Assembling Çatalhöyük

Edited by Ian Hodder and Arkadiusz Marciniak

Themes in Contemporary Archaeology

Series Editors:
Professor Kristian Kristiansen, *University of Gothenburg, Sweden*
Professor Eszter Banffy, *German Archaeological Institute, Frankfurt, Germany*
Professor Cyprian Broodbank, *University of Cambridge, UK*

Themes in Contemporary Archaeology provides cutting edge summaries of areas of debate in current archaeological enquiry, with a particular emphasis on European archaeology. The series has a broad coverage, encompassing all periods and archaeological disciplines from theoretical debate to statistical analysis and three-dimensional imaging. The multi-author volumes are based on selected sessions from the well-regarded annual conference of the European Association of Archaeologists.

Forthcoming Volumes:
Volume 2: Tripolye: Megasites and European Prehistory

E
A European Association
A *of* Archaeologists
A

The European Association of Archaeologists (EAA) is the association for all professional archaeologists of Europe and beyond. The EAA has around 2200 members from 60 countries world-wide working in prehistory, classical, medieval, and later archaeology.

The EAA aims
* to promote the development of archaeological research and the exchange of archaeological information
* to promote the management and interpretation of the European archaeological heritage
* to promote proper ethical and scientific standards for archaeological work
* to promote the interests of professional archaeologists in Europe
* to promote co-operation with other organisations with similar aims.

Maney Publishing delivers personalised service to authors, societies, readers, and libraries for the publishing and international dissemination of high quality, peer-reviewed scholarship and research. Maney is committed to technical and editorial innovation combined with traditional values of quality and collaboration. Maney's portfolio includes more than 170 scholarly journals, most published in partnership with societies, universities, and institutes. Maney's transition from printing to publishing grew out of long-standing professional relationships with learned societies and academic bodies, built on our capacity for listening closely and responding to societies' publishing needs.

Maney
Publishing

Cover image(s): *Left*: Ochre hand prints on the north wall of Building 77; *Middle*: Bucrania and horned bench associated with the northeast platform of Building 77 (both taken from Taylor pp. 127–50, this volume); *Right*: The incised panel above burial 327 in TP Area (taken from Marciniak et al., pp. 151–66, this volume).

Contents

Introduction

Assembling the Archaeological Process at Çatalhöyük

ARKADIUSZ MARCINIAK

The archaeological process today is more complicated and heterogeneous than ever before. A wide range of new types of data are being introduced and these are responsible for the production of different types of knowledge. This knowledge no longer conforms to universal and abstracts epistemic standards. In particular, a claim by logical positivists and empiricists believing in the uniformity of empirical evidence and epistemic procedures free of nonepistemic influences is to be rejected. In these circumstances, a 'much richer, more dimensional and hybrid model of scientific practice and its product is needed' (Wylie, 2002a: 10).

Almost all contemporary archaeological projects mobilize a range of datasets and have some form of interdisciplinary endeavor. However, an in-depth understanding of the process of assembling different categories of material culture in the inference process has not yet been achieved. Theoretical underpinnings of these studies remain unexplored and links to dedicated case studies have been limited. This is particularly worrisome in a period of rapid incorporation of new data-to-become-evidence in archaeological practice. Many of these new forms of data have been generated by the dynamically developing archaeological sciences. As a result, an increasingly heterogeneous and idiosyncratic archaeological practice has emerged, which is part and parcel of contemporary archaeology. The heterogeneity applies to different aspects, such as assembling research teams, recording and documenting numerous datasets, and interpreting and interlinking diverse facets of the past.

Conceptualizing the very nature of the archaeological process as it assembles and consumes the results of analyses of ever increasing categories of data, produced by a wide of range of disciplines and undertaken within the realms of their own theoretical traditions, is an ongoing challenge for archaeology. The notion of 'assemblage' appears to be very useful in achieving these goals. Recent decades have witnessed a range of interesting proposals intended to conceptualize the complex nature of archaeological practice. The conjunctive approach of Walter Taylor, Wylie's 'cables and tacking', Latour's Actor Network Theory, Peirce's semiotics, Knappett's network theory or Hodder's entanglement theory provide examples that bear on the idea of assembling. When applied in archaeology, they facilitated a better understanding of large and complex datasets, operating at a micro- and supra-regional or diachronic scale.

