



PART 4

CHANGING MATERIALITIES IN THE BACH AREA

In *Çatalhöyük Volume 5: Changing Materialities at Çatalhöyük: Reports from the 1995–99 Seasons*, the focus was on the relationship of Çatalhöyük residents to the material world, involving especially the analysis and interpretation of movable artifacts. We have mirrored the CRP discussion of changing materialities in Part 4 of *Last House on the Hill*.

In his introduction to *Çatalhöyük Volume 5*, Ian Hodder remarks that with the increasing settling down in longer-established settlements that make a permanent mark on the landscape, “Humans get increasingly caught up in society through their involvement with objects” (Hodder 2005a:10). In other words, they become entangled in everyday acts of planning and carrying out tasks that involve people and materials which themselves are tangled in a web of dependencies. We can see it in the intricate webs of “taskscape” for procuring materials for building, eating, drinking, feasting: no task is a simple act. The act of bringing water and building materials to a house or building site must have become more and more complicated as the mound grew in height. The history of the Çatalhöyük mound is a history of the increasing complexities of living and the perhaps increasingly ritualized strategies of the human agents to center themselves in their entangled world. In the BACH Area, we were excavating buildings that lay chronologically in the middle of this process, as far as the East Mound at Çatalhöyük is concerned.

As in other excavations that the BACH project leaders had directed, the driving force of our analyses of excavated materials was the life history of objects—the procurement of raw materials, manufacture, consumption, maintenance, and final deposition as garbage, loss, or cache—all of which

are discussed in this section of *Last House on the Hill*. In one previous project (Selevac), this aspect of materiality was related to the intensification of production; in another (Opovo), it was related to social inequality among households. In the BACH project, these questions are in the background of the investigation of Neolithic households in Anatolia, but the details of life in the neighborhoods and the villages as a web of microhistories are also driving our project.

Many of the authors of chapters in *Çatalhöyük Volume 5* also authored the specialist reports on movable artifacts from the BACH excavation. Nerissa Russell, for example, wrote the worked bone reports for both volumes (Chapter 15, this volume), in addition to being the lead author on the faunal analyses. This reflects her long-standing interest in this topic, even as an undergraduate student.¹

Jonathan Last analyzed and published the Neolithic East Mound ceramics from the Çatalhöyük Research Project 1995–1999 excavations and based his analyses of the BACH material on these previous studies (Chapter 16, this volume). His focus in both publications is on how ceramic frequencies can function as chronological indicators in the sequence of Çatalhöyük deposits to reveal a transformation of the settlement from the late Aceramic Neolithic to the fully Ceramic Neolithic. His analysis makes a significant contribution to the dating of Building 3 in the Çatalhöyük sequence, as discussed in Chapter 3.

¹ Nerissa Russell’s senior thesis as an undergraduate at Harvard University, written under the supervision of Ruth Tringham, was the analysis of bone tools from the Neolithic settlement of Selevac, Serbia, and later was published in the monograph of that project.

Sonya Atalay authored the analysis of the clay balls from both the 1995–1999 excavations of the Çatalhöyük Research Project and the 1997–2003 excavations of the BACH Area (Chapter 18, this volume). Atalay argues for the importance of clay balls in food preparation, specifically cooking, at a time when there was a relative lack of ceramic vessels. *Çatalhöyük Volume 5* contains an article about baskets and basketry by Willeke Wendrich which also demonstrates the entanglement of non-ceramic vessels in food preparation in Neolithic Çatalhöyük. Some of the baskets she discusses are from the BACH Area.

Tristan Carter was the lead author of the chapter on the analysis of lithic materials in *Çatalhöyük Volume 5*. He joined Heidi Underbjerg in writing the final lithic report of the BACH materials in 2005 in order to make the analysis more comparable with the format of the earlier publication, and to include his expertise in the examination of the obsidian assemblage. Their report (Chapter 19) mirrors the format of his chapter in Volume 5. Carter's analysis of obsidian sources for the BACH materials, using the XRF laboratory at UC Berkeley, has been published separately from this volume.

Katherine (Karen) Wright joined Adnan Baysal in writing the chapter on the ground stone or macrocrystalline rock assemblage for the Çatalhöyük Research Project 1995–1999 materials in *Çatalhöyük Volume 5*. Their final report on these materials for the BACH volume (Chapter 20) is based very closely on this publication. Karen Wright also has a special interest in the beads manufactured out of a variety of materials, but especially macrocrystalline rocks, and wrote Chapter 21 in this volume about these materials. This report is rather different from that of Naomi Hamilton who reported on the beads of the 1995–1999 excavations, which incorporated data from a University of London project that is investigating diversity of bead technology in Neolithic Southwest Asia.

Chapter 17 on the clay figurines from the BACH excavations was authored by Carolyn Nakamura, who did not participate in the publication of the clay figurines from the 1995–1999 excavations. In fact, Nakamura argues that her method of analysis and interpretation diverges strongly from that of Naomi Hamilton, who authored the study of figurines in Volume 5.