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The region of Rough Cilicia, known in antiquity as Cilicia Tracheia, constitutes the western part of the larger area of Cilicia and is characterized by the ruggedness of its territory, especially as compared to its ‘smooth’ sister-region to the immediate east, Cilicia Pedias. The mountainous landscape had fundamental consequences for the history of the region. It limited agricultural production that in turn must have had an impact on the economy and size of population centers of the region relative to the larger urban centers of its agriculture-rich neighbors, Smooth Cilicia and Pamphylia, which bordered Rough Cilicia on the west. The forests that dominated the mountains of Tracheiotis, however, compensated to some extent for the restricted farming. Well known from the Hellenistic period through the Roman Empire as a source of timber, primarily for shipbuilding, this natural resource had potential for considerable income. The rugged terrain also offered protection to the inhabitants during times of invasion and played a major role in the acculturation process of the region. In addition, the protection afforded by the high mountains combined with the rugged seacoast fostered the prolific piracy that developed in the late Hellenistic period, bringing much notoriety to Rough Cilicia, to such an extent that the terms “Rough Cilicia” and “piracy” go hand in hand.

Until relatively recently, however, Rough Cilicia could be considered terra incognita to modern scholarship. The pioneers of Rough Cilicia studies are few: Beaufort, Heberdey, Wilhelm, Bean, Mitford, Rosenbaum, Huber, Russell, Karamut, Tomaschitz, Equini Schneider, and Rauh. The past few decades, however, have seen a shift in scholarly attention paid to the region. Beginning in the 1960s the well-preserved remains of Anemurium were systematically exposed by James Russell. More recently Syedra and Elaiussa Sebaste have also undergone excavation. In the mid-1960s the survey led by Elizabeth Rosenbaum-Alföldi and Gerhard Huber produced the first extensive investigation of the architectural remains of Rough Cilicia. The resulting publication (Rosenbaum 1967) has yet to be superseded, although beginning in 1996 the Rough Cilicia Survey Project (RCSP), led by Nicholas Rauh, has explored a portion of the region in a controlled systematic fashion. The recently published preliminary report (Rauh et al. 2009) offers the first systematic view of the long-term urban development of Rough Cilicia, setting the stage for future research.

Such recent work has added considerably to our understanding of the region. Unavoidably, however, the findings have been diffuse, the product of individual specialists and teams of researchers from a wide array of countries: Turkey, Austria, Canada, Denmark, Germany, Ireland, Italy, United Kingdom, United States, among others. Several colloquia have helped to overcome this deficiency, and our purpose in convening the conference, Rough Cilicia: New Historical and Archaeological Approaches at the University of Nebraska-Lincoln in 2007, was simple: to add to this process of synthesis by drawing upon the expertise of those scholars who have conducted important research in Rough Cilicia in order to assess the state of knowledge regarding the region.

The papers in the volume are presented in approximate chronological order. Spelling conventions, always vexing in classical publications, are particularly problematic in a volume of this sort, which ranges widely from prehistory through Greek and Roman eras into the medieval period. Recognizing that no one convention is satisfactory, the editors have elected to use the Latin rather than the Greek spelling of all proper names in order to maintain consistency, hence, e.g., Selinus rather than Selinos and Antiochia ad Cragum rather than Antiocheia epi Krago.

The editors would like to thank the other organizing committee members, Hugh Elton, Ismail Karamut, Nicholas Rauh, and the late Kurt Tomaschitz, for their thoughtful help and suggestions that ultimately made the conference a success. We would also like to thank the individual contributors, for their cooperation in revising their conference presentations and their patience in seeing this volume to publication. A special note of appreciation is given to James Russell, not only for his help in the conference organization.
and subsequent editing of the papers, but also because of his pioneering work in the archaeology of Rough Cilicia.

The conference would not have been possible without the financial assistance of a number of sponsors. The University of Nebraska–Lincoln has earned our deep gratitude for its generous support of the conference. In particular we would like to thank the following: UNL Research Council; MEDICI; Edward Forde, Chair, Department of Art and Art History; and Giacomo Oliva, Dean, Hixson-Lied College of Fine and Performing Arts.

We also extend our appreciation to Bailey Barnard, Emma Clute, and Amanda Washburn who assisted in certain editorial aspects of these proceedings, to Christy Aggens for her graphic designs and web mastery, and to Clare Litt at Oxbow Books for editorial and publication advice. Special thanks are due to the two anonymous reviewers of the submitted manuscripts who made the papers better.

