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MESSAGE FROM THE DIRECTOR

Dear workshop participants

‘Bordered places | bounded times’ is the first of three related ‘events’, united under the central themes of ‘Divisions, Connections and Movement’ that will be organized by the BIAA in collaboration with several institutions. These themes derive from the well-known regional concept of Turkey as a crossroads, but the envisaged concept goes beyond that of regional studies focusing on Turkey’s important geopolitical location or its position as a bridge between Europe and the Middle-East. Indeed, the multi-disciplinary character of the regional approach has rarely promoted a creative dialogue between the different disciplines, but rather seems to have tended to facilitate ‘parallel monologues’. This has resulted in the further affirmation of disciplinary borders and has been an impediment to productive academic innovation. As a result, significant issues that cut across national and regional, as well as disciplinary borders have not received proper attention. Introducing a thematic approach in a longue durée perspective addresses these concerns. It offers a better basis for the development of interdisciplinary projects, by facilitating a culture of academic dialogue and cooperation that permits the exchange, counterpoint and cross-fertilization of ideas between different disciplinary terrains.

The current workshop ‘Bordered places and Bounded times: Reflexive approaches to understanding societies. Interdisciplinary Perspectives on Turkey from archaeology, anthropology, history and political science’ aims at studying the concept of borders through detailed reflection on the Turkish case, and will also aim to deepen understanding of the Turkish region by examining borders. Theoretical themes include the identification and effects of delineated borders at all social levels from the individual upwards and the construction and maintenance of social, cultural and political borders in all contexts from prehistory onwards.

The workshop on ‘Movements and Mobility in Turkey from prehistory to the present day’ will aim at using a comparative approach to examine the ways in which the mobility of materials and products, people and ideas, has affected social change at different periods.

The conference on ‘Pathways of communication: Roads and Routes in Anatolia from the prehistory to Seljuk times’ will be organized under the auspices of the British Institute at Ankara, in collaboration with Ankara University and aims at a pioneering dialogue between the different strands of archaeology-related disciplines to enhance knowledge on the routes and road systems through Anatolia throughout times.

We hope that the current workshop will prove an excellent start towards the realization of these aims.

Lutgarde Vandeput

Director
BIAA
# Workshop Programme

## Day 1 | Tuesday 4 June 2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8:00</td>
<td>Shuttle service BIAA to METU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8:45 Registration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9:00 Opening remarks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:15</td>
<td>**Panel 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>**Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Leticia R. R. Hinojosa, The University of Texas at Austin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Borderless: Archaic - East Greek Art and Cultural Interchange in Ionia and Western Anatolia: A Case Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Maja Muhić, South East European University, Tetovo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Turks in Macedonia: Memory, Space and Representation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Duygu Gül, York University, Toronto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Redrawing Temporal Boundaries: Trauma, Memory, and Justice in Turkey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Çiğdem Atakuman, Middle East Technical University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Boundaries and Borders of the Past in the Narratives of the Neolithic Period in Turkey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:15</td>
<td>Coffee Break</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:30</td>
<td>**Panel 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>**Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Özge Dilaver Kalkan, The British Institute at Ankara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Between Istanbul and Thessaloniki: Mobility Across Borders of Balkanisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ali Huseyinoglu, University of Sussex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Living as the ‘Other’: Implication of the Greek-Turkish Border for the Muslim Turkish Minority of Western Thrace in Greece</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Souad Osseiran, Goldsmiths College, University of London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A ‘Guest’ in Turkey; Syrian Migrants in Istanbul, Legality and the Limits of Hospitality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nikolai Vukov, Bulgarian Academy of Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Borders: Permeability, Social Practices, and Borderline Identities. Perspectives from the Bulgarian-Turkish Border Since mid-20th Century</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13:30</td>
<td>Lunch Break</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**14:15 | PANEL 3 | Finding the edges: interpreting faint traces**

Chair | Lutgarde Vandeput, The British Institute at Ankara

Frederic Dessène, University Laval & Yves Monette, Canadian Museum of Civilization

Wares Production, Archaeometry, Potters Know-how, Regionalization and Border? How to Deal with in a Pluridisciplinary Perspective?

Anna Chrzanowska, Johannes Gutenberg-Universitat, Mainz

Fortified Cities, High Rocky Mountains, Steep Places. What do We Know About the Border Between the Hittite State and the Country of Azzi Ḫayaša?

Elif Koparal, Hitit University, Çorum

Frontiers of Polis: Defining the Borders of Klazomenai

Konstantinos Kopanias, University of Athens

An Attempt to Define the Ubaid and its Cultural Borders in Northeastern Mesopotamia

16:15

Coffee Break

**16:30 | PANEL 4 | Tangled layers / shifting attachments**

Chair | Ayşe Parla, Sabancı University

Alice von Bieberstein, University of Cambridge

*Beziehungsgeschichte*: Relating Histories Across the Border

Eirini Avramopololoulou, University of Cambridge

Thinking Through the Affective Registers of Borders: Reflecting on a Letter.

Leonidas Karakatsanis, The British Institute at Ankara

De/re Politicising Borders: Spatial and Political Affinities at the Aegean Coasts

Marc Herzog, The British Institute at Ankara

Crossing Back and Forth: Identity and Belonging Across and Beyond Bordered Worlds in the Movies of Fatih Akin

18:45 Shuttle service METU to BIAA

19:30 Garden Dinner Party at BIAA
DAY 2 | Wednesday 5 June 2013

9:30  Shuttle service BIAA to METU

10:30  PANEL 5  |  On close encounters: imagining the ‘other’

Chair  |  Elif Denel, American Research Institute in Turkey

Julia Linke, Albert-Ludwigs-Universität Freiburg
A View over High Mountains: The Assyrian Perception of the Urartians and their Kings

Elif Keser-Kayaalp, Mardin Artuklu University
In Between: Northern Mesopotamia in Late Antiquity

Abby Robinson, The British Institute at Ankara
Arabic and Christian Historiography of the Early Islamic Conquests

Richard Dietrich, Middle East Technical University
Digenēs Akritēs and the Battālnâme: The Muslim-Christian Frontier in Eastern Anatolia

12:30  Coffee Break

12:45  PANEL 6  |  On close encounters: influencing the ‘other’

Chair  |  Lale Özgenel, Middle East Technical University

Çiğdem Maner, Koç University
Society/Civilization Follows From? Impacts on Architecture in Late Bronze Age Anatolia

David Hill, University of Oslo
Fuzzy Borders and no Man’s land. Regulating Inter-regional Relations in Ionia and Central West Anatolia from the Archaic to the Hellenistic Period.

Jesper Majbom Madsen, University of Southern Denmark
The Coming of Rome and the Re-definition of Cultural and Ethnical Boundaries in Northern Anatolia

14:15  Lunch Break
15:00 | PANEL 7 | **Inside, outside / in-between**

Chair | Susan Sherratt, University of Sheffield

Emma Baysal, The British Institute at Ankara
Dynamic and Deconstructed: Material Cultural Boundaries and Theorizing the Exchange of Ideas in Neolithic Anatolia

Ömür Harmansah, Brown University
Monuments and Borders in the Anatolian Countryside: Empire, Place and Politics during the Late Bronze Age

Carol Delaney, Stanford University
At the Boundaries of the Body, the House, the Village, and the Nation

16:30 | Coffee Break

16:45 | ROUND TABLE | **Bridging divides**

Chair | Mark Herzog, The British Institute at Ankara

Kerem Öktem, University of Oxford
Ayşe Parla, Sabancı University
Susan Sherratt, University of Sheffield

18:45  Shuttle service METU to BIAA
The idea of an interdisciplinary workshop focusing on Turkey while promoting the theoretical exploration of borders and boundaries was stimulated by the incentive of linking the different research directions of the British institute at Ankara, spanning from Archaeology and History to Anthropology and Political Science. In discussions on ongoing research it became apparent that the different scholarly fields represented at the BIAA were using similar conceptual tools to examine diverse subject areas.

Emma (an archaeologist) and Leonidas (a political scientist) realised that borders/boundaries are their shared area of interest while working on themes as different as prehistoric material culture and contemporary politics of reconciliation.

Boundaries are a powerful defining feature in human society, they can separate, unite and catalyze change, they are an area of conflict, of friendship and of trade. Theorizing the role of borders, both in the past and present, and understanding the role that they played and continue to play in the construction of social identity, is important across a wide range of academic disciplines.

Indeed, in the last few years the importance of studying borders and boundaries has become more than apparent. Research on the subject has been flourishing, responding to the pressing need to understand complex contemporary processes where borders become, at the same time, more fluid for some and more rigid for others. Work undertaken by research institutes or groups like the Nijmegen Centre for Border Research in the Netherlands, has been feeding significant contributions into the debate on case studies and analyses of contemporary border making and unmaking processes. On the other hand, a fresh push has been given to conceptual work that aims at producing new theoretical perspectives to look through or at borders. The recently completed project EastborderNet has been a hub for the moulding of such new interdisciplinary perspectives by looking not only at obvious positions of borders but also at what Sarah Green (2009) calls their ‘traces and tidemarks’.

This workshop focuses on three main targets. First aiming to expand the scope of interdisciplinary discussions on borders and boundaries between scholarly fields that do not usually ‘meet’ at the panels of workshops and conferences. In fact, borders and boundaries can be seen as defining the field of scholarly work and research; they can appear as disciplinary divisions, separating spheres of expertise but also enabling innovative exchange and cooperation.

Second, stressing the dynamic diachronic processes of making and unmaking borders. This means focusing on transformations, continuities and discontinuities, but also exploring how borders can be time-related, representing the dilemmas arising from the
distance between the ‘text’ and the ‘field’, between our object of study and our representations of it.

Finally, but most significantly, we aim at fostering the diffusion of such an interdisciplinary, mutually beneficial dialogue with a broad perspective on border and boundary studies in Turkey, and with a special focus on Turkey. 'Turkey' is approached in its widest and most stretched sense connoting both the modern state/nation/society, as a place imagined from different viewpoints, and also the space/territory/land marked by the traces of pre- and proto-historic, Classical, Byzantine, Ottoman or contemporary histories. In other words the main idea for the workshop is to think borders through Turkey and also think Turkey through borders.

The workshop is an ideal environment in which to encourage unrestricted and open exchange of ideas between the various scholarly fields that are represented. We aim to encourage this communication and the exploration of commonalities that will lead to new perspectives on such an important topic. The response to the call for abstracts was enthusiastic, intensively interdisciplinary and international; the passion shown by the participants thus far indicates that there will be a lively, innovative dialogue between scholars whose paths may otherwise not have crossed.

