamı ile uyumlu olmalıdır (bkz.: Amaç ve Kapsam).

Makaleler Türkçe veya İngilizce olarak yazılmalıdır. Makalelerin yayın diline çevirisi yazar(lar)ın sorumluluğundadır. Eğer yazar(lar) makale dilinde akıcı değilse, metin gönderilmeden önce anadili Türkçe ya da İngilizce olan kişilerce kontrol edilmelidir.

Her makaleye 200 kelimeyi aşmayacak uzunlukta Türkçe ve İngilizce yazılmış özet ve beş anahtar kelime eklenmelidir. Özete referans eklenmemelidir.

Yazarın Türkçesi veya İngilizcesi akıcı değilse, özet ve anahtar kelimelerin Türkçe veya İngilizce çevirisi editör kurulu tarafından üstlenilebilir.

Metin, figürler ve diğer dosyalar wetransfer veya e-posta yoluyla **archaeologicalsciences@gmail.com** adresine gönderilmelidir.

Makale Kontrol Listesi

Lütfen makalenizin aşağıdaki bilgileri içerdiğinden emin olun:

- Yazarlar (yazarların adı-soyadı ve iletişim bilgileri buradaki sırayla makale başlığının hemen altında paylaşılmalıdır)
- Çalışılan kurum (varsa)
- E.mail adresi
- ORCID ID

Makalenin içermesi gerekenler:

- Başlık
- Özet (Türkçe ve İngilizce)
- Anahtar kelimeler
- Metin
- Kaynakça
- Figürler
- Tablolar

Bilimsel Standartlar ve Etik

- Gönderilen yazılar başka bir yerde yayınlanmamış veya yayınlanmak üzere farklı bir yere gönderilmemiş olmalıdır.
- Makaleler özgün ve bilimsel standartlara uygun olmalıdır.

- Makalelerde cinsiyetçi, ırkçı veya kültürel ayırım yapmayan, kapsayıcı bir dil kullanılmalıdır (“insanoğlu” yerine “insan”; “bilim adamı” yerine “bilim insanı” gibi).

Yazım Kuralları

Metin ve Başlıkların Yazımı

- Times New Roman karakterinde yazılan metin 12 punto büyüklüğünde, iki yana yaslı ve tek satır aralıklı yazılmalıdır. Makale word formatında gönderilmelidir.
- Yabancı ve eski dillerdeki kelimeler *italik* olmalıdır.
- Başlık ve alt başlıklar **bold** yazılmalıdır.
- Başlıklar numaralandırılmamalı, italik yapılmamalı, altları çizilmemelidir.
- Başlık ve alt başlıklarda yalnızca her kelimenin ilk harfi büyük olmalıdır.

Referans Yazımı

Ayrıca bkz.: Metin içi Atıflar ve Kaynakça Yazımı

- Referanslar metin içinde (Yazar yıl, sayfa numarası) şeklinde verilmelidir.
- Referanslar için dipnot ve son not kullanımından kaçınılmalıdır. Bir konuda not düşme amacıyla gerektiği taktirde dipnot tercih edilmelidir.
- Dipnotlar Times New Roman karakterinde, 10 punto büyüklüğünde, iki yana yaslı, tek satır aralıklı yazılmalı ve her sayfa sonuna süreklilik izleyecek şekilde eklenmelidir.

Şekiller ve Tablolar

- Makalenin altına şekiller ve tablolar için bir başlık listesi eklenmelidir. Görsellerde gerektiği takdirde kaynak belirtilmelidir. Her şekil ve tabloya metin içerisinde gönderme yapılmalıdır (Şekil 1 veya Tablo 1).
- Görseller Word dokümanının içerisine yerleştirilmemeli, jpg veya tiff formatında, ayrı olarak gönderilmelidir.
- Görüntü çözünürlüğü basılması istenen boyutta ve 300 dpi'nin üzerinde olmalıdır.
- Görseller Photoshop ve benzeri programlar ile müdahale edilmeden olabildiğince ham haliyle gönderilmelidir.
- Excel'de hazırlanmış tablolar ve grafikler var ise mutlaka bunların PDF ve Excel dokümanları gönderilmelidir.

