Excavations at Hacımusalar Höyük in southwestern Turkey have uncovered thousands of years of occupation history, from the Early Bronze Age through the Late Byzantine era. This article offers a general survey of the Bronze Age occupation levels so far explored on the northern and western slopes of the mound, with particular focus on two well-preserved Early Bronze II destruction levels, closely superimposed. We present selected finds and architectural features from each stratigraphic level in sequence and discuss their significance for current theories of cultural interaction and social organization in West Anatolia in the Early Bronze Age. This new evidence indicates that Hacımusalar Höyük and the Elmalı plain were more connected with other parts of Anatolia than recent studies of Early Bronze Age cultural zones suggest but still maintained a distinctive regional character.

INTRODUCTION: THE MOUND AND REGION

Hacımusalar Höyük, the largest settlement mound in the Elmalı basin, measures about 200 x 250 m and rises some 13 m above the level of the surrounding plain. It is situated along a natural travel route linking this upland valley of the Taurus Mountains with coastal Lycia (figs. 1, 2). Its location can be spotted from a great distance by its proximity to Çatal Tepe, a distinctive two-humped hill that is visible from each of the four natural entries to...
**Fig. 1.** View of Hacimusalar Höyük looking north toward Çatal Tepe.

**Fig. 2.** Topographical map of Elmali basin showing ancient settlement mounds and modern villages and cities (graphic by S. Aydal).
the Elmalı basin and that probably had strategic significance in antiquity. Advantages of the settlement location also included a nearby river, the ancient Aedes (modern Ak Çay), and the ancient predecessors of lakes known today as Kara Göl and Avlan Gölü. Called Beyler or Beylerbey Höyük in early surveys, the mound has been identified by inscriptions as ancient Choma (mound), mentioned in Roman and Byzantine sources. Its upper levels and slopes show continuous occupation from the Iron Age through the Byzantine period. Surface surveys in the area have, however, yielded very few Middle and Late Bronze Age (MBA and LBA) finds, and no LBA material has been securely identified among materials collected by the Hacımusalar project, whether during excavation or survey. Geological study suggests that lakes may have filled much of the basin and made habitation difficult in the MBA and LBA, before the dramatic opening of a karstic sinkhole (duden) at the base of the mountains on the east side of the valley, ca. 1000 BCE.

Since the Bryn Mawr College excavations of the 1960s–1970s, Karataş Höyük in the eastern part of the Elmalı plain has been the type site for Early Bronze Age (EBA) culture in southwest inland Anatolia. Mellink noted, however, that "Karataş is but a simple representative of a ceramic and cultural province which in the Elmalı plain itself is represented by many sites, including the mound of Hacımusalar-Choma, of urban size." Hacımusalar Höyük is the largest of 15 prehistoric mounds recorded in surveys of the area (see fig. 2). More than twice as large as the central mound at Karataş, Hacımusalar Höyük should be considered the regional center and is therefore critical to current discussions of regionalism and urbanism in this period.

HISTORY OF EXPLORATION

Archaeological investigation of Hacımusalar Höyük began in 1993, with surface survey of the mound and surrounding fields. EBA pottery was found in nearly every sector of this initial survey but was most abundant on the west side of the mound. Trenches were opened on the west slope in 1998, in a staggered arrangement designed to reveal a continuous stratigraphic section (fig. 3). Two excavation seasons...
here indicated at least 10 EBA occupation levels. At the time, it was theorized that EBA settlement was concentrated at the west, on a small mound (höyük) later subsumed by the present mound. Excavations in later contexts in all parts of the mound, however, regularly yield EBA pottery and other artifacts. In one of the deepest trenches on the north rim, just inside the city wall (see fig. 3, C4b9), an EBA occupation stratum with pebbled surface was reached beneath Iron Age levels. It was a limited window, however, nearly 5 m below the surface in a 2.5 x 5.0 m probe.

EBA levels were more widely exposed on the steep north slope of the mound, beginning in 2007 with four 10 x 5 m step trenches (fig. 4). These trenches were wider than normal in order to allow greater

14 In D2b2, D2c3, and D2b4.
horizontal exposure while also revealing continuous vertical stratigraphy. Two well-preserved EBA destruction levels were explored in the top step over five seasons (2007, 2008, 2010–12). Work in the lower step trenches, including a small (2 x 3 m) sondage reaching about 2.5 m below present ground level at the base of the mound, revealed at least seven earlier EBA occupation levels (fig. 5; table 1). The North Sounding, a narrow 2 x 15 m stratigraphic trench cutting through and beneath a collapsed portion of the later city wall (see figs. 3, 5), was excavated in order to link the EBA destruction levels exposed on the north slope with the EBA level reached earlier on the north rim. This sounding yielded evidence for at least seven more EBA occupation levels postdating the conspicuous destruction horizon, for a minimum of 16 EBA occupation levels recorded in all, constituting about 12 m of elevation. An EBA stratum was also reached on the south rim of the mound, in a small sondage (1.5 x 2.0 m) next to the inner face of the Iron Age fortification, about 1.8 m below the bottom of the city wall (see figs. 3, South Sounding). Exposure of the EBA levels has been limited to such windows on the slopes and edges of the mound because work in the center of the mound has focused on later phases of occupation, including two Byzantine churches with mosaic floors. The primary goal of investigating the EBA levels even in these limited exposures has been to gain an overall picture of the occupation and settlement history through vertical stratigraphy while leaving room for further exploration of these levels in future excavations.

SUMMARY OF EBA LEVELS AND FINDS

The following section presents the EBA remains so far explored at Hacımusalar Höyük in stratigraphic sequence, from earliest to latest. Chronological designations have been suggested on the basis of ceramic and architectural parallels with nearby Karataş (see table 1). For each level and context, the most diagnostic finds and features are here described in preliminary fashion, as a basis for discussion and analysis in the following section.

EB I

Though some Neolithic and Chalcolithic material has been encountered in surveys of the Elmalı plain, the earliest material so far encountered in excavations at Hacımusalar Höyük comes from trenches at the base.

15 “B4i8–i9,” expanded to “B4i10” and “B4i7,” covering about 25 m east–west.
16 In “B4h8–h9” and “B4g8–g9.”
17 C4a8, B4i8, and “B4x8.”
18 In F5j4.
19 Özgen and Baughan 2016, 330–34; Sulosky Weaver 2018; Reger 2020.
of the mound on the north and west sides (fig. 6). Most diagnostic are bowl rims with white-painted decoration (see fig. 6, a–c) and downturned handles with interior knobs (see fig. 6, h and i). While these pieces could be as early as Late Chalcolithic, the contexts are probably not earlier than late EB I on the basis of ceramic parallels with Karataş—most notably, tripod cooking pot legs (see fig. 6, l and m), which do not appear at Karataş until period III.

Limited exposure makes the architectural layout of the site in this period difficult to determine, but walls recorded in the small sondage at the base of the north slope are made of coursed mudbrick surrounding a wooden post atop stone foundations (online fig. 1).

Early EB II

The majority of the EBA levels excavated so far at Hacımusalar Höyük appear to belong to the EB II period, with the earliest exposed near the bottoms of the north and west slopes, in “B4g8–g9” and D2b2 (see fig. 3). Wall foundations are composed of two parallel lines of stones with smaller stones between. Stratigraphy and associated finds comparable with material from Karataş IV suggest a dating in the early EB II period: e.g., a stone stamp seal (fig. 7, b), lid with incised decoration (see fig. 7, d), fragments of jars with impressed or mottled surface decoration (see fig. 7, j–1) or projecting horn-like knobs (see fig. 7, m and n), and bowl rims with rising tabs (see fig. 7, f–h). The relative infrequency of white-painted pottery (see fig. 7, i), compared with later EBA levels, supports this base of the west slope (D2b2 Loci 25, 26) may be contemporary. (See AJAOnline for additional, online-only figures).

Table 1. Chronology of Early Bronze Age levels at Hacımusalar Höyük and correlation with Karataş-Semayük.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Approx. Dates (BCE)</th>
<th>Karataş Period</th>
<th>Hacımusalar Höyük Levels</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EB III</td>
<td>2400–2000</td>
<td>VI</td>
<td>Lowest levels reached in South Sounding Latest EB levels on north rim (North Sounding C4b9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EB II</td>
<td>2700–2400</td>
<td>V:3</td>
<td>North Sounding Phase C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>V:2–3</td>
<td>butted foundation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>mud/pi is leveling fill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>mudbrick corner and pebbled surfaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>large stone foundations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>V:2</td>
<td>lowest occupation level of North Sounding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>III–V:1</td>
<td>Green Mudbrick Phase on north and west slopes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Terraced Building Phases 1 and 2 on north slope</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EB IB</td>
<td>3000–2700</td>
<td>I–II</td>
<td>Lowest levels in “B4g9” sondage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EB IA</td>
<td>3400–3000</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Adapted from Mellink 1992, 2:173, table 3.

22 For interior decoration (see, e.g., fig. 6, a, herein), cf. French 1961, fig. 5.2, collected 1959, Akhisar, British Institute of Archaeology at Ankara survey; Lloyd and Mellaart 1962, figs. P6.1, P6.5, P7.3, excav. 1954–59, Beycesultan, British Institute of Archaeology at Ankara excavations. For exterior decoration (see, e.g., fig. 6, b and c, herein), cf. Lloyd and Mellaart 1962, figs. P9.4, P11.9 (also from Beycesultan); Joukowsky 1986, fig. 320, excav. 1969, Aphrodisias, New York University excavations.


25 Two mudbrick walls exposed in the lowest trench at the base of the west slope (D2b2 Loci 25, 26) may be contemporary. (See AJAOnline for additional, online-only figures).

26 “B4g9” Locus 46, ca. 0.6–0.8 m thick, running southwest–northeast for ca. 5.1 m, ca. 0.7–1.0 m above the level of the mudbrick wall in the “B4g9” sondage; D2b2 Loci 5 and 16, both ca. 0.6–0.7 m thick, forming a corner and associated with a rectangular hearth or oven that had been disturbed by later pits.


