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ABSTRACT

NETWORKS OF EXCHANGE IN NORTH-CENTRAL ANATOLIA DURING THE LATE-IRON AGE AND EARLY HELLENISTIC PERIOD WITH KOMANA AS A CRITICAL NODE

BATMAN, Ayşe
Doctor of Philosophy, Department of Settlement Archaeology
Supervisor: Prof. Dr. Deniz Burcu ERCIYAS

July, 2024, 270 pages

In this thesis, the Late Iron Age and Early Hellenistic contexts from the occupation layers of Komana, were examined primarily to understand the possible relations with the other settlements within the same region. The pottery from these layers have been the main medium to decipher networks of communication, and thus, the "Banded Ware" and the so-called "Hellenistic Color-Coated Ware" were studied in detail. These sub-groups of the "Fine Ware" category represented a significant portion of the entire assemblage which were distinguished by their distinctive features. This research is based on the macroscopic examination of the typological features of this pottery. Similar examples have been sought for among the occupational layers of the surrounding contemporary settlements, and the obtained results led to the extension of the borders of the scope of this thesis towards the Halys Basin and Central Anatolia to the west, Cappadocia and Cilician littoral to the south, and Black Sea littoral to the north.

In an attempt to understand the relations between sites demonstrating similar material culture, the roads that traversed the region during the Late Iron Age and Early Hellenistic Period have been studied in the scope of this research. A network of exchange of traditions, styles, and material culture in general was built by creating maps of roads connecting the sites that indicated close links with Komana. This enabled to see a wider picture of communication and exchange beyond the previously defined regional borders through the centuries.
The close geographical study revealed that Komana was situated on the principal arteries throughout the majority of historical periods. The results of future archaeometric analysis can be integrated with this study to elucidate the dynamic relations within the region.

**Keywords:** Late Iron Age, Early Hellenistic, Pottery, Roads, Network.
ÖZ

Geç Demir Çağı ve Erken Helenistik Dönem’de Bir Kesişim Bölgesi Olarak İç Anadolu’nun Kuzeyi: Stratejik Bir Nokta Komana

Batman, Ayşe
Doktora, Yerleşim Arkeolojisi
Tez Yöneticisi: Prof. Dr. Deniz Burcu ERCİYAS

Temmuz, 2024, 270 sayfa


Seramik verileri üzerinde yürütülen araştırma sonuçları, Geç Demir Çağı ve Helenistik Dönemde bölgeden geçen yolların da araştırma kapsamına alması gerektiğini göstermiştir. Komana
benzeri seramik verilerinin bulunduğu yerleşimler, Roma öncesi ve Roma Dönemi yolları üzerine oturtulmuş böylelikle mikro ölçekte Komana, daha büyük perspektifte ise İç Anadolu’nun kuzeyinin söz konusu dönemlerdeki ilişki ağlarının tespit edilmesine olanak tanımıştır. Öte yandan, bu coğrafi çalışma Komana’nın hemen her dönemde ana güzergâhlar üzerinde yer aldığını ortaya çıkarmaktadır. Ancak, ileride yapılabilecek olan arkeometrik çalışmalarından elde edilebilecek sonuçlar, bu çalışma ile birleştirilerek bölge dinamiklerinin anlaşılmasına olanak tanıyacaktır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Geç Demir Çağ, Erken Hellenistik, Seramik, Yol, İletişim.
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

The examination of archaeological material culture artifacts, regardless of the period in which they are dated, within the context that they’ve been found, is intended as a reference guide to date the settlement or occupation layer and to understand the settlement patterns where the study is conducted. Pottery is the most frequently found data set during archaeological surveys and excavations. When examined macroscopically, the typological and decorative classifications, in addition to the archaeometric analysis of the fabrics, can provide crucial data regarding pottery. The obtained data enable the comparison of data from identically dated occupational layers at nearby or distant sites or in the territory where the study is conducted. This allows for the differentiation of import or export pottery and the determination of production centers. From a broader perspective, the analysis can also shed light on the dynamics of the relations between the settlements.

1.1. The Scope and Objectives of the Study

In relation to this, the pottery repertoire found within the scope of the Komana Archaeological Research Project and dating to the Late Iron Age-Early Hellenistic Period formed the basis for determining the research questions of this thesis. Macroscopic analyses were carried out by me on pottery assemblages that were excavated from a very narrow and restricted architectural context during the seasons between 2018 and 2020, in which I personally participated. The team members conducted various studies on architectural elements and other find groups in primary undisturbed contexts, which were then dated.

The most dense group of the repertoire consists of fine ware decorated and painted pottery. Although the samples were never encountered in the previous studies, it was concluded that these are the most suitable group for comparative macroscopic analysis until the results of archaeometric studies are obtained.

Another category of Komana pottery repertoire classified under the fine ware category is pinched-handled carinated cups (Hellenistic Color-Coated Ware). Although their number is
proportionally lower than the decorated and painted examples, especially in terms of the forms of the handles, they are notable for their distinctive characteristics. It was suggested that the samples belonging to this pottery group, which have different thicknesses, may have been produced in different centers, which is why this group was also included in the scope of the thesis. Additionally, analogous examples were discovered in the Hellenistic Period pottery assemblage of Kinet Höyük in Dörryol, Hatay, where I worked between 2001 and 2005. The documented presence of this group at this site, which is a harbor and littoral settlement in Cilicia, was another rationale for including this group in the scope of the thesis.

Firstly, the pottery assemblages of the sites in the North-Central Anatolia region, where Komana Pontica is located, and the sites in the proximal region between Samsun and Ordu on the southern littoral of the Black Sea were investigated. The preliminary results indicated that pottery similar to the band-decorated examples was particularly abundant at sites south-west of Komana. Consequently, the necessity arose to extend the study to the peripheries of the territory of Komana. This was initially carried out by investigating the Kızılırmak Basin in the west, and then Cappadocia in the south.

This dissertation focuses on a group of painted pottery excavated between 2018 and 2020 as part of the Komana Archaeological Research Project, where I have been working as a team member for nearly five seasons. Komana Pontica is located in the Gümenek district of today's Tokat province, in the region called North-Central Anatolia, in the inland of the Central Black Sea region. The settlement was established on both sides of the Iris River and in the middle of the Dazimontis Plain, today known as Kazova. In 2004, Prof. Dr. Deniz Burcu Erciyas, Head of the Department of Settlement Archaeology at the Middle East Technical University, initiated archaeological investigations on behalf of the Ministry of Culture and Tourism of the Republic of Turkey in order to determine the socio-economic and administrative structure and its relations with other sites and regions of this religious center, which served as a temple state in the Hellenistic period. In his book Geography, Strabo states that Komana Pontica was a religious and trade center that hosted religious festivals twice a year (Strabo, 12.3.32). These festivals attracted many guests from other regions. Strabo's account suggests that Komana Pontica played an important role in the religious and commercial life of the region.

Therefore, not all Komana pottery dating to the Late Iron Age – Early Hellenistic Period was included in the scope of this thesis. This study was conducted on two pottery groups that stand out with their characteristics and are thought to contribute to the differential diagnosis. The results of this study are intended to contribute to the understanding of the relationship dynamics of Komana Pontica, a Hellenistic temple state that hosted guests from distant
Archaeological excavations began in 2009 did not reveal primary undisturbed contexts dating to the Hellenistic Period in any sector of the mound called Hamamtepe. Until, in 2018, when a previously unexplored layer supported by both architectural features and small finds was encountered. Contrary to the inter-settlement strata of the mound, which belong to the Ottoman, Danishmend/Seljuk and Middle Byzantine phases, when the walls were built in an east-west direction for over 800 years. The walls in these trenches in the sector called HTP01 were in northeast-southwest direction. In addition, these Hellenistic walls did not contain mortar like the following Roman and Byzantine Periods. The architectural remains, were studied more carefully in 2020 by opening sounding trenches and two distinct wall levels were identified. A separate study to date other small finds was conducted simultaneously together with the dating of the pottery and the bone assemblages. For these layers, a silver siglos from Amisos with Hera on the obverse and an owl with open wings on the reverse (4th-3rd century B.C.), suggestive of connections with the Black Sea and a bronze coin from Knossos (2nd century B.C.-early 1st century B.C.) with the letters K N Ω surrounded by a labyrinth on the obverse and a labyrinth on the reverse were discovered assisting with dating the contexts. Furthermore, a bronze fibula classified as "Middle La Tene type" (Müller-Karpe 1988; Darbyshire et al., 2000; Coşkun, 2014), which is considered to be a Galatian fibula was discovered. Although there are two kinds of fibulae are dated between 3rd-2nd century B.C. and 2nd-1st century B.C.

The objective of this thesis is to establish the network relationship between North-Central Anatolia and other inland regions, as well as possible overseas sites and regions, based on the Late Iron Age and Early Hellenistic pottery from Komana. Although there is an influx of data on Roman roads, milestones, bridges and amphorae indicating the presence of trade, Late Iron Age and Hellenistic evidence is limited. This study aims to examine the relationship dynamics of the geographical region considered in the thesis during this period. In this regard, written sources play a key role. It is noteworthy that Komana was a religious center and Temple State dedicated to the local deity, Goddess Ma. The biannual festivals not only made the region a commercial and trading center, but also a cultural crossroads. Thus, the pottery subject of this thesis is expected to provide evidence for possible trade routes and cultural patterns in the distribution of pottery forms and decorations across regions. The thesis will define its scope by selecting distinctive groups from the pottery repertoire to determine the relationship
networks of North Central Anatolia in the Late Iron Age and Early Hellenistic Period. The investigation will focus on the sites where similar examples exist. The research is based on the notion that relations with the littoral may be more limited than with Central Anatolia and Cappadocia due to difficult geographical conditions, steep mountain ranges and climatic differences. In other words, as an indication, it will be emphasized that Komana and North Central Anatolia may have faced south and west rather than north. Another topic that will be discussed later is identifying potential north-south routes, aside from the east-west 'Royal Road' dating back to the 5th century B.C. Therefore, on the basis of the Komana pottery, settlements with similar pottery repertoires will be followed.

This thesis consists of six chapters in total. The first chapter consists of an Introduction. The second chapter is Historical Geography. It includes a physical description of the area where the study was conducted, the geographical characteristics of the region and the reflections of the climate on the societies living in the region and their economic activities, the historical geography of the region within the scope of the thesis, and finally the location, archaeological studies and the importance of Komana Pontica in particular.

The third chapter, titled Contextualizing North-Central Anatolia and Komana, includes information on archaeological studies at Komana primarily. In particular, the pottery assemblages from the Late Iron Age and Early Hellenistic primary undisturbed layers of Komana are discussed and described in detail. The similarities of the pottery groups covered in this dissertation with other sites in North-Central Anatolia, the Black Sea littoral between Amisos and Kotyora, partially Central Anatolia as well as some sites on the Cilician littoral are detailed. In the fourth chapter, Roads And Routes in North-Central Anatolia and Its Surroundings: Inter-Regional Connectivity passing through the North-Central Anatolia region are reviewed in chronological order, with an attempt to identify the roads passing through Komana and its vicinity. In this context, the aim is to reveal the contextual relationship dynamics of Komana. The fifth chapter of the thesis entitled Recontextualisation of Komana on Networks Based on the Archaeological Data. This chapter presents an analysis of the pottery, bone, coinage, and small artefacts from primary undisturbed contexts, not only from Komana, but also from comparable materials. By doing so, it aims to elucidate the possible connections and network links that Komana was a part of. Furthermore, it considers their local, interregional, and possible overseas dichotomization, as well as the results of the study aimed at placing Komana in a network during the Late Iron Age and Early Hellenistic Period. The final chapter is the conclusion chapter. It summarizes all of the data and conclusions drawn from the studies conducted throughout the dissertation.
1.2. Methods

The methods that have been used in this research can be summarized as follows:

- The selected pottery groups from trenches 297/608 and 307/608 in the HTP01 sector of Hamamtepe during the 2018-2020 excavation seasons of the Komana Archaeological Research Project were examined macroscopically for typological and decorative patterns.
- A comprehensive search for comparable pottery with similar forms and decorative patterns, first in North-Central Anatolia and then by expanding the area to the north, south and west,
- Determining the geographical region that will constitute the thesis in the light of the data obtained and narrowing the scope and focusing on North-Central Anatolia,
- The dissertation integrates and analyzes the information provided by ancient sources,
- In addition to the east-west routes, the existence of which has been demonstrated by previous studies, the production and distribution networks of pottery, which constitute the concrete data of the thesis, have been established and a possible north-south land route has been mapped.

The thesis relies on the pottery discovered during previous and ongoing archaeological excavations as the primary dataset to answer the research questions. Specifically, the pottery from the Komana Archaeological Research Project conducted between 2018-2020 serves as the basis for the research questions and dating used throughout the thesis, following the Yasshöyük Chronology. This thesis focuses on a specific selection of pottery from Komana dating to the Late Iron Age and Hellenistic Periods. The chosen pottery groups include painted and band-decorated fine ware vessels, as well as sherds with pinched handles, which are unique in their typology compared to the rest of the repertoire.

In addition to these specific data, ancient sources have guided the possible relations between settlements during the Late Iron Age (YHSS Late Phrygian 540-330 B.C.) and the Hellenistic period (YHSS Early Hellenistic 330-260 B.C., YHSS Late Hellenistic 260-100 B.C.), as well as the trade routes used since the 5th century B.C. and the settlements located along these routes.

This dissertation primarily examines ancient literary sources that reveal the interactions between the settlements within the scope of the dissertation and that describe the geography and politics of the Hellenistic period. Strabo, Herodotus, Polybius, Xenophon, Plutarch, Justinus (Marcus Junianus Justinus), and Diodorus Siculus are among the ancient authors who
extensively wrote about the Black Sea and played a crucial role. The economic and political situation in the specified geography and the reflections on the commercial activities of the settlements are also considered.

In this context, I would like to point out that the preliminary results of all the data from the 2018-2020 seasons of the Komana Archaeological Research Project have now been published, including a broad assessment of the pottery repertoire (Erciyas et al., 2021). This work has contributed to the expansion and deepening of the research.

The results of the analysis of the concrete data are discussed within the scope of the dissertation with a theoretical component. The archaeological data was used to estimate road routes between settlements. Using the example of Komana, this study offers a new perspective on the relations between North-Central Anatolia, inland regions, and overseas geographies. During the Hellenistic Period, Komana Pontica was a temple state that hosted a temple dedicated to Ma, a local goddess, and held large festivals bi-annually, which led to secondary commercial activities that contributed to the development of the region. The interaction of merchants and guests from different regions must also have been a facilitator of the interweaving of cultural relationships. The data analysis aimed to investigate whether the forms and decoration patterns of the pottery groups included in the thesis were inspired by neighboring or overseas regions. This sheds light on the intercultural interactions of the region during the Late Iron Age and Early Hellenistic Period. The pottery groups from the Komana repertoire, which are distinguished from the general repertoire in terms of decoration and form, have been used not only to determine the economic network of the region in the Late Iron Age and Early Hellenistic period, but also to investigate the cultural interactions that Komana may have had with regional and overseas geographies due to its religious position.

The pottery from the 2018-2020 season of the Komana Archaeological Research Project was washed, sorted, and deposited in the relevant crates during the fieldwork days of the years in which they were excavated. Following the acquisition of the required permissions from the Republic of Turkey Ministry of Culture and Tourism Tokat Museum, the pottery was transported to the Komana Office located in the Middle East Technical University Campus in Ankara. The pottery was examined with Prof. Dr. Deniz Burcu Erciyas, who is also my thesis advisor and the Head of Komana Archaeological Research Project. Tuğba Tekin created technical drawings of the pottery, which was grouped into Fine Ware, Medium Ware, and Coarse Ware at the end of the study. The most prominent typological and stylistic examples of the entire repertoire have also been formally photographed and added to the Komana archive. Concurrently, the pottery groups that could be the subject of the dissertation were
determined and the decorated and painted pottery group and the pottery group that is characterized by different handle structures, which are flattened in the middle and looped from the edges, were identified.

The study of this thesis is subject to a number of limitations. Firstly, the number of surveys and excavations in the Black Sea region is limited. Although the number of studies and publications has increased in recent years, it is still relatively scarce. Nevertheless, some attempts have been made to study the published and unpublished pottery from the identified settlements in situ. However, due to the COVID-19 pandemic during the period of 2020-2021 while writing the thesis, it was not possible to conduct the targeted field trips. In addition, some of the excavations in which I wanted to participate had a very limited number of team members, so it was not possible to go to the settlements that were thought to have materials similar to the Komana examples. Therefore, there are gaps in the routes and the settlements along them that were attempted to be established on the basis of the pottery assemblages identified. Additionally, the number of settlements where pottery resembling Komana examples has been identified is limited. These settlements range from the region between Amisos and Kotyora on the Central Black Sea littoral zone to the region between Kelenderis and Kinet Höyük in Cilicia. Not all of the settlements in the region have Late Iron Age and Hellenistic occupation layers, or have not yet been investigated in these strata, and some of the existing settlements do not contain pottery similar to that encountered in Komana. As previously mentioned, future archaeological studies in the region, along with the fact that global health problems have relatively decreased and travel has become possible, will allow future studies and facilitate the filling of these gaps.

1.3. Sources

The primary sources consulted for this dissertation were the Geographica of Strabon and the History of Pliny the Elder. These sources were utilized not only to gain insight into the historical facts of the research area, but also to gain a deeper understanding of the geographical and geomorphological aspects of the region.

As has been previously noted, the total number of archaeological excavations conducted in the north-central region of the Anatolian Plateau and the Pontic region is still relatively limited. While the number of excavations in the region has increased in recent years, the Hellenistic Period remains a significant area for further investigation. The monographs of the eminent 18th-century travelers, Anderson (1903) and Cumont & Cumont (1906), were instrumental in elucidating the settlements and their ancient names within the research area. Additionally, the
studies conducted by Professor Olshaussen constituted the primary sources for historical geography.

In addition to the sources consulted prior to the 2000s, Professor Erciyas's Ph.D. dissertation (2001), entitled *Studies in the Archaeology of Hellenistic Pontus, The Settlements, Monuments and Coinage of Mithradates VI and His Predecessors* and her book *Wealthy, Aristocracy and Royal Propaganda under the Hellenistic Kingdom of the Mithradatids in the Central Black Sea Region in Turkey* (2006) constituted the principal sources for both an understanding of the settlement patterns of the research area and the connectivity between the southern Black Sea littoral and the inland Pontic region. One of the most essential and up-to-date sources for understanding the geography and defensive patterns of Hellenistic Pontus is the Ph.D. dissertation completed by Emine Sökmên in 2016 under the title *Surveying the Pontic Landscape Through the Fortresses of the Mithridatids*.

The other significant source was the book series on the Black Sea Studies of the Danish National Research Foundation, which has been inactive since 2010.

In addition, the Ph.D. dissertation (2010) of Shannan Stewart, entitled "Gordion after the Knot: Hellenistic Pottery and Culture," constituted a pivotal source for this dissertation. Initially, she conducted a comprehensive investigation into the so-called "Hellenistic Banded Ware" of the Anatolian plateau, collating all the terms that have been used to define this group since the beginning of the 20th century. Subsequently, she devised a novel classification system for the pottery group in question, designating them according to their geographical distributions rather than by reference to an ethnic group. In regard to her study, Gordion publications were also utilized as reference points for the chronology of the Komana Late Iron Age and Hellenistic pottery repertoires. Accordingly, the publications about the Hellenistic levels of the settlements that were used as comparanda sites were also significant in terms of identifying relations. Especially for the distribution and production of the Hellenistic Color-Coated Ware pottery within the Anatolian plateau Professor Kassab-Tezgör’s studies (1988, 2003) about Knidian pottery were also very helpful.

In the case of the pottery, personal interviews with a number of scholars, including Dr. Andrea Berlin and Dr. Peter Stone, were of particular importance. The same is also true of the routes and roads, where interviews with Dr. Geoffrey Summers, Dr. Tonnes Bekker-Nielsen, and Dr. Marie-Henriette Gates were similarly crucial for this dissertation.

For the routes and roads and for the establishment of the networks, David French’s publications (especially the *Pre- and Early-Roman Roads of Asia Minor. The Persian Royal*
Road and Roman Roads and Milestones in Anatolia (1982)), the Roads in Pontos, Royal and Roman (1901) of Munro, The Byzantine Monuments and Topography of the Pontos (1985) of Bryer & Winfield and the Barrington Atlas of the Greek and Roman World were the most relevant and significant sources in this research. Moreover, Professor Kassab Tezgör’s recent publication, entitled From the Miltos/Sinopis of Ancient Sinope to the Yoşa of Modern Cappadocia (2023), was instrumental in identifying and understanding the north-south routes between the southern Black Sea littoral and inland regions of the Anatolian plateau, as well as the commercial dynamics between these two regions.
CHAPTER 2

PHYSICAL AND HISTORICAL GEOGRAPHY OF THE NORTH-CENTRAL ANATOLIA

2.1. Definition of the Research Area

The Pontic landscape is divided into four parts, starting from the point where the Halys River discharges into the sea on the littoral and extending eastward to Trapezus, the region above the Halys River in the inland, the main zone formed by the Iris and Lycus Rivers, and the mountainous zone close to the North Anatolian mountain range, which formed deep valleys and gorges shaped by the Iris and Halys Rivers (Olshausen, 1978: 438). In this context, Komana Pontica, located within the borders of the Pontic region in antiquity and today within the province of Tokat (Dazimon) in the inland of the Central Black Sea region of the Anatolian plateau, is the focal site of this dissertation.

The study of the pottery repertoire of primary undisturbed contexts is critical for dating strata and determining subsistence patterns, including consumption habits, possible cultural interactions, and demographics. Notably, there has been limited archaeological research in the Black Sea and the North-Central Anatolia. Nevertheless, the investigations in Oluz Höyük (Dönmez et al., 2009) and Hadrianopolis (Kan Şahin, 2019) have provided substantial data on the Hellenistic occupation layers of the sites and have made an essential contribution to the archaeology of the region. Thus, the datasets from Komana, located in the east of the North-Central Anatolia, have the potential to further enhance the knowledge of the Hellenistic period in the Pontic region (Erciyas et al., 2021, 235). In this context, the scope of the thesis covers north-central Anatolia, part of Galatia in the west, Cappadocia and Tarsus, Antioch (Antakya), Kinet Höyük, Kelenderis, and Nagidos on the Cilician littoral in the south, and the coastline between Amisos and Kotyora in the north.

The study was deepened to include two groups of pottery (Hellenistic Banded Ware and Hellenistic Color-Coated Ware) within the pottery repertoire found in the Late Iron Age and Hellenistic occupation layers contexts previously investigated in 2018-2020. In order to contextualize Komana in its intermediate region, the nearby sites with comparable examples
were reviewed. Accordingly, the closest littoral to Komana is the southern coast of the Black Sea. Furthermore, the discovery of similar finds at Amisos and Kotyora restricted the northern limit of the study to these two sites. Upon reviewing the results of the studies conducted in the proximity of Kimistene and Kepez in the Paphlagonia region northwest of Komana (Laflı & Kan Şahin, 2014: 56-58), it was found that there were discrepancies with the Komana data and therefore the region was not included in the scope of the study. However, the close resemblance between Bogazköy on the Galatia-Paphlagonia border (Maier, 1963; Genz, 2000), Tavium/Büyük Nefes Köy to the southwest of Komana, and the Late Iron Age and Hellenistic period data group with Komana necessitated the scope of the study to encompass these sites. The westernmost point of the area covered by this thesis is the site of Gordion in Galatia. When the pottery assemblages from the Late Iron Age and Hellenistic occupation layers are analyzed, Gordion is of great importance, not only for its resemblance to the Komana examples, but also for demonstrating the distribution of the assemblage discussed in this dissertation. In relation with this, Stewart's 2010 PhD thesis on Gordion's Hellenistic pottery repertoire, along with the research conducted by Winter (Winter, 1984), Henrickson (Henrickson, 1993), and Voigt (Voigt, 2003) played a key role in comprehending the Komana examples and structuring the network of interconnections. Conversely, the contexts of the settlements in the western littoral of the Anatolian plateau dating to the same period were also reviewed, and comparable examples of materials thought to be imported only from the Komana pottery repertoire were found. Additionally, Stewart proposed limiting the distribution of pottery examples, particularly during the Hellenistic Period. This distribution was observed to be concentrated in inland areas rather than the littoral zones of the Anatolian plateau, with the western limit being Eskişehir, the northern limit being the Black Sea, and the southern limit being Çatalhöyük (Stewart, 2010, 153). As the research in Galatia proceeded, it was considered necessary to involve Zengibar Kalesi in Konya and Porsuk/Zeynevhöyük and Kınık Höyük in Niğde, which are located in the southern part of the region, and therefore the southern border of the thesis was initially extended to the Cilician Gates.

During the research, the determination of the existence of Komana-like examples led to the inclusion of Camihöyük in present-day Nevşehir, Sivas Ziyaretsuyu in Sivas, and Komana Cappadocia in Tufanbeyli district of Adana province within the scope of the research. The Hellenistic pottery is reviewed and it is noted that the examples of the pottery repertoire show a remarkable harmony with Komana Pontica. On the basis of the data from Galatia, it was necessary to extend the survey to Cilicia, and the southern border of the study was defined with Nagidos, Kelenderis, Tarsus, Kinet Höyük, and Antioch. The results indicated the presence of comparable assemblages, suggesting that Komana may have established a littoral-
inland relationship with both the Black Sea to the north and the Mediterranean during the Late Iron Age and Hellenistic Period.

As research proceeded, the data obtained indicated that the cultural and economic relations established by Komana in the Late Iron Age and Early Hellenistic period were mostly oriented towards the regions to the other directions, rather than further to the east of the site. In addition to these observations, Summers, who has made important contributions to the archaeological material culture landscape of the region in light of his studies in North-Central Anatolia, shared the perception that Komana was the easternmost site known to have these contexts, as indicated in the chapter on pottery in this dissertation, and this is another factor that supports the need not to extend the scope of this dissertation beyond Komana as the eastern limit.

2.2. The Physical and Historical Geography of the Research Area

The relationship between people and geography is essential and constantly evolving. Settlement distribution and continuity of habitation form the foundation of this relationship. Factors such as geomorphology, climate, fertile agricultural lands, and access to water resources play a crucial role in determining the location of settlements, both in the past and present. These factors contributed to the establishment of settlements and the division of the territory into geographical regions. In this context, the Anatolian plateau was divided into several geographical regions based on climate, anthropogenic activities, economic factors, and geomorphological commonalities in ancient times, as it is today.

The most frequently cited time period for the north of the Anatolian plateau involves the arrival of the Kashka People into Hittite territory, crossing the North Anatolian Mountain Range and supposedly bringing an end to the Hittites, the dominant figure of the Bronze Age. The Anatolian plateau, which was inhabited by the Phrygians and Lydians during the Iron Age, came under Achaemenid control in the last decades of the period. However, it is challenging to identify the widespread presence of material culture elements from this period, notably in the Pontic region. Following the establishment of the great kingdoms on the territories previously held by Alexander, it is possible to identify the Pontic Kingdom, which emerged in the Pontus region during the middle of the Hellenistic period. Mithradates VI, who was able to traverse the Northern Anatolian Mountain Range and advance into the interior of the Anatolian Plateau, was the final ruler of the Hellenistic Mithradatic Kingdom. His struggles against the Roman defense during his campaigns in Asia Minor in the 80s B.C. resulted in the complete Roman control of Pontus (Erciyas, 2001: 10). Among the periods discussed, Iron
Age and early Hellenistic Periods are represented poorly, due to the limited excavations in the region.

Therefore, this dissertation is an attempt to understand the relations of north-central Anatolia, which is the focal point of this study, with the littoral zone between Amisos and Kotyora on the Black Sea littoral and its hinterland to the south, Galatia to the west, Cappadocia and Cilicia to the south, and how this region served as a crossroads in the Late Iron Age and Hellenistic periods. The geomorphology and historical background of North-Central Anatolia, the Pontic region and other territories involved in the research will be considered in the light of ancient sources and contemporary studies.

2.2.1. Geography of the Research Area

**The Origin of the Term “Ποντος” and Its Borders:**

Presently, the southern Black Sea region is located in the north of Türkiye, neighboring Central Anatolia in the south, Caucasus in the east, the Balkans in the west and the Black Sea in the north. The geographical location of the Black Sea region has been described by several authors in ancient times. The earliest existing references are based on the works of Homer. In the Iliad, he used the word 'Pontus' to refer to a sea, or a compound word, and not merely to describe the Black Sea and the territory around it (Kınacı, 2015:182). It was also suggested that Hellenistic and Roman writers coined the epithet Ponticus (Ποντικος) to mean "belonging to Pontus", "of the Pontic region", or "from Pontus". (Arslan, 2010:10). Arslan also signified that the word Pontus may have been of Latin origin and was later used to refer to the "sea" (Arslan, 2007: 3). According to Olshausen the term 'Pontus' was not only used to refer to a specific sea but also to describe the surrounding region (Olshausen, 2014:40). In fact, Xenophon only defined the southern littoral of the Black Sea as 'Pontus' (Xenophon, Anabasis 5.6.19).

In addition to these, there exist various perspectives on the etymology of the term. The word Pontus (ποντος) was probably not Greek in origin, but evolved into Greek from a term used by the peoples of the region before the arrival of Hellenic culture (Mitchell, 2002:38, West, 2003:157).

When defining the boundaries of the "Pontic Region," Strabo initially delineated the regions inhabited by various ethnic groups. However, while identifying Pontus, he also delineated it as the region situated between Colchis in the east and Heracleia Pontica in the west (Strabo. XII.3.2, 3). In addition, Herodotus in his books identified the western border of Pontus with
Paphlagonia as the Halys River, which he referred to as "ο Αιγαιος Ποντος" and "Προποντις" (Hdt. I, 6; 72).

Modern authors have also been defining borders for the Potus region. Işık draws the borders of the Pontus region from Euxenios to the north, to the Halys River on the west, from Colchis on the east, to the Halys River to the west and to Cappadocia to the south. (İşik, 2001: 11).

Map 2.1 The ancient regions of the Black Sea (İşik, 2001; Map.2).

Arslan describes the borders of Pontus based on Strabo from Pontus Euxenios in the north, Halys river in the west that marks the border with Paphlagonia, Absarros river in the east that marks the border with Colchis, Cappadocia in the south, lower Halys basin and one of the branches of Halys; Kappadoks (Delice Stream) mark the border in the southwest with the region where the Gallic tribe called Trokmoi lived (Arslan, 2007: 16).

Map 2.2 The historical geography of the Black Sea region (Arslan, 2007: 17).
Map 2.3 Map of pontus-phasis (Braund & Sinclair, 1997).
2.2.2. The Geomorphology of the Pontic Landscape

The geographical boundaries of Pontus were drawn by ancient writers mostly based on the location of ethnic groups, while modern authors based their description on geography. The relationship between people and geography is essential and constantly evolving. The impact of geomorphologic formations, tectonic movements, and climate and human factors on settlement patterns from ancient times to the present is undeniable (Erciyas, 2001: 21). Settlement distribution and continuity of habitation form the foundation of this relationship. The maintenance of sustainable settlements and economic prosperity is contingent upon the continued availability of fertile agricultural lands and access to water resources. In addition to them, all these factors contributed to the establishment of settlements and the division of the territory into geographical regions. In this context, the Anatolian plateau was divided into several geographical regions based on climate, anthropogenic activities, economic aspects and geomorphological commonalities in ancient times as well as today.

The region where Komana is located constitutes the focal area of the thesis. In today's conditions, this region is easily accessible to Ordu through Niksar and Samsun through Amasya. In this context, it is perhaps the region where the North Anatolian Mountain Range provides the most convenient passage to the littoral-inland relationship. In this context the Anatolian plateau was divided into several geographical regions based on climate, anthropogenic activities, economic aspects and geomorphological commonalities in ancient times as well as today. Furthermore, in addition to the historical background of the regions included in the scope of the thesis, the geography and geomorphology of the region are also reviewed in this chapter.

Map 2.4 The ancient landscape of Pontus (Olshaussen, 2014: 42).
The earliest description of the Black Sea, which has a basin of about 436,000 km$^2$ and is connected to the Mediterranean Sea by the Bosphorus, comes from the ancient authors. According to Pliny, the Black Sea was referred to as 'Aksenos Pontus' (Αξενος Ποντος), which literally means 'unfriendly sea' or 'inhospitable sea', due to the weather that made navigation in the Black Sea difficult for most of the year, the height of the waves and the lack of natural harbors, and also because of the fact that the tribes living in the Black Sea attacked the Greeks who came to the region during the colonization period, namely the 8$^{th}$ century B.C. (Plin. nat. VI. 1. 1-2). According to Herodotus (IV 85), the Black Sea in the north of Anatolia was called by the Greeks "Pontus Euxenus", which means "hospitable sea". With its length of 11,100 stadia (about 2,000 kilometers) and its width of 3,300 stadia (about 600 kilometers), it was the most wild and impressive of all the oceans, and it still gives its name to the lands around it. In his book Geography, Strabo calls it “The Pontic Sea”, is not limited to the sea only, but the land around it is also named "Pontus":

Writers of Homer’s age took the Pontic Sea to be a second ocean, and thought that those who sailed there were out of place, just like those who voyaged far outside the Pillars of Heracles. It was also thought to be the greatest of all seas of our own world, and for that reason particularly they called it simply the Pontus, as men called Homer the poet.

However, the discourse shifted after the 8$^{th}$ century B.C. with the construction of ports by the colonial cities established by the Greeks on the littorals, marking the end of the colonization period and the beginning of overseas commercial activities. Although ancient authors indicate that the peoples or tribes living on the Black Sea littoral did not welcome or even "slaughtered" these people from the sea (Diod. IV. 40. 3-4; 47. 2), the increasing presence of inhabitants may have contributed to the change by integrating into the new settlement. In other words, the word "Pontus" has become more than just a name for the sea, it has also become a term for the entire coastline bordering the sea (Arslan, 2007:10).

The research area of this thesis is limited to the southern littoral of the Black Sea, which is located to the north of the Anatolian plateau. This region is characterized by its rainy climate, fertile lands, narrow coastline, wider inland zone, and east-west oriented mountain ranges, which naturally divides the region into two. The littoral has shaped the region's overseas trade relations since antiquity and has also hosted migrating Greeks. Sinope, located between the Paphlagonia and Pontus regions, was a significant harbor on the southern Black Sea littoral. Its natural harbor was a notable feature. However, it is also acknowledged that Amisos had a harbor that blocked the northwest winds, where the Kürtün River discharged into the sea.
From the 8th century B.C., waves of colonization from the Aegean reached the Black Sea and the settlements were established along the littoral. The land south of the Black Sea was divided into the regions of Bithynia, Paphlagonia, and Pontus. The western territory between the Mysia region and the Billaios River was called "Bithynia", the region between the Billaios River and the Halys River was called "Paphlagonia", and the region from the east of the Halys River to the Phasis River (Rioni River) was called "Pontus" (Emir, 2014:16-17). The territory, starting from the Gazelonitis (Bafra) plain, where the Halys river discharges into the sea, was inhabited, including the eastern part, by the Milesians, who established colonies along the coastline, and by the indigenous people who lived in the higher regions of the mountains (Emir, 2014: 18).

The inland provinces of Pontus, south of the North Anatolian mountain range, consisted of fertile plains. It was divided into three regions: the land between the Iris and Lycus Rivers and irrigated by these rivers and their tributaries, the relatively higher plateaus north of the Halys River and the deep valleys created by the Halys and Iris Rivers in the region that forms the secondary inland massif of the North Anatolian Mountains, and that the province of Pontus, including the coastline, consisted of four main areas. (Arslan, 2007:17).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>North</th>
<th>South</th>
<th>East</th>
<th>West</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bithynia</td>
<td>Pontus Euxenios</td>
<td>Sündiken Mountains</td>
<td>Billaios River²</td>
<td>Mysia³</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paphlagonia</td>
<td>Pontus Euxenios</td>
<td>Karabük-Pazar⁴</td>
<td>Gangra (Çankırı) Basin⁵</td>
<td>Bithynia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pontus</td>
<td>Pontus Euxenios</td>
<td>South: Saravene (Yozgat-Terzi Hamam (?), Laviansenne (Malatya-Hekimhan/Erguvan (?), South West: Lower Halys and Cappadocs (Delice River) South East: Armenia Minor⁶</td>
<td>Phasis River</td>
<td>East of Halys</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Mountains:**

The geographical extent of what is today referred to as Anatolia is approximately 1600 km from east to west and 800 km from north to south. The main elevations of the peninsula are

1 Sevin, 2001: 31-32.  
2 Plinius, nat., VI. 4-5.  
3 Idem.  
⁵ Marek, 1993: 7-8.  
the Pontic (Northern Anatolian) Mountain Range in the north and the Taurus Mountains in the south, formed by the movements of the African and Eurasian tectonic plates. The mountains in the west are not in the formation of mountain ranges, rather are perpendicular to the sea, while the mountain ranges in the north and south are aligned parallel. Therefore, the Pontic Mountains in the north and the Taurus Mountains in the south are folded mountains, while the mountain formations in the west are fractured mountains. The topographical structure of the region took its present shape in the last phase of the great geological revolutions, when the Alps, Himalayas and Andes Mountains emerged (Bryer & Winfield, 2020: 3). The Pontic Mountains are oriented in an East-West direction and makes reciprocal access with the littoral and inland difficult. Manoledakis suggested that while the mountains draw a border and the littoral should be examined as if it were another region completely independent of Anatolia, the valleys formed by the Halys and Iris Rivers remind that the littoral is a part of it (Manoledakis, 2022).

