NEOLITHIC POTTERY FROM THE NEAR EAST

PRODUCTION, DISTRIBUTION AND USE

Third International Workshop
on Ceramics from the Late Neolithic Near East
7-9 March, 2019 – Antalya

PROCEEDINGS

Editors
RANA ÖZBAL – MÜCELLA ERDALKIRAN – YUKIKO TONOIKE

AKMED
KOÇ UNIVERSITY
Suna & İnan Kıraç
Research Center for
Mediterranean Civilizations

25 years

NEOLITHIC POTTERY FROM THE NEAR EAST

Production, Distribution and Use

Third International Workshop
on Ceramics from the Late Neolithic Near East
7-9 March, 2019 – Antalya

PROCEEDINGS

OFFPRINT


This volume is
dedicated to
the memory of
Olivier
Nieuwenhuyse

NEOLITHIC POTTERY FROM THE NEAR EAST

Production, Distribution and Use

Third International Workshop

on Ceramics from the Late Neolithic Near East

7-9 March, 2019 – Antalya

PROCEEDINGS

Antalya

RANA ÖZBAL – MÜCELLA ERDALKIRAN – YUKIKO TONOIKE

KUP

KOÇ UNIVERSITY PRESS 259
ARCHAEOLOGY

NEOLITHIC POTTERY FROM THE NEAR EAST: Production, Distribution and Use - Third International Workshop on Ceramics from the Late Neolithic Near East 7-9 March 2019 – Antalya - PROCEEDINGS

By Rana ÖZBAL, Mücella ERDALKIRAN and Yukiko TONOIKE

Proofreading and Preparing for Publication: Tarkan Kahya, Arif Yacı

Production by Zero Prodüksiyon Ltd.

1st Edition: İstanbul, November 2021

Front cover: Sixth millennium painted pottery, by Halil Tekin, fig. 20.3.

This book was published in collaboration with

Koç University Suna & İnan Kıraç Research Center for Mediterranean Civilizations (AKMED)

Press: 12.matbaa
Seyrantepe Mah. İbrahim Karaoğlanoğlu Cad.
No: 35 K: 1 D: 2 Kağıthane, İstanbul, Türkiye

Certificate no: 46618
+90 212 281 25 80

Koç University Press
Rumelifeneri Yolu 34450 Sarıyer, İstanbul, Türkiye
kup@ku.edu.tr • press.ku.edu.tr

Certificate no: 51577
+90 212 338 1000

Koç University Suna Kıraç Library Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Neolithic Pottery from the Near East: Production, Distribution and Use - Third International Workshop on Ceramics from the Late Neolithic Near East, 7-9 March 2019, Antalya - Proceedings / by Rana Özbal, Mücella Erdalkıran and Yukiko Tonoike; proofreading and preparing for publication Arif Yacı, Tarkan Kahya - İstanbul : Koç University Suna & İnan Kıraç Research Center for Mediterranean Civilizations, 2021.

344 pages; 21,5 X 28 cm. Koç University Press; 259. Archaeology

Includes bibliographical references.

ISBN 978-605-7685-69-8

1. Neolithic period--Middle East--Congresses. 2. Pottery--Europe--Congresses. 3. Pottery, Prehistoric--Middle East--Congresses. 4. Middle East --Antiquities--Congresses. I. Özbal, Rana. II. Erdalkıran, Mücella. III. Tonoike, Yukiko. IV. Yacı, Arif. V. Kahya, Tarkan. VI. Title.

GN776.32.N4 I5 2019

CONTENTS

PART V: ENRICHING REGIONAL REPERTOIRES THOUGH NEW DISCOVERIES

ABBREVIATIONS LIST

AAS	Annales Archéologiques Arabes Syriennes
AASOR	Annual of the American Schools of Oriental Research
ADAJ	Annual of the Department of Antiquities of Jordan
AJA	American Journal of Archaeology
AmerAnt	American Antiquity
AnAr	Anadolu Araştırmaları
AnatAntiq	Anatolia Antiqua
AnatSt	Anatolian Studies
AÜDTCFD	Ankara Üniversitesi Dil ve Tarih-Coğrafya Fakültesi Dergisi
Anmed	News Bulletin on Archaeology from Mediterranean Anatolia
AnnLiv	Annals of Archaeology and Anthropology (Liverpool)
APAD	Anadolu Prehistorya Araştırmaları Dergisi (Journal of Anatolian Prehistoric Research)
AST	Araştırma Sonuçları Toplantısı
BAR-IS	British Archaeological Reports-International Series
BASOR	Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research
BIAA	British Institute at Ankara
BMMA	Bulletin of the Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York
BMusBeyr	Bulletin du Musée de Beyrouth
CAJ	Cambridge Archaeological Journal
BASOR	Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research
CAJ	Cambridge Archaeological Journal
CurrAnthr	Current Anthropology
IEJ	Israel Exploration Journal
IstMitt	Istanbuler Mitteilungen
JAS	Journal of Archaeological Science
JAMT	Journal of Archaeological Method and Theory
JFA	Journal of Field Archaeology
JMA	Journal of Mediterranean Archaeology
JNES	Journal of Near Eastern Studies
KST	Kazı Sonuçları Toplantısı
MAC	Museu d'Arqueologia de Catalunya
MélBeyrouth	Mélanges de l'Université Saint Joseph, Beyrouth

OJA	Oxford Journal of Archaeology
OREA	Oriental and European Archaeology
PALMA	Papers on Archaeology of the Leiden Museum of Antiquities
PEQ	Palestine Exploration Quarterly
PPS	Proceedings of the Prehistoric Society
RANarb	Revue archéologique de Narbonnaise
TAS	Tematik Arkeoloji Serisi
TÜBA-AR	Turkish Academy of Sciences Journal of Archaeology
TürkArkDerg	Türk Arkeoloji Dergisi
UMUT	University Museum, the University of Tokyo
WorldArch	World Archaeology

Chapter 7

NEOLITHIC POTTING TRADITIONS AT ÇUKURİÇİ HÖYÜK

CLARE BURKE AND BARBARA HOREJS*

Abstract: This paper discusses the Neolithic ceramics from the important site of Çukuriçi Höyük, Western Turkey, detailing typological and technological elements. The results of the pottery analysis undertaken at the site so far, have highlighted the use of a range of different forming techniques, often in combination. It has also highlighted the use of multiple raw material types to make a varied range of shapes, all of which testify to long-held potting traditions, as well as demonstrating the high degree of knowledge and skill used to make these durable and well-finished pottery types. We discuss our results within the contexts of those from other sites, in terms of typological affinities, key technical elements related to vessel forming, and potential pottery use.