We hope that the workshop, and the subsequent publication, lead to a lasting discourse and a broadening of horizons of all those in the social sciences who work on borders and boundaries.
PANEL 1 | **Bir varmış bir yokmuş: negotiated narratives**

Chair | Stephen Mitchell, The British Institute at Ankara
Situated between the east and west sides of The Belfer Court at the Metropolitan Museum of Art, is a capped, four-sided, sculpted limestone pillar whose label identifies it as Archaic (ca. 550-525 B.C.) and of East Greek provenance. Three of its reliefs are of robed, processional figures in profile—a lotus-bearing female, a lyre-carrying youth and a man leading a goat—with an eroded image of the Egyptian god Bes standing atop a beast occupying the remaining side. According to the museum label, the carvings are ‘Greek provincial’ in style, with the monument itself having a distinctive ‘Phoenician form.’ Its physical setting, floating between two early Greek galleries, status as an Anonymous Loan, in addition to its ‘provincial’ style and form, make this object an appropriate exemplar and metaphor for material culture produced in Western Anatolia—material caught between cultures, identities, iconographies, and styles.

Scholars of the ancient world commonly refer to the coast of Western Anatolia as East Greece. This term alone no doubt influences our choice of what and how material culture from this area is studied as the resulting descriptions of visual culture are often reduced to equally monolithic terms. My research challenges the binary terminology that gives implicit preference to mainland ‘Greek’ art and has led to accepted generalizations regarding the identity of the figural imagery produced and consumed by this cosmopolitan population as such approaches stifle the exploration of the fluid and variable identity expressed by the artist, patron or user through his or her stylistic choices. This is the case with the Metropolitan stone pillar, whose designation as ‘provincial’ inappropriately implicates inferiority of style and consumption under the guise of a singular, predominant group, while pointing an accusatory finger at the object’s non-Greek characteristics.

Drawing from a visual analysis of the Metropolitan stone pillar alongside comparanda from a Western Anatolian milieu, this paper argues for the necessity of a ‘borderland’ approach to material culture that occupies, as Alan Greaves has recently proposed, a “world between worlds.” The diverse geographic, cultural and socio-political environments of ‘East Greece’ allowed for the expression of alternative identities that are not necessarily reliant on any one force; Greek, Persian, Phrygian and the like. The media through which these identities were expressed betray the negotiation of ethnic, cultural and political personae, projected in a particular manner dependent upon the audience and context. This paper explores how the pillar, as a case study for East Greek art, was not produced and consumed in a vacuum reliant on mainland, predictable models, but rather in ‘the space between’ that led to new stylistic and functional vocabularies that lay between established paradigms.

Leticia Rios Rodriguez Hinojosa is a doctoral candidate in The Department of Art and Art History at The University of Texas at Austin. She received her MA from this school in 2007 and her BA from Trinity University, San Antonio, Texas in 2005. With the support of a U.S. Student Fulbright Grant she is conducting dissertation research in Turkey for the 2012-2013 academic year on visual culture and identity in Ionia and Western Anatolia (7th-early 5th centuries BCE). She has worked on the Sikyon Survey Project in Greece (2007-2009), and held a Graduate Student Summer Fellowship at the Center for Hellenic Studies, Washington D.C. (2006). In addition to working six years as a digital archivist at the Institute of Classical Archaeology, UT Austin-Department of Classics, she was a gallery teacher at the Blanton Museum of Art, UT Austin, and is an instructor of Art History at Austin Community College.
This work takes the form of an anthropological and empirical analysis of the redefining, reshaping, but at the same time, of the continuity of people’s identity expressed through some of the polemics of primordialist and instrumentalist theories of ethnicity (Barth 1969; Cohen 1974; Gellner 1983). The particular case studied here is that of the Turks in the Republic of Macedonia, and the main patterns of analysis are the aspects of memory, space, and representation of this community in the country. Throughout these aspects, the questions regarding the intersection and influence of symbolic, material, internal and external boundaries, as well as their influence in the complex reshaping of the identity of the Turks throughout the past years in the Republic of Macedonia (and to some extent the Balkans as a whole) are analyzed.

Much of the nineteenth-century Europe bipolar perceptions where a sharp borderline is drawn between the “rational Orient” and the “irrational Orient” (Boyar, 2007:84) can be identified even today in different shapes and discourses. While looking through the lens of some of the main ethnicity theories, this paper analyses the Ottoman past in the Republic of Macedonia, the way it is remembered in the country, as well as the remnants of that past through several symbolic and material borders, such as space, architecture, and language. The paper will hence aim at locating the borders between past and present identity and representation of the Turks in the country, as well as try to diagnose the effects they currently generate and have on present representations of the Turks in the Republic of Macedonia.

Finally, this work aims at showing how all narratives and memory of the major ethnicities in Macedonia seem to intermingle in a rather complex way to the extent that one ethnicity, its history and narratives, can have an immense role in the formation of another ethnicity’s identity. This shows a complex plethora of borders that overlap and create an intersection of narratives, self-identification processes, and public representation. Some of the findings show that Macedonian nationalism is defined to a great extent by negative stereotypes towards both the Ottoman Empire as well as towards the Albanians, whom they often consider as allies of the Ottomans in their denationalising politics.

One of the most plastic examples that this paper will focus on is a currently ongoing project aimed at an intense urban reshaping and remodeling of the capital of Macedonia, Skopje, created through a project called Skopje 2014. So far, this project has radically changed the face of the city, by creating a monumental statue of Alexander the Great, dubbed The Warrior on a Horse, at least 50 additional sculptures, a triumphal arch, new foreign ministry, constitutional court, bridges, churches, and museums, including the Museum of Macedonian Struggle and of the Victims of Communism.

This project, in all its extravagance, glitter and kitsch, is also known and criticized as a project that brings forth Antiquisation, prompts one to see the collision of grievances of a questioned nation that produced it in the first place and that still resonate around it. It is an expression of a multitude of grievances and moans of Macedonians that finally found their reification and palpability in the Skopje 2014 project. Little does it take for one to see the symbolic and material boundaries going across ethnicity and nation, and that through the baroque
architecture and museums, like the one of the victims of communism, there is a clear governmental policy to stand against the previous soc-realistic architecture and the socialist past, just as much as it is a shunning of the long and omnipresent Ottoman past.

Maja Muhić is lecturer of cultural studies, multiculturalism, gender theory, post-colonial theory, and Culture of the English-speaking countries at the South East European University in Tetovo. She holds a Ph.D. in Philosophy from Ss Cyril and Methodius University, Skopje. Her thesis focuses on the interpretive/symbolic anthropology with special attention to the American anthropological trends and the work of Clifford Geertz. During 2007-2008, Muhić spent 5 months at the Department of Anthropology at the University of California, Berkeley. In the previous years, she has also visited and worked closely with other renowned universities, such as The University of Santa Barbara, California. As a result of her stay there and her cooperation with the Department of Religious Studies, Muhić shows up as the co-author of the Encyclopedia of Global Religion (2011) edited by Mark Juergensmeyer and Wade Clark Roof. She has also published her work in the recent After Yugoslavia: Identities and Politics within the Successor States (2011) edited by Robert Hudson and Glenn Bowman. In addition to this, Muhić has published a number of articles in philosophical and anthropological journals.

Paper 3 | Redrawing Temporal Boundaries: Trauma, Memory, and Justice in Turkey

Duygu Gül, York University, Toronto, Canada | duygu@yorku.ca

In Turkey, popular interest in memory and historical justice has recently reached to unprecedented heights. Examples include (but are not limited to) the following: debates around transitional justice and the prospects for Truth and Reconciliation Commissions; the September 12 coup trial; efforts of Alevi and Kurdish groups to carve out a counter memory that challenges the official historical narrative; growing calls for the state to apologize for its past mistakes; the PM's apology for the Dersim massacre in 1937/38; and the increasing number of books and movies about “coming to terms with the past” (“Geçişiyle yüzleşme/hesaplaşma”). Obviously, this incipient politics of memory has become quite popular, especially among oppressed groups and communities because it functions as a new language of claim-making and justice-seeking.

In my paper, I examine the implications of this burgeoning politics of memory for citizenship. I argue a new configuration of citizenship has emerged and it heavily draws upon the psychopathological discourse of trauma, healing, and working through. In particular, I intend to discuss how this new model of citizenship, in its close links to memory, renegotiates boundaries: [a] It puts great emphasis on the individual’s conscious efforts to redraw the temporal boundaries between past and present. The individual citizen should be capable of searching for past truths, going through an individual process of healing, and perhaps more importantly, s/he should be able to forgive those who committed past crimes. [b] This new conception of citizenship blurs the boundaries between the individual and the collective: the nation should undergo a collective process of healing and restoration through individual remembrances and forgiveness. It should come to terms with its past; this is the only way it can move away from its traumatic past, restore its unity, and launch a new beginning.

Duygu Gül | I am a PhD student in the Department of Sociology at York University, Toronto, Canada. I hold a Masters degree in Political Science and International Relations from Boğaziçi University, Istanbul, with a thesis titled “Women of Power: The Policewomen in Turkey”. I received my Bachelor of Arts in Political Science and International Relations, and Sociology from the same university. My research interests lie in collective memory studies and current debates around citizenship and transnationalism, particularly in the European context.
Despite the exponential increase in data and the interpretive frames offered by archaeological theory over the last 50 years, the Neolithic Period (app. 11000-7000 BC) research in the Near East largely remains as an origins quest within a diffusionist approach. It has been widely discussed over the last few decades that this type of research is a product of the late 19th and early 20th century style nation-state building projects. Implicit in the origins quest is the assumption that those who can claim to have identified the first sedentary community, the first domesticated species, the first monumental structures, the first pottery or the first empires within the borders of their research territories can lay a competitive claim to the history of civilization while increasing personal and national prestige in the ranks of the modern world order.

In such a frame, there is always a deep desire to be part of the universal/European history of civilization. Therefore, it is understandable that the most up to date syntheses of the Neolithic Period in Turkey are also proud of locating the origins of complex societies within the Anatolian soil at such an early stage as the Neolithic. However, for the Turkish case, there is also a reactionary attachment to the grand narrative of civilization, in that many syntheses are ecstatic in establishing the role of Anatolia as a ‘bridge’ that conveyed the material ‘package’ of a ‘civilized’ way of life to Europe. Arguably, the above-mentioned reaction mirrors the historical struggle between modernity and the Turkish state since the collapse of the Ottoman Empire. While giving a brief history of this struggle, my exploration actually revolves around a basic question: Considering that the post-colonial landscapes of late capitalism have been producing vastly different voices in protest of the grand narratives of civilization, why do the Turkish researchers continue to re-produce the basic ideological tenets of the Turkish nation-state building projects in their archaeological syntheses?

I believe that Turkish archaeological research repeatedly falls short of explaining the uses of the past, place and material culture in the past, because the political climate in Turkey constructs a culture of archaeological thought and practice that ultimately fails to recognize the uses of the past in the present. Thus, we are left with the peculiar relationships between the archaeologists and the state and a purportedly more objective single narrative of the Neolithic that is still prevalent among the Turkish researchers. Ultimately, the paper also asks if it is possible to step into new territories of understanding the past beyond the boundaries of the traditional histories of civilization and the regional-chronological constructions of the state?

