

# The Archaeology of Anatolia



# The Archaeology of Anatolia:

*Recent Discoveries (2011-2014)*  
*Volume I*

Edited by

Sharon R. Steadman  
and Gregory McMahon

Cambridge  
Scholars  
Publishing



The Archaeology of Anatolia: Recent Discoveries (2011-2014) Volume I

Edited by Sharon R. Steadman and Gregory McMahon

This book first published 2015

Cambridge Scholars Publishing

Lady Stephenson Library, Newcastle upon Tyne, NE6 2PA, UK

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data

A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

Copyright © 2015 by Sharon R. Steadman, Gregory McMahon  
and contributors

All rights for this book reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without the prior permission of the copyright owner.

ISBN (10): 1-4438-7815-4

ISBN (13): 978-1-4438-7815-9

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

List of Figures.....	viii
List of Tables.....	xv
Chapter One.....	1
Introduction: The Archaeology of Anatolia: Recent Discoveries	
Sharon R. Steadman and Gregory McMahon	
<b>Part I: Excavations</b>	
Chapter Two.....	6
A New Perspective on the Central Anatolian Late Neolithic:	
The TPC Area Excavations at Çatalhöyük East	
Arkadiusz Marciniak	
Chapter Three.....	26
Barcın Höyük Excavations: The 2014 Season in Perspective	
Rana Özbal and Fokke Gerritsen	
Chapter Four.....	46
Çamlıbel Tarlası: Late Chalcolithic Settlement and Economy	
in the Budaközü Valley (North-Central Anatolia)	
Ulf-Dietrich Schoop	
Chapter Five.....	69
Recent Work (2013-2014) at Çadır Höyük on the North Central	
Anatolian Plateau	
Sharon R. Steadman and Gregory McMahon	
Chapter Six.....	98
Kınık Höyük, Niğde: A New Archaeological Project in Southern	
Cappadocia	
Nancy Highcock, Pam Crabtree, Douglas V. Campana, Marco Capardoni,	
Anna Lanaro, Alvise Matessi, Naomi F. Miller, Philip Strosahal,	
Andrea Trameri, and Lorenzo d'Alfonso	

Chapter Seven.....	128
The Ziyaret Tepe Archaeological Expedition, 1997-2014: Overview and Recent Discoveries Timothy Matney	
Chapter Eight.....	149
Research at Uşaklı Höyük (Central Anatolian Plateau) Stefania Mazzoni and Anacleto D'Agostino	
Chapter Nine.....	180
Recent Fieldwork at Gordion C. Brian Rose	
Chapter Ten .....	201
Antiochia ad Cragum in Western Rough Cilicia Michael Hoff, Rhys Townsend, Ece Erdoğan, Birol Can, and Timothy Howe	
<b>Part II: Surveys</b>	
Chapter Eleven .....	228
Lower Göksu Archaeological Salvage Survey Project: The Results of the 2013 and 2014 Seasons T. Emre Şerifoğlu, Naoise Mac Sweeney, and Carlo Colantoni	
Chapter Twelve .....	255
Landscape, Politics, and Water In the Hittite Borderlands: Yalbur Yaylası Archaeological Landscape Research Project 2010-2014 Peri Johnson and Ömür Harmanşah	
Chapter Thirteen.....	278
The Burdur Plain Survey (SW Turkey): In Search of the Middle Chalcolithic (5500-4200 BCE) Ralf Vandam	
Chapter Fourteen .....	298
Sinop Regional Archaeological Project: Report on the 2010-2012 Field Seasons Owen Doonan, Alexander Bauer, E. Susan Sherratt, Aksel Casson, James Feathers, Matthew Conrad, Mark Besonen, Emre Evren, Krzysztof Domzalski, and Anna Smokotina	

Chapter Fifteen .....	328
Euchaïta	
John Haldon, Hugh Elton, and James Newhard	
Contributors to the Volume .....	352
Index .....	363