Introduction and Site Background

The Neolithic is characterised by fundamental shifts in the way people lived, organized themselves, and the way they materialized their worldview through the production of new cultural objects, particularly the widespread adoption and development of ceramic containers. In this paper, we will discuss the Neolithic pottery excavated from the tell site of Çukuriçi Höyük, western Turkey, providing an overview of the pottery shapes and styles at the site. In addition, we discuss the early results from technological analysis relating to forming and firing methods, situating these trends with those from surrounding sites to place pottery production at Çukuriçi Höyük within a broader context.

The early founding of the site related with the pioneer phase of the first farmers in the region[1] offers the opportunity to analyse the production of ceramic vessels in the perspective of materiality within the Neolithisation process of the 7th millennium BCE. Frequently related with cultural terms, such as *Praekeramikum* as applied for Thessaly,[2] the impact and function of early pottery production represents a long-lasting topic in the early Neolithic Aegean. The new excavated data from early Neolithic sites in the İzmir region, such as Ulucak VI and Çukuriçi XIII, demonstrate the marginal role of ceramic vessel production in their founding horizons. Evidence for pottery is attested in the subsequent phases at both sites, dating after 6600 cal BCE. This particular situation allows a deep insight into the Neolithic societies' handling of this "new material" in aspects of adoption, adaptation, establishing local traditions and fulfilling their distinct needs.

* Clare Burke and Barbara Horejs, Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, Österreichisches Archäologisches Institut [Hollandstraße 11-13, 1020, Vienna, Austria]. clare.burke@oeaw.ac.at ; barbara.horejs@oeaw.ac.at

1 Horejs et al. 2015; Horejs 2019a.

2 See Reingruber et al. 2017.



FIG. 7.1. Overview of chronological phases at Çukuriçi Höyük.
(Adapted from design by Ostmann, Schwall and Börner in Horejs 2017, 17, fig. 1.6).

The settlement of Çukuriçi Höyük was originally founded near the Aegean coast at a natural lagoon but is nowadays located in the east plain of Bülbüldağ, approximately 1 km south-east of the ancient city of Ephesos, near modern day Selçuk. Activity at the site dates from the Early Neolithic (6680–6600 cal BCE), with a continuous occupation until the Late Neolithic around 6000 cal BCE and is divided into 6 phases based on stratigraphic and architectural evidence of occupation and supported with absolute dating (fig. 7.1). This continuous inhabitation of the site was followed by a hiatus after the Late Neolithic, before the settlement was reoccupied in the Late Chalcolithic in the 4th millennium. The Neolithic settlements represent villages composed of houses, open spaces and activity zones with pyrotechnical installations, working and midden areas.[3]

As a tell site, Çukuriçi Höyük is characterised by the continuous accumulation of human debris from the construction and inhabitation of small structures, built one on top of the other following earlier building orientations, even when this construction technique caused structural problems and building collapse.[4] This continuity of building design and orientation suggests a shared idea of living arrangements between earlier and later occupants;[5] indeed this common worldview is also reflected in elements of the pottery shapes, styles, and crafting practices, at the site which are characterised by long held traditions.

The Pottery

Analysis of the ceramics at Çukuriçi Höyük utilizes an integrated typological, macroscopic, microscopic and technological approach, supported with *chaîne opératoire* and *habitus*[6] conceptual frameworks. Initial investigation of the pottery was undertaken alongside the excavations, beginning with the formation of 'ware groups' by the co-author. Ware groups are based on a range of visual characteristics of the pottery, defined by the colour of vessel surfaces and breaks, surface treatment

[3] See contributions in Horejs 2017.

[4] Brami et al. 2016.

[5] Horejs 2019b.

[6] Leroi-Gourhan 1943, 1945; Mauss 2009; Bourdieu 2009.

types, and the nature of visible inclusions within the macroscopic fabric. The ongoing evaluation and definition of wares during the excavation years offered a framework for the first analyses aimed at characterising the raw materials used from the early Neolithic until the early Bronze Age period.[7] The author undertook a further study focused on the Neolithic material, examining the range of macroscopic fabric variation, and other technological features relating to forming, finishing and firing. Material was then sampled across the range and combination of shapes, macroscopic fabrics and technological features identified, for analysis using instrumental analytical methods (thin section petrography and scanning electron microscopy-SEM), complimented by spatial analysis, both of which are ongoing.

Typology and Style

Typologically, the Neolithic assemblage is comparable to assemblages within western Anatolia and shares many forms and typological features with pottery from sites further north and south.[8] Comparative forms and finishes are found at Ulucak Höyük, Yeşilova Höyük, Ege Gübre, Barcın Höyük, Erbaba, Çatalhöyük, Hacılar, Menteşe, Ekşi Höyük and Aktopraklık,[9] amongst others. The range



FIG. 7.2. Overview of the main Late Neolithic pottery shapes recorded at Çukuriçi Höyük (not to scale). (Profile illustrations by M. Röcklinger).

