Katholieke Universiteit Leuven
Faculty of Arts

Settlement Pattern in Southeast Anatolia:
An analyse of the structures at the site of Nevalı Çori.

Thesis submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Eastern Mediterranean Archaeology

by Ercoskun Pakize

Supervisor: Prof.Dr. Joachim Bretschneider

Leuven 2007

Acknowledgements

I sincerely thank my supervisor Prof.Joachim Bretschneider for his interest and support and Prof. P.M.Vermeersch for his time, guidance, critisism and patience.

Table of Contents

Chapter I
Introduction

The region of Upper-Mesopotamia provides a lot of sites that have the greatest importance for the understanding of the archaeology of this region.
Especially the area of Southeast Anatolia within this region turns out to have an eminent position that has been revealed by the excavations and researches during the last decade. The importance of Southeast Anatolia can not be minimized, especially when dealing with Neolithic sites. Among the remarkable sites of Çayönü and Göbekli Tepe, there is a third Neolithic site that also deserves the attention: Nevalı Çori in the province of Şanlıurfa.

The main objective of this study is to discuss the site of Nevalı Çori in order to obtain a picture of its settlement pattern. By analysing the settlement of Nevalı Çori from an architectural point of view, the buildings of the settlement will be attempted to be classified. First we will look what kind of buildings the settlement consisted of, then an attempt will be made to classify them into types where possible. Finally, this analyse will form the base to support suggestions about the function of the structures at the site. In order to do so, interior features and findings will be involved into the discussion besides architectural features. Complementary information coming from other sites in the region, such as Çayönü and Göbekli Tepe, will contribute to the interpretation of the analyse where necessary.
To work out this subject in systematic way, following steps will create the structure of this writing. The following two chapters will deal with the nature and position of Nevalı Çori; its geographical position will be discussed starting from Upper-Mesopotamia, focusing on Southeast Anatolia and finally ending with Şanlıurfa. As determinants of the nature of the site climate, vegetation and faunal data are included. These conditional settings together with the chronological data create the platform on which the Neolithic nature of the site is based. The analyse of the structures at the site in Chapter IV is based on the sites building levels. The discussion is supported with illustrational maps and plans for each building level. In Chapter V the evaluation of the analyse follows, creating the base for the next chapter that deals with function assessment. In the last chapter conclusions are formulated on the site of Nevalı Çori.

Chapter II

Conditional Settings and Nature of the Site Nevalı Çori

II.a. Geographical settings

II.a.a Geographical settings of Upper-Mesopotamia

In broader perspective the study area is Upper Mesopotamia, consisting of Northern Syria and Southeastern Turkey. It must be conceded that there is often significant overlap between these two regions, both geographical and cultural.[1] Especially concerning the Neolithic sites it is not easy to distinguish culturally and geographically Northern Syria from Southeastern Turkey (Ill.1).
Subregions of Upper Mesopotamia are as follows[2]:

- East Taurus intermontane basins belt and Upper Tigris basin (sites Çayönü and Hallan Çemi)
- Gaziantep-Urfa-Mardin plateau (Southeast Turkey) (sites Göbekli Tepe and Nevali Çori)
- Harran plain and Balikh valley
- Syro-Mesopotamian steppes and Middle Euphrates (Southeastern Turkey and Northern Syria)
- West Zagros valleys (Northern Iraq)

The Syrian natural environment is characterized by mountain ranges.[3] The northernmost range is the Amanus, in what is now the Turkish province of Hatay. The Upper Mesopotamian plain is across the Euphrates river in northeast Syria, extending into northern Iraq and southeast Turkey. This region is a relatively flat semi-arid steppe traversed by the Tigris and Euphrates and by the latter's tributaries the Balikh and Khabur.
The main focus is Southeastern Turkey during this writing.

[1] Akkermans and Schwartz2003:2.
[2] CANeW website

II.a.b Geographical settings of Southeast Anatolia

Southeast Anatolia is basically the area lying between the southeastern Taurus Mountains and the modern Turkish-Syrian border.[4]
Starting from the southern piedmont of the Taurus, the plateau (500-1000 m) spreads out and descends in altitude towards the Syrian plain with a fairly uniform topography. Southeast Anatolia is considered to be a transition zone between the highlands of East Anatolia and the semi-arid Syrian plain.

Geographically many areas of this region are extensions of the Syro-Mesopotamian landscape. This zone consists of steppe like plateaus on the southern flanks of the Amanus and the southeastern Taurus Mountains.
The outer edge of this crescent-shaped region is bordered by more humid mountainous areas which were part of the natural forest zone. Its inner curve is bordered by the northern extremities of the Syrian Desert. This zone is bordered on the north by strongly folded mountains which separate it from the high altitude (2000-3000 m) and very cold eastern Anatolia.

II.a.c Şanlıurfa

The site of Nevalı Çori is located in Şanlıurfa (19.615 km²) in Southeast Anatolia. The geograhical position of Urfa determined by Gaziantep in the west, Adıyaman in the northwest, Diyarbakır in the notheast, Mardin in the east and Syria in the south (Ill.2). Urfa is located on the southern flanks of the central part of the southeastern Taurus Mountains and the nothern part of the Suudi-Arabic platform, which explains the wide valleys.[5]
The most remarkable aspect of Urfa is that its environment is varied. The region is showing a mountainous character for 22% of the area, steppe-like for 1.3%, while valleys cover 16.3% of the area, leaving the resulting 60.4% for hills.
Besides the Euphrates there are not many streams in the region; the Kantara, the Hortum Çay or Incesu, which are tributaries of the Euphrates, fed by springs. 25 karstic

[3] Akkermans and Schwartz2003:5.
[4] Erinç1980:78, Yakar1994:32.
[5] www.urfali.de

springs feed the Karakoyun stream, which flows around the old city of Urfa on the north and east.
Along the Euphrates there are narrow alluvial bands; Samsat-Arapkantar-Lidar in the north and Halfeti-Birecik in the west.
Urfa shows a lot of mountains and hills in the north. The most important mountain is the volcanic massive Karacadağ Mountain (1957 m), which is forming the border with Diyarbakır. The altitude decreases moving southwards. The most important valleys are in the southern half of Urfa; Harran, Suruç and Viranşehir. The plain of Harran has an average altitude of 375 meters, which makes it the lowest plain in the region. It spreads over 150 000 hectares and consists of reddish alluvial soil. The fertile Suruç plain of 710 km² consists also of red alluvial soil. The third important plain in Urfa, the Viranşehir plain, is also alluvial and the largest of all, covering 1200 km². It is located between the Tektek and Karacadağ Mountains.
The extensive plains of Suruç, Urfa-Harran and Viranşehir are seperated from each other by high ranges.
In the west the Arat Mountains are spreading along the Euphrates Valley. The Tektek Mountains (801 m) border the Urfa-Harran plain on the north while the Şebeke Mountains (750 m) further west form a chain with the Tektek Mountains together with the Susuz Mountains (817 m).
The fertile farmland is cut off in the east by the Germuş Mountains (800 m). The open depression to the south descends with 400 meters and meets with the desert-like zone and the semi-arid steppes of Northern Syria.
The lavas of the Karacadağ Mountain are spread out over a wide area and are basaltic in nature. The southern, southwestern, western and nothern parts of the Urfa region is surrounded by hills with varying altitudes between 600-800 meters. A great part of the region consist of calchite, which causes surface formations of carstic topography.

II.b Climatical conditions

Today the climate dominating Southeastern Anatolia as a whole can be described as an extreme continental Mediterranean climate. Although summers are very hot and dry, winters are mild and relatively humid. This is a function of distance from the Mediterranean, expressed by a wide annual range of temperatures and a small amount of precipitation. The area has an average precipitation of 500 to 700 mm per year and

most of it falls in winter. Two rivers, Euphrates and Tigris, and their tributaries drain the plateau.

In Syria the climate is also characterized by dry and hot summers and cool, rainy winters with regional variability. In the Upper Mesopotamian plain, the more rainier parts of the area are in the north, near the Turkish frontier.
In the semi-arid steppe the average annual rainfall is 200-600 mm.
The valleys of the Euphrates, Khabur and Balikh are amenable to irrigation. The Euphrates creates a fertile alluvial valley incized into the dry steppe.

II.c Vegetation and fauna

The vegetation varies from dense forests to steppes towards lower altitudes. Forests of oak are found mainly in the eastern Taurus Mountains at elevations higher than 700-800 m. Areas below 700 m are covered with steppe formations and reddish-brown steppe soils, which are rich in lime and potassium, making the soil appropriate for cereal production. This reddish brown alkaline steppe soils with a medium to low organic content are suitable for cultivation with irrigation. Legumes, peas, cereal, pistachio, almond, grape, wild grasses were gathered by the people of this region. The economy of the Northern Mesopotamian site Jerf el-Ahmar was based on intensive exploitation of wild species.[6] It is remarkable that at Jerf el-Ahmar barley in stead of wheat was predominantly harvested in the wild. This reflects local environmental variation or cultural preferences.

Light forest or forest steppe habitats were the natural abode of aurochs (*Bos primigenius*). Wild sheep (*Ovis orientalis*) prefer a habitat in the mountains, hills of high plateaux. While in the summer this animal grazes the meadows and grassy slopes of mountains, in winter it descends to valleys and piedmonts. The wild boar (*Sus scrofa*) is an animal of wet environments such as swamps, lake shores and river banks. It needs the vegetation cover provided by trees, bushes and reeds.Wild cattle, wild goat (*Capra aegrus*), wild bear (*Ursus arctus*), common fox (*Vulpes vulpes*), gazelle (*Gazella*), wild cat (*Felis sylvestris*), land turtle, birds and fresh water fish were the most hunted animals.

Natural roads follow the river valleys of the Euphrates and Tigris and the few mountain passes. Passages and roads in the region are leading to the inlands of Anatolia. As well as interaction and sharing information, those routes were used also for trading, for instance, obsidian, native copper, timber and exotic material like seashells.
Together with the raw material resources of Taurus in easy reach, the region had very suitable living conditions. The most common architectural media in Syria and throughout Mesopotamia are mudbrick or pisé.

II.d Neolithic site

II.d.a The Anatolian Neolithic

The Neolithic of the Anatolian plateau is of major importance, being a part of the formative zone of the period.[7] With the geography of Turkey, the Anatolian Neolithic can not be considered as a single entity as is the Neolithic of the Syro-Levant region. Anatolia comprises of a number of distinct ecological zones, being cultural entities with in between vast and also ecological varied areas. This obscures cross-cultural comparisons.

PPN settlements of the southeast Anatolian region seem to be gathered in three sub-regions (Ill.3):
The first sub-region is along Tigris and its tributaries in the east.
The Tigris region is represented by two settlements, Çayönü and Hallan Çemi.
The distance between them is about 75 km.
Evidence from Hallan Çemi suggests that the evolution of Neolithic societies in this area took a somewhat different trajectory than did the evolution of Neolithic societies in the Levant, one that did not always involve the intensive exploitation of cereals.[8]
The economy of site's inhabitants was based primarily on the hunting-gathering of wild animals and plants.
The Urfa Plateau is the most important sub-region considering this time-period.