## LIST OF FIGURES

- Figure 2-1. TPC Area and other excavation areas in the southern part of the East Mound at Çatalhöyük.
- Figure 2-2. Çatalhöyük East, TPC Area. Building 121.
- Figure 2-3. Çatalhöyük East, TPC Area. Building 121, eastern wall with geometric decoration.
- Figure 2-4. Çatalhöyük East, TPC Area. Building 110.
- Figure 2-5. Çatalhöyük East, TPC Area. Building 122, Space 49.3.
- Figure 2-6. Çatalhöyük East, TPC Area, oval bowl with basket handle and decorative motif of bull horns.
- Figure 2-7. Çatalhöyük East TPC Area, a bell-shaped Hellenistic pit.
- Figure 2-8. Çatalhöyük East, TPC Area, the Seljuk-period burial.
- Figure 3-1. Map of the southern Marmara Region.
- Figure 3-2. Plan of the excavation trenches at Barcın Höyük.
- Figure 3-3. Photo of the excavations in process.
- Figure 3-4. Photo of the row houses 21, 2B, 2A, and 19 taken from the west.
- Figure 3-5. Photo of the footprints discovered in the entrance area of structure 2A.
- Figure 3-6. Photo of Structure 19 taken from the northwest.
- Figure 3-7. Photo from the east showing the large postholes that precede the Phase VIId1 architecture.
- Figure 3-8. Photo of the cluster of fire pits with fire reddened sides.
- Figure 3-9. Photo of the small rectangular semi-subterranean room along the eastern balk of trench L12.
- Figure 3-10. An adult burial excavated in the courtyard area north of trench L12.
- Figure 3-11. A baby burial with bowl given as a burial offering.
- Figure 3-12. Photo of Evren Kıvançer preparing to make a silicone cast of the footprint.
- Figure 4-1. Map of Late Chalcolithic Anatolia.
- Figure 4-2. Çamlıbel Tarlası, view from the west. The rocky knoll south of the site is a natural feature and was not included in the course of the site's boundary wall.
- Figure 4-3. Çamlıbel Tarlası I, Bowl Furnace: top view and cross-section.
- Figure 4-4. Çamlıbel Tarlası II, partial plan.



- Figure 4-5. Çamlıbel Tarlası II, *hocker* burial of a 4–5 year old child.
- Figure 4-6. Çamlıbel Tarlası III, partial plan. Two laterally abutting long-houses; note the flat threshold stone settings which mark opposing entrances in the northern part of both buildings.
- Figure 4-7. Çamlıbel Tarlası III. Large terracotta figurine of a horned animal, probably a bovid.
- Figure 4-8. Çamlıbel Tarlası IV, partial plan showing the Flagstone House and the large courtyard to the west of this building.
- Figure 4-9. Çamlıbel Tarlası, red-slipped drinking vessel with horned handle.
- Figure 4-10. Çamlıbel Tarlası IV, pottery vessel with incised decoration.
- Figure 4-11. Çamlıbel Tarlası, selection of blades made from imported flint.
- Figure 5-1. Map of Anatolia showing location of Çadır Höyük.
- Figure 5-2. Çadır Höyük topographical plan.
- Figure 5-3. Plan showing the Late Chalcolithic occupation.
- Figure 5-4. Plan showing the entire complement of roughly contemporary Late Chalcolithic occupation.
- Figure 5-5. Photo of mudbrick semi-circular feature and posthole in non-domestic building in Trench SES 1.
- Figure 5-6a-b. (a) Large oven with in situ ceramic vessels in USS 10; (b) Small animal figurine found in ash pit.
- Figure 5-7. Photo of second millennium BCE defensive architecture.
- Figure 5-8. Plan of second millennium domestic architecture in Trench ST 7.
- Figure 5-9. Plan of mudbrick/plaster/ash features dating to the Early Iron Age in Trench USS 4.
- Figure 5-10. Photo of feature which may be related to metal smelting.
- Figure 5-11. Photo of the stone pathway and room in SMT 15.
- Figure 5-12. Photo of the stone pathway and associated room in SMT 4.
- Figure 5-13. Plan of the North Terrace architecture.
- Figure 5-14. Photo of room excavated in SMT 3 likely associated with the Byzantine tower and defensive wall.
- Figure 5-15. Photo of Byzantine fortress wall in SMT 4.
- Figure 6-1. Operation sectors at Kınık Höyük.
- Figure 6-2. View of Kınık Höyük.
- Figure 6-3. Stratigraphy of Citadel Walls.
- Figure 6-4. Operation A.2 Walls.
- Figure 6-5. Fragmentary zoomorphic vessels: base with body of bird with geometric decoration; head of bird with geometric decoration.
- Figure 6-6. Plan of Level A1.1 (Hellenistic).