Finally, we would like to dedicate this volume to Kurt Tomaschitz, a member of our organizing committee, who was to present a paper at the conference but whose failing health at the time would not allow travel to Nebraska, and whose subsequent tragic death has left a great void in Rough Cilicia studies. Thank you, Kurt.
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Rural settlement has been a neglected topic in Byzantine archaeology but its study holds a key to our understanding of the dynamics of urban as well as rural life since such a large proportion of the population were inhabitants of the countryside. This paper briefly considers archaeological approaches to new primary data from the Early Byzantine period in Rough Cilicia and focuses on the excavations at Kilise Tepe carried out during the 1990s and reinitiated in 2007. It begins with a brief critical summary of previous work in the region in order to provide a rationale and context for the discussion of selected evidence from Kilise Tepe. The paper highlights some of the results from these excavations and advocates the importance of considering domestic structures and the social dynamics of space in order to outline key themes for future work both at Kilise Tepe and elsewhere in the province as well as further afield.

Rural settlements from the Byzantine period in Rough Cilicia

In her recent book, *The Byzantines*, Averil Cameron begins Chapter 7: How People Lived, by stating that, “It is difficult to convey the flavour of ordinary life in a society whose surviving material is dominated by luxury items.” As she remarks a few lines below, many Byzantine sources do not concern themselves with “ordinary life” and those that do, such as saints’ lives, are often “rhetorical or fanciful.” The problem, certainly in Byzantine archaeology, is not really that the surviving material culture is dominated by luxury items, but rather that it is the luxury items which seem to have dominated research agendas. The result is that it is indeed difficult to provide a detailed picture of how people lived. Many scholars of Byzantium have been so heavily influenced by the study of elites and their material culture that the everyday lives of the majority of the populace have remained understudied. But here archaeology has much to offer other disciplines within Byzantine studies. A close examination of the landscapes of the eastern Mediterranean demonstrates that the early Byzantine countryside was bulging with activity for which copious evidence survives. There is in fact a rich archaeological record for this research area; the real problem is that, in Anatolia at least, we are only in the early stages of recording and interpreting such a huge body of evidence.

Cyril Mango recognized three decades ago that there was only a problem of approach, not of data. The physical remains of rural settlements in southern Anatolia, as he observed, received “very little attention as compared with ecclesiastical architecture.” As recently as the late 1990s the lack of understanding of the Anatolian countryside and its history in general was highlighted frequently in publications, often in strong terms: “Given the lack of documents, and even more so the backward state of medieval Anatolian archaeology, the settlement history of the plateau is obscure.”
Work across Anatolia continues to gather momentum to redress this problem. In Byzantine and medieval Cilicia, our comprehension of rural settlement and housing has changed significantly since the 1980s and has continued to develop dramatically in the last decade. Rough Cilicia has of course occupied the attention of travellers and scholars for centuries. Major contributions were made with the publication of volumes 4 and 5 of the *Tabula Imperii Byzantini* on Byzantine sites in Cilicia and Isauria. Notable earlier studies of the rural settlements and their domestic buildings include those of Semavi Eyice. More recent research on these topics in Cilicia has concentrated particularly on the surveying of a sample of the many standing stone domestic structures along the foothills of the coastal fringe. These studies reflect an important shift towards studying vernacular remains and rural settlements. They have benefited from the application recently of modern and innovative surveying techniques to the complicated and extensive ruins and the thick vegetation that complicated traditional approaches to building survey. The analysis of the archaeological record here, as elsewhere in the period, demonstrates the fact that Byzantine landscapes were often more densely populated than periods since. Building-focused projects have been complemented by multi-period landscape surveys such as the Göksu Archaeological Project (GAP) and the Rough Cilicia Survey Project (RCSP) which have applied both intensive and extensive approaches to whole landscapes.

This recent research represents a growing interest not just in monumental structures but also in the broader landscape context. If we are to understand the large coastal settlements such as Anemurium and Elaiussa Sebaste, and monumental ecclesiastical sites such as Alahan, for example, where excavation in the period was pioneered, we need also to understand the breadth of occupation across the landscape and at other types of sites, including rural settlements and more ephemeral elements such as ancient trees and terraces.

The analysis of rural settlements in Rough Cilicia can help to address both the impact of international-scale events at particular periods and the changing dynamics of such places over the longue durée. Firstly, since Cilicia occupies a position of major importance between central Anatolia and both the Mediterranean and the provinces to the east, it is ideally situated to facilitate questions of international political, military, and economic significance. Secondly, since it was on the countryside that the cities of the province relied, a sample of rural settlements should ideally be excavated to complement the more extensive surveys and the excavation of urban coastal settlements. Focus on such rural sites will provide an important complement to the research taking place in the broader urban landscape.