[6] Akkermans and Schwartz2003:72.
[7] Özdoğan1991:10.
[8] Rosenberg1994:25, Roosenberg1999:38.

The Urfa region in southeast Turkey has been the meeting point of routes that connected Syro-Mesopotamian lowlands with the Anatolian highlands.[9] It is no coincidence that this spot has been a favorite for settlements since Early Neolithic times. From the beginnings of the Holocene the southern piedmont of the Taurus presented a climatically superior habitat in which man found an environment ideal for a Neolithic way of life.
Urfa Plateau has the highest number of settlements: Nevalı Çori, Göbekli Tepe, Karahan Tepe, Hamzan Tepe and Yeni Mahalle Höyük. All of them are located on the foothills and on the banks of streams, but not close to Euphrates. Nevalı Çori is the nearest to the river, yet there is still a distance of 3 km in between.
PPN settlements of the third sub-region are located along the Euphrates in the southwest.

As suggested by the CANeW 14C Chart, a distribution line around 8 000 cal BC seems to point out two main types of settlements corresponding to different subsistence strategies: hunter settlements in hills, mountains and high places between 10 000-8 000 cal BC (e.g., Hallan Çemi, Çayönü till cobble-paved phase, Göbekli Tepe, Nevali Çori; and subsequently herder settlements in the valleys or near the rivers after 8 000 cal BC (e.g., Akarçaytepe, Cafer Höyük, Gritille, Kumartepe, Mezraa/Teleilat).
This second distribution is easy to follow at the periphery of Southeastern Turkey, on the Middle Euphrates (Halula for example).
As in South Levant, a major change took place around 8000-7500 cal BC in Upper Mesopotamia. From a dynamic point of view, it is becoming clear that the phase of 'neolithisation' went over to an 'achieved Neolithic'.

II.d.b Subsistence at Nevalı Çori

Opinions about subsistence at Nevalı Çori are based on data from the site. Archaeological arguments for understanding the subsistence of the inhabitants are both botanical and zoological in nature. The zoological remains consist of animal bones that are analysed in order to shed light on the question which species were involved in the

[9] Hauptmann1999:66.

inhabitants dietary. Most common among the animal bones are the gazelles.[10] From Levels I/II at the site to Levels IV/V their percentage decrease from 60% to 40%.
The site of Nevalı Çori provides evidence of livestock domestication for the species goat, sheep and pig.[11] Research has pointed out that Nevalı Çori is one of the two distinct places for domestication of goats with consistent archaeological data. Nevalı Çori revealed that goats were actually kept in captivity in the southern Turkish region of the Euphrates Valley. The calibrated date derived from directly-dated fossil material is established as approximate 8500-8000 BC.
Sheep and goats were domesticated as is indeed attested by their increasing percentage among all the animal bones from 10% in Levels I/II to 17% in Levels IV/V.[12]
The plants and legumes that are attested by the botanical remains are presented below together with the other components of the inhabitants diet.
These other components are hunting and gathering. The botanical and zoological remains do indeed support the view that the inhabitants have lived from agriculture and husbandry. Still, the main dietary components seem to have come from hunting and gathering at Nevalı Çori. Analyse of animal bones (mentioned above) proves the increase in husbandry and the decreasing hunting activities.[13] There is also a high percentage of hunting weapons in the chipped stone inventory, which proves the maintained importance of hunting in the inhabitants diet.

In conclusion, the site of Nevalı Çori can be termed Neolithic based on its subsistence pattern. However, it dietary habit seems to be quite diverse. Terminologic answers for this situation can be ‘sedentary hunter-gatherers’ or ‘mixed economy’ to define this dietary variety but it is most safely to conclude that the inhabitants of Nevalı Çori still lived from hunting and gathering, with an increasing emphasis on agriculture and husbandry.
The environment that Nevalı Çori provided for its inhabitants, as described by its geography, climate, vegetation and fauna above, was ideal for a Neolithic way of life.

[10] Hauptmann1999:78.
[11] Luikart et al.2001:5929.
[12] Hauptmann1999:78.
[13] Hauptmann1999:78.

Table 1: Diet at Nevalı Çori

Cultivation	Gathering	Hunting
Plants Einkorn (*Triticum boeoticum*) (*Triticum monococcum*) Wheat (two-grained) (*Triticum dicoccoides*) ***(*Triticum dicoccum*)*** Barley (wild) (*Hordeum distichon*) (*Hordeum spontaneum*) **Legumes** Lentils (*Lens culinaris*) Peas (*Pisum sativum*) Vetch (*Vicia ervilia*) Pulses (*Lathyrus "sativus"*) Broad beans (*Vicia faba*)	Pistachios Almonds Grapes Wild grasses Spelt (*Aegilops squarosa*)	True gazelle (*gazella gazella*) Persian gazelle (*gazella subgutturosa*) Aurochs (*bos primigenius*) Wild boar (*sus scrofa*) Red and fallow deer (*certidae*) Wild sheep (*ovis orientalis*) Goats (*capra aegrarus*) Wild donkey (*equus africanus* and *hemionus*)

Chapter III
The Position of Nevalı Çori in the Study Area

III.a. Chronological database for Nevalı Çori

The data covering the site of Nevalı Çori are based on the CANeW 14C database of Upper Mesopotamia.[14] 14C data are calibrated with OxCal v3.10 using the most recent calibration curve IntCal04. Dates are based on the calibrated age at 1 sigma (б).
The data are presented according to the stratigraphic sequence of the site, with earliest levels first.

Level I

Provenance	**Sample material**	**Lab.no.**	**Date BP**	**Cal BC 1б**
Burial 86, area FG5, H21A, room 4	Human bone	OxA-8303	9280±55	8620-8350
Burial 89, area G8, H25	Human bone	OxA-8235	9180±60	8460-8300
Burial 81, area FG5, H25, room 2	Human bone	OxA-8236	8960±60	8280-7990

Level II

Provenance	**Sample material**	**Lab.no.**	**Date BP**	**Cal BC 1б**
Burial 81, area FG5, H21B, room 4	Human bone	OxA-8234	8930±60	8240-7980

[14] www.canew.org/data (last update 2006)

Level I/II[15]

Lab.no.	Date BP	Cal BC 1б
Hd-16781-835	9261±181	8740-8280
Hd-16782-351	9243±55	8560-8340
Hd-16783-769	9212±76	8540-8310

Level IIIA

Provenance	Sample material	Lab.no.	Date BP	Cal BC 1б
Burial 55, area G4/76-77, H2, room10, pit 22	Human bone	OxA-8302	9205±55	8530-8310
Burial 76, area FG6, H7, room 9	Human bone	OxA-8382	8990±90	8290-7980
Burial 61, area G4, H2, room 8	Human bone	OxA-8381	8710±100	7940-7590

Level IIIA

Provenance	Sample material	Lab.no.	Date BP	Cal BC 1б
Burial 72, area G5, H6, room 4, wall 6	Human bone	OxA-8247	8610±90	7740-7550

[15] No dates available for sample material, reference for provenance: Hauptmann1999:78.

Level III-V

Provenance	Sample material	Lab.no.	Date BP	Cal BC 1б
Area H5, pit 277	No data available	Hd-16784-768	9882±224	9900-8900
Area H5, pit 277 (NC 0108)	Bone	KIA-14756	9663±42	8570-8350
Area G7, pit 314 (NC 0102)	Bone	KIA-14762	9207±43	8470-8320
Area F5, pit 217 (NC 0104)	Bone	KIA-14760	9100±43	8325-8255
Area G4/5, H1 (NC 0107)	Bone	KIA-14757	9020±41	8285-8235
Area F7, pit 291 (NC 0106)	Bone	KIA-14758	8864±48	8210-7950
Area F5, pit 176 (NC 0103)	Bone	KIA-14761	8778±46	7940-7740
Area F5, pit 249 (NC 0101)	Bone	KIA-14763	8381±157	7590-7190
Area H4N, pit 278, spit 29 (NC 0105)	Bone	KIA-14759	8213±132	7450-7060

III.b Data of other settlements in the area and the correlation with Nevalı Çori

Most of the settlements in presented in the time chart below are dating to PPNB, while some of them are dating to PPNA, which helps to understand the development and changing patterns of buildings, since the buildings of PPNB Anatolia seems to have their roots in the earlier PPNA buildings of the region. Although the time charts seems to vary, it is between early 11th millennium to 8th millennium BC for Southeast Anatolia.

The chronological data of other settlements in Southeast Anatolia are as follows:

Table 2. **Chronological chart of the settlements**

Hallan Çemi	**10700 – 9210 BC**
Çayönü **(Round Buildings)**	**10150 – 9400 BC**
Jerf el-Ahmar	**9200 – 8700 BC**
Göbekli Tepe	**9100 – 8750 BC**
Çayönü **(Grill and Channeled Buildings)**	**8400 – 8200 BC**
Nevalı Çori	**8540 – 8300 BC**
Çayönü **(Cobble-Paved Buildings)**	**8200 – 7840 BC**

At Çayönü the Round Buildings and the early phase of the Grill Buildings belong to the PPNA.[16] The 14C samples are coming from the Round Buildings. The last layer of this phase offers two 14C samples but they are not very reliable. When combined, these two dates offer an average date of 10150 BC, which can be accepted as *terminus ante quem*. According to this, the PPNA period can be situated approximately between 10150-8700 BC for the site of Çayönü.

The earliest dates for PPNA come from the site of Hallan Çemi. In general, most of the 14C dates of this site have a very large error range and can not be considered as reliable. Leaving out the dates with an error range larger than ±150, Hallan Çemi can be dated between 10700-9210 BC. The rough sequence of the site is known but

[16] Erdoğu2002:10.

assignments of the dates to the three excavated Aceramic building levels has not yet been published.
The first two radiocarbon dates for Göbekli Tepe dates the site between 9130-8610 BC. Two other dates are yielded by pedogenic carbonate coatings of pillars constitute a *terminus post quem* for the buildings structure B and C.

The PPNB period in Anatolia is situated between 8500-6700 BC. The late phase of the Grill-
Planned Buildings, the Channeled Buildings, the Cobble-Paved Buildings and the Cell Buildings of Çayönü belong to this period. According to the 14C dates the PPNB period at Çayönü between approximately 8600-7300 BC.
Most of the dates coming from the Channeled Buildings are earlier than the dates belonging to the late phase of the Grill-Planned Buildings. The 'independent' transition phase from the Cell Building Subphase into the Large Room Subphase appears to cover the late phase of the former and the early phase of the latter. The Large Room Building Subphase is included in the PPNC period. The only date of this period is 6640-6240 BC. Nevertheless, it could be considered that some of the dates of the transitional phase belong to the Large Room Building Subphase. 6640 BC can be taken as the end of the Aceramic Neolithic in the settlement of Çayönü.