7 Peloschek 2017, 2019.

8 Horejs 2016.

9 Çilingiroğlu 2012; Derin 2011; Gerritsen et al. 2013; Özdöl 2012; Sağlamtimur 2012; Roodenberg et al. 2003; Dedeoğlu et al. 2017; Karul and Avcı 2011.

of simple shapes at Çukuriçi Höyük consists of larger jars and small globular jars, hole-mouthed / narrow-mouthed vessel types, with smaller amounts of deep bowls with s-profile, and shallow bowls, (fig. 7.2). Bases are mainly simple flat bases, rounded discs or oval-shaped, whilst vessel mouths are either oval or rounded depending on body shape, with oval mouths belonging to oval bodies. Handles most dominantly include single or double lug types, when they are horizontal, and usually curved upwards towards the rim. Vertical tubular lugs are elongated and sometimes very thin appearing in the late Neolithic, whilst basket handles, although present, are very rare.

The pottery dominantly displays monochrome exterior surfaces, in either red-brown-orange or cream-buff-brown colours (fig. 7.2). They are highly burnished or polished, with burnishing usually in a vertical direction (base to rim) although there are examples of horizontal, and combined vertical and horizontal burnishing, similar to that at Menteşe[10] and comparable with Neolithic pottery from other sites across Anatolia.[11]

It is notable that the interiors of vessels are often less highly burnished, with several poorly finished examples providing important information in relation to the range of hand forming methods used to make the pottery (discussed below). Although it has not been possible to identify *in situ* pottery production, stone and animal bone 'polishers' have been recorded, possibly associated with pottery burnishing,[12] similar to evidence from Çatalhöyük.[13] Over time, the lighter more buff-coloured pottery declines from Phase IX onwards, with a rise in red-brown vessels, whilst between Phases XI and X we see the introduction of painted vessels in the form of red linear thinly painted motifs on cream-buff exteriors. Similar trends are noted elsewhere with a shift from Cream Slipped Burnished Wares (definition by Çilingiroglu: CSBW) towards Red Slipped Burnished Wares (RSBW) evident in Ulucak V and IV, and cream vs. red pottery noted at Çatalhöyük. Painted Wares are also evident in the Anatolian Aegean Coastal Group as well as in the Lake District, such as in Hacılar. At Çukuriçi, alongside these new decorative elements, the practice of burnishing continues, indeed some examples of painted pottery appear to have been burnished or polished before the application of paint and final firing, perhaps indicating the merging of earlier and newer pottery finishing traditions.

To accompany the shifts in vessel colour, Impresso Wares are introduced at Çukuriçi appearing in Phase VIII. Examination of the Impresso Wares by the author has highlighted the use of different techniques, one possibly achieved with a finger or crescent shaped implement, and the other with an angular tool (fig. 7.3).



FIG. 7.3. Photograph comparison of two Impresso Ware vessels showing different shaped impressions. (Image: C. Burke).

10 Roodenberg et al. 2003, 26.

11 For example, in Aktopraklık C, Karul and Avcı 2011, 4.

12 Emra pers. Comm. March 2019.

13 Russel and Griffiths 2013, 290.

As discussed by Çiler Çilingiroğlu,[14] Impresso Wares are an indicator for eastern Mediterranean and Aegean connectivity around 6100 / 6000 BCE, which sits well with the dating of the Çukuriçi evidence. However, it remains as an open question, if these containers were related to special practices which could potentially explain the wide distribution of this style.

In terms of vessel shapes, the trends from Çukuriçi are similar to many other sites: jars, particularly narrow / hole mouth jars, are consistently the most dominant shape. Whilst the numbers of diagnostic pieces are quite small for some (early) phases, there appears to be a general trend for a decrease in narrow / hole mouth types over time, accompanied by an increase in bowls and deep bowls, which may indicate changes in consumption practices and the use of pottery.

Whilst detailed analysis of vessel function is ongoing, the shape and spatial distribution of different vessel types is consistent with activities related to storage, and probable food consumption. Significantly, the presence of several bases with charred residues on their interior indicates potential use for cooking or burning associated with other activities, for example tar production, which will be examined in more detail through residue analysis. Similar evidence for cooking has been noted at other sites, for example at Çatalhöyük where residue analysis confirmed the use of pottery for food preparation,[15] and at Barcın Höyük where petrographic examination of raw materials has been framed within investigation of their suitability for different cooking methods.[16]

Pottery Fabric

Previous analysis of the raw materials within the pottery from Çukuriçi identified a narrow range of fabrics, the majority of which were compatible to the local area, and have a long history of use.[17] This work is currently being expanded by the author to form a spatial and diachronic examination of the pottery technology (forming, surface finishes, and firing) and its relationship to raw materials and typology. What is already clear from existing and new work is that unlike many other comparable Anatolian sites[18] and largely contemporaneous sites further afield such as Paliambela in Greece,[19] Çukuriçi pottery does not include organic tempering. Instead, pottery sampled in earlier work by Peloschek,[20] and more recently by the author, from Phases XII–VIII (c. 6600–5970 BCE) is dominated by mineral and rock-based pastes. The author has only identified organic temper in building materials indicating that clay pastes for structures were considered in different terms to those for pottery, although they both use the same base clay from the local area. A similar picture is presented from Menteşe Höyük and Barcın Höyük where the Neolithic pottery also doesn't appear to contain organic temper.[21]

Building on the earlier analysis of raw materials, it is clear that the Neolithic assemblage is dominated by three broad raw material groups in particular: schist-based pastes, those based on actinolite, and tremolite pastes related to asbestos and serpentinite. The choice not to use organic temper in pottery production is not only related to the different learnt practice of the Çukuriçi potters but also perhaps to the quality of the locally available raw materials they were using. It is very striking when

14 Çilingiroğlu 2010.

15 Copely et al. 2005; Pitter et al. 2013.

16 de Groot et al. 2017.

17 Peloschek 2017, 2019.

18 Ulucak: Çilingiroğlu 2012; Çatalhöyük: Akça et al. 2009; Doherty and Tarkan 2013.

19 Papadakou et al. 2015.

20 Peloschek 2017.

21 Roodenberg et al. 2003, 37; de Groot et al. 2017, 545-48.

handling vessels made in the main fabrics that the pots are very durable (also evidenced from their good state of preservation), with the exception of weaknesses at the base due to forming methods discussed below.

