



Hodos, T. (2015). Lycia and Classical Archaeology: the changing nature of archaeology in Turkey. In C. Antonaccio, & D. Haggis (Eds.), *Classical archaeology in context: theory and practice in excavation in the Greek world* (pp. 87-118). de Gruyter. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9781934078471-008>

Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

Link to published version (if available):
[10.1515/9781934078471-008](https://doi.org/10.1515/9781934078471-008)

[Link to publication record in Explore Bristol Research](#)
PDF-document

This is the final published version of the article (version of record). It first appeared online via de Gruyter at <https://www.degruyter.com/viewbooktoc/product/128539>. Please refer to any applicable terms of use of the publisher.

University of Bristol - Explore Bristol Research

General rights

This document is made available in accordance with publisher policies. Please cite only the published version using the reference above. Full terms of use are available:
<http://www.bristol.ac.uk/pure/about/ebr-terms>

Donald C. Haggis and Carla M. Antonaccio
Classical Archaeology in Context

Classical Archaeology in Context



Theory and Practice in Excavation in the Greek World

Edited by
Donald C. Haggis and Carla M. Antonaccio

DE GRUYTER

ISBN: 978-1-934078-46-4
e-ISBN (PDF) 978-1-934078-47-1
e-ISBN (ePub) 978-1-61451-998-0

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

A CIP catalog record for this book has been applied for at the Library of Congress.

Bibliographic information published by the Deutsche Nationalbibliothek

The Deutsche Nationalbibliothek lists this publication in the Deutsche Nationalbibliographie; detailed bibliographic data are available on the internet at <http://dnb.dnb.de>

© 2015 Walter de Gruyter GmbH, Berlin/Boston
Typesetter: Satzstudio Borngräber, Dessau-Roßlau
Printer: Druckerei Hubert & Co GmbH und Co KG
Printed in Germany

www.degruyter.com

Contents

List of Figures — VII

List of Tables — XII

List of Contributors — XIII

Donald C. Haggis and Carla M. Antonaccio

1 A Contextual Archaeology of Ancient Greece — 1

Historical Contexts and Intellectual Traditions

James Whitley

**2 Scholarly Traditions and Scientific Paradigms:
Method and Reflexivity in the Study of Ancient Praisos — 23**

Carla M. Antonaccio

3 Re-excavating Morgantina — 51

David B. Small

4 A Defective Master Narrative in Greek Archaeology — 71

Tamar Hodos

**5 Lycia and Classical Archaeology:
The Changing Nature of Archaeology in Turkey — 87**

Mortuary Contexts

Alexandra Alexandridou

**6 Shedding Light on Mortuary Practices in Early Archaic Attica:
The Case of the Offering Trenches — 121**

Anna Lagia

**7 The Potential and Limitations of Bioarchaeological Investigations in
Classical Contexts in Greece: An Example from the Polis of Athens — 149**

Urban and Rural Contexts

Jamieson C. Donati

8 The Greek Agora in its Peloponnesian Context(s) — 177

Donald C. Haggis

**9 The Archaeology of Urbanization: Research Design and
the Excavation of an Archaic Greek City on Crete — 219**

Manolis I. Stefanakis, Konstantinos Kalogeropoulos,
Andreas Georgopoulos, and Chryssi Bourbou

- 10 Exploring the Ancient Demos of Kymissaleis on Rhodes:
Multidisciplinary Experimental Research and Theoretical Issues — 259**

Kalliope E. Galanaki, Christina Papadaki, and Kostis S. Christakis

- 11 The Hellenistic Settlement on Prophetes Elias Hill at Arkalochori,
Crete: Preliminary Remarks — 315**

Evi Margaritis

- 12 Cultivating Classical Archaeology:
Agricultural Activities, Use of Space and Occupation Patterns in
Hellenistic Greece — 333**

Sanctuary Contexts

Athanasia Kyriakou and Alexandros Tourtas

- 13 Detecting Patterns through Context Analysis: A Case Study of Deposits
from the Sanctuary of Eukleia at Aegae (Vergina) — 357**

Dimitra Mylona

- 14 From Fish Bones to Fishermen:
Views from the Sanctuary of Poseidon at Kalaureia — 385**

Index — 419

List of Figures

Figure 2.1: Map of Eastern Crete showing location of Praisos and other sites in Eastern Crete (drawing H. Mason; Praisos Archaeological Project).

Figure 2.2: “Eteocretan” inscription (circa 500 B.C.) discovered by Halbherr (barxe inscription) (after Guarducci, *JCr* III.6.1).

Figure 2.3: Map of the Praisos survey area, with locations of sites referred to in text (drawing H. Mason; Praisos Archaeological Project).

Figure 2.4: Excavation (2007) outside of the Almond Tree House/Andreion on the first Acropolis of Praisos (view from NW) (photo S. Pak; Praisos Archaeological Project).

Figure 2.5: Archaic pithos (pithos 3) found on Hellenistic floor in 2007 (A-216.10 rim; A-216.13 base) (photo S. Pak; Praisos Archaeological Project).

Figure 2.6: Terracotta plaque (A-205.7 object 6) recovered from upper layers of trench 200 (photo J. Whitley; Praisos Archaeological Project).

Figure 3.1: Map of eastern Serra Orlando Ridge and Cittadella (drawing E. Thorkildsen).

Figure 3.2: Incised grayware basin fragment, Cittadella Trench 9, inv. no. 59-2138 (photo C. Williams)

Figure 3.3: Incised and burnished amphora neck fragment, Cittadella Trench 29, inv. no. 63-1207 and joining fragment (right) (photo C. Williams).

Figure 3.4: Incised grayware amphora or bowl fragment, Citadella Trench 29, inv. no. 67-388B (Leighton) (photo C. Williams).

Figure 3.5: Carinated cup fragments, Morgantina Tomb 51, uninventoried (photo author).

Figure 5.1: Map of Lycian sites mentioned in the text (drawing S. Grice).

Figure 5.2: Çaltılar in its landscape (photo Çaltılar Archaeological Project [ÇAP]).

Figure 5.3: Intensive collection survey (photo Çaltılar Archaeological Project [ÇAP]).

Figure 5.4: Geophysical results (photo Çaltılar Archaeological Project [ÇAP]).

Figure 5.5: Tomography results (photo Çaltılar Archaeological Project [ÇAP]).

Figure 6.1: Reconstruction of a Seventh-century Cremation Burial and Offering Trench (after Houby-Nielsen 1996, 45, fig. 1).

Figure 6.2: Lekane of Stais’ “Attico-Corinthian” style. Athens, National Museum, 1000 (photo A. Alexandridou).

Figure 6.3: Representation of vase shapes from Kerameikos trenches (after Houby-Nielsen 1992, 350–351, pls. I–IV).

Figure 6.4: Representation of vase shapes from Kerameikos trenches (after Houby-Nielsen 1992, 350–351, pls. I–IV).

Figure 6.5: Plan of the Vourva tumulus (after Stais 1890b, pl. XIII.3).

Figure 6.6: Plan of the Marathon tumulus (after Stais 1893, 49).

Figure 6.7: Plan of the North Necropolis of Vari. (drawing A. Alexandridou)

Figure 7.1: The distribution of $\delta^{13}\text{C}$ vs. $\delta^{15}\text{N}$ values in the Classical and Early Roman periods at the Kerameikos and Plateia Kotzia cemeteries combined.

Figure 7.2: The proportion of single vs. multiple graves per chronological subphase at the Kerameikos and Plateia Kotzia cemeteries combined.

Figure 7.3: The proportion of individuals in single vs. multiple graves per subphase at the Kerameikos and Plateia Kotzia cemeteries combined.

Figure 8.1: Agora of Mantinea (as published in *Mantinée et l’Arcadie Orientale*, G. Fougères, 1898).

VIII — List of Figures

- Figure 8.2: Old Bouleuterion in the Athenian Agora (cover illustration of *The Archaeology of Athens and Attica under the Democracy*, W.D.E. Coulson et al., eds., 1994).
- Figure 8.3: The Peloponnese showing the three sites included in study (Google © 2012 Tele Atlas © 2012 Cnes/Spot Image).
- Figure 8.4: Argos (drawing J.C. Donati).
- Figure 8.5: Archaic foundations beneath the northern colonnade of the southern stoa in the Argive agora from southeast (photo J.C. Donati).
- Figure 8.6: Doric architrave block with nail holes originally from the sanctuary of Apollo Lykeios in the Argive agora (photo J.C. Donati).
- Figure 8.7: Archaic inscription from the Theban dedication in the Argive agora (Pariante 1992a, p. 228, fig. 2).
- Figure 8.8: Agora of Argos in the fourth century B.C. (drawing J.C. Donati).
- Figure 8.9: Circular platform in the Corinthian agora from southwest. The starting line of racetrack in the left background (photo J.C. Donati).
- Figure 8.10: Elis: satellite image (DigitalGlobe © 2012).
- Figure 8.11: Archaic terracotta sima discovered in the vicinity of the classical agora at Elis (Eder and Mitsopoulos-Leon 1999, pp. 27–28, fig. 14c).
- Figure 8.12: Archaic bronze inscription discovered in the vicinity of the classical agora at Elis (Eder and Mitsopoulos-Leon 1999, p. 25, fig. 13).
- Figure 8.13: Agora of Elis: satellite image (DigitalGlobe © 2012).
- Figure 8.14: Eastern foundations of the West Stoa in the Elean agora from south (photo J.C. Donati).
- Figure 8.15: Central urban area of Megalopolis: satellite image (DigitalGlobe © 2012).
- Figure 8.16: Agora of Megalopolis: satellite image (DigitalGlobe © 2012).
- Figure 8.17: Stamped roof tile from southwestern building (prytaneion?) in the Megalopolitan agora (Lauter-Bufe and Lauter 2011, Taf. 101b).
- Figure 8.18: Stoa of Philip in the Megalopolitan agora from southeast (photo J.C. Donati).
- Figure 9.1: State plan of Azoria South Acropolis: projected area of civic space shaded (after drawing of R.D. Fitzsimons, 2014).
- Figure 9.2: Northeast Building (drawing R.D. Fitzsimons).
- Figure 9.3: Northeast Building (A400): collapsed pithos in storeroom (photo M.S. Mook).
- Figure 9.4: Northwest Building (drawing R.D. Fitzsimons).
- Figure 9.5: Northwest Building: D700 storeroom (photo D. Haggis).
- Figure 9.6: Northwest Building: D1600-3 storeroom (photo D. Haggis).
- Figure 9.7: Northwest Building (D1600-3): collapsed pithos on stand.
- Figure 9.8: Pithos from domestic storeroom in B3600 (photo C. Papanikolopoulos).
- Figure 9.9: Northwest Building: D1600-2 kitchen (photo D. Haggis).
- Figure 9.10: Northwest Building: D1600 kitchen and storeroom from north (photo D. Haggis).
- Figure 9.11: Northwest Building: D700 hall and storeroom (photo D. Haggis).
- Figure 9.12: Northwest Building (D1500): drinking cup on floor (photo D. Haggis).
- Figure 9.13: Northwest Building (D1500): *louterion* from hall (photo C. Papanikolopoulos).
- Figure 9.14: Monumental Civic Building (drawing R.D. Fitzsimons).
- Figure 9.15: Monumental Civic Building: main hall from north (D500) (photo D. Haggis).
- Figure 9.16: Service Building: B700 storeroom (photo M.S. Mook).
- Figure 9.17: Communal Dining Building (drawing R.D. Fitzsimons).
- Figure 9.18: Dining room (A3100) with dumped debris, during excavation (photo L. Thompson).
- Figure 9.19: South Slope Buildings: G300 dining room; G500 kitchen (photo D. Haggis).
- Figure 9.20: Bronze Corinthian podanipter base (B2200/2300) (photo C. Papanikolopoulos).
- Figure 9.21: Attic black-figure cup-skyphos (B1500) (photo C. Papanikolopoulos).
- Figure 9.22: Aiginetan chytra (E100) (photo C. Papanikolopoulos).