Çiğdem Atakuman received her PhD from UCLA’s Archaeology Program. She is currently employed at Middle East Technical University’s Settlement Archaeology Program. Her work concentrates on the Neolithic Period of South-East Anatolia. She has also been publishing on the subject of heritage politics in Turkey.
PANEL 2 | Bodies cross borders differently

Chair | Kerem Öktem, University of Oxford
Paper 1 | Between Istanbul and Thessaloniki: Mobility Across Borders of Balkanisation

Özge Dilaver Kalkan, The British Institute at Ankara | odilaverkalkan@biaatr.org

To ‘balkanise’, a word coined shortly after the Balkan wars, means to break up something such as a region, country or a group into smaller, hostile and ineffectual units. Throughout the rest of the twentieth century the Balkans continued to be balkanised, or to self-balkanise, in different ways across the backgrounds of the cold war, tensions between Greece and Turkey and the breaking up of Yugoslavia.

It is thus not surprising that Greece-Turkey relations capture scholarly interest mostly for defence economics studies of military expenditure, the (alleged) arms race and their effects on economic development (Brauer, 2010). The two countries did not use the full potential of their geographical proximity due to historical and political tensions (Angelos and George, 2003). This has started to change towards the end of the century. The mutual support during devastating earthquakes in both countries brought about a new political discourse that puts emphasis on strengthening economic relations and the bilateral trade has been rapidly growing. Then again, the borders between Turkey and Greece remain concrete with legal and practical barriers to travel.

Borders and boundaries are often seen as limits dividing an otherwise unitary entity into parts and segments, thereby bringing about exclusion and separation. Studies on symbolic and social boundaries, for example, reveal how these abstract entities are used to mark and create cultural distance or proximity between social classes (Bourdieu, 1984) and other groups. From a different perspective, borders and boundaries can be regarded as the edges where otherwise distinct entities meet, communicate and make exchanges. National borders involve concrete manifestations and formalised experiences of states, clearly marking the shift from one negotiated and legitimised system of rules to another. As the geographies of the states, nations, economies and cultures are not necessarily isomorphic, national borders both cut through and bridge communities.

States use measures to promote or inhibit cross-border mobility of particular national groups and the exchange rates and availability of infrastructure affect the distribution of travel opportunities (Adler, 1989). While it is difficult to achieve clear-cut categories of mobility, travel can be incidental to achieving other social or economic goals or it may be performed with the primary aim of observing and discovering meanings beyond the routine home life. In both cases, the act of travel involves habits and decisions about how to move in time and space, selection of experiences and foci of interests, and imaginative construction and re-construction of encounters (Adler, 1989).

This study investigates perspectives and experiences of travellers between Istanbul and Thessaloniki, two important Balkan cities with historical couplings. Cities have long captured academic interest since the movement of populations from countryside to cities has been part and parcel of economic development (Kuznet, 1966). More recently, cities have acquired a central role in environmental and developmental policy agendas (Batty, 2013). The study focuses on the cross-border journeys on the road and aims to explore what these journeys mean for the travellers with in-depth interviews. The study investigates what exactly happens during and through mobility of people between the two cities and how these interactions affect the economic sociology of the region.

Özge Dilaver Kalkan is a Balkan Futures Research Fellow at British Institute at Ankara and British School at Athens. Her research interests predominantly relate to evolutionary economics and computational social science. Özge completed
her PhD at Lancaster and worked at Manchester and Surrey Universities as a postdoctoral researcher. She has experience in both qualitative and quantitative methods, while her particular expertise is in social simulation. Interactions between social and economic agents are central to her research. While investigating issues like emergence of markets and value, technology-induced social change and evolution of innovation systems, Özge aims to accommodate social construction of reality in the computational models of social complexity. In her Balkan Futures research project, Özge will investigate trade flows and mobility of people between Thessaloniki and Istanbul. She will investigate the socio-economic contexts and geographical patterns of these interactions and build simulation models that enable scenario analysis.

Paper 2 |
Living as the 'other': Implication of the Greek-Turkish border for the Muslim Turkish minority of Western Thrace in Greece

Ali Huseyinoglu, University of Sussex | alihuseyinoglu1@gmail.com

Borders, either imagined or real, have various meanings and implications for people concerned with them. Living in a borderland is an old phenomenon for historical, imperial or national minorities in the Balkans and wider Europe. The First World War resulted in dissolution of great empires, flow of millions of people and formation of new nation states across the European peninsula. Formerly majority members of these empires either fled between the newly-formed boundaries or remained in situ and continued living as minority groups.

The Muslim Turkish minority living in the north-eastern most borderland of Greece with Turkey is one of those examples who have been surviving on their historic land since the incorporation of the region into Greece with the 1923 Peace Treaty of Lausanne. They number around 150,000 people in a country with a population of 11 million inhabitants and they have an official status of minority emanating from the 1923 Lausanne Treaty. Also, they are citizens of Greece. Nevertheless, they affiliate themselves with the nation of the neighbouring country, Turkey, rather than the one they are living in. For the vast majority of the Turkish locals of Western Thrace, Turkey is their kin state and the major guarantor of their survival at the north-eastern borderland of Greece.

The concepts of borders and boundaries in the Balkans and Europe have been getting porous since the end of the Cold War. Thus, more academics from various disciplines of Social Sciences like Ewing (1998) started to emphasize the link between borders and the multiplicity of identities at the local, national and international level. Being caught between the two-mutually antagonistic nationalisms, the concept of internal and external boundaries as well as the real and imagined ones continue to differentiate members of the Minority and problematize relations between the Turkish and Greek locals of Western Thrace. However, recalling the prominent study of Barth (1969:10), it is those inter-ethnic boundaries through which social relations between the Turkish and Greek communities are also maintained in the Greek borderland with Turkey.

Drawing from a one-year fieldwork in Western Thrace in 2009 for my PhD studies, my reflexive experience of being a member of the Muslim Turkish minority of Western Thrace, as well as my academic interest in Turkish-Greek relations since my undergraduate studies, this paper aims to combine both anthropological perspectives at the local level with those of the international affairs while rethinking the concept of
boundaries through the context of Western Thrace. While doing so, it also tries to provide possible answers to a question that I was asked by a Greek friend with whom I shared the same barrack during my compulsory military service in the Greek Army:

“Dear Ali. You are a good friend of mine. But I cannot put you into any category in my mind. Are you Greek or Turkish? If you are Turkish, then why did you come here to serve for the Greek Army? If you are Greek, then why do you have a non-Greek name and why are you not an Orthodox Christian? Finally, will you still join the Greek Army in a case of a possible war between Greece and Turkey?”

Ali Huseyinoglu was born in Komotini-Greece. After his secondary and high school education in Istanbul-Turkey, he received his BA and MSc from the Department of International Relations, Middle East Technical University (METU) in Ankara-Turkey. His master’s thesis, awarded with the best thesis of 2005 at METU, was about continuities and changes of the Greek minority policy of Western Thrace in the post-Cold War era. He started his PhD studies in 2007 at the University of Sussex/UK. His doctoral thesis focused on the historical development of the educational regime of the Muslim Turkish Minority of Western Thrace in Greece

Paper 3 | A ‘Guest’ in Turkey; Syrian Migrants in Istanbul, Legality and the Limits of Hospitality

Souad Osseiran, Goldsmiths College, University of London | s.usayran@gmail.com

What does it mean to be Syrian and a ‘guest’ in Istanbul? The question focuses on the state legal framework determining the status of Syrians in Turkey and how Syrian migrants experience living in Istanbul within and beyond the Turkish legal system. I discuss the legal framework alongside Syrian migrants’ experiences to interrogate ideas of nation state hospitality and ‘guest’-hood (cf. De Genova 2010; Khosravi 2010). Turkey, through its policy of temporary protection in the case of Syrian migrants is developing a legal framework determining the extent and limits of state hospitality. Bodies cross borders differently which is experienced not only in the methods of crossing but also upon arrival (Khosravi 2010). Syrian migrants fleeing the conflict in Syria enter Turkey as ‘guests’ or tourists rather than refugees. Those entering on their passports may remain in Turkey for up to three months while migrants crossing the border without documentation enter as ‘guests’ (Helsinki Citizens’ Assembly Turkey 2012). Temporary protection was instituted to legalize the presence of migrants crossing the border into Turkey without documentation. Migrants entering as tourists were expected at the end of their three months to register with camp authorities in southern provinces and come under the temporary protection of the state (Helsinki Citizens’ Assembly Turkey 2012). However many migrants travelled to Istanbul rather than remain in or travel to the border regions complicating the offer of temporary protection. The Turkish state has since November 2012 sought to organize the presence of Syrians living outside the state run camps by granting one year residence permits (Andoulu Ajansi 2012). However not all Syrians apply for the residence permits and many are continuing their lives in Istanbul without holding the permits. Alongside granting the residence permits, the Turkish state is deporting Syrian migrants apprehended trying to cross into European space to Syria, Lebanon or Egypt. Certain activities on the part of ‘guests’, such as presence within certain spaces, highlight the
limits of state hospitality (De Genova 2010). ‘Guests’ within the temporary protection of the state must adhere to certain boundaries.

Analysing the legal framework developed for Syrian migrants in Turkey, I examine the category of ‘guest’ through the ways Syrian migrants’ presences in Istanbul problematizes the category. By following the legal changes and placing them alongside migrants’ experiences I explore how hospitality is made effective and its limits are felt. Through interviews and participant observation undertaken with Syrian migrants in Istanbul, I explore how Syrian migrants use, counter and live with the legal framework developed.

Souad Osseiran | I am currently enrolled as an MPhil student at Goldsmiths College, University of London in the department of Anthropology. The MPhil is part of an ESRC doctoral program. This is my second year at Goldsmiths during which I am undertaking 12 months of fieldwork in Istanbul researching mobility and Syrian migrants waiting practices in transit. My research project is entitled ‘Making time at the frontiers of Europe, Syrian migrants/refugees in Istanbul, waiting practices in uncertain times.’ Prior to undertaking this MPhil, I attained an MSc in Social Anthropology from Oxford University in 2010.

