Preliminary report on the forth season of the Konya-Ereğli Survey (KEYAR) 2016

Çiğdem Maner

Electronic version

URL: <http://journals.openedition.org/anatoliaantiqua/451>

DOI: 10.4000/anatoliaantiqua.451

Publisher

IFEA

Printed version

Date of publication: 1 May 2017

Number of pages: 95-113

ISBN: 978-2-36245-066-2

ISSN: 1018-1946

Electronic reference

Çiğdem Maner, « Preliminary report on the forth season of the Konya-Ereğli Survey (KEYAR) 2016 », *Anatolia Antiqua* [Online], XXV | 2017, Online since 01 May 2019, connection on 19 December 2020.

URL : <http://journals.openedition.org/anatoliaantiqua/451> ; DOI : <https://doi.org/10.4000/anatoliaantiqua.451>

ANATOLIA ANTIQUA ESKİ ANADOLU

XXV

INSTITUT FRANÇAIS D'ETUDES ANATOLIENNES GEORGES-DUMEZIL
CNRS USR 3131
DE BOCCARD
2017

TABLE DES MATIERES

N. Pinar ÖZGÜNER et Geoffrey D. SUMMERS

The Çevre Kale Fortress and the outer enclosure on the Karacadağ at Yaraşlı 1

Abuzer KIZIL et Asil YAMAN

A group of transport amphorae from the territorium of Ceramus: Typological observations 17

Tülin TAN

The hellenistic tumulus of Eşenköy in NW Turkey 33

Emre TAŞTEMÜR

Glass pendants in Tekirdağ and Edirne Museums 53

Liviu Mihail IANCU

Self-mutilation, multiculturalism and hybridity. Herodotos on the Karians in Egypt (Hdt. 2.61.2) 57

CHRONIQUES DES TRAVAUX ARCHEOLOGIQUES EN TURQUIE 2016

Erhan BIÇAKÇI, Martin GODON et Ali Metin BÜYÜKKARAKAYA, Korhan ERTURAÇ,

Catherine KUZUCUOĞLU, Yasin Gökhan ÇAKAN, Alice VINET

Les fouilles de Tepecik-Çiftlik et les activités du programme Melendiz préhistorique, campagne 2016 71

Çiğdem MANER

Preliminary report on the forth season of the Konya-Ereğli Survey (KEYAR) 2016 95

Sami PATACI et Ergün LAFLI

Field surveys in Ardahan in 2016 115

Erkan KONYAR, Bülent GENÇ, Can AVCI et Armağan TAN

The Van Tuşpa Excavations 2015-2016 127

Martin SEYER, Alexandra DOLEA, Kathrin KUGLER, Helmut BRÜCKNER et Friederike STOCK

The excavation at Limyra/Lycia 2016: Preliminary report 143

Abuzer KIZIL, Koray KONUK, Sönmez ALEMDAR, Laurent CAPDETREY, Raymond DESCAT,

Didier LAROCHE, Enora LE QUERE, Francis PROST et Baptiste VERGNAUD

Eurômos : rapport préliminaire sur les travaux réalisés en 2016 161

O. HENRY et D. LÖWENBORG, Fr. MARCHAND-BEAULIEU, G. TUCKER, A. FREJMAN,

A. LAMESA, Chr. BOST, B. VERGNAUD, I. STOJANOVITC, N. CARLESS-UNWINN,

N. SCHIBILLE, Ö.D. ÇAKMAKLI, E. ANDERSSON

Labraunda 2016 187

**CHRONIQUES DES TRAVAUX ARCHEOLOGIQUES
EN TURQUIE
2016**

Çiğdem MANER*

PRELIMINARY REPORT ON THE FORTH SEASON OF THE KONYA-EREĞLİ SURVEY (KEYAR)¹ 2016

The KEYAR survey project began in 2013 with the intention to fill in a gap of underinvestigated provinces of the greater Konya region. The south-eastern corner, which encloses the provinces of Karapınar, Ereğli, Emirgazi and Halkapınar are investigated in this survey project². The survey focuses on the investigation of Bronze and Iron Age sites, which is a great challenge, as the area comprises different geographies, such as the fertile Konya plain, the slopes of the Bolkar Mountains, the Karacadağ and Arısama Mountains and an area which consists of sand hills, dried out lakes and small conical volcanic hills. The results of the survey so far indicate that this diverse geography has led to different types and locations of settlements during the Bronze and Iron Ages in this region, namely *höyük* settlements, slope settlements, hilltop settlements and fortified settlements (fortresses). The survey region lies on important crossroads, which is reflected in the material culture. I am grateful to the Ministry of Culture and Tourism Directorate of Antiquities and Museums of the Republic of Turkey for granting us the permission to investigate this very important part of Anatolia.

