www.turkishstudies.net/turkishstudies

Turkish Studies

eISSN: 1308-2140

Research Article / Araştırma Makalesi

INTERNATIONAL
BALKAN
UNIVERSITY

Sponsored by IBU

Defense Systems of the Bronze Ages at the Urla Peninsula

Urla Yarımadası'nda Tunç Çağı Savunma Sistemleri

Tayfun Caymaz*

Abstract: The Urla Peninsula, in the middle of the Western Anatolian coast, is a bridge that brings together the Anatolian mainland and Aegean cultures. As a matter of fact, it has hosted various cultures associated with these two aspects throughout the ages. While two of the twelve Ionian cities are located on the peninsula, both are close neighbors. However, the geographical structure and location of the peninsula creates a defense and security weakness. Throughout the ages, the peninsula has been exposed to security-oriented activities such as piracy, banditry and smuggling and, on the other hand, military attacks by organized political forces. Archaeological data have revealed that such threats were also present in the protohistoric period. During the Early Bronze Age, Liman Tepe on the Urla İskelesi became a regional administrative and political center with a magnificent castle, lower city and port. In the same period, it is seen that a security and defense system which has the ability to keep the main roads and bays of the peninsula under control. Within this system, Gökayası near Alaçatı has control of the direction of Samos Island whereas Kale Tepe controls the Urla-Çeşme road, and Yaren Tepe controls the direction of Sığacık Bay. Within the 2nd millennium BC, narrow regional administrative structures began to be replaced by powers dominating larger regions. The material culture in the settlements of this period on the peninsula is parallel to Anatolia. In addition, in the process, first Minoan, then Mycenaean commercial and cultural influences emerged. Few defense units are known from the Middle and Late Bronze Ages. These are mostly located in the eastern part of the region, which is connected to the mainland.

Structured Abstract: The Urla Peninsula, reaching from the İzmir and Sığacık gulfs to the Aegean Sea, has an attractive geographical location for life with its mild climate, fertile lands and marine opportunities. In this context, it has hosted various cultures, administrative and political formations throughout the ages. Early human traces in the area belong to the Lower Paleolithic period. The first villages were established on the hill sides overlooking the plains. The observed material reveals that these settlements were mainly engaged in agriculture. The following Chalcolithic period is the period in which both agricultural production and metallurgy were developed. In both periods, nutrition from these also has an important place. In the Early Bronze Age, covering the 3rd millennium BC, an administrative and political system including the entire peninsula was formed. The center of this structure is Liman Tepe on the Urla İskelesi. Here, there was a castle surrounded by magnificent walls, the part where the people lived, and a harbor protected by a breakwater. In the Ionian period, two of the twelve cities, Klazomenai and Erythrai, were located on the peninsula. The

* Dr. Öğr. Üyesi, Nevşehir Hacı Bektaş Veli Üniversitesi, Fen-Edebiyat Fakültesi, Arkeoloji Bölümü.
Asst. Prof. Dr., Nevşehir Hacı Bektaş Veli University, Faculty of Science-Letters, Department of Archaeology.
ORCID 0000-0001-8847-4315

tayfuncaymaz@nevsehir.edu.tr

Cite as/ Atıf: Caymaz, T. (2021). Defense systems of the Bronze Ages at the Urla Peninsula. *Turkish Studies*, 16(7), 45-64. <https://dx.doi.org/10.7827/TurkishStudies.54813>

Received/Geliş: 01 December/Aralık 2021

Accepted/Kabul: 27 December/Aralık 2021

Published/Yayın: 31 December/Aralık 2021

Checked by plagiarism software
CC BY-NC 4.0

geographical position of the peninsula is vulnerable to external threats. Within this respect, ensuring security and defense has always been of great importance. In this article, defense systems of the Bronze Ages have been evaluated, considering the developments in other periods.

