

ARCHAEOLOGY,
ANTHROPOLOGY AND HERITAGE
IN THE BALKANS AND
ANATOLIA: THE LIFE AND TIMES
OF F.W. HASLUCK, 1878-1920

Edited by

David Shankland

Volume II

THE ISIS PRESS
ISTANBUL

2004

37. CHRONOLOGIES OF DESIRE AND THE USES OF MONUMENTS: EFLATUNPINAR TO ÇATALHÖYÜK AND BEYOND

Lucia NIXON

The first of my two major themes is subsumed in the phrase 'chronologies of desire', which I have adapted from Lynn Meskell's phrase 'archaeology of desire'.¹ I am suggesting that time and dating are often very much what we make of them, particularly when we think we are being most objective. Chronologies of desire are always linked with an intention to control people's views of time: as Geary puts it, 'Those who could control the past could direct the future'.² Chronologies of desire also involve selection. Some events or aspects of a period are selected for remembrance; others are selected for suppression and oblivion.

There are perhaps two main types of chronologies of desire: those that seek to encompass the whole of history in one chronological system ('all-encompassing'); and those that insist on an important threshold, before or after which everything was fundamentally different, either incomparably better or immeasurably worse. In both types of chronology, there can also be subdivisions, the number and length of the chronological periods varying according to the agenda of those making them. In some cases, two different groups can regard the same landscape in very different chronological terms, depending on their perspective. One group may hold a dominant view; the other group's view may be muted or submerged.

The second major theme of this paper has to do with monuments and how people use them. Monuments constitute the locus of public memory and public forgetting, both of which are important in making chronologies of desire visible and material. The construction of monuments and their subsequent treatment can reflect very directly the successive chronologies of desire involved at each stage of the monument's life. By looking at a monument and the landscape of which it is a part, it is possible to read the particular chronology of desire which created it, and then maintained or destroyed it.

¹ Meskell (1998; 60).

² Geary (1994; 6) in discussing early mediaeval Europe; also quoted in Alcock (2001; 325).

The selection of events for remembering and forgetting can have very specific affects on monuments. Alcock has used the phrase 'memory theatres' to describe the manipulation of existing monumental landscapes, in relation to the Roman treatment of the Agora at Athens.¹ I have added a similar phrase, 'theatres of oblivion', as a way of describing the destruction, total or partial, of monuments, such as the Buddhas at Bamiyan.

Control of monuments is thus tantamount to control of the past, and therefore of time itself. Many monuments manipulated in this way are sacred structures, or were when they were built, and changing them therefore has a direct effect on the sacred landscape of a particular period.² But all the monuments used in the ways I describe here have one thing in common, whether they are sacred or otherwise: they resonate with powerful symbolic meaning. It is not an accident that that when powerful people reshape their chronologies of desire, they soon make changes to monuments, and in so doing manipulate their symbolic power. For example, the Old Bridge at Mostar, which linked the two banks of the River Neretva, is a poignant example of a conspicuous structure which was destroyed because its ability to connect people symbolically as well as literally was no longer desired. It was built by the Ottoman Turks in 1566, and destroyed by Christians in 1993, who wanted to obliterate the Muslim heritage of Bosnia.³

In this paper I will be talking about how and why groups of people, including academic research teams, ethnic groups, and states construct chronologies of desire, and in some cases, apply them directly to powerfully symbolic monuments. My aim is not to criticise, but rather to show what it is that people are doing when they construct their desired chronologies. As a Canadian I come from a country that once worked very hard to forget that native people arrived in Canada long before Europeans arrived, and to remember only the British and the French: a very particular chronology of desire.⁴ Instead my goal is to draw attention to the constant construction and

¹ Alcock (2001; 334ff). I will discuss the definition and application of this phrase in greater detail below when discussing the Parthenon.

² Alcock (2001; 333).

³ Blakstad (2002; 154-91). The symbolic importance of the Old Bridge is obvious in this quotation: 'I cried when my husband died and I cried when my children died in the war, but the day I cried the most was the day that the Old Bridge came down' (p. 157); and see now Ignatieff (2003).

⁴ Histories of Canada used to begin with the arrival of explorers such as John Cabot and Jacques Cartier, as a way of suggesting that time began in Canada only with the arrival of Europeans. More recently, the *Historical Atlas of Canada* has made it clear that the story of what we call Canada began much earlier (18,000 to 10,000 BC); Cole Harris and Matthews (1987).

revision of chronologies of desire, in which all of us have been complicit at one time or another - the understandable wish to pick and choose what we remember and what we forget.

I will begin with a discussion of Hasluck's study of a monument on one side of the Konya Plain in south west Turkey, and end with an archaeological site on the other side, with detours to Athens and to Afghanistan along the way. Eflatunpınar, studied by Hasluck, provides an example of an all-encompassing chronology of desire, and includes a monument. The Parthenon at Athens is an excellent example of a memory theatre; the Buddhas at Bamiyan exemplify a theatre of oblivion. Çatalhöyük is an archaeological site which also constitutes a monument, though of a somewhat different kind. Four different views of the site are discussed here. All of them belong to the threshold kind of desired chronology, and all of them are different.

Before moving to the four examples, I present Table 1, which shows four different ways of reckoning time. Three belong to the religions of the book (Judaism, Christianity, and Islam); the other belongs to Greek religion which was literate, but did not organize and codify time in quite the same way. Two (Greek religion and Judaism) are chronological systems which begin with the creation of the world and move seamlessly through time thereafter; the other two, Christianity and Islam, begin with an important event, the birth of Christ and the journey (Hijrah) of Mohammed from Mecca to Medina.

In each of these two cases, time begins with the important event. There remains the problem of what to do with the time before the important event. Both Christianity and Islam have been at best ambivalent about it. Both make use of the Old Testament, but repudiate any possible influence of pagan ignorance. Indeed, the Muslim name for the time before Islam is *Jahiliyya*, which means the Time of Ignorance. In both cases, it is extremely clear, and extraordinarily interesting, that the names of the months retain the obvious imprint of the repudiated 'time before': Roman names for the Christian calendar, and pre-Islamic Arabic names for the Islamic calendar.¹

¹ For the *Jahiliyya* see Lewis and Schlacht (1965), under *Djahilyya* and *Fatra*. Cf. (Ali 2002; 27, 62).

