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Geographical coordinates to the nearest second
38° 22’ 58.00” N - 38° 21’ 47.43” E

Textual description of the boundaries of the nominated property

The nominated property comprises the mound of Arslantepe, which was scheduled as first degree archaeological conservation site in 1989 according to legal regulation and was then enlarged in 2010 by declaration of two adjacent parcels in the North as first degree archaeological conservation site. This boundary comprises the whole mound plot and surface, together with adjacent small portion of land where movable cultural objects dated to settlement layers the mound embodies were recorded.

The determination of the buffer zone boundary surrounding the mound was based on the boundaries of the 3rd degree archaeological conservation site, defined in 2018. The reference for this boundary line was basically the result of archaeological survey project conducted by MAIAO in 2005 in an area with approximate 500 m. radius around the mound. The main road axes where it was possible to follow within a-500-meter air-distance diameter was taken as basis to delineate the exact boundary line, while topographic thresholds and the cadastral parcel boundary lines in the southwest were also determinant. Residential buildings in Orduzu settlement area exceeding 500-meter diameter was left outside the buffer zone. The buffer zone boundary also overlaps with the management plan boundary, approved by the Ministry in 2018.

A4 (or "letter") size map of the nominated property, showing boundaries and buffer zone (if present)

See Pages 6-10

Criteria under which property is nominated (itemize criteria)

ii, iii, iv
Draft Statement of Outstanding Universal Value

a) Brief Synthesis

Arslantepe is a *tell* of about 4.5 ha in extension, and 30 m high, at the heart of the fertile Malatya plain, some twelve kilometres from the right bank of the Euphrates. The long sequence of the site covers several millennia at least from the 6th millennium cal BC until the final destruction of the neo-Hittite town - *Malitiya* according to Hittite sources, *Melid*, *Meliddu* or *Meliteya* in neo-Assyrian and Urartu sources - by Sargon II of Assyria in 712 BC. After a short neo-Assyrian occupation, the site was abandoned for a while, to be occupied again in the Late Roman age and subsequently in the Byzantine/Medieval time, when the site was used mainly as a cemetery.

Arslantepe shows in detail the complex processes bringing to the birth of the State and a sophisticated bureaucracy before writing, offering basic information on the early formation of this new society, which was at the basis of our contemporary world. The site, being located in a real geographic and cultural border, thanks to the intensive and varying external relations that have significantly marked its history, is also a testimony of fundamental events and changes in various and different civilisations of the Near East.

Arslantepe 4th millennium levels, in particular, show fundamental changes in human relations in the period of State formation, which involved Eastern Anatolian and Mesopotamian societies in the course of the entire 4th millennium BC, and is thus an exceptional testimony to the first emergence of State society in the Near East, original though related with the great 4th millennium Uruk civilization. This interchange of cultural traditions and social values resulted in the emergence of new social and political systems based on hierarchies and social differences, economic privileges and new power relations which led to new developments in monumental architecture, administrative technology and iconography of power in artistic representation.

The extensive and systematic excavations of the palace complex, full of material in situ, and the thorough researches conducted on them have allowed to reconstruct the characteristics of this civilization, the life of these first elites and their activities with incomparable details, enlightening the emergence of a centralised government controlling the economy of the population and exercising a central political authority. The finding of an exceptional group of metal weapons, among which the earliest swords so far known in the world, which were probably hanging on a wall in one of the building of the palace (and are now exhibited in the Malatya Museum), also points to the beginning of forms of organized combat as the prerogative of an elite, who probably flaunted it as an instrument of their new political power.

b) Justification for Criteria

(ii) to exhibit an important interchange of human values, over a span of time or within a cultural area of the world, on developments in architecture or technology, monumental arts, town-planning or landscape design

Arslantepe exhibits important human values in the development of an original and innovative architecture and monumental art, unique in the entire South-Western Asia and in the world in such an early period (the 4th millennium BC), whose exceptional state of preservation and conservation makes them enjoyable from the public.

In this context, the importance of Arslantepe is also derived from the plurality of cultural expressions manifested at the site as a result of both the intensity of interactions and
encounters between cultures and societies, and the uninterrupted succession of diverse periods and cultural developments, from the 5th to the 1st millennia BC, which have significantly transformed the Arslantepe society across time. Arslantepe indeed does not present a homogeneous culture from a single historical period, but it represents a strong expression of cultural diversity in the course of several millennia, which was primarily the result of the site’s location at the intersections of diverse civilizations, and at the crossroads of population movements, political and cultural contacts, transhumance and trade routes, all making Arslantepe a “cosmopolitan” economic and political centre where diverse communities lived together.

Co-existence of different cultural traditions are reflected in the architecture, seal designs, pottery and metal production, motifs and themes in wall paintings and decorations. The exceptional economic, artistic, architectural and cultural growth of Arslantepe reflects the multicultural vocation of the site, where different traditions met, producing original unparalleled developments and cultural expressions. The site is an example of the integration of diverse cultural components in the course of its long millenarian history.

(iii) to bear a unique or at least exceptional testimony to a cultural tradition or to a civilization which is living or which has disappeared

Arslantepe is an exceptional testimony to the first emergence of State society in the Near East, with an original form though related with the 4th millennium Uruk civilization. The extensive excavations of the palace complex, full of material in situ, has allowed to reconstruct the characteristics of this civilization, the life of these first elites, their activities and relations with the rest of the population with incomparable details, enlightening the emergence of a centralized government in a non-urban centre, controlling the basic economy of the surrounding population. The thousands of clay sealings found in situ in the Palace have allowed reconstruct a very sophisticated and innovative bureaucratic system for administering the movements of goods and the redistribution of staples as a compensation of labour. This is a unique testimony of the emergence of a state bureaucracy and accountability before any writing was invented, by using the seals as a document of the transactions performed and the identification of the authors of these transactions, in a highly developed and advanced administrative system.

The location of Arslantepe in an area outside the conventional borders of Mesopotamia, also shows that the mountainous regions surrounding the alluvial plains of the Tigris and Euphrates rivers have greatly contributed to the development of this momentous phenomenon, changing the traditional knowledge on the rise of State civilizations in the old world.

The Arslantepe Palace have been brought to light over a very large area (3500 square metres), offering a wide information on a very early and unique political experiment of central government and exercise of authority, where new codified forms of paying tribute to the rulers are attested. Meaningful and symbolic artistic expressions materialized in wall paintings and in seal designs, supported and displayed this new type of authority and its ideology of power. The archaeological evidence brought to light at the site have indeed shown that the Palace was the expression of a new type of secular power, not based any more on a religious/ceremonial consensus, which developed very early (around 3400 BC) at Arslantepe, in the Upper Euphrates region of Eastern Anatolia.

Storerooms full of vessels and seal impressions, now largely kept in the Malatya Museum and partly in the excavation house stores, also reveal the development of an original
culture and artistic expressions in the context of the new forms of political and economic power, controlling resources and labour.

A group of arsenical copper weapons, some with silver inlay, found in one of the buildings of the palace, and now exhibited in the Malatya Museum, shows the development of a sophisticated metallurgical technology and artistic taste. Among them, 9 swords constitute the earliest examples of this type of weapon discovered so far in the world, and testify the innovation of the forms of combat and a new political power exhibiting force.

All these anthropological and historical achievements write a new page in the history of early civilizations and are explained to the public in the Arslantepe Open Air Museum.

(iv) to be an outstanding example of a type of building, architectural or technological ensemble or landscape which illustrates (a) significant stage(s) in human history

The Arslantepe mud-brick architecture, due to its antiquity, advanced technology, and state of preservation, is also an outstanding example of a traditional building system representative of a millenarian culture shared by all Near Eastern communities, which documents a sustainable and successful human interaction with the environment, well in keeping with the local climatic conditions and easy to maintain.

The Arslantepe 4th millennium “palace” complex is an outstanding example of a new type of monumental public architecture for two main reasons: i) it is the earliest example of a public palace, substantially antedating the well-known 3rd millennium examples of the Syro-Mesopotamian areas and revealing a precocious development of new forms of secular power based on economic and administrative control; ii) This architectural complex of buildings, excavated over more than 3500 square metres, is very large and in an extraordinary state of preservation, with walls more than 2-2.50 metres high, original white plasters and wall paintings, unique in their subject and style. iii) Architectural innovative solutions are manifested in the agglutinative arrangement of the buildings linking them each other in a new planning and architectural/functional concept, terracing the mound slope to locate the buildings with different functions and symbolic role at different height in the complex.

c) Statement of Integrity

The large extension of the areas uncovered, its preservation and exhibition ensure the complete representation of the features and processes which convey the Arslantepe significance: the birth of the State and a new type of society marking a radical change in the history of humankind. The monumental palatial complex of the 4th millennium BC, in particular, has been widely exposed and preserved in perfect and integral state, with the original mud-brick walls, mud plaster and floors, internal features and paintings almost unchanged since they were brought to light in the course of more than forty years. The progressively expanding researches on the Hittite and Neo-Hittite period levels are in progress and can potentially bring to light new monuments of great historical and cultural value in the near future. All attributes that manifest proposed outstanding universal value lays within the proposed world heritage boundary which encompasses the whole mound plot and surface, together with adjacent small portion of land towards north where movable cultural objects dated to settlement layers the mound embodies were recorded. Neither the property nor its buffer zone suffered from adverse effects of new developments or inappropriate interventions so far.
d) Statement of Authenticity

All the buildings brought to light at Arslantepe and the Palace structures exhibited in the Open Air Museum in particular are totally original and no reconstruction has been made. The mud-brick walls and the whole 4th millennium BC architecture, including the internal mud features, plaster, wall paintings and floors are in the same condition in which they were found. The only interventions practiced on these buildings are minor repairing interventions made, when necessary, by using the same original materials, i.e. mud and straw tempering. The roofing system itself has not damaged the structures in any point, since it is supported by metal poles which do not stand on the walls, but directly on the floor, without perforating it and therefore even without damaging the underlying archaeological levels. The entire palatial complex has not been modified in any way and is protected maintaining its total authenticity. The landscape silhouette around the site is fairly preserved, as well.

e) Requirements for Protection and Management

The activities for the protection of the site derive from an agreement between the MAIAO (Sapienza Archaeological Expedition), the General Directorate of Monuments and Museums, the Malatya Governorship, and the Malatya Battalgazi Municipality. The whole nominated property and its buffer zone is under protection by the Turkish Legislation for Preservation of Cultural and Natural Property, Law No.: 2863. The palatial complex is already protected by a modular roofing system and it will be extended towards the newly excavated part of the palatial complex as a part of landscaping project prepared by the Ministry of Culture and Tourism and approved by Sivas Regional Conservation Council in 2017. Conservation Plan is now being prepared by Battalgazi Municipality in compliance with related legislation as to define building regulations and to control the settlement development within protected areas. A management plan is prepared by the collaboration between Ministry of Culture and Tourism, Battalgazi Municipality and Sapienza Archaeological Expedition and approved on the 8th of January, 2019. A management structure composed of a site manager, an “Advisory Board” and “Supervision and Coordination Board” is established by the Ministry.

Name and contact information of official local institution/agency

Ministry of Culture and Tourism,
General Directorate of Cultural Heritage and Museums:
Anafartalar Mah. Cumhuriyet Cad. II. Meclis Binası Yani 06110 Ulus Ankara /TURKEY
Tel: +90 312 470 80 00
Fax: +90 312 470 65 32
E-mail: kulturvarlikmuze@kultur.gov.tr
www.kultur.gov.tr
www.kulturvarliklari.gov.tr
1. IDENTIFICATION OF THE PROPERTY

1.a. Country (and State Party if different) : TURKEY
1.b. State, Province or Region : Eastern Anatolia, Province of Malatya
1.c. Name of Property : ARSLANTEPE MOUND
1.d. Geographical coordinates to the nearest second:
   38° 22’ 58.00’’ N - 38° 21’ 47.43’’ E

1.e. Maps and plans, showing the boundaries of the nominated property and buffer zone
   Annex 1.e.1: Location Map
   Annex 1.e.2: World Heritage and Buffer Zone Boundary Map
   Annex 1.e.3: Topography Map
   Annex 1.e.4: Ownership Map
   Annex 1.e.5: Land Use Map

1.f. Area of nominated property (ha.) and proposed buffer zone (ha.)
   Area of nominated property : 4.85 ha
   Buffer zone : 66.46 ha
   Total : 71.31 ha

2. DESCRIPTION

2.a. Description of the Property

2.a.1. The Nominated Property

   Arslantepe is a 4.5 hectares and 30 m. high archaeological mound (tell/höyük) dominating the plain and formed by the superimposition of settlements for millennia, from at least the 6th millennium BC to the late Roman period. It is located in the Malatya plain, 5 kilometres from the city centre and 15 kilometres from the Euphrates right bank.

   On the north-eastern edge of the site, the excavations conducted in the 1960s and 1970s brought to light a long sequence of levels from the first half of the 4th millennium BC (Period VII) to the Neo-Hittite phase (Period III). The upper levels were characterized by a superimposition of town-walls and gates of the Late Bronze Age (period IV) and the Iron Age (Neo-Hittite, period III). Levels of the earlier period in this zone belonged to Period VII (first half of the 4th millennium and consisted of common mud brick houses of rather small dimensions made of one to three rooms, in one case with a geometric painting on the wall alternating black and white triangles. Numerous ovens have been found, mainly outside the dwellings, and burials underneath the floors or close to the houses with simple and poorly
differentiated grave goods. Adults were buried in a flexed position lying on one side often with shell and bead ornaments; only in one instance was the body accompanied by a stone stamp seal while in another case the body was resting on two large cooking pots and had a set of two bowls and one beaker at its feet. Small children and infants were buried in pots underneath the floor of the houses.

Excavations in the western/south-western area started in 1972. Here again a long sequence of levels covering the 4th, 3rd and early 2nd millennia have been brought to light over large extensions. The earliest period thoroughly investigated so far is Period VII, Late Chalcolithic 3-4, 3800-3400 BC). In the higher part of the mound, on the top of the ancient hill, more recent excavations have brought to light imposing large buildings with mud brick walls over 1-1.20 m thick, covered with white plaster and often with paintings on the walls, belonging to several successive levels. The earlier construction phase so far excavated in this area consisted of fairly monumental buildings with traces of wall paintings and white-plastered mud brick columns lining the walls. The monumental character of these buildings, which stands out in comparison with the houses that have been excavated on the northeastern edge of the tell, their large size and ground plan, their topographic location as a separate district on the top of the mound, their proximity to public ceremonial areas, and the material unearthed there suggest that they were not for ceremonial use or administrative activities, but rather residences for the élites.
Close by these residences, immediately S/SW of them and near the western edge of the mound, the excavations have revealed two large and monumental ceremonial buildings probably two temples. The latest and most preserved one of them (Temple C - occupies an extent of more than 450 m$^2$), had a tripartite plan and was built on a platform made of huge stone slabs and mud layers standing on a series of parallel horizontal wooden poles. This platform raised the building above the surrounding surface.

Tripartite floor plan, which was only used in these buildings at Arslantepe, together with multiple recessed niches decorating the short sides of the central room, is reminiscent of Mesopotamian architecture. There are, on the other hand, also features of local, or at all events, northern traditions, such as the wall paintings in the northern niches of the main room and the particular sophisticated construction technique using wooden beams which laid horizontally under the stone platform. This combination of foreign and local features already reveals the originality of the Arslantepe development towards an early hierarchical society, within the general framework of a shared Mesopotamian cultural environment.

The layouts of the structures dated to period VII show a certain uniformity in planning choices: square massive structures were oriented along a north-east/southwest axis. The structural features demonstrate an evident ability to realize complex building concepts but they never attain the high standard of the following period VIA. The mud bricks are heterogeneous both if we compare those used in different buildings and different phases and inside the same walls. The foundations, except for the platform of Temple C, never achieve the grandeur of the foundations of the following periods, although several interesting solutions were employed.
Period VII (LC4). The ceremonial building (Temple C) with materials in situ.
Top: bowls upside down on the floor of the northern side room; Center left: niches on the northeastern corner of the large central room; Center right: cretula from the southern side room; Bottom: isometric plan of the building.

Fireplaces and benches and, in one structure of particular relevance (A582/A617), clay columns, which were possibly employed as decorative elements, characterized the internal arrangement of the structures of this period. Ovens were built against the walls (A849, A845 and A683) and in one case (behind the temple) they were oval and detached from the walls; the fireplaces, circular, were located in the middle of the rooms (A581, A582, A617, A646), while a large vessel was inserted in the angular bench of A682, probably as a fixed container for water. The building techniques, which were based on the use of earth, stone and wood, show walls which tended to be very thick in comparison to the available space.

However, we cannot exclude that the great thickness of the walls in specific monumental structures (such as the storerooms A850/A848/A842 and the columns building A582/A617) did also fulfil the need for a second storey. The structures are usually built one against the other and give the impression of a dense and close knit district, in which it is possible to identify a small alley with pebble and sherd floor (A626). The vertical sequence of the levels becomes evident in the excavations carried out in the western areas (E6-D6). In the sequence of the phases of period VII there is a level, which is characterized by two pebble floors and on which several light ovoid structures (A574, A564, A571 and A579) were built.
These structures were probably used for the production of goods or food, and their side walls were built with mud brick or clay and, in one case, with an internal wooden structure.

In the large central room of Temple C, measuring 18 x 7.20 m, containing a low and wide platform in a central position, meals must have been distributed in a ritual context, as evidenced from the presence of hundreds of mass-produced bowls (both flint-scraped and wheel-turned) found scattered on the floor and set aside in the lateral rooms, where they were found piled up and overturned, partly still in situ, and partly probably fallen from an upper storey, as they were ready to be used.
Mass-produced bowls for ceremonial redistribution of food found in situ on the floor of the side rooms in Temple C.

In the south-eastern room, there were also numerous clay sealings (cretulae) bearing seal impressions, which were also found in large amount discarded after use in a small room, originally a stair-room, in the second building (Temple D). The presence of cretulae and bowls in large quantities suggests that redistribution practices were performed in this ceremonial environment in connection with an initial process of centralising goods and labour, which was to develop fully at Arslantepe at the end of the 4th millennium BC.

Although the pottery from period VII reflected the general trend towards mass production, the use of chaff pastes, the lack of decoration and poor firing observed in the whole Late Chalcolithic Upper Mesopotamian environment, the shapes and the repertoire one again reveal a local cultural horizon typical of the Malatya plain, with links, also in this case, with the regions to the west of the Euphrates and the ‘Amuq plain. Potter's marks appeared, and may be interpreted as signs for recognising the workshops products brought to common areas for drying or firing.

These two temples were abandoned in the Period VIA (Late Chalcolithic 5, 3400-3100 BC) and to the E/SE of them, an imposing and completely new architectural complex was built along the slope of the mound, made up of agglutinated monumental buildings standing on several terraces and linked by corridors and courtyards, where various different public functions (religious/ceremonial, administrative, storage, reception) were performed.

In the complex, there were two small temples (Temple A and Temple B), which were much smaller than the older Temples C and D and only bipartite. Here, ceremonial activities seem to have been restricted to a limited number of persons, probably the ruling elites.

The religious aspect, though still important, seems to have somehow come down, whereas the public performances took place in a large courtyard where people gathered in front of a huge secular building standing in all its monumental spendour, where a probable throne platform has been recently discovered. This was a sort of Audience Building, where people paid tribute to the authority, staying outside the building in front of the ‘throne’
platform. This building communicated, on the backside, with the residences of high status persons, probably the ruler family.

The Arslantepe architectural complex of period VIA therefore appears as the earliest example so far known of a ‘public palace’, preceding by several centuries the famous Near Eastern palaces of the 3rd millennium.

The complex of period VIA was archaeologically investigated over a surface of more than 3500 squared meters.
All the structures belonging to this period were built on terraces obtained along the slope, using the different height for buildings with different functions and symbolic status. The structures were built along a NE/SW axis. Stone foundations in part emerging from the floor level, thick mud brick walls, wooden and clay roofs are the typical features of this architecture. Wood and stone were also employed for architectural details as window sills and thresholds.

The northern area, on the upper part of the mound, showed several structures built one next to the other, with bipartite plan. The installations, small finds and pottery found on their floors as well as the internal circulation of these structures clearly suggest a domestic function. The monumentality of the buildings and some particular objects however suggest they were the residences of the elites, probably the rulers of the community.

This northern residential complex, which was integral part of the Palace, was built on top of the Chalcolitic structures, which were abandoned in the previous period. Some of the remains were levelled and the foundations of the new buildings were constructed directly on top of the levelled walls. Other still standing walls were reused inside the new structures and influenced the alignment of the new sectors. This sequence shows that the passage from the Late Chalcolitic 4 to the Late Chalcolitic 5 period was marked by a short time gap. This is confirmed by recent C14 datings.

The tripartite model, probably originated from an Ubaid tradition, is only employed at Arslantepe in period VII for the two temple buildings. It is interesting to point out that this architectural model used for ceremonial/public buildings changed from a tripartite scheme to a bipartite one in the subsequent period VIA.
Period VIA: The southern public areas of the Palace from the South: The person walking along the corridor and gate gives an idea of the enormous size of the walls and buildings as they are preserved until today.

The buildings progressively added to the first core of the Palace (Audience Building, courtyard, Temple B and residences) extended over a huge area to the South and were linked by a NE/SW corridor sloping to the SW.

A covered stone drain was built under the clay floor of the corridor and drained the water from NE to the SW. Architectural features, internal circulation, small finds and pottery allow us to identify the functions of each building. Two bipartite structures built on the higher terraces may be interpreted as buildings with ritual function, to which only few high status people seem to have participated. A complex of smaller rooms that opened onto a courtyard appear to have been used as storerooms.

The functions of other not completely excavated or only partly preserved buildings remain unclear, but they appear to have had a representation function. Interesting in this respect is a room where a group of extraordinary arsenical copper weapons, spearheads and swords, were exhibited hanging on the back wall. The circulation was regulated by doors, courtyards, the main corridor that was one of the main internal routes, and minor side corridors. The storerooms opened directly to the corridor while the accessibility to the religious structures was regulated by a more complex and restricted circulation system. The complex is the result of a progressive addition of structures in the course of the last centuries of the 4th millennium BC.
During this enlarging process not all buildings were kept in use and some of them were reused with different functions. The walling of some doors prevented the access to rooms which were abandoned. Also, the entrance from the courtyard to the storerooms was closed and the rooms were not accessible from the interior of the complex. The main entrance of the latest temple (Temple A) was narrowed suggesting a possible shift in function.

The analysis of the buildings, which has taken into account the whole of field data, including the characteristics of the room filling and the materials collapsed on the floor, has allowed to better understand the architectural features of the buildings, their functions, and their process of destruction.

The existence of a second storey for example is proved not only by general architectural features, e.g. the thickness of the walls, but also by the stratified filling into the rooms, which sometimes showed remains of a second floor, and in some other cases showed concentrations of materials collapsed above the filling of the first floor.

The north-eastern building, so-called Temple B, is a 160 square meters bipartite structure with a large room and three smaller rooms on the eastern wing. The main large entrance provided access to a first passage room with red painted rhomboid figures on the walls and two windows opening onto the main room. The entering route led then to a second room in. The access the large main room was possible only passing through a small side corner room, with a mortar and a grinding stone embedded in the floor. Several installations were found in the main hall: a central fireplace in a rectangular plastered basin flanked by two cylindrical podia at its southern side. A main altar on the back wall and a second low altar/platform on the western wall suggest the cult function of the room, also confirmed by the presence of three small clay trays one of which is still standing close to the southern wall. The internal walls of this room were decorated with niches. Common people was remained outside looking at the ceremonies from the two windows in the side room. A corner stair-room was also found.

The sudden destruction by fire of the building and the extraordinary state of preservation of the materials has allowed us to reconstruct the last internal arrangement of the objects into the rooms, as well as the dynamics of the collapse. Thanks to a detailed
Documentation of the location of the broken materials on the floor, it was also possible to reconstruct the position of in situ materials and the dynamics of the timbers’ collapse on the floor. Each timber was sampled and analysed by the team of Prof. Sadori from the University of Rome la Sapienza revealing different types of wood (elm, ash tree, pine, juniper and poplar, etc.) and each recognised timber piece was dated with C14 method. Several burnt mud pieces found in the collapse revealed traces of grass mat and lattice so that it was possible to reconstruct the building technique of the roofing system.

The ceiling of both ground and upper storey were built with large timbers along the width of the rooms and thinner ones forming the frame of the ceiling. A grass mat was laid on top of this timber frame in order to support the clay plaster on top of it. Archaeological evidence and ethnographic analogies confirm this reconstruction. Some of these timbers embedded in the walls burned completely during the destruction of the complex, and some remains of them were preserved, as was the case of part of the wood door frame. Interestingly, local building technique in the near village of Orduzu shows the same features: timbers embedded in the walls, roofing timber frame resting on these embedded timbers, and shorter supporting timbers at the corners.

All these elements, such as the materials in situ, the collapsed architectural elements allowed us to propose a reconstruction of the main room in Temple B with the largest group of in situ pots. The height of the walls was calculated according to the length of the collapsed wall portions found in the filling.
Archaeological and architectural elements together allow a general view of the architectural volumes and provide us with very useful elements for understanding ancient building techniques and the function of the structures.

If we compare the two cult structures of level VIA, Temples A and B, we can point out several similarities as far as similar ritual procedures: same layout, same size, same accessibility, same internal circulation, same rhomboid or oval impressed and painted decoration in the entering room, same internal arrangement of the main room with altars along the walls and podia. However, when we compare the internal disposition of the materials and the different degree of architectural modifications, it is possible to emphasise a difference occurred during their period of use. In Temple B almost all pots, including storage jars, are located in the main area in Temple A by contrast, all containers and storage jars were located in the first and second entering rooms, somehow preventing the access to the main room. Moreover the entrance to Temple A was narrowed by adding two smaller walls, while the layout of Temple B did not suffer any architectural changes. It seems therefore possible that, while Temple B kept its original function, the function of Temple A possibly changed or it was heavily redefined.

In the storeroom complex brought to light so far, there is an interesting and pronounced difference in the function of the two main rooms. The larger, northern room was full of large vessels and was the actual storageplace; the smaller, southern room contained only three pithoi, two large jars and a few cooking pots, but there were hundreds of wheel made mass-produced bowls, probably used for the distribution of meals or food rations, and 130 cretulae bearing seal impressions. Dozens of beautiful restored vessels and the best preserved clay sealings are now kept and exhibited in the Malatya Museum.

The pottery was mostly wheel-made, fine, well-fired and pale in colour, and, once again, though being strongly influenced by the Mesopotamian models of the Uruk culture, retained original and typically local features. Mass production was restricted to conical wheel-made bowls, which were now mass-produced on the fast wheel. But, other categories of pottery were also wheel-made and appear more standardized and homogeneous than in the previous period. The disappearance of the potter’s marks is also indicative of this change towards a more “industrialized” manufacture. In addition to wares referring to the Syro-Mesopotamian Uruk world and a more ‘domestic’ hand made kitchen ware, a type of hand-made red-black ware, which had appeared at the end of period VII, also characterised the
Arslantepe period VIA repertoire; its shapes, aesthetic taste and manufacture techniques demonstrate connections with contemporary central Anatolian wares.

Some of the cretulae had fallen to the floor from the containers which they had sealed, while others were piled up in a corner of the room, probably temporarily set aside; some more had probably fallen from a collapsed upper storey. In this room, which was perhaps supplied from the northern room, the stored foodstuffs were probably redistributed in the form of meals to the workers employed by the central élites. The movement of goods was now controlled in an administrated and "secular" form, independently of any religious or ceremonial practices which had conversely characterised the earliest archaic forms of redistribution.
Thousands of cretulae were also found discarded in ordered groups in specific dumping places inside the palace, after being temporarily set aside and accounted (Some 2200 still bear the seal impression and the clear imprint of the sealed objects). Over 200 different seals with an extraordinary variety of beautiful designs and styles have been reconstructed from the impressions, through a long and thorough study of this unique assemblage of well-contextualized materials.

Period VIA: Cretulae and bowls from the palace storerooms

A significant role was also attributed to the wall paintings, which, in this case, were not only decorations of the walls but figurative motifs and actual scenes painted on the sides of doors and along the main corridor, transmitting ideologically important and highly meaningful messages to everyone entering the palace. The best preserved of these paintings are two almost identical stylised anthropomorphic figures associated with powerfully symbolic elements on both sides of what had originally been the door (subsequently walled in) leading from the access corridor to the internal courtyard of the palace, passing through the central room in the stores. Even more complex and interesting is the depiction of a scene with a sort of car (or plough?) drawn by two oxen and driven by a coachman, which seems to be moving in the direction leading out of the building, painted on the eastern wall of the inner corridor. This image, together with a similar motif (though completely different in style) on a seal impression, stresses the ideological importance of agriculture control by the Arslantepe rulers.

The wall paintings
The wall paintings in the Arslantepe Palace have been preserved *in situ* and can be still admired by the public visiting the monumental complex.

A group of arsenical copper weapons (nine swords, some decorated with silver inlay, and twelve spearheads) with a quadruple spiral plaque was discovered in one of the buildings of the Palace (Building III), constituting the first evidence so far known of the use of the sword. Other interesting metal findings have been uncovered in the Palace: an unusual arsenical copper door socket at the corner of a monumental entrance to another building, and various other objects made of copper, lead and silver, as well as sophisticated metal alloys.
Taken together, the buildings forming up this monumental public structure make up a unitary complex, which seems to have been developed following a kind of architectural planning in keeping with the increasing needs and specialised functions of the central institutions. This is the first example so far known of a real Palace, including both diversified public functions and the residences of the ruling elites.