The old roads in the peninsula were shaped according to the mountainous-hilly surface structure. At some points, transportation was provided through narrow passages. The transition to the western part was possible through the Çarpan strait on the shore of Gülbahçe Bay. The mountains reaching from here to the south sea did not allow easy transportation. On the other hand, in order to reach the Çeşme section from the Barbaros plain, it was necessary to cross the Mataracı and Turna straits in the Birgi and Nohutalan regions. Especially the data obtained from travel books reveal that transportation on the peninsula was difficult and dangerous until the end of the 19th century. It has been understood that pirates and bandits posed a great threat to the life and property of the people of the peninsula during the Ottoman period. These threats came largely from the sea. On the other hand, the peninsula has been attacked by various political forces throughout the ages. Ancient writers recorded the various attacks that the city of Klazomenai faced from the Archaic period to the Roman period. Threats to security and defense also existed in prehistoric times. It is seen that military units were established in strategic locations of the peninsula in the Early Bronze Age. They have the position of surveillance and supervision of critical land and sea connections. Kale Tepe, on the old Urla-Çeşme road, controlled both this main road and the secondary road branching from there to Ildırı (Ancient Erythrai). Gökayası, near Alaçatı, dominates Samos on the one hand and Çeşme on the other. Yaren Tepe, south of the Kuşçular village, controlled the Düden valley, which descends into the Sığacık Gulf. The entrance to Gülbahçe Bay was watched by the unit on Mount Erendede in Balıklıova. Further south, the Cinderesi Tepe unit, near the village of Gülbahçe, strengthened the security of the bay. The Early Bronze pottery was observed on the summit of Değirmen Tepe near Birgi village. The Mataracı (Çipinoz) strait, which provides the transition to the Çeşme direction, is within the sight of this hill. The current defense system seems to be related to the administrative authority established in Liman Tepe. In this period, there is no other settlement on the peninsula that is bigger or close to Liman Tepe.

In the 2nd millennium BC, great political powers were formed in Anatolia and the Aegean. The Hittites, whose core region is inside the Kızılırmak bend, became an empire from the middle of this millennium and spread their dominance to the Aegean coast. In the same period, maritime sovereignty in the Aegean changed hands in favor of the Mycenaeans. Both the Mycenaeans and their predecessors, the Minoans, had commercial and political relations with the Anatolian coast. In the Urla Peninsula, there is a cultural structure parallel to Anatolia. In addition, in the process, first Minoan and then Mycenaean cultural influences are observed. Relations with Minoans are intense in Çeşme, at the western end of the peninsula. There are data showing the existence of a Mycenaean commercial colony at Liman Tepe. It has been understood that the small peninsula known as Küçük Ada in Germiyan Yalısı also hosted a Mycenaean colony. In Miletus, further south, indigenous items are quite scarce. This is a Minoan settlement first and then it seems as Mycenaean settlement. It can be said that the Hittite-Mycenaean struggle focused on Miletus. It has been claimed that the great destruction that took place around 1300 BC was done by the Hittite army. In the Middle Bronze Age, which roughly corresponds to the first half of the 2nd millennium BC, Sivrice Tepe in the eastern part of the Urla Peninsula gained importance. The hill, on which there is a medieval castle, dominates the Gulf of İzmir on the one hand and the land directions on the other. Yaren Tepe, at the mouth of the valley that goes down to Sığacık Bay, is also active in this period. The Değirmen Tepe, which dominates the Mataracı strait in the interior, also seems to have preserved its importance. On the other hand, Kale Tepe left the system. There are very few finds from this period in Gökayası, which has the ability to clearly observe the open sea. The known settlements of the Late Bronze Age are limited. There is a fortification remnant made of rubble stones at the summit of Hacıgebeş Tepe at the south of Gülbahçe Bay. This place is in a position that dominates both the bay and the old Çeşme road. No finds belonging to this phase have been found at Sivrice Tepe. On the other hand, the discovery of Mycenaean pottery at Yaren Tepe is noteworthy.

The available data reveal that in the Early Bronze Age (3rd millennium BC), there was a defense system covering the entire peninsula, but especially for the sea. This system seems to belong to the administrative and political authority in Liman Tepe. With the 2nd millennium BC, there is a decrease in the number of defense units. It is understood that the units in the western part are out of use or lost their importance. Known military units are mostly directed towards the mainland. During this period, Liman Tepe continued to be the largest settlement of the peninsula. However, it is difficult to say that its administrative

and political dominance also covers the western part, based on the available data. The Minoan and Mycenaean cultural influences are significant in this area.

