



HAL
open science

Concluding remarks on Yumuktepe Level XVI: the combined data

Isabella Caneva, Giulio Palumbi

► **To cite this version:**

Isabella Caneva, Giulio Palumbi. Concluding remarks on Yumuktepe Level XVI: the combined data. The Chalcolithic at Mersin-Yumuktepe Level XVI Reconsidered, Ege Yayinlari, pp.185-192, 2019. hal-02414219

HAL Id: hal-02414219

<https://hal.science/hal-02414219>

Submitted on 6 Dec 2021

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

Concluding remarks on Yumuktepe Level XVI: the combined data

ISABELLA CANEVA* and GIULIO PALUMBI**

Since the publication of the final report on the British excavations at Mersin-Yumuktepe (Garstang 1953), Level XVI has become the most prominent level of the site and one of the most challenging aspects of the Ubaid culture: firstly, because it represented the westernmost archaeological evidence in the wide Ubaid cultural horizon; secondly, because it exhibited a totally atypical architectural model for the Ubaid. In spite of the rich Ubaid presence brought to light by intensified research in northern Syria and south-eastern Anatolia, Level XVI has continued to represent a unique phenomenon that still awaited an explanation in terms of the dynamics of cultural manifestation.

1. The new data

The new excavations provided a bulk of new data that helped to significantly expand our understanding of the Level XVI occupation. First of all, ten radiocarbon measurements allowed to place this occupation in a 200 year time frame, from 4800 to 4600 BC (Calcagnile *et al.* this volume), the date of 4600 BC marking the onset of Level XV, according to the absolute dates available to present (Caneva *et al.* 2012). Second, the new discoveries revealed that the settlement of Yumuktepe might have been composed of numerous households. Besides a fortified sector, the settlement also hosted a number of dwellings scattered on the slopes of the mound: the recent unearthing of a possible second gate on the southern side of the mound suggests that another road, if not numerous more as yet undiscovered roads, existed on the mound. According to an approximate downward calculation, it is conceivable that a minimum of 60 extramural houses existed, in addition to another 20 to be added to the 13 that already form the exposed contour of the citadel, and possibly even a few others that might have occupied the inner space, for an estimated total of ca. 100 houses. Assuming that each of these structures was inhabited by at least two people, the number of people that lived in this settlement can tentatively be expected to be not less than 200,

the majority of whom would have resided outside the area that was circumscribed by the fortification wall. Bearing in mind that the population of the smaller settlement of Değirmentepe was estimated to be 120–130 people (Gurdil 2010), our estimate on the size of the community at Yumuktepe may be deemed realistic and suggests that Yumuktepe was a centre of a certain importance in the region and was probably one of the most important “intersection nodes” (Parker 2010: 348) for a wide range of overlapping networks that crisscrossed Cilicia and linked this region to the surrounding geographic and cultural areas.

As regards the settlement layout, which represents one of the most outstanding breaks from the past and peculiar traits within the Ubaid culture, the new excavations yielded three main field acquisitions:

1. Evidence showing that the Early Chalcolithic settlement extended for about 1 ha over the entire mound.
2. The discovery that, besides the “citadel”, there was a large extramural, terraced dwelling quarter.
3. The observation that, despite being conceived and built according to a comprehensive “urban” plan, the various sectors of the village had different characteristics. Another question consequently arose as to whether these differences were due to the fact that the sectors had been built in different periods or that each was used for a distinct function.

The relatively long duration of the Level XVI settlement, which had already been hypothesized by the first excavators (Garstang 1953: 134), is demonstrated by the repeated modifications and reconstructions of the houses brought to light in the new excavations, with the insertion of dividing walls and the raising of the floor level in several rooms. This was not the case, however, with the houses that had been excavated previously, for whom a much shorter duration has to be assumed. Since both sectors of houses, north and south of the gate and the central building, ended with the same architectural level characterised by concentra-

* Salento University, Department of Cultural Heritage. Italian Archaeological Expedition at Mersin-Yumuktepe. isabella.caneva@unisalento.it