The settlement of Nevalı Çori consists of five building phases (I-V). The Nevalı Çori building phases I-V are considered to be contemporaneous with the Cobble-Paved Buildings of the Grill-Planned Building Subphase. Based on the reliable 14C dates Nevalı Çori I can be dated between 8530-7540 BC.

III.c Relation of Nevalı Çori with other settlements in the region

The number of mounds with Neolithic occupation in Southeast Anatolia is around 60 when survey results are included.[17] Urfa appears to be the densest area with 27 sites, 14 of them are in Birecik District, mostly gathered along Euphrates. Four of them have Palaeolithic material on their surfaces as well as Neolithic. Adıyaman and Diyarbakır are represented by nine sites each. In Diyarbakır, the sites are dense in Ergani District,

where Çayönü is also located. Çayönü Tepesi was occupied almost without a break from 10 000 BP to modern times.[18] This permanency can be explained by its location at the transition point of zones of different periods. Its location also enabled the people of Çayönü to communicate with different regions distinct in tradition.

Different subsistence strategies are thought to be the reason behind such a distribution.[19] The early settlements, whose subsistence was highly depended on hunting, were located carefully according to the particular spots where animals were crossing the river. Nevalı Çori, for instance, is close to such a crossing spot, but still in a safe distance to the route of animals. After 8000 BC, when hunting became less important, settlements moved closer to the river.

Geomorphologic and archaeological surveys conducted in the Ergani plain in 1990-1991 demonstrated a relationship between soil composition and the distribution of settlements in various periods.[20] The earlier settlements, usually low mounds or flat sites grouped near another, were located on the plio-quaternary deposits at the edge of the alluvial plain and in the northernmost part of it, close to the rocky ridges. Exception is the site of Çayönü, where the locations of the PPN settlements were not suitable for agriculture.
Çayönü and Nevalı Çori are 160 km, and Nevalı Çori and Göbekli Tepe are 70 km apart.

The Ergani plain, ca 15 hectars in the N-NW of the Southeast Anatolian region, is surrounded by different geographical zones[21]:
- In the north, the Southeastern Taurus mountain range, a series of plains of different character running in an E-W direction on the hilly flanks
- At the west of the Erani plains, the area cut by two water systems, the Tigris and Euphrates with their tributaries
- In the south, the Diyarbakır basin

[17] Data taken from TAY GIS on www.TAYproject.org
[18] Özdoğan1991:36.
[19] Schmidt2001:10.
[20] Özdoğan1999:38.
[21] Özdoğan1999:37.

Çayönü is located in the middle of the second zone. Its location enabled the people to access various raw material within the vicinity, such as basalt from Karaca Dağ, copper and malachite from the sources between Ergani and Çermik, marble from limestone outcroppings, and various other metamorphic and sedimentary rocks within a distance of 10-20 km. Obsidian was brought from sources near Bingöl, about 150 km from Çayönü.
Generally seen, Çayönü seems to represent an exception within the PPN and PN periods by being in the middle of a plain far from a main water source. The intermittent stream in the north (Bestakot) and the series of springs formed ponds and or a wider and deeper river surrounded by marshes and swamps that were relatively close to the settlement.
The settlement pattern of each PPN phase seemed to be established depending on the fluctuations of this water system.

The relation between these settlements is a matter of debate. Even in Urfa Plateau where a density can be observed, the distance between two settlements is at least 50 km. Çayönü in the Upper Tigris region is 100 km far from Nevalı Çori. Although Göbekli Tepe was proposed to be a ritual centre dominating the region, such a hierarchy is doubtful since we are still far from understanding the nature of the settlements.[22] It is worth mentioning here, Göbekli Tepe, when it was first noticed by scholars in 1960's, was thought to be a Roman settlement on top of a Neolithic lithics workshop. Perhaps, with our knowledge of PPN cultures today, the region should be reinvestigated; it is likely that Göbekli Tepe is not the only example of PPN settlements on an unusual elevation and without a stream running nearby.

Chapter IV
Nevalı Çori

In the previous chapters the position of the site Nevalı Çori in Upper-Mesopotamia and more specifically in Southeast Anatolia, is enlighted concerning its geography, chronology and economy. In the following chapter Nevalı Çori will be evaluated as an archaeologic site with a main focus on its architectural remains (Ill.4).
What kind of buildings did the settlement of Nevalı Çori consist of?

To obtain a clear picture of the settlement pattern of the site, two levels of observation will be followed.
On the first level, the settlement of Nevalı Çori will be evaluated. In order to do so, the building levels of the settlement will be traced down.
The second level of observation will deal with the architectural remains, the structures that are traceable on each building level. The individual building is considered here as a significant determinant of the settlement pattern.
Once we have a total view of all the structures, an attempt will be made to categorize these structures, based on the building forms. If possible, the analyse of the structures will lead to the recognition of specific types of buildings and/or function assessment. Therefore, whereas findings are included, they will be involved into the discussion. Data such as findings or inventory will be considered as characterizing elements in order to help identifying the function of the building.

IV.a The archaeology of Nevalı Çori

The discovery of the site of Nevalı Çori took place in 1980, during the survey of H.G.Gebel. From 1983 until 1991 rescue excavations were conducted by the University of Heidelberg with collaboration of the Archaeological Museum of Şanlıurfa.[23] The architectural remains from the site, which is under the Atatürk Dam since 1992, are displayed in the Şanlıurfa Museum.[24]
In the province of Şanlıurfa, the village called Kantara is cut in two sections by the small stream Kantara Çayı. The site of Nevalı Çori is located 750 m northwest of

[22] Schmidt2001:11.
[23] www.TAYproject.org

Kantara Village, located on an elevation of 490 m, 3 km southward of the Euphrates. On the right bank of the Kantara stream a limestone hill of Yangıntepe is located. The eastern section of the site displays Early Neolithic architecture (Nevalı Çori I) and is also better preserved than the western section, which lays below this hill. This western part of the settlement (Nevalı Çori IV) has been obliterated due to erosion. Two dry wadis are bordering the terrace (90 m long and 40 m wide) on which this part of the settlement is located.[25]
The latest findings at Nevalı Çori date back to the Early Bronze Age I. The Halaf period is also represented at the site.

IV.b The settlement of Nevalı Çori

The Early Neolithic occupation at Nevalı Çori is divided into five phases.[26] Only two of the building levels were represented on the left bank. The architectural sequence of the site starts with Level I ,the earliest one, right on the virgin soil and is to be followed up to Level V.
The earliest levels, Level I and Level II, are dated between 8400 and 8100 BC.[27]
The total number of excavated buildings is 29.[28] It has been claimed that after demolition and leveling, old foundations were used again for the construction of new buildings.[29]

IV.c The structures

The basic plan of the structures at Nevalı Çori is that of a freestanding rectangle with consistent interior division. The walls are of limestone bounded by a thick mortar of mud. The width of the external walls varies from 0.30 to 0.60m.
An important issue concerning the construction of a building is the division of the structure into units. The main division of a building can display a main unit, a front and back unit etc. This is determined by the construction of the foundations. The inner division of a building on the other hand is created by interior walls.

[24] Hauptmann1993:39.
[25] Hauptmann1993:39, Hauptmann1999:70.
[26] Hauptmann1999: 70.
[27]Hauptmann 1999: 78.
[28] Hauptmann1999: 70, Schmidt1996: 363.
[29] Hauptmann 1999: 70.

While constructing the foundation platform of many buildings, open spaces are left in order to create channels. Such open spaces are called sub-floor channels. These buildings belong to the type channel house (e.g. House 4 in Level IV).
The basic type of a channel house displays a smaller front unit and entrance with a larger main unit that is regularly divided.
Channels can be inserted crosswise in the foundation platform (e.g. House 25 in Level I and House 4 in Level IV) or can run lenghtwise the building (e.g. House 21A in Level I).
If the larger main unit is divided in lenghtwise two spaces, the building is termed two-tier channel house.
A fine example of the two-tier channel type architecture is House 26 in Level II. According to the excavators[30] the building process of the foundation and the channels of House 26 must have been as follows: the foundation of the building is a platform, built of six lines of large blocks. While building the platform, some thirty cm wide spaces are left and when the platform was covered with stone slabs these spaces formed five channels under the floor. Both the exterior and the interior walls were built after the construction of the platform.
The plaster of the exterior walls was applied in such a way that the ends of the channels were not closed and it is thought that the openings were in order to keep the rooms ventilated and cool or maintain the drainage.
Another variant of the channel house is the three-tier channel house.

During the analyse of all the structures of each building level, these architectural arguments will help us to define some building types where possible.

IV.d Analyse of the buildings

IV.d.a Level I

On the map of building level I of Nevalı Çori seven structures are recognizable (Ill.5). Of these seven structures, one structure, House 27, is not excavated. Two of the

[30] Hauptmann 1999: 71, Hauptmann 1997: 132.

structures of this earliest level, House 25 and House 21A, are fully uncovered and display individual plans.

House 13A

The structure called House 13A is located in the northwest of the settlement. House 13A is represented by remnants of a wall and there is no plan of it available. However, these remnants prove the earliest existence of this building House 13A, that continues at the same location during the two following levels, II (House 13B) and III (House 13C). The remains consist only of a 4 meters long outer wall in the southeast, set against the slope.[31]

Before the erection of House 13A, there was a pit, scraped off from the conglomerate slope to the valley side of the area, which went at least 3 m deep in northeast.

The building was standing on this "planned" ground, its back walls leaning on the vertically scraped slope and an entrance towards the valley. With this location the building was hanging above the rectangular buildings and gaining a safe, almost cave-like characteristic while still providing the monumental image when looking at it from south, the valley side.

It is suggested that House 13A was demolished and cleaned away before the construction of House 13B. Some of its building material, such as broken stones and pillars, were re-used while building House 13B and the rest of the building material was reused within the settlement.

House 24

House 24 is located some north of all the other structures and it seems to be oriented north-south as the House 25. House 24 is poorly preserved.

House 22B

House 22B is in the west side of House 25 and it has two almost parallel walls that are curving slightly on their northern edges.

House 25

Like it is mentioned above, House 25 of Level I has the same noth-south orientation as House 24. Unlike the latter, it is possible to make an analyse of this structure due to the

walls that are preserved up to 13.25 x 5.40 meters. However, the walls are disturbed by the later Level II.
The rectangular structure called House 25 consists of three main units.[32] The front unit is located in the south. The second room or main section in the middle is divided into four cells while the third room at the back shows two long divisions. Three stone settings were located about a meter apart from the outer wall. They are tought to be related to the posts supporting the roof. Also close to the north-western outer wall there is one channel running crosswise to the longitudinal axis.