28 Cf. Warner 1994, pl. 163g:KA373; Eslick 2009, pls. 28: KT60, 32:KT155; all three excav. 1964–69 (see n. 23).

29 Cf. Eslick 2009, 37, pl. 13, tab type 1.
periodization—at Karataş white paint began to appear in period IV, becoming more common in period V.30

The strata between this early EB II architectural level and the well-preserved late EB II destruction levels are less well understood. On the west slope, four occupation levels were attested, but only in small exposures. At the north, seven distinct occupation levels were discernible, including a mudbrick wall and three different burnt layers noted in “B4g8–g9,” and three plastered floors in “B4h8–h9.” Associated and intervening strata yielded a wide variety of typical EB II artifacts: grinding stones and pounders, polished stone tools and beads, stone and clay stamp seals (fig. 8, a and b),31 clay spindlewhorls and beads (see fig. 8, c–g),


31 For a possible goat or deer motif (see fig. 8, b, herein), cf. Warner 1994, pl. 187b:KA741, excav. 1969 (see n. 23).
Fig. 8. Selected finds from levels between early EB II and Terraced Building phases, from "B4g8–g9," "B4h8–h9," and D2b2: stone stamp seal (a, HM17349); clay stamp seal with incised decoration (stylized goat or deer?) (b, HM16617) and impression; clay spherical whorl with incised lines (c, HM17138) and rolled impression; clay spindlewhorl with incised patterns (d, HM17091); clay whorls (e, HM17409; f, HM17426; g, HM15984); clay brush handle (h, HM16937); polished green stone object (whetstone?) (i, HM16957); red-burnished ceramic legs (j, HM15991; k, HM25163); pedestaled lid (l, HMS096.1); red-burnished jar (m, HM17096); dark-burnished jar or jug shoulder with horizontal fluting (n, from HM17347); red-burnished jug (o, HM16985); brown-burnished jug (p, HM25652.2); straight-walled cup (q, HM17802); red-burnished strainer-spouted askos (r, HMS279); red-burnished fragment with strainer spout (s, HM15970.2); burnished bowl rims (t, from HM17435; u, HMS080.13; v, HMS080.26; w, HMS080.9; x, HMS080.17) (a–g, n, o, r now in the Antalya Museum; b and q now in the Elmalı Museum).
a clay brush handle (see fig. 8, h), and pyramidal clay loomweights and pot supports (similar to pyramidal loomweights but without suspension holes). 32 On a plastered floor in one of the upper levels, two red-burnished ceramic supports were found very close together, each in the shape of a schematic human leg and foot, with minimally articulated toes and knob-like ankle bones (see fig. 8, j and k).

For the most part, pottery from these layers is comparable with material from Karataş IV–V:1, with relatively few white-painted pieces. Particularly notable are fragments of horizontally fluted vessels, in both red- and dark-burnished varieties (see, e.g., fig. 8, n). Horizontal fluting is attested at Karataş and Beycesultan in EB I and EB II levels33 as well as at Kaklık Mevkii (Late Chalcolithic–EB I).34 Other notable parallels with Karataş V:1 and earlier phases include a fragment of a pedestal lid with white-filled incisions including a goat motif (see fig. 8, l),35 a jug with cutaway spout (see fig. 8, o),36 and a burnished jug with relief ridges (see fig. 8, p).37 Fragments of red-burnished strainer-spouted vessels were found in these levels on both the north and west slopes (see fig. 8, r and s). The one from the west slope (see fig. 8, r) is a nearly complete askos (narrow-necked pouring vessel), with a wide, squat body, a vertical handle on one side, and part of an additional small loop handle that probably connected the spout to the neck. Strainer spouts appear at Karataş for the first time in period IV and do not occur there after V:2.38 Unlike examples from Karataş and other EBA sites in West Anatolia, however, on both examples from Hacimusalar the strainer is located on or near the wall of the vessel and surrounded by a projecting spout rim, rather than at the end of the spout.39

**EB II Terraced Building Phases**

Two phases of terraced row houses were discovered on the north slope, each destroyed by intense fire. These levels have been dubbed Terraced Building Phases 1 and 2; in each level the lowest parts of the walls on the east side were laid against cuts into earlier strata, so that the floor level of each room or structure, with one exception (discussed below), is about 0.2–0.4 m below that of the neighboring one to its east. In other words, the rooms or buildings in both levels appear to step down, in terraced fashion, from east to west (fig. 9). The exposed rooms or structures were named, to ease description and correlation across trenches, North Slope Structure (NSS) 1, 2, and so on, with numbers assigned in order of discovery. There is evidence for standardized interior arrangements and continuity from one phase to the next: the southeast corner of each room or space is usually filled with a rounded corner platform. The walls of both Terraced Building phases so far exposed are shared party walls composed entirely of wattle and daub (or pisé), built directly on the ground, without stone foundations.40 Intense burning accidentally fired many pieces of mud walling and roofing, which hardened to preserve impressions of the plant materials used for internal structuring and support, from thin, tubular reeds to wider wooden planks and rounded and squared posts (online fig. 2).41

Terraced Building Phase 1 includes at least three structures, each with plastered floors and built-in plastered features. NSS-4 is the best preserved, with three

35 Incised goats or stags occur on pottery from Karataş II; see Mellink and Angel 1966, 250, pl. 62.37, excav. 1965 (see n. 23); Eslick 2009, 58, motifs 142, 143. They also occur on a burial pithos from Karataş as well as on an EBA jar from the Burdur region; see Mellink 1964, 274–75, pl. 79.12 and .13, excav. 1963 (see n. 23).
36 Cf. Eslick 2009, 18, pl. 6, jug type 26; pl. 63:KT198, excav. 1964 (see n. 23).
37 Parallels at Karataş are period III or undated; e.g., Eslick 2009, pl. 31:KT251, excav. 1965–69 (see n. 23).
38 Eslick 2009, 217, 236.
39 Cf., for example, Lloyd and Mellaart 1962, fig. P25.9 and .10, 1954–59 (see n. 22); Eslick 2009, pls. 38, 79c:KA744, KT171, excav. 1965–69 (see n. 23).
40 Cf. the palisade and fence houses at EB I Karataş, as well as internal partitions in a storage shed there: Mellink and Angel 1968, 248, pl. 79.10; 1973, 295, ill. 2, pl. 41.1 and .2; Warner 1979, 139–40; 1994, 81–82, 144, fig. 6. Party walls at EB II Tarsus, too, were “rarely bedded on stone foundations” (Goldman 1956, 14).
41 For the leaf impression (see online fig. 2b), cf. Dönmez and Dönmez 2005, 155, 165 fig. 5, excav. 1974–2004, İkitzepe, Istanbul University excavations.
walls defined, a rounded platform filling the south-east corner (Locus 67), a low ledge running along the eastern wall (Loci 62 and 70, interrupted by an interior buttress), and a freestanding platform (Locus 77) in front of an opening on the south side (fig. 10; table 2). A shallow slot on the floor of the opening to the west of the platform could mark the location of a wooden threshold for a door or partition, and on the floor was a large, flat concentration of charcoal that could represent a fallen wooden door or shutter. Four grinding stones were found in the northeast part of the room, next to the low ledge. Finds from within the burnt debris include a few spindlewhorls and stone objects as well as many fragments of coarse jars, burnished bowls (some white-painted), and white-on-red beak-spouted jugs (including fig. 11, a–c, j, k).

The east side of NSS-4 was laid against a cut through earlier clay strata, on top of which (and thus at a higher level) was a contemporary mud-walled structure, NSS-3, with at least three rooms or partitioned spaces (fig. 12; see table 2). Its walls are preserved only a few centimeters high, but their locations are clearly

---

42 Corner platform is ca. 0.15 m high; ledge is ca. 0.40 m wide. The freestanding platform (ca. 0.42 x 0.44 m, 0.18 m high) has more than one layer of plaster coating and in its final form seems to have included a wooden element (post?), as indicated by a concentration of charcoal and contoured plaster on the north end, similar to “tables” in Ilıpınar Phase 6 (Coockson 2008, 155, fig. 23).

43 Ca. 1.60 x 0.60 m, 0.02–0.05 m thick.
Table 2. Details of North Slope Structures (NSS) in the Terraced Building phases.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Space</th>
<th>Trench Name(s)</th>
<th>Year(s)</th>
<th>Max. Preserved Area (m)</th>
<th>Max. Preserved Wall Height (m)</th>
<th>Wall Thicknesses (m)</th>
<th>Floor Elevations (masl)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Terraced Building Phase 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSS-3</td>
<td>“B4i10”</td>
<td>2010–11</td>
<td>2.00 x 3.25</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.10–0.12</td>
<td>1048.42–.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSS-4</td>
<td>“B4i9–i10”</td>
<td>2010–11</td>
<td>4.68 x 4.00</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.12–0.20</td>
<td>1048.20–.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSS-5</td>
<td>“B4i9”</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>1.93 x 1.60</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>1048.07–.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terraced Building Phase 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSS-1</td>
<td>“B4i8–i9”</td>
<td>2007, 2008, 2011</td>
<td>1.74 x 2.60</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.10–0.16</td>
<td>1048.55–.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSS-2</td>
<td>“B4i7–i8”</td>
<td>2010, 2012</td>
<td>3.60 x 3.90</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>1048.03–.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSS-7</td>
<td>“B4i7”</td>
<td>2011, 2012</td>
<td>3.30 x 3.60</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.08–0.16</td>
<td>1047.86–.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSS-8</td>
<td>“B4i7”</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>3.10 x 2.00</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>1047.69–.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSS-9</td>
<td>“B4i7–h7”</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>2.70 x 1.90</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.10–0.18</td>
<td>1047.59</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 11. Selected finds from Terraced Building Phase 1: clay loomweight (a, HM23651), spit support (b, HM23663), whorls (c, HM24025; d, HM24574), and stamp seal (e, HM24877); carved horn handle (f, HM24597); copper-alloy pin (g, HM22374) and coil (h, HM23140); white-painted bowl rim (i, from HM22962) and jugs (j, HM23817; k, HM24758; l, from HM22860; m, from HM22867; n, from HM22962/23110/23143 [slash indicates joining fragments from three different pottery lots]) (c and d now in the Elmali Museum).
discernible in the upturning of the plastered floors and, in some cases, the presence of round postholes. At least some of these holes seem to be connected horizontally beneath the floor level, as if the posts were secured in a horizontal beam at the base of the wall.\(^{44}\) In the floor of the largest room is a round, curbed depression (Locus S3) in which three loomweights were found with the bottom of another pyramidal object that could have been a loomweight or a pot or spit support (online fig. 3a).\(^{45}\) A neighboring depression or pit just to the southwest (Locus S6) held broken pottery and carbonized botanical remains, including several pistachios,\(^{46}\) and another just to the northwest (Locus S4) was full of ash. It is possible that some of the loomweights had been reused as supports for cooking pots\(^{47}\) and that the curbed depression functioned as a hearth. Other notable finds from the burnt debris in NSS-3 include a fragment of a copper-alloy earring or hair spiral\(^{48}\) and pieces of at least six white-on-red beak-spouted jugs (see fig. 11, h, i, l–n).