Tarihlerin ve Sayıların Yazımı

- MÖ ve MS kısaltmalarını harflerin arasına nokta koymadan kullanınız (örn.: M.Ö. yerine MÖ).
- “Bin yıl” ya da “bin yıl” yerine “... binyıl” kullanınız (örn.: MÖ 9. binyıl).
- “Yüzyıl”, “yüz yıl” ya da “yy” yerine “yüzyıl” kullanınız (örn.: MÖ 7. yüzyıl).
- Beş veya daha fazla basamaklı tarihler için sondan sayarak üçlü gruplara ayırmak suretiyle sayı gruplarının arasına nokta koyunuz (örn.: MÖ 10.500)
- Dört veya daha az basamaklı tarihlerde nokta kullanmayınız (örn.: MÖ 8700).
- 0-10 arasındaki sayıları rakamla değil yazıyla yazınız (örn.: “8 kez yenilenmiş taban” yerine “sekiz kez yenilenmiş taban”).

Noktalama ve İşaret Kullanımı

- Ara cümleleri lütfen iki çizgi ile ayırınız (—). Çizgi öncesi ve sonrasında boşluk bırakmayınız.
- Sayfa numaraları, tarih ve yer aralıklarını lütfen tek çizgi (-) ile ayırınız: 1989-2006; İstanbul-Kütahya.

Kısaltmaların Yazımı

- Sık kullanılan bazı kısaltmalar için bkz.:

Yaklaşık:	yak.	Circa:	ca.
Bakınız:	bkz.	Kalibre:	kal.
Örneğin:	örn.	ve diğerleri:	vd.

Özel Fontlar

- Makalede özel bir font kullanıldıysa (Yunanca, Arapça, hiyeroglif vb.) bu font ve orijinal metnin PDF versiyonu da gönderilen dosyalar içerisine eklenmelidir.

Metin içi Atıflar ve Kaynakça Yazımı

- Her makale, metin içerisinde atıf yapılmış çalışmalardan oluşan ve “Kaynakça” olarak başlıklandırılan bir referans listesi içermelidir. Lütfen metin içerisinde bulunan her referansın kaynakçaya da eklendiğinden emin olun.
- Metin içerisindeki alıntılar doğrudan yapılabilir: ‘...Esin (1995)’in belirtmiş olduğu gibi’ ya da parantez içerisinde verilebilir: ‘analiz sonuçları gösteriyor ki ... (Esin 1995).’
- Aynı parantez içerisindeki referanslar yayın yılına göre sıralanmalı ve “;” ile ayrılmalıdır: ‘... (Dinçol ve Kantman 1969; Esin 1995; Özbal vd. 2004).’
- Aynı yazarın farklı yıllara ait eserlerine yapılan atıflarda yazarın soyadı bir kere kullanılmalı ve eser yılları “,” ile ayrılmalıdır: ‘... (Peterson 2002, 2010).’
- Aynı yazar(lar)ın aynı yıl içerisindeki birden fazla yayınına referans verileceği durumlarda yayın yılının yanına harfler ‘a’, ‘b’, ‘c’ gibi alfabetik olarak koyulmalıdır.
- Tek yazarlı kaynakları, aynı yazar adıyla başlayan çok yazarlı kaynaklardan önce yazınız.
- Aynı yazar adıyla başlayan fakat farklı eş yazarlara sahip kaynakları ikinci yazarın soyadına göre alfabetik sıralayınız.
- Aynı yazara ait birden fazla tek yazarlı kaynak olması durumunda kaynakları yıllara göre sıralayınız.
- Dergi makaleleri için doi bilgisi varsa kaynakçada mutlaka belirtiniz.

Aşağıda, farklı kaynakların metin içerisinde ve kaynakçada nasıl yazılacağına dair örnekler bulabilirsiniz.

Tek yazarlı dergi makaleleri, kitap içi bölümler ve kitaplar

Metin içerisinde:

Yazarın soyadı ve yayın yılı (Esin 1995).