The analysis of the sealings has shown that this elite was responsible for the collection and redistribution of food and a real class of bureaucrats have arisen to accomplish sophisticated administrative tasks, even before writing was invented.

The sudden and abrupt collapse of the Palace by a big fire around 3100 BC interrupted for ever this powerful centralisation process, and put an end to the political system related to it.

Period VIB1 (3100-3000 BC) was a phase of abrupt change and transition to a different type of society. Scattered wooden structures consisting of huts and fences for animals were built on the palace ruins by pastoralists settled seasonally at Arslantepe. These groups, which had perhaps already visited the Malatya plain in the previous Palace period, appear to have used the site as a kind of meeting point and political landmark in the region. A large mud-brick building, completely different from all the other structures, consisting of a large meeting hall and storerooms full of vessels and metal objects, was built on the top of the mound, exactly above the ‘Audience building’ of the ruined palace. The pottery used by these groups was exclusively hand-made red-black and burnished; it was made using identical firing techniques and according to identical aesthetic standards (black was always used on the most visible surfaces of the pots) to those of Late Chalcolithic red-black ware, but new shapes were adopted reminiscent of the repertoire belonging to the Transcaucasian culture. A few items of ceramics belonging to the old Late Uruk tradition have also been found in a special building of the VIB1 period, showing that in other areas of the site, or in the plain, the
sedentary population may have continued to pursue their traditional way of life and maintained their customs.

At the end of this period, a “royal” cist grave was found on the margins of the tell, with very rich funerary gifts, among which 75 metal objects, weapons, tools, vessels and jewellery in copper, silver, gold and various alloys. On top of the cist grave, 4 adolescents were probably sacrificed, constituting one of the earliest evidence of a human sacrifice.

Two of them, a girl and probably a boy, lay on the top of the tombstone, wearing copper pins and a diadem and hair spirals made of copper-silver alloy, similar to the items found among the grave goods buried with the ‘lord’ in the cist, which may indicate kinship or some other kind of close linkage with him. Two other individuals, once again very young and both female were found outside the area of the cist, with no burial goods, and may have been servants.
The materials show the association of items belonging to the pastoralist culture of Period VIB1, linked to the so-called Kura-Araxes cultural environment of the Southern Caucasus and NE Anatolia (Early Transcaucasian culture), with features related to the previous Uruk-like culture of the Late Chalcolithic. The mingling of the two traditions living side by side in the border area of the Upper Euphrates valley indicate that at Arslantepe the continuity in the local development was not completely interrupted after the palace destruction and the site is an exceptional testimony of these complex dynamics of cultural interaction between different communities and perhaps ethnic groups.

The cist tomb is still visible and will be part of the visit route. A reconstruction of the tomb and its funerary gifts is planned for the near future.

In the following Period VIB2 (3000-2800 BC) a rural village occupied the southern slope of the mound extending around a massive mud-brick wall surrounding an upper town, of which only a large open area was preserved. The residential structures of period VIB2 consisted of several functional units, with one to three rooms which fulfilled domestic functions grouped in blocks of neighbouring houses, separated by streets, paved with sherds, pebbles and slag fragments. The harvest was stored in each residential unit, probably on the roofs. The internal arrangement consisted of round fireplaces in a central position, which were similar in shape to the Late Chalcolithic ones, and of benches of different dimensions and shapes. Basins made of clay were probably used as containers for grains. The ovens, built against the walls, were located outside or in specific rooms. An open area or courtyard was used for communal slaughtering and metal smelting operations, attested by the presence in the courtyard of large crucibles, small mineral fragments and chilos of slag. This evidence of metal smelting carried out in the village, is an uncommon very important documentation of a very early metallurgical technology using sulphide minerals.
In Period VIB2 there was a revival of the wheel-made light coloured pottery of Uruk origin. This shows both a continuation of the earlier LC typological features, such as the necked jars with reserved slip decoration, and the appearance of a number of new shapes which produced a general change in the repertoire on the whole, with an increase in the number of small vessel shapes and a decrease of large pots suitable for central storage.

A new typology of houses and internal arrangements characterize the following periods; as a matter of fact, during the following periods VIC and VID (2750-2000 B.C.) the settlement was organized differently. Period VIC marked the largest cultural split recorded in the history of Arslantepe and the Malatya region, may be even ascribable to the settlement of a new population, thus marking the beginning of a new age. From period VIC onwards, indeed, the shape of the houses changed, as did the domestic equipment, with the appearance of new types of hearths and ovens, and the pottery production, which now only comprises two main hand-made classes of ware, one dark and one painted. External relations of the
Arslantepe community also radically changed becoming more restricted and limited to the Anatolian Upper Euphrates region, even though a few imported metallic ware items indicated there were still some sporadic contacts with the Syro-Mesopotamian environment.

These general cultural features and domestic customs as well as the external relations of the Arslantepe community developed with a remarkable continuity throughout the whole of the second half of the third millennium, in the Arslantepe Period VID, corresponding to Early Bronze III. But on this new cultural basis, starting from 2500 BC, a process of gradual sedentarisation and expansion of the settlement began, which achieved a degree of settlement agglutination and planning in the mature VID2 phase, around 2300 BC. We might in some respects define this new arrangement of the settlement as ‘urban’, not in the Mesopotamian sense of the term – as a large concentration of population in a vast and organic settlement comprising numerous specialised and interdependent social sectors –, but in the Anatolian sense of a compact, clearly defined and often agglutinated settlement, somehow distinct from its rural landscape.

We have no idea whether Arslantepe once again became a central place, as it had been in the 4th millennium, but it was certainly the largest and most important site in the Malatya plain. For a certain period of time there was probably still some interaction with seminomadic groups that frequented the plain, and who must have established relations of peaceful coexistence with these new ‘settled’ and farming communities. This may be inferred from the presence, from time to time, of round semi-subterranean dwellings, which were now much more evolved and carefully constructed, with plastered benches and small entrance steps, usually occupying open spaces and abandoned areas. However these visits came almost to an end, with a few isolated exceptions, in the mature VID2 phase, when the settlement had by now covered virtually the whole slope of the mound, with streets, squares and water channels, and the urban area was still more sharply distinct and separated from the rural hinterland by an imposing town walls with semicircular bastions, which now surrounded the whole settlement. The town-wall form Period VID2 is still visible at the entrance of the Open Air Museum of Arslantepe.

The defence walls, which seems to have become a characteristic feature of the EBIII sites in this region, may indicate that there was a certain degree of conflict between independent and perhaps competing centres, according to a typically Anatolian model.
The pottery of period VID2 was a development from the EBII tradition. It continued to consist of two main classes, both handmade, with an increased number of shapes and class varieties and with a few typical imports from the south. But it was now much more standardised and present over a wider territory that included both the Malatya and the Elazığ provinces.

This new organisation of the site and its relations with the territory remain more or less unchanged until the Middle Bronze Age (Period VA), albeit with new openings towards the northern Syro-Mesopotamian world. There would certainly have also been contacts with Central Anatolia, which had already existed in EBII. But Arslantepe seems to have remained on the border of the Palaeo-Assyrian trade routes, without being directly involved.

It was probably in the context of a new trend towards a the opening to other worlds, but in a community still characterised by what was a traditional Anatolian political organisation, that new intense relations with Central Anatolia were established during the Old Hittite Kingdom, in the second quarter of the second millennium (Late Bronze I, Period VB). The history of Arslantepe changed once again, and its central position in the region was re-established on new basis, as was its role in the international panorama of Late Bronze Age. The most obvious archaeological sign of this was the construction of a monumental fortified citadel in the northeastern part of the mound, whose town gates were no longer opened in a south/south-west direction, as it had been in the Chalcolithic and Early Bronze phases, but towards the north-east, looking this time towards the Euphrates, which became the new political ‘border’.
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The recent investigations have brought to light an interesting transitional phase following the collapse of the Hittite Empire in Central Anatolia and preceding the foundation of the Neo-Hittite kingdom of Arslantepe/Melid. In this phase, imposing structures, among which a huge town-wall 4 m. thick, made of a solid stone foundations and a mud-brick elevation, are testimony of an interesting continuity in the local political organization, leading
the site to take the role of capital of the Neo-Hittite kingdom. Close to this wall, which is preserved for a height of more than 3 m, two beautiful stone reliefs were found collapsed on the floor, that may have been part of a destroyed town-gate.

Fortification town-wall surrounding the citadel of the Early Iron Age

Stone reliefs found collapsed close to the Early iron Age town-wall. Exhibited in the malatya Museum.

All these evidences confirm the role of political central place that Arslantepe played across the millennia, interacting with the neighbouring political entities, states, and empires as a powerful counterpart. The extraordinary ivory plaque very recently found in one of the Neo-Hittite levels is evidence of the continuing participation of the site in the wide international relation network, playing a crucial role in the historical events of various periods, from the early formation of State societies in the 4th millennium BC to the expansionist struggles between empires in the 2nd and 1st millennia BC.
This flourishing history ended with the definitive destruction of the town by Sargon II of Assyria.

2.a.2. Buffer Zone

The mound is surrounded by the Orduzu village, made of dispersed houses among gardens. Some of the houses along the street bringing to the site are still mud-brick buildings.

The Malatya plain, on which the site of Arslantepe rises in an eccentric position in the town of Orduzu, is characterized by rainfall not exceeding 400 mm per year and high summer temperatures (average in July of 26°). Without taking into account the present irrigation practices, these values determine sub-desertic steppe conditions, which only locally give rise to oases due to the emergence of groundwater. According to the meteorological office of Turkey, the annual mean temperature of Malatya is 13.7°C, and the mean annual sum of precipitation equals 386 mm, with pronounced monthly maxima during the winter and spring season (1-41 mm, 2-37 mm, 3-51 mm, 4-58 mm, 5-47 mm, 6-18 mm, 7-2 mm, 8-2 mm, 9-7 mm, 10-38 mm, 11-45 mm, 12-41 mm) in the period 1960-2012.

Arslantepe lies in an extensional fault-bounded basin filled with a sequence of alluvial and lacustrine sediments of Neogene age. The immediate surroundings of the site are characterized by Neogene sequences of clay rich lake sediments alternating with sandy fluvial deposits. Both types of sediments contain carbonates; 700 m to the northeast, the remnant of an andesitic volcano probably of Miocene age forms the eastern flank of the small creek valley of the Orduzu Stream, which passes the tell of Arslantepe at its eastern rim.

According to Marcolongo and Palmieri, Arslantepe is situated favourably within the landscape because of a large hydrogeological catchment, supplying the site reliably with running water. Today, large parts of the area of the Malatya Plain are covered by sediments providing fertile soils for extensive apricot plantations. So far, the genesis and age of the young sediments exposed at the surface (Pleistocene or Holocene) have rarely been studied.

The presence of numerous springs both in the plain and near the mound of Arslantepe favours hygropilous and hydrophilous arboreal vegetation (poplars, willows, elms and ashes). This naturally watered soil allows the intensive cultivation of apricot trees in the plain so that now there are few remnants of natural vegetation.
Google Earth image of proposed world heritage and buffer zone boundaries
The south-eastern Turkish province of Malatya is ca. 100 km east of the Anatolian Diagonal, a famous hotspot for biodiversity. This Anatolian province is included in the Irano-Turanian phytogeographical region and is the richest of Turkey in endemic taxa. Among the endemic taxa of the province are species like Hypericum malatyanum Pesymen and Lotus malatayicus Poinert, whose names reveal their geographic origin. Various floristic studies have been carried out in the Malatya province in the last two decades. In the region of Malatya, steppe vegetation is dominant. However, in some areas Quercus shrubs are common. Among Quercus species are Quercus infectoria Olivier subsp. boissieri (Reuter) O. Schwarz, Quercus cerris L. var. cerris, Quercus brantii Lindl., Quercus libani Olivier, often accompanied by many shrubs of rosaceans, mainly ascribed to species of Crataegus, Rosa, Prunus, Pyrus and Cotoneaster. Gymnosperms are very rare, and represented almost exclusively by some Juniperus species, the most common of which is Juniperus oxycedrus L. subsp. oxycedrus. Many of these species have been used in the 4th and 3rd millennia cal.BC architecture of Arslantepe.

The village of Orduzu is a predominantly agricultural highland plain, approximately 900m asl, mostly cultivated with apricot trees. To the East of the mound is the small hill of Gelincik tepe, where an archaeological site of Early Bronze Age II has been identified and excavated in the late sixties by the Italian team. The immediate surroundings of the mound have only a few numbers of houses, except to the south, where the central part of Orduzu expands and where 5 story cement flat buildings have recently been built. A road passes just by the mound, connecting two sides of Orduzu and linking it to the centre of Battalgazi. The agricultural land surrounding the site is formed by a deep alluvial deposit, the date of which is still unknown, but most probably of historical age. For this reason, archaeological finds outside the mound are extremely difficult to identify, as they might be underlying metres of alluvial deposit. Special attention should thus be given to construction within Orduzu to protect the visual integrity of the mound and the landscape as impact to the site setting will inevitably come from changes in the surrounding landscape. Notwithstanding modern construction, Orduzu, even though very near to the large city of Malatya, still retains today most of its natural environment unaltered, because of the many apricot orchards that characterise it.

Since 1961 male generations of families of Orduzu have worked for the archaeological investigations at Arslantepe. This has brought economic income to the village, even though seasonal, and many of these people, who were otherwise farmers, benefit now from Turkish Social Security Agency (SGK) thanks to this job. Local Orduzu residents still today compose the workmen of the site, and it is in general the less wealthy that get recruited, as it is only those without a job that seek seasonal occupation, as that of an excavation. This has a great economic and social effect on village dynamics as the more marginalized people receive an income and at the same time become those with the most knowledge on the history and importance of the settlement. Permanent jobs too are covered by Orduzu residents, as those of site and excavation guardians.

While the estimated population within buffer zone is about 1000 people, the overall demographic structure within Orduzu neighbourhood can be read from the table below.

Table: Demographic Structure in Orduzu Neighbourhood

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ages</th>
<th>0-14</th>
<th>15-29</th>
<th>30-44</th>
<th>45-59</th>
<th>60 and above</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Man</td>
<td>1888</td>
<td>1695</td>
<td>1456</td>
<td>840</td>
<td>668</td>
<td>6547</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woman</td>
<td>1883</td>
<td>2938</td>
<td>1367</td>
<td>804</td>
<td>804</td>
<td>7796</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3771</td>
<td>4633</td>
<td>2823</td>
<td>1644</td>
<td>1472</td>
<td>14343</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Today social and economic conditions of local inhabitants are very different from the past. Most male adults leave the village for jobs in the city of Malatya and in other cities of Turkey, and only few of them have continued working at the excavation for decades, becoming very well trained and closely linked to the site. There are however many university students on summer vacation that come to their village and work at the site, getting financial support for their studies and maintaining, together with the memory and affection still alive in their families, the perception of cultural and economic relevance that Arslantepe has for the village of Orduzu and the Malatya province. The inhabitants of the village, thanks to their long-term involvement and closeness to the archaeologists operating at Arslantepe, have undertaken a process of appropriation of knowledge and are indeed today the best guarantee of protection of the site and transmission through generations of its cultural and historical heritage.

Many inhabitants of Orduzu work today in the city of Malatya and return to the village in the evening. Life in the village, thus, even though so near to the city, is mostly that of a slow running rural context.

Even though women too are more autonomous than before, they, together with children and elderly, are those that mostly keep alive the small town of Orduzu. Local craftsmanship is still visible in the streets, with bread making, boiling of wheat to make bulgur, wool cleaning, preparation of dung cakes for fuel, weaving, drying of vegetables, cutting of wood for winter needs, etc. These activities, that have disappeared elsewhere, at Orduzu still make up an important part of the life style and for this reason should be to some extent preserved, as they represent millennia old local traditions, archaeologically attested at the site of Arslantepe too. The promotion of such traditions furthermore would contribute to an economic as well as social development of women that are mostly those involved in these craft activities.

At the moment Orduzu has no touristic facilities and the local markets that sell beverages and food are about 500 metres from the site. The increase in popularity of Arslantepe will undoubtedly bring the development of facilities and thus economic benefits to the village and immediate region.

At the same time, Arslantepe has already inspired various economic and cultural activities in Malatya. Its name has been given to several shops and two of the symbols of Arslantepe - the 3000 BC metal swords found in the palace and the Hittite Tarhunza statue - have been printed on the apricot metal boxes sold by one of the most relevant apricot merchants in Malatya, Hasanbey.

Local artists too have been inspired by Arslantepe’s finds: the main square in Malatya, in front of the Governorate, is decorated with panels inspired to the iconography of the seals found in the Arslantepe palace (Fazıl Ercan is the artist who produced them). Finally, the winner’s statuette at the Malatya International Film Festival is that of Tarhunza, again, the Arslantepe Neo-Hittite king.

Since 2009 the Battalgazi Municipality organises an activity called International Caravanserai Meetings (Uluslararası Kervansaray Buluşmaları) during which conferences on the history of the region are given and the Arslantepe team is always invited to participate. Art laboratories (ceramics, metallurgy, and painting) are also organised and often inspired by the Arslantepe finds.

Recently, fashion shows were organized in the Caravanserai of Battalgazi and in Istanbul with clothes using fabrics designed with the motifs of the 4th millennium seals from
Arslantepe. Local awareness of the importance of the site is thus rather strong and constitutes a good base from which to start a broad and all-inclusive promotion program.

2.b. History and Development

2.b.1. Excavation and Research History

Excavations began in the 1930s, conducted by a French mission headed by L. Delaporte. By investigating the upper part of the mound, Delaporte unearthed the remains of remarkable Iron Age buildings, among which the so-called neo-Assyrian palace (7th century BC) and the well-known Lions' Gate (9th-8th centuries BC). The gate was flanked on either side by two lions statues carved from stone blocks with high relief bodies and round heads, which probably gave the name to the site (Arslan Tepe, namely, "Lions' Hill"), and had walls lined with stone slabs decorated with bas-reliefs, whose iconography and style were typical of the neo-Hittite kingdoms art. Inside the gate, there was a great royal statue that had been felled and probably intentionally concealed. The statue and the reliefs can be admired in the Ankara Museum of Ancient Civilizations. The Second World War put an end to the work of the Delaporte expedition and after a short and rather fruitless resumption of excavations in 1949-51 by C. Schaeffer, the French activity in the site came to an end.

In 1961 a new Italian archaeological project began at Arslantepe, originally under P. Meriggi and S. Puglisi and soon after under the latter alone, which is still being operating in the site, and has since become one of the major archaeological projects of Rome's La Sapienza University. After Puglisi, the excavations were taken over by Alba Palmieri and are now continuing under the direction of Marcella Frangipane. The Italian mission started investigating in the same NE zone where the French had previously worked, identifying a long stratigraphic sequence along the northern edge of the mound. There, a number of building levels dating back to the 1st and 2nd millennia BC - Neo-Hittite (Iron Age), Imperial Hittite (Late Bronze II) and Early Hittite (Late Bronze I) periods have been brought to light above unsubstantial Early Bronze layers with scanty architectural remains and a series of seven building levels with domestic structures from Late Chalcolithic 3-4 (4th millennium BC), built on the virgin soil. The sequence in this area ended with the remains of a late Roman occupation.

In the last 45 years the researches have focused on the prehistoric and proto-historic levels of Arslantepe, by operating in the W and SW zones of the mound, where the earliest settlements made up the original nucleus of the tell. There, a long and detailed sequence of Late Chalcolithic, Early Bronze, and Middle Bronze levels, from the end of the 5th to the beginning of the 2nd millennium cal BC, has been investigated over vast areas, supported by more than one hundred C14 dates.

Only recently, in 2008, excavations in the NE zone were resumed to once again investigate, by using modern research methodologies, the important phases in the late history of the site, between the Hittite "expansion" to the region, the subsequent dismemberment of the imperial system, and the crucial transitional periods during which the neo-Hittite kingdom of Malatya was formed. An imposing town-wall and two new beautiful reliefs, now exhibited in the Malatya Museum, have been found belonging to these transitional periods.
The ongoing programme of excavations is central to the better understanding and its history and significance. The following are ongoing operational issues and targets at the site:

**Research issues:** On the medium-long term the broad research questions that are leading excavations are:

- A further investigation of the origin of State and bureaucracy, through the enlargement and further understanding of the palatial area,
- The process of development of hierarchies, through the investigations of the earlier formative stages (5th and 4th millennia BC)
- The investigations of the earliest occupation of the site and the beginning of its history,
- The research on the forms and dynamics of the Hittite period occupation, inquiring into the relations between this “periphery” centre on the border of the empire and the political core of the Hittite state in Central Anatolia (Latye Bronze Age, 2nd millennium BC).
- Finally, the investigations of the transition and development towards the foundation of the Melid kingdom and its subsequent collapse, through the analysis of the final Late
Bronze and Early Iron Age levels (transition to and beginning of the 1st millennium BC).

1. **Practical seasonal targets:**
   - protection of trenches and outstanding architectural findings during the excavation period
   - restoration of archaeological finds,
   - annual monitoring of the state of preservation of the palace mud-brick structures
   - analysis, cataloguing and study of archaeological finds, seasonally brought to light and stored.
   - Interdisciplinary analyses of various find categories

2. **End of season targets:**
   - secure storage
   - handing over of inventoried objects to the Malatya Archaeological Museum
   - secure closing of the excavation and weather proofing as necessary.

3. **Long Term Considerations:**
   - protection and conservation of outstanding architectural remains and artefacts,
   - on-site conservation of monuments and special findings for display where necessary,
   - on and off site storage and
   - off-site display of finds.

2.b.2. **History of Arslantepe**

The presence of Halaf and Ubaid sherds found out of context in a recently opened excavation area on the lower western slope of the mound indicates that Arslantepe was certainly occupied as early as the 6th millennium BC. The earliest evidence so far well documented in the excavations, however, dates back to the end of the 5th millennium BC: Arslantepe period VIII / Late Chalcolithic 1-2 (4300-3900 cal BC). This period is documented by three superimposed building levels, which comprise domestic structures full of equipment for cooking food (numerous ovens, some very large in size, inside and outside the dwellings). The pottery recovered in these levels belongs to a local repertoire with connections in the areas of south-eastern Turkey to the west of the Euphrates (Oylum Höyük). This repertoire nevertheless, in general terms, form part of a wider typically post-Ubaid ceramic horizon which links - Eastern Anatolia to the various areas of Upper Mesopotamia in the initial phase of Late Chalcolithic (LC 1-2).
Stratigraphic section with some of the superimposed periods represented at Arslantepe
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phases</th>
<th>Arslantepe period</th>
<th>Absolute Chronology</th>
<th>Other contemporary cultures of the NE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Roman and Byzantine</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iron Age</td>
<td>II-III</td>
<td>1100-712</td>
<td>Neo-Hittite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late Bronze Age II</td>
<td>IV</td>
<td>1600-1200</td>
<td>Middle Hittite reign and Empire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late Bronze Age I</td>
<td>VB</td>
<td>1750-1600</td>
<td>Early Hittite reign</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Bronze Age</td>
<td>VA</td>
<td>2000-1750</td>
<td>Palaeo-assyrian colonies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Bronze Age III</td>
<td>VI D</td>
<td>2500-2000</td>
<td>Early Dynastic IIIb, Ur III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Bronze Age II</td>
<td>VI C</td>
<td>2750-2500</td>
<td>Early Dynastic II-IIla</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Bronze Age IB</td>
<td>VI B2</td>
<td>3000-2800</td>
<td>Early Dynastic I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Bronze Age IA</td>
<td>VI B1</td>
<td>3100-3000</td>
<td>Jemdet Nasr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late Chalcolithic 5</td>
<td>VI A</td>
<td>3400-3100</td>
<td>Late Uruk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late Chalcolithic 3-4</td>
<td>VII</td>
<td>3900-3400</td>
<td>Middle Uruk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late Chalcolithic 1-2</td>
<td>VIII</td>
<td>4700-4000</td>
<td>Early Uruk and Final Ubaid</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Period VII developed over a long period of time (Late Chalcolithic 3-4, 3900-3400 cal B.C.) and, among the periods found at Arslantepe, is one of the most extended settlement. Currently Period VII has been indeed identified at several locations on the mound and is characterised by a clear differentiation between functionally and symbolically diverse areas. It has been excavated in three separated sectors, each characterized by different functional features: The North-east, where common people houses have been found, the Western/South-western area, where elite and public buildings have been brought to light, and the Southern zone, where several traces of substantial structures dated to period VII have been identified immediately underneath the palace structures of period VIA. The latter, even though they had been badly destroyed by the palace itself, witness the extent of the settlement from north to south during this period.
The excavations carried out during the 60s on the North-eastern side of the mound, at the northern limit of the tell, brought to light at a lower elevation, just above the virgin soil in this area, six superimposed habitation levels belonging to Period VII, which consisted of relatively small mud-brick houses, with burials under the floors and domestic features, such as numerous ovens.

No less than four main phases dated to the Late Chalcolithic 3-4 were excavated so far in the upper part of the mound towards the West, where they were standing above a stratified deposit more than 15 m high. This area therefore appears as the core of the most ancient occupation of the site (from at least the 6th millennium BC), and the elevation reached during the preceding periods made this zone the summit of the ancient mound in Late Chalcolithic, both in periods VII and VIA. Here, the most monumental and imposing buildings have been significantly erected, forming a separate and well distinct elite district, made of substantial elite residences, and a ceremonial public area with two temples.

These temples (Temple C and Temple D) were built in the last phases of Period VII, adjacent to some long rooms and open areas probably intended respectively for craft activities and cooking practices related to the ceremonial performances. “Temple C” was the last building phase of period VII and was built near the western edge of the mound above a stone, mud, and wooden platform, terracing the slope and raising the building to the South and West, so that it was visible from the surrounding villages in the plain.

Economic and political centralisation reached its climax in the next period VIA (Late Chalcolithic 5, 3400-3100 BC). The two temples were abandoned and to the E/SE of them, an
imposing and completely new architectural complex was built along the slope of the mound, made up of agglutinated monumental buildings standing on several terraces and linked by corridors and courtyards, where various different public functions (religious/ceremonial, administrative, storage, reception) were performed.

The residential structures of the palatial complex, of fairly large dimensions, were built again in the uppermost area of the ancient mound, directly on top of the walls of Period VII structures, indicating that, although there was a radical change in the political organization and the consequent arrangement of the public area, an interesting continuity is observable in the residential sectors of both periods. Both the residential and public areas of period VIA expanded enormously, forming what we can now undoubtedly define as the first example of a Palace. Bipartite houses, similar in shape and dimension to two small temples included in the palace (Temples A and B), were erected in the northern sector of the complex, also invading the areas previously occupied by Temples C and D. They were however communicating with the public area of the complex through a door leading into a monumental building (Audience Building) opened onto a large courtyard where people had to gather to pay tribute to the authority.

The palace expanded over time towards the southern parts of the slope, showing a process of quick growth and development in architectural, political and economic terms.

The buildings of this huge monumental complex were added progressively from north to south, starting from the point where the Period VII remains have been brought to light. The development was determined by the need to fulfil new functions. A temple (Temple B), a roofed entrance corridor and the Audience building formed the first nucleus.

![Image of the earliest core of the Period VIA Palace (3400-3300 BC)](image)

In a second phase storerooms and other buildings were added to the south on both sides of the corridor that was extended by building both open and roofed new sectors. In this way, the alignment of the corridor’s axis slightly changed and a dumping space was obtained in the western wall of the corridor where thousands of clay sealings were discarded. In a third phase the southern limit of the corridor was reshaped by adding a gate chamber, and a second temple (Temple A) was added to the west of the complex.
It is possible to point out this sequence by analysing the architectural relationships among the units. Figure below, 1-2 shows the transition from the first to the second phase with the storerooms adjoined, on a lower terrace, to the southern temple wall. 3-4 show the last phases of the complex in its maximum extension, with the addition of the gate and Temple A.
From the second phase onwards the growth of the economic power of the ruling elites was completely accomplished. The adding of the store rooms, full and vessels of different size and function, as well as of mass-produced bowls and seal impressions (cretulae), together with the new dump of this administrative materials highlight that the new power was supported by a complex administrative organisation for the control of goods, mainly staple goods, and particularly food.

The in-depth study conducted for many years on these cretulae shows that hierarchically organised officials sealed and controlled different types of containers and storerooms, and through the accounting of sealing operations and the documentary value assigned to the cretulae, perfectly managed and temporarily recorded the economic transactions even in the absence of writing.

The discovery of arsenical copper weapons, door socket at the corner of a monumental entrance to another building, and various objects made of sophisticated alloys, including lead and
silver, demonstrate a high technological standard attained in metallurgy and, for the first time, the use of the sword.

According to the data at disposal so far, it is only possible to sketch the shape of the settlement in Period VIA, but the mound appears not to have been entirely occupied, being mainly the seat of the public and elite buildings.

In this period, Arslantepe probably had a major role as an intermediary centre in the vast network of interregional relations involving the Syro-Mesopotamian communities and those living in the mountain areas of Central-Eastern and North-Eastern Anatolia, while at all times retaining its marked autonomy. The development of a powerful system of centralised political and economic control on a site which never actually became “urban” in a real sense of the term shows that, whereas Arslantepe played an important and active part in the State formation process, in close connection with what was happening in the Mesopotamian world, it also followed its own specific, and different, development pattern, which was less deeply-rooted and stable than those in the highly urbanised environments, and rapidly collapsed.