- Figure 10.1: Map of ancient Rhodes (after Papachristodoulou 1989, 75, fig. 10.3).
- Figure 10.2: Map of the archaeological sites in the Kymissala area (drawing KARP).
- Figure 10.3: Topographical map of the main areas of excavation (drawing KARP).
- Figure 10.4: The temple on the acropolis (Hagios Fokas hill) (photo KARP).
- Figure 10.5: Central part of the west defensive wall of the acropolis (photo KARP).
- Figure 10.6: State plan (1968) of the funerary monuments (courtesy 22nd Ephorate of Prehistoric and Classical Antiquities).
- Figure 10.7: State plan (2008) of the funerary monuments present situation (drawing KARP)
- Figure 10.8: Grave 2/2006 (photo KARP).
- Figure 10.9: Grave 4/2007 (photo KARP).
- Figure 10.10: Pottery from grave 2/2006, end of 4th century (photo KARP).
- Figure 10.11: Black glazed cup (Π210-220) from grave 4/2007, last quarter of 4th century (photo KARP).
- Figure 10.12: Lamp (Π293) from grave 4/2007, end of 4th century (photo KARP).
- Figure 10.13: Lamp (Π209) from grave 4/2007, late 4th century C.E. (photo KARP).
- Figure 10.14: Plan of grave 10/2010 (drawing KARP).
- Figure 10.15: Excavation stratum from grave 10/2010 (photo KARP).
- Figure 10.16: Late Roman commercial amphora from grave 10/2010 (photo KARP).
- Figure 10.17: Late Roman pithoid vessel from grave 10/2010 (photo KARP).
- Figure 10.18: The funerary stele of Kymissala (AMP 3516) (photo after Maiuri 1916, Fig. 14).
- Figure 10.19: Part of Archaic pithos with relief decoration (Π45) from grave 2/2007, 7th century (photo KARP).
- Figure 10.20: Part of Ionian cup from grave 4/2007, 7th–6th centuries (photo KARP).
- Figure 10.21: Trefoil oinochoe from grave 5/2009, 6th century (photo KARP).
- Figure 10.22: Plan of grave 3/2007 (drawing KARP).
- Figure 10.23: Grave 3/2007, Chamber B, burials (photo KARP).
- Figure 10.24: Black glazed skyphos of Bol-Sal type (Π104) from grave 3/2007, second quarter of 4th century (photo KARP).
- Figure 10.25: Black figure lekythos (Π103) from grave 3/2007, first half of 4th century (photo KARP).
- Figure 10.26: Black glazed kotyle (Π147) from grave 19/2010, second quarter of 4th century (photo KARP).
- Figure 10.27: Burial of grave 19/2010 with two amphoriskoi (Π154, Π150), first quarter of 4th century (photo KARP).
- Figure 10.28: Sector III, grave monument (photo KARP).
- Figure 10.29: Aerial photograph of the Kymissala region: α) Hagios Fokas/Acropolis; β) Charakas hill; γ) Marmarounia hill; δ) Alonia; ε) Kymissala hill; ζ) Kymissala plain; η) Vassilikos plain; θ) Vassilika settlement; ι) Atoumas hill; κ) Glyphada; λ) Stelies settlement; μ) Kampanes settlement; ν) Nappes settlement; ξ) Aptetones settlement; ο) Oglyma cemetery (photo KARP).
- Figure 10.30: Orthophoto of the west defensive wall of acropolis (photo KARP-NTUA).
- Figure 10.31: A stable grid on the inclining ground of the Kymissala Hill (photo KARP).
- Figure 10.32a–b: Vertical photography with the use of the large tripod in Sector I (photo KARP).
- Figure 10.33: Students of the University of the Aegean during excavation (photo KARP).
- Figure 10.34: Students of the University of the Aegean during trench drawing (photo KARP).
- Figure 10.35: Students of the University of the Aegean cleaning skeletal remains (photo KARP).
- Figure 10.36: Skeletal remains in grave 11/2009 (photo KARP).
- Figure 10.37: The orthophotomosaic of the Kymissala area (photo KARP-NTUA).
- Figure 10.38a–b: The geometric documentation of grave 2/2006 on the Eastern Necropolis of Kymissala-Orthophotos (a) and 3D model (b) (KARP-NTUA).
- Figure 10.39: The orthophotomosaic of the road network in the Vassilika settlement (photo KARP-NTUA).
- Figure 10.40: Digit: hierarchical data model and table relations (drawing K. Kalogeropoulos).

- Figure 11.1: Map of central Crete with sites of the Arkalochori region mentioned in the text (drawing M. Spyridakis, 23rd Ephorate of Prehistoric and Classical Antiquities).
- Figure 11.2: Prophetes Elias Hill: rock cut houses from the east (photo I. Papadakis-Ploumidis).
- Figure 11.3: West edge of Prophetes Elias Hill: Hellenistic fortification wall from the north (photo I. Papadakis-Ploumidis).
- Figure 11.4: Northeast edge of Prophetes Elias Hill: rectangular built watchtower from the southwest (photo I. Papadakis-Ploumidis).
- Figure 11.5: Northeast edge of Prophetes Elias Hill: rectangular built watchtower from east (photo I. Papadakis-Ploumidis).
- Figure 11.6: Northeast edge of Prophetes Elias Hill: rock-cut houses with monumental east-west aligned stepped road from east (photo I. Papadakis-Ploumidis).
- Figure 11.7: Northeast edge of Prophetes Elias Hill: rock-cut houses from the east (photo I. Papadakis-Ploumidis).
- Figure 11.8: Southeast slope of Prophetes Elias Hill: linear houses (prothyron) from the east (photo I. Papadakis-Ploumidis).
- Figure 11.9: Work area of a house: rectangular and circular stone bases for pithoi from the east (photo I. Papadakis-Ploumidis).
- Figure 11.10: Work area of a house: rectangular and circular stone bases for pithoi (photo I. Papadakis-Ploumidis).
- Figure 11.11: Rock-cut cavities for pithoi in the floor of a house (photo I. Papadakis-Ploumidis).
- Figure 11.12: Northeast edge of Prophetes Elias Hill: base of post support column and cistern from the east (photo I. Papadakis-Ploumidis).
- Figure 11.13: East slope of Prophetes Elias Hill. Rock-cut foundations for houses from the east (photo I. Papadakis-Ploumidis).
- Figure 11.14: Houses on the east slope of Prophetes Elias Hill: domestic assemblages (loom weights and mortar) (photo I. Papadakis-Ploumidis).
- Figure 11.15: Work area of a house on the southeast slope of Prophetes Elias Hill: spouted press bed from the north (photo I. Papadakis-Ploumidis).
- Figure 11.16: Fragments of Archaic relief pithoi (photo I. Papadakis-Ploumidis).
- Figure 11.17: Pithos fragment decorated with horses and groom (photo courtesy of the 23rd Ephorate of Prehistoric and Classical Antiquities).
- Figure 12.1: Map of southern Pieria with sites mentioned in the text (after Margaritis 2014).
- Figure 12.2: Site plan of Kompoloi (courtesy of E. Poulaki).
- Figure 12.3: Site plan of Platania (courtesy of E. Poulaki).
- Figure 12.4: Plan of Building Δ at Krania showing distribution of archaeobotanical samples (after Margaritis 2014).
- Figure 13.1: Plan of the archaeological site of Vergina/Aegae (drawing A. Tourtas).
- Figure 13.2: The main terrace of the sanctuary of Eukleia (drawing A. Tourtas, after N. Haddad in Saatsoglou-Paliadeli 1993, p. 53).
- Figure 13.3: The pits around Temple II (drawing A. Tourtas, after N. Haddad in Saatsoglou-Paliadeli 1993, p. 53).
- Figure 13.4: The pit with the marble snake (courtesy Aristotle University of Thessaloniki, Vergina excavation archive).
- Figure 13.5: Bronze coins from the pits: a) Augustan period from the pit of 1990; b) Augustan period coin from the pit of 2003/2011; c) coin issued by Philip V from the pit of 1991; d) coin issued by Domitian from the pit of 1993; e) coin issued by Alexander III from the pit of 1990 (courtesy Aristotle University of Thessaloniki, Vergina excavation archive).

- Figure 13.6: The “statuary pit” (courtesy Aristotle University of Thessaloniki, Vergina excavation archive).
- Figure 13.7: The “statuary pit” (drawing A. Tourtas, after N. Haddad in Saatsoglou-Paliadeli 1990, p. 24).
- Figure 13.8: Male marble head encircled by stones (courtesy of Aristotle University of Thessaloniki, Vergina excavation archive).
- Figure 13.9: Cooking pot and statue neck fragment found underneath the female statue (courtesy of Aristotle University of Thessaloniki, Vergina excavation archive).
- Figure 13.10: The female statue within the “statuary pit” (courtesy of Aristotle University of Thessaloniki, Vergina excavation archive).
- Figure 13.11: Pottery from the “statuary pit” (courtesy of Aristotle University of Thessaloniki, Vergina excavation archive).
- Figure 13.12: The face and neck fragments of the female statue (courtesy of Aristotle University of Thessaloniki, Vergina excavation archive).
- Figure 13.13: The pit excavated in 2003 / 2011 (courtesy of Aristotle University of Thessaloniki, Vergina excavation archive).
- Figure 13.14: The Stenomakri Tomba (drawing A. Tourtas, after N. Hatzidakis in Kyriakou 2008, p. 31).
- Figure 13.15: The marble krater inside the funerary monument (courtesy of Aristotle University of Thessaloniki, Vergina excavation archive).
- Figure 13.16: The funerary monument (courtesy of Aristotle University of Thessaloniki, Vergina excavation archive).
- Figure 13.17: Pyres around the funerary monument (drawing A. Tourtas, after N. Hatzidakis in Kyriakou 2008, p. 43).
-
- Figure 14.1: The sanctuary of Poseidon at Kalaureia, Poros (photo St. Sturnara and E. Savini).
- Figure 14.2: A typical sample of fish bones from the sanctuary of Poseidon (photo C. Mauzy).
- Figure 14.3: Site plan with “dining deposit” and cistern (Feature 03) (drawing E. Savini).
- Figure 14.4: Bronze fish hook (MoP 1460.1) (photo C. Mauzy).
- Figure 14.5: Purple shells (*Bolinus brandaris*) from the cistern (Feature 03) (photo M. Nilsson).
- Figure 14.6: Aerial photography showing location of Kalaureia, Poros, and the Argolid (Google © 2012 Tele Atlas © 2012 Cnes/Spot Image).
- Figure 14.7: Tuna vertebrae from the sanctuary of Poseidon (photo C. Mauzy).

List of Tables

Table 10.1: Data taxonomy (derived from Phpmyadmin 3.4.1.10 database management system) (www.phpmyadmin.net/).

Table 14.1: Fish and seashells recovered from the sanctuary of Poseidon at Kalaureia.

List of Contributors

Alexandra Alexandridou

Chargée de Recherches FNRS
Centre de Recherches en Archéologie et
Patrimoine
Université libre de Bruxelles, CP 175
Avenue F.D. Roosevelt, 50
B-1050 Bruxelles

Carla M. Antonaccio

Professor of Classical Archaeology
Department of Classical Studies
Box 10903
Duke University
Durham, NC 27708

Chryssi Bourbou

Bioarchaeologist
Ministry of Culture and Sports
28th Ephorate of Byzantine Antiquities
Sourmeli 24
71313 Chania, Crete

Kostis S. Christakis

The Sanctuary of Hermes and Aphrodite at Syme
Viannou Project
Archaeological Society at Athens
Institute for Aegean Prehistory Study Center for
East Crete
J. Psyhary 18
71305 Heraklion, Crete

Jamieson C. Donati

Postdoctoral Researcher
Institute for Mediterranean Studies
Laboratory of Geophysical-Satellite Remote
Sensing and Archaeoenvironment
Melissinou and Nikephorou Foka 130
74100 Rethymno, Crete

Kalliopi E. Galanaki

Archaeologist
23rd Ephorate of Prehistoric and Classical
Antiquities
Herakleion, Crete
Solomou 1
71414 Gazi, Herakleion, Crete

Andreas Georgopoulos

Professor of Photogrammetry
Laboratory of Photogrammetry
School of Rural and Surveying Engineering
National Technical University of Athens
9 Iroon Polytechniou
15780 Zographos, Athens

Donald C. Haggis

Professor of Classical Archaeology
Department of Classics
The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill
212 Murphey Hall, CB 3145
Chapel Hill, NC 27599-3145

Tamar Hodos

Senior Lecturer
Department of Archaeology and Anthropology
University of Bristol
43 Woodland Road
BS8 1UU Bristol

Konstantinos Kalogeropoulos

Ph.D. Candidate in Archaeological Theory
University of the Aegean
Department of Cultural Technology and
Communication
University Hill
81100 Mytilene

Athanasia Kyriakou

Laboratory Teaching Staff
Department of Archaeology
Aristotle University of Thessaloniki
54124 Thessaloniki

Anna Lagia

Freelance Anthropologist
Wasagasse 33/25
1090 Vienna

XIV — List of Contributors

Evi Margaritis

Adjunct Assistant Professor, Cyprus Institute
Marie Curie Post-doctoral Fellow
McDonald Institute for Archaeological Research
University of Cambridge
Downing street
CB2 3ER Cambridge

Dimitra Mylona

The Kalaureia Research Program, Swedish
Institute at Athens
Institute for Aegean Prehistory Study Center for
East Crete
E. Daskalaki 59
74100 Rethymnon, Crete

Christina Papadaki

Ph.D. Candidate, University of Athens
Contract Archaeologist
23rd Ephorate of Prehistoric and Classical
Antiquities
Solomou 1
71414 Gazi, Herakleion, Crete

David B. Small

Professor of Anthropology
Department of Sociology and Anthropology
Lehigh University
681 Taylor Street
Bethlehem, Pennsylvania 18015-3169

Manolis I. Stefanakis

Associate Professor in Classical Archaeology
and Numismatics
University of the Aegean
Department of Mediterranean Studies
Demokratias 1
85100 Rhodes

Alexandros Tourtas

Archaeologist, Ph.D. Candidate
Aristotle University of Thessaloniki
School of Architecture
Cholomontos 24
54351 Thessaloniki

James Whitley

Professor in Mediterranean Archaeology
School of History, Archaeology and Religion
Cardiff University
John Percival Building
Colum Drive
Cardiff
CF10 3EU Wales

Tamar Hodos

5 Lycia and Classical Archaeology: The Changing Nature of Archaeology in Turkey

Abstract: Since Sir Charles Fellows' discovery nearly 200 years ago of ancient Xanthos and Patara, the region of Lycia, southwestern Turkey, has remained a major focus of archaeological investigation. Much, however, has centered on the mapping and excavation of the region's Greco-Roman city-states. In 2008, an international collaborative team led by UK and Turkish institutions commenced the Çaltılar Archaeological Project (ÇAP) to contextualize Lycia within a wider Mediterranean setting over a *longue durée* through an intensive study of Çaltılar *höyük*, an upland settlement site with contexts from the late fourth millennium to the middle of the first millennium B.C. The project emphasizes socio-cultural connectivity in the ancient Mediterranean, a broader framework that represents a new direction for periods associated with classical archaeology in Turkey, which have otherwise focused traditionally on the urban built environment of individual cities. The aims and methods of the project both respond to and anticipate changing perceptions of archaeology in Turkey, and the position of classical archaeology, in particular. The project's integrated research design has enabled us to answer socio-cultural questions for periods previously relatively inaccessible in Lycia, and as such creates new dimensions to the merits of classical archaeology both as a discipline and in practice.