- Figure 6-7. Decorated juglet fragments from Level A2.4; 7<sup>th</sup>-6<sup>th</sup> century BCE.
- Figure 6-8. Plan of Level A2.4b (Achaemenid or early Late Iron Age), Room 1.
- Figure 6-9. Plan of Room 7 in Level B7 (Achaemenid).
- Figure 6-10. Basalt Olynthus mill hopper dated to Level D3.a (Achaemenid).
- Figure 6-11. Species ratios for cattle, sheep/goat, and pig for the Late Iron Age, Hellenistic, and Medieval features excavated during 2011-12.
- Figure 7-1. Regional map of the upper Tigris River valley showing the location of Ziyaret Tepe.
- Figure 7-2. Topographic plan of Ziyaret Tepe showing the location of all excavation units.
- Figure 7-3. Plan of the Bronze Palace, building phase II.
- Figure 7-4. Hypothetical reconstruction of the Bronze Palace. Excavated walls are shown in black.
- Figure 7-5. Preliminary results of the magnetic gradiometry survey of the lower town.
- Figure 7-6. Electrical resistivity map of southwestern portion of the lower town showing city fortifications and gate.
- Figure 7-7. Plan of the four phases of the Operation Q gate in the southern city wall.
- Figure 7-8. Photograph of the pebble mosaic floor in Operation GR, Room 20.
- Figure 7-9. Slightly stylized plan of two adjacent buildings in Operation GR.
- Figure 7-10. Cut into the pebble mosaic in Operation W, removing a section of large stones.
- Figure 7-11. Magnetic gradiometry map of southeastern lower town.
- Figure 7-12. Plan of the Neo-Assyrian architecture and street found in the upper phase of Operation U.
- Figure 7-13. Frit figurine depicting the Egyptian god Bes (ZT 37920) found in burial M-134.
- Figure 7-14. Plan of city wall and domestic architecture in Operation K.
- Figure 8-1a-c. (a) Map of the Central Anatolian Plateau; (b) The site of Uşaklı; (c) Topographic plan of Uşaklı Höyük.
- Figure 8-2. Five fragments of tablets with cuneiform signs.
- Figure 8-3. The results of the geomagnetic and geoelectric prospection.
- Figure 8-4. The scraping on the southern slope of the high mound.
- Figure 8-5a-b. (a) Spots of different kinds of soil visible on the surface; (b) The superficial features overlapped to the geomagnetic anomalies.

- Figure 8-6. Operation 1, on the northwestern edge of the high mound.
- Figure 8-7. The location of the excavation areas.
- Figure 8-8. Panoramic view of Area A and map of Building II.
- Figure 8-9. Details of Building II.
- Figure 8-10. Details of Building II.
- Figure 8-11a-f. Details of Building II.
- Figure 8-12. Area A, Building II: pottery sherds.
- Figure 8-13. The test sounding below Building II.
- Figure 8-14. Test sounding below Building II: sherds from US 25.
- Figure 8-15. Test sounding below Building II: sherds from US 25
- Figure 8-16. Test sounding below Building II: sherds from US 25.
- Figure 8-17. Area C, the step trench.
- Figure 8-18. Area C, the step trench.
- Figure 8-19. Area C, the step trench: pottery sherds.
- Figure 8-20. Area C, the step trench: pottery sherds and slags.
- Figure 9-1. Aerial view of Gordion's citadel.
- Figure 9-2. Phase plan of Gordion.
- Figure 9-3. Reconstruction of the fortification system of Gordion during the Middle Phrygian period.
- Figure 9-4. Aerial view of the Early Phrygian Citadel Gate, looking west.
- Figure 9-5. The Terrace Building at Gordion, looking northwest.
- Figure 9-6. Consolidating the wall blocks of the Terrace Building with steel cables.
- Figure 9-7. The new stairs of the visitors' path near the entrance to the site.
- Figure 9-8. Aerial view of Early, Middle, and Late Phrygian fortifications on the southern side of the Citadel Mound.
- Figure 9-9. The Early Phrygian glacis, looking north. Photo by Gabriel Pizzorno. (Gordion Project, Penn Museum).
- Figure 9-10. The fortifications of Gordion detected through remote sensing.
- Figure 10-1. View of Antiochia ad Cragum from the northwest.
- Figure 10-2. The "Anticragus," overlooking the sea, from the west.
- Figure 10-3. Aerial view of Antiochia ad Cragum, towards the west.
- Figure 10-4. Plan of Antiochia ad Cragum.
- Figure 10-5. Aerial view of Antiochia ad Cragum. Monumental Gate and Colonnaded Street beyond.
- Figure 10-6. Northeast Temple. Aerial view from the southwest.
- Figure 10-7. Northeast Temple. Detail of pediment, Apollo within clipeus.
- Figure 10-8. Colonnaded Street. Excavation of peristyle and shops.
- Figure 10-9. Colonnaded Street. Carving of new column bases for *anastylosis*.