The forth field season of the KEYAR survey project took place from June 20th until June 30th 2016. Sinan Durmuş from the Museum of Anatolian Civilizations in Ankara joined as the representative of the fourth field season. The survey team consisted of Muhip Çarkı (Phd candidate at Koç University, Department of Archaeology and History of Art), Müslim Demir (Master student at Ömer Halis Demir Üniversitesi, Geological Engineering), Murat Erün (Photographer and documentarist), Doç. Dr. Ali Gürel (Ömer Halis Demir Üniversitesi, Geological Engineering), Gülgün Gürcan (Archaeologist and amateur spelologist), Dr. Emre Kuruçayırılı (Archaeologist and amateur spelologist), Dr. Catherine Kuzu-

cuoğlu (CNRS), and Yiğit Pekzeren and Batuhan Kuru both undergraduate students of Koç University Department of Archaeology and History of Art. Mrs. Sadiye Kaya has been our devoted driver since 2013. I am much obliged to the entire team for their hard and meticulous work and our *temsilci*, who was of great help with every problem we faced. I am grateful to my colleagues in the Directorate of Antiquities and Museums for their immense help, the Ereğli Museum director Mahmut Altuncan, the governor of Ereğli Lütfü Ömer Yaran, the mayor of Ereğli Özkan Özgüven, the former governor of Halkapınar Erdal Çetinbaş, the mayor of Halkapınar Fahri Vardar, the former governor of Emirgazi Saadettin Doğan and all the regional *jandarma* units. The *muhtars* of Karaören: Halil Sert, Gölören: Necati Uğurlu, Ekizli: Mukavip Erdem, Işıklar: Bayram Şenol Döleker, Oymalı: Mustafa Yılman and İvriz: Cumali Yurter were immense help in understanding and investigating the regions. The survey is financed by Koç University's Faculty of Social Sciences and Humanities. I would like to thank especially my dean Prof. Ahmet İçduydu and Prof. İrşadi Aksun Vice President of Research and Development for their unceasing support. I am also grateful to our sponsors and supporters: AVIS, Akmed, Özkoçlar Otel and Derya Lokantası. Lastly, I must thank every single person who provided us with a glass of water, ayran, çay, gazoz, fruits, food and a place in the shade to rest.

2016 SEASON: OBJECTIVES AND METHODOLOGIES

This season was divided into five work units: a) archaeological survey, b) collecting an assemblage of pottery from previously investigated sites (2013-2015 seasons), c) survey and investigation of the

* Koç University, Department of Archaeology and History of Art, cmaner@ku.edu.tr

1) KEYAR: Konya Ereğli Yüzey Araştırması, Konya Ereğli Survey Project.

2) For research history please see Maner 2014, 2015, 2016.

cave in Ambarderesi in İvriz, d) palaeoenvironmental research survey in Adabağ and e) public outreach.

The archaeological survey aims to locate and systematically survey Bronze and Iron Age settlements in the region mentioned. Since 2015 it has been coupled with a geophysical survey³ and since 2016 with a geomorphological survey. The goal is to locate ancient sites with the help of remote sensing, information from locals, oral history, maps and Hittite texts. Of particular importance for the project are the two, treaties between Hattushili III and Ulmi Teshup and Tuthaliya IV and Kurunta, since these define the frontiers of Tarhuntassa and Hatti, which cuts across the area we cover.⁴

Detailed records are made of the ancient settlements (site sketches, photographs, drone images if the weather condition allows it, sketch of pottery collection units, GPS points, google map images). The region is extremely windy and even at the best of times it is difficult to take drone images. The few images which could be shot are due to meticulous and steady work of Murat Erün. From 2013-2015 collecting pottery from archaeological sites and taking it for further study to the university was restricted. This regulation was changed by the Directorate of Antiquities and Museums for the 2016 field season.

Generally, the pottery is collected within sample units. The top of the *höyük* is collected separately, the slopes and the area around is divided into sample units. The pottery is photographed on the site and a small assemblage representing the Bronze and Iron Ages was taken with the permission of the Ereğli Museum to Koç University for further analyses and studies. However, during the 2017 field season they have to taken back to the sample area they were collected. During the first three days of the 2016 field season we collected representative assemblages from Ereğli Karahöyük, Zencirli Höyük, Akhüyük, Eskişla Dikilli Taş Mevkii, İbizlik Kalesi Ören Yeri and Çiller Höyük (Map 1), which are some of the most important sites of the region, representing Bronze to Iron Age settlement sequences. The shards will be returned to the site during the 2017 field season.

An important study was conducted in Ambarderesi in İvriz by Kuruçayırılı, Gürcan and Çarkı, who in-

vestigated the cave across the Neo Hittite relief and also prepared plans of the cave. The cave hasn't been previously investigated and the plans of it included here are the first to be published. The palaeoenvironmental research survey was conducted by Dr. Catherine Kuzucuoğlu, Dr. Ali Gürel and Müslüm Demir from 21 to 27 June 2016 in the marshes of Akgöl in Adabağ. One of the objectives is to identify spots possibly containing the sediment records capable of delivering time-controlled and high resolution palaeoenvironmental records (Fig. 1). Every season we are trying to combine our archaeological field work with communal work to enhance the notion of heritage protection. In 2016 we organized an exhibition in the Ereğli Museum with photos taken by Jospheine Powell and a class on Anatolian archaeology at YBO (Yatılı Bölge Okulu) in Halkapınar. The following section provides a detailed introduction to the surveyed sites and investigated regions investigated.

REGIONS AND SETTLEMENTS INVESTIGATED AND SURVEYED IN 2016

For the 2016 field season, three regions were selected, which comprise districts within the borders of the provinces of Karapınar, Emirgazi and Halkapınar. Investigations in Emirgazi and Halkapınar had begun in 2014 and the survey of Karapınar started during this field season. Certain sites in Karapınar had been surveyed previously by (in chronological order) James Mellaart⁵, Semih Güneri⁶ and Hasan Bahar⁷. The sites the KEYAR team surveyed in Karapınar (which are listed below N° 56, 57, 58, 59, 61 - see also Table 1) have been also surveyed by Güneri and Bahar.