Paper 4 |
Borders: Permeability, Social Practices, and Borderline Identities. Perspectives from the Bulgarian-Turkish Border since mid-20th century

Nikolai Vukov, Bulgarian Academy of Sciences | nikolai.vukov@gmail.com

Some of the questions raised in recent explorations on borders address their role for triggering practices of maintenance and transgression and their ability to find projection on individual and group identities. This mutual dependence between borders, social practices and identities bears special significance in occasions when historical and political circumstances have led to substantial changes in border-related policies within short periods of time. This is largely the case with the Bulgarian-Turkish border, which was among the most staunchly guarded frontiers of the former communist bloc, due to the ideological interpretation of Turkey as an ‘imperialist’ country that posed a direct threat on the communist states of the region. After several decades of limited possibilities of travel abroad, the frontier virtually ‘exploded’ with the decision of the communist government to allow the exodus of Bulgarian ethnic Turks to Turkey in the summer of 1989, and the subsequent examples of travel back and forth of this community in the following years. Later on, the liberalized procedures of border crossing after 1989 increased the cases of trans-border trade, labour migration, family re-gathering, and tourism between the two states. Recently, Bulgaria’s becoming a member of EU and the envisioned integration of Turkey produced new steps in managing border-crossing and public debates around border’s impermeability and control, adding to the previous considerations also criteria such as the protection of European borders, management of human mobility into the European Union, and environmental protection.

The goal of the current paper is to discuss practices related to Bulgarian-Turkish border since the mid 20th century and — on the basis of fieldwork research along this border, to outline how its new functions have influenced the cross-cultural interaction, the social
practices, and the worldviews of individuals and groups near the border. Putting a stress on practices over the last two decades, the paper will shed light on the debates surrounding the issues of permeability or closure of the political border between Bulgaria and Turkey following Bulgaria’s integration to the European Union, and will address several cases of public tension on both sides of the state frontier, among which those of border control, labour migrants, illegal trade, human and stock trafficking. On the basis of media materials and internet forums on the regulations surrounding this border, the paper will seek to outline the interplay of historical and cultural factors in the interpretation of the new border procedures, the symbolic construction of new social and cultural borders, and the public anxieties stirred by claims of this frontier’s permeability or closure. The research is based on several years of fieldwork research in towns and villages along the Bulgarian-Turkish border – Haskovo and Kardjali on the Bulgarian side, and Edirne and Istanbul in Turkey. Taking impetus from fieldwork materials gathered during these visits and from analyses of political and media discourses surrounding this border, the paper will interpret borders as lines of permeability and change, which – in line with the Deleuzean concept of rhizome formations, are constitutive of characteristic social practices and of specific borderline identities.

---

Nikolai Vukov has Ph.D. in anthropology (2002, Bulgarian Academy of Sciences) and Ph.D. in history (2005, Central European University). He works as Associate Professor at the Institute of Ethnology and Folklore Studies with Ethnographic Museum – Bulgarian Academy of Sciences, and teaches courses on anthropology and history at Sofia University “St. Kliment Ohridski,” Plovdiv University “Paissiy Hilendarski,” and New Bulgarian University in Sofia. Nikolai Vukov has held research fellowships at Maison des sciences de l’homme – Paris, Center for Advanced Studies in Sofia; Wissenschaftskolleg – Berlin; New Europe College – Bucharest, etc. He has published extensively on monuments and museum representations in Eastern Europe after 1945; communist rule and post-communist transition; borders and borderline identities; history, memory and commemorations of the dead after the Two World Wars in Bulgaria. His most recent book (co-authored with Luca Ponchiroli) is: Witnesses of Stone: Monuments and Architectures of the Red Bulgaria, 1944-1989, Ponchiroli Editori, 2011.
PANEL 3 | **Finding the edges: interpreting faint traces**

Chair | Lutgarde Vandeput, The British Institute at Ankara
This paper focuses on the technological study of the Chaff Faced and Kuro-Araxe wares from the excavations of Ovçular Tepesi, an archaeological site located in the southern Caucasus (Autonomous Republic of Nakhichevan, Azerbaijan). The pottery under study was recovered from levels dated from 4300 to 2600 BC, with Chaff Faced Ware pottery attributed to the Chalcolithic 1 and 2 periods, and Kuro-Araxe Ware to the Late Chalcolithic 3 - Early Bronze Age 1. During the 4th millennium BC, the southern Caucasus witnessed many technological links with the Anatolian highlands with sites such as Norshuntepe or Tulin tepe in the Elaziğ-Malatya plain and also with sites like Aratashen in southern Armenia. The goal of this study is to present the technological borders between the ceramic productions of Nakhichevan, a region mostly unknown until recently, northern Mesopotamia and the northern region of southern Caucasus, i.e. Armenia. The project, combining macro-feature and petrographic analyses, is aimed at reconstructing the regional know-how used in the production of both wares, as well as establishing their provenance. Forming methods, thin sections petrography and geochemistry (ICP-MS and AES) have been successful in characterizing the wares and defining source-related groups. According to those results, what should we consider as regionalization and how can the concept of border play an operating role in archaeometry and ceramology?

Frederic Dessène is an archaeologist and collaborates with the Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique UMR-7041 in Paris and the University Laval (Qc). He holds a PhD (2007) in Protohistoire from the universities of Paris Panthéon-Sorbonne and Roma La Sapienza and realized between 2007 and 2012 two postdocs in archaeometry, both applied to ceramics, at the University Laval, Québec city. The main interest of his research concerns technological know-how, technological transfers and the relation between potters and their environment (sourcing). Using a pluridisciplinary methodology, he used the technological knowledge of potters, geochemistry and petrography to understand the potters know-how in Anatolia and in the Caucasus during the transition from the Late Chalcolithic and the Early Bronze Ages.

Yves Monette is curator for Québec Archaeology at the Canadian Museum of Civilization and Associate professor at Montreal University. He holds a PhD in historical archaeology from Laval University and he has realized a postdoc in Earth Sciences applied to archaeology at the Institut National de la Recherche Scientifique (Québec, Canada). His main research interests focus on Modern period ceramic sourcing which he explores through various scientific techniques and methods of analysis, such as geochemistry and microscopy. Recently he’s been invited to collaborate to various international projects including Tecnolonial, directed by J. Buxeda i Garrigos (U. Barcelona), and another on the palaeomagnetic intensity variations of the last 400 years in Northeastern America with researchers of the Institut de Physique du Globe de Paris.
Fortified Cities, High Rocky Mountains, Steep Places. What do We Know About the Border Between the Hittite State and the Country of Azzi Ḫayaša?

Anna Chrzanowska, Johannes Gutenberg-Universitat, Mainz | chrza001@students.uni-mainz.de

The course of a border of a state is the result of several factors. The most important include: the geographic distance, the landscape situation and accessibility, the political and economic significance of a neighbouring country, its social structure and level of political development. A border between ancient states – in this case in the 2nd half of the 2nd millennium BC between the Hattie Empire and Azzi-Ḫayaša, a country that can only be located in the greater area of the plain of Erzincan in relation to its surrounding and delimiting territories such as in the west by the Hittite Upper Land and in the north by the regions populated by Kaškians – can be analysed through three approaches:

Borders given by features of the topography

Features of the landscape determine borders. The mountain barrier of the inner eastern Taurus Mountains and the Pontic Chain form a natural border that makes communication between the central Anatolian plateau and interior Eastern Anatolia difficult. Although the distances are not considerable – in a straight line, the distance from Boğazköy, the Hittite capital, to Sivas, located in the centre of the Upper Land, equals the distance from Sivas to Erzincan where Azzi-Ḫayaša is suspected – the morphological and climatic features make it difficult to successfully access the eastern regions of Anatolia. The interruption of the campaign in the east is for example explained in the Annals of Muršili by the onset of winter (KBo 4.4 III 26).

Borders according to the archaeological sources

Due to the reduced archaeological source material and its unclear age determination, it is either difficult or impossible to define cultural i.e. archaeological borders. Possible remains of border facilities in the landscape can only be speculated about. Moreover, it is impossible to describe the local archaeological culture from Azzi-Ḫayaša perspective.

From the other perspective, the Hittite side, it is possible to confirm the existence of a Hittite border. It is characterized by a number of fortified settlements located along the trade route to the south-east (e.g. Ökse 2007: 41). There possibly existed, as in the case of the northern boundary with the Kaškians, a kind of ‘frontier zone’ (Lightfoot and Martinez 1995: 481, Matthews and Glatz 2005: 49-50), beyond which no more Hittite findings could be identified.

Borders in the written sources

Main key sources such as border descriptions in treaties that could provide the most revealing information about borders are missing in the case of Azzi-Ḫayaša. Available are four well-known texts that mention a border between Azzi-Ḫayaša and the Upper Country. Three of these relate in different ways to border violations of the Hittite territory.
The different types of sources for the reconstruction of the course and the importance of the border between Ḥatti and Azzi-Ḫayaša provide separate, independent picture parts. At first sight, these pictures of the border do not overlap, nor do they refer to each other, nor do they confirm each other in a direct way. But this discrepancy is only apparent.

This paper reviews the different categories, presents and analyses the so far available sources. On the basis of this analysis it concludes on the relationship between the Hittite Empire and Azzi-Ḫayaša and finally describes the situation on the border between these two countries.

Anna Katarzyna Chrzanowska, originally postgraduate at the University of Warsaw, Poland, in Archaeology on ‘The Political and Cultural Situation in Western Anatolian in the Late Bronze Age’, is a researcher at the Johannes Gutenberg University of Mainz, Germany. She is preparing her PhD on the Borders of the Kingdom of Ḥatti. She delivered a paper on the ‘8th International Congress of Hittitology’ in 2011 on ‘Unerwünschte Nachbarschaft. Ereignisse an der nördlichen Grenze des Ḥatti-Reiches’. Although originally an archaeologist, experienced with several excavations in Poland, Turkmenistan and Turkey (Ḫattuša/Boğazkale), her work and research is philological as well, last but not least through her participation to the project ‘Beschwörungsrituale der Hethiter’ published on ‘Hethiter.net’.

---

**Paper 3 |**

**Frontiers of Polis: Defining the Borders of Klazomenai**

Elif Koparal, Hitit University, Çorum | ekoparal@gmail.com

The recognition of territorial borders is directly linked with the claim on peripheral land and it was crucial for poleis particularly during the formation phase. Both symbolically and politically unifying the central place and the territory could have been achieved by marking the fringes of the territory physically. Natural obstacles such as rivers and mountains were defining the borders most of the time due to the lack of technology to intrude on the environment. However the borders defined within the topographic context mostly formed the essential part of the territory. On the other hand the political borders were likely to change due to the shifting political and economic conditions. The archaeological field surveys conducted at the territory of Klazomenai provided us with various data sets to define the extensions of the Klazomenian khora and to explain the cognitive aspects that created the cultural landscape of Klazomenai. In order to define the borders of Klazomenai topographical features, the ritual landscape, defensive networks, the distribution of tumuli, border marks and epigraphical evidence are evaluated altogether. GIS applications are used to examine the validity of suggested borders and for producing visual material that defined the borders. In the context of urbanization process or polis formation, awareness of the extent of the territory and the effort expended for its protection are directly linked with the degree of institutionalisation and provide us with a terminus for the beginnings of urbanization or polis formation at the given place.

