



Hodos, T. (2017). Lycia and the Hatay: Understanding Communication between Coast and Interior. In E. Kozal, M. Akar, Y. Heffron, Ç. Çilingirolu, T. E. erifolu, C. Çakrlar, S. Ünlüsoy, ... E. Jean (Eds.), *Questions, Approaches, and Dialogues in Eastern Mediterranean Archaeology: Studies in Honor of Marie-Henriette and Charles Gates* (Vol. 4, pp. 421-436). (Alter Orient Und Altes Testament; Vol. 445). Münster: Münster: Ugarit-Verlag.

Peer reviewed version

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

This is the author accepted manuscript (AAM). The final published version (version of record) is available online via Ugarit-Verlag at <https://www.ugarit-verlag.com/index.html?l=en%20-%20RC>. 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>

Lycia and the Hatay: understanding communication between coast and interior.

Abstract

The Iron Age of Anatolia's Mediterranean coastline was a period of transformation, especially during the first half of the first millennium BCE. During this time there is increasing evidence of material similarities, especially in ceramic styles, which has given rise to arguments for an Iron Age Mediterraneanisation. The interactions that promoted these common styles were remarkably diverse, however. Comparing and contrasting coastal region of the Hatay, in the northeastern corner of the Mediterranean, with Lycia's upland zone, in the southwestern landmass of Anatolia, this contribution examines the phenomenon of the development of common ceramic styles amid different networks of engagement. It assesses the complexity of the balance between shared and divergent practices and the mechanisms that underpin the social and cultural developments of the Mediterranean's Iron Age as seen along its Anatolian shores.

Preface

I first met Marie-Henriette in July 1993, when I came to Turkey to participate in Kinet Höyük's initial two-month excavation season. I had just completed the first year of my doctorate and had limited fieldwork experience under my belt. Little did I realise then how that one summer would shape both my professional and personal lives. Kinet was meant to be a five-year project. I stayed for a decade, and the project continued for another decade afterwards. During those summers, I learned not only the skills of excavation, survey, post-excavation analysis and interpretation, but I also witnessed first hand a model of professionalism in challenging circumstances. The physical environment was relentless. In addition to the extreme heat and humidity, early seasons also included vicious mosquitoes, oversized cockroaches, erratic water and electricity supplies (in combination with one another during the 1993 season), and livestock invasions of the various dig house residences. These particular aspects of adventure came to an end in the late 1990s, when the permanent dig house was constructed and the municipality commenced its programme to keep the mosquito population in check by belching diesel fumes over the district every few weeks. Living communally in close quarters every summer had its own understandable challenges, regardless of abode. Nevertheless, every member of the project was always equally valued: our views were listened to, our concerns respected, our requests considered (and usually honoured). Professionally, we were given opportunities to explore our own interests and pursue our developing specialisms. Externally, the project was famous for its genuine welcome: every traveller who made the effort to visit us received outstanding hospitality from the moment of arrival with the warmest *hoşgeldiniz* to the time of departure and the *su gibi git, su gibi dön*. I have carried this model of efficient, effective project management, team building and heartfelt welcome with me to my own subsequent field projects. In addition, I have gained much personally from the wisdom of both Marie-Henriette and Charlie in the over two decades that I have had the privilege and honour to call them friends.

There is also a serendipitous symmetry between my fieldwork career in Turkey and that of Marie-Henriette, as well as an underlying unity. While Marie-Henriette may be best known for her work at Kinet Höyük, she began her fieldwork in Turkey in the Elmalı region of Lycia, working under the direction of Machteld Mellink, her undergraduate Bryn Mawr College professor and mentor. Twenty years after Marie-Henriette graduated from Bryn Mawr, I completed my own undergraduate degree at the same institution. My first field experience in Turkey was at Kinet, where I worked actively from 1993 until 2003. In 2007, I commenced my own field project in Turkey, this time in the Seki plain in Lycia, the upland plateau adjacent to Elmalı. Thus, it seems a fitting tribute to Marie-Henriette to look at these two regions we have in common.

The Iron Age along Anatolia's Mediterranean shores

The Mediterranean's Iron Age was a period of transformation, especially during the first centuries of the first millennium BCE. During this time along the lands that circumscribe the sea we see increasing evidence of material similarities, especially in ceramic styles. This has given rise to arguments for an Iron Age Mediterraneanisation as a kind of global Mediterranean.¹ This notion derives from contemporary processes of globalisation, a concept that refers to our recognition of the world as a coherently bounded place. This one-placeness does not reflect a unified culture or world society, however. Rather, the sense of unity is generated by sets of shared practices that are used by those interacting at the global level, and which thereby transgress cultural or national practices. At the same time, these common traits also generate a sharper delineation of the boundaries between those groups involved with one another at the global level. This reinforcement of cultural heterogeneities is one of the paradoxes of globalisation processes.