** Laboratoire CEPAM, UMR 7264, CNRS Nice – Université Nice Sophia Antipolis. giulio.palumbi@cepam.cnrs.fr

tions of large ovens (labeled level XV. B by Garstang 1953: fig. 95a), but the houses in the northern block lasted a shorter timespan and appear to have been built, destroyed and abandoned very rapidly, they might have been added to the southern block of houses towards the end of their use, perhaps shortly replacing them in their function before their final destruction. The abundance of metal remains in the area excavated by Garstang, combined with the absence of any metal remains in the southern sectors of the citadel, appear to confirm this scenario (Fig. 1). Indeed, such precious items might have been left behind in catastrophic escape circumstances, but would otherwise have been carefully guarded by their owners. To sum up, the apparently coherent parts of the architectural complex of Level XVI do not seem to have been constructed and used contemporarily and were not, in fact, built using exactly the same plan, techniques and materials.

The whole complex of the northern citadel barrack rooms might have been a later addition to the previously built southern side. The terraced houses, which display the same signs of short-lasting and sudden abandonment and are well connected to the northern houses by the road that runs past their entrances, would therefore be contemporary. According to this reconstruction, the so-called tripartite building was probably built during the first phase of construction of the citadel, together with the earliest rooms (A5 and A6, for instance) on the south. Our reconstruction does not, consequently, confirm Breniquet's hypothesis (1995), according to which the "tripartite Ubaid building" was constructed before the "citadel", unless with reference to the old, northern part of the citadel only. Indeed, judging from some unpublished photos preserved in the archives stored at the Institute of Archaeology of University College London, even the hypothetical tripartite plan/form of this building might be questioned: the structure simply consisted of an open court, with a large oven that probably leant against one side of the fortification wall, and a row of adjacent rooms on the other side. This structure might even have been part of an early casemate wall, with the walls of the rooms that "incline towards each other in plan, as do those of the northern system, so responding to the bend in the outer rampart" (Garstang 1953: 138).

In spite of the difference in time and construction technique, all the dwelling sectors in Level XVI seem to belong to a coherent whole, which was reconstructed and modified as required. The absence of any noticeable change in the findings suggests that the separating time lapse, which was so short as not to be neatly detected by the C14 measurements, might correspond to

a few decades, i. e. to the physiological average lifespan of mud brick structures. Bearing this in mind, an attempt was made to analyse the functional peculiarity of each sector in terms of food production and/or consumption, craft activities and vessel repertoire.

On the southern side of the citadel, the newly excavated architectural units were smaller and more sparsely furnished than all the other units. Some of these rooms, which might not have been dwellings, may have served a peculiar function. Room 5, for instance, with its large clay rectangular bin labeled A4, contained 95% of all the barley remains uncovered in Level XVI. In addition, in the adjoining room 6, a large grinding stone lying inside a clay basin and a large oven suggest that this group of rooms functioned as a kind of "baker's" house. The relative scarcity of animal remains in these rooms if compared with the other rooms appears to confirm the "specialized" nature of this area. The adjacent room A402, where cereals and legumes were found in almost equal amounts, appears to have been used for a more "domestic" purpose. Another specialized function may tentatively be proposed for room A414, where a group of loom-weights suggests that weaving activities took place in this specific space.

However, the inventory of tools, ornaments and other objects at Yumuktepe was generally very poor, it being too scarce in the majority of cases to define the type of functional context of each architectural unit. The same degree of scarcity seems to characterize the few contemporary sites in the region, such as Tell Zeidan (Stein 2010b, 2010a) and Tell al-Abr (Hammade and Yamazaki 2006). By contrast, much richer inventories were uncovered at Değirmentepe, where the distribution of the object classes clearly points to quite a homogeneous network of dwelling structures, as is also demonstrated by the densely laid out, almost identical houses in the village (Esin 2001: 67-71; Gurdil 2010). The fact that most of the small findings at Yumuktepe were uncovered in the terraced houses and that their inventory coincides perfectly with that of the old excavation in the northern part of the citadel confirms the close temporal association between these two sectors of the settlement. Generally speaking, the terraced houses appear to have been used as private houses, as the finding of hearths, grinding stones and meal residues suggests (almost two thirds of the total animal remains were uncovered in these houses, while less than one quarter was uncovered in the southern houses of the citadel).