The recent attention paid to rural settlements and housing in Cilicia reflects a growing interest in this topic more generally by contemporary academics and funding bodies. Of course, work on the late antique countryside in countries such as Syria, Jordan, Israel, and Cyprus and further afield has been conducted since the 19th century with important results often far more comprehensively than in Anatolia. It is not the aim of this paper to review that work carried out further afield; the bibliographies from papers presented at recent conferences provide an excellent starting point.

The theme of the conference for which this paper was originally presented encouraged critical reflection of recent approaches and methodologies in Rough Cilicia for the benefit of future research in the field as a whole. This paper aims to advocate the value of approaching a better understanding of Byzantine rural settlement and housing through the examination of vernacular buildings and their associated contexts and to signal the ongoing work at Kilise Tepe. ‘Vernacular’ structures are built from materials suited to local environments and often reflect local building techniques and cultural traditions; they might be domestic houses, but they might also be other kinds of non-monumental structures used, for example, as barns, workshops, or for a combination of different purposes. These structures and their associated deposits offer significant potential to address questions unapproachable through the study of monumental buildings alone. Vernacular structures are, however, often sidelined by scholars who are attracted to associated monumental remains which are themselves often unstudied and promise more spectacular rewards. One is struck by the fact that even at impressive, well-known sites many standing buildings have not been subject to more than the most basic archaeological recording. The more ephemeral remains of the wider landscape such as terraces and paths remain almost completely unstudied. Modern farming techniques, road building, and construction are speeding up the processes of change and threaten to remove much of the archaeological record contained within. Clearly there is much that might be done to record the wealth of data from the past for the future. One technique which will facilitate this kind of approach is Historical Landscape Characterization. This technique is currently being applied to sampled areas in Cyprus, Pisidia, and the Göksu Valley in Cilicia for precisely these reasons.

We still need to gather high quality excavated data sets from rural settlements. Rural settlements with vernacular architecture, little sculpture, locally-produced ceramics, and comparatively few small finds may appear at first sight less important than the urban areas of antiquity, but they will help us to “convey the flavour of ordinary life in a society.” These finds may include bioarchaeological data from studies of faunal remains and palaeobotanical sampling which will contribute significant evidence for the rural economies on which most people relied. We need in particular to use all the
data from such sites to aid our understanding of human agency and the social spaces created by rural folk. In so doing, we will be able to add considerably to our knowledge, not only of the social aspects of life in the Byzantine countryside, but also of urban archaeology and wider landscapes as well as wider political, economic, and military debates.

The question of which, and how much, of the archaeological record to sample has always presented logistical problems. But as population pressure and the industrialization of the countryside exacerbate change to the character of the ancient landscape, archaeologists in the 21st century are presented with considerable and formidable hurdles in terms of recording even a fraction of the archaeological record. The proposed construction of dams to flood valleys which for centuries have been foci of human attention is a clear mandate for rescue projects and was the reason, for example, for the rescue excavation on the lower Göksu River south of Mut at Kilise Tepe from 1994 to 1998 and to the north of Mut by the GAP. But in addition to the potential of very dramatic destruction by large-scale engineering projects in unexplored rural areas, the destruction by modern farm machinery also will have a major impact.

We must continue to employ our limited resources to examine the landscape and to tackle also the less obvious traces of human activity through time, as well as sites and monuments, if we are to approach a more nuanced understanding of the ancient province. New recording techniques are therefore vital in our approaches to Rough Cilicia. Approaches to Roman and Byzantine archaeology generally—not just in Rough Cilicia—have tended to reflect traditional methods of enquiry which may be categorized broadly as “culture history.” We must not simply apply our new technology to old recording methodologies; for if we do, we will not facilitate new interpretations but simply reinforce older ideas based on a greater sample. Rather we must endeavor to develop our research along new theoretical avenues taking into account the advances made in other areas of the discipline and to use interdisciplinary techniques in order to facilitate new interpretations of our data. We have been attempting to contribute to the issues highlighted in the previous section through our recent research at Kilise Tepe.