Table 1. Four Different Time Systems¹

	Classical Greek religion	Judaism	Christianity	Islam
Creation	World created (Hesiod, <i>Theogony</i>)	World created (<i>Genesis</i>)	World created (<i>Genesis</i>)	World created, (<i>Genesis</i>)
Continuous or threshold with time before?	Continuous (but see below)	Continuous	Threshold. Time before divided into two: useful Judaic heritage; pagan (Greek and Roman etc) idolatry to be repudiated	Threshold. Time before seen as monolithically Jahiliyya (time of ignorance).
Calendar	12 months (names varied from city to city) plus use of eponymous years, again variable Seleucid calendar used 312/ 311 BC as year 1; Olympiads used only from 3 rd c. BC	12 months Time counted from 3761 BC	12 months. Jesus' birth is starting point of Christian chronology., hence AD, 'in the year of our Lord.' B C added later to keep track of 'time before'.	12 months. The Hijrah of Mohammed in AD 622 is starting point, hence AH Before that the Seleucid calendar.
Names of the month	Greek	Hebrew	Roman, including two names referring to 'pagan' Roman emperors (Julius Caesar and Augustus).	Pre-Islamic Arabic.
2002 equivalent	None	5763	2002	1380

¹ References for Table 1 on chronological systems: Blackburn and Holford-Strevens (1999: Greek, 712f.; Jewish, 722f.; Christian, 766f.; Muslim, 731f). Other sources: Hesiod, and the book of Genesis. I have deliberately not used BCE/CE terminology in this paper. I am aware that some people think that it is somehow more neutral than BC/AD, but it still seems to me to be a concealed way of maintaining a dating system based on Christianity.

Table 2. Eflatunpınar¹

	Eflatunpınar
Construction	Mound with evidence for settlement (Late Chalcolithic, Early Bronze II and III, Middle Bronze, Late Bronze, Iron Age, Classical; Hittite sanctuary with pool, late 13 th c. BC).
Afterlife	Ruined village, ?date. 17th c. AD Haji Khalfa refers to Plato as preventer of floods in the Konya Plain. Church with spring of Plato in Konya. Eflatunpınar referred to as 'ancient' (1842); 'Hittite' (1886). Hasluck studies folklore of site. Atatürk encourages Turks to think of Hittites as 'ancestral'. Mellaart investigates site.
Current	Turkish excavations take place at Hittite sanctuary.

Eflatunpınar

At Eflatunpınar (Plato's Spring), near Beyşehir at the western edge of the Konya Plain, stands a monument with sculptured figures in human form. By Hasluck's time, the monument was already known to the scholarly world as a Hittite structure, therefore dating to the Bronze Age. It was also known that Hittite was an Indo-European language. In his article 'Plato in the Folklore of the Konia Plain', originally published in 1913, Hasluck explored the connection between a Hittite monument and an ancient Greek philosopher. Using local accounts and texts, Hasluck showed that both in Konya and in the surrounding plain, Plato was seen, at least by some people, as a magician-philosopher-engineer who prevented floods in the area, and then set 'talismans' (the monument at Eflatunpınar) to guard the spring. Plato in these Turkish traditions was a benignly Islamicised sage, and the Hittite monument he established 'long ago' was apparently totally unproblematic in Hasluck's own time, despite its anthropomorphic reliefs.

¹ References for Table 2 on Eflatunpınar: previous archaeological work includes Hamilton 1842 (Vol. II; 350-1), who identified the monument as 'ancient'; Ward (1886, fig. 1), as Hittite; Mellaart (1962) for a description of the Hittite monument as it then was, and a summary of the material of other periods, including a mention of the ruined village, with sketch plan on p. 112, plus references to other archaeological studies; Özenir (2001) on the current excavations, with numerous plans. Hasluck (1929a) on the stories of Plato associated with the site. It is important to note that we do not know how many people in the area of Konya held the view of Eflatunpınar recorded by Hasluck. Delaney 1991: 289 mentions the official Turkish view of the Hittites as 'ancestral', citing only Gurney's book on the Hittites (1954) with no page number. I have been unable to find additional references on this subject, but see Özdoğan (1988; 116-117) and note also that Hittite emblems appear frequently on a variety of items, from Turkish museum tickets to modern Turkish textiles.

As stated above, the local views of Eflatunpınar, as recorded by Hasluck in the early twentieth century, are a good example of an 'all-encompassing' chronology of desire. There is nothing that cannot be accommodated here. A second millennium BC Hittite monument; a fourth century BC Greek philosopher; Christianity, a new religion unsure of the value of pagan writers; Islam, a new religion beginning in the seventh century AD, whose practitioners were responsible for the translation and survival of many ancient Greek texts; worries about floods and how to prevent them; a plain preserving the name of a classical city (Iconium): all these elements are combined, sometimes in very deep disguise, in the story of Plato's Spring as analysed by Hasluck. The dates of the individual elements are compressed into one long period, the time since Plato stopped the floods forever. When exactly that was does not matter; what does matter is the eternal present since he did stop them.

The Hittite monument at Eflatunpınar was a pre-existing structure which could have been ignored or destroyed by people living near Beyşehir in the Ottoman period. Instead it was neither: it was incorporated, seemingly without question, into a narrative that suited the people living in the locality. The 'no questions asked' strategy is in itself a chronology of desire; the questions aren't asked because the answers might disturb the chronological narrative already constructed.

Archaeological work has now established that the Hittite monument at Eflatunpınar is a spring sanctuary dating the thirteenth century BC, and currently excavations are being conducted at the site. At this point, national (Turkish) points of view come to the forefront. Since the time of Atatürk, Turks have been taught that the Hittites, who lived in Anatolia from the second millennium BC, and spoke a form of Indo-European, were their ancestors. Thus it is possible for Turkish officialdom not only to tolerate pre-Islamic anthropomorphic representations but also actively to excavate and preserve them. Eflatunpınar is now part of an official Turkish chronology of desire which stresses the Hittite phase of the monument's life, and de-emphasises any others.

Table 3: The Parthenon¹

	Parthenon
Construction	Temple to Athene, city goddess of Athens, 447-432 BC.
Afterlife	Attalids erect sculptural monument at very steps of temple part of second c. AD Roman memory theatre (see text). 3rd c. AD fire; and disappearance of cult statue? 5th or 6th c. church, with mutilation of sculptures and apse built at east end, new entrance at west. 12th c. cathedral of Virgin Mary western church 15th c. mosque 1 (simple conversion of church with minaret added) 1687: mosque 1 used as refuge and powder magazine by Turks; bombarded and ruined by Venetian general Morosini. Mosque 2 (small structure built inside ruins, on different axis) 1805: Lord Elgin removes the marbles 1821: rallying point in Greek War in Independence restoration of Akropolis to 5th c. BC state begins in 1842; mosque 2 dismantled 1844. Major restoration of Parthenon under Balanos after earthquake begun 1895, continues until 1933. New restoration under Korres since 1980s.
Current	Symbol of 'grown-up' Greek state, able to ask UK for return of Parthenon marbles as member state to member state of EU.