During the Mediterranean's Iron Age, we see a number of common features develop, notably and most obviously with regard to ceramic forms. In particular, it is Greek ceramic shapes and decorative motifs that gain popularity around the Mediterranean. This process begins in earnest during the eighth century, and explodes during the seventh and sixth centuries.² The widespread use of Greek pottery, and imitations of its styles, at this time is one of the factors that creates the sense of one-placeness we associate with Mediterraneanisation. This does not mean, however, that these styles were used in the same way or had the same social meanings in different contexts, nor that the social, economic, political or cultural networks that brought these wares to these various regions were similar. Closer analysis of the patterns of import and imitation in the ceramic assemblages of two of regions along Anatolia's Mediterranean shores, the Hatay and Lycia, and even within two sites, Kinet Höyük in the Hatay, and Çaltılar Höyük in Lycia, between the eighth and sixth centuries will enable us to assess the complexity of the balance between shared and divergent practices, and to explore the mechanisms that underpin this phenomenon of broadly shared ceramic taste.

The Hatay and Lycia

The Turkish regions of the Hatay and Lycia are modern delineations related to contemporary politics. The political situation during the Iron Age was much more ambiguous and flexible than it is today, especially from the eighth century onwards. In the eastern Mediterranean, this is the era of the Neo-Hittite states. The lower Orontes valley is identified politically as Unqi, with its seat at Tell Tayinat. The coastal strip that circumscribes the Iskenderun Gulf, where Kinet has its commanding views around the entire bay, seems to have been part of Que, whose capital city was at Karatepe. In terms of material culture, however, Kinet has more in common with settlements in the Amuq than those further west,³ reminding us of the complexities and differences between social and political identities.

The significance of this littoral zone should not be underestimated. It represents the end of the shortest caravan route between Mesopotamia and the Mediterranean. The Orontes river itself it was the primary natural route from the northeastern corner of the Mediterranean to the interior of Syria, and on to not only Mesopotamia but also the Anatolian highlands, Syro-Palestine and further Levantine regions. Therefore, it should not be surprising that this is where the most intensive importation of Greek pottery to the Near East can be found, a trade that begins with regularity during the eighth century.⁴ Kinet, while engaging in trade, may have also played a strategic role in protecting the gulf, and thus perhaps the Orontes itself, from seaborne menaces from the west, given its centred location at the head of the bay; it surely controlled the coastal strip that lay between the two access point down to the sea from the Amanus mountains, at Arslanlı Bel to the west and Belen to the east.

In southwestern Anatolia at this time, the politics were somewhat different. According to ancient literary sources, the coastal zone may be affiliated with Lycians, but the upland zones are associated with Milyans in and around the Elmalı plain, and Kabalians in the area extending from the Seki plateau up to Burdur and Gölhisar. How they distinguished themselves from one another in name and material

¹ E.g. Ian Morris, "Mediterraneanization"; Tamar Hodos, "Colonial Engagements".

² Tamar Hodos, "Greeks and Cultural Development".

³ Tamar Hodos, *Local Responses*, 48.

⁴ Tamar Hodos, "Relative Ceramic Densities".

culture remains uncertain, however.⁵ The Elmalı basin was accessed from the coast near Finike, in eastern Lycia, while contact between the Elmalı and Seki plains was via the mountains. Although the precise routes of antiquity are uncertain, ceramic evidence from the two basins suggests communication and exchange with one another. The Seki plateau itself is accessed from the coast via the Xanthos river. The route of the river played a vital role in connecting the southwestern coastal zone of Lycia with the inland kingdoms of Anatolia. An Ottoman bridge, Roman inscription, and Hellenistic watchtower along the course of the Xanthos river in the Seki basin attest to the long-lived importance of the Seki route between the interior zones of Anatolia and the sea. Today, the highway between Fethiye and Antalya across the mountains follows the same route. A blade from Çaltılar Höyük of Nenezi Dağ obsidian, worked in a manner that recalls Bronze Age Aegean techniques, illustrates the longevity of this route as a conduit (and consumer) between inland and coastal regions.