- Figure 10-10. Colonnaded Street. Anastylosis of original column upon new base.
- Figure 10-11. Urban Center of Antiochia ad Cragum. Covered Court.
- Figure 10-12. Aerial view of Covered Court.
- Figure 10-13. Great Bath Complex. Covered court, foreground; Great Bath, background.
- Figure 10-14. *Natatio* of the Covered Court, from north.
- Figure 10-15. Geometric mosaic panel, from the Covered Court.
- Figure 10-16. Aerial view of the Great Bath during excavation, 2014.
- Figure 10-17. Peristyle Building with mosaic, from the northeast.
- Figure 10-18. Aerial view of the Acropolis.
- Figure 10-19. Acropolis, Structure II (church), from the southwest.
- Figure 11-1. A map of the region showing the LGASSP survey area.
- Figure 11-2. Distribution of pre-Hellenistic, Hellenistic, and post-Hellenistic sites along the valley.
- Figure 11-3. The mound of Attepe.
- Figure 11-4. The preliminary results of the resistivity surveys conducted at the western slopes of Attepe) and Çingentepe.
- Figure 11-5. The western side of the mound of Çingentepe.
- Figure 11-6. The mound of Damtepe.
- Figure 11-7. Distribution of Hellenistic through Roman and Byzantine period sites along the valley.
- Figure 11-8. The Dağcamii mosque.
- Figure 11-9. The remains of Akkale castle.
- Figure 11-10. A high column base found near the village of Pamuklu.
- Figure 12-1. Map of the Yalburt Yaylası Archaeological Landscape Project area 2010-2014.
- Figure 12-2. Photograph of the Yalburt Yaylası sacred mountain spring monument of Tudhaliya IV with hieroglyphic Luwian inscription.
- Figure 12-3. Map of the narrows at the southwestern start of the Bulasan River Valley around Karaköy Kale Tepesi.
- Figure 12-4. Map of Kurugöl and Yalburt Yaylası.
- Figure 12-5. Plan of Yalburt Yaylası (Peri Johnson).
- Figure 12-6. Photograph of Karaköy Kale Tepesi.
- Figure 12-7. Plan of Karaköy Kale Tepesi and nearby loci.
- Figure 12-8. Karaköy Kale Tepesi, ashlar stone masonry.
- Figure 13-1. The territory of Sagalassos in Turkey.
- Figure 13-2. Overview of the Burdur Plain and surveyed area.
- Figure 13-3. Overview of the known Early Chalcolithic sites in the Burdur Plain and the surveyed area.
- Figure 13-4. Intensive survey methodology in the Burdur Plain.

Figure 13-5. The Middle Chalcolithic sites in Western Anatolia and the Aegean Islands.

Figure 14-1. Map, 2010-12 survey areas in Boztepe, Sarıkum, Kırkgeçit Çayı, and Sarımsaklı Çayı areas.

Figure 14-2. Survey tracts (2012 Field Season) on Boztepe headland.

Figure 14-3. Limestone Ionic capital from monumental Roman building.

Figure 14-4. Çakıroğlu map indicating tracts and locus boundaries and numbers.

Figure 14-5. Ceramics from the coastal erosional scarp at Çakıroğlu, ranging from Late Hellenistic to Late Roman in date.

Figure 14-6. Areas of GPR survey in 2012.

Figure 14-7. Topographic map of Sinop province, indicating clusters of Roman milestones in heavy ovals, and least-cost paths connecting Sinope through the main clusters of milestones.

Figure 14-8. Map of tracts and loci in Tıngiroğlu quadrat.

Figure 14-9. Geomorphological core locations from Sarıkum.

Figure 14-10. Locations of sites for Luminescence analyses.

Figure 14-11 a-d. Radial graphs of age distributions. (a) Luminescence dates from Kocagöz; (b) Luminescence dates from Güllüavlu; (c) Luminescence dates from Maltepe; (d) Luminescence dates from Mezarlıktepe.

Figure 14-12. Late Roman Red-slip ware finds in the 2010-2012 survey area.

Figure 14-13. GPR transect map, Sinop Citadel survey 2012. The black lines mark the locations of the GPR transects.

Figure 14-14. GPR results at depth of -5.0 m from Sinop citadel.

Figure 14-15. Detail of GPR results, Sinop citadel, former bus station area at depth of -5.0 m.

Figure 15-1. Location of Beyözü - Avkat – Euchaïta, the wider area, and survey units.

Figure 15-2a-b. (a) Project area, divided according to general landform conditions; (b) Intensive Survey Units and Observed Densities of Tile and Ceramics.

Figure 15-3. Concentrations of ceramics found in Area 1.

Figure 15-4. Kale Tepe: interpreted GPR and magnetometry.

Figure 15-5. Beyözü village: magnetometry interpreted.

Figure 15-6. Beyözü village: GPR interpreted.

Figure 15-7. Areas Surveyed in Area 4, showing concentrations of ceramic and tile and chronological associations for the imperial Roman – Ottoman phases.

Figure 15-8 c-d. Constans II, follis, ca. 640-645.

Figure 15-9. A possible line for the Anastasian wall (early 6<sup>th</sup> century CE).

Figure 15-10. “Ephesian” small amphorae/unguentariae.

## LIST OF TABLES

- Table 3-1. Chart showing the Neolithic Phases at Barcın Höyük and the approximate dates of these phases.
- Table 4-1. Çamlıbel Tarlası, stratigraphy and phasing.
- Table 6-1. Periods and Levels at Kınık Höyük.
- Table 6-2. Animal bone remains identified from the Achaemenid features.
- Table 6-3. Comparison between Gordion and Kınık Höyük archaeobotanical assemblages; Late Iron Age I and II samples are treated as one unit in this table. (Source for Gordion data: Miller and Marston 2012.)
- Table 11-1. LGASSP 2013-2014: documented sites and a preliminary assignment of settlements to chronological periods.
- Table 11-2. LGASSP 2013-14: methods of investigation leading to site identification.
- Table 11-3. Byzantine settlement classification.
- Table 14-1. Quadrats investigated in Boztepe survey.
- Table 14-2. Quadrats surveyed in the Sarımsaklı Çayı area.
- Table 14-3. Surveyed quadrats, Kırkgeçit Çayı river valley.
- Table 14-4. 2010-12 luminescence dates.