Memory Theatres: The Parthenon at Athens

Eflatunpınar, though interesting, is problematic because there are many gaps in the story of the monument, for example from its last phase of Hittite use to the Ottoman period. In the case of the Parthenon, we can track how people have used it ever since it was constructed. The complicated history of the building is summarised in Table 3 above. Here I show how the Parthenon has

¹ References for Table 3 on the Parthenon: Travlos (1971), Andrews (1979), Yalouri (2001; 27ff.), Beard (2002). Travlos (1971; 44) gives the history of the Parthenon site before its construction; see also 52-71 for the Akropolis. Note also Ferrari (2001), who discusses the role of the Parthenon's predecessor in the choreography of memory on the Akropolis at Athens.

Plans and photographs: Parthenon: Travlos (1971; 446), Church: Travlos (1971; 456), Mango (1995), Price (1999; 166, n. 82). Cathedral: Beard (2002; 53), Mosque 1: Beard (2002; 79 = Parthenon being blown up by Venetians), Mosque 2: plan, Travlos (1971; 457); photograph, Beard (2002; 84 - taken in 1839; the earliest photograph of the Parthenon). Later stories connected with Parthenon: Yalouri (2001; 18 and 142). Note the seventeenth century Turkish traveller Evliya Çelebi's description of 'the divine philosopher Plato' giving counsel in the Parthenon (Beard 2002; 76 and Andrews 1979; 71) - another example of Muslim regard for 'Eflatun'.

been the focus of successive chronologies of desire for some two and a half millennia, by focussing on a selection of crucial episodes in the afterlife of the Parthenon.

The temple to the goddess Athene Parthenos known as the Parthenon was already controversial when it was built on the Akropolis at Athens in the fifth century BC. Built entirely of marble, lavishly adorned with architectural sculpture, and housing a cult statue of gold and ivory, the temple was expensive. It was also immediately conspicuous: in antiquity it could be seen for miles around, and even today it is visible for some distance. As soon as it was constructed, it became a powerful symbol of Athenian supremacy, both military and cultural. Since then, nearly all those with power over Athens and its territory have proclaimed their conquest by doing something in or near or to the Parthenon.

Like the Hittite monument at Eflatunpınar, the Parthenon was a pre-existing structure. But there is an important difference between the two monuments: neither the Parthenon's original date of construction, nor the cultural milieu which it so conspicuously represents were ever lost from public understanding. Indeed, the Parthenon stood and still stands for something so important, and so desirable, that it has had to be incorporated in all later chronologies relating to Athens — even though incorporating it reminds everyone of a non-Roman, non-Christian, non-Ottoman, non-western European, non-modern Greek time, which existed before all these periods. Some of these later groups have attempted to destroy the Parthenon; others have tried to preserve it. The degree of mutilation and destruction of the Parthenon on the one hand, and conspicuous care and reverence on the other, is a direct reflection of the feelings, negative and positive, toward the time and culture represented by the temple. I want to look now closely at three of the episodes listed in Table 3. The first is the Roman period, which is of exceptional interest here.

Alcock in discussing the reconfiguration of memory in the eastern empire introduces the concept of 'memory theatres': 'spaces which conjured up specific and controlled memories of the past through the use of monuments, images and symbols, spaces which served to remind communities at large of just who they were by drawing on who they had been'. During the Roman period, classical buildings and other architectural elements were moved to the Agora, and new structures were built; indeed the new Odeion of Agrippa was constructed in the formerly open centre of the Agora. Alcock suggests that in

the second century AD the Agora at Athens was a memory theatre; entering it then was to 'confront a space newly configured and charged with monuments, statues and structures, all carrying with them a burden of memory.'¹

To Alcock's memory theatre I would add the Akropolis, including the Roman additions to it. Alcock's reconstructed view of the Agora includes the Sacred Way leading up to the Akropolis. Soon after 27 BC the Romans made their presence felt on the Akropolis by building a temple or altar to Roma and Augustus east of the Parthenon and on axis with it. This new Roman structure affected the Akropolis in two ways: first, you could no longer enter the Parthenon without seeing this visible reminder of Roman power. Second, a new view of the Akropolis - the great Parthenon punctuated by the small, new Roman temple/altar - could be seen from the Agora. This new architectural combination would have been an early part of Alcock's memory theatre, and part, too, of what she sees as an attempt to avoid 'severe disjunctures between past and present'.²

The Christian approach to the Parthenon was more violent. When Christians converted the temple into a church, probably around the end of the sixth century AD, they destroyed most of the sculptures in the eastern pediment by building an apse. Christians irrevocably opposed to the pagan subjects depicted in the sculptures mutilated the metopes on the west, north, and east sides, sparing only N32 because the figures in it resemble those of an Annunciation scene. Clearly the intention of the Christians was to make use of the temple but also simultaneously to distance themselves from its pre-Christian past by destroying anything conspicuously connected with pagan worship. This kind of destruction, when done on a grander scale, is part of the

¹ Alcock (2001; 334-338); first quotation is p. 335; second quotation is p. 337; reconstructed view of the Agora in the second century AD with Akropolis and Parthenon in the background (336).

² Roman changes to the Akropolis: temples/altar to Roma and Augustus, Travlos (1971; 71, 494-7); possible identification as altar rather than temple, Camp (2001; 188). Travlos mentions Roman refurbishment of structures on the slopes of the Akropolis (1971; 54, 70-1). In the last quarter of the first century BC, a statue of Agrippa was erected on a base which had previously displayed statues of Hellenistic kings of Pergamon, and then of Antony and Cleopatra. The base and any statue on it were visible in front of the Propylaia (monumental gateway of the Akropolis) to people going up to the Akropolis; Travlos (1971; 70-1, 487, 493); Camp (2001; 189). The Odeion of Herodes Atticus was built between 160-170 AD on the south slope of the Akropolis; Travlos (1971; 70-71, 378-86); Camp (2001; 215-7). Picture of Agora and Akropolis model (with Parthenon and Roma and Augustus), Camp (2001; 258). The Roman buildings on the Akropolis and in the Agora are not the only Roman structures in Athens, but they are the most significant in the construction of the Roman memory theatre there; for more information see Camp (2001; ch. 6, Roman Athens).

construction of theatres of oblivion, to be discussed in the next section on Bamiyan.¹

The third episode which I wish to examine is the construction of the second mosque after Morosini's bombardment of 1687. The first mosque had been a simple conversion of the more or less complete temple-turned-church. After the bombardment there was enough room on the Akropolis to build a new mosque elsewhere, yet this option was not pursued. Instead, the second mosque, a completely self-contained structure which was effectively free-standing, was set inside the bombed-out Parthenon. The one major difference was that the second mosque was placed on a different axis, presumably to align it more accurately with Mecca. The Parthenon, even in ruins, remains so symbolically powerful that no one in charge of it has ever been able to let it alone.