Kinet Höyük and Çaltılar Höyük

Kinet Höyük was first investigated by Marie-Henriette Gates as part of her 1991 regional survey of the northern Hatay and Cilicia.⁶ Fieldwork at the site itself commenced the following year and continued until 2012, when the project celebrated its twentieth birthday and final season. The primary fieldwork methodology was excavation. This consisted of a series of strategically placed trenches of various size in locations on top, around the edges and down the sides of the mound to generate a holistic understanding of the various periods of occupation. In addition, trenches were opened in the lower terraces and fields surrounding the mound, revealing that during certain periods of the settlement's life, its residents lived beyond the mound itself. Survey work conducted in and around the site included various geomorphological surveys and a topographical survey, which established that the mound covers an area of 3.3 hectares and is 26m high.

The site is famous for, amongst other things, its extremely well-stratified Iron Age contexts, although its periods of occupation extend from the Neolithic to the middle of the first century BCE, with a brief reoccupation between the twelfth and fourteenth centuries CE. It is, in fact, one of few sites in Anatolia, and the eastern Mediterranean in general, with excellent stratigraphy for the Iron Age. Although the final publication of its Iron Age strata is still being prepared, preliminary reports give an indication of the nature of its Iron Age assemblage.⁷ For the purposes of this particular contribution, the periods of particular interest are its eighth, seventh and sixth century contexts. Monumental structures on stone foundations and with plastered walls characterise the site during the ninth and first half of the eighth centuries. During the second half of the eighth century, a sudden and dramatic change took place. Buildings were reconstructed along new orientations, with different techniques and less precise finishes (jogs and niches in the walls; occasional absence of stone foundations). The ceramic assemblage included Assyrian wares and a corresponding substantial drop in local painted outputs (down to 5%, when they had previously comprised 30%). Even the diet of the community changed, with a marked disinterest in fish, despite the site's coastal setting, and in contrast to previous and subsequent periods. Collectively, these have been interpreted as a period of Neo-Assyrian occupation with settlement by an inland group. Some time after the beginning of the seventh century, this population left. After a brief break in occupation, the site was reconstructed, and there appears to have been an emphasis on domestic and industrial workings, with modest multi-roomed buildings situated adjacent to cobbled areas, hearths and ovens across the excavated settlement areas. Kilns associated with both the late ninth/early eighth century and late seventh century were excavated at the eastern side of the site. Collectively, strata pertaining to these periods are preserved to a depth of over 2m.⁸

Çaltılar Höyük was first recorded in 1988 as part of the Balboura Survey, directed by Jim Coulton, University of Oxford, UK. The mound covers an area of 3 hectares, and is thus slightly smaller in area than Kinet's höyük, yet it is only 12m high at its highest point. The site has never been excavated. Instead, a series of intensive surveys was conducted by the Çaltılar Archaeological Project between 2008 and 2010.⁹ This included a topographic survey, rapid reconnaissance survey, and intensive

⁵ Tamar Hodos, "Lycia and Classical Archaeology," with references.

⁶ Gates and Özgen, "Report".

⁷ In addition to the annual reports published by Marie-Henriette Gates in *KST*, see also Charles Gates, "Orientalizing and Archaic East Greek Pottery"; "Greeks in the East"; Tamar Hodos, "Kinet Höyük and Al Mina"; "Kinet Höyük and Pan-Mediterranean Exchange"; *Local Responses*, 25-88; Tamar Hodos, Carl Knappett and Vassilis Kilikoglou, "Middle and Late Iron Age Painted Ceramics".

⁸ Hodos, "Relative Ceramic Densities," 66.

⁹ Nicoletta Momigliano et al, "Settlement History".

collection survey, as well as magnetometer and electrical resistance tomography surveys to detect sub-surface features without excavation. Material culture pertaining to the site's occupation history was gathered through the intensive collection survey. This involved a systematic total collection of all visible artefacts from a series of 5mx5m squares from across all visible areas of occupation, the extent of which had been established by the rapid reconnaissance survey. Over the two collection seasons, c.33,000 sherds and nearly 1000 other artefacts (flint, blades, querns, slag, and occasionally a shotgun cartridge case and a donkey shoe) were recorded.

Ceramic evidence indicates occupation from the Chalcolithic period until the middle of the sixth century BCE. Like Kinet, it is clear that the physical extent of occupation fluctuated between periods. This was especially clear in areas to the immediate north and south of the mound, where the fields were rich in pottery (alluvium may overlie the eastern and western extents of occupation). The Iron Age material from these areas was considerably worn, suggesting long-term exposure and natural movement down the slopes of the mound; this contrasts noticeably with the Chalcolithic and Bronze Age material retrieved from the same squares, which showed little comparable erosion evidence. This suggests that the settlement extended beyond the contours of the mound in periods prior to the first millennium BCE. Without stratified contexts, there is a limit to what we can say about the settlement itself. Proportions of sherds by period, for instance, are of limited value since the most recent periods of occupation are likely to be the most represented in a surface collection. Indeed, ceramics dated to the Iron Age represent 75% of all the sherds (and 62% by weight). We also lack good contextual information that might indicate how various areas of the site was used. Nevertheless, despite the fact that our evidence is drawn only from surface collection, a number of important observations from the collected assemblage have enabled several significant interpretations to be suggested about the nature of the site and its residents.