In the 2016 field season the districts (*mahalle*) of Yeni Kesmez⁸, Oymalı, Yağmapınar, Yeşilyurt, Gölören, Işıklar, Karaören, Meşeli, Ekizli on the Karacadağ were investigated. A systematical survey in the region of the dry Hotamış lake was conducted which include the districts of Hotamış, Küçükkaşlama and Ortaoba. In Halkapınar the cave in Ambarderesi and the İvriz castle were investigated and surveyed. In total seven new sites were registered (Table 1, Map 1), which are explained in detail below.

3) The geophysical survey could not be continued in 2016 as the team of Dr. Ercan Erkul from Kiel University was not able to come due to political reasons.

4) For the treaties see: Otten 1988 and Beckmann 1996: 103-118.

5) Mellaart 1963.

6) Güneri 1989, 1990: 324.

7) Bahar 2002, Bahar and Koçak 2004, Bahar and Küçükbezi 2012: 105-106.

8) Eski Kesmez is located on the slopes of Karacadağ, the survey of Eski Kesmez will be conducted in 2017.

Table 1

Settlement Number	Settlement Name	Province and District	Altitude (m)
56	Sırnık Höyük	Karapınar, Hotamış	1029
57	Eşektepesi Höyük	Karapınar, Ortaoba	1017
58	Erkinlik (Kaynak) Höyük	Karapınar, Ortaoba	1029
59	Gedemen Höyük	Karapınar, Küçükaşlama	1024
60	Ambarderesi Mağara	Halkapınar, İvriz	1495
61	Yağmapınar Höyük	Karapınar, Yağmapınar	1044
62	İvriz Kalesi	Halkapınar, İvriz	1365

Map 1: Settlements and *tumuli* identified and surveyed from 2013-2016.

Fig. 1 : Palaeoenvironmental research in Akgöl.

56. Sırnık Höyük (Fig. 2-3)

The settlement is located 6.6 km northeast of the district of Hotamış (Map 1, N° 56). The ancient settlement is located close to the Hotamış lake, which has dried-out in recent years. The *höyük* is *ca* 480 x 300 m large and *ca* 28 m high. Pottery is scattered over an area of 750 m. On the northeastern side an illicit excavation (*ca* 5 m deep and 2.5 m wide) was dug with a digger. The pottery in the profile and on the ground all date to the Iron Age, which suggests that there is at least 5 m accumulation of Iron Age layers. Large building slabs are scattered around in the adjacent fields. The pottery from the site indicates an occupation from the Early Bronze to the Roman period. Especially the Iron Age pottery is very dominant (Fig. 3) Sırnık Höyük is also mentioned by Güneri, who believes that this is one of the most important post classical sites in the region⁹. Bahar and Koçak argue that this is the most important Late Bronze Age site of the region and also that shards of a Mycenaean jar, jugs and bowls were found here¹⁰.

57. Eşektepesi Höyük (Fig. 4-5)

Eşektepesi Höyük is located 1.7 km west of the district of Hotamış (Map 1, N° 57).¹¹ The *höyük* is situated on the west side of the Hotamış-Ortaoba land route. The mound is shallow, about 4 m high

and *ca* 220 x 380 m large. The pottery is scattered *ca* 170 m around the site. No architectural remains were discovered. The pottery which was found on the surface dates mainly to the Iron Age (Fig. 5). However, this doesn't necessarily indicate that the site was only occupied during the Iron Age, maybe the shards of the earlier levels were not on the surface. Güneri argues that it is an important site for the 3rd and 2nd Millennium B.C.¹².

58. Erkinlik (Kaynak Höyük) (Fig. 6-7)

Erkinlik Höyük is known as Ortaoba Höyük by the locals. The settlement is located 2.7 km northeast of the district of Ortaoba (Map 1, N° 58). The *höyük* is *ca* 400 x 350 m large and *ca* 27 m high. The pottery is scattered around the *höyük* over an area of *ca* 0.5 km. According to the villagers the northern side was once on the shore of the Hotamış lake: today this area is used as a field for agriculture. Villagers mentioned that around 200 m south of the *höyük* graves were discovered, however, we didn't see any remains only a few Roman pottery shards were scattered on the ground. The pottery of the *höyük* settlement shows a sequence from Early Bronze Age until the Iron Age (Fig. 7)¹³.

59. Gedemen Höyük (Fig. 8-9)

Gedemen Höyük is known by the locals as Küçükaşlama Höyük. The *höyük* settlement is located 2 km south of the district for Küçükaşlama (Map 1, N° 59). The settlement is *ca* 280 x 230 m in area and *ca* 22 m high. The pottery diffusion around the *höyük* could not be determined, as the area is used for agriculture, and we couldn't go through the plants. The pottery from the *höyük* dates to from the Early Bronze Age to the Iron Age (Fig. 9). Güneri mentions that many his assemblages' date to the 3rd, 2nd Millennia and Medieval period¹⁴.