The citizens of the new modern Greek state who removed the second mosque had their own chronology of desire, which did not include visible monuments of the Tourkokratia, and which did include the restoration of the Parthenon as a conspicuously Greek building. Between the construction of the mosque in the seventeenth century and its dismantling in the nineteenth, another chronology of desire had affected the Parthenon: that of imperial Britain, in the form of Lord Elgin. Depending on whose chronology of desire you follow, either Lord Elgin rescued the sculptures of the Parthenon for the benefit of world civilisation from the ignorant inhabitants of Athens - so ignorant that they were burning fifth century BC marble sculptures for lime; or he stole a vital part of the cultural heritage that links ancient and modern Greece, by distorting the terms of a permit which was issued by an occupying power, i.e. the Ottoman Turks. It is of course relevant that Britain at the time was emerging as a major world power, and that many people in Britain wished to establish a close link between that most respectable of all ancient pasts, the classical world, and their own culture. The sculptures displayed in the British Museum were called the Elgin Marbles after the person who brought them to England. In the twentieth and twenty-first centuries the Greek government (like its nineteenth century predecessor) has continued to pour huge sums into the restoration of the Parthenon, and to ask for the return of the Parthenon

¹ For details of the Christian mutilation of the Parthenon, see Parthenon metopes (including those on the east and west sides mutilated by Christians), Boardman (1991; 96-105, and figs 85-91). Many temples were turned into churches; see for example the Temple of Aphrodite at Aphrodisias (Aphrodite's city) in western Turkey, renamed Stavroupolis (city of the cross) as part of an aggressive programme of Christianisation discussed by Cormack (1990) and Smith (1993). For the Romanisation of Greek Aphrodisias before that, see now Alcock (2001; 338-342).

Marbles. In the meantime the Louvre is keeping very quiet about the section of Parthenon frieze on display in Paris.¹

The story of the Parthenon is thus one that involves many chronologies of desire. Outsiders with power over Athens always desire to incorporate all or part of the temple into their own histories (Roman temples, Christian church, mosque, museum collections) — and in some cases to eliminate histories that are considered unsuitable. Similarly, the now Orthodox Greeks seem to deny that there have been any changes to the temple since its construction in the fifth century BC, by removing all traces of any other subsequent period (the churchly adaptations as well as the second mosque), possibly as a way of forgetting that Greece was ever subjugated by anyone. In this case the pagan-ness of the Parthenon can be overlooked, because establishing and maintaining a connection to the 'free' classical past is more important for national identity than denying the existence of all pre-Christian religions. In all cases the Parthenon has served as a focus for a series of chronological agendas, each one made visible by changes to the temple or its setting.

Table 4. Bamiyan²

	Bamiyan
Construction	Buddhas constructed in 5 th -6 th c. AD plus other Buddhist structures and paintings.
Afterlife	7th c. Chinese pilgrim Hiuen-Tsang records visit. 7th-8th c. arrival of Islam. 12th-13th c. Islamic city of Shahr-i-Gholghola built. 19th c. stories about Buddhas recorded: 1. Islamic ruler (Aurangzeb or Nadir Shah) ordered shots at larger Buddha but when statue's leg bled and he had bad dreams, shots called off. 2. local Hindus, Buddhists, and Muslims all have different identifications of the statues and their origins; e.g. they were built by Christian infidels. Late 20th c. Buddhas part of official Afghan gov't site under Ministère de l'Information et de la Culture. March 2001. Buddhas blown up by Taliban.
Current	Theatre of oblivion

¹ The Parthenon East Frieze slab VII in the Louvre is illustrated in Boardman (1991; fig. 96.15).

² References for Table 4 on Bamiyan: MacDowell and Taddei (1978); Wilford (1799, also quoted in Godard et al. 1928; 85-6), Burnes (1833), Baker and Allchin (1991, 1-21).

Theatres of Oblivion: Bamiyan, Buddhism, and the Taliban

Buddhism came to Afghanistan in the third century BC. The Buddha statues and other Buddhist structures, such as cave monasteries and a stupa, were constructed at Bamiyan in the fifth or sixth centuries AD. Together they constituted one part of an extensive Buddhist landscape in what is now Afghanistan. Other Buddhist monuments are known from many other parts of the country.¹



Figure 1: Entry ticket to Bamiyan

At Bamiyan, there was a later Islamic city, which included the palace of a Muslim governor. These structures lay opposite the great cliff into which the Buddha statues were cut. The statues were therefore visible from the later settlement. By the eighteenth century the statues had already been mutilated by the then Islamic inhabitants - mutilated but not destroyed. There were also a

¹ The partially preserved inscription in Greek and Prakrit found at Kandahar, recording the Edict of Asoka, constitutes part of the evidence for the early phase of Afghan Buddhism; MacDowell and Taddei (1978; 192-3, 195-6).

number of legends about the statues which enjoined Muslims to refrain from destruction. The Buddha statues and other Buddhist remains which more or less surrounded the Islamic settlement at Bamiyan could then be tolerated as part of the landscape.

By the late 1970s when I went to Bamiyan, the site had become one of several tourist destinations for those passing through Afghanistan. These destinations included Islamic monuments such as the Great Mosque at Herat, which I also visited. The ticket receipts for these two sites were large pieces of paper printed with a picture of the monument with text in Dari and English (Herat), or in Dari and French (Bamiyan, Fig. 1). In other words, in 1978 the Afghan Ministry of Information and Culture was happy to charge people for the privilege of visiting a broad range of monuments, even when those monuments were clearly anthropomorphic in nature. It was still possible for the then government of Afghanistan to acknowledge the existence of other cultures before the coming of Islam.

Less than 25 years later, the Taliban decided to destroy the Buddha statues of Bamiyan. I interpret this act as an attempt to 'forget' Buddhism in Afghanistan, indeed to deny the existence of any kind of pre-Islamic time. The destruction of the Buddhas was thus part of a Taliban chronology of desire, through the creation of a very conspicuous theatre of oblivion. But what was it that the Taliban wanted to forget, in destroying the Buddhas? After all, Buddhism has not been a serious threat to Islam in Afghanistan for a millennium. The Buddhas were selected, I suggest, precisely because they constituted a conspicuous monument of a non-Islamic kind, and because people would notice if they were destroyed. The ideological target is more likely to be any and all non-Islamic belief systems, including Buddhism, but also including the far greater threat of western (particularly American) values which can be made religious by calling them Christian.