Ceramic Consumption Patterns

Consumption and demand are not direct consequences of production and distribution, as simple or automatic responses to the availability of goods. Instead, they are culturally, temporally, socially, and even politically specific, although this does not mean that they are unrelated to production and distribution matters. Amphoras and wine drinking vessels seem to have been the primary commodity of many ships during the Iron Age, or at least of those ships that never reached their destinations. Ships carried single-origin or multi-origin cargoes, and it is clear that both cabotage and redistribution networks operated. Our earliest post-Bronze Age evidence dates to the eighth century, with the Tanit and Elissa wrecks near Ashkelon, both of which carried Phoenician amphoras bound for Egypt or the western Mediterranean. Evidence for mixed cargoes exists from the seventh century, with examples such as the Kekova wreck, with its assemblage of southeast Aegean, Corinthian, and Cypro-Levantine amphoras.¹⁰ The more substantial evidence from over the course of the sixth century confirms that ships regularly carried wares of mixed (e.g. Giglio; Gela; Pointe Lequin 1A) and single origins (e.g. Ecueil de Miet, Grand Ribaud F).

From even before the eighth century, Kinet's ceramic repertoire belonged to a Cypro-Cilician milieu, much like its regional neighbour Tarsus. Its painted products include Cypro-Cilician geometric, bichrome, black-on-red, white slip, red slip, and burnished wares, which together represent nearly a third of the total ceramic assemblage of the ninth and eighth centuries. During the seventh century, its potters adhered to the Cypro-Cilician tradition, but supplemented their decorated output with the introduction of Wave Line styles, associated with East Greece, during the later part of the century. Between the last quarter of the seventh century and the end of the sixth century, Wave Line wares came to dominate the painted repertoire and to represent a substantial proportion of the entire assemblage. Banded bowls and so-called Ionian bowls also became popular forms for Kinet's workshops. Kinet craftsmen also produced some figural and non-figural vessels in so-called orientalisising styles, in imitation of East Greek and Corinthian workshops.¹¹

Imported pottery includes Greek geometric wares, such as Euboean pendent semi-circle skyphoi, and Cypriot Bichrome, examples of both dating particularly to the second half of the eighth century. Assyrian palace ware and related imports characterise imports of the late eighth and early seventh

¹⁰ Tamar Hodos, "Colonial Engagements," 224 with references.

¹¹ Charles Gates, "Orientalizing and Archaic East Greek Pottery Types," 369; "Greeks in the East," 44.

centuries; no Greek wares were imported during this phase.¹² East Greek bird bowls represent the main foreign wares during the first half of the seventh century, while a few examples of figural and non-figural decorated classes, such as Wild Goat jars and Ripe Corinthian juglets, were imported during the later seventh century. A so-called ‘Sidonian’ bottle belongs to the sixth century.¹³ No Chian of Fikellura wares have been found; Attic Black Figure (and later Red Figure) appears rarely. Attic SOS and East Greek transport amphoras (including a one-handled example from Miletus) illustrate the bulk import habits between the second half of the seventh and sixth centuries (although very few of the imported transport vessels, if any, can be assigned clearly to the sixth century¹⁴). Levantine wares include basket-handled amphoras and glazed earthenware vessels during the seventh century.

Çaltılar’s ceramic output is harder to characterise for there are no well-published Iron Age strata from neighbouring sites with which to compare its local outputs. Most Iron Age contexts in modern Lycia and its neighbouring regions come from sporadic soundings at major Graeco-Roman city states; Iron Age material collected from surveys, such as the Balboura Survey, are unstratified. Sites that have been more widely excavated have not yet been published, such as Hacimusalar. Our parallels are therefore often drawn from sites further away, such as Clazomenai or Kilise Tepe. Nevertheless, their plain and decorated products enable us to offer some general dating and understanding of Çaltılar’s own assemblage. The site’s painted outputs include banded and geometric motifs, in increasing complexity and more precise execution, over the course of the ninth to sixth centuries. Mixing and pouring shapes, with a variety of rim shapes and sizes, complement a range of drinking vessels. There are also storage and cooking wares, although precise dating of these is difficult in the absence of stratified contexts or published parallels from well-stratified neighbouring sites.