House 27

As it was the case for House 13A, House 27 is also only recognizable by remnants of its walls on the map. This structure is unexcavated. It is built close to House 21A, although their orientation is not quite the same.

House 21A

House 21A is mainly divided into two units seperated by a joint: a front unit and a back unit, measuring respectively 3 x 4.40 meters and 8.20 x 4.50 meters. The smaller front unit has two partitions while the back unit is divided into six irregular cell-like small rooms that are created by two longitudinal tiers cut crosswise by two walls. The building is 11.30 meters long and 4.50 meters wide, with two sub-floor channels running along the length. These channels were 0.30 m wide.

House 14

The last structure that is displayed on the map of building level I is House 14. This building consists of two pieces of wall, running in the northeast-southwest direction, which makes it roughly parallel to House 21A.

IV.d.b Level II

In this level, a total of seven buildings are to be found (Ill.6).
When the two maps of building level I and building level II are being compared, it is remarkable that the structures from building level I overlap with some of the structures

[31] Hauptmann1993:41.
[32] Hauptmann1999:70.

from building level II. Exceptions are House 25 and House 22B. House 23 stands in the north as House 24 from Level I did. Stratigraphic correlation points out that House 23, House 26, House 21B, and House 12 are indeed located almost at the same places as respectively House 24, House 27, House 21A, House 14 of Level I, their predecessors.

In the southeast section of the settlement three houses are facing the stream. They are not lying exactly parallel to each other but in an obvious line-up. These structures, House 26, House 21B and House12, are separated from the other structures in the west by a ravine running down the slope of the Yangıntepe hill.

House 26

House 26 of Level II measures 18.20 x 6.20 meters with interior walls of 0.40 meter thick and exterior walls measuring 0.50 meter. This building is one of the largest rectangular buildings in Nevalı Çori. It consists of two main sections with no passage between the back unit and the front part. The latter is one single rectangular chamber while eight rooms form the 16.10 meters long back unit. [33]

The rubble floor was covered with a thick coat of plaster, which continued up to the interior side of the walls and also applied to the exterior, in some places up to 10 cm thick.

There are some stone settings found along the long walls of the building, which were possibly supporting the posts carrying the roof. In earlier publications[34], a stone bench surrounding the building was mentioned.

House 21B

House 21B, 12.70 meters long and 4.64 meters wide, has two units.[35] The front one is divided into four rooms and the back unit into six chambers, all unequal in size. The back unit has door openings to connect the rooms and two channels lying on the cross axis.

[33] Hauptmann 1999: 71.
[34] Hauptmann 1997: 132.
[35] Hauptmann 1999: 71.

House 12

House 12 is not so well preserved as the other two buildings and measures12 x 5.3 meters. Although it is not clear, it can be suggested that the space was divided into two sections, one front room and a main unit. Interior divisions are not recognizable. The foundation platform is better preserved than the rest of the building. There are six channels left open crosswise to the long axis and in this case two more channels lengthwise, connected to the ones running crosswise. A line of postholes was again found in both long sides of the building, about one meter far from the walls.

House 23

Up north of these three buildings House 23 stands with only a couple of its walls remaining, however its plan seems quite similar to those with two main units and inner divisions and at least two channels running crosswise the long axis.

Round House 2

Although named as "round house 2", it is not clear what the structure actually looked like, given the fact that the remnants are not more than a group of walls.
Round House 2 is a group of walls, situated close to the northeast corner of House 26.

House 22A

House 22A must have been the northern edge of another building or two buildings. The rest of the structure is not preserved.

House 13B

In the western end of the settlement stands House 13B, located northwest of the other buildings, in northeast-southwest direction. Its eastern side facing the dry valley, 5 m from the nearest structure in Level II (Ill.7).
Measuring 13.90x13.50 m, House 13B was built on an area of 188 m², which is almost two times larger than the area House 26 covers, the largest rectangular structure of Level II.[36]
There is a wall, running from northwest to southeast, whose northwestern end is connected to the eastern outer wall of House 13B. It has been argued that it could have

[36] Hauptmann1999:74, Hauptmann1993:43.

limited the settlement for safety and functioned as a barrier[37] or a terrace wall cutting off the settlement from the slope.[38]

The northeastern walls of the structure are preserved up to a height of 2.80 m. The thickness of the walls is changing between 0.50 and 0.90 m.[39] The entrance faces the stream and it is placed 0.50 m towards the southwest and not exactly in the middle of the southwestern wall. Two 1.15 m wide steps lead into the building, the top one is 0.35 m, and the bottom one 0.30 m high.

It is claimed that the entrance should have continued as an open portico with two pillars standing on both left and right sides of the entrance.

The structure was made of a soft, easy to work, white limestone, carefully broken into pieces.

The floor is up to 15 cm thick and of pieces of limestone fitted into a mortar bed, with a hard, grayish-white shimmering terrazzo surface, covering an area of 81 m².

Inside the building, there is a stone bench, surrounding the structure except the southwestern side, where the entrance is. In construction of the bench, quarry-stones and clay were used and that was covered with large, hard, limestone slabs, which are preserved only in the northern corner. The rest were used in the bench of the later building, respectively House 13C from Level III.

On the southeast wall, a 1.85 m wide, 2.50 m deep opening was left while building the bench, to form a niche. It is suggested that there could have been a pedestal at the back of the niche, since the terrazzo floor does not reach inside the niche more than 0.60 cm and this pedestal could have had a statue standing on it.[40] The back wall of the niche is formed by a part of the southeastern wall of House 13A of Level I.

Along the bench, 13 pillars were regularly erected.[41] In a later building stage in Level II, a rectangular podium was situated on the east corner of the bench. It was covered with a stone slab and two new "T-shaped" pillars were set into this podium.[42]

The interior of the building, including the front façade of the bench and the walls, were plastered with white clay, which is 2 cm thick and has traces of black and red paint.

[37] Hauptmann 1993: 41.
[38] Hauptmann 1999: 72.
[39] Hauptmann1993:43.
[40] Hauptmann2003:626, Hauptmann1999:74.
[41] Hauptmann1993:45.
[42] Hauptmann1999:74, Hauptmann1993:47-48.

IV.d.c Level III

Level III has the highest number of buildings when compared to other phases of Nevalı Çori and is divided into two sub-phases, IIIA and IIIB (Ill.8). One structure, House 13C, remained in the northwest of the settlement during both sub-phases. Close to House 13C, a 'U-shaped' structure was situated on the slope.

House 13C

In Level III, House 13C remained exactly in the same location, rebuilt inside the older structure.[43] It was built into the walls of the earlier House 13B, which caused a decrease in its area. The space the structure covers is almost a square, each side measuring 13.30 m. The outer wall is 1 m wide (Ill.9).

In the northeast, it leans towards the wall of the old House 13B, which creates a thickness of 1.50 m.

In southeast the new wall was built in such a way, that a distance of 0.60-1.40 m were left between the two lines of walls and the total thickness measures 2.50 m. This opening was filled with rubble and lines of stones.

The inner sides of the walls give both the structures (House 13B and House 13C) a "bowl-like" shape, leaning slightly towards the outside (Ill.10). Unlike the ones in House 13B, the edges here are rounded.

The entrance is in the same location as it was in House 13B, almost untouched.

Its form remains unclear due to the erosion and some modern disturbance that caused damage on the southwest side, where the entrance is. However, it is thought to be an open entrance, with two pillars on both sides, in order to let light into the building, if the building was roofed at all.[44] The roof is suggested to be flat and constructed with timber, reed and clay, which was carried by pillars.[45]

Because of the new southeastern wall, the niche of House 13B was closed.

Instead of the old one, a new niche was opened right against the entrance, about 0.50 m above the bench on the back wall. It is 0.70 m wide, 0.60 m deep and its preserved height is 1.20 m.

Both the bench and the pillars in the middle are made of a hard limestone.

The pillars on the bench are made of a softer kind of limestone.

[43] Hauptmann1993:48.
[44] Hauptmann1993:51.

A stone bench again, this time up to 1.30 m, surrounds the walls on three sides. The sidelines measure 7.30 m from northwest to southeast and 7.90 m from northeast to southwest.[46] It is made of 5 to 7 lines of stones, bounded with clay, and covered with stone slabs. The slabs are up to 1.90 m long and 0.15 – 0.20 m thick with a polished surface.
A total of 12 pillars are set into the bench, each with a distance of about 2.50 m to the next one. It is suggested that two pillars stood in the middle of the building, set into the floor.

IV.d.c.1 Level IIIA

The development and distribution of the structures is best seen in Level IIIA.
In this earlier Level IIIA, the southeastern line-up that was remarkable on the plan of building level II appears again with a new building added.
Some of the structures are built again right on top of structures from the previous building level.

House 7

House 7 is almost on top of the earlier House 26 from Level II, and parallel to House 6. The structure is 14.30 meters long and 6m wide. The inner division consisted of eleven rooms.

House 6

House 6 displays probably more or less the same dimensions as House 7. The main division could have existed of two or three units. During the construction four channels were built.

House 2

House 2 is also parallel to House 6 and built over its possible predecessor House 12 from Level II. The dimensions of this building are 15.60 x 6.15 m. As was the case in House 7, the interior space of the building existed of 11 separate rooms. The main division consisted of four units.

---

[45] Hauptmann1993:53.
[46] Hauptmann1993:51.

House 3

The new, relatively smaller House 3 stands in the east of House 2. These four buildings are all facing the stream as the earlier ones in Level II. This building is 8.10 m long and 5.40 m wide.

House 10

West of this group of four buildings, there is a “M-shaped”, small structure, House 10.

House 15

Moving west, House 15 is oriented differently than the other five buildings. House 15 also differs with its long and narrow plan.

House 16

Built somewhat north of House 15, House 16 shares a similar orientation. Dilensions of this building are 9 x 6.10 meters.

IV.d.c.2 Level IIIB

Level IIIB saw minor changes. The free standing houses were retained and new structures were built only in the middle of the settlement. They differ from the buildings in the southeastern part in plan and orientation.

Round House 1

Round House 1 is located slightly above the northern edge of House 10 but has no relation to it. There is also very less known about this structure.

House 8

House 8 is a very large rectangular building; it must have been one of the largest structures in Nevali Çori. House 8 was built above House 15 and a small part of House 16, roughly in east-west direction. Only its northeastern corner is preserved. This presumably bipartite channel-house has noticeable thick exterior walls (0.85m across) than those of the other houses. Four channels were apparent in the scant remnants.

IV.d.d Level IV

Several parallel structures in a row belong to this level, but they are only represented by remnants of walls (Ill.11).[47]

House 4

House 4, located in the southeastern section, is the only structure, identified as a building in this level. It is identifiable as a typical channel house. It is 8m wide and preserved to a length of 12m. Probably, its plan resembled that of House 2 or 7 in Level III. The northeastern rooms show a buttress-like feature along the walls. Three cross-wise channels were inserted in the foundation platform.