Of NSS-5, only part of a plastered floor with curbed hearth was exposed (online fig. 3b; see table 2). This hearth (Locus 147) is larger than the one in NSS-3 and is horseshoe shaped, with an opening on the north side, flanked by extending arms.\(^{49}\) Finds from the burnt debris immediately covering this hearth include several pieces of a white-painted one-handled globular jar or cup (online fig. 4). Other finds generally attributable to the burnt debris layer covering Terraced Building Phase 1 but not associated with identified structures include two clay stamp seals, a copper-alloy pin, a perforated horn handle with incised decoration, and other finds comparable with Karataş V:2 (see fig. 11, d–g).

Terraced Building Phase 2 (online fig. 5) followed shortly after the destruction of Phase 1 structures, cutting into them at the west.\(^{50}\) Five adjacent rooms or spaces have been uncovered, four with rounded platforms built into their southeast corners (NSS-1, -2, -8, and -9). Of the identifiable structures, NSS-1 is the least well preserved, with only the east and west walls, corner platform (fig. 13, Locus 48), and blackened floor identified (see fig. 13; table 2).\(^{51}\) On top of the corner platform is a round depression, and next to the platform is a small round bin. On and around the corner platform were pieces of two bowls and a jug (fig. 14, k–m). Finds from the debris layer covering Terraced Building Phase 1 but not associated with identified structures include two clay stamp seals, a copper-alloy pin, a perforated horn handle with incised decoration, and other finds comparable with Karataş V:2 (see fig. 11, d–g).

![Fig. 12. Plan of NSS-3.](image-url)

---

\(^{44}\) Cf. Korfmann 1983, 32 fig. 41, 125 figs. 215, 216.

\(^{45}\) Ca. 0.70 m wide x 0.17 m deep, bordered by low curb ca. 0.06 m wide. Objects here identified as spit supports are shaped like pyramidal loomweights but lack a suspension hole at the top and are pierced instead at the bottom on one side; cf. examples from Karataş (Warner 1994, 121, 206, pl. 196d:289/U, excav. 1969–71 (see n. 23) and Demircihöyük (Baykal-Seeher and Obladen-Kauder 1996, 245, pl. 99.3, excav. 1975–78 (see n. 32)).

\(^{46}\) Pistachios: HM23445, HM23115, HM23142. A carbonized lentil (?, HM23285) was found in the soil just atop one of the loomweights in the curbed depression.

\(^{47}\) Cf. a rimmed hearth with nearby ashpit and pot supports at EB I Karataş: Mellink and Angel 1973, 295, ill. 2, pl. 41.1 and 2; Mellink 1974, 351–52; Warner 1994, 139 n. 2.


\(^{49}\) Ca. 1.05 m wide; cf. a hearth in Karataş IV (Warner 1994, pls. 62, 145).

\(^{50}\) Intervening strata were encountered only at the east: clayey layers with ashy lenses and cobbles concentrations dense with ash and animal bones. From among the cobbles came a loomweight (see online fig. 16, a), a murex shell (HM22811), and pithos fragments.

\(^{51}\) The corner platform is ca. 0.35 m high with raised rim and round depression, ca. 0.26 m wide.
(see fig. 14, n), and a large white-painted pitcher (see fig. 13, Pot IV; fig. 14, r).

Of NSS-2, adjacent to the west but with the floor level about 0.5 m lower, all but the north wall is preserved, and the full dimensions of the room are suggested by slight turnings in the plaster faces of the east and west walls, where the northern wall must have stood (fig. 15; see table 2). Impressions of wood and plant materials in the fallen chunks of burnt wall that filled the room indicate both the direction of wall collapse (toward the west) and the use of tubular materials (probably reeds) set vertically between posts (see online fig. 2c).52 Along the east wall is a low ledge, just as in NSS-4 (fig. 16, Locus 67).53 The corner platform (Locus 65) is similar in shape and size to that in NSS-1, with a raised, curved feature that may have functioned as a pot stand (see fig. 15, Locus 89).54 Farther along the south wall, near the southwest corner of the room, is a cooking platform with projecting arms (Locus 79)55 surrounding a concentration of ash, with a shallow round ashpit in front. Small returned projections from the arms probably provided stability for cooking pots. On the corner platform were an intact beak-spouted jug (see fig. 14, j), a broken globular jar or cup (see fig. 14, u), and, directly atop the crushed jar, an intact, plain-burnished bowl (see figs. 14, q; 16), perhaps stacked for storage or used as a lid to cover the jar. Part of another white-painted bowl (see fig. 14, p) was found on the front edge of the platform, its other half leaning against the platform’s side. On the ledge running along the east wall were fragments of two coarse jars, a flat lid (see fig. 14, i), and a stone grinder or pounder. Fragments of a white-painted pedestaled lid were found on and around the northern part of this ledge, evidently broken before being burned (see fig. 14, h). On the floor just next to the east ledge were a plain globular cup or jar (see fig. 14, t) and a pyramidal spit holder (see fig. 14, g). Other finds from the floor include a small beak-spouted jug and many joining pieces of a large white-painted, red-burnished jar within a wide floor depression in the southwestern corner of the room, near the cooking platform (see figs. 15, 16, Locus 87).56 Pieces of a red-burnished jar or jug lay shattered on a narrow, low ledge (Locus 82) in the southwest corner, beneath broken pieces of a coarse jar that were coated with charred wheat grains.57 Based on the distribution of its pieces, the jar full of grain may have been suspended on a wall. Other finds from within the NSS-2 debris include spindles and spindlewhorls (see fig. 14, d and e), a clay animal figurine, possibly a sheep (see fig. 14, f),58 and a fragmentary wide-bodied jug with a second small handle beneath the spout, similar to the one found in NSS-1 (see fig. 14, s).

---

52 Two postholes are aligned on the center axis of the room 2 m apart: one square (ca. 0.18 x 0.18 m), just north of the south wall; the other in the center of the room and round (Locus 84, diam. ca. 0.25 m).
53 Ca. 0.15 m high.
54 The platform is ca. 0.30 m high, with a slightly raised edge.
55 Ca. 0.60 x 0.30 m, 0.15 m high.
56 Ca. 0.90 m wide, with a smaller, deeper depression inside (ca. 0.20 m wide).
Adjacent to NSS-2 at the west, NSS-7 differs from the other exposed rooms of this phase in not having a corner platform and being on the same level as its neighboring space to the east (see further discussion below). The next room to the west, NSS-8, is 0.2–0.3 m lower, thus resuming the stepped pattern. Of NSS-8, only the eastern part has been exposed (see fig. 15; online fig. 5; table 2). In addition to the rounded...
corner platform (Locus 68), a horseshoe-shaped hearth (Locus 66) was built into the floor, ringed by a low, round curb on three sides and at the north with a slightly higher ledge with upturned, hornlike ends (online fig. 6). On the blackened floor were fragments of white-painted and other pottery (fig. 17, o, q, aa–dd).

Of NSS-9, only the southeast corner has escaped erosion at the mound edge, and, having a corner platform (Locus 77) with a sunken bin or basin on one side (Locus 78), it presents an interesting variation on the formula seen in the other rooms (see fig. 15; online fig. 7). Next to the platform is a smaller, round bin built up from the floor, made of plastered mud and chaff (Locus 10; online fig. 8a). The walls of this room also differ from others so far revealed in this level because the postholes are more closely set (0.02–0.10 m apart) and variously shaped, with some squarish and others round. Because the floor level of this room is about 0.3 m lower than the adjacent spaces to the south, it seems that the terraced buildings stepped down here toward the north as well as toward the west.

NSS-7 is the name given to the space surrounded by NSS-2, -8, and -9, though it is not clear whether it was
FIG. 17. Selected finds from NSS-7 and NSS-8: clay whorls (a, HM25664; b, HM26615; c, HM26386; d, HM26033; e, HM26000; f, HM26396; g, HM26001; h, HM26002; i, HM26006); stone beads (j, HM25342; k, HM25614; l, HM26395); fragmentary stone axe-head from bin, Locus 57 (m, HM27141); pottery lids (n, HM26616; o, HM25197); cups (p, HM25175, and q, HM25177, red-burnished; bb, from HM26374, coarse gray); bowls (r, from HM26036; s, from HM26393); small jars (t, HM26378.1; u, from HM26043); jugs (v, HM26037, Pot 7 in fig. 15; w, HM25128, x, HM26371, and y, HM26372, from hearth, Locus 70; z, HM24944; aa, HM25196; hh, from HM25306 and HM25604); coarse jars (cc, HM26042; dd, from HM26374; ee, HM26365; ff, from HM26354; gg, from HM26603/26015/26312/26617/26624, Pot 4 in fig. 15) (a–i, q, v–y now in the Elmalı Museum).
Hacımusalar Höyük in the Early Bronze Age