Turkey and its Classical Archaeology

It is widely considered that Turkey possesses the most, and among the best, Greek and Roman ruins, including two of the Seven Wonders of the Ancient World—the Temple of Artemis at Ephesos, and the Mausoleum at Halicarnassos. Indeed, this heritage was the focus of early interest by eighteenth and nineteenth century European travelers to the eastern Mediterranean, who brought whole temples and tombs back to their nations. Most prominent, perhaps, are the Pergamon Altar in its dedicated museum in Berlin, and the Nereid Monument from Xanthos in the British Museum, London, although other works are scattered through the major international museums of the western world. Famously, the Ottoman sultans allowed the exportation to Europe of many such classical buildings and sculptures, and turned a blind eye to the digging of sites by local people, who sold the objects they found to dealers (see, most recently, papers in Bahrani, Çelik, and Eldem, eds, 2011).

Caring for its heritage has been a major concern for Turkey since the Republic was declared by Atatürk in 1922. Interest in promoting a Turkish past was central to Atatürk's aims of overturning associations with its immediate Ottoman past, in the eyes of the new nation and other countries (Özyürek 2006). He drew heavily on the ideologies of Mehmet Ziya Gökalp (1876–1924), the sociologist, political activist and poet who popularized the idea of a nationalist Turkish identity during the declining years of the Ottoman Empire. Gökalp's ideas, ultimately brought together in his 1923

The Principles of Turkism, called for a common language, religion, morality and aesthetic to produce a strong sense of national identity and national pride (Landau 1995). Atatürk recognized that any such identity was vital in order to counter European Orientalist and anti-Ottoman perspectives. Such change had to begin with the rehabilitation of the notion of “Turk” and the demonstration of Turks as the natural heirs of Anatolia, alongside the rejection of Ottoman practices. Thus, the fez was banned in 1925 to be replaced with western headgear; the Islamic calendar was abandoned in 1926 in favor of the Western clock and calendar; Arabic script was replaced with Latin in 1928, and from 1932 the language was reformed, with the replacement of all foreign words with so-called purely Turkish words, some of which were invented (Shaw 2004; Özyürek 2006; Goode 2007); in 1936 the Sun-Language Theory (*Güneş-Dil Teorisi*) was unveiled to proclaim Turkish as the mother of all languages (Aytürk 2004). Most significantly, Atatürk embarked upon a sweeping revision of the history of Turkey to claim ancestry with the earliest inhabitants of Anatolia. This process was known as the Turkish History Thesis (*Türk Tarih Tezi*) and purported to demonstrate Turkish ethnic continuity in Anatolia since prehistoric times (Erimtan 2008; Tanyeri-Erdemir 2006; Gül 2006 notes that it continues today under less racial yet nevertheless essentialist narratives, which she refers to as the Anatolian Civilizations Discourse). Intellectual thinkers of the time argued that the root of national power was a national identity founded in national history (e.g. Kandemir 1933, 3).

Turkey’s archaeological heritage had an important role to play in shaping and promoting this sense of shared ancestry and national pride (as, indeed, archaeology did elsewhere during this era, particularly in Europe: Kohl and Fawcett 1995; Díaz-Andreu and Champion 1996; Meskell 1998). Archaeology as a discipline of practice and study began to be formalized during the last decades of the Ottoman Empire, although more as a handmaiden to international relations: the first piece of legislation to deal specifically with antiquities was enacted in 1869 and outlined the division of finds between the excavation team (all of whom were foreign), landowner, and state. This began to change at the end of the nineteenth century, when Osman Hamdi Bey (1842–1910) was appointed director of antiquities in 1881. He introduced tight regulations governing excavations and antiquities, including state ownership of all antiquities, and established an archaeological museum in Istanbul (although the decision to establish an imperial museum had been passed in 1869, it was not founded until 1891) (Blake 1994). However, the production of archaeological knowledge at this time remained an elite affair and continued to be used by the Ottoman rulers in their political negotiations with Europeans. Thus, Osman Hamdi Bey’s efforts were often undermined by the Porte, which gave in to the foreign archaeologists and diplomats who complained directly about the enforcement of such regulations (Özdoğan 1998; Goode 2007).

Atatürk quickly realized that archaeological evidence would be necessary to provide support for his promotion of Turkey’s past as a source of pride for the new nation, and that it was essential to keep in Turkey the antiquities coveted by the Euro-

peans. As early as 1920, he established a department of antiquities, with Halil Ethem Bey (1861–1938), the brother of Osman Hamdi Bey, at the helm. The new department maintained strict control over excavations, with permits selectively allocated to assure the highest scholarly standard; a representative was assigned to oversee every excavation; and in some cases, excavated material was not allowed to be exported (Goode 2007, 25–29). Many of these policies remain in place today. The First Turkish Congress of History was held in July 1932 for nine days (every session of which Atatürk attended), for an audience of high school teachers with the goal of educating them about the Turkish History Thesis. Proponents of the Thesis recognized the need for corroborating evidence, and thus in 1933 a series of archaeological excavations commenced at explicitly prehistoric sites, as well as those of Hittite, Phrygian and other cultural origins, to demonstrate Turkey's relationship with these past mighty civilizations. A second Congress was held in 1937 with focus more on the empirical presentation of archaeological data than the theoretical nationalist theories that had prevailed at the previous Congress, and to an international audience of scholars (Atakuman 2008; Çiğ 1993; Shaw 2004; Tanyeri-Erdemir 2006).

This paved the way for archaeological research across a range of periods and cultures to create a rich and diverse understanding of Turkey's pre-Ottoman heritage that is maintained today. Sites pertaining to the Greek and Roman periods not already under excavation in the 1930s (such as Ephesos, the excavation of which began in 1863) were overlooked until the 1950s (Uçankuş 2000, 15), when interest in the Greco-Roman period was renewed. Sites pertaining to Islamic and Ottoman periods have become subject to systematic study even more recently (e.g. Baram and Carroll 2000; Milwright 2009; Peacock 2010). Today, Turkey permits over 250 archaeological field projects—including excavation and survey work—that span from prehistory to the Ottoman period through a highly regulated system that oversees the conduct of fieldwork in accordance with legal protocol to protect Turkey's heritage. (The numbers fluctuate each year slightly, although an overall, steady increase is noticeable over the past ten years. In 2011, there were 166 excavations and 104 surveys: <http://www.kulturvarliklari.gov.tr/belge/1-97365/2011-yili-kazi-ve-yuzey-arastirma-faaliyetleri.html>.) The system also encourages professional standards and promotes the rapid dissemination of results, primarily through an annual symposium, at which projects are expected to present their results from the previous season (see below).

Lycia's history of archaeological research illustrates these developments and exemplifies the current trajectory of scholarly emphasis and practice in Turkish archaeology. Initially, it was Lycia's rich classical heritage that was mined by Europeans, and its Greco-Roman periods remain a major focus of modern archaeological research. Increasingly, however, other periods are the focus of study as scholarship seeks to contextualize Lycia, and Turkey, within broader socio-cultural settings in antiquity. This article examines the history of archaeological work in Lycia, which begins in the eighteenth century, to the present day to illustrate the changing nature of Turkey's heritage focus. It examines the Çaltılar Archaeological Project, which

seeks to contextualize Lycia within a wider Mediterranean setting over a *longue durée*, as a case study, for the aims and methods of the project both respond to and anticipate changing perceptions of archaeology in Turkey, and the position of classical archaeology, in particular.

The Archaeology of and in Lycia

Interest in the history and archaeology of Lycia began at the turn of the eighteenth century and was led by Europeans. The English prelate Richard Pococke (1704–1765) visited the region in 1739–40 as part of a grand tour of Greece and the Near East, publishing an account of his travels in 1745 (Pococke 1745). The English classical scholar and antiquarian Dr. Richard Chandler (1738–1810), the artist and neoclassical architect James Stuart (1713–1788) and the painter William Edmund Pars (1742–1782) came in 1764 on behalf of England’s Society of Dilettanti to record Lycia’s ruins, search for and transcribe inscriptions, in which Europeans were beginning to become interested (Stuart 1769; Chandler 1775). In 1776, the Comte de Choiseul-Gouffier, the future French ambassador to the Ottoman Empire, accompanied the Marquis de Chabert on a voyage around the Aegean shores, which took in the Lycian coast, to chart a mathematically rigorous representation of the Mediterranean (Choiseul-Gouffier 1782). Others were soon to follow, or at least planned to: Lt.-Col. William Martin Leake (1777–1860), who was also a topographer, visited Telmessos, Antiphellos and the Kekova region in 1800 before being turned back by fever, while the diplomat William Richard Hamilton (1777–1859) had intended to come but never pursued the trip because of rumors of plague (Spratt and Forbes 1847). The Austrian orientalist Joseph von Hammer (1774–1856) visited not long after, however (von Hammer 1811).

In 1811, Captain Francis Beaufort (1774–1857), a hydrographer to the British Admiralty and captain of the frigate HMS *Frederiksteen*, commenced a survey of the Lycian coast to assess its hydrography and naval capabilities, and he could not help but notice and record the abundant and diverse ancient architectural remains he observed along the coast from Patara to Phaselis. He published the results of his trip in 1817. Beaufort was accompanied by the architect Charles R. Cockerell (1788–1863), who recorded the first Lycian inscription, at Telmessos, and which happened to be a bilingual, thus affording interpretational possibilities and linguistic interest (Spratt and Forbes 1847, xii; Fellows 1852, 412) (**fig. 1**).

In 1838, Mr. Charles Fellows (1799–1860), later to become Sir Charles, visited Lycia for the first time. His 1839 *Journal written during an excursion in Asia Minor*, which recalled his journey around Patara and Xanthos, included lavish descriptions of the temples, tombs and monuments, and was lithographed by Charles Hullmandel (1789–1850). These Lycian carved remains were regarded as the epitome of Greek artistic achievement, and their images convinced the British Museum to support a second



Figure 5.1: Map of Lycian sites mentioned in the text (drawing S. Grice).

expedition to retrieve these antiquities for the museum. Fellows returned in 1840, although the *firman* for removal was not secured, and he returned empty handed.

Unaware of Fellows' second visit, in 1840 and early 1841, a parallel expedition around the Lycian coast was undertaken by HMS Surveying Ship *Beacon*, under the captaincy of Thomas Graves (1802–1856) and the mastership of Richard Hoskyn (1811–1873). Graves, Hoskyn and the *Beacon* returned in October 1841, and the team explored the interior, including Oinoanda and Balboursa. Aboard the ship on this expedition were Thomas Abel Brimage Spratt (1811–1888), who served as Lieutenant and assistant surveyor; Edward Forbes (1815–1854), a naturalist; and Edward Thomas Daniell (1804–1842), an artist and amateur enthusiast who had joined the expedition at Smyrna. Hoskyn published his account in 1842, while Spratt and Forbes published the results of their discoveries in 1847 (Hoskyn 1842; Spratt and Forbes 1847).

During the winter of 1841–42, Fellows returned with a substantial team to excavate, document and reconstruct the architectural and sculptural finds from Xanthos, including the Harpy Tomb, lion sculptures, and the Nereid Monument. In 1842, the Harpy Tomb frieze and lion sculptures were delivered to the British Museum. The sensation of their impact resulted in a renewed expedition to retrieve remaining pieces of the monuments now in the possession of the British Museum, as well as additional antiquities. By 1844, over one hundred additional cases of sculptures and casts arrived in Great Britain, and in 1848 the Xanthian Room was opened in the British Museum to critical acclaim (Hooek 2010, 245–252).

French, Austrian and Prussian interest in Lycia furthered at this time, as well. Félix Marie Charles Texier (1802–1871) was sent by the French government in 1836 to procure antiquities for the French state. Augustus Schönborn (1801–1857) from Posen discovered the frieze of the fourth century Heroon at Gölbaşı-Trysa in 1841, although it was not until 1881 that the frieze and lintel were removed, by Otto Benndorf (1838–1907), along with the nearby Dereimis-Aischylos sarcophagus, to the Kunsthistorisches Museum in Vienna. The Austrian epigraphist Eduard Hula (1862–1902) visited Xanthos in 1894 and made copies and squeezes of the inscriptions. These were not published until 1920 (Kalinka 1920), although a bilingual Greek-Latin inscription from Arykanda, discovered by Benndorf in 1893 and submitted to Hula then, was published immediately (Grosart 1893; Mommsen 1893).

More methodological interest in Lycia began during the middle of the twentieth century and mimics the pattern of archaeological interest notable elsewhere in Turkey: namely, that only by this time were Classical sites more regularly examined. Indeed, one might argue that sites surveyed and excavated in Lycia since this period have largely been Greco-Roman city-states. In 1941, the Turkish archaeologist Ekrem Akurgal (1911–2002) published a study of sixth century A.D. reliefs in Lycia (Akurgal 1941). In 1950, a French team under the direction of Pierre Demargne (1903–2000) began the excavation of Roman Xanthos (1951) and in 1962, the project expanded to include the nearby sanctuary site of Letoon. Excavations at Limyra commenced in 1969 under the German scholar Jürgen Borchhardt, who had previously excavated briefly at Myra between 1966 and 1968, and who in 1984 moved to the University of Vienna, whereby the project fell under Austrian auspices; between 2002 and 2006, the late Thomas Marksteiner served as director, and since 2007, it has been directed by Martin Seyer. The Turkish archaeologist Cevdet Bayburtluoglu excavated at Arykanda from 1971 for forty years, and since 2011 the project director has been Macit Tekinalp. Excavations at Patara commenced in 1988 under the direction of the Turkish archaeologist Fahri Işık until 2009, when the project directorship transferred to Havva Işık, under whose auspices it continues today. An intensive survey around Kyaneai was conducted between 1989 and 2001 by the German scholar Frank Kolb. Excavations at Tlos begin in 2005 under Havva Işık, and in 2009 Taner Korkut took over the direction. Each of these projects has produced substantial reports and publications (see below). European scholarship no longer dominates the study of Lycia.