Keywords: Archaeology, Ancient Roads, Early Bronze Age, Middle Bronze Age, Late Bronze Age

Öz: Batı Anadolu kıyılarının ortasındaki Urla Yarımadası, Anadolu anakarası ve Ege kültürlerini buluşturan bir köprü konumundadır. Nitekim çağlar boyunca bu iki yönle ilişkili çeşitli kültürlerle ev sahipliği yapmıştır. On iki İon kentinden ikisi yarımada da yer alırken, ikisi de yakın komşudur. Ancak yarımada nın coğrafik yapısı ve konumu, savunma ve güvenlik zaafı oluşturmaktadır. Yarımada çağlar boyunca bir yandan korsanlık, eşkıyalık ve kaçakçılık gibi güvenliğe yönelik faaliyetlere, diğer yandan organize siyasal güçlerin askeri saldırılarına maruz kalmıştır. Arkeolojik veriler, bu tip tehditlerin protohistorik dönemde de mevcut olduğunu ortaya koymaktadır. Erken Tunç Çağı'nda Urla İskeleyi'ndeki Liman Tepe, görkemli bir kalesi, aşağı şehri ve limanı olan bölgesel idari ve siyasal bir merkez haline gelmiştir. Aynı dönemde yarımada nın başlıca yollarını ve körfezlerini denetim altında tutma yeteneğine sahip bir güvenlik ve savunma sistemi oluştuğu görülmektedir. Bu sistem içinde Alaçatı yakınlarındaki Gökayası Samos adası yönünü, Kale Tepe Urla-Çeşme yolunu, Yaren Tepe Sığacık Körfezi yönünü denetim altında tutan başta gelen birimlerdir. MÖ 2.binyıl ile birlikte dar bölgesel idari yapıların yerini daha geniş bölgelere hükmeden güçler almaya başlamıştır. Yarımada da bu döneme ait yerleşimlerdeki materyal kültür Anadolu paralelindedir. Bunun yanı sıra süreç içinde önce Minos, takiben Miken ticari ve kültürel etkileri ortaya çıkmıştır. Orta ve Geç Tunç Çağlarına ait az sayıda savunma birimi bilinmektedir. Bunlar daha çok bölgenin anakaraya bağlanan doğu kesiminde yer almaktadır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Arkeoloji, Eski Yollar, Erken Tunç Çağı, Orta Tunç Çağı, Geç Tunç Çağı

Introduction

The Urla Peninsula which penetrates to the Aegean Sea from the middle of the Western Anatolian coasts, is a big land mass which has an area of 3.000 km² approximately. The wide rift valley reaching to Seferihisar from Güzelbahçe in the east, generates a natural border between the peninsula and the continent. The bays of İzmir and Sığacık are located at the two points of this line. The coasts of which length is about 550 km, include many bays and coves that some part of them have conditions of harbor. Some islands partly exists in front of the coasts. The peninsula which is called as *Erythraia* in the ancient sources, was named as the *Urla Peninsula* at the 1st Congress of Geography (T.C. Maarif Vekaleti 1941, p. 100). The city of Urla is at center of the peninsula which is given named by it. The central location of Urla has been followed in a process reaching today from the early ages. The Prehistoric and Protohistoric settlement of Liman Tepe and Klazomenai, one of the twelve Ion cities, are located at the lands of Urla. Liman Tepe which hosted Neolithic and Chalcolithic societies, had developed just from the beginning of the Early Bronze Age and identified as a city. Through the middles of this age, the settlement became a center formed by a citadel with powerful and monumental walls, and a harbor protected by breakwaters, and a lower city (Erkanal, 1996, p. 79). During the surface surveys, the existence of some security and defense units has been detected in the strategical zones of the peninsula at this period and it has been considered that these were situated in a central system (Erkanal 1999, p. 313; 2008, p. 183). Liman Tepe was used to be the biggest settlement of the peninsula in the both Middle and Late Bronze Ages. It has been understood that some changes came up in sense of defense due to the political developments seen in Anatolia and Aegean in these periods.

Majority of the security and defense units in the peninsula, has been found during the surface surveys within the scope of the Liman Tepe excavation. On the other hand, there are also some new data detected in the Prehistoric and Protohistoric Surface Surveys in South of the Urla

Peninsula which has been still continued by us¹. This paper aims to reconsider the subject in the frames of old and new data. While reconsidering the subject, the peninsula's structure of transportation which is shaped by the surface characteristics, and location which is delicate to the exterior threats, have been discussed in detail. According to this ground, the defense systems of Bronze Ages, have been examined on the basis of the Early, Middle and Late periods. The geographical features and settlements have been shown in Fig.1 and 2, and it has not been separately referred in the text. Place names have been written in Turkish spelling. For example: İzmir, Gülbahçe, Sığacık, Urla İskelesi.