These archaeological applications neither capture all diverse facets of the heterogeneous nature of archaeological practice nor are their applications comprehensive enough to take these different manifestations into consideration. While archaeological projects usually mobilize different datasets, they are often limited in scope and character. They rely upon a limited number of categories of potentially useful data, while others, mobilized to meet requirements of the genre of interdisciplinary studies, are only mentioned in passing, if at all, and treated superficially. In other instances, studies choose to focus only upon a restricted portion of their otherwise-rich heuristic potential, be it materiality, symbolism, monumentality or visuality, to pick up a few (see Marciniak, 2006).

The heuristic potential of different categories of data is not universal and straightforward. The meanings of objects are not only created in the conventional relation between the sign and its reference but through relations generated by the sign. Hence, its meaning is given in relation to other items constituting a cluster of objects that make an assemblage. Hence, the semiosis of any category of data in the ongoing process of contextualization and entextualization (transformation of objects into categories of objects and their types) (Preucel, 2006) is neither firm nor fixed. Furthermore, this meaning is subjected to change throughout the object's own 'life history'. Hence, any assemblage is made of objects at different phases in their life histories and hence ascribed different meanings. Accordingly, the assemblage is some kind topical entity where different syntactic, semiotic, and ideological transformations are taking place.

Scientific procedures applied in archaeology are often portrayed in the form of a hermeneutic circle. As pointed out by Wylie (2002b: 205) archaeologists should systematically exploit disunities 'that permit on many levels among scientific fields and theories' and their idiosyncrasy needs to be stressed in the context of the inference process. As this is not a viciously circular process, it is necessary to define the conditions of both justified and satisfactory interruption of this inferential-hermeneutic circle. In general, inference in archaeology needs to be defined both as the movement back and forth between theory and data and a series of inferential steps. These two modes should be viewed as complementary and not contradictory to each other.

Strategies of hypothesis formation involve exploitation of 'multiple strands and diverse types of evidence, data, hunches, and arguments' (Bernstein, 1983: 69). In playing back and forth between theories offered by sociology or anthropology, analogies, and constraints offered by archaeological data, archaeological inference should seek substantive coherence (Hodder, 1999: 43). Evidential claims provide both security (what is most plausible and what is not) and independence (a separate line of reasoning and justification). There are different dimensions of security depending upon the kind of evidence used and scale of phenomena studied. Wylie (2002b) defined three types of security in archaeological assessments of evidential claims: (i) a freedom from doubt regarding the linkages between archaeological data and the antecedents that produced them, (ii) security that arises because of the overall length and complexity of the linkages involved and (iii) the degree of determinism allocated to the linkages involved.

Archaeologists commonly refer to various scales and resolutions of studied phenomena. They usually require carefully selected types of material culture, variables, and methods of analysis. They also define the way in which these materials are sampled. This implies that there are no 'objective' results of various techniques and the use of science as such does not stand for objectivity. There is no single set of procedures universally applicable. Hence, it is necessary to recognize interdependencies between a wide range of scales at which prehistoric processes operate, and the variability and multidimensionality of material culture. It is then necessary to conceptualize convergences and divergences between various categories of data to avoid the situation in which some datasets are mobilized for supporting some theoretical stances but do not match up in relation to other categories of data (see Johnson, 2006). Furthermore, it is necessary to reflect on how empirical evidence constrains reconstructive claims about the past and what is the degree of epistemic independence in this process.

An inseparable element of the heterogeneous character of the archaeological process is the emergence of the dynamically growing archaeological sciences. They have often become a self-contained academic enterprise, largely disentangled from the main body of archaeology. Mutual understanding has rarely been deep, and both camps rather misrepresent and even caricaturize each other rather than elaborate the thoroughly grounded foundations for a mutual cooperation. Such foundations should include issues such as the sources and limits of knowledge, differences in ways of gathering and assessing evidence, problems of perceptual knowledge, or the role of experience and reasoning in knowledge acquiring.