The positions of the burnt wall chunks and the orientations of reed and wood impressions within them indicate that much of the debris filling the east side of the space represented the collapsed west wall of NSS-2 (online fig. 9, Locus 54). Installations within NSS-7 are primarily concerned with grain processing and storage (fig. 18; see table 2): two grinding platforms (grinding stones surrounded by plastered earth and stones, Loci 74 and 75) with an adjacent floor bin (Locus 72), presumably for collecting ground grain as it fell from the platform; an oval platform (Locus 53) covered and surrounded with a scatter of charred wheat grains and broken pottery; and two storage bins (Loci 57 and 60) made of plastered mud and chaff, built directly up from the floor, one caked with carbonized grain at the bottom (see online fig. 8b). Similar clay bins may have been used in the disturbed NSS-1 and are attested at EBA Aphrodisias, where they were also used to hold grains in a storage area that was “not necessarily enclosed.” Parallels for grinding stones embedded in plastered installations are found from Neolithic Ilıpınar to EB II Arslantepe. Near the middle of NSS-7 is a small horseshoe-shaped hearth (Locus 70) with three knobs projecting inward (to form a tripod pot support), an upright stone slab at the end of each projecting arm, and a larger, shallow rimmed basin in front (see fig. 18). Sitting on top of the horseshoe-shaped hearth was the base of a large red-burnished, white-painted jar with relief knobs and grooved handles, the upper parts of which were found in debris strewn toward the south (see fig. 17, ee; online fig. 10a). In the ash filling the small space below that base and between the projecting arms were three matching beak-spouted jugs with white-painted decoration (see fig. 17, w–y; online fig. 10b). In the shallow curbed basin were pieces of a large red-burnished, white-painted jug (see online fig. 10c), and sitting upright on the floor just north of the hearth were a shattered one-handled bowl with white-painted decoration and a small red-burnished juglet (see online fig. 10d). The concentration of decorated non-cookware pottery on and inside this hearth is notable, as is the assortment of different shapes used for pouring and consuming liquids. Its orientation is also notable: in contrast to all the other horseshoe-shaped hearths in neighboring rooms, its opening faces east rather than north. In the debris covering this hearth and between it, the oval platform to the west, and the grinding platforms to the south, was a swath of broken pots, including several coarse jars, one full of charred grains (see figs. 15, Pot 4; 17, gg), a brown-burnished jug (see figs. 15, Pot 7; 17, v), and a small, globular red-burnished bowl or cup (see fig. 17, p). Many more pieces of coarse decorated jars and burnished jugs and bowls were found in the general debris, along with 13 spindlewhorls or beads (see fig. 17, a–i), two loomweights, and three stone beads (see fig. 17, j–l). A fragmentary stone axe head and pounding stone were

---

64 Two large round postholes (ca. 0.13 and 0.20 m wide) located just in front of the east wall (0.02 and 0.12 m, respectively, to the west) and a carbonized squared timber post (0.07 x 0.04 x 0.42 m) lying on the floor toward the southeast corner suggest at least partial coverage on the east side.

65 The floor bin measures 0.38 x 0.54 m, 0.18 m deep, with rim ca. 0.02 m high and exit spout 0.13 m long.

66 Ca. 0.98 x 0.60 m, 0.27 m high.

67 Locus 57, ca. 0.51 m wide at base, preserved to 0.31 m above floor; Locus 60, ca. 0.37 m wide at base, preserved only up to 0.05 m above floor. A smaller, squared bin (Locus 56, ca. 0.31 x 0.29 m, ca. 0.26 m high) was built against the east face of the west wall.

68 Ben Claasz Coockson, field notes, 14 August 2008.


70 Coockson 2008, figs. 18, 26, 82.

71 Sadori et al. 2006, 210–11, fig. 6.

72 The raised, horseshoe-shaped part of the hearth measures 0.36 x 0.49 m, 0.11–0.17 m high, with plastered upright stones (0.22–0.25 m high); the rimmed basin is ca. 0.65 m wide.

73 For the shape, cf. Eslick 2009, pl. 8, jar type 32; pl. 9, jar type 47; pl. 46:KT394, excav. 1965 (see n. 23).

74 Sample HM25693.

75 Cf. Eslick 2009, pl. 6, jug type 6.
found in the bottom of the bin containing charred wheat (Locus 57, figs. 17, m; 18; online fig. 8b).

Other notable finds attributable to this level but found in strata that were disturbed or could not be associated with a particular room or structure include a flat copper-based strip or bracelet (online fig. 11, m); a copper-based toggle pin with a spherical head (see online fig. 11, n); a jar with earlike solid lug handles (online fig. 12, n); a blackened beak-spouted jug with pierced earlike lugs on the neck (see online fig. 12, x); and a carbonized grape pip. From the burnt debris at the northern edge of “B4i7” (see fig. 15, upper left) came a pile of nine loomweights (see online fig. 11, w–y), with a tenth one found nearby, and a spindlewhorl and oblong polished stone object just below. The pile probably results from storage of the loomweights together, rather than hung on a loom, because their holes were oriented in different directions. The stone object (see online fig. 11, o) is comparable with one from “B4g8” (see fig. 8, i), possibly a whetstone pendant. A clay brush handle (online fig. 11, l) and six more spindlewhorls were also found in this disturbed area.

Overall, the finds from both Terraced Building levels suggest a variety of different domestic activities, from food preparation and consumption to spinning thread and weaving cloth. While it is difficult to compare artifact assemblages by room because most of the spaces were not completely preserved or exposed, all contained coarse as well as decorated pottery, storage as well as serving vessels, and some artifacts related to textile production. The corner platforms were probably multipurpose, as they could be used as tables or working surfaces as well as supplementary fireplaces.

Questions raised include: What was the purpose or benefit of the stepped arrangement of buildings? Did the terracing create greater stability for the rooms or structures sharing party walls? Or did staggered rooflines allow for more light or ventilation in the upper parts of the side walls while maintaining a party-wall system? No clear indications have yet been identified among the chunks of burnt mud walling and roofing to answer the question of whether the ceilings of the terraced buildings were flat or pitched, though contiguous structures with party walls (as at EB I Demircihöyük) are usually thought to have had flat roofs. The social implications of this standardized planning is further explored below.

Comparisons with material from Karataş suggest a late EB II date. Painted jugs from both Terraced Building phases are especially comparable with the Mound South Hook Group from mixed deposits at Karataş, assigned to period V:2. Another strong indicator of contemporaneity with Karataş V:2 is the prevalence of incurved bowls (see, e.g., figs. 11, i; 14, p; 17, r), with or without painted decoration. While such handmade bowls were popular at Karataş during V:2–VI:1, from V:3 they coexisted with shallow plates, tankards, and wheelmade forms, all of which are completely lacking in the Terraced Building levels. Radiocarbon analysis of charred wheat grains from the destruction debris in NSS-2 carried out by the Sarayköy Nükleer Araştırma ve Eğitim Merkezi, Ankara, yielded a date range of 2617–2349 cal BCE (1 sigma). This range fits well with the chronology for the EB II period laid out by Mellink and followed here (see table 1).

The So-called Green Mudbrick Phase of EB II

On the north slope, the destruction debris of Terraced Building Phase 2 was followed directly by another building level characterized by the use of greenish mudbrick or pisé over stone foundations,
with rubble stone facing on the lowest parts of some wall exteriors. In NSS-6 (fig. 19), the interior wall faces (Loci 14 and 37) were covered with white plaster that merged with the plastered floor, with at least five re-plasterings. Two rectangular mudbrick pedestals in the middle of the room (Loci 20 and 21), near a circular hearth (Locus 26), had been re-plastered at least three times. The finds from strata filling NSS-6 were not as numerous as from the burnt levels below but include a bone awl, an idol figurine made of soft sandstone or clay, and a globular red-burnished jug (online fig. 13, h). The continuation of this level toward the east is represented by a rough line of green mudbricks placed end to end (see fig. 19), an oval hearth (Locus 49), and lenses of green mud alternating with black ashy layers, (Loci 20 and 21), on the west slope that probably correspond to the previous phase (the burnt layer that seems to correspond to the destruction of Terraced Building Phase 2), these levels are generally 1.0–1.5 m higher on the west than on the north slope.

**Late EB II**

A later EB II horizon is represented by several walls and associated floors at the bottom of the North Sounding (see figs. 3, 5) and isolated features at the same level in trenches on the slope, with wall types ranging from mudbrick on stone to simple mudbrick to a combination of mudbrick and pisé. Red- or dark-burnished and white-painted wares continue, though not as frequently as in the Terraced Building levels.

Subsequent EBA levels were encountered with certainty only in the narrow North Sounding, where they had not been eroded or cut back in later antiquity in part because they were overlain by the Iron Age city wall (online fig. 14). In the southernmost part of the sounding, two successive pebbled surfaces (Loci 212 and 187/195) ran under and up to the exterior of a mudbrick corner (Locus 189, one wall of which extended into the east balk), covered by a layer of dense burnt mudbrick debris. The mudbrick corner and soil layers immediately beneath were dramatically cut at the north, and the cut, nearly 1 m deep, was filled

---

88 The room was about 4 m wide and at least 3.2 m long, with preserved walls 0.7–0.8 m thick.
89 Each about 0.35 x 0.22 m and at least 0.20 m high, located ca. 0.40 m apart (see fig. 19, inset).
90 The narrow line of green mudbrick (0.16–0.20 m wide, preserved up to 0.24 m high) was ca. 1.60 m to the east of NSS-6 and running roughly parallel to it. To the east of this, the hearth was partly above the east wall and corner platform of NSS-2.
91 Cf. Warner 1994, pl. 187h:KA450, excav. 1966 (see n. 23).
92 D2b4 Locus 9 (= D2c3 Locus 2), D2c3 Locus 6 (= D2b4 Locus 17), D2b4 Locus 16.

---

93 North Sounding Loci 227, 232, 239; “B4i10” Locus 17.
94 “B4i10” Locus 22 (= “B4i8–i9” Locus 36; the same feature was assigned a different locus number in each trench).
95 North Sounding Locus 200/205 (slash indicates the feature was assigned two locus numbers before it became apparent the two formed one entity).
96 The corner was at least 0.26 m high, 0.85 m long, and 0.72 m wide, with four preserved courses of mudbrick of varying color. One wall was oriented northwest–southeast; the other was perpendicular to it, oriented southwest–northeast.
with a series of dense, sloping layers of clean mud or pisé, within which an upright mudbrick wall may have served as a filling partition or retaining wall. This deposit may have been a leveling fill\(^9\) to aid construction of the subsequent building, represented by a stone foundation (Locus 156/158) exposed for a length of 9.1 m, composed of parallel rows of fieldstones with smaller stones and cobbles between them (fig. 20).\(^9\) It was buttressed on both sides, with buttresses about 0.5 m wide placed 2.0–2.4 m apart. The lack of a crosswall and the presence of buttresses suggest that this wall was part of a rather large building, comparable to buttressed buildings in the EB III levels of Karataş, which had standard megaron plans (with long hall and porch).\(^10\) But unlike buttressed foundations at Karataş, which supported walls of pisé or timber-reinforced mud, here, up to two courses of large, square mudbricks of various colors were preserved.\(^10\) Although the overall plan of the building is uncertain, it is not impossible that it was a building of megaron or megaroid type.\(^10\)

