



ISSN: 2651-2742
2022- Cilt: 5 Sayı: 1
Sayfa:144-150

Dergi Web Sitesi: <http://sita.cumhuriyet.edu.tr/tr/>

Gönderilme Tarihi:29.10.2022	Düzeltilme Tarihi: 12.12.2022	Kabul Tarihi:30.11.2022
------------------------------	-------------------------------	-------------------------

Review Article

GÖBEKLİTEPE AND ITS MANAGEMENT PROCESS

Muammer MESÇİ * 

Duzce University

School of Akcakoca Tourism and Hotel Management

ABSTRACT

The aim of this study is to evaluate the construction process of Göbeklitepe, which was built in the Neolithic Period around 10 thousand BC, within the framework of management and organization. Göbeklitepe is a historical area which has many historical artifacts and columns up to 6 meters in height, on which various symbols are engraved. It is highly unlikely that the columns in Göbeklitepe were built and erected by a single person. In this case, it is more likely to think that more than one person came together and combined their efforts, talents, and expertise in the construction of the Göbeklitepe area. It can be thought, then, that these people come together for a specific purpose and adopt the "management process" to plan, direct and evaluate the work they do. According to the result of the study, it can be stated that the understanding of "management and organization" played an important role in the formation of Göbeklitepe.

Key words: Göbeklitepe, Management Process

1. GÖBEKLİTEPE

Göbeklitepe is located within the borders of Şanlıurfa province and approximately 12 km northeast of the city centre. The region is surrounded by the Euphrates river in the north and west, its eastern border extends to Karaca Mountain and its southern border extends to the Syria-Turkey border. The geological structure of the region is mainly composed of limestone (Knitter et al. 2019:2). According to archaeological research, Göbeklitepe is thought to be an area built during the Neolithic Period (10000 years BC). In the literature, it is also stated that this area is a belief center (Özdoğan, 2015:25). This historical area, consisting of monumental structures, has been systematically excavated since 1995 by the Şanlıurfa Museum and the

* Sorumlu Yazar: muammermesci@duzce.edu.tr

Önerilen Atıf: Mesci M. (2022). Göbeklitepe And Its Management Process, Sivas İnterdisipliner Turizm Araştırmaları Dergisi, 5(1), 144-150.

German Archaeological Institute. It is seen that the waterproof terrazzo technique is used on the floors of the buildings (Özdoğan, 2015). Göbeklitepe, which is a unique example of monumental megalithic architecture, has a very special range of historical artifacts (Schmidt, 2001, 2002, 2003; Peters and Schmidt, 2004; Pustovoytov, 2006). The cult structures found in Göbeklitepe are incomparably larger than what we see in other historical settlements. It is seen that the area is characterized by one-piece T-shaped columns weighing tons, and with the arrangement of these columns, circle-like structures are formed in the area (Dietrich et al. 2012). These columns surrounding Göbeklitepe are connected to each other by walls and stone benches (Dietrich et al. 2018). To date, the remains of nine monumental (round-oval structures) structures have been excavated, and during this process, each of them has been named with letters from A to H (Clare, 2017:29-32). On these pillars, many engraved figures that depict life can be found ranging from animal figures ((bird figures, scorpion figures, snake figures, various game animal figures), and hunter figures, and abstract figures to various depictions such as arms, hands and clothes (Dietrich et al. 2018). Besides, there are also figures symbolizing power, fertility and abundance (Özdoğan, 2015:25). It is thought that there is a difference between a statue with a closed mouth and a stripe symbol found in Göbeklitepe and a statue with an open mouth found in Karahan Tepe. On the other hand, in Balıklıgöl sculpture, it is thought that the hands standing in front symbolizes respect. As can be understood from the differences in these examples, perhaps it can be stated that there is a hierarchical subordinate relationship in the management process of Göbeklitepe. Table 1 lists the symbols found in Göbeklitepe.