Sayfa sayısı bilgisi verilecekse:

Yazarın soyadı ve yayın yılı, sayfa sayısı (Esin 1995, 140).

Dergi makalesi:

Bickle, P. 2020. Thinking Gender Differently: New Approaches to Identity Difference in the Central European Neolithic. *Cambridge Archaeological Journal* 30(2), 201-218. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0959774319000453>

Kitap içi bölüm:

Esin, U. 1995. Aşıklı Höyük ve Radyo-Aktif Karbon Ölçümleri. A. Erkanal, H. Erkanal, H. Hüryılmaz, A. T. Ökse (Eds.), *İ. Metin Akyurt - Bahattin Devam Anı Kitabı. Eski Yakın Doğu Kültürleri Üzerine İncelemeler*, İstanbul: Arkeoloji ve Sanat Yayınları, 135-146.

Kitap:

Peterson, J. 2002. *Sexual Revolutions: Gender and Labor at the Dawn of Agriculture*. Walnut Creek, CA: AltaMira Press.

İki yazarlı dergi makaleleri, kitap içi bölümler ve kitaplar

Metin içerisinde:

Her iki yazarın soyadı ve yayın yılı (Dinçol ve Kantman 1969, 56).

Dergi makalesi:

Pearson, J., Meskell, L. 2015. Isotopes and Images: Fleshing out Bodies at Çatalhöyük. *Journal of Archaeological Method and Theory* 22, 461-482. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10816-013-9184-5>

Kitap içi bölüm:

Özkaya, V., San, O. 2007. Körtik Tepe: Bulgular Işığında Kültürel Doku Üzerine İlk Gözlemler. M. Özdoğan, N. Başgelen (Eds.), *Türkiye’de Neolitik Dönem. Yeni Kazılar, Yeni Bulgular*, İstanbul: Arkeoloji ve Sanat Yayınları, 21-36.

Kitap:

Dinçol, A. M., Kantman, S. 1969. *Analitik Arkeoloji, Denemeler*. Anadolu Araştırmaları III, Özel sayı, İstanbul: Edebiyat Fakültesi Basımevi.

Üç ve daha çok yazarlı dergi makaleleri ve kitap içi bölümler

Metin içerisinde:

İlk yazarın soyadı, “vd.” ve yayın yılı (Özbal vd. 2004).

Dergi makalesi:

Özbal, R., Gerritsen, F., Diebold, B., Healey, E., Aydın, N., Loyet, M., Nardulli, F., Reese, D., Ekstrom, H., Sholts, S., Mekel-Bobrov, N., Lahn, B. 2004. Tell Kurdu Excavations 2001. *Anatolica* 30, 37-107.

Kitap içi bölüm:

Pearson, J., Meskell, L., Nakamura, C., Larsen, C. S. 2015. Reconciling the Body: Signifying Flesh, Maturity, and Age at Çatalhöyük. I. Hodder, A. Marciniak (Eds.), *Assembling Çatalhöyük*, Leeds: Maney Publishing, 75-86.

Editörlü kitaplar

Metin içerisinde:

Yazar(lar)ın soyadı ve yayın yılı (Akkermans ve Schwartz 2003).

Akkermans, P. M. M. G., Schwartz, G. M. 2003. (Eds.) *The Archaeology of Syria. From Complex Hunter-Gatherers to Early Urban Societies (c. 16.000-300 BC)*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Web kaynağı:

Soyad, Ad. Web Sayfasının Başlığı. Web Sitesinin Adı. Yayınlayan kurum (varsa), yayın tarihi. Erişim tarihi. URL.



Submission and Style Guideline

Submission Criteria for Articles

The content of the manuscripts should meet the aims and scope of the Turkish Journal of Archaeological Sciences (cf. Aims and Scope).

Manuscripts may be written in Turkish or English. The translation of articles into English is the responsibility of the author(s). If the author(s) are not fluent in the language in which the article is written, they must ensure that the text is reviewed, ideally by a native speaker, prior to submission.