Elif Koparal | Born in İzmir, 1973. Completed BA and MA at Ege University (Department of Classical Archaeology) and Phd at METU (Department of Settlement Archaeology) with the work entitled ‘The Urbanization Process and Spatial Organization in Klazomenian Khora from Iron Age to Roman era’ in 2011. Participated at several different archaeological projects including Klazomenai excavations, Ephesos excavations, Teos Survey, Kinet Höyük Excavations, Komana Survey Project, Datça-Old Knidos Excavations, Urla-Seferihisar Archaeological Survey Project. Research areas are Classical Archaeology, Industrial Archaeology, Archaeological Survey Methodology, Urban Studies, Cultural Heritage and Theoretical Archaeology. Working as a faculty member of Hitit University, Department of Archaeology.
An Attempt to Define the Ubaid and its Cultural Borders in Northeastern Mesopotamia

Konstantinos Kopanias, University of Athens | kkopanias@arch.uoa.g

In April 2011 a new excavation began in the previously unknown site Tell Nader, which lies at the outskirts of the rapidly expanding city of Erbil, the capital of the Kurdistan Region of Iraq. The finds from the first two excavation campaigns allow us to sketch the history of the habitation on this site. It seems to have been in use from the Late Neolithic, in particular the Hassuna period, down to the Middle Assyrian or Early Neo-Assyrian period. The main occupation period in Tell Nader dates to the Late Ubaid/Early Uruk. Several sites from NE Mesopotamia, like Tepe Gawra and, to a lesser extent, also Qalij Agha, form the base of our knowledge on the material culture and the society of this period, but the stratigraphical problems in the older publications remain a significant obstacle. Despite the abundance of Ubaid elements in Tell Nader, and also other Northeastern Mesopotamian sites, the picture is much more complicated and, as a result, it is not possible to easily define their character and assign them to a cultural koine. The very analytical method we used for the excavation in Tell Nader offers new insight to this old problem. We collected and evaluated statistically all pottery and lithics from the site (a total of ca. 25,000 sherds from the first two excavation seasons). Despite the fact that the excavation produced all finds that are expected to be found in an Ubaid site (e.g. clay nails, clay tokens, clay figurines and pottery in the Ubaid style etc.), the bulk of pottery shows non Ubaid characteristics. What makes things even more complicated is the find of a female skeleton, which was apparently submitted to head-shaping during her infancy, a practice attested in several 6th and 5th millennium sites from modern Syria, Iraq and Iran. This paper is not only going to present the available statistical, archaeozoological, archaeobotanical and anthropological evidence from the Tell Nader excavation, but also offer a critical overview of the elements that are currently thought of characteristic of the Ubaid culture. In sum, the case of Tell Nader shows exactly how difficult it is to define a site as “Ubaid” and even more so, if we try to make assumptions about the cultural affinity or the ethnicity of the people who lived in this and other similar sites. In short, no matter how hard we try, pots don’t speak; our only hope is the use of new tools, such as DNA and anthropological analysis.

Konstantinos Kopanias is Lecturer for the Archaeology of the Eastern Mediterranean Cultures at the University of Athens. He studied at the Universities of Athens, Salzburg and Tübingen, as member of the Graduiertenkolleg ‘Anatolien und seine Nachbarn’ with a scholarship from the DFG. He worked as a Post-Doc-Researcher at the University of Athens, as Lecturer (407/80) at the University of Crete and Researcher (Allgemeiner Referent) at the German Archaeological Institute in Athens. He participated and co-organized many excavations and field surveys in Greece, Germany and Turkey. Since 2011 he is the director of an excavation of the University of Athens in Tell Nader in Erbil (ancient Arbela) in the Kurdistan Region of Iraq. His publications are mainly about the acculturation between the Aegean and the Near East during the Late Bronze Age and the Early Iron Age, but also prehistoric Northern Mesopotamia.
PANEL 4 | **Tangled layers / shifting attachments**

Chair | Ayşe Parla, Sabancı University
Doğan Akhanlı left Turkey in the early 1990s after having been imprisoned for his active involvement in an underground revolutionary movement. The significant boundaries that had informed his political struggle were those of class. They appeared as the site of exploitation, repression and violence. Doğan’s beliefs securely bounded his identity as distinct from the state and structured his moral world: the state and capital were wrong and bad; those fighting for the rights of workers and peasants were right and good. Yet, already preceding his departure from Turkey, this worldview started to shake as he became perceptive to ethnic differences that criss-crossed economic stratifications and heightened the precarity of some over others. They pointed to violent ruptures in the history of the region that he had previously not considered. Awaking to his own blindness with regards to the history of racism and anti-Semitism in Turkey, a field of coincidence and therefore also complicity with Turkish state ideology came into view.

This incipient re-evaluation of Doğan’s political biography coincided with his emigration to Germany, setting off its own particular dynamic. His new surrounding was marked by a normative ordering that accords the memory of the Holocaust, as a violence done to difference, a powerful public presence, while reinscribing racialised differences vis-à-vis a Turkish/Muslim other. As Doğan repositioned himself across the border, so to speak, he entered a process of remaking by engaging with these ‘new’ boundaries. He sensitized himself to previously neglected boundaries, adopting a humble and self-critical attitude towards victims of collective violence. On the other hand, a critical questioning of the selectiveness of sensitivities within his new ‘home’ culminated in artistic and activist work in defiance of other potent boundaries.

By taking the case of Doğan, I would like to discuss, in this paper, the interplay between migration and the remaking of subjectivities with regards to geographical and ideological boundaries. The crossing of borders can necessitate re-subjectification in response to sovereign and governmental powers and/or facilitate an ethical remaking of the self. It takes place by providing an impulse for the reconsideration and realignment of personally significant boundaries in engagement with normative systems that are personally brought into contact and tension through the migratory repositioning. In the case at hand, the juxtaposition of experiences in Turkey and Germany also revealed for Doğan delineations valid across the board, namely the inscription of individuals within certain national histories and the difficulties of articulating transnational trajectories. In my discussion I would therefore like to focus on the boundaries that delimit the field of possibilities for inscribing self and other within particular ‘histories’. It is important to pay special attention to how Doğan’s activism has been similarly reoriented, away from the overcoming of class boundaries towards the unearthing and narrating of what he calls Beziehungsgeschichte, relational history. Based on historical research, his novels and plays now weave German, Turkish, Jewish, Armenian and Greek histories together across time and space, exhibiting the complexities of transnational constellations of victimhood and perpetratorhood. Written in Turkish, published in Turkey, they thereby form their own transnational political intervention.
Thinking Through the Affective Registers of Borders: Reflecting on a Letter.

Eirini Avramopoloulou, University of Cambridge | ea298@cam.ac.uk

In this paper, I reflect on a letter written by a Turkish LGBT activist a short while after the humanitarian ship Mavi Marmara, owned by the Islamic human rights organisation IHH (İnsan Hak, Hüriyetleri ve İnsani Yardım Vakfı, The Foundation for Human Rights, Freedoms and Humanitarian Relief), took part in a convoy that tried to breach the blockade of Gaza in 2010. This humanitarian mission triggered an Israeli military intervention, storming the ship and leading to the death of nine activists with more severely injured, according to international media coverage. This incident stimulated high political friction, adding to the already tense relations between the AKP government and the Israeli state. At the same time, it led to various protests in Istanbul at a time when various human rights organisations, including IHH, had signed a petition denouncing homosexuality as a disease and a threat to society, alas, legitimising hate crime in Turkey.

Poignantly exposing fears, anger, loss and hopes, as well as various political implications and contradictions, this letter also reveals that from a person’s ‘minoritarian’ position crossing the distance set by national, ethnic, gendered, heteronormative, material and affective borders cannot be an easy process. Drawing on my ethnographic research in Istanbul, in this paper, I focus on this letter in order to critically engage with the bonds and boundaries set between ethnographic moments, which expose the difficulties attached to the ‘politics of “thick life”’ (Povinelli 2006, p.21), and pertaining methodological questions of representation and writing.

"Why must the question of power (an old word that needs differentiation, an abstraction that needs analysis) be worked out today, urgently and insistently, as a question of writings? What must follow from this, with regard both to the powers and to the writings?” Derrida asks (1998, p.55). Departing from this question, my aim is to examine the possibilities attached to ‘performatif speech’ (Butler, Spivak 2007), i.e. to a speech that might carry a new possibility for social and political life, especially when a person’s voice echoes the agony of acquiring a position or a stance that exposes confrontation while potentially leading to reconciliation, but that nevertheless “unsettles established models, as well as their reassuring certitudes” (Loraux 2001, p.25).

Eirini Avramopoloulou has recently attained her PhD in Social Anthropology at the University of Cambridge, titled “The Affective Language of Activism: An Ethnography of human rights, gender politics and activist coalitions in Istanbul, Turkey”. Her research interests include anthropology of human rights and activism; gender and sexuality; biopolitics and affect. She has worked as a junior researcher in the interdisciplinary European funded project ‘Veil: Values, Equality and Differences in Liberal Democracies,’ the results of which have been published in Sieglinde Rosenberger and Birgit Sauer (eds.) Politics, Religion, and Gender: Regulating the Muslim Headscarf. Routledge: Taylor and Francis Group, 2012. Her academic work has also been published in the Greek journals EKKE (forthcoming), Kritiki Diapistimonikotita (2007) and Thesis (2002).
This paper examines the mutual transformation of intersecting borders: national, affective and political. The first, national, demarcate two states—Turkey and Greece—shaped by a long history of tense relations between them; the second, affective, resonate upon the swing of a pendulum between contradictory emotional states—enmity and friendship—that have constantly marked the encounters between ‘Turks’ and ‘Greeks’. Finally, the political borders examined in this paper delineate opposing ideological camps where the Left occupied a significant role as a catalyst for change.

Drawing from an extended archival and ethnographic research at the Turkish coastal towns and the neighbouring Greek Islands dispersed across the Aegean Sea borderline, the first part of this paper explores spatial proximity to the border both as a source of interstate animosity as well as a condition for promoting reconciliation. I specifically focus on a number of Turkish-Greek rapprochement initiatives organised or supported by Left-wing local governments and left-oriented civil society groups in the area during the 1980s to the mid-1990s; a period largely ignored until now by studies on Greek-Turkish rapprochement. I show that despite the eruption of brink-of-war episodes at the Aegean, the realisation of affinities between the Greek and the Turkish Left at the local level led to the tightening of relations between segments of the two societies and fostered a common mobilisation for peace.

In the second part of the paper I argue that those innovative actions of reconciliation stimulated the transformation of different kind of borders: The national border separating the Turkish and Greek societies was rendered less contentious and more porous through the efforts of the peace activists; the border was criss-crossed and turned into a bridge of communication instead of a dividing line. In this respect, the border was de-politicised. However, such a development was made possible only by rendering another type of border more rigid: the political border separating nationalist conservatives from pro-rapprochement affiliates in each country and in each local community; Such a border, built upon old ideological differences, was re-politicised.