As regards the spatial distribution of the ware groups in Level XVI, no significant differences were observed either in the quantitative incidence of these groups be-

tween the different sectors of the settlement or in the diachronic sequence of the different construction phases recorded in the citadel. The unchanged pottery characteristics also highlight the considerable unity between the architectural sectors in terms of food production, storage and consumption practices, in contrast with the architectural inconsistencies of Level XVI mentioned above, which might therefore be due to other kinds of activities, not related to food manipulation. The economic homogeneity is further underlined by the archaeozoological and archaeobotanical data, with the same trends being observed throughout the spatial and temporal development of Level XVI even in the most innovative features if compared with the earlier cultures. In particular, significant shift to barley cultivation is documented in all contexts. Unfortunately, apart from the rectangular bin A4, the generalized absence of storage furniture and containers (which we believe may have been located elsewhere in the village) as well as the finding of 95% of the uncovered cereal remains in one room only, cannot shed light on whether an increase in agricultural productivity really did take place, as has been hypothesized for many sites of the Ubaid. However, the sudden and drastic concentration on barley cultivation, which appears to be a “marker” of the new economy of the Chalcolithic societies, must be stressed. This innovative practice, which must have marked a change in the alimentary practices of the community, highlights new strategies in agricultural production (probably owing to the higher yield of barley per cultivation unit with respect to wheat) and marks the beginning of a trend that continues at Yumuktepe as well as at other contemporary sites in the following millennia.

Besides the radical agricultural shift to barley cultivation and the growing exploitation of cattle, it is the precocious metal production that suggests to an even greater extent that Level XVI anticipates, by incubating a series of “structural” traits of the Late Chalcolithic societies, the political economy that is to characterize the following millennia. The sudden appearance of metals at Yumuktepe is then the third major element that breaks with the past. The significant quantity of metal tools found during Garstang’s excavations signals an important breakthrough in the developments of extractive metallurgy. These tools are among the earliest examples of extractive metallurgy in Anatolia (Caneva 2000; Yalçın 2000; Palmieri 2011) and confirm that Level XVI, which witnesses a fracture from the “metallurgy” and technologies used in the previous Neolithic levels, marks the beginning of a true Chalcolithic era at Yumuktepe. The abundant and widespread presence of metal tools in the citadel area also indicates that the value of these tools

was more closely associated with their intrinsic utilitarian function (we hypothesize that they were not abandoned by their owners) than with social status or accumulation of “wealth”, which are instead traits that characterize the later Chalcolithic and Early Bronze societies of the Near East. Although the absence of metal tools in the lower terraced village remains unexplained, the possibility that the citadel was more closely associated with artisanal activities and hosted manufacturing areas related to metals, as is suggested by the scarce domestic furniture in the houses as well as by the retrieval of copper ore in the courtyard of one of the “barrack rooms” (Garstang 1953: 137), cannot be excluded (Caneva 2004: 72). It is even conceivable that the production and use of these metal tools was at that time still limited to circumscribed social circuits.

2. Uniqueness and break

We believe that the combination of (or dialectic between) a series of traits that appear in Level XVI at Yumuktepe marks a number of significant breaks with the former Neolithic developments as well as the beginning of a new “era” in the history of Yumuktepe.

These traits can be split in two groups, with elements signaling either a degree of “precocity”, as in the economic production and new technologies described above, or even of uniqueness, when compared with contemporary developments in the surrounding regions, as will be argued below.

Pottery is, after architecture, the second outstanding element of fracture and novelty. The Level XVI ceramic assemblage, the bulk of which was shown by the petrographic analyses to have been produced locally, appears abruptly, with no connection with, or evolution from, the ceramic developments in the earlier levels. The data yielded by the pottery analysis confirm those outlined by Garstang, though the new study has led to the identification of many more ware groups, each of which is defined by distinct and rather standardized *chaines opératoires* that do not share any traits with the ware groups from the earlier periods. The concomitant appearance of a completely new morphological repertoire attaches a strong new, peculiar connotation to the Level XVI ceramics. This innovative style is best represented by the “gourd-shaped” handled jars in the Cream Slipped and Cream Slipped Painted Ware, which are characterized by very precise morpho-functional features that do not find any correspondence with either the previous repertoires at Yumuktepe or the contemporary repertoires in the nearby regions. A further discrepancy between this new vessel repertoire and that found elsewhere in the Ubaid is the remarkably unbalanced ratio, within the groups of the painted ceram-