Kilise Tepe (36°30’ N; 33°33’ E) is a mound 150m N-S by 100m E-W (Fig. 18.1), whose 13m of deposits date from the early Bronze Age through to the thirteenth century after Christ. This mound therefore provides an unusual opportunity to excavate a stratified Byzantine rural settlement and to examine its characteristics and dynamics against not just other sites of particular periods but also against the much longer sequence of occupation at the site itself. The mound is located on a terrace above the Göksu River so that it towers over the floodplain in this rich agricultural basin. Its location and long duration are aided also by its position both at a spring and close to a crossing of the river where today the remains of a stone-built bridge of unknown date are still visible in the water near the modern village of Kısla. Kilise Tepe represents therefore a long-term record of human occupation in Rough Cilicia. The river passes Kilise Tepe about 18 km SSE of Mut (the ancient settlement of Claudiopolis) linking it to the regional capital at Silifke (ancient Seleucia) some 45 km downstream. Ammianus Marcellinus records (14.8.1–2) that Seleucia and Claudiopolis were the main
cities of Isauria; but in spite of its important location we have, so far, discovered no good evidence to identify the ancient name of Kilise Tepe. An introduction to the area in the Byzantine period is provided in the final report of the excavations carried out in the 1990s.21

The Göksu (Calycadnus) Valley has always presented a natural route through the Taurus Mountains linking central Anatolia and the Mediterranean. It offers its inhabitants access to contrasting environments and a wide range of resources, from the valley floor which has a climate similar to that of the coast, to its upper reaches which are typical of highlands.22 In recent times the threat of floods in the Göksu Valley led to rescue excavations at Kilise Tepe from 1994 to 1998 under the direction of Nicholas Postgate, the preliminary report of which was published in 2007.21 The permit given to excavate the mound did not include survey of the surrounding area,22 but subsequently integration with the broader region has been made possible through collaboration with subsequent surveys carried out by the GAP,23 and Emre Şerifoğlu24 (now Kilise Tepe Assistant Director) and museum-based work by the author on the archives of previous projects by Michael Gough at Alahan and Dağpazarı. The excavations at Kilise Tepe will facilitate further studies of the broader landscape in which it lies. This may be of particular importance if the plans to flood additional parts of the valley materialize.

In spite of its Turkish name – “Church Hill” – no attention was paid to the mound at Kilise Tepe by Byzantinists before excavations began there in the 1990s. This was due in part to two factors, both of which concealed the existence of its Byzantine occupation. The first was the misidentification of the name of the site by scholars in the 1950s and 1960s who recorded the site known to locals as Kilise Tepe as Maltepe, which is the name of another nearby mound. Mal can be translated as ‘goods’ or ‘property,’ so the mixing of the site names gave no indication of a Byzantine presence. Had the site been identified in the scholarly literature as Kilise Tepe the presence of a church would have been expected. The second factor which concealed its Byzantine remains was the publication (under the name of Maltepe) of ceramics collected in the 1950s and 1960s at Kilise Tepe in reports which summarized material from sites across the region under pre-classical period-based headings.25 The presence of Byzantine material on the site was not reported, giving the impression, even if inadvertently, that no later material was present.

When rescue excavations began under the direction of Postgate in 1994, a surface survey of the mound itself was carried out which involved the scraping of finds and stones within every 10 m × 10 m square over the top and gentler slopes of the mound (120 m × 100 m). The quantification of this material revealed evidence of Hellenistic, Roman, and Byzantine ceramics.26 The true extent of the Byzantine occupation soon became clear when nearly a meter of material dating mostly from the first millennium after Christ was found to overlie much of the earlier phases. By 1997 it was clear that a large early Byzantine basilica occupied the west side of the mound overlooking the floodplain; this formed the focus of the work into the Byzantine phases during the 1990s.27

The excavation and survey of the church were completed in 1997 and 1998 by this author who became subsequently responsible for the publication of the Level I stratigraphy and associated pottery excavated mostly in earlier seasons. During the post-exavagation study many new research questions were raised about the Byzantine occupation at Kilise Tepe. It became clear that a second phase of fieldwork was desirable to investigate the Byzantine phases of Kilise Tepe. Thus, following the publication of the report of these first five seasons, a new campaign of excavation began in 2007 with a joint Cambridge-Newcastle project.28

The aim of this paper is to highlight some of the discoveries from the initial phases of work at Kilise Tepe and to assess critically the Byzantine work carried out during the 1990s. It will make reference to recent publications and provide an outline of the research questions, aims, objectives, and resources of the current phase of study.