The North-Anatolian Mountain Range is a system of mountains that runs from the Propontis Sea in the west to Trans-Caucasia in the east. This geomorphological formation is a branch of the Alpine System (Magie, 1950: 177). The mountain range is composed of three sections: West, Central, and East. This mountain range increases in density and height from west to east, turning into mountains that do not exceed 1,500 meters in the province of Sinope, and into heights with a much lower ratio in the province of Amisos; the mountain range is replaced by more fertile areas (Erciyas, 2001: 32). In ancient times, it was divided into three parts, each with a distinct name as well. Ilgaz Mountain was known as Olygassys, Giresun (Canik) Mountains were called Paryadres, and Scythian Mountain was referred to as Scydises, in ancient times. (Sökmen, 2016: 24). The Paryadres Mountains in the central Black Sea region begin in the Halys Valley in the province of Amisos, and the Melet River, located east of Kotyora, and marks the easternmost point of these mountains. The basins formed by the rivers flowing to the west and north, whose headwaters are in the east, pass through these mountains in that region. (Magie, 1950: 177).

Additionally, there is a secondary mountain range on the south side of the main range facing Central Anatolia. The mountains located in the inland parts of the North Anatolian Mountains are referred to as Anatolids. This range includes Ilgaz Mountain in the Central Black Sea Region and Mescit Mountain on the east. Atalay states that besides these mountain ranges, there is another massif between the Lycus (Kelkit) River and the Iris (Yeşilirmak) River which is called Dönek Mountains in the east and Yaylacık and Sakarat Mountains in the west. (Atalay, 1982: 60). The highest altitudes are found in the east, while the altitude is lower in
the center and lowest in the west. In other words; this mountain range is known to have low elevations in the Iris (Yeşilirmak) and Halys (Kızılırmak) basins (Gözenç, Gümüş & Ertin, 1998: 4). These mountain ranges are separated from each other by deep valleys and these valleys also facilitate the littoral-inland interactions. In addition to these, the valleys of the Çoruh and Lycus Rivers and the valley constructed by the Gök Irmak, which runs within the borders of today’s Kastamonu, form the secondary ridge apart from the North Anatolian Mountain Range (Kınal, 1962: 2). At this point it is essential to note that the southern part of the region is along the North Anatolian Fault Zone.

Map 2.5 Map displaying the altitudes and geomorphologic formations around Komana (Erciyas, D.B. & Sökmen, E. 2010: 122, and Fig.1).

The North Anatolian Fault Zone is 1150km long strike-slip fault located between the Sangarios River to the west and Lake Van to the east (Ketin, 1969: 2). It is intersected by another fault line coming from the south in the area of Bingöl-Varto-Karlıova (Ardos, 1985: 119). The part of the zone that extends from the northern part of the Ladık Plain to the north of Phanarooia and reaches Neocaeseraiia is the area under consideration in this dissertation.
Map 2.6 The route map of the North Anatolian Fault Zone (Ketin, 1969:L.1)
Rivers:

- Halys:

The Halys (Kızılrmak) and the Iris (Yeşilrmak), the two major rivers of the region, flow through the deep valleys of the North Anatolian mountain range to join the sea and have contributed significantly to the economy of the region and the establishment of the settlements over time. Bryer and Winfield described the course of the Halys River, whose headwaters are located in the southern part of central Pontus. The river heads east from Sebasteia (Sivas), then makes a bend to the southwest, turns to the north, and finally discharges into the Black Sea at Paurae (Bafra) (Bryer and Winfield, 2020: 3).

Strabo gives the source of the Halys as Kimistene in Great Cappadocia and claims it formed a large basin in the west, then turned north between Galatia and Paphlagonia, constituting the border of the Leukosyrians (Cappadocians) (Strabo, XII.3.12).

These rivers not only created fertile soil in the areas they passed through as they reached the sea, but also contributed significantly to the development of settlements in the region. The economy of the region flourished through the export of agricultural products. In this context, an inquiry is made into possibility that the Halys River was also utilized for transportation purposes. In other words, the question is whether the Halys was navigable or not. The width of the Halys, as mentioned by Xenophon, was at least 2 stadia and it was impossible to cross it without boats (V.6.9). However, the construction of numerous hydroelectric power plants has led to the flooding of the lower part of the river, for a length of about 150 km, and thus to the destruction of possible features related to river transportation in ancient times, such as towpaths and bridges (Bekker-Nielsen, 2016: 18). In his study of 1894, Maercker mentioned that in the 19th and 20th centuries, grain and brick transportation was carried out on the north of the river (Maercker, 1894:80), and Bekker-Nielsen mentioned that in the 20th century, grain and brick transportation was carried out between the villages around Vezirköprü by sailboats in the summer season, but this stopped due to the dam construction (Bekker-Nielsen, 2016:18). In regions with abundant rainfall and mostly forested vegetation, wood construction remains prevalent. Despite the 21st century's technological advances, wood remains a primary construction material in the villages on the periphery of Black Sea region cities. Although wood is primarily utilized for fuel and construction, it is also employed in a multitude of other industries. That’s why, it is exported both domestically and overseas, particularly to regions in the Anatolian plateau where wood resources are scarce.
Erciyas wrote that timber and wood were transported in this part of the Halys, which passes through Boyabat in Sinope and Vezirköprü in Samsun. The products could be brought to the delta on the littoral (Erciyas, 2001: 35). Halys was not conducive to the transportation of goods on a long-distance river route, although instances of short-distance transportation are also suggested (Maercker, 1984:80).

Figure 2.1 Wood used as a construction material (Niksar/Tokat) (Photo: Ayşe Batman).

○ Iris:

The headwaters of the Iris, which passes through the modern cities of Samsun, Amasya and Tokat, originate from Kösedağ in Sivas and discharge into the sea from a promontory called Cıva, located within the borders of Samsun province. Lycus (Kelkit) and Scylax (Çekerek) are its most important tributaries. The lower basin of the Iris stretches along a line from Amaseia to Eupatoria (Roman Magnopolis) and merges with the Phazemonitis Plain to the west (Olshausen, 2014: 43). According to Strabo, the Iris initially flows through Komana in Pontus, then continues through Dazimonitis (Kazova), turns north towards Gaziura, and merges with the waters of other nearby rivers, especially the Scylax, then turns east again, flows through Amaseia, reaches Phanaroia, joins the Lycus and discharges into the Black Sea (Strabo, XII.3.15).
The Lycus River, one of the influents of the Iris, has its source around Gümüşhane and, after passing through Sivas, reaches the province of Tokat, irrigates the Niksar and Erbaa plains and joins the main stream of the Iris around Erbaa. It runs parallel to the southern foothills of the North Anatolian Mountain Range and serves as a natural border between the inland parts of Central Anatolia and the Black Sea littoral due to its aligned position. The Lycus River is located in a valley known as the Lycus Valley, which is the widest and most prominent among other valleys in the Black Sea region, such as the Melanthios Valley south of Kotyora (Ordu) and the Amnias Valley, one of the tributaries of the Iris River, which flows through Sinope (Sinop) and Paurae (Bafra) (Bryer & Winfield, 2020: 4). Compared to the smaller rivers in the Black Sea Region, the Lycus and Iris Rivers are wider and flow through large basins to irrigate fertile lands before draining into the sea. (Bryer & Winfield, 2020: 4). Moreover, these fertile valleys, forested areas as well as the hilly terrain of the region take advantage of the northern and western winds of the Black Sea (Pitt, 2016) and contribute to the habitation of these territories.
o Scylax (A Tributary of Iris):

This tributary of the Iris, located in the southeast of the region, has played a crucial role in the formation of deep valleys. It determines the southern border of the Pontic landscape. Olshausen writes that it reaches the high plateaus of the mountains at an average altitude of 800-1,200m and can reach up to 1,500m, while the valleys it forms are also inhabited, citing the settlement of Sebastopolis (Sulusaray) and Zela, another temple state in the region. (Olshausen, 2014: 44).

Table 2.2 The major rivers and their tributaries in the research area.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of the River</th>
<th>Length (km)</th>
<th>Headwater</th>
<th>Basin</th>
<th>River Mouth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sangarios</td>
<td>824 km.</td>
<td>One tributary: Northeast of Afyon, One tributary: Eskişehir-Sakaryabaşı</td>
<td>Sangarios Basin</td>
<td>Sakarya-Karasu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Halys</td>
<td>1355 km.</td>
<td>Sivas-İmranlı (Kızıldağ)</td>
<td>Halys Basin</td>
<td>Samsun-Bafra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iris</td>
<td>519 km.</td>
<td>Sivas-Suşehri (Köse Mountain)</td>
<td>Iris Basin</td>
<td>Samsun-Çarşamba</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iris Lycus Scylax</td>
<td>320 km.</td>
<td>Gümüşhane</td>
<td>Iris Basin</td>
<td>Amasya-Taşova</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|                   | 256 km.     | Sivas-Yıldız Mountains                          | Iris Basin       | 15km. south of Amasya meets with Iris River.

Figure 2.3 Fig. Lycus River (with bridge piers dated to the Roman Period) Niksar/Tokat (Photo: Ayşe Batman).
• **Lakes:**

In addition to the rivers, there are several lakes in the region. Samsun has Liman Lake, which generates an annual yield of 150 tons of gray mullet and offers economic wealth (Erciyas, 2001: 34); Strabo described the Ladik Lake, called Stiphane (Strabo, XII. 3.38), with its pastures of various types of grasses and opportunities of fishing; and Boraboy Lake near Phanoeira (Taşova), which was reached during the author's survey of the region. It has been stated by the Boraboy Lake and Natural Park staff of the lake that there are underground water resources at the base of the lake, which can be accessed by the winding road through the mountains surrounding the plain, and that it is also fed by small streams in the vicinity. The lake is surrounded by agricultural lands and is utilized for electricity generation and irrigation purposes.

![Lake Boraboy](Photo: Ayşe Batman)

• **Plains:**

The tectonic movement emanating from the North Anatolian Fault in the central part of the Black Sea also resulted in the formation of plains such as the Erbaa-Niksar Plain or the Suluova Basin (Ardos, 1968: 135). These plains were transformed into areas suitable for agricultural activities, which had economic benefits. The depression plains in the Havza-Ladik, Suluova-
Gümüşhacıköy, Erbaa-Niksar region were filled with alluvium due to vertical dislocations caused by severe seismic activity on the North Anatolian Fault (Ardos, 1985: 119).

- Plains on the Littoral:

The region comprises OF Gazelonitis (Bafra) with an area of 56,000 hectares, which is formed by the alluvial deposits where the Halys River discharges into the sea, and Themiscyra (Çarşamba) with an area of almost 59,000 hectares, where the Iris River discharge into the sea. The Plain of Bafra is called "Gazelonitis" by Strabo, who described the place with very fertile soil, fruits are abundant. Here, the livestock was small and the sheep-breeding was the most common, especially in Cappadoica and Pontus, where the wool was of rare quality and even gazelle could be found. (Strabo, XII.3.13). The plain was named after the city of Gazelon according to Pliny (Plin. nat. VI.2).

Strabo refers to the Çarşamba Plain as Themiscya. He described that it is located where the Iris and Thermedon Rivers, which descend from Pontus towards the littoral, discharge into the sea, and that the plain, which is surrounded by a mountainous terrain, is also fed by small tributaries, that cattle and horses can be bred here, and that white millet and heather grow here, while fruit trees grow wild on the slopes of the mountains, so that there is never any famine in the region (Strabo, XII.3.15). The plain, according to Pliny, was formed by the alluvial deposits carried by the Iris and the Thermedon (Terme) rivers (Plin. nat. VI. 3. 10). Furthermore, Strabo states that there is another plain towards Kotyora, which is the westernmost coastal point of the dissertation, and he calls the plain, which is now called Perşembe Ovası, Sidene, and says that this plain is less irrigated compared to the others, but it is still a fertile plain (Strabo, XII.3.16). Saramene is another region located between the areas where the Halys and the Iris rivers discharge into the sea. It is known to have less fertile soils compared to Gazelonitis and Themiscyra (Olshausen & Biller, 1984: 162).

- Plains on the Inland of Pontus:

The inland of Pontus is characterized by deep valleys formed by the Iris, Lycus, and Scylax rivers (Olshausen, 2014: 43). The region between the Iris and Lycus Rivers is of geostrategic importance, has a milder climate than the Black Sea littoral zone and inland of the Anatolian plateau, and has extremely fertile lands as they are irrigated by rivers (Arslan, 2007:18). According to Arslan, this was the most central zone of Pontus with these characteristics.

Because Dazimonitis (Kazova) is considered as one of the most fertile plains of inner Pontus is that it is localized right above the Iris. Komana Pontica, the focus of this dissertation, is also
located on this plain. The plain was also rich in underground reserves, especially iron ore, as mentioned by Xenophon and Strabo (Xenophon, Anabasis V.5.1; Strab. XII. 3.19).

Figure 2.5 Dazimonitis Plain with the cultivated lands (Photo: Ayşe Batman)

Phazemonitis has an average basin area of 1,200km$^2$ and rises to an altitude of 897m. It is located east of Lake Stiphane, descends around Neaclaudiopolis (Vezirköprü) and extends west to the banks of the Halys, with Tavşan Mountain to the south and the North Anatolian Mountain Range to the north (Olshausen, 2014: 43). Amaseia is located in Gazekene, which is another fertile plain to the south of Phazemonitis (Wilson, 1960: 209). Strabo describes this district as the Phazemonitis Plain, with hot springs from the Amisos area to the Halys, through which the Iris flows, and the plain adjacent to Amaseia, which is built in a deep valley, the Chiliocomum Plain (Binköy Ovası) (Strabo, XII.3.38).

Taşova, formerly known as Phanaroia, is a plain where agricultural and wood production activities are intensive due to its forest-type vegetation. The Lycus River runs through the middle of the plain, and it is said to have been irrigated by the Iris River (Olshausen & Biller, 1984: 155). The crops cultivated in the plain north of Komana Pontica (Magie, 1950: 1067) formed the basis of the economy of the Niksar (Neocaesarea) district which fronts the lowland (Sökmen, 2010: 27). It was described by Strabo as a plain with many different resources, especially grapes and olives (Strabo, XII.3.30). A further factor that makes the plain so fertile
is that the north winds coming from the sea are blocked by the Paryadres Mountains, which lie to the north of the plain and are parallel to the Lycus River (Olshausen, 2014: 44).

Figure 2.6 View of Phanaroia from niksar castle (Photo: Ayşe Batman).

The southern interior is characterized by the valleys formed by the Scylax River. The valleys, at an average altitude of 800-1,200 meters, were the site of ancient settlements such as Sebastopolis (now Sulusaray) and Zela (Zile), a temple state located in the basin of the Hotan Deresi (Olshausen, 1987:204).

The plain of Chiliocomum, which he calls "the plain of a thousand villages", and the plains of Diakopene (Suluova / Gümüşhacıköy) and Pimolisene (Osmançık), which extend towards the Halys, and the plain of Phanoreia (Taşova) in the northeast. (Strabo, XII.3.38-40). Another plain of the region, the Zelitis Plain (Zile Plain), takes its name from Zela, a temple state, and is located in the east of the region, enclosed by Scylax and Iris, also a highly fertile land (Sökmen, 2006: 125).
Map 2.7 The major plains of Pontus (Sökmen, 2010: 27).

- Climate and Vegetation:

The North Anatolian Mountain Range System makes reciprocal access with the littoral and the hinterland difficult. This East-West oriented mountain range starts from the Propontis Sea on the west, follows the north of Anatolian plateau, and extends to Trans-Caucasia on the east (Magie, 1950: 177). The mountain range not only determines the routes but also affects the region's climatic conditions. The southern coastline of the Black Sea, which is approximately 70-80km wide, experiences rainfall throughout the year, with decreasing precipitation towards the west. This type of climate, as emphasized by Kinal, is called "The Northern Peripheral Mountains Climate" (Kinal, 1962: 4). Conversely, the southern ridges of the mountains face Central Anatolia, where a continental climate is prevalent in the inland of the Black Sea region.

The North Anatolian Mountain Range acts as a barrier between coastal and inland climates, resulting in colder and snowier winters in the inland and less precipitation in the summers. The precipitation in the zone between Samsun and Sinop is between 700 and 1,000 mm per year, but it is noted that it decreases to 400-500 mm around Amasya, Tokat and Gümüşhane in the inner parts of the region (Erciyas, 2001:37). The vegetation in the region is affected by this situation, resulting in differences. Mediterranean-type vegetation is typically found on the south-facing slopes of the valleys between Kelkit-Erbaa and Niksar, as well as on the southern
sides of the mountains. On the other hand, Euro-Siberian vegetation is commonly found on the north-facing slopes of the North Anatolian Mountain Range (Erciyas, 2001: 24). It is recognized that the province of Ordu and the region east of Ordu have Colchic flora and the region west of Ordu has Euxine type vegetation (Erciyas, 2001: 37). The vegetation in the Euxine region between sea level and 500m altitude consists of chestnut, linden, oak, and beech trees. At higher elevations, between 500m and 900m, only beech forests are present (Erciyas, 2001: 40).

The availability of land for arable farming in the littoral zone is very limited when the entire Black Sea region is considered. Erciyas notes that heavy rains have caused erosion of the lands, which has negatively affected agricultural activity. Local people mainly cultivate cereals, particularly wheat, on all suitable farmlands, and this has continued to the present day in modern Tokat, Gümüşhane and Amasya (Erciyas, 2001: 41). Although wheat and barley were the main agricultural products in the inland regions, corn was the major crop in the littoral zone. An increase in bread wheat production was observed at Kaman-Kalehöyük, Boğazköy, and İkiztepe in the 2nd millennium B.C. (Erciyas, 2001: 41). Maize was popularly cultivated within the Near-East and Caucasus regions (Ökse, 1998: 307). The fertile plains of the inland are fed by rivers that allow the cultivation of all kinds of fruits.

Figure 2.7 Fruit trees in the dazimonitis plain (Photo: Ayşe Batman).
Strabo mentions fruit-filled trees up to the ground in the Themiskyra Plain and notes that orchards surrounded the territory of Sinope (Strabo, XII.3.11-15). In describing Phanarodia, Strabo points out that although the oceanic climate did not penetrate far into the plain, there was a stable humidity in the lowlands, which favored the forested areas and enabled the production of large quantities of timber (Strabo, XII.3.15).

In addition, Strabo tells that fishing was an integral part of sustaining life, giving examples such as tuna being caught around Trapezus (Trabzon), and small dolphin fish species that swam close to the shore being hunted, and their oil being extracted and used for different purposes. Today, the subsistence livelihood of the settlements along the Black Sea littoral is largely based on fishing (Strabo, XII.3.19). The amount of cattle and sheep breeding is very low in comparison to the inland of the Anatolian plateau due to the sparse agricultural lands.

- **Underground Resources and the Rock Formations:**

  The North Anatolian Fault is composed of multiple segments, rather than a single plane-dependent shift direction. This has led to the emergence of underground water resources and the formation of dam lakes due to rock fragmentation caused by movements (Ketin, 1969: 5). In fact, *Thermai Phazemoniton*, located in the Havza district near the Phazemonitis Plain, constitutes an example of such thermal springs (Wilson, 1960: 187-192). Erciyas argues that the high altitudes of the mountains in the region make it difficult to access marble, schist and limestone deposits; that sandstone and conglomerate, which are widely available in the region, are not suitable construction materials; and that basalt and andesite are used in the foundations of buildings as the region is a volcanic area (Erciyas, 2001: 36). Trapezus was rich in silver deposits prior to his time, according to Strabo, but only iron ore was quarried during his lifetime (Strabo, XII.3.19). Moreover, the Lycus Valley is rich in copper, silver, lead, and zinc quarries.

2.2.3. Geomorphology of the Central Anatolian Plateau, Cappadocia and Cilicia

Interregional networks have likely facilitated cultural exchange, economic mobility, and demographic diversification within each region or with other regions. However, it is important to consider that geomorphological structures may have contributed to the formation and continuity of these networks, but may also have made them difficult or impossible at time. In the case of the Black Sea, the inland-littoral relationship has been realized to the extent that the east-west oriented mountain range allowed. The pottery analysis indicates that the communication networks of Late Iron Age and Early Hellenistic Period in North Central Anatolia were established mostly with the settlements in the south of the region, where
transportation is much easier than in the north, as will be further discussed in the following chapters of this dissertation.

The comparable examples of Late Iron Age-Hellenistic pottery categorized as "Banded Ware" and "Hellenistic Color-Coated Ware (HCCW)" of the Late Iron Age-Hellenistic period found in the Komana pottery repertoire, which constitutes the starting point of the dissertation, were first encountered throughout North-Central Anatolia and then in the contexts of settlements located on the littoral between Amisos and Kotyora. The study was extended to Gordion in the west, Cappadocia in the south, and some sites between Kelenderis and Antioch on the Cilician littoral. Therefore, it was necessary to consider the geomorphology of Galatia, Cappadocia, and Cilicia in order to understand the network of relationships between settlements and regions, which will be discussed in detail in the fifth chapter of the thesis dealing with networks.

The Black Sea Region and Central Anatolian plateau have distinct geomorphologic features, which determine the formation of settlements. Accordingly, the settlements established in these regions are also formed according to the topographical forms of the territories. Nevertheless, the central part of Anatolia is reminiscent of a naturally divided geographical region due to the mountain ranges that surround it from the north and south. However, there is an evident relationship between these two neighboring regions both in ancient times and today. This coherence was also mentioned by the ancient writers; Strabo's description of the southwestern border of Pontus includes the land of one of the tribes of the Galatians called "Trokmi" within the Halys Basin and the so-called "Great Cappadocia". (Strabo, XII.3.39).

The Central Anatolia is located between the Taurus Mountains on the south and the North Anatolian Mountain Range on the north. The elevation ranges from 600 to 1,200 meters, higher in the eastern part of the region and lower in the west (Grave, 2011: 416). It lies at the center of Anatolian plateau with its almost non-mountainous landscape and drier climatic conditions in contrast to the high average of annual precipitation at the Black Sea. Erciyes and Melendiz (extinct) volcanoes, are among the important elevations of the region. Though no active volcanoes exist at present, volcanic activity, very intense in the Pleistocene but gradually decreasing in the postglacial era, explains the presence of obsidian in the region and the presence of lava fields (Erciyas, 2001: 32). Other than these, Central Anatolian landscape is dominated by the high plateaus as well. In addition to volcanic activity, the region is located between two major fault zones, the North Anatolian and the South Anatolian, which contribute to tectonic activity, as well as the simultaneous formation of igneous, sedimentary and metamorphic rocks (Kealhofer, L. & Grave, K. 2011:417).
The basins formed by Lycus, Iris and Halys Rivers in the region must have contributed significantly to the shaping of the region in a way. A significant proportion of the basin of the Sangarios and Halys Rivers is situated within Central Anatolia. Halys River is the longest river that originates within its borders and discharges into the sea within its borders. This river has the second biggest basin of Anatolian plateau after the Euphrates Basin. The Halys Basin covers a large area to the east of the Central Anatolian plateau and forms a circular arc of about 700 km in length, branching out around Çorum where it reaches the North Anatolian mountain range (Dewdney, 1971: 194).

As mentioned above, the Central Anatolian Plateau is dominated by the steppe zones however, it is a little outside the research area, when it is considered as a river basin, it is seen that the north and east of the Halys Basin are mountainous. The Bozok Plateau is situated at an average elevation of 1,200-1,400m. on the Halys Basin. The Sangarios River, along with its tributaries Porsuk and Delice, flows through the northwest of the region and irrigates the plains. The other important water resources of the region are the Porsuk Stream and the Delice River, which can be considered as main streams rather than tributaries of the main rivers.

The rainy and cold winters and dry and hot summers in the region indicate that it has a terrestrial climate type and this situation affects the vegetation. Steppe type vegetation is prevalent up to an elevation of 1000-1200 m. approaching the North Anatolian mountain range to the north of the region, and with the effect of the rivers in the province, the landscape becomes more irrigated and has a forest-based vegetation consisting of oak and pine trees (Atalay & Mortan, 1997: 362-364).

Phrygias neighbors are: Cappadocia to the east, Lykaonia and Psidia to the south, Mysia to the west, and Bithynia and Paphlagonia to the north. Additionally, Galatia borders Phrygia to the northeast, Bithynia to the northwest, Pontus to the east, Cappadocia to the southeast, and Phrygia Epiktetos to the south and west (Sevin, 2001: 193). Thus, the western part of the interior of the Anatolian plateau was called “Phrygia”, whereas the southeastern part, near Cilicia, was called “Tabal” (Genz, 2011: 331).

Cappadocia is located relatively to the west of Central Anatolia, enclosed by the Taurus Mountains to the south, part of the Upper Euphrates River to the southeast, the Halys River to the north, and the Konya Plain to the west (Allcock & Roberts, 2014: 37). The term "Cappadocia" should not be considered as a geographical designation for the southeastern part of Anatolia between Lycaonia and the Euphrates. This is because the northern parts of this region, in close proximity to Pontus, were also known as Cappadocia (Mitchell, 2002: 54).
The second biggest lake of the Anatolian Plateau is located within the borders of the Cappadocia. Salt Lake, with an average surface area of 1,500 km², is located in the middle-south part of the region as a closed basin. Despite the presence of the plateaus in higher altitudes in the northern and inner parts of the region, the Salt Lake Basin has the ones which are approximately less than 2,000 m. above the sea level. The lake, along with the Konya Basin, forms the reservoirs of the region (Grave, 2011:416) and contributes to the regional economy through salt production. Arslan adds that the land around the lake is fertile and suitable for the cultivation of wheat and barley (Arslan, 2000:61).

Strabo locates Cilicia between Coracesium (Alanya) and the Syrian Gorges in the west and the Taurus Mountains in the north (Strabo, XII.1.4; XIV.5.2). It is limited to Pamphylia to the west (Hild & Hellenkemper, 1990:17-20) and Syria to the east. The western part of Cilicia, which is mountainous and where agricultural activity is very limited, is defined as Cilicia Trachea, while the west of the Carycadus (Göksu) River in the region is described as more suitable for settlement, that is, the east of the Lamus (Limonlu) River is Cilicia Pedias, a part with well-watered fertile plains, relatively low elevations compared to the west, and a large number of settlements (Varinlioğlu, 2019: 188).

The location of the region, both in antiquity and in the present, allowed for dynamic relations with the entire Mediterranean, the Levant, Cyprus and even the Aegean world. The Taurus Mountains, one of the two orogenic mountain ranges of the Anatolian Plateau, connected the region with the inland of the Anatolian Plateau through several gorges.

Map 2.8 Map of Cilicia with ancient and modern sites (Gates, 2015: 82).
2.2.4. The Pre-Hellenistic and Hellenistic Historical Overview

The Greek impact on the settlements along the southern littoral of the Black Sea from the beginning of the Greek colonization process that began in the 8th century B.C. was still perceivable during the heyday of the Persians in the Anatolian plateau in the 5th century B.C. Between 750-550 B.C., the Greeks carried out the so called "Great Colonization" of the region (Doonan, 2011: 176). The settlements were inhabited by various local groups, including the Bithynians and Mariandynoi in the west, the Paphlagonians and Leucosyroi in Paphlagonia, and the Tibarenoi, Chalybes, and Mossynoikoi in the east. These settlements were in existence even during Alexander's invasions of the Anatolian plateau (Manoledakis, 2021: 623). Strabo distinguishes between the 'Syrians' living south of the Taurus Mountains and those in Paphlagonia on the basis of their physical characteristics, stating that the inhabitants of this region were called 'Leucosyrians', meaning 'White Syrians', because they were relatively 'whiter-skinned' (Strabo, XII. 3.9). On the contrary, Herodotus writes that the Greeks defined the Cappadocians as "Syrians" (Hdt. I. 6: 72).

![Map 2.9 The Locations of the inhabitants in Pontus (Kinaci, 2015: 185. Fig.1).](image)

The Iron Age in Anatolia started around 1300 B.C. after the decline of the Hittites. It marked a considerable change in the material culture from common Bronze Age elements to distinct new constituents associated with the formation of newly established states. The territory within the scope of this dissertation, North-Central Anatolia, can also be considered the northwestern
border of the Hittite Empire. Furthermore, the region was the subject of Hittite texts due to the regular attacks of the Kashka People, who played an active role in the fall of the empire.

Lydians controlled the economic dynamism of the inland regions of the Aegean from the mid-8th century B.C. to the mid-6th century B.C. This control probably reduced the welfare of the Greeks living in the colonies established on the Anatolian plateau along the Aegean Sea, disrupting their commercial relations and prompting them to search for new resources and harbors abroad (Erciyas, 2001: 63). In this regard, the main settlements established around the Black Sea by the Ionians, Dorians and Aeolians in the 8th century B.C. are Heracleia Pontica, Sinope, Amisos, Kotyora, Kerasos and Trapezus from west to east (Boardman et al., 1994:78). The preserved material culture remains and the accompanying historical sources indicate that the Milesian colonists reached the southern littoral of the Black Sea in the late 7th century B.C. and founded a "harbor city" in Sinope, a natural shelter (Boysal, 1959: 9-10). Kotyora, Kerasus, and Trapezus are secondary colonies established in the late 8th to early 7th century B.C. by inhabitants of Sinope who mixed with the local population (Umar, 2000:16-17). Mitchell argued that the southern littoral of the Black Sea facilitated a three-legged mechanism of trade. One, between the Greeks who settled in the littoral and the indigenous inhabitants of the more inland areas; two, between the colonial cities that were established along the entire littoral; and finally, between the Greek colonies on the Black Sea and the settlements in the Mediterranean basin. He also suggested that it was possibly the only territory in the antiquity that was able to increase its economic prosperity through such interaction (Mitchell, 2002:43). The aforementioned colonies east of Sinope were involved in lasting commercial and strategic relations with Sinope between the 6th and late 5th centuries B.C., eventually leading to their establishment (Doonan, 20009: 71). Summerer posited that the littoral zone between the Halys and Iris rivers, where they discharge into the sea, is the least elevated part of the North Anatolian mountain range and therefore the most accessible territory for inland-littoral links. Additionally, the lack of a natural harbor, which was one of the priorities of the colonists, led to the preference of this area by the native Syrians (Summerer, 2008: 260).

In addition to these, Xenophon talks about the discourteous behaviors of the locals to the foreigners (Xenophon, VI. IV. I) and even the existence of the high mountain ranges between the hinterland and the littoral, it is very possible to think that the Persians did not deign to fight with the Black Sea locals (Manoledakis, 2021: 634). Summerer, who analyzed the Early Greek pottery in the periphery of Sinope and Amisos suggested that the littoral-inland aspect of the distribution of these pottery assemblages in the settlements is mostly between Amisos in the littoral and the settlements within the borders of the Halys Basin within the inland, which are mostly inhabited by local populations (Summerer, 2008: 263).
Map 2.10 The inland settlements of the indigenous people (Summerer, 2008: 262).

- The Persian Empire:

The Persians were founded by Cyrus II, also known as Cyrus the Great, in 550 B.C. They existed between the mid-6th century B.C. and the late 4th century B.C. (Plutarch, Artaxerxes 1.3.). From the Balkans in the west to India in the east and Egypt in the south, the territory under their control was extensive. The Lydians posed a formidable threat to Cyrus the Great on the Anatolian Plateau, who had turned his policy of territorial expansion westward. Croesus reigned as King of Lydia from 560-546 B.C. At the beginning of his reign, the kingdom lived in wealth and prosperity, however, in 547-546 B.C., it was taken over by the Persians as a result of the Persian attacks, which intensified with the end of the Median Empire by Cyrus the Great (Dusinberre, 2003: 11).
In the mid-6th century B.C., they achieved complete sovereignty over the Anatolian plateau and divided all the lands they controlled into satrapies. The first foundations of this system were laid during the reign of Cyrus the Great, and there are indications that Cyrus II issued a statement in which he defined the administration of the provinces as being carried out by commanders appointed by him, and the tasks of these individuals, as well as his own responsibilities (Xenophon, VIII. 6). The Persian satraps are mentioned by Herodotus as twenty, six of them in the Anatolian plateau (Herodotus, III: 89-97). These satrapies (Kaya, 2018: 162-163) can be listed as:

- Daskyleion – tyaiy drayahya
- Sardis – Satrapy of Sparda
- Cappadocia – Katpatuka
- Ionia – Yauna
- Satrapy of Armenia
- Satrapy of Cilicia

During the 6th century B.C., the central part of North-Central Anatolia and Pontus, which is the primary research area of this dissertation also came under Persian control as well (Benario, 2006: 81). Despite its monarchical structure, Dusinberre argued that the preservation of central authority and the Persian Empire's ability to dominate such a large area for more than two centuries could be explained by the fact that such vast territories were ruled by individual satraps (Dusinberre, 2013: 33). Moreover, under Persian domination, Sardis, the former capital of the Lydians, became the center of the Lydian satrapy, the most esteemed satrapy within the territory, and retained its previous status (Khurt, 2009: 256).

Nevertheless, the mid-4th century B.C. was a period of Persian interest in the Black Sea littoral, especially with the invasion of the Cappadocian satrap Datames (Manoledakis, 2021: 637). Even though there were some Persian components in the easternmost Colchis, the Black Sea was never directly under Persian hegemony (Mitchell, 2002: 44). The satrapies neighboring this satrapy were Daskyleion, Armenia, Sardis, and the Cilician region (Kaya, 2018) The Persians brought the system of satrapy to the region of Cappadocia, but almost nothing is known about the specific history of Pontic Cappadocia during the Persian hegemony until the reign of Datames, who made the Persian fleet active on the Black Sea littoral (Umar, 2000: 18, 20, 32). However, the dynamics of Sinope's relations with other small-scale colonies in its vicinity were likely disrupted, leading to Sinope falling under Persian rule (Doonan, 2009:71).
Map 2.11 The Persian Empire around 500 B.C. (Ian Mladjov).
Komana, central site of this study, is located in the satrapy of Daskyleion (Erciyas et. al., 2021: 239). In the late 5th and early 4th centuries B.C., several revolts occurred in this satrapy, which resulted in most of its territory getting transferred to the satrapy of Northern Cappadocia (Sökmen, 2010: 41). After the death of Alexander the satrapy of Cappadocia was divided into two regions: Pontus and Cappadocia. Strabo, speaking of Pontus, states that the Persians had two satrapies in the region of Cappadocia, and after the area was brought under the control of the Macedonians, they transformed them into kingdoms, one of which they called "Main Cappadocia", "Cappadocia near Taurus" or "Great Cappadocia", and the other was called "Pontus" by the Macedonians, although it was called "Cappadocia Pontica" by different ethnic groups. (Strabo.XII.1.4.

- **Taxation System**

The Persians not only established the satrapy system, which made it easier to administer the lands, but they also established a system of taxation. In the satrapy system, the ruler of the satrapies was called a 'Satrap' and was responsible for representing the king in their assigned location. Their duties included not only providing for the needs of the citizens, but also remitting the taxes collected to the king. Despite Persian domination of the Anatolian plateau, the inhabitants of Pontus persisted in acting as if they were an autonomous region. Herodotus noted, however, that over time they provided military troops and paid taxes to the Persians (Hdt. III. 94: VII. 78).

- **The Links on the Anatolian Plateau:**

The desire to monopolize the resources of the Lydians and to increase their own wealth and prosperity can be considered as one of the reasons for the Persian western campaigns. Furthermore, the idea that they could dominate the overseas trade mechanism, which was under the control of the settlements on the littoral of the Anatolian plateau overlooking the Aegean Sea, must have strengthened the desire for these military expeditions. The last ruler of Persia, Darius III (Darius the Great), who ascended the throne after the mid-6th century B.C., built an east-west trade route with an average length of 2,700 km, starting from Susa in the lands that formed the nucleus of the empire and extending to Sardis (Külzer, 2016: 1). The Royal Road played a significant role in the economic development of the settlements along its route and facilitated their active participation in trade. Although there are different arguments about the precise locations of the settlements along the route, the road and the sites that passed through the north of the Salt Lake, which is located in the center of the Anatolian plateau, will be discussed in detail in the following chapter of the dissertation. The reign of Darius III, son of Xerxes who ruled between 519-465 B.C., marked a decisive turning point in the history of
the Persian Empire. During his reign, revolts occurred in different parts of the territory under his control, and the central authority faced difficulties in their management, as well as the loss of territories and the weakening of the army, all of which indicate the beginning of a collapse. Darius III was defeated in Alexander's campaigns on the Anatolian plateau, leading to the end of the Persian Empire (Gates, 2015: 83).

- **Alexander and Beyond:**

334 B.C. was the first victory of Alexander the Great in Anatolia over the Persians and he continued his expedition towards the Aegean before the invasion of the inner parts of Anatolian plateau. During his pursuit of the Persians to the east, Alexander fought his second war with Darius III at the Battle of Issos in 333 B.C. He then continued his campaign towards the east, briefly diverting his coastal route inland. After his death in 323 B.C., his successors established another system of kingdoms in the territories he controlled up to Mesopotamia and India. This period, spanning three centuries up to the Battle of Actium in 31 B.C., saw significant political changes. (Tekin, 2019: 2-10). During his eastern campaigns, Alexander turned his route to the western littoral of the Anatolian plateau after the Battle of Granicus in 334 B.C. He then reached Halicarnassus in the southwest and, after passing through Pamphliya, moved inland to the Anatolian plateau. He plans to continue his coastal campaign from Hellespont in the west to Tarsus/Cilica via Pamphylia in the south. General Parmenio was in charge of the Macedonian Kingdom inland, and he was given the task of taking the lands under Persian control and bringing them under the control of the Macedonian Kingdom by following the Royal Road. The Royal Road had one end in Sardis and the other in Susa. In 333 B.C., Alexander reached Gordion, which was under Persian control. The ancient writers Plutarch, Marsyas, Curtius and Arrian all state that Alexander's arrival in Gordion was for military and tactical objectives, while only Justin suggests that it was because he desired to untie the legendary knot and dominate Asia (Stewart, 2010: 57). Gordion became not only the strategically significant point that enabled him to control the southern and northern trade routes but also; a location that he met with a group of Black Sea inhabitants, who offered him pay taxes regularly rather than invading their lands (Plut., Alex. 18.5; Arr. 20.4; Curt.3.1.22-24.). Alexander was never interested in either the littoral or the inland of the Pontic region, but controlled it through a system of satrapies inherited from the Persians (McGing, 2014: 23). He did not march into the Pontic region either. Sinopeans and Heracleians were the only people that Alexander met during his campaign an information comes from a single ancient author called Memnon (Manoledakis, 2021: 630-632).
Map 2.12 Alexander’s Conquests in 323 B.C. (Ian Mladjov).
The absence of an heir for Alexander posed challenges in the distribution of his territory among his successors, who were comprised of his generals in his army. The Ptolemies were in charge of Egypt, the Antigonids were in charge of the interior of the Anatolian plateau, the islands, the Greek mainland, and Macedonia, and the Seleucids were in charge of Syria and Mesopotamia (Magie, 1950: 4). In addition to the major kingdoms, smaller kingdoms were also established in the Anatolian plateau during the mid-Hellenistic period. Although these kingdoms were smaller in size, they had a significant impact. According to Strabo, Philetairos established a small kingdom in and around Pergamon with the assistance of the Seleucids after the death of Lysimachus, who had ruled the Anatolian plateau following the death of Antigonus (Strabo, XIII. 4.1.). The Attalid Kingdom, founded on the western littoral of the Anatolian plateau and with its principal city Pergamon, would later become known as the Attalid Kingdom and would gain importance with its battles against the Galatians, who came to the Anatolian plateau from the northwest. The Attalids were the most Hellenized of all the kingdoms of the period, and this was reflected not only in their urban planning and administrative system, but also in many other aspects, including the construction of civic buildings and sculpture.