The new program of investigation has also shown that the choice of different raw material groups is directly related to desired vessel colour, with the schist-based paste producing red-dark brown fired pottery and the actinolite-tremolite groups producing cream-buff fired pottery. Indeed, there is evidence that potters using these pastes attempted to slip vessels to alter their colour, e.g. those producing naturally red firing pottery used slips to make light buff coloured pottery and vice versa. Such early results highlight that colour was an important element in pottery production and consumption. They also indicate that all potters didn't necessarily have access to or a desire to use the same raw materials, so adapted their practices to include slipping, this despite the local availability of clays that would naturally produce both light and dark colours without the need for this new practice.

Vessel Forming

Examination of vessel forming methods looked at breakage patterns, surface traces and the morphology of vessel walls.[22] In many cases, it was difficult to establish forming methods due to the use of burnishing, and later painted decoration, obliterating key visual evidence on vessel surfaces. However, there were examples of poorly finished pottery that provided key visual clues, in addition to characteristic orientation of voids and paste within sherds breaks and distinct undulations in vessel wall thickness. Taken together, the evidence indicates the presence of multiple hand building methods, consisting of coil, slab / flat coil, and drawing techniques, accompanied by limited evidence of paddle beating. The use of slab vs. coil techniques is evident from the vessel walls, with horizontal linear peaks and troughs in the thickness of the walls, and cracks or breaks providing evidence of relic coils, whilst the presence of finger marks show where the sides of vessels have been pinched and pulled upward after slabs and coils have formed the basic vessel shape. Other vessels displayed uneven vessel thickness in a broadly vertical or uneven fashion with distinctive pitting, more indicative of paddle beating. In examples with well-preserved vessel profiles or almost complete pots, it was possible to see that these methods were commonly used in combination.

Coiling and slab methods have been identified at a number of Neolithic sites in Anatolia, including Menteşe,[23] Ulucak Höyük,[24] Barcın Höyük,[25] Çatalhöyük,[26] and Ilıpınar,[27] alongside lesser evidence for pinching[28] and paddle and anvil techniques.[29] Indeed, the use of coil and slab pottery forming techniques in the Neolithic is well known across broad areas of the Aegean,[30] as well as in Neolithic pottery from the Near East,[31] highlighting the wide distribution of such techniques within Neolithic communities. What is notable is that at Anatolian sites, vessel construction is commonly done using a series of components put together in a similar way, suggesting a shared cognitive approach to how to make pottery.

---

22 Rye 1981.

23 Roodenberg et al. 2003.

24 Çilingiroğlu 2012, 67.

25 Gerritsen et al. 2013, 60.

26 Yalman et al. 2013, 155-6.

27 Roodenberg et al. 2003, 24-5; Yalman et al. 2013; van As and Wijen 1995.

28 Roodenberg et al. 2003.

29 Çatalhöyük and Erbaba: Özdöl 2012, 31, 54; Ulucak: Çilingiroğlu 2012, 67; Barcın Höyük: Gerritsen et al. 2013.

30 See Dimini: Hitsiou 2003; Sesklo: Pentedeka and Kotsakis 2008; Sporades / Youra: Quinn et al. 2010; Pentedeka 2015, 272.

31 For example in Late Neolithic pottery from Shir, Nieuwenhuyse et al. 2018, 13.

FIG. 7.4. Examples of disc / slab attachments to make bases with smooth unscored joins (Images: C. Burke).

At Çukuriçi Höyük, the body of a vessel was commonly formed from a pinch pot or slab / coil pot that was pulled / drawn, and / or paddled to form a basic vessel shape, onto which the base, handles and any distinct rims were subsequently added before final vessel finishing, dominantly through burnishing but later also including incised (Impresso), or painted decoration. Thankfully for us, we can reconstruct this sequence through the way in which many elements of the pottery construction have fractured, particularly in relation to bases which come in two main types. The first was either a slab or coiled base onto which the slab / coil-built walls of the vessel were added, similar to the technique used by female potting communities in parts of Africa.[32] The second base-forming method at Çukuriçi was the addition of a disk or slab to an already rounded (convex) or partially flattened base of a preformed vessel. Both of these methods do not appear to have included an attempt to cement the clay together through scoring, and the separation of the base from the rest of the vessel appears to be quite common in the assemblage (fig. 7.4).

The disk method and its attachment to rounded base surfaces indicates that vessels were not always formed on a flat surface but rather by a slab of clay being laid over a rounded object, or within a shallow pit, with convex bases at other sites being taken as evidence for the use of a mould during base forming.[33] Subsequently, the disk was likely added to provide a more stable, and perhaps thicker / heavier base, to help the vessel stand upright. Interestingly, the use of both of these methods for base manufacture are noted at other Anatolian sites such as Barcın Höyük,[34] where walls were added to a slab / coil base, and at Ulucak where the discs from bases have been found associated with a pottery production area.[35]

In many examples, rims, like bases, also appear to have been added as a separate component, although generally rims are not well articulated. In all cases, lugs and handles were attached to the vessel before burnishing and not well-embedded into the vessel wall. There are also very few examples of scoring to help cement pieces together. Indeed, the absence of many attempts to plug handles into the walls of the vessel, or to score the clay of components to be joined (for example, disc bases and handles as noted at Menteşe),[36] suggests a limited degree of knowledge about the relationship between forming and areas of potential breakage, despite these evidently being a problem. It seems pottery did not form a substantial component of the material culture of the Çukuriçi Höyük

32 Livingstone-Smith 2010, 2016.

33 Menteşe: Roodenberg et al. 2003, 25; Ulucak: Çilingiroğlu 2012, 67.

34 Gerritsen et al. 2013, 61.

35 Çilingiroğlu 2012, 67; Çevik 2016.