At some point, the northern end of the buttressed wall was disturbed and superimposed by yet another EBA occupation level, North Sounding Phase C. In the southern part of the North Sounding, this occupation phase overlies an intervening sediment layer that may have been another leveling fill. Joining fragments of a remarkable globular spouted jug were found dispersed throughout this soil over a wide area.\(^103\) This jug (fig. 21, x) is distinctive in fabric (chalky buff with light bluish-gray interior) and surface decoration (crossing diagonal and curving bands painted in reddish-brown slip) as well as shape, with an unusually tall neck and nearly vertical spout.\(^104\) Horn-shaped knobs project from the shoulder and are paired along the sides of the neck. Only a few red-painted sherds have otherwise been found in EBA levels at Hacimusalar Höyük and elsewhere in West Anatolia, where they are sometimes identified as imports.\(^10\) The fabric and general decoration of this jug are comparable with Cypriot White Painted or Philia Ware,\(^10\) while horn-shaped lugs are paralleled on Middle Cypriot pottery.\(^10\) Otherwise the pottery from these intervening strata includes mostly dark- and red-burnished as well as coarse wares, with only a few white-painted bowl rims (see fig. 21, a–d, f). Several shallow red-burnished bowl or plate rims (see, e.g., fig. 21, i, j, u)\(^108\) and two red-burnished tankard rims (see fig. 21, e and l) mark the earliest occurrence of these shapes on the mound. These distinctive shapes appear at Karataş in period V:3 and thus suggest a date in the late EB II period for this deposit.\(^109\) Still lacking from deposits directly beneath North Sounding Phase C, however, are any traces of wheelmade pottery, which appeared at Karataş and elsewhere in West Anatolia by early EB III.\(^11\) Other notable finds from these intervening strata include spindlewhorls decorated with white-filled incisions, one lentoid in shape (see fig. 21, y).\(^11\)

\(^9\) These dense mud layers contained very few finds, except at the lowest level, which included some animal bone and flat lenses of ash and organic remains.

\(^10\) Cf. a mudbrick fill for an EB II building at Liman Tepe (Ercan 1996, 77).

\(^10\) The foundation measured 0.50–0.60 m thick and 0.10–0.26 m high. Cf. the “triple line” construction found in Karataş III–V:3 (Warner 1994, 142).

\(^10\) Warner 1979, ill. 2; 1994, pl. 13, 40, 55, 133b–c, 134a.

\(^10\) Bricks 0.40–0.44 m wide, ca. 0.40–0.60 m long.

\(^10\) For the use of the term “megaron,” which some scholars avoid because it implies Aegean connections for a West Anatolian building type, see Mellink 1986, 140; Werner 1993; Düring 2011, 269; Perelîo 2011, 119; Ivanova 2013, 18.

\(^10\) North Sounding Loci 145, 152, 153, 154, and 168; strata constituting a total depth of 0.54 m and covering most of C4a8 and B4j8.

\(^10\) Cf. Eslick 2009, 18, pl. 6, jug type 21; also, EB III “libation vessels” from Seyitömer Höyük, Bilgen 2015, figs. 152, 153, excav. 2006–2013, Dumlupınar University excavations.

\(^10\) Beycesultan: Lloyd and Mellaart 1962, 217, fig. P56.3, excav. 1954–59 (see n. 22); Aphrodisias: Joukowsky 1986, 388–89, fig. 321.18, excav. 1967 (see n. 22); Karataş: Mellink 1991, 170; Eslick 2009, 52.

\(^10\) Swiny 1991, 41; Webb and Frankel 1999, 24–25. Many thanks to David Frankel and Jennifer Webb for assistance with this comparison.

\(^10\) E.g., Frankel 1983, nos. 40, 1244 (Ashmolean Museum AN1888.667, AN1896-1908.C.24). Horn-shaped knobs also occur on jug shoulders from earlier strata at Hacimusalar (e.g., fig. 7, m and n, herein).

\(^10\) Cf. Eslick 2009, 14, pl. 5, bowl type 43.


\(^11\) Cf. Warner 1994, pl. 183g:KA545, Karataş VI, excav. 1966–67 (see n. 23).
**FIG. 20. Buttressed wall in North Sounding:** *left*, drawing before mudbricks removed, with mudbrick characteristics noted; *right*, stone foundation completely exposed.
North Sounding Phase C consisted of two mud-brick walls forming the northwest corner of a room, both made of silty yellow mudbrick with barely discernible courses, one with an irregular stone socle (online fig. 15). In and around a pit hearth on the adjacent surface to the north (see online fig. 14, Locus 150) were found several red-burnished bowl rims of light pinkish-red color as well as fragments of a small red-burnished, white-painted jar or cup (fig. 22). The bowls are shallow types that were popular at Karataş in periods V:3–VI:1. Nearby were the fragments of a nearly complete jar (see fig. 22, a), at least two other large coarse ware vessels, and an unbaked clay die (see fig. 22, h) with impressed dots on each side: 1 opposite 3, 2 opposite 5, and 4 opposite 6. Cubic dice are known from EBA contexts in the Near East and Indus Valley, but these usually have opposite sides paired as 1/2, 12 cm.

112 North Sounding Locus 101, at least 0.60 m thick and 0.56 m high, with stone socle 0.34–0.11 m high. The other wall (Locus 114) was ca. 0.35 m thick, with a thin white plaster layer on its north face.

113 Cf. esp. Eslick 2009, 11, 14, pls. 4, bowl type 12; 5, bowl type 40.
3/6, and 4/5. The closest parallel known for our arrangement of numbers, except that the face opposite 4 is blank, occurs on a stone die from Mohenjodaro.

**EB III**

Two subsequent EBA burnt layers were attested in the North Sounding in the space just beneath the later city wall and toward the mound edge at the north (see online fig. 14). Finds from these loci and the intervening strata between them and Phase C offer more examples of tankard and plate rims, including a type found at Karataş only in period VI:1 (fig. 23, d), and S-profile bowls (see fig. 23, b and f), also found in EB III in this region. A narrow-mouthed jar rim with incised horizontal grooves on the neck (see fig. 23, m) is comparable to EB III examples from Troy, Tarsus, and Aphrodisias.

3. From the deepest levels reached in C4b9 on the north rim come further tankard rims and numerous red-burnished shallow plate and platter rims (fig. 24). It is in this context that the first clear traces of wheel-thrown pottery appear (see fig. 24, h), though

---

115 Mackay 1938, 559–60, pl. 142, no. 85.
116 One ca. 0.6 m above the surface of Phase C, traceable for about 7.8 m (North Sounding Loci 75, 85, 89, 92, 97, 104); another 0.5–0.6 m above that but preserved only directly beneath the city wall (North Sounding Loci 60, 61).
117 Cf. Eslick 2009, 14, pl. 5, bowl type 42.
119 Blegen et al. 1951, 137, 199, fig. 181.15, excav. 1932–38 (see n. 76); Goldman 1956, fig. 275.596, excav. 1935–39 (see n. 81) (see also Ünlü 2009, 150–51, pl. 48); Joukowsky 1986, or more coarse jars with hooked swastika designs in relief (see fig. 23, i).
120 Cf. examples from Karataş: Mellink 1964, 274–75, pl. 79.12 and .13; Mellink 1969, 321–22, pl. 73.13; Eslick 2009, 41, pls. 27:KT53, 56:KA177; all excav. 1963–68 (see n. 23).

---

---

---

---

---
handmade wares still predominate.\textsuperscript{122} From an uncontaminated EB III stratum on the south rim come more shallow bowl or plate rims as well as a possible example of black-topped ware, not otherwise attested at Hacımusalar.\textsuperscript{123}

**DISCUSSION: EBA HACIMUSALAR HÖYÜK IN CONTEXT**

The EBA remains at Hacımusalar Höyük are important for understanding the history of the Elmalı region, the cultural affinities of its inhabitants, and settlement connectivity and development in EBA West Anatolia as a whole (fig. 25). The density of EB II remains is remarkable, with key cultural elements persisting through successive building levels. Most of the present height of the Hacımusalar mound accumulated through this process of rebuilding. Its material evidence is readily comparable with neighboring Karataş but presents some key differences that may shed light on the relationship between neighboring settlements of different sizes in a time of developing urbanism. Evidence for extra-regional connections and cultural affinities suggests broader cultural interactions and trade. The mountain-defined borders of the Elmalı plain help to explain its regionalism while making all the more significant any external connections that are found. Hacımusalar Höyük also contributes new perspectives to discussions of cultural changes, trade, and connectivity in EB II–III West Anatolia.

**Pottery**

Overall, the EBA material culture of the Elmalı basin is regionally distinct. Since the surveys by Mel-laart, Elmalı EBA pottery has been recognized for its abundance of white-on-red decoration.\textsuperscript{124} As Eslick has noted, the “strong local character” of the Elmalı plain is not surprising given its location “away from major routes.”\textsuperscript{125} Its pottery is distinct even from that of the neighboring Seki and Çaltılar plains, just 25 km northwest but on the other side of a mountain range reaching more than 2,500 masl.\textsuperscript{126} Regionalism within broader trends can also be explained by pottery manufacturing methods, at least for the EB I–II periods, when pottery was produced at the household level and probably did not travel far,\textsuperscript{127} though petrographic analysis for the few white-painted sherds from Çaltılar suggests that they may have been produced in the Elmalı region.\textsuperscript{128}

Both Hacımusalar and Karataş have yielded a wealth of EB II red- and dark-burnished pottery with white-painted decoration, especially incurved bowls and beak-spouted jugs. Some of the painted motifs—overlapping, crossing, or zigzag parallel diagonal lines or chevrons—belong to a widespread decorative vocabulary that appears in both incised and painted form across West Anatolia in the EBA. Multiple chevrons, or groups of parallel diagonal lines in a zigzag arrangement with ends sometimes overlapping in a grid pattern (see figs. 11, j; 14, m and r; 17, w–y; 21, a–c), are a hallmark of Yortan-style painted pottery, particularly on beak-spouted jugs, and also occur on pottery from Kusura, period A.\textsuperscript{129} Curvilinear motifs, on the other hand, seem to have been more at home in the Elmalı

![Map of Anatolia, with sites mentioned in the text.](image)

\textsuperscript{122} One earlier example of possible wheel marks, on a bowl rim from North Sounding Phase C (pottery lot HM19215), is less certain.

\textsuperscript{123} HM27958, South Sounding Locus 48.