Other regional kingdoms include the Mithradatic kingdom, located in the Pontic region. Unlike the Attalids, this kingdom emphasized its Persian background and established a system that highlighted both the Persian state system and religious beliefs (Mitchell, 2010: 143). It was founded by Mithradates I Ctistes, also known as Mithradates III of Cius (Ballesteros-Pastor, 2013: 185). It is important to note that none of the Hellenistic kingdoms established in the region prior to Roman rule had absolute sovereignty in Pontus, while Mithradates VI Eupator was the only one who was able to control the entire territory as a whole during his twenty-five-year reign, and the territory later passed under Roman administration (Mitchell, 2002: 44).

Map 2.13 The Black Sea basin with the names of the settlements (Højte, 2009: 9).
Map 2.8 Map of the regions with the major settlements around 200 B.C. (Ian Mladjov).
The successors of Alexander, known as the *diadochoi*, did not hold any significant power in the region either. Despite the Persian impact that dominated almost every aspect of life on the Anatolian plateau with Alexander, which was gradually replaced by Greek elements, the first people to have an impact in the region had eastern and Persian ancestry. Therefore, Mithradates I Ctistes, the first ruler of Pontus, and Ariarathes III, the first ruler of Cappadocia, both claimed to be descended from Persians (Sökmen, 2010: 41). While Polybious (Polyb. V.43.2) states that Mithradates I Ctistes, the son of Ariobarzanes, the founder of the Kingdom of Pontus or Mithridatic Kingdom, was of Persian descent and that the lands he founded the kingdom were given by the Persian King Darius I, Diodorus writes that he was killed by Antigonus during the Battle of Ipsus (Diod. XIX.43.2). Mithradates I left one of his descendants in Mysia and then appointed Philetareas, a Macedonian born on the southern littoral of the Black Sea, thus shifting the Persian descendant from west to east and the western descendant from Paphlagonia to west. However, this shift not only caused Mithradates I to lose power in the west, but also allowed the Attalid Kingdom to flourish as another independent Hellenistic Kingdom in the west, where Hellenization influences were strongest (Mitchell, 2002: 54). Nevertheless, Mithradates I tried to regain the power he had lost in the west in the east and turned his attention to Cappadocia, even making Amaseia the center of the inland and the capital of the Kingdom, since it was surrounded by strong walls and located on very fertile lands for the protection of the inland territories (Mitchell, 2002:55).

According to Summerer the kings of the Mithradatic Kingdom retained their "Hellenic" characteristics, even if they were of Persian ancestry or still maintained the Persian administrative system (Summerer, 2009: 100). This association is also mentioned by Strabo, who speaks of Komana Pontica as a temple-state dedicated to the goddess Ma, probably originating in the pre-Hellenistic period, but also in the time of the Mithradatids, where festivals were held twice a year and ruled by a priest under the king, and of the temple at Zela, where the cult of Anaitis took place; Kabeira is mentioned both as the site of Mithridates' palace and as the site of the temple of Pharmakes’ Men and the temple of Selene (Strabo, XII.2.3; XII.3.31; XII.3.37) (Map.5). However, the decision to establish a monarchy for the new kingdom can be attributed to Mithradates I's Persian descent, but it can also be considered an "Achaemenid tradition" and can be supported by the fact that there are sacred sites in the heart of the kingdom, such as Amaseia, Komana, Zela, and Kabeira, where Persian cults were housed (Mitchell, 2002:59). In other words, Mitchell argues that, it was not the Greek poleis that sided with Mithradates, but rather mall “temple-states” that retained Persian impact (Mitchell, 2010: 149).
A number of groups arrived on the Anatolian plateau from the west around 275-260 B.C. and left their mark on the historical trajectory. In addition, a group separated from the Celts, who had occupied the upper basin of the Danube River, reached the Hellespont via the Balkans and then moved further into the inland of the Anatolian plateau, settling in diverse territories. In fact, it has been reported that the Celts, hired as mercenaries by Nicomedes of Bithynia to support him against the Seleucids, later settled in the surrounding territories, especially in Gordion and Pessinus (Darbyshire et al., 2000:79, 84-88, Strobel, 2002: 5). In other words, the Galatians were labeled as 'barbarians' due to their dominant cultural and religious characteristics, as well as their role as mercenaries in various ranks, which threatened the Hellenistic Kingdoms and peoples of the Anatolian plateau (Mitchell, 2010:145). According to Strabo, the three important tribes of this Celtic group settled in different regions: Trockhmi in Pontus and Cappadocia, where Tavium, a major commercial center, was located; Tektosag in Pessinus and Great Phrygia; and Tolistobogii in Bithynia and Phrygia, bordering Epiktetos (Strabo, XII.5.2). Tavium was likely a commercial center that controlled trade in the region, and the fact that it was located at the crossroads of the routes coming from different directions must have made it an attractive place to settle (Darbyshire et al. 2000:88). The Tolistobogii were neighbors of Pessinus, where the temple of Cybele Agdistis was located, and also controlled Gordion, which was of great geostrategic importance (Coşkun, 2012: 52). Mitchell suggested that the impact of their dominant cultural elements and reputations was not limited to the Anatolian Plateau where they inhabited; they also greatly influenced the inland of the Anatolian plateau at the time of their existence (Mitchell, 2010: 145).
The geographical and climatic characteristics of the North Anatolian Mountain Range, which runs from east to west, are a distinguishing feature of the province as well as its settlement patterns. The major harbor cities in the region under consideration are Sinope on the border between Pontus and Paphlagonia, Amisos to the east, a smaller but very well-functioning harbor, and Kotyora to the east of Amisos, which came under the control of Pharnaces I in 183 B.C. (Olshausen, 1974: 154). In contrast, settlements in the inland of Pontus and North-Central Anatolia rely mostly on agriculture and are smaller in scale compared to the harbor settlements. They were of great importance for the establishment of littoral-inland relations and commercial dynamics and were established in the part of the North Anatolian mountain range with the easiest access to the littoral. Additionally, the existence of temple-states and periodically held festivals in the region must have contributed to this network of interactions. In addition to the temples dedicated to the goddess Ma at Komana Pontica, Anaitis at Zela and Men at Kabeira in the north-central Anatolian plateau, there was also a cult of Cybele at Pessinus and Men at Psidian Antiocheia (Dignas, 2002: 227). According to Strabo Pessinus was the largest commercial center in the territory and that there was a temple of the "Mother of Gods" (Strabo, XII. 5. 3).

Map 2.16 Region of Galatia (Darbyshire et. al. 2000: 80).

The Hellenistic settlements in Central Anatolia, located in the southern and southwestern flanks of the region, are characterized by three centers, Ancyra, Gordion and Tavium (Büyük Nefes Köy), which were established on the routes of major and prominent roads (Ulusoy, 2006: 11). Still it can be suggested that the process of "Hellenization" began in the settlements
on the western littoral of the Anatolian plateau facing the Aegean Sea with the Greek colonization in the 8th century B.C. and had a predominant impact on the communal spaces of the settlements, the administrative patterns and the domestic life of the population in the Hellenistic period. The Hellenistic Period is unfortunately sparse and thus, evidence in the pre-Alexander settlements of the inland region; it is difficult to suggest that it became a dominant component in the post-Alexander period. In the aforementioned centers, buildings and settlement plans that follow conventional patterns are observed, rather than the monumental public buildings found in settlements on the littoral. This is reflected in the way of life. Mitchell postulated that the effects of this transition could only be observed in the Late Hellenistic-Early Roman Imperial Period. He further proposed that the east-west oriented mountain ranges to the south and north of the Anatolian plateau functioned as a kind of barrier to the penetration of Hellenization into the interior, with the consequence that coastal settlements were more readily affected (Mitchell, 1993: 7). In other words, although there is a general perception that the Anatolian plateau to the east of mainland Greece had integrated typical Greek urbanization patterns and completed the Hellenization in the construction of civic buildings, urban planning, and administrative forms before the Roman domination of this territory, the inland process can be considered to be dated back to Romanization (Erciyas, 2021: 335). The inland peoples, such as the Phrygians, Mysians, and Lydians, were ethnically distinct from each other, but they shared common characteristics, such as similar languages and religious practices, which not only distinguished them from the coastal peoples, but also impacted their settlement patterns, based on the notion of agricultural villages rather than large-scale urbanization (Mitchell, 1993:7). Erciyas argues that there are distinct cultural dynamics in the inland region and Pontus. The urban structure at the center of the east-west synthesis was able to access the Hellenization process later than the littoral settlements that had been under the impact of Hellenic culture for centuries; this transition can be dated to the Early Roman Imperial Period (Erciyas, 2021: 335, 340, 342).
CHAPTER 3

CONTEXTUALISING THE NORTH-CENTRAL ANATOLIA AND KOMANA

3.1. Komana

3.1.1. Geographical Location and Description of Komana

Komana Pontica is located on the southeastern border of the Pontic Region, now called the Central Black Sea Region, with the Central Anatolia. The site is situated in the village Gümenek, in the central district of Tokat. It is located 10 km from Tokat (Dazimon) on the road to Niksar (Neocaesarea). The settlement is situated on both sides of the Iris River (Yeşilırmak), which flows through its center. It was situated on the fertile land of the Dazimonitis Plain (today's Kazaova), which was irrigated by the Iris River.

Map 3.1 Location of Komana Pontica.

The hill, designated as Hamamtepe, is a semi-natural, semi-artificial formation. It has been observed that numerous fragments of architrave and frieze may have fallen from the slope of the hill and may have been used as spolia in the construction of the walls of nearby structures (Hamilton, 1842: 349-350). One of the architraves, which is dated to 160 A.D., currently on display at the Tokat Museum features the inscription "Sacred city of Komana" (Erciyas, D.B.,
Additionally, an inscription fragment was found near the regulator located to the east of the hill, built by the General Directorate of State Hydraulic Works. This discovery has identified the settlement area of Komana Pontica (IGR III, no. 106; Cumont and Cumont, Studia, 1906: 251; Wilson, 1960: 231-233; Supplemantum Epigraphicum Graecum, XLII 1992: 339; Rémy, 1990: 515-31). Additionally, Hamilton also mentions a Roman bridge and fragments of architectural temples found in the vicinity (Hamilton, 1842: 350). The feet of the bridge is still in place and constitutes the foundation of the water regulator (Erciyas, D.B., et. Al.: 23). The bridge features two spolia inscriptions that inscribe the name of Komana together with the title of hierokaisareion komaneon (IGR III, no.106) (Erciyas, 2006: 14).

Although Komana is situated inland, it can be considered a northern neighbor of the southern littoral of the Black Sea, which lies to the north of its territory. The site is situated in a geographically strategic location, encompassed by the Cappadocia region to the south, Central Anatolia to the west and southwest, and Eastern Anatolia to the east. North Central Anatolia still remains as a significant crossroads where different regions meet and interact. In fact, since
Komana was built on the road connecting the modern city of Tokat (Dazimon) with the district of Niksar (Neocaesareia), it can be suggested that Komana was located at a provincial crossroads. On the eastern side of the mound, there is another road leading to Almus. Hogarth and Munro shared comparable data and discourse after their studies of the region in the late 19th century, noting that Komana was located at the intersection of several important roads and had a route to the sea through the Lycus Valley to the northeast of the settlement. (Hogarth & Munro, 1893, 734). Ramsay also noted that Komana had another access to the coast of the Black Sea, which ran to the north of the settlement through what is today known as Amasya (Amaseia) (Ramsay, 1890: 158). Although it will be discussed in more detail in the chapter on ‘Routes and Roads’ in this thesis, Wilson suggested that Komana might have been connected to Cappadocia and even to Cilicia in the south via the road that passes through present-day Sivas (Sebasteia) (Wilson, 1960: 242). In accordance with this, Marek, in his two-volume work on the dynamics of the Anatolian plateau, entitled “Asia Minor” from prehistory to Roman Imperial Times, discusses the roads and routes in different periods, including both pre-Roman and Roman roads of Bithynia and Pontos. He also discusses the Romanization of the region and its impact on Komana and the surrounding area (Marek, 2016). The studies have demonstrated that Komana maintained its role as an important crossroads of north-south and east-west roads due to its strategic location from the early Roman and Roman Imperial periods to the Byzantine, Seljuk and Ottoman times, however, it will be discussed in detail in this thesis that this role may have begun in pre-Roman times.

3.1.2. History of Komana

Komana Pontica is one of three temple districts of the Hellenistic Mithridatic Kingdom in present-day North Central Anatolia, the others being Zela at Zile/Tokat and bu ne at Niksar/Tokat. Strabo, Appianus, Cassius Dio, Procopius and Plutarch are the main ancient authors providing information about Komana. Strabo’s ‘Geography’, is the most informative source among them. The earliest accounts of Komana, which also served as a guide for the commencement of scientific studies, were the itineraries of travelers who traveled to the region in the late 19th and early 20th centuries. Hamilton (1842), Hogarth and Munro (1893), Anderson (1903) and Cumonts (1906) identified the location of Komana through the study of ruins in and around Tokat, as well as inscriptions in the vicinity.

Komana continued to be under the rule of the Mithradatic Kingdom during the Hellenistic period. Mithradates VI, along with the other kings who ruled the kingdom, reigned from 120 B.C. to 63 B.C. He was the last ruler of the kingdom, and his reign was distinguished by his
wars against Rome, which had become de facto dominant in the west and was initiating its eastern campaigns. He engaged in prolonged conflicts with Sulla, Lucullus, and Pompey, the principal leaders of the Republican Period of Rome. In 88 B.C., Mithradates VI expanded the borders of the kingdom and consolidated its dominance in the southern Asian territories, while confronting Rome in the inlands of Anatolia (Arslan, 2002: 116-117). De Souza stated that the First Mithridatic War, which lasted from 89 B.C. to 85 B.C., resulted in the victory of Mithradates VI and the temporary disruption of Roman hegemony over the Anatolian plateau. However, Mithradates VI believed that the Roman leader Sulla was absent from the Anatolian plateau due to his war in mainland Greece and therefore his victory would not be sustained (De Souza, 1999: 116).

The second war between Mithradates VI and Rome lasted for two years between 83 B.C. and 81 B.C. and ended with the defeat of Murena, who was appointed Proconsul of Asia by Sulla at the head of the Roman armies (Arslan, 2007: 530). The third war, which spanned from 79 B.C. to 63 B.C., is regarded as the most extensive and longest-lasting conflict. It saw Rome engage on multiple fronts, with its armies initially led by Lucullus before being taken up by Pompey. In 67 B.C. Pompey was given absolute authority by the Romans to calm the turmoil in the entire Mediterranean basin, put an end to piracy and ensure absolute sovereignty (Appian, Mithr., 94; Cass. Dio, XXXVI. 36a-37. 1; Plut. Pomp. XXV. 2). In relation with this, The Pontic region was invaded by Pompey in 66 B.C. (Strabo, XII. 3. 28). With the suicide of Mithradates VI in 63 B.C., Rome assumed control of the Anatolian plateau (Arslan, 2007: 530-531).

After the conclusion of numerous conflicts, Pompey's initial action upon assuming control of the territories under his authority was to implement the Roman provincial system (Erciyas, 2021: 339). Therefore, after the Hellenistic period, the Pontus region also took its place in the Roman administrative system. Following Pompey’s reorganization, Pontus comprised a geography that extended as far as Bithynia. (Erciyas, 2021). Subsequently a principality, Komana was assigned to Archelaus by the Roman ruler Pompey in the middle of the 1st century B.C. (Appian, Mithridates 115; Wilson, 1960: 223). In 48 B.C., Julius Caesar ascended the throne, and the very next year he deposed Archelaus and replaced him with his son. (Erciyas, 2012: 164).

The temple was in use throughout the Roman period, and the Romans even associated goddess Ma with Bellona, the goddess of war, and Virtus, symbolizing strength and courage (CIL XIII 7281; Juvenal 4, 123-125). In the last years of the Roman Republic, during the wars of Sulla
VI against the Mithridatids, the cult of Ma was transferred to the city of Rome, where it was placed in the same temple as Mars.

Under the reign of Augustus, the territory of the Roman Empire greatly expanded. The ancient writers Cassius Dio and Strabo mention that Medeius, Cleon, and Dyteutus were appointed as priests at Komana during the reign of Augustus (Cassius Dio, 51.2.3; Strabo, 12.3.35; 12.574). During the early years of the Empire, the eastern provinces underwent another reorganization. Komana was initially integrated in “The Pontus” region, but in 34/35 B.C. it was placed within the borders of Pontus Galaticus in the southern part of the Pontus region, near Galatia (Erciyas, 2012: 164). The depiction of the goddess Ma is found on coins minted during the reign of Caligula III (37-41 A.D.), while coins representing the temple are dated to the reigns of Emperors Trajan (98-117 A.D.), Septimius Severus (193-211 A.D.) (Amandry and Rémy, 1990: 33-40), and Caracalla (211-217 A.D.).

During the reign of Maurice Tiberius (593 A.D.-602 A.D.), Komana was annexed to the Eastern Roman Empire’s imperial borders after a series of fierce wars in the eastern part of the empire at the end of the 6th century (Erciyas, 2012: 164).

According to Hogarth and Munro, between the reigns of the Mithridatids and Maurice Tiberius, Komana held the status of ‘ager publicus’, a term referring to public lands acquired at the end of wars (Hogarth & Munro, 1891, 736).

Komana continued its existence during the Roman period. However, with the spread of Christianity, it lost its former importance as a pagan temple and even began to deteriorate. Komana Pontica was continued to be settled during the Byzantine period. The Byzantine levels have been dated to the — 7th - 8th century A.D. and the—11th - 12th century A.D. Right after the Middle Byzantine Period, a settlement layer dating to the Danishmend/Seljuk period (12th-14th centuries), characterized by workshop complex was recognized on Hamamtepe (the central mound). The latest occupation phase in Komana dates to the Ottoman period (17th-18th centuries).

3.1.3. Administrative and Religious Position of Komana During the Hellenistic Period

Komana Pontica was rather than just a city located on fertile land and of strategic importance. It was established on the southern shore of the Black Sea during the Hellenistic period and was part of the Mithradatic Kingdom, which ruled from 281 B.C. to 63 B.C., but at the same time had its own semi-autonomous status. Although this status gave Komana the opportunity to act
as a semi-independent state, it minted the same coins as the other cities of the Hellenistic period (Erciyas, 2012: 164).

The temple-states on the Anatolian plateau, which are not numerous, include the cult dedicated to the goddess Cybele at Pessinus, the temple dedicated to Anaitis at Zela, the sanctuary of Men at Psidian Antiocheia and the cult of Zeus at Venasa (Dignas, 2002: 227). The original location of the cult of Ma, an Anatolian cult, is Komana Cappadocia (Erciyas, 2021: 337). Komana Pontica, on the plateau of north-central Anatolia, was also a temple state dedicated to the goddess Ma during the Mithradatic Kingdom that ruled in the Hellenistic period.

According to Cassabone, the settlement at Komana can be dated back to the Hittite period (Casabonne, 2009: 181-182). Although the “te”rm "Ma" literally “eans "other", associates her with war. The depiction of the goddess Ma on the coins with maces and shields, which are tools of war, supports the idea that she had a warrior characteristic. The epithet aniketos (invincible) and nikephoros (victorious) is attributed to her as well (Cancik, H., Schneider H., Salazar, C.F. & Orton, D. E., 2011). The priest was an elected official of the king and was also responsible for the economy of the temple state. The choice of priest for Komana Pontica was crucial: it was necessary that the chosen priest be someone close to and trusted by the king, so that he could be constantly informed of the settlement's affairs.

Strabo identifies the goddess Ma with Enyo (Strabo, 12.2.3), while Plutarch equates her with Semele and Athena (Plutarch Sulla 9.7.457c.). Essentially, Ma is an Anatolian goddess with a local cult, and the original center of this cult is Komana Cappadocia, located in the village of Şar in the Tufanbeyli district of Adana province (Erciyas, 2021). Moreover, Strabo states that Komana Cappadocia and Komana Pontica had similar forms of administration, that both cults were dedicated to the goddess Ma, and that the temple at Komana Pontica was a copy of the Cappadocian example:

\[ \text{and nearly the same course of religious rites is practiced there; the mode of delivering the oracles is the same; the same respect is paid to the priests as was more particularly the case in the time of the first kings, when twice a year, at what is called the Exodi of the goddess (when her image is carried in procession), the priest wore the diadem of the goddess and received the chief honors after the king. (Strabo 12.3.32).} \]

Strabo provides important details about the temple at Komana, the rituals, the temple economy, and the impact of the region. (Strabo, 12.3.32). Twice a year, festivals were held in this temple-state, where guests from both within and outside the region were invited. Komana Pontica is described by Strabo as an emporion and these biannual festivals were known as "the exoduses of the goddess" (Strabo, 12.3.32). People, who came from neighboring regions such as
Armenia Minor (Strabo, XII.3.33) as well as from overseas. Strabo describes that all the lands around Komana, located on the Dazimonitis plain, were connected to the temple and that the priest was responsible for cultivating the fertile lands (Strabo, XII.3.33). Approximately 6000 temple servants were involved in agricultural activities under the authority of the priest and were granted impunity. In addition, the cult of Ma is known to be associated with the transition of both genders from childhood to adulthood. Female temple servants were also present, and it is assumed that sacred prostitution was prominent in the festivals organized in the temple. This is also associated with the mythological story of Iphigenia and Orestes donating their hair to the Goddess Ma in Komana when they brought the cult of Artemis Tauropoulos from Scythia to Anatolia (Strabo, XII. 2.3; Cass. Dio., 36, 11).

The economy of the temple was based on agriculture and festivals. Merchants purchased the products at festivals, and the revenues were then transferred to the temple. Komana was compared to Corinth by Strabo due to its geographical location, commercial and sacred activity. Strabo stated that Komana was at least as important and magnificent a commercial and religious center as Corinth (Strabo, XII.3.36).

3.1.4. Archaeology at Komana

The Komana Archaeological Research Project began its initial scientific studies with field surveys led by D. Burcu Erciyas, Chair of the Graduate Program in Settlement Archaeology at the Middle East Technical University, on behalf of the Ministry of Culture and Tourism of the Republic of Türkiye. Geophysical studies and field surveys were conducted between 2004 and 2006 in and around the semi-natural, semi-artificial mound now called Hamamtepe, and between 2006 and 2008 within a 10 km radius of the mound. The purpose of the surveys was to determine the extent of the settlement of Komana, to obtain data on the possible settlement plan, and to determine the locations of other settlements in the vicinity (Erciyas, 2012: 165). In order to gather information about nearby settlements, a variety of material samples had to be collected and examined due to the lack of previous scientific studies in the region. The study of these materials, together with the presence of identifiable remains, provided information about the neighboring settlements. Only a few settlements dating to the Hellenistic Period were encountered, while there were a significant number of settlements dating to the Middle Byzantine Period (Tatbul, M.T.& Erciyas, D.B., 2019, 272). The Hellenistic period is also represented by the presence of several rock-cut tombs, as mentioned by Anderson and Cumont (Anderson, 1903; Cumont & Cumont, 1906) and revisited by the survey team. Furthermore, it was discovered that spolia from the Hellenistic and Roman periods revised as architectural building elements in the villages located to the east of the settlement, now known
as Ballıdere and Döllük represents the Classical Period settlement. Consequently, it is possible to speak of the existence of settlements related to the aforementioned periods in the vicinity.

In 2009, excavations started in different sectors of Hamamtepe, a mound located in the plain of the Iris River. The excavations carried out in sectors HTP01, HTP02, HTP03 and HTP04 revealed a multilayered occupation at the mound. The HTP01 sector is where these layers are most intensively identified. In this chapter of the thesis, the settlement phases and the finds of the Late Iron Age and the Early Hellenistic period will be discussed.

![Figure 3.2 Grid Plan of Komana sectors and trenches.](image)

- **The Stratigraphic Sequence of Komana:**

  The settlement layers of Komana are represented both by architectural and archaeological remains. Although illicit digging destroyed stratification at some locations, studies have demonstrated that each layer has its own characteristics (Erciyas, 2019: 3).

  The chronological settlement levels identified at Hamamtepe are as follows:

  - The Ottoman Level (17th -18th century A.D.)
  - The Danishmend/Seljuk Level (12th -14th century A.D.)
  - The Middle Byzantine Level (11th -12th century A.D.)
• The Early Byzantine Level (7th-8th century A.D.)
• The Roman Level (2nd-3rd century A.D.)
• The Hellenistic/Late Iron Age Level (4th-2nd century B.C.)
• The Late Chalcolithic – The Early Bronze Age Level (3000 B.C. - 2700 B.C.)

- The Ottoman Level (17th-18th century A.D.):

The uppermost layer, which is reached after removing only the topsoil is the Ottoman occupation level, which dates back to the 17th-18th century A.D. The wall foundations are generally two (or more) courses of gray stones, 56-99 cm wide. The settlement at this level must have been built with mud-brick superstructures over stone foundations. Additionally, no special flooring material was discovered on the floors of the room, and the existing room floors were eroded by the earth. The Spolia was widely used as bases for wooden pillars supporting the roofs of the Ottoman dwellings. The excavations have yielded four large building structures, two in the north and two in the south. These buildings which were part of a rural village settlement were abandoned in the 18th century and the interiors were completely cleared of belongings (Erciyas, D.B., Batman, A., & Çivilidağ, A., 2021: 231).

- The Danishmend/Seljuk Level (12th-14th century A.D.):

The mound is situated on bedrock, which is often close to the surface, particularly in the central area where the structures from the Danishmend/Seljuk Period are concentrated. These structures, found just after the Ottoman layer, are distinguished by the presence of tandır type ovens within the rooms. The architectural elements of the walls very closely resemble that of the Ottoman period, the foundations consisting of 1-2 rows of stones. The floors of these rooms are also significantly damaged. The presence of pithoi, waste pits, and cesspits, along with a significant amount of raw materials, semi-processed materials, and finished products, strongly suggest that these buildings were industrial.

- The Middle Byzantine Level (11th-12th century A.D.):

This building phase is characterized by two churches and a cemetery (Erciyas & Tatbul, 2017: 272-273). Around 150 graves have been excavated to date, all of which are oriented east-west. Some graves were used for single burials, while others were used for multiple burials. Certain graves were covered only with soil, while others were adorned with decorative tiles. The two churches have identical architectural structures and are three-aisled chapels. Although primarily used for burials, the chapels may have also been used for other ceremonies. Spolia is occasionally found within the walls. Red stones, in addition to Spolia and local stone, which
are easily workable and thought to be indigenous to the region, were used as building materials. The walls and ceilings of the chapels were decorated with frescoes, as evidenced by the colorful fresco fragments found during excavations. On the other hand, a significant number of bronze objects have been found in the chapels where architectural terracotta decorations were also used, suggesting that the chapels were elaborately decorated.

- **The Early Byzantine Level (7th -8th century A.D.):**

The Early Byzantine phase, one of the occupation levels identified at Hamamtepe, is characterized by a fortification wall surrounding the mound rather than small finds. This type of wall was also used in many settlements during the Middle Byzantine Period, as demonstrated by examples from Gritille and Çadır Höyük (Erciyas et. al.: 2015, 33). Excavations on the exterior of the fortification have yielded a gold coin and a glass weight, and a Phokas (602-610 A.D.) coin which is dated to the 7th century A.D., the 7th century A.D., provides a *terminus post-quem* dating of this fortification. The wall, with a height of up to 2 meters in some areas, has a mortared structure and was restored and reused during the Seljuk period.

- **The Roman Level (2nd -5th century A.D.):**

Information pertaining to the administrative and religious structure and functioning of Komana during the Hellenistic period is derived from the bibliographies of ancient authors. Additionally, accounts of the Roman settlement and status of Komana can be found in the works of Strabo (XII. 2. 3), Plutarch (9, 7, 457c), and Cassius Dio (36, 11). From the 1st century B.C. onward, a system of provinces was established, particularly in the eastern Roman territories. This system underwent further reorganization during the Roman Imperial Period. Additionally, Komana was incorporated into a province due to its strategic location on the Anatolian plateau.

In relation to this, Komana, which held a different status due to its religious position, was the sole settlement to receive the designation of polis in 34-35 A.D. and was connected to the province of *Pontus Galaticus*. In the second century A.D., when *Pontus Galaticus* and *Pontus Polemaniacus* were merged to form a single province (*Pontus Mediterraneus*), which dominated the region, Komana was included within the borders of this province (Bekker-Nielsen, 2017: 39, Marek, 2017: 431). The excavations carried out in Komana in 2015 revealed the torso of a Roman statue. The sculptural style suggests that it was of a “Euergetes” in the 2nd century A.D. which indicates the presence of high-ranking people and that Komana must have been a polis.
Until 2020, data on the Roman settlement of Komana was scarce. The only available material consisted of a few inscriptions unearthed during the excavations of Middle Byzantine church buildings, sherds of Pontus Sigillatta and imported Terra Sigiliatta, and coins from various sectors of the mound (Erciyas et. al., 2021: 232).

The results of the 2020 to 2022 excavations enable the identification of at least three distinct building phases associated with the Roman occupation. The earliest phase is dated to the 2nd century A.D., while the latest phase is dated to the 5th century A.D. These primary undisturbed contexts contain pottery, bones, metal artefacts and as well as the architectural elements. The Sword Building, dated to the 3rd century A.D., provides the most striking context when considered together with its assemblage. The building's destruction by a particularly intense fire is indicated by the presence of burnt mud-brick superstructures on two of the intersecting walls. The other wall is composed of rubble and concrete. The well-preserved condition of the mud brick can be attributed to the fact that it has been baked by fire and hardened to become durable. Additionally, the exposure of the walls revealed stucco fragments. In addition to the in situ fragments, which indicate that the walls in question may have been plastered, the presence of a terracotta pipe was also identified within the building, which may suggest the presence of a drainage system (Erciyas, et. al., forthcoming).

The primary undisturbed contexts of the Sword Building yielded a variety of artifacts, including swords, military equipment such as daggers and axes, personal metal objects, a hoard of 42 bronze coins, (12 coins mostly dated to the 3rd century A.D.), pottery, bones, and carbonized botanical remains such as almonds, wheat, olive pits. Additionally, textile products, including cloaks, were also identified within the assemblage (Erciyas, et. al., forthcoming).

The second layer, which has the most robust structure among the Roman layers of Hamamtepe, is called the Basilical Building. The walls of the structure, which has a basilical ground plan measuring 16x14 m., were constructed with mortar and stone. In addition to pottery and bones, coins from the 4th century AD have been recovered from the building through primary undisturbed contexts. Considering the architectural features of the building and its relationship with the fortification wall, it is suggested that the building may have been used for civic services (Erciyas, et. al., forthcoming).

Another structure with an open courtyard, constructed adjacent to the Basilical Building with a significantly altered plan, is designated the "Residential Quarter." In the subsequent phase of the building's construction, which underwent a comprehensive renovation in the latter
The courtyard was divided into sections with dry walls constructed using spolia. The vestibule and an L-shaped area are also identified in the last occupation phase of the building. In addition to the architectural elements, the assemblage includes a few pithoi and a bronze bread seal inscribed with the name Νικανόρος (Nikandros).

It is aimed to obtain more detailed and comprehensive information about the Roman settlement levels of Komana with the further researches regarding this period in the following years.

- **The Hellenistic / Late Iron Age Level (4th - 2nd century B.C.):**

Excavations on the mound from 2009 to 2018 did not reveal a distinct occupation layer from the Hellenistic period. However, several buildings, partially destroyed by Early Byzantine walls, with two different levels of construction, indicate the use of the mound from at least the 5th century B.C. The Late Iron Age/Early Hellenistic Levels of Komana, including its pottery and other artifacts, will be discussed in the following parts of this chapter in the dissertation (Erciyan, D.B., Batman, A., & Çivilidağ, A., 2021).

- **The Early Bronze Age / Late Chalcolithic Level (3000 B.C. - 2700 B.C.):**

In the course of the excavations conducted in the HTP01 sector between 2017 and 2020, sherds, an obsidian tool, and an axe were found mixed with some of the contexts containing Late Iron Age and Early Hellenistic pottery, and these finds were dated to the Late Chalcolithic - Early Bronze Age period.

### 3.1.5. The Hellenistic Occupation Layers of Komana

The surveys were carried out from 2004-2008 Komana Archaeological Research Project and the excavations in Komana have been ongoing in four different areas on the mound called Hamamtepe since 2009. Notably, HTP01 is where the highest density of settlement layers that constitute the stratigraphy of the mound are identified. Studies in 2018-2020 revealed a number of distinctive architectural and material culture elements while working the deeper layers of the Byzantine, Seljuk, and Ottoman occupation levels. The primary undisturbed contexts have been found in five layers of soil and on two levels of the building. Previous excavations have uncovered pottery and small artifacts from the Hellenistic and Roman periods from contaminated contexts in various parts of the mound. However, in accordance with the results of prior studies, it was concluded that the earliest level reached until 2018 season dated to the early Byzantine period.
HTP01 is the sector with the occupation layers that best reveal the stratigraphy of the mound. Byzantine and later occupation layers, as well as the alluvial sediments from the Iris River that came with the deepening of the trenches, revealed that the Hellenistic and Roman occupation layers of the mound were much deeper than the upper layers (Erciyas, D.B. & Tatbul, M.N., 2019: 538).

During the 10th year of excavations at Hamamtepe in 2018, excavations continued in the HTP01 and HTP02 sectors. Excavations were carried out in HTP02 in and around the fortification wall, and in HTP01 in trenches 307/608 and 297/608. In 2019 and 2020 seasons, excavations continued in these trenches. The architectural remains uncovered in these trenches are characterized by stone wall foundations. Pottery and bone fragments as well as small artifacts were also recovered from these trenches. The bedrock of the mound is very close to the surface in some areas, indicating that there are different elevations between the settlement layers in different trenches. The bedrock, which is almost visible on the surface, is particularly prominent in the center of the mound. In the northeast direction of Hamamtepe, the bedrock is deeper, which allows for the excavation of earlier occupation layers by deepening the trenches in that area. In addition to the layers containing architectural elements, deposits consisting of broken stones, pebbles and a hard soil structure were discovered beneath the Early Byzantine settlement of Hamamtepe.

- **Architectural Remains:**

The excavations could go deeper on the north of the mound where the bedrock. Here, a group of walls constructed in a different architectural style was discovered during the excavation, beneath the walls of the Early Byzantine period. These walls were recognized as the “earliest building phase” in the chronology of the mound until 2018. The orientation of the newly exposed walls in Komana contradicted the known north-south-east-west orientation of the wall structures in the Byzantine, Danishmend/Seljuk and Ottoman phases. Additionally, a dense pottery repertoire was found, along with changes in texture and soil color that accompanied the architectural structures. A context identified as T10 in Trench 297/608 and T8 and T17 in trench 307/608, which contained a very dense assemblage of sherds, shells, and mixed pottery, was recorded in association with the Middle Byzantine church structure. The stratigraphy of this part of the mound indicated a significant hiatus layer between the Early Byzantine and Hellenistic Period levels. These contaminated layers may represent a “transitional level” between the Byzantine and Hellenistic periods, and this layer may even be an accumulation that provided a kind of foundation for the Byzantine structures (Erciyas, D.B. et al., 2021: 233). Previous studies conducted in the Ottoman and Seljuk phases at Hamamtepe revealed the presence of dry wall structures consisting of one or two rows (four rows in well-preserved
sections) of gray stones, in addition to mortared walls. The examination of the new walls uncovered in trenches 297/608 and 607/608 revealed walls that were similar to the previously known dry walls. However, it was observed that the stones used in these walls were larger than those used in the late periods. Another distinguishing feature of the layers containing these walls is that no mortared walls were encountered. Additionally, the red colored stone, which was used in the Byzantine settlement of the mound and thought to be unique to the region, was occasionally used in the construction of these walls. It is considered that the red stones used in the walls of the Byzantine period may have been spolia, removed from the walls of the Hellenistic period and reused as construction material (Erciyas, et. al., 2021: 233).

These walls comprise of two rows of stone foundations, and the superstructures were likely built using mud brick. Although the walls are in different trenches and more than one in number, the presence of mortared wall structures in the upper layers makes it difficult to work in the areas, and therefore, a complete ground plan cannot be created.

There are two different levels of walls and the second/deeper level is much better preserved.

Figure 3.3 Sketch plan and aerial view of the Hellenistic Walls together with Byzantine Walls.
- **The Deposits:**

The deposits beneath the Early Byzantine occupation layers have a heterogeneous composition, with early pottery, coins, and sea shells found in contrast with the later period pottery. While the layers of T10/T12/T14/T20 of 297/608 demonstrate the characteristics of fill deposits, the layers T08/T09/T10 of trench 307/608 also have the same features. These differences can be explained by the elevation differences caused by the bedrock.

The layer T11 of trench 307/608, where the Hellenistic wall foundations were uncovered firstly, is accepted as the “transitional layer” to the earlier levels. T12 layer of the trench 307/608 is one of the most crucial layers for the dating of these new deposits. This layer is the one where the stone foundations could be observable with their all rows. Additionally, the painted pottery, terracotta figurine fragments and mostly corroded coins were found within the context of T12. All these above mentioned material culture elements were dated to the Hellenistic Period.