**The church at Kilise Tepe**

Work on the church at Kilise Tepe in 1997 and 1998 revealed two main Byzantine phases immediately below the topsoil: an Early Byzantine basilica which was subsequently destroyed and replaced by a single-chambered church and associated cemetery.29 The early building is typical in many ways of the Cilician type (Fig. 18.2): it has a nave with two side aisles, and additional side chambers linked by an eastern passageway running behind the apse.30 Most of the church had been razed to the level of the foundations, with superstructure three courses high found only in the northeast side-chamber where the plaster floor was also intact. The lack of surviving floors meant that relatively little material for dating was found associated with the early church. The area beneath the building had been leveled before construction began; material culture sealed beneath the floors was mostly Hellenistic, thus not providing a helpful *terminus post quem*. The construction date of the church is best estimated from architectural elements which, although discovered in secondary contexts around the church, most likely came from the building. Most helpful is a marble impost that was excavated in 2007 from a layer of rubble lying immediately beneath the topsoil about 10 m to the south of the western end of the church. The impost can be compared to similar examples from Constantinople that date to the late fifth/early sixth century.31
Fig. 18.2. Plan of the early Byzantine and medieval churches at Kilise Tepe 1998.
It is one of numerous marble fragments so far recovered from the building, among which include seven column bases and a large fragment of a formerly complete marble column. Clearly a considerable amount of architectural marble was transported to Kilise Tepe; a plethora of imported material that is interesting to note in view of the lack of marble used at many other churches in the region.

The smaller single-chambered church, built over the east end of the original basilica, clearly dates after the destruction of the earlier church. A skeleton in a burial located 3m to the east of the later church (see plan) has been radiocarbon-dated to the twelfth/thirteenth century, providing a rather late and therefore unhelpful terminus ante quem for the destruction of the east wall of the basilica over which it lay and thus offering few clues to when the basilica was destroyed. The radiocarbon date does provide, however, a timeframe for the cemetery located around the later structure and so we may infer a contemporary period of use of the later church itself.

The reduction in scale of the later structure parallels a pattern for the region. We can see, for example, broad parallels in terms of the scale of later structures at the West Church at Alahan and the Necropolis Church at Anemurium; though the form is different at both, the smaller scale is typical. Some degree of the amount of cultural change taking place between these periods is appreciable from the changes in the perceived needs of a church building reflected in its different scale and design.

The publication of the church at Kilise Tepe posed many questions, some of which have been raised at other sites in the region. Focus by excavators on monumental structures tends to concentrate interpretations solely on periods of major investment, modification, and destruction. The church buildings at Kilise Tepe provide detailed evidence for specific periods of monumental construction and destruction, but are much less useful for aiding our understanding of the nature of changing Byzantine occupation between these relatively short episodes of activity. At Kilise Tepe, following the initial work during the 1990s, we needed to consider questions of site duration and the nature of occupation at the site between the monumental building phases of the church. We aimed to understand, for example, details of the settlement around the early Byzantine church and to question whether the destruction of that building was representative of early Byzantine structures elsewhere on the mound or whether perhaps there was evidence of continued settlement there until the period when the later church was constructed. The later church was intentionally built over the east end of the earlier building but could there have been a break in occupation during the so-called ‘Byzantine dark age’ as is often posited for the period? In order to write a ‘biography’ of this church we therefore needed to consider not only its primary phase but also its ‘afterlife’ and its structural context. Perhaps the buildings and contexts located around the church at Kilise Tepe could provide us with a long-term picture of occupation from the time of the early church through to the period of the Medieval cemetery. For a valley as important as the Göksu, an excavated record of a broader sample of this settlement throughout this period would be most desirable and has been an objective for the recent work.

It was clear that much of the data available for addressing questions about the nature of everyday life through time and the duration of the settlement would lie not in the monumental church structure – which may have stood for centuries with little sign of physical change – but rather in the features and artifacts associated with buildings located around the church building. Thus to approach a more nuanced understanding of the chronology and use of the church building at Kilise Tepe we aimed to study its context. At the same time the rest of the settlement and later cemetery would hopefully enable us to address further questions about life at the site and in the region that the excavation of the church building at Kilise Tepe could not answer alone. The potential of such “less impressive” buildings and their associated deposits is very exciting.

Vernacular structures at Kilise Tepe

At Kilise Tepe only the lower courses of the Byzantine domestic buildings survive beneath about 15–20 cm of soft plough soil. Since they do not even break the surface of the soil, they might not appear as impressive as the magnificent stone façades of the standing buildings in the settlements located closer to the coast which date to a similar period. The domestic buildings at Kilise Tepe, however, provide access to about 50 cm of mostly undisturbed archaeological contexts from the Byzantine period. Furthermore, excavation at Kilise Tepe can be carried out relatively easily without danger of falling masonry or the difficulty of lifting heavy stones.