A radical crisis overwhelmed the central institutions at the beginning of the 3rd millennium BC leading to the collapse of the Mesopotamian-type centralised system, and changing the course of Arslantepe's history for ever. Around 3000 BC a devastating fire completely destroyed the
palace, putting an end to the early-state organisation of Late Chalcolithic society. Relations with the southern areas and with Syro-Iraqi Jezira were weakened, while close links remained for a short time (during Early Bronze I) with the rest of the Upper and Middle Euphrates Valley; at the same time new relations were established and strengthened with the north-eastern Anatolian and Transcaucasian world.

One of the elements of instability and imbalance must certainly have arisen from the presence of pastoralist groups from the mountains who regularly visited the Malatya plain, probably supplying the palace with dairy products and metal. These groups do not seem to have necessarily come from far away, i.e. from the Transcaucasian regions, but may rather have been local transhumant people culturally linked to Early Transcaucasian groups moving around along the north-eastern highlands of Anatolia. When the crisis of the central institutions began around 3100 BC, they might have contributed to this crisis by rebelling, together with the local population, against the central institutions and driving an increasing need for defence. The finding of weapons in one of the Arslantepe palace buildings, with a combination of swords and spears for the first time ever, suggests the embryonic development of a military apparatus and the initial codification of organised forms of battle. Another indication of instability and conflicts was the construction, at the end of period VIA, of an imposing wall standing on a stone foundation, which seems to have surrounded the palace complex and certainly blocked the entrance road leading to the monumental gate.

Power began to change in character and to be imposed by force. But, without a solid basis of social legitimisation and without a compact urban structure based on a firmly-rooted system of economic specialisation, as was the case in Mesopotamia, a system of the kind we have described for Arslantepe was unable to withstand the impact of conflicts, clashing interests, and contradictions.

Two phases have been recognised at Arslantepe in Early Bronze I (3100-2800 cal BC, Period VIB), providing evidence of instability, and probably conflicts, which are clearly shown by a complex sequence of events occurred on the site for one or two centuries following the collapse of the palatial system.

In the first phase of EBI (period VIB1) the areas previously occupied by the public and élite buildings were abandoned, and probably seasonal settlements were built on their ruins by groups of transhumant pastoralists who may have been moving around the plain and in the surrounding areas even earlier, joining a vast system of relations with the Eastern Anatolian and Transcaucasian world, with which they shared customs and cultural features. The new groups lived in sub-quadrangular huts with wattle and daub walls coated with mud, separated by wide, open areas, often with rows of post-holes which may have been post fences, perhaps for stabling livestock.
At the beginning of period VIB2, new forms of power seem to have been re-established, perhaps as a result of the introduction of a new political system and a new leadership. On the top of the mound a stout 4 m thick mud-brick fortification wall built on stone foundations with internal buttresses surrounded the upper part of the settlement, like a sort of citadel, whose features are yet to be identified. A village developed at the base of the fortification wall covering the whole southern slope of the mound, outside the great wall, in the second phase of period VIB2, and comprised small mud-brick dwellings (with one to three rooms), with the floors covered with many kilos of charred grains (mostly barley, but also wheat and pulses), which had probably fallen from upper floors where the harvest had been stored before the fire destroyed the village. There were courtyards and open areas for activities performed in common, such as slaughtering livestock or working metals (smelting) (fig. ).
Further evidence of the co-existence of two different groups and two cultural horizons comes from the discovery of a rich tomb, the so-called Royal Tomb (T1), dated to about 3000-2900 BC, which seems to belong to the very beginning of period VIB2 or the transition from VIB1 to VIB2. This is an imposing stone cist built at the bottom of a large irregular 5 m wide pit, located on the edge of the village, outside the fortification wall. It contained an adult lying in a flexed position on its right side accompanied by a very rich assortment of grave gifts, including vessels, personal ornaments made of cornelian, rock crystal, silver and gold, together with a hoard of metal objects placed behind its back, comprising weapons, tools, and ornaments made of arsenical copper, copper-silver alloy, silver and gold. On the top of the cist were the bodies of four adolescents, probably sacrificed.
The ‘Royal Tomb’ (3000-2900 BC): The cist grave, head with diadem, and some metal gifts

The presence of the extraordinary burial, and the large fortification wall on the top of the mound, together with the disappearance of cult areas, cretulae, and mass produced bowls, indicate that a new type of power had been established, focusing more on defence and on the political and military role of the chiefs rather than on their capacity to centralise resources and labour, as had been the case in the fourth millennium.
Reconstruction of the excavated areas of the settlements from periods VII, VI A and VI B2.
In fig. 1a, the hatch highlights the possible extent of the period VII town.

Following the fire that also destroyed the period VIB2 settlement, a new and more radical fracture occurred, marked by a temporary abandonment of the site before it slowly re-emerged with wholly new cultural and political features. Between 2750 and 2500 BC (Early Bronze II, Arslantepe period VIC) the site was first re-occupied by nomadic groups which perhaps settled there on a seasonal basis, leaving light structures behind, as in the earlier period VIB1, but this time building a few scattered slightly sunken circular huts paved with mud and tiny pole structures, together with rubbish pits. It was only in a second phase in this period that a large terraced multi-roomed building was erected on the upper part of the tell. It seems to be a sort of cluster of large quadrangular rooms fitted with new types of domestic equipment, such as mortars sunken into the floors, horseshoe-shaped hearths, and articulated ovens with high cooking platforms and basins for ashes. This large isolated building, which also showed evidence of conservation and processing of agricultural products, may have housed an extended family or kinship group. All around this building, nomadic people continued to use the site, perhaps seasonally.

All the pottery was now handmade, and comprised two main classes of production: One black or dark burnished ware, originated from the red-black pottery belonging to the Transcaucasian tradition but this time using new shapes with new typological traits. The second
class was a light buff ware, painted with red or brown linear geometric motifs in a very distinctive local style (Gelincik ware).

The shape of the houses, the domestic equipment and pottery all show a radical cultural change in a period characterised by the fragmentation of groups and pronounced provincialism. Arslantepe may have remained as a benchmark site in the narrow territory of the Malatya plain, though no longer dominating it. From that moment onwards the history of the site and of its region was completely separated from the history of the Syro-Mesopotamian areas and of the southernmost region of the Middle Euphrates Valley, rather being an integral part of the Eastern Anatolian world.

During the Early Bronze III (Period VID, 2500-2000 BC), the settlements gradually spread to occupy the slope of the mound with increasingly planning and density, and were provided with roads, channels, courtyards and craft workshops. At the beginning of this period the groups with semi-subterranean round houses still continued to frequent the site mainly settling in free spaces or on the ruins of abandoned houses, but they gradually disappeared as the densely built-up settlement expanded to cover the whole of the mound. The EBIII settlements slightly changed across time as the houses and the quarters were continually refurbished and rebuilt, but there were no more massive widespread episodes of destruction. Arslantepe once again became the largest and most important centre in the Malatya plain, even though there is no clear evidence of any new political centralisation. Indeed, the evidence suggests that the organisation was based on small autonomous centres, increasing in number in the plain and on the surrounding hills. This new organisation was perhaps connected with new defence requirements, as showed by the construction of a huge fortification wall, with a stout semi-circular bastion, on the edge of the mound, surrounding the whole of the settlement.

The pottery, which was still handmade, very closely followed the tradition of the previous period, keeping the two main classes, black burnished and painted, and developing a number of typological traits, which became well characterised and full established in this period. A much denser, complex and standardised style of pottery painting emerged, closely related to similar
items produced in the Province of Elazig, which may have been the work of specialised craftsmen who distributed their products throughout the whole area. The finding of a metallurgist workshop with numerous moulds confirms that the craftsmanship was highly specialised.

Most of the evidence from the Middle Bronze Age (Period VA, 2000-1750 BC) has been found in the south-western area of the mound, exhibiting very close continuity in terms of the architecture and material culture with the Early Bronze III settlements, on which they were directly superimposed. The buildings were seriously damaged because of their closeness to the top of the mound and due to later terracing operations. The architecture was therefore limited to only a few structures preserved in good condition, among which one dwelling comprising a single large square room with an imposing central horse-shoe shaped double hearth and the remains of what was probably a weaving loom, suggested by the discovery of dozens of clay loom weights piled up in the NW corner of this room. The pottery also partially indicates continuity with the previous period, even though new classes of wheel-made ware now appeared, some of which indicate that contacts had been resumed, albeit sporadically, with the Syro-Mesopotamian world.

The political breakup that is thought to have occurred in the territory of Malatya and Elazig in the second half of the 3rd millennium may have created favourable conditions for the cultural and, later, expansion eastward of the Hittite state during the 2nd millennium BC. The effects of this influence may already have begun to be felt in the Early Kingdom period judging from the fact that, in Late Bronze I (Period VB, 1750-1600 BC), in the Arslantepe defence system made of earthen walls, a town gate was built, flanked by two bipartite quadrangular towers, which was highly reminiscent of similar central Anatolian gates. The entrance to the town now pointed in a N/NE direction, namely towards the Euphrates, unlike what had occurred in pre-protohistoric times; and this new arrangement of the fortification systems was to remain unchanged throughout the imperial Hittite and neo-Hittite periods, although the town became smaller and there was a slight shift of the gates westwards.
citadel, which mainly extended in the N/NE area of the mound, was probably destroyed after the collapse of the empire but, between the end of the 2nd and the beginning of the 1st millennia BC, a new huge town-wall was built, to which a town gate, now destroyed, might have been attached. This gate was probably decorated by stone reliefs, judging from the finding of two of them collapsed on the floor linked to the wall.

This transitional period, during which the local rulers probably took over the government of the town and the region, prepared the foundation of the new autonomous Neo-Hittite kingdom of Melid/Malatya (Iron Age, Period III), when Arslantepe was once again to flourish as the capital of this kingdom with the construction of new imposing buildings, among which a large pillar hall and the famous “Lions Gate”, entirely decorated by typical stone reliefs. The settlement increasingly took the form of a small citadel, a seat of political and administrative power, while the existence of a lower town is still unknown at the present state of research.

Even though the remains of minor occupations dating back to the late Roman and Byzantine age have been uncovered, it was the destruction of the neo-Hittite town by Sargon II of Assyria in 712 BC that put an end to Arslantepe’s prosperity and centrality.
3. JUSTIFICATION FOR INSCRIPTION

3.1.a. Brief synthesis

(i) Factual Information

Arslantepe is a tell of about 4.5 ha in extension, and 30 m high, at the heart of the fertile Malatya plain, some twelve kilometres from the right bank of the Euphrates. The long sequence of the site covers several millennia at least from the 6th millennium cal BC until the final destruction of the neo-Hittite town - Malitiya according to Hittite sources, Melid, Meliddu or Meliteya in neo-Assyrian and Urartu sources - by Sargon II of Assyria in 712 BC. After a short neo-Assyrian occupation, the site was abandoned for a while, to be occupied again in the Late Roman age and subsequently in the Byzantine/Medieval time, when the site was used mainly as a cemetery. Arslantepe is the largest mound in the Malatya plain and it has always been the dominant centre in its region in the entire course of its millenarian history.

Its long history, which has been largely brought to light over 60 years of excavations by the Italian Archaeological Expedition of the Sapienza University of Rome, has been thoroughly analysed and understood thanks to a rigorous extensive and stratigraphic excavation methodology. Arslantepe today very clearly reflects the history of the whole Eastern Anatolia and neighbouring regions in the course of several millennia. It moreover writes a new page in the history of the Near Eastern proto-state civilizations as it shows in detail the complex processes bringing to the birth of the State and a sophisticated bureaucracy before writing, offering basic information on the early formation of this new society, which was at the basis of our contemporary world. The site, being located in a real geographic and cultural border, thanks to the intensive and varying external relations that have significantly marked its history, is also a testimony of fundamental events and changes in various and different civilisations of the Near East.

A second crucial period in the site’s history was the 2nd millennium BC when Arslantepe interacted with the Hittite State and culture, being strongly influenced by it. Relations with central Anatolia had already been established previously, from the late phase of Late Chalcolithic, but it was with Late Bronze I and, more evidently, Late Bronze II that Arslantepe was included in the cultural and political orbit of the expanding Hittite Empire, which pushed as far as the banks of the Euphrates. This gave rise to a new political change heralding in another important stage in the history of Arslantepe, which led to the foundation of the Neo-Hittite kingdom of Melid, of which the site was the capital (beginning of the 1st millennium BC).

(ii) Synthesis of qualities of Arslantepe

Arslantepe was the protagonist in the primary process of formation of the first centralised societies, as an emblematic case to illustrate not only the history of this site and the events that took place there, but also the general processes that these events revealed, and which have changed the history of humanity; founding processes of great interest to all those who wish to acquire an understanding of their own past and to catch its links with the present.

The data obtained so far support the interpretation of the emergence of a strong centralised power at Arslantepe as the outcome of a long-term process generating a hierarchical society which, like the Mesopotamia’s, may be defined as an ‘early state’ society, while-differing from Mesopotamia’s in terms of its own specific features. The most remarkable phenomenon documented by archaeological investigations in the 4th millennium palace at Arslantepe is the extraordinary growth of the administrative organisation, which attained levels of sophistication and complexity wholly similar to those of the major Late Uruk Mesopotamian centres, even
though some of the innovative elements found on those sites (hollow spherical *bullae*, often associated with tokens, numerical tablets, and, only in the city of Uruk-Warka, pictographic tablets) were absent. The study of the vast amount of administrative materials from Arslantepe has revealed that the *cretulae* by themselves were a most effective means of controlling the movement of goods, practised in northern Mesopotamia since the neolithic and fully developed by the early central authorities in the 4th millennium. What the exceptional evidence provided by the clay-sealings at Arslantepe does reflect is the presence of an administrative system that is almost identical in its basic structure to the Mesopotamian one, probably even in the details, but at the same time it shows a long tradition of local elaboration, well evidenced in the formal aspects. Several features are, for example, peculiar to the Anatolian site as structural (e.g., the formation of a state in absence of real urbanization or the internal organization of architectural spaces) and symbolic elements (e.g., the figurative repertoire in the glyptic and wall paintings).

Arslantepe is therefore presently a unique site for representing in detail the history of the earliest formation of politically centralised societies, the origin of sophisticated bureaucracy with a hierarchy of officials, in other words the State, by showing a very well preserved complex of public and monumental buildings constituting the first example of a public Palace, unique for many centuries, which has no comparison, as for its features and state of preservation. The Palace is moreover the first example in the world of this type of architectural and functional organisation of power, which antedates of six-seven centuries the well-known 3rd millennium palaces of the Near East. There are a few 4th millennium sites in Mesopotamia with monumental public architecture of the same period and representing the same processes. These are however almost completely destroyed or deteriorated, due to the construction of dams such as Habuba Kabira and Jebel Aruda in Syria, or to abandonment and, more recently, war struggles and conflicts, such as the well-known large cities of Uruk-Warka in Iraq, Susa in Iran, or Tell Brak in Syria. Furthermore, the latter two sites have only been very partially brought to light as far as the 4th millennium levels are concerned, and in no case there was so well preserved architecture on such a vast extension as in Arslantepe. Arslantepe is moreover the only ‘Early State’ centre showing the birth of this crucial phenomenon in Anatolia and the regions north of Mesopotamia. Arslantepe is the only site that today can still narrate and visually display this phenomenon in its whole picture, through its extraordinarily well preserved architecture, rich material culture and artistic expressions (seals, ceramics, metals, and wall paintings). The geo-cultural importance of the site is also that this out-of-the-ordinary evidence has been brought to light in the Upper Euphrates region in SE Anatolia, an area once considered peripheral to the main core of the urbanization and State emergence phenomena.

Visitors can learn on the spot the history of one of the fundamental socio-political and economic changes in the history of human societies, have the experience of physically entering and walking through the rooms of a still standing mud-brick monumental palatial complex through the centuries and millennia along a path that lead them on a knowledge route, from the phenomena that have preceded the foundation of the Palace creating the conditions for its development, to those that have followed its collapse, laying the basis for the successive flourishing of the town in the Hittite and Neo-Hittite periods (2nd and 1st millennia BC), till its definitive destruction by the Assyrian king Sargon II in 712 BC. Moving up the hill to the north-eastern zone of the mound, the visitors can indeed observe the material remains of the later phases of the Arslantepe History.

The site has been moreover protected with an innovative roofing system and is the object of continuous monitoring and conservation procedures by the team of restorers of the Italian Expedition. Thousands of archaeological objects narrating this history are kept in the nearby Malatya Museum and many of them are exhibited and visible to the public.
As a result, the property is considered to be of outstanding universal value as a cultural property for the following reasons:

- **Arslantepe** is the only known site outside Mesopotamia testifying the origin of State, the beginning of bureaucracy and political centralisation, and is the only site where this process is documented in detail and can be observed and experimented by visiting its extraordinarily well preserved material remains,

- The most ancient public Palace in the world has been discovered at Arslantepe (3300 BC), which is extraordinarily well preserved, making the site the only known place in the world in which so ancient mud-brick monuments can today be visited and admired in all their monumental splendor.

- Preservation of the monumental palatial buildings is unique, with mud-brick walls still standing more than 2 m. high and wall paintings and plastered decorations are still preserved in situ and can be admired on the walls.

- The most ancient metal swords known today worldwide have been found in the Arslantepe palace and are visible at the Archaeological Museum of Malatya.

- Thousands of sealings found in situ in different contexts inside the palace testify the birth of a complex centralised administrative system for the control and distribution of goods and show one of the most varied, original, and breath-taking iconographic repertories of its time.

- In historical periods Arslantepe was the capital of a Neo-Hittite kingdom dominating its region and interacting with the neighboring states, evidence of which are monumental buildings, statues and reliefs,

For all these reasons the site and its monuments need to be sustained and protected, improving as much as possible the fruition of its great historical and cultural value by a wide public.

**3.1.b. Criteria under which inscription is proposed (and justification for inscription under these criteria)**

(ii) to exhibit an important interchange of human values, over a span of time or within a cultural area of the world, on developments in architecture or technology, monumental arts, town-planning or landscape design

Centralized economic and political systems frequently tended to expand in various geographic and historical contexts, as somehow intrinsically “necessary” for their reproduction. Particularly in their formative phases, such systems were mainly based on the accumulation of staple goods and labor, which, together with redistribution practices, constituted the basis of their way of operating. The first forms of central government must therefore have tended to expand to take in the territories and/or the productive components from which they derived their resources and their social base, while at the same time attracting the populations gravitating around them, by offering them guaranteed outlets for their products and easier conditions for trade and mutual relations.

The Uruk period (4th millennium BC) in the broader Mesopotamian world was a time in which these forms of centralized political, economic, and administrative systems underwent primary development, sometimes accompanied by a remarkable process of urbanization. In connection with these developments, there is a great deal of archaeological evidence of the
expansion of interregional relations on a large scale, encompassing a very wide area, running from the Persian Gulf to the mountains of Eastern Anatolia and beyond. But this expansion was not only the result of the drive to expand the developed south toward a less urbanized north, as some have suggested but it was the result of the general trend in every center to interact very closely with other populations, who were somehow interfering in their sphere of action.

One very clear and well-documented example of the complexity and variety of these relations is the case of Arslantepe, in the Malatya plain, in the Anatolian Upper Euphrates. This site was a regional center lying on the borderline between different cultural worlds and geographic environments and, in the latter half of the 4th millennium, established wide-ranging relations with culturally different components. This center developed a powerful early “palatial” centralized system in this period, similar, in its basic functioning, to the contemporary Mesopotamian systems, with which it shared a number of general structural features, although with a great deal of highly original traits of its own. But at the same time, there is good archaeological evidence indicating that Arslantepe also established wide-ranging relations with the Anatolian mountain peoples, probably specialized pastoralists. It was with these latter groups that complex dynamics of interethnic relations were established.

Although Arslantepe in periods VII-VIA shows strong indications for an indigenous identity, several features may appear to be as a result of Uruk influence. There are certainly many elements of Mesopotamian origin in the structural and systemic organisation of Arslantepe’s 4th millennium society, as well as in some more specific aspects, such as the use of a tripartite plan in the construction of an imposing ceremonial building, Temple C, in Period VII. But the archaeological information unearthed on the site suggests that these were elements that had already been wholly assimilated and modified to meet certain essential features and needs of the local community.

Temple C has a typical Mesopotamian tripartite layout: it had at least four entrances to the central room, making it widely accessible to the public, a characteristic stairwell in one corner, and multiple niches in the internal walls of the main central hall. This ceremonial public building is the only construction that has been found so far at Arslantepe with a tripartite plan, perhaps indicating that the Mesopotamian model, probably acquired in the Ubaid period, had been selectively retained only for the use of public buildings and for structures with a high symbolic value. But, in addition to this floor plan and the multiple niches of non-local origin, the walls were decorated with red and black paintings, which have also been found in private buildings, in both the élite and the common houses, and belong to an Eastern Anatolian tradition, also found on other sites of the Upper Euphrates region, such as Değirmentepe in the final Ubaid period and Norşuntepe in LC 21.

In addition, the major finding of level VIA is a ‘temple/palace’ complex in which there is a long connective corridor, the walls of which are painted with lozenge shapes in red on white. Some of the rooms within the complex also are painted with geometric and stylized figures in black, red and white. One wall of the ‘temple/palace’ complex had a painting with a scene. In this painting two figures of stylized bulls face one another, and are surrounded with a decoration of red and black concentric lozenge shaped triangles. This theme has commonly been found on typical Uruk seals, and one example of this seal was also found at Arslantepe. The Uruk seal theme was reshaped, integrated into Arslantepe’s styles and re-contextualized within a temple/palace complex. Arslantepe elites borrowed a southern glyptic theme and re-interpreted it according to their own visual-expressive ways through applying it to a new medium: wall-painting. The depiction of a scene from an Uruk seal on one of these temples’ wall points to an iconographical mentalité. As far as we know, this kind of representation is not found in southern Mesopotamian temple walls.
The composition of the population controlled by the central structure of Arslantepe which, despite its extremely small size was at all events the main and the largest centre in the whole Malatya region, was probably not homogeneous and unitary and may have included several different cultural and possibly ethnic groups. This is suggested by the settlement patterns in the plain, the various pottery groups, and the glyptics recognised in the thousands of sealings found in the period VIA palace, which show extremely varied iconographic and stylistic patterns within a clearly local general framework.

The relationship between the early state center of Arslantepe and the itinerant pastoralist groups from the mountains was, therefore, one of inclusion of different ethnic and cultural components with a specific economic vocation into a centralized political and economic system, integrating them into the central economy, and making them an essential part of its modus operandi. The recurrent presence in the plain of nomadic or semi-nomadic components with an Eastern Anatolian/Transcaucasian culture, which became clearly visible after the collapse of the palace at the beginning of the 3rd millennium, might suggest they were already there in the previous period, and formed part of the population controlled by the period VIA huge administrative apparatus. In this case, it was the local component that was the “strongest,” but the integration process in economic and organizational terms did not lead to the loss of the identity of any of the related groups. The symbols of their diverse identities continued to be exhibited, and the “foreign” groups, while probably perceiving the importance and usefulness of their relations with and belonging to the powerful political center, also seem to have retained a high level of self-awareness. Here, the relationship brought about development was an important element in the growth of the centralized system at Arslantepe. The lack of cultural integration was, however, a source of weakness, which ultimately undermined the solidity of this nascent early-state organization.

The fact that many of the changes observable in the archeological materials at Arslantepe in LC5 relate to different cultural environments, thereby suggesting that the external relations of the site expanded widely in various directions. (i) Pottery production radically changed, borrowing models, tastes, and partially repertoire and manufacturing techniques from the Late Uruk culture of the Mesopotamian world, while at the same time preserving certain aspects of the local tradition, which set apart Arslantepe from the southern centers. (ii) As in all Mesopotamian-related regions, the mass production of bowls used for the redistribution of food developed enormously both in number and technology, but, unlike Mesopotamia, the Arslantepe potters used only the wheel to produce items that, once again, while resembling the southern so-called flower pots, possess distinctive features of their own. (iii) A profound change occurred in livestock rearing, with an extraordinary increase in sheep and goats, particularly sheep, which accounted for almost 80% of the domesticated species whereas pigs disappeared almost completely. This change shows the dominance of specialized pastoralism probably linked to the use of byproducts (dairy products and wool), even though the finding of substantial quantities of bones disposed of as food waste shows that these animals were also widely used for their meat. (iv) There was the appearance in the pottery repertoire of a class of hand-made red-black ware of a type that was completely alien to the local traditions and very closely resembled the contemporary pottery of north-central Anatolia. (v) These changes were accompanied with a significant development of metallurgy, with the production of weapons and highly sophisticated objects using copper-arsenic “alloys” obtained from polymetallic ores, which are abundantly found in the mountains of Northern and Northeastern Anatolia and Southern Caucasus.

The first two changes are to be ascribed to the intensified relations established with the Mesopotamian world, of which Arslantepe seems to have been a partner interacting on an equal footing. This privileged relationship certainly led the local elites to emulate their southern neighbors, probably considered to be very powerful, without, however, undergoing any kind of
cultural, and certainly not political, submission, and without any evidence of ethnic cohabitation and mixing. The other three new features were related to each other and all together suggest a different type of interaction with the communities of the northern mountainous regions. These communities must have been transhumant pastoralist populations moving along the mountain range to the north of Arslantepe, perhaps coming down on a seasonal basis to the Euphrates Valley, where they could certainly find outlets for their products and interesting opportunities to relate to the emerging early-state centers. These centers must have interacted with them from a position of strength, steering relations to their own benefit and incorporating the pastoralist groups into the centralized economic system.

Specialized sheep pastoralism was certainly also a distinctive feature of the whole urbanized Uruk world. But the fact that, on the one hand, Arslantepe was not an urban context, and, on the other, the extraordinary increase in sheep rearing on the site was accompanied by the emergence of red-black ware, alien to the local tradition and much more similar to north-central Anatolian examples, suggests that the development of sheep rearing on the site was due to the involvement of external pastoralist groups coming from the north, who were incorporated as a specialized productive component into the economic system governed by the Arslantepe elites. The great development of metallurgy at the end of the fourth millennium and the close similarity between the metal objects found in the palace and those produced by the pastoralist communities, which would subsequently settle on the site after the collapse of the centralized system at the beginning of the 3rd millennium BC, may moreover suggest that the pastoral groups frequenting the palace, coming from zones rich in metal ores, also brought metals and their technologies.

This belonging to a widely shared system involving the whole of Mesopotamia, and particularly the northern regions, while at the same time being detached from it for specific features, can also be seen in the Arslantepe period VII pottery production more generally. For, while there was a prevalence of the very widespread chafffaced ware, almost always produced on the slow-wheel and badly fired (probably in the open air), numerous particular features set apart the style of the Arslantepe period VII pottery. Among these, we can mention the very common use of red slip—which is more common than in other contemporary sites and regions—and the shapes of the majority of the vessels, whose profiles were partly shared with the regions to the west of the Euphrates as far as the ‘Amuq plain (including the Malatya, Gaziantep and Antakya provinces), but were quite different from the contemporary Jezira pottery of the so-called LC 3-4.

The fairly sudden appearance of a Central Anatolian-like red-black ware and its very different manufacture technology at the end of LC4, and its regular, although minor, use in the palace buildings, almost exclusively in the form of table vessels (for eating and drinking) and high-stemmed bowls (for ceremonial use), suggest that other groups producing this pottery frequented the public area on a regular basis. The cooccurrence of this ware and the wheel-made light-colored pottery in the Uruk tradition, both emblems of different worlds and with a powerful symbolic-identity value, reveals the desire of the different groups operating in the palace to keep their identity visible, evidencing a certain degree of self-awareness and suggesting a multiethnic composition of the population present in the Malatya plain at the end of the 4th millennium BC. Integrating different productive components of diverse origins and cultures into a centrally governed economic system did not therefore wipe out the identity, features, and recognizability of the groups concerned, which, on the contrary, seem to have emphasized their diversity also in practices performed inside the buildings in the palace complex. Moreover, the great variety of the iconographies and styles shown by the seal designs used in the palace, which is unique in Near Eastern glyptic assemblages, suggests that these varied motifs and styles probably identified various components that, through them, represented themselves and their different identity in the administrative environment.
The Period VIA pottery assemblage could also be said to symbolize these complex relationships. A meaningful example: at Arslantepe, Uruk bevelled-rim bowls are rare and not found *in situ*, whereas the local wheel-thrown truncated conical bowls are mass produced. Moreover, these are the most common open containers in the VIA period repertoire and appear to be only similar to the so-called “flower pots,” a Late Uruk wheel-thrown container less commonly attested than the ubiquitous beveled-rim bowls.

On the other hand, the highly developed form of centralised organisation found in the Period VIA palatial complex was accompanied by the production of new types of pottery imitating Uruk models, and by evident references to typically Mesopotamian elements and iconographies such as the presence of cylinder seals -even though they are a minority-, which in some cases moreover reproduced scenes and motifs from the southern repertoire. There therefore seemed to have been a very high degree of imitation.