There is a consistency between T12 and T15 in the trench 307/608, although the contexts of the walls and their surroundings vary slightly. The deposits contain a large amount of pottery and bone fragments. The pottery will be further examined in the scope of this thesis, it will suffice to say here that these assemblages have a very different character than the glazed pottery and the thick-walled large storage vessels mostly found in the upper four layers of the mound. There are both plain and painted groups in the assemblage. The bone assemblages are also different and contain a greater variety of animal bones compared to the upper layers and, in this context, illustrate a major difference in consumption habits and animal husbandry at Komana in different phases. The predominant species are pig, goat and sheep. A sheep tooth was tested for C14 and the results indicate an average date range of 264-93 B.C. (TÜBİTAK MAM/ Report No: 82325108-125.05-40/3593) (Erciyas, et. al., 2021: 234).

In terms of small finds, the contexts were found to contain fragments of female votive figurines, numerous 50 coins, fibulae, and other finds that may provide a window into Komana’s interactions with overseas regions.

During excavation season 2020, a scarab-shaped stamp seal was unearthed from T17 of trench 307/608. The seal depicts Menkheperre, one of the titles of Thutmosis III, and the raw material of the well preserved scarab is steatite. Menkheperre was used to describe the High Priest of the XXI Dynasty of Egypt, but it was also used for the "High Priest of Amun" in the 18th Dynasty of Egypt (personal communication with Salima Ikram). Thutmosis III was the 6th monarch of the XVIIIth Dynasty of Egypt and ruled for a long period between 1479-1429 B.C.
His epithet *Menkheperre* is found on seals used in the Mediterranean and Near East long after his death, even in the Late Period of Egypt (664-525 B.C.) (Jaeger, 1982: 280-281, Peck, 1987: 235). In this context, it is not possible to make a definite statement about the dating of the scarab from Komana, but when the pottery between the deposits is analyzed, it is possible to give a range from the 6th to the 4th century B.C.

There are at least 50 coins from these strata. The majority of the coins, mostly bronze, are deformed and almost impossible to identify. However, among them are "anonymous coins of Pontus" that could be dated to 130-100 B.C. (Erciyas, et. al., 2021: 221, 234). Also, among the coins was a bronze coin with a much deteriorated obverse, but with a labyrinth on the reverse and the letters K N Ω around the labyrinth. The coin comes from Knossos/Crete and is dated from the 3rd century B.C. to the late 2nd century B.C. and early 1st century B.C. (Svornos, 1890, 189; Jackson, 1971: 294; Ackermann, 2005: 207). The Komana find belongs to the group that Jackson defines as Denomination A and dates it to around 221 B.C.

Another prominent example among the coins in question is the silver siglos with representations associated with Amisos, depicting Hera on the obverse and an owl with open wings on the reverse. Previous examples recovered from various sites have been dated to the 4th-3rd century B.C. However, considering the possibility that the Komana example may have been reduced, it is possible to date this example to a later period, such as the 3rd-2nd century B.C. (Erciyas, et. al., 2021: 221,234). It would not be wrong to say that the coin in consideration is one of the earliest examples of coins found in Komana.

Another unique object from these deposits is a mostly preserved bronze fibula. The find, which may be an example of a Galatian fibula, is considered to be of the "Middle La Tene type" (Müller-Karpe, 1998, 192-195; Darbyshire et al., 2000, 83 & Coşkun, 2014, 138-139). The examples of this type of fibula from the 3rd-2nd millennium B.C. were used in a wider area than the Galatian region, while the more recent examples from the 2nd-1st millennium B.C. are limited to the Galatian region. When the Galatian fibula specimens previously found in Anatolia were analyzed, it was found that the Komana specimen was similar to the Komana Cappadocia (Şar Köy in the Tufânbeyli district of Adana) specimen dated to the 3rd-2nd century B.C.

When these rare finds are evaluated together with the possible imported pottery samples from the Hellenistic period levels of Komana, which will be discussed in the following chapters of the thesis, they have a potential to shed light on the network of relations with overseas regions.
3.1.6. The Pottery Repertoire of Komana Late Iron Age/Early Hellenistic Levels

Administrative and ethnic differences may result in different or similar material culture characteristics among societies and regions. After coins in circulation, pottery is perhaps the most widespread element of material culture. In other words, pottery is a commonly found facet of material culture that provides crucial insights into the time and place of its discovery, as well as the decorative techniques employed by the craftsmen of the time, the workshops where it was produced, and the regions in which it was distributed. In order to decipher the various social and economic dynamics, it is crucial to understand the distribution, diffusion and possible incorporation of imported materials into typologies and decorations produced in different workshops and with different techniques. The typological characteristics of the pottery indicate its use.

In this part of the thesis, the pottery recovered from Komana during the excavations between the years 2018-2020 will be reviewed. The primary undisturbed contexts between T10-15 of trenches 297/608 and 307/608 contain a large quantity of pottery finds. All the material in this context has been thoroughly investigated. Particularly, which groups are concentrated in terms of quantity will be considered together with the examples that stand out in the repertoire with their different characteristics even though they are few in number. Although a general assessment of the pottery will be based on the categorization of the pottery in this study; which groups are included in the scope of the research will be explained and detailed together with the reasons and characteristics of each group.
Through the specific case of Komana, one of the aims of the dissertation is to obtain indications of the possible network of connections between North-Central Anatolian plateau and distant territories. The dataset that allows for an understanding of the network dynamics of the region, among the finds uncovered during the excavations carried out between 2018 and 2020, stems from the pottery repertoire. Since it is quite difficult to trace the production centers and distribution areas of the undecorated pottery groups with the available data at this stage, and may require an archaeometric study along with clay analysis to answer the questions that form the basis of the research, two pottery groups have been chosen from the entire pottery repertoire. Both groups were selected from the fine ware, the densest category of the repertoire, the first being the banded ware, painted and decorated with concentric circles, and the second the Hellenistic Color-Coated Ware, characterized by handles with loops on the sides and depressed in the middle.

- **General Characteristics:**

  The 2018-2020 excavation seasons of Komana, revealed, in newly discovered partially contaminated and primary undisturbed contexts, a significant amount of pottery with characteristics different from those found in upper levels of the mound. These sherds were studied together with the other small finds, particularly coins, found in the same contexts, and the results show that this pottery group mostly dates to the Late Iron Age-Hellenistic Periods. A comprehensive literature review was conducted after this initial study in order to date this pottery group more precisely and to relate it to the surrounding settlements. The research is expected to facilitate the understanding of the economic position of Komana in the region during the Late Iron Age and Hellenistic periods, as well as the dynamics of interregional and overseas relations within and beyond its geographical region. Initially, the study focused on centers in north-central Anatolia, but was later expanded to include data from a wide area stretching from the present-day central Black Sea littoral in the north, to Cappadocia in the south and inland of the Anatolian plateau in the west.

  Characteristics like fabric, typology, production or intended use, and decoration, if any, are the parameters for the assessment of the archaeological pottery assemblages. The pottery from Trenches 297/608 and 307/608, located next to each other in Area HTP01, was macroscopically classified as “Fine, Medium and Coarse Wares” depending on the thickness of the fabric.

  Geoffrey Summers identified Maşathöyük as the most easterly site from which Komana pottery originated, in personal correspondence. The most recent data suggest that the
distribution of this type of pottery in the east may have extended beyond Maşathöyük. This thesis aims to investigate the potential networks established by Komana and North-Central Anatolia with regions beyond the east. The investigations are oriented towards the archaeological assemblages and are based on the Komana sample. The limited number of archaeological studies and publications in the eastern parts of Anatolian plateau has shifted the focus of research to other regional areas as well. A future study may explore the extent to which Komana and its region are related to the east.

- **Forms/Typology:**

The Komana repertoire comprises of 51 distinct forms, some of which are represented by only one example and some by very few. However, not all of the aforementioned pottery types were included in the scope of the thesis. Instead, a group of painted pottery (Banded Ware) was included among the table wares representing the proportionally dense category. A second group was also included, comprising thin-walled pottery characterized by pinched handles. The primary focus of this study will be on the forms, decoration, and distribution patterns of the two groups of pottery under consideration. In addition, a few examples of pitcher fragments from the Komana pottery repertoire dating to the Late Iron Age and examples thought to be imports will also be included in the discussion.

The pottery repertoire of the Komana of the Late Iron Age and Hellenistic Period encompasses mainly daily use containers such as open vessels, plates, bowls, cups and pitchers. The macroscopic analysis distinguishes four main groups of cups: Carinated Cups, Achaemenid Cups, Mastoid Cups and Lipped Cups. Their number in context is given in Graph. 1, and the majority of cups are small-diameter, hemispherical bowls with a lipped rim.

![Figure 3.4 Number of cups in the Komana pottery repertoire.](image)
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The Komana pottery repertoire contains a dense group of bowls, which are morphologically similar except for slight differences on the rim. The undecorated and unpainted bowls are divided into three groups: 161 flat upturned rim bowls, 144 incurving rim bowls, and 6 flattened rim bowls.

![Figure 3.5 Number of bowls in the Komana repertoire.](image)

The other typological category consists of plates which are classified into five sub-groups as part of the open-formed pottery group. The pottery represented is the plain rim plate (12 small, 5 large), the rounded rim plate (10 small, 5 large), the inverted rim plate (8 in total), the downward folded rim plate (8 in total), and the inward folded rim plate (5 in total).

![Figure 3.6 Number of plates in the Komana repertoire.](image)
Komana has a diverse range of pottery, with pitchers being the most varied type. In all, the number of jug types is 14, dominated by two groups, thickened jugs (7 in total) and jugs with rounded rims (8 in total).

![Potters](image)

**Figure 3.7** Number of pitchers in the Komana repertoire.

### 3.1.7. The Coarse Ware

The limited area of both trenches, as already stated, makes it difficult to obtain a more comprehensive data set for the time being, but the number of coarse ware fragments found in the pottery repertoire is quite limited compared to fine ware and medium ware. The fabrics vary from light brown/buff to darker tones of orange and brown. These coarse ware examples are mainly body sherds, flat-based, conical bodied vessels, probably for daily use, whose rim fragments were not found, and three amphora fragments, one of which is believed to have imported from Rhodes.

![Coarse Ware](image)

**Figure 3.8** Komana Hellenistic Coarse Ware examples (Photo: Ayşe Batman).
3.1.8. The Medium Ware

The medium walled vessels were predominantly undecorated and mostly burnt cooking pots. The sherds indicate presence of domestic activity in the excavated areas. However, the pottery was found to be dispersed throughout the floor levels between the walls, rather than being confined to a specific area. Consequently, identifying the specific area or areas where domestic activity occurred proves to be a challenging task. Medium-walled pots are generally quite burnt. Their fabrics and surfaces vary from very dark brown to black. There are medium to large pores in the fabric and lime and additives such as quartz or quartzite. Fragments in complete profile, handles, and fragments with everted rims constitute this category.

![Figure 3.9 Komana medium ware fragments of cooking pots (Photo: Ayşe Batman).](image)

3.1.9. The Fine Ware

The fine ware is the most represented group in the repertoire of Komana pottery. Carinated bowls, cups, plates and fish plates characteristic of the Hellenistic period, small scaled kylixes and unguentarias are encountered. The fabric textures were generally smooth with occasional inclusions. In addition, chert, quartz, mica, and lime were encountered in the fabric matrix with small to medium pores. In general, the predominant colors of the fabric range from light orange to buff/brown. The entire repertoire was found to consist of wheel-made pottery. While
almost all of the examples are open-formed vessels, most of them are small in size. Possibly, carinated bowls, plates and fish plates with Achaemenid features coexist with small Hellenistic kylixes and unguentarias. This pottery is roughly divided into painted and plain vessels according to their decorative features, and the painted pottery are divided into monochrome, bichrome, and polychrome. Although plain or monochrome pottery constitute the majority of the Komana pottery assemblage, banded examples are again the most common decorated pottery group (Graph. 5).

![Fine Ware distribution in the whole repertoire.](image)

**Figure 3.10** Fine Ware distribution in the whole repertoire.

### 3.1.10. The Late Iron Age Pottery of Komana

The sherds within the scope of the research were found to be reminiscent of the Hellenistic Period in some cases and more indicative of Iron Age patterns in others. The typological and decorative characteristics of the pottery from layers T10 and T15 in trenches 307/608 and 297/608 suggest that the forms, such as thicker-walled bowls and pitchers, and the motifs and colors used on these samples reflect the Iron Age traditions of the pre-Hellenistic period. In fact, the literature review also indicates that examples of pottery similar to Komana are present at multiple sites in Central Anatolia during the Late Iron Age.

- Red/Brown Banded Ware:
  - **Typology:**

    The repertoire of the Komana pottery includes a group of sherds with an orange-buff / brownish fabric color and slightly thicker walls in comparison to the fine ware of the Hellenistic period, but they are classified in the same category. Typologically, cups and bowls are predominant, and 6 of them were even grouped as Achaemenid Cups. Upon analyzing the diagnostic fragments of all the pottery, it was noticed that there are 204 rim fragments
belonging to cups and bowls in the fine ware group. Therefore, in line with the research questions of the thesis, it was observed that painted and decorated pottery is easier to follow in terms of determining the distribution areas than plain examples. Accordingly, only painted and decorated sherds were included in the scope of this study, which aims to determine the networks of Komana and of the territory to which it belongs during the Late Iron Age and Hellenistic Periods.

○ **Decoration:**

The period in question saw a rise in the production of monochrome, grey-slipped pottery, accompanied by a decline in the quality and quantity of painted pottery (Genz, 2011: 161). The defining characteristic of the examples in this group, as opposed to those from the Hellenistic Period, is the presence of a red-brown band decoration on the lip margins of the rims. This decoration in thickness varying between 1cm-1.2cm and encircles the entire rim. In comparison, the closest early examples to the band-decorated pottery of the Hellenistic period at Komana, which will be discussed later in this chapter, are the pottery with band decoration only on the rim and plain on the rest of the surface.

○ **Dating and Distribution of the Red/Brown Banded Ware:**

The Anatolian Iron Age chronologically covers the time between the end of Bronze Age and the Hellenistic Period that began with the death of Alexander the Great. While Goldman divided the Iron Age into three sub phases based on the Tarsus-Gözlükule stratigraphy (Goldman, 1963: 23), there exists another chronological framework accepted for the Anatolian Iron Age based on the Yassıhöyük/Gordion stratigraphy (Matsumura, K., Omori, T. 2010: 443). The presence of the Phrygians in Central Anatolia is characteristic of this period, when political formations changed from empire scale to smaller state structures. In relation with this, the Gordion Iron Age deposits were dated on the basis of the Phrygian settlement levels (Voigt, 2002; 2005, DeVries et al. 2005). Genz, on the other hand, dates the beginning of the Late Iron Age to the end of the 8th and beginning of the 7th centuries B.C. and associates this date with the change in the pottery traditions of eastern Central Anatolia (Genz, 2011: 349). The dating in this study based on the data in the table, which covers both the Iron Age and the first millennium B.C.

The bichrome pottery of Komana consists mostly of thin-walled, small cups. The exterior of these cups often has a poorly applied red/brown braided band. This kind of decoration is also found on the inside of some examples. It can be argued that bichrome pottery paved the way for polychrome pottery, based on Sams' observation that bichrome pottery had been produced
and used since the beginning of the 7th century B.C (Sams, 1978: 228). According to Ökse (Ökse, 1998: 93.), the band decoration technique has been used since the end of the 7th century B.C. and such examples can be found in the pottery repertoires of Alacahöyük (Koşay, H. Z. and M. Akok, 1966: 69), Alişar IV c M (Osten, 1937:n132-134), Maşat Höyük II (Özgüç, T., 1971), Akalan (Cummer, 1976), Kuşaklı (Müller-Karpe, A., Segschneider, M. & Stümpel, H. 1995). Kealhofer and Grave suggested that red paint decoration was dominant in the Late Iron Age and that vessels with red bands around the rim were the distinctive pottery group of the period as "Red-Banded Wares" (Kealhofer & Grave, 2011: 421).

One of the most interesting comparanda site that has very similar Red/Brown Banded Ware examples of Komana was the Gövezli Tepesi Höyük. It is located within the borders of today’s Karaman. While all the above mentioned relatively north central Anatolian sites that have similar pottery fragments in their repertoires, examples from a very southern site were surprising and more promising to understand the extension of the distribution of these sherds within the Central Anatolian plateau. The time frame between the 7th-4th centuries B.C. were dated to the Late Iron Age in Gövezli Tepesi chronology and in relation with this, the presence of similarly painted cups were represented with a few sherds in the Middle Iron Age contexts but there was a dramatic increase in the number of these shallow cups within the Late Iron Age levels (Ergürer, 2018: 69).

![Figure 3.11 Komana red/brown banded wares (Photo: Ayşe Batman).](image)
Figure 3.12 Gövezli Tepesi höyük red banded ware examples (Ergürer, 2018: 86).
Table 3.1 Stratigraphic sequence of Yassihöyük / Gordion.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Settlement</th>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Approximate Dates</th>
<th>Settlement</th>
<th>Periods</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yassihöyük/Gordion</td>
<td>Roman</td>
<td>1st century B.C.-3rd century A.D.</td>
<td>Tarsus/Gözlükule</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yassihöyük/Gordion</td>
<td>Late Hellenistic (Galatian)</td>
<td>3rd century B.C.-189 B.C.</td>
<td>Tarsus/Gözlükule</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yassihöyük/Gordion</td>
<td>Early Hellenistic</td>
<td>330 B.C.-3rd century B.C.</td>
<td>Tarsus/Gözlükule</td>
<td>Late Iron Age (600-330 B.C.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yassihöyük/Gordion</td>
<td>Late Phrygian (Achaemenid)</td>
<td>540-330 B.C.</td>
<td>Tarsus/Gözlükule</td>
<td>Late Iron Age (600-330 B.C.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yassihöyük/Gordion</td>
<td>Middle Phrygian</td>
<td>800-540 B.C.</td>
<td>Tarsus/Gözlükule</td>
<td>Middle Iron Age (800-600 B.C.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yassihöyük/Gordion</td>
<td>Early Phrygian Destruction</td>
<td>800 B.C.</td>
<td>Tarsus/Gözlükule</td>
<td>Early Iron Age (1200-800 B.C.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yassihöyük/Gordion</td>
<td>Early Phrygian</td>
<td>900-800 B.C.</td>
<td>Tarsus/Gözlükule</td>
<td>Early Iron Age (1200-800 B.C.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yassihöyük/Gordion</td>
<td>Initial Early Phrygian</td>
<td>950-900 B.C.</td>
<td>Tarsus/Gözlükule</td>
<td>Early Iron Age (1200-800 B.C.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yassihöyük/Gordion</td>
<td>Early Iron Age</td>
<td>1200-950 B.C.</td>
<td>Tarsus/Gözlükule</td>
<td>Early Iron Age (1200-800 B.C.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Polychrome Painted Ware:**
  - **Typology:**

A total of three painted and decorated pitcher fragments were identified in the entire Komana pottery repertoire between 2018 and 2020. These fragments can be considered a notable group of pottery due to their usage, decoration, and relatively proportionately less quantity. There are body sherds; one with a complete handle and several attached body sherds, one fragment includes ¾ complete rim and neck, and one with a ¼ neck and ¼ shoulder. The fabric of all pitcher fragments is orange-light orange.
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Figure 3.13 Iron Age Painted Ware pitcher fragments.

Decoration:

The decoration of these pitchers can be considered an essential aspect that highlights their prominence in the entire repertoire. Two of the fragments are characterized by geometric patterns, including triangles and diamonds with diagonal lines. The decorations on the pottery were painted using darker colors on a light-colored background in beige tones. The use of red, brown, black, and white on these sherds suggests that they can be identified as polychrome examples, distinct from the Red/Brown Banded Ware category found in the Komana Late Iron Age repertoire. The third fragment belongs to another bichrome pitcher with inverted triangles on the neck and continuous and consecutive semicircular motifs resembling a basket on the shoulder on a light-colored slipped background. In contrast to the Komana fragment, however, the continuous semicircular motifs on the examples found at different sites within the scope of the research were hollow and decorated only with sequential dots. In this respect, the Komana example remains unique for the time being.

Figure 3.14 “Pot”, Phrygian Period. Alaca Höyük Museum.
The Middle Iron Age pottery decoration traditions encompass a variety of techniques, including the use of stamps, paint decoration, and incision (Yılmaz, 2016: 71). Additionally, the style is characterized by the extensive use of concentric circles, as well as fully dotted/painted diamond shapes, and also by the use of animal motifs, especially the deer motif, and the use of these patterns to cover the entire exterior surfaces (Batman, forthcoming). However, Late Iron Age (559-330 B.C.) pottery traditions demonstrate differences both in typology and decorations. The increased interaction of the interior of the Anatolian plateau with the west during this period suggests that Greek pottery forms, which were already in use on the littoral, were also introduced in the inland territories (Kealhofer & Grave, 2011: 421).

The motifs or compositions on decorated pottery, such as jars, pitchers, and trefoil-mouthed oinochoes, are known to be limited to panels with distinct margins and generally light backgrounds during the Late Iron Age. Özgüç associated the presence of paneled decorations on polychrome fragments and red/brown banded examples with the Pontic region (Özgüç, 1972). It is clear that similar examples from the contemporary settlement levels of Boğazköy and Kaman-Kalehöyük are actually examples of Late Iron Age pottery in which the decoration is localized to the shoulders and body of the pottery in a panel, as contrasted to the Middle and Early Iron Age traditions in which the decoration is extended over the entire surface. There are different approaches to the distribution of this method, which can also be defined as "Panel Decoration Technique". The Polychrome pottery similar to Komana examples were uncovered in the Late Iron Age layers of Boğazköy (Level BK1) (Matsumura, 2005: 238) and Kaman-Kalehöyük (Levels IIa6-IIc1-IIa3-5) (Matsumura, 2000, Genz, 2000), both of which were densely occupied settlements in Central Anatolia during the Iron Age. In addition to these, KMik Höyük level V, dating from the end of the Early Iron Age and the beginning of the Middle Iron Age (11th-9th centuries B.C.), contains an example of a comparanda similar to the first of these three pitcher fragments of Komana (Ergürer, 2016: 92).

Additionally, another point to be mentioned, which will be discussed in greater detail in the subsequent pages of this chapter, is that similar Komana examples have been identified at sites in the inland regions of the Anatolian plateau during the literature review. Attempts were made to examine these similar specimens on site and in the context of their assemblages and to compare them with Komana finds during the ongoing excavations at some of these sites. However, 2020's global pandemic did not allow for this to be completed. However, during personal visits to Çorum, Boğazköy, Alacahöyük, and the Anatolian Civilizations Museums, these examples were encountered on display. It was determined that in addition to the
examples from Eskiyaşar and Boğazköy, there are also Komana-like examples that are exhibited without specifying the site where they were found.

**Figure 3.15** Late iron age pitcher from Eskiyaşar (Currently of exhibition at Çorum Museum) (Photo: Ayşe Batman).

**Figure 3.16** Late iron age pitcher from Eskiyaşar (Currently on exhibition at Çorum Museum) (Photo: Ayşe Batman).
These data suggest that pottery decorated with the "Panel Technique" is predominantly found in Late Iron Age contexts at sites within the Halys Basin. However, it does not seem possible to identify a similar group of finds at Gordion, another site with Iron Age occupational levels located inland of the Anatolian plateau. Gordion’s chronology is consistent with the “Late Phrygian” phase of the 4th century B.C. and with the late phases of Boğazköy Büklükale I a, Alişar 3-2 M and Maşat Höyük I, Kültepe I and Kaman-Kalehöyük Ila in Central Anatolia (Ökse, 1999: 87.). In the occupation layers of Gordion, which dated to the 4th century B.C.,
corresponding to the Late Iron Age and defined as the 'Late Phrygian Phase', newly included in the repertoire are carinated cups that show Achaemenid elements of the period, as well as one-handed jugs and trefoil-mouthed oinochoes in which the Early and Middle Phrygian traditions are continued, but it was found that the 'panel decoration technique' was not used in these samples, some of them have band decoration and some are burnished. (Stewart, 2010: 46; Toteva, 2007: 381). Therefore, in light of these findings, one can conclude that the Komana examples more closely resemble the pottery repertoire found in the north and south of Central Anatolia.

3.1.11. Hellenistic Banded Ware of Komana

The banded ware has been the subject of various studies since the beginning of the 20th century regarding its dating, distribution areas, production centers, and thus, whether it belongs to a specific population. The earliest description and titling of band decorated pottery was made by Zahn in 1907. According to Zahn (Zahn, 1907: 231), these band decorations were accompanied by floral motifs and referred to this group of pottery as "Galatian Ware". On the contrary, De Genouilliac attributed the banded pottery to a specific region rather than an ethnic group, and referred to it as "Cappadocian Ware" (De Genouilliac, 1927). It was additionally proposed that the decoration of the pottery with varying width band motifs applied in a polychrome manner was not commonly seen on the examples dated prior to the first half of the first millennium B.C. (Zoroğlu, 1979: 347).

Subsequent studies have yielded divergent viewpoints on linking this pottery classification to a particular ethnic group or a region. As a result of research in Samsun and the surrounding area, Akarca (Akarca, 1960: 145) determined that referring to this pottery group as “Galatian Ware” would be wrong and that Kara Samsun could be the production center. In their study "La céramique dite 'galate' du basin du Kızılırmak" (Özsait and Özsait, 2003: 332), Özsaitstated that, the banded pottery group was found at also Pontic settlements and the Amasya region in North Central Anatolia in addition to the settlements of the Halys Basin. Conversely, the typological characteristics of this group of pottery, in addition to the fact that they are painted and decorated, have led to divergent arguments regarding whether they represent a stylistic innovation or a continuation of an existing practice. In relation with this, the decorations, predominantly in colors ranging from black to red on light backgrounds, would have been a continuation of Late Iron Age traditions (Bittel, 1974: 233-237; Maier, 1963: 215-252; Zoroğlu, 1979: 345). Körsulu also suggested that this group of pottery was used during a period spanning from the Iron Age, Hellenistic period to the Roman periods in Anatolian plateau, and that this tradition was a continuation of the Phrygian Iron Age pottery tradition (Körsulu, 2014: 267).
## Table 3.2 Types, dating and properties of banded ware pottery.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>DISTRIBUTION AREAS</th>
<th>PROPERTIES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kelenderis Banded Ware/Band Decorated Pottery</td>
<td>6th-4th centuries B.C.</td>
<td>-Israel (Tel Dor, Akko, Ashkelon) -Kinet Höyük, Al Mina</td>
<td><strong>Fabric &amp; Typology:</strong> Fine Ware: bowls, plates, Coarse Ware: jugs, table amphorae, hydriae, <strong>Decoration:</strong> -Smooth surface, -Decoration: Broad bands, wavy lines, -Black Banded and Red Banded Examples, <strong>Other:</strong> -Combination of Greek nuances with Achaemenid styles.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Anatolian Banded Ware</td>
<td>Late 4th – Mid. 2nd centuries B.C.</td>
<td>Eskişehir, Kızılırmak Basin, Southern Black Sea Littoral, Çatal Höyük</td>
<td><strong>Fabric &amp; Typology:</strong> -Buff, semi-fine fabric, -Dishes, fish plates, hanging rim platters, bowls, <strong>Decoration:</strong> -Slipped, -Concentric bands, -Fine Ware, <strong>Other:</strong> -Characterized with Gordion Middle Hell. (240-189 B.C.) -Assoc. with the arrival of Galatians however, existed long before.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delicate Banded Ware</td>
<td>3rd-2nd centuries B.C.</td>
<td>-Priene -Knidos</td>
<td><strong>Fabric &amp; Typology:</strong> -Light reddish to orange fabric, -Hemispherical drinking bowls, slightly curved rim, groove on the outside, -1mm-05mm. thin walls, <strong>Decoration:</strong> -Smoothed surface, delicate, -Horizontal bands, inner and outer surfaces, -First type; clearly separated bands, -Second type; Bands are formed due to the non-uniform application of the glaze. <strong>Other:</strong> -Dated to the 2nd century B.C.,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hellenistic Central Anatolian/East Anatolian Banded Ware</td>
<td>2nd-1st centuries B.C.</td>
<td>-Between Samsun-Amasya, -Between Boğazköy and Tavium -Cappadocia</td>
<td><strong>Fabric &amp; Typology:</strong> -Fine Ware, fine fabric, -Bowls, cups, plates, jars, kantharoi, amphorae, <strong>Decoration:</strong> -Polished surface, -Both use of concentric bands and bands, -Polychrome: red, black and white, <strong>Other:</strong> -Zahn “Galatian Ware” at Boğazköy, -Maier “Late Phrygian Ware”,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

8 Stewart, 2010.  
• **Typology:**

The analysis of the fragments indicates that the collection of 45 band-decorated sherds is the most significant collection of painted and decorated pottery/ fine ware in the entire Komana repertoire. In this dissertation only number of these sherds are studied. As previously mentioned, the most prominent forms in the fine ware category are bowls, cups and dishes. Diagnostic fragments belonging to this category are limited to rim, base, and body sherds. There are no handle fragments. The macroscopic analysis of the fabrics reveals the inclusion of lime, chert, quartz, and in some cases mica particles in all of the orange to pale orange, beige-colored fine ware.

![Figure 3.19 Typological and decorative statistical analysis of the Banded Ware of Komana.](image-url)
• **Decoration:**

The texture of the Komana Banded Ware pottery, its quality of manufacture and the decorations suggest that these pottery were produced with more sophisticated and advanced techniques than the Late Iron Age examples.

The surfaces of banded ware sherds are covered with pale brown/dark beige slip. Concentric bands of varying thickness have been painted over these light backgrounds. They range on a gradient from orange-brown to reddish brown. In some exceptional cases, the use of band decoration has diversified.

While band decoration is rarely found on the exterior surfaces of the pottery, there are instances of such decoration on the exterior surfaces in the assemblage. An example for this is a rim fragment that shows brown, black, reddish-orange, and white bands on a smooth orange surface on both interior and exterior surfaces. A sherd of a plate has three concentric white bands after the background has been transitioning from light brown to dark. In all examples of banded fine ware, the bands are distinctly smooth and precise, suggesting the use of compasses in their execution.

The band decorations were the main decorative pattern of the sherds belonging to this category, but additional motifs were also used intermittently and divided the motifs into two groups: the first group includes triangles, friezes and zigzag motifs; the second group includes floral motifs (Zoroğlu, 2011: 519). Nevertheless, there are also arguments that floral patterns are not inherently unique to the Hellenistic pottery of the inland of the Anatolian plateau. The examples with floral motifs referred to by Akarca are among them most frequently found along the Black Sea littoral (Akarca, 1960: 145). It is additionally proposed that the Hellenistic Period inland pottery decoration tendency is characterized by the utilization of bands, which are composed of concentric circles (Zoroğlu, 2011: 517).

In the context of Komana band-decorated pottery, the presence of floral motifs is not a common occurrence, with the exception of one example (Ephesianizing (?)). However, there are examples of pottery decorated with plant motifs, which are classified in a separate category. The unique example is a polychrome base sherd decorated on both sides with a "dog-tooth pattern" and floral motifs on a pale background with a buff fabric; it is similar to the pottery of the "Ephesianizing Ware" type of the 7th and 6th centuries B.C.
Although Gürtekin Demir states that this type of pottery is only found in Sardis and Daskyleion (Gürtekin Demir, 2002: 116), it should be taken into consideration that Komana was ruled by the satrapy of Daskyleion during the Achaemenid period. While the similarities are highlighted in the case of the mentioned sherd, it is also thought that it may belong to the pottery group called "Kızılırmak Basin Ware or Galatian Ware". In relation to this, it is proposed that the pottery group with a small elliptical-shaped bud decoration at the point where two or more bow-shaped leaf motifs hatched with crossed stripes come together is a category belonging to the so-called "Kızılırmak Banded Ware" (Zoroğlu, 2011: 519). Similar to this statement, the leaf motif on the Komana sherd, filled with black lines, is reminiscent of the bud and leaf motif on another example found at Eskiyapar mentioned by Zoroğlu (Zoroğlu, 1986: 226), while the zigzag motifs are similar to those found at Kızkayası I, west of Amasya (Özsait and Özsait, 2003: Pl.IV, III).

Figure 3.20 Ephesianising ware examples from daskyleion (End of 7th century B.C.-5th century B.C.).

Figure 3.21 “Kızılırmak Ware” example from Eskiyapar (2nd century B.C.) (Zoroğlu, 2011: 251, Pic. 5, Drw. 4).
Geoffrey Summers conducted a macroscopic examination of a significant portion of the pottery repertoire included in this thesis and stated in a personal interview that there is a high concentration of sherds belonging to the group he calls "Central Anatolian Banded Ware," and that the base sherd mentioned above may be a very well made imported Hellenistic sherd with smooth fabric and surface and decoration patterns.

- **Dating and Distribution of the Hellenistic Banded Ware Pottery:**
  
  - **Southern Black Sea Littoral:**

  As one of the few sites where Hellenistic Period settlements can be observed in their primary undisturbed contexts, Kurul Kalesi also contributes to our understanding of the littoral-inland interactions. The pottery assemblage of Kurul Kalesi reveals that the majority of the examples are non-diagnostic body sherds. These sherds exhibit a buff/light red fabric structure and are represented by both fine ware and coarse ware examples in terms of form. Furthermore, the decorations include colored band decorations of ivy garlands, which can be dated between the

Figure 3.24 Kurul Kalesi “Painted Pottery from Kızılırmak Basin” examples (End of 2nd century B.C. - first half of the 1st century B.C. (Yorulmaz, 2019: Pl. XXVIII).

- The North-Central Anatolian Plateau and Cappadocia:

Another significant site lies to the west of Komana within the borders of today’s Amasya. This site, Oluz Höyük, was also the capital of the Mithridatic Kingdom during the Hellenistic Period. It is situated in close proximity to Komana, in the vicinity of Sebastopolis, Neocaesarea, and Maşat Höyük. The study of Komana pottery began, and Oluz Höyük was one of the first sites to be examined in terms of its Hellenistic and Late Iron Age contexts. Despite the limited number of excavations in the north central Anatolian region, Oluz Höyük has been identified as one of the most crucial sites for systematic archaeological exploration since 2007 under the direction of Prof. Dr. Şevket Dönmez. Notably, the chronology of Oluz Höyük exhibits some differences with other sites in the central Anatolian plateau, such as Gordion, which has been used for the dating of Komana deposits.
Table 3.3 Oluz Höyük chronological sequence of the occupation layers (Dönmez, 2014: 257).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Periods</th>
<th>Architectural Layers</th>
<th>Dates</th>
<th>Trenches</th>
<th>Finds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Medieval Age</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10th-14th cent. AD.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Glazed potsherds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hellenistic Period</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2nd cent.–first half of the 1st cent. BC.</td>
<td>A, B and C</td>
<td>Coins of Mithradates and an Iron helmet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late Phase of the Late Iron Age (Achaemenid)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Last quarter of the 5th cent.–3rd cent. BC.</td>
<td>A, B and C</td>
<td>A cultic vessel with a camel head, an amphora and painted pottery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Phase of the Late Iron Age (Achaemenid)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5th cent. BC.</td>
<td>A, B, C and D</td>
<td>An Achaemenid seal, a cultic vessel in form of a female breast and a crater sherd, painted with partridge figures, painted pottery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Phase of the Late Iron Age (Late Phrygian)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6th cent. BC.</td>
<td>A and B</td>
<td>A Phrygian seal and painted pottery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Iron Age</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7th cent. BC.</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Painted pottery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Classical Phrygian)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Iron Age</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8th–8th cent. BC.</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Painted pottery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Classical Phrygian)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late Bronze Age</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15th–13th cent. BC.</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>A Hittite seal, sickle blade and an arrowhead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Hittite Imperial Period)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Bronze Age</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4th–3rd millennium BC.</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Potsherds</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Hellenistic painted pottery examples from Oluz Höyük were grouped under the category of "Central Anatolian Local Hellenistic Pottery," and these were compared with the examples from the Hellenistic settlements within the Halys Basin (Dönmez, 2014: 259). However, these have different painted styles when they are compared with the Komana examples.

Figure 3.25 Oluz Höyük Hellenistic painted pottery (Dönmez, 2014: 259).

The second occupational layer of Oluz Höyük has been accepted as a transitional layer from the Late Iron Age to the Hellenistic period. In relation to this, Dönmez proposed the use of the term "Hellenistic Pottery" for the repertoires of the sites located to the north of the Halys or Iris. However, this is not a relevant proposition. Additionally, he posited that these decorative patterns were in use since the 10th and 9th centuries B.C., undergoing modifications in terms of the details and typology of the pots, yet persisting throughout the Roman Period. (Dönmez, 2009: 261). In other words, the similar examples of the Early Hellenistic pottery assemblage of Komana were classified under the name of “Later Phase of the Late Iron Age Pottery” at Oluz Höyük.
An examination of the comparanda suggested that band decorated pottery was used or produced at a number of settlements. Kerkenes Dağı, Çadır Höyük and Uşaklı Höyük, three sites in Yozgat province, are three important centers that played a key part in the establishment and continuation of north-south relations during the first millennium B.C. Their significance on important routes will be discussed in Chapter 4. The fact that these settlements, located at a crossroads, probably connected the north-south and east-west routes will be discussed in detail in the other chapters of this thesis.

Considerable data from Kerkenes and Çadır Höyük pointed to Iron Age levels while recent studies at Uşaklı Höyük produced Hellenistic Period data as well. D'Agostino categorized the examples at Uşaklı Höyük under Lohner-Urban's "Central Anatolian Hellenistic Banded Ware" or "Hellenistic Polychrome Ware of the Galatian Type". These examples are decorated with red and white bands and polished with a light-colored slip to achieve a smooth surface, and possible dated to the 2nd and 1st centuries B.C. (D’Agostino, 2019: 38-40). D'Agostino argued that the forms and decorations on the pottery, went back traced back to the Middle and Late Iron Ages traditions and this grouped pottery discovered at Uşaklı Höyük, identified as "semi-finished shallow bowls with red stripes and wide bands," could be attributed either to the "West Anatolian Banded Ware" of the late 4th to mid-2nd centuries B.C., or to the red-banded group known to have existed in further south of Yozgat and dated to the Achaemenid or early Hellenistic periods (D’Agostino et al., 2021: 70).