ics, between open and closed vessel shapes, with closed forms dominating and cups and bowls accounting for only a minor part of the repertoire at Yumuktepe Level XVI. This is in sharp contrast to the usual domestic repertoires, and particularly to the Ubaidian ones: at Tell al-Abr closed forms (necked jars) account for a minority of the repertoire, which mainly consists in open forms (Hammade and Yamazaki 2006: 62); the same at Tell Abada, where open drinking vessels account for almost 80% of the repertoire (Pollock 2010: fig. 7. 6), and in the Ubaid sites of the Persian Gulf, where cups also account for 81% of the repertoire (Carter 2006: 63, site H3). In addition, the remarkable dissimilarity between the repertoire discovered in Level XVI and the usual Ubaid vessel repertoire is not limited to its vessel shape, and therefore to its functional use, but is also extended to its stylistic and probably symbolic value, since painted bowls, which are one of the most typical and widespread hallmarks of Ubaid culture, are absent at Yumuktepe where they are replaced by black-brown burnished bowls that were characterized by different manufacturing techniques and were possibly linked to different cultural and regional traditions. Yet another trait that signals a break with the former Neolithic traditions as well as a significant difference from other Ubaid contexts is the complete absence of seals and clay-sealings in the archaeological evidence found in Level XVI. Rather interestingly, this contrasts both with the previous traditions of seals, which are commonly found in the Neolithic layers at Yumuktepe, as well as with the evidence from the following level XV, in which a clay-sealing was found in a large, possibly monumental, architectural complex (Caneva *et al.* 2012). We may hypothesize that the lack of administrative material in Level XVI rules out practices of collective storage (such as those documented in the Neolithic period) (Akkermans and Schwartz 2003: 140-141) as well as the existence of public institutions that used such devices to control the accumulation and distribution of foodstuffs. The absence of seals and clay-sealings in Level XVI might, however, also mark significant differences from other northern Ubaid communities (such as Değirmentepe and Tepe Gawra) where clay-sealings were found in the tripartite buildings. It has been suggested that the Ubaid communities were organized in lineage-based extended families (Forest 1996: 62-63) and that these administrative devices might have served as markers of relations of interdependence between the families within the same community and bore witness to the economic capacity of the extended households to control incipient forms of accumulation and redistribution of foodstuffs (Frangipane 1996: 140). In this regard, the large-scale appearance of mass-produced bowls in some northern Ubaid sites (such as Değirmentepe) has been in-

terpreted as evidence of incipient forms of hierarchical organization of labour as these bowls might have been used for the collective consumption of foodstuffs, e. g. during feasting events (Helwing 2003), that were handed out in exchange for labour (Frangipane 1996: 141). The absence of administrative devices in Yumuktepe Level XVI is also linked, according to our re-interpretation of the architectural evidence, to the absence of the tripartite architecture. This confirms, as pointed out by Akkermans (1989) and as also Parker stated (2010), that “*architectural forms that have come to be associated with the Ubaid (tripartite buildings) did not predominate at all or even most of the sites that exhibit Ubaid ceramics*” and, by suggesting a diverse definition of the residential unit of the family groups at Yumuktepe, these data might also reflect differences in the organizational structure and mode of operation between the households in Level XVI and those in other northern Ubaid communities.

In this regard, the lack of administrative devices in Level XVI combined with the very rare presence of flint scraped bowls, appears to suggest that the economic “potential” of the family groups at Yumuktepe might not have been the same as that of the contemporary northern Ubaid families or, alternatively, that this potential was not commonly expressed through practices of collective foodstuff consumption and that the dynamics between the households in Level XVI at Yumuktepe did not evolve immediately into forms of hierarchized or formally-controlled interdependence. By contrast, the abundance of flint scraped mass-produced bowls recorded in the following Level XV indicates that a transformation at the level of household organization, in terms of its economic role, is likely to have occurred at Yumuktepe after Level XVI, thereby indirectly confirming that Level XVI hosted a community composed of households that were organized according to a different socio-economic model from that found in the northern Ubaid communities.