36 Roodenberg et al. 2003, 26.

community (as suggested by its relatively small proportions), and / or pottery may not have been regularly handled or in long term use; as such, breakage may not have been a particular concern and did not warrant experimentation with different forming and attachment techniques.

Significantly, there does not appear to be a distinctive diachronic development to the use of these different forming methods, which appear in the same phases. This would suggest the variability relates more directly to the presence of different approaches to pottery-making within one community. This contemporaneous presence of different potting traditions is also reflected in the paste recipes and raw material choices evident in the assemblage, as discussed above. Additionally, there does not appear to be a correlation between the use of particular paste recipes and forming methods; instead, multiple forming methods were used within a single paste recipe tradition. This would suggest that potting knowledge related to the choice of raw materials was dictated by colour but knowledge of forming methods was more widely shared. Indeed, it may have been that raw material procurement was undertaken by a more limited group of people whilst forming and using those materials was more widely distributed. This would suggest that pottery making was not undertaken in a standardized way, although a degree of standardization in terms of the range of shapes, colours and finish of the pottery is evident. Certainly, the presence of very similar-looking pottery at other sites suggests that communities had a shared idea of what pottery should look like.

What is notable is that when we consider the *chaîne opératoire* and *habitus* of potters at other Anatolian sites, we start to see many elements of shared practice beyond vessel shape —with forming using slab / coil techniques, vessel construction in components, particularly the distinctive addition of disc bases and building walls onto preformed bases, and the use of the same finishing methods. This suggests that the appearance of the vessels not only represents a shared cultural concept of what a pot should look like that was copied from place to place, but that potters at different sites shared elements of potting knowledge and technological *habitus* or practice. As potters learn their craft within the cultural context of what is the 'best' or 'right' way to make pottery, additionally informed by what pottery should look like in relation to how it is viewed and used by a cultural group,[37] strong similarities in multiple elements of a *chaîne opératoire* can indicate not only shared knowledge, choices and practice, but also evidence of spheres of contact and a degree of cultural coherence.[38] Indeed, recent network and similarity analysis by de Groot,[39] although not focused on technology, has shown a strong degree of correlation in terms of Neolithic pottery types and styles between sites in Western Anatolia, the Balkans and Greece, which she relates to the connectivity and the migration of people over the period.

Vessel Firing

Turning now to one of the final stages of the *chaîne opératoire* of pottery production: firing. Much of the pottery displays mottled surface colours and dark firing cores, which indicate that the pottery was fired in mixed oxidising and reducing atmospheres and that firing was a short process. It is likely that the pottery was open fired / pit fired or fired in such a way where it was not possible to control the conditions and contact with fuel, resulting in dark or black areas on vessels. The firing conditions of the pottery from Çukuriçi Höyük will be examined further using other analyses at a later stage in the analytical programme, but it is likely that firing temperatures were below 800 °C, indicated by three key features. Firstly, the presence of a burnished surface—at high temperature ranges the vitrification

37 Mauss 2009; Bourdieu 2009; Lemonnier 2002, 2; Dobres 2000.

38 Mauss 2009; Bourdieu 2009.

39 de Groot 2019.

of the ceramic would destroy the clay alignment that results in the burnished sheen, so burnished pottery is by necessity a low-fired technology. Secondly, the high degree of optical activity in many samples under the polarising light microscope indicates a low firing temperature (the higher fired a ceramic is, the more vitrified the clay paste and so the less optically active it is). Finally, the presence of calcite in some samples, which suggests a low firing temperature as calcite begins to degrade at around 750–800°C. Similarly, low firing temperature ranges have been put forward from other sites including Çatalhöyük[40] and Menteşe[41] where mottled colouration and uneven firing has also indicated some form of open firing practices. This again suggests elements of shared technological knowledge and practice between potters at different sites.

Conclusions

This brief comparative exploration of the results from Çukuriçi Höyük in relation to typological and technological studies at other sites has indicated a level of shared practice and knowledge between Neolithic potting communities in Anatolia. Some of these similarities could be explained through potters seeing pots and copying their shape and finish, whilst others seem more deeply embedded in specific learnt practices that would be more likely the result of direct learning. Notably, the strong similarities in some elements of technological practice between sites does indicate a degree of contact in terms of sharing knowledge between potting communities, alongside the similarity of pottery styles more directly related to shared consumption choices and tastes. This may suggest that although there is limited evidence for small-scale pottery movement during this time, potters themselves and / or their knowledge and practice did move. Something not so unexpected for a period where the movement of people is widely attested.[42] However, these similarities cannot be generalised, with clear evidence for more nuanced choices at the site level in terms of raw materials as well as pottery types. This is most evident when we compare Çukuriçi Höyük, Ulucak and Barcın Höyük which all broadly share pottery styles and forming methods but where potters at Çukuriçi Höyük and Barcın Höyük did not consider organic tempering as part of their *chaîne opératoire*, unlike the potters at Ulucak. Such observations give us a tentative look at possible spheres of socio-technological interaction and individual choices to adopt or reject technological practices but require a much broader study beyond that of the present paper.

What is clear is the relatively small amount of pottery in comparison to the time span of occupation, which indicates that pottery did not form a fundamental part of the material culture of the Neolithic community, particularly in the earlier phases. Despite this, the potters at Çukuriçi were well skilled in their practice from the beginning, clearly understanding the properties of the raw materials they used to produce high quality finishes and relatively durable pottery with little evidence for experimentation, with the exception of slipping.

The next stages of the analysis at Çukuriçi are to compliment the ongoing technological work with an investigation of function through residue analysis, particularly looking at the vessels that show charred residues on their interior. It is hoped that through such an integrated approach that looks at the life of the vessel from its creation through to its use and deposition, we will better understand the role of pottery at the site and more generally in comparison to others with similar analyses. The ongoing spatial analyses are also expected to reveal a better insight into household practices and

40 Franz and Ostaptchouk 2012; Camizuli 2008; Noll 1991.

41 Roodenberg et al. 2003, 27-30.

42 Hofmanová et al. 2016; Mathieson et al. 2018.

their potential differences. This integrative approach including shape, style, technology, function and spatial distribution appears promising for a better understanding of pottery in the Neolithic communities at Çukuriçi Höyük.