House 5

On the west side of House 4, there are remnants of three walls; two parallel walls cutting the third one in a right-angle. The third wall is slightly longer than the other two, who measure approximately 3.5 meters.

House 9

House 9 is very poorly preserved; there are only some remnants of walls.

IV.d.e Level V

House 1

The final level is represented by House 1, the only architectural evidence, which is oriented east-west. The western part of it was disturbed by pits and erosion, the northern side is not preserved either due to later disturbance.[48] It differs from the typical channel-type houses in dimensions (10 x 6m) as well as in interior divisions.[49] However, the foundation platform was constructed according to the same basic principles, but the subterranean channels were lacking. The bench along the exterior facade is innovative. Its division into a cross-wise front unit and a two-tiered main unit is following the tradition.

[47] Hauptmann1999:73.
[48] Hauptmann 1988: 102.

Table 3. Building levels and buildings at Nevalı Çori

Level	**Level I**	**Level II**	**Level III**		**Level IV**	**Level V**
Sub-phase			**Level IIIA**	**Level IIIB**		
Building	House 21A →	House 21B	House 6		House 4	House 1
	House 24 →	House 23	House 2		House 9	
	House 27 →	House 26 →	House 7		House 5	
	House 14 →	House 12	House 3			
	House 25	Round House 2	House 10 →	Round House 1		
	House 22B	House 22A	House 15	House 8		
			House 16			
	House 13A →	House 13B →	House 13C			

Note: Buildings with in arrow placed in between have more or less the same location with or without a relation between the two building levels.

[49] Hauptmann1999:73.

Chapter V
Evaluation of the site Nevalı Çori

V.a The building forms at Nevalı Çori

Based on the building levels and the remnants of the settlement, three different forms of construction can be seen at Nevalı Çori: rectangular, round and square planned buildings.

V.a.a Rectangular buildings

Regarding the buildings from the five building levels, it becomes clear that freestanding rectangular buildings are the most common type at the site. 24 of the 29 excavated buildings are rectangular in plan, with inner walls, dividing the space into small rooms- cells and sub-floor channels. The following table presents an overview of all the buildings of the settlement that have been identified as being rectangular in form with certainty. For the rectangular structures certain types can be recognized.

Table 4. Rectangular buildings at Nevalı Çori (drawn after Hauptmann 1999a)

Level	Building	Size in m	Main Division	Inner Division	Channels
I	H25	13.25 x 5.40	3	7	1
I	H21A	11.30 x 4.50	2	7	2
II	H26	18.20 x 6.20	2	9	5
II	H21B	12.70 x 4.64	2	10	2
II	H12	12 x 5.3	2?	?	6
II	H23	?	2?	?	2?
III	H7	14.30 x 6	2	11	10
III	H6		2-3		4
III	H2	15.60 x 6.15	4	11	7
III	H3	8.10 x 5.40	3?	?	3
III	H16	9 x 6.10	?	?	4
III	H8	?	2?	?	4+?
IV	H4	12 x 8	2?	7+?	3
V	H1	10 x 6	2	7	-

V.a.a.1 Type of buildings

The buildings categorized under the heading Rectangular buildings are mainly channel houses (Ill.12 and 13). Under the previous heading architectural details of channel houses were explained together with structures that display a ground plan fitting or diverging the picture.

Table 5. Channel houses at Nevalı Çori

Two-tier Channel House	Three-tier Channel House
H12 (Level II)	H2 (Level III)
H21B (Level II)	H4 (Level IV)
H26 (Level II)	H16? (Level III)
H3 (Level III)	H7? (Level III)
H8 (Level III)	
H21A (Level I)	
H25 (Level I)	
H23? (Level II)	

V.a.b Round structures

There are two round structures to be found at the site, Round House 2 (Level II) and Round House 1 (Level III), both of them poorly preserved.
The plan and size of these large round buildings can only be traced by the postholes and lines of pebbles, which also indicate that they were built without using any stone foundations or mudbrick.[50]

V.a.c The square building

The square planned building is obviously different from the other two forms of structure, not only by its plan, also by its size and interior features such as benches and pillars. The succeeding of a square planned building during three following levels at the same location leads to the conclusion that the settlement knew just one square building that continued to be used. The earliest remains of this building are called House 13A (Level I), to be found in Level II as House 13B and finally resulting in the construction called House 13C in Level III.

[50] Schmidt 1996: 363.

V.b The settlement plan of Nevalı Çori

The settlement plan shows a developing character considering the simple layout of Level I with only a couple of buildings and some walls, whereas Levels II and III display a more complex picture when looking at the line-up of rectangular structures and the square building appearing with its all interior elements. Level IV and Level V can be called as the end of this development, for there are only several structures in Level IV and just one building in Level V.

Another distinction remarkable is the direct sequence of the individual structures throughout Levels I-IV. The square building kept its place in the northwestern part of the settlement from Level II onwards. Similarly most of the rectangular buildings, especially the ones that are lined up in the southern area, are rebuilt almost in the same spots throughout the Neolithic occupation.[51] In general, the structures display the same orientation (NNW-SSE), except House 1 in the most recent building level.

Chapter VI
Function Assessment

To obtain a function assessment for the distinct building forms and house types, the findings and inventory of the structures will be evaluated. These will be considered as characterizing elements in order to understand what purposes these buildings have actually served for.

VI.a The rectangular buildings

The rectangular building form like in Nevali Çori is a common type of architecture in the Taurus piedmont in Southeastern Anatolia. Freestanding rectangular buildings are unusual in Syria and the Levant.[52] Another site in Southeastern Anatolia that show this kind of architecture is Çayönü.
Since there is very little information on the artifact distributions, it is difficult to understand the function of the rectangular structures.[53] Clear deposits on the floor of the rooms are very rare. Also, the area is affected by erosion; therefore artifacts were usually not recovered in situ.
The buildings categorized under the heading Rectangular Buildings (V.a.a) are mainly houses of the two-tier channel type. The basic type of the channel-house consisted of a smaller front unit and entrance and a larger, regularly divided main unit. It is thought to have combined two functions: residence in the front unit and storage in the main unit, based on archaeological findings. For these channel houses the most likely function assessment that can be obtained is residence-depots.[54]
However, the height of the sub-floor channels is not known for each structure, which makes it difficult to obtain a function with certainty. The sub-floor channels probably provided ventilation of the rooms, which could indicate a storage facility in this rooms. In general, it is believed that the rectangular structures with ventilation openings have been storage places for dry food (grain, wheat etc.).[55] Storage could have been kept cool in the small separate chambers and dry by the channels under the floor.

---

[51] Schmidt 1996: 366.
[52] Akkermans and Schwartz2003:61.
[53] Schmidt1996:363.
[54] Hauptmann1999:74.
[55] Günenç2000:2.

Another difficulty is the lack of any meaningful differentiation between the sizes of the rooms. Some buildings consist of rooms with spaces differing from 11 m² to 3 m². There are also buildings with rooms of 4-5 m². In this case one should be careful to suggest that the rectangular buildings were used both for storage and living purposes. This view does not fit the situation perfectly either but the possibility can not be excluded until further research confirms this opinion.

One of the rectangular structures, House 6 in Level III, will be discussed in detail as an example.
House 6 is a channel house but it displays a different plan.[56] The house is divided in two: a (probable) front unit and a main unit. The main unit is irregularly divided into rooms of varying dimensions. The usual channel houses have a regular ground plan with maximum ten channels. House 6 had only four channels.
What is remarkable in House 6 is that it also had different furnishings: two hearths, a stone roasting pit, in one room a limestone mortar and pestle, a pounding stone and an antler shaft was found. This is likely the inventory of an atelier. Aside from these findings, two cores and an antler hammer are interpreted as indications for the production of stone tools.
Remains of House 6 from Level IIIA in Level IIIB are two pits sunk into seperate rooms. Findings such as a limestone waste, several small sculptures, and a pillar with a Γ-capital leads to the interpretation that this area became the workshop of a stone mason and sculptor.
In conclusion, House 6 can be called a residence if it did indeed originally have a front unit. More probable is that House 6 served as a workshop or an atelier. This function assessment is supported by the findings that have been listed above.

VI.b The round structures

The round structures at Nevalı Çori are first of all not to be considered as buildings, although they are called ‘round house 1 and 2’. The round structures at Nevali Çori are to be interpreted with caution. This type of construction is not comparable to the round houses of Çayönü sub-phases 1-4 or to those of Hallan Çemi.[57]

[56] Hauptmann1999:72.
[57] Hauptmann1999:73.

Very less is known about the structure of Round House 1 and Round House 2 consists of a group of walls.

For the function of these round structures Round House 1 and Round House 2 there are no strong arguments. Based on its location and topography of the site, for Round House 2 of Level II the suggestion has been made that this group of walls could have been preventing the stream running downhill towards the buildings.[58] The group of walls is located close to the northeast corner of House 26. Still, the function of Round House 2 is not clear.

The only clue for Round House 1 from Level IIIB is its location; it is located slightly above the northern edge of House 10 without having any relation to it. For this round structure too, nu definte function can be assigned.

Round structures in the open areas at Nevalı Çori are related to the daily activities. The distribution of lithics at Nevalı Çori display high concentrations in the open areas and inside the round structures, pointing out that the daily activities were held in the open areas and the round structures could be functioned as workshops for tool-making, retooling etc.

Although being contemporary with the other structures, the function of these round structures are thought to be different, especially considering the large number of lithics found inside and around them.

VI.c The square building

According to the excavators, among the three distinct building forms at Nevalı Çori, only the Square Building (House 13A, 13B and 13C) has a clearly defined function and is named after it: Cult Building. First the characterizing elements of this square planned building will be discussed. Which data have lead to the identification of the Square Building as ‘Cult Building’? Then other sites in the region will be involved to trace parallels that may contribute to this identification.

VI.c.a Architectural elements

First of all, the particular architectural elements are the strongest arguments to identify this building as "different" than the other structures. Before discussing the furnishing,

the Square Buildings general architecture displays remarkable aspects. Its plan and more elaborate construction set it apart from the rectangular houses.[59] During the five building levels, this structure remained the only square planned building of the settlement. Considering the eminent location of the Square Building, the three structures (House 13A, 13B and 13C) again follow each other up very well in the western end of the settlement.
Although the other buildings were mostly re-built, still some minor changes in the location occurred. The Square Building, however, was exactly in the same location. Moreover, in Level III, the new building (House 13C) was built right inside the old one (House 13B), which caused shrinkage of the area covered, from 188 m² to 178 m².[60]
Other characteristics of the Square Building can be listed as follows: subterranean or semi-subterranean, large, and single-roomed structure, specially made and multiple times renewed floors, deliberately filling and/or burning and rebuilding of the structure in the same location, which on its turn is on the fringe of the settlement.
One of the common features of these buildings (House 13A,B and C), the terrazzo floors and narrow channels along the floors, could indicate an activity including liquids. The terrazzo floor of House 13B was mainly re-used and renewed in some places. Besides all the architectural elements, the effort given in the construction of the buildings and especially the floors, pillars and walls, maintaining and rebuilding can be considered as too much for a temporary dwelling.