A local villager indicated that there are remains of a stone paved road within the fields, which is called the "king's road – *kral yolu*". Apparently, this stone paved road is located on the southwestern side of Gedemen Höyük, however villagers have dismantled the road partially in the past years from to build the stone foundations of their houses. Since crops abundantly covered the ground and there was

9) Güneri 1990: 324.

10) Bahar and Koçak 2004: 13-16.

11) Mentioned by Güneri as Eşek Tepesi. The registration list of the Konya Protection Board has registered the site as Eşektepesi Höyük.

12) Güneri 1990: 324.

13) Also, Güneri mentions the same periods. Güneri 1990: 325.

14) Güneri 1990: 325.

Fig. 2 : Sırnık Höyük (drone image).

Fig. 4 : Eşektepesi Höyük.

Fig. 3 : Sırnık Höyük pottery assemblage.

Fig. 5 : Eşektepesi Höyük pottery assemblage.

Fig. 6 : Erkinlik (Kaynak) Hüyük.

Fig. 7 : Erkinlik (Kaynak) Hüyük pottery assemblage.

Fig. 8 : Gedemen Höyük.

Fig. 9 : Gedemen Höyük pottery assemblage.

Fig. 10 : Fragment of a stele with Luwian hieroglyphs from Ambardere (İvriz).

no space to walk in between, this stone paved road was not visible in the field. However, I have seen remains of a stone paved road parallel to the southern shore of Akgöl close to Böğücek (Karaman district). The road was indicated to me by a shephard in 2015 when we were surveying the vicinity of Adabağ and Akgöl. This paved road connected several small *höyüks* on the southern flank of Akgöl (all in the Karaman district). This road could be a loop or continuation of the so called “royal road”, which is mentioned by Herodotus. The Persian royal road was passing through the Cilician Gate, and continued via Kybistra to the west to Sardis¹⁵.

Investigation in Ambarderesi (Fig. 10 - 14)

On November 17th 2015 while walking down the gorge of Ambarderesi to İvriz together with the architect Sinan Omacan, an outstanding find was made unexpectedly. Among thousands of stones Omacan found in the dried-out river bed a fragment of a stele inscribed with three Luwian hieroglyphs

Fig. 11 : Entrance to the cave in Ambardere.

(Fig. 10). This is the first fragment of a stele with Luwian hieroglyphs from Ambarderesi, its importance is indescribable. The limestone fragment is 17 x 13 cm large, and was registered with the *Etüdlük* number Et. 1752 in the Ereğli Museum. Three signs are visible:

wa/i
tu
zi

According to J. David Hawkins *wa/i-tu* could be the beginning of a sentence (“to him ...”), *-wa/i-tu* could be the end of a word, *zi* could be related, or

15) Calder 1925.

Fig. 12 : Plan of the cave in Ambardere.

Fig. 13 : Longitudinal section of the cave in Ambardere.

Fig. 14 : Libation hole in front of the cave in Ambardere.

might be separate. There also appears to be a further sign below the line divider¹⁶.

This remarkable fragment of a probably larger inscribed stele was located either in front of or in the vicinity of the relief in Ambarderesi and was washed down by the river in recent centuries. Three stele fragments with Luwian hieroglyphic inscriptions, and one bilingual with Luwian and Phoenician inscriptions have been discovered in İvriz¹⁷. The Ambarderesi fragment is an important indication that there was one or more inscribed stelai in front of the relief in Ambarderesi likely placed by Warpalawas to praise the weather god.

The main aim of the 2016 season in Ambarderesi was to survey and investigate the cave (Table 1, N° 60) which is located just next to the main church of the monastery (known by the locals as Kızlar Oğlanlar Sarayı) and *ca* 100 m to the south of the Neo Hittite relief. In 2015 during an extensive survey in Ambarderesi the cave was superficially investigated however the ground was very slippery and the deeper we went into the cave it seemed impossible to continue. Also, the sound of a strong water flow was frightening and we decided to leave further investigation for the 2016 field season with specialists¹⁸. The cave hasn't been investigated previously, the only archaeological object from this cave is a small jar in the Ereğli museum, dating to the Middle Iron age¹⁹.

60. Ambarderesi Cave

The cave is located across the Neo Hittite relief in Ambarderesi and consists of a main part and a branch (Fig. 11-13). The main part of the cave is 57 m long and the deepest point of the cave is - 12 m (Fig. 13). Generally, the cave is dry, in some places water is seeping out of the rock. The sound of rushing water, which was heard in September 2015, was not present in June 2016. There are few stalactites in the cave. Left of the entrance of the cave is another section, whose entrance is mere 0.5 m high so that it is only possible to enter that part by crawling. This section is 7 m long, 2.5 m wide, and has an elevation of %33. Two sherds were found in the deep pit, they probably date to the Middle or Late Iron Age. Just in front of the main entrance of the cave a cup-mark (also known as libation hole) (*ca* dm: 0.29 m, depth: 0.24 m) is carved into the rock (Fig. 14). The reason why it is thought to have been used for libation is its depth²⁰. Cup-marks were used to pour liquid offerings to the gods, which is described for example in the Hittite AN.TAH.SUM ritual²¹. They are known to be connected to Hittite rock reliefs of the Late Bronze Age, such as the libation holes on the rock plateau above the Fıraktin relief²² or at Sirkeli, above the relief of Muwatalli II²³.

16) I would like to thank Prof. Hawkins sincerely for his kind help in transliteration of the signs and for his comments.