This synchronic transformation of borders observed through this case study produces a paradox in need for theoretical clarification. How can processes of de-politicization and re-politicisation of borders coexist? What are the conditions of such co-existence, what the constraints and what the possibilities of such mutual transformations? Drawing from Jacques Derrida’s critique to Carl Schmitt on the concept of the ‘political’ (Derrida 2005; Schmitt 2004; Schmitt 2007), I address the questions stemming from the paradox. I argue that de-politicisation and re-politicisation of borders and frontiers—or what I call frontiers in différance—can be, sometimes, complementary instead of a contradictory processes. By connecting theory to the empirical life upon a contentious borderline, this paper will show how the Political can be revived through its own annulment, producing ‘friends’ instead of ‘enemies’; and therefore destabilising the positioning of a long-endured affective border separating the two societies.

Leonidas Karakatsanis received his PhD in Ideology and Discourse Analysis from the University of Essex in the UK. He has worked and published on issues related to nationalism and the politics of reconciliation, minority rights, identity politics, migration and theories of qualitative methods in social and political sciences. He was the co-convenor of the ‘European Identities’ graduate seminar series at the Centre for Research in the Arts, Social Sciences and the Humanities (CRASSH), University of Cambridge. He is currently a post-doctoral fellow at the British Institute at Ankara finishing his first monograph on the history of Turkish-Greek rapprochement.
Fatih Akin’s movies are frequently set in situations in which characters find themselves constantly crossing or straddling borders and boundaries, whether those of the actual nation-state as in the travel-movie ‘In July’, which traverses half of Europe, or social lines of separation as in the urban drama ‘Short, Sharp Shock’ set in Hamburg. In many of Akin’s movies, the crossing of borders occurs on multiple levels and dimensions and the protagonists are characterised by a ‘double consciousness’, positioned between different transnational spheres of social, political and cultural reality. This hybrid sense of belonging and identity is often, though not exclusively, located within the transnational spaces of connection between Turkey and Germany which Betigül Ercan Argun names as ‘Deutschkei’. This particular hybridity, positing identity as ‘not being but becoming’, seems well suited to question or disrupt the ontology of bordered worlds and counter-act bordered imaginaries in contrast to the global, transnational and multi-cultural realities of Akin’s characters.

Themes of borders and boundaries as institutions of the state and society are, at least implicitly, represented in all of Akin’s movies and explicitly in most. With a highly critical focus, nation-state borders are depicted as institutions of social injustice and agents of socio-political conceptions of order (the Westphalian nation-state; Fortress Europe; ethnically and religious homogenous social identities) that seem out of place with the global, multi-cultural realities depicted within Akin’s films. In highlighting the possibility of post-national forms of belonging and identity as well as the injustice that institutions of borders and boundaries can perpetrate, Akin’s work can be interpreted as an agent of reflexive modernization. Through this process, linked to Ulrich Beck’s notion of risk society, particular practices and norms of modernity and modernization are called into question with the promise of activating more global and transnational forms of solidarity as understood by terms like global civil society or discursive global democracy. This process could be extended to the concept of the nation-state and its borders and real-life examples of this can be seen in the pan-European No-Borders campaign network.

Akin’s movies can be seen as public documents shared and seen across a wide, transnational spectrum that problematize and challenge notions of bounded and bordered identity, especially in the context of Turkey, Germany and the European Union. They can thus participate in the resistance of what Etienne Balabou calls the ‘subjective interiorization of the idea of the border’. In most of Akin’s works, the incomplete promise and potential of broader, more post-national conceptions of citizenship and belonging beckon. This paper then seeks to unpack the representation of state and socio-cultural borders and boundaries throughout these films and on one hand tie this to broader current critiques of ‘hard-border’ notions of belonging, identity and solidarity implicit in the current global political order. On the other, it will also explore how Akin’s films link with wider current considerations of alternative transnational, multicultural and cosmopolitan conceptions of identity, solidarity and belonging.
Marc Herzog is currently the Assistant Director of the British Institute at Ankara (BIAA). He is the co-editor of the forthcoming Turkey and the Politics of National Identity (IB Tauris, 2014). He is also co-editing another volume dealing with new approaches to area studies and international relations. He will contribute to the forthcoming Routledge Handbook of the Arab Spring: Rethinking Democratization (2014). He finished his PhD at the University of Exeter in 2011. His doctoral thesis focused on the emergence of conservative, pro-religious politics in the past two decades and its impact on the dynamics and institutionalization of the Turkish party system in a comparative frame. His research interests include Turkish party politics, political Islam and the dynamics of moderation, democratization, party system institutionalization, Turkish foreign policy as well as the politics of identity in the Turkish context. He is also an avid cat lover.
PANEL 5 | On close encounters: imagining the ‘other’

Chair | Elif Denel, American Research Institute in Turkey
Paper 1 |
A View over High Mountains: The Assyrian Perception of the Urartians and their Kings

Julia Linke, Albert-Ludwigs-Universitat Freiburg | julia.linke@orient.uni-freiburg.de

The perception of a society outside the border of one’s own country is based on cultural convention and at the same time dependent on the materiality of power relations. In the case of the Urartian and the Assyrian empires in the early first millennium B.C. the border that separates them is a quite strong one: the South-Eastern Taurus mountains.

In general, the knowledge of a society on the other side of a border is partial and often inaccurate. Thus people tend to perceive these distant spaces as threatening. So we would expect that the Assyrian view on the Urartian society behind the mountains is rather suspicious and pejorative, but indeed that’s not always the case. Instead, the Assyrian texts ‘Assyrize’ Urartu and attach their own view on the culture and organization of the land behind the border, calling the Urartian kings "šarru" and defining the different areas of Urartu as "nagû" (provinces) – just as they do in their own country. Despite of the usual negative ‘enemy-propaganda’ about coward kings and struggles for rule, the Assyrian texts also admire Urartian achievements, especially in the field of irrigation.

In my paper I want to describe the different aspects of the Assyrian image of the land of Urartu and its kings, using both the certainly tendentious Assyrian royal inscriptions as well as the so called “Secret Service Correspondence” sent by Assyrian officials from the Urartian border to their king. I will on the one hand outline the increasing conflict between Assyria and Urartu and try to show how this mainly military point of view affects the Assyrian image of the Urartians. On the other hand I will take a closer look at the positive depictions of the land of Urartu and the accomplishments of the Urartian kings, e.g. the fortress of Ulḫu and its sophisticated irrigation system. In a third step I will compare the (quite few) Urartian sources we have at our disposal with the image that Assyrian records create of the kingdom of "Urartu" or "Biainili" (as the Urartians call their empire themselves) to check how accurate the Assyrian image of their neighbours is.

Julia Linke | I completed my studies in Near Eastern Archaeology, Assyriology and Islamic Studies at Freiburg University in 2007. For 5 years (2006-2011) I have worked at the excavation project in Kamid el-Loz, Lebanon. In 2011, I joined the team of the Ayanis excavations, also in respect of my PhD-project: ‘Das Charisma der Könige – Zur Konzeption des altorientalischen Königums im Hinblick auf Urartu’ that I successfully completed in September 2012. My main research interests are therefore the archaeology of the Late Bronze Age Levant and the Iron Age (Eastern) Anatolia, as well as historical sociology and concepts of kingship and authority on a theoretical basis. I am currently a Postdoctoral fellow at the Department of Near Eastern Archaeology, Albert-Ludwigs-Universität Freiburg, Germany.
The eastern frontier region between the Byzantines and Sasanians in Late Antiquity, today south-eastern Turkey, was a stage of not only continuous wars but also interesting cultural and religious encounters. Thus the ‘In between’ of the title does not have a connotation related to place only but it also reflects the situation of the communities, the artistic style and the architecture. The cities, from which we have considerable archaeological remains, were changing hands continuously. Their foundations and refortifications caused problems and resentments that continued for centuries. The building of churches in these multi-denominational, ethnically cosmopolitan cities was usually loaded with symbolism, targeted to either the nearby Sasanians or other Christian denomination of the times (monophysites) or the Christians (East-Syrians) living under Sasanians. Artistic encounters facilitated by being on the border shaped the architecture of the region to a certain extent. In the rural areas of the region, Christological differences resulted in ruined monasteries, wandering monks and secluded areas. Holy men and monasteries had extra significance in the frontier regions probably because of the divine protection they were believed to have provided. Traffic of monks, relics and pilgrims were important factors that shaped above all the rural areas.

Being close to the border affected the economy of the region. Nisibis was one of the few cities where trade between the Romans and Persians was allowed. The wealth of these cities at the time is mentioned in more than one chronicle. In addition to that, imperial patronage was significant. Emperors were patrons of various projects ranging from big scale urban projects to small monastic churches. At times when the region was under the Sasanians building activities continued.

The region was conquered by the Muslim Arabs in 640 AD. The Syrian Christians of the region, now especially concentrated in the Tur Abdin, a limestone plateau to the east of Mardin, were no longer under the Christian Byzantines who considered them heretics. Muslim conquest brought dramatic changes to this landscape which was no longer a border region by the shifting of the frontier to the west. During the one and a half centuries after the Muslim conquest, the Syrian Orthodox flourished in the region and many village churches were built in that period.

---

Elif Keser | My research focuses primarily on the Christian Heritage of Northern Mesopotamia. My doctoral thesis, completed at the University of Oxford in 2009, analysed the architectural and artistic aspects of the late-antique church architecture of modern south-eastern Turkey in its wider cultural and historical implications. During 2010, I conducted research on the monasteries of the region, especially of the Tur Abdin region which is a limestone plateau to the east of Mardin. Since then, I have divided my time between two projects. First is the analysis of the region in the 8th century under the early Muslim rule. I have focused particularly on a village called Hah in Tur Abdin. The second is analysing the evolution and modern situation of the Syrian Orthodox churches in and around Mardin. I am currently preparing the latter for publication.
The early Islamic conquests (here, mainly AD 632–656) were swift and sweeping, dislodging long-established Roman and Persian powers with an ease that was previously unimaginable. But despite the invaders’ spectacular momentum, they were not unstoppable. In the historiography of the conquests, certain types of locations in the natural world regularly appear as limits to their progress. Prominent amongst these are mountains. It comes as no surprise that chains such as the Taurus, Caucasus and Elburz were sometimes impassable, but mountains were more than just physical barriers. In the narratives of the conquests, they also represent limits of a more ideated kind. With reference to established models for decoding depictions of space, I will argue that while mountainous landscapes certainly represent literal physical limits to the conquests, they also have two kinds of shared symbolic significance. First, they are the settings for stories—plausibly crafted to inspire or galvanise audiences—about prevailing against even the most formidable opponents. Second, they are a context within which authors address political and ideological issues about the extent of the conquests. I will also discuss how, even as the populations of towns on the mountainous frontiers became increasingly mixed, the highlands themselves continued to be associated with resistance and power.