Table 1 Symbols Found in Göbeklitepe

Symbols and Figures	A field	B field	C field	D field
	(piece)	(piece)	(piece)	(piece)
Pig	0	0	10	1
Predator	1	0	7	0
Fox	1	3	3	5
Bull	2	0	1	3
Rabbit	0	0	1	0
Quadruped	1	0	1	0
Duck, Goose	0	0	8	7
Crane, Stork	1	0	2	4
Vulture, ibis	0	0	1	2
Snakes and other reptiles	24	3	0	31
Scorpioan, insects	0	0	0	5
Abstract symbol	0	0	2	9
Human	0	0	0	1

Reference: Klaus Schmidt (2008). Göbekli Tepe – Enclosure C, NEO-LITHICS 2/08 The Newsletter of Southwest Asian Neolithic Research

Göbeklitepe has different features that make it unique as a historical site. The first of these features is that it is the oldest monumental building area (it is thought that people used it for various ceremonies in a very ancient age). Another feature is the existence of communities that built these historical monumental structures (Clare, 2017:29-32). The symbols on the columns, levelers and stone vessels found in the area indicate that Göbeklitepe is closely related to other places in its vicinity (Dietrich et al. 2012). It can be stated that various visits were made to

Göbeklitepe from places such as Karahan Tepe, Kurt Tepesi, Ayanlar, Nevali Çori, Sefer Tepe, which surround Göbeklitepe. It can be said that the main purpose of these visits is to fulfill the religious rituals of the people. It is thought that many different meetings such as hunting rituals and funeral practices were held in this area (Peters and Schmidt, 2004:215). In the early days, the belief that this region brought fertility and abundance may have played a role in the people's religious rituals in this region. It is thought that the nomadic people first built a religious belief center in the Göbeklitepe region and then positioned their settlements around this center.

2. GÖBEKLİTEPE IN THE CONTEXT OF THE MANAGEMENT PROCESS

It can be thought that Göbeklitepe, which is a Pre-Pottery Neolithic (PPN) region, was inhabited by people because of its fertile soils (Pustovoytov, 2006). In the process of establishing a long-term settlement it can be said that people's cooperation occurs around this purpose (Hodder and Meskell, 2011). It can be stated that Göbeklitepe's people and visitor groups built a common "cult community" with common beliefs and traditions (Dietrich et al. 2012: 684). Changes can also be seen in the lifestyles of the people of that period, who tried to adapt to the changes in climate and natural environmental conditions. In this period, it is evidence that the transition from nomadic life to settled life reconstructs social life and social institutions (Özdoğan, 2015).

It can be stated that the areas in Göbeklitepe were built in such a way as to allow a large number of people to gather. In these areas, it is seen that there are suitable places both to make speeches and to watch the activities of the participants who come to this area (McBride, 2014:357). It is seen that these areas are not very different from each other in terms of their quality of influencing the follow the activities of the participants. It is also possible that a central performance organized by a leader were exhibited in the activities in these areas, and that all participants spoke and performed in turn (Mcbride, 2013:61-63).

Based on the various symbols on some of the artifacts found in the region, it can be argued that a leadership institution has an influence on the organizations held in this region. Based on the various symbols on some of the artifacts found in the region, it can be argued that a leadership institution has an influence on the organizations held in this region. For example, it can be thought that the snake on the human statue in Nevali Çori (Schmidt, 2010:247) and the vulture figures on the human statue in the region may have been depicted as leaders. In addition, temple architecture in Nevali Çori can be given as an example (figure 1). However, it is estimated that many different practices such as theater performances, council activities, judicial proceedings, religious ceremonies or rites of passage may have taken place in these areas (Mcbride, 2013:63-64). Such organizational activities can be thought of as being carried out under the direction of a leader.

Figure 1



There is a niche in the place indicated by the arrow sign and this niche is thought to belong to the person who directs/follows the ceremonies in the temple.