17) Hawkins 2000a: 516-8, Hawkins 2000b: Pl. 292-95, Dinçol 1994.

18) Maner 2015: 8.

19) An extensive article on the research in the cave is forthcoming. Maner and Kuruçayırılı forthcoming.

20) Multi hollow anvil stones or rocks bear circular indentations, which were used to crush ores, however, these indentations are shallow, whereas libation holes are deeper, as liquid needed to be poured into them.

21) Haas 1994: 780.

22) Kohlmeier 1983.

23) Kohlmeier 1983.

The Hittites deified springs, mountains and caves²⁴. According to Hittite belief the netherworld was just below the inhabited world, and the entrance to the netherworld are the caves. Springs, wells and ponds are related with the netherworld as well. The weather god of Nerik descends through a cave and a spring to the netherworld and rises from there²⁵. The Hittites chose Ambarderesi probably because of the combination of the cave, the springs and the mountains, the Hittite version of the holy trinity. The cultural and social memory of the springs, river, Mount Bolkar and the cave, were adapted by the people who built a monastery here in the Middle Byzantine period.

61. Yağmapınar Höyük (Fig. 15-16)

Yağmapınar Höyük is one of the largest settlements in the Karapınar region, and was an important settlement during the Iron Age and probably a significant center throughout the ages being located on important road networks. Well preserved pottery from this site are in private collections and in several museums including the Konya and Ereğli Museums²⁶. The site is located on the road from Karapınar to Emirgazi on the eastern shore of the dried out Sultaniye Sazlığı Lake (Map 1, N° 61). At the entrance of the turnout there is a little mosque which is known as Kıcıkışla mescidi.

Yağmapınar Höyük is 26 km northeast of Karapınar and 4 km south of the Kıcıkışla village (also known as Yeşilyurt). The *höyük* is oval shaped and is *ca* 280 m x 220 large and *ca* 26 m high. Because shepherds built pens on the top of the *höyük* using scattered building stones, the top of the mound is highly disturbed and no ancient architecture is preserved. The slopes are steep, on the northern slope an obelisk like rectangular shaped pillar is standing, perhaps a pillar of a gate? Small boulders are scattered over the southern slope, probably the remains of a fortification wall. The whole mound was covered with high dry grass, which made it difficult to find pottery. The areas adjacent to the mound are used as fields with animal pens. In the fields to the southeast pottery is scattered over an area of *ca* 500 m x 600 m.

The pottery mostly dates to the Iron Age and Roman period (Fig. 16). This does not preclude the presence of earlier periods, we probably just couldn't find it. Bahar who also surveyed the site observed pottery from the 2nd Millennium B.C., the Iron Age and the Roman period²⁷. To the south there are *tumulus* like hills. It is not obvious whether they are natural or artificial. Zoroğlu identified the pottery which is now in private collections and museums as Middle or Late Phrygian Ware and Ionian Ware²⁸. He indicates that villagers pointed out that the pottery was looted from graves located to the south.

62. İvriz Kalesi

İvriz Kalesi (also known as Ardos Kalesi)²⁹ is located on an outcrop *ca* 0.8 km southwest of the İvriz relief (Fig. 17). The fort can be reached through a narrow path just opposite of the relief, it is a very steep and slippery path. A second option is to walk up Ambarderesi until the first canyon and then walk up to the northeast.

The fort is located on a triangular shaped outcrop and is *ca* 364 x 120 m large³⁰. The fortification wall is built on the natural rock and follows the edges of the outcrop. The slope of the northern and eastern part is steep. The south-western and western fortification wall is well preserved, there is a break through the middle part of the wall. The building stones are roughly shaped which gives the wall a pseudo isodomic appearance. Two towers are preserved on the western side. In the northwest – inside the fort – the remains of a building built of medium sized boulders fixed with mortar are preserved.

Hild and Restle date the fort to the Byzantine period. They argue that the fort was built to protect the road from Herakleia (Tont Kalesi) to Mundas (Kayasaray)³¹. Karauğuz and Kunt date the fortification wall to the Iron Age and assume that the buildings inside were also used during the Ottoman period³². However, parts of the fortification wall as well as the walls of the buildings inside the fort are made with mortar which dates these probably to the Late Antiquity. No pottery was found during the survey. It is likely that this fort was built on a Late Bronze Age or Iron Age forerunner. The results of the 2015

24) Haas 1994: 127-136, 460-465.

25) Haas 1994: 127, 464.

26) Zoroğlu 1991.

27) Bahar 2002: 258.

28) Zoroğlu 1991.

29) Apparently, the name Ardos is deriving from the Hittite word *ardu*, which is a name of a bird. Hild and Restle 1981:147-148.

30) Karauğuz and Kunt 2006: 41.

31) Hild and Restle 1981: 148, fig. 10.

32) Karauğuz and Kunt 2006.

Fig. 15 : Yağmapınar Höyük.

Fig. 17 : İvriz Kalesi.

Fig. 16 : Yağmapınar Höyük pottery assemblage.

survey season showed that the ancient settlements in İvriz are located on slopes and hilltops³³. One of the reasons must have been the rising water from the underground springs during certain periods of the year³⁴. Probably the road was passing from Herakleia (Tont Kalesi), which is likely the Hittite town Hupisna³⁵, to İvriz Kalesi, then to Dibek Kalesi and from Dibek to Kayasaray. The location of the fort also protects the way up to Ambarderesi, where the second Neo-Hittite relief and the monastery are located. It seems likely that it protected several routes.