3. Analogies and interregional connections

It is important to stress that the developments that characterized Level XVI and marked a break with the previous Neolithic traditions did not occur independently of the “outside world”. On the contrary, there are several aspects in these developments that show that the Level XVI community was closely associated with contemporary developments taking place in the same period in the nearby regions. The time frame of 4800-4600 BC, in fact, tightly corresponds to the Ubaid developments in Syria and North Mesopotamia (Campbell and Fletcher 2010).

The painted ceramics of Level XVI, which bear clear affinities with the painted pottery of Ubaid phases 3 and 4, represent the main element of interregional connec-

tions. On the one hand, the vessels of Fine Painted Ware or of Trichrome with Jabbed Impressions Ware that occur sporadically, but constantly, throughout the various construction phases of the settlement are likely to have been imported thanks to exchanges with Ubaid settlements in the 'Amuq plain, or from even more distant regions. On the other hand, the more common locally produced painted ceramics (such as the Monochrome Slipped Painted Ware and Multiple Brush Ware) feature colours, geometrical motifs and a repetitive decorative syntax that closely corresponds to the decorative codes of the Ubaid painted ceramics. Moreover, the linear circularity that characterizes the decorative syntax of the most common ware groups may also signal the adoption at Yumuktepe of new rotating technologies for the manufacture and decoration of vessels that were analogous to those being used by potters in all the contemporary Ubaid communities. As a whole, the painted ceramics of Level XVI encode messages related to manufacturing techniques, to the way in which the vessels were used and possibly even to food consumption practices. These messages were shared within networks of information and communication that most certainly connected Yumuktepe to the wider Ubaid horizon and that contributed to a sense of shared identity between the Level XVI community and the Ubaid *oikoumene*.

Additional archaeological evidence, however, also suggests that Yumuktepe was not involved in Ubaid-related networks alone, but also in networks of interaction that encompassed other regions and focused on specific material resources. For instance, obsidian, which is the most common raw material used in the lithic industry in Level XVI, in sharp contrast with most of the contemporary sites, where the rate of obsidian implements is usually below 10% (Healey: 189), may be considered as an index of intensive relations with Anatolia. The chemical analyses carried out on the obsidian exploited in the Neolithic levels of Yumuktepe point to Cappadocian sources, and the macroscopic analyses carried out on the obsidian from Level XVI appear to confirm that the procurement networks that originated in the obsidian outcrops of Cappadocia might have reached Yumuktepe also in the Chalcolithic period (Altınbilek-Algül this volume). Stein suggested (2010a) that the sense of a widely shared Ubaid identity based on the social and political connections that were required for the circulation of raw materials might have facilitated inter-regional exchanges between regions and communities. From this point of view, the possibility that Yumuktepe played a strategic role in the ramification both southwards and eastwards of these obsidian networks, which would have allowed obsidian to reach other areas of the Ubaid *oikoumene* such as the 'Amuq plain and the Euphrates valley, cannot be excluded.

Yumuktepe might also have been connected to the Taurus mountains, and more specifically to the mining region of Bolkar Dağ, which lies less than 80 km north of Yumuktepe (Yener *et al.* 1989), as this chain of mountains provided the copper ores that were smelted and transformed into metal artifacts at the site. The people that inhabited Yumuktepe Level XVI might have been closely linked to that part of the Anatolian plateau and even have been involved in the control of the rich metal ore outcrops (Mellaart 1975: 129). Only future research on the Ubaid metallurgy will shed light on whether Yumuktepe was involved in the networks of exchange of metal items that linked Cilicia to the neighbouring regions.