There is a significant amount of common ground in how mountains are portrayed in Christian and Arabic sources, but there are also important differences. The Christian writers often portray mountains as a refuge. The physical terrain provides shelter, but the concept extends to linking the rugged qualities of the landscape to the mountain-dwellers as well, making them especially reliable protectors. It also connects with the various ways in which being at a height distances people from events below them. The landscape takes form in the imaginations of audiences as well as in tangible space. In the Arabic sources, the highlands are arguably more likely to be associated with the theme of claiming and possessing the land. The divergent perspectives of defenders and invaders can be seen in this contrast, but it is also arguably linked to authorial intent. I will discuss how the defenders’ tales of triumph, whose authors were close to events, might be meant to reassure and inspire. The Muslim authors, on the other hand, compiling their accounts some time later, may be conveying the developing priorities of the new Islamic empire.

My paper will focus on depictions of mountains in the record of the early Islamic conquests with the aim of glimpsing the external and interior worlds of people experiencing and documenting the momentous events of the time. It will be concerned with how those people themselves characterised border zones. The meanings of these places seem unfixed; paradoxically, they were both scenes of crossing over and barriers to progress. Finally, I hope to show that a study of this type can lead to a more complex and comprehensive understanding of this turning point in world history.
This paper will examine three aspects of the medieval frontier between Muslims and Christians in eastern Anatolia as depicted in the Byzantine epic Digenēs Akritēs and the later Turkish epic the Battālnāme.

First, it will discuss the physical aspects of the frontier that are described in each of the epics. Afterwards, the characteristics of the Anatolian frontier as described in the two works will be compared those of other medieval Muslim - Christian frontiers, such as Spain.

Next, it will look at the mental borders between the two confessional groups, that is, what aspects of the people (and their culture) on the other side of the border were considered worthy of mention in the two epics, and what was not. In addition, when examining the information about ‘the other’, the issue of how deeply and how correctly the inhabitants on the other side of the border were understood by these epics’ writers will be considered. As for the cultural aspects that are not mentioned in the epics, we will try to determine why it was ignored.

Finally, the paper examines the culture of the frontier dwellers, their livelihoods, their pastimes, values and social organization. It will look at the similarities and differences and, in particular, the theme of crossing the border, that is, becoming a member of the society and culture on the other side. The questions of how and why individuals or groups chose to switch allegiances and the degree to which they were accepted by the new society will be of particular interest.

The conclusion will examine how these different kinds of borders intersect, and how an awareness of the various aspects and characteristics of medieval border regions can help to better understand the literature and the people of this period.

Richard Dietrich is a lecturer in the Department of History, Middle East Technical University, Ankara, Turkey. He received a Master’s degree in Ancient Near Eastern Languages & Literature from Cornell University. He holds a Master’s degree and a PhD in Medieval History from Ankara University. His main areas of interest are Ancient, Classical, Byzantine, Islamic History; Religions in Antiquity; Languages; Military History.
PANEL 6 | **On close encounters: influencing the ‘other’**

Chair | Lale Özgenel, Middle East Technical University
Paper 1 |
Society/Civilization Follows From? Impacts on Architecture in Late Bronze Age Anatolia

Çiğdem Maner, Koç University Istanbul | cmaner@ku.edu.tr

This paper aims to analyze the manifold architecture and building techniques of Anatolia in the LBA. There is no coherent building style during the LBA in Anatolia. During the LBA in Anatolia one can witness that a major part of Anatolia is occupied by the Hittite Empire. They start with a nucleus in central Anatolia and expand within 400 years to Western and Southeast Anatolia, even towards the Black Sea Region and the Mediterranean coast. Looking at Hittite architecture it is obvious that the Hittites followed a standardization of shapes and also applied standardized techniques to build their architecture. However, the places they added to the empire and which stayed vassals are often show different architectural programs, building techniques and hybrid shapes. Western Anatolia for example had a different building program, and so did Southeast and East Anatolia. These regions were influenced by the architecture of different civilizations, respective societies or have their own indigenous architecture. Is it possible to trace a Hittite influence in the architecture of these regions? Or vice versa? Where and how can we set borders for Hittite, Hittitanizing and non Hittite architecture in Anatolia during the Late Bronze Age?

Following the statement of Amos Rapaport “The architecture is the mirror of a civilization” the paper will try to set geographical and architectural borders within Anatolia in order to show, if a society/civilization follows always the same forms of architecture in their habitation area and if they can be identified with specific forms and building techniques in the geographical regions they are living. In addition it will be discussed whether the different civilizations/societies of Anatolia have influenced each other and exchanged ideas and how this can be traced back in the architecture.

---

Çiğdem Maner received her PhD in 2011 from University of Heidelberg. She is an Assistant Professor at Koç University where she has worked as an instructor since 2005. Her research interests include Early Bronze Age-Early Iron Age Anatolia, Mesopotamia and Greece, interrelations and exchange, Hittites, Mycenaeans, fortification architecture.

Paper 2 |
Fuzzy Borders and No Man’s Land. Regulating Inter-regional Relations in Ionia and Central West Anatolia from the Archaic to the Hellenistic Period.

David Hill, University of Oslo | david.hill@khm.uio.no

The growth of city state territoriality in Ionia created a politically fragmented region that was bordered by the large inland kingdom of Lydia. The topography of Ionia has been seen as creating a political mosaic of separated states (Greaves 2010). Political amalgamation did not take place in Ionia as elsewhere, such that the region maintained its fragmented nature into the Roman Period. Territorial conflict between poleis was common, particularly on the Mykale Peninsular and around the Latmic Gulf. It is
possible to recognize how regional space dealt with political tension by studying the way in which political boundaries were drawn up. To the east of Ionia the highly strategic Torbali Plain functioned as a depoliticized buffer zone, or ‘no-man’s land, between Ionia and Lydia from the Archaic Period, until the first half of the 3rd century BC when it was urbanized through the foundation of Metropolis. Territorial tension in the landscape was no longer present at levels that would influence landscape use, and a no-man’s land to regulate regional space was no longer necessary. The (probable) Seleucid foundation of Metropolis that filled the landscape compartment, can be likened to the process of urban infill using an empty plot in a cityscape (Hill 2013).

In addition to a complex territorial landscape, the mutually beneficial, though antagonistic relationship between the Ionian states and Lydia, created a fuzzy border that can be likened to the modern Syrian–Lebanese political relationship. During the Archaic Period this solution gave the Ionian states autonomy and access to Lydian wealth, whilst Lydia received nominal over-lordship, access to Ionian skills and goods and maritime contacts through Ionian infrastructure (Roosevelt 2009). The relationship was regulated through a sophisticated use of military threat, direct political involvement, marriage alliances and investment. The political situation as described above is difficult to track archaeologically and hard to draw on to a map. The question of ‘fuzzy borders’ in ancient landscapes is important to archaeologists who lack a toolbox for describing political and economic boundaries that are not sharply delineated.

David Hill | I have undertaken research at Metropolis in Ionia from 2007-2009, and at Hierapolis from 2008-2013. I am also involved in ongoing research at Tegea in the Peloponnese and Kastro Apalirou on Naxos. Urban transition and urbanized landscapes are my main fields of interest. I have previously studied the urban landscape of Eastern Norway during the High Middle Ages. I work at the Museum of Cultural History, University of Oslo.

Paper 3 |
The Coming of Rome and the Re-definition of Cultural and Ethnical Boundaries in Northern Anatolia

Jesper Majbom Madsen, University of Southern Denmark | majbom@sdu.dk

This paper discusses the impact Roman rule had on the cultural, social and political life in northern Anatolia. It is far too often assumed that the influence from Rome was less pronounced in the eastern parts of the Empire. This preconceived opinion suggests that the Greeks were culturally superior and as a result would benefit little from the culturally inferior Romans. In the Roman West we find a systematic urbanization, the introduction of Latin, and a political system inspired by Roman norms and values. In the East however the coming of Rome did allegedly not witness the same degree of cultural exchange. Rome only settled a few colonies and other urban structures, such as Apameia and Sinope and the cities Pompey founded in the newly conquered Mithridatic kingdom, but these were either modelled on the Greek polis or still very much attached to a Greek cultural heritage.

Contrary to this scholarly consensus this paper will argue that the coming of Rome had a profound impact on the region, politically as well as culturally. It is tempting to
approach cultural identity as a one-dimensional phenomenon (e.g. Woolf 1994 & Swain 1996). This approach however is flawed and this paper will instead suggest that the sense of being Greek did not exclude a sense of being Roman.

By focusing on what has been described as the ‘communitarian identity’ (Sen 2006), there is a tendency to ignore the multiple memberships of individuals, depending on their status, financial means, religious affiliations and their access to political institutions and societies. In this paper I shall argue that the inhabitants of the Northern Anatolian cities, most notable in the case of the elite, could perfectly identify themselves as Greeks as well as Romans. Being Roman was not exclusively a legal matter of being a Roman citizen, but to a high degree a question of showing a cultural attachment to Rome.

Epigraphic material from the province of Pontus et Bithynia and from the Pompeian cities in the Pontic inland is revealing: the inhabitants were keen to show their affiliation to Roman society. The local context in which these inscriptions appear suggests that the affiliation to the Roman collectivity was not only aimed for local consumption, but also expected to create admiration within its local context.

Members of the elite did not as a result feel less Greek, but it does imply that it was possible to identify oneself as Greek and Roman at the same time. The coming of Rome and the influence of Roman culture succeeded in dissolving the existing boundaries between Greek and Anatolian communities but it also created new boundaries, as already Aelius Aristides believed, between the Empire and the outside world.

Jesper Majbom Madsen | I am senior lecture in ancient history at the University of Southern Denmark. My main area of research is the study of the cultural interaction between Greek communities in Asia Minor and the Roman World. In 2009 I published the book Eager to be Roman: Greek responses to Roman Rule in Pontus and Bithynia focusing on how the influence from Rome and Roman culture changed not only everyday life in the Pontic and Bithynian cities but also how the civic population perceived themselves in relation to the Roman empire. I am currently writing a new book on the cities Pompey settled in the Pontic inland when reorganizing the Mithridatic Kingdom.
PANEL 7 | Inside, outside / in-between

Chair | Susan Sherratt, University of Sheffield
Dynamic and Deconstructed: Material Cultural Boundaries and Theorizing the Exchange of Ideas in Neolithic Anatolia

Emma Baysal, The British Institute at Ankara | emmabaysal@gmail.com

‘...the conceptual and analytic act of ferreting out and affixing boundaries around the material, social, and symbolic ‘sides’ of technology creates in its wake a false object of study: material things, separated from the agents who work and transform them, and each of these partitioned from the meaningful experiences such acts entail.’ (Dobres 2000, 98).