Survey on the Karacadağ

The Karacadağ is a volcanic mountain which covers an area of *ca* 150 square km and its highest peak is 1995 m³⁶. The massive is located northeast of Karapınar and stretches from southwest to northeast. The explosion of the Karacadağ caused two crater lakes, which are Acıgöl and Tuzla Gölü, also known as Meke Tuzlası.

Getrude L. Bell is the only one who has conducted small investigations on Karacadağ. On July 1st 1907 she went on a horseback to Se Kalesi (Segh Kalesi in her diary) and drew a plan of it³⁷. She camped in Ovacık (Ovajik in her diary) and the next day she explored Mennak Kalesi and Kurşuncu Monastery³⁸. Her diary entries are important as they are illuminating the region as seen 110 years ago.

Our survey of the Karacadağ started in 2014 and continued in 2015³⁹. During the 2016 season Oymalı, Yağmapınar, Yeşilyurt, Gölören, Işıklar, Karaören, Meşeli and Ekizli were investigated. The flora of the Karacadağ region is different from the semi-arid Karapınar and Hotamış plain. Karacadağ is very green and has many underground water sources. Traditional houses are built of dark-grey basalt stone. Locals say that the oldest settlements were located on the crest of the mountain and that with the time they were moved to lower parts. The area around the mountain specifically the south, west and east was covered with lakes or with marsh. Even today there are almost no settlements around Karacadağ, although the marsh has dried out.

The investigation and surveying of the regions of Karacadağ is difficult most of the time as it includes a lot of climbing. Therefore, understanding

the landscape and the settlement pattern takes time. Oral history with locals helps a lot to understand the changing settlement pattern of the Karacadağ region and to locate ancient remains. As a preliminary result, it can be said that the Karacadağ was an important settlement area especially during Late Antiquity. The cave settlements in Oymalı (Fig. 18), remains of large buildings made of stone in Gölören (Fig. 19), the *spolia* in Meşeli (Fig. 20), remains of a large settlement, graves, a water pool and water cave in Ekizli (Fig. 21-22) are some of the examples. Karaören, which is located on the north of Karacadağ, is an interesting village. Karaören was visited first in 2015 and revisited in 2016. There are remains of a large Byzantine or medieval town, with dome covered circular tombs at the corner of some buildings (Fig. 23). The stone houses of the village are mainly built with these old stones. The *muhtar* told us that at the beginning of the 20th century there were large churches and buildings. The stones were sold and they were carried with donkeys, oxen and camels to their next destination. A villager told us that his father sold a lot of building stones. Most of the buildings in Karapınar, Emirgazi, Kutören and Ereğli are built with the stones from Karaören. There are hundreds of *spolia* scattered throughout the village, some of them bear crosses, some other symbols such as circles.

A piece of very important evidence for Hittite presence is a rectangular slab with a line of hieroglyphic Luwian script. The slab was published by Nizamettin Tezcan in a poetry book⁴⁰. However, that slab has been missing since 2014. Tezcan had contacted Metin Alparslan from the Hittitology Department of Istanbul University to come and visit the site to see the slab, but upon Alparslan's arrival the stone bolder was not there anymore. Currently it is the subject of a search by Interpol. The only remains are the published photo⁴¹. During the survey we went to the house where the slab was originally located. We also talked with the owner of the house, who lives in Ereğli. He remembered very well where the slab was removed from and took us to one of the Late Antique stone houses. There weren't any other inscribed stones. However, this shows that the people of Late Antiquity have used Hittite building stones.

33) Maner 2016.

34) Maner 2016: 232-234.

35) Maner 2017.

36) Türkecan 2015: 122.

37) http://gertrudebell.ncl.ac.uk/diary_details.php?diary_id=612

38) http://gertrudebell.ncl.ac.uk/diary_details.php?diary_id=614. Also, Ramsey and Bell 1909: 301.

39) Maner 2015a: 250, 2016: 230.

40) Tezcan 2011.

41) A publication by Alparslan is planned in the near future.

Fig. 18 : Entrance to one of the Late Antique cave settlements in Oymalı.

Fig. 19 : Remains of the Late Antique settlement in Gölören.

Fig. 20 : *Spolia* in Meşeli.

**Fig. 21 : Remains of a water pool
in Ekizli.**

**Fig. 22 : Water cave (part of the
pool) in Ekizli.**

**Fig. 23 : Circular tomb in
Karaören.**

Hittite building stones became *spolia* in their buildings. Locals told us that their grandfathers and fathers removed all kind of scripts and images meticulously so that it doesn't look Christian anymore.

In the treaty between Tuthaliya IV of Hatti and Kurunta of Tarhuntassa, which describes the frontiers of Tarhuntassa and Hatti, paragraph 5 indicates that a lake on Mount Arlanta is the border between the Hulaja River and Hatti:

"In the direction of the cities of Wanzataruwa and Kunzinasa, his frontier is Mount Arlanta and the city of Alana. Alana belongs to the land of the Hulaya river, but the water which is upon Mount Arlanta belongs jointly to the land of the Hulaja River and Hatti"⁴².