The architectural elements that furnish the Square Building are remarkable and consist of stone benches along the walls, podia, and stone monoliths and/or pillars, which are decorated. The interior features of the Square Building are discussed above in detail. Therefore, we will focus here mainly on the benches, podia and pillars.

Although the first phase of the structure, House 13A in Level I provided not many architectural remains due to re-use of its material, pillars were present, as they are re-used in House 13B in Level II. Also remnants of wall suggest that it may well have been the predecessor of House 13B. Given the fact that none of the pillars has been found in situ, it is a matter of debate wether they have been introduced from somewhere else or not. The presence of pillars in the earliest building House 13A of

[58] Hauptmann 1999: 71.
[59] Hauptmann1999:74.

the Square Building indicates the use and function in the structure, which becomes more clear in the later structures House 13B and 13C (Ill.14).
In House 13B (Level II) two pillars are flanking the entrance, being part of an open portico, as is the situation in House 13C (Level III). Also remained in the two phases of the structure are the stone bench that surrounds the interior, leaving the entrance open and the niche, located above the bench.
The stone bench in House 13B is 1 m wide, measuring 2.30-2.50 m wide in the southeast (Ill.15).
13 monolithic, decorated, "T-shaped" pillars were placed with a distance about 2.30-2.40 m left between each pillar.[61] In cross-section, they are rectangular and measuring about 0.40 to 0.50 m. In this level there are no fully preserved pillars found, they are either only the bottom parts or some fragments. One of the fragments is a "T- shaped" capital.[62]
The rectangular podium in House 13B measures 1.70 x 1.30 m.
The two pillars set into the podium were also "T-shaped". The one at the corner was 1.70 m high and had an incised line on its narrow and visible side. It was standing diagonally with an east-west orientation.[63]
The second one was 1.95 m high, standing in the corner between the northeastern wall and podium.
Of the 12 pillars set into the bench in House 13B, not every pillar is found in-situ or preserved within the building. The number is given according to the spaces left along the bench, where the pillars are supposed to be set into.
One pillar is fully preserved, even with the "T-shaped" top. However it was found lying on the ground, not in its original place. It is 2.35 m high from top to the pointed bottom.
Because of the pointed bottom, it is suggested to be the eastern one of the two pillars, which were standing in the middle of the building, set into the floor. It has two slightly bent arms on its wide sides and two hands with five fingers each under an incised line on the narrow side, in low-relief (Ill.16).

[60] Hauptmann1993:48.
[61] Hauptmann1993:45.
[62] Hauptmann1999:75, Hauptmann2000:9.
[63] Hauptmann1993:48.

The pillars are defined as "anthropomorphic" because of the arm-like lines incised on the sides According to the excavators, the same style is visible on the rest of the pillars. Even most of them are broken into pieces.[64]
The western pillar standing in the middle of the building was found in situ, but only the bottom half of it was preserved. It stands 4 m far from the entrance and 2.25 m from the northwestern bench. It was originally 3 m high and measures 0.80 to 0.33 m in cross-section. Like the other one, this pillar has the arms and hands as well in low relief on its sides.

VI.c.b Sculptures and reliefs

Besides its structural features that distinguish the Square Building from the others, the sculptures found within play an important role. All the large sculptures except one piece were found within the Square Building. The problem here is that none of them were found in situ. They were either buried into the walls or found in the deposit.
The monumental sculpture is integrally related to the Square Building.[65] Even if one considers the anthropomorphic pillars as supporting elements of a flat roofing, there remain 11 sculptures in soft limestone to vouch for the special significance of the buildings.
With only one exception from the podium in House 3 all the sculptures were found in secondary context, quite properly ‘interred’ in the later House 13B and 13C.

A head larger than life-size (0.37 m) with jug ears and the face broken away, preserves a snake curled up on the back of its bald head. This must have belonged to a large cult statue that might have originally placed in the niche of House 13B. Especially the snake figures on the narrow side of the pillar are made with the style, characterized by a triangular head and curling body.
A small torso with the head, arms and lower part broken away displays a collar-like ridge across the front, above which there is a nose-like projection that would look better completed with a bird's head than with that of a human. The fully rendered back,

[64] Hauptmann1993:50.
[65] Hauptmann1999:75.

on the other hand, looks human. It may have been a hybrid creature combining the attributes of man and bird (Ill.18).

One statuette has the shape of a bird with the head of a man with strongly stylized features.

The front of a pillar displays a large, presumably female head apparently in the clutches of a bird's talons. Based on the evident cheekbones, the head is more likely to be female rather than male; however the sex is still not very clear.

Fragments of a composite sculpture were found built within the stone structure of the northeastern bench of House 13B (Ill.19).

There are four pieces joining together, forming a column with a height of more than 1 meter. ('Totem-pole' in the publications) In the lower part of it, there are two human figures standing back to back, one of them is very poorly preserved and misses the face and the neck. Their long hair looks like gathered in a net, falling over the shoulders. The more preserved one has deeply incised eyes, which could have had inlays of some sort, a long nose and a pursed mouth.[66] As for the body part of the figure, there are two different interpretations, in early publications the body is thought to have bird-like elements.

Later, the body is defined as female, with respect to the rounded belly and breasts and perhaps with respect to the new joint to the top of those human figures, an obvious bird.

This bird is 34 cm high and located on top of the human heads. It is depicted in a standing position, the head is broken away. The figure has a rounded belly and the feathers of its wings are shown by incised thin lines.

Another pillar fragment portrays two birds opposite one another. A vulture-like bird, also sculpted in the round, might have belonged to such a composite piece although the pegs on its tail suggest that it might even have been fastened to a wall of the Square Building. Neither is there any further interpretation yet in hand for the frog-like creature in high relief.

A limestone bowl fragment has a scene showing three figures standing side by side in relief. (Fig. 26) The 13.5 cm high fragment was found in the foundation of House 3. The centered figure is smaller than the others, has a pointed head, a very rounded belly and four legs. Because of its head being pointed, it is suggested that the centered figure is a Euphrates tortoise. The two other figures are carved on the left and right of the

centered one. Both have their arms raised up; their fingers are depicted as small, incised lines. Their bellies are bulging and the legs are open. The left figure is claimed to be male since it is taller than the right figure, which is supposed to be female. In more recent publications, both the human figures are interpreted as pregnant, whereas rounded bellies do not necessarily indicate just pregnancy, but could also be linked to food and well fed people and still be related to fertility.[67]

Except the 'pillar with the female head' and the limestone bowl fragment with the 'human and tortoise' relief, sculpture at Nevalı Çori seems to be associated with the Square Building.

Although all the sculptures were buried within the walls or benches of the building, found in their secondary contexts, it is possible that the sculpture was somehow connected (perhaps limited) to the function of these buildings.

In House 13C (Level III), all the three sculptures were found either inside or around the niche.

In House 13B (Level II), both the sculptures are associated with the particular architectural elements, such as the bench and the podium.

In this aspect, the two fragments from House 3 could be an exception or this building had some sort of significance although it is not different at all by plan, but smaller in size when compared to the other rectangular buildings of its level. At this point, since there is no information about the actual size of the settlement, there is a chance that House 3 could not be the only exception.

[66] Voigt2000:271.
[67] Voigt2000:272.

Table 6. Sculptures at Nevalı Çori

Building	Figure	Size	Position	Condition
House 13C	Human head with a snake on its back (Ill.17)	37 cm	Inside the niche	Face damaged
House 13C	Human-bird creature	23 cm	Below the niche	Front side and lower part damaged
House 13C	Human torso (Ill.17 and 18) (possibly male)	37 cm	In the deposit below the niche	Lower part, arms, head broken
House 13B	Vulture-like Bird (Ill.19)	50 cm	In the podium	Well preserved
House 13B	Composite column (totempole)	above 1 m	Built within the stone bench	Partly preserved. The column is incomplete
House 3 (Level III)	Pillar with female (?) head (Ill.20)	29 cm	Built inside the podium	Lower part of the face damaged
House 3 (Level III)	Limestone bowl fragment with relief (two human and a tortoise) (Ill.21)	13.5 cm	in the foundation	The bowl is partly preserved, the scene is incomplete
?	Frog-like Human (Ill.20)	45 cm	unspecified	Upper part damaged?
?	Lion head (Ill.21)	4.4 cm	?	Probably the head of a complete figure

IV.c.c Other sites in the region

When we look at other sites in the region, different sites provide structures with common architectural features. For the site of Nevalı Çori the following two sites offer a lot of similarities.

The Square Building displays following features that are characteristic:

- subterranean or semi-subterranean
- large, and single-roomed structure
- specially made and multiple times renewed floors
- deliberately filling and/or burning and rebuilding of the structure in the same location
- location on the fringe of the settlement

IV.c.c.1 Çayönü

Nevalı Çori and Çayönü can be considered as two sites that stand very close to each other when both settlements are analysed. The direct sequence of the individual structures that is very remarkable in the settlement of Nevalı Çori is also to be seen in Çayönü (Ill.22).[68]
The 'basal pits' at Çayönü are to be compared with the 'roasting pits' at Nevalı Çori that are encountered in Level I only. Also the presence of one-room structures is testified for Çayönü as well as for Nevalı Çori.[69] The chronological link between the two sites had been explained in Chapter III.
However, the most remarkable link between Nevalı Çori and Çayönü concerns the architectural differentiation that leads to the identification of 'special buildings'. These buildings differ from the others in a settlement, depending on their plan, size, construction, interior features and finds. 'Special Buildings' are structures in which no domestic activities were being held.

The site of Çayönü offers structures that are termed 'Special Buildings', based on similar arguments as the Square Building or 'Cult Building' in Nevalı Çori.

[68] Hauptmann1999:70.
[69] Hauptmann1999:75.

The buildings in Çayönü belonging to the monumental class are as follows (Ill.23):

- the Flagstone Building with central pillars (subphase 4)
- the Plaza with monoliths like menhirs
- the Bench Building and Skull Building (Subphase 5) with stone benches
- the Terrazzo Building with its special floor (Subphase 6)

These are the basic architectural features that are also found in the Square Building at Nevalı Çori.