\textsuperscript{124} Mellaart 1954, 179, 190, 206, 210; Yakar 1985, 123–24, 158; Efe 2003, 91; Eslick 2009, 52, 214–17; Efe and Türkteki 2011b, 218–19; French 2012, 8; Fidan et al. 2015, 62, 72; Thater 2016, 16.

\textsuperscript{125} Eslick 2009, 215.

\textsuperscript{126} Momigliano et al. 2011, 77; French and Coulton 2012, 45; French 2012, 8.

\textsuperscript{127} Mellink 1986, 141; Eslick 2009, 4, 230; Ünlü 2009, 52; Thater 2016, 20.

\textsuperscript{128} Momigliano et al. 2011, 80–81, 105.

\textsuperscript{129} Kusura: Lamb 1937, fig. 16, no. 13, excav. 1935–37 (see n. 32); Yortan: Kâmil 1982, figs. 41, 42, 46, 47, 52, 58, 59, 61, excav. 1900–01, French excavations; Karataş: Eslick 2009, pls. 14, 15, motifs 11–13; on the motif in general, Thater 2016, 14.
basin than elsewhere in West Anatolia. The double-
swag (concentric semicircles) was especially popular on the rims of incurved bowls (see, e.g., figs. 14, 1 and p; 17, r; online figs. 12, p; 13, z), while overlapping swags (intersecting arcs) are found also around the shoulders and mouth interiors of jugs, jars, and cups (see figs. 11, i; 14, m and r). These motifs find no parallels in contemporary incised pottery, as they are more suited to the movement of the paintbrush.

Particularly common are hooks, whether pendant from a horizontal band around the neck of a vessel or hanging from the legs of chevrons or triangles formed by crossing diagonals (see figs. 11, n; 17, o and x; 14, n; online fig. 12, a, b, e, s). At Karataş, this motif was found primarily in a group of jugs from mixed contexts dubbed the Mound South Hook Group, thought to belong to Karataş V:2 (EB II), and on a few graves of the same period. The decoration was so distinctive at Karataş and the group so “cohesive” that Eslick suggested the vases were “made within the same household” and that there may have been “some connection between the producing household, presumably in Mound South, and those burials.” The discovery of five jugs with similar decorative schemes combining diagonal and hook motifs in contexts associated with both Terraced Building levels at Hacımusalar not only helps secure an EB II dating for these levels but suggests a broader decorative trend in the region, possibly originating at Hacımusalar, where the hook motif is also found on globular one-handed cups as well as on larger jugs and jars and a pedestaled lid. In fact, there is a greater variety of painted shapes in general at Hacımusalar, including globular one-handed cups, large jugs and jars, and pedestaled lids (see, e.g., figs. 14, h, s, u; 17, o, aa, cc; online figs. 12, a–e, h; 13, r). The pedestaled lids are particularly interesting because at other EBA sites in West Anatolia these are normally not decorated. Pedestaled lids at Karataş also usually have vent holes, which are lacking in the decorated examples from Hacımusalar; the decorated, nonperforated types may have been used more for storage (covering jars) than for cooking.

The recurrence of specific decorative motifs is particularly notable for pottery that was probably produced at the household level by nonspecialists. Were potters at Karataş emulating designs more commonly found at the larger, regional center? While the similarities are striking, there is still enough variability to support a local, household-based production model; these are not mass-produced items. The beak-spouted jugs from Karataş, for instance, do not have suspension holes at the tops of the handles like many from Hacımusalar. And there is a great deal of variety in the combination and execution of these decorative motifs. For instance, the designs painted around the mouths of jugs in the Mound South Hook Group at Karataş—parallel angled dashes or a chain of intersecting swags—are found on cups as well as jugs at Hacımusalar, with various other motifs as body decoration. It seems that painters freely mixed and matched motifs. Hooks with crosshatched filling and crosshatch-filled ovals (see figs. 14, h; 17, o and x; online fig. 12, a) are found at Hacımusalar but are not represented among the published pottery from Karataş.

Also rare at Karataş but frequent at Hacımusalar is the combination of painted and relief decoration. At Karataş, this combination is found in only a few cases, and the painted decoration usually bears no relation to the relief elements; for instance, a small knob on the shoulder of a red-burnished, white-painted jug or vertical ridges that seem to interrupt a painted design at Karataş—all parallel angled dashes or a chain of intersecting swags—are found on cups as well as jugs at Hacımusalar, with various other motifs as body decoration. It seems that painters freely mixed and matched motifs. Hooks with crosshatched filling and crosshatch-filled ovals (see figs. 14, h; 17, o and x; online fig. 12, a) are found at Hacımusalar but are not represented among the published pottery from Karataş.

D3, 5, 7, 8; Blegen et al. 1951, fig. 154b, Types D1, D5, D7, D8, excav. 1932–38 (see n. 76); Thermi: Lamb 1936, 77, 115, no. 290; 122, no. 382; 134, nos. 592–94; pls. XXXVI, XL, excav. 1929–33 (see n. 77); Aphrodisias: Kadish 1971, 138, pls. 29.29, 30.41, excav. 1968–69 (see n. 22); Seyitömer and Küllüoba: Efe 2007, fig. 10 (see nn. 104, 118); Karataş: Eslick 2009, 27, pl. 11, lid type 1; see also Thater 2016, 19.


131 Mellink and Angel 1966, 252; Eslick 2009, 188–89, 230, pl. 15, motif 134; pls. 62, 90–92, excav. 1964–69 (see n. 23).


133 Troy: Schliemann 1881, 374–75, 538, figs. 328–32, 1093, excav. 1870–79; Blegen et al. 1950, fig. 370b, Types
A relief medallion covered with painted crosshatching and surrounded by double swags radiating from it produces an almost floral effect (see fig. 17, cc). A radiating pattern is found on a shape not paralleled at Karataş or anywhere else to the authors’ knowledge: a large, wide-mouthed jug with saggy body, vertical loop handle opposite the pouring spout, and an additional, smaller vertical loop handle on the shoulder just beneath the spout (see fig. 14, s; for the shape, fig. 14, r). The small vertical handle beneath the spout is formally reminiscent of metallic ware jugs from central Anatolia and Cilicia, though here it is larger in relation to the overall vessel size and seems more functional, perhaps to facilitate closure by a soft cloth or leather covering.

Another shape well represented at Hacımusalar and worth discussing in some detail is the small, one-handed globular jar or cup, found in both Terraced Building phases as well as sporadically in later EB levels (see, e.g., fig. 14, t and u; online fig. 12, a–e). It has already been noted that this shape bears painted decoration more often here than at Karataş (where has already been noted that this shape bears painted levels (see, e.g., fig. 14, t and u; online fig. 12, a–e). It should be handled globular jar or cup, found in both Terraced Building phases as well as sporadically in later EB levels (see, e.g., fig. 14, t and u; online fig. 12, a–e). It has already been noted that this shape bears painted decoration more often here than at Karataş (where there are in fact only two examples; one from VI:1139 and another from the cemetery140). Examples of this general shape elsewhere in EBA central and western Anatolia, variously called mugs, cups, or small jars, are also usually plain or burnished. These vessels probably functioned as drinking cups and have been seen as predecessors of EB III tankards. Their find contexts at Hacımusalar support this function, as they often occur together with beak-spouted jugs and one-handled bowls. In NSS-2, a fine decorated example of this shape was found atop the corner platform, crushed beneath an intact bowl that must have been sitting on top of it at the time of the destruction (see figs. 14, u; 16).

Pottery from Hacımusalar also demonstrates the interacting networks of the Elmalı plain during EB II and III. Fluted decoration so common in the Beycesultan region was previously thought rare in the Elmalı basin but is now attested in both dark- and red-burnished varieties in some of the earliest levels of Hacımusalar (see, e.g., fig. 8, n). The foot-shaped vessel supports from the north slope (see fig. 8, j and k) also demonstrate the remarkable connectivity of the Elmalı region with other parts of West Anatolia, as they are closely paralleled by footed vessels from Yortan (EB II) and Beycesultan (EB III).143 The leg-shaped tripod supports of a miniature table from EB II Bademağaç are also comparable, though they are smaller and lack articulation of ankles and toes. The horned jug from a late EB II level (see fig. 21, x), on the other hand, signals a possible connection with Cyprus, though not necessarily evidence for direct contact via the Lycian coast. Rather, it may be seen, along with the use of the fast wheel and the occurrence of shallow plates and tankards, as evidence for the participation of Hacımusalar (and the Elmalı plain) in an interior Anatolian trade route linked with the Cilician coast (discussed further below).

Small Finds

Like the pottery, the small finds from EBA Hacımusalar demonstrate strong similarities with material from Karataş while also fitting into broader West Anatolian traditions. A few also provide evidence for contacts outside Anatolia, probably along an inland Anatolian trade route. It is important to note that ties with inland West Anatolia seem to have been stronger than connections with coastal areas.

Metal finds from Hacımusalar’s EBA levels are few, but these are generally comparable with those from Karataş. The toggle pin (see online fig. 11, n) is

---

137 One example is known from Karataş: Mellink 1965, 243, pl. 60:7b, excav. 1964 (see n. 23).
138 E.g., Öztan 1989, figs. 5, 6, 21, excav. 1975–83, Açemihöyük, University of Ankara excavations.
139 Eslick 2009, 170, pls. 52, 86a:KA454, excav. 1966 (see n. 23).
140 Mellink 1965, 243, pl. 60:8, excav. 1964 (see n. 23).
141 E.g., examples from Thermi: Lamb 1936, 87, 100–3, fig. 26, cup types 1 and 2, pl. 8:24, 25, 73, pl. 35:8, excav. 1929–33 (see n. 77); Tarsus: Goldman 1956, fig. 274.455, excav. 1935–39 (see n. 81); Beycesultan: Lloyd and Mellaart 1962, 123, figs. P16.13, P46.3, P46.4, excav. 1954–59 (see n. 22); Aphrodisias: Kadish 1971, 138, pl. 30:37, excav. 1968–1969 (see n. 21); Kaklık Mevkii: Efe et al. 1995, 367, fig. 12, form 8, excav. 1983–90 (see n. 23); Karataş: Eslick 2009, pl. 7, jar types 5, 8, 9, 11, 12; pls. 52:KT504, 64:KA329, KT 574, excav. 1964–69 (see n. 23); Çiledir Höyük: Türk tüzün et al. 2014, fig. 9, excav. 2009 (see n. 38).
142 Şahoğlu 2008, 160; 2011, 139.
143 Yortan: Forsdyke 1925, 10, fig. 16, London, British Museum 132447; Beycesultan: Lloyd and Mellaart 1962, 217, fig. P56.7, excav. 1954–59 (see n. 22). The legs from Hacımusalar are somewhat taller than these.
especially important because it is a Syro-Cilician type that does not appear on the Aegean coast until the LBA; its presence in an EB II–III context in inland West Anatolia has been used to support the theory of an overland trade route linking Syria to West Anatolia in the EBA. This example from Hacımusalar provides further evidence that the Elmali plain was connected with that inland communication route as early as the EB II period.