The archaeological process operating at different levels can be described as 'heterogeneous assemblages of things – objects such as tools and furnaces, but also institutions, places, humans, social groups, rules, metaphors, rituals, and abstractions' (Hodder, 2012: 44). In particular, the assembling process refers to (a) different datasets used to address a wide range of issues pertaining to the past, (b) different modes of recording, documenting and managing datasets, and (c) assembling people and things in researching the past and communicating it to the general public.

The book aims to address these concerns by discussing the experience of the multiscalar and multifaceted research process at the Neolithic settlement in Çatalhöyük in Central Anatolia. The chapters show how to build a robust argument that expands the understanding of different aspects of Çatalhöyük and its people. They attempt to explore to what extent a proposed hypothesis is consistent with all the lines of evidence that are constructed using diverse sources. Disparate datasets are then seen as converging to allow for a highly contextualized analysis of different facets of these groups, which are weaved from multiple threads of biological and social data at the same time. The volume shows that it is possible to find greatest resolution in our understanding of these aspects when we consider multi-disciplinary evidence and approaches from the archaeological record. In more general context, it attempts to make the creation and presentation of archaeological knowledge explicit.

This volume thus has a number of purposes. At one level it reports on the exciting new discoveries and advances that are being made in the understanding of the 9000-year-old Neolithic site of Çatalhöyük. The site has long been central to debates about early village societies and the formation of 'mega-sites' in the Middle East. The current long-term project has made many advances in our understanding of the site that impact on our wider understanding of the Neolithic and its spread into Europe from the Middle East. These advances concern the use of the environment, climate change, subsistence practices, social and economic organization, the role of religion, ritual, and symbolism. The chapters assemble data from cultural,

social, biological and environmental realms in order to deal with key issues in the growth of the large agricultural village at Çatalhöyük and its transformation over time. At another level, the volume reports on methodological advances that have been made by team members, including the development of reflexive methods, paperless recording on site, the integrated use of 3D visualization, and interactive archives. The long-term nature of the project allows these various innovations to be evaluated and critiqued. In particular, the volume includes analyses of the social networks that underpin the assembling of data, and documents the complex ways in which arguments are built within quickly transforming alliances and allegiances within the team.

The Çatalhöyük Research Project is one of the most comprehensive and complex archaeological projects in contemporary archaeology. For more than 20 years the wide range of types of data have been collected and studied by a group of ca. 160 researchers representing 34 different specialisms. There have been attempts at inter-disciplinary collaboration and the assembling of strong arguments on the basis of multiple lines of evidence. Project members seek lines of connection between different datasets. When three to four different sets of data align, unexpectedly robust arguments can be built, but the different forms of data can also create dissonance that has to be resolved. The project epitomizes the current condition of archaeology, where research undertakings are no longer carried out within the realms of national traditions but assemble people from different traditions of training and practice.

The Çatalhöyük Research Project is directed by Ian Hodder of Stanford University. Since 1995, a number of excavation teams started excavating a number of areas of the mound and on the adjacent Early Chalcolithic mound, Çatalhöyük West. The core excavation team from University of Cambridge and Stanford University was later joined by independent groups from the University of California at Berkeley, the University of Thessaloniki, the Universities of Poznań and Gdańsk as well as three Turkish teams representing Istanbul University, Selçuk University and the University of Thrace at Edirne. On the Chalcolithic West Mound, the excavation works were carried out by a University of Cambridge and University of Buffalo team. In addition, different contract and professional archaeologists from different countries participated in the excavations.

In addition to the various excavation teams, an integral element of the project are the largely independent teams of specialists working at the site during the entire season and co-operating with the excavators on a daily basis. The organization of the different laboratories has varied considerably, from highly centralized structures, to more loosely organized entities. Over the years, the leaders of teams of specialists have changed, inevitably leading to modification of analytical procedures. Further modifications have been required as a result of the gradual accumulation of experience and changes of research questions.