What is a boundary in the construction of narrative interpretations of the material culture of the Neolithic period? Is it a false object of study? In prehistory definitions of borders and boundaries have long been grounded in material cultural differences, based on the premise that different cultural or ethnic groups will manifest their identity through the manufacture, acquisition and use of different products. In Neolithic archaeology borders are defined between regions, sites, levels of complexity, stages of ‘development’, wild and domestic, and settled and transhumant populations, based on material culture. How many of these are, or have been, imposed by archaeologists, and whether they are a plausible or realistic representation of Neolithic society and its interactions is an important question. The legacy of early archaeological methodologies, which preached the reliance on sequential differentiation of artefacts chronologically and geographically has left us without any concrete identification of differentiated groups, or reflexive discussion of how the individuals concerned may have viewed themselves. The validity and inflexibility of such boundaries has relied on fitting newly excavated items into already existing material cultural paradigms, often without questioning whether, or how, processes of invention, adoption and transformation were at work. Here I ask how and why these boundaries have been formulated and whether it is possible to question and reformulate the cultural paradigms that have become codified in archaeological literature. I use the concept of dynamic margins to explore the role of liminal areas in processes of interaction and change and crucially in the exchange of ideas that catalyzed materially visible processes of transformation.

In questioning the nature of material-cultural border and boundary definition, and in taking a sideways look at how change processes occurred a wide variety of issues are raised: core and periphery; idea exchange; adoption processes/ selective adoption; catalysts for change; identity and the representation of identity; cultural transmission; interregional interactions/ juxtaposed identities to name but a few. Approaching borders not as divisions but as conduits for the transmission of knowledge, innovation and change, renegotiating the definition of regions, allows an account of the different dynamic processes that constituted the construction of Neolithic identities. This paper explores the ways in which theorizing the archaeology of material cultural change using elements from theoretical approaches used in disciplines outside of archaeology might help reevaluate places of division as the most open/transformative areas of society by deconstructing borders and embracing dynamic processes as a fundamental part of the interpretation of the archaeological record.
strands of this research is the assessment of borders as dynamic places, and transforming their perception as places of division into a more nuanced understanding of the layers of interaction and difference both in the past and in the present. A key element in founding this new approach to prehistoric material culture studies is the employment of theoretical approaches from a variety of disciplines. She also works as a specialist in early beads and items of personal ornamentation in Anatolia, currently on material from Boncuklu Höyük, Pınarbaşı and Kanitaş.

Paper 2 | Monuments and Borders in the Anatolian Countryside: Empire, Place and Politics during the Late Bronze Age

Ömür Harmanşah, Brown University | omur_harmanshah@brown.edu

Cultural historian Elliott Colla proposed in a recent paper that ancient borders, unlike their modern versions, are often roughly hewn, both materially and conceptually. With this he not only refers to the artfully crafted and politically contested nature of borders in antiquity but also cleverly highlights their geological grounding. For the Hittite imperial landscapes, Colla's statement has special resonance since Hittite frontiers are often discussed with respect to the carving of rock reliefs and the construction of stone built spring monuments that both commemorate the kingship ideology at politically contested border regions and appropriate local sites of geological wonder and cultic significance such as caves, springs and sinkholes while transforming them into state sanctioned sites of ritual practice. Treaties are signed and border disputes are settled at these liminal sites, often associated with DINGIR.KAŞ.KAL.KUR sites that are known from Hittite and Hurrian texts. These are special locales where divinities and ancestors of the underworld make an appearance and take part as witnesses of political events of border delineation. One such well-known monument is the mountain spring at Yalburt Yaylası that features a lengthy Hieroglyphic Luwian inscription put up by the Hittite kings in the countryside. Excavated by Ankara Museum in 1970s, Yalburt Monument near Konya is dated to the time of Tudhaliya IV (1209-1237 BCE) who commemorates his military campaign to Lukka Lands in the lengthy Hieroglyphic Luwian inscription carved on the monument. Since 2010, Brown University's Yalburt Yaylası Archaeological Landscape Research Project has investigated both the immediate and more regional landscapes surrounding Yalburt monument. The preliminary results of the three archaeological survey seasons in 2010-2012 suggest that the region of Yalburt was a deeply contested frontier, where the Land of Hatti linked to the politically powerful polities of western Anatolia. The results of extensive and intensive survey in the survey area points to a major Hittite imperial intervention into the region in the form of a rigorous program of irrigation, agricultural rehabilitation and settlement in the last centuries of the Empire, and a complex process of landscape negotiation between local communities and the Hittite colonial intervention. This paper therefore will discuss the nature of a Hittite borderland with respect to settlement programs, monument construction and regional politics.

Ömür Harmanşah is Assistant Professor of Archaeology and the Ancient Western Asian Studies at Brown University where he teaches courses on Near Eastern archaeology and material culture, theories of archaeology, architecture, and art history, cultural heritage and politics of archaeological practice in the Middle East. He received his PhD in the History of Art from University of Pennsylvania. He is the director of the Brown University based Yalburt Yaylası Archaeological Landscape Research Project in Konya province, Turkey since 2010. He has also worked with Kerkenes Dağ, Ayanis and Gordion Archaeological Projects. His first monograph entitled Cities and the Shaping of Memory in the Ancient Near East was recently published by Cambridge University Press (2013).
My paper is based on anthropological research that I conducted between September 1979 and July 1982, two years of which were spent in a central Anatolian village (August 1980-July 1982) and augmented by many returns, most recently just a year ago. While that research was not focused on boundaries or borders, several salient categories emerged in everyday speech and in non-verbal customs that structured peoples’ notions of their lived world (habitus). Most notable was the distinction between “inside” and “outside” (iç vs dış) and its corollaries “closed” and “open” (kapalı vs açık). The latter dichotomy was so often applied to women that it would have been difficult not to notice. A covered woman, that is, a woman with a headscarf was referred to as kapalı. That indicated that she was “covered” by the protection of some man - her father or her husband. In contrast, an uncovered woman was açık and assumed to be open to sexual advances from men. In the village all women were covered. If I wanted to remain in the village, I was told I had to dress like a village woman - not only adopting the headscarf but also wearing şalvar rather than pants or a skirt. Soon I was no longer an outsider and the villagers took a protective stance towards me.

But I also noticed that the same words, inside/outside and open vs closed, were applied to the house, the village, and the nation. In addition, the boundaries of these socially constructed categories were a focus of concern that required rules or social conventions about who or what could cross from one side to the other and what counted as a transgression. For example, although our village was not walled, it might as well have been. Villagers said it was “kapalı ” (closed) to outside, potentially polluting or threatening influences. They compared it to villages they thought had become dirty (pis), adulterated, impure (karışık, bulaşık),or “açık” (open). People inside the village knew each other and most were somehow related; an outsider entering the village was immediately questioned about his business and directed to the proper person or sent on his way. In the paper I will discuss each of the categories in turn and how these beliefs and customs worked out in practice. Ultimately, I suggest that these dichotomies are symbolically rooted in a particular understanding of the female body.
ROUND TABLE | Bridging divides

Chair | Mark Herzog, The British Institute at Ankara
Invited Discussants

Ayşe Parla, Sabancı University

Kerem Öktem, University of Oxford

Susan Sherratt, University of Sheffield

Ayşe Parla received her B.A from Harvard in 1995 and her Ph.D. in Anthropology from New York University in 2005. Since then she has been teaching at Sabancı University where she is Associate Professor of Anthropology in the program in Cultural Studies. She has completed a three year TUBITAK project on the legalization strategies of Turkish migrants from Bulgaria. As a 2011 recipient of the Turkish Academy of Sciences Young Scholar Award (TÜBA-GEIP), her current research project involves a critical examination of the “Europeanization” of the field of migration in Turkey through a focus on undocumented migrants’ children’s access to education. She has published her research on questions of migration, citizenship, labor and ethnicity in various journals including Alternatives: Global, Local, Political, American Ethnologist, Citizenship Studies, Differences, International Migration and Toplum ve Bilim.

Kerem Öktem is Research Fellow at the European Studies Centre, St Antony’s College and an associate of Southeast European Studies at Oxford. He teaches the Politics of the Middle East at the Oriental Institute. He read Modern Middle Eastern Studies at Oxford, where he also completed his D. Phil. thesis at the School of Geography in 2006. In the thesis, he explored the destruction of imperial space in the Ottoman Empire and the subsequent construction of an exclusively Turkish national territory. His research interests range from the history of nationalism, ethnopolitics and minority rights in Turkey to debates on history, memory and trauma, and to Turkey’s conflicted relations with Armenia and Greece. More recently, he has started a research project on the emergence of Islam as a central discursive category in European public debates. His latest book is the edited volume Another Empire? A Decade of Turkey’s Foreign Policy under the Justice and Development Party.

Susan Sherratt | I studied Classics as an undergraduate at New Hall, Cambridge, and completed a DPhil on 12th century BC Mycenaean pottery at Somerville College, Oxford in 1982. I researched and taught in Oxford, based chiefly in the Department of Antiquities, Ashmolean Museum, for many years before coming to Sheffield in 2005. My research interests are in the Bronze and Early Iron Ages of the Aegean, Cyprus and the wider eastern Mediterranean, particularly in all aspects of trade and interaction within and beyond these regions. Since 2009 I have been a member of the Sinop Regional Archaeological Project, directed by Professor Owen Doonan of California State University-Northridge and Dr Alex Bauer of Queens College, City University of New York. I am also academic director of ArchAtlas, a web-based project founded by the late Andrew Sherratt, which, among other things, aims to provide visual summaries of spatial processes in prehistoric and early historic times.
Chairs of Panels

Ayşe Parsa (see previous page)

Elif Denel has been the director in residence at the Ankara office of the American Research Institute in Turkey for almost five years. She studied history at the University of Chicago before completing an M.A. and a Ph.D. at the Classical and Near Eastern Archaeology Department of Bryn Mawr College. Since 2006 she has been participating in the University of Toronto's Tayinat Archaeological Project under the directorship of Timothy Harrison.

Kerem Öktem (see previous page)

Lale Özgenel is Associate Professor in Architecture at the Middle East Technical University (METU). Graduated from the Department of Architecture at METU in 1987. Özgenel received her master's degree in 1992 and doctoral degree in 2000 from the same university and made post-doctoral research and publication in Oxford University, American Academy at Rome and American School of Classical Studies at Athens. She is teaching at METU since 1992, offering courses on architectural history and leading a group in the 4th year architectural design studio. Among her research interests and publications are history of domestic architecture, daily life, gender and privacy studies with an emphasis on antiquity. She worked as coordinator and responsible architect in international archaeological projects. Since 2007 she has also been realizing architectural projects within the scope of METU Revolving Fund. At present she is acting as Advisor to the President of METU, as Chairs of Department of Music and Fine Arts and Department of Architectural History.
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