Each manuscript should include a Turkish and an English abstract of up to 200 words and five keywords in both Turkish and English. Citations should not be included in the abstract.

If the author(s) are not fluent in the language of the manuscript, a translation of the abstract and the keywords may be provided by the editorial board.

Manuscripts, figures, and other files should be sent via wetransfer or e-mail to archaeologicalsciences@gmail.com

Submission Checklist

Each article must contain the following:

- Authors (please provide the name-last name and contact details of each author under the main title of the manuscript)
- Affiliation (where applicable)
- E-mail address
- ORCID ID

The manuscript should contain:

- Title
- Abstract (in English and Turkish)
- Keywords
- Text
- References
- Figures (when applicable)
- Tables (when applicable)

Scientific Standards and Ethics

- Submitted manuscripts should include original research that has not been previously published or submitted for publication elsewhere.
- The manuscripts should meet scientific standards.
- Manuscripts should use inclusive language that is free from bias based on sex, race or ethnicity, etc. (e.g., “he or she” or “his/her/their” instead of “he” or “his”) and avoid terms that imply stereotypes (e.g., “humankind” instead of “mankind”).

Style Guide

Manuscript Formatting

- Manuscripts should be written in Times New Roman 12-point font, justified and single-spaced. Please submit the manuscript as a word document.
- Words in foreign and ancient languages should be *italicized*.
- Titles and subtitles should appear in **bold**.
- Titles and subtitles should not be numbered, italicized, or underlined.
- Only the first letter of each word in titles and subtitles should be capitalized.

References

Cf.: In-Text Citations and References

- In-text citations should appear inside parenthesis (Author year, page number).
- Footnotes and endnotes should not be used for references. Comments should be included in footnotes rather than endnotes.
- The footnotes should be written in Times New Roman 10-point font, justified and single-spaced, and should be continuous at the bottom of each page.

Figures and Tables

- Please provide a caption list for figures and tables following the references. Provide credits where applicable. Each figure and table should be referenced in the text (Figure 1, or Table 1), but please do not include figures in the text document.
- Each figure should be submitted separately as a jpg or tiff file.
- Images should be submitted in the dimensions in which they should appear in the published text and their resolution must be over 300 dpi.
- Please avoid editing the figures in Photoshop or similar programs but send the raw version of the figures if possible.
- Tables and graphs prepared in Excel should be sent as both PDF and Excel documents.

Dates and Numbers

- Please use BCE/CE and please avoid using dots without dots (i.e., BCE instead of BC or B.C.).
- Please use a dot for numbers and dates with 5 or more digits (i.e., 10.500 BCE).
- Please avoid using dots for numbers and dates with 4 or less digits (i.e., 8700 BCE).
- Please spell out whole numbers from 0 to 10 (e.g., “the floor was renewed eight times” instead of “the floor was renewed 8 times”).

Punctuation

- Please prefer em dashes (—) for parenthetical sentences: “Children were buried with various items, the adolescents—individuals between the ages of 12-19—had the most variety in terms of grave goods.”
- Please prefer an en dash (-) between page numbers, years, and places: 1989-2006; İstanbul-Kütahya.

Abbreviations

- Commonly used abbreviations:

Approximately:	approx.	Figure:	Fig.
Confer:	cf.	<i>Id est:</i>	i.e.,
Circa:	ca.	<i>Exempli gratia:</i>	e.g.,
Calibrated:	cal.		

Special Fonts

- If a special font must be used in the text (e.g., Greek or Arabic alphabet or hieroglyphs), the text in the special font and the original manuscript should be sent in separate PDF files.