## CHAPTER ONE

### INTRODUCTION TO *THE ARCHAEOLOGY OF ANATOLIA: RECENT DISCOVERIES*

SHARON R. STEADMAN  
AND GREGORY MCMAHON

We are delighted to have the opportunity to offer this introductory chapter and this new series of volumes on recent archaeological work in Anatolia. This series had its origin well over a year ago when Cambridge Scholars Publishing approached the editors about publishing a series of papers from an upcoming American Schools of Oriental Research annual meeting. Discussions between the editors and Cambridge Scholars turned a one-time publication into a series of volumes providing not conference presentations but rather reports on recent fieldwork in Anatolia. The present volume is the first in what we hope will be a long series of publications on the archaeological discoveries across the breadth of Turkey over the coming decades.

As those in the archaeological field well know, rapid presentation of fieldwork is not only desirable but mandatory, in both a practical and an ethical sense. In Turkey, and likely in other countries, projects are required to present their results in print on a regular basis in order to ensure the timely renewal of excavation permits each year. This is a laudable requirement on the part of the Turkish government and one that archaeologists strive to meet. As professional archaeologists we are also bound by the ethics of our discipline which require us to make our data available to our colleagues and students, and to the general public, as quickly and efficiently as possible. The rise of the Internet as a scholarly tool has aided in this endeavor immensely, but print publications remain a standard. However, the publishing process and the need for quick presentation of results are often at odds with one another, given the time it sometimes takes for an article to make its way through the review process of most journals. In addition, few journals are pleased to receive what are

deemed “interim reports,” even when these present interpretive critiques of the data retrieved.

A shining example of a journal that offers timely publication and serves as a home for important interim reports is *Anatolica*, cited frequently in the chapters included here (Tim Matney, in the note accompanying his chapter submission, joked that his bibliography was “an advertisement for *Anatolica*”). The *Anatolica* journal has provided a haven for those of us seeking to present our recently retrieved field results, and the quality of the publication and its respected standing in the scholarly world are a tribute to its editor and staff. However, it is but a single publication, and there are many who work in the “open air museum” of Anatolia. We believe, therefore, that this series will serve as a helpful complement to the yeoman’s work that *Anatolica* and a few other fine publications have done over the years.

The proposal the editors submitted to Cambridge Scholars noted that submission to this series will be open to all scholars working in Turkey, whatever their country of origin might be. The present volume offers a testament to this premise, featuring contributions from archaeologists from the U.S., Turkey, Poland, Italy, and the U.K. It is hoped that this list of countries from which contributors hail will increase with each new volume. The chapters included here also represent a wide range of occupational periods, spanning from the Late Neolithic to Medieval occupation, and feature projects located all over Anatolia, from the Black Sea to the southern coast and on to the southeastern regions, lacking coverage only from the far west and northwest, and the far east. Future volumes will seek to present data from all corners of the country, and all periods investigated.

One other characteristic of this new series is worth noting here: its inclusion of survey projects. While excavation projects find it difficult to find venues to publish interim reports, survey projects find it close to impossible. The *Archaeology of Anatolia: Recent Discoveries* volume is committed to publishing results from survey projects and is pleased to feature, in this inaugural volume, close to a third of the chapters devoted to these endeavors.

The submissions accepted for this present volume were vetted by the editorial panel at Cambridge Scholars and by the present editors. Future volumes will also be submitted to a review process including the volume’s editors (at present Steadman and McMahon), the CSP series editors (see the Cambridge Scholars website), and by the Cambridge Scholars editorial panel. Submissions selected for acceptance will then enter the editorial process that results in publication in the series. It is the intention of both

the series editors and Cambridge Scholars that submission and publication take place within the same calendar year, thereby achieving the goal of rapid public reporting of recently acquired archaeological data. The appearance of the present volume testifies to this goal, with submission in March and appearance in the late fall of 2015.

Volumes in this series will appear at two-year intervals, in the “odd” years. The next volume is intended to appear in 2017. The intention of the founding series editors is to serve as editors for two or possibly three volume presentations. The series editor torch will then pass to new editors (it will be the responsibility of current series editors to identify a new cohort), and after a minimum of two and maximum of three volumes, editorship will change again, and so on. Submissions for the 2017 (and succeeding volumes) may be made between January 1 and February 15 of the publication year (therefore, for Volume II, submissions will be accepted between Jan. 1-Feb. 15, 2017). Authors will be notified about the success of their submission by March 15 of the same year. As noted above, it is the intention of both editors and publishers that the volume then appear within the next six to eight months. These specific dates, and the general process, may change over the years, especially with new editors. However, for the short term, at least for the next two volumes (II and III), potential authors may use these general dates as guidelines for preparation of their material. The editors look forward to seeing the results of the archaeological work to take place over the next two years.