An explicit methodology was defined prior to commencement of fieldwork not only to carry out the project's objectives, but also to confront 'the challenge of introducing multivocality and reflexivity in the laboratory and trench', as formulated by Hodder (2000). This new approach included: (a) priority tours aimed at discussions between the laboratory and field staff, (b) interpretive approaches to sampling strategies, (c) co-operation of specialists at the site, (d) quick feedback by the laboratory staff to the field staff, (e) interactive database available on and off the site, (f) the writing of a diary to enhance a fluid and flexible data, (g) video recording, (h) presence of social anthropologists studying the construction of knowledge at the site, and (i) hypertext solutions to challenge the linearity of archaeological narratives and allowing accounts with multiple pathways and multimedia.

The chapters in this volume cover two major dimensions of the assembling in the project: (i) recording and documentation, and (ii) interpretation of the Neolithic past. The former comprises the challenges of a continuous catching up with ever emerging technological innovations and exponentially increasing number of archaeological data. The latter covers three intertwined aspects of life at the settlement: (a) social practices and lifestyles, (b) house and household, and (c) long-term changes and landscape exploitation.

The book opens with the chapter by Ian Hodder presenting different theoretical underpinnings for the notion of assemblage. It underlines the nature and practice of the collaboration between different specialisms present in the Çatalhöyük project. Through the process of interlacing and braiding across and between domains within evanescent networks of various types, a solid and well-grounded knowledge about the Neolithic past is achieved.

Three chapters in the volume address the character of assembling in recording and documentation. Claudia Engel and Karl Grossner address the intrinsic difficulties in any large-scale project of integrating new digital methods into the long-term documentation of the archaeological process. They advocate geo-visualization and Linked Open Data as efficient means of facilitating long-term, collaborative, multivocal knowledge creation. In the chapter by Allison Mickel and Elijah Meeks the character of the social interactions, politics, and production of knowledge in the project, as a form of assemblage of researchers representing wide-ranging disciplinary traditions, is discussed. The authors explore the ways in which

team members are linked to each other by participating in diverse research groups and co-authoring excavation records and reports. These conditions enable the flow of data and the production of multi-disciplinary knowledge about the past. The challenges of recording a wide range of data and their subsequent interpretation are addressed in the chapter by Maurizio Forte, Nicolo' Dell'Unto, Kristina Jonsson, and Nicola Lercari. The authors advocate the application of 3D models as a qualitatively new means of managing, visualizing, and querying a wide range of archaeological data that significantly enhances the archaeological process. They not only serve to advance inferential methods of interpretation but more importantly enhance their meta-interpretation.

Multi-disciplinary evidence and approaches to social practices and lifestyles at Çatalhöyük are addressed in three chapters. Joshua W. Sadvari, Christina Tsoraki, Lilian Dogiama, and Christopher J. Knüsel discuss the socioeconomic roles of the sexes at Çatalhöyük through the integration of data about people, objects, and practices in a single study. They investigate them by assembling data about human skeletal remains, ground stone, and projectile point assemblages, in addition to selected wall paintings and figurines. Bodily concerns and preoccupations are also addressed by Jessica Pearson, Lynn Meskell, Carolyn Nakamura, and Clark Spencer Larsen as they assemble evidence from stable isotope analysis and physical anthropology and bodily representation through figurines and in the burial assemblage. A wide range of datasets, including human remains, figurines, art and architecture, and burial assemblages, have made it possible to build up a more robust evidentiary basis for the identification of embodied practices at Çatalhöyük. Gender roles at the settlement are also addressed by Sabrina Agarwal, Patrick Beauchesne, Bonnie Glencross, Clark Spencer Larsen, Lynn Meskell, Carolyn Nakamura, Jessica Pearson, and Joshua W. Sadvari. By mobilizing different social and biological data, such as human remains and material culture in the form of figurines, the authors offer a more synergistic representation of sexual difference and division of labor for the individual and community in the Neolithic.