During discussions with Prof. David Hawkins he advised me to search if there is a crater lake on Karacadağ. Analyzing the google earth map of Karacadağ a crater lake could be determined. On the map, everything seemed to be easy and smooth, however the expedition to the crater lake was the most difficult task we had so far.

Approximately 4 km southeast of Yeşilyurt a crater known as Ovacık is located at *ca* 1600 m⁴³. The crater is *ca* 2.4 km x 2.7 km large (Fig. 24). The area is green, there are many springs and wild horses live here, which are known as *yılka*. In the center of the crater the remains of a 160 x 170 m large building are visible (Fig. 25). The southern part is a necropolis, where several graves were observed. Some of them have been looted, some of them are covered or built with *spolia*. Part of a relief with a leg of a horse was lying next to one of the graves. We climbed up the southern side of the crater for *ca* 0.5 km, which was very steep and difficult as it was very rocky. It was a very hot day and when we arrived at the top our water supplies had already run out. On the southeastern and southwestern peaks of the crater two Byzantine forts are located, which are known as Mennak Kalesi and Keçi Kalesi. Kuşuncu Manastırı is close by and is located on a hill. From the top of the crater *ca* 700 m to the south a crater lake is located (Fig. 26). The water is very muddy. Shepherds from Kesmez and Yeşilyurt come here to pasture their animals. The meadows on the western side of the lake belong to the shepherds of Kesmez, and the eastern side to the shepherds of Yeşilyurt. If this is the crater lake which is mentioned in the treaty, then the division of the land is still the same

as in the 13th century B.C. On the western side, there are several pens for the animals. One of them is built of stones which are dressed in Hittite manner (Fig. 27). A well by the lake is used to get water only for animals. The troughs are made of *spolia*. One of the slabs by the trough has probably few Luwian hieroglyphs, one can be identified as *na*. (Fig. 28). The dressed and the inscribed slab might belong to a Hittite cult monument. The heat, the strong thirst, and the search for the drone which was lost for a few hours forced us to go back. The Hittite boulders, the slab with the Luwian hieroglyphic inscription, the crater lake and the whole setting on top of a mountain are indications for a Hittite sanctuary. It reminds of the Huwasi sanctuary from Kuşaklı-Sarissa⁴⁴, or Göllüdağ⁴⁵. Investigations will continue at this location during the 2017 field season.

PUBLIC OUTREACH

With the onset of the 21st century archeology is seen through a new lens. The discipline now includes cultural heritage protection, education and communal work to create a notion, sense and understanding for locals to preserve their cultural heritage and traditions. One of the major problems we face during the survey are illicit excavations and the destruction of cultural heritage. Many people dream of finding treasure, which could be converted into money. Wherever we go, looters had been there before us, even in the most remote regions. Therefore, communal work, informing locals on cultural heritage issues and archaeology, lectures, and looking for ways to establish sustainable cultural tourism are goals of the KEYAR project.

For the past several years, local schools have asked for lectures on archaeology and cultural heritage preservation. This season a lecture on archaeology and cultural heritage protection was presented in a local boarding school in Halkapınar (YBO – *Yatılı Bölge Okulu*). To create awareness on the access to heritage sites for disabled people the documentary *800 km Engelli – 800 km Hurdles* by Murat Erün was screened in the garden of the Oğuz Ata complex. *800 km Engelli – 800 km Hurdles* is telling the story of a thirteen day journey on motorcycle combo from Istanbul to the ancient site of Stratonicea in Muğla Yatağan by Hüseyin Eroğlu,

42) Beckmann 1996: 109.

43) Gertrude Bell camped here on July 1st 1907. http://gertrudebell.ncl.ac.uk/diary_details.php?diary_id=612

44) Müller-Karpe 2002.

45) Schirmer 2002.

Fig. 24 : Ovacık crater on Karacadağ.

Fig. 25 : Remains of a large building and the road to Yeşilli in Ovacık (drone image).

Fig. 26 : Crater lake on Karacadağ.

Fig. 27 : Hittite building stones in the walls of a stable next to the crater lake.

Fig. 28 : Slab with Luwian hieroglyphs (Karacadağ).

who has considered himself a disabled for years, and the painter Aydın Erkuş. As the two friends attempt to visit the sites they always wanted to see, they also encounter access problems, as most of the time no special entrance for disabled people exists. They try to show and analyze how the society perceives and thinks about disabled people, their lives, and problems and the impact of our behaviors towards disabled people. This documentary won first prize in the TRT documentary competition of the Ministry of Culture and Tourism in 2012.

A photo exhibition of the American photographer Josephine Powell took place from 17 to 29 June 2016 in the courtyard of the Ereğli Museum (Fig. 29). Powell documented the life of Turkish nomads and villagers from 1974-1994. She was primarily interested in women who worked on textile. The exhibition contained photos she took in Ereğli, Karapınar, the Bolkar Mountains and Konya plain. She donated her 30,000 slides and her field notes to Koç University Suna Kıraç Library, which are all digitalized⁴⁶. Among Powell's photos were images of Ereğli in the 1970's, with traditional civic architecture made of stone, wood and mudbrick and women knotting carpets. Today only a few of these traditional houses are preserved. The aim of the exhibition was to create awareness of the preservation of intangible and tangible heritage and how important it is to protect local cultural heritage to create and support sustainable tourism.

Ç.M.