Table 7. Buildings associated with the subphases of Çayönü

1	**Round Buildings Subphase (10200-9400 BP)**
	Earliest Skull Building
	Possibly earliest Flagstone Building
2	**Grill Buildings Subphase (9400-9100?)**
	Flagstone Building
	Skull Building (2 phases)
3	**Channeled Buildings Subphase (9100-9000)**
	Flagstone Building
	Skull Building (?)
4	**Cobble-paved Buildings Subphase (9000-8600?)**
	Skull Building (2 phases)
	Bench Building
	Building BL
	Pebble Plaza
5	**Cell Buildings Subphase (8600-8300)**
	Terrazzo Building
	Clayey plaza with standing stones

The Flagstone Building is named after its floor built of large flagstones. It is a rectangular structure with rounded corners, located in the southeastern edge of the settlement as the other two cult buildings. As a result of the destruction the stream has

caused, the southern part of the building is lost and the dimensions of the whole structure cannot be revealed; only the width was measured approximately 10.70 m.[70]

The building was terraced into the slope. The northern wall, built of flat broken stones, is preserved up to a height of 1.30 m and has two buttresses that are 1.20 m wide and 50 cm deep.[71] Two meters south from the buttresses, there are two standing stones, aligned with the buttresses and a third one is set in the east of the building, right in front of a bench.

The Skull Building at Çayönü went through several modifications and stood more or less at the same place during the first four levels of occupation. The earliest Skull Building was in shape of a half circle with double walls. There is a gap of 30 cm left between the walls, covered with large stones. Several skulls were found on the floor and many skeletons were recovered in a pit dug in the center of the building. There are about 70 skulls and skeletons of at least 400 individuals counted. Whether the southern half of the structure was circular or rectangular like its successors remains indefinite due to the disturbance caused by the later building levels.[72]
The later phases of the Skull Building display roughly the same layout. It is a rectangular structure, measuring 9.70 to at least 8 m. The northern part of it is set into the slope and the southern end, that is where the entrance is supposed to be, is heavily destroyed by erosion.[73] The southern part of the building is a courtyard-like large space with a plastered floor. There are three interconnecting, small rooms in the north of the building (four rooms in earlier phases), which measure 1.80 to 2.30 m and these are separated from the rest of the space by a mudbrick bench, which has two standing stones set into it.[74] Later, a high wall was built on this bench, which made the rooms more isolated but still connected to the main space by two openings. At its latest phase, the Skull Building had a polished ‘altar’ in front of the western wall and the rooms were paved with pebbles.[75]

[70] Schirmer1990:378.
[71] Schirmer1983:473.
[72] Schirmer1990:381.
[73] Schirmer1983:469, Schirmer1990:381 see also Özdogan,A.1999:50 where she claims that the destruction was caused by EBA terracing and also the presence of a southern wall is questionable.
[74] Schirmer1983:469.
[75] Özdogan,A.1999:50.

The Terrazzo Building was constructed after the burning down of the Skull Building, some meters north of it. It is a single roomed structure, measuring 11.75 x 9 m, with outer walls 0.8 to 1.2 m wide.[76] The walls are built of rough stones and have buttresses along, which are 1m wide and 0.25 m deep. The building was named after its red terrazzo floor that consists of limestone set in lime mortar.

The Bench Building is a small, rectangular, single-roomed structure set into the slope and was in use during the Cobble-Paved Buildings Sub-phase, contemporary with the latest phase of the Skull Building and before the Terrazzo Building. A massive stone bench is running along its walls, its floor is of fine sand and there is drainage channel.[77]

Right from the earliest levels, non-domestic buildings appear only in the eastern section of Çayönü. The 'plaza' was also located in this area, covered with pebbles during the Cobble-Paved Buildings Sub-phase and coated with a reddish clayey soil in the Cell Buildings Sub-phase. This clayey plaza covers an area of 60x20 m and had two rows of large standing stones set into its floor, which were broken and laid flat before the renewal of the floor.[78]

IV.c.c.2 Göbekli Tepe

The greatest similarity between Göbekli Tepe and Nevalı Çori concerns the 'T'-shaped pillars. The T-pillars with miniature reliefs indicate according to the excavators a different building perception of the inhabitants.
Two buildings in Göbekli Tepe, the Lion Pillar Building and the Schlangenpfeilergebäude show remarkable similarities with findings in Nevalı Çori concerning the architecture, relief and sculpture.

To the southeast of the settlement, the Lion Pillar Building is the only structure of Level II that has decorated pillars. The 'Löwenpfeilergebäude' (Ill.24) is a semi-subterranean, single-roomed, rectangular structure, which measures 6.5 x 4.4 m and is located in the southeast of the mound. It has four T-shaped pillars standing and two

[76] Schirmer1990:382.
[77] Özdogan,M and Özdogan,A.1989:71.

more built into the side walls facing each other.[79] Two of the freestanding pillars (1.60 and 1.45 in height) have lions depicted in low-relief on their upper parts. The lions have open mouths as they were growling and clearly shown male organs as it is the case in almost all the animal figures at Göbekli Tepe.
The southern pillar (1m high) built into the wall is decorated as well and thought to be in secondary context. Reminding very much of Nevalı Çori pillars, it has parallel lines (hands) and a deep vertical line (tie or krawatten) above them, incised on it.[80]
Between the northeastern pillar and the northeast corner of the structure, a stone bench was placed. The floor of the 'Löwenpfeilergebäude' is terrazzo.

The Schlangenpfeilergebäude (Ill.25) of the earliest level[81] of the settlement is represented by four round or oval structures, with benches and decorated T-shaped pillars that are more than 3 m in height. In this layer several monolithic architectural features appeared.[82] One room is accentuated by two central pillars, 3.1 m high, with T-capitals. In a later phase these were incorporated into a curving wall, diminishing the size of the room. Both pillars were framed by a bench of stone slabs. The pillars are set as they were delineating the structures and there are two of them in each structure, standing in the center. In some cases, pillars look as if they were set before the walls. This type of arrangement resembles the Nevalı Çori Cult Building very much, both concerning the monumentality and the placement of pillars, however the motifs on the pillars demonstrate a different world.

Reliefs of Göbekli Tepe show very often common motifs as in Nevalı Çori.
Three of the total of five pillars boasted relief decoration. Pillar 1 is decorated with a "tapestry" of interwoven snakes and scattered individual snakes in low relief, depicted below is a ram. Snakes seem to be quite commonly chosen to decorate pillars (Ill.25). There are single snakes, groups of them, even a 'net' of them. They are depicted as wavy lines that form the body and slightly pointed heads.

[78] Özdogan,A.1995:87.
[79] Schmidt1999:16.
[80] Schmidt1999:17.
[81] Two 14C samples taken from the fill are dating around 9000 BC (cal.), see Schmidt2001:49.
[82] Hauptmann1999:79.

On one narrow face of Pillar 2 is a bucranion. On one of the wide faces, three animals arranged one above the other: a bovine, a canine and a bird possibly representing a crane.
Another pillar shows the relief of a fox in the same style like Pillar 2 and probably being the part of a similar narrative scene.
The collection so far recovered includes foxes, boars, wild cattle, gazelle, ram, birds (duck-like birds, long-legged birds, perhaps storks), insects, spiders, bucrania and some geometric motifs like H-shapes and rings.
Animals appear both alone and in groups of two or three. Pillar 33 of Structure D displays the most crowded scene at Göbekli Tepe, which has large birds, two small foxes, H-shaped motifs and snake bodies on its wide sides and spiders, heads of the snakes and rows of triangles on the narrow side. The wide side on the left contains some wavy lines and a single fox, which is a very rare example of animal without male indication at Göbekli Tepe.[83]
Pillar 18 of Structure D is the only example from the oldest level that has Nevalı Çori type of bent arms carved on the wide sides of the pillar. Unlike the pillar with the same motif of Löwenpfeilergebäude, Pillar 18 is decorated also with a fox and some geometric motifs.[84]
Portrayed from above in high relief are wild animals resembling reptiles, their bared frangs, however, suggest rather that they be interpreted as panthers or lions.[85]

Two bone objects from Hallan Çemi depict snakes, which is an animal that is frequently represented in sculptures of Nevali Çori and Göbekli tepe. But the sculptures of Göbekli Tepe testify more similarities with Nevalı Çori.
Göbekli Tepe has a wide collection of sculptures. Many pieces of sculpture came to light, both from the rooms and among the surface materials.
Two pillars are sculptured with animal figures. The first one is a reptile-like animal depicted in high-relief on the upper, T-shaped part. The animal is about 80 cm long and has a long tail and legs bent upwards. Similar reptile reliefs are to be found on limestone fragments and as small, broken parts of figurines.
A second sculptured pillar is 1.20 m high. It is crowned by an animal, sculptured in the round. A bear (or perhaps a lion) sitting at the top of the pillar seems to be holding a

[83] Schmidt2003:6-7.
[84] Schmidt2002:24, Schmidt2004:103.

human head between its paws. More animals on human heads are present at Göbekli Tepe.
A 40 cm long fragment, found in the fill of an early structure, displays the lower body of an unidentified animal holding a human head.
Another fragment, 34 m long, is suggested to be a bird on a human head.
This time the human face is clearly visible, although there is only a wing-like line on one side to prove the bird.[86] Ithyphallic animals and persons, bird-like animals, lions, boars, a torso, a life-sized human head, large phalloi are among the plastic finds.
On the eastern plateau, there are three phalloi carved on the bedrock, three of them in same style, the largest one is 25 cm long.[87]
There are also carved stone fragments present at the site, such as small limestone fragments with incised parallel lines or snakes.

In conclusion, besides the architecture, the sculptures and reliefs of Nevalı Çori show also similarities with other sites in the region, especially with Göbekli Tepe, as is explained above. There is no doubt that the sculptures of Nevalı Çori reflect the Early Holocene fauna of the Middle Euphrates Valley: lion, bear, wild boar, wild horse etc.

IV.d Conclusions on function assessment

Among the three building forms that could be distinguished for the settlement of Nevalı Çori, evaluations on their functions can only been put forward for the rectangular and square planned buildings.
Channel houses are accepted as residences, in some cases as ateliers (House 6) or as storage spaces based on their specific features. In other words, when it is not clear which specific purpose the buildings were serving, the question of how these buildings were used remains unanswered. It can be concluded that function assessment of these certain type of buildings is limited to defining them as either residences, workshops or storages. More detailed research in the future will point out which of these functions can be established for which structure with certainty.
Only for the Square Building a definite answer can be given corcerning its function: based on its architecture, location, and findings inside such as pillars, sculpture, reliefs,

[85] Hauptmann1999:80.
[86] Schmidt1998a:2-3.

podia and benches, this monumental and remarkable building was a cult building. This view is also supported by similarities with other monumental buildings in other sites in the region as is mentioned above. The special character of the Square Building is supported by structures with similar architectural features of Göbekli Tepe and Çayönü.
Still, it is prefered by some archaeologists to restrict the definition of the Square Buildings function to 'public' in stead of 'cult' because of the lack of knowledge about any form of spiritual behaviour in this early period of time.

Function assessment of certain type of buildings is difficult due to a number of reasons. The lack of knowledge of the original form of the buildings limits any definition.
For example, wether a building was roofed or not is an issue that is closely related to its function.
In the case of Nevali Çori, it has been the question wether or not the buildings were roofed.
Also, the population of a settlement, as far as it can be approached by demographic studies, has implementations on the idea a specific type of building gives.
Based on demographic studies, it seems that in the case of the Square Building, it was only a small percentage of the population that could fit in.[88] A roofed structure gives more privacy, so it can be pictured as a small group gathering in the structure in privacy. On the other hand, if the building was not roofed, these gatherings would become more public in character.