Data from Level XVI also suggest that the networks linking Yumuktepe to Anatolia may not have been exploited solely for the procurement of raw materials. Indeed, it is suggested elsewhere in this volume that the significant incidence of the Black/Brown Burnished Ware in Level XVI hints at shared roots between the ceramic traditions of Yumuktepe and those of inner Anatolia. These roots may, however, have been even deeper as the analogies that can be drawn between the settlement layout of Level XVI at Yumuktepe and that of the contemporary settlement of Güvercinkayaşı are quite striking. The Chalcolithic settlement at Güvercinkayaşı was, similarly to Yumuktepe, divided into two main residential sectors composed of a lower village and of an upper "citadel" that was protected by an imposing fortification wall reinforced by two towers (Gülçür 1997: 2012). These analogies in the spatial organization of the settlement hint at a set of shared principles related to the structure of the inhabited area and to the conception of a bounded community. Although it is not possible to determine whether one site was spatially planned on the basis of the other, the analogies between Yumuktepe and Güvercinkayaşı do point to the existence of channels of bidirectional communication between Cilicia and Cappadocia that allowed the inhabitants of Level XVI to access exogenous ideas and social and cultural models that might have actively contributed to the development of shared social and cultural trajectories with the Anatolian communities.

It has recently been suggested that the Ubaid was not a monolithic phenomenon (Parker 2010) but rather an *oikoumene* where differences are as important as the overarching similarities (Stein 2010a; Stein and Özbal 2007). Like many other sites on the periphery of the area over which the Ubaid culture extended, Level XVI at Yumuktepe features both significant similarities and striking differences in relation to the Ubaid *oikoumene*. Stein (2010: 37-38) pointed out that local pre-existing traditions generated the regional variability and differences that were a regular feature of the Ubaid phenom-

enon, the latter fed and enriched by the interactions between different regions, economic systems and different varieties of social complexities. The traits of regional and local variation expressed at Level XVI at Yumuktepe might reflect multiple and parallel connections with variegated cultural models that mingled with a pre-existing cultural background.

The flexibility of territorial boundaries in pre-state societies must have played a crucial role in these mingling dynamics by favouring widespread interregional movements (Frangipane 2015: 91-82). Besides the possible models of cultural contacts, Frangipane (2015) stresses the importance of the following two points in this phenomenon of cultural interrelations and hybridization: the duration of local identitarian features after two cultures have mingled, and the extent to which cultural integration induces social changes in the communities involved.

A large bulk of literature has explored the dynamics of replacement of the Halaf culture by the Ubaid culture in peri-Mesopotamian regions in recent decades. The authors generally agree that this transition occurred gradually, with a marked degree of continuity with the pre-existing Halaf culture and the maintenance over a long period of time of a number of cultural traits, such as seals and sealings, smaller nuclear family-sized houses, and Halaf-style figurines and house shapes in Ubaid levels (Akkermans and Schwartz 2003: 158; Breniquet 1989; Frangipane 2015: 91-82; Hammade Yamazaki 2006: 1, 459). Recent excavations at Tell Zeidan and Tell al-Abr, in north central Syria, have provided strong evidence of these co-existing local and global identities in the incipient complex societies of the Ubaid period, which suggests that the transition to an Ubaid occupation was peaceful (Stein 2009, 2010b, 2011). A second point upon which there is widespread agreement regards the benefits afforded by adopting the better organized socio-economic model of the Ubaid communities, as is testified by the acquisition of the structural features of the Ubaid model, i. e. the architecture and administrative systems.

Neither of the above described models of integration and hybridization is observed at Yumuktepe Level XVI: there is no final Neolithic transition, or, if expressed in cultural terms, a Halaf-Ubaid transition, nor is the Ubaid structural model adopted, with the exception of pottery decoration.

It is also agreed that Ubaid sites display a remarkably homogeneous material culture in the most prominent archaeological evidence, i. e. in pottery and architecture. However, the tripartite architecture is always associated with painted Ubaid pottery, whereas Ubaid pottery is not invariably linked to the tripartite architecture, as

Yumuktepe and many other “Ubaid” sites demonstrate (Hole 2016: 241; Parker 2010; Akkermans 1989). All aspects of the material culture reflect the structuring and organising principles of a society. If vessel forms are related to their function, and decoration to identity codes, then the only connection between Yumuktepe and the Ubaid consist in standardized decorative codes, which probably indicate a general belonging to a large group; instead, vessels at Yumuktepe are functionally and morphologically related to the local daily practices, as is the house model, which is functionally and socially specific to this group and is unlike that of the Ubaid model.