![Figure 3.26 “Galatian Ware” from Uşaklı Höyük (First centuries A.D.) (D’Agostino, 2019: 40).](image-url)
The pottery Maier referred to as "Galatische Keramik" includes bowls and cups, but also rim-handled large containers referred to as "amphorae". While the exterior surfaces of the smaller pottery have red/reddish and white thick band decorations on a light/buff background, the larger decorated sherds have both floral motifs and band decorations. There are also thinner band decorations on the interior surfaces of the pottery (Maier, 1963: 228).

Figure 3.27 Examples from Boğazköy (2nd-1st centuries B.C.) (Maier, 1963: 239, 243)

Figure 3.28 “Central Anatolian Banded Ware” examples from Boğazköy (https://www.levantineceramics.org/wares/522-central-anatolian-hellenistic-banded-ware).

Ute Lohner-Urban suggested that, if the production details as well as fabric characteristics were compared with the East Mediterranean groups, which their properties are relatively better known, these “Galatian Ware” examples have thin walls and more significantly, Urban highlighted the use of three colors for the painting or decoration of these pottery, was the reflection of a longue durée tradition of the previous Iron Age period (Lohner-Urban, 2019: 2). The pottery group designated as "Galatische Keramik" within the Tavium repertoire is
predominantly represented by bowls and cups. These vessels are characterized by thin walls, a smooth surface, and a light orange/buff color. They are decorated with dark reddish, well-preserved white and dark/brown, blackish bands. This pottery is dated to the Mid Hellenistic-Early Roman Period (Gerber, 2003: 246-247).

Figure 3.29 “Galatische Keramik” from Tavium/ Büyük Nefes Köy (Mid Hellenistic-Early Roman Period) (Gerber, 2003: 242).

Figure 3.30 “Central Anatolian Banded Ware” example from Tavium (Mid Hellenistic, Late Hellenistic-Early Roman) (https://www.levantineceramics.org/wares/522-central-anatolian-hellenistic-banded-ware).
Following the arrival of Alexander the Great to Gordion and his "cut" of the Gordion knot in 333 B.C., it is not possible to talk about a sharp "Hellenization" of an inland settlement that had been ruled by an eastern monarchy for years. Archaeological evidence indicates that the material culture and architectural remains of the Early Hellenistic Gordion reflect a significant drastic change and this is evident in the reuse of older administrative building materials for the construction of Hellenistic simple buildings, as well as in the construction of new monumental buildings (Dussinberre, 2019: 121). In contrast, another notable occurrence that had a profound impact on both military achievements and the course of the Hellenistic Period was the arrival of the Galatians in the 260s B.C. (Dussinberre, 2019: 121). In that extent, with the production of the black slipped pottery and imitations of the Greek type pottery within Gordion by the local potters during the early Hellenistic Periods (Dusinberre, 2019: 123), can be interpreted as the first impacts of the “Hellenization”. Furthermore, the majority of the Gordian imitations of Greek pottery were of the easily portable variety, as opposed to the larger, more capacious types (Winter, 1988: 63). The Hellenistic pottery of Gordion, which constitutes the westernmost part of the scope of this thesis, has been extensively analyzed by Shannan Stewart. In her studies, Stewart categorized and named band ware into two distinct
groups based on their stylistic characteristics. The "East Anatolian Banded Ware" is associated with Büyüknefes Köy, Amasya, Alişar, Alacahöyük, and Boğazköy contexts, while "West Anatolian Banded Ware" is linked to Ankara, Adapazarı, Çatalhöyük, and Gordion (Stewart, 2010: 100).

Figure 3.32 “West Anatolian Banded Ware” from Gordion (Stewart, 2010: Fig. 60, 241).
In addition to the body sherds with a reddish brown, white, and gray horizontal band pattern on their exterior surfaces, the vessels with "ivy garlands" motifs were also classified together under the category of "Kızılırmak Basin Ware." These examples were dated between the 3rd century B.C. and the 1st century B.C. (Uysal Tezer, 2011: 24, 26, 63). The resemblance of the band-decorated pottery in the group named "Kızılırmak Basin Ware" in the repertoire of Nevşehir Camihöyük to the Late Iron Age examples of Komana is remarkable. Furthermore, the white/beige banded decoration on dark color in the group labeled "Hellenistic and Roman Eastern Sigillata A (ESA) Pottery" at Camihöyük is resembling the white/beige banded decoration on brown color represented by a single example in the Komana Hellenistic Banded Ware repertoire. In this context, a different dating can be proposed for the Late Iron Age and Hellenistic occupation layers of both sites.

Figure 3.33 Kızılırmak Basin Ware (3rd-1st centuries B.C.) (Uysal Tezer, 2011: 135).
The Ziyaretsuyu pottery repertoire includes a total of 26 examples, which have been designated as "Kızılırmak Basin Ware." Four of these examples are decorated with floral motifs (ivy garlands) and band decorations, while the remaining examples are only band decorated (Ortaç, 2006: 341-342). Those with band decoration are dated between the 3rd century B.C. and the 1st century A.D., while those with ivy garland motifs are dated between the end of the 2nd century B.C. and the first half of the 1st century B.C. (Abdioğlu, 2007: 39-40).
In search of parallels for the Banded Ware, the study extended beyond the inland of the Anatolian plateau and the central part of the Black Sea territory to include Cappadocia and Cilicia, in order to investigate the possible southern connections of North Central Anatolia. Komana Cappadocia, now situated in Şar Köy in the Tufanbeyli district of Adana province, was the site where this study initially considered similarly band-decorated Komana pottery, given their shared cult and interrelated religious status. A series of surveys and excavations were conducted by various groups at different times, beginning in the 1960s. During the surveys conducted by Dr. Serdar Girginer in the early 2000s, Hellenistic and Roman pottery assemblages were identified (Girginer, K. S. & Özdemir, F. H. & Kaplan, B., 2007: 231). The study of the Komana Cappadocia pottery assemblage revealed that, in contrast to the vessels decorated with plant and geometric patterns that were in use in the inland parts of the Anatolian plateau during the Hellenistic Period, the Komana Cappadocia examples lacked floral patterns and only featured band decoration. Furthermore, this repertoire is identified as the “Central Anatolian Painted Ware” within the Komana Cappadocia pottery assemblage and dated between the 3\textsuperscript{rd}-1\textsuperscript{st} centuries B.C. (Körsulu, 2014: 47, 92).
In addition to the finds from North-Central and western Central Anatolia, Zengibar Kalesi (Isauria Nova?) which is located within the Konya province, also has similar examples and among the pottery collection at Zengibar Kalesi, there is a particular shallow vessel with oblique walls (Korkmaz & Doğanay, 2015: 349, 356; No. 4) Its open form features an everted rim, and it bears a decoration of concentric band motifs. This vessel presents a striking resemblance to a similar Komana example, both in form and decoration. Korkmaz and Doğanay reported that the Zengibar example resembles the Samaria and Paphos examples from the south only in form, without being decorated with bands. These similar examples have been dated to the Late Hellenistic Period (Korkmaz and Doğanay, 2015: 349).

![Figure 3.38](image)

**Figure 3.38** Zengibar Kalesi banded ware example (Korkmaz & Doğanay, 2015: 356).

There are also examples of banded ware in the pottery repertoire of Porsuk/Zeyve Höyük and Kınık Höyük within the boundaries of modern Niğde. The Porsuk/Zeyve Höyük repertoire includes inverted rim bowls and straight rim bowls with neither inverted nor everted rims. These examples are characterized by band patterns with red or dark brown paint in concentric or radial shapes, and these motifs are similar to those of Boğazköy and are therefore dated to the 3rd-2nd centuries B.C. (Köker Gökçe & Barat, 2022: 142).

![Figure 3.39](image)

**Figure 3.39** Porsuk-Zeyve Höyük “Hellenistic Painted Ware” bowls (Köker Gökçe & Barat, 2022: 142).
Moreover, among the base fragments from the Porsuk-Zeyve Höyük Hellenistic Period painted pottery repertoire, those with high ring bases and spiral-shaped decorations in different dark tones on a light-colored ground, as well as a base example from the Komana Late Iron Age repertoire, are similar in terms of form and decoration.
The banded ware example of Kınık Höyük, consequently dated to the late 4th century B.C., which is defined as "Late Achaemenid", and that this tradition continued in the 2nd-1st centuries B.C., again characterized by Gordion-like examples (Trameri & d'Alfonzo, 2020: 68).
Furthermore, the pottery assemblage of the Kültepe Hellenistic Period occupational layers shares comparable examples with the Komana pottery repertoire. While the assemblage is predominantly composed of painted examples, these polychrome examples have been grouped under the designation of the "Kızılırmak Basin Painted Ware" and are dated to the 2nd-1st centuries B.C. (Tüysüz, 2022: 218). The decorative compositions were predominantly composed of horizontal band decorations, with additional elements including geometric patterns such as triangles, chevrons, and motifs of ivy, leaves, and buds. Additionally, animal figures were incorporated into the compositions (Tüysüz, B. & Kulakoğlu, F., 2023:33-34).
The presence of the “Galatian Ceramic” that were dated roughly to the 3rd and 2nd centuries B.C. (Alkım, 1956: 75) within the pottery assemblage of Kırşehir Höyük, made this site as another comparanda settlement with the Komana examples. Light colored band decorations were used on the exterior of one example and also probably worned out floral motif was also used on the other example.

Figure 3.46 Kültepe Kızılırmak Basin Ware band decorated base fragments (Tüysüz, B., 2022: 735).

Figure 3.47 Hellenistic “Galatian” band decorated examples from Kırşehir Höyük (Alkım, 1956: Fig.20a,20b,21).
Rough Cilicia and Cilician Littoral:

On the other hand; in Cilicia; band decorated examples are found in the pottery repertoire of Kelenderis and Kinet Höyük. The Kelenderis examples are called "Band-Painted Table Ware" and it is suggested that their production started in the 6th century B.C. and they were exported to the whole Levant and Cyprus especially in the 5th century B.C. (Lehmann, G., Shalev, Y., Mommsen, H., Ben-Shlomo, D., Daskiewicz, M., Schneider, G. & Gilboa, A., 2020: 14-20).

Figure 3.48 Kinet Höyük band painted ware (6th-4th centuries B.C.) (https://www.levantineceramics.org/vessels/23323-kinet-hoyuk-kt-7569-02).

Figure 3.49 Kelenderis band painted ware (Late 6th-Mid.4th centuries B.C.) (https://www.levantineceramics.org/vessels/23345-kelenderis-k42-29-7-42-3-75-83).

A closer look at the distribution of the banded decoration revealed that it was not only the most common at Komana, but also in general at the Hellenistic layers of the settlements of the Halys Basin. The band-decorated ware was also found on the littoral of the Middle Black Sea region. Furthermore, examples of this group have also been found in major production centers to the
south of Central Anatolia, in Rough Cilicia and the Cilician littoral. It is important to study the
distribution of the banded ware through Central Anatolia, the southern Black Sea and Cilician
littorals in order to understand trade networks emerging from Central Anatolia.

**Table 3.4** Distribution and Dating of the Hellenistic Banded Ware Pottery in Anatolia.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Ware</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cıngırtkayası/Ordu</td>
<td>Banded Ware</td>
<td>Type 1: Hellenistic Period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Type 2: 2nd-1st century B.C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kurul Kalesi/Ordu</td>
<td>Kızılırmak Basin Ware</td>
<td>End of 2nd century B.C.-First half of the 1st century B.C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akalan/Samsun</td>
<td>Kızılırmak Basin Ware</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boğazköy/Çorum</td>
<td>East Anatolian Banded Ware</td>
<td>3rd century B.C. - Mid. 2nd century B.C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gordion/Ankara</td>
<td>West Anatolian Banded Ware</td>
<td>First three quarters of the 4th century B.C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tavium-Büyüknefes Köy/Yozgat</td>
<td>Central Anatolian Hellenistic Banded Ware</td>
<td>Mid. Hellenistic-Early Roman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uşaklı Höyük/Yozgat</td>
<td>Central Anatolian Hellenistic Banded Ware</td>
<td>2nd-First half of the 1st century B.C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camihöyük/Nevşehir</td>
<td>Kızılırmak Basin Ware</td>
<td>3rd-1st century B.C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kınık Höyük/ Niğde</td>
<td>Hellenistic Banded Ware</td>
<td>3rd century B.C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Porsuk-Zeyve Höyük/ Niğde</td>
<td>Hellenistic Banded Ware</td>
<td>Late 4th-2nd century B.C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ziyaretsuyu/Sivas</td>
<td>Banded Ware</td>
<td>2nd century B.C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Komana Cappadocia/Tufanbeyli-Adana</td>
<td>Hellenistic Banded Ware</td>
<td>Hellenistic-Early Roman Per.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tarsus/Mersin</td>
<td>Band Decorated Ones</td>
<td>Hellenistic Period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nagidos/Mersin</td>
<td>Banded Ware</td>
<td>Late 5th-Mid. 4th century B.C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kelenderis/Mersin</td>
<td>Kelenderis Band Painted Ware</td>
<td>7th-4th century B.C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kinet Höyük/Hatay</td>
<td>(Kelenderis) Banded Ware</td>
<td>Late 6th-Mid. 4th century B.C.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.1.12. Hellenistic Colour-Coated Ware of Komana

- **Typology:**

The other important group in the category of fine ware, is the pinched handled cups. They have
small, pinched, loop-shaped handles and are semi-slipped. Their fabric is different than the
banded ware examples. The group consists of both rim and handle fragments, as well as examples fragmentary handles. While the rim walls are slender, the handles are thicker.
Unfortunately, there are no examples of bases from this group. In proportion, they represent
1/6 of the entire fine ware group. Kögler suggested that this type of cups may have been used
for drinking vessel in which more liquid would be put without the danger of overflowing due to the globular shape of them as well as the more concave rim. (Kögler, 2010: 99). In addition to these, Rotroff defined this pottery as "Hellenistic Color-Coated Ware" (Rotroff, 1991). However, there is also a sub-group of these pottery called "Hellenistic Color-Coated Ware-A".

Figure 3.50 Hellenistic Color-Coated Ware of Komana (Photo: Komana archive).

Figure 3.51 Hellenistic Color-Coated Ware of Komana-Drawing.
• **Decoration:**

The Hellenistic Color-Coated Ware examples from Komana are seem partially slipped in red, dark red, or dark/brown blackish colors on their exterior and fully slipped on their interior surfaces. They are distinguished by their pinched handles. While three of the four examples were being slipped, the base of the cup must have been held with the rim sloping downwards and partially slipped. Therefore, the interior surfaces of these cups are fully slipped, while the exterior surfaces are partially slipped to the middle of the body. Thus, the upper and middle parts of the pottery, including the handles, were slipped, while the lower parts of the vessels near the bottom were left un-slipped. Some sherds that belong to this category, had caused by the technique of dipping them into slip. In fact, the brown/red slipped echinus bowls and plate fragments examples on which slip drops flow from the rim to the base are categorized as "Dribble Ware" in the Early Hellenistic pottery repertoire of Kinet Höyük and dated to the 3rd century B.C. (Gates, 2005: 167).

Among the examples, there are also sherds without slip. The varying thickness of the sherds with non-slipped examples being thicker may indicate that the slipped sherds might have been imported while the non-slipped were locally made. While this possibility remains, further investigation suggests that the slip applied as a very thin texture is not of Sigilatta quality and that the cup surfaces in question may have been abraded and found to be plain. In support of this view, another opinion was expressed by Andrea Berlin in a personal interview; she stated that the group in question lacked a high-quality fabric texture and that the applied slips were not particularly durable.

• **Distribution and Dating of the Hellenistic Color-Coated Ware:**

In the course of the study, the settlements along the southern Black Sea littoral were first examined in order to find examples that could be compared with the Komana Hellenistic Color-Coated Ware examples, in consideration of the possibility that they could have been an import group.

The initial data obtained in the research along the Black Sea littoral within the scope of the dissertation were found in the pottery repertoire of Cingurtkayasi (Fatsa). These examples have been designated as "bowls with curved handles" (Erol, A. F. & Tamer, D., 2023:115).

Additionally, analogous examples can be observed on the pottery of Kurul Kalesi (Ordu), another settlement on the littoral (Yorulmaz, 2019: 110).
Figure 3.52 Cingirtkayası “Bowls with curved handles” (Erol, A.F. & Tamer, D. 2023: 147, Cat.No.4).

Figure 3.53 Kurul Kalesi “Hellenistic color-coated ware” (3rd – 1st centuries B.C.). (Yorulmaz, 2019: 455, Pl.24).

In addition to these, it is suggested that, a group of fragments from the pottery repertoire uncovered during excavations on the island of Giresun-Aretias/Khalkeritis, a little to the east of Ordu, which is defined as the easternmost point of the thesis, may belong to the Hellenistic Color-Coated Ware group and possibly be imported pottery. (Doksanalti & Ekici, 2017: 396).
These cups, which are characterized by pinched handles and similar slipping techniques, are also present in the Gordian pottery collection. Stewart affirmed that the presented example is a representative of the Hellenistic Color-Coated Ware-A category in all its elements, including form, color, and fabric characteristics (including inclusions) and this group is represented by one example in the Gordian pottery assemblage and is distinguished from the other fragments by its unadulterated, buff-colored fabric and "recurved" handles (Stewart, 2010: 163-164).

**Figure 3.54** Gordian “Hellenistic color-coated ware-a” example (Late 3rd-Early 2nd centuries B.C.) (Stewart, 2010: 163-164).

Besides Gordion and Komana, Kültepe is the other inland settlement that has examples of Hellenistic Color-Coated ware in the Hellenistic pottery assemblage. However, it is represented with only one example, the transportation of these vessels to the inland settlements from the coastal harbor settlements or they were local imitations of the imported pottery should be the question of further investigations. The Kültepe example is called a "Π"-shaped handle cup within the Kültepe repertoire and is dated to the middle of the 2nd century B.C.-1st century B.C. (Tüysüz, 2022: 221). On the other hand, the Knidian "Π" shaped handle cups were taken as comparanda for the Kültepe example, but the forms of the handles may have some differences. While the handles of the Knidian cups were not pinched, the Kültepe example seems to have a pinched handle. Also, the rims of these cups are very important in identifying the shapes. Therefore, the missing rim of the Kültepe example raises questions.

**Figure 3.55** “Π” shaped handled cup from Kültepe (Tüysüz, 2022: 494).
In the course of the research it was noticed that some of the Hellenistic contexts of certain settlements in Cilicia also yielded pottery similar to the Komana examples. These are as follows; one thin-walled, dipping red slipped, rim-pinched handle fragment at Nagidos (Durukan & Körsulu, 2007: 200), two examples at Tarsus-Gözlükule (Goldman, H, Jones, F. 1950: Fig. 181, 182, Abb. 122), and a personal communication with Peter Stone revealed that there were only a few fragments at Kinet Höyük, whereas more were expected. He stated that he classified these fragments as "Rhodian Classical-Hellenistic Color-Coated Ware", "Rhodian Fine Ware/Cilician Hellenistic Slipped Fine Ware", "Cilician Hellenistic Slipped Fine Ware (?)" and "Unknown Place of Production" according to their fabric, form and finish. Additionally, he mentioned the fact that, Kinet Höyük examples are also semi-slipped, with dribble effect and pinched handles, and that there is a suggestion of one of them being a local product, while the others are imports. Furthermore, in his previous study of the Antioch repertoire, he stated that out of an average of 2000 diagnostic sherds, only 5 could be included in this categorization.

Figure 3.56 Nagidos (first half of the 1st century B.C.) (Durukan & Körsulu, 2007: 200, Cat. No. 67).

Figure 3.57 Kinet Höyük_1 Cilician Hellenistic (?) (Photo: Kinet Höyük archive).
Figure 3.58  Kinet Höyük_2 Rhodian Classical Hellenistic color-coated ware (Photo: Kinet Höyük archive).

Figure 3.59  Kinet Höyük_3 Rhodian fine ware/Cilician hellenistic slipped fine Ware (Photo: Kinet Höyük archive).

Figure 3.60  Kinet Höyük_4 unknown place of production (Photo: Kinet Höyük archive).
Additionally, examples of Hellenistic Color-Coated Ware with pinched handles have been identified among the Hellenistic Period pottery from Miletus (Pfrommer, 1985: 50, 55, 56, 68) and Didyma (Wintermeyer, 2004: 144, Fig. 1395) in the Ionia region in the western littoral of the Anatolian plateau.

Figure 3.61 Miletos hellenistic color-coated ware example (Pfrommer, 1985: 50, 55, 56, 68).

Figure 3.62 Didyma Hellenistic color-coated ware example (Wintermeyer, 2004: Fig. 1395).

In the course of the research, comparable examples were encountered in the settlements on the Central Black Sea littoral and in Rough Cilicia on the Anatolian plateau. There are different suggestions about the production centers and the areas of distribution of the Hellenistic Color-Coated Ware beyond the territory of Anatolia. The first suggestions for their distribution were given by Kenrick and Hayes, who suggested that they were found in Nea Paphos in Cyprus (Hayes, 1991: Figs. XII, 1-3) and Aigios in the eastern Mediterranean, the Black Sea and northern Africa, in particular Egypt (Kenrick, 1985; Hayes, 1991).
Rotroff, while referring to their distribution in the Aegean, underlined that examples of this group also have been identified in Hellenistic contexts of some settlements in the Black Sea basin (Rotroff, 1997: 117-118). The study conducted by Domzalsky contributes to the existing data concerning their distribution in the Black Sea basin. The production centers of such pottery, which he claims to be present in a wide range of repertoires such as Nymphaion, Olbia, Pantikapaion, Myrmekion, Phanagoria, Kepoi, Gorgippia, Tanais, Tomis, Bizone, Tyras, Scythian Neapolis, and the outskirts of Vani, either may have been Rhodes or have been
distributed from Rhodes to the territories within the framework of the commercial network established by Rhodes. (Domzalsky, 2007: 166,171). Additionally, Andrea Berlin stated that the cups in question are very common and therefore unlikely to have been produced in a single production center such as Rhodes. Berlin further mentioned that many different fabric and slip textures exist, which supports the idea of multiple production centers.

Figure 3.65 “Hellenistic Color-Coated Ware-A” examples from Pantikapaion and Kepoi (Domzalski, 2007: 168-169).

Figure 3.66 “Hellenistic Color-Coated Ware-A” examples from different sites around Black Sea basin (Domzalski, 2007: 170).

According to Domzalsky, X-ray fluorescence archaeometry of 18 different samples showed homogeneous clay constituents, indicating that the pottery was produced in a single center (Domzalsky, 2007: 173,180). Also, the fabric structure of the Kurul Kalesi sherds contains white lime particles, a small amount of mica, and some of them have small black stone particles, and this structure is also familiar from other types of pottery produced in Rhodes,
Yorulmaz stated that the findings from Kurul Kalesi could also be of Rhodian origin (Yorulmaz, 2019: 112).

Hayes' research on the color-coated pottery from Nea Paphos stands out in terms of distribution in the Mediterranean. On the basis of their fabric, Hayes associated some of the examples with Rhodes, while others are of Levantine production (Hayes, 1991: 23-24). In addition, Berlin also commented on Rhodes' role in trade during the Hellenistic period. According to her; there is not much evidence that Rhodes had a leading position in the production of amphorae and therefore in trade activities, but whether it produced very high quality pottery in the fine ware production is unclear. Berlin added that almost the entire pottery repertoire found at the Kyrenia shipwreck is Rhodes production and not the result of flawless and high quality manufacturing, and that the slip and fabric textures of the Hellenistic Color-Coated Ware type pottery group are not of very high quality (Berlin, 2019). Nevertheless, she personally suggested that this group of pottery may not have been produced particularly in Rhodes, but in Rhodian Perea, which has better quality clay deposits, perhaps in and around Halicarnassus. In relation with this, the Hellenistic examples of colored ware in the Cnidian repertoire were imported and identified as 'Palestinian bowls'; and that 'Cnidian' imitations of these cups were produced (Kögler, 2014: 159), which supports Andrea Berlin's perspective in this regard.

In this context, it can be suggested that similar examples are represented by Pulak and Townsend with two examples in the pottery repertoire from the Serçe Limanı shipwreck, that there are typological differences in the bases of the dipped slipped examples with pinched handles, and that the pottery, which was probably produced in the early 3rd century B.C. and distributed in the 2nd century B.C., has a wide distribution in the Mediterranean, making it difficult to determine the exact location of its provenance (Pulak & Townsend, 1987: 44-45).

![Figure 3.67 “Glazed Bowl” from Serçe Limanı Shipwreck (Pulak & Townsend, 1987: 45).](image)

Also, this type of pottery is not very abundant in the pottery repertoire of the sites where it has been found, even if there are certain subgroups with minor variations (the applied slips and
their quality, the presence or absence of handles). Andrea Berlin stated that these vessels, which are widely distributed, are not intensively found at any one site and are represented by only a few examples. According to Berlin, these examples were probably produced in small workshops and distributed regionally due to the low quality and value of this group of pottery as possible "long-distance trade goods".

Hellenistic Color-Coated Ware may have been in production and use between the second half of the 3rd century B.C. and the second half of the 2nd century B.C., and was in use in the Levant until Eastern Sigillata A-type pottery became popular, according to Peter Stone in a personal interview. Stone stated that the Hellenistic examples of colored ware A are of a finer slip and that the production site was Rhodes, while on the Phoenician littoral, multi-grained and matt-slipped pottery may have been produced in an unspecified number of centers in a region from Akko to Tell-Dor. He also encountered examples from many different centers and that the upper 2/3 of all of them are slipped and the lower 1/3 is left plain. They are found mostly in sites in the eastern Mediterranean, the western littoral of the Anatolian plateau, the Aegean islands, Cyprus, especially in the central and southern Levant, but very rarely in mainland Greece. Stone mentioned that this type of pottery reached the hinterland as far as Gordion, and at this point the Komana examples will undoubtedly contribute to the distribution of the Hellenistic Color-Coated Ware group in the inlands of the Anatolian plateau.

Figure 3.68 Hellenistic Color-Coated Ware example from Gezer/Israel (Late 3rd – Early 2nd century B.C.) (https://www.levantineceramics.org/vessels/22305-gezer-l-31004-b-31050).
Table 3.5 Distribution and dating of the Hellenistic color-coated ware type pottery.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SITE</th>
<th>REGION</th>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>REFERENCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gordonia</td>
<td>Galatia</td>
<td>189 B.C.</td>
<td>Stewart, 2010. Pg. 163-164, Fig.237, No: 378.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gözlükule</td>
<td>Cilicia</td>
<td>Mid. Hellenistic Per.</td>
<td>Jones, 1950. Fig. 181, 82, Abb.122.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nagidos</td>
<td>Cilicia</td>
<td>First half of the 2nd century B.C.</td>
<td>Durukan-Körşulu, 2007. 169. Fig. 68, Pg.200.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kinet Höyük</td>
<td>Cilicia</td>
<td>2nd half of the 3rd century B.C.- 2nd half of the 2nd century B.C.</td>
<td>Stone, P. (Personal Comm.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nea Paphos</td>
<td>Cyprus</td>
<td>175/120-100 B.C.</td>
<td>Hayes, 1991. Fig. XII, 1-3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aigios Georgios Hi</td>
<td>Cyprus</td>
<td>Early 3rd c. B.C.-Mid 2nd century B.C.</td>
<td>Berlin-Pilacinski, 2003: Fig. 4, 58-60.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tell Dor</td>
<td>Levant</td>
<td>2nd century B.C.</td>
<td>Gyz-Zilberstein, 1995: 294. Fig. 6.7:1-7.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samaria</td>
<td>Levant</td>
<td>2nd century B.C.</td>
<td>Crowfoot, 1957: 266 Fig.57, 1-2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashdod</td>
<td>Levant</td>
<td>2nd half of the 2nd century B.C.</td>
<td>Dothan, 1971: fig.9, 15, Fig.10, 15, Fig. 16, 1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tell-El-Herr</td>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>2nd century B.C.</td>
<td>Gratien, 1997: Fig.9, k.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attica</td>
<td>Mainland Greece</td>
<td>200-175 B.C.</td>
<td>Agora, XXIX:117.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corinth</td>
<td>Mainland Greece</td>
<td>175 B.C.s</td>
<td>Agora, XXIX: Fig.22, 391.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the course of dating the Hellenistic Color-Coated Ware examples, different dates were proposed for this group of pottery at different sites within the Hellenistic Period contexts. It is suggested that the Hellenistic Colored-Coated Ware type pottery examples from the Hellenistic Period contexts of the settlements in the western, northern, and southern littorals of the Black Sea Basin were first produced in Rhodes and their identification as export
products should be dated to the late 3rd to early 2nd century B.C. (Domzalsky, 2007: 172). Regarding the examples from the Anatolian plateau, it has been suggested that the Kurul Kalesi examples are dated to the end of the 2nd century B.C.-first half of the 1st century B.C. (Yorulmaz, 2019: 274) and were still in use in the 1st century B.C. and the Cingrktayasi examples were also dated to the 2nd-1st half of the 1st centuries B.C. (Tamer & Erol, 2023, 115-116). Additionally, the examples from Giresun Aretias/Khalkeritis are assigned to a wider date range; 2nd-1st century B.C. (Doksanalti & Ekici, 2017: 395-396).

Stone dated the Hellenistic Color-Coated Ware from Kinet Höyük, Antioch and Tarsus/Gözülküle to the second half of the 3rd century B.C.-second half of the 2nd century B.C.; and that they were in use in the Levant until just before the Eastern Sigillata A Type pottery was manufactured and began to be used. The Nagidos sherds; another site where this type of pottery was found in Cilicia; are dated to the first half of the 2nd century B.C. Kögler dated the Hellenistic Color-Coated Ware repertoire of the Cnidus to the mid-2nd century B.C., while the Gordion example is dated to 189 B.C. by Stewart.

- **Hellenistic Periods:**

- **The Position of Komana According to the Pottery Traditions of the Late Iron Age and Hellenistic Periods:**

In order to contextualize the assemblage from the related Komana contexts to consider the decorations of pottery produced in North Central Anatolia and Central Anatolia from the Middle Iron Age onwards. While the forms and decorations of pottery may have the potential to change rapidly, Matsumura suggested that the production techniques may remain mostly stable and not show significant changes over time (Matsumura, 2001: 101). The decorative elements that characterize Early Iron Age pottery are radial motifs, geometric patterns, lozenges, chevrons, tree and deer figures, and are referred to in the literature as Alişar IV type pottery (Akurgal, 1988: 191-195). These elements were modified in later Iron Age phases, with a focus on large vessels like craters. The Upper Kızılırmak Basin is situated between the mountains in the interior of the Central Black Sea region to the north and the beginning of the Taurus Mountains to the south (Ökse, 1998: 299). It is located between the Central Anatolian Plateau and the mountainous area in Eastern Anatolia. Although, in this chapter it refers to the region within the province of Sivas in eastern Central Anatolia, which was surveyed by Tuba Ökse starting in 1992.

The first scientific archaeological investigation in the region was carried out by Durbin in 1971, encompassing the Tokat and Sivas provinces along with their hinterlands (Durbin,
1971). Nevertheless, Durbin's work is still an accepted reference, especially for dating Iron Age painted pottery and classifying it through the identification of its characteristic elements. The data collected from Karatıcı Tepe (near Komana) during the survey in 2004 were also reviewed during the study of Komana banded pottery. It has been determined that there exist similar examples of handmade coarse wares featuring motifs like wheels, rays, dots, and triangles, which Durbin dated to the Early Iron Age, and were typically painted using black and dark brown colors.

During the Early and Middle Iron Age, the exterior surfaces of much decorated pottery were almost completely covered, and additional filling patterns were used in addition to the main motifs. Such pottery decoration was not restricted to a specific area, but was usually found over a large part of the surface. The decorated forms of the Late Iron Age are relatively smaller than those of the earlier phases. On the other hand, the later examples are smaller but more varied in form.

Intensification of ties with the West initiated the introduction of Greek forms in Anatolia in limited numbers, however, the use of traditional decorations on the locally produced pottery draw the attention of the imported imitations. In comparison to earlier periods of the Iron Age, the fabric of the pottery is of better quality, especially due to fewer particles of lime. The smoother surfaces of the pottery as well as the more consistent decoration show a similar attention to detail. The Late Iron Age examples of Gordion in Central Anatolia and Sardis in the West show that, because of locally elected governors and the presence of local artists, eastern cultural inspirations were combined with pre-existing traditions (Toteva, 2009: 320). Kealhofer and Grave claim that in addition to the Phrygian forms commonly used in Central Anatolia, the production and use of imitations of imported Greek pottery, the frequent use of the panel technique in decoration, the establishment of the band decoration style, and the production of polychrome examples in large quantities can be seen as the result of the networks of the region with Anatolia during the Late Iron Age (Kealhofer and Grave, 2011: 421).

The Hellenistic Period was characterized by the rule of different monarchical structures in different geographical zones and at different times during the three centuries leading up to the Battle of Actium in 31 B.C., with a regional or overseas spread. Each political entity probably developed its own material culture traditions over time, but mainland Greece, especially Athens, was a pioneer in pottery production from the 6th to the 4th centuries B.C. with the use of the "Red-Figure" technique. In addition, with the development of the metal industry in the Hellenistic period, Athens became prominent in the production of pottery imitations of metal vessels. (Thompson, 1934: 311).
Even though the Iron Age data from the Paphlagonia region is beyond the scope of this study, it is important to look at it in order to show the characteristics and distribution of banded pottery. Iron Age pottery in the south and southeast of the region is largely Middle and Late Iron Age, but unlike settlements in Central Anatolia and southern part of the Central Anatolia, Sivas and its environs in the east, and Tokat and its environs in north Central Anatolia, the assemblage is similar to the Ikiztepe pottery from the Black Sea coast (Kan Şahin, 2019: 56). Kan Şahin suggests that the decoration of pottery with arbitrary linear figures between the 6th and 4th centuries B.C. was mainly done in two or three colors (Kan Şahin, 2019: 56-58). The painted pottery from Hadrianopolis in Paphlagonia during the Iron Age is different from the examples found in Komana, both in terms of its forms and in the style of painting.
CHAPTER 4

ROUTES AND ROADS IN NORTH CENTRAL ANATOLIA AND ITS SURROUNDINGS: INTER-REGIONAL CONNECTIVITY

4.1. The Effects of the Geomorphological Aspects on the Land Routes

The geographical, climatic, and geomorphological features of a territory directly affect the socio-economic situation of the inhabitants of that region. Thus, agricultural activities and livestock breeding, the use of the sea, rivers and lakes as economic inputs, the use of underground resources for commercial purposes are among as examples of the key elements that shape the socio-economic formation of a territory. The geological timetables reveal that the ongoing tectonic activities within the Mediterranean cause this region to look “young” and almost the same as 2,500 years ago (Migeotte, 2009: 16). Therefore, it would not be inaccurate to suggest that Anatolian plateau is also affected by this natural phenomenon.

Relations between Communities living in different but neighboring regions result in sociological as well as intercultural dynamics, in particular as a result of commercial and economic cooperation and cross-communal transitivity. The formation of these connections can be attributed to various factors such as to explore different opportunities, ahead for social interactions and dynamics of warfare due to a desire to expand borders. The transportation of people by land and sea requires suitable conditions, including climate, geography, and infrastructure such as routes, roads, and vehicles. The geomorphological features of the areas being traveled through can offer advantages in terms of ease of access. Topographical factors, such as the location of rivers and lakes, the existence of mountains or mountain ranges and their altitudes, valleys and natural gorges, play important role in the planning of routes and roads. The natural valleys, passes between mountain ranges and roads along the bends of long rivers in the Anatolian plateau served as natural routes for ancient communities (Ökse, 2007: 35).

However, the establishment of all sorts of connections is directly related to manpower and technological infrastructure. Infrastructure in the scope of cross-communal relations, first of all, encompasses roads and routes for transportation between the territories concerned. The
improvement and development of existing roads and routes, as well as the building new ones or increasing the capacity of existing ones and expand their reach allow for the creation of a system of roads and routes, in other words; a network. Geography plays a significant role in the formation of these connections. Massa notes that the establishment of networks of connections is determined by three factors: the natural conditions along the route, the natural or artificial barriers to mobility, and the proximity or remoteness of the localities (Massa, 2016: 57). The concept of 'Natural Road' recognizes the peripheries of hollow areas, mountain passes, plateau outcrops, flat terrains with no risk of flooding or inundation, river crossings, and other places as natural routes for inter-regional communication (Gürsoy, 1974: 25-26).

Moreover, the terrain characteristics, such as soil structure, rocky areas or the presence of a fault zone, the annual rainfall of the territory through which the road passes, the fact that these roads cannot be used throughout the year, but only seasonally, are some of the factors that determine the layout of the routes (Gürsoy, 1974: 26). It is possible to argue that technological possibilities and competencies correlate with limited or non-existent interactions between regions with difficult topographical terrain. Additionally, political, religious, and social incidents can also contribute to the formation of economic networks. Pre-determined routes between initial and termini can not only serve as a template for roads to be built in later periods, but can also lead to the contrasting creation of alternative routes.