Acknowledgments

Thanks goes to the Çukuriçi, ERC Prehistoric Anatolia, BEAN and Ephesos teams. The Çukuriçi project was funded by the Austrian Science Fund, the European Research Council and Marie Curie ITN projects (FWF P 19859-G02; Y 528-G02; P 25825; ERC 26339; MC 289966). Additional financial support is provided by the OREA institute and the Austrian Academy of Sciences. We like to thank the Turkish authorities for permissions and the Ephesos excavations for support. The authors would particularly like to thank Lisa Bettina (née Peloschek) for access to her raw material data from Çukuriçi Höyük. Thanks also goes to Maria Röcklinger and Sabina Cvecek for their help with sorting the material and drawing, and to Bogdana Milić for advice about Turkish publications.

Bibliography

Akça, E., S. Kapur, S. Özdöl-Kutlu, I. Hodder, J. Poblome, J. Arocena, G. Kelling, and Ç. Bedestenci. 2009. "Clues of Production for the Neolithic Çatalhöyük (Central Anatolia) Pottery." *Scientific Research and Essays* 4.6: 612-25.

Bourdieu, P. 2009. Reprint. *Outline of a Theory of Practice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Brami, M.N., B. Horejs, and F. Ostmann. 2016. "The Ground Beneath their Feet: Building Continuity at Neolithic Çukuriçi Höyük." *AnatSt* 66:1-16.

Camizuli, E. 2008. "Clay Provenance of Neolithic and Chalcolithic Ceramics from Çatalhöyük (Turkey)." In *Çatalhöyük 2008 Archive Report: Çatalhöyük Research Project*, compiled by Shahina Farid 289-399. http://www.catalhoyuk.com/sites/default/files/media/pdf/Archive_Report_2008.pdf (Accessed January 2020)

Çevik, Ö. 2016. "Neolithic Pottery Production Workshop at Ulucak Höyük, Western Turkey: Evidence for a Full Production Sequence." *Antiquity* Project Gallery 90.350. https://www.antiquity.ac.uk/projgall/cevik350

Çilingiroğlu, Ç. 2010. "The Appearance of Impressed Pottery in the Neolithic Aegean and Its Implications for Maritime Networks in the Eastern Mediterranean." *TÜBA-AR* 13:9-22.

Çilingiroğlu, Ç. 2012. *The Neolithic Pottery of Ulucak in Aegean Turkey: Organization of Production, Interregional Comparisons and Relative Chronology*. BAR-IS 2426. Oxford: Archaeopress.

Copley, M.S., K.A. Clark, and R.P. Evershed. 2005. "Organic Residue Analysis of Pottery Vessels and Clay Balls." In *Changing Materialities at Çatalhöyük. Reports from the 1995-99 Seasons*, edited by I. Hodder, 169-74. BIAA Monograph Series 39. Cambridge: McDonald Institute for Archaeological Research.

de Groot, B.G. 2019. "A Diachronic Study of Networks of Ceramic Assemblage Similarity in Neolithic Western Anatolia, the Aegean and the Balkans (c. 6600-5500 BC)." *Archaeometry* 61.3:600-13.

de Groot, B., L. Thissen, R. Özbal, and F. Gerritsen. 2017. "Clay Preparation and Function of the First Ceramics in North-west Anatolia: A Case Study from Neolithic Barcın Höyük." *JAS: Reports* 16:542-52.

Dedeoğlu, F., H.H. Baysal, E. Konakçı, A. Ozan, and B. Temür. 2017. "Ekşi Höyük 2015 Yılı Kazı Çalışmaları." *KST* 38.2:389-403.

Derin, Z. 2011. "Yeşilova Höyük." In *Beginnings - New Research in the Appearance of the Neolithic between Northwest Anatolia and the Carpathian Basin. Papers of the International Workshop 8th-9th April 2009, Istanbul*, edited by R. Krauß, 95-106. Rahden, Westf.: Verlag Marie Leidorf.

Dobres, M-A. 2000. *Technology and Social Agency: Outlining a Practice Framework for Archaeology*. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.

Doherty, C., and D. Tarkan. 2013 "Pottery Production at Çatalhöyük: A Petrographic Perspective." In *Substantive Technologies at Çatalhöyük: Reports from the 2000-2008 Seasons*, edited by I. Hodder, 183-92. Çatalhöyük Project 9. BIAA Monograph Series 48. Monumenta Archaeologica 31. London / Los Angeles: British Institute of Archaeology at Ankara / Cotsen Institute of Archaeology Press.

Franz, I., and S. Ostaptchouk. 2012. "Illuminating the Pottery Production at Çatalhöyük West Mound (Turkey) Around 8000 cal. BP." In *Naturwissenschaftliche Analysen vor- und frühgeschichtlicher Keramik II. Methoden, Anwendungsbereiche, Auswertungsmöglichkeiten. Dritter und vierter internationaler Workshop für junge Wissenschaftlerinnen und Wissenschaftler in Hamburg am 13. Februar 2010 und 5. Februar 2011*, edited by B. Ramminger and O. Stilborg, 97-129. Universitätsforschungen zur prähistorischen Archäologie 216. Bonn: Habelt.

Gerritsen F.A., R. Özbal, and L.C. Thissen. 2013. "The Earliest Neolithic Levels at Barcın Höyük, Northwestern Turkey." *Anatolica* 39:53-92.

Hitsiou, E. 2003. "Production and Circulation of the Late Neolithic Pottery from Makrygialos (Phase II), Macedonia, Northern Greece." Ph.D. diss., University of Sheffield.