The existence of a common purpose is an important tool in bringing communities or organizations together. For this reason, communities or organizations come together to achieve the goals they set. There are some methods, techniques or plans to achieve these goals. In order to reach these tools (eg plans), the effort and ability of each member of the community comes into play (Stoner, Freeman and Gilbert, 1995:6-7). The administrators of the period or the management phenomenon (function, etc.) play a major role in bringing these communities together. In short, management can be defined as the manager bringing together communities to achieve a certain purpose. Management refers to the process of planning, organizing, directing and controlling people to complete their work-related activities effectively and efficiently (Robbins and Coulter, 2002:6). It is thought that all elements of the management process were fulfilled in the formation of the Göbeklitepe area. Because, it can be stated that historical artifacts and ruins in Göbeklitepe are not brought together by a single person, but as a result of a division of labor, and the organization of valuable resources such as the talents and efforts of people. It is likely that the planning, coordinating, directing and controlling process of this division of labor was carried out under the direction of a manager (leader). For example, during the construction of this area, the effectiveness of the management process emerges at the point of hosting the employees, providing their needs such as food and beverage, and arranging other social activities.

Göbeklitepe is an important center that emerged as a result of the unity formed by the members of the community in order to achieve a certain purpose in the Neolithic period (Schmidt, 2010: 254). The structure was formed by the division of labor, manpower and a significant number of talented people. It was also brought together by a well-organized hierarchical community willing to do business. It can be thought that Göbeklitepe started to

form with the combination of these elements. In addition, this formation was accelerated by the gathering of people living around Göbeklitepe to fulfill a certain purpose (Peters and Schmidt, 2004). The erection / modification / burial of a monumental structure in Göbeklitepe was time consuming and costly. In addition, it was very difficult to manage the community in the process of doing these works (Clare, et al.,2018:130-133). As stated earlier, this process is thought to be organized by a manager or leader.

Göbeklitepe, which was thought to be a central gathering place at the time it was built, is also mentioned as an important influence on the emergence of agriculture and animal husbandry, one of the most important moments in history (Dietrich et al. 2012). It can be understood that new division of labor systems emerged such as the development of agriculture, the emergence of land use systems, the storage, use and trade of the obtained foods (eg grains) (Hodder and Meskell, 2011). In addition, it can be said that in this temple-like area, people living in the Neolithic period performed religious rituals in the sense of gratitude before they produced the products necessary for their own survival (Notroff, Dietrich, & Schmidt, 2014). Until recently, it has been heard that people living in this area visited Göbeklitepe region before planting their crops before the it was discovered.

A few studies on Göbeklitepe are included in the literature. Dietrich and Schmidt (2017) conducted research on the sculptures in Göbeklitepe in their study. Çelik (2017) shared his findings that some artifacts found in Ayanlar Höyük are similar to some artifacts found in Göbeklitepe. Gresky (2017) conducted research on 3 human skulls in Göbeklitepe in his study.

3. CONCLUSION

The gathering of people for a purpose was effective in Göbeklitepe's, of which history dates back to approximately 10,000 BC, becoming a central place. It would not be wrong to say that while making these monuments, there was an important cooperation between the people who lived in the Neolithic period in the settlement where Göbeklitepe is located because it is thought that structures of this size (for example, large T-shaped stones) cannot be transported and positioned by a single person. For this reason, it can be stated that the people living in that period were in constant cooperation and communication while the area in Göbeklitepe was being created. It can be stated that this community, which came together from the surrounding regions for a certain purpose, and in cooperation and communication, built this area. Of course, it is possible that there was a management process in the formation of this field and a manager in the administration of this process. Because, in order to bring together the area and the works in it, a management process that constitutes planning, coordination, direction and supervision may have been needed. However, it is thought that a manager was needed to ensure the effectiveness and efficiency of this process. As a result, it is thought that the management process had an important role in the formation of Göbeklitepe.

Thanks

I would like to express my gratitude to Sanliurfa Provincial Director of Culture and Tourism, Aydın Aslan, who made significant contributions to the preparation of this study.