This difference is not merely a matter of form. The mass production of beveled rim bowls may also have involved a manufacturing process in which unskilled potters could easily have shaped the bowls in a simple mould, such as a hole in the ground, while producing wheel-thrown vessels as simple as the Arslantepe VIA bowls, on a complicated tool such as the fast wheel, would have required a certain level of skill and experience. This does not imply that Arslantepe pottery production is more specialized than that at Late Uruk sites; it does rather suggest that the scale of pottery production and consumption at the Anatolian site is at a more restricted level: potters could satisfy the demand for mass-produced bowls and there was no need to involve unskilled workers. Most importantly, the mass production of bowls was not a novelty at Arslantepe; on the contrary, these objects appear to be part of a long-lasting local tradition, which began during the previous period VII. However, it is not only a general link with the widespread mass production of bowls that is characteristic of the Late Ubaid and Late Chalcolithic communities, especially in the northern areas of Greater Mesopotamia. The link between period VII and VIA mass-produced bowls is a cogent and strong one.

The presence of extremely elaborate and original glyptics, the vast majority of which consisted of stamp seals, and the sophisticated complexity of the administrative system, however show that the Arslantepe people were completely familiar with those methods and procedures, probably due to a long tradition of using seals in the northern regions, which was recently confirmed by the finds in the Neolithic village of Sabi Abyad, on the Balikh. The mass production of bowls, all of them wheel-made, and without any evidence of bevelled-rim bowl type artefacts, indicates, on the one hand, a purely local development of this technology, suggesting strong local roots in the centralisation phenomenon found at Arslantepe; on the other hand, the needs that underlay this production are clear indication of the involvement of the site in the wide-ranging phenomena linking all the regions of Greater Mesopotamia.

The same can be seen in the glyptics: the poor presence of cylinder seals, which are already well documented in Mesopotamia from LC4, and the peculiar art expressions in the prevailing iconography of the seal designs, as well as the absence of counting and written tablets, clearly point to a local original development of the administrative practices and related craft production flourishing at Arslantepe, whereas the general administrative system was a peculiar sophisticated development of shared practices and economic strategies in the whole Mesopotamian areas in the 4th millennium BC.

Wide interactions with various cultures and civilisations and at the same time an outstanding originality in the local interpretation and accomplishment of the phenomena are both the hallmarks of the Arslantepe history.
(iii) to bear a unique or at least exceptional testimony to a cultural tradition or to a civilization which is living or which has disappeared

In the earliest phases of its history, in the Chalcolithic Period, Arslantepe had close links with the Syro-Mesopotamian world with which it shared many cultural features, structural models, and development trajectories. But in the early centuries of the 3rd millennium BC, far-reaching changes took place in the site which halted the development of the Mesopotamian type centralized system and reoriented Arslantepe’s external relations toward eastern Anatolia and Transcaucasia.

Arslantepe probably had a major role in period VIA, as an intermediary center in the vast network of interregional relations involving the Syro-Mesopotamian communities and those living in the mountain areas of central-eastern and northeastern Anatolia, while at all times retaining its marked autonomy. The development of a powerful system of centralized political and economic control on a site that never actually became “urban” in any real sense of the term shows that whereas Arslantepe played an important and active part in the state formation process in connection with the Mesopotamian world, it also followed its own specific, and different, development pattern, which was less well entrenched than those of the highly urbanized environments.

In the last three centuries of the 4th millennium BC (Late Chalcolitic 5 – Period VIA), when one of the earliest palace organisations in the Near East developed in the site, with indications of pronounced economic and political centralisation of goods and labour, an extremely sophisticated administrative system and political control over the region, which can be regarded as a local early state society, developed at Arslantepe, with its own architecture, pottery, glyptic, and metallurgy, but it certainly interacted with the Uruk world and other Anatolian communities.

Arslantepe period VIA shares numerous features with Late Uruk culture. The centralization and redistribution of primary goods (essentially food) and the control of the labor force are the critical elements that may allow us to associate, at an analytical level, Arslantepe with the Late Uruk horizon. Indeed, it would appear that the settlement shrank further, leaving an even larger area as the public centre. The process seems to have been again very similar to what happened at Tepe Gawra VIII. The absolutely predominant use of stamp seals over cylinder seals, the iconography with a clear majority of animal figures, and the styles indicate that the glyptics of Arslantepe is fully part of the northern Syro Mesopotamian tradition, so well represented at Tepe Gawra.

As we are dealing at Arslantepe with a much more developed and powerful centralised system, not very different from what we observe in the large urban sites of Late Uruk Mesopotamia, the absence of urbanisation and the different kind of relations with the territory appear, however, even more clearly to have been the expression of a radically different model of a centralised hierarchical society. Besides, numerous iconographic and stylistic elements reveal the presence of original characters, suggesting a strong local development of this craft activity. Even where the figures are clearly inspired by the southern Mesopotamian repertoire, such as *tete-beche* opposite animals or figures of sack and pot bearers, these themes are re-elaborated according to the local taste and repertoire.

The increasing need for ever larger quantities of bowls during the course of the 4th millennium is a common feature throughout the Mesopotamian world and was probably linked to similar economic and social needs, which themselves were related to a similar organisation of the society. The distribution of food and the use of commensality as a means of acquiring prestige were also typical of the formation of the early centralised structures throughout the whole of Mesopotamia. But, the technological and organisational response to these needs that in Mesopotamia had given rise to the widespread manufacture of *bevelled rim bowls* appears to have been wholly original in the case of Arslantepe: there were no bevelled rim bowls, and no moulded
bowls in general, but the response was an enormous increase in the use of the “slow wheel” and the traditional northern technique of quickly refining the vessels by scraping their bottom, which had started with the so-called Coba bowls at the end of the 5th millennium BC. And the spreading of slow-wheel manufacture rapidly brought to the use of fast-wheel.

At the end of the 4th millennium BC (Late Chalcolithic 5 - period VIA), the centralization process at Arslantepe led to the construction of a monumental complex of public and elite buildings in which a highly developed and sophisticated administrative system was used to control economic transactions, essentially based on the accumulation and redistribution of food to large sections of the population. Archaeological findings and the detailed and interdisciplinary study of the material remains have shown that in that final part of the 4th millennium, there was an increasing distinction of the élites and their activities, evidenced clearly by the distinctive character of their symbolic and religious acts, which now became more private and were probably intended to further emphasise the privileged and distinct status of the highranking figures. The sphere of their public “business” -that is to say, the economic-administrative sphere- was by then more clearly separated from the religious/ceremonial sphere and was managed in a more “secular” way, involving a very large number of individuals.

The data suggest the existence of an already advanced process of centralising staple products in Arslantepe VII, as in Mesopotamia, which alone was able to allow such an intense and widespread redistribution of food. However, the intensity of redistribution practices in the palace, confirmed by the discovery of the well-known dump of thousands of discarded cretulae that had been ordered after a kind of accounting procedure shows that redistribution had become a systematic practice, perhaps even a daily one, and was no longer an occasional and ceremonial event. This increasing separation between the “private”/religious and the “public”/ economic affairs of the élites is also shown from the physical and functional contiguity of Temple B with the residences of these élites, which, as in the previous period VII, were located on the upper part of the mound, immediately to the north of the palatial complex, and of Temple B in particular. This radical transformation of the public area from the temple architecture of the previous period into a full-fledged multifunctional palatial complex, which also comprised the residences of the elite, was an extraordinary and somehow precocious achievement in the process of state formation.

The shift from a very complex hierarchical community to the “palatial period” is visible in several aspects. While public structures of period VII are characterized by tripartite planned temples, the following period VIA illustrates bipartite planned temples. The physical change in their forms reflects their change of accessibility by its public population from “secular” to less “secular”. That is to say, even though meal consumption took place in both periods VII and VIA, it appears to have been performed in a different secular way in period VIA. This increasing separation between the “private”/religious and the “public”/ economic affairs of the élites is also shown from the physical and functional contiguity of Temple B with the residences of these élites, which, as in the previous period VII, were located on the upper part of the mound, immediately to the north of the palatial complex, and of Temple B in particular. This radical transformation of the public area from the temple architecture of the previous period into a full-fledged multifunctional palatial complex, which also comprised the residences of the elite, was an extraordinary and somehow precocious achievement in the process of state formation.

We are therefore dealing with a society that perhaps grew on the basis of an early sharing of elements with the Mesopotamian world and, on that initial basis, seems to have developed its own autonomous growth towards a social, economic and political system that was parallel and structurally similar to that of its southern neighbours. In Southern Mesopotamia, however, although it was the probable locus of the first cities and states, the whole system is nowhere clear as it is at Arslantepe.
The archaeological record from the palace period at Arslantepe clearly indicates that ceremonial buildings and residential units housed socially restricted feasting events, which are quite different from work related food distributions in the storerooms in terms of setting, scale, paraphernalia and food/drinks consumed. It is possible that in this society, the organization of diacritical feasts was the key to stress the prestige of the elites. The same detailed lens cannot be applied to the record from the southern alluvium due to the limited well contextualised LC 5 remains, and hence due to the lack of reliable datasets on different behaviors in different contexts. The set of weapons retrieved inside Building 3 at Arslantepe indicates that war/display of military power may have been another strategy for gaining prestige. This can be applied to some extent also to the LC 5 societies of southern Mesopotamia, given the evidence of violence on visual media.

The lack of a real concentration of population in the main political-administrative centre is, also, one of the most prominent features of the type of centralised society found in the Malatya Plain, distinguishing it from the classical Mesopotamian model and evidencing a form of Early State without "urbanisation".

One crucial aspect of this diversity was the absence of urbanisation in the Malatya plain and throughout the whole of the Upper Euphrates region, a feature which conversely had characterised the growth of political and economic centralisation in the true Mesopotamian sites. “Urbanisation”, where it does exist, together with a large agglomerated population living in the same settlement, leads to the development of a high level of specialisation among the various social and economic components both within the main centre and between it and the countryside, on which the centre closely depends; it thus creates a strong structural interdependency between the different parts of society, founding a system which would be difficult to reverse. The lack of a real urban structure at Arslantepe and the likely basic autonomy of the population living around it in their daily life must have been one of the reasons for the weakness of the site’s centralised system.

The Arslantepe VIA settlement was even smaller than in period VII, and its surface appear to have been largely occupied by public and elite structures. Given the huge numbers of people coming to the palace, as evidenced from the large number of seal designs and therefore of seal owners affixing them in the palace area, and given the intensity of the redistribution and administrative operations performed there, as evidenced from the very large number of *cretulae* (2191 fragments with identifiable impressions) found in various administrative spaces in the palace relating to the various steps in the bureaucratic procedures (administered redistribution of meals; temporary conservation of the *cretulae* as documents of the transactions; their controlled discarding after the accounting phase), we may infer that large sectors of the population operating in the palace did not live at Arslantepe itself, but lived in scattered villages or hamlets in the surrounding plain. They must therefore have retained certain independence in the way they managed their daily activities, despite being subject to strong pressure from the powerful central institutions. Indeed, the rural and pastoral components seem to have maintained a dominant place in the Malatya region, as is probably also evidenced by the preliminary results of the surveys recently carried out in the plain. And no specialised quarters or craft activity areas have yet been found at Arslantepe, either in the elite residence zones, although products such as sophisticated metal objects certainly indicate the presence of specialised craftsmen.

The absence of urban growth can be at least partly explained by the environmental conditions of the plain and these mountainous areas of Anatolia in general, which offer good quality arable land, but are hemmed in by the mountains, with the result that using the technologies available at that time, agricultural production could not be expanded sufficiently to support a large unproductive urban population, as had been the case in the large Mesopotamian cities and plains.
There was almost certainly another cause: the different structure of Anatolian society, which was traditionally much less hierarchically articulated and probably less internally specialised. In this society, the increasing centralisation of staple products and primary activities by the paramount chiefs had enabled a very powerful élite to develop, which became increasingly more detached from the rest of the population, and whose role was probably not sufficiently legitimated by an intrinsically hierarchical social system (as must have been the case in Mesopotamia) which would have created the perception that the differences were to be accepted as “natural”. A process of “secularisation” which took place very early and developed more rapidly than in other Mesopotamian regions, probably linked to a different relationship existing between the ‘chiefs’ and their population, based on the different structure of the Arslantepe society. The acceleration in the process which had led to the early formation of the palatial system at Arslantepe was also probably one of the reasons leading to its collapse.

A process of State formation, therefore, had started, in which the central authority was probably exercised over a number of small settlements (sometimes even scattered hamlets) in the region surrounding the site.

If we mean by ‘early state’ the centralised government of the community based on a) an institutionalised power, b) the use of sophisticated and complex instruments of administrative control to manage the centralised resources, c) a system of delegated tasks and powers to an emerging class of bureaucrats/administrators fully representing the ‘central institution’ and managing public goods and activities on its behalf, d) circuits of circulation of surpluses which are at least partially detached from the ideological-religious and prestige sphere, then Arslantepe VIA can be considered to be a form of, albeit embryonic, early state society.

Arslantepe period VIA was therefore a crucial moment in the formation of a system that had a great deal in common with a state organisation, even though it was probably not a mature form of state in the sense of a governmental structure politically controlling a territory with formal boundaries, institutionalised laws, and real armed forces.

(iv) to be an outstanding example of a type of building, architectural or technological ensemble or landscape which illustrates (a) significant stage(s) in human history

Arslantepe’s presumabley paramount function in the region as early as the Late Chalcolitic (period VII in the site sequence) is shown by the presence of a monumental area with a huge mud-brick building standing on what must have been the top of the ancient mound.

The large “palatial” public area of the end of Late Chalcolithic 5 (Period VIA) at Arslantepe, with its original ground plan organisation and decorative elements, and with its slight but significant references to the Mesopotamian model, was formerly interpreted as a local elaboration of Late Uruk public architecture and its functions. The compact and agglutinative ground plan of the building assemblage, the painted or impressed decorations on the walls, the bipartite shape of the two temples and the residences included in the architectural complex, are all elements emphasising the originality and the local features of the monument. However, the fact that the two temples at any rate have a large extended rectangular room flanked by small rooms along one side, niches in the walls, podiums, and platforms/altars, all seemed to indicate that the development was largely based on an emulation of the Mesopotamian organisation occurred in the previous Period VII.

On this basis of shared experiences, a completely new and innovative system developed around 3400-3300 BC. The concept itself of a palace, including both the residences of the rulers and elite families and the public spaces where different functions (religious, ceremonial, political, economic, administrative) were performed in various architecturally diversified buildings, all
linked together in a single whole, is completely new and precedes the spread of these types of public architecture and related political systems of many centuries. The functional distinction of the public spaces (temples, storerooms, courtyards, representation buildings) created new architectural models in connection with new forms of performing the various activities. Among these, the creation of specific places for discarding seal impressions as documents used for accountability before writing was invented is an original and very significant aspect telling the story of the birth of bureaucracy. The architectural language aimed at receiving and displaying new types of political performances and new official expressions of the exercise of authority through codified places where the rulers gave ‘audience’ to the people and the people paid tribute to them (all still visible) is totally unprecedented. The architectural monumentality of the building that was the seat of these new secular ceremonies indicates the cultural and political importance attributed to these practices and their material expressions, which spread in the Near and Middle East, and beyond, much later, featuring new architectural models.

This architectural complex meets the criteria for being called a “palace”, not in the sense of being simply a royal residence, but as a complex architectural spaces in which, besides the residence of thigh status people, probably the rulers, multiple public activities (religious, economic, political and administrative) were performed by the central institutions in distinct but interconnected buildings. The Arslantepe Palace represents, in this sense, a first creative experiment of a totally new public architecture, organization of public spaces, artistic representation of power, innovative development of an old administrative system, new forms of paying tribute to the authority.

The Palatial Complex so far best represents the history of the construction activities at Arslantepe. The excavated portion covers a surface of about 3500 m² along the south-western slope of the mound and shows sectors that differ from a functional as well as an architectural point of view, with a bipartite arrangement predominating both in cult buildings and in residences. The complex was planned as a single whole including two small temples, storage rooms, courtyards, corridors, representative buildings, administrative areas, and elite residences where the leaders of the community lived and performed religious, economic, political and administrative activities.

The exceptional preservation of this monumental earthen architecture dated to 3400-3100 BC (5500 years ago) considering its antiquity and the fragility of the material and the conservation practices applied to protect them make the Arslantepe 4th millennium Palace the only place in the world where the public can actually enter such a kind of monument and learn in situ the history of one of the basic stages in human developments. The extraordinary preservation of the ‘Audience Building’ and its internal clay features, consisting of a “throne” platform and two standing bases in front of it, as well as its visibility from the very entrance to the palace already guaranteed in old times, visually manifest the architectural and political creativity of the Arslantepe 4th millennium palatial system, making it well perceivable and fully accessible to the public visiting the site. The plenty of materials that have been recovered in these buildings by means of systematic excavations, attest, even in detail, the centralisation of the economy, the control of labour, and, more in general, the ways of operating of one of the earliest State systems.

Furthermore, Arslantepe shows a long historical succession of periods and events covering several millennia, from the 5th to the 1st millennium BC, which are a reflection of the history of the most important civilizations in the Near East and the Mediterranean, from the first centralised societies to the empires. Therefore, the site of Arslantepe, as a whole, is unique because it shows not only the earliest example of a public Palace known so far, but also a unique example of tangible, well preserved, and in-depth material expression of the rise of this new political institution in the 4th millennium BC. The history of Arslantepe indeed ends much later with the establishment of a new political centre under the influence of the Hittite Empire, its following breaking up and the creation of the kingdom of Melid.
The huge mud-brick town-walls of the Hittite and post-Hittite periods (2\textsuperscript{nd} and early 1\textsuperscript{st} millennia BC), one of which has been brought to light for a height of almost 4 m. and is still visible, together with the famous stone bas-reliefs decorating the superimposed town gates, today visible in the Ankara Museum and, as for the new findings, in the Malatya Museum, all together constitute another magnificent expression of the architectural and artistic creativity of Arslantepe.

\section*{3.1.c. Statement of Integrity}

The large extension of the areas uncovered, its preservation and exhibition ensure the complete representation of the features and processes which convey the Arslantepe significance: the birth of the State and a new type of society marking a radical change in the history of humankind.

Original buildings, wall paintings, stone reliefs and archaeological materials used by the ancient populations in their daily life have been systematically brought to light and preserved as found.

The monumental palatial complex of the 4\textsuperscript{th} millennium BC, in particular, thanks to a long and careful excavation and conservation activity, has been widely exposed and preserved in perfect and integral state, with the original mud-brick walls, mud plaster and floors, internal features and paintings almost unchanged since they were brought to light in the course of more than forty years. Visitors can hence experience the original archaeological monuments and the history they tell them by walking in the places where these historical events occurred.

The palatial complex has been uncovered over about 3500m\textsuperscript{2} with walls preserved up to 2,50-3 metres in height, still covered by the original white plaster and with red and black wall paintings accurately brought to light, protected and maintained in situ. These paintings discovered in the entrance room to the stores, close to doors, and in access areas of the Palace show figurative and symbolic elements that have been done in the early phase of use of the buildings, around 3400-3300 BC. They have then been covered by re-plastering the walls when the function of the rooms has changed. All these events, including the number of plaster layers that had covered the paintings in a second phase of use of the rooms, have been carefully analysed and preserved in situ, and are shown to the public.

The ongoing research and preservation activities by the MAIAO (the Italian archaeological expedition at Arslantepe conducted by the Sapienza University of Rome) annually bring to light, restore, protect and exhibit new parts of such a unique monument and investigate other levels belonging to other periods in the long Arslantepe history as well. The progressively expanding researches on the Hittite and Neo-Hittite period levels, for instance, are in progress and can potentially bring to light new monuments of great historical and cultural value in the near future.

Architecture, walls paintings and fixed installations are constantly monitored by specialized restorers, whilst the objects found have been all regularly restored by a professional team and issued to the Malatya Museum, where they are presently kept.

All attributes that manifest proposed outstanding universal value lays within the proposed world heritage boundary which encompasses the whole mound plot and surface, together with adjacent small portion of land towards north where movable cultural objects dated to settlement layers the mound embodies were recorded. Neither the property nor its buffer zone suffered from adverse effects of new developments or inappropriate interventions so far.
3.1.d. Statement of Authenticity

All the buildings brought to light at Arslantepe and the Palace structures exhibited in the Open Air Museum in particular are totally original and no reconstruction has been made. The mud-brick walls and the whole 4th millennium BC architecture, including the internal mud features, plaster, wall paintings and floors are in the same condition in which they were found. The only interventions practiced on these buildings are minor repairing interventions made, when necessary, by using the same original materials, i.e. mud and straw tempering. The visitors can hence feel and fully enjoy the perception of the original architecture without any disturbing element, except for the roofing made to protect the very fragile mud structures.

The roofing system itself has not damaged the structures in any point, since it is supported by metal poles which do not stand on the walls, but directly on the floor, without perforating it and therefore even without damaging the underlying archaeological levels.

The roofs are very high, they are conceived to respect the different height of the individual buildings, are planned to be modular, and leave the air come in from the open sides and the spaces between the individual roofs. This latter point (air circulation) is very important for the preservation of the mud structures since it avoids concentration of humidity and the formation of molds and vegetation. These spaces, together with a few sectors in the roof covered with special glass, allow illuminating the structures with natural light coming more or less from where it came in ancient times.

The roof covering consists of multilayer panels, which prevent from excessive temperature stress, while the internal surface of the roof has been covered with wood. It further isolates the buildings from climatic stress and reproduces the original colours and atmosphere of the ancient wooden roofs, without any reconstruction intent.

The entire palatial complex has not been modified in any way and is protected maintaining its total authenticity.

The Arslantepe mound stands out from the green plain, at a certain distance from the river, showing its round well defined silhouette from a long distance. The village of Orduzu is scattered around the site with rather sparse houses with gardens. Only a small part of this village (to the south of the mound) is more densely occupied. Thus, the landscape silhouette around the site is fairly preserved. A buffer zone of approximately 500-meter diameter has been delineated around the mound, encompassing the beautiful agricultural and natural landscape, and recently approved as a 3rd degree archaeological conservation zone by the related regional conservation council. A large portion of land at north and the west of the mound is scheduled by the Soil Protection and Land Use Act as the agricultural lands to be protected, which guarantees their prevention from a dense development activity, strictly.

3.1.e. Protection and management requirements

The activities for the protection of the site derive from an agreement between the MAIAO (Sapienza Archaeological Expedition), the General Directorate of Monuments and Museums, the Malatya Governorship, and the Malatya Battalgazi municipality.

A fence and wall surround the mound and protect it from intrusion. The site area is guarded by staff of the Malatya archaeological museum. Their task is to control the state of preservation of the site, to manage the visits, and signal any unexpected event or risk for the site protection. Task of the guardians is also that of giving basic information to the tourists and guiding them through the site. Visitors should not indeed be allowed to visit the site alone because the very fragile nature of the monuments could easily expose them to damages and risks.
Mudbrick, mud plaster and wall paintings, so resistant to time and natural decay due to the accurately studied and experimented roofing system, are instead extremely fragile to human vandalism. Therefore, nobody should enter the monument unaccompanied.

Legal protective measures are present for the whole nominated property and its buffer zone. The Arslantepe Mound is registered as a 1st Degree Archaeological Conservation Site and is under protection by the Turkish Legislation for Preservation of Cultural and Natural Property, Law No.: 2863 while the buffer zone is scheduled as a 3rd Degree Archaeological Conservation Site. Security measures are sufficient at the property, but yet being improved through landscaping project this year. However, special attention should be given to control building development in the adjacent Orduzu settlement within conservation plan.

The MAIAO is directly responsible for the protection of trenches during the excavation period, the restoration of all archaeological finds, the protection and conservation of outstanding architectural remains in situ, the annual monitoring of the state of preservation of the palace mud-brick structures, and the analysis and cataloguing of archaeological finds seasonally brought to light and stored in the dig house storehouse. At the end of each excavation or study season, the MAIAO is further responsible for the secure storage of all finds, for the secure closing of the excavation areas from one season to the other, the construction of temporary roofing as a protection from rain and snow when deemed necessary, and for the handing over of inventoried objects to the Malatya Museum.

The palatial complex is already protected by a modular roofing system and it will be extended towards the newly excavated part of the palatial complex as a part of landscaping project prepared by the Ministry of Culture and Tourism and approved by Sivas Regional Conservation Council in 2017.

The Malatya Archaeological Museum, whose staff works for the on-site protection and exhibition of the site, is furthermore responsible for the off-site storage and display of inventoried finds from Arslantepe. Collaboration between the İnönü University of Malatya (the Archaeology and Architectural Landplanning departments) and the MAIAO has been stipulated and aimed to the training of local professionals to be on the long term involved in the monitoring and protection of the site.

Conservation Plan is now being prepared by Battalgazi Municipality in compliance with related legislation as to define building regulations and to control the settlement development within protected areas. The conservation plan boundary overlaps with 3rd degree archaeological conservation site boundary as well as with the management plan boundary approved by the Ministry in 2018.

A management plan is prepared by the collaboration between Ministry of Culture and Tourism, Battalgazi Municipality and Sapienza Archaeological Expedition and approved in the 8th of January, 2019. A management structure composed of a site manager - who is the Museum Director Kenan Özdas- together with an “Advisory Board” and “Supervision and Coordination Board” is established by the Ministry, as well.

3.2. Comparative Analysis

Introduction

Arslantepe is in a crucial zone in the Upper Euphrates valley, which was (and still is) a geographical, political and cultural border between diverse regions and Near Eastern Civilizations:
Anatolian, Mesopotamian, and Caucasian. The development of a political powerful centre at the site was also partly the result of this location and the close and changing relations established across time with diverse cultural groups: urban societies of the Mesopotamian world in the 5th and 4th millennium BC, mobile groups of the Anatolian and South-Caucasian mountains in the 3rd millennium BC, people of the Peri-Mediterranean regions west of the Euphrates valley in various periods, Central Anatolian Hittite societies in the 2nd millennium BC, northern Syro-Mesopotamian regions and the Assyrian cultural world in the 1st millennium BC. The site was a real place of cultural encounters reflecting different cultural worlds across time. It was also an economic meeting point between mobile pastoralist groups and sedentary rural population, as well as a crossroads in metal and other raw materials trade.

Arslantepe comes into prominence among the archaeological sites with mud-brick architecture discovered so far, because the site thoroughly reveals the process of formation of the earliest hierarchical and politically centralized societies, the emergence of a very early State system and bureaucracy, by showing an extraordinarily well preserved 4th millennium BC complex of public and monumental mud-brick buildings, which constitute the earliest example of a public Palace known so far. The second reason is that this phenomenon can be physically experienced and observed by the visitors moving into the buildings of the Palace complex, which, notwithstanding the fragile materials with which they have been constructed (mud and mud bricks), are still in an exceptional state of preservation, with walls more than 2 m. high, still observable in their original state and integrity. The third reason is that all the buildings were found full of materials in situ, buried under the collapse of the upper part of the structures, and these archaeological findings, after restoration and many decades of researches and thorough study, are largely visible in the nearby Malatya Museum and represent an exceptional testimony of the process of formation of hierarchical and politically centralized societies and the very early emergence of the State. Arslantepe is today the only site of this period representing such an important stage in the development of human societies where visitors can directly observe what had happened millennia ago by entering and moving through the rooms of the palace and feeling fully part of the knowledge experience leading to a distant but founding common past.

The antiquity and high cultural and historical value of the events documented at Arslantepe together with their full visual and physical availability make this property a unique site, which has no real comparisons in the world.

This current comparison is focused on the cultural values of the nominated property and their visual and physical availability. Accordingly, the comparison is mainly made with archaeological sites in mud-brick architecture representing the phenomenon of early urbanization and early state systems in the World Heritage List. Although not listed, some comparable sites with similar characteristics are also included in the comparison. Impressive examples of traditional mud-brick architecture, such as the Djenné Medina in Mali or the Citadel of Agadez in Niger, or the Asante Traditional Building in Ghana have not been the subject of comparison, since those sites are still inhabited, even if the mud-brick structures have been in use for a long period. Here only archaeological sites, which are no longer inhabited, as Arslantepe, are taken into consideration.

Being an archaeological site pertaining to a geo-cultural area that is located at the intersection of the Anatolian world and what is generally defined, in historical terms, as Greater Mesopotamia, an analysis is made mainly taking into consideration other sites referring to the wide cultural region of the Near and Middle East. Settlements with well-preserved private and/or public architecture in mud-bricks belonging to the periods preceding the formation of urban and state societies and sites representing the maturity of these types of societies are however also considered as a second case in point, as well as other sites representing similar phenomena and stages in the development of human societies in other regions of the world.
In this context, at the beginning, it would be useful to overview Greater Mesopotamia and the place of Arslantepe in the Late Chalcolithic period in order to understand the significance of the site.

3.2.1. The Contextualisation of Arslantepe within Late Chalcolithic Greater Mesopotamian Settlements Providing Material Evidence for Social Complexity and Centralisation

It is well known that Mesopotamia provides some very ancient archaeological evidence of the control, management, and administration of the primary economy, and equally important evidence of the use of ideological instruments – hinging on cultic/ceremonial aspects – to manage social consensus. It was in the second half of the 5th millennium BC (Final Ubaid and Late Chalcolithic 1)–that, particularly in the north, mass production of bowls for the large-scale distribution of food (the so-called coba bowls) and administrative procedures based on sealing food containers to control the circulation of food staples developed for the first time, both in public contexts and amongst private elites. The concentration of seals and sealings in the larger and paramount house of level XII at Tepe Gawra (the so-called white room building) clearly suggests a new role for the community leader and his family in managing resources, involving special economic prerogatives and privileges.