Another block of three chapters builds a robust argument that expands the understanding of different aspects of house and household at Çatalhöyük. The changing social standing of the house through time is addressed by Tristan Carter, Scott Haddow, Nerissa Russell, Amy Bogaard, and Christina Tsoraki. The authors address various activities associated with the foundation of a Çatalhöyük house, such as the deposition of the body parts of different animals, the deposition of fragmentary human remains, clay figurines, pieces of crystal, or pigment stained stone. The cycle of house construction, use and abandonment

from the architectonical standpoint is addressed in the chapter by Marek Barański, Aroa García-Suárez, Arkadiusz Klimowicz, Serena Love, and Kamilla Pawłowska. The architectural perspective is advocated as a complex process in which experience and technical skills played a major role. These variables were recognized by studying the house architecture, micro-geomorphology and clay procurement and use. A fine-grained analysis of a single house is provided in the chapter by James Taylor and co-authors. It aims at linking stratigraphic temporal data to spatial data, involving an innovative articulation of space and time within the structure of a Geographic Information System (GIS). The chapter offers a large number of visualizations exploring details of the lifecycle of one of the distinct dwelling structures.

Diverse datasets converged to allow for a highly-contextualized analysis of social changes and landscape exploitation at Çatalhöyük, as presented in three other chapters. Arkadiusz Marciniak, Eleni Asouti, Chris Doherty, and Elizabeth Henton in their chapter aim at explicitly testing a hypothesis regarding the emergence of the autonomous household in the Late Neolithic. Diverse datasets, such as settlement layout, clay, wood charcoal, and animal bones, were investigated to address different dimensions of the functioning of the community at the end of Çatalhöyük's occupation. Another dimension of landscape exploitation is discussed by Joshua W. Sadvari, Michael Charles, Christopher Ruff, Tristan Carter, Milena Vasić, Clark Spencer Larsen, Daniella Bar-Yosef Mayer, and Chris Doherty. The authors investigate the complex web of factors influencing mobility patterns as evidenced by the human skeletal remains, pottery, chipped stone, shell bead, and stone bead datasets. The final chapter by Serap Özdöl-Kutlu, Tristan Carter, Lech Czerniak, Arkadiusz Marciniak aims at understanding developments in the final centuries of the settlement occupation of the East Mound in the context of the Anatolian plateau as well as western and northwestern Anatolia. They use multiple datasets from Çatalhöyük and other Anatolian settlements concerning spatial organization, patterns of architecture, burial practices, chipped stone, and pottery manufacture to reveal the character of the Çatalhöyük community shortly before it was abandoned.

REFERENCES

Bernstein, R.J. 1983. *Beyond Objectivism and Relativism. Science, Hermeneutics, and Praxis*. Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Hodder, I. 1999. *The Archaeological Process. An Introduction*. Oxford and Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Hodder, I. 2000. Developing a Reflexive Methodology in Archaeology. In: I. Hodder, ed. *Towards Reflexive*

Method in Archaeology: The Example at Çatalhöyük. Cambridge: McDonald Institute for Archaeological Research, pp. 3–14.

Hodder, I. 2012. *Entangled. An Archaeology of the Relationship between Humans and Things*. Oxford and Malden, MA: Willey-Blackwell.

Johnson, M. 2006. *On the Nature of Theoretical Archaeology and Archaeological Theory*. Paper presented at the 71st Annual Meeting of Society for American Archaeology in Puerto Rico.

Marciniak, A. 2006. Theorizing Archaeological Practice. An Outline. *Archaeologia Polona*, 44:41–52.

Preucel, R. W. 2006. *Archaeological Semiotics*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.

Wylie, A. 2002a. Introduction. Philosophy from the Ground up. In: A. Wylie, ed. *Thinking from Things. Essays in the Philosophy of Archaeology*. Berkeley, Los Angeles & London: University of California Press, pp. 1–24.

Wylie, A. 2002b. Rethinking Unity as a 'Working Hypothesis' for Philosophy of Science. How Archaeologies Exploit the Disunities of Science. In: A. Wylie, ed. *Thinking from Things. Essays in the Philosophy of Archaeology*. Berkeley, Los Angeles & London: University of California Press, pp. 200–210.