Fig. 29 : Banner outside the Ereğli Museum of the Exhibition *Josephine Powell'in Ereğli'de 1970-80'lerde Gördükleri*.

46) <http://digitalcollections.library.ku.edu.tr/cdm/landingpage/collection/JPC>. The exhibition was sponsored by AVIS. I am grateful to SKL and Mrs. Tuba Akbaytürk for the permission to exhibit the photos. All of the panels for the exhibition were prepared by Jeremy James, the invitation and exhibition banner by Yiğit Pekzeren.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Bahar, H. 2002: "Konya Karaman İlleri Yüzey Araştırmaları 2000", *AST*, 21: 257-270.
- Bahar, H. and Küçükbezi, H.G. 2012: "2010 yılı Konya ve Karaman İlleri ile İlçeleri Arkeolojik Yüzey Araştırması", *AST* 29: 97-116.
- Bahar, H. and Koçak, Ö. 2008: "The Transition from Bronze to Iron Age in Lycaonia and its Vicinity", in Kühne, H., Czichon, R.M. and Kreppner, F.J. (eds.), *Proceedings of the 4th International Congress of the Archaeology of the Ancient Near East: 29 March - 3 April 2004*: Vol. 2, Wiesbaden: 9-20.
- Beckmann, G., 1996: *Hittite Diplomatic Texts*, Atlanta, Georgia.
- Calder, W.M., 1925: "The Royal Road in Herodotus", *The Classical Review* 39 No. 1/2: 7-11.
- Dinçol, B., 1994: "New Archaeological and Epigraphical Finds from Ivriz", *Tel Aviv* 21: 117 - 128.
- Güneri, S., 1990: "Orta Anadolu Höyükleri, Karapınar, Cihanbeyli, Sarayönü, Kulu Araştırmaları", *AST* 7: 323-340.
- Haas, V., 1994: *Geschichte der hethitischen Religion*, Brill, Leiden.
- Hawkins, J.D. 2000a: *Corpus of Hieroglyphic Luwian Inscriptions. Volume I Inscriptions of the Iron Age: Part 1: Text*, Berlin, New York.
- Hawkins, J.D., 2000b: *Corpus of Hieroglyphic Luwian Inscriptions. Volume I Inscriptions of the Iron Age: Part 3: Plates*, Berlin, New York.
- Hild, F. and Restle M., 1981: *Tabula Imperii Byzantini 2: Kappadokien*, Wien.
- Karağuz, G. and Kunt, H.I., 2006: "İvriz Kaya Anıtları ve Çevresi Üzerine bir Araştırma", *Arkeoloji ve Sanat* 122: 23 - 50.
- Kohlmeyer, K., 1983: "Felsbilder der hethitischen Grossreichszeit", *Acta Praehistorica et Archaeologica* 15: 7-112.
- Maner, Ç., 2014: "Preliminary Report on the First Season of the Konya-Ereğli (KEYAR) Survey 2013", *Anatolia Antiqua* XXII: 343-360.
- 2015a: "Preliminary Report on the Second Season of the Konya-Ereğli (KEYAR) Survey 2014", *Anatolia Antiqua* XXIII: 249-273
- 2015b: "Konya ili Ereğli, Halkapınar, Karapınar ve Emirgazi 2013 Yılı Yüzey Araştırmaları (KEYAR)", *AST* 32/1: 27-46.
- 2016: "Preliminary Report on the Third Season of the Konya-Ereğli (KEYAR) Survey 2015", *Anatolia Antiqua* XXIV: 225-252.
- 2017: "Searching for Hüpişna. Hittite Remains in Ereğli Kara Höyük and Tont Kalesi", in Alparslan, M. (ed.), *Places and Spaces in Hittite Anatolia: Hatti and the East; Proceedings of an International Workshop on Hittite Historical Geography in Istanbul, 25th-26th October 2013*, Ege Yayınları, İstanbul, 2017.
- forthcoming a: "Konya ili Ereğli, Halkapınar, Karapınar ve Emirgazi 2014 Yılı Yüzey Araştırmaları (KEYAR)", *AST* 34.
- Forthcoming b: "Konya ili Ereğli, Halkapınar, Karapınar ve Emirgazi 2015 Yılı Yüzey Araştırmaları (KEYAR)", *AST* 35.
- Müller-Karpe, A., 2002: "Kuşaklı-Sarissa", *Die Hethiter und ihr Reich*, Stuttgart: 176-189.
- Ramsay, W.M. and Bell, G.L., 1909: *The Thousand and One Churches*, Philadelphia.
- Schirmer, W., 2002: "Stadt, Palast, Tempel. Charakteristika hethitischer Architektur im 2. Und 1. Jahrtausend v. Chr.", *Die Hethiter und ihr Reich*, Stuttgart: 203-217.
- Tezcan, N., 2011: *Şairler ve Şiirlerle Karaören, Konya*.
- Türkecan, A., 2015: *Türkiye'nin Senozoyik Volkanitleri*, Ankara.
- Zoroğlu, L., 1991: "Karapınar – Kıcıkışla Demir Çağı Buluntuları. The Iron Age finds from Kıcıkışla near Karapınar", in Çilingiroğlu, A. and French, D.H. (eds.), *Proceedings of the 2nd Anatolian Iron Ages Colloquium*, Oxford: 149-153.