Hacımusalar’s clay, stone, and bone objects, too, are easily paralleled at Karataş, though many are types found widely throughout EBA Anatolia (e.g., truncated biconical spindlewhorls, pyramidal loomweights, animal figurines, axe-heads) and speak less to regional distinction than to broader cultural connectivity across West Anatolia. As Goldman noted, similarities in the shape and design of spindlewhorls were probably “due to a common background rather than to the influence of one site upon another.” Loomweights with incised lines or cross patterns on the top (online fig. 16) are paralleled both nearby at Karataş and in interior West Anatolia at Demircihöyük. Similarly, most of the stamp seals from Hacımusalar Höyük are of a general type known throughout western and central Anatolia from the Chalcolithic period through the Bronze Age, with roughly conical shape, suspension hole, and round face (see figs. 7, b; 8, b; 11, e; online fig. 11, j). One (see fig. 11, e) has a distinctive design of alternating lines and dots, recently discussed as a possible recording system. At the same time, the division of the stamp face into four quadrants is comparable to the so-called angle-filled cross motif widely documented across Anatolia and the Aegean and also attested at Hacımusalar (see online fig. 11, j). The clay die discussed above (see fig. 22, h) was probably made locally, but it places Hacımusalar (and the Elmali plain) within the remarkably wide context of a shared leisure pastime stretching from Mesopotamia west to Anatolia and east to the Indus Valley. The carved horn handle (see fig. 11, f) is rare among the small finds from Hacımusalar in having no parallel from Karataş. While its form is comparable to examples from inland West Anatolia, its decoration resembles the carved patterns on Aegean EB II bone tubes.

Most of the idol figurines discovered at Hacımusalar Höyük are the schematic, figure-eight type common across West Anatolia in the EBA (see online figs. 13, g; 17). Like similar examples from Karataş, they occur in marble as well as other types of stone or clay. Rounded dark lines on the face of one (see online fig. 17b) may be remnants of facial details, like those on the so-called owl-faced idols from Troy. The functions and meanings of such figurines are uncertain and probably multivalent, as they are found in domestic contexts as well as in graves. The occurrence of this figurine type in the Elmali region shows the area’s connectedness with other parts of West Anatolia and calls into question assumed cultural group boundaries. Maps purporting to show the distribution of idol figurine types according to supposed cultural regions of West Anatolia in the EBA misleadingly present the so-called violin type with long, thin neck as typical for the Lycian-Pisidian region. While several violin-shaped figures have been found at Karataş, none have yet been found at Hacımusalar, and the simpler figure-eight type is attested not only at Hacımusalar but also at Karataş and Aphrodisias and elsewhere in

145 Efe 2003, 93; 2007, 49; Şahoğlu 2005; Fidan 2012; Türkteki 2013, 193; Fidan et al. 2015, 73–74. Examples from Tarsus: Goldman 1956, fig. 431, nos. 210, 211, 222–27, 231, excav. 1935–39 (see n. 81); from Karataş: Mellink 1967, 253, 255, pl. 77.22 right, excav. 1966 (see n. 23).
146 Goldman 1956, 330; see also Lamb 1938, 237; Rahmstorf 2015, 154–55. For notable close parallels in spindlewhorl designs, cf. figs. 14, a, and 17, h, herein, with Warner 1994, pls. 189h:KAS03, 185b:KA697, excav. 1967–68 (see n. 23).
149 Also, HM27071 found in mixed context in “B4h7.”
West Anatolia and the eastern Aegean. Both types were widely dispersed throughout West Anatolia, not confined to one region or another; rather than showing cultural distinction, the idol types of EBA West Anatolia indicate significant connectivity.

The clay brush handles from Hacımusalar Höyük likewise find parallels both within the Elmalı basin and in inland West Anatolia. Both pieces from Hacımusalar have an elongated oval body with narrow rows of closely set bristle holes. One (see online fig. 11, l) has a conical grip, with a round suspension hole in the center near the transition from body to handle. The other (see fig. 8, h) is more fragmentary but appears to be of similar shape. Unbaked clay brushes such as these have been found throughout West Anatolia and the eastern Aegean from the EBA, but this particular type—with oval body, neat rows of bristle holes, conical handle, and suspension hole—is closely paralleled in EBA levels at Troy, Tarsus, Beycesultan, Karataş, Demircihöyük, and Çiledir Höyük. It is difficult to say what materials may have served as bristles in such brushes; traces of plant material were reportedly found within some of the holes on brush handles from Troy, but animal-hair bristles are also likely. The uses of these brushes are also difficult to determine and may have been quite varied. At Demircihöyük alone, several different possible use-contexts have been identified on the basis of in situ find circumstances: cleaning hearth areas, combing wool, applying cosmetics, and dyeing textiles. The first two uses accord well with the context of the brush handle from Terraced Building Phase 2 (see online fig. 11, l), found near a hearth and a collection of loomweights.

**Architecture**

The terraced buildings at Hacımusalar Höyük are comparable with the row houses or “parallel rows of long-room units” found in Troy I and at other West Anatolian EBA sites, though somewhat smaller. Whether parallel or radially arranged, as in Korfmann’s “Anatolian Settlement Plan,” standardized buildings sharing “common walls represent the most efficient plan with which to build in a restricted area” and were also economical, because party walls, not exposed to outdoor elements, would need less maintenance than exterior walls. Offering “a horizontal solution for privacy in a densely populated settlement,” they also carry social implications: party walls imply some level of communal cooperation and planning, and a continuous band of structures (whether radial or rectangular) creates a sort of enclosure, both an efficient sort of fortification and a windbreak, while marking off communal space in the interior. At Demircihöyük, the storage of grain in this open interior space underlines the idea of communal identity. And, in row houses of any kind, there is limited spatial hierarchy and an “interdependence of households” that suggests some amount of “social equality.”

---

157 Troy: Schliemann 1976 [1881], 232, fig. 73, excav. 1870–79 (see n. 133); Blegen et al. 1950, figs. 127, Types 2, 3, 216, excav. 1932–38 (see n. 76); Blegen 1952, pl. 23.5; 1971, 135, pl. 29.33, excav. 1968–69 (see n. 22); Yortan: Kâmil 1982, fig. 84.290 and .291, excav. 1900–01 (see n. 129); on the type in general, Bilgi 1972, 14, 17, 191; Höckmann 1977, 553, nos. 475–85.

158 Troy: Blegen et al. 1951, 108, 140, fig. 150, nos. 37.210–11, 37.163, excav. 1932–38 (see n. 76); Tarsus: Goldman 1956, 325, fig. 443.32–36, excav. 1935–39 (see n. 81); Beycesultan: Lloyd and Mellaart 1962, pl. XXXIIIa, excav. 1954–59 (see n. 22); Karataş: Mellink 1965, 250, pl. 65, fig. 39, excav. 1964 (see n. 23); Warner 1994, pl. 197c, 197d, KA419 and 243/U, excav. 1966–67 (see n. 23); Demircihöyük: Baykal-Seeher and Obladen-Kauder 1996, 252–54, pls. 104–6, excav. 1975–78 (see n. 32); Çiledir Höyük: Türküözü et al. 2014, figs. 32, 33, excav. 2009 (see n. 58).
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164 Harrison and Bilgen 2019, 206.

165 Korfmann 1983, 243; Fidan 2013, 29; Massa 2014b, 89; Fidan 2018, 70; Harrison and Bilgen 2019, 194; Umurtak 2020.

166 Düring 2011, 268; Bachhuber 2014, 149; 2015, 57–58.

167 Fidan 2013, 30. Finds from the cemetery associated with Demircihöyük do, however, suggest some degree of “vertical variability” in social status (Massa 2014b, 89–91).
arrangement of rooms around a larger, central building at EB I Karataş may represent a step toward further social complexity. Not enough of the row houses at Hacımusalar Höyük has been exposed to determine whether their overall arrangement was parallel or radial, but the different orientations of the walls so far exposed on the west and north slopes (see fig. 3, insets) do allow the possibility of a radial plan.

Locations and forms of hearth installations in the Terraced Building phases also have social implications. While corner hearths are known from prehistoric Anatolia as early as the Neolithic period, with their location probably meant to facilitate smoke ventilation along walls, centrally placed hearths (as in NSS-7 and -8) could facilitate "more communal preparation and presentation of food," and communal drinking and dining activities are also suggested by the many tablewares found close together, as at Demircihöyük. The raised ends of these central hearths are paralleled in EB II–III levels at Tarsus, Seyitömer Höyük, and Beycesultan. Though first interpreted at Beycesultan as horned altars, these are now recognized as functional or decorative hearth elements. The upright stones and eastward orientation of the central hearth in NSS-7 could suggest a possible symbolic or cultic significance, though, in the EBA, ritual activity was probably not segregated or easily distinguished from other daily or domestic tasks.

A notable difference between EBA architectural styles at Hacımusalar and at Karataş comes in the use of mudbricks. While regular mudbricks were rarely found at Karataş outside the central building complex, they are attested at Hacımusalar from the earliest EBA occupation level (in the "B4g9" sondage at the base of the north slope) through the latest (North Sounding Phase C), though not in the Terraced Building levels. Even the buttressed foundation in the North Sounding supported mudbricks (see fig. 20), while buttresses at Karataş appear only on the exteriors of pisé walls.

Synthesis

Although the full layout of Hacımusalar Höyük's EBA settlement remains unknown, important conclusions concerning social complexity can be drawn from the existing evidence. The repetition of features within neighboring domestic units as well as the occurrence of similar artifact types in each space suggest that the exposed part of the settlement, at least, was relatively egalitarian. The integration of structures into a single unit, with shared walls, suggests some degree of communal cooperation and identity. Vertical continuity of building layout from one level to the next could suggest stability of households through time; similar continuity is found in Anatolian settlements as early as the Neolithic period. Standardization of plan on a horizontal level from one space to the next, on the other hand, conveys a sense of group identity and reflects steps toward urbanism.