The Late Chalcolithic 2 period (ca. 4200-3850 BC) marks the first time architectural evidence consistent with the emergence of formalized political leaders, as exemplified by the unique and large scale “round house” which dominated the other smaller and less elaborate houses in the community at Tepe Gawra in level XIA/B. At Brak TW20, the monumental basalt threshold building was constructed on a cobble and mud platform and represents large scale non-ritual public architecture. At the much smaller 3.3 ha site of Hacinebi in the Euphrates valley, there is
clear architectural differentiation, with the construction of a massive stone enclosure wall 3 m. wide and preserved to a height of 3 m. At the west end of the site, a complex of 4 narrow stone-built storerooms 10 m. long suggests large scale storage of surpluses. Although the LC 2 apparently overlaps, at least partially, with the Early Uruk period in Lower Mesopotamia, there is no material evidence for southern cultural influences on the north in the late 5th-early 4th millennia BC.

Although differing from one another in terms of local ceramic and architectural styles, the Local Late Chalcolithic polities of the eastern Taurus (Arslantepe), the Taurus piedmont (Hacinebi), the Khabur headwaters in north Syria (Brak, Hamoukar), and the north Iraqi Jazira (Gawra, Hawa) seem to exhibit basic similarities in their economic, political, and ideological systems. The specific trajectories towards the rise of hierarchical and centralised societies show important differences in the scale of the phenomenon, in the degree of urbanization, and in the degree and forms of the power exercised by the elites. The highland site of Arslantepe has a crucial location close to the principal copper, lead, and silver deposits of eastern Anatolia, as well as the crossroad of different cultures and civilisations. Evidence for highly sophisticated metallurgy and ceramic mass production, as well as the recent findings of hundreds of clay-sealings with numerous seal impressions in ceremonial buildings (temples) suggests that local highland communities had already begun to develop a fairly complex, specialized economic organization in Arslantepe period VII, before the Uruk expansion. In the piedmont and steppe zones, sites such as Hacinebi, Brak, Hamoukar, and Gawra show similar evidence for social complexity in the early fourth millennium, before Uruk contact.
Bureaucratic management of goods and forms of political centralization become clearly distinguishable in the archaeological record in these sites, but they were differently characterised. Sites in the Jezira, as Tell Brak and to some extent also Hamoukar, show a high degree of urbanization, whereas other sites such as Hacinebi and Tepe Gawra were indeed small settlements, little more than villages in terms of their size and function. The two sites on the mountains, Arslantepe and Tepe Gawra, however appear as real political centres with an architecturally separated public and elite area, without undergoing any urbanization process, suggesting they were developing their own way of acquiring power and exercising it over the population.

The LC 4 period sees the first organized contacts between the “Uruk” alluvium and northern Greater Mesopotamia and a significant spread of distinctive forms of southern material culture in the neighbouring regions (the so-called “Uruk expansion”). But, whereas even large sites as Tell Brak have received a significant impact from the southern Mesopotamian culture and other sites, such as Tepe Gawra were probably abandoned, Arslantepe maintained its autonomy and improved further its power structures, probably acting as a real counterpart of the Mesopotamian communities pressing to the north.

The full-fledged administrative systems already manifested in LC 4, continue to grow further in LC 5 (Period VIA), at the same time evolving into a real sophisticated and hierarchical bureaucratic form of political and economic control, which was the basis of the power of emergent institutional bodies and the development of an early state system. LC 4-5 glyptics show strong similarities throughout Greater Mesopotamia in both iconographic and stylistic features and in function. The archaeological and administrative records from the best-documented case studies of the period LC 5 Greater Mesopotamia are Arslantepe VIA and Uruk (Eanna V-IV).

3.2.2. Sites in the Near and Middle East Representing the Same or Similar Phenomena

NORTHERN MESOPOTAMIA

Hacinebi Tepe, TURKEY

It is a small mound on the limestone bluffs overlooking the east bank of the Euphrates River, in Şanlıurfa province, SE Turkey. The site lies on the main north-south river trade route linking Anatolia with Syria and Mesopotamia. According to stratigraphy and associated ceramics the Late Chalcolithic occupation is subdivided into an earlier phase A (LC 2), which has early forms of local Anatolian handmade, chaff-tempered ceramics, and a later phase B. Phase B1 (LC 3) has late forms of local Anatolian ceramics (with bevelled-rim bowls appearing at the end of the phase), while phase B2 (LC 4) has both LC local Anatolian and the full range of Mesopotamian Late Middle Uruk ceramics.
The phase A and B1 occupations at Hacınebi indicate that the site, though small, reflects the changes occurring in the region by showing a complex administrative technology, relatively advanced metallurgy, public works, such as a huge town-wall, long-distance exchange and contacts with the Mesopotamian world. The administrative technology of seals and sealings also suggests that there were elites mobilizing surplus, although the scale of these exactions remains to be determined. Phase B2 deposits in the northeast area of Hacınebi have yielded an almost complete range of standard Uruk administrative artefacts, including jar sealings, jar stoppers, a hollow clay ball filled with tokens, and a fragmentary clay tablet, all bearing Uruk cylinder seal impressions and all found in association with Uruk ceramics. Contacts with Mesopotamian groups with Uruk culture are evident, but the seal designs also suggest a shared imagery and ideology across the Syro-Anatolian borderlands.

The site of Hacınebi represent a different situation with respect to Arslantepe in that it is a small site, probably a rural village and today it is moreover flooded by the Birecik dam.

Tell Brak, SYRIA

Tell Brak, located in the Khabour river basin in the northern regions of the so-called Greater Mesopotamia, was the major site of the area and the second very large city of the 4th millennium BC in Mesopotamia. It has been the object of intensive and long term researches by a UK team, unfortunately ended in 2010 due to the war in Syria.

The site represents the same periods and phenomena shown at Arslantepe, but once more with substantial differences in the path of development and its outcomes, according to what we can hypothesise so far. Tell Brak, as Uruk, was the theatre of a remarkable urbanization process and centralisations of power, and, as Arslantepe, also has a long sequence of archaeological superimposed levels, which attest the flourishing of later occupation, particularly the city in the Akkadian period.

Tell Brak, reached an extension of perhaps 130 ha already during the LC 3 (3850-3400 BC) period. The LC 2-3 occupations on the main mound are represented by various superimposed phases, TW 20-19 and TW 18-16. TW 19 main feature is the so-called “Red Libn (mud-brick) Building”, consisting of massive walls and many ovens, archaeologically dated to the very onset of LC 3 and interpreted as an industrial complex. In Brak TW18, excavations recovered a monumental public building that was apparently used for large scale redistributive feasts. Already in this phase, communal events involving consumption of huge amounts of food and beverages were recurrent and carried out at very large-scale by using mass-produced utilitarian ceramics. This is corroborated by the finds from a few tripartite buildings from levels TW18-16. All these
buildings have been however only very limitedly excavated and only a small part of them have been brought to light.

A 4th millennium temple area had been discovered in the past (the “Eye Temple”, but this is now very poorly preserved.

Generally speaking, since the site is very big, with a very thick stratigraphic deposit, and the excavation strategies were based on a system of ‘trenches’, the area where the 4th millennium levels have been brought to light is relatively small in comparison with the assumed original extension of the settlement in that period, and hence only gives a very partial idea of its architectural and functional features. Moreover, these structures, all made of mud-bricks, have not been protected and have been substantially damaged by their exposure to the weather pressures. Now, after the Syrian war, the 4th millennium architecture of Tell Brak is unfortunately even more ruined, and no access to them is moreover possible at the present.

Tell Hamoukar, SYRIA

Tell Hamoukar is in the eastern border of the Khabur area, in the Jazira region of northeastern Syria. In area B at the site, three large tripartite compounds with courtyards and cooking facilities, destroyed by fire during LC 4, yielded hundreds of seal impressions along with stamp seals of stone and bone. The cooking facilities and the large amounts of food processing remains indicate that these loci had the means to organize large-scale commensality, beside substantial storage. The location and contexts of this material are consistent with the operation of a centralized administrative bureaucracy operating in the service of a political leader, rather than a religious institution.

Neither the monumentality of the structures, nor their functional features (they were private and not public buildings), neither their state of preservation, nor their accessibility are comparable with those of Arslantepe. Hamoukar is today also located in a conflict zone and has suffered the consequences of this.

Tepe Gawra, IRAQ

It is situated in Northeastern Iraq, 24 km north-east of the Tigris River at Mosul. It has a long sequence of levels from the Ubaid period, widely excavated, although the field investigation took place in the early 20th century and therefore the precise contexts of the rich materials found are difficult to reconstruct in a really reliable way. The earliest rich assemblage of clay-sealings (cretulae) dates back to level XIII (Ubaid 4 period), where they have been found in connection
with a temple area. Then fairly substantial assemblages of seals and sealings have been found in level XII, mainly in connection with a chief house (LC1), as well as in levels VIIIA-C (LC 3), where they were concentrated in a public area consisting of ceremonial buildings and a storehouse. As at Arslantepe, sealing systems appear to have been used to regulate storage, production and distribution of commodities, and most notably, food allotments, as indicated by the finding of numerous mass-produced bowls.

The most important character of Tepe Gawra is the growth of central institutions at a very small site and with a small population, and, as at Arslantepe, this suggests that the emergence of the new authorities which exercised forms of political and economic control over the population by means of ideological and administrative tools took place in a non-urban centre. The architectural remains and materials are however not so well preserved and documented as at Arslantepe, where both public and residential fairly monumental buildings have been found and archaeological materials have been recovered and analysed in their contexts, offering a unique picture of this peculiar type of development in the crucial phase of hierarchical society formation in Greater Mesopotamia.

SOUTHERN MESOPOTAMIA

Ahwar of Southern Iraq (Cultural Components: Uruk, Ur, Eridu), IRAQ

The Ahwar of Southern Iraq, was inscribed on the World Heritage List in 2016 on the basis of criteria (iii), (v), (ix) and (x). The Archaeological Cities of Uruk and Ur together with Tell Eridu Archaeological Site form part of the remains of a hierarchy of Sumerian cites and settlements that developed in southern Mesopotamia between the 4th and 3rd millennia BC, in what was then a rapidly urbanising area of small states in the marshy delta of the Tigris and Euphrates rivers. Between 2120-2000 BC, monumental architecture emerged in these cities, particularly ziggurats, religious structures reflecting a complex cosmology.

Uruk-Warka

Uruk-Warka is the largest and first city in the ancient world (almost 200 ha in the 4th millennium BC), where the same process of State formation represented at Arslantepe took place in the same period (4th millennium BC) on an even larger scale. The site, that has been the object of very long term researches by German teams, was a sort of capital in this early time and was the
only place in the 4\textsuperscript{th} millennium BC where there is the first evidence of a pictographic writing system.

In Uruk, very broadly, two imposing public areas dating to 4\textsuperscript{th} millennium BC have been brought to light in the centre of the city: The area of the so-called Ziggurat of Anu, where a single temple (The White Temple) was standing suggesting that its function was basically religious, and the huge Eanna area, where numerous imposing buildings with different layout and probably functions were found and where the majority of administrative materials, both clay-sealings (cretulae), clay balls with tokens (bullae), and thousands of pictographic tablets have come out., it is possible to say that the Eanna precinct encompassed multiple functions, for sure administration, large-scale “ceremonial” events (be it for cultic purposes or other kinds of public practices), accumulation of prestige goods, and seemingly craft activities (metallurgy). Given the nature of the archaeological deposits and the shortcomings imposed by excavation and publication methods, no systematic contextual analysis has ever been carried out on the assemblages from the “Eanna” district. This and the paucity of floor assemblages prevented reliable functional interpretations of the individual buildings and complexes excavated within the district. It has been however possible, thanks to the huge amount of objects, to review the significance of administrative materials and propose some general insights into the economic functions of these buildings.

Most of the some 1800 tablets and fragments retrieved at Uruk were embedded in debris layers accumulated during the latest sub-phase (IVa) of the Eanna sequence that, according to the new C14 determinations from Building C, may now be placed in the late LC 5 period. This dataset, coupled with the evidence of in situ tablets in Building C, and the widespread use of seals and sealings, indicates that some of the Eanna buildings certainly had strong administrative/economic connotations linked to the storage and distribution of commodities.

The archaeological and textual records from LC 5 Uruk attest to a large-scale political and economic centralization process that may span less than 200 years. The last phases of this period saw the formation of an extended economic-political decision-making apparatus (institution/s) that was using a complex bureaucratic template for administering extensive economic activities related to land exploitation, mobilization of agricultural surpluses, manufactured products, and workforce.

According to a review of the architectural features of the LC monumental complexes, Butterlin (2015) proposes a distinction of functions for the tripartite architecture which may be related to distinct spheres of cultural, political and economic action in these societies. According to him, architectural and topographic specifics indicate isolated monumental buildings built on top of terraces and/or in specific compounds – such as the “Eye Temple” of Tell Brak, the Anu Ziqqurat at Uruk, the Uqair “painted temple” and possibly the Jebel Aruda “temples” – as loci of
religious activities, i.e. proper sanctuaries. On the other hand, the large scale complexes and architecturally varied buildings of the “Eanna” can be characterized as loci of social, economic and political activities.

On the basis of the archaeological evidence examined above, it seems safe to assume that some of these activities –storage and distribution of products, administration, communal/ceremonial events– were physically concentrated in the Eanna large-scale non-residential/public complex.

The monumental, multifunctional public area of the Eanna at Uruk certainly recall the Arslantepe VIA Palace complex, similarly monumental and rich in administrative materials, which were the result of public activities carried out on a large scale. Uruk and Arslantepe were certainly both part of the same great phenomenon leading to the foundation of early State societies. They however represent two different paths and outcomes in this crucial process. Uruk was a certainly larger and more powerful centre than Arslantepe in general terms, and was qualitatively different being part of a very large urban context. But Arslantepe shows in great detail and in a perfectly contextualised form the very first emergence of a real Palace system, where power was exercised and displayed for the first time in a secular way. The Arslantepe Palace is the first evidence of a formal and actual separation of political power from the religious/cult sphere.

Both sites show the birth of central administration and bureaucracy; but, whereas Uruk shows the first known writing system, Arslantepe, with the thousands of well contextualised clay sealings with seal impressions (cretulae), documents in detail the origin of a sophisticated administrative system before writing and the existence of accounting procedures and a hierarchy of bureaucrats in the absence of any permanent recording system.

Furthermore, the legibility of the architecture at Uruk is highly difficult because of the intrusion of later buildings into the older ones, thus blurring the layers of different historic periods. Many of the 4th millennium structures at Uruk are moreover unfortunately destroyed. The public buildings of the Arslantepe Palace are the only structures of this period in perfect state of preservation, which give back the full perception of the architecture and functioning of this extraordinary complex that was the seat of fundamental processes changing the history of human societies.

Finally, Arslantepe is, and can be furthermore, the object of visits from a wide public, whereas Uruk is still unfortunately hardly accessible.

Ur and Eridu

They are both sites where levels testifying the same process attested at Arslantepe have not been adequately brought to light and in any case they are not preserved.

Ur was once a coastal city, at the mouth of the Euphrates, on the Persian Gulf, though it now sits well inland in an arid landscape south of the current course of the river. Ur emerged as a city-state during the First Ur Dynasty (2670 BC), when, as the capital of Sumer, it became one of the wealthiest Sumerian cities and developed a highly complex and centralised administration system. At Ur, no level referring to the 4th millennium BC has been documented.

Tell Eridu was a 6th and 5th millennium BC site, where a religious centre has been found belonging to the Ubaid period. A sequence of superimposed tripartite temples starting with the Ubaid period, from at least Ubaid 3, in eighteen successive temple buildings, were uncovered many decades ago, built on an artificial mud-brick terrace, which would have developed into the oldest known example of a Ziggurat. The Eridu temples represent the earliest and founding examples of that type of cult/ceremonial tripartite buildings and would have later characterized the
typical religious architecture in Mesopotamia. The form that appears to have developed at Eridu and also later at Uruk, eventually reached maturity at Ur, which has one of the largest and best-preserved remains of ziggurats.

As stated in the nomination file of the Ahwar of Southern Iraq, buildings in southern Mesopotamia were generally of mud brick, and, since they have not been adequately protected, are thus rarely well preserved. In Uruk, Ur and Eridu usually only the foundations of buildings are today discernible. Architectural remains were found in many superimposed strata and early excavations blurred layers. Many buildings have been completely reburied under the sand after being excavated. Notable exceptions are remains of the four ziggurats, which still stand relatively high above the sites, together with some temples and the Royal Tombs at Ur which have been the objects of conservation intervention. Well into the 20th century, archaeological practices were destructive and sites situated in remote desert areas were largely unprotected. Finally, many of the previously adopted conservation approaches proved to be damaging mud architecture.

Susa, IRAN

Susa was inscribed on the World Heritage List in 2015 on the basis of criteria (i), (ii), (iii) and (iv). Located in the south-west of Iran, in the lower Zagros Mountains, the property encompasses a group of archaeological mounds rising on the eastern side of the Shavur River, as well as Ardishir’s palace, on the opposite bank of the river. The excavated architectural monuments include administrative, residential and palatial structures. Susa contains several layers of superimposed urban settlements in a continuous succession from the late 5th millennium BC until the 13th century CE. The site bears exceptional testimony to the Elamite, Persian and Parthian cultural traditions, which have largely disappeared.


It is one of the most comparable sites in the WHL, because of its long historical sequence from the 5th millennium BC to the medieval time, because of the urbanization process and the rise of state-like society documented there, and because of its being part of the same geo-cultural area, the so-called Greater Mesopotamia. The site has however been investigated many years ago and it is largely destroyed today, with a small part preserved, where the mud-brick walls have been re-plastered and have lost their original integrity. The site is moreover in a region difficult to be reached and visited by tourists.

As stated in ICOMOS evaluation report dated 12 March 2015, some of the conservation problems affecting the remains of Susa date back to the early excavations, which were not carried out according to correct methodologies, to environmental conditions and to consequences of the
Iran–Iraq war. The extreme climatic conditions in combination with the particularly vulnerable materials, also cause damage to building materials, e.g., surface water erosion and mechanical stress.

ANATOLIA

Archaeological Site of Troy, TURKEY

The Archaeological Site of Troy was inscribed on the World Heritage List in 2010 on the basis of criteria (ii) and (iii). Troy, with its 4,000 years of history, is one of the most famous archaeological sites in the world. The first excavations at the site were undertaken by the famous archaeologist Heinrich Schliemann in 1870. In scientific terms, its extensive remains are the most significant demonstration of the first contact between the civilizations of Anatolia and the Mediterranean world. Moreover, the siege of Troy by Spartan and Achaean warriors from Greece in the 13th or 12th century B.C., immortalized by Homer in the Iliad, has inspired great creative artists throughout the world ever since. The earliest remains of the city, before the historical times, mainly belong to the 3rd and 2nd millennia BC.

(L. Iglesias, https://whc.unesco.org/en/list/849/gallery/)

It represents an important development towards urbanisation and the growth of a political central power, which is however very different from the Arslantepe example. Troy and Arslantepe are the tangible examples of two different models of early establishment of hierarchical societies and power systems, and are part of different worlds, one gravitating towards the Aegean and Mediterranean, the other towards Mesopotamia and Peri-Mesopotamian regions. No centralisation of staple resources is documented at Troy, nor any evidence of labour control or administrative device, such as the thousands of clay-sealings documented at Arslantepe. On the other hand, somehow similar was probably the involvement of the local rulers in the development of metallurgy and trade in prestige and luxury goods. The earlier imposing structures visible at the site are later than the Arslantepe public complexes (3rd millennium versus 4th millennium BC), they are of a different nature (mainly town-walls and structures linked to them) and they are less immediately comprehensible in their original architectural arrangement compared to the complete and integral Arslantepe Palace structure.

The authenticity of the archaeological site is high, since there have been very few reconstructions. Those that have taken place on the defence structures have been carried out in
strict accordance with the principles of anastylosis. However, mud brick walls are not so well preserved, and they have even almost disappeared in some structures.

OTHER REGIONS in THE MIDDLE EAST

Shahr-i Sokhta, IRAN

The site was inscribed on the World Heritage List in 2016 on the basis of criteria (ii), (iii) and (iv). Shahr-i Sokhta, meaning ‘Burnt City’, is located at the junction of Bronze Age trade routes crossing the Iranian plateau. The remains of the mudbrick city represent the emergence of the first complex societies in eastern Iran. Founded around 3200 BC, it was populated during four main periods up to 1800 BC, during which time there developed several distinct areas within the city, where monuments and separate quarters for housing, burial and manufacture were built. Diversions in water courses and climate change led to the eventual abandonment of the city in the early second millennium.


It is an early urban site of the 3rd millennium BC with specialized quarters that provides information regarding the emergence of complex societies and contacts between them. However, the site documents a living area, not a monumental public complex and refers to a period later than the Arslantepe palace. Only part of the town has been conserved and the walls are preserved only for a very limited height.

According to ICOMOS evaluation report dated 6 March 2014, at Shahr-i Sokhta, sacrificial mud and straw plaster treatment (Kahgel) were applied to preserve the excavated structures, using a conservation procedure that highly disturb the integrity of the monuments. Protective roofs used over various parts of the excavations confuse the understanding of the site. In some cases, the indiscriminate use of the Kahgel plaster has resulted in blocked doorways, and the thick plaster makes all surfaces look the same and conceals the different architectural elements.

Archaeological Ruins at Moenjodaro, PAKISTAN

Archaeological Ruins at Moenjodaro was inscribed on the World Heritage List in 1980 on the basis of criteria (ii) and (iii). The Archaeological Ruins at Moenjodaro are the best preserved urban settlement in South Asia dating back to the beginning of the 3rd millennium BC, and exercised a considerable influence on the subsequent development of urbanization. The property
represents the metropolis of Indus civilization, which flourished between 2,500-1,500 BC in the Indus valley and is one of the world’s three great ancient civilizations. The Archaeological Ruins at Moenjodaro comprise burnt brick structures covering 240 ha, of which only about one third has been excavated since 1922. All significant attributes are still present and properly maintained. However the foundations of the property are threatened by saline action due to a rise of the water table of the Indus River.

Moenjodaro is the first urban centre in the Indus valley showing evidence of a town planning, and there is an acropolis with remains of public structures. Their nature and features are however completely different from the public buildings at Arslantepe, where the architectural remains formed a real Palace complex.

The Moenjodaro urban structures are later than the Arslantepe architectural findings (again 3rd millennium against 4th millennium BC) and their state of preservation is also not comparable.

3.2.3. Arslantepe in the 4th Millennium BC

Period VII (LC 3- LC 4, 3800-3400 BC) at Arslantepe was marked, as was the rest of the Mesopotamian world, by the emergence of elites, probably with the role of governing their communities, which was exercised and expressed symbolically through the performance of ritual practices in monumental buildings that are assumed to have been cultic in character (temples). Other types of monumental buildings, with stout walls, painted plaster and decorative mud-brick columns, had been built on the top of the mound, close to the cult buildings, and were probably the residences of the elites.

The adoption of a new hierarchical system must have gone together with a change in the economic strategies of the local rulers. Unequal labour relations and new forms of economic control over staple production were the evident outcomes of this process, indicated by the intensive use of sealing practices and the mass production of rough fast made bowls, probably used for distributing meals. Huge quantities of these bowls were also found in the whole Mesopotamia from the end of the 5th millennium BC, where they were mainly concentrated in the public areas and chief houses, perhaps indicating the beginning of the alienation of labour force and the emergence of economic differences in these types of hierarchical and centralised societies.

All these elements appear in an imposing ceremonial building from the end of period VII at Arslantepe (Late Chalcolithic 4, 3600-3400 BC). This building (Building XXIX or Temple C)
was extraordinarily monumental in character, it does not belong to a larger set of structures, but stands in isolation on a raised platform, made up of large stones and mud layers that rested on a series of horizontal wooden poles – a building technique very unusual and extremely sophisticated for such an early period. These were probably used to give stability to the building (perhaps also in case of earthquakes), whereas the platform raised the building above the ground, also making it clearly visible from the surrounding plain. Temple C had been built adjacent to another public building (Temple D), which, besides having been partly destroyed afterwards by the construction of the Period VIA Palace and subsequent disturbance into the 4th millennium levels, appears to have also been ‘tripartite’ with a central large hall provided with wall decorations and a platform/podium in the middle. These two cult buildings (Temple C and Temple D) significantly represented the only example of tripartite architecture at Arslantepe, and belong to a period that undoubtedly preceded the influence of the Uruk culture at the site. It must therefore be related to an older tradition, which probably went back to the Ubaid period, when local and Mesopotamian cultural features were mingling, producing original outcomes. As in the case of Tepe Gawra XI-VIII, to an even greater extent at Arslantepe VII, the tripartite architecture of Mesopotamian origin was exclusively designed for public and ceremonial performances. Here, the presence, along the western edge of the mound, of monumental residential buildings constituting a real elite district, physically close to the public area, was another significant aspect of the socio-political originality of the Arslantepe 4th millennium society.

Another peculiar feature of the Arslantepe development towards the formation of political and economic hierarchies was the exclusive concentration of clay-sealings (cretulae), and hence the administrative control of economic transactions, in the public buildings. In period VII, hundreds of mass-produced bowls and cretulae (424 cretulae out of 595 belonging to period VII) were found in the two temples C and D. This shows that the process of accumulating goods and controlling labour, though still occurred in ceremonial contexts, was already at an advanced stage at Arslantepe by the middle of the fourth millennium BC, before any direct influence of the Late Uruk culture. The structure of the settlement, however, shows no signs of “urban” transformation. Even though the present surface of the mound was entirely occupied in period VII, the whole area is no more than 4 or 4.5 hectares in size and what we know from the excavation appears as a kind of large intensively settled village with an imposing central monumental area intended for élite and public buildings.

At Arslantepe VIA (LC 5, 3400-3100 BC), this process was embodied in an extraordinary monumental complex of buildings raised on the upper part of the mound, close to the previous abandoned temples. This complex, which is now undoubtedly the earliest example of a Near Eastern Palace known so far, has been excavated over a wide extension covering about 3500 sq.m., and is still in perfect state of conservation, with walls more than 2 m. high still covered by the original white plaster and red and black paintings. This unique huge architectural whole clearly shows the establishment of a complex organizational system in which the power of the elite groups, now the ‘rulers’, was founded on the accumulation of staple products and the systematic redistribution of processed food to people going to the palace to receive food ‘rations’ in the area of central stores, probably as a remuneration for their work. Very intensive, routine redistribution and administrative practices were now carried out not any more in temples and cult buildings, as it was still in the Mesopotamian world, but in a totally secular environment. The formation of a formally independent, centralised political structure, in other words the State, was already under way at Arslantepe in the last centuries of the 4th millennium BC.

The thousands of clay sealings (impressed with a majority of stamp seals) found in period VIA – in situ in the redistribution storeroom and discarded in dumps in special spaces into the palace –, after having carefully and thoroughly been studied in all their aspects, document a full-fledged bureaucratic structure which managed concentration and large-scale distribution of staples
inside an integrated complex of public buildings and spaces, consisting of cult buildings (small temples), courtyards, storage/distribution areas, administrative and representation areas, as well as, the residences of the elite (probably the ruler’s families) on the back side of a very monumental Audience Building opened into a large courtyard, where people were received by the authority.

Some significant aspects for the Arslantepe VIA evidence are: 1) the huge quantities of transactions performed in the public area; 2) the fact that these transactions (at least the ones documented by the *cretulae*) were exclusively internal movements of goods and almost entirely (perhaps exclusively) foodstuffs, as is indicated by the vast number of *cretulae* that were attached to pots; 3) the documentation of forms of likely regular routine redistribution, with very limited redistribution operations on special occasions; 4) and the fact that in these circuits there were individuals or officials with different responsibilities and probably differing ranks in the hierarchy. The existence of a full-fledged bureaucracy with distinct tasks and ranks indicates that a class of specialists who only supplied services may have emerged. The large numbers of people doing transactions in the stores, almost certainly people withdrawing foodstuffs, may have been palace outsiders who had links to the central institutions as workers or people giving their services or labour corvée; but officials operating intensely and continuously, both in routine operations and on the occasion of special events, may have been of a socially higher rank, either linked or not to the paramount chiefs by kinship or lineage bonds.

Everything points to the central position that the administrative activity occupied in public life, and shows the magnitude of the redistribution practices, around which the life of the palace seems to have revolved. Thousands of mass-produced bowls are the most frequent and widespread findings in the public area, but the storerooms and the two temples (A and B) were also full of large vessels and pithoi, where food was kept, which have been systematically restored year by year and are now exhibited, or at any rate kept, in the Malatya Archaeological Museum. Large amounts of *cretulae* and bowls were often associated indicating the intensive and regular allocation of food, probably in the form of meals. The materials found in the temples conversely suggest that cult practices and related activities performed in these buildings, which have become smaller than the earliest temples C and D of the previous period, were intended for a few people, probably the elite, thus excluding the majority of the population.

In the Arslantepe palace, we can observe a kind of initial division between a more specifically managerial-administrative sphere, through which centrally managed goods and labour flowed in specifically intended architectural spaces (stores and courtyard), and an ideological-symbolic sphere connected with cult and ceremonial practices (Temples A and B). A similar functional separation may perhaps also be detected at Uruk-Warka between the various isolated buildings in the large public area of the Eanna, or between it and the White Temple on the Anu Ziggurat. And it is certainly an indication of the development towards more complex, solid and organised forms of central power. But the Warka temples, characterised by gigantic dimensions and a great openness towards the outside world, continued to be the main places where people used to go and participate in the public events without any apparent distinction between the various buildings in the public area, whereas ‘temples’ remain architecturally dominant as well as spatially separated. At Arslantepe, conversely, the ceremonial practices, though we assume they must have continued to play an important role in the formation and maintenance of consensus, took place in two small buildings, which, besides being strictly part of the architectural whole, were able to hold only a limited number of people and were the seat of distribution of special food (i.e. cattle meat) to selected individuals, performed in a restricted, and probably elitist environment. Common people could not have access to the main hall and was excluded from directly participating in the performances, looking at them from the side room, where the wall decorations significantly stood.
The excavations, conducted over many years at Arslantepe, have uncovered many crucial aspects of this process, culminating here in the establishment of an early State system, in which the economic and political power of the ruling elite was consolidated and their authority was expressed and exercised in a non-religious and explicitly «secular» way, marking a new era. A similar growth of centralised leadership took place all over the Mesopotamian world at the end of the 4th millennium BC, but, even though in all societies of Greater Mesopotamia, authority began to be exercised by using more effective instruments of political and administrative control, nowhere such transformation into a secular direct exercise of political power is so clearly attested and well documented by strong material evidence. The recent discovery in the Arslantepe palace of an Audience Building with a possible ‘throne’ platform, opening into a courtyard where people gathered to pay tribute to the authority is the definitive proof of this crucial change, marking a radical turn in the history of the earliest political institutions and the codification of ceremonial practices aimed at strengthening and sustaining the political leadership.

The sophisticated metal weapons discovered in one of the public buildings at Arslantepe, as well as the images of prisoners prostrated in front of a codified representation of the ruler – the so-called king-priest – in the Uruk-Warka glyptics, are both signs of a more explicit display of the use of force and coercion. But the process of the institutionalisation and centralisation of political and economic leadership went hand in hand with an advanced urbanisation process in Lower Mesopotamia and the Khabour, with all its complexity and proliferation of tasks, social categories, and specialised sectors, and the control exercised by the central authorities over many of these sectors are clearly evidenced by the pictographic texts from Uruk IVa.

However, the process of the secularisation of power and the way it was exercised was not yet clearly recognisable in the public areas of the Mesopotamian sites, since these were still either temples or other forms of sacred area, and the character of the performances that took place there still seems to have been, at least formally, predominantly religious. This is evidenced by both the types of public architecture and the iconography of power expressed in glyptics and other forms of art, where scenes depicting the »temple« (or the »god/goddess« as in the case of the famous alabaster vase from Uruk) and people bringing »offerings« to it largely prevail.

In contrast, the palatial complex from the end of the 4th millennium BC at Arslantepe, and in particular the building brought to light in its northern part in the 2014 and 2015, provide unequivocal evidence of the secularisation of the exercise and expression of authority and power, testifying to a substantial change of which there is at present no evidence elsewhere at such an early period (or at least none so explicitly manifested). This extraordinary evidence moreover comes from the northernmost sector of the Euphrates valley in Anatolia, once considered a periphery with respect to the Mesopotamian core. These recent findings completed the picture already shown by the great deal of evidence of sophisticated and complex economic-administrative organisation brought to light in earlier campaigns, making ever clearer the elaborate and explicitly diversified functionality of the public spaces in this monumental complex. They further stress the far-reaching and rapid change that occurred at the site from the period of the previous ceremonial/cultic area of the first half of the 4th millennium BC.

Finally, the violent destruction of the Palace by a great fire occurred at the very end of the 4th millennium BC that ended forever its life, abruptly interrupting this innovative experiment, also allowed its exceptional preservation. The collapse of the upper parts of the buildings filled in with earth the rooms, protecting the floors, the materials left there, and the walls for a considerable height. After excavating and emptying the structures, the excavation team took care to protect these well preserved mud-brick buildings, first by using temporary shelters during the excavation activities and then with a project of definitive roofing, which was thoroughly studied and experimented over many years. A constant monitoring of the conditions of the walls, totally
original and integral, conducted yearly by the restorers of the excavation team has allowed maintaining the entire monument and its features in an excellent state of preservation.

3.2.4. Other comparable archaeological sites, in mudbrick architecture, inscribed in the World Heritage List:

**Tchogha Zanbil, IRAN**

The site of Chogha Zanbil (also spelled Tchogha Zanbil) was inscribed on the World Heritage List in 1979 on the basis of criteria (iii) and (iv). The ruins of the holy city of the Kingdom of Elam, surrounded by three huge concentric walls, are found at Tchogha Zanbil. Founded c. 1250 B.C., the city remained unfinished after it was invaded by Ashurbanipal, as shown by the thousands of unused bricks left at the site. Today, a huge mud-brick ziggurat dominates the site. Three circular walls and the remains of temples, palaces, houses, tombs, and other structures surround the ziggurat.


The site was in the war zone during the 1980s, and suffered from bombardments. It was subsequently liberated from the military occupation, and the ziggurat was restored. In 1997, some mud brick walls have been built cased inside modern cement brick walls. Unfortunately, parts of the original mud brick walls were damaged in the construction process. High rainfall has had a damaging effect on original adobe structures.

**Ashur (Qal’at Sherqat), IRAQ**

Ashur was inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger in 2003, based on criteria (iii) and (iv). The ancient city of Ashur is located on the Tigris River in northern Mesopotamia in a specific geo-ecological zone, at the borderline between rain-fed and irrigation agriculture. The city dates back to the 3rd millennium BC. From the 14th to the 9th centuries BC it was the first capital of the Assyrian Empire, a city-state and trading platform of international importance. It also served as the religious capital of the Assyrians, associated with the god Ashur. The city was destroyed by the Babylonians, but revived during the Parthian period in the 1st and 2nd centuries AD.
The photographs indicate that subsurface stratification and structures were in good state of preservation when first encountered in excavation at the beginning of the 20th century. Nevertheless, the excavated structures were left open, remaining exposed to erosion by rain and winds and normal natural destruction.

Proto-Urban Site of Sarazm, TAJIKISTAN

Proto-urban Site of Sarazm was inscribed on the World Heritage List in 2010 on the basis of criteria (ii) and (iii). Sarazm, which means “where the land begins”, is an archaeological site bearing testimony to the development of human settlements in Central Asia, from the 4th millennium BC to the end of the 3rd millennium BC. The ruins demonstrate the early development of proto-urbanization in this region. This centre of settlement, one of the oldest in Central Asia, is situated between a mountainous region suitable for cattle rearing by nomadic pastoralists, and a large valley conducive to the development of agriculture and irrigation by the first settled populations in the region. Sarazm also demonstrates the existence of commercial and cultural exchanges and trade relations with peoples over an extensive geographical area, extending from the steppes of Central Asia and Turkmenistan, to the Iranian plateau, the Indus valley and as far as the Indian Ocean.

The adobe remains left exposed after the excavations (particularly after the earliest excavations) have undergone a process of natural degradation as a result of climatic effects, and particularly the cycle of moisture/freezing/thawing. However, this process seems to have been brought under control by partial protective backfilling, the shelters erected in the early 2000s, and the implementation of a programme of active conservation measures.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Property Current</th>
<th>Geographic /Regional Context</th>
<th>Typology/ Classification</th>
<th>Historical Period</th>
<th>Cultural/political context</th>
<th>State of Conservation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Uruk-Warka, Iraq</td>
<td>Southern Mesopotamia</td>
<td>Archaeological site</td>
<td>Long sequence from the 4th (possibly 5th) millennium BC to historical periods</td>
<td>The rise of state-like and urban society, the largest city in the ancient world, the origin of writing, early Dynastic and later developments</td>
<td>Badly preserved, particularly the 4th millennium levels. Difficult to access.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tell Brak, Syria</td>
<td>Northern Mesopotamia</td>
<td>Archaeological site</td>
<td>Long sequence form the 5th millennium BC to Akkadian and later periods</td>
<td>Early urbanization and political-economic centralization, one of the few and largest early cities in the northern regions of Greater Mesopotamia</td>
<td>Small areas brought to light as for the 4th millennium levels. Damaged by the erosion and the recent Syrian war. Impossible to access today.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susa, Iran</td>
<td>Near/ Middle East (SW Iran)</td>
<td>Archaeological site</td>
<td>Long sequence from the 5th mill. BC to medieval period</td>
<td>Urbanization process, the rise of state-like society, early Dynastic and later developments</td>
<td>Badly preserved, particularly the 4th millennium levels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shahr-i Sokhta, Iran</td>
<td>Near/ Middle East (eastern Iran)</td>
<td>Archaeological site</td>
<td>Early Bronze Age, 3rd millennium BC</td>
<td>Early urban site in Iran, with specialized quarters</td>
<td>Partly eroded mud-brick structures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tchogha Zanbil, Iran</td>
<td>Near/ Middle East</td>
<td>Archaeological site</td>
<td>End of 2nd millennium BC</td>
<td>Short lived walled urban site</td>
<td>Unfinished and partly eroded. Buildings mostly reconstructed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashur (Qal'at Sherqat), Iraq</td>
<td>Near/ Middle East (Northern Iraq)</td>
<td>Archaeological site</td>
<td>From 3rd millennium BC to 9th cent. BC and beyond.</td>
<td>The capital of Assyrian State</td>
<td>Mud-brick structures badly preserved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archaeological Ruins at Moenjodaro, Pakistan</td>
<td>Central Asia</td>
<td>Archaeological site</td>
<td>3rd millennium</td>
<td>Large urban center</td>
<td>Quite well preserved mud-brick structures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proto-urban Site of Sarazm, Tajikistan</td>
<td>Central Asia</td>
<td>Archaeological site</td>
<td>4th-3rd millennia BC</td>
<td>Early development of proto-urbanization in the mountainous regions of Central Asia</td>
<td>Buildings poorly preserved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Bronze Ages site of Troy</td>
<td>Western Anatolia</td>
<td>Archaeological site</td>
<td>3rd to 1st millennium BC</td>
<td>One of the most important polities in West Anatolia. Early-Middle Bronze walled town and citadel.</td>
<td>Stone town-walls and structures ruins. Mud-brick structures almost non-preserved.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.2.5. The contextualisation of Arslantepe within the Anatolian UNESCO sites representing the earliest developments towards social complexity

Göbekli Tepe (9,600 - 8,200 BC) and Çatalhöyük (7400 BC-5200 BC) are World Heritage Sites that provide unparalleled insights into earliest stages of development and the way of life of
human beings in prehistoric times. Hattusha also demonstrates an important stage in Anatolian history as the capital of the Hittite Empire.

The Archaeological Site of Arslantepe is shedding light on a different period of history with its uninterrupted occupation sequence from the Late Chalcolithic (V millennium BC) to the Byzantine period, while providing valuable evidences particularly for the Late Chalcolithic and Early Bronze Age. In this context, the inscription of Arslantepe on the World Heritage List, will certainly fill a chronological gap in the list to a certain extend.

Göbekli Tepe, TURKEY

Göbekli Tepe was inscribed on the World Heritage List in 2018 on the basis of criteria (i), (ii) and (iv). Located in the Germuş mountains of south-eastern Anatolia, this property presents monumental circular and rectangular megalithic structures, interpreted as enclosures, which were erected by hunter-gatherers in the Pre-Pottery Neolithic age between 9,600 and 8,200 BC. These monuments were probably used in connection with rituals, mostly likely of a funerary nature. Distinctive T-shaped pillars are carved with images of wild animals, providing insight into the way of life and beliefs of people living in Upper Mesopotamia about 11,500 years ago.

Neolithic Site Of Çatalhöyük, TURKEY

Çatalhöyük was inscribed on the World Heritage List in 2012 on the basis of criteria (iii) and (iv). Two hills form the 37 ha site on the Southern Anatolian Plateau. The taller eastern mound contains eighteen levels of Neolithic occupation between 7400 BC and 6200 BC, including wall paintings, reliefs, sculptures and other symbolic and artistic features. Together they testify to the evolution of social organization and cultural practices as humans adapted to a sedentary life. The western mound shows the evolution of cultural practices in the Chalcolithic period, from 6200 BC to 5200 BC. Çatalhöyük provides important evidence of the full maturity of a settled village, which was maintained in the same location for over 2,000 years, and prepare the transition to urban agglomeration. It features a unique street-less settlement of houses clustered back to back with roof access into the buildings.
Hattusha: The Hittite Capital, TURKEY

Hattusha was inscribed on the World Heritage List in 1986 on the basis of criteria (i), (ii), (iii) and (iv). It is an Anatolian site on the List, representing a more mature state development and Empire. The archaeological site of Hattusha, former capital of the Hittite Empire, is notable for its urban organization, the types of construction that have been preserved (temples, royal residences, fortifications), the rich ornamentation of the Lions' Gate and the Royal Gate, and the ensemble of rock art at Yazılıkaya. The city enjoyed considerable influence in Anatolia and northern Syria in the 2nd millennium B.C.

3.2.6. The contextualisation of Arslantepe within other UNESCO sites representing early urban and state societies in the world

Other sites in the UNESCO Cultural Heritage list attest the primary formation of hierarchical societies, political power and the development of early cities in other parts of the world. These sites however represent totally different developments and types of societies, arisen in much later times. None of these sites is characterized by preserved mud-brick architecture and none of them reflects the same kind of economic centralisation processes and the same type of ruling institutions. None of these properties moreover show evidence of very old forms of bureaucracy.
Historic Centre of Oaxaca and Archaeological Site of Monte Albán, MEXICO

The site was inscribed on the World Heritage List in 1987 on the basis of criteria (i), (ii), (iii) and (iv). Inhabited over a period of 1,500 years by a succession of peoples – Olmecs, Zapotecs and Mixtecs – the terraces, dams, canals, pyramids and artificial mounds of Monte Albán were literally carved out of the mountain and are the symbols of a sacred topography. Elite power at Monte Alban resulted from social deception, that is, ideological change: the emergence of ritual specialists as mediators with the forces that controlled the cosmos. Non-elites provided productive tribute (foodstuff and labor) to the elite in ritualized contexts, rather that participating in a ritual redistributive network.

The nearby city of Oaxaca, which is built on a grid pattern, is a good example of Spanish colonial town planning. The solidity and volume of the city's buildings show that they were adapted to the earthquake-prone region in which these architectural gems were constructed.

Pre-Hispanic City of Teotihuacan, MEXICO

The site was inscribed on the World Heritage List in 1987 on the basis of criteria (i), (ii), (iii), (iv) and (vi). The holy city of Teotihuacan ('the place where the gods were created') is situated some 50 km north-east of Mexico City. Built between the 1st and 7th centuries A.D., it is characterized by the vast size of its monuments – in particular, the Temple of Quetzalcoatl and the Pyramids of the Sun and the Moon, laid out on geometric and symbolic principles. As one of the most powerful cultural centres in Mesoamerica, Teotihuacan extended its cultural and artistic influence throughout the region, and even beyond. Teotihuacan was a strategic site controlling obsidian mines and fresh-water springs, a locus of specialized crafts, a vast planned urban settlement, a redistributional centre, and a place of mingling and integration of ethnic groups. It was also a model of the Mesoamerican cosmos which render it as the main pilgrimage site in Central Mexico.
Cahavin (Archaeological Site), PERU

The archaeological site of Chavin was inscribed on the World Heritage List in 1985 on the basis of criterion (iii). Chavin gave its name to the culture that developed between 1500 and 300 B.C. in this high valley of the Peruvian Andes. This former place of worship is one of the earliest and best-known pre-Columbian sites. It was an important centre of ideological, cultural and religious convergence and dissemination around a cult spread over a wide territory of the Andes. Its appearance is striking, with the complex of terraces and squares, surrounded by structures of dressed stone, and the mainly zoomorphic ornamentation.

General Evaluation:

An analysis of the World Heritage List, as the comparative table and the short site descriptions above shown, clearly highlights that, while the category “archaeological sites” is rather well represented in the World Heritage List, archaeological sites in mud-brick architecture, are indeed a minority, most of all for the difficulty in preserving the mud-brick structures after the abandonment or destruction of the buildings, and, even more, once they are exposed. And, among these, no site with a really well preserved, still standing architecture is present.
Particularly, the period (4th millennium BC) and the region (SE Anatolia and northern periphery of Greater Mesopotamia) of which Arslantepe is an emblematic site are poorly represented. At Arslantepe, the abrupt and final “collapse” of the 4th millennium centralised system, unlike what occurred on most sites in the Mesopotamian world, froze a situation at a particular moment of its development, blocking it for ever. This situation has offered a major opportunity for archaeological research, not only because the violent destruction of the public area by fire left, in situ, all the materials that had been present there at that precise moment in time, buried under the fallen debris (which can, and normally did, occur in the near Eastern tells, even during the course of a process of uninterrupted historical development – occasional collapses and destruction occurred continuously on these sites for a variety of reasons, even contingent, such as earthquakes, occasional fires, etc), but above all because this collapse marked a radical crisis in the existing system of social, economic and political relations, stopping the ongoing progress permanently in its tracks, at a given stage of its development. This has given us what is a fairly rare opportunity to observe a snapshot of the “formation” period at the height of its still incomplete development, frozen in time. On the other hand, in the UNESCO Cultural Heritage list, very few sites are present that attest, through material and visual remains, the origin of pristine State and urban societies in what was the core region of the phenomenon (Greater Mesopotamia) and the period of their earlier formation in the 4th millennium BC.

No 4th millennium site in this list (and in the archaeological record in general) moreover presents a full-fledged monumental public Palace in perfect state of preservation, as is the case of Arslantepe. Here rooms, courtyards, corridors document the performance of many different public functions, and the visitors entering the rooms can tangibly see the places where centralization of staple resources, the operation of an early sophisticated administrative system before writing, the performance of rituals and ceremonies took place. No other archaeological site from such an early period, particularly those with mud-brick architecture, presents the same clear and tangible evidence.

Arslantepe is the only site that today can still narrate and visually display the phenomenon of Early State formation in its whole picture, through its extraordinarily well preserved architecture, rich material culture and artistic expressions (seals, ceramics, metals, and wall paintings). The geo-cultural importance of the site is also that this out-of-the-ordinary evidence has been brought to light in the Upper Euphrates region in SE Anatolia, an area once considered peripheral to the main core of the urbanization and State emergence phenomena.

The site is distinguished by its authenticity, integrity, and extraordinary preservation. The preservation of the walls, still standing to a height of more than 2/2,50 m., and the integrity of the rooms are due to: (1) the nature of the stratigraphic deposits, consisting of the collapse layers of a monumental, probably two-storey, earthen architecture in the course of an abrupt and sudden destruction by fire, which had almost completely filled the rooms; (2) the careful stratigraphic methods applied to the excavations, carried out over decades, which systematically removed the filling layers clearing the rooms, bringing to light the materials in situ on the floors and reconstructing their original position; (3) the conservation strategies accurately studied, tested, and adapted to the environmental, climatic and architectural contexts. The large amount of in situ materials, carefully recovered, restored, and now kept in the Malatya Museum, represents, together with the preserved architecture of the Palace, the high cultural value of this extraordinary archaeological site, and makes it a unique testimony of the birth of a new type of political society, which is at the basis of our contemporary world.

In no other archaeological site of such an early period and with mud-brick architecture, the visitors can have the experience of physically entering and walking through the rooms of a still standing ancient architectural complex. Visitors can also complete their fascinating experience by observing, in the local Malatya Museum, the objects found in the Palace, which tell them the story
of the emergence of this pristine State system and the process of formation of a secular way of exercising power in a very early, innovative, and creative Palatial organization, which precedes the famous palaces of the third millennium in Mesopotamia of about a thousand years.

The whole monument has been protected with a carefully studied roofing system and is the object of continuous monitoring and basic conservation practices by the team of restorers of the Italian Expedition. Other roofing systems have been constructed in some other compared sites (Çatal Höyük, Sarazm, Troy, Göbekli Tepe), but the Arslantepe one is the only structure fully accomplishing the criteria of (a) absence of damage to the underlying archaeological levels, (b) aesthetic compatibility with the monument, (c) minimum environmental impact, (d) maintaining stable climatic conditions inside the protected area.

All these conditions make the Arslantepe site the only place in the world where the public can still enter a 4th millennium BC Palace and have the experience of learning on the spot the history of one of the fundamental socio-political and economic changes in the history of human societies. The visitors can also walk out of the Palace through the centuries and millennia that have both preceded the foundation of the Palace creating the conditions for its development, and followed its collapse laying the basis for a successive flourishing history of the site till its definitive destruction by the Assyrian king Sargon II in 712 BC. Moving up the hill to the northeastern zone of the mound the visitors can indeed observe the material remains of the later phases of the Arslantepe history, from the establishment of a new political regional centre in the 2nd millennium BC in connection with the expansion of the Hittite Empire to the Euphrates, to the citadel that represents the final phase of the expansion of the Arslantepe power in the region as the capital of the kingdom of Melid at the very beginning of the 1st millennium BC.

3.3. Proposed Outstanding Universal Value

a) Brief Synthesis

Arslantepe is a tell of about 4.5 ha in extension, and 30 m high, at the heart of the fertile Malatya plain, some twelve kilometres from the right bank of the Euphrates. The long sequence of the site covers several millennia at least from the 6th millennium cal BC until the final destruction of the neo-Hittite town - Malitiya according to Hittite sources, Melid, Meliddu or Meliteya in neo-Assyrian and Urartu sources - by Sargon II of Assyria in 712 BC. After a short neo-Assyrian occupation, the site was abandoned for a while, to be occupied again in the Late Roman age and subsequently in the Byzantine/Medieval time, when the site was used mainly as a cemetery.

Arslantepe shows in detail the complex processes bringing to the birth of the State and a sophisticated bureaucracy before writing, offering basic information on the early formation of this new society, which was at the basis of our contemporary world. The site, being located in a real geographic and cultural border, thanks to the intensive and varying external relations that have significantly marked its history, is also a testimony of fundamental events and changes in various and different civilisations of the Near East.

Arslantepe 4th millennium levels, in particular, show fundamental changes in human relations in the period of State formation, which involved Eastern Anatolian and Mesopotamian societies in the course of the entire 4th millennium BC, and is thus an exceptional testimony to the first emergence of State society in the Near East, original though related with the great 4th millennium Uruk civilization. This interchange of cultural traditions and social values resulted in the emergence of new social and political systems based on hierarchies and social differences,
economic privileges and new power relations which led to new developments in monumental architecture, administrative technology and iconography of power in artistic representation.

The extensive and systematic excavations of the palace complex, full of material in situ, and the thorough researches conducted on them have allowed to reconstruct the characteristics of this civilization, the life of these first elites and their activities with incomparable details, enlightening the emergence of a centralised government controlling the economy of the population and exercising a central political authority. The finding of an exceptional group of metal weapons, among which the earliest swords so far known in the world, which were probably hanging on a wall in one of the building of the palace (and are now exhibited in the Malatya Museum), also points to the beginning of forms of organized combat as the prerogative of an elite, who probably flaunted it as an instrument of their new political power.

b) Justification for Criteria

(ii) to exhibit an important interchange of human values, over a span of time or within a cultural area of the world, on developments in architecture or technology, monumental arts, town-planning or landscape design

Arslantepe exhibits important human values in the development of an original and innovative architecture and monumental art, unique in the entire South-Western Asia and in the world in such an early period (the 4th millennium BC), whose exceptional state of preservation and conservation makes them enjoyable from the public.

In this context, the importance of Arslantepe is also derived from the plurality of cultural expressions manifested at the site as a result of both the intensity of interactions and encounters between cultures and societies, and the uninterrupted succession of diverse periods and cultural developments, from the 5th to the 1st millennia BC, which have significantly transformed the Arslantepe society across time. Arslantepe indeed does not present a homogeneous culture from a single historical period, but it represents a strong expression of cultural diversity in the course of several millennia, which was primarily the result of the site’s location at the intersections of diverse civilizations, and at the crossroads of population movements, political and cultural contacts, transhumance and trade routes, all making Arslantepe a “cosmopolitan” economic and political centre where diverse communities lived together.

Co-existence of different cultural traditions are reflected in the architecture, seal designs, pottery and metal production, motifs and themes in wall paintings and decorations. The exceptional economic, artistic, architectural and cultural growth of Arslantepe reflects the multicultural vocation of the site, where different traditions met, producing original unparalleled developments and cultural expressions. The site is an example of the integration of diverse cultural components in the course of its long millenarian history.

(iii) to bear a unique or at least exceptional testimony to a cultural tradition or to a civilization which is living or which has disappeared

Arslantepe is an exceptional testimony to the first emergence of State society in the Near East, with an original form though related with the 4th millennium Uruk civilization. The extensive excavations of the palace complex, full of material in situ, has allowed to reconstruct the characteristics of this civilization, the life of these first elites, their activities and relations with the rest of the population with incomparable details, enlightening the emergence of a centralised
government in a non-urban centre, controlling the basic economy of the surrounding population. The thousands of clay sealings found in situ in the Palace have allowed reconstruct a very sophisticated and innovative bureaucratic system for administering the movements of goods and the redistribution of staples as a compensation of labour. This is a unique testimony of the emergence of a state bureaucracy and accountability before any writing was invented, by using the seals as a document of the transactions performed and the identification of the authors of these transactions, in a highly developed and advanced administrative system.

The location of Arslantepe in an area outside the conventional borders of Mesopotamia, also shows that the mountainous regions surrounding the alluvial plains of the Tigris and Euphrates rivers have greatly contributed to the development of this momentous phenomenon, changing the traditional knowledge on the rise of State civilizations in the old world.

The Arslantepe Palace have been brought to light over a very large area (3500 square metres), offering a wide information on a very early and unique political experiment of central government and exercise of authority, where new codified forms of paying tribute to the rulers are attested. Meaningful and symbolic artistic expressions materialized in wall paintings and in seal designs, supported and displayed this new type of authority and its ideology of power. The archaeological evidence brought to light at the site have indeed shown that the Palace was the expression of a new type of secular power, not based any more on a religious/ceremonial consensus, which developed very early (around 3400 BC) at Arslantepe, in the Upper Euphrates region of Eastern Anatolia.

Storerooms full of vessels and seal impressions, now largely kept in the Malatya Museum and partly in the excavation house stores, also reveal the development of an original culture and artistic expressions in the context of the new forms of political and economic power, controlling resources and labour.

A group of arsenical copper weapons, some with silver inlay, found in one of the buildings of the palace, and now exhibited in the Malatya Museum, shows the development of a sophisticated metallurgical technology and artistic taste. Among them, 9 swords constitute the earliest examples of this type of weapon discovered so far in the world, and testify the innovation of the forms of combat and a new political power exhibiting force.

All these anthropological and historical achievements write a new page in the history of early civilizations and are explained to the public in the Arslantepe Open Air Museum.

(iv) to be an outstanding example of a type of building, architectural or technological ensemble or landscape which illustrates (a) significant stage(s) in human history

The Arslantepe mud-brick architecture, due to its antiquity, advanced technology, and state of preservation, is also an outstanding example of a traditional building system representative of a millenarian culture shared by all Near Eastern communities, which documents a sustainable and successful human interaction with the environment, well in keeping with the local climatic conditions and easy to maintain.

The Arslantepe 4th millennium “palace” complex is an outstanding example of a new type of monumental public architecture for two main reasons: i) it is the earliest example of a public palace, substantially antedating the well-known 3rd millennium examples of the Syro-Mesopotamian areas and revealing a precocious development of new forms of secular power based on economic and administrative control; ii) This architectural complex of buildings, excavated over more than 3500 square metres, is very large and in an extraordinary state of preservation, with walls more than 2-2,50 metres high, original white plasters and wall paintings, unique in their
subject and style. iii) Architectural innovative solutions are manifested in the agglutinative arrangement of the buildings linking them each other in a new planning and architectural/functional concept, terracing the mound slope to locate the buildings with different functions and symbolic role at different height in the complex.

c) Statement of Integrity

The large extension of the areas uncovered, its preservation and exhibition ensure the complete representation of the features and processes which convey the Arslantepe significance: the birth of the State and a new type of society marking a radical change in the history of humankind. The monumental palatial complex of the 4th millennium BC, in particular, has been widely exposed and preserved in perfect and integral state, with the original mud-brick walls, mud plaster and floors, internal features and paintings almost unchanged since they were brought to light in the course of more than forty years. The progressively expanding researches on the Hittite and Neo-Hittite period levels are in progress and can potentially bring to light new monuments of great historical and cultural value in the near future. All attributes that manifest proposed outstanding universal value lays within the proposed world heritage boundary which encompasses the whole mound plot and surface, together with adjacent small portion of land towards north where movable cultural objects dated to settlement layers the mound embodies were recorded. Neither the property nor its buffer zone suffered from adverse effects of new developments or inappropriate interventions so far.

d) Statement of Authenticity

All the buildings brought to light at Arslantepe and the Palace structures exhibited in the Open Air Museum in particular are totally original and no reconstruction has been made. The mud-brick walls and the whole 4th millennium BC architecture, including the internal mud features, plaster, wall paintings and floors are in the same condition in which they were found. The only interventions practiced on these buildings are minor repairing interventions made, when necessary, by using the same original materials, i.e. mud and straw tempering. The roofing system itself has not damaged the structures in any point, since it is supported by metal poles which do not stand on the walls, but directly on the floor, without perforating it and therefore even without damaging the underlying archaeological levels. The entire palatial complex has not been modified in any way and is protected maintaining its total authenticity. The landscape silhouette around the site is fairly preserved, as well.

e) Requirements for Protection and Management

The activities for the protection of the site derive from an agreement between the MAIAO (Sapienza Archaeological Expedition), the General Directorate of Monuments and Museums, the Malatya Governorship, and the Malatya Battalgazi Municipality. The whole nominated property and its buffer zone is under protection by the Turkish Legislation for Preservation of Cultural and Natural Property, Law No.: 2863. The palatial complex is already protected by a modular roofing system and it will be extended towards the newly excavated part of the palatial complex as a part of landscaping project prepared by the Ministry of Culture and Tourism and approved by Sivas Regional Conservation Council in 2017. Conservation Plan is now being prepared by Battalgazi Municipality in compliance with related legislation as to define building regulations and to control the settlement development within protected areas. A management plan is prepared by the collaboration between Ministry of Culture and Tourism, Battalgazi Municipality and Sapienza
Archaeological Expedition and approved on the 8th of January, 2019. A management structure composed of a site manager, “Advisory Board” and “Supervision and Coordination Board” is established by the Ministry.

4. STATE OF CONSERVATION AND FACTORS AFFECTING THE PROPERTY

4.a. Present state of conservation

The site has been under constant conservation and excavation since 1961, thanks to the continued presence of a research team on the mound that has guaranteed constant monitoring and to which is thus due the excellent state of preservation of the site.

The MAIAO is responsible, together with its local collaborators and the Malatya archaeology museum for the preservation of the site. Yearly monitoring, started immediately as the first parts of the monument started coming to light in the 1970s, and intervention of specialized restorers to the mud-brick monuments of the site has resulted in presenting the wider public one of the best preserved mud brick sites of the entire Near East. Reports on the state of preservation and restoration interventions are written yearly, both by inspectors of the General Directorate of Cultural Heritage and Museums and by the professional restorers who carry out the monitoring. Such reports are stored by the General Directorate of Cultural Heritage and Museums, together with all documents on the site of Arslantepe.

The Arslantepe dig house complex includes a large storehouse made of various storerooms for the finds that are processed during the excavation seasons, drawn, photographed, registered into a database, and carefully stored, divided by category of finds and by periods, in such rooms. At the end of the excavation season the most well preserved, completely restored, and important objects are selected by the Ministry representatives and the excavation director to be handed over to the Malatya Museum, together with their data sheets (inventory). A second list of objects is also made with those finds that are considered to be not so important as to be exhibited in the museum, but are worthy of particular consideration for study reasons (studying). These are partly stored in the excavation house storages, and in the Malatya Museum storehouse. All the other materials brought to light by the excavation are likewise entirely stored at the excavation house. The storerooms are locked and sealed when the excavation season is off and any permission to access them has to come from the Ministry of Culture and Tourism or the Malatya Museum. The finds from the early excavations, before the construction of the Malatya Museum (1969), were sent to Ankara.

Restoration and conservation of architectural remains

Archaeology and conservation at Arslantepe have been two strictly linked matters; in fact, though the investigation and knowledge in a tell necessarily imply the removal of levels to thoroughly analyse the entire historical developments, it became immediately clear that some finds at Arslantepe were so monumental, historically and architecturally exceptional that they should not be destroyed, and preservation of such structures was felt as an obligation. A large quota of the available resources for the archaeological research have thus been devoted in the years to the preservation of structures, through the maintainance of mud-brick walls and construction of shelters that kept water -the main cause of destruction of mud architecture- away from the areas to be preserved. When the wall paintings started coming to light, preservation became even more crucial; it took years to uncover the paintings with figurative motifs over extended surfaces, through a delicate and minute work of mechanical removal of superimposed plaster, cleaning and
preserving the cleaned surfaces by restorers. The complexity of this operation was increased by
the presence of multiple coats of paint, by the delicacy of the pictorial material used (ochre and
charcoal) and by the combined presence of impressed decoration.

Restoration work on wall paintings

Restorers specialized in wall frescos and mud architecture have intervened on the walls, bringing the paintings to light, and carrying out conservative and stabilizing operations, which were mostly precautionary conservation actions. After long observations and discussions between the archaeologists and the restorers, it was decided not to remove the paintings from the walls but to preserve them in situ. This has meant that an accurate protection system and constant monitoring was needed. The “restoration” that has been carried out has essentially been a routine procedure of preventive and programmed conservation; minimal restoration has been made: controlled seepage of powdered soil from the same structure to consolidate small fragments that had fallen off, repair in those places where small insects dig into the walls, light maintenance for the removal of soil that deposits on the surface during the winter. A second specific roofing have been constructed above the painted surfaces, to ensure protection from any possible small drop of water and curtains have been hung to these secondary roofs to protect the paintings from sun and light.

Most important is the annual monitoring, consisting of a direct and meticulous observation of the most critical points and a comparison with the previous conditions by photographically documenting the state of the paintings every year.

Protection during the excavation process
In 40 years of intervention, excavation team has been able to create a protocol of actions and has observed that finds as fragile and instable as these, once brought to light can be stabilized, preserved and resist to environmental factors if since the very first moment of their discovery they are protected from water and humidity by covering them and leaving the air circulate (the roofing must be open on the sides), and are the object of constant attention and monitoring. The only real danger for the paintings might come from accidents caused by human actions, what makes crucial the regulation of tourist visits, which must always be carried out with the guidance of guardians or museum personnel. Yet, the sequence of images from 1987 to today testifies the excellent state of preservation of the wall painting.

Besides the preservation of wall paintings and decoration, the mud-brick walls themselves must be protected. The walls of the palatial complex are monumentally preserved to outstanding heights and thickness, with formidable stone basements and the original white plaster still in situ. A channel system has also been brought to light below the floors that allowed water to flow out of the building through the central access corridor, together with monumental thresholds, door hinges, mud plastered benches and basins. All these elements are perfectly preserved, with their original plaster and, thanks to the roof cover that has always been secured above them (even during the excavation), are today in the exact condition they were when found.

The long-term observation has demonstrated that whilst the mud-brick structures that remain exposed to water and snow are fully destroyed, those protected by a roof substantially maintain their conditions. Climatic stability is assured by a carefully planned covering structure made of steel poles and multilayer and wooden panels, which has been conceived in order to resist to the weight of snow, not to cause any perforation in the underlying archaeological levels, while leaving the air circulate, thus maintaining optimal conditions of temperature and humidity. A non-invasive and protection procedure has been therefore implemented, which simply protects the buildings, and does not use any chemical consolidation material, which rather would damage the thick mud-brick walls over time. The walls are entirely original and no reconstruction of the structures has been done.

Cracks due to thermal stress provoked by the strong seasonal excursions may occur and need monitoring, but they can easily be repaired by expert restorers by using the same original mud material. The presence of the multilayer roof panels on the exterior and the wood coating inside has minimised the impact of these alterations as it maintains a relatively constant temperature, whereas the ventilation secured by the open sides of the cover system has eliminated the problem of humidity and consequently the covered walls, the problem of plant and mildew growth.
Finally, insects (mostly wasps) tend to nest within the more chaffy mud-brick; whilst this rarely happens on the plastered parts of the walls which are more compact, and very limitedly thus hamper the wall paintings. Monitoring of wasp nests is however important to assure a good preservation of the wall structures.

According to what has been shown above, the monitoring of the palatial buildings should consider the following indicators:

- Changes in the number of cracks on the mud-brick walls
- Possible enlargement of existing fractures
- Changes in the inclination of the walls
- Possible collapse of small pieces of plaster
- Fall of fragments of material (plaster and/or mud) in the basal area of the walls
- Appearance of small holes caused by insects
Possible alterations due to human actions

The first 6 types of minor damages (excluding the possible unpredictable damages by human actions) can be easily controlled and repaired by using the traditional materials (mud and straw) by expert restorers. These are actively present in the Italian archaeological team.

As a result, what visitors see today at Arslantepe are the authentic walls of the 4th millennium BC palace, exactly as archaeologists saw them when bringing them to light the first time.

Security of the site and remains

Arslantepe is protected by a perimeter wall and fence; at the basis of the mound and within its same perimeter is the excavation dig house and deposits. The dig house has been gradually built in the years, and grown from the single small mud-brick structure existing in 1961 at the beginning of the Italian excavations to comprehend now 4 independent structures, all built with the traditional mud-brick technique. These buildings serve as lodgings and work area for the archaeologists and specialists and as deposits for the archaeological materials.

A large storehouse and three smaller distinct storages are filled with archaeological material and get sealed by the Malatya Archaeological Museum authorities when the work season is closed. Various shelters are also present and modified upon need, where sherds are stacked. The quantity of materials found during the uninterrupted for almost 60 years of excavation are uncountable and these storages are now starting to be non-sufficient. Further storage spaces need to be constructed within a broad and all-inclusive planning of the work and living space. Another problem of the existing structures is their maintenance; roofs need to be repaired and general maintenance planned.

Lodging is provided at the excavation house for team members, but these too are now insufficient and every year shifts amongst the participants have to be planned in order to be able to host everyone.

The dig house is within the fence protecting the site but has a distinct entrance to that of tourists. Information boards inform about the two distinct entrances, but often tourists mistakenly go knocking at the dig house; it might thus be useful to find a better way of signalling the difference.

Both excavation house and site have guardians and the area is thus entirely controlled. The site guardian has a small building at the open air museum entrance, where guardians take shifts to cover the site over the 24 hours, whilst the excavation guardian lives at the excavation dig house.

The areas of the mound that are not currently under excavation are covered by vegetation, regularly cleaned by the MAIAO and site guardians.

The mound has been in the past a source of soil for building materials (mud-brick) and there are a series of holes which refer to soil removal by the village inhabitants in the years preceding its regular archaeological excavation. Other disturbances on the surfaces are due to the old excavation trenches made in the 1930s and 40s, when the French expedition was working at the site, and in the early 60s. The northern edge of the mound excavated in the 1960s and 70s nearly down to the level of the surrounding plain has high vertical sections that still stand in a rather good condition even though having suffered from weather erosion during the years. This area has not been included until now in the visitor’s itinerary as it would need to be further investigated and secured. The vertical sections that delimit the area of the 4th millennium BC palatial complex are under control and secured by the MAIAO excavation team since these are
within the exhibited area. A regular long term security plan, carried out in coordination with the museum authorities, should however include the protection of such sections too, as weather and time will increase security problems related to the high vertical earthen sections.

Soil from the excavations is being dumped along the western edges of the mound that are particularly eroded, and in this way the accumulated soil helps to protect the south eastern edges and the archaeological strata behind them. Only occasionally, in the past, the soil removed in the digging operations has been used to fill in the various holes in the mound.

**Restoration and Conservation of Finds**

As with the architecture, the Arslantepe team gives primary attention to the restoration of all finds. During every campaign two to four restorers work on the finds. Objects found in the excavation have also been constantly restored by specialized professionals and are safely kept in the Malatya Museum and in the Arslantepe storages.

All sherds from the excavation are laid out on long lines of tables and attaches are searched for all items and not uniquely for those pots that are clearly found whole. This is preliminary to any serious study of the materials. All sherds composing a pot are sought in order to recompose the pots as integral as possible and then the best preserved pots are completely restored. The restoration techniques followed are concerned with the ethic and aesthetic rules of correct restoration. Colour pigments are added to the gypsum used for integrations in order to give the pot a harmonious look; the integration is visible but not disturbing.

**Conservation of buffer zone**

The mound itself is fully protected since many years and so do the village of Orduzu, within which Arslantepe is found, as it is a predominantly agricultural highland plain, mostly
cultivated with apricot trees. The agricultural land surrounding the site is formed by a deep alluvial deposit, the date of which is still unknown, but most probably of historical age. For this reason, archaeological finds outside the mound are extremely difficult to identify, as they might be underlying metres of alluvial deposit. This somehow protects them, but also makes it difficult to identify areas that might need major attention. Also for this reason, a buffer zone has been created around the site, so as to protect any “invisible” heritage, that might be uncovered in the future, as well as to preserve the surrounding landscape.

The immediate surroundings of the mound have only a few numbers of houses, except to the south, where the central part of Orduzu expands and where 5 story cement flat buildings have more recently been built. In 2018 though, a 3rd degree archaeological conservation zone was created in the area surrounding the site as a guarantee for future environmental preservation of the area. The municipality is furthermore preparing a conservation plan for the whole nominated property and its buffer zone, for a comprehensive assessment of the property with its surrounding and thus respectful development of the area, with abundant green spaces, public areas and touristic facilities.

A road passes just by the mound, connecting two sides of Orduzu and linking it to the centre of Battalgazi. This provides access to the site and might need an increase in facilities (parking lot, for example) in the future, but it should not impact on the site, as it runs outside its proper limits.

4.b. Factors affecting the property

(i) Development Pressures (e.g., encroachment, adaptation, agriculture, mining)

Special attention should be given to construction within Orduzu as impact to the site setting will inevitably come from changes in the surrounding landscape, obstructions to the beautiful views from the site and to the way the mound is viewed from the surrounding area. Today, notwithstanding some modern construction, Orduzu, even though very near to the large city of Malatya, still retains unaltered most of its natural environment, because of the many apricot orchards that characterise it.

Even though the surrounding environment is still mostly uncontaminated, construction in the last years has started menacing local traditional architecture. Most of the land ownership is private in the buffer zone and the current use is for housing and for apricot or orchard cultivation. As main livelihood of the local community is based on agriculture, apricot in particular, and apricot is the primary tourism and economic value for Malatya, there seems no threat of transformation of agricultural land and thus damage to the landscape silhouette, as this has been the case for many years until today, also thanks to the strict legal building regulations on agricultural lands by the Soil Protection and Land Use Act. Yet, the construction activity in the nearby village needs close inspection for preserving the authenticity of building stock, and maintaining the compatibility with the traditional architecture of the area.

(ii) Environmental pressures (e.g., pollution, climate change, desertification)

At the moment there are no environmental pressures on the monumental finds of the site as it has been protected from its major threats: water and snow. Water and snow are in fact the only environmental factors to menace mud-brick preservation, as 40 years of monitoring of the buildings have widely demonstrated. The roof cover open to the sides, thus letting air through, provides the best
protection from environmental risks. There are substantially no risks linked to temperature, as the monumental area is open to the sides, guaranteeing constant ventilation, and the isolating materials of the roof provide an optimal and constant temperature. Twenty years of research and tests are those that have brought to the building of this specific roof cover, whose qualities are also those of respecting and reproducing original volumes of the monument (shape and height of the original roofs of the buildings), respecting original luminosity by alternating dark roof and glass to reproduce ancient open and closed spaces. Importantly, the protective roof cover has been planned to preserve the modern shape of the mound as this has now become part of the heritage landscape: the roof in fact does not protrude above the silhouette of the mound and maintains intact its profile, when seen from the east, upon arrival to the site.

Future activities must ensure the maintenance and increase of the roofing and protection systems, as the excavations proceed.

(iii) Natural disasters and risk preparedness (earthquakes, floods, fires, etc.)

Flooding and fire are the main natural risks for the mound. The first is highly unlikely due to the high position of the monumental area on the mound, but for both situations the site management plan discussed by the various local stakeholders, and thus authorities has planned the implementation of a special task force of the local fire brigades (now located 5km from the site) aimed at the protection of the site in such events.

(iv) Responsible visitation at World Heritage sites

The site is open to the public following official opening hours of Turkish museums (closed on Mondays). The visits can be held free of charge, and between 08:00 – 19:00 in summer, 08:00 – 16:45 in winter.

Visitor pathways

The mound has specifically built non-invasive paths for tourists. Visitors cannot go around on the mound, but must follow these paths and be accompanied at all times. Rigorous pathways have also been designed inside the roofed monumental area so as to guide the visit and protect the architectural structures. Groups of maximum 20-30 people may be taken inside the monumental area at a time, always accompanied by a guard or a tourist guide.

Visitors can view excavation work taking place from outside, but cannot step into the work area. Security and scientific reasons are to blame for this. The possibility for the visitors to
observe work taking place helps in explaining the aims and methods of archaeological research and is an integral part of the visit to the site.

The perception of the importance and monumentality of the Neo-Hittite period at the site is given to visitors on the way back in time and, further approaching the present proper entrance to the tell (tepe). Here, they can admire real size stone copies of the Neo-Hittite reliefs and statues found at Arslantepe in the early excavations (now on display in Ankara, at the Anatolian Civilizations Museum), as well as of two reliefs found in recent years and displayed at the Malatya Museum. All these fantastic works have been made by a local sculptor, who has carved the statues again, exactly reproducing the originals. The Hittite king Tarhunza is there, and the lions and reliefs that decorated the city gates. These have been made with the same stone used in the past, quarried from the Gelincik tepe that stands less than a kilometre from Arslantepe. Arslantepe thus welcomes its visitors starting with its last period of splendour for which Malatya has long been famous, when it was a Neo-Hittite capital. The traces of this phase, exhibited now in the Ankara museum, have with this operation somehow been returned to their original location.

An experimental 1:1 replica of an Arslantepe Early Bronze Age mud-brick house, has also been built in 2010 in this entrance area. The plan, building materials and internal features of the house are those of the original structure, and have been reconstructed on the basis of a thorough architectural and archaeological analysis. The original aim of reconstructing this house was to investigate, and at the same time, exhibit the old mud-brick architecture techniques, and show to local modern inhabitants how their traditional houses have not changed for millennia. This should further help bridge the past with the present as well as being a very effective educational tool for the preservation of traditional cultural heritage.

Even though extremely important and useful within the general exhibition, the position of this house outside the present proper museum area may put that the structure in danger and, for this reason, it was decided not to complete its exhibition by positioning copies of the original objects inside it. Being a mud-brick structure, it obviously also needs maintenance. The lack of a guarded entrance to this area has hitherto prevented fully pursuing the initial aims of this operation. A further planning of the general open-air museum layout should evaluate the possibility of locating the guarded entrance to the Open Air Museum outside this access route, both protecting the valuable copies of the Neo-Hittite statues and allowing to make better use of this house.
Although Arslantepe is a site of great cultural and historic importance, its location in eastern Anatolia means it is much less likely to experience the pressures to sites in coastal areas, particularly those in close proximity to popular resorts. Nevertheless, in recent years much has been done to publicise the site, through press and other media and Arslantepe is becoming an increasingly known and recognised site in Turkey and in the world. The extraordinary discoveries have brought to an increasing number of public lectures on Arslantepe in different countries, as well as the production of a number of international documentaries. The excavations at Arslantepe have received two important awards: The Discovery Award by the international Shanghai Archaeology Forum in 2015, and the Rotondi Award to Art Saviors in Italy in 2017. All these recognitions are increasing the awareness of the importance of Arslantepe in the world. It is thus expected that with the inclusion of the site in the UNESCO World Heritage List, a further increase of visitors will come to the site.

Since the only real threat to the site preservation is human damage due to careless use of the site, a potential increase in visitors will necessarily need to see an increase in the number of guardians. Facilities, as a video area, are also planned, so as to sort the visitors in different areas of the site and do not overload the monumental palatial area with visitors at the same time.

Annual visitor numbers to Arslantepe as of 30 November 2018 can be seen from the table below (The site was opened to visitors in 2011).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>6,090</td>
<td>11,855</td>
<td>12,037</td>
<td>17,644</td>
<td>25,735</td>
<td>23,404</td>
<td>51,315</td>
<td>41,668</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to the statistics provided by the Ministry of Culture and Tourism, 51,315 people visited Arslantepe in 2017 and 41,668 in 2018. On the other hand, visitor numbers for Malatya Archaeology Museum where findings from Arslantepe are exhibited was 25,270 in 2017 and 17,447 in 2018. This means that the Malatya Museum attracted nearly half of the numbers of people that visited Arslantepe recent years. In order to better convey the site’s values to visitors, a well-prepared presentation scenario that will link the site and the museum is required and to be prepared.

Management Plan dealt with visitor management issue closely and priority among policies is given to this necessity.
(v) **Number of inhabitants within the property and the buffer zone**

Estimated population located within

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of nominated property</th>
<th>: None</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Buffer zone</td>
<td>: 1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>: 1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>: 2018</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. **PROTECTION AND MANAGEMENT OF THE PROPERTY**

5.a. **Ownership**

The mound and all its finds are property of the State whereas a small portion of private property exists within the 1st Degree Archaeological Conservation site, corresponding to the nominated property boundary. The Directorate General for Cultural Heritage and Museums of the Ministry of Culture and Tourism are thus responsible for taking necessary measures to protect, conserve and present the State property. The lands within the buffer zone are almost totally the private property, as shown by the map below (parcels in yellow), and by the orginal scaled map as annexed. Thus, private property forms 85% of all area nominated.

![Ownership map](image)

Ownership within nominated property and its buffer zone

5.b. **Protective designation**

The mound of Arslantepe itself is scheduled as a 1st degree archaeological conservation site for the first time by the decision of Adana Regional Conservation Council dated 20/201/1989
The boundaries were then enlarged by the decision of Sivas Regional Conservation Council dated 23/12/2010 numbered 2145. The immediate surroundings of the site were also defined as a 3rd degree archaeological conservation site by the decision of Sivas Regional Conservation Council dated 24/01/2018 numbered 4081. 3rd degree archaeological conservation site boundary overlaps with conservation plan boundary, which is now being prepared as well as the management plan boundary which was approved by the Ministry decision dated 09/04/2018 numbered 303566.

The legislation states that within 1st degree archaeological conservation sites no building or any form of damage to archaeological layers is permitted, the boundaries of the protection zone need to be indicated on a city or town plan, and no excavation is permitted except for the scientific archaeological excavation. No tree plantation or intervention, including agriculture, is permitted, but only limited seasonal production and agricultural harvesting from existing plantation is allowed. Necessary infrastructural applications by legal and private enterprises shall be implemented upon the conservation council’s assessment and approval based on the scientific reports of excavation teams and museum directorate. Interventions for visitor path, open parking area, toilets, ticket sales and guardhouse arrangements can be made upon conservation council’s approval.

Within the third degree conservation boundary, new developments and building activity is allowed providing the balance between conservation and development. While defining development conditions and provisions at these areas, conformity between current and proposed densities, functions and construction materials and techniques is essential. The experts of the concerned museum are required to carry out sounding works before a building permit is issued at these sites. The works may be implemented pursuant to the decree of the concerned cultural heritage conservation board after a report based on the sounding results prepared by the experts, and the opinion of the head of excavation is forwarded to the board by the museum directorate in case a cultural heritage is found there.

Amalgamation and parcelling out may be carried out at both of these archaeological sites without affecting their nature provided that the permission is obtained from the authorized cultural and natural heritage conservation board. Stone, soil or sand is not allowed to be taken away from these sites; the quarries to extract lime, stone, brick, marble, sand or mine are not allowed; soil, cinder, garbage, industrial waste or alike cannot be dumped to these sites.

A large portion of the buffer zone is also protected by Soil Protection and Land Use Act No:5403 as it includes lands whose farming nature is to be protected. Pursuant to the Regulation on Protection, Use and Planning of Agricultural Lands which is based on this Act, at the lands whose farming nature shall be protected, the facilities in which the agricultural product may be processed or utilized are permitted to be built only in order to operate the agricultural enterprise owned by a farmer economically or encourage the agricultural production. The land to be assigned to such agricultural use shall not exceed 2/100 of the total land area. Assigning the land to the non-agricultural use is subject to the permission of the concerned Ministry and construction permit in those lands are defined within development plans on conditions that it cannot exceed 10% upper limit as a general acceptance.

5.c. Means of implementing protective measures

The mound is a state property where Ministry of Culture and Tourism, upon the Article 63rd of Constitution is the main responsible government body for conservation and management of the site. The Ministry is organized both in central, regional and local level. Directorate General for Cultural Heritage and Museums is centrally regulating the activities of its local branches and
fulfilling certain tasks regarding landscaping and the World Heritage issues and also responsible for taking necessary measures to protect, conserve and present the site, has thus direct access and control on the area. Local branches, which are relevant for this case, are Sivas Regional Council for Conservation of Cultural Heritage, Sivas Directorate of Surveying and Monuments while the local branch is the Directorate of Malatya Museum.

All conservation and development activities take place according to the national Act on the Preservation of Cultural and Natural Property with the approval of the Regional Conservation Council. Designating the site as 1st and 3rd Degree Archaeological Conservation Sites infers that no construction activity in these areas is allowed unless approved by regional conservation council. The activities within registered conservation zones should be defined within scope of a project by related institutions appropriately to the conservation plans and can only be implemented if they are approved by regional conservation council. If there is a problem with implementation of projects or any activity is realized inappropriately to the conservation law, these organs implement legal action.

Sivas Directorate of Surveying and Monument is the executive body of monitoring the implementation of projects operated at site.

Excavation, restoration and scientific researches in archaeological site are held by excavation team which is charged by the Cabinet (Council of Ministers) at yearly base. Activities and works of the excavation team are regularly monitored by the Ministry of Culture and Tourism. Head of the excavation team works in collaboration with Malatya Museum Directorate and sends annual excavation report to the Ministry at the end of every excavation season.

5.d. Existing plans related to municipality and region in which the proposed property is located (e.g., regional or local plan, conservation plan, tourism development plan)

1/100,000 scaled Zoning Plan for Malatya-Elazığ-Tunceli-Bingol region prepared by the Ministry of Spatial Planning and Urbanism, 1/50,000 scaled Zoning Plan and 1/25,000 Development Plan for Malatya Province as well as Malatya Tourism Master Plan prepared by Malatya Metropolitan Municipality are upper scale plans prepared for the region where the nominated property is located.

The mentioned scaled plans do not include a specific action for Arslantepe Mound, except for the Tourism Master Plan, in which the nominated property is aimed to be promoted as a value of the province and integrated into the surrounding visitor itineraries. The plan also targets to increase economic return from tourism activities to the local economy. The related provisions of Tourism Master Plan were taken into consideration during management planning process.

5.e. Property management plan or other management system

As the site stays within the administrative boundaries of Battalgazi Municipality, it has responsibility for planning, access and servicing the area.

According to the Articles 7 and 10 of legal regulation on site management, the draft management plan shall be prepared by a team composed of experts and consultants from different professions depending on the characteristics of the area in coordination with the site manager appointed by the competent authority according to these principles. In this case, the plan team shall include experts who would be graduates from architecture, urban and regional planning, art history, archaeology, public administration, business management and economic departments of universities.

The first draft of the management plan has been prepared on behalf of the Ministry of Culture and Tourism (General Directorate of Cultural Heritage and Museums) by Prof. Dr.
Marcella Frangipane (La Sapienza University), Prof. Dr Francesca Balossi Restelli (La Sapienza University), Prof. Gian Maria Di Nocera (archaeology, Università della Tuscia di Viterbo) along with other the members of the Italian Archaeological Mission of the Sapienza University of Rome, through “Future is in Tourism” project in 2015 managed by the Ministry of Culture and Tourism (General Directorate of Investments and Enterprises) and supported by Anadolu Efes. The draft was reviewed, revised and developed by the experts of General Directorate of Cultural Heritage and Museums, and legal process for its assessment and approval was initiated thereafter.

The plan was generated through a process with participation of all relevant partners, and in legal collaboration between the Ministry of Culture and Tourism, Battalgazi Municipality and Prof. Dr. Marcella Frangipane. The management plan aims at:

- Integrating archaeology with the natural, social and built environment,
- Identifying sustainable management practices for the site and its environs and
- Proposing practices that are appropriate and relevant to the region

Plan objectives and policies defined to that end are as follows:

**OBJECTIVES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective 1</th>
<th>The site shall be evaluated and managed in the context of its setting and surrounding landscape.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Objective 2</td>
<td>The research interest of the site shall be enhanced by providing better access to information, training and site presence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective 3</td>
<td>Impacts on exposed and underground archaeological material shall wherever possible be minimised.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective 4</td>
<td>Any archaeological finds from the excavation shall be stored and displayed in conditions that are appropriate for their conservation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective 5</td>
<td>Local communities shall be encouraged to become partners in the protection and interpretation of the site and its surroundings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective 6</td>
<td>Visitors to the site shall enjoy a safe, informed and memorable visit including access to good quality interpretation and educational materials.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**POLICIES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use and Planning</th>
<th>LP.1 Protecting the natural setting and silhouette of the surrounding landscape</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LP.2 Planning the site comprehensively</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archaeology and Research</td>
<td>AR.1 Continuation of excavations in its current setting and profile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AR.2 Improving the on-site working conditions of excavation team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AR.3 Dissemination of information regarding Arslantepe excavations and research to a broader public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AR.4 Turning the site into a multidisciplinary scientific research field</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protection, Conservation and Security</td>
<td>PC.1 Increasing the security measures across the site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PC.2 Increasing the protective measures for archaeological remains</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PC.3 Constant and systematic monitoring of the site and remains</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion and Presentation</td>
<td>PP.1 Increasing the quality of on-site visiting infrastructure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PP.2 Benefiting from new technologies for off-site presentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PP.3 Increasing the level of recognition of Arslantepe by a broader public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PP.4 Increasing the accessibility to the site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socio-Economic Development and Management</td>
<td>SDE.1 Increasing the quality of economic infrastructure at nearby settlements for tourism activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SDE.2 Ensuring economic benefit from activities at Arslantepe to local community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SDE.3 Integration of Arslantepe identity to local life at Malatya province</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SDE.4 Increasing coordination and cooperation capacity among stakeholders</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Priority in the management policies is given to protection, conservation and planning in the action plan, followed by research, presentation and socio-economic integration of local community.

One of the sensitivities in management policies has been raised on visitor management. Taking into consideration the fragility of the mud-brick structures in the site and relatively small size of the tell in terms of visiting area, although no damage is foreseen to be witnessed for the near future, presentation and promotion policies are deliberated in an integrated manner in order for better management of possible increase in visitor numbers in the long run. While aiming at attracting more visitors through different policies, the attention is also paid to the capacity and character of the site. Therefore, providing presentation opportunities for off-site visitors, improving protective measures and managing circulation within the site as well as developing an integrated visit between the Museum and the site to prolong the visit duration and expand visiting area are defined as main targets to be achieved through visitor management policies. Primary target is, however, to complete upgrading the on-site presentation infrastructure until expected increase in visitor numbers is realized in order to get the site prepared for more visitors by increasing its carrying capacity and not threatening its unique values.

According to the legal regulation, a management plan is to be produced by the Ministry of Culture and Tourism in archaeological conservation sites, assessed by the Advisory Board composed of members from professional chambers, civil society organisations, relevant university departments and persons with the right to property in the area, and approved by Supervision and Coordination Board whose members are representatives from each of the administrations the services of which are needed within the scope of the management plan. The process (preparation, assessment, approval, implementation, monitoring and revision of the management plan) shall be in coordination with a site manager, additional to his/her other duties of devising annual work schedules and audit reports. The management structure composed of a site manager, advisory board and supervision and coordination board is appointed by the Ministry.

Therefore, the Ministry of Culture and Tourism has appointed 19th of December, 2018 as the site manager for Arslantepe Management Plan and established the two boards as to consist of the following members:

**Advisory Board**
- Arslantepe Excavation Team
- Dr. Sevgi Dönmez (Inonu University, Department of Archaeology)
- Dr. Hulusi Binbaşoğlu (Malatya Turgut Ozal University, Department of Tourism and Hotel Management)
- Dr. Aysun Tuna (Inonu University, Department of Landscape Architecture)
- Malatya Chamber of Merchants and Craftsmen
- Malatya Chamber of Trade and Industry
- Malatya Chamber of Architect
- Orduzu Neighbourhood Administration
- Orduzu Education and Culture Foundation

**Supervision and Coordination Board**
- General Directorate of Cultural Heritage and Museums
- Malatya Metropolitan Municipality
- Battalgazi Municipality
- Malatya Provincial Directorate of National Education
- Malatya Provincial Directorate of Culture and Tourism
- Malatya Provincial Directorate of Agriculture and Forestry
• Malatya Museum Directorate
• Sivas Regional Directorate for Conservation of Cultural Heritage
• Sivas Surveying and Monuments Directorate
• Fırat Development Agency

The plan was assessed by Advisory Board, and legally approved by Supervision and Coordination Board on 8th of January, 2019.

5.f. Sources and levels of finance

Financial resources for the annual excavation and conservation activities are ensured by the Sapienza University of Rome and the Italian Ministry of Foreign Affairs for a total amount of approximately 90,000 euro annually.

The Malatya Directorate of Culture and Tourism, together with the Malatya Governorship and Battalgazi Municipality have in the years covered expenses related to the restoration of the surrounding traditional architecture, the cleaning and maintenance of the surrounding environment and the construction of the protective roof cover (based on a project made in collaboration by the MAIAO Directorhip of Sapienza University of Rome, the Italian Institute of Conservation and Restoration (ISCR) and the Italian Ministry of Culture and Tourism). The total amount spent by Malatya Governorship on construction of protective roof cover was almost 1.2 million TL (app. 600,000 Euros in 2008 -the project budget year). Their future commitments and obligations are specified in the subscribed Management Plan.

For the landscaping project of Arslantepe that was prepared by the Ministry of Culture and Tourism and approved recently, the Ministry spent nearly 20,000 TL (appr. 6,000 Euro). The implementation expenses of the project, which correspond to nearly 1.7 million TL (app. 280,000 Euros in 2019 budget year) will be met jointly by Malatya Governorship and Eastern Anatolia Project Development Administration.

Fırat Development Agency is another partner institution which is organized at regional base for supporting sustainable development of the region by stipulating local potential and it provide financial supports for projects upon project applications.

5.g. Sources of expertise and training in conservation and management techniques

The value of the property has been established by a long lasting research activity carried out in the site of Arslantepe by professional archaeologists and interdisciplinary team and is documented by a large number of scientific publications in international reviews and books. The high historical and cultural value of the site has been recognized by assigning it international prizes and awards (Shanghai Discovery Award 2015; Vittorio De Sica Prize for Science - Archaeology 2015; Rotondi Award for Art Saviors’ 2017).

Archaeologists, restorers, specialists in various disciplines, professional drawers and photographers are provided by the Sapienza University of Rome - MAIAO; physical anthropologists are provided by the Hacettepe University of Ankara; architects, archeobotanist, and archaeologist are available at the Inonu University of Malatya; expert in landscape reconstruction is available at the Instanbul Technical University. Town planning and tourism experts are guaranteed by the Battalgazi Municipality and the Inonu University.
5.h. Visitor facilities and infrastructure

The site is open to the public following official opening hours of Turkish museums (closed on Mondays). The mound has specifically built paths for tourists. Visitors cannot wander around the mound, but must keep to these paths and be accompanied at all times. The monumental area is roofed and there too visitors follow a rigorous pathway so to protect the architectural structures.

At the moment at the entrance visitors find a single toilet that suffers from poor cleaning and maintenance. A few seats and shade are provided in the same entrance area, but no selling booths for drinks or souvenirs are present so far in the vicinity. A plan for the enlargement and refurbishment of this area has been approved through designed landscaping project. This project has a particular attention also to the surrounding environment and includes a general planning of the landscape. Within this will also be a small visitor centre and installation of a camera system. It has been prepared by the Ministry of Culture and Tourism with the aim of increasing the carrying capacity of the site maintaining a controlled visit while preserving the site’s values, ensuring the transfer of the precise information about the site, increasing visitor satisfaction as a response to possible increase in visitor number, resolving problems caused by the current use and circulation, and meeting the needs of the site by benefiting modern technological equipment. The aforementioned needs are responded within these design projects which were approved by the decision of Sivas Regional Conservation Council dated 07/12/2017 numbered 4000. The implementation of the project is already scheduled.

Visitors can view excavation work taking place from outside, but cannot step into the work area. Security and scientific reasons are to blame for this. It is important that the visitors can see work taking place as this aids in explaining the aims and methods of archaeological research and is an integral part of the visit to the site. Real size copies of the Neo-Hittite reliefs and statues found at Arslantepe both in the early excavations and now on display in Ankara, at the Anatolian Civilizations Museum, and those found in recent years and displayed at the Malatya Museum have been made by a local sculpture and are positioned just outside the entrance of the open-air museum. The Hittite king Tarhunza is there, and the lions and reliefs that decorated the city gates. These have been made with the same stone used in the past, quarried from the Gelinciktepe that stands less than a kilometre from Arslantepe. Arslantepe thus welcomes its visitors starting with its last period of splendour, that for which Malatya has long been famous, when it was a Neo-Hittite capital.

Information has been given with traditional explanatory panels placed along the visiting route, and convey meanings using traditional communication strategies. Written in three languages (English, Turkish and Italian), they are richly illustrated in order to show the finds, including the objects that are kept in the Malatya museum, as well as the reconstruction of places and activities. The positioning of such panels follows a narrative sequence, which has to gradually “construct” the visitor as a competent observer able to correctly interpret what he or she is observing.

“Heritage of Malatya: Arslantepe Project”, financed by Anadolu Efes (2015), granted the audio guides in four languages, English, Turkish, Italian and German. Currently 10 audio guides are present at the Arslantepe Open Air Museum to be given to the visitors. Use of these audio guides has been monitored in these years and proved highly satisfactory. The audioguide system will thus be increased in number in the near future and a version for children will be implemented.

5.i. Policies and programs related to the presentation and promotion of the property

Pannels, brochures, web site, audio guides will be constantly updated in a collaboration between the General Directorate of Cultural Heritage and Museums, the Malatya Museum, the municipality and the MAIAIO. All these already exist and are in use, but need constant reprinting
and renewal. Next to these, innovative technological systems based on the use of smart phones are being implemented at the Arslantepe Open Air Museum thanks to two projects. These systems do not only make it possible to present a quantity of information much higher than that contained in the printed panels (the number and dimension of which is limited by the physical space and the necessity of not disturbing the visual perception of the monuments), but also to implement different type of media such as video and audio.

The first of these projects is Tarihim Cebimde (my history in my pocket), which is broadcasted in three languages, Turkish, English and German as well as in sign language and operated at http://tarihim.battalgazi.bel.tr/. It was funded by the Firat Development Agency in cooperation with the Battalgazi Municipality. Through this application not only the information on Arslantepe but also those on other historical sites and monuments of Old Malatya can be listened and watched by the visitors. Avoiding the needs to read the long texts written on the conventional panels during the visit, the visitor may see the storage rooms and the withdrawal/redistribution of foodstuffs performed there, as well as the sophisticated bureaucratic recording system with the use of cretulae.

Two distinct but linked web sites shall be implemented in order to be able to work more effectively on the scientific and research matters concerning the site of Aslantepe www.arslantepe.com is the web site managed by the excavation team) and on the informative, touristic and educational aspects of the visit (a new site is being created, implemented and managed by the Malatya Archaeology Museum, Kultur Müdürlüğü and Malatya municipality). The two web sites will be accessed through a single homepage and will thus appear to the user as a unitary site, but the autonomy of its two parts shall facilitate undating and correctness of information.

The basic excavation data, information regarding education and publications is already accessible through www.arslantepe.com. The website has Turkish, English and Italian versions. It provides information on the history and importance of the site; it is rich in photographic data and is a scientific instrument for bibliographical research, as well.

The second web site, which will be linked to the existing one, will contain the more informative, educational, social and touristic information and will provide communication on events related with the site. This web site, supposed to be managed by the Museum, will have a more interactive interface and will also be implemented with the aim of bringing the silent groups who may have opinions about Arslantepe to participate with opinions, discussions and forum groups and thus aid in increasing awareness and participation by creating an “Arslantepe community and network”.

The web sites will be regularly updated and be operated in cooperation by the MAIAO (Archaeological team), the Provincial Directorate of Culture and Tourism and Malatya Museum, and the Battalgazi Municipality.

The management of the site area too is the product of a fruitfull collaboration, in which the local municipality is also involved together with the İnönü University department for Landscape Architecture, for a contextualization of the site of Arslantepe within a wider project of archaeopark, with environmental and historical values. Work on the archaeopark project is underway and being financed by the Turkish national TUBITAK research centre.

5.j. Staffing levels and expertise (professional, technical, maintenance)

Archaeologists specialized in Near Eastern and Anatolian prehistory and protohistory, well trained in the complex methodologies of complex stratified mound excavations; professional
restorers expert in the restoration of pottery, metals, clay objects, organic material; specialized restorers in the delicate mud-brick and wall painting restoration and conservation; archaeozoologist and archaeobotanists; geomorphologists; experts in archaeometric analyses of pottery, clay, and metals; experts in topographic survey and digital drawings; professional photographers are all needed and available within the team of MAIAO of the Sapienza University of Rome and their collaborators in order to guarantee the continuation of high quality research, conservation and documentation activities at the site, and promote training of young generations on these topics.

Experts in communication and tourism are also needed to promote the knowledge of the site in a wide international environment and manage the visitor flows.

Professional and technical services in Arslantepe are performed by Malatya Museum Directorate affiliated to General Directorate of Cultural Heritage and Museums. The Arslantepe excavation team works in direct and continuous relation with the Museum authority. 11 expert personnel (archaeologists and art historians) including Museum Director and about 40 auxiliary staff (administrative, technical and security) are charged in Malatya Museum and its sub-units. At Arslantepe, 5 guards are working in shifts affiliated to Malatya Museum Directorate. There is also one guard in the Excavation house, employed by MAIAO of the Sapienza University of Rome.

Besides, 4 personnel (archaeologist, city planner, architect and an administrative staff) are employed within UNESCO Section founded within the body of Battalgazi Municipality, in order to facilitate preparation and implementation of management plan, providing coordination between conservation and management plans towards the site, and organizing awareness raising, educational and training programs for local citizens.

6. MONITORING

6.a. Key indicators for measuring state of conservation

The following key indicators are taken as basis while monitoring the site regularly by excavation team in collaboration with the local branches of the Ministry of Culture and Tourism; such as the Malatya Museum, Sivas Regional Conservation Council and Sivas Surveying and Monuments Directorate.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Monitoring the Nominated Property</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indicator</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cracks in the mud-brick due to thermal stress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Possible enlargement of existing fractures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changes in the inclination of the walls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presence of wasp/insect nests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decrease in intensity of colour paintings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detachment of pieces of plaster or paintings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presence of animal or human disturbance of the mudbrick structures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Possible presence of water infiltration from the roof during the winter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temperature and humidity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vegetation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall condition of pathways</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall condition of roof system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of visitors to the site</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Monitoring the Buffer Zone

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Periodicity</th>
<th>Location of Records</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tangible aspects</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of new building permits</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>Battalgazi Municipality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of new settlement permits</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>Battalgazi Municipality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Civic life and intangible aspects</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>Battalgazi Municipality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of visitors to the city</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>Battalgazi Municipality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of visitors to the museums</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>Battalgazi Municipality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of overnight stays</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>Battalgazi Municipality</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Records include written records, drawings and digital photo documentation. A database is currently being developed for monitoring, documenting and updating scientific information. Photos are taken of each assessment category to ensure greater clarity of the possible problems and their assessment year by year.

### 6.b. Administrative arrangements for monitoring property

Monitoring the property is held regularly by related institutions in the light of their own legal responsibilities. These institutions are as follows:
- Ministry of Culture and Tourism
  - General Directorate of Cultural Heritage and Museums (central)
  - Sivas Regional Council Directorate for Conservation of Cultural Heritage (regional)
  - Sivas Directorate of Surveying and Monuments (regional)
  - Malatya Museum Directorate (local)
- Battalgazi Municipality (local)
- Excavation Team (local)
- Site Management (local)
  - Site Manager
  - Advisory Board
  - Supervision and Coordination Council
Ministry of Culture and Tourism’s monitoring includes not only the site itself, but also the actions of individuals and implementations of plans and projects of different institutions, as well. In order to follow the implementation of the management plan itself, Ministry of Culture and Tourism has established site management unit which is both responsible for preparing and monitoring of the management plan (detailly explained in section 5.e).

6.c. Results of previous reporting exercises

Annual reports and documentation on the preservation status of the site are kept in the archives of the General Directorate of Cultural Heritage and Museums as well as in the archives of Malatya Museum Directorate, Sivas Regional Conservation Council Directorate and Sivas Surveying and Monuments Directorate.

Reports are written yearly by the professional restorers of the ISCR (Istituto Centrale per la Conservazione e il Restauro) of Italy, who carry out the conservation and the monitoring of the state of preservation of the mud-brick structures and paintings, and annual reports on the excavation and conservation activities are prepared by the director of the MAIAO expedition and sent to the General Directorate of Cultural Heritage and Museums of Turkey. Yearly, the Inspector from the General Directorate send to the Ministry of Culture and Tourism of Turkey reports every 15 days and a final report at the end of the season. These are internal documents kept by the competent authorities.

The paper archive of the excavation consists of a huge documentation relating to the Italian excavations since 1961 and contains hundreds of excavation notebooks, plans, stratigraphic sections, unit sheets, and a very large number of drawings and lists of finds. Together with these is the photographic documentation that includes a wide range of formats (black and white photographs, coloured photographs, slides and videos, digital photographs). Digital photographs are kept in Hard Disks and in CDs. The Italian Archaeological Expedition MAIAO is facing the issues concerning the storage and updating of the format of this huge archive due to the changing nature of the technology used.

Part of the paper documentation has been already digitised and the finds have been recorded in a digital database that is in process of being continuously increased and updated. All this archive is kept in the office of the Arslantepe Excavation Team at the Sapienza University of Rome, but copies are also kept at the Arslantepe excavation house for work during the excavation season.

The photo archive prepared by the Arslantepe Excavation Team is available in print, slide and digital format. They are used for scientific and not commercial purposes. The whole archive of pictures documents the history of excavations, the methodology of field research adopted in the course of time, the various members of the team (academicians, restorers, technicians, students, specialists, etc.) and workers as well as the social life in the excavation house. In order to use these materials in unofficial websites, TV programs, documentaries, brochures, magazines, books etc. the permission of the Italian Archaeological Mission and the Sapienza University of Rome is needed.

7. DOCUMENTATION

7.a. Photographs and audiovisual image inventory and authorization form

Photo Album including up-to-date photographs of the site is enclosed to the nomination (Annex 7.a).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Format</th>
<th>Caption</th>
<th>Date of Photo</th>
<th>Photographer/Director of the video</th>
<th>Copyright owner</th>
<th>Contact details of copyright owner</th>
<th>Non-exclusive cession of rights</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>photo</td>
<td>Overview of Arslantepe in the Malatya plain.</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>Roberto Ceccacci</td>
<td>MAIAO</td>
<td>See below</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>photo</td>
<td>Overview of Arslantepe mound in the Orduzu plain.</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>Roberto Ceccacci</td>
<td>MAIAO</td>
<td>See below</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>photo</td>
<td>General Overview of Arslantepe Mound.</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>Roberto Ceccacci</td>
<td>MAIAO</td>
<td>See below</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>photo</td>
<td>Elite houses of the first half of the 4th millennium BC</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Roberto Ceccacci</td>
<td>MAIAO</td>
<td>See below</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>photo</td>
<td>Small marble lion figurine from Period VII.</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>Roberto Ceccacci</td>
<td>MAIAO</td>
<td>See below</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>photo</td>
<td>Niched wall at the corner of the central cult hall in temple C.</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Roberto Ceccacci</td>
<td>MAIAO</td>
<td>See below</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>photo</td>
<td>Mass-produced bowls for ceremonial redistribution of food found in</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Roberto Ceccacci</td>
<td>MAIAO</td>
<td>See below</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>photo</td>
<td>Wall painting from Temple C.</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Roberto Ceccacci</td>
<td>MAIAO</td>
<td>See below</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>photo</td>
<td>Vessels from Period VII.</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Roberto Ceccacci</td>
<td>MAIAO</td>
<td>See below</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>photo</td>
<td>Large jars from Period VII.</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Roberto Ceccacci</td>
<td>MAIAO</td>
<td>See below</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>photo</td>
<td>Mass produced bowls from period VII temples.</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Roberto Ceccacci</td>
<td>MAIAO</td>
<td>See below</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>photo</td>
<td>Obsidian blade core from period VII.</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>Roberto Ceccacci</td>
<td>MAIAO</td>
<td>See below</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>photo</td>
<td>Arslantepe Palace Southern public sectors from Period VIA.</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>Roberto Ceccacci</td>
<td>MAIAO</td>
<td>See below</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>photo</td>
<td>4th millennium Palace from the north in the foreground Temple B.</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>Roberto Ceccacci</td>
<td>MAIAO</td>
<td>See below</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>photo</td>
<td>The cult room in Temple B.</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>Roberto Ceccacci</td>
<td>MAIAO</td>
<td>See below</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>photo</td>
<td>4th millennium Palace, the Audience Building.</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Roberto Ceccacci</td>
<td>MAIAO</td>
<td>See below</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>photo</td>
<td>The oldest corridor section with wall paintings leading to the great court and the Audience Building.</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Roberto Ceccacci</td>
<td>MAIAO</td>
<td>See below</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>photo</td>
<td>Wall paintings in the old corridor section.</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Roberto Ceccacci</td>
<td>MAIAO</td>
<td>See below</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>photo</td>
<td>Impressed and painted decoration in Temple A.</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>Roberto Ceccacci</td>
<td>MAIAO</td>
<td>See below</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>photo</td>
<td>Impressed and painted decoration in the side room of Temple B.</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>Roberto Ceccacci</td>
<td>MAIAO</td>
<td>See below</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>photo</td>
<td>Wall paintings in the room leading to the storage area.</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Roberto Ceccacci</td>
<td>MAIAO</td>
<td>See below</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>photo</td>
<td>A detail from the painted wall of the room leading to the stores.</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Roberto Ceccacci</td>
<td>MAIAO</td>
<td>See below</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>photo</td>
<td>High-stemmed bowls in Temple B.</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Roberto Ceccacci</td>
<td>MAIAO</td>
<td>See below</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>photo</td>
<td>The storage room</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td>Roberto Ceccacci</td>
<td>MAIAO</td>
<td>See below</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>photo</td>
<td>Vessels and Pithoi in the redistribution storeroom.</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Roberto Ceccacci</td>
<td>MAIAO</td>
<td>See below</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>photo</td>
<td>Mass produced bowls from the redistribution storeroom.</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Roberto Ceccacci</td>
<td>MAIAO</td>
<td>See below</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>photo</td>
<td>Seal impression with animals.</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Roberto Ceccacci</td>
<td>MAIAO</td>
<td>See below</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>photo</td>
<td>Seal impression with chief-king on a sledge car.</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Roberto Ceccacci</td>
<td>MAIAO</td>
<td>See below</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
29 photo Seal impression with goats and sheep. 2003 Roberto Ceccacci MAIAO See below yes
30 photo Seal impression with lion. 2013 Roberto Ceccacci MAIAO See below yes
31 photo Palace Swords. 2014 Roberto Ceccacci MAIAO See below yes
32 photo Sword's hilt with silver inlay. 2003 Roberto Ceccacci MAIAO See below yes
33 photo Palace Spearheads. 2014 Roberto Ceccacci MAIAO See below yes
34 photo Palace weapons in situ. 2011 Roberto Ceccacci MAIAO See below yes
35 photo Metal plaque found with the weapons. 2015 Roberto Ceccacci MAIAO See below yes
36 photo Huge communal building on the top of the mound from Period VIB1. 2012 Roberto Ceccacci MAIAO See below yes
37 photo Copper spearheads from Period VIB1. 2012 Roberto Ceccacci MAIAO See below yes
38 photo Royal Tomb cist grave from Period EB1. 2013 Roberto Ceccacci MAIAO See below yes
39 photo Royal Tomb Spearheads from Period EB1. 2013 Roberto Ceccacci MAIAO See below yes
40 photo Royal Tomb Vessels outside the cist. 2012 Roberto Ceccacci MAIAO See below yes
41 photo Royal Tomb Silver pins. 2013 Roberto Ceccacci MAIAO See below yes
42 photo Town gate from the Imperial Hittite period Late Bronze Age I. 2007 Roberto Ceccacci MAIAO See below yes
43 photo Pottery from Late Bronze Age I. 2009 Roberto Ceccacci MAIAO See below yes
44 photo Early Iron Age monumental Town wall. 2016 Roberto Ceccacci MAIAO See below yes
45 photo Neo-Hittite period, A large pillared hall adjacent to the area where the Lion's Gate was. 2008 Roberto Ceccacci MAIAO See below yes
46 photo One of the lion statues flanking the Lion's Gate exhibited in the Ankara Museum of Civilizations. 2005 Roberto Ceccacci MAIAO See below yes
47 photo Early Iron Age, the first relief found. 2010 Roberto Ceccacci MAIAO See below yes
48 photo Early Iron Age, the second relief found in situ. 2010 Roberto Ceccacci MAIAO See below yes
49 photo Early Iron Age, the second relief found. 2010 Roberto Ceccacci MAIAO See below yes
50 photo Open Air Museum, roofing on 4th millennium Palace. 2010 Roberto Ceccacci MAIAO See below yes
51 photo Open Air Museum entrance to the 4th millennium palace. 2011 Roberto Ceccacci MAIAO See below yes
52 photo Tourists visiting the Palace. 2011 Roberto Ceccacci MAIAO See below yes
53 photo Visitors at the site entrance. 2011 Roberto Ceccacci MAIAO See below yes
54 photo External visitor route on the mound. 2011 Roberto Ceccacci MAIAO See below yes
55 photo Malatya Museum. 2019 Kenan Özdaş Malatya Museum See below yes
56 photo Malatya Museum Exhibition Room. 2019 Kenan Özdaş Malatya Museum See below yes
7.b. Texts relating to protective designation, copies of property management plans or documented management systems and extracts of other plans relevant to the property


7.b.2. Decision of Sivas Regional Conservation Council for Cultural and Natural Heritage dated 23/12/2010 and numbered 2145.


7.b.5. Decision of Sivas Regional Conservation Council for Cultural Heritage dated 07/12/2017 numbered 4000.

7.b.6. Arslantepe Management Plan

7.b.7. Approved Landscaping Project

All above mentioned documents are presented as annex (See Annex 7.b).

7.c. Form and date of most recent records or inventory of property

The main official yearly records relating to the site and its research, excavation and restoration history consist of drawings, photographs, and reports since 1961, in both hardcopy format and in digital format. Most of the records, which are filled in by the Excavation and research director and by the Ministry inspectors that follow yearly the research that takes place at the site, and more irregular previous records are archived in General Directorate of Cultural Heritage and Museums of Ministry of Culture and Tourism, while Regional Conservation Council decisions are kept within the archive of the Sivas Regional Directorate of Conservation of Cultural Heritage.

These are synthetic reports and summaries of activities, as well as statements on the finds and the state of preservation and are accompanied by a selection of images and plans.

Detailed excavation reports, excavation notes, photographs, plans, and database of finds are produced and stored by the Sapienza University Archaeological Expedition.

7.d. Address where inventory, records and archives are held

Ministry of Culture and Tourism,
General Directorate of Cultural Heritage and Museums:
Anafartalar Mah. Cumhuriyet Cad. II. Meclis Binası Yani 06110 Ulus Ankara / TURKEY
Tel: +90 312 470 80 00
Fax: +90 312 470 65 32
E-mail: kulturvarlikmuze@kultur.gov.tr
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8. CONTACT INFORMATION OF RESPONSIBLE AUTHORITIES

8.a. Preparer

Prof. Dr. Marcella FRANGIPANE
Head of Arslantepe Excavation Team
MAIAO Missione Archeologica Italiana in Anatolia Orientale:
Università Sapienza di Roma, Via dei Volsci 122, ROMA
E-mail: marcella.frangipane@uniroma1.it (director Prof. Marcella Frangipane)
Evrim ULUSAN
Urban Planner, M.Sc – Culture and Tourism Specialist
Kultur Varlıklar ve Muzeler Genel Müdürlüğü
II. Meclis Binası Ulus / ANKARA
Tel: +90 312 470 60 55
Fax: +90 312 470 65 45
E-mail: evrim.ulusan@kulturturizm.gov.tr

Ugur ISIK
Archaeologist – Culture and Tourism Specialist
Kultur Varlıklar ve Muzeler Genel Müdürlüğü
II. Meclis Binası Ulus / ANKARA
Tel: +90 312 470 60 58
Fax: +90 312 470 65 45
E-mail: ugur.isik@kulturturizm.gov.tr

Pınar KUSSEVEN
Archaeologist – Culture and Tourism Specialist
Kultur Varlıklar ve Muzeler Genel Müdürlüğü
II. Meclis Binası Ulus / ANKARA
Tel: +90 312 470 60 32
Fax: +90 312 470 65 45
E-mail: pinar.kusseven@kulturturizm.gov.tr

Cem KAYA
Archaeologist
Battalgazi Municipality
Uçbaglar Mah. Sivas Cad. No: 48 Battalgazi / MALATYA
Tel: +90 422 328 44 44
Fax: +90 422 322 00 50
E-mail: arslantepehoyugu@gmail.com

Bülent KORKMAZ
Malatya Provincial Directorate of Culture and Tourism
Istasyon Kavşağı, Kongre ve Kültür Merkezi Battalgazi / MALATYA
Tel: +90 422 323 29 42
Fax: +90 422 323 29 12
E-mail: korkmazbulent@gmail.com

8.b. Official Local Institution/Agency

Ministry of Culture and Tourism
Directorate General of Cultural Heritage and Museums
Address: Kultur Varlıklar ve Muzeler Genel Müdürlüğü
II. Meclis Binası Yani 06110 Ulus/ANKARA/TURKEY
Tel: +90 312 470 80 00 (Pbx)
Fax: +90 312 470 65 32
E-mail: kulturvarlikmuze@kulturturizm.gov.tr
8.c. Other Local Institutions

Malatya Museum Directorate  
Kernek Meydani No:5 Malatya / TURKEY  
Tel: +90 422 321 30 06  
Fax: +90 422 324 98 98  
E-mail: malatyamuzesi@kultur.gov.tr

Battalgazi Municipality  
Uçbaglar Mah. Sivas Cad. No: 48 Battalgazi / MALATYA  
Tel: +90 422 328 44 44  
Faks: +90 422 322 00 50  
Email: battalgazibel.kultur@gmail.com

8.d. Official Web address

Ministry of Culture and Tourism  
http://www.kultur.gov.tr  
http://www.kulturvarliklari.gov.tr
AUTHORIZATION

On behalf of the Ministry of Culture and Tourism, I hereby grant free of charge, to UNESCO the non-exclusive cession of rights to diffuse, to communicate to the public, to publish to reproduce, to exploit, in any form and on any support, including digital, all or part of images provided and license these rights to third parties.

I understand the non-exclusive of rights does not impinge upon intellectual property rights (rights of the photographer or copyright owner if different) and that when the images are distributed by UNESCO a credit to the photographer will always be given, if clearly provided in the form and all possible profits deriving from such cession of rights will go to the World Heritage Fund.
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22/01
DIRECTORATE GENERAL FOR CULTURAL HERITAGE AND MUSEUMS

Ankara, 22/01/2019

Murat GÜRÜL
General Director