While most research in Lycia has focused on the coastal sites, additional work has been conducted in its upland regions, although largely for epigraphic purposes, and generally still pertaining to the Classical era. The interior cities that belonged to the Roman Lycian League were first explored by Spratt and Forbes in 1842, although it was not until 1882 that this area was subject to more focused study, when the German archaeologist Eugen Petersen (1836–1919) surveyed the epigraphic remains at Oinoanda (Petersen 1889; see also Robert 1971; Smith 1977). In 1884, fragments of a substantial philosophical Epicurean inscription by a then-unidentified Diogenes were discovered by the young French epigraphists Maurice Holleaux (1861–1932) and Pierre

Paris (1859–1931). In 1885, two more young French epigraphists, Georges Cousin (1860–1907) and Charles Diehl (1859–1944), continued the exploration of the site and discovered additional fragments of the inscription. Cousin returned in 1889 to seek further remains (Cousin 1892). In 1895, the Austrian epigraphists Rudolf Heberdey (1864–1936) and Ernst Kalinka (1865–1946) visited Oinoanda to recopy many of the inscriptions published by Cousin in 1892 and search (successfully) for additional pieces (Heberdey and Kalinka 1897). In 1968, the British epigraphist Martin Ferguson Smith commenced a series of regular seasons at Oinoanda to seek additional fragments of the Epicurean inscription. This study was complemented between 1974 and 1983 by Alan Hall and a team of British scholars, who began systematically to plan the site and record its architecture (Coulton 1998). Only a single season of excavation occurred, in 1997, under the direction of Smith and with the express aim of recovering additional fragments of what is now recognized as the longest ancient inscription. Between 2007 and 2012, further mapping work at the site was undertaken by Martin Bachmann of the Deutsches Archäologisches Institut, Istanbul.

Between 1988 and 1995, the British archaeologist Jim Coulton conducted a survey of the area around Balboura, Oinoanda's neighbor to the north, to contextualize the development of both Roman cities within a wider landscape setting (Coulton 1998; Coulton et al. 2012). The Balboura survey was one of the first intensive surveys of a broad landscape in Turkey (and part of a growing trend: the Pisidia Survey Project, for example, commenced in 1982 under the direction of Stephen Mitchell and continues today under Lutgarde Vandepuit). One immediate result was to provide evidence for Lycia's long-term settlement history going back to the Chalcolithic period (at Çaltılar, which was examined by the Balboura team).

Nevertheless, it remains true that the vast majority of these projects have focused on the Graeco-Roman periods. Yet the famous Bronze Age shipwrecks of Uluburun and Gelidonya attest the region's Bronze Age antecedents (e.g. Pulak 1998; Bass et al. 1967), and there is a relatively rich literary tradition that refers to the inhabitants of southwestern Anatolia during the Bronze and Early Iron Ages.

Lycia may be mentioned as *Lukka* in the chronicle of the late fifteenth century Hittite king Tudhaliya II, who lists it among his West Anatolian enemies forming the Assuwa coalition (Mellink 1995, 34 with bibliography; see also Bryce 2005, 125); during the fourteenth century, the *Lukka* are characterized in the Amarna letters as commando-style sea-raiders of Cypriot and Egyptian coastal communities (*El-Amarna Letters* 37, 7–12); at the end of the thirteenth century, we learn from Egyptian texts pertaining to Ramesses II that soldiers from the *Lukka* lands fought alongside the Hittites against the Egyptians in the battle of Qadesh (c. 1274 B.C.; Bryce 2005, 235), but by the end of the thirteenth century, Hittite texts speak of Hittite campaigns against the *Lukka* lands (e.g. Tudhaliya IV and Suppiluliuma II; Hawkins 1995, 66–85; Bryce 2005, 304; 329). The *Lukka* are also mentioned as one of the peoples who invaded Egypt along with other so-called Sea Peoples at the very end of the thirteenth century B.C. (Bryce 2005, 336; 338). The relationship between Lycia and its Late Bronze Age

past is first assessed by Herodotus (*Histories* 1.173), who notes that the Lycians originated from Crete but called themselves Termilai when they settled in the region subsequently known as Lycia, which was so called after Lycos, who joined them from Athens. A multilingual stele from Xanthos—in Lycian and Greek—has the equivalent of *Lukia* of the Greek text as *Trmmis* in the Lycian; as Machteld Mellink has surmised, the Greek custom of calling the Classical Termilai as Lycians must have been due to the persistence of Bronze Age and Homeric usage, when Greeks began to hellenize the name *Lukka* into Greek *Lukioi* (Mellink 1995). Thus, by the time of Homer, these people are the *Lukioi*, or Lycians. In the Trojan War, the Lycians are named as one of the principle allies of the Trojans, led by Sarpedon and Glaukos. In the *Iliad*, the Lycians feature for their *aristeia*—a warrior’s prowess, excellence and virtue—exhibited in the death of their leader Sarpedon, while in the Glaukos episode, in which Glaukos and Diomedes exchange armor, this *xenia*, or ritualized friendship, bind Greek and Lycian families together, forcing them to refrain from combat against one another (*Il.* 6.150–211; 224–225). In Homer’s epic tale, Apollo is their god: not only does Glaukos pray to Apollo for strength (*Il.* 16.514–515) but it is Apollo who rescues and prepares Sarpedon’s body for return to and burial in Lycia (*Il.* 16.676–683; see also Bryce 1985; Mellink 1995). Furthermore, we are told that these Lycians speak Greek, although we know the Lycian language is related to Luwian, and so an element of mythical-historical license must be assumed.

But what was the extent of the territory discussed in these texts? The upland area of the modern region of Lycia became affiliated politically with coastal Lycia during the Roman period, when coastal and upland city-states united to form the Lycian League. Prior to this, during the first millennium B.C., the eastern upland zone may have been known as Milyas, and included the Elmalı plain, while the western zone perhaps was known as Kabalia, although the boundaries between such groups seem to have fluctuated over time (Coulton 2012). We know that during the Bronze Age, for example, the *Lukka* lands themselves at one point may have extended as far as Konya, judging by an inscription at Hattusa from the period of Suppiluliuma II (Hawkins 1995, 29; see also Bryce 1992). Ultimately, the long-term Hittite notion of the *Lukka* may simply pertain to territories of Luwian-speakers (see, for example, Walakaens 2000, 480).

Milyas and Kabalia, themselves, are thought to derive from the Hittite names of *Mira* and *Kuwaliya*, kingdoms of the Arzawan region, which extended from central-western towards southwestern Anatolia (Bryce 2005, 43, 73–74; see also Mayer and Garstang 1925, 30). The kingdoms were united under a single ruler during the twelfth year of the reign of Mursili II (1321–1295 B.C.), according to the Kupanta-Kurunta Treaty, and by the end of the thirteenth century and the reign of Tudhaliya IV (c. 1237–1209 B.C.), *Mira* had become one of the largest and powerful states in western Anatolia, incorporating *Kuwaliya* (Bryce 2005, 308). By this time, a new power-sharing arrangement was established here, with a local ruler holding direct authority over neighbouring vassal kingdoms, as attested by the Milawata Letter; the Karabel inscription,

located less than 20 miles to the east of modern Izmir at the Karabel mountain pass, refers to the kingdom of *Mira* under the leadership of Tarkasnawa, and its location may have marked *Mira*'s northern extent (Milawata Letter: Bryce 2005, 306–308 with bibliography; Karabel inscription: Hawkins 1998; 1999).

Herodotus distinguishes the Milyans, Kabalians and Lycians from one another (*Histories* 7.77 and 7.92), and it is clear that during his time, there were noticeable material differences between the coastal and upland regions, although distinctions between the Milyan and Kabalian zones themselves are much harder to determine; personal names nevertheless suggest that they were linguistically related (Coulton 1993). In fact, a broadly uniform material culture has been argued for during the Bronze Age stretching from Afyon, in central western Anatolia, down to Elmalı, a region that also has climatic coherence (Coulton 2012). Coulton speculates that during the second millennium the inhabitants of this large area were known as *Kuwaliyans*, but that only the northern part was regarded politically as *Kuwaliya*. New ceramic traditions that emerged during the early part of the Iron Age suggest socio-cultural changes, with a dividing line around Dinar; ceramic patterns suggest that those settlements north of Dinar looked more towards Phrygia, while those south of Dinar were oriented towards the southern highlands. Coulton offers that during this time, and in response to Phrygian pressure, some *Kuwaliyans* may have moved south into the area between Burdur and Gölhisar and down to the Seki basin, lending to the area their name, which became Hellenized as Kabalian. He hypothesizes that those who became known as the Milyans, and who would have previously covered the whole of the southern highlands, consolidated to the southeast of this zone and into the Elmalı plain.

Until very recently, only one project explicitly sought to understand these—or indeed any—periods before that of the Greco-Roman city states in this part of Turkey. This was the work by the Dutch-born, American-based scholar Machteld Mellink (1917–2006) during the 1960s in and around the Elmalı upland plateau. Mellink's fieldwork provided the first evidence of Neolithic, Chalcolithic and Early Bronze Age occupation of this region, as well as the identification of several Iron Age tombs (Eslick 1992; 2009; Mellink 1998). Other even broader extensive surveys, such as those conducted by Hood, Mellaart, and French, although not specifically devoted to the modern region now called Lycia, did nevertheless incorporate prehistoric remains from this territory (Mellaart 1954; material collected by David French is held in the British Institute at Ankara pottery collection).

The upland region of modern Lycia has continued to be fruitful for achieving a different understanding beyond the Greco-Roman urban centers and public buildings that first attracted antiquarians to the region almost 200 years ago, although it nevertheless remains largely underexplored. In 1993, the Turkish archaeologist İlknur Özgen began formal examination of the site of Hacimusalar, the largest *höyük* (mound) in the Elmalı plain. Inscriptions indicating that the site was Classical Choma have been known since the 1960s, and excavations have focused on the later periods

of occupation. Nevertheless, soundings at the site have revealed evidence of occupation as early as the Neolithic period, and include Bronze and Iron Age evidence, although to date these lack stratified contexts (Özgen, pers. comm.).

Finally, in 2008, an international team of European and Turkish archaeologists under the direction of Dr. N. Momigliano (University of Bristol) commenced the Çaltular Archaeological Project in the Seki basin with the explicit aim of focusing on the pre-Classical periods of occupation of the Lycian upland zone (see below). This is significant, for, as is clear above, virtually all research in Lycia has focused on periods associated with its Greco-Roman history, although in 2010, early Chalcolithic (specifically Hacilar I: 5800–5700 B.C.) remains were salvaged from Girmeler Cave, in the vicinity of Tlos (Becks 2011). This represents the earliest archaeological evidence for the lower Xanthos zone. Other evidence pertaining to the Bronze and Early Iron Ages in both lower and upper Lycia is sporadic and generally unstratified (for places and bibliography, see Momigliano et al. 2011, 64; Momigliano and Aksoy forthcoming). One reason why earlier periods have been difficult to examine is because walls of an archaeological nature are not supposed to be removed. Given that most sites in Lycia that have been subject to archaeological examination are Greco-Roman city-states, earlier settlement contexts at such sites will, therefore, be challenging to examine, since the Greco-Roman periods are characterized by massive stone structures with deep foundations, especially in their public spaces; indication of earlier occupation at such sites is therefore usually only gained from soundings not impeded by substantial walling.

The Practicalities of Fieldwork in Turkey

Fieldwork in Turkey is highly regulated. Every fieldwork project, whether involving excavation or survey, and whether foreign-led or Turkish-led, requires a permit that is granted by the General Directorate for Monuments and Museums, TC Ministry of Culture and Tourism. Permit applications must be submitted to the authorities by December 31 of the calendar year before the work is due to commence. The application must explain precisely the work to be conducted and list each team member. All excavation projects must also offer a ten-year plan of activity and outline funding resources as part of the initial application for a permit, a timeframe of work that recalls the days of the Big Dig paradigm of classical archaeology (Dyson 1993; 2006), although one that is no longer fiscally realistic. While in the past, foreign teams may have been subject to tighter regulation than Turkish-led projects, today the regulations apply equally to all fieldwork teams.

During the field season, a representative of the Ministry of Culture and Tourism (a *temsilci*), usually a curatorial staff member from one of the over 100 museums across the country, accompanies the project for the duration of the season; the same person

may not return in this role to the project for three years. These *temsilciler* oversee all aspects of the work conducted by the field team to ensure that it is done in accordance with professional responsibility as well as within the law. They have the authority to close a project down at any time during the field season if they are unhappy with the conduct of work or fiscal matters pertaining to the season.

In recent years, the government has increasingly required projects to take responsibility for site protection, the preservation of collected material, and site sustainability. More specifically, managing the protection of a site under excavation, especially to prevent looting and other illicit activities, is the responsibility of the project director. In practice, this means that part of a project's budget pays for at least one site guard, who is employed throughout the year. In the late 1990s, the authorities passed a requirement that all excavation projects provide separate accommodation and long-term storage facilities for collected material within three years of commencing excavation, although any item classified as a special find must still be deposited in the local museum. This usually means that projects now construct such facilities, which must be distinct from one another, for the authorities will not permit a space to be used for accommodation during the field season and storage during the inactive periods.