Everyone who does fieldwork in Turkey knows the joys of living and working in that country. Nor, clearly, are those of us who work in Anatolia the first to discover its attractions; the breadth and depth of its archaeological riches testify to the multitude of peoples and cultures who came to Anatolia and stayed. Those of us who look forward eagerly to our field season in Anatolia know that its incomparable archaeological legacy is equalled only by the depth and richness of modern Turkish culture, the food, language, and most of all people of Turkey who allow us to enjoy simultaneously the thrill of seeking the past while enjoying to the full the present culture of Anatolia.

Anatolian archaeologists also understand the debt they owe to the administrative infrastructure that so ably supports archaeology in Turkey. The annual Kazı Sonuçları Toplantısı is an exceptional opportunity to hear and learn about all the fieldwork in Turkey in one very intense week, a unique place where everyone you meet shares your passion for the most interesting work in the world. In addition, the Kültür ve Turizm Bakanlığı, and its Kültür Varlıkları ve Müzeler Genel Müdürlüğü, provide an exceptional model of support for archaeology, by both Turkish and foreign

scholars, which reflects a deeply admirable interest in discovering, maintaining, and making known the endlessly fascinating legacy of the cultures of Anatolia. Our thanks therefore to the Ministry of Culture and Tourism, the General Directorate of Cultural Monuments and Museums, the museum directors, government representatives, Turkish colleagues, and everyone else in Turkey who makes this foundational scholarship not only possible, but eternally enjoyable.

**PART I:**  
**EXCAVATIONS**

## CHAPTER TWO

# A NEW PERSPECTIVE ON THE CENTRAL ANATOLIAN LATE NEOLITHIC: THE TPC AREA EXCAVATIONS AT ÇATALHÖYÜK EAST

ARKADIUSZ MARCINIAK

### Introduction

The Late Neolithic in the Near East is a major threshold in the development of farming communities. It is marked by a transformation of the major constituent elements of the Neolithic revolution, creating conditions for strengthening and consolidating local groups and providing prerequisite foundations for their spread across vast areas. The new mode of existence comprised individualized and autonomous social units, integrated character of arable-husbandry economy, pastoralism, and occupation of forest and coastal areas as well as the creation of sacral landscape (see Marciniak 2015, in preparation).

The ongoing work in the upper strata at Çatalhöyük East has significantly contributed to a better understanding of this important period in the history of the Near East. The last half century of the Çatalhöyük East occupation corresponds to Mellaart Levels III-0, South P-T, North G-J Levels, Summit, KOPAL, IST, TP-M to TP-R and TPC (see Hodder, 2014c: Fig. 1, Table 1). These are dated to the period ca. 6500-5950 cal BC. However, a correspondence between these different excavation areas (1960s and 1993-2000s) has not yet been systematically scrutinized. The period witnessed dynamic changes in different domains and can be divided into (i) early Late Neolithic (6500–6250 cal BC) and (ii) the late phase of the Late Neolithic (ca. 6250-5950 cal BC). The top levels in the South sequence (Q-T) have been dated to the period 6400-6300 cal BC (Hodder 2014: s. 4, Table 1), while the bottom of the TP Area to the period around 6300 cal BC (Marciniak et. al. 2015a: 169).

The first round of excavations on the top of the southern eminence of the East Mound was carried out in the years 2001–2008 in an area known as the Team Poznań (TP) Area. It was conducted by a joint expedition of Adam Mickiewicz University of Poznań and University of Gdańsk, and directed by Lech Czerniak and myself. This work revealed significant change in different domains of the local community, as compared to the pattern characterizing the period that may be labelled classic Çatalhöyük. These comprised, among other things, settlement layout, house architecture, burial practices, human-animal relations, lithics procurement and technology, and pottery production and use. The excavated levels were named by letters, starting from TP-M, the oldest Neolithic level, to TP-R, marking the final Neolithic sequence. Thanks to this work we know that the mound was finally abandoned in the first decades of the 6<sup>th</sup> millennium cal BC (e.g. Marciniak and Czerniak 2007, 2012; Marciniak et al. 2015a).

The work on the Late Neolithic at Çatalhöyük is now carried out in the new excavation zone named the TP Connection Area (TPC), located in the previously unexplored area on the SW slope of its southern prominence. It is placed between the TP Area and Mellaart Area A to the east and north and South Area to the west and south. TPC trenches were hence set up south of Mellaart's Area A, where remains of buildings assigned to Level I and III were discovered in the 1960s. It is also worth mentioning that Level III in Area A is represented by two buildings designated by Mellaart as shrines (Shrine 1, "Hunting Shrine," and Shrine 8). The most northern part of the TPC Area is located where Buildings 4 and 5 from Level III (according to Mellaart's scheme) were located. It is also placed as close as possible to the South shelter's southeastern corner and its eastern edge, where Building 10 and several associated exterior spaces were excavated in past years (Kotsakis 1996, 1997; Jonsson 2003).