4. Conclusions

To sum up, the widespread distribution of the Ubaid material culture led to the formation of a “horizon style” that connected all of Mesopotamia and the neighboring areas (Stein 2010a), but important political and economic differences remained between the different regions notwithstanding the sharing of the Ubaid pottery styles. In particular, “*in the foothills of southern Turkey, . . . Ubaid clearly mixed with local non-Halafian traditions to create another dialectic variant of the pan-regional Ubaid phenomenon*” (Hole 2016: 241).

Yumuktepe Level XVI stands as one of these variants with its peculiar architecture, selective vessel repertoire, intensive obsidian use, utilitarian metal tools and egalitarian society, lacking any prestige items and bureaucratic devices. Apparently earlier than Değirmentepe, it might have represented a dissimilar and preliminary - though not necessarily chronologically older - phase of adhesion to the Ubaid world, which was to be completed in all its aspects within a few generations.

As J. Mellaart also suggested “*neither at near-by Tarsus nor at any other site during the Cilician survey, was there any further trace of the Mersin XVI culture. For the moment, it is confined to Mersin itself and the few northern links, to which may be added the new use of metal for tools . . . rather point to Anatolian plateau influences*” (1975: 129).

Is it then conceivable that people from the north (possibly connected to the exploitation of the Taurus copper sources?) came and settled on a vacant mound after the end of the local Halaf occupation. These newcomers might have maintained their own practices for some centuries while adopting a formal “membership” of the widespread regional culture whose economic practices they slowly acquired until, a few centuries later, they became fully integrated within the northern Ubaid social model, as demonstrated by the use of seals, tripartite architecture and mass produced bowls for food distribution in the immediately following level XV settlement.