The surface and transportation structure of Urla peninsula

The Urla Peninsula has a mountainous-hilly surface structure. The parts of Karaburun in the north and Kıran in the south are the mountainous masses which have much value of elevation (Mater 1982, p. 39). The land of the peninsula is generally arable for olive and vineyard. Much sinuous structure of coast includes some bays of which some parts have characteristics of a harbor. The surface surveys have shown that the peninsula's continental and naval opportunities were evaluated from the early periods and the units of settlement and action were properly formed to this.

The road which passes the peninsula in the direction of east-west, is the main road of the peninsula today. The side roads coming from the northern and southern sides, resemble distributaries connecting to the main river bed. The available data shows that the Ottoman roads were also shaped on the same natural line. The main road consists of two sections, İzmir-Urla and Urla-Çeşme. The road which connects Urla to İzmir, follows the coast. This road reaches to the southern coasts of the bay of Gülbahçe, alias İçmeler (Malgaca), after Urla. There are some remains of the Ottoman bridges on the stream mouth here (Baykara 1990, p. 613; Caymaz-İreç, et al., 2018, p. 502). It has been understood that the old road remained under water within the rise of sea level in time. İçmeler becomes connected to the part of Gülbahçe with the Çarpan Boğazı (Strait). This narrow passage is in a strategical position. In September of 1922, the Greek troops passed from this passage while withdrawing, and the war ships located at the bay, blocked the Turkish troops' follow-up (Genelkurmay, 1969, pp. 139, 147, Kroki 25). After the Çarpan Boğazı, the road follows the Tatar Stream valley and leads to the Barbaros plain. There is an old station near the village of Birgi in the west of the plain. There is a square-planned single person bath with a dome roof (Baykara 2021, pp. 198-199) and a location known as Deveyatağı (where camels rest) near it. There is simple bathroom setup similar to today's showers in the bath, which has wells around it. Tuncer Baykara, who made the first research in the region, considered it likely that the bath belongs to the 16th century (2021, p. 199). Moreover, there are also some available data that can relate the structure with the Aydinids (the 14th century) (Akin 1946, p. 146; Caymaz- Menteşe, et al., 2020, pp. 438, 441). The caravan road follows the 2 km-long Mataracı (Çipinoz) valley and reaches to the Nohutalan plain, and from there it passes the Turna Boğazı (Strait) and reaches the open land (Baykara 1990, p. 613; Vlamos 1946, p. 126). 20 km distance to Çeşme, Merdivenlikuyu station which is distinctive with its wells and plane trees, exists in the west of Nohutalan. The remains of structure standing on both sides of a street, prove the existence of a small settlement unit here. The road which turns into the north near Alaçatı, reaches to Çeşme over Ilıca. During his journey in 1671-72, Evliyâ Çelebi left the main road in Merdivenlikuyu to go to Karaburun (1935, p. 107). The traveler must have followed the Germiyan-Ildırı road. It has been understood that the road dividing from the Barbaros plain to reach Ildırı (Ancient Erythrai) in the 18th and 19th centuries, came to the prominence (Chandler, 1817, p. 103; Mac-Farlan, 1829, p. 191-195; Wilkinson 1806, p. 363). During this period, the station of Sıradam (today's Barbaros) seems to have replaced with Birgi. There is another road which connects Ildırı to Çeşme from the coast

¹The surface survey has been carried out since 2015 with the permission of General Management of Cultural Heritage and Museums, and the support of Nevşehir Hacı Bektaş Veli University.