More recent developments have been increasingly directed at the management and research avenues of field projects. From 2010, all foreign-run excavation projects were required to have a Turkish assistant director, to be active for a minimum of four months per year (with a two-month minimum of field work, and additional time for related research, museum studies, restoration, etc.), and to provide an annual budget for approval in advance of the commencement of each season's activities (Atakuman 2010, 123). From 2012, scientific samples could no longer be exported from the country for analysis if the relevant equipment and expertise were available in Turkey. In 2012, it was also decided that surveys could cover at most two provinces and could not be conducted during July and August. Foreign scholars were also required to publish their results in Turkish. From 2013, survey projects were no longer allowed to pick up material, while foreign excavation director candidates were required to have their status, which had to be at least Associate Professor (or equivalent), accredited by the Turkish Council of Higher Education (Yükseköğretim Kurulu, or YÖK). These regulations are cumulative and are incorporated into the latest version (<http://teftis.kultur-turizm.gov.tr/TR,50815/kultur-ve-tabiat-varliklariyla-ilgili-yapilacak-yuzey-a-.html>).

These requirements and changing goalposts, although discouraging, have not been insurmountable to conducting archaeological research in Turkey, and fieldwork projects, both foreign and Turkish, continue to thrive. This is most evident in the number of presentations given at the annual Symposium, which is, in fact, a series of symposia—one for survey, one for archaeology, one for archaeometry, and one for museum studies, which are held together at the end of May each year, at which projects present their research from the previous season. In 2011 and 2012, nearly a third of fieldwork projects were led by foreign teams, although this percent-

age is gradually decreasing toward one quarter. Excluding rescue fieldwork, in 2011, there were 43 foreign-led excavations and 123 Turkish; and 21 foreign-led surveys and 83 Turkish (<http://www.kulturvarliklari.gov.tr/belge/1-97365/2011-yili-kazi-ve-yuzey-arastirma-faaliyetleri.html>); in 2012, there were 39 foreign-led excavations and 116 Turkish; and 18 foreign-led surveys and 84 Turkish (<http://www.kulturvarliklari.gov.tr/TR,50150/2012-yili-kazi-ve-yuzey-arastirma-faaliyetleri.html>).

Nevertheless, the level of intervention by the government in the management of Turkey's vast heritage has reached the consciousness of the national press. Discussions appear regularly about the degree to which the authorities are interfering with the running of projects, and the politicization of archaeological fieldwork. A series of articles in various (government opposition) newspapers reported during 2011 that the excavation permits at Xanthos and Letoon had been removed from the French team that had been excavating for nearly 50 years and given to young Turkish archaeologists; the Turkish authorities claimed in part that the French were not publishing sufficiently substantial results to warrant the continuation of the permit, and that insufficient amounts of excavation and conservation were being conducted; some Turkish archaeologists have questioned the appropriateness of such action (Eğrikavuk 2011; Finkel 2011; Güsten 2011). Reported difficulties for foreigners obtaining *new* fieldwork permits in 2011 coincided with a number of calls the same year by the Turkish government for the return of various artifacts from major European museums (Allsop 2011; Edgers 2011; Güsten 2011; a number of Turkish-led projects also were not granted *new* permits in 2011, despite substantial funding and international recognition of the importance of the projects and the quality of the teams and project directors; most continuity permits were granted). It should be noted that national elections were also held on June 12, 2011, for which the incumbent party, the AK party, ran a nationalistic campaign. Similar stories have continued to circulate (Stonington 2013).

Part of the tension between academics and the government has arisen because of a perceived lack of coordination between the national government, regional and local administrations, and various stakeholders in Turkey's approach to tourism development (Tosun 2001). Tosun notes that the centralization of public administration functions has concentrated power in too few hands, and calls for local government to be empowered politically, legally and financially, although with an element of caution (Tosun 2001, 300; it should be noted that tension between national and local authorities has been a characteristic of Turkey's tourism development industry with regard to its archaeological heritage for decades: see Morrison and Selman 1991 for a study of Patara).

Mehmet Özdoğan, professor emeritus of archaeology at Istanbul University, has lamented the interference of political and personal agendas in the granting and renewing of research permits, and the politicization of the practice of archaeology in Turkey in recent years (Özdoğan 2006). In particular, the government has increasingly pressured projects to support and finance expanding tourism through site development (Hodder 1998 discusses this balance at Çatalhöyük; museums are also

under increasing pressure to balance the maintenance of collections and the need for market-focused impact: Yurtseven 2006). It has been observed that the practice of archaeology can never be free from politics, for any site potentially provides material for contemporary national mythologies, which are politically charged. This is especially relevant with regard to state (and even corporate) intervention (or manipulation) for public relations benefits. In such situations, often heritage activity becomes reduced to touristic consumption and prestige signaling in international diplomacy (Hamilakis 1999, 72–73; Atakuman 2010, 109; 124–126). This situation in Turkey has been described as having reached “fever pitch” (Finkel 2011; Neel 2011).

The Çaltılar Archaeological Project

New field projects in Turkey that seek to broaden our understanding of the past are commencing nevertheless. The Çaltılar Archaeological Project is one such example. It was conceived to contextualize this corner of Turkey within a wider Mediterranean setting over a *longue durée* through an intensive study of Çaltılar *höyük*, an upland settlement site with contexts from the late fourth millennium to the middle of the first millennium B.C. (Momigliano et al. 2011). Intellectually, the project engages with developing theoretical emphasis on socio-cultural connectivity in the ancient Mediterranean (e.g. Horden and Purcell 2001). It was also explicitly designed to shed light on the periods prior to the Greco-Roman in order to understand the material, social and cultural backgrounds to the development of those city-states, and to provide material evidence to complement the literary references to Bronze Age inhabitants of the region.

The project has been a collaboration between Bristol and Liverpool Universities in the United Kingdom and Uludağ Üniversitesi in Bursa, Turkey. The Principal Investigator (and permit holder) through 2012 was Dr. N. Momigliano, who co-directed the project alongside Dr. B. Aksoy (Uludağ Üniversitesi), Dr. A. Greaves (Liverpool University), and this author (Bristol University). The project has been facilitated by the British Institute at Ankara, which oversees the submission of the annual permit application to the General Directorate. The British Academy, the Institute for Aegean Prehistory, Three Counties Ancient History Society, Richard Bradford McConnell Trust, Seven Pillars of Wisdom Trust, our respective universities, and several private donors have supported the project financially, and Likya Şarapları kindly provided sponsorship in kind for fundraising purposes.

Although foreign survey projects are not required to have a Turkish co-director, we designed the project from the beginning—since our initial application in 2007 for permission to commence survey work in 2008—to be a collaboration between Turkish and foreign archaeologists. We have also actively sought close relations with our local hosts, in particular through regular outreach activities, which include an annual

public presentation of our finds and results; an opportunity for the children in the village to participate in timed total collection survey using a mock grid and modern broken pottery scattered throughout; the chance to participate in artifact reconstruction using the modern pottery collected in the mock survey; and a series of small-group interviews to gather information about the villagers' attitudes to their local heritage and the impact of the project's activities on those attitudes, particularly in terms of the history of the village itself, long-term chronologies, and broader heritage issues. One result is that many are interested in the potential for economic expansion deriving from tourism and improved infrastructure that the development of an archaeological site will necessitate.

With permission of the *vali* of Muğla province, the director of the Fethiye Museum, and the *mukhtar* of the village, we commenced restoration of the disused school buildings in the village to serve as a place of storage for our material and a research space for the project during the field seasons, and to provide a cultural heritage center for the community. In 2011–2012, through the collaboration of Dr. Greaves, the Project benefitted from a successful European Union grant by the Fethiye Museum and Liverpool University to finance the construction and development of the cultural center. These activities complement the aims and intentions behind some of the government's recent regulations for excavations.

The Setting of Çaltılar

The ancient site of Çaltılar is located in the Seki plateau, which is the first upland reached from the coast at Fethiye and has an altitude of 1,250 meters above sea level. This and its neighboring plateaus are nestled between high mountains that lead to the Turkish lake district province of Burdur. Although the summers are hot, the air is dry, rather than humid. For this reason, the village of Çaltılar today is a typical *yayla* settlement. *Yayla* has been defined as “a place to go for a definite period during the summer for: grazing of animals, conducting agricultural practices, supplying livelihood or even rest, which lies outside of the subsistence boundaries of a village, is usually joint property of a village, and although far away, is wholly or partially tied to that area with socio-economic connections, or a secondary area added to a village's actual subsistence area” (Tunçdilek 1974, 63). In short, a social and practical symbiosis exists between a village and its *yayla* counterpart.

This symbiosis can be seen today in Lycia between Antalya and Fethiye, the major towns along the coast, and the upland pasture zone at the top of the Xanthos river valley system. Many of the summer residents of Çaltılar live in Antalya or Fethiye during the winters, retreating to the *yayla* to avoid the coastal summer heat, humidity and tourists. Settlement names in both the coastal and *yayla* regions reflect the residential relationship. For example, Patlangıç, a district in Fethiye, has the corresponding Yaylapatlangıç, Esenköy in the Fethiye coastal plain now has an eponymous *yayla*

counterpart (although this is a recent renaming, for the upland village was previously known as Dont; the change may be regarded as the continuation of the Turkification of place names); but most tellingly is Kınık, the modern name for Xanthos village, for the first settlement one reaches in the Seki plateau from the coast is also called Kınık. Çaltılar itself has its lowland equivalent at Çaltıözü in the Fethiye district of the Xanthos valley. A pastoral origin of the *yayla*-coastal symbiosis may be seen in village names such as Çobanlar (“shepherds”) near the coast, and Çobanisa in the *yayla*.

Today, the village sits alongside the D350, which is the main road between Fethiye and Antalya across the mountains (**fig. 2**). This road has been a major transit route between the coast and the interior of the country for centuries. An Ottoman bridge near the base of Oinoanda reflects one relatively modern crossing point over the river, and a Roman inscription indicates that this was the crossing during the first century CE, as well (Milner 1998). Further north, closer to Söğüt, is a Hellenistic watchtower. Finally, the recovery from the ancient settlement at Çaltılar of an obsidian blade originating from Nenezi Dağ in southern Cappadocia, c. 460 kilometers away, is likely to be of Bronze Age date, and its working is reminiscent of Aegean techniques (Momigliano et al. 2011, 109; Carter 2009), thus suggesting that this *yayla* zone served as a conduit, as well as a consumer, between the interior zones of Anatolia and the Aegean for a considerable time.

The ancient settlement mound (*höyük*) is situated just to the south of the modern village (the origins of the modern village date to the 1920s, when it and three other



Figure 5.2: Çaltılar in its landscape (photo Çaltılar Archaeological Project [ÇAP]).

districts on a nearby hill two and a half kilometers away, and now abandoned, were founded). The mound itself covers an area of about 30,000 square meters. The area immediately around the site is very fertile and is used for a diverse range of agricultural produce including plum, apple, tomato, cucumber, corn, chickpea, and wheat. The lush and fertile region may also be referred to indirectly in ancient literary sources. Homer tells us that Sarpedon and Glaukos owned fields and vineyards in the Xanthos valley and that this contributed to the source of their wealth (*Il.* 12.310–314); the assumed relationship between this *yayla* region and the Xanthos valley encourages us to muse that these lands up here may have contributed to the agrarian wealth of the Lycian heroes (although the region itself was not necessarily part of ancient Lycia politically until Roman times, and, as noted above, may have been part of Kabalia: Coulton 1998, 226).

It is commonly assumed that transhumance was practiced in antiquity much as it was during the Ottoman period, when western scholars first began to travel to Turkey and marvel at—and plunder—its ruins. While it is doubtful that ancient and Ottoman transhumance practices were the same, many do believe that a form of transhumance between the coast and upland did take place in antiquity. The presence of Lycian-style tombs from the fifth century B.C. in the Kabalian and Milyas regions imply the movement of people and their burial practices (Coulton 1993, 82). The multi-lingual fourth century B.C. Inscribed Pillar from Xanthos includes Greek, Lycian, Milyan and Solymian (Robinson 1999, 367–368), suggesting that readers and speakers of all these languages were regularly circulating between the coast and upland. This idea of a fluid movement between lowland and highland is further reinforced by a mid-second century B.C. inscription from Xanthos that establishes the border between Xanthos and Termessos Minor, next to Oinoanda; the text explicitly establishes rights of transit and the use of highland territory for pasture and wood collection by the Oinoanda Termessians, although the mountain itself, Mt. Masa, is agreed to belong to the lower-lying Tlos (Rousset 2010). The necessity of this resolution inscription indicates a significant, perhaps long-standing, conflict arising from the encroachment of pastoralists from one city onto the territory of the other.

Çaltılar was first recorded in 1988 as part of Coulton's Balboura Survey. Coulton's work determined that the site did not have any Greco-Roman overlay and that its occupation ceased some time during the middle of the first millennium B.C. His team was also able to identify Early Bronze Age evidence, indicating the longevity of the site, but nothing earlier and nothing later until the Iron Age (French and Coulton 2012, 44). In 1990, the site and its environs were declared a protected archaeological area. Between 1990 and 2008, the only archaeological activity at the site was the occasional collection of surface finds by staff members of the Fethiye Museum, sometimes with the project co-directors during preliminary reconnaissance visits to the site in anticipation of commencing fieldwork.

Fieldwork Methodologies

The project has included a number of studies to situate the ancient site within wider social and geographic contexts during its periods of occupation, as well as to reconcile the presence of an ancient site with the needs, pressures and aspirations of not only a modern community, but also of a country that is taking a prominent position in international relations, a role that brings about scrutiny of practices by national and international bodies. The methodologies and results of the main surveys conducted at the site between 2008 and 2010 have been published in detail in *Anatolian Studies* 61 (Momigliano et al. 2011), and readers are warmly recommended to consult this article for more extensive discussion. The following is a brief summary of our results and their contextualization with regard to developments in Turkish archaeology.