REFERENCES

- Celik, B. (2017). A new Pre-Pottery Neolithic site in Southeastern Turkey: Ayanlar Höyük (Gre Hut). *Documenta Praehistorica*, 44, 360-367. DOI:10.4312\dp.44.22.
- Clare, (2017). Göbeklitepe, Neolitik Şanlıurfa Müzesi Arkeolojik Eser Kataloğu, Ed.Necmi Karul-Gülriz Kozbe-A. Yavuzkır, Kültür ve Turizm Bakanlığı Yayınları
- Dietrich, O. Schmidt, Ç.K, Notroff, J. Schmidt, K. and Kürkçüoğlu C. (2012). *Actual Archaeology Magazine*, Anatolia, Summer Issue 2
- Dietrich, O., & Schmidt, K. (2017). A short note on a new figurine type from Göbekli Tepe. *Neo-Lithics*, 1, 43-46.
- Ian Hodder and Lynn Meskell (2011), A "Curious and Sometimes a Trifle Macabre Artistry" *Current Anthropology*, 52 (2): 235-263
- J. Gresky, J. Haelm, L. Clare,(2017), Modified human crania from Göbekli Tepe provide evidence for a new form of Neolithic skull cult. *Science Advances*, 3, e1700564 (2017).
- Klaus Schmidt (2008). Göbekli Tepe – Enclosure C, NEO-LITHICS 2/08 The Newsletter of Southwest Asian Neolithic Research
- Knitter, D., Braun, R., Clare, L., Nykamp, M., & Schütt, B. (2019). Göbekli Tepe: A Brief Description of the Environmental Development in the Surroundings of the UNESCO World Heritage Site. *Land*, 8(4), 72. doi:10.3390/land8040072
- Konstantin Pustovoytov (2006) Soils and Soil Sediments at Göbekli Tepe, Southeastern Turkey: A Preliminary Report, *Geoarchaeology: An International Journal*, 21 (7): 699–719
- Lee Clare, Oliver Dietrich, Jens Notroff and Devrim Sönmez (2018), Establishing identities in the Proto-Neolithic: 'history making' at Göbekli Tepe from the late tenth millennium cal BCE, Hodder, I. (Ed.). *Religion, history, and place in the origin of settled life*. University Press of Colorado..115-136. ISBN: 978-1-60732-736-3
- Mc Bride, A. (2013). Performance and participation: multi-sensual analysis of near eastern pre-pottery neolithic non-domestic architecture. *Paléorient*, 39(2): 47-67.
- McBride, A. (2014). The acoustics of archaeological architecture in the Near Eastern Neolithic. *World archaeology*, 46(3), 349-361.
- Notroff, J., Dietrich, O., & Schmidt, K. (2014). Building Monuments, Creating Communities. *Approaching monumentality in archaeology*, IEMA proceedings, 3, 83-105.
- Oliver Dietrich, Jens Notroff & Laura Dietrich (2018) Masks and masquerade in the Early Neolithic: a view from Upper Mesopotamia, *Time and Mind*, 11:1, 3-21, DOI: 10.1080/1751696X.2018.1433354
- Özdoğan, M. (2015). "Understanding Göbekli Tepe The Place of Göbekli Tepe in the History of Civilization", *Actual Archaeology Publishing*
- Peters J. & Schmidt K. 2004. – Animals in the symbolic world of Pre-Pottery Neolithic Göbekli Tepe, south-eastern Turkey: a preliminary assessment. *Anthropozoologica* 39 (1): 179-218.
- Robbind S. P and Coulter M. (2002). *Management*, Seventh Edition, Prentice Hall: New Jersey, ISBN:0-13-031965-1
- Schmidt, K. (2001). Göbekli Tepe, southeastern Turkey. A preliminary report on the 1995–1999 excavations. *Paléorient*, 26(1): 45–54.

Schmidt, K. (2002). The 2002 excavations at Göbekli Tepe (southeastern Turkey)–Impressions from an enigmatic site. *Neo-Lithics*, 2/02, 8–13.

Schmidt, K. (2003). The 2003 campaign at Göbekli Tepe (southeastern Turkey). *Neo-Lithics*, 2/03, 3–8.

Schmidt, K. (2010). Göbekli Tepe–the Stone Age Sanctuaries. New results of ongoing excavations with a special focus on sculptures and high reliefs. *Documenta Praehistorica*, 37, 239-256. DOI: 10.4312\dp.37.21

Stoner, J., Freeman, R. E. and Gilbert D. A. (1995). *Management*, Sixth Edition, Prentice Hall: New Jersey, ISBN:0-13-108747-9