The absence of some features that characterize developed EB III urban centers—centralized architecture and administration, elite cemeteries, rich metal finds, fortification—may be explained by limited preservation and exposure. Because EBA levels are not preserved fully to the edge of the mound, it is uncertain whether the EBA settlement at Hacımusalar was fortified. The center of the EBA settlement has not been revealed, and no EBA cemetery has been located. The small number of metal objects from Hacımusalar...
is consistent with other inland West Anatolian EBA sites where cemeteries have not been excavated, such as Küllioba.\textsuperscript{183} Thirteen stamp seals have so far been discovered at Hacımusalar (including one from a later context and five possible or uncertain examples), but no seal impressions or other evidence for centralized administration have been found, in striking contrast to nearby Karataş, with its large central building and seal impressions on pithoi.\textsuperscript{184} Relative scarcity could be explained by the limited preservation (and exposure) of levels belonging to the EB III period, when seal use increased elsewhere in Anatolia, as well as the lack of exposure of the center of the EBA settlement, which presumably lies beneath Iron Age–Byzantine occupation levels at the center of the mound.

It is also possible that the relatively egalitarian structure suggested by the EBA finds so far at Hacımusalar Höyük applied to what was essentially an elite class. Bachhuber has recently argued that most EBA villages in Anatolia were “vertically” egalitarian, with one group of higher status at the “top of a decision-making hierarchy.”\textsuperscript{185} The preponderance of shapes associated with the serving and consumption of liquids among the painted pottery assemblages of the Terraced Building levels suggests that communal drinking was a focus of activity there. The presence of a grape pip among the charred botanical remains as well as comparative evidence from contemporary sites\textsuperscript{186} make it likely that the liquid being served and consumed was wine and that these pottery assemblages reflect elite wine consumption. This social fashion seems to have emerged in West Anatolia in the EB I–II periods, when domestic contexts show an “unprecedented concern for the presentation and pouring of liquids,” with serving and drinking vessels often found “together with a remarkable density and diversity of vessels related to the storage, preparation and consumption of food, normally associated with hearths.”\textsuperscript{187} With the technological advance of the fast wheel in late EB II and EB III, standardized drinking and eating sets, with tankards, shallow plates, and depas cups, became popular.\textsuperscript{188} Such specialized sets were found in nearly every household at Karataş and seem to reflect communal activity, with two-handed cups for passing from one person to another and large shallow dishes for sharing food.\textsuperscript{189} Though Eslick linked the disappearance of strainer spouts with the emergence of the tankard shape at Karataş in the beginning of period V:3 as evidence for a shift in beverage preference from beer to wine,\textsuperscript{190} the evidence for wine consumption in the Terraced Building levels at Hacımusalar is contemporary with Karataş V:2, and the traditional globular cup with rising handle (see fig. 14, t and u; online fig. 12, a–d) was the predecessor of the tankard. Thus it seems that communal wine drinking was already an important part of the community at Hacımusalar in EB II, when strong communal aspects are also observed in architecture. But it is important to note that communal drinking was essentially an elite practice that served “to consolidate and convert agricultural resources into a kind of social capital in contexts of hospitality and conviviality.”\textsuperscript{191} Wine consumption in EBA Anatolia likely encouraged “communal solidarity” while also reinforcing “elite status.”\textsuperscript{192}

The diffusion of wheelmade pottery technology and the West Anatolian drinking set has been an important topic of discussion and debate in studies of the Anatolian EBA. Mellink proposed a southwest Anatolian origin for the shapes and argued for the diffusion of wheel technology along a coastal route from Syria and Cilicia to the Aegean.\textsuperscript{193} Efe and Şahoğlu, on the other hand, have proposed a central Anatolian origin for the shapes and an inland route connecting Syria and Cilicia to

\textsuperscript{183} Bachhuber 2015, 63; Fidan et al. 2015, 67, 69, 81–82.

\textsuperscript{184} Mellink 1964, pl. 82.26, excav. 1963 (see n. 23); 1972, 259; Eslick 1988; Bachhuber 2015, 78. Eslick (1988, 13) cautions that seals “should only be used as evidence of the marking of property if sealings have also been recovered” since they could have been “used for other purposes, such as stamping skin or textiles.” For seal uses, see also Goldman 1938, 38; von Wickede 1990, 53–54, with n. 73; Çevik 2007, 136.

\textsuperscript{185} Bachhuber 2015, 53, 71.

\textsuperscript{186} Lloyd and Mellaart 1962, 45; Fairbairn 2002, 205; Bachhuber 2014, 141; 2015, 31.

\textsuperscript{187} Bachhuber 2014, 141; see also 2015, 63.


\textsuperscript{189} Eslick 2009, 233–34; see also Düring 2011, 273; Bachhuber 2014, 141–42.

\textsuperscript{190} Eslick 2009, 236.

\textsuperscript{191} Bachhuber 2014, 141.

\textsuperscript{192} Ünlü 2016, 355.

Hacımusalar Höyük in the Early Bronze Age

Troy through central Anatolia—the “Great Caravan Route” or “Anatolian Trade Network”—that is supported by recent finds in the Eskişehir region. The evidence from Hacımusalar Höyük contributes a few important points to the debate. First, the existence of essential shapes of the drinking set (shallow bowls and tankards) in handmade form, before any wheelmade wares are found at Hacımusalar Höyük, is consistent with the emergence of these shapes first in handmade versions (as at Karataş and Kullüoba) and suggests that the social practice preceded the adoption of the new technology. The application of this new technology to specific local shapes associated with drinking may further imply a shared social significance for these tablewares and specialized manufacturing. Second, the finds from Hacımusalar offer support for an interior West Anatolian trade route already existing in the EB II period, preceding the spread of wheel technology in the late EB II to early EB III period. The many features of pottery, small finds, and architecture at Hacımusalar Höyük with links to inland West Anatolia, as noted above, show that the Elmalı plain, though culturally distinct, had strong connections with that area in the EB II period. The few hints at more long-distance connections (such as the toggle pin) could be explained by access, through these inland connections, to a wider network of interaction and exchange. The Cypriot jug, however, reminds us that objects probably also reached the Elmalı basin via the Lycian coast.

Another point of debate in the study of EBA West Anatolia has been the question of what caused the wave of destructions documented at the end of the EB II period. Mellaart’s theory of a Luwian invasion has largely been abandoned because the pottery of the EB III period seems to evolve from earlier forms, the new forms seem to have been distributed along an existing inland West Anatolian trade route, and Luwian peoples may already have been present in the EB II period. The question hinges partly on whether the conflagrations at the end of the EB II period were intentionally caused by hostile activities. At Hacımusalar, the fire that engulfed Terraced Building Phase 2 marked neither the end of the EB II period nor a significant break in occupation and seems more likely to have been caused by accident than warfare. As many vessels were evidently broken before they were burned (see, e.g., fig. 14, h and r), the collapse of the buildings appears to have preceded the fire. The stratification of the burnt debris within the collapsed buildings also supports this sequence: the upper levels of debris were more oxidized (red and orange), while the lower levels, just above the floor, were usually darker (dark brown, gray, or black) because less oxygen could circulate there amid pieces of fallen walls and roofs. The top-down burning also suggests that fire spread from roof to roof, as in an accidental situation, rather than being intentionally set within buildings. Although the scarcity of metal finds in the collapsed buildings could be taken as evidence for intentional ransacking before destruction, it could also be explained by a quick departure with valuables during an earthquake and is therefore inconclusive. Massa has argued that the frequency and “clustering of fire destructions in two distinct horizons (2550–2450 BCE and 2250–1950 BCE) suggests that they might not be accidental episodes,” but it is also possible that a clustering of such destructions could have been caused by an era of increased seismic activity.

194 Efe 1988, 114–15; 2003, 93; 2007; Şahoğlu 2005; Bachhuber 2013, 287; Kouka 2013, 577; Fidan et al. 2015, 78–79; Massa and Palmisano 2018, 79; Harrison and Bilgen 2019, 195; Oğuzhanoğlu-Akay 2020. Wheelmade wares on Samos in the late EB II period (Kouka and Menelaou 2018, 130–36) suggest that this inland route was not singular but involved movement through various inland valleys to the central western Anatolian coast. For alternative routes of pottery technology transfer in the Aegean, see Choleva 2020.

195 Mellaart 1986, 145; Eslick 2009, 231–33. Eslick (2009, 5) cautions, however, that the amount of wheelmade pottery may be underestimated because wheel marks were sometimes smoothed over; see also Türkteki 2013, 194–95.

196 Supra n. 110.

CONCLUSION

Recent excavations at Hacımusalar Höyük have shed important new light on the largest EBA settlement of the Elmalı region. In at least two successive building phases, structures were built side by side like terraced row houses. Built-in features like corner platforms suggest both standardization of plan and continuity from one phase to the next. This site thus provides a new example of an "Anatolian Settlement Plan" and demonstrates the connectivity of the Elmalı basin with inland West Anatolia and inland trade routes connecting Syria and Cilicia to the Aegean coast. While maintaining a distinct regional character, the material from EBA Hacımusalar Höyük shows more affinities with interior West Anatolian sites, like Demircihöyük and Beycesultan, than with sites on the Mediterranean and Aegean coasts and thus challenges recent definitions of cultural zones in EBA West Anatolia.206 The existence of regional cultural groups is not surprising given the natural boundaries presented by the landscape; more remarkable is the interconnectivity of these regional groups in spite of these natural boundaries. Mountainous regions were more connected in antiquity than is often assumed today.207 While we cannot assume that geographically determined cultural groups corresponded to emerging political entities,208 shared architectural and artifactual types and styles may indicate a shared sense of identity that was both locally and regionally specific while also signaling participation in a wider network of cultural interaction spanning the western part of Anatolia. Of course, wider exposure is necessary for drawing firmer conclusions about spatial and social organization, but we now have a clear sense of the range and sequence of EBA occupation of Hacımusalar Höyük, and future study of these levels may further illuminate its role as a settlement center in its immediate region as well as in broader cultural interactions of West Anatolia in the Early Bronze Age.
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