Archaeological Fieldwork

“Survey” is the preferable first step any new archaeological project in Turkey should conduct. A permit is unlikely to be issued for excavation unless “the new applicant has carried out a survey in the intended excavation area in advance and completed the survey to a certain stage” (according to the directive issued for 2012). The nature of the survey conducted is dependent entirely upon the individual project, however, and may be a type of extensive survey, or may include any number of kinds of intensive surveys, each of which may incorporate geophysical, topographic and planning work. Regardless, the exact nature of the work to be conducted must be detailed in the permit application. Since Çaltılar is a mound-type site, as well as because so very little is known of pre-Classical Lycia, we decided that the best method to inform us of the nature of the settlement within its regional setting was to conduct a series of different intensive surveys on the site itself over several seasons.

We began our archaeological fieldwork in 2008 with an assessment of the shape and extent of the mound primarily through a topographic survey using a Sokkia SET4E total station. Some 3,200 individual measurements were taken and entered into a GIS package to create a digital elevation map of the site. This survey revealed a series of cultivation terraces over the surface of the mound. In addition, a rapid reconnaissance survey with no collection of material was conducted in the fields immediately adjacent to the mound. Judging by the nature and quantity of visible material in these areas, we observed a sudden drop-off in material to the east and west of the visible mound edges. To the north and south, however, the fields were rich in pottery, and were included in the subsequent intensive archaeological survey that involved artifact collection. Finally, aerial photographs were commissioned from a commercial air photographic service, which used a tethered helium balloon and remote-controlled digital camera to produce a systematic series of oblique, vertical and panoramic views of the site and its environs.

The most time-consuming survey was the intensive collection survey, in which a grid system was established over the site, followed by a systematic total collection of all visible artifacts from a series of five by five meter squares (**fig. 3**). Each square was walked by two people. They moved *boustrophedon* through a square in both north-south and east-west directions, and systematically covered ground walked by the other to ensure nothing was missed. A third person kept time and the paperwork. The walkers were trained to common perceptions of visibility, and the walking of each square was timed (the average time taken for each square was eight minutes). In 2008, 413 squares were covered within a fifty by 150 meter transect across the north-south axis of the site and limited extensions to the north, east and south. In 2009, an additional 715 squares were walked, which covered the extent of the mound to the east and west.

The volume of material from any given square was largely determined by recent post-deposition activities, as suggested by a secondary study conducted in 2009, in which two ten by ten meter areas walked in 2008 were re-walked, and individual finds were plotted using a total station. One area had been subject to plowing, and the other not but had evidence of extensive mole activity (which is common at the site). The number of artifacts in each was similar to the quantity collected from each the previous year, and their respective distribution accorded with the method by which



Figure 5.3: Intensive collection survey (photo Çaltılar Archaeological Project [ÇAP]).

the finds had been brought to the surface: sherds were clustered in the area with considerable rodent activity, whereas they were more aligned with plough tracks in the area that had been subject to cultivation.

From these surveys, we are able to understand certain features of the site itself. The geophysical and collection surveys suggest that the extent of the *höyük* itself largely corresponds to the extent of occupation, with the exception of terraces in the north and south, from which a considerable quantity of material of all periods was recovered; alluvium may mask the eastern and western extents of the ancient settlement during its history of occupation. Our post-excavation study of this material did reveal one pattern with regard to the northern extent. Much of the Iron Age material recovered from these lower levels appeared very worn from water and erosion, in clear contrast with Chalcolithic and Early Bronze Age sherds from the same contexts. This suggests that the later material had been exposed for some time, perhaps washing down from upper levels, and implies that occupation in the Iron Age may have been less extensive, and perhaps limited to the upper levels of the mound itself, than in earlier periods, which clearly extended further to the north.

We also conducted successful magnetometer and electrical resistance tomography surveys to detect sub-surface features. For the former, a fluxgate gradiometer was used across twenty by twenty meter squares, from which readings were taken every meter, to assess the differential compaction in magnetic fields. The same north-south transect covered in the 2008 intensive survey was followed in the magnetometer survey, also conducted in 2008, as well as the northeast corner of the mound and the north terrace, for a total area of 13,600 square meters. More extensive coverage was not possible because steep ground, thickets, walls, and an electricity pylon in the northwest corner of the top of mound adversely affected the safe and accurate use of the equipment otherwise. Evidence of a series of east-west oriented farming terraces across the south and central areas of top of the mound was clear in the results of this survey; archaeological indications were apparent in the northeastern area of the mound, where a rectangular feature of approximately ten by twenty meters in a northeast/southwest orientation was identified (**fig. 4**).

For the latter, a Campus system was used to generate vertical profiles through the soil to a depth of approximately four meters to provide information on sub-surface stratigraphy. This method is effective in outlining the depth particularly to which stone features might lay, given the resistance of stone to the electrical pulses used in this system. Thus, a series was taken of twenty-five long east-west profiles at ten-meter intervals from north to south to corroborate the limits of the site noted in our other surveys. An additional series of eighteen profiles was taken east-west at ten-meter intervals moving south along the central axis of the mound. Few features were firmly identifiable, most likely because the archaeology lies further underground as a result of plough soil accumulation. Finally, an intensive north-south sequence of profiles was taken at one-meter intervals in the area of the rectangular feature noted in the magnetometer results. In the tomography survey, the feature was visible clearly




Figure 5.4: Geophysical results (photo Çaltılar Archaeological Project [ÇAP]).

and consistently from the current ground surface to a depth of two and a half meters. This suggests that it is a rectangular building with stone walls extant to a height of two and a half meters, the top of which lie just under the current mound surface (**fig. 5**).

We also conducted several other studies pertaining to the wider social and geographic area. One is a study of the *spolia* found in the modern village (Williams 2010). Many of these are Roman in date and are usually column drums, capitals, and other




Figure 5.5: Tomography results (photo Çaltılar Archaeological Project [ÇAP]).

ornately carved panels, or cut blocks. They have been built into the threshold of public properties (such as the perimeter walls of both the older village mosque, originally constructed in the 1920s as a guest house but converted and possibly renovated to a mosque by 1958, and the newer, larger mosque of c.1985) and private houses, where they sometimes additionally form part of the exterior façades. Several pieces were also found in fields to the south of the *höyük* itself.

In addition, in 2009 a series of Tauber pollen traps were deployed on an altitudinal transect in the woodland above the village as a means of better interpreting extant ancient pollen data (e.g. Momigliano et al. 2010, 25; see also Eastwood et al. 2007).

Finally, we also conducted an ethnographic investigation into traditional pottery production practices in the region today, which is evident in the nearby village of Esenköy. Here, women are responsible for the collection and processing of clay and the manufacture and firing of traditional pottery, which is wheel-made. Knowledge of these processes is transmitted through female kinship lines and remains particular to each village, such that if a woman moves to another village, perhaps through marriage, she is sworn to secrecy as to how her village of origin sources and processes their clays and produces their particular pots (Momigliano and Kibaroglu, forthcoming).

Material Results

In our first year alone, we collected, washed and processed over 14,000 sherds and recovered almost 400 other finds, including flint blades, querns, slag, and the occasional shotgun casing and donkey shoe. By the end of our 2009 season, those figures had swelled by approximately 18,700 sherds and 580 finds, bringing our total to around 33,000 sherds and 1,000 other artifacts.

The earliest ceramic material found on the surface of the site may be assigned to the Late Chalcolithic period (second half of the fourth millennium B.C.). This material is hand-made and chaff-tempered, and the surface is often burnished, but not always. The closest parallels are Late Chalcolithic material from Elmalı-Bağbaşı, and one unique piece appears related to types known from contemporary Beycesultan and Aphrodisias.

There is also evidence of substantial occupation during the Early Bronze Age (third millennium B.C.). It is not clear whether the site was occupied in Early Bronze Age I, but there is evidence of significant occupation during Early Bronze Age II and possibly Early Bronze Age III phases. Much of the pottery is handmade, but some fragments belong to wheel-thrown vessels. Evidence of imports during this time can be seen particularly in micaceous pieces, which may originate in the Denizli/Menderes massif area, while other types come from Elmalı, in the next upland to the east, as suggested by our petrographic results.

We have also identified for the first time in this upland region evidence of second millennium occupation, i.e. pertaining to the Middle and Late Bronze Ages. What we have is small in quantity and lacks sufficient diagnostic characteristics that could allow for more precise dating, but this evidence is nevertheless extremely important because archaeological remains of the second millennium in Lycia and elsewhere in southwest Turkey are relatively rare and not widely known. Our petrographic analysis indicates that a number of these were also imported, including from the Denizli/Menderes massif, and the area around Elmalı.

The majority of our pottery dates to the Iron Age, specifically the tenth to the sixth centuries B.C., since this is the latest period of occupation and thus the most widely exposed. Most date to the Middle Iron Age and Late Iron Age periods (roughly the ninth to sixth centuries B.C.), although some styles and shapes, especially concentric motifs and high-footed monochrome bases, compare to material elsewhere associated with the Greek Protogeometric period, which would indicate at least tenth century occupation.

We have a number of sherds, many of which belong to large and highly decorated vessels, that have been imported to the site from elsewhere in Anatolia. The origins of these include Phrygia (late eighth/early seventh centuries); several production centers in western Anatolia (eighth and seventh centuries) and the islands (seventh century), and Lydia (sixth century). Some material was also imported from Greece, including Euboea (eighth century), Corinth (seventh century), and Athens (seventh/sixth centuries).

Preliminary petrographic interpretations suggest that many of the sherds we associate with the Iron Age, and, indeed, from all the main periods of occupation at the site, come from four main geological zones. These include the Çaltılar basin itself, which is characterized by the inclusion of serpentinite; calcareous clays from the region of Elmalı, which is in the next upland basin to the east, or the mountain in between; a clay characterized by slate inclusions, which may originate in the western part of Denizli and the so-called Menderes massif region, which are considerably to the north; and a small fourth group that cannot yet be placed into any of the main geological areas.

Even within this breakdown, further distinctions are possible. For example, we have a notable collection of large, thickly-slipped vessels of eighth and seventh century dates that originate somewhere in western Anatolia (Southwest Anatolian Ware). Some have a distinctive thick white slip, while on others the slip is more pink, and we have a group of red slip with added white and black, rather than white slip with added red and black. Each of these is petrographically discrete, which suggests several production centers were exporting their wares to Çaltılar, or perhaps the residents of Çaltılar were importing material from a number of different production centers in western and southwestern Anatolia, clear distinctions between which have not previously been established.

We have several fabrics that we considered to be “local” because of their ubiquity and longevity at the site. Our petrographic analyses reveal, however, that a number of sherds that look identical macroscopically, and even with a hand-held magnifying glass, such that we might consider them to belong to a common group, in fact belong to clays of very diverse origins. Several such “groups” appear to be composed of examples with clays that originate near Çaltılar, the calcareous clays associated with Elmalı, and the slate-rich clays that may be associated with the Denizli/Menderes massif zone. This suggests that much of the material we had originally considered “local” comes not only from our immediate upland basin, but also regionally, and is related to a geographic *koine* in affinity with wares produced elsewhere in southwestern Turkey.

Notable, therefore, is the fact that the Late Iron Age table wares we subjected to petrographic analysis—selected to cover the visually-observed range of fabric types, including types we had deemed to be local and types we knew were likely imports (from western Anatolia)—come almost entirely from what has been initially identified as the Denizli and Menderes massif zone. This may be suggestive of the nature of Çaltılar’s connectivity, especially socio-commercial relations, during the seventh and sixth centuries.

Little material can be dated to after the middle of the sixth century. Later Iron Age (often described as Archaic and Classical, as derived from Greek-based classifications, although a Persian periodization is also used sometimes in the eastern Mediterranean: see Lehmann 1998), Hellenistic, Roman, Byzantine and Islamic wares account for less than one percent of the total assemblage. With virtually no such wares recovered from

the site, Çaltılar's settlement history as suggested by the pottery implies that occupation ceased during the middle of the sixth century. This coincides very neatly with the historical date of the Persian annexation of Lycia, described in dramatic detail in Herodotus's tale of the destruction of Xanthos by Harpagus (1.176). Herodotus notes that eighty families were away from Xanthos when Harpagus laid siege to it, and it has been widely assumed that these families were instead in the *yayla* (e.g. Treuber 1887, 92–93; Metzger and Couplel 1963, 80 n. 23; Bean 1978, 50; Harrison 2001, 29). The largely seasonal nature of Çaltılar today initially made us speculate whether the ancient site also served as a seasonal summer settlement in antiquity. Our results, however, suggest otherwise.

We were surprised by the sheer number of imported Iron Age sherds collected from the surface alone, and the geographical distance of their production origins—from as far as Phrygia and Lydia all the way to Greece—for a relatively small site on a modest upland plateau. Furthermore, we were struck by the large size and elaborate decoration of many of the vessels. We questioned, therefore, whether a community really would haul their high status, imported, large and heavy pottery all the way from the coast for the summer season in their *yayla* village? The status value associated with imported pottery in general has further made us wonder if Çaltılar served a different function during the early first millennium B.C. rather than just as a summer pastoral residence for coastal dwellers, as it is today.

We suspect that the large stone-walled building holds a key to answering questions about the nature and role of the site. Stone buildings of such dimension tend to be associated with the Late Iron Age, as early as the eighth century B.C., generally speaking, and such structures are usually identified as a temple or a fortification.

The Inner Defence Platform (sic) at Old Smyrna, for instance, seems to have been laid during the second half of the eighth century B.C. (Cook and Nicholls 1998, 49). “Inner Defence Platform” refers to a great fill of mostly river stones bedded in clay mortar. This was encompassed by a wall built of river stones to a substantial height, with a mud-brick superstructure. Nicholls believes that it served as a modest fortress just inside the city during the eighth and seventh centuries to control access to the circuit wall and to the defenses of the North East Gate. Although its name alludes to a military purpose, it may also be a contemporary temple, suggested by votive evidence pertaining to this feature. In addition, this part of the site developed subsequently into the principal cult-place of the city. Finally, it is during this period that the first ramp was constructed up to the platform. We may also have a ramp at Çaltılar that leads up to the stone structure, but this is difficult to ascertain with greater certainty without excavation.

The site of Akalan, near the shores of the Black Sea, is another contemporary fortified site with similar rectangular structures (for recent results, see Dönmez and Ulugergerli 2010). The origin of the fortress itself is usually dated to the early or mid-sixth century (Dönmez 2004; see also Macridy 1907; Åkerström 1966, 132). The site's local wares derive from the Central Anatolia Alişar IV sequence (ninth and eighth cen-

turies B.C.: Matsumura and Omori 2010), while the site imported a notable amount of Wild Goat material and other so-called East Greek wares during the seventh and sixth centuries (Macridy 1907; Willson-Cummer 1976).

It may be that Çaltılar was something similar during its Iron Age occupational phases, although any further discussion about the precise nature of the site would be purely speculative (see also Işık 2010). Nevertheless, our results have illuminated a number of features of modern Lycia's past. Although the area serves as a *yayla* today, our results suggest strongly that Çaltılar itself was something much more substantial than a seasonal destination, and certainly well connected to other regions. This is very much the case for the Iron Age, given the large, ornately decorated, expensive and high status pottery vessels from a variety of origins near and far, and that there is a substantial stone structure here with walls at least two and a half meters high. Such a claim may also be made for at least the Early Bronze Age, given the quantity of imported material during this phase of occupation and its extent along the lower terraces. Collectively, these results overturn general assumptions made by Bean, Harrison and others about the role this region might have played in the past, although it does not exclude the possibility that it nevertheless maintained a symbiotic relationship of some sort with the coastal settlements. Perhaps the eighty families who were away from Xanthos when Harpagus laid siege were in this area, although whether it was explicitly to seek refuge in a sanctuary or fortified site or for some other reason we can only muse upon fancifully. Nevertheless, our results indicate that the region itself in its pre-Greco-Roman eras was something much more significant on the road through Turkey's southwestern land corner and that it played a major role in connecting the populations around the Mediterranean shores with the kingdoms of Anatolia.

Conclusions

Classical archaeology cannot, and should not, be regarded independently from other archaeological periods in a particular region. Indeed, the development of an area's Greco-Roman period is conditional upon social, cultural and economic histories particular to that region. The Çaltılar Archaeological Project's work to date at the site of Çaltılar itself exemplifies this. Already we have generated an understanding of the connectivity of this upland zone during periods prior to the Persian conquest, and we have suggested possibilities surrounding the role this area may have played as a nexus between land and sea, and across regions. Thus, the ability of the Çaltılar Archaeological Project to address the nature of settlement over the *longue durée* through survey work alone renders it a self-contained field project in its own right (it may, however, also satisfy the strong encouragement of survey prior to an excavation permit application). In short, therefore, it still does not take a Big Dig to address big questions (in support of Dyson 1993, from the classical archaeology perspective)—

which contrasts with Turkey's aim to have Big Dig-style archaeological investment, indicated by its requirement for ten-year field work plans at the start of an excavation project—although survey work more often than not will raise additional questions than it might answer, as the Çaltılar Archaeological Project demonstrates.

The Çaltılar Archaeological Project is not considered a classical archaeology project in the eyes of the Turkish authorities, precisely because it is not examining periods pertaining directly to Classical Greece and Rome. Çaltılar *höyük's* Chalcolithic, Bronze and Iron Ages renders the site as pertaining more to Pre- and Protohistoric Archaeology; its latest phase, which covers the seventh and sixth centuries, and thus in some contexts is called Archaic, makes it more ambiguous yet still not fully Classical either as a specific period (fifth-fourth centuries B.C.) or as referring more broadly to Greeks and Romans. Yet in other regards, the project itself may nevertheless be considered more broadly as classical archaeology. The later Bronze and Iron Ages of, especially, the Aegean world, have an affiliated history of scholarship to later Greek and Roman studies (Morris 2004, 257–258), especially when one considers that early excavators sought sites and aimed to link strata with historical events discussed in the ancient Greco-Roman texts, such as with regard to Troy and the Trojan War. Indeed, in Turkey material connected to the Bronze Age Aegean world, such as Mycenaean pottery, is regarded as classical archaeology, while study of the (later) Phrygians is considered Protohistory (V. Köse, pers. comm.). One may argue, therefore, that classical archaeology is not Classical in any classical sense. Terms like Classical, Greek and Roman have more than just temporal and cultural indications. Projects like the Çaltılar Archaeological Project (and, for this area, the congruent, more regional Balboura Survey) underpin our understandings of the development of the subsequent periods that may form the core temporal and cultural emphases of classical archaeology, but Greek and Roman are not all that classical archaeology pertains to. These kinds of sites and regions must be assessed from the perspective of their own contexts, in this case as a settlement situated in the southwestern corner of Anatolia that maintained strong connections with other cultural groups during many of its periods of occupation. The mix of ceramic material from Çaltılar itself, especially during its latest period of occupation, suggests that we need to consider the site in its own terms without prioritizing any one cultural group over another, if we are ever to understand the nature of the site and how its residents lived and moved through the landscape and connected with their local and regional neighbors. Understanding these phases will also enable us to shed further light on subsequent socio-cultural development of the region. Indeed, the diversity of practice of Greek and Roman culture in general means that we can no longer accept fixed notions of what being Greek or Roman meant anywhere in the ancient world. For this reason, an integrated perspective and approach to research questions, and to fieldwork projects in general, as outlined above, is more fruitful.

Regardless of what period a project is defined as belonging to, the contemporary climate of conducting archaeological research in Turkey nevertheless does pose challenges, especially as the government amends regulations and requirements frequently.

Yet two recent studies on Turkish archaeology, by archaeologists, have suggested that projects need to be proactive to stakeholder involvement, rather than reactive, as they currently are, as means of maintaining intellectual control in the face of pressures by the state to develop archaeological sites as revenue streams derived from tourism (Shoup 2008; Görkay 2009). Independently, they argue that archaeologists should incorporate planning, management and outreach activities as part of their research designs, which should “help to build a constituency for archaeologists, as they try to reshape the discourse about sites away from spectacular entertainment toward an understanding of the past that better meshes with the archaeological evidence... broadening the definition of the discipline to include conservation, planning, management, and ethics might open the way for archaeologists to build the social and political capital that they need in order to maintain their role as stewards of the past” (Shoup 2008, 338–339). Indeed, archaeologists elsewhere in the Mediterranean are becoming more reflexive, especially in their engagement with the communities in which they work (e.g. papers in Stroulia and Sutton 2010). Our own collaboration with Turkish academics and students were not required by the authorities for our survey permit but derived from our desire to work more closely with Turkish colleagues. Our outreach activities have similarly been a proactive means of fostering and maintaining positive relationships with our hosts, and to enable the local development of a better understanding of the area’s socio-culturally complex heritage, which extends considerably beyond modern memory and community oral histories; they were not conducted as a mere public relations exercise. Nevertheless, politics continues to influence the directions of archaeological practice in the early twenty-first century, including the ways that scholars approach ancient cultural landscapes, form broader theoretical perspectives and contextualize research to peers and the public. While there is clearly an integrated dialogue between realms of data and interpretive methodologies, the circumstances of politics affect the practical and methodological, and in some cases interpretational, frameworks in which the work itself is actually conducted.

In sum, it could be said that the aims and methods of the Çaltılar Archaeological Project both respond to and anticipate changing perceptions of archaeology in Turkey, and the position of classical archaeology, in particular. From the beginning of the survey, we have incorporated activities that are currently required of excavation projects, such as having a Turkish co-director, planning for storage, and preparing for sustainable heritage management. In terms of regulations, the Project’s survey work at the site of Çaltılar itself stands as both a self-contained project and as the potential foundation for new research avenues, including excavation. The integrated research design of the project enables us to answer socio-cultural questions for periods previously relatively inaccessible in Lycia, even by excavation, and which have been otherwise only of limited interest, since most research in Lycia has focused on the Graeco-Roman periods. As such, projects such as the Çaltılar Archaeological Project create new dimensions to the merits of classical archaeology both as a discipline and in practice.

Acknowledgements

Belgin Aksoy; Andrew Brown; Jim Coulton; Gülgün Girdivan; Kutalmış Görkay; Alan Greaves; Veli Köse; Nicoletta Momigliano; B. Nilgün Öz; Ilknur Özgen; Lutgarde Van-deput; Susan Williams; students and colleagues at Bristol, Exeter and Stanford Universities, and colleagues in London and Ankara.

References

- Åkerström, A. 1966. *Die Architektonischen Terrakotten Kleinasiens*, Lund.
- Akurgal, E. 1941. *Griechische Reliefs des VI. Jahrhunderts aus Lykien*, Berlin.
- Allsop, L. 2011. "Echoes of Elgin Marbles: Turkey asks UK to Return Ancient Sculpture," *CNN*, September 8, 2011, http://articles.cnn.com/2011-09-08/world/turkey.archaeological.repatriation_1_anatolia-greek-government-marble-head?_s=PM:WORLD.
- Atakuman, Ç. 2008. "Cradle or Crucible? Anatolia and Archaeology in the Early Years of the Turkish Republic (1923–1938)," *Journal of Social Archaeology* 8, no. 2, pp. 214–35.
- . 2010. "Value of Heritage in Turkey: History and Politics of Turkey's World Heritage Nominations," *JMA* 23, no. 1, pp. 107–31.
- Aytürk, I. 2004. "Turkish Linguists against the West: Origins of Linguistic Nationalism in Atatürk's Turkey," *Middle Eastern Studies* 40, no. 6, pp. 1–25.
- Bahrani, Z., Z. Çelik, and E. Eldem, eds. 2011. *Scramble for the Past: A Story of Archaeology in the Ottoman Empire, 1753–1914*, Istanbul.
- Baram, U., and L. Carroll, eds. 2000. *A Historical Archaeology of the Ottoman Empire: Breaking New Ground*, New York.
- Bass, G.F., P. Throckmorton, J. Du Plat Taylor, J.B. Hennessy, A.R. Shulman, and H.-G. Buchholz. 1967. "Cape Gelidonya: a Bronze Age Shipwreck," *TAPS* 57, no. 8, pp. 1–177.
- Bean, G. 1978. *Lycian Turkey*, London.
- Beaufort, F. 1817. *Karamania, or a Brief Description of the South Coast of Asia Minor*, London.
- Becks, R. 2011. "Girmeler: Excavation of a Prehistoric Site in Western Lycia," *DAI-Istanbul*, pp. 12–13.
- Blake, J. 1994. "The Protection of Turkey's Underwater Archaeological Heritage: Legislative Measures and Other Approaches," *International Journal of Cultural Property* 3, pp. 273–294.
- Bryce, T.R. 1985. *The Lycians in Literary and Epigraphic Sources*, Copenhagen.
- . 1992. "Lukka Revisited," *JNES* 51, no. 2, pp. 121–130.
- . 2005. *The Kingdom of the Hittites*, Oxford.
- Carter, T. 2009. "L'obsidienne égéenne: caractérisation, utilisation et culture," in *L'Homme et le Précieux. Matières Minérales Précieuses de la Préhistoire à Aujourd'hui*, M.-H. Moncel and F. Fröhlich, eds., Oxford, pp. 199–212.
- Çiğ, M. 1993. "Mustafa Kemal Atatürk und die Archäologie in der Türkei," *IstMitt* 43, pp. 517–522.
- Chandler, R. 1775. *Travels in Asia Minor*, London.
- Choiseul-Gouffier, M.-G.-F.-A. de. 1782. *Voyage Pittoresque de la Grèce*, Paris.
- Cook, J.M., and R.V. Nicholls. 1998. *Old Smyrna Excavations: The Temples of Athena*, London.
- Coulton, J.J. 1993. "North Lycia before the Romans," in *Akten des II. Internationalen Lykien-Symposiums. Wien, 6–12 Mai 1990*, J. Borchhardt and G. Dobesch, eds., Vienna, pp. 79–85.
- . 1998. "Highland Cities in South-West Turkey: the Oinoanda and Balboura Surveys," in *Ancient Anatolia: Fifty Years' Work by the British Institute of Archaeology at Ankara*, R. Matthews, ed., London, pp. 225–236.

