

### **Istanbul Area**

The Istanbul team have excavated a wide area in this season. The exposure of some of the buildings' walls also revealed some ground stone artefacts, some of which had been left as though they were ready to be used again at any time. Similar behaviour was also revealed in Building 1 in the North area where a slab with paint residue was left upside down within the building (Baysal and Wright 2005). One of the most important discoveries for us was an enigmatic object, made of very sandy clay, with two protruding extensions (Fig. 106). The shape could be interpreted as a pair of bull horns or a pair of breasts, but the object is particularly reminiscent of hearth decoration features ('andirons') such as are seen at Chalcolithic and Early Bronze Age sites in central and eastern Anatolia (eg, Beycesultan, Pulur Sakyol) (Kosay 1976; Lloyd and Mellaart 1962). The careful placement of this object Area TP (Team Poznan)

The Area TP excavations continued this year and this is an area which generally produces large grinding tools. Amongst these tools the most noticeable thing is the size of the objects and fragments, so far, this area's excavations have revealed the largest tools and fragments, after those of the West Mound. Some of the artefacts, such as stone trays, are reminiscent of the west mound fragments, as well as being similar both technologically and typologically to the previous examples. Similar artefacts, stone trays, are also common in the late Neolithic and early Chalcolithic periods of other sites in the vicinity.



*Figure 106. Clay object and grinding slab.*

### **Conclusion**

Thus, ground stone studies continue apace at Catalhoyuk and are taking us into new directions that should shed new light on the use of stone artifacts in the Neolithic. Provisionally, we can say that patterns of discard of ground stone artifacts vary widely within Catal itself and at other sites of this age (Wright 1993; 2000). These patterns at Catalhoyuk indicate systematic recycling and refuse removal, but sometimes in special ways that do not easily fit into the well-known categories of refuse disposal such as primary refuse, secondary refuse, de facto refuse, abandonment refuse or provisional discard (Hardy-Smith and Edwards 2004; Martin and Russell 2000). We will be addressing this issue in more depth in forthcoming publications.