[87] Schmidt1998b:30.
[88] Sentek2005:32.

Chapter VII
Conclusions on the Site of Nevalı Çori

The site of Nevalı Çori is discussed in detail as it has been put forward in the introduction of this writing. The settlement is analysed by following the building levels, based on the plans of each level. For each building level the structures have been described to conclude which building forms come to the fore at the site. These building forms are categorized as rectangular, round and square buildings. After analyse, we have come to the conclusion that indeed types of buildings can be recognized with the exception for one building form. Only the round structures can not be called building for the reasons that have been explained during their analyse and therefore remain unclear in terms of type and function.
For the rectangular structures, and especially the ones that could be recognized as channel houses it was possible to formulate some plausible suggestions as it has been concluded in the previous chapter. The type and function of the Square Building could be defined and proved (with complementary information from other sites) with more certainty.

To formulate conclusions corcerning the settlement pattern of Nevalı Çori, it is worth mentioning that the excavated area is only a fraction of the original settlement.
Since sites are usually excavated to some degree, which is usually a 10 to 20 %, the full layout of the settlement of Nevalı Çori and how much of the whole area was in use cannot be figured out. Based on the area exposed, the settlement pattern includes a division between the rectangular structures and the Square Building. The Square Building is located west of the area with a distance to the rectangular structures in southeast, standing side by side.
The round structures are situated in between, closer to the rectangular buildings.
The open areas of the settlements, where several roasting pits and fire-pits were found, are where daily life has been mostly spent, outside the houses.
It is remarkable that the two last building levels show very few structures, compared to the earlier building levels. Moreover, the Square Building, which is showing continuity from Level I onwards up to Level III, seems to remain untouched in Level IV and V. Regarding the timeperiod and the region, this phenomenon fits in the picture.

By the end of PPNB most of the settlements of Southeast Anatolia were either abandoned or got smaller in size. Based on the evidence recovered from the site, it seems that at Nevalı Çori the settlement was gradually shrinking. The settlement of Nevalı Çori has a short life span, around 200 years, and its permanency may be questioned.

During the previous chapters the meaning of Nevalı Çori has been explained as a settlement and as a site in Southeast Anatolia.

In a broad perspective it can be established for Nevalı Çori that it has been a site that fits in perfectly in the Neolithic of this region.

Nevalı Çori reveals numerous indications that support the view that this site is very likely one of the most important sites in the region to understand the Southeast Anatolian Neolithic.

Together with Çayönü it can be put forward that the settlement pattern displays an architectural organization by the distinction of areas with different functions. Stone buildings are seperated from the storage houses both by their architecture and furniture. These buildings that are considered by their excavators as the earliest cultural structures of the Near East have lead to the definition of the 'Çayönü Culture' and respectively the 'Nevalı Çori Culture'.[89] This indicates a central organization with the production of sculptures and reliefs with stone tools in ateliers and workshops and with an isolated cult building belonging to the settlement.

Bibliography

Akkermans P.M.M.G and Schwartz G.M. 2003, The Archaeology of Syria, From Complex Hunter-Gatherers to Early Urban Societies (ca. 16.000-300 BC), Cambridge.

Erdoğu, B. 2002. Türkiye Arkeolojik Yerlesmeyerleri: Karsilastirmali Tablolara Göre Anadolu Kronolojisi [Turkey Archaeologic Settlements: Anatolian chronology according to comparing schemes], Istanbul.

Güvenç, Ayşegül Yılmaz.Başlangıçta Anadolu vardı [In the beginning there was Anatolia]. TÜBITAK Bilim ve Teknik, Eylül 2000.

Erinç, S. 1980, "Human Ecology in Southeastern Anatolia", The Joint Istanbul-Chicago Universities' Prehistoric Research in Southeastern Anatolia, ed. By Çambel, H., Braidwood, R.J., Istanbul, 73-81

Hauptmann, H. 1993, "Ein Kultgebäude in Nevali Çori", Between the rivers and over the mountains, Archaeologica Anatolica et Mesopotamica, Alba Palmieri dedicata, ed. by Frangipane, M. et al., Rome, 37-69

Hauptmann H. 1997, "Nevalı Çori", The Oxford Encyclopedia of Archaeology in the Near East 4, NY-Oxford, 131-134

Hauptmann, H. 1999, "The Urfa region", Neolithic in Turkey: the cradle of civilization, Istanbul, 65-87

Hauptmann, H. 2000, "Ein frühneolitisches Kultbild aus Kommagene", Gottkönige am Euphrat, ed. by Wagner J., Mainz, 5-9

Hauptmann, H. 2003, "Eine frühneolitische Kultfigur aus Urfa", Studies Presented to Ufuk Esin-From Village to Cities, ed. by Özdogan, M. et al., Istanbul, 623-637

[89] http:/arkeoloji.cukurova.edu.tr.

Luikart G., Gielly L., Ecoffier L., Vigne J-D., Bouvet J., Taberlet P. , Multiple maternal origins and weak phylogeographic structure in domestic goats, PNAS 98, 10, May 2001: 5925-5931

Özdogan, A. 1995, "Life at Çayönü during the Pre-pottery Neolithic period", Readings in prehistory: Studies presented to Halet Çambel, Istanbul, 79-97

Özdogan, A. 1999, "Çayönü", Neolithic in Turkey:the cradle of civilization, Istanbul, 35-65

Özdogan, M. 1995, "Yakın Dogu Neolitigi ve Güneydogu Anadolu: Elestirisel bir degerlendirme", Eski Yakındogu kültürleri üzerine incelemeler [Near Eastern Neolithic and Southeast Anatolia, Investigations on ancient cultures of the Near East], Metin Akyurt-Bahattin Devam Anı Kitabı, Istanbul, 267-80

Özdogan, M. 1999, "Concluding remarks", Neolithic in Turkey:the cradle of civilization, Istanbul, 225-36

Özdogan, M. and Özdogan, A. 1989, "Çayönü. A Conspectus of Recent Work", Paléorient 15/1, 65-74

Rosenberg, M. 1994, "Hallan Çemi Tepesi: Some further observations concerning stratigraphy and material culture", Anatolica XX, 121-140

Rosenberg, M. 1999, "Hallan Çemi", Neolithic in Turkey:the cradle of civilization, Istanbul, 24-33

Schirmer, W. 1990, "Some aspects of building at the 'aceramic-neolithic' settlement of Çayönü Tepesi", World Archaeology 21:3, 363-387

Schmidt, K. 1996, "Nevalı Çori: Chronology and Intrasite Distribution of Lithic Tool Classes. Preliminary Results", Neolithic Chipped Stone Industries of the Fertile Crescent, and Their Contemporaries in Adjacent Regions. Studies in Early Near Eastern Production, Subsistence, and Environment 3, Berlin, 363-376

Schmidt, K. 1998a, “Beyond Daily Bread: Evidence of Early Neolithic Ritual From Göbekli Tepe”, Neo-Lithics 2, 1-5

Schmidt, K. 1998b, “Frühneolithische Tempel. Ein Forschungsbericht zum präkeramischen Neolithikum Obermesopotamiens”, Mitteilungen der Deutschen Orient-Gesellschaft 130, Berlin, 17-51

Schmidt, K. 1999, “Frühe Tier- und Menschenbilder vom Göbekli Tepe –Kampagnen 1995-98. Ein Kommentierter Katalog der Großplastik und der Reliefs”, Istanbuler Mitteilungen 49, 5-21

Schmidt, K. 2000, “Zuerst kam der Tempel, dann die Stadt.Vorläufiger Bericht zu den Grabungen am Göbekli Tepe und am Gürcütepe 1995-1999”, Istanbuler Mitteilungen 50, 5-40

Schmidt, K. 2001, “Göbekli Tepe, Southeastern Turkey. A Preliminary Report On The 1995-1999 Excavations”, Paléorient 26/1, 45-54

Schmidt, K. 2002, “Göbekli Tepe-Southeastern Turkey. The Seventh Campaign, 2001”, Neo-Lithics 1, 23-25

Schmidt, K. 2003, “The 2003 Campaign at Göbekli Tepe (Southeastern Turkey)”, Neo-Lithics 2, 3-8

Schmidt, K. 2004, “Frühneolithische Zeichen vom Göbekli Tepe”, TÜBA-AR VIII, 93-105

Sentek, M. 2005, Cult Buildings in Aceramic Neolithic Southeast Anatolia: A case study of Nevali çori. Unpublished Masters Thesis, Middle East Technical University, Department of Social Sciences.

Voigt, M.M. 2000, “Çatal Höyük in Context: Ritual at Early Neolithic Sites in Central and Eastern Turkey”, Life in Neolithic Farming Communities, Social Organization, Identity, and Differentiation, ed.by Kuijt, I., 253-290

Yakar, J. 1994, Prehistoric Anatolia: the Neolithic transformation and the Early Chalcolitic period, Supplement No.1, Monograph series of The Institute of Archaeology, Tel Aviv University, Jerusalem.

Electronic sources

http://arkeoloji.cukurova.edu.tr
http://www.CANeW.org
http://www.urfali.de
http://www.TAYproject.com

List of tables

List of illustrations

12. The two-tier channel houses (300% enlarged detail of map, original scale 1/20m)
13. The three-tier channel houses (300% enlarged detail of map, original scale 1/20m)
14. House 13B: podium and pillars in the southern corner and bench and pillars (Hauptmann1993:47-48)
15. House 13B from the northeast: bench and niche with limestone head in the backwall of the niche (Hauptmann1993:52-53)
16. House 13B: pillars with carved arms
17. Limestone head with a snake relief and limestone torso (Hauptmann1993:59-62)
18. Limestone torso (h 0.37m) and limestone hybrid creature (h 0.23m) (Hauptmann1999:45-62)
19. Vulture-like bird and limestone composite sculture (Hauptmann1999:47-48)
20. Pillar with a female head on top, limestone frog-like human and limestone plate with stylized figures (Hauptmann1999:46-48)
21. Limestone bowl fragment with relief and miniature lion head (Hauptmann1999:50)
22. Map showing Çayönü
23. Buildings of Çayönü
24. Göbekli Tepe: Löwenfpeilergebäude and detail from the pillar (Hauptmann1999:51), pillar with reliefs of a gazelle, pillar with reliefs of a fox and a snake (Schmidt2003:4), pillar with reliefs of a fox, a wild boar and three birds (left), pillar with reliefs of a fox (Schmidt2003:6)
25. Göbekli Tepe: Schlangenfpeilergeäude: pillar with reliefs of wild cattle, fox and bird, bucrania on the narrow side (Hauptmann1999:50, Schmidt1998:38), pillar with reliefs of snakes (Hauptmann1999:54)