Study suggests that there is a number of Iron Age imports from as early as the ninth century until the middle of the sixth century. The majority of these come from western Anatolia. This includes several micaceous fabrics associated with East Greek outputs of the eighth and seventh centuries, decorated with banded and wave line motifs. There is also a notable collection of Southwestern Anatolian ware that consists of several visually-distinctive, petrographically discrete sub-groups. This may indicate more than one production centre, or, rather, that Çaltılar imported wares from more than one producer. Black-on-red plates and flasks that have been recovered are more likely to come from Rhodes or the Anatolian mainland itself, rather than the eastern Mediterranean, judging by their petrography. Several Phrygian pieces were also recovered, including an example of a large, closed vessel of the ornate brown-on-buff style, known at Gordion during the late eighth and early seventh centuries, and possibly a discrete group of burnished grey ware open and closed vessels (research is ongoing to determine if this group is, indeed, of Phrygian origin; Phrygian influence in Lycia at this time makes the kingdom a plausible candidate). A small number of Greek sherds were also found, including Protocorinthian open vessels (plates or kotylai) and a possible Euboean closed vessel. Several bird bowls were also recovered, indicative of seventh century contact with the western Anatolian littoral and islands, as is a Chian chalice bowl fragment with cable motif. Slightly later imports include a piece of Lydian marbled ware open form (sixth century output). No Attic Black Figure pieces were collected from the mound surface, although several Attic black glazed body sherds were retrieved (and nor was Attic Red Figure, although the site was no longer occupied by its floruit). Other classes are harder to pin down, such as a fine ware red fabric group with a grey core (open and closed forms), which originates probably in central-western Anatolia. Several figural and banded vessels can be associated with a temporal horizon between the seventh and early-mid sixth centuries, but their places of manufacture cannot yet be identified; they are likely to be in western Anatolia, however. Some depict animal motifs (ears, a hoof, or polychrome feathers) that relate to outputs such as Wild Goat and similar, while others are

¹² Gunnar Lehmann, personal comment. I am extremely grateful to Gunnar for sharing with me his current assessment of Kinet’s Iron Age ceramic periodisation, including the site’s import patterns.

¹³ This particular vessel form exemplifies the complexities of globalisation. The ‘Sidonian’ bottle is a shape of Phoenician origin that was known in Aegean and central Mediterranean contexts, and probably produced widely. For instance, William Culican, “Sidonian bottles,” regards them as imitations of Phoenician examples and made by a variety of workshops. Sarah Morris, *Daedalos*, 136, note 149, views the Thera examples as material culture support for the presence of Phoenicians on Thera. The Kinet example has a Greek letter on it that was inscribed prior to firing. This suggests that the vessel was manufactured in a Greek-speaking environment. So does this make it a Greek product, or a transplanted Phoenician object (and if so, then how are we to address its Levantine origin?), neither, both, or something new? Further discussion, especially about the roles and natures of hybridisation within globalisation processes, lies beyond the scope of the present contribution.

¹⁴ Gunnar Lehmann, personal comment.

monochrome and bichrome banded table wares common during the seventh and sixth centuries. There is no evidence of material from further east, such as the Levant or Cyprus.

Similarities and Differences

Quantitative comparisons between the two sites are pointless as the nature of the data collection is completely different. The imported wares identified at Çaltılar are, presumably, only a fraction of what lies under the ground still. That already there is evidence for imports from Greece, Lydia, Phrygia, and around western Anatolia is suggestive of the site's connections with both Anatolia and the Aegean during this period. More cannot be said, however, until evidence from under the surface becomes obtainable. Equally, Kinet's Iron Age assemblage comes from predominantly the northeast and southwest edges of the settlement. Iron Age strata were never excavated in the areas in the centre of the top of the settlement. Nevertheless, with these limitations in mind, observations about both assemblages, and comparisons between them, can be made fruitfully.

It is surprising that Kinet, with its harbours, does not have more imports. The community was engaged regionally, especially with Cyprus and the nearby Levant, and more widely with the Aegean, with stylistic influence moving from one to the other over the course of the eighth to sixth centuries. Given the proximity of Cyprus, a direct relationship between Kinet and Cyprus is assumed. The precise nature of the site's links with the Aegean has not been explored, either, although they are presumed to be commercial rather than of a settlement nature.¹⁵ The limited number of imports in comparison with local production in imitation of those imported styles must be probed. As noted above, the Cypro-Cilician painted output accounts for nearly a third of the entire ceramic assemblage of the ninth and eighth centuries, while it has been estimated that 40% of the total ceramic assemblage during the seventh and sixth centuries is in imitation of painted Aegean styles.¹⁶ The presence of a major trading site at Al Mina during this time in contrast with the limited number of imports in each phase at Kinet suggests multiple networks of commerce and communication in this littoral zone. More specifically, the networks that connected Kinet with Cyprus, and then the Aegean, seem to have been separate from the routes between those regions and the Al Mina, which served as a major port. Perhaps ships were more willing to have sailed for an additional hour or two to reach this regional emporium, at the mouth of the Orontes river, bypassing a neighbouring harbour like Kinet.