Hofmanová, Z., S. Kreutzer, G. Hellenthal, C. Sell, Y. Diekmann, D. Díez-del-Molino, L. van Dorp, S. López, A. Kousathanas, V. Link, K. Kirsanow, L.M. Cassidy, R. Martiniano, M. Strobel, A. Scheu, K. Kotsakis, P. Halstead, S. Triantaphyllou, N. Kyparissi-Apostolika, D. Urem-Kotsou, C. Ziota, F. Adaktylou, S. Gopalan, D.M. Bobo, L. Winkelbach, J. Blöcher, M. Unterländer, C. Leuenberger, Ç. Çilingiroğlu, B. Horejs, F. Gerritsen, S.J. Shennan, D.G. Bradley, M. Currat, K.R. Veeramah, D. Wegmann, M.G. Thomas, C. Papageorgopoulou, and J. Burger. 2016. "Early Farmers from Across Europe Directly Descended from Neolithic Aegeans." *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 113.25:6886-891.

Horejs, B. 2016. "Aspects of Connectivity on the Centre of the Anatolian Aegean Coast in 7th Millennium BC." In *Of Odysseys and Oddities: Scales and Modes of Interaction between Prehistoric Aegean Societies and their Neighbours*, edited by B.P.C. Molloy, 143-67. Sheffield Studies in Aegean Archaeology. Oxford: Oxbow.

Horejs, B. 2017. *Çukuriçi Höyük 1. Anatolia and the Aegean from the 7th to the 3rd Millennium BC.* OREA 5. Vienna: Austrian Academy of Sciences Press.

Horejs, B. 2019a. "Long and Short Revolutions towards the Neolithic in Western Anatolia and Aegean." *Documenta Praehistorica* 46:68-83.

Horejs, B. 2019b. "Migrating and Creating Social Memories: On the Arrival and Adaptation of the Neolithic in Aegean Anatolia." In *The Central / Western Anatolian Farming Frontier: Proceedings of the Neolithic Workshop held at 10th ICAANE in Vienna, April 2016*, edited by M. Brami and B. Horejs, 159-79. OREA 12. Vienna: Austrian Academy of Science Press.

Horejs, B., B. Milić, F. Ostmann, U. Thanheiser, B. Weninger, and A. Galik. 2015. "The Aegean in the Early 7th Millennium BC: Maritime Networks and Colonization." *Journal of World Prehistory* 28.4:289-330.

Karul, N., and M.B. Avcı. 2011. "Neolithic Communities in the Eastern Marmara Region: Aktopraklık C." *Anatolica* 37:1-15.

Lemonnier, P., ed. 2002. Reprint. *Technological Choices: Transformation in Material Cultures Since the Neolithic*. London: Routledge.

Leroi-Gourhan, A. 1943. *Évolution et Techniques*. Vol. 1, *L'Homme et la Matière*. Paris: Albin Michel.

Leroi-Gourhan, A. 1945. *Évolution et Techniques*. Vol. 2, *Milieu et Technique*. Paris: Albin Michel.

Livingstone Smith, A. 2010. "Pottery Tradition in Katanga (DRC): A Comparative Examination of Roughing-out Technologies." *Anthropos: International Review of Anthropology and Liguistics* 105.1:179-90.

Livingstone Smith, A. 2016. "Pottery and Politics: Making Sense of Pottery Traditions in Central Africa." *CAJ* 26.3:471-91.

Mathieson, I., S. Alpaslan-Roodenberg, C. Posth, A. Szécsényi-Nagy, N. Rohland, S. Mallick, I. Olalde, N. Broomandkhoshbacht, F. Candilio, O. Cheronet, D. Fernandes, M. Ferry, B. Gamarra, G. González Fortes, W. Haak, E. Harney, E. Jones, D. Keating, B. Krause-Kyora, I. Kucukkalipci, M. Michel, A. Mittnik, K. Nägele, M. Novak, J. Oppenheimer, N. Patterson, S. Pfrengle, K. Sirak, K. Stewardson, S. Vai, S. Alexandrov, K.W. Alt, R. Andreescu, D. Antonović, A. Ash, N. Atanassova, K. Bacvarov, M. Balázs Gusztáv, H. Bocherens, M. Bolus, A. Boroneanţ, Y. Boyadzhiev, A. Budnik, J. Burmaz, S. Chohadzhiev, N.J. Conard, R. Cottiaux, M. Čuka, C. Cupillard, D.G. Drucker, N. Elenski, M. Francken, B. Galabova, G. Ganetsovski, B. Gély, T. Hajdu, V. Handzhyiska, K. Harvati, T. Higham, S. Iliev, I. Janković, I. Karavanić, D.J. Kennett, D. Komšo, A. Kozak, D. Labuda, M. Lari, C. Lazar, M. Leppek, K. Leshtakov, D.L. Vetro, D. Los, I. Lozanov, M. Malina, F. Martini, K. McSweeney, H. Meller, M. Menđušić, P. Mirea, V. Moiseyev, V. Petrova, T.D. Price, A. Simalcsik, L. Sineo, M. Šlaus, V. Slavchev, P. Stanev, A. Starović, T. Szeniczey, S. Talamo, M. Teschler-Nicola, C. Thevenet, I. Valchev, F. Valentin, S. Vasilyev, F. Veljanovska, S. Venelinova, E. Veselovskaya, B. Viola, C. Virag, J. Zaninović, S. Zäuner, P.W. Stockhammer, G. Catalano, R. Krauß, D. Caramelli, G. Zariņa, B. Gaydarska, M. Lillie, A.G. Nikitin, I. Potekhina, A. Papathanasiou,

D. Borić, C. Bonsall, J. Krause, R. Pinhasi, and D. Reich. 2018. "The Genomic History of Southeastern Europe." *Nature* 555.7695:197-203.

Mauss, M. 2009. *Techniques, Technology and Civilisation*, edited by N. Schlanger. New York / Oxford: Durkheim Press / Berghahn Books.