The work in the TPC<sup>1</sup> Area commenced in the 2012 excavation season, and three excavations seasons have been carried out to date. They are conducted within the Çatalhöyük Research Project (see e.g. Hodder 2014) as a project of Adam Mickiewicz University of Poznań directed by the author. They are carried out in four new trenches. Trench 1 is 5 x 5 m and is located directly to the south of Mellaart Area A. Trench 2 is placed directly south of Trench 1 with an overall dimension of 5 x 6 m. Trench 3 is located in the southern part of the TPC Area. It is quadrilateral in shape, with the southern and eastern edges being 10 m long and the northern edge

---

<sup>1</sup> The project is financed by the Polish National Science Centre (decision DEC-2012/06/M/H3/00286).

measuring 6 m in length. Trench 4, measuring ca. 8 x 6 m, is located in between these two sections of the TPC Area (Fig. 2-1).



Figure 2-1. TPC Area and other excavation areas in the southern part of the East Mound at Çatalhöyük (Camilla Mazzucato, revised by Gareth Cork).

The ultimate goal of this project is to connect the stratigraphy in the TP Area, excavated in the years 2001-2008, with the main stratigraphic sequence in the South. The corresponding goal comprises recognition of architecture, burial practice, pottery, and obsidian manufacture. They will make it possible to investigate changes in subsistence and the economic system, in particular whether the economy became more intensive, more integrated, and more heavily based on individual household production. These variables will be studied in the period immediately following the demise of the classic phase of occupation, delimited by the end of the South sequence (Building 10 in South-T), and the beginning of the TP sequence (Building 81 in TP-M).

The chapter aims to provide a comprehensive overview of major results of the work carried out in the TPC Area in the 2012-2014 excavation seasons.



## **The TPC Excavations in 2012-2014**

Work in the TPC Area in the past three excavation seasons was carried out in all four trenches. These excavations brought about the discovery of a complex Neolithic sequence as well as intense post-Neolithic occupation.

### ***The Late Neolithic Occupation***

The excavations carried out in the past three seasons made it possible to reveal a sequence of Neolithic buildings and features in three excavated Trenches: 1, 2, and 3. Altogether, remains of four buildings (B.121, B.110, B.115, and B.109) in Trenches 1 and 2, and two (B.122, Space 520) in Trench 3 have been unearthed to date. The work in Trench 4 conducted to date has concentrated on post-Neolithic occupation, and only yet unspecified remains of the Neolithic architecture have been revealed.

### ***Trenches 1 and 2***

The oldest structure discovered to date in the TPC Area is Building 121 (Fig. 2-2). (Marciniak et. al 2013). It was exposed in its entirety within the limits of the trench but not yet excavated. It is a relatively large structure with a suite of in-built structures and arguably a complex history of occupation. Its details may be difficult to reveal as it has been badly truncated by later occupation activities.

Only the eastern and northern walls were identified and exposed, as the remaining two extend beyond the edge of the trench. The eastern wall (F.7160) has been plastered and painted with black and white geometric design in the form of vertical and transverse sets of parallel lines (Fig. 2-3). The northern wall (F.7187) was also plastered and painted. However, its character is unknown as the wall was almost completely torn down by a large post-Neolithic truncation. The solidly built structure followed a division into “clean” and “dirty,” typical for the classic phase of the settlement occupation.



Figure 2-2. Çatalhöyük East, TPC Area. Building 121.

The house had five subsequently built platforms, a hearth, and a bin. A large fire installation (F.7250) was placed in the center of the house. It was rectangular in shape with thick raised and plastered walls. The eastern part of its infill was composed of a number of burnt striations, full of phytoliths, seeds, charcoal, and dung. A small circular bin (F.7187) with plastered, concave walls was placed directly against the northern wall of the building. A small pit was dug into the platform (F.7251) abutting the building's eastern wall. It appears that a posthole was placed against the richly decorated wall with geometric motifs, which is a quite uncommon location. Five platforms, located in the eastern and western parts of the building, were not contemporaneous and are indicative of subsequent

reconstructions of its space. The house was then deliberately abandoned. Interestingly, shortly afterwards, it was temporarily used, as indicated by the presence of a fire spot and two adjacent pits of unspecified character in its fill. B.121 is dated to the period of ca. 6400-6250 cal BC, which appears to be contemporaneous with B.81 (TP-M level) from the TP Area (Marciniak et al. 2013).



Figure 2-3. Çatalhöyük East, TPC Area. Building 121, eastern wall with geometric decoration.