In-Text Citations and References

- Each article should contain a list of references in a section titled “References” at the end of the text. Please ensure that all papers cited in the text are listed in the bibliography.
- Citations in the text may be made directly, e.g., ‘as shown by Esin (1995) ...’ or in parenthesis, e.g., ‘research suggests ... (Esin 1995)’.
- References within the same parenthesis should be arranged chronologically and separated with a “;”, e.g., ‘... (Dinçol and Kantman 1969; Esin 1995; Özbal et al. 2004).’
- In references to the studies by the same author from different years, please use the last name of the author once, followed by the years of the cited studies, each separated by a “,”, e.g., ‘... (Peterson 2002, 2010).
- More than one reference from the same author(s) in the same year must be identified by the letters ‘a’, ‘b’, ‘c’ placed after the year of publication.
- When dealing with multiple papers from the same author, single authored ones should be written before the studies with multiple authors.
- When dealing with papers where the first author is the same, followed by different second (or third, and so on) authors, the papers should be listed alphabetically based on the last name of the second author.
- When dealing with multiple single-authored papers of the same author, the papers should be listed chronologically.
- Please provide the doi numbers of journal articles.

Below, you may find examples for in-text citations and references.

Single-authored journal articles, book chapters, and books

In-text:

Last name and publication year (Esin 1995).

If the page number is indicated:

Last name and publication year, page number (Esin 1995, 140).

Journal article:

Bickle, P. 2020. Thinking Gender Differently: New Approaches to Identity Difference in the Central European Neolithic. *Cambridge Archaeological Journal* 30(2), 201-218. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0959774319000453>

Book chapter:

Esin, U. 1995. Aşıklı Höyük ve Radyo-Aktif Karbon Ölçümleri. A. Erkanal, H. Erkanal, H. Hüryılmaz, A. T. Ökse (Eds.), *İ. Metin Akyurt - Bahattin Devam Anı Kitabı. Eski Yakın Doğu Kültürleri Üzerine İncelemeler*, İstanbul: Arkeoloji ve Sanat Yayınları, 135-146.

Book:

Peterson, J. 2002. Sexual Revolutions: *Gender and Labor at the Dawn of Agriculture*. Walnut Creek, CA: AltaMira Press.

Journal articles, book chapters, and books with two authors

In-text:

Last names of both authors and publication year (Dinçol and Kantman 1969, 56).

Journal article:

Pearson, J., Meskell, L. 2015. Isotopes and Images: Fleshing out Bodies at Çatalhöyük. *Journal of Archaeological Method and Theory* 22, 461-482.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s10816-013-9184-5>

Book chapter:

Özkaya, V., San, O. 2007. Körtik Tepe: Bulgular Işığında Kültürel Doku Üzerine İlk Gözlemler. M. Özdoğan, N. Başgelen (Ed.), *Türkiye’de Neolitik Dönem. Yeni Kazılar, Yeni Bulgular*, İstanbul: Arkeoloji ve Sanat Yayınları, 21-36.

Book:

Dinçol, A. M., Kantman, S. 1969. *Analitik Arkeoloji, Denemeler*. Anadolu Araştırmaları III, Özel sayı, İstanbul: Edebiyat Fakültesi Basımevi.

Journal articles and book chapters with three or more authors

In-text:

Last name of the first author followed by “et al.” and the publication year (Özbal et al. 2004).

Journal article:

Özbal, R., Gerritsen, F., Diebold, B., Healey, E., Aydın, N., Loyet, M., Nardulli, F., Reese, D., Ekstrom, H., Sholts, S., Mekel-Bobrov, N., Lahn, B. 2004. Tell Kurdu Excavations 2001. *Anatolica* 30, 37-107.

Book chapter:

Pearson, J., Meskell, L., Nakamura, C., Larsen, C. S. 2015. Reconciling the Body: Signifying Flesh, Maturity, and Age at Çatalhöyük. I. Hodder, A. Marciniak (Eds.), *Assembling Çatalhöyük*, Leeds: Maney Publishing, 75-86.

Edited books

In-text:

Last name(s) of the author(s) and publication year (Akkermans and Schwartz 2003).

Akkermans, P. M. M. G., Schwartz, G. M. 2003. (Eds.) *The Archaeology of Syria. From Complex Hunter-Gatherers to Early Urban Societies (c. 16.000-300 BC)*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Web source:

Last name, Initial of the first name. Title of the web page. Title of the website. Institution (where applicable), publication date. Access date. URL.