References

- Akkermans, P., 1989. Tradition and social change in Northern Mesopotamia during the later fifth and fourth millennium BC. In E. Henrickson and I. Thuesen (eds.) *Upon this Foundation: the 'Ubaid reconsidered. Proceedings from the 'Ubaid Symposium, Elsinore, May 30th-June 1st, 1988*. Carsten Niehbur Institute of Ancient Near Eastern Studies Publications 10, Copenhagen, Museum Tusulanum Press, pp. 339-368.
- Akkermans, P., Schwartz, G., 2003. *The Archaeology of Syria. From complex hunter-gatherers to early urban societies*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Breniquet, C., 1989. Les origines de la culture d'Obeid en Mésopotamie du nord. In E. Henrickson and I. Thuesen (eds.) *Upon this Foundation: the 'Ubaid reconsidered. Proceedings from the 'Ubaid Symposium, Elsinore, May 30th-June 1st, 1988*. Carsten Niehbur Institute of Ancient Near Eastern Studies Publications 10, Copenhagen, Museum Tusulanum Press, pp. 325-338.
- Breniquet, C., 1995. La stratigraphie des niveaux préhistoriques de Mersin et l'évolution culturelle en Cilicie. *Anatolia Antiqua* 3, pp. 1-31.
- Caneva, I., 2000. Early metal production in Cilicia : a view from Mersin-Yumuktepe. In Ü. Yalçın (ed.) *Anatolian Metal I. Der Anschnitt, Beiheft 13, Veröffentlichung ungenaus dem Deutschen Bergbau-Museum, Bochum*, pp. 69-73.
- Carter, R., 2006. Boat remains and maritime trade in the Persian Gulf during the sixth and fifth millennia BC. *Antiquity* 80/307, pp. 52-63.
- Esin, U., 2001. Salvage Excavations at Değirmentepe, Malatya. In O. Belli (ed.), *Istanbul University's Contributions to Archaeology in Turkey*, Istanbul University Rectorate Publications, Istanbul, pp. 67-71.
- Forest, J.-D., 1996. *Mésopotamie. L'apparition de l'État. VIIe - IIIe millénaires*. Paris-Méditerranée, Paris, 1996.
- Frangipane, M., 1996. *L'origine dello Stato nel Vicino Oriente*. Laterza, Bari.
- Frangipane, M., 2015. Different types of multiethnic societies and different patterns of development and change in the prehistoric Near East. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 112 (30), pp. 9182-9189.
- Garstang, J., 1953. *Prehistoric Mersin. YümükTepe in Southern Turkey*. Clarendon Press, Oxford.
- Gülçur, S., 1997. Güvercinkayası. Eine vorgeschichtliche Felsrückensiedlung in Zentralanatolien. *Anatolica* 23, pp. 85-110.
- Gülçur, S., 2012. The Chalcolithic period in Central Anatolia Aksaray-Niğde region. *Origini* 24, pp. 213-227.
- Gurdil, B., 2010. Exploring social organizational aspects of the Ubaid communities: a case study of Değirmentepe in Eastern Turkey. In R. Carter and G. Philip (eds.) *Beyond the Ubaid. Transformation and Integration in the Late Prehistoric Societies of the Middle East*. SAOC 63, The University of Chicago Press, Chicago, pp. 361-376.
- Hammade, H., Yamazaki, Y., 2006. *Tell al 'Abr (Syria): Ubaid and Uruk Periods*. Louvain, Peeters.
- Healey, E., 2010. Ubaid lithics revisited: their significance for the interpretation of Ubaid society. In R. Carter and G. Philip (eds.) *Beyond the Ubaid. Transformation and Integration in the Late Prehistoric Societies of the Middle East*. SAOC 63, The University of Chicago Press, Chicago, pp. 181-200.
- Helwing, B., 2003. Feasts as a social dynamic in prehistoric Western Asia – three case studies from Syria and Anatolia. *Paléorient* 29(2), pp. 63-85.
- Hole, F., 2016. Historical processes on the Middle Khabur River, Syria, during the Late Ubaid: transition, attenuation and divergence. In R. Stucky, O. Kaelin, H-P. Mathys (eds.) *Proceedings of the 9th International Congress on the Archaeology of the Ancient Near East: 9-13 June 2014, Basel, vol. 3*. Harrasowitz Verlag, Wiesbaden, pp. 231-42.
- Mellaart, J., 1975. *The Neolithic of the Near East*. Thames and Hudson, London.
- Parker, B., 2010. Networks of interregional interaction during Mesopotamia's Ubaid period. In R. Carter and G. Philip (eds.) *Beyond the Ubaid. Transformation and Integration in the Late Prehistoric Societies of the Middle East*. SAOC 63, The University of Chicago Press, Chicago, pp. 339-360.
- Pollock, S., 2010. Practices of daily life in fifth-millennium B. C. Iran and Mesopotamia. In R. Carter and G. Philip (eds.) *Beyond the Ubaid. Transformation and Integration in the Late Prehistoric Societies of the Middle East*. SAOC 63, The University of Chicago Press, Chicago, pp. 93-112.
- Stein, G.J., 2010a. Local identities and interaction spheres: modeling regional variation in the Ubaid horizon. In R. Carter and G. Philip (eds.) *Beyond the Ubaid. Transformation and Integration in the Late Prehistoric Societies of the Middle East*. SAOC 63, The University of Chicago Press, Chicago, pp. 23-44.
- Stein, G.J., 2010b. Tell Zeidan 2009. Oriental Institute Annual Report 2009-2010. University of Chicago Oriental Institute Publications, Chicago, pp. 105-118.
- Stein, G.J., 2014. Economic Dominance, Conquest, or Interaction among Equals? Theoretical Models for Understanding Culture Contact in Early Near Eastern Complex Societies. In H. Azizi, M. Khanipoor and R. Naseri (eds.) *Proceedings of the International Congress of Young Archaeologists*. The Pearson Institute Discussion Paper No. 14, University of Tehran Press, Tehran, pp. 55-67.
- Stein, G., Özbal, R., 2007. A tale of two oikumenai: variation in the expansionary dynamics of 'Ubaid and Uruk Mesopotamia. In E. Stone, (ed.) *Settlement and Society. Essays Dedicated to Robert McCornick Adams*. Cotsen

- Institute of Archaeology University of California, Los Angeles, pp. 329-342.
- Yalçın, Ü., 2000. Frühchalkolitische Metallfunde von Mersin – Yumuktepe: Beginn der Extraktiven Metallurgie? *TÜBA-AR* 3, pp. 109-128.
- Yener, K.A., Özbal, H., Minzoni-Deroche, A., Aksoy, B., 1989. Bolkardağ: archaeometallurgy surveys in the Taurus Mountains, Turkey. *National Geographic Research* 5, pp. 477-481.