In the Early Byzantine period, unlike some of the houses in the settlements located towards the coast, the buildings at Kilise Tepe were constructed with foundations of undressed and unmortared field stones rather than ashlar blocks (Fig. 18.3). The upper courses of the stone foundations may have been topped by further stone courses but since so little stone is found in the excavation these foundations were likely topped by mud-brick walls, as is common with certain of the traditional buildings surviving in the local villages today. In places mud-bricks have been found in situ on the stone foundations, but mostly the mud-bricks have been eroded away due to ploughing and weathering resulting from the walls’ close proximity to the current ground level. These houses, similar to those typical of the Anatolian plateau,
Fig. 18.3. Working plan of the Level I phases at Kilise Tepe 2009.
therefore provide a stark contrast to the Roman and early Byzantine villages best known in the limestone hills built near Silifke. The internal floors of these structures consist of either hardened earth, layers of plaster, or roughly hewn slabs of stone. External courtyard surfaces associated with these buildings include an area identified between the houses to the north of the church that is composed of rounded river cobbles.

Two main sub-phases were identified during the excavations in the 1990s. The walls labeled Level Id clearly cut, and therefore postdate, those of Level Ic. The complicated nature of the walls within the sub-phases suggested gradual construction of buildings over a considerable period of time within the Early Byzantine period.

Intensive archaeological excavation will, by nature of the approach, produce a more detailed record than survey. But good descriptions of buildings, even those recorded in great detail, do not explain the living that took place inside them. Thus, as Penelope Allison has pointed out, the analysis of the physical structure of a dwelling is not the analysis of...
domestic behavior. Good descriptions are a tool for the next step: “Archaeologists do not dig up households. They dig up dwellings and domestic artifacts, but not social units.”

The recommencement of excavations at Kilise Tepe in 2007 has enabled us to concentrate in a more deliberate way on the vernacular buildings and their associated features. Although we have evidence for a relatively long period of inhabitation preserved in the structure of the buildings, the best represented period of activity belongs to the final phase of the early Byzantine occupation. Several of the early Byzantine buildings excavated between 1994 and 1998, for example those in areas K19 and N12a, had been found with complete vessels lying in situ on floors. Excavation since 2007 elsewhere on the mound, in particular in areas M18, N14, and N15-O15, has demonstrated similar findings. The discovery of finds and vessels – sometimes broken but with all their pieces present – appears to represent the abandonment of belongings within buildings by the inhabitants. The date when this abandonment happened is the subject of current study but appears to have been after the early seventh century after Christ. The evidence uncovered from these excavations will enable us to consider life at the site leading up to that fateful event but also to gain a particularly rich snapshot of life in this settlement.

**Early Byzantine building: preliminary report**

In 2007 we continued the excavations 10m north of the northeast corner of the church in area M18, where we excavated rooms of a building that we interpret as an early Byzantine dwelling. We can see from the architecture and the internal features and archaeological stratigraphy that it developed over several centuries before coming to a sudden end. A full description of the archaeological deposits and their interpretation will be provided in the final excavation report where it will be possible to consider the structure within the context of surrounding buildings and open areas.

The building in area M18 has the shape of a slightly irregular rectangle divided into four spaces (Fig. 18.4). The structure as a whole is oriented roughly North-South, and divided into two halves (north and south) by a central partition wall W2201. The northern half of the structure was divided by a short wall W2204 into two spaces (east and west). A similar wall (W2216) created two spaces east and west in the southern half of the building. A doorway, which opened onto the courtyard at the southern end of W2202, provided access into the southwestern part of the structure. In the northeastern ‘room’ of the structure, along the west side of the east wall, a stone bench (W2301), 3.11m long by about 0.70m wide, was constructed on top of a plastered floor surface. By the time the bench was built this floor had been plastered already at least five times.

Relatively few finds were uncovered in the northern part of the building. The main feature was represented by a large ceramic roof tile laid against the wall which was associated with a round ceramic tile (M18/064 [78808]), 4.8 cm thick and 20 cm diameter (Fig. 18.5). In the southeast corner of the building, opposite the doorway, traces of a rectangular fire installation lined with broken roof tiles was noted.