The following Neolithic structure in this part of the TPC Area is Building 110 (Fig. 2-4). Its preserved dimensions were ca. 8 x 6 m. The walls were made of solid yellow/sandy bricks. The eastern wall (F.3910) was constructed in the previously prepared foundation cut, a practice recognized also in the TP Area. It may imply some kind of deliberate construction practice in the late levels. The floor has not yet been reached, which may indicate that it either did not exist or was completely destroyed. The building was divided into two rooms by the E-W partition wall (Space 485 and 486). Both rooms were filled in with a fairly homogenous sequence ca. 1.30 m deep and composed of small striations indicating its long and continuous accumulation. As indicated by the character of the walls and elements of construction practices, the building

was probably contemporary to B.74 from the TP Area, which means it can be dated to the TP-N level (Marciniak et al. 2012, 2013).



Figure 2-4. Çatalhöyük East, TPC Area. Building 110.

A cluster of artifacts and ecofacts was found between the northern wall of B.110 and southern wall of adjacent B.111 (not yet excavated). It contained a large amount of animal bones, pottery, ground stones, shells, and phytoliths. They seem to have been deposited after both walls were constructed. This is a deliberate deposit of a ritual character, dated to the period of ca. 6350-6220 cal. BC (Marciniak et al. 2012). In particular, it contained almost 200 sheep bones (mainly astragali, phalangi, and metapodials) and two cattle horn cores. Around 30 per cent of them were flattened on one or both sides, which are known as “knucklebones” (Best et al. 2012; Jones et al. 2013). There was an extraordinarily rich assemblage of stones, both worked and natural. They represented a wide range of raw materials, including andesite, schist, greenstone (possibly diabase), limestone, metamorphosed limestone/marble, quartz, crystal, chert, and quartzite. In terms of forms, the assemblage was made of upper and lower grinding tools (querns and grinders). Debitage from the

production or modification of grinding stones was also found, as well as polishers, an abrader, a palette, small sized stone balls, unmodified pieces of crystal, limestone pebbles of different size, and chert objects. The production/modification debris more likely originated from different grinding tools, possibly from different primary contexts. They seem to represent all stages of production and use (Tsoraki 2013). A small jar of Dark Gritty Ware found in this context is a typical representative of the classic holemouth that continued to be used from the preceding period into the Late Tradition (Özdöl and Tarkan 2013: Figure 14.3).

Following the abandonment of Building 110, the area went out of use for some time. It was later re-occupied in the form of some kind of open space, as identified by a solidly made brickly layer with fragments of a packed floor (20256). After some time, the area again went out of use and was transformed into a midden (20232 and 20215). This makes it a sequence identical to that in the TP Area, where temporarily occupied B.72 of a light construction and the following open space (B.73) emerged after the abandonment of a solid B.74. This further supports the claim that B.110 and B.74 may have been contemporaneous (see Marciniak et al. 2015a).

A small area of *in situ* occupation activities was found directly above the open space and superimposed midden. Despite the fact that it was badly destroyed, but considering its character, it is right to attribute the activities there to a separate Building 115 (Space 491). The only preserved fragment comprises a kind of unspecified platform. It was built on a layer of bricks, placed directly on the midden (20213), and the following layer above was made of small pebbles (20207). The outer surface consisted of whitish plaster. This construction is almost identical to the floor of B.61 in the TP Area, the latest in that sequence. The “platform’s” western and southern face was lined from outside by a homogeneous silty layer (20198), similar to mortar or plaster. A fragment of a short E-W partition wall, with lining from the south, was discovered east of the “platform.” Two distinct superimposed floors were recorded from the northern side of the “platform.” They may have been remains of the room, possibly linked to Building 115. As it was only preserved in very small fragments, no details of its construction and layout are available.

The latest dwelling structure in this part of the TPC Area was Building 109. It probably respected both the size and layout of Building 110, its indirect predecessor. The walls were made of greyish/beige bricks of a poor quality. They were very homogenous in terms of their length—80–82 cm—and were relatively well preserved. This building is possibly contemporaneous with the latest B.61 from the TP Area and can be

tentatively dated to the Level TP-R. This preliminary conclusion cannot be further explored due to a profound destruction of the structure.

### ***Trench 3***

The excavations carried out in Trench 3 have led to the discovery of two solid Neolithic buildings. They are placed next to one another, with B.122 in the north and Space 520 to the south. B.122 is a large complex-style structure extending beyond the edges of the trench. It is composed of three spaces located within Trench 3 (Space 517, 521, and 493).



Figure 2-5. Çatalhöyük East, TPC Area. Building 122, Space 493.

Space 493 was a storage room of 3 m<sup>2</sup> within the perimeter of the trench with two small bins. It was built into the interior of the building following a destruction of some kind of structure (“platform”?) placed against its eastern wall. It is dated to the period ca. 6400-6250 cal BC (Marciniak et al. 2013). The room infill yielded a lot of botanic remains and several ground stones. Both turned out to be storage bins for barley grain (Fig. 2-5). The amount and preservation of the barley could indicate a quick destruction phase. In the west-middle part of the room floor a cluster of worked antler, bone, clay objects, and ground stones was found.