The presence of mountain ranges in the north and south of the Anatolian plateau, running parallel to the Black Sea in the north and the Mediterranean in the south, makes this plateau a naturally closed region. Although the inland plains of the Anatolian plateau were suitable for road construction and interregional transportation networks, the mountain ranges on the peninsula, as well as the beds of major rivers and the large basins they created, posed obstacles to transportation, and communities were often oriented toward certain natural passes through which transportation was only possible (Massa, 2016: 249). Although the interior plains of the Anatolian Plateau were suitable for road construction and interregional transportation networks, the mountain ranges of the peninsula, the valleys of the great rivers, and the wide basins they formed were obstacles to transportation, and communities generally turned to specific natural passes where transportation was only possible (Massa, 2016: 249). It is likely that settlements were built along these natural routes from the 3rd and 2nd millennia B.C. onwards. Fortresses, another type of settlement pattern that will be discussed in the following pages, were also built upon both natural and man-made routes during the Hellenistic Period. Ökse suggested that settlements for caravans must have been planned at frequent intervals along the route, considering that a day's distance was 20 km on foot and 40 km by horse-drawn cart. If the terrain was hilly, more frequent settlements must have been necessary. If the
distance between the two points is too great, land suitable for accommodating caravans (such as water sources and food supply facilities) should have been provided (Ökse, 2005: 16).

Regardless of the purpose of the communication, the most efficient and cost-effective way to cover the distance between origin and destination should be prioritized. The development of more convenient roads for mass transportation can be attributed to the advancement of ordinary life. In prehistoric times, walking paths may have been the only routes between regions. However, after the use of wheels and chariots began to make everyday life much easier, the paths used in the past had to be modified to allow the passage of wheeled vehicles. The construction of new roads aims to facilitate traffic and to reduce the time and cost of travel. In addition, the occupation processes of the settlements built along these roads can provide information about the periods of time during which these roads were in use (Ökse, 2007: 35-45). Even today, many of the railroads and country roads in use on the Anatolian plateau were built on pre-existing natural routes (Ökse, 2005: 15).

Due to their clean water sources and abundant food supplies, the inner flanks of the North Anatolian and South Anatolian Mountain Ranges, which border the inland of the Anatolian plateau, must have been the most favored routes for transportation (Gürsoy, 1974: 28).

![Figure 4.1 The Karalar Fortress (Blucium) and its monitoring road dated to the reign of Deiotarus (105-42 B.C.). (Photo: Ayşe Batman).](image)
Having said that, the difficulty of crossing between the littoral and the inland persists even today, as a result of the North Anatolian Mountain Range. And this is a challenge in antiquity as well as it is today. Considering the North Anatolian Mountain Range as a natural barrier between the littoral and the inland, it is conceivable that the north-south routes should have been built along the most convenient passes of this natural boundary. Additionally, while there exists an east-west route that links the settlements along the littoral, it is the central region that seems to be most conducive to the relationship between the littoral and the inland (Talbert, 2000: Map.87).

The North Anatolian Mountain Range, allows the construction of roads in the north-south direction that is, connecting the littoral to the inland in the zone between Amisos and Kota, which is also the limited littoral band included in this dissertation. The mountains between Amisos and Amaseia have average altitudes between 820m and 900m, making this region more suitable for north-south transportation than the eastern and western parts of the Black Sea (Broughton & Mitchell, 1999: 1220).

Obviously, there must have been a direct correlation between the routes that made this connectivity possible and the settlements built along them. Kinaci emphasized the role of the North Anatolian Mountain Range that extend in East-West direction, in dividing the urbanization process into two different zones. Sinope is located in the littoral of Paphlagonia, with the Iris River to the east and the Halys River to the west, and the settlements of Kotora east of Siden, Kerasos east of Kota, and Trapersus east of Pharnakeia, while the settlements of Amaseia, Phazemontitis, Eupatoria, Kabeira, and Sebastapolis are in the inland of Pontus (Kinaci, 2015: 201-205).

The seas to the north, south, and west of the Anatolian plateau constituted the basis of overseas transportation and commercial networks, while the land routes across the plateau functioned as administrative or military communication systems (Ökse, 2018: 126). The lakes, rivers and their basins in the north, inland sections of the Mediterranean region to the south and the inland of the Anatolian plateau are the other significant geomorphological features that directly affect the road networks. While these formations, created obstacles for easy communication, they at the same time provided natural passages. Especially the rivers provided transportation for trade, where possible contributing to local economies. While topography remained constant, factors such as shifting riverbeds, stagnating rivers, and the accumulation of alluvium in deltas must have caused roads to change over time. Construction of bridges crossing the rivers with evolving technology may have also changed the course of roads (Massa, 2016: 249).
Considering that Anatolia’s terrain, which is as rough as its plains, and its wide rivers, may have provided very difficult conditions for establishing new roads, the idea is put forward to use the existing routes must have been vigorously used for many centuries (Massa, 2011:39). The natural passages and river valleys, according to the ancient writers Xenophon and Arrian, may have provided communication between the poleis on the southern Black Sea littoral and the inland (Doğancı, 2020: 132). Unfortunately, it is almost impossible to talk about bridges and paved roads in the upper Halys region before the Roman Period, the roads must have followed the routes could have been built from the localities where the topographic features allowed them (Ökse, 2007: 36).

Winfield mentioned the existence of four main routes that were used to cross the Anatolian plateau, one of which was used during the Hellenistic and Roman periods for the commercial network between the littoral and the inland of the Anatolian plateau (Winfield, 1977: 151-
This East-West oriented main route starts from the western coast of the Anatolian plateau, continues all the way through the lakes of Beyşehir and Eğirdir, reaches modern Konya and proceeds towards the Cilician Gates on the south (Winfield, 1977: 151). However, the Salt Lake (Tatta Limne), which has an area of 1600 km², does not allow a direct east-west route through the lake; it is necessary to pass from either north or south of the lake. Winfield also suggested that; due to the location and size of the Salt Lake within the central Anatolian territory, it is difficult to talk about a possible direct route leading from the Aegean coast, across central Anatolia and directly to the east (Winfield, 1977: 151). This must be the reason for the existence of an alternative route that runs through the capital city of the Hittites, Boğazköy (Garstang & Gurney, 1959: 32-39), continuing to Sivas and Erzurum, reaching Persia (Winfield, 1977: 155).

Figure 4.3 Eğirdir Lake (Photo: Ayşe Batman).

The location of not only the ancient settlements; but also today’s urban centers are determined by the advantages provided by geographical conditions. Winfield describe some as “gates to the interior” among which he mentions Amisos first and foremost geographical and topographical characteristics that made it one of the crucial passages to the inland. Today’s Ünye (Classical Oenoe) was used by the inhabitants of Niksar and Tokat as a port, Fatsa (Polemonitis) and Giresun (Cerasus) as a crucial settlement that was located at the beginning of a road that reached Nicopolis and other Byzantine sites (Winfield, 1977: 155). Although the
existence of a dependable water source can rank high for the establishment of a settlement, having easy access to and from the location is also a crucial factor at least in terms of enabling the commercial activities. In addition to these, the potential use of rivers as well as their branches for the transportation of trade goods between the Pontic littoral and the inland must have played a significant role.

Iris River, another important stream of the Black Sea Region, which is located on the north-eastern part of the Halys basin, also originates within the borders of Sivas province, however, makes a smaller curve compared to Halys and disembogues into the Black Sea from Çarşamba Plain. The valley formed by the Iris and the fertile plains above it are considered the heart of the territory (Munro, 1901: 53). Considering all these, passes in the valleys between the mountains cannot be seen as the sole geographical features that allowed passages between the littoral and the inland. Winfield states the possible use of the major river valleys as natural passages in antiquity and he listed the names of these rivers at Pontus beginning from the West as; Amnias (Göksu), Iris (Yeşilırmak), Lycus (Kelkit), Harşit Dere, and Acampis (Çoruh) (Winfield, 1977: 158). The routes come from the North to the Central Anatolia and even the inter-regional roads within the basins of the rivers must have met at some point with the East-West directed ones.

4.1.1. The Pre-Roman Roads

Archaeologically, it is difficult to trace the routes of pre-Roman roads, so the repertoire of imported pottery found in the sites can be used as indicators of possible commercial routes, while sites with a defensive system, such as a wall or fortress, can be considered indicators of possible military routes (Ökse, 2005: 15). This chapter will provide a detailed analysis of the existence and potential use of the East-West and North-South routes in the North-Central, Central, and inland of Pontic territories of the Anatolian plateau during the pre-Hellenistic, Hellenistic, and Roman periods. The discussion will be from a broader perspective, while the routes in Cilicia, which lie to the west of the scope of the dissertation, will be discussed in a peripheral manner.

- Bronze Age and Chalcolithic:

The effects of all these commercial and military dynamisms are observable mostly in terms of determination of urban settlement patterns and communication networks. There is limited information on the settlements along the northern littoral zone of the Anatolian plateau during the Prehistoric Period, at least until the Bronze Age, the settlements inland were located closer to water sources and fertile agricultural lands rather than at high altitudes for defense purposes.
In the Bronze Age, when settlements and states emerged human groups had different motivations to move through the landscape such as for trade and to attend communal sacred festivals, which were held in different territories. In other words, as part of mass migrations but for long distance trade which resulted in cultural interactions too. The communication mechanisms initiated and sustained by these factors lead not only to economic relations, but also to cultural interactions across regions or overseas.

Ökse mentioned four natural roads that connected the inland of the Anatolian plateau to the East during the 3rd millennium B.C. The first road came down from the north-central part of the Anatolian plateau and passed through the basin of the Halys River within the plains of Çekerek, Yıldız, and Yıldız. This road had two different divisions:

- The first one was between Tokat-Sivas, which passed from the valleys of Çekerek River, reaches Halys and continued through the mountain ranges of Çamlıbel and Yıldız. The other was between Tokat and Şarkışla, passed through the plains of Yıldızırma and connected the plain of Çekerek to the Halys basin. Ökse referred to a continuous settlement pattern from the Early Bronze Age to the Hellenistic Roman periods, in which even a fortified Hittite citadel was located in the aforementioned region, and this crossing is still in use (Ökse, 2000: 91-92).
- The second road comes from the south-central part of the Anatolian plateau towards Sivas within the plains of Gemerek and Şarkışla and reaches eastern Anatolia after passing the Kızılırmak basin. This road connects Halys with the valleys around İncebel and Şamandağ. In particular, Kahvepınar, which was a continuously inhabited site from the Early Bronze Age to the Hellenistic-Roman period (Ökse, 2000: 97-98), was located on this road.
- The third road starts from the Halys Basin and reaches Altınyayla and the plains of Malatya,

The increase in the number of settlements and villages on the plains of the Anatolian plateau and in Mesopotamia during the last quarter of the 4th millennium B.C. and the first quarter of the 3rd millennium B.C. caused both the renovation of existing roads and the construction of more modern road networks (Massa, 2016: 71). During the second millennium, it is highly likely that more consistent routes were used over longer distances. This may have occurred due to population growth, an increase in the number of settlements, and the prioritization of safety and defense. The Hittite inland of the Anatolian plateau and the Urartians to the east must have considered urban defense to be of vital significance, for they built their city centers on highly defendable ridges (Bryer & Winfield, 1985: 15). The Hittite Empire, which dominated a vast territory for over four centuries, likely constructed a well-organized system
of roads to ensure the stability of its settlements and the communication between its provinces and regions; the only archaeological evidence of these road networks are the rock reliefs found in the excavations at Karabel, Fraktin, Sirkeli, and Keben (Sevin, 2001:4). The Hittite kings of Hattusa in the 2nd millennium B.C. may have used the active roads in central Anatolia to travel south for commercial, religious and military purposes (Summers, 2013: 41-51).

Map 4.1 The Hittite Territory and the Location of Kaska People around 1200 B.C.  
(https://sites.google.com/a/umich.edu/imaldov/maps)

In fact, Ökse, in her study conducted in the Upper Halys region, states that the natural routes used in the Chalcolithic Period were still in use in the early 2nd millennium B.C. (Ökse, 2007: 42), while Faist stated that the Hittites, who were prevailing in the Anatolian plateau during the Late Bronze Age, controlled all of these natural routes and used them for both military and commercial purposes (Faist, 2001: 60-63). During the Hittite Period, settlements had fortification walls of their own dimensions, and that the threats that could come from the roads
leading to the cities could be defended in this way, and gives the regional distribution of important centers with roads between them as the following11:

- North-Central Anatolia: Hattusa (Boğazköy), Hanhana (İnandık),
- Within the Iris River basin: Kizzimara (Gaziura), Anziliya (Zela), Tapigga (Maşat Höyük), Tahazimuna (Dazimon),
- Zalpuwa in the Black Sea littoral (around Bafra (?)),
- In Cappadocia: Kussar (Acemhöyük (?), Kanes (Kültepe), Kumanni (Komana Cappadocia),

In South Central Anatolia: Tuwanuwa (Tyana) (Alp, 2001:48-50). Tapigga (Maşat Höyük) was founded as a defensive city against the raids of the Kashka people from the north and served as a buffer zone (Alp, 2002: 637-640) and additionally, during the Hittite period, the road running through the southeast of the site was north-south and provided traffic between Amisos and Caesernea (Özgüç, 1978: 2-3).

However, despite the geomorphological structures of the Upper Halys region not being conducive to the establishment of large and sophisticated settlements, the region was used by the Assyrian Trade Colonies and the Hittites to reach first Cilicia and then Mesopotamia and the Euphrates region (Ökse, 2007: 43).

The distribution patterns of pottery are the only means of comprehending the existence of an active trade network system within the Anatolian plateau during the third millennium B.C. (Ökse, 2007: 36).

- **During the Colonization of the Black Sea:**

The Greek colonies on the southern littoral of the Black Sea, Sinope and Heracleia Pontica, dominated the sea trade, due to their location on the littoral, which acted as a natural harbor, despite the difficult passes over the mountain ranges (Manoledakis, 2021: 639). Amisos was not as effective as Sinope and Heracleia Pontica in terms of overseas commercial relations but, it established accelerated links with Central Anatolia by using a north-south trade route that passed through Akalan, Amasya, Zela, and Caeserea and reached Tarsus in the south (Tsetskhati, 2011: 202). Bilgi even argues that the route from Amisos to Cappadocia and Cilicia via Amaseia was actively and intensively used during the Assyrian Trade Colonies Period (1950-1750 B.C.) and that the road starting from the south of İkiztepe reached

11 The following list includes only settlements covered in the dissertation. For further information (see Alp, 2001).
Mesopotamia via Dündartepe, Horoztepe, Maşathöyük, Kayseri, Pınarbaşı, Gürün, Drende, Arslanatepe and Kargamış (Bilgi, 1990: 175).

Munro also suggested the same, as Amisos are direct access to Amaseia and Cappadocia with its location between the mountains of Paphlagonia and the Paryadres Range (today's Canik Dağları) and the two major rivers of the Black Sea, the Halys and the Iris (Munro, 1901: 52). On the other hand, Amisos played a significant role in the interaction between the littoral and the inland, as it was at the end of the easiest way to reach the littoral from the inland (Manoledakis, 2017: 217-218).

Calder presented a contrasting view to that of Kiepert, who had proposed that all east-west roads crossing the Anatolian plateau must necessarily pass north of Tatta Limne (Salt Lake) (Kiepert, 1857: 123). Accordingly, the Royal Road was believed to have crossed the Halys and passed through Ancyra (Calder, 1925: 7). Calder, however, argued that this view was erroneous. In opposition to this view, Ramsey proposed that the existence of a road predating the Royal Road, which traversed Pteria into Phrygia and Lydia, could be substantiated by the discovery of monuments at various points along the route, which were dated to pre-Persian times. Upon this comparison, he concludes, contrary to Kiepert, that east-west routes across the Anatolian plateau must have passed either north or south of Tatta Limne, while also agreeing with Ramsey that there must have been a pre-Persian route from the north (Calder, 1925: 7).

[Map 4.2: The Persian royal road (Calder, 1925: 8).]
Persian Roads:

The Persian policy of expansion began with the conquest of Sardis by Cyrus the Great in 547 B.C. By 476 B.C., the end of the reign of Darius, the Persian Empire had expanded into a vast territory defined from the Aegean Sea in the west to India in the east (Sevin, 2013: 6). The system of satrapies under a monarchy was a crucial factor in the ability of this broad territory to remain an empire for so long, as mentioned in the previous chapters of this dissertation. A major reason for the Persian expansion was to gain a monopoly on trading cities and ports throughout the Anatolian Plateau, the Aegean, and the Mediterranean, and to achieve this goal they built the "Royal Road" from Sardis to Susa during the reign of Darius I.

As Young notes, not only the construction of the Royal Road, but also the organization of traffic on it, dates to the reign of Darius I, between 521 and 485 B.C. (Young, 1963: 349). This road facilitated the movement of goods and people, allowing the Persians to control trade in the entire region (Sevin, 2001: 7).
Map 4.4 The illustration of the routes of the Royal Road according to Xenophon Anabasis (Loeb ed., 1918).
The discussion of the archaeological data related to this heavily traveled road has led to many different opinions and, therefore, different maps, since there is limited data on some parts of the road and the names of the settlements mentioned in the ancient sources are different. Nevertheless, Külzer states that there is a broad general concord that the Royal Road passed north of the Salt Lake (Tatta Limne) in the inland of the Anatolian plateau and proceeded eastward (Külzer, 2016: 1).

Additionally, there are two important roads on the Anatolian Plateau that are dated to the Persian Period; the first is the "Royal Road" from Sardis to Susa, and the other is the "Southern Road" that runs south of the Salt Lake and was primarily used by the Greeks and Romans (Ramsey, 1961: 27). The strategic position of the region was enhanced by the fact that the routes of both roads passed through the inland of the Anatolian plateau. The 2,500km route begins at Ephesus and Sardis, reaches Gordion in the Upper Sangarios Valley, then heads south through Pteria to the western province of the inland region leading to Cappadocia, then curves south through the Euphrates Valley to northern Mesopotamia and eventually leads to Susa (Ökse, 2019: 97). Archaeological studies carried out at various sites have revealed the existence of material culture related to Persian roads. One such study was conducted by Young at Gordion between 1950 and 1973. Young argues that Gordion may be one of the 111 "post stations" on the royal road between Sardis and Susa. Archaeological excavations conducted at
Gordion between 1955-1977 uncovered a road more than 6 meters wide, paved with smoothly cut, flat stones on the sides, which may be part of the "trunk road (Young, 1963: 349). The road in question, as described by Young, underwent significant reconstruction during the Roman period and was paved with paving stones and larger rocks (Stephens, 2018: 113, 114).

The archaeological data from Gordion is significant for the dating of the Royal Road. The sounding trench opened in the floor level of the road, which is thought to belong to the Royal Road, yielded pottery examples dated to the late 6th century B.C., while pottery from a building that was apparently destroyed by fire and dated to the mid-6th century B.C. suggests that the trunk road in question existed before Darius I and that Gordion was located on a main route from the west in the mid-6th century B.C. (Young: 1963, 349-350).

![Figure 4.4 Reconstructed Roman Road at Gordion (Stephens, 2018: 114; Fig. 54)](image)

On the other hand, the eastern section of the Persian Royal Road is thought to have continued through Caesarea (Mazaca) and Sebasteia (Sivas), two important centers of the Persian Cappadocian satrapy, to Tonosa (Altinyayla), and then curved southward to Susa via Melitene (Malatya) (Edens, 2003: 130-131). This may have contributed to the economic development of pre-existing settlements along the route, but it may also have led to the emergence of new settlements.
It is beyond doubt that Herodotus’s descriptions and mentions of the Royal Road in his book served as the starting point for the occurrence of the different suggestions by different scholars during the modern era. For example, French selected two "key" words from Herodotus's paragraphs about the Royal Road with an ostentatious perspective: one was "διακεραν" (to go through it) (Herodotus, 5.52.2) and the other was "διαβαινειν" (Herodotus, 7.26). Additionally, he identified the term πυλαι (gates) (Herodotus, 5.52.2) as a reference point for understanding his description of the route. From these points of reference, he proceeded to construct a map of the Royal Road of Herodotus, as follows:

- From Sardis to east (to Phrygia),
- Proceed to the Cappadocian borders,
- To the “Halys Gates”,
- Either “pass” or “run alongside” the Halys,
- Continued towards Cappadocia to the “Double Gates” (French, 1998: 16).
Now the true account of the road in question is the following: Royal stations exist along its whole length, and excellent caravanserais; and throughout, it traverses an inhabited tract, and is free from danger. In Lydia and Phrygia there are twenty stations within a distance of 94 1/2 parasangs. On leaving Phrygia the Halys has to be crossed; and here are gates through which you must needs pass ere you can traverse the stream. A strong force guards this post. When you have made the passage, and are come into Cappadocia, 28 stations and 104 parasangs bring you to the borders of Cilicia, where the road passes through two sets of gates, at each of which there is a guard posted. Leaving these behind, you go on through Cilicia, where you find three stations in a distance of 15 1/2 parasangs. The boundary between Cilicia and Armenia is the river Euphrates, which it is necessary to cross in boats. In Armenia the resting-places are 15 in number, and the distance is 56 1/2 parasangs. There is one place where a guard is posted. Four large streams intersect this district, all of which must be crossed by means of boats. The first of these is the Tigris; the second and the
third have both of them the same name, though they are not only different rivers, but do not even run from the same place. For the one which I have called the first of the two has its source in Armenia, while the other flows afterwards out of the country of the Matienians. The fourth of the streams is called the Gyndes, and this is the river which Cyrus dispersed by digging for it three hundred and sixty channels. Leaving Armenia and entering the Matienian country, you have four stations; these passed you find yourself in Cissia, where eleven stations and 42 1/2 parasangs bring you to another navigable stream, the Choaspes, on the banks of which the city of Susa is built. Thus the entire number of the stations is raised to one hundred and eleven; and so many are in fact the resting places that one finds between Sardis and Susa.

[54] The exact distance (if anyone desires still greater accuracy) is somewhat more; for the journey Ephesus to Sardis must be added to the for the foregoing account; and this will make the whole distance between the Greek Sea and Susa (or the city of Memnon, as it called) 14,040 furlongs; since Ephesus is distant from Sardis 540 furlongs. This would add three days to the three months’ journey” (Herodotus, The Histories (G.Rawlinson, Trans.) Roman Roads Media: 339-340).

Map 4.7 The route of the “Royal Road” (Sevin, 2001: 11).

Although Kiepert inferred from the parasangs mentioned by Herodotus that the section of the Royal Road crossing Cappadocia passed through Komana Pontica and Sebasteia before reaching the Euphrates, and reflected this view in his cartography, this was not accepted by Calder (Calder, 1925: 10).
Map 4.8 The principal routes of the Persian Empire (Briant, 2002: 366).

Map 4.9 Map of Persian empire and the route of the royal road (https://sites.google.com/a/umich.edu/imladjov/maps).
Calder concluded that the route and distance measurements given by Herodotus for the Royal Road changed as a result of his studies in the first quarter of the 20th century: (Table 4.1).

French, who acknowledged the Royal Road descriptions of Herodotus, conceded all the aforementioned perspectives, which asserted that the major road followed a northern route that passed through Gordion, Ancyra, and Pteria. This was a traditional and conservative interpretation (French, 1998: 15). Furthermore, he proposed that Xerxes took the route that ran towards the south of the Salt Lake on the Anatolian plateau and passed the Halys River before reaching the Phrygia. Therefore, the French supported the idea that if someone wishes to reach the western regions of Anatolia even today from the east, a single pass can be sufficient to reach the Phrygia. In other words, the opinions of previous scholars who believed that the route of the Royal Road ran through the north were also controversial, as they supported the idea that the Halys River should have been passed twice to reach the west (French, 1998: 15-16).

**Table 4.1** Comparison of the distances of Herodotus and Calder (Calder, 1925: 11).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Distances</th>
<th>Herodotus</th>
<th>Calder</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>From Sardis to Cilician Gates</td>
<td>718 miles</td>
<td>511 miles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From Sardis to Euphrates</td>
<td>738 1/2 miles</td>
<td>749 miles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From Samosata (over Mazaka and Tavium) to Sardis</td>
<td>738 1/2 miles</td>
<td>738 1/2 miles + 130 miles = 868 1/2 miles.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Map 4.10** Royal Road route suggestions by different scholars (Müller, 1994: 21, Fig.3).
Map 4.11 The Routes in Asia Minor (Levick, 1967: 256).
Map 4.12 Combined maps of D. French showing the route of the Royal Road in western and central parts of the Anatolian plateau (French, 1998: 39-40).
While constructing the route of the Royal Road French took the remains of the Roman paved roads and his own observations as critical points.

- **Routes during and shortly after Alexander the Great:**

The aforementioned Royal Road map by David French was constructed according to the Achaemenid Road System. French indicated that this road was the predecessor of the Hellenistic routes and roads on the Anatolian plateau, which were used from the beginning of the Hellenistic Period until they were taken over by the Romans in 133 B.C. (French, 1998: 16). It can be reasonably assumed that, had the aforementioned so-called "Pre-Roman Roads" been reconstructed, paved, and integrated into a complex road network system during the Roman Period, regardless of the specific time frame, individuals would have selected the "easy passes," shortcuts, and most reliable routes for their road system. In other words, the topography was consistent, suggesting that there were no other reasons to discover additional routes under normal circumstances. With regard to this, the Hellenistic routes on the Anatolian plateau should be interpreted as the continuation of the Persian Roads at one point.

The eastern campaigns of Alexander that began when he took over the entire Anatolian plateau with the end of Persian rule, continued eastward into Mesopotamia and India. In fact, a quote from Arrian's book on Alexander reflects Alexander's own rhetoric, in which he called himself "Lord and King of all Asia (Arr.2.14.8-9). Alexander followed a route that started from Hellespontos, travelling along the western coast of the Anatolian Plateau to Halicarnassus. He continued along the southern axis to Tarsus, crossed inland from Pamphylia to Gordion, then turned south again and continued through the Cilician Gates. During his first campaign against the Persians, Alexander fought and triumphed in the territory within the borders of the satrapy of Hellespontine Phrygia at the Battle of Granicus in 334 B.C. Kalas, a cousin of Antigonus, was appointed as the satrap of the territory, which was the first large territory in the Anatolian plateau to come under Alexander's control. He demanded that the inhabitants continue to pay taxes to him, just as they had previously paid to Darius (Arr. 1.17; Plut.).

There is no record of Alexander ever leading an expedition to Pontus. Additionally, the great kingdoms established by his commanders, among whom his lands were divided after his death, did not encompass Pontus. One of Alexander's encounters with the peoples of the Black Sea is when, he met with the Paphlagonians in Ankara, when Alexander accepted their request not to occupy their lands. They became subject to Kalas (Curtius 3.1.22-24; Plut. Alex. 18.5; Arr. 2.4). In Memnon 4.1, it is reported that representatives of the people of Heracleia Pontica expressed their desire for the restoration of democracy in their city. However, no details of the second meeting, such as the time and place, are mentioned in any source (Manoledakis, 2021: 142).
Manoledakis disputed Appian's claim that Alexander established democracy in Amisos, citing the lack of evidence that Alexander ever visited the city. (Manoledakis, 2021: 631).

The discussion of why Alexander's route did not include the Black Sea littoral raises the question of whether the Greek settlements in the north of the Anatolian plateau intermarried with the local population during the colonization process and subsequently lost their "Greek" characteristics due to Persian influence, or whether the "Greek" population in this area became more distinct from the "Aegean Greeks" as a result of cultural integration (Manoledakis, 2021: 632). Indeed, given Alexander's attitude of asserting his own ethnic identity and striving to defend and spread it in every situation, it is to be expected that the population of the coastal cities in question would have turned towards the southern Black Sea littoral with a greater ambition to regain their supposedly lost Greek identity. The reason why he stayed away from the littoral can be attributed to his desire to achieve his military missions and the targets he set for himself.

Additionally, According to Arrian, during his eastern campaign, Alexander traveled for a period of time on the road through the north-central territory of the Anatolian plateau, specifically the road north of the Salt Lake. This was after he reached Gordion and before he turned towards the Cilician Gates in southern Cappadocia (Arr. Anabasis). Following Strabo's account, the region of Cappadocia was liberated from Persian rule by the Macedonians and divided into two distinct "kingdoms", one called "Main Cappadocia / Cappadocia near Taurus / Greater Cappadocia" and the other called "Cappadocia Pontica / Pontus" (Strab. XII. 1. 4). The road from the north continued eastward across the Anatolian plateau into the Caucasus. However, before that, it curved southward from Cappadocia and merged with the road from the south of the Salt Lake around Tyana (Kemerhisar) near present-day Niğde. Alexander must have used this road as he continued southward after Gordion towards Mesopotamia (Ökse, 2018: 117).

- **Routes during Mithridatic Kingdom:**

The Mithradatis built their central sites on the basis of "defense" and occupied rough terrains, but it is concluded that exceptional settlements such as Komana Pontica, which were built on the plain, also existed owing to their "temple-state" characteristics (Bryer & Winfield, 1985: 15). Munro describes the two main road routes in Pontus during the Hellenistic Period with two different purposes, one as the "alimentary canal of the natural body" due to its commercial use and the other as the "spinal cord" due to its administrative use. Of these:
• **Commercial road:** The road connecting Amisos and Zela was the only communication route between the littoral and the inland, and connected with Amaseia, the capital of the kingdom, even extending as far south as the Cilician Gates.

• **Trunk road:** The road between Themiscyra (Çarşamba Plain), Phanaroea (Taşova) and Dazimonitis (Kazova) in the Iris Valley passed through Dazimonitis, the highest elevation, and this road extended from the part of the plain where Komana Pontica was located to Amaseia in the west and Zela in the southwest, and the communication between Lycus in the east of Phanaroea, where Kabeira was located, and the Amnias Valley in the west was easily possible (Munro, 1901:53).

Munro also mentioned the possible short cut routes that connected to these above mentioned main routes from various regions of the Pontus:

• From Phanaroea to Themiscyra,
• From Herek to Komana,
• From Tokat to Sivas (Munro, 1901: 54).

In addition to all these, Munro emphasizes the importance of Amaseia, which has a direct connection with the plain of Phanaros, as the inland commercial capital of Pontus. This connection led Amaseia to develop another road that goes up to the Iris Valley and connects with the roads coming from Ankara through Çorum and from Paphlagonia through Osmancık (Munro, 1901: 55).

Whatever the other reasons or alternative routes, Munro thinks that the road between Amisos-Zela and the other one that started from the head of Lycus and continued to Amnias were vital roads for the nourishment and survival of the entire Pontus region (Munro, 1901: 55).

Among the north-south roads, the first one starts from Amisos and passes through Amaseia, Zela, Sebastopolis, Caesarea and reaches Antiocheia; the second one starts from Polemonium and passes through Neocaesarea and Komana Pontica and reaches Sebasteia. These roads provided the coastal settlements with access to the sources of raw materials and even the mined ores from Cappadocia and the hinterland of Pontus, which could be transported through these routes (Doğançlı, 2020:148).

Sinope and Amisos are both located on the Black Sea littoral, which makes them natural harbors protected from the winds. However, Sinope's hinterland is limited to a narrow area, while Amisos, with its large delta, functions as the gateway of the territory to the inland. Sinope is a crucial city on the littoral, with strategic and military implications, while Amisos is the commercial heartland of both the littoral and the inland (Munro, 1901: 53). However,
the higher elevations south of Sinope and their proximity to the littoral indicate that the hinterland south of the settlement has a very small surface area. In contrast, Amisos, with its different geomorphologic structure, can be considered the area where the relationship between the littoral and the hinterland is most easily achieved in the central Black Sea region.

Robinson suggested that there may have been north-south connecting routes between Sinope and important Persian routes through the Anatolian plateau. Additionally, there may have been east-west routes through the littoral between the settlement, which was almost the focal point of overseas commercial activity, and larger settlements further east with better access to the interior, thus ensuring the littoral-inland connection of traded commodities (Robinson, 1906: (?)). Amisos is often considered the foremost settlement in the eastern region. It has been suggested that Amisos was the only littoral settlement from which "all the products of northern Asia Minor" emanated, and that these products were transported to the littoral by important routes (Leaf, 1916: 7). The two settlements, Zela and Mazaca (Caesarea), were crossed by the Mithridatic roads and connected with the ones coming from the Halys to the east and from Tavium (Yozgat) to the west (Munro, 1901: 52-53).

It is proposed that during the existence of the Mithridatic Kingdom, the majority of settlements were established in areas of fertile land, which constituted the kingdom's primary source of agricultural revenue and consequently, urbanization was largely confined to large agrarian settlements (Marek, 2003: 78). In examining the fortification models in the Black Sea basin, it becomes evident that the dating is in reverse chronological order. In relation with this, the earliest 6th century B.C. date has been assigned to the small-scale fortress and defensive patterns in the northern littoral of the Black Sea basin. (Alcock et al., 2005: 360).

During the Mithridatic Kingdom period, settlements were designed with more sheltered and defensible properties, which resulted in construction of many as fortresses through the kingdom. All of these routes, no matter what their purpose, need to be defended against potential threats (whether military or commercial). In the study conducted by Sökmen, the Least Cost Path analysis method of the GIS tool was employed to identify the existence of roads between fortresses that were intended to be used either administratively or defensively during the Hellenistic period. The cost of the distance traveled between the point of departure and the point of arrival was determined. The data obtained at the end of the study, which was carried out assuming that the least costly roads could have been used, was found to be largely overlapping with the road network used in the Roman Period. This led to the suggestion indicating the possibility of the network in question used during the pre-Roman periods (Sökmen, 2016: 305, 306, 355).
Map 4.13 Map showing the settlements and the fortresses within the territories of the Mithridatic Kingdom (Sökmen, 2016: App.4).
Sixty-one fortresses have been identified in the territory of the Mithridatic kingdom in the study of Sökmen and the settlement patterns have also been revealed along with these fortresses (Sökmen, 2016: App.4). The fortresses overlooking the Dazimonitis Plain and Komana (the focus of this thesis) is compiled from Sökmen's PhD thesis:

**Table 4.2** The Fortresses Overlooking Dazimonitis Plain and Komana. This table is generated with reference to Emine Sökmen’s Ph.D. Dissertation (Sökmen, 2016: 386-443).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fortress</th>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Elevation</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Monitors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Çördük (Taulara (?))</td>
<td>Defensive</td>
<td>894 m.</td>
<td>Hellenistic/Byzantine</td>
<td>On the Tokat-Sivas highway.</td>
<td>Dazimonitis Plain and the road from Sebasteia.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geyras</td>
<td>Defensive</td>
<td>891 m.</td>
<td>Hellenistic</td>
<td>On the Tokat-Sivas highway.</td>
<td>Dazimonitis Plain and the road from Sebasteia.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tokat (Dazimon)</td>
<td>Defensive</td>
<td>659 m.</td>
<td>Hellenistic/Byzantine/Byzantine/Seljuk/Ottoman</td>
<td>Modern city center of Tokat.</td>
<td>The road from Sebasteia, The road from Zela to Komana.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turhal (Gaziura)</td>
<td>Administrative</td>
<td>584 m.</td>
<td>Hellenistic/Byzantine/Ottoman</td>
<td>In the middle of the Dazimonitis Plain. On the road between Amaseia and Komana.</td>
<td>Dazimonitis Plain.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zile (Zela)</td>
<td>Administrative</td>
<td>766 m.</td>
<td>Hellenistic / Roman/Byzantine/Ottoman</td>
<td>Western end of Dazimonitis Plain.</td>
<td>Roads from Phrygia to Komana and Sebasteia, Roads from Black Sea littoral.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niksar (Cabeira)13</td>
<td>Non-defined</td>
<td>458 m.</td>
<td>Hellenistic/Byzantine/Seljuk/Ottoman</td>
<td>Intersection of the roads that passes through Komana and Dazimonitis Plain.</td>
<td>Overlooks Phanaroria Plain and Lycus Valley.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

12 Olshausen & Biller, 1984: 54.
13 Hamilton, 1842: 347.
**Roman Roads:**

The period in which regular road construction works were carried out most intensively in Anatolia is the Roman Period. In light of the empire's strategy of orderly expansion, these road networks can be regarded as a construction project that aims to reinforce the center-periphery relationship, not only in a direct manner, but also in a more indirect and expansive way, even in territories that fall within the borders of monarchical sovereignty. It has been pointed out that the "transport mechanism" in the Roman period can be thought of as a closed system intertwined on land, sea, and river planes (Adams, 2012: 231). The availability of the know-how and materials necessary for the establishment of an advanced road network means that more archaeological data on Roman Roads can be obtained compared to previous periods. In relation with this, Massa mentions that the tangible data of the roads from the Pre-Classical Period are very limited, except for a certain part of the east-west oriented Royal Road (Massa, 2011:39). In contrast to the pre-Classical roads, the Roman period is distinguished by the establishment of a systematic and well-constructed road network, which was interconnected within the territories of the empire. It has been proposed that the construction, capacity, and quality of the *Viae Publicae* (Main Roads) did not reach their zenith until the 2nd century AD.
Prior to this, they were only connected by roads built to meet the communication and military needs of the expanding frontiers, which were then developed and incorporated into the *Viae Publicae* (Kolb, 2019: 10). The construction of *Cursus Publicus*, or wide roads for wheeled vehicles, during the Roman period facilitated the proliferation of both military and commercial activities. (Doğancı, 2020: 148).

![Map 4.15 Asia Citerior. (Kiepert, 1890: Tab. IV).](image)

After the Persian rule in Anatolia, the major and minor Hellenistic kingdoms established immediately after Alexander continued to use the communication network established by the Persians, especially the Royal Road. Pompey did not alter any established "Persian" elements during his campaigns in Pontus (Nielsen, 2016: 34). Moreover, he restored and developed the independence of temple states such as Komana and Zela (Strab. XII. 3.34) while Roman rule was being established in Anatolia. In essence, the existing roads should have been utilized with the addition of necessary improvements. In relation with this, during the Pontic invasion in 64 B.C., Pompey improved the already neglected roads and made additional contributions (Doğancı, 2020: 148). In relation with this well-organized over time Roman Road system and constructive developments, it was proposed that, the paved and structured main Roman Roads, which ran through the Anatolian plateau, were the ones that were in use before the arrival of the Romans (French, 1998: 15). In other words, the pre-Roman main routes of the Anatolian plateau were re-structured during that new period.
Naturally, regardless of purpose for which the roads were utilized – be administrative, military or economic - it is reasonable to assume that the shortest and the easiest routes were preferred in order to save time, manpower, money and vehicles. On the other hand, the Roman route through the north of the Anatolian plateau, the so-called "Pontic Road", was not the shortest route between the northwest and the southeast; however, there are two reasons why Pompey preferred this route: first, the fact that Sinope was the capital of the Mithradatid kingdom in the Hellenistic period, but had been an important commercial center and harbor since the Greek colonization in the 8th century B.C.; and secondly, the fact that the northern route was in a position to see the entire Anatolian plateau by acting as a roof, which may have been chosen in order to build new settlements and strengthen its dominance (Nielsen, 2016: 37).