- . 2012. “The Kabalians: Where and When?” Paper read at the International Kibyrtis Conference, “Between the Cultures: The Ancient Kibyrtis and its Neighbors,” 4–6 October 2012, Vienna.
- Coulton, J.J., P. Armstrong, A. Erdentuğ, D.H. French, M. Kiel, N.P. Milner, N. Sekunda, and J.M. Wagstaff. 2012. *The Balboursa Survey and Settlement in Highland Southwest Anatolia, from the Prehistoric Period to the Turkish Republic*, London.
- Cousin, G. 1892. “Inscriptions d’Oenoanda,” *BCH* 16, pp. 1–70.
- Demargne, P. 1951. “Les Fouilles de Xanthos en Lycie (Campagne 1950),” *Comptes-rendus des séances de l’Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres* 95, no. 1, pp. 63–70.
- Díaz-Andreu, M., and T. Champion, eds. 1996. *Nationalism and Archaeology in Europe*, London.
- Dönmez, Ş. 2004. “Akalın Hakkında Yeni Gözlemler,” *Anadolu Araştırma/Jahrbuch für Kleinasienische Forschung* XVII/1, pp. 67–91.
- Dönmez, Ş., and E.U. Ulugergerli. 2010. “Akalın Arkeojeofizik Araştırmaları,” *Anadolu Araştırmaları* 19, no. 1, pp. 13–40.
- Dyson, S.L. 1993. “From New to New Age Archaeology: Archaeological Theory and Classical Archaeology—A 1990s Perspective,” *AJA* 97, no. 2, pp. 195–206.
- . 2006. *In Pursuit of Ancient Pasts: A History of Classical Archaeology in the Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries*, New Haven.
- Eastwood, W.J., M.J. Leng, N. Roberts, and B. Davis. 2007. “Holocene Climate Change in the Eastern Mediterranean Region: A Comparison of Stable Isotope and Pollen Data from Lake Gölhisar, Southwest Turkey,” *Journal of Quaternary Science* 22, no. 4, pp. 327–341.
- Edgers, G. 2011. “‘Herakles’ United. MFA Returns Roman Sculpture’s Top Half to Turkey, Declaring it’s the Right Thing to Do,” *Boston Globe*, September 24, 2011, http://articles.boston.com/2011-09-24/yourtown/30198640_1_mfa-turkish-officials-loading-dock.
- Eğrikavuk, İ. 2011. “‘Made-in-Turkey’ Archaeological Digs Raising Concerns,” *Hürriyet Daily News*, July 31, 2011, <http://www.hurriyetdailynews.com/n.php?n=8216made-in-turkey8217-archaeological-digs-raising-concerns-2011-07-31>.
- Erimtan, C. 2008. “Hittites, Ottomans and Turks: Ağaoğlu Ahmed Bey and the Kemalist Construction of Turkish Nationhood in Anatolia,” *AnatSt* 48, pp. 141–171.
- Eslick, C. 1992. *Elmalı-Karataş I: The Neolithic and Chalcolithic Periods: Bağbasi and Other Sites*, Bryn Mawr.
- . 2009. *Elmalı-Karataş V: The Early Bronze Age Pottery of Karataş: Habitation Deposits*, Oxford.
- Fellows, C. 1982. *Travels and Researches in Asia Minor, More Particularly the Province of Lycia*, London.
- Finkel, A. 2011. “Turkish Tourism Drive Threatens Ancient Sites,” *The Art Newspaper* 228 (October 2011), <http://www.theartnewspaper.com/articles/Turkish-tourism-drive-threatens-ancient-sites/24682>.
- French, D., and J.J. Coulton. 2012. “The Kabalian Highlands before Balboursa: Settlement and Connections,” in *The Balboursa Survey and Settlement in Highland Southwest Anatolia, from the Prehistoric Period to the Turkish Republic*, J.J. Coulton, P. Armstrong, A. Erdentuğ, D.H. French, M. Kiel, N.P. Milner, N. Sekunda, J.M. Wagstaff, London, pp. 43–59.
- Goode, J.F. 2007. *Negotiating for the Past: Archaeology, Diplomacy and Nationalism in the Middle East, 1919–1941*, Austin.
- Görkay, K. 2009. “The Future of Classical Archaeology in Turkey,” in *Perceptions of the Past in the Turkish Republic (Classical and Byzantine Periods) ANES Supplement 31*, S. Redford, ed., Leuven, pp. 197–203.
- Grosart, A.B. 1893. “Bilingual Inscription from Arykanda,” *The Expository Times*, September, 4 no. 12, pp. 535–539.
- Gül, A. 2006. “Stories in Three Dimensions: Narratives of Nation and the Anatolian Civilizations Museum,” in *The Politics of Public Memory in Turkey*, E. Özyürek, ed., Syracuse, pp. 40–69.

- Güsten, S. 2011. "Turkey Presses Harder for Return of Antiquities," *New York Times*, May 25, 2011, <http://www.nytimes.com/2011/05/26/world/europe/26iht-M26C-TURKEY-RETURN.html>.
- Hamilakis, Y. 1999. "La trahison des archeologues? Archaeological practice as intellectual activity in postmodernity," *JMA* 12, no. 1, pp. 60–79.
- Harrison, M. 2001. *Mountain and Plain: From the Lycian Coast to the Phrygian Plateau in the Late Roman and Early Byzantine Period*, Ann Arbor.
- Hawkins, D. 1995. *The Hieroglyphic Inscription of the Sacred Pool Complex at Hattusa (SÜDBURG)*, Wiesbaden.
- . 1998. "Tarkasnawa King of Mira: 'Tarkondemos', Boğazköy Sealings and Karabel," *AnatSt* 48, 1–31.
- . 1999. "Karabel, 'Tarkondemos' and the Land of Mira: New Evidence on the Hittite Empire Period in Western Anatolia," *WürzJbb*, Neue Folge 23, pp. 7–12.
- Heberdey, R., and E. Kalinka. 1897. "Die philosophische Inschrift von Oinoanda," *BCH* 21, pp. 346–443.
- Hodder, I. 1998. "The Past as Passion and Play: Çatalhöyük as a Site of Conflict in the Construction of Multiple Pasts," in *Archaeology under Fire: Nationalism, Politics and Heritage in the Eastern Mediterranean and Middle East*, Meskell, L. ed., London, pp. 124–319.
- Hoock, H. 2010. *Empires of the Imagination. Politics, Wars and the Arts in the British World, 1750–1850*, London.
- Horden, P., and N. Purcell, 2001. *The Corrupting Sea*, Oxford.
- Hoskyn, R. 1842. "Narrative of a Survey of Part of the South Coast of Asia Minor; and of a Tour into the Interior of Lycia in 1840–1; Accompanied by a Map," *JRGS* 12, pp. 143–161.
- Işık, F. 2010. "Anadolu-Lykia Uygarlığı: Lykia'nın 'Hellenleşmesi' Görüşüne Eleştirel Bir Yaklaşım," *Anadolu/Anatolia* 36, 65–125.
- Kalinka, E. 1920. *Tituli Asiae Minoris* 2.1, Vienna.
- Kandemir, S. 1933. *Etiler (Hititler)*, Ankara.
- Kohl, P.L., and C. Fawcett, eds. 1995. *Nationalism, Politics and the Practice of Archaeology*, Cambridge.
- Landau, J.M. 1995. *Pan-Turkism: from Irredentism to Cooperation*, London.
- Lehmann, G. 1998. "Trends in the Pottery Development of Late Iron Age Syria and Lebanon, ca. 700 to 300 BC," *BASOR* 311, pp. 7–37.
- Macridy, T. 1907. "Une Citadelle Archaïque du Pont," *Mitteilungen der Vorderasiatischen Gesellschaft* 12, pp. 167–175.
- Matsumura, K., and T. Omori. 2010. "The Iron Age Chronology in Anatolia Reconsidered: The Results of the Excavations at Kaman-Kalehöyük," in *Proceedings of the 6th International Congress of the Archaeology of the Ancient Near East, vol. 1*, P. Matthiae, F. Pinnock, L. Nigro, and N. Marchetti, eds., Wiesbaden, pp. 443–456.
- Mayer, L.A and Garstang, 1925. "Kizzuwanda and other Hittite States," *JEA* 11, pp. 23–35.
- Mellaart, J. 1954. "Preliminary Report on a Survey of Pre-Classical Remains in Southern Turkey," *AnatSt* 4: 175–240.
- Mellink, M.J. 1995. "Homer, Lycia, and Lukka," in *The Ages of Homer: A Tribute to Emily Townsend Vermeule*, J.B. Carter and S.P. Morris, eds., Austin, pp. 33–42.
- Mellink, M.J. 1998. *Kizibel: An Archaic Painted Tomb Chamber in Northern Lycia*, Philadelphia.
- Meskell, L., ed. 1998. *Archaeology under Fire: Nationalism, Politics and Heritage in the Eastern Mediterranean and Middle East*, London.
- Metzger, H., and P. Coupel, 1963. *Fouilles de Xanthos II: L'acropole lycienne*, Paris.
- Milner, N. 1998. "A Roman bridge at Oinoanda," *AnatSt* 48, pp. 117–123.
- Milwright, M. 2009. *An Introduction to Islamic Archaeology*, Edinburgh.

- Momigliano, N., and B. Aksoy. Forthcoming. "Lycia before the Lycians: The Elusive Second Millennium BCE in Southwest Turkey and the Çaltılar Survey Project," in *Nostoi: Indigenous Culture, Migration and Integration in the Aegean Islands and Western Anatolia during the Late Bronze and Early Iron Age: Proceedings of the International Symposium, March 18–20, 2011*, Istanbul.
- Momigliano, N., and M. Kibaroglu. Forthcoming. "Çaltılar Archaeological Project – Archaeological, Archaeometric, and Ethno-archaeological Investigations of Pottery Production and Consumption in SW Turkey," in *Mediterra 2011: Uluslararası Katılımlı Akdeniz'de Seramik Kültürü Sempozyumu*, November 14–16, 2011, T. Korkut, ed., Antalya.
- Momigliano, N., A. Greaves, T. Hodos, and B. Aksoy. 2010. "Çaltılar Survey Project 2010," *Anatolian Archaeology* 16, pp. 24–25.
- Momigliano, N., A. Greaves, T. Hodos, B. Aksoy, A. Brown, M. Kibaroglu, and T. Carter. 2011. "Settlement History and Material Culture in Southwest Turkey: Report on the 2008–2010 Survey at Çaltılar Höyük," *AnatSt* 61, pp. 61–121.
- Mommsen, T. 1893. "Die Zweisprachige Inschrift aus Arykanda," *AEM* 16, pp. 93–102.
- Morris, I. 2004. "Classical Archaeology," in *A Companion to Archaeology*, J. Bintliff, ed., Oxford, pp. 253–271.
- Morrison, P., and P. Selman. 1991. "Tourism and the Environment: A Case Study from Turkey," *The Environmentalist* 11, no. 2, pp. 113–129.
- Neel, A. 2011. "Tourism Development Versus Historic Preservation in Turkey Reaches 'Fever Pitch'," *Today's Zaman*, October 30, 2011. <http://www.todayszaman.com/news-261336-tourism-development-versus-historic-preservation-in-turkey-reaches-fever-pitch.html>.
- Özyürek, E. 2006. "Introduction," in *The Politics of Public Memory in Turkey*, E. Özyürek, ed., Syracuse, pp. 1–15.
- Özdoğan, M. 1998. "Ideology and Archaeology in Turkey," in *Archaeology under Fire: Nationalism, Politics and Heritage in the Eastern Mediterranean and Middle East*, Meskell, L. ed., London, pp. 111–123.
- . 2006. *Arkeolojinin Politikası ve Politik Bir Araç Olarak Arkeoloji*, Istanbul.
- Peacock, A., ed. 2010. *The Frontiers of the Ottoman World*, Oxford.
- Pococke, R. 1745. *A Description of the East and Some other Countries, Vol. II.2: Observations on the Islands of the Archipelago, Asia Minor, Thrace, Greece, and Some Parts of Europe*, London.
- Pulak, C. 1998. "The Uluburun Shipwreck: an Overview," *IJNA* 27, no. 3, pp. 188–224.
- Robert, L. 1971. "Un Oracle Gravé à Oinoanda," *Comptes-rendus des séances de l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres* 115, no. 3, pp. 597–619.
- Robinson, T. 1999. "Erbinna, the 'Nereid Monument' and Xanthus," in *Ancient Greeks West and East*, G.R. Tsetschladze, ed., Leiden, pp. 361–377.
- Rousset, D. 2010. *De Lycie en Cabalide: La convention entre les Lyciens et Termessos près d'Oinoanda: Fouilles de Xanthos X (Hautes études du monde gréco-romain 45)*, Geneva.
- Shaw, W.M.K. 2004. "Whose Hittites and Why? Language, Archaeology and the Quest for the Original Turks," in *Archaeology under Dictatorship*, M.L. Galaty and C. Watkinson, eds., New York, pp. 131–153.
- Shoup, D.D. 2008. *Monuments, Materiality, and Meaning in the Classical Archaeology of Anatolia*, Ph.D. diss., University of Michigan.
- Smith, M. 1977. "Diogenes of Oinoanda and L'École Française d'Athènes," *BCH* 101, no. 1, pp. 353–381.
- Spratt, T.A.B., and E. Forbes. 1847. *Travels in Lycia, the Milyas and Ciybratis*, London.
- Stonington, J. 2013. "Permit Runaround: Politics Slow Archaeologists in Turkey," *Spiegel Online International*, June 4, 2013, <http://www.spiegel.de/international/zeitgeist/german-archaeologists-waiting-for-dig-permits-in-turkey-a-902913.html>

- Stroulia, A., and S.B. Sutton, eds. 2010. *Archaeology in Situ: Sites, Archaeology, and Communities in Greece*, Lanham.
- Stuart, J. 1769. *Ionian Antiquities*, London.
- Tanyeri-Erdemir, T. 2006. "Archaeology as a Source of National Pride in the Early Years of the Turkish Republic," *JFA* 31, no. 4, pp. 381–393.
- Tosun, C. 2001. "Challenges of Sustainable Tourism Development in the Developing World: The Case of Turkey," *Tourism Management* 22, pp. 289–303.
- Treuber, O. 1887. *Geschichte der Lykier*, Stuttgart.
- Tunçdilek, N. 1974. "Types of Rural Settlement and their Characteristics," in *Turkey: Geographic and Social Perspectives*, P. Benedict, E. Tümertekin, and F. Mansur, eds., Leiden, pp. 48–70.
- Uçankuş, H.T. 2000. *Bir İnsan ve Uygarlık Bilimi, Arkeoloji: tarih öncesi çağlardan perslere kadar Anadolu*, Ankara.
- von Hammer, J. 1811. *Topographische Ansichten, gesammelt auf einer Reise in die Levante*, Vienna.
- Walkaens, M. 2000. "Sagalassos and Pisidia during the Late Bronze Age," in *Sagalassos V*, M. Walkaens and L. Loots, eds., pp. 473–484, Leuven.
- Williams, S. 2010. *Çaltılar Spolia Database 2010*, unpublished report for the Çaltılar Archaeological Project.
- Willson-Cummer, W. 1976. "Iron Age Pottery from Akalan," *IstMitt* 26, pp. 31–39.
- Yurtseven, H.R. 2006. "Managerial Perspectives of Museum Directors in Turkey: The Balance between Custodial and Market-Focused Management," *Tourism Today* 6, pp. 134–143.