If Kinet were involved in trade in a substantial way, we would expect to see either direct evidence of warehouses, such as at Al Mina, or a substantial percentage of imported goods, such as we see at emporia elsewhere in the Mediterranean at this time (e.g. Naukratis; various emporia¹⁷). No warehouse structures have been identified at Kinet during these Iron Age periods, and Kinet does not appear to have been a vast consumer of imported material. One might then question whether the business of trade really was a core activity during this time. A consideration of the geographic networks of connection may also support such a doubt. The river that ran alongside the site originates in the Amanus Mountains, but there is no evidence that its course provided a route over and across the mountains, which are surprisingly high. Furthermore, the site's central location within the bay and its notable elevation – it is the only geographical feature in an otherwise extraordinarily flat landscape – lend it a particularly valuable strategic position to keep an eye over the comings and goings through the northeastern corner of the Mediterranean by both land (between the two passes from the Amanus mountains discussed above) and by sea. Trade, such as it was during this period, may have been a byproduct, or secondary industry. Yet the fashions of the era did not pass Kinet by. Rather, it was actively engaged with wider fashions, tastes and habits. Initially this was expressed through preference for Cypro-Cilician styles, and may reflect a shared system of taste, and perhaps values, with the site's Cypriot and Cilician neighbours. During the seventh and sixth centuries, as East Greek table wares began to dominate regional markets, Kinet's talented potters and painters copied the styles that were so in fashion, but perhaps slightly harder to access directly precisely because ships did not offload their cargoes on a regular basis at Kinet's port. Nevertheless, Kinet was a full participant in the global Mediterranean of the Archaic period, producing ceramic styles that were expressions of the sense of one-placeness we see in the wider Mediterranean at this time. A strong network of importation is not

¹⁵ Charles Gates, "Orientalizing and Archaic East Greek Pottery Types," 369.

¹⁶ Charles Gates, "Greeks in the East," 44.

¹⁷ Naukratis: e.g. Astrid Möller, *Naukratis*; France: e.g. Michael Dietler, *Archaeologies of Colonialism*, 148-55. See also Denise Demetriou, *Negotiating Identity*.

necessary to enable a settlement to be globally connected; other networks, such as those that revolve around social values and understandings, may play a stronger role.

It is equally surprising that Çaltılar has as many imports as it does, given its location in a modest upland plateau that seems to be neither a gateway nor a major production centre. It is only alongside a transit route, rather than at a significant physical feature of such a route, like a confluence of roads or rivers, or a natural point of transition between landscape types. The site's import pattern, therefore, may be indicative of the site's function, and this may relate to the single clear architectural feature identified by the sub-surface surveys. An archaeological feature was noticed in the northern sector of the site, rather than one pertaining to the modern farming terraces that otherwise mark the surface of the mound. The magnetometry results outlined a structure of 10m by 20m in size. The electrical resistance tomography survey indicated that this was made of stone, and that its walls are extant from just below the current ground level to a depth of 2.5m. Given that the latest occupation at the site, judging by the ceramic assemblage, is the middle of the sixth century, it is most likely that this construction relates to that era (seventh-sixth centuries). Stone buildings of such dimension at this time are usually identified as a temple or fortification. One example is the Inner Defence Platform at Old Smyrna, which is believed to have served as a fortress during the eighth and seventh centuries, although votive evidence suggests it might have been a contemporary temple, and this part of the site evolved into the city's main cult area by the sixth century. The majority of the later seventh and sixth century ceramics from Çaltılar is dining wares, including various cup forms, mixing shapes, and serving vessels (including so-called fruit stands). As feasting and drinking are often associated with cultic activities, it is possible that such activities may have taken place in and around the structure, itself. The quantity and variety of imported pottery between the eighth and sixth centuries retrieved just from the surface and not from excavated contexts were surprising. That many of these seem to be large, ornately decorated, and presumably expensive, high status vessels suggests that the site was something significant during this time, perhaps serving as a sanctuary, not just for the community itself but more regionally. The imported vessels may represent dedications, or be related to ritual observance by visitors. Thus, Çaltılar, too, participated in the global Mediterranean world of the seventh and sixth centuries, its residents and/or visitors replete with the latest ceramic fashions, especially those originating in the East Greek/west Anatolian world.