Nieuwenhuyse, O.P., M. Daskiewicz, and G. Schneider. 2018. "Investigating Late Neolithic Ceramics in the Northern Levant: The View from Shir." *Levant* 52.1-2:15-33. https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/00758914.2018.1453213

Noll, W. 1991. *Alte Keramiken und ihre Pigmente: Studiern zu Material und Technologie*. Stuttgart: E. Schweizerbart'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung.

Özdöl, S. 2012. *The Development and Traditions of Pottery in the Neolithic of the Anatolian Plateau: Evidence from Çatalhöyük, Süberde and Erbaba*. BAR-IS 2439. Oxford: Archaeopress.

Papadakou, T., D. Urem-Kotsou, and K. Kotsakis. 2015. "Early Neolithic Pottery from Paliambela Kolindrou." *To Archaeologiko Ergo sti Makedonia kai sti Thraki* 25:157-62.

Peloschek, L. 2017. "Social Dynamics and Development of New Pottery Signatures at Çukuriçi Höyük, 7th to 3rd Millenium BCE." In *Çukuriçi Höyük 1. Anatolia and the Aegean from the 7th to the 3rd Millennium BCE*, edited by B. Horejs, 125-37. OREA 5. Vienna: Austrian Academy of Science Press.

Peloschek, L. 2019. "Marble-tempered Ware in 3rd Millennium BC Anatolia." In *Pottery Technologies and Sociocultural Connections between the Aegean and Anatolia during the 3rd Millenium BC*, edited by E. Alram-Stern and B. Horejs, 63-76. OREA 10. Vienna: Austrian Academy of Science Press.

Pentedeka, A. 2015. "Technological and Provenance Study of the Visviki Magoula Ceramic Assemblage." In *Visviki Magoula / Velestino: Die deutschen Grabungen des Jahres 1941*, edited by E. Alram-Stern, A. Dousougli-Zachos, and H. Hauptmann, 222-97. Beiträge zur ur- und frühgeschichtlichen Archäologie des Mittelmeer-Kulturraumes 36. Bonn: Rudolf Habelt Verlag.

Pentedeka A., and K. Kotsakis. 2008. "Thin Sectioning Neolithic Identities: The Red Monochrome Ware (A1) from Middle Neolithic Sesklo, Thessaly." In *Proceedings of the 4th Symposium on Archaeometry of the Hellenic Society of Archaeometry, National Hellenic Research Foundation, Athens, 28-31 May 2003*, edited by Y. Facorellis, N. Zacharias, and K. Polikreti, 305-11. BAR-IS 1746. Oxford: Archaeopress.

Pitter, S., N. Yalman, and R. Evershed. 2013. "Absorbed Lipid Residues in the Çatalhöyük Pottery." In *Substantive Technologies at Çatalhöyük: Reports from the 2000-2008 Seasons*, edited by I. Hodder, 189-196. Çatalhöyük Project 9. BIAA Monograph Series 48. Monumenta Archaeologica 31. London / Los Angeles: British Institute at Ankara / Cotsen Institute of Archaeology Press.

Quinn, P., P. Day, V. Kilikoglou, E. Faber, S. Katsarou-Tzeveleki, and A. Sampson. 2010. "Keeping an Eye on your Pots: The Provenance of Neolithic Ceramics from the Cave of the Cyclops, Youra, Greece." *JAS* 37.5:1042-52.

Reingruber, A., Z. Tsirtsoni, and P. Nedelcheva, eds. 2017. *Going West? The Dissemination of Neolithic Innovations between the Bosporus and the Carpathians. Proceedings of the EAA Conference, Istanbul, 11 September 2014*. London: Routledge.

Roodenberg, J., A. van As, L. Jacobs, and M.H. Wijnen. 2003. "Early Settlement in the Plain of Yenişehir (NW Anatolia): The Basal Occupation Layers at Menteşe." *Anatolica* 29:17-59.

Russel, N., and J.L. Griffiths. 2013. "Çatalhöyük Worked Bone: South and 4040 Areas." In *Substantive Technologies at Çatalhöyük: Reports from the 2000-2008 Seasons*, edited by I. Hodder, 277-306. Çatalhöyük Project 9. BIAA Monograph Series 48. Monumenta Archaeologica 31. London / Los Angeles: British Institute at Ankara / Cotsen Institute of Archaeology Press.

Rye, O.S. 1981. *Pottery Technology: Principles and Reconstruction*. Manuals on Archaeology 4. Washington D.C.: Taraxacum.

Sağlamtimur, H. 2012. "The Neolithic Settlement of Ege Gübre." In *The Neolithic in Turkey*. Vol. 4, *Western Turkey*, edited by M. Özdoğan, N. Başgelen, and P. Kuniholm, 197-225. Istanbul: Archaeology and Art Publications.

van As, A., and M.H. Wijen. 1995. "The Neolithic and Chalcolithic Pottery from Ilıpınar's Phases X-V: A Technological Study." In *The Ilıpınar Excavations I. Five Seasons of Fieldwork in NW Anatolia, 1987-91*, edited by J. Roodenberg, 77-107. Uitgaven van het Nederlands Historisch-Archaeologisch Instituut te Istanbul 72. Istanbul: Nederlands Historisch-Archaeologisch Instituut te Istanbul.

Yalman, N., D. Tarkan, and H. Gültekin. 2013. "The Neolithic Pottery of Çatalhöyük: Recent Studies." In *Substantive Technologies at Çatalhöyük: Reports from the 2000-2008 Seasons*, edited by I. Hodder, 147-82. Çatalhöyük Project 9. BIAA Monograph Series 48. Monumenta Archaeologica 31. London / Los Angeles: British Institute at Ankara / Cotsen Institute of Archaeology Press.

kuyayinlari
kuyayinlari
kocuniversitesiyayinlari
www.press.ku.edu.tr

ISBN 978-605-7685-69-8

KUP

$80