(Mac-Farlane, 1829, pp. 185-186; Texier, 1862, p. 367). It is recorded in the travel books that until the second half of the 19th century, the İzmir-Çeşme road was mountainous, narrow and difficult to pass, accompanied by pedestrians and riding animals. (Chandler, 1817, p. 103; Evliya Çelebi, 1935, p. 104-106; Mac-Farlan, 1829, p. 175-178; Macgill, 1808, p. 61-64; Sonnini 1801, pp. 329; 329-331; Wilkinson, 1806, p. 363). Especially Karaburun is a high mountainous and remote. Travel books describe this region mostly from the seaside. It has been understood that the roads of İzmir-Urla and Urla-Çeşme which are proper to car traffic, was made in the second half of the 19th century (Çadırcı, 1991, p. 159; Hayta 2002, p. 73; Vlamos, 1946, pp. 79-80). The Urla-Çeşme section of the road is known as the Old Çeşme Road. This road used to follow the old route in the valley of Tatar Stream and reach to the Barbaros plain. On the plain, the Uzunkuyu station has replaced with Sıradam. It should have been waited for the ends of 1930s to connect the mountainous part of Karaburun to the main road from the coast ("İzmir İli Daimi Encümeninden", 1938, p. 9). The high peninsula of Kıran in the south is the furthest and most isolated part of the region. Transportation here, even today, can be provided with a partly extremely rough road. In the southeast, there is also a line of an old road which connects Sivrihisar (today Seferihisar) to Urla over a mountainous-hilly land (Dallaway, 1797, pp. 266-267; Annual Reports, 1838, p. 244).

The traces of settlement indicate that the road network mentioned above, majorly existed in the Byzantine period. At Sivrice Tepe near Urla, there is a Medieval Age castle which dominates the coast road coming from İzmir and the vicinity (Caymaz, Emeç & Erim, 2013, pp. 15-17). Evliya Çelebi recorded this as Urla Castle (1935, 100). Gülbahçe at the junction point of Urla-Çeşme, was an important settlement with a harbor especially in the 5-6th centuries (Caymaz & Emeç, 2017, pp. 625-627). There are also some pottery of this period at the station Merdivenlikuyu on the road of Çeşme (Caymaz, 2008, p. 12). The number of the traces of the Ion period are remarkable on the road network. Sivrice Tepe which dominates the road junction of İzmir-Urla-Seferihisar, the mountain of Ulaştıran which can widely see the peninsula, Köy Tepe in the Barbaros Plain are the common units and settlements of this period on the road line (Caymaz, Emeç & Erim, 2013, p. 14; Caymaz-Menteşe, et al., 2020, p. 430). The peninsula was hosting two Ion cities in this period, Klazomenai and Erythrai. Teos, another Ion city, is neighbor of the southeastern edge of the peninsula. The cultural and political relations with Aegean World are outstanding in this period. The central cities were founded around the harbors with powerful transportation and transfer opportunities. Identifying with ancient *Airai* and *Daphnous*, Demircili Adası and Yaren Tepe are both important settlements (Caymaz-İreç, et al., 2019, pp. 431-432; Caymaz-Menteşe, et al., 2020, p.434). The roads reaching both Ildırı (Ancient Erythrai) over Çeşme-Ilıca and Barbaros plain, and Urla from Sivrihisar (today Seferihisar), should have been significant in this period.

The peninsula has a quite wavy coast structure. On these coasts, there are plenty of bays and coves that enable boats to shelter. The surface surveys have proved that there have been some Late Roman-Early Byzantine settlement units and piers in some of these coves. It has been considered that producer units in the inner parts, were bringing their products to these piers and transferring them to the harbors. It has been understood that there was a similar transportation network in the Ottoman period. The Çeşme and Urla İskelesi were the main harbors in this period.

Security and defense

Due to its nature, the peninsula is generally open to the threats coming from sea. Strabo stated that the coasts of the peninsula of Korykos (Koraka, today Kıran) had so many pirates (XIV I.32). An isolated settlement of Late Classical-Hellenistic period which was detected in the isolated Kokar bay (ancient Kasystes) in the surface surveys, could be review in this context (Caymaz-Menteşe, et al., 2020, p. 432). The piracy activities towards to the peninsula were quite common in the Ottoman period. Both of Turkish and Christian pirates were not only taking shelter in convenient coves, but also landing and making banditry. Bandits were extorting villagers'

belongings, provisions and herds, and also they were killing and kidnapping (Kütükoğlu, 2010, pp. 207-213). Due to the insecure position of the coasts, the settlements of the Ottoman period were inhabited at inner areas. The main settlements of the peninsula, Urla, Karaburun, Mordoğan and Seferihisar, are located 3-5 km inside from their piers. It has been known that the main settlement of Çeşme was previously located at Çeşmeköy in the inner part (Baykara, 1990, p. 609; Kütükoğlu 2010, pp. 25-27). It has been understood from the travel books that the banditry were still continuing in the first half of the 19th century and the security of road could not be literally provided (Fontanier, 1829, p. 128; Mac-Farlane, 1829, pp. 200, 202; Macgill, 1808, p. 63).