A global Mediterranean

Kinet residents strongly favoured wave-line and so-called Ionian bowls, while Çaltılar inhabitants preferred other decorated forms (figural; geometric; banded wares), yet the general repertoire of import origins between the two sites is comparable, as, indeed, it is often in the Mediterranean at this time because of widespread usage of common types, some of which were undoubtedly mass produced.¹⁸ In both cases, despite the proximity of Greeks resident in both regions,¹⁹ there is little evidence that the Greeks themselves played a direct role in shaping the tastes at either site. Indeed, given the mixed nature of many cargoes, and evidence for cabotage networks of exchange, the geographic or ethnic origins of ship owners or crew are less exclusive to questions of trade in general than once thought. The point is that direct trade does not seem to form a substantial core of either site's activities. The popularity of Greek wares at these two sites, and elsewhere at this time, instead reflects the pervasion of shared practices that we associate with the level of global connectivity in globalising processes. Shared practices are not the same as identical ones, however. One of the features of globalisation, and one that is often misunderstood, is that engagement at the global level does not necessarily involve identical activity or belief, but rather represents common understanding; nevertheless, the practices are particular to each participating community. The widespread use of similar styles may reveal broadly shared values pertaining to the social contexts of the use of such types. The use of East Greek wares at both sites suggests that in general these were desirable commodities; that they were objects in demand derives precisely because of commonly held notions of social status display, even if each site exhibits that display in a locally-specific, locally-appropriate manner.

¹⁸ Pierre Dupont, "Contribution." Increasingly, studies are revealing that such wares were also often locally produced rather than widely imported. For example, For Kinet itself: Filiz Songu, *Wave-Line Pottery*; Tamar Hodos, Carl Knappett and Vassilis Kilikoglou, "Middle and Late Iron Age Painted Ceramics," 80-81. For Çaltılar: Nicoletta Momigliano et al, "Settlement History," 94-97; Tamar Hodos, "Lycia and Classical Archaeology."

¹⁹ Greeks in Cilicia are reputed to be at Soloi, Nagidos and Kelenderis according to ancient literary sources; archaeologists have often argued for Greeks at Tarsus and Al Mina, as well. See Charles Gates, "Orientalizing and Archaic East Greek Pottery Types," 369 with references. Greeks in Lycia are at Phaselis: Hansen and Nielsen, *Inventory*, 1140-41.

Political matters in each region may not have played a significant role in the long-term tastes. Kinet's Iron Age period is marked by a brief Neo-Assyrian phase. While this particular period is notable for its site-wide differences, the continuities evident between the periods before and after this phase are surprising. Architecturally, the site is rebuilt in traditional techniques. Ceramic-wise, Cypro-Cilician outputs are resumed, although initially supplemented with, and then supplanted by, the new Aegean style of Wave-Line ware and so-called Ionian bowls, while the residents themselves returned to their fish-eating ways. Political changes may have had some disruption, but daily life patterns sustained for far longer. Çaltılar seems to have been similarly unbothered by major political issues during the eighth and seventh centuries, perhaps being too far away from the power centres of Phrygia and Lydia, although their influence and activities may have encouraged Çaltılar's links with inland zones and interior Anatolia. Persian activity in the sixth century almost certainly put an end to the site's existence, however, as the abandonment of the site, judging by its ceramic evidence, corresponds with literary records of Harpagus's conquest of Lycia mid-century.

The networks of connectivity, whether for political, economic or cultural purposes, were very different for each site. For Kinet, sea links must have been vital, but not necessarily long-distance ones. It would have been perfectly possible to bypass the Gulf of Iskenderun altogether moving in a westerly direction from somewhere like Al Mina, especially if one wanted to go considerably west and to do so quickly.²⁰ Kinet was more likely part of a cabotage network, with smaller crafts hugging the coast as they moved along from port to port. Equally, Çaltılar would not have been easy to reach from the coast, given the steepness of the mountains to reach the Seki basin, whether one follows a riverine or road route.

Despite these differences, the ceramic import and production patterns at these two sites during the Iron Age demonstrate that both communities were active participants in the wider Mediterranean world. They were not passively taking what they could get, but they made active choices about what to procure and produce. Political developments may have impacted upon availability, temporarily or longer-term, perhaps encouraging the development of new links, and opening up new influences. The common taste for Greek ceramic styles, however, especially during the seventh and sixth centuries, represents shared practices. These were tempered by local needs and interests, though, with Kinet favouring especially Wave-Line vessels and Ionian bowls, and Çaltılar preferring a wider variety of banded table wares. This exemplifies the balance between practices in common at a global level and differences that define a region or community. Both Kinet and Çaltılar were just as much a part of the global Mediterranean as the Greeks, themselves.