Afghanistan of course had and has many Buddhist monuments, including the cave monasteries at Bamiyan itself. The landscape of Afghanistan still retains the imprint of local Buddhism, just as the Christian and Muslim calendars retain the imprint of the 'ignorant' paganism so conspicuously repudiated by the authorities. The Taliban have failed to obliterate all vestiges of the Buddhist past, but they have certainly succeeded

in making their chronology of desire very clear: there never was a time before Islam, and if there was, we want to forget all about it.¹

Çatalhöyük: Local and Archaeological Views

It may seem unusual, even perverse to call an excavation a monument. But the physical process of digging makes visible what was previously covered, and the metaphysical process of interpretation can, in cases like that of Çatalhöyük, monumentalise the significance of what is found. Çatalhöyük is clearly of particular archaeological interest because it has been excavated by two different archaeologists and their teams within the space of 30-odd years.

Table 5 opposite summarises how four different groups of people see the site of Çatalhöyük.² The first three seem to agree that the Neolithic Period, the floruit of Çatalhöyük, is a crucial threshold after which things have been either much better, or much worse. The fourth group focusses on a different threshold altogether, the Exchange of Populations mandated by the Treaty of Lausanne in 1928. What interests us here is how and when these two crucial thresholds were constructed, and what they mean for the chronologies of desire that led to their construction.

The first three groups see the Neolithic as the important chronological threshold. Mellaart thought that the Neolithic was the time when important cultural resources were transmitted from Anatolia to Europe, and that Çatalhöyük was the place where this transmission occurred. The second two groups, women participating in Goddess worship (mainly from the U.S.) and contemporary archaeologists (mainly but not exclusively western), think that the Neolithic was the time when two pivotal changes occurred. The first of these was a change in subsistence from a mobile economy based on gathering

¹ There is more than one way of 'forgetting' the destruction of the Buddhas of Bamiyan. Tariq Ali in his recent book *The Clash of Fundamentalisms* (2002) simply omits any mention of it, despite much excellent discussion of Afghan history and politics, particularly in ch. 17, Afghanistan: Between Hammer and Anvil.

² References for Table 5 on Çatalhöyük: Mellaart (1967; 11, 52-3); Hodder (1990; 3-11, 16-18, 69, 97, and Hodder 1996); Shankland (1996; 35 and 1999; 145, 153); Meskell (1998; 47-8, 52-55, 60); Eller (2000; 142-147). Again, the villagers' view of Çatalhöyük as recorded by Shankland (and which I use here) is only one view, not necessarily a dominant one, as he points out.

Table 5. Çatalhöyük: Four Views of the Site

Çatalhöyük	Archaeo-logical Sequence	Mellaart, 1960s	Goddess Worshippers	Contemporary Archaeologists	People from Villages
Constructon	Settled ca 6500 BC; deserted 5600	Art, economy, goddess religion of site all exported to form foundations of western civilisation via Greece; site is monument to this important threshold.	Site represents acme of peaceful matrilineal culture -- harmonious and artistic. The Goddess embodies the sacred earth; site is monument to this important threshold.	During the Neolithic, major domestications of plants and animals. Possibly also of women by men; site is monument to this important threshold.	Pre-Islamic site with anthropomorphic wall-paintings.
Afterlife	Çatalhöyük West abandoned ca 4900 BC BC ----- AD Turkey Islamicised 1928 Treaty of Lausanne and the Population Echange 1961-63 Mellaart's excavations.	Hittites in second millennium BC = another major Anatolian civilisation (and they are speakers of Indo-European). It's all getting better and better.	Decline into nasty and brutish (and very long) patriarchy; only bright spot since Neolithic is the peaceful matrilineal civilisation of Minoan Crete. It's all getting worse and worse.	Finally! Men in more or less complete charge of economy, and women relegated to the house It's all getting better and better	Descendants of site's original inhabitants were the local Rum (infidel Greeks), now gone because of Population Exchange; a formerly mixed population is now more safely pure. It's mostly getting better and better
Current	1993 - Hodder's excavations	Site is memory theatre for origins of western civilization.	Site is memory theatre for matriarchal utopia.	Site is memory theatre for threshold of domestication.	Site is a theatre of ambivalence; should this alien time be remembered or forgotten?

and hunting, to a sedentary, agricultural way of life. There is also a view that men domesticated women as well as plants and animals, so the second change has to do with a major change in the relative status of women and men - for

the worse if you are a Goddess worshipper, for the better if you are a contemporary archaeologist. The views of the Goddess worshippers and contemporary archaeologists are mirror images of each other, with the Neolithic acting as the chronological pivot. These two groups see Çatalhöyük as one of the places where these two changes may have taken place.¹

The fourth group consists of at least some of the people who live in the local village of Küçükköy. Their crucial chronological threshold, the Treaty of Lausanne in 1928, is completely different in time, place, and consequences. The main result of the Treaty was the Exchange of Populations, which meant that Christian Greeks left Turkey forever; ever since, the area of Çumra, once dangerously mixed, has been safely Islamic. It was the ancestors of the Greeks who lived at Çatalhöyük, and it was they who created the non-Islamic anthropomorphic wall-paintings there, some of which may represent women. The Treaty of Lausanne is the threshold that made an important difference to the villagers' own lives, but the most important threshold of all is the conversion of what is now Turkey to Islam. In contrast to the Eflatunpınar accounts analysed by Hasluck, these narratives of the late twentieth century AD/late fifteenth century AH reveal a new preoccupation with the categories Islamic, and pre- or non-Islamic.

It is easy to dismiss the views of Mellaart, the Goddess Worshippers, and the villagers as unfashionable or unscientific, and to privilege the more or less dominant view of contemporary archaeologists: easy, but wrong, because it means that the views of these archaeologists are not properly scrutinised by comparing them with other ways of looking at the site.² While the Neolithic does seem to be the time when some people did domesticate some plants and animals in this part of the world, we do not know whether women or men (or a combination of both) did the domestication, nor do we know what effect domestication had on their relative status. Indeed we will never know what, if any, gender transformations happened in the Neolithic, or any other period, until we develop the methodologies for finding out, instead of assuming that we already know.

¹ I discuss another set of mirror images connected with Minoans and Mycenaeans in Nixon (1994; 8-13).

² Hasluck was certainly aware of local views of foreign visitors; see his article, 'Western Travellers through Eastern Eyes' (1929b).

In the meantime, the archaeological site of Çatalhöyük, itself a construct, has become a monument in various debates about time. Neolithic Çatalhöyük reflects the chronologies of desire of the two groups of archaeologists and of the Goddess worshippers, just as the non-Islamic site of 'Greek' Çatalhöyük reflects some villagers' chronology of desire.¹ The two main groups, archaeologists and goddess worshippers on the one hand, and villagers on the other, home in on the chronological thresholds and periods which are most relevant to their agenda. The archaeologists think that they are being 'objective' when in fact their chronological focus reveals their very subjective concerns, just as the stories told by the villagers reveal theirs. It is all the more important that archaeologists like Hodder and his team continue their search for more appropriate ways of determining archaeological agendas, and excavating and interpreting archaeological data.²

Conclusions

In this paper I have looked at four monuments, Çatalhöyük, Eflatunpınar, the Parthenon, and the Buddhas at Bamiyan, to list them in the order in which they were built. The construction of monuments is the result of complex human decisions, and so is everything that happens to them later on. Sometimes a monument remains significant throughout its entire history (the Parthenon); sometimes a monument becomes significant only millennia after it came into being (Çatalhöyük). The events of 11 September 2001 AD/ 22 Jumada al-thani 1422 AH show that monuments need not be old to be suddenly and crucially significant in ways that their builders and users never intended. It is also important to notice that the aim of the al-Qa'ida bombers was precisely the destruction of monuments, in this case the World Trade

¹ It is important to note that two of these narratives have formal parallels with other chronologies of desire. The contemporary archaeological view has much in common with the accounts in Hesiod and Genesis (both roughly Eighth century BC, linking the origins of agriculture with the status of women and men. The narrators of both ancient texts narrators were convinced that things had once been much better, when Adam and Eve lived in the Garden of Eden (Genesis), and when men (literally only men) co-existed with the gods (Hesiod). Both narrators thought that human life since then had become much worse. But both texts, Genesis and Hesiod, blame specific women (Eve and Pandora), for the separation of people from the divine sphere, and for the difficulty of making a living through agriculture. This story is clearly a very old one with contemporary archaeologists narrating the most recent version. I have discussed these similarities in my lectures on 'Archaeology and Gender: the Power of Narrative' given at Oxford University, and will be producing a written version in due course. The story at the village that Çatalhöyük and its problematic images were created by Christians who have now left the area, is remarkably similar to local stories about the Buddhas at Bamiyan, noted above in Table 4. Both narratives assign responsibility for a problematic monument to another religious group which has now disappeared from the local landscape.

² Hodder (1997). See also Nixon (2001) for an earlier discussion of some of these issues.

Center in New York City, and the Pentagon in Washington D.C.¹ They could have killed many more people than they did, *if* wholesale murder had been their aim. I have no wish to trivialise the tragic deaths of several thousand people, but rather to emphasise the symbolic content of the two attacks that caused them.² The World Trade Center was a powerful symbol of international commerce dominated by the U.S.; the Pentagon symbolises American military might. Attacking these two conspicuous monuments was a way of attacking American dominance in two crucial areas of modern life. Thus the al-Qa'ida bombers were people with a symbolic purpose: to insist on their own chronology of desire, where the very existence of non-Muslim time and culture could be denied, by creating theatres of oblivion where infidel monuments once stood.

Like the destruction of the Old Bridge at Mostar and the Buddhas at Bamiyan, the events of 11 September confirm that using monuments to make new chronologies of desire visible is not something that happened only in the past. People are still constructing chronologies of desire to suit their own agendas, and no doubt will continue to use monuments in the ways I have described.

In this paper, then, I hope to have shown that chronologies of desire exist in a wide variety of periods and places. Chronologies of desire, and the use of monuments are linked by a desire to control the present and the future by manipulating the past. Some chronologies of desire are to do with remembering, other with forgetting. Most are connected with monuments and their manipulations. All are human artefacts.

There is often a direct link between chronologies of desire and the monuments selected as their focus. In considering the relationship between changing chronologies of desire and their effect on monuments, it is useful for

¹ World Trade Center: http://www.GreatBuildings.com/buildings/World_Trade_Center.html; The Pentagon: http://www.GreatBuildings.com/buildings/The_Pentagon.html. There is no space here to describe the place of these two monuments in their respective landscapes; I will simply note that the WTC was intervisible with its predecessor, the Empire State Building, and that the Pentagon lies directly across the Potomac River from the Washington Monument. Yamasaki, the architect of the WTC, was certainly aware of its symbolic significance: 'I feel this way about it. World trade means world peace and consequently the World Trade Center buildings in New York ... had a bigger purpose than just to provide room for tenants. The World Trade Center is a living symbol of man's dedication to world peace ... beyond the compelling need to make this a monument to world peace, the World Trade Center should, because of its importance, become a representation of man's belief in humanity, his need for individual dignity, his beliefs in the co-operation of men, and through co-operation, his ability to find greatness.' (Yamasaki quotation from Paul Heyer, *Architects on Architecture: New Directions in America*, p. 186, cited on WTC section of Great Buildings website as given above.)

² Consider, for example, Arthus-Bertrand's aerial photograph of the city of Priapat in the Ukraine (1999; 348-9, caption 332). Priapat (former population 50,000) was abandoned when the nuclear reactor at Chernobyl exploded in 1986, as a result of which many people died, and several million people were affected by cancers and immune deficiencies. People left Priapat for horrific reasons, but their disappearance is invisible -- the buildings of their city still stand in the snow.

researchers to consider *all* episodes or stages in the history of a monument. It can be very revealing to consider not only the time of a monument's construction, but also its entire *Nachleben* or afterlife. In a number of cases, monuments and how they are treated make chronologies of desire conspicuous and visible, both when the monuments are built, and in their *Nachleben*. Indeed in some cases, the fate of a monument constitutes the first public declaration that the dominant chronology of desire is changing.

The same monument can be used in different ways at different times. As Alcock remarks, 'reworking of the past is most pronounced in periods of dramatic social transformation'.¹ Monuments can be used to create memory theatres, or destroyed to make theatres of oblivion. Memory theatres arise from a desire to integrate the past and the present; theatres of oblivion arise from a desire to separate them, often through fear of future dominance by a past or present power. By looking at monuments, then, politicians and archaeologists alike can monitor changes in the agendas of powerful groups, and distinguish between integrative memory and destructive forgetting

Monuments receiving this kind of desirous attention need not be religious in origin, but they do have to be conspicuous, and to command instant recognition. Monuments are commonly used by people who are motivated by their own belief system, sometimes regardless of the religious focus of the monument. In the case of Çatalhöyük, the site has *become* religious for at least one of the groups discussed above. It is important to remember that more than one view of a monument is possible during the same period. Again, Çatalhöyük reveals that a heterogeneous community will produce a heterogeneous response. Alcock discusses different strands of Greek memory and identity in second century AD Athens - panhellenic, inter-city, intra-city, and subject to Roman power.² It is when one group insists that their memories and their chronology of desire are the right ones, and that all others must be suppressed that problems arise. One example of such a situation is the metamorphosis of multiple views and agendas in NW India during the second millennium AD into a fiercely binary view, brilliantly dissected by Thapar. It should come as no surprise that the focus of all these views — recorded in Turco-Persian and Jaina texts, Sanskrit inscriptions, nineteenth century debates in the House of Commons in London, and modern nationalist readings — is a raid on a temple, in Somanatha (Gujarat), in which its idol was broken or stolen. Out of a highly complex mixture of identities

¹ Alcock (2001; 325).

² Alcock (2001; 345-6).

and agendas has come a dichotomous twentieth century Hindu-Muslim view, which repudiates complexity, and insists that there is only way of thinking about the original event.¹

The desire to create special chronologies of desire and the wish to monumentalise them by projecting them onto conspicuous structures is not necessarily bad. But acting on these desires and wishes without being aware that this is what we are doing can be extremely dangerous. The reduction of multiple issues into sharply polarised views (that was then, this is now; that was them, and this is us) is not always an appropriate way of considering a complicated reality. It can result in a bid for control by one group insisting that their view is dominant, as though to reach some pluralistic accommodation both in belief systems and in monumental space were impossibly dangerous. The real danger may lie in not doing so.

One of the worst effects of applying unexamined chronologies of desire to monuments is that it closes off interesting lines of enquiry. What will happen to Hittite monuments, nearly all of which are anthropomorphic, if Islamic fundamentalists in Turkey choose to construct a chronology of desire which insists that they ought never to have existed, that there never was a time when people in Turkey could conceivably have thought that such monuments were a good thing? Why did the newly created modern Greek state see post-fifth century BC monuments and structures on the Akropolis as separators rather than links between it and the Parthenon? Why did the Taliban think that destroying the Buddhas would make people forget them, instead of bringing worldwide attention to the former presence of Buddhism in Afghanistan? Why, exactly, may people living near Çatalhöyük become bothered by the notion that their local past is a mixture of non-Islamic and Islamic? Why do educated, urban women from the West find religious consolation in wall-paintings interpreted by a male archaeologist at a Stone Age village site? Why does the agenda of many archaeologists focus so tightly on issues such as human exploitation of the environment, changes in gender relations and the division of labour, and elaborate symbolism and the processes of social control, with similarly tight insistence that these changes took place at Neolithic Çatalhöyük? These are only some of the questions that one might pose in connection with the chronologies of desire discussed here.

¹ Thapar (2000; 24-50).

My final point is to repeat that all of us create chronologies of desire, archaeologists as well as imperialists and fundamentalists of every kind and belief. The problem stems not from the construction of chronologies of desire, but from a lack of awareness that this is what we are doing. Chronologies of desire are precisely that, and they exclude all questions that do not contribute to the desired view of a particular past. Our goal should be to recognise them for what they are, and to be aware of their dangers. Achieving this goal would be a suitable commemorative monument to Hasluck and his work.

Acknowledgements

My first acknowledgement must be to Hasluck himself. In his own work he set a shining example of the importance of taking notice of what you see before you, even if it isn't what you thought you were investigating to begin with, or what you were 'officially' meant to be looking at. As assistant director and librarian of the Canadian Archaeological Institute at Athens in 1983-85, I enjoyed thinking of Hasluck (who occupied a similar post at the British School at Athens) as an illustrious predecessor. Since 1987 I have co-directed, with Jennifer Moody, an interdisciplinary diachronic survey in Sphakia, SW Crete; information about the Sphakia Survey can be found on our website (Nixon and Moody et al. 2000). I have always hoped that this is the sort of project that Hasluck himself would have liked. I am also grateful to David Shankland for organising the Hasluck conference in November 2001, which enabled me to think longer and harder about these issues. The papers given by Keith Hopwood and Charles Stewart were particularly relevant. Before the conference, the events of 11 September 2001 focussed the world's attention on the fate of people and monuments when ideologies are in conflict. I organised a discussion at Magdalen College, Oxford on these events on 11 October, which brought together specialists who spoke about terrorism, international law, Islam, and humanitarian aid; I spoke briefly about the use of monuments to make statements about time and ideology. Some of this material is incorporated here, in particular the discussion of Bamiyan.

At the Hasluck conference David Barchard told me about the Islamic concept of the Jahiliyya. Later Clive Holes and Christopher Melchert (Oriental Institute, Oxford) helped me to follow up on this information. Simon Price (Lady Margaret Hall, Oxford) directed me to references on the Christianisation of time. Robin Osborne (King's College, Cambridge) and John Bennet (Institute of Archaeology, Oxford) also provided useful comments and references. I thank all of them for their help. I thank also my students, chiefly in Archaeology and Anthropology, who have heard and commented on some of this material in tutorials. I am grateful, as always, to helpful members of staff in several libraries in Oxford: the Sackler (classical archaeology, including Afghanistan); the Oriental Institute (Buddhist monuments); the Indian Institute; the Modern History Faculty; Magdalen College. As readers will see, I learnt a great deal from Alcock's article (2001); her 2002 book (*Archaeologies of the Greek Past. Landscape, Monuments, and Memories*, Cambridge University Press) appeared too late for me to benefit further from her work. The faults that undoubtedly remain in this article are my own.

REFERENCES

- Alcock, S. 2001 'The Reconfiguration of Memory in the Eastern Roman Empire', in Alcock, D'Altroy, Morrison, and Sinopoli 2001 (eds), pp. 323-350.
- Alcock, S., D'Altroy, T., Morrison, K. and Sinopoli, C. (eds) 2001 *Empires. Perspectives from Archaeology and History*, Cambridge; Cambridge University Press.
- Ali, T. 2002 *The Clash of Fundamentalisms, Crusades, Jihads and Modernity*, London; Verso.
- Allchin, F. and Hammond, N. (eds) 1978 *The Archaeology of Afghanistan from earliest times to the Timurid period*, London; Academic Press.
- Andrews, K. 1979 *Athens Alive*, Athens; Hermes Publications.
- Arthus-Bertrand, Y. 1999 *The Earth from the Air*, transl. from the French by David Baker, London; Thames and Hudson.
- Baker, P. and Allchin, F. 1991 *Shahr-i Zohak and the History of the Bamiyan Valley, Afghanistan*, Ancient India and Iran Trust Series No. 1, British Archaeological Reports International Series 570, Oxford; Tempus Reparatum.
- Beard, M. 2002 *The Parthenon*, London; Profile Books.
- Blackburn, B. and Holford-Strevens, L. 1999 *The Oxford Companion to the Year. An Exploration of Calendar Customs and Time-Reckoning*, Oxford; Oxford University Press.
- Blakstad, L. 2002 *Bridge. The Architecture of Connection*, Basel; Birkhäuser.
- Boardman, J. 1991 *Greek Sculpture. The Classical Period*, London; Thames and Hudson.
- Burnes, A. 1833 'On the Colossal Idol of Bamian' [sic], *Journal of the Asiatic Society (Bengal)*, Vol. 2; 560-4.
- Camp, J. 2001 *The Archaeology of Athens*, New Haven; Yale University Press.
- Cole Harris, R. and Matthews, G., (eds) 1987 *Historical Atlas of Canada* vol. I. *From the Beginning to 1800*, Toronto; University of Toronto Press.
- Cormack, R. 1990 'Byzantine Aphrodisias: Changing the Symbolic Map of a City', *Proceedings of the Cambridge Philological Society* 36; 26-41.
- Delaney, C. 1991 *The Seed and the Soil: Gender and Cosmology in Turkish Village Society*, Berkeley and Oxford; University of California Press.
- Eller, C. 2000 *The Myth of Matriarchal Prehistory. Why an Invented Past Won't Give Women a Future*, Boston; Beacon Press.
- Ferrari, G. 2002 'The Ancient Temple on the Acropolis at Athens', *AJA* Vol. 106; 11-35.
- Geary, P. 1994 *Phantoms of remembrance: memory and oblivion at the end of the first millennium*, Princeton; Princeton University Press.

- Godard, A., Godard, Y. and Hackin, J. 1928 *Les Antiquités Bouddhiques de Bamiyan*, Mémoires de la Délégation Française d'Archéologie en Afghanistan II.
- Goodison, L. and Morris, C. (eds) 1998 *Ancient Goddesses. The Myths and the Evidence*, London; British Museum Press.
- The Great Buildings Collection* 1997-2002 <http://www.GreatBuildings.com/gbc.html> (2 August 2002).
- Gurney, O. 1954 *The Hittites*, second edition with later revisions, Harmondsworth; Penguin.
- Hamilton, W. 1842 *Researches in Asia Minor, Pontus, and Armenia; with Some Account of their Antiquities and Geology*, London; John Murray.
- Hasluck, F. 1929 *Christianity and Islam under the Sultans*, edited by M. Hasluck, 2 Vols, Oxford; Clarendon.
- Hasluck, F. 1929a 'Plato in the Folk-lore of the Konia Plain.' In Hasluck 1929; 363-9.
- Hasluck, F. 1929b 'Western Travellers through Eastern Eyes', In Hasluck, 1929; 641-5.
- Hesiod 1959 [8th c. BC], *The Works and Days, Theogony [The Begetting of the Gods], and The Shield of Herakles*, translated from Greek by Richmond Lattimore, Ann Arbor, MI; University of Michigan Press.
- Hodder, I. 1990 *The Domestication of Europe. Structure and Contingency in Neolithic Societies*, Oxford; Basil Blackwell.
- Hodder, I. (ed.) 1996 *Archaeology on the Surface; Çatalhöyük 1993-95*. Cambridge and London; The Çatalhöyük Research Trust, Çatalhöyük Project Vol. 1.
- Hodder, I. 1997 'Always Momentary, Fluid and Flexible: Towards a Reflexive Excavation Methodology.' *Antiquity* Vol. 71; 691-700.
- Hodder, I. 27 June 2002 *Çatalhöyük. Excavations of a Neolithic Anatolian Höyük* <http://catal.arch.cam.ac.uk/catal/catal.html> (2 August 2002).
- Ignatieff, M. 2003 'The Bridge Builder', in *Empire Lite. Nation-Building in Bosnia, Kosovo and Afghanistan*, London; Vintage, 27-43.
- Lewis, B., Pellat, C. and Schlacht, J. (eds) 1965 *Encyclopaedia of Islam*, vol. II (s.v. Djahiliyya, Fatra).
- MacDowell, D. and Taddei M. 1978 'Chapter 4. Early Period. Achaemenids and Greeks', in Allchin and Hammond; 170-231.
- MacDowell, D.W. and Taddei, M. 1978 'Chapter 5. The Pre-Muslim Period. Achaemenids and Greeks,' in Allchin and Hammond; 233-99.
- Mango, C. 1995 'The Conversion of the Parthenon into a Church: the Tübingen Theosophy,' *Δελτίον της Χριστιανικής Αρχαιολογικής Εταιρείας (Bulletin of the Society for Christian Archaeology) Delta* Tomos IH; 201-203.

- Mellaart, J. 1962 'The Late Bronze Age Monuments of Eflatun Pınar and Fasillar near Beyşehir,' *Anatolian Studies* Vol. 12; 111-17.
- Mellaart, J. 1967 *Çatal Hüyük. A Neolithic Town in Ancient Anatolia*, London; Thames and Hudson.
- Meskell, L. 1998 'Twin Peaks: the Archaeologies of Çatalhöyük', in Goodison and Morris (eds), 36-62.
- Nixon, L. 1994 'Gender Bias in Archaeology', in Archer, L. Fischler, S. and Wyke, M. (eds), *An Illusion of the Night: Women in Antiquity*, London; Macmillan; 1-23.
- Nixon, L., Moody, J. Price, S. and Rackham, O. 2000 *The Sphakia Survey: Internet Edition*, <http://sphakia.classics.ox.ac.uk>.
- Nixon, Lucia 2001 'Seeing Voices: Filming an Archaeological Survey', *American Journal of Archaeology*, 105; 77-97.
- Özdoğan, M. 1998 'Ideology and Archaeology in Turkey', in *Archaeology under Fire*, edited by L. Meskell, London; Routledge, 111-123.
- Özenir, A. 2001 'Eflatunpınar. Kutsal Anıt — Havuz (1966-2000)', 2000 Yılı Anadolu Medeniyetleri Müzesi Konferansları, Ankara; Türkiye Cumhuriyeti Kültür Bakanlığı, Anadolu Medeniyetleri Müzesi; 35-66.
- Price, S. 1999 *Religions of the Ancient Greeks*, Cambridge; Cambridge University Press.
- Shankland, D. 1995 'An Anthropology of Archaeology?' *Anatolian Archaeology*, 1; 20.
- Shankland, D. 1996 'Çatalhöyük: the Anthropology of an Archaeological Presence,' in Hodder 1996; 349-57.
- Shankland, D. 1999 'Integrating the Past. Folklore, Mounds and People at Çatalhöyük.' In *Archaeology and Folklore*, edited by Gazin-Schwartz, A. and Holtorf, C. London; Routledge; 139-157.
- Smith, R. 1995 'Aphrodisias 1993'. in *Kazı Sonuçları Toplantısı* 16: 191-206, esp. 193-4 (article in English).
- Thapar, R. 2000 *Narratives and the Making of History. Two Lectures*, New Delhi; Oxford University Press.
- Travlos, John 1971 *Pictorial Dictionary of Ancient Athens*, New York; Praeger
- Yalouri, E. 2001 *The Acropolis. Global Fame, Local Claim*, Oxford; Berghahn
- Ward, W. 1886 'Unpublished or imperfectly published Hittite Monuments I. The Façade at Eflatun-Bunar. *American Journal of Archaeology* Vol. 2; 49-51.
- Wilford, F. 1799 'On Mount Caucasus', *Asiatick Researches* Vol. VI; 455-536.