Sevin identified three main east-west routes that were in service even during the Imperial Period of Rome, although he does not give specific information about their exact dates of construction.

- The first one started from Ephesos, continued all the way through Meandros Valley (Büyük Menderes), Tralleis (Aydın), Psidian Antiocheia (Başaran Köyü), Laodicea (Goncalı Köyü), Celaenae (Dinar), Iulia (Çay/Afyon), Philoumelion (Akşehir), Ikonion (Konya) and separated into two different directions: one towards the Garsaura (Aksaray) and Mazaca (Kayseri) on the east and the other towards southeast to the Podandos (Pozanı), Cilicia Pylai and finally reached Tarsus,

- Started from the western littoral of the Anatolian plateau, continued all the way through the Hermos Valley (Gediz Vadisi), Sardis, Satala (Sandal), Timenou Therai (Uşak), Cotyaeum (Kütahya), Dorylaion (Şar/Eskişehir) and reached Ancyra (Ankara) towards Gordion. It was separated towards different directions from Ankara and while one continued towards northeast; Amaseia (Amasya), Komana Pontica (Tokat), Sebastia (Sivas) and Melitene (Malatya) and reached to Mesopotamia, the other route continued towards the east; reached Sebastia (Sivas) over Tavium (Yozgat) and the last route continued towards the southeast Garsaura (Aksaray), Tyana (Kemerhisar), Podandos (Pozanı) and Cilicia Pylai (Cilician Gates) and reached today’s Syrian territory,

- On the north of the Anatolian plateau, there was another east-west route which was especially used by the Bythinian and Pontic Kingdoms during the 3rd-2nd centuries B.C. and this route started from Nicomedia (İznil), followed Bithynion (Bolu), Krateia (Gökçesu), Pompeiopolis (Taşköprü), Amnias Valley (Gökârmak Vadisi) and continued towards Amisos (Samsun) and Amaseia (Amasya) (Sevin, 2001:5-6).
Map 4.16 Major road networks of the Asia Minor (Sevin, 2001: Fig. 3).
New settlements were likely established in the late 1st century B.C. when the Anatolian plateau came under Roman rule. The east-west oriented 'Trunk Road' between Nicopolis and Pompeiopolis, which Pompey used during his Pontic campaign, may have aided in identifying suitable locations for the establishment of new settlements (Nielsen, 2016: 35). Munro suggested the existence of a north-south oriented road between Amisos and Zela, in addition to the east-west oriented road. The former may have been used for economic facilities, while the latter for military purposes. (Munro, 1901: 54, 60). The archaeological data obtained from the limited number of studies conducted throughout the region support Munro's views on the purpose of the roads. Fortifications near most of the settlements suggest that the roads may have been built for military or commercial purposes, and the presence of imported pottery sherds found in the settlements also supports the idea of commercial use (Ökse, 2007: 35).

Although, on the basis of the results of the detailed studies carried out in the 20th century, the clear indicators of the Roman roads, such as the bridges and milestones, and the historical sources, emphasize that the newly constructed road networks may have been built over the primitive but densely used previous main routes (Massa, 2011: 39).

![Figure 4.6](image-url)  
**Figure 4.6** Roman milestone dated to 1st-3rd centuries B.C. from Boğazkale territory (Photo: Ayşe Batman) (Boğazköy Museum Exhibition).
Studies on settlements along roads have led to differing opinions on their purpose. There are those who argue that the eleven settlements in Pontus were selected on the basis of their geographical characteristics, taking into account both civic and commercial concerns; this can be understood by looking at the examples of Pompeiopolis, Neapolis, Magnopolis and Diospolis, which were located on the "Trunk Road" (Broughton, 1938: 532-533). The settlements located far from the littoral ensured their sustainability by marketing their own products through these roads; especially after the regulations of Pompey and even during the period of Pax Romana (1st and 2nd centuries A.D.) (Doğancı, 2020: 132). In this context, the insights of Magie in the middle of the 20th century are important. He claimed that the cities of Nicopolis, Diospolis, Magnopolis, Neapolis, and Pompeiopolis were located on an east-west trade route, while the cities of Zela and Megalopolis were located on another north-south trade route from the Black Sea coast to Amaseia, then to the upper Halys region, and finally to the Euphrates (Magie, 1950: 370). Julius Caesar arrived in Syria, traveling through Cilicia to
Cappadocia and then arriving at Komana Cappadocia, and after some administrative business (such as an amnesty for Deiotarus and an apology for Pharnaces' opposition activities in Pontus, which was rejected by him), he continued northward, arriving in Pontus and defeating Pharnaces at Zela in 47 B.C. and finally arriving in Rome via Bithynia (Caes. Bell. Alex. 65-78).

Winfield describes two possible routes from the Bosphorus to Dazimon, suggesting that Pompey chose his cities based on the convenience of geomorphological structures rather than economic and civic considerations, thus following river valleys, so that one route runs through Ankara, while the other runs a little further north toward Osманçık and Amasya. He also mentions Komana Pontica as the Roman equivalent of Tokat, a few miles from Iris, and this other route could have passed from there to reach Nicopolis and even Satala in the east (Bryer & Winfield: 1977: 158-159, 163). Mitchell offered another view, in which he argued that the valleys formed by the rivers were specifically identified as city locations. In his view, Pompeiopolis, Neapolis, Magnopolis, Diospolis, and Nicopolis, cities names of which were also mentioned by Magie among "cities on the trade route" in the inland of Pontus, were located in the east-west oriented valleys as well (Mitchell, 1993: 32).

Mitchell identified four main routes in the Anatolian plateau:

- The northernmost route, which starts from Byzantium and Nicomedia and passes through Pompeiopolis, Neoclaudiopolis, Neocaesarea, and Nicopolis, located in the valleys of the Paphlagonia and Pontus regions, and reaches Satala in the east, was likely used by Mithridates in the Late Hellenistic Period and by Pompey in the early Roman Period,
- The second route starts from the Bosphorus in the northwest and descends to the Anatolian plateau. It passes through Ancyra and continues northeast and east, reaching Tavium, Sebastopolis and Sebasteia before reaching Melitene,
- The third route follows the same path as the second route as far as Ancyra, from where it turns to the southeast and passes through Caesarea before reaching Melitene via Cocussus near Komana Cappadocia,
- The fourth route is defined as the 'Pilgrim's Road'. It crosses the Anatolian plateau from northwest to southeast and extends into present-day Syria (Mitchell, 1993: 127-129).

Rennel identified the route of the first road described by Mitchell at the end of the 19th century; Ancyra was recognized as being at a key position on the route. (Rennel, 1831: 216-218). Although the Roman military road between Ancyra (Ankara) and Melitene (Malatya) did not pass through Caesarea (Kayseri) and Sebasteia (Sivas), it intersected with one of the two roads.
coming from the ports of the southern Black Sea littoral, which passes through Amaseia and Sebastea and reaches Plasta (Elbistan) (Ökse, 2019: 101).

Nielsen described the views of various scholars as "classical," citing, Munro argued that the "military road" between Nicopolis and Pompeiopolis was crucial to Pompeius' choice of cities (Broughton, 1938). Magie (Magie, 1950) emphasized that the purpose of this road was "commercial," while Broughton argued that this purpose was part of the so-called Romanization process. In contrast, Magie argued that there was a "strategic" point behind this purpose. Also, he explained that "Classical Link" between the settlements of Pompey and the previously used Pontic road system in three aspects:

- The commercial activities took place in the center of the Pompeian cities,
- Pompey recognized the importance of the pre-existing roads and utilized them for the construction of new cities,
- The Pontic road system follows the main trade route between northwestern (Bosphorus) and northeastern Anatolia (Nielsen, 2016: 36).

Doğancı identified three major routes that connected the Pontic littoral to the inland based on Herodotus, Xenophon, Ptolemy and Arrian as well as Tabula Peutingeriana, Itineriarum Antonini and the mile stones that were found in situ 19 locations:

- Amisos-Amaseia-Zela-Sebastopolis-Kaesareia-Antoicheia,
- Polemonium-Neokaesareia-Komana Pontica-Sebasteia,

Map 4.18 The Inland Routes that links the settlements on the littoral in Antiquity (Doğancı, 2020: 131).
Map 4.19 The suggested routes of the Roman Road between Caesarea and Tavium (French, 1974: 145).

In relation with the north-south directed routes that connected the littoral to inland, French also proposed that, there was a road between Tavium Büyüknefes and Caesarea. However, there are some differences between Itin. Ant. and Tab. Peut., while Itin. Ant. suggests a direct route, Tab. Peut. suggests an indirect way that passes through today’s Kırşehir and Kaman. In relation with this, that secondary road could have another aim as not only binding two major settlements but also passed through the settlements with less prosperous conditions (French, 1974: 148). So that, it made possible to speak about the overland routes between these two settlements.

Nielsen argued that certain sections of the 'Pontic Road' from Armenia to Eupatoria may have existed prior to Pompey's time. However, construction of the ‘Pontic Road’ was not solely the work of the Hellenistic Pontic King Mithridates. Therefore, he suggested that while some parts of the road may have predated Pompey, the road system as a whole should be referred to as the 'Pompeian Road' rather than the 'Pontic Road' (Nielsen, 2016: 43).
Furthermore, two Roman roads have been identified passing through Komana: one started from Amaseia and reached Neocaesareia, while the other started from Dazimon and reached Neocaesareia (Anderson, 1903: 60-67; Bryer & Winfield, 1985: 21; Munro, 1891: 732-735). Although it was not on the main route of the two Roman roads from the north, Mitchell noted that strong connecting roads were built and that Komana Pontica, Zela and Amaseia were included in this network (Mitchell, 1993: 129).

The main east-west route, which started from the settlements along the Aegean littoral of the Anatolian Plateau, descended towards the present day plains of Beyşehir and Eğirdir Lakes, continued towards Konya and the Taurus Mountains and reached the Cilician Gates, was used during both the Hellenistic and the Roman times (Winfield, 1977:151). The case of the so-called "Northern Route" described by Winfield, which came crossing over the Bosphorus, continued towards Crateia Flaviopolis (Gerede), went up north towards the Halys basin and crossed the river at Vezirköprü, continued through the plains of Merzifon, went through the Lycus valley (both in Roman and Byzantine times), and reached Satala and Theodosiopolis (Erzurum) in the east (Winfield, 1977: 159).

This "Northern Route" mentioned by Winfield was mostly used for military purposes rather than commercial and administrative activities (Winfield, 1977:160). In addition, Nielsen suggested that the north-south "trade road" had multiple uses: The littoral sites used it to transfer their trade goods to the inland, and the inhabitants used it to maintain their economic prosperity by exporting their products not only to the settlements on the littoral, but also overseas from the harbor of Amisos (Nielsen, 2016: 43). In accordance with Munro's (Munro, 1893: 739) proposition that the occurrence of a series of Roman settlements, including Pompeiopolis, Neapolis, Magnopolis, Diospolis, and Nicopolis, along the principal east-west route traversing the Anatolian plateau is intriguing, Winfield postulated that this route must have existed and been extensively utilized prior to the Roman era. Furthermore, he posited that Pompey's armies employed it (Winfield, 1977: 159).

There are differing opinions on the existence of secondary roads that connect Komana to the main roads. It was been proposed that a small road in the valley, formed by the Lycus River, may have been connection to the main road to Laodicea, which passed nearby Komana (Rennel, 1831: 211).

4.1.2. Commercial Relations and Commodities

Each particular landscape has its own transportation system (on foot, wheeled transport by pack animals, requiring the use of water vehicles, etc.), which implies that each system
requires the use of different equipment, different technological advancements, and therefore needs a certain amount of time and proficiency in their use (Massa, 2016: 57). The construction of the land routes in Pontus was intended to transport agricultural products, mined ores, and other commercial goods to harbor sites such as Amisos, Polemonion, and Trapezus on the littoral of the Black Sea (Doğancı, 2020: 132).

Fishing has been the primary source of livelihood for settlements around the Black Sea since the ancient times due to the diverse species of fish available. The limited hinterland and climatic conditions of the littoral settlements led to limited agricultural activity. Therefore, fish was not only a foodstuff consumed by the local population, but was also an economic product that can be exported. In order to preserve it for a long time, it must be pickled or salted and dried. It is most likely that the salt required for these processes in ancient times was brought from the inland Anatolian plateau. The Tatta Limne in the Cappadocia region was likely a source of raw material. The overland route from Amisos to Antiocheia, passing through Amaseia, Zela, Sebastopolis, Caesareia, was probably used to transport salt from the inland to the littoral, and the same route was used to transport the necessary materials from the littoral to the inland (Olshausen, 2002: 581; Rostovtzeff, 1941: 592-593; Arslan, 2007: 40). In fact, it has been reported that a total of 181 Sinopean amphorae from the Classical and Hellenistic periods, found in various locations in the Mediterranean basin, most likely contain salted fish (Garlan, 2000:89). Furthermore, while it is unlikely that salted fish was imported to Athens, there are references to salted fish produced in Pontus and exported, as mentioned in verses by Athenaios (a Greek rhetorician born in Naucratis (Late 2nd - Early 3rd century A.D.), preserved (Garnsey, 1999: 117; Lund & Gabrielsen, 2005: 166):

"...One could in principle buy salt-fish as small fry, or as a piece of a larger fish. The price paid depended on the variety, place of origin (the Pontus produced the best) and size of the piece (Athen. 117d-e)".

Strabo describes the distances between Sinope and three different settlements to the west;

- 3500 stadion between Hieron and Sinope,
- 2000 stadia between Heracleia Pontice and Sinope,
- 700 stadia between Carambis and Sinope (the shortest point between the northern and southern Black Sea littorals) (Strabo, XII 3. 11).

It must also be considered that the harbors to the west of Sinope, which Strabo mentions, were more active in overseas trade during the Roman period, while Sinope may have been a "distribution center ". In relation with this, Braund suggested that Sinope was connected to Amisos through a route and that goods produced in or imported from these settlements may
have been distributed to different districts of the Anatolian Plateau (Braund, 2005: 123). The existence of an overland route (Strabo, II. 1. 3) from Amisos to Sinope and then to Issos Bay in the Cilician littoral, goods from the littoral to inland must have found a market, which supported his notion. Additionally, there have been instances of the remains of "salted fish" reported from some sites along the route to Cappadocia (Curtis, 1991: 126). In the 4th century A.D., administrators of Bithynia and Pontus had close relations with the Bosporus, which enabled Roman soldiers in the Pontic littoral and Cappadocia to be supplied with food, particularly salted fish and grain (Rostovtsef, 1916/1917-1917/1918: 14). In sum, the Sinope - Issos road mentioned by Strabo must have been used for commercial purposes during the 1st century B.C. and the early imperial period, when Roman rule was established on the Anatolian plateau. Rock salt is an important substance for preserving fish for export. It is still extensively produced in the Cappadocia region and distributed both abroad and to other inland territories (Tezgör, 2022: 49), probably transported from Cappadocia to Amisos and Sinope. However, the transportation of salted fish from the littoral to the inland of the Anatolian plateau as early as the 4th century A.D. suggests that this route may have been used reciprocally.

Map 4.20 L’Asie mineure orientale sous la domination perse (Debord, 1999: 84, Carte: 2).
Each route could have different geographical challenges, and human factors can also disrupt communication networks. There were differences between the amount of cargo that could be carried by trading ships and that which can be carried by caravans, and although maritime transportation was considered more convenient in every way in the long run, overland routes were also used extensively. Additionally, overseas trade was easier but sometimes inefficient due to factors such as wars and smuggling, so land transportation was a good alternative, and people who were living inland had no choice but to use land transportation for both human and commercial purposes, and that the shortest route to the littoral was a highway that passed closest to their settlement (Young, 1963: 350).

The rivers were a vital source of sustenance for nearby settlements, and the harbors on the rivers intersected with overland routes, leading to the development of commercial activities (Adams, 2012: 227). The flow directions of the rivers and their seasonal variations in flow rates could negatively impact the commercial activities, naturally. Timber trade was likely indispensable in the littoral-inland realm due to the mostly forested vegetation of Pontus and the north-central Anatolian plateau. Strabo reports that the Scylax and Lycus rivers were utilized for shipbuilding and table-making, and that timber was transported from inland to the littoral via these rivers (Strab. XII. 3. 12).

It is suggested that olive oil, which was produced in various centers and became one of the most significant export products of the Mediterranean, was exported not only to Greek colonial cities in the Black Sea region but also to non-Greek communities until the end of the Hellenistic period (Opait, 2009: 155).

Conversely, it was proposed that olive was grown as a significant agricultural product on the southern Black Sea littoral especially between Sinope and Trapezus (Mitchell, 2005: 85). According to, Strabo olive cultivation was practiced in Phanaorea and there were many trees here, (Strabo, XII. 3. 30), and that the land south of Sinope, all of inland Pontus, was completely covered with olive trees (Strabo, XII. 3. 12).

Additionally, Anderson observed there the 'weigh-stones' mentioned by Strabo, were used in olive oil production, and were widespread in Pontus. He encountered these weights himself in the south of Çorum plain, around Sebastopolis, and around Komana in the Dazimonitis plains (Anderson, 1901: 14-16). This indicated the presence of olive oil production in the inland region of Pontus.
The olive production was also present around Hasan Dağ, which is located in western Cappadocia, evinced by tools and objects found around the territory indicating olive oil production (Ramsay, 1941: 244-245).

The region had a reputation for its grapes suitable for vine making in the fertile plains of Pontus. In ancient times, the Phanaroea plain was recognized for its cultivation of olives and grapes. (Strabo, II. 1. 15). On the other hand, Pliny the Elder (nat. XIV. 9. 76) reports that the Dazimonitis plains and Komana Pontica were also regions that cultivated grapes for the wine industry. Furthermore, it is known that aromatic wines made from absinthium (wormwood) were consumed locally and exported (Plin. nat. XI. 75. 194; XXVI. 58. 91).

In antiquity, red ochre was referred to as miltos (μιλτος). It was also known as 'Miltos of Sinope' or 'Sinopis' because the dye, now known as yogasa, was exported from the harbor of Sinope, mined in the Cappadocian region (Tezgör, 2022: 45-46). Pliny the Elder also mentioned this red dye, referring to it as 'Sinopis' or 'Sinopis Pontica' (Pliny HN 35.31). Strabo, another ancient writer, provided additional details about Miltos. He stated that it was also produced in the Iberian Peninsula, but Sinopis Pontica was the highest quality pigment and mentions that it was so named since it was exported from the harbor of Sinope before Ephesus was active in trade (Strabo, XII. 2. 10).
Strabo, on the other hand, mentions that this ochre was brought directly from Capadocia to Sinope, suggesting the route described by Munro, which crossed the Anatolian plateau from north to south, passing through Zela and Amaseia and thus connecting to the east-west oriented trunk road, the Pontic Road (Tezgör, 2022: 50). Tezgör also offers two alternative routes: one of these is a north - south route, but one that connects directly to Amisos, not to Sinope (from where it may have been brought to Sinope by sea, which is less dangerous than the land route) (Olshausen, 2014: 45), and the other is that river transportation may have been utilized at appropriate times of the year in sections of the Halys River that are suitable for transportation (Tezgör, 2022: 51).

Although the distance between Sinope - Cappadocia or Amisos - Cappadocia is shorter, considering that the ancient route between Ephesus and Nevşehir can be 815 km. on average, the route must have been changed since the longer route has a more streamlined and easier to overcome terrain (Tezgör, 2022: 52). However, this change should not be interpreted as a complete abandonment of Sinope. The inhabitants continued to trade in the belief that it was much easier to access pigment originating from Cappadocia and that its quality was higher than others (Tezgör, 2022: 52). The route in question must have been the route used for the supply of salted fish and food during the Roman Period.

Map 4.21 The roads between Pontus and Cappadocia (Tezgör, 2022: 46).
CHAPTER 5

RECONTEXTUALIZATION OF KOMANA ON NETWORKS BASED ON THE ARCHAEOLOGICAL DATA

5.1. Archaeological Investigations and What is Known So Far at the North-Central Anatolian Plateau

Although the number of archaeological excavations has increased and promising developments are ongoing in the last decades, the knowledge about not only the north-central Anatolian plateau but also the archaeology of the Pontic region in general remains scarce. The knowledge of the region’s Hellenistic Period remains particularly obscure. One significant contributing factor to loss of information is the construction of modern urbanized cities on top of ancient sites since the beginning of the 20th century. Nevertheless, the sites along the southern Black Sea littoral are more extensively documented, particularly with regard to their occupational layers, especially dating to the colonization period. Furthermore, the study of Roman amphorae from workshops in the southern Black Sea region (especially Sinopean amphorae) has led to new insights into the overseas commercial interactions of the region (for further information, see Kassab-Tezgör). These studies have facilitated an understanding of the extent and nature of the networks established by coastal settlements during the colonization and Roman periods.

One of the most recent studies about the Hellenistic Period of the Black Sea region is Sökmen’s doctoral dissertation about the Mithridatic fortresses on the Pontic region (2016). In addition to that, two sites within the borders of today’s Ordu Cingürt Kayası and Kurul Kalesi on the littoral, Oluz Höyük in Amasya, and also Komana in Tokat, revealed Hellenistic occupation layers. The deposits at Giresun Arethias Island also contain Hellenistic pottery. The results of the studies conducted at these sites are crucial for understanding both the settlement patterns of the Hellenistic Period and the possible inter-regional and overseas interactions or established networks of these sites. From a general perspective of the Pontic region and the north-central Anatolian plateau, the results of these studies are also key to understanding the broader context of the region.
Conversely, it still remains challenging to discuss primary, undisturbed contexts from the Mithridatic period of the Hellenistic era in the entire southern Black Sea region.

5.2. The Aims of the Network Analysis

Given the limited data available, it was necessary to employ material culture studies in order to gain insight into the dynamics of the north-central Anatolian plateau. This study therefore focused on the comparison of data from the Late Iron Age/Early Hellenistic contexts of Komana with that from neighboring and distant settlements. In other words, the dissertation adopted a new perspective, focusing on the inland of Pontus and the north-central Anatolia from the central parts of the Anatolian plateau rather than from the southern littoral of the Black Sea.

In relation to this, while Komana was identified as a critical node, the scope of the research was limited to the area between Amisos (present-day Samsun) and Kotyora in the north. Another significant factor contributing to this limitation was the positioning of these two settlements at the endpoints of the most crucial passageways enabling the inland to be connected to the littoral. In other words, the only area that provides relatively easy natural passageways through the North Anatolian Mountain Range, which runs east-west from the Bithynia to the Caucasus, is the region between Amisos and Kotyora. Additionally, the Greek colonization of settlements along the narrow littoral zone suggests that Greek ascendancy was maintained even during the Iron Age and until the establishment of the Mithridatic Kingdom. Conversely, the inland regions of the Pontic area and north-central Anatolia possess more straightforward access to the central regions, as well as the western and southern regions of the Anatolian Plateau. That is to say, although the north-central Anatolia region is situated on the routes of the more accessible passes to the littoral zone, the littoral-inland passes on the North Anatolian Mountain Range may have been viewed as secondary options by the inhabitants of the inland Pontus region. Furthermore, it is necessary to consider the interactions between north-central Anatolia and the rest of the Anatolian Plateau, rather than limiting the connectivity with the southern Black Sea littoral.

The chronological frame of this thesis expanded between the Late Iron Age and Early Hellenistic Periods. The period under consideration in this thesis coincides with the concluding phase of the Achaemenid hegemony and the initial stages of the Hellenistic Period, which commenced with the arrival of Alexander the Great on the Anatolian plateau. In this context, the aforementioned time frame can be interpreted as the "transition" from Iron Age to Hellenistic traditions.
5.3. The Role of the Roads and the Archaeological Artefacts in Network Diagnosis

The inland of the Anatolian plateau is well-suited for the construction of a complex road system oriented in an east-west direction. However, the North Anatolian Mountain Range to the north and the Taurus and Amanos Mountains to the south present limitations in terms of access, with only river valleys and natural passages offering potential routes. Furthermore, the construction of the roads and the establishment of a road system are contingent upon the technological and financial circumstances. Following the utilisation of walking paths during the prehistoric period, the introduction of wheeled vehicles and chariots would have been a significant factor in the subsequent modifications to the road network. Furthermore, these constructed roads served as the foundation for the establishment of settlements along them. The occupational layers of these settlements, as well as the archaeological evidence, can be used to determine the time periods during which these roads were built and in use (Ökse, 2007: 35-45). Moreover, the presence of expansive rivers, expansive plains, and mountainous regions could have made the construction of new roads challenging or impossible during different historical periods (Massa, 2011: 39). In other words, the constructors or builders of these road systems should have selected the most cost-effective and time-efficient routes to establish these roads. Consequently, these roads were likely subject to modification and continued to be utilized for centuries.

In addition to these, the "Royal Road" and the "Southern Road" used by the Persians are the most well-known road networks dated to the Persian Period. French (1998: 15) proposed that the main highways of the Roman Anatolia were those constructed prior to the arrival of the Romans. The Romans improved them by paving the roads, setting up milestones and building bridges where necessary. Archaeological evidence indicates that milestones and inscriptions represent the most significant data to trace the routes of Roman roads in the Anatolian Plateau. This is also the reason why the Romans are better known than those dating to the pre-Roman times. Still, the presence of imported pottery can be linked with a trade road, while the defensive architectural remains can be linked with a martial road, and hence the function of ancient roads could be identified (Ökse, 2005:15).

A similar study was conducted within the context of this doctoral dissertation. In order to pursue it, two distinctive categories of pottery from the Late Iron Age and Early Hellenistic periods were included into this research project. The objective was not only to identify the sherds, but also to gain insight into the connections between Komana and other settlements in the region. Other small finds also assisted in bringing together routes and settlements within a network.
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Map 5.1 Land Routes on the Anatolian Plateau during the 8th-7th centuries B.C. according to the metal find spots (Birmingham, 1961: 188-189).
According to Birmingham, the land route utilized during this period, which dates to the early to mid-8th century BC, originated in Urartu or Iranian territory and traversed the interior of the Anatolian plateau to reach the Ionian cities. He postulated that this land route must have been utilized in conjunction with the sea route, which originated from Al Mina and traversed Cyprus, Rhodes, and Crete before reaching Greece and Etruria (Birmingham, 1961: 185). The primary evidence for the use of this land route is the discovery of metal objects (cauldrons, belt buckles, fibulae, etc.) at the settlements along the route.

5.3.1. Historical Overview

While Durbin's study indicated the presence of a few Phrygian settlements in the vicinity of Tokat and Sivas, specifically on the plains of Kazova, Niksar, and Erbaa, his most significant contribution was the identification of the Iron Age pottery of the research area (Durbin, 1971). In addition, Çâdîr-höyük, Tavium, Ziyaretsuyu, and Maşat Höyük are other Iron Age settlements in the region. The Phrygian layers at these sites dated to before the hegemony of the Achaemenids of the Anatolian plateau. The 6th century B.C. can be considered the period during when the north-central part of the Anatolian plateau and the Pontic region were under the rule of the Achaemenids (Xenophon, VIII. 6). However, there is still very little stratified data belonging to the Achaemenids, except for those at Oluz Höyük, which can be found in the publications of the Oluz Höyük Excavations (https://web.archive.org/web/20131204163910/http://oluzhoyuk.org/index.php/yayinlar).

The arrival of the Galatians in Anatolia, around 280-260 B.C. (Dusinberre, 2019:121), was associated with the production and distribution of a specific type of pottery found at sites on the Anatolian plateau. This pottery however, could not be sufficiently related to architecture. Further study of similar examples found at various sites within the Halys Basin led to the need to re-evaluate the name of this group of pottery. In recent years, these examples have been defined according to their distribution patterns rather than referring to a specific ethnic group.

From the mid-4th to the 1st centuries B.C., the Pontic region was under the rule of the Mithridatic Kingdom, which was succeeded by Roman domination.

5.3.2. Archaeological Data Sets from Komana

The pottery assemblage unearthed from the primary undisturbed contexts of Komana from the excavation seasons of 2018-2020 was categorized into three groups: Coarse, Medium, and Fine Wares. These categories were established based on the observed differences in the quality
and finish of the pottery. While the architectural remains were limited, the pottery and small artefacts were included in this dissertation to gain insight into the dynamics of Komana at these time periods. The contexts between the northeast-southwest oriented walls, which had stone foundations with superstructures of mud brick, also yielded coins, metal objects, one Egyptian scarab, and terracotta votive figurine fragments.

The Coarse Ware category was represented by a few sherds, while the Medium Ware category included cooking wares. The considerable quantity of pottery was classified as Fine Wares. The pottery within this group was further subdivided into two categories: plain and painted wares. It is postulated that the unpainted and undecorated examples may have been manufactured in large quantities for use as utilitarian wares. Moreover, the painted examples and the distinctive group with pinched-handled vessels were selected as the primary research material for this dissertation. All pertinent details regarding the characteristics, dating, and distribution of these pottery pieces were previously discussed in Chapter 3. The research was conducted according to their typological characteristics and, more significantly, their painting and decorative patterns. In other words, a macroscopic analysis was conducted, as well as comparisons.

5.3.2.1. The Banded Ware

The most conspicuous painted group of pottery was that decorated with horizontal concentric bands. The pottery found at Gordion was classified as the "West Anatolian Banded Ware" (300-150 B.C.), while the examples from the sites within the Halys Basin were designated as the "East Anatolian Banded Ware" (200-50 B.C.) based on their painting techniques and dating (Stewart, 2010; Maier, 1963).

The distribution of the analogous Banded Ware examples of the Komana repertoire that were identified during this study can be observed on the map. It was expected that similarity would be found at neighboring sites, such as those in the North-Central Anatolia and northern Cappadocia regions. However, the most notable indications were the discovery of similar pottery outside the Halys Basin, at the Gordion context in the west of Galatia and, more intriguingly, at Cilician sites.

In addition to this, further research revealed that the production and use of the Banded Ware pottery continued between 334 B.C. and 25 B.C. at the Hellenistic deposits of the sites included in the dissertation.
Map 5.2 Banded Ware sites within the scope of the thesis dated to the Pre-Hellenistic Period (Map: Dries Daems, Ayşe Batman).

Map 5.3 Distribution of the Hellenistic Banded Ware over the sites within the scope of the research (Map: Onuralp Uluçay, Ayşe Batman).
5.3.2.2. The Hellenistic Color-Coated Ware

The other pottery group included in the scope of this research is the Plain Wares, which is one of the subcategories of the Fine Wares within the Komana pottery repertoire. Dipping technique was employed for the slip of these examples. However, the most distinctive feature of these examples was their pinched handles. The cups in question exhibit, a loop handle pressed at the center, on each side. This category is designated as the Hellenistic Color-Coated Ware.

The precise location of the distribution and production centers of this pottery remains uncertain. While Domzalsky proposed that the Rhodes was the distribution center (Domzalski, 2007: 166, 171), alternative sites at the Levantine coast (Hayes, 1991: 23-24), Cyprus (Hayes, 1991), and Cnidus (Kögler, 2014:59, Tuna, N. & Kassab-Tezgör, D., 1987: 34-35) have also been suggested as potential production centers. While the production centers are still the subject of controversy, they have a very broad distribution. Examples of this category can be found in the Hellenistic pottery repertoires of Cingirt Kayasi, Kurul Kalesi, and Giresun-Aretias/Khalkeritis, situated in the southern Black Sea region. Furthermore, some sites in the western and northern parts of the Black Sea basin, such as Olbia and Tanais, also exhibit these
examples in their Hellenistic pottery assemblages (Domzalsky, 2007). Additionally, the sites in the vicinity of Rough Cilicia and the Cilician Littoral, including Nagidos, are worthy of mention (Durukan-Körsulu, 2007). As Jones (1950: Fig. 181-182) and Peter Stone (personal communication) have noted, examples of this phenomenon can be found at Tarsus-Gözlükule and Kinet Höyük. It is of interest to note that only three sites in the interior of the Anatolian plateau have yielded these examples: Gordion (Stewart, 2010: 163-164), Kültepe (Tüysüz, 2022: 221) and Komana. The latter site has also yielded examples of Hellenistic pottery. Furthermore, at sites on the western coast of the Anatolian plateau, such as Miletus (Pfrommer, 1985: 50, 55, 56, 58) and Didyma (Wintermeyer, 2004: 144, Fig. 1395), similar examples can be found. Further archaeological and scientific analysis is required to ascertain the production centers and distribution of them.

Map 5.5 Distribution of the Hellenistic Banded Ware over the sites within the scope of the research (Map: Onuralp Uluçay, Aysçe Batman).
Map 5.6 The Network Map according to the distribution of the Hellenistic Color-Coated Ware (Map: Dries Daems, Ayşe Batman)

The remaining examples in these categories, as well as a unique body sherd with incised ivy tendrils over a burnished gray background at the Komana repertoire, exhibit similarities with the ones from Gordion, which were grouped under the categories of "Goat Pitchers" and "Mottled Purple Slip Ware" (Stewart: 2010, 210, Fig. 241, 243).

The Komana pottery repertoire also includes four body sherds with thin walls and a shiny black gloss, which could be interpreted as imitations of metal cups. The evidence suggests that these sherds may have been imported from Attica.

A concurrent investigation was also conducted with the analysis of pottery artifacts during this research. The objective of this study was to ascertain the routes and roads on the Anatolian plateau, particularly during the Persian Period, in order to gain insight into the position of Komana on these routes. In light of this, it was determined that Komana was situated along the principal arteries.

The results of the studies conducted during this dissertation indicate that Komana had well-established connections with the southern littoral of the Black Sea and the Cilician littoral of the Mediterranean to the south, as well as with the west during the Late Iron Age and Early
Hellenistic Periods. The exceptional discoveries at Komana, including the Knossos coin and the Egyptian scarab-shaped stamp seal, were regarded as evidence of overseas networks. It seems plausible to suggest that these networks of relations were established via the Black Sea.

Map 5.7 The position of Komana on the roads dated to the Persian, Hellenistic and Roman Periods and the sites with the studied pottery (Map: Onuralp Uluçay, Ayşe Batman).
CHAPTER 6

CONCLUSION

The scope of this dissertation was derived primarily on a group of pottery unearthed during the excavations conducted between 2018 and 2020 as part of the Komana Archaeological Research Project, of which I have been a member since 2018. The studies have been carried out since 2004 at Komana Pontica, located within the borders of Gümenek Village in the center of today's Tokat province under the directorship of Burcu Erciyas (METU, Ankara). Komana, located at the 10th km of the Tokat-Niksar highway, is a settlement spread on both banks of the Iris River and is situated on the Dazimonitis Plain (today's Kazova). The fact that it was located on the route of the Iris River must have increased not only its fertile agricultural lands but also its strategic importance. The studies at Komana, which is known to have functioned as a temple-state during the Hellenistic Period, have been initiated and are continuing in order to follow the administrative, socio-cultural and economic processes of the settlement and to identify its possible internal and external connections as a religious center. These studies continue on the mound called Hamamtepe.

During the 2018 excavations, a group of northeast-southwest oriented walls and accompanying deposits unearthed from primary undisturbed contexts provided the starting point for this thesis. In contrast to the thick, mortared, north-south oriented walls built with small stones familiar from the Ottoman, Danishmend/Seljuk and Byzantine periods of the mound, the north-south oriented walls, also mortared, but built with larger stones arranged haphazardly, were uncovered in trenches 297/608 and 307/608 in the HTP01 sector of the mound. The pottery and bone finds in the contexts where these architectural elements were found shed light on the dating of these levels. On the other hand, coins, figurine fragments and small metal finds from the same contexts also played an important role in the dating of these levels.

During the course of investigating analogous examples of the pottery under consideration in terms of their typological and decorative features, certain limitations were identified. As the study progressed, plans were formulated within the context of the planned site visits and the idea of examining the contexts where parallel examples were identified. However, the pandemic (COVID-19) from 2020 to 2022 led to travel restrictions and the necessity for
excavation teams to be unable to work intermittently or to continue their work with a limited number of members. In this context, it is unfortunately impossible to realise the planned field trips and surveys. Nevertheless, several field trips were organized in 2023, with a particular focus on examining the topography and elucidating the littoral-inland relationship. During these field trips, visits were also made to museums where it was determined that examples of pottery similar to Komana were being exhibited. At least, it was possible to closely examine the exhibited examples.

Within the scope of the thesis study, the pottery from the primary undisturbed contexts of trenches 297/608 and 307/608 were first analyzed and it was decided that the investigation of the relationship networks in question would be based on the pottery. The group categorized as Coarse Ware consists of unpainted and undecorated body sherds and three handle fragments, one of which may be of Rhodes origin. The group labeled as Medium Ware consists of cooking pots with medium thick walls, with different diameters, depths and forms, many of which are burnt. The Fine Ware group consists of thin walled table wares.

The Fine Ware group is the densest group in the Late Iron Age-Early Hellenistic pottery assemblage. These pottery can be divided into two main categories: plain ones and painted and decorated ones. Forms such as bowls, cups and plates are more common, while forms such as large-scale craters are not encountered. All examples are wheel-made. All of them are slipped. It is understood that the plain ones are mass-produced. Some prominent groups were identified among the painted and decorated ones. The Late Iron Age examples consist of "Red/Brown Banded Ware" and "Polychrome Painted Pitcher Fragments" whose decorations are localized on only one "panel". The situation is slightly different in the Hellenistic Period. The banded decorated examples defined as "Hellenistic Banded Ware", which can be interpreted as the characteristic pottery trend of the settlements in the central Anatolian plateau during this period, constitute the densest group of Komana pottery repertoire. On the other hand, the "Dipping Technique" with pinched handles, which are completely slipped on the inside and partially slipped on the outside, and made by pressing in the center and creating a loop on the sides, represents another dense and prominent group of the repertoire.