²⁰ Sabire Ashi Oflaz, *Taxonomy*, 10, fig. 1-5.

Bibliography

- Culican, William. "Sidonian bottles." *Levant* 7 (1975): 145-50.
- Demetriou, Denise. *Negotiating Identity in the Ancient Mediterranean: the Archaic and Classical Greek multiethnic emporia*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013.
- Dietler, Michael. *Archaeologies of Colonialism. Consumption, Entanglement, and Violence in Ancient Mediterranean France*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2010.
- Dupont, Pierre. "The Contribution of Archeometric Results to our Understanding of Archaic East-Greek Trade." In Sergey Solovyov, ed. *Archaic Greek Culture: History, Archaeology, Art and Museology. . Proceedings of the International Round-Table Conference, June 2005, St-Petersburg, Russia*. 37-40. Oxford: Archaeopress, 2010.
- Gates, Charles. "Orientalizing and Archaic East Greek Pottery Types from Kinet Höyük (Cilicia)." In Armağan Erkanal-Öktü, ed. *Hayat Erkanal'a Armağan: Kültürlerin Yansıması/Studies in Honor of Hayat Erkanal; Cultural Reflections*. 368-72. Istanbul: Homer Kitabevi, 2006.
- "Greeks in the East: A View from Cilicia." In Sergey Solovyov, ed. *Archaic Greek Culture: History, Archaeology, Art and Museology. Proceedings of the International Round-Table Conference, June 2005, St-Petersburg, Russia*. 41-45. Oxford: Archaeopress, 2010.
- Gates, M.H. and I. Özgen. "Report on the Bilkent University Archaeological Survey in Cilicia and the Northern Hatay (1991)." *Araştırma Sonuçları Toplantısı* 10 (1993): 387-94.
- Hansen, Mogens Herman, and Thomas Heine Nielsen, eds. *An Inventory of Archaic and Classical Poleis*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004.
- Hodos, Tamar. "Kinet Höyük and Al Mina: new views on old relationships." In Gocha Tsetskhladze, Anthony M. Snodgrass and A. John N.W. Prag, eds. *Periplus: Festschrift to Professor Sir John Boardman*. 145-52. London: Thames and Hudson, 1999.
- "Kinet Höyük and Pan-Mediterranean Exchange." In Roger Brock, Tim Cornell, Stephen Hodkinson, and Graham J. Oliver, eds. *The Sea in Antiquity*. 25-37. Oxford: British Archaeological Reports, 2000.
- *Local Responses to Colonization in the Iron Age Mediterranean*. London: Routledge, 2006.
- "Relative Ceramic Densities in the North-Eastern Mediterranean." *Olba* 16 (2008): 57-72.
- "Colonial Engagements in the Global Mediterranean Iron Age." *Cambridge Archaeological Journal* 19.2 (2009): 221-41.
- "Greeks and Cultural Development in the Pre-Roman Mediterranean." In Franco De Angelis, ed. *A Companion to Greeks Across the Ancient World*. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell, in press.
- "Lycia and Classical Archaeology: the changing nature of archaeology in Turkey. In Carla Antonaccio and Donald Haggis, eds. *Classical Archaeology in Context: Theory and Practice in Excavation in the Greek World*. New York and Berlin: De Gruyter, in press.
- Hodos, Tamar, Carl Knappett and Vassilis Kilikoglou. "Middle and Late Iron Age Painted Ceramics from Kinet Höyük: macro, micro and elemental analyses." *Anatolian Studies* 55 (2005): 61-87.
- Möller, Astrid. *Naukratis. Trade in Archaic Greece*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001.
- Momigliano, Nicoletta, Alan Greaves, Tamar Hodos, Belgin Aksoy, Andrew Brown, Mustafa Kibiroğlu, Tristan Carter. "Settlement History and Material Culture in Southwest Turkey: report on the 2008-2010 survey at Çaltılar Höyük." *Anatolian Studies* 61 (2011): 61-121.

Morris, Ian. "Mediterraneanization." *Mediterranean Historical Review* 18.2 (2003): 30-55.

Morris, Sarah. *Daedalos and the Origins of Greek Art*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1995.

Oflaz, Sabire Asli. *Taxonomy and Distribution of the Benthic Foraminifera in the Gulf of Iskenderun, Eastern Mediterranean*. Unpublished MSc dissertation, Middle East Technical University, 2006.

Songu, Filiz. *Wave-Line Pottery from the Late Iron Age Levels of Kinet Höyük*. Unpublished MA dissertation, Bilkent University, 1997.