The burnt destruction layer which preserved the final occupation phase of this building revealed that it was roofed by beams, running North-South, and sticks running perpendicular to the beams. These sticks would presumably have supported a flat mud roof. The timbers were sampled for radiocarbon dating. Taken together, the samples from beams and other...
burnt remains from the structure indicate the date of the construction of the building between the mid fifth and the mid sixth century, most likely therefore near the beginning of the sixth century after Christ. This is very interesting and provides a helpful complement to the architectural sculpture from the church which as we have seen was apparently of the late fifth/early sixth century date. These dates therefore support the interpretation for the roofing of the building in M18 during the same period as the church lying some 20m to the southwest. Of course these timbers could have been reused from an earlier structure or could belong to an episode when this building was re-roofed. The orientation of the south wall (W2217=W2213) shows that it was constructed to respect a pre-existing feature lying to the south which will be the focus of subsequent fieldwork. The relative relationships of the walls, the stratified floor phases and associated artifacts can help to build up a picture of the development of the structure through time. This will be considered in our final report, but for now I will concentrate on the final phase of this structure.

The northern part of the house presumably was protected from dust and dirt which would have come in through the outside door in the southern part of the west wall and from the fireplace in the southeast corner of the building. The walls survive only a few courses above the floors, so it is impossible to establish where any windows may have been located, but if there were windows in the east or west walls the bench in the northeastern space would have been shaded from light in morning, but perhaps lit up by the sun from the west in the evening. We can suggest that the bench could have been used as a bed and that the northeast part of the building was a sleeping area more protected from dust and dirt than the rest of the house.

Several finds discovered in the southern part of the
structure which derive from the final phase of the building were trapped beneath the fallen roof. These can be used to suggest that the southeastern part of the building was used for food preparation and cooking. The fire installation in the southeast corner was rectangular in shape and made of broken roof tiles (Fig. 18.6). It was aligned at an angle across the corner of the building between the east and south walls. A closed wheel-made cooking pot with strap handles, rolled rim and ribbing on the exterior (M18/270 [78818]) (Fig. 18.7) was found close to this fireplace together with a small juglet with a flat, disk base, rounded body, and vertical neck (M18/166 [78818]) (Fig. 18.8) and a jug with rounded body and domed, button base (M18/302 [87348 + 87346]) (Fig. 18.9); all were found in pieces. Starved of oxygen, the jugs were ‘reduced’ to a grey-black color in the fire, but originally would have been fired orange and probably decorated with dark paint as is typical of similar vessels used at Kilise Tepe. The cooking pot would have been used for the boiling of stew-type liquid food, the juglet and jug probably for water or possibly oil or wine. A lamp M18/301 (37345) was smashed beneath one of the beams near the hearth as it fell, also reduced by the burning from orange to grey.

A coin of Maurice Tiberius (M18/294 [87342]) found in the destruction deposit is dated AD 593–595. Although this coin clearly provides a terminus post quem for the destruction, this is only one coin and that event may have been long after the date of the coin’s minting. The date of these vessels would fit the late sixth/seventh century date comparable, for example, with similar material from Elaiussa Sebaste, but such material may date later. The arrival of dark-on-light painted decoration together with such domed base forms appears from the early eighth century especially in Jordan and Syria. We need therefore to proceed with caution and not leap to providing a date for this material too hastily; the ceramic material from the final phase of all the early Byzantine trenches at Kilise Tepe is therefore the subject of ongoing study.

The items preserved in the dwelling following this
Fig. 18.11. Three examples of early Byzantine painted closed vessels from Kilise Tepe.

destruction event are very similar in form to examples recovered from the final phases of rooms with artifacts found abandoned elsewhere on the mound. The domed ‘button base’ jug M18/302, for example, has been found in the abandonment deposit in both area N15-O15 and in area J15 (Fig. 18.10). It seems possible therefore that the destruction in M18 and the abandonment of the rooms in N15-O15 and in area J15 may have occurred at the same time. The exact date of this abandonment is of particular importance due to the position of Kilise Tepe and the significant international events of the seventh century and later in particular the potential impact of the Persian and later the Arab invasions. The details of this debate and the contribution to it of the evidence from Kilise Tepe will be the subject of subsequent publications when a full discussion of the evidence can be presented.

The excavation of such houses provides important information on the layout and use of rooms. It is complemented by numerous features that offer insight into a variety of activities that occurred at the settlement. Particularly interesting in view of the rural location of Kilise Tepe is evidence for agricultural produce that was stored for use at the site in pits. Pit P96/11 for example was dug into the courtyard area between buildings to the west of the dwelling in M18. It was one of a number of pits lined with clay to be used for the storage of grain. Careful excavation and the flotation of the different layers of fill in P96/11 showed that it contained processed wheat grain (T. spelta) at its base, but higher up contained a secondary fill of coarse sieved product that had been winnowed and sieved to remove chaff and seed heads but was waiting further fine sieving to remove the weed seeds smaller than the grain itself. It would appear that the wheat grain originally stored in the pit was mostly removed and the feature then used later for the storing of the coarser product. Later these pits were often employed as refuse pits, sometimes preserving remnants of their original contents at their bases.

The typical ceramic assemblage for the early Byzantine houses at Kilise Tepe includes wheel made and mold made lamps, juglets and small jugs in plainware fabric but with painted decoration on the shoulders, a very small number of imported red slipped bowls, and rolled rimmed closed cooking pots with flat strap handles. Larger vessels include locally made storage and transport vessels as well as imported amphoras, most commonly Late Roman Amphora 1 (LRA 1) and large pithoi. Quantification of the sherds from all the different contexts is being carried out in order to facilitate interpretation of the different rooms and features.

The cooking pots, amphoras, and the few finewares which are found at Kilise Tepe are typical of those found in the assemblages at sites on the Mediterranean coast such as Anemurium and Elaiussa Sebaste as well as Alahan located inland. The key difference between the material from Kilise Tepe and that published at Anemurium and Elaiussa Sebaste are the closed, unslipped vessels made in local fabric and used for storing water and other liquids. These range from small juglets, through jugs and storage vessels to pithoi. Although some of the Kilise Tepe painted wares were made in a finer fabric than those found at Alahan, these locally-made pale orange containers, painted with a range of dark
red motifs, have greater similarity in terms of form and decoration with the assemblages from Alahan and Dagpazar than with the wares of the coastal region. Similar painted motifs decorating the closed vessels at Anemurium were not found.

The vessels from Kilise Tepe are painted with a range of motifs including spirals and dots in what seems to be a stylized grape and vine design, as well as birds, fish, elements of foliage, stars, and crosses. They come not from the church but from the surrounding buildings and associated features.

LRA 1 sherds are typical of amphoras produced on the south coast of Cilicia, such as at Elaiussa Sebaste. The discovery of such containers at Kilise Tepe associated with household occupation represents proxy evidence for their contents arriving from the coast and reflects contact and exchange between settlements in the central Göksu Valley and those of the coastal region. Such ‘imports’ prompt us to consider the nature of products from the Göksu region that were traded in exchange. Presumably agricultural goods could have been floated down the river.

It is interesting to note also the relatively small number of plainware bowls and open or frying pan-type cooking vessels at Kilise Tepe. A similar distinction was noted by Caroline Williams in the pottery assemblage at Alahan. Since other forms of pottery common at the coast are traded to the valley, the differences may well reflect shared aspects of food preparation, cooking, and the variety in food preparation and eating habits between the people in the Göksu Valley and those at the coast. The evidence of the pottery from recent excavations and analysis of the animal bones recovered from Kilise Tepe will enable us in the future to develop further our understanding of food preparation, consumption, and aspects of animal husbandry.

Slowly the arrangement of the buildings is being uncovered and, as we uncover individual features of structures, their doorways, orientation, the spaces around them, their internal proportions, and the relationship of the contextual artifacts, we are beginning to build up a picture of life at Kilise Tepe.

As we examine the details of individual features and their relationships with each other, we can begin to approach an understanding of the everyday dynamics of life in a rural settlement like Kilise Tepe, as well as its interrelationships with others in the region and beyond. Periods of growth, transition, and even demise of the cities on the coast can be compared with the evidence from Kilise Tepe.

The aim of this paper has been to try to reflect on our theoretical and methodological approaches to domestic and monumental buildings at rural settlements in Rough Cilicia. It stresses the importance of context and has attempted to show how the results of the work on the church excavated at Kilise Tepe during the 1990s necessitated further research to understand the settlement in which it was located. The post-2007 study of the buildings situated around the church has begun to reveal a dense concentration of structures that illuminate our understanding of activity in the Göksu Valley. The relationship between artifacts, environmental remains, and buildings promises to provide a rich understanding of life in the past. It is hoped that, as we continue the excavations at Kilise Tepe, we will be able to understand better the changing nature of life in the countryside and the people on whom the cities and their populations relied, while at the same time, through analysis of the changing fortunes of the site, contribute to the discussion about the history of the region during the period of transition from Late Antiquity into the Medieval period when Cilicia occupied so important a geographical position between international powers.
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