The distribution of the above-mentioned pottery groups was primarily investigated in the settlements in North-Central Anatolia, the settlements in the region between Amisos and Kotyora, where the Black Sea coastline provides the easiest communication with the inland, Gordion in western Phrygia constitutes the westernmost part of the scope of the thesis, while some settlements in Cappadocia and then in Cilicia were reached south of Komana.
On the other hand, by analyzing the roads and routes passing through the interior and the north of the Anatolian plateau from the Achaemenid Period to the Roman Period, and by looking at the correlations with the sites where the pottery in question were found, it was tried to understand the position and strategic importance of Komana in the Late Iron Age and Early Hellenistic Period.

The results of the study indicated that there was sufficient evidence to conclude that Iron Age traditions continued without significant modifications during the subsequent period. Consequently, the comprehensive examination of the data and analyses indicates that the "Iron Age" tradition in the pottery repertoire of Komana persisted into the Hellenistic Period. Although there is a partial Hellenization in the forms of the samples, which do not show a significant change especially in terms of painting and decoration, the presence of Phrygian elements continues.

When the data provided by the primary undisturbed contexts of the Late Iron Age and early Hellenistic Period at Komana are evaluated together with the ancient sources and the results of the limited number of archaeological studies conducted at the sites covered by this thesis, it can be reasonably concluded that Komana followed the pottery traditions of the inland parts of the Anatolian plateau in terms of pottery repertoire during this period. Given that Komana may have been a destination point due to the roads passing through the region and its religious location, as well as its relatively easier access to the southern Black Sea littoral, it can be inferred that Komana may have established networks of relations with overseas regions more easily or may have been secondarily involved in the existing networks. However, the analysis of the pottery and other small finds yielded an intriguing result: the southern relations appear to have originated in Cilicia. To gain a more comprehensive understanding of this finding, it is recommended that archaeometric studies be conducted. Furthermore, it is proposed that new data be obtained from the ongoing studies at Komana and that deeper investigations be conducted at the settlements identified along the roads and routes. This will help to reveal the position of the entire northern interior of Anatolia from Komana to the roads in the Late Iron Age and Hellenistic Period with greater clarity.
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A. PLATES

Komana Late Iron Age painted examples.
Komana Late Iron Age pitchers.
Komana Hellenistic Banded Ware base fragments.
Komana Hellenistic Banded Ware base fragments.
Komana Hellenistic Banded Ware rim fragments.
Komana Hellenistic Banded Ware body sherd fragments.
Komana Hellenistic Color-Coated Ware examples.
Komana Hellenistic Color-Coated Ware examples.
Komana Hellenistic imported (?)/ Ephesianising example.
Komana imported Delicate Banded Ware example (?).
Komana sherds with ivy garlands.
B. CATALOGUE

Komana Late Iron Age Pottery:

Red/Brown Banded Ware:

Cat. No.: 1

KARP18  HTP01

Trench: 297/608  Layer: T15

Fabric of the rim: 0.7cm.

Fabric of the sherd: 1.00cm.

W: 10.01cm.  H: 7.01cm.  D: 24cm.

Width of the band on the interior: 3.3cm.

Rim fragment of a large bowl.

Fabric: Brownish orange fabric with rough texture, some pores and small black stone inclusions.

Both the exterior and interior of the body sherd are slipped. The exterior is decorated with a 2.1 cm. wide red band that surrounds the rim, while the interior is decorated with one 3.4 cm. wide red band on the opposite side of the rim.

Date: Late Iron Age
Cat. No.: 2

KARP HTP01

Trench: 307/608 Layer: T13

Fabric of the rim: 0.4cm.

Fabric of the sherd: 0.6cm.

W: 8.1cm. L: 7.7cm.

Rim fragment of a bowl.

Fabric: Brownish orange fabric with a few mica inclusions.

Straight rim. There is a one row of reddish brown band around the rim on the exterior. One of them is very prominent, and the other, the tip of which is visible on the edge of the lower fracture of the sherd, has red bands on the exterior.

Date: Late Iron Age
Polychrome Pitcher Fragments:

Cat. No.: 3

KARP19      HTP01

Trench: 297/608   Layer: T15

Fabric: Orange fabric without inclusions.

This example comprises three body fragments without any diagnostic fragments, such as a base, rim, or handle. The exterior of the pitcher is painted with beige slip. The horizontal decorations on the exterior are semi-circular and arranged in a row, resembling a basket. They are flanked by vertical reddish-orange bands at regular intervals. A horizontal row, painted in reddish-orange and measuring 3.00cm thick, is used to separate the neck from the rest of the sherd. The neck fragment bears a thin black contour at the bottom. Geometric patterns, including cross-hatchings, are partially visible on the beige background. This is the only example in the Komana repertoire.

Date: Late Iron Age (?)

Comparanda: No comparable example was found.
Cat. No.: 4  

**KARP18**  
**HTP01**

**Trench:** 307/608  
**Layer:** T12

**W (handle):** 3.4 cm.  
**H (handle):** 8.9 cm.

**Fabric:** Orange fabric with a few pores and unsmooth texture.

The exterior and interior of half of the rim, the entire handle, and half of the neck are not slipped. A horizontal, black-contoured, leaf-like motif painted in white and red is visible on the rim. There are upside down, black-contoured, cross-hatched red motifs on panels with a buff/beige background underneath the handle and neck.

**Date:** 11\textsuperscript{th}-9\textsuperscript{th} centuries B.C. (Kınık Höyük) (Ergürer, 2016: 92), 7\textsuperscript{th}-6\textsuperscript{th} centuries B.C. (Kaman-Kalehöyük (Matsumura, 2008: 177), Gordion (Henrickson, 1993: 132).

**Comparanda:** Kınık Höyük (Ergürer, 2016: 92), Gordion Destruction Level (Sams, 1974: 148).
Cat No.: 5

KARP20        HTP01

Trench: 297/608    Layer: T

W (body sherd): 6.7 cm.

H (handle): 9.7 cm.

W (handle): 2.9 cm.

Fabric: The fabric is reddish orange in color with few pores and a partly smooth texture.

The fragment comprises the entire handle and two body fragments, all of which have slipped exterior and interior surfaces. The exterior surface has a very smooth texture, and the entire handle is painted brown-red. The body fragments have a beige/cream background with a row of red band decoration between thin, black band decorations. Between the banded rows are upside-down triangular motifs on a beige/cream background with black contours on the outside and completely painted in red on the inside. The interior of the fragment has been left undecorated.


Comparanda: Boğazköy (Matsumura, 2005: 338), Kaman-Kalehöyük (Matsumura, 2000: 126; Genz, 2000). Furthermore, similar examples of Komana have been found in the settlements of Eskiypar and Boğazköy and are currently exhibited in the Çorum Museum.
Hellenistic Banded Ware:

Cat. No. : 6

KARP HTP01

Trench: Layer: T

F: 1.00cm. Center: 0.9cm. Wall: 0.7cm.

Fabric: Buff fabric with lime and a few mica inclusions.

Base with wide conical foot. Exterior is plain while the interior surface is decorated with compass made concentric dark red circles over a very thin, light colored background.

Date: Late Iron Age (?)/ Hellenistic (?)
Cat. No. : 7

KARP20    HTP01

Trench: 297/608    Layer: T25

Fabric: Buff with a few lime inclusions.

The exterior rim of a plate slipped without any decorative patterns. The unslipped interior surface is decorated with two orange and one white concentric bands.

Date: Hellenistic
Cat. No.: 8

KARP HTP01

Trench: 307/608 Layer: T13

Fabric of the base: 3.2cm.

Fabric of the foot: 0.9cm.

Fabric of the wall: 0.9cm.

Center thickness: 1.00cm.

W: 6.1cm. L: 5.4cm.

Base of a bowl.

Fabric: The fabric is orange in color, with a few white lime inclusions.

Both the exterior and interior surfaces slipped. The exterior surface is smooth, while the interior surface is decorated with five rows of red bands.

Date: Hellenistic

Comparanda: East Anatolian Banded Ware.
Cat. No.: 9

KARP HTP01

**Trench:** 307/608  **Layer:** T13

**Fabric of the base:** 2.00cm.

**Fabric of the foot:** 0.8cm.

**Fabric of the wall:** 0.5cm.

**Center thickness:** 0.5cm.

**W:** 8.8cm.  **L:** 7.3cm.

A fragment of a fish plate imitation or predecessor.

**Fabric:** Light orange fabric.

The surface is characterized by a smooth texture. Both the exterior and interior surfaces exhibited slippage. The exterior surface was unadorned, while the interior surface was decorated with a reddish and white band motif.

**Date:** Hellenistic

**Comparanda:** East Anatolian Banded Ware.
Cat. No.: 10

KARP HTP01

Trench: 307/608 Layer: T13

Fabric of the base: 1.8cm.

Fabric of the foot: 0.6cm.

Fabric of the wall: 0.4cm.

Center thickness: 0.3cm.

Base fragment of a cup.


Both the exterior and interior surfaces slipped, admitting a high degree of smoothness. The exterior surface is plain, while the interior surface appears to have been decorated with a single row of red band. Additionally, a leaf-shaped stamp is visible towards the center of the base fragment.

Date: Hellenistic

Comparanda: East Anatolian Banded Ware.
Cat. No.: 11

KARP HTP01

Trench: 307/608  Layer: T13

Fabric of the base: 1.1 cm.

Fabric of the foot: 0.7 cm.

Fabric of the wall: 0.3 cm.

Complete base of a small cup.


One of the thinnest vessels in the Komana repertoire, it is notable for its thinness and the quality of its slip. The exterior has a smoother surface than the interior, which is decorated with three rows of concentric orange bands.

Date: Hellenistic

Comparanda: East Anatolian Banded Ware.
Cat. No.: 12

KARP HTP01

Trench: 307/608 Layer: T13

Fabric of the base: 0.8cm.

Fabric of the foot: 0.7cm.

Fabric of the wall: 0.6cm.

Base of a circular footed cup.


Both exterior and interior slipped. While exterior left plain, the interior is decorated with three rows of reddish bands.

Date: Hellenistic

Comparanda: East Anatolian Banded Ware.
Cat. No.: 13

KARP  HTP01

Trench: 307/608  Layer: T13

Fabric of the base: 1.3cm.

Fabric of the foot: 0.7cm.

Fabric of the wall: 0.5cm.

Center thickness: 0.5cm.

Base fragment of a footed wide bowl.

Fabric: Pure orange fabric with a few mica inclusions.

Both exterior and interior are slipped. Both surfaces have smooth textures. While exterior left plain, a 1.00cm. thick wide, concentric, red band applied as a decoration to the interior surface.

Date: Hellenistic

Comparanda: East Anatolian Banded Ware.
Cat. No.: 14

KARP HTP01

Trench: 307/608  Layer: T13

Fabric of the base: 1.8cm.

Fabric of the foot: 1.00cm.

Fabric of the wall: 0.7cm.

Center thickness: 0.3cm.

Base fragment of a bowl which has a conical foot.


Both exterior and interior slipped. Both surfaces have smooth textures. While exterior left plain, interior is decorated with one red, one white concentric bands.

Date: Hellenistic

Comparanda: East Anatolian Banded Ware.
Cat. No.: 15

KARP18  HTP01

**Trench:** 297/608  **Layer:** T15

**Fabric of the base:** 1.8cm.

**Fabric of the foot:** 0.7cm.

**Fabric of the wall:** 0.5cm.

Base fragment of a footed bowl.

**Fabric:** Light orange brownish fabric without inclusions.

The exterior and interior surfaces are slipped, exquisitely smooth textured. While the exterior is plain, the interior is decorated with four rows of concentric thin bands.
Cat. No.: 16

KARP18            HTP01

Trench: 307/608    Layer: T13

Fabric of the rim: 1.00cm.

Fabric of the sherd: 0.6cm.

W: 9.2cm.        L: 8.3cm.

Rim fragment of a plate.

Fabric: The fabric is reddish orange in color and without inclusions or pores.

The lip of the plate is outturned. Five rows of bands have been applied over the slip of the interior surface, while the exterior surface has been left plain. The bands are arranged from outside to inside, with one red and one white.

Date: Hellenistic.

Comparanda: Kınık Höyük.
Cat. No.: 17

KARP HTP01

Trench: 307/608  Layer: T13

Fabric of the rim: 0.4cm.

Fabric of the sherd: 0.4cm.

W: 8.4cm.  L: 4.9cm.

Rim fragment of a bowl.


Both the exterior and interior surfaces slipped. The surface was smooth, and there were no inclusions on the fabric. However, mica could be identified on the slip. One row of red bands was applied to the exterior of the rim, and the rest was left plain. Two red bands were used towards the center of the sherd: one thin and one thick.

Date: Hellenistic

Comparanda: East Anatolian Banded Ware.
Cat. No.: 18

KARP HTP01

Trench: 307/608  Layer: T13

Fabric of the rim: 2.00 cm.

Fabric of the foot: 0.8 cm.

Fabric of the wall: 0.5 cm.

Center thickness: 0.5 cm.

Rim of a small cup.


Both interior and exterior slipped. One row of dark red band applied around the rim. However the slip is deformed. Interior one row of dark red band applied.

Date: Hellenistic

Comparanda: East Anatolian Banded Ware.
Cat. No.: 19

KARP18 HTP01

**Trench:** 297/608  **Layer:** T16

P: 0.6cm.  W: 9.1cm.  H: 7.4 cm.

**Fabric:** Orangey brown with a few pores, without any inclusions.

A wheel made body sherd with a smooth, polished surface on the exterior. Semi-slipped sherd and the slip drips towards the non-slipped part of the sherd. Dark-brown slip was applied to the entire interior surface. The brown background consists of three concentric white bands made with a compass.

**Date:** Nevşehir/Camihöyük example dated to the 1st century B.C.

**Comparanda:** Nevşehir Camihöyük (Tezer, 2011: 45, 136).
Cat. No.: 20

KARP18      HTP01

Trench: 307/608      Layer: T14

P: 0.7cm.      H: 8.8cm.      W: 6.4cm.

Fabric: Dark orange fabric without inclusions unsmoothed texture.

The body sherd of a bowl has slip applied to both the exterior and interior with the same color as the fabric. Two concentric bands were used as a decorative pattern on the interior.

Date: Hellenistic

Comparanda: East Anatolian Banded Ware.
Cat. No.: 21

KARP18        HTP01

Trench: 307/608    Layer: T14

P: 0.4cm.     H: 6.3cm.     W: 9.5cm.

**Fabric:** Orangey brown fabric without inclusions smooth texture.

A body sherd of a bowl with both exterior and interior surfaces slipped with the same color of the fabric. The exterior of the object has a smooth and plain surface, while the interior is decorated with two concentric bands - one thin and one thick - both colored red. The thin band is located on the outer side of the thick band.

**Date:** Hellenistic

**Comparanda:** East Anatolian Banded Ware.
Cat. No.: 22

KARP20    HTP01

**Trench:** 297/608    **Layer:** T25

**P:** 0.4cm.    **H:** 6.00cm.    **W:** 5.8cm.

**Fabric:** The fabric is orange-brown with a few white lime inclusions.

This is a body sherd of a small bowl. The exterior and interior surfaces are slipped with the same fabric color. The exterior is plain, while the interior is adorned with one thin and one thick concentric orange band.

**Date:** Hellenistic

**Comparanda:** East Anatolian Banded Ware.
Cat. No.: 23
KARP18        HTP01

Trench: 307/608          Layer: T14

Fabric of the body sherd: The fabric is orange-brown with a few white lime inclusions.

W: 0.4cm.       H: 4.5cm.

Body sherd of a bowl.


Both the exterior and interior surfaces are slipped, with the exterior being plain and having an extremely smooth surface, while the interior is rough and decorated with one thin and one thicker concentric orange band.

Date: Hellenistic

Comparanda: East Anatolian Banded Ware.
Cat. No.: 24

KARP19      HTP01

**Trench:** 297/608      **Layer:** T16

**P:** 0.4cm.      **H:** 3.1cm.      **W:** 2.8cm.

**Fabric:** The fabric is brown and has a smooth texture without any visible inclusions.

Body sherd of a bowl (?). Both exterior and interior slipped with the fabric color. Exterior left plain and interior is decorated with two concentric bands. The other band is black whereas the inner one is white. There’s a little trace of a white band on the outer edge of the black one.

**Date:** Hellenistic

**Comparanda:** East Anatolian Banded Ware.
Cat. No.: 25
KARP18    HTP01

**Trench:** 307/608    **Layer:** T14

**P:** 0.9cm.    **H:** 4.01cm.    **W:** 4.2cm.

**Fabric:** Dark orange fabric with a few pores not smooth.

A body sherd of a plate that has been slipped with fabric color on both the exterior and interior. The exterior is left plain, while the interior is decorated with two concentric orange bands, one thick and one thin.

**Date:** Hellenistic

**Comparanda:** East Anatolian Banded Ware.
**Hellenistic Color-Coated Ware:**

Cat. No.: 26

KARP18  HTP01

**Trench:** 297/608  **Layer:** T17

**Fabric of the rim:** 0.4cm.

**Fabric of the sherd:** 0.4cm.

**W:** 10.1cm.  **H:** 3.8cm.

**Width of the handle:** 3.8cm.

Rim fragment of a carinated cup with a fragmentary part of a pinched handle.

**Fabric:** Orange fabric with a few little pores.

Both exterior and interior surfaces slip in orange color. While the color of the slip on the exterior is orange, the slip on the interior appears brownish due to oxidation during the firing process. Both surfaces are smooth in texture without decoration. The handle is not preserved, but the shape of the missing handle can be discerned as a pinched handle with two loops on either side, based on the proximity of the handle to the sherd.

**Date:** Hellenistic.

**Comparanda:** Hellenistic Color-Coated Ware.
Cat. No.: 27

KARP18          HTP01

Trench: 297/608     Layer: T16

Fabric of the rim: 0.3cm.

Fabric of the sherd: 0.4cm.

W: 11.4cm.          H: 4.3cm.

Fabric of the handle: 0.7cm.

Width of the handle: 0.7cm.

Height of the handle: 2.3cm.

This is a rim fragment of a carinated cup with a pinched handle.

Fabric: Light orange / orange fabric with a few black stone inclusions.

Both interior and exterior surfaces exhibited a slippage in an orange/brown coloration. Both surfaces exhibited a smooth texture. While the exterior was partially slipped, the interior was completely slipped. The dipping technique was used. Both surfaces were without decoration.

Date: Hellenistic.

Comparanda: Hellenistic Color-Coated Ware.
Cat. No.: 28

KARP20          HTP01

Trench: 297/608       Layer: T15

P (body sherd) : 0.5cm.
P (handle)       : 0.9cm.
H (handle)       : 0.6 cm.
H (handle)       : 0.6cm.
W (body sherd): 6.4 cm.

Fabric: Reddish orange fabric. A few lime inclusions undecorated both exterior and interior.

The fragment shows a complete handle attached to part of a carinated cup. It is bow-shaped with a loop on each side, as it is pressed in the middle, namely a recurved handle.

Date: Hellenistic.

Comparanda: Hellenistic Color-Coated Ware.
Cat. No.: 29

KARP18  HTP01

Trench: 297/608  Layer: T15

P (body sherd): 0.4 cm.
P (rim): 0.4 cm.
P (handle): 1.6 cm.

H (body sherd): 4.4 cm.
H (handle): 1.8 cm.

Fabric: Orange fabric without inclusions.

A handle and rim fragment of a carinated cup with a prominent lip. Traces of the orange slip were applied to both the exterior and interior, however, the slip is deformed and peeled off. It is bow-shaped with a loop on each side, as it is pressed in the middle, namely a recurved handle. Notably, the coil used for the handle is the thickest among the Komana examples.

Date: Hellenistic.

Comparanda: Hellenistic Color-Coated Ware.
Cat. No.: 30

KARP20 HTP01

Trench: 297/608 Layer: T15

Fabric: Light orange fabric without inclusion and pores.

P (sherd): 0.4 cm.

P (rim): 0.3 cm.

P (handle): 1.00 cm.

H (sherd): 5.1 cm.

H (handle): 2.4 cm.

W (sherd): 7.7 cm.

Fabric: Dark orange fabric without inclusions.

The lip is attached to a very prominent carinated cup with a recurved handle. Both the exterior and interior are slipped with the same colored slip. The exterior is heavily corroded. Despite resting on only half of a recurved handle, it is considered to be the largest of the Komana examples.

Date: Hellenistic.

Comparanda: Hellenistic Color-Coated Ware.
Cat. No.: 31

KARP18  HTP01

Trench: 297/608  Layer: T17

Fabric of the rim: 0.4cm.

Fabric of the sherd: 0.4cm.

W: 5.4cm.  H: 2.5cm.

Fabric of the handle: 0.8cm.

Width of the handle: 4.00cm.

Height of the handle: 1.5cm.

The fragment of a rim of a carinated cup with a complete pinched handle.


The exterior and interior surfaces slipped, however a reddish slip was applied over the lip and interior of the rim. Both surfaces are undecorated.

Date: Hellenistic.

Comparanda: Hellenistic Color-Coated Ware.
Cat. No.: 32
KARP20 HTP01

Trench: 297/608 Layer: T17

Fabric of the handle: 0.8cm.

Fabric of the sherd: 0.3cm.

W: 4.4cm. H: 2.3cm.

Body sherd of a carinated cup with a ¾ remained pinched handle.


Both exterior and interior surfaces are worn, with the majority of the slip having been removed. Traces of reddish orange slip are visible on the handle and sherd. The two surfaces are undecorated.

Date: Hellenistic.

Comparanda: Hellenistic Color-Coated Ware.
Cat. No.: 33
KARP20       HTP01

Trench: 297/608       Layer: T17

Fabric of the rim: 0.4cm.

Fabric of the sherd: 0.3cm.

W: 3.9cm.           H: 3.00cm.

Fabric of the handle: 0.9cm.

Width of the handle: 3.3cm.

Height of the handle: 2.2cm.

Rim fragment of a carinated cup with a ¾ remained pinched handle.

Fabric: The fabric is reddish orange in color with a few white lime inclusions. The exterior and interior are both slipped, with the exterior exhibiting a brownish coloration, while the interior is reddish orange. Both surfaces are undecorated.

Date: Hellenistic.

Comparanda: Hellenistic Color-Coated Ware.
Cat. No.: 34

KARP20 HTP01

Trench: 297/608    Layer: T17

Fabric of the handle: 0.8cm.

Fabric of the sherd: 0.4cm.

H: 3.00cm.

A pinched handle fragment of a carinated cup.

Fabric: Orange fabric without inclusions.

The exterior and interior of the item in question have been slipped with a brown-colored slip. It is an undecorated sherd.

Date: Hellenistic.

Comparanda: Hellenistic Color-Coated Ware.
Cat. No.: 35

KARP18        HTP01

**Trench:** 297/608  **Layer:** T17

**Fabric of the handle:** 0.8cm.

**Fabric of the sherd:** 0.3cm.

A pinched handle fragment of a carinated cup.

**Fabric:** Orange fabric without inclusions.

The exterior and interior surfaces are slipped with reddish-colored slip. Both surfaces do have color shading due to oxidation during firing. There are no decorations.

**Date:** Hellenistic.

**Comparanda:** Hellenistic Color-Coated Ware.
Cat. No.: 36

KARP18 HTP01

**Trench:** 297/608  **Layer:** T17

**Fabric of the handle:** 0.7 cm.

A pinched handle fragment of a carinated cup.

**Fabric:** Orangey/light orange fabric.

The slip should have been applied, but it is no longer visible. In fact, there are no remaining traces on the sherd to identify the color of the slip.

**Date:** Hellenistic.

**Comparanda:** Hellenistic Color-Coated Ware.
Komana Imported Examples:

Cat. No.: 37

KARP18  HTP01

Trench: 307/608  Layer: T14

Fabric: The fabric is dark gray and has a smooth texture.

This is a sherd from a deep bowl. The sherd is burnished both on the exterior and the interior. The exterior of the jar is decorated with ivy tendrils with a horizontal S-shaped incised waves. The interior is plain. At the bottom of the sherd there is a horizontal projection that probably covers the entire surface of the vessel. A groove on the interior surface of the protrusion extends symmetrically and encircles the vessel.

Date: 189 B.C.

Comparanda: Gordion (Stewart, 2010: 304). The pottery, which were black glazed and decorated with ivy tendrils and sometimes with deer motifs, which were made by using the incision technique at Gordion can be counted as good comparandas for the Komana example. In relation with this, Winter engaged in a debate regarding the underlying reasons behind the prevalence of these pottery examples, which the citizens of Gordion found appealing. One hypothesis was that the citizens preferred the black glazed pottery of the Greeks, while another was that they continued to embrace the black glazed pottery tradition that had been popular in the Iron Age at Gordion (Winter, 1988: 63).
Cat. No.: 38

KARP18   HTP01

Trench: 307/608   Layer: T14

P (body sherd): 0.8cm.

H (body sherd): 7.7cm.

W (body sherd): 6.6 cm.


While the exterior of the sherd is decorated with beige/white colored slip at the background, and black ivy tendrils are painted over it. Additionally, one complete and one half red ivy leaves are placed horizontally and consecutively. These are also visible within the black ivy tendrils as well. The interior of the sherd is left plain.

Date: 3rd century B.C. (Oluz Höyük, Eskiyapar, Boğazköy), Early Hellenistic (333-235 B.C.) (Gordion).

Comparanda: Oluz Höyük (Dönmez & Naza Dönmez, 2007: 412, Pic.26-28), Eskiyapar (Zoroğlu, 1986: 460, Pic. 1-2), Göynüce-Harmancık Village - Amasya (Dönmez, 2001: 96, Fig.2-3), Boğazköy (Zoroğlu, 1986: 227, Fig.13, 460, Fig.3 (5-6)), Akkaya – Amasya (Özsait, 2003: Pl.1, 6), Daskyleion (Bulut, 2013: 78), Gordion (Stewart, 2010: 182-183). Ivy leaves, which are characteristic of the 'West Slope Ware' type of pottery, were widely used in Attica and later spread to a workshop established in Pergamon on the western coast of the Anatolian plateau. The workshop of the 'Ivy Platter', whose location is uncertain, also exported to the Black Sea, Alexandria, Cyprus and the Levant (Rotroff, 2002: 97). Dönmez compared the various ivy motifs on the pottery from the Amasya Museum and proposed that the ivy motifs with a light background may have been the prototype of the Hellenistic ivy motifs, which were created on carinated pottery as well as horizontally placed over the sherds (Dönmez, 2001: 93).
Fig. Ivy leaf decorated cup in the exhibition at Amasya Museum (Amasya/Göynücek Village) (Dönmez, 2001: 98).
Cat. No.: 39

KARP18        HTP01

Trench: 297/608   Layer: T16

Fabric of the body sherd: 0.7cm.

W: 4.3cm.   H: 4.4cm.

Body sherd of a fabric is brownish orange in color and has a very smooth and pure texture.

The exterior and interior of the body sherd are highly decorated. The exterior is decorated with black, brown, and orange bands, as well as orange tooth patterns and upside-down triangles. The interior is decorated with bands that match the exterior colors, orange waves, and "leaf"-shaped black-contoured pattern with black hatched designs over a beige background.

Date: 7th/6th centuries B.C./Hellenistic (?)

Comparanda: Ephesianising (?)
Cat. No.: 40

KARP18  HTP01

**Trench:** 307/608  **Layer:** T15

**P (base):** 0.7cm.

**P (foot):** 1.4cm.

**P (wall):** 0.5cm.

**Fabric:** Very smooth orange fabric of a bowl.

A unique sherd in the repertoire of Komana pottery, belongs to a plate. The interior of the sherd features brown and black brush bands, as well as a floral motif stamp towards the center of the base. The stamp was printed on the painted row and the transitions between the colors were made according to the rotation of the brush. There is an unpainted band 0.5 cm thick from the upper edge of the painted row to the walls of the plate, and a painted band, similar to the one in the middle, above it.

**Date:** 3rd-2nd centuries B.C. (Heinze et al., 2018: 807).

**Comparanda:** Although this type of stamp was used in Hellenistic pottery (especially in the groups of the Black Slipped Predecessors (BSP) Eastern Sigillata A (ESA) in mainland Greece, both in the southern parts and inland of the Anatolian plateau and in the Levant), the Komana example and that from Priene belonging to the group called "Delicate Banded Ware" (Heinze et al., 2018: 807) are similar regarding the brushstrokes and the applied technique.
Cat. No.: 41

KARP18  HTP01

Trench: 297/608  Layer: T16

Fabric of the rim: 0.4cm.

Fabric of the sherd: 0.7cm.

W: 7.6cm.  L: 6.1cm.

Rim of a large bowl.

Fabric: Orange fabric without inclusions.

Both exterior and interior slipped. Smooth surface. Both sides of the rim are decorated with black, orange, white and orange bands.

Date: Hellenistic.

Comparanda: East Anatolian Banded Ware.
Figure 1 Komana Late Iron Age Red/Brown Banded Ware examples.
Figure 2 Komana Late Iron Age painted pitcher fragments.
Figure 3 Komana Hellenistic Banded Ware base fragments.
Figure 4 Komana Hellenistic Banded Ware rim fragments.
Figure 5 Komana Hellenistic Banded Ware body sherds.
Figure 6 Komana Hellenistic Color-Coated Ware examples.
Figure 7 Komana fragments with ivy garlands.
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D. TURKISH SUMMARY/TÜRKÇE ÖZET

GEÇ DEMİR ÇAĞI VE ERKEN HELENİSTİK DÖNEM’DE BİR KESİŞİM BÖLGESİ OLARAK İÇ ANADOLU’NUN KUZEYİ: STRATEJİK BİR NOKTA KOMANA


Bölgede yürütülen arkeolojik projelerden Helenistik Dönem çalışmalarına katkıda bulunan dört kazıdan söz edebilmek mümkündür. Bunlar, Ordu/Fatsa Cıngırt Kayası (Erol), Ordu Kurul Kalesi (Şenyurt), Amasya Oluz Höyük (Dönmez) ve Helenistik Dönem seramik buluntularının varlığıyla bilinen Giresun Arethias sayılabilir. 2018 yılı kazı sezonunda ilk defa kontamine olmamış kontekstlerden gelen ve Helenistik Döneme tarihlenen yapı katmanlarıyla Komana (Erciyas vd.) da bu araştırmalar kapsamında yer almaktadır.


14 Tez çalışması kapsamında dönemlerin tarihlandırılmelerinde Gordion kronolojisi esas alınmıştır (Stewart, 2010: 129-134).
Bugüne kadar elde edilen veriler, söz konusu seramik repertuarsının tespit edildiği en doğudaki yerleşim olabileceği konusunda fikir uyandırmaktadır. Bu bağlamda, Komana’nın doğusu, bir başka kapsamlı çalışmanın konusu olmak üzere bırakılmış ve tez kapsamı içerisinde dahi edilmemiştir.


- Komana: Coğrafi Konum ve Yapı Katmanları:


Komana’daki arkeolojik araştırmalar 2004 yılında Türkiye Cumhuriyeti Kültür ve Turizm Bakanlığı adına Orta Doğu Teknik Üniversitesi Yerleşim Arkeolojisi Anabilim Dalı Başkanı Prof. Dr. Deniz Burcu Erciyas başkanlığına başlamış ve hala devam etmektedir. 2004-2009 yılları arasında kapsamlı yüzey araştırmaları yapılmış, 2009 yılından beri ise Komana’nın yerleşim tabakalarının tespit edilebilmesi ve yerleşimin ekonomik, kültürel ve idari
fonksiyonlarının dönemsel olarak anlaşılabilmesi için kazılar bugün Hamamtepe olarak adlandırılmakta olan höyük üzerinde devam etmektedir.

Hamamtepe’de yürütülen kazılardan elde edilen sonuçlar, neredeyse Geç Kalkolitik Dönemden itibaren Osmanlı Dönemi’ne kadar kesintisiz bir istikandan bahsedebilmeyi mümkün kılmaktadır. Komana stratigrafisi şu şekilde sıralanmaktadır ve tarihlendirilmektedir:

- Osmanlı Evresi (M.S. 17. -18. yy.)
- Danişmand/Selçuklu Evresi (M.S. 12. -14. yy.)
- Orta Bizans Evresi (M.S. 11. -12. yy.)
- Erken Bizans Evresi (M.S. 7. yy.)
- Roma Evresi (M.S. 2. - 5. yy.)
- Helenistik/Geç Demir Çağı Evresi (M.Ö. 4. -2. yy.)
- Geç Kalkolitik - Erken Tünc Çağı Evresi (M.Ö. 3000 - M.Ö. 2700)

- Geç Demir Çağı/Erken Helenistik Yapı Katları ve Seramikler:


Açımların Tablo’da gösterilmiş olan katmanların bazılarında karışık kontekstler bulunurken, diğerleri sterildir.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Açma</th>
<th>Tabaka</th>
<th>Kontekst</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>297/608</td>
<td>T14, T17</td>
<td>Bizans ve Helenistik kontamine tabaka.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>307/608</td>
<td>T09, T10, T11</td>
<td>Bizans ve Helenistik kontamine tabaka.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>T12</td>
<td>Helenistik kontamine olmassı en net tabaka.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

297/608 ve 307/608 no’lu açımlardan gelen seramik buluntuları makroskopik gruplamayla

- Kalın CIDARLI,
- ORTA CIDARLI,
- İnce CIDARLI seramikler olmak üzere üç ana gruba ayrılmaktadır.
Kalın Cidarlı grubun örnekleri oldukça az olup, bir tanesinin Rodos yapımı olduğu düşünülen üç adet amfora parçası önce çıkılmaktadır. Bu gruba ait örnekler, ağzı ve kulp gibi formlar arası ayırtıcı tanıya olanak sağlayan parçaların bulunmadığı ancak, tabanı düz, gövdesi konik formlu, dekorasyonsuz ve boyasız bir takım seramik buluntuları ile karakterizedir. Söz konusu örneklerin hamur yapıları da kireç gibi katkı maddeleri içeren, turuncu ile kahverengi tonları arasında renge sahip hamur yapısından meydana gelmiştir.


Boyalı/Bezemeli örnekler;

• **İki Renkli Boyalılar (Kırmızı/Kahverengi Bant Bezemeliler):** Kızılırmak Havzası içerisinde bulunan diğer yerleşimlerin Komana ile çağdaş kontekstlerinden gelen ve M.O. 7. yy’dan itibaren kullanımlık olduğu bilinen seramik grubunun, Geç Demir Çağı seramiklerine örnek teşkil ettiği önerilmektedir. Ağız kenarları kalınca bir sıra kırmızı/kahverengi bant bezemesiyle karakterize olan örneklerin cidarları ise sofra kapları kategorisinin en kalın örneklerini oluştururmasının ve Komana seramik repertuarında sadece ağız kenarları ile temsil edilmektedir.

• **Çok Renkli Boyalı ve Bezemeliler:** Bu gruba ait örnekler üç farklı sürahiye ait görevde parçalarıyla Komana seramik repertuarında temsil edilmektedir. Kırmızı, beyaz, siyah gibi üç farklı rengin açık renk zemin üzerine yapılmış olan bezemeler için kullanıldığı iki sürahinin üzerinde, üçgenler, ters üçgenler, içi taralı üçgenler, beyaz bant bezemeleri ile içleri kırmızı boya üçgenler bulunmaktadır. Bir diğer sürahide ise araştırma kapsamlı içerisinde hiçbir benzer örneğe rastlanmamış olan açık renk zemin üzerine turuncusun kırmızı boya ile yapılmış setep motifi bezemesi bulunmaktadır. Kızılırmak Havzası içerisinde bulunan yerleşimlerin Geç Demir Çağı’na tarihlenen yapı katmanlarında büyük formlu benzer sürahi örneklerinde bezemelerin kabin tüm dış yüzeyine yapılamasından ziyade daha çok çerçevelemiş spesifik bir alan ile sınırlanmıştır olduğu örnekler...


Helenistik Dönemin bir diğer karakteristik seramik grubunu oluşturutan siyah firnisli kaplar, Komana seramik repertuarında dört adet incé cidarlı gövde parçası ile temsil edilmektedir.


KOMANA’Nın GEÇ DEMİR ÇAĞI-HELENISTIK DÖNEM İLİŞKİ AĞLARı:

Seramik verileri ile birlikte az miktarındaki mimari öğeler ve tüm küçük bulunktular beraber değerlendirildiğinde, kuzey-orta Anadolu’dan başlayarak tezin kapsamının genişletildiği kuzey, doğu ve güneye bulunan yerleşimler ile Komana’nın dinamik ilişkiler kurmuş olduğu sonucuna varılabilir. Ayrıca bu ilişklere ek olarak, tek bir Rodos (?) amfora kılığı, Knossos darbı bronz sikkeler ve Mısır kökenli skarabe damga mühür, Komana’nın (olasılıkla) Karadeniz kıyı şeridinde bulunan liman yerleşimleri ile kurduğu ilişkiler ve bu ilişkiler sayesinde ulaştığı deniz aşını birliklerini gösterir niteliktedir. Bu noktada Komana’nın Helenistik Dönemde yılda iki defa farklı coğrafyalar arasında davetlilerin ve tüccarların katıldığı festivallerin düzenleniği bir “tapınak-devleti” olduğu akılda tutulmalı ve söz konusu bölgeler arasında deniz aşını ilişkilerin kurulması ve geliştirilmesinde bu festivallerin önemli rol oynamış olabileceği düşünülmelidir.
Elbette, bahsi geçen ilişkilerin ve bağlantı ağlarının kurulabilmesi için farklı dönemlerde Komana ve Komana civarından geçen yollar ve güzergāhlar tez kapsamı içerisinde incelenmiştir.


- **Roma Dönemi Yolları Üzerinde Komana:** Roma Dönemi’nde Anadolu platosunda kullanılan ana arter de doğu-bati doğrultuluydu. Sardis-Dorylaion-Ancyra ortak hat olmakla beraber, Ancyra’dan yol ikiye ayrılmaktadır: bunlardan kuzeye doğru devam eden
Amaseia-Komana-Sebasteia-Melitene-Mezopotamya güzergâhını izlerken; güney rota ise Ancyra-Sebasteia-Kilikya Kapıları olarak devam etmiştir.
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