The indented coasts enable smuggling and unauthorized entrances and exits. It is stated that some coves near islands were being used in smuggling some materials such as tobacco and gunpowder in the Ottoman period (Chatzimpeis, 1965, p. 219; Milioris, 1955, p.221). It is recorded that some Greek population left their villages in the tense political atmospheres at the same period and moved to the islands from close piers and came back in the same way after the tense atmosphere had calmed down (Chatzimpeis, 1965, pp. 219, 221-223; Milioris, 1970, pp. 220-225). It has been understood that smugglers and rebels were coming in and out to the peninsula by sea (Fontanier, 1829, p. 128).

The peninsula has witnessed some military actions of various political powers throughout the history. The peninsula was exposed to various attacks from the land and sea in the Ion period and the following periods. Herodotus recorded that the Lydians captured İzmir and then attacked Klazomenai at the time of Alyattes, however they encountered with a powerful resistance and withdrew (I.16). At the same period, Erythrai fought against Chios which was supported by Miletus (Herodotus, I.18). Ionia was under control of Persian dominance from the middles of the 6th century BC to the period of Alexander. Herodotus mentioned that Artaphrenes, satrap of Sardes, and Persian commander Otanes took Klazomenai (V.123). During the Wars of Peloponnese (431-404 BC), the Polichna, the land settlement of Klazomenai was exposed to the interference of the Athens fleet (Thucydides. VIII.23). In 302 BC, Propelaus, general of Lysimachus, attacked Erythrai and Klazomenai from the sea, could not take the cities, however looted the region (Diodorus, XX.107). In 191 BC, the fleets of Rome and Antiochus III fought against each other in front of the southern coasts of the peninsula (Livius, XXXVI.XLIII). It has been understood that the Roman fleet was taking advantage from the harbors of Cissus and Phoenicus of Erythrai and the natural harbors at the coasts of Korykos (Kıran) during this war. Çaka Bey who formed a fleet at İzmir in the ends of the 11th century, took Klazomenai (Komnene, VII.8). It has been understood that the peninsula of Urla was included to the Aydinids in the first half of the 14th century (Lemerle, 1957, pp. 106-108, 114). During the phase of the Ottoman's dominance over the region, a social and religious rebellion occurred in the leader of Börklüce Mustafa at Karaburun. The rebellion in 1415-16 was quelled in the results of very bloody wars (Dukas. XXI.11-14). Klazomenai also existed among the coastal settlements that the allied fleet in the command of Admiral Mocenigo, attacked and looted, during the war of Ottoman-Venice in 1472 (Uzunçarşılı, 2011, p. 119). Evliya Çelebi recorded that the Urla Castle (Sivrice Tepe) was partly pulled down in order to prevent the invaders capturing and reusing it in the period of Mehmet the Conqueror (1935, 100). In 1587, 9 ships of Venice, Frank and Malta attacked near Urla and kidnapped three hundred people besides looting and pillaging (Selânik-i Mustafa Efendi, 1989, p. 191). In 1770, the Ottoman fleet was burnt and demolished by the Russian fleet at the harbor of Çeşme (Baron de Tott, 1794, pp. 34-39).

As it can be seen, the data that the written sources provide, prove that the Urla Peninsula has been exposed to various threats throughout the history. The archaeological excavations and researches enable us to examine the security and defense issue of the peninsula within the context of protohistoric ages.

The defense system of Early Bronze Age

It is seen that a settlement which had been taken under protection by walls at Liman Tepe on the Urla İskelesi, emerged in the beginnings of the 3rd millennium BC (Fig.3). It has been revealed a conserved part which has 15.50 meters length and about 3 meters height, of the fortification wall which was built with limestone slabs. The thickness of the wall in the south of settlement, is 0.90 meters. The wall was supported with a ramp wall from outside and structure walls from inside. In the excavated part, there is also a monumental entrance (Erkanal, 2001, pp. 307-308; Erkanal-Şahoğlu et al., 2012, 470). Inside the walls, rectangle long houses have been detected side by side. The length of these houses built with mudbrick on stone foundation, is over 20 meters. The finds taken from the long houses, prove both the metallurgical advancement including precious metals, and the commercial relations with the Aegean World (Erkanal, Artzy & Kouka, 2003, pp. 424-425; Erkanal-Şahoğlu, et al., 2010, pp. 348-351). In the following period (Early Bronze Age II), the previous walls were closed and graded and a more powerful and magnificent defense system was reconstructed just outside of this (Fig.4). Citadel walls, two bastions and a monumental entrance has been detected within the scope of this new system. One of the horseshoe shaped bastions has about 5 meters preserved height, 12 meters length and about 20 meters width on the ground. The exterior of the bastion was built with limestone slabs. It has been thought that the upper sides of bastion and walls were continuing with mudbrick. The second tower which has been largely destroyed, is larger than the other (Erkanal 2001, p. 308; Erkanal-Aykurt, et al., 2014, pp. 504-505). In the north of the settlement, it has been detected some breakwaters and piers remained underwater and considered as a harbor. Within this scope, it has been put forward that the fortification system was covering the settlement as an oval and integrating with the harbor part (Erkanal 1996, pp. 76-77; 2001, p. 312). An inner defense system has been unearthed at the high part of the settlement in approximately 300 meters length. Two towers which belong to this inner citadel built on terrace, have been determined (Erkanal, Artzy & Kouka, 2003, pp. 427-428). A central structure known as *corridor house*, exists at the center of the settlement (Erkanal, 2001, p. 311; Erkanal & Günel, 1996, pp. 312-313). In the south, some remains of structure and street have been found besides the fortification wall, and it has been considered that these belonged to the lower city (Erkanal, 1997, pp. 327, 331; 2001, p. 311). In about 200 meters south of Liman Tepe, fortification walls and a horseshoe shaped bastion were unearthed. The length of the wall remains is 5.60 m and its height is 1.55 m. The horseshoe-shaped tower has a depth of 6.75 m and the height of 8.30 m. The wall and the tower were built mudbricks inside and flat limestones outside. According to these data, it is understood that the lower city in Liman Tepe also has a fortification system (Ersoy, Güngör & Cevizoğlu, 2011, pp. 169-171).

During the surface surveys many Early Bronze Age settlements have been detected. These have spread over all around the peninsula from the coasts to the mountainous parts (Caymaz, 2008, pp. 8-16). None of them has a size and feature to compare with Liman Tepe. On the other hand, the excavations carried out at Bağlararası just behind the harbor of Çeşme, have proved the existence of a small coastal village here. No defense system was found within the excavated area (Şahoğlu-Çayır, et al., 2018, p. 375).

Besides these settlements, some security and defense units have been detected in the peninsula. Kale Tepe, one of these, is on a road in east-west direction and located at the junction of Germiyan (Fig.5) (Caymaz, 2008, pp. 11-12; Erkanal, 1999, p. 331; 2001, p. 313; 2008, p. 183; Tuncel, 2008, p. 584). There is a flat place in 40 meter diameter at the top of the rocky hill with 186 altitude. The pottery finds of the Early Bronze Age take place here (Fig.6). The stones in various size spread around the top, make us think that the flat place was surrounded with a fortification wall. The hill has been known as a castle for a long time (Vlamos, 1946, p. 122). At the foots of the hill, old station Merdivenkuyu exists.

Gölkayası in 193 meters height around Alaçatı, is exactly dominant on both the road in east-west direction and the bay of Mersin (Saplıca) in the south (Fig.7) (Caymaz 2008, pp. 13-14; Erkanal 1999, p. 331; 2001, p. 313; 2008, p. 183). The citadel remains located at the islet of Böğürtlen (Dümbelek), close to the land, reveal the delicate situation of the bay to the exterior threats. The top of the conglomerate rocky hill is in the image of a huge tower. Piri Reis recorded that when someone looked from the sea, this hill looked like a devastated castle (1988, pp. 378-379). The finds increase in rock holes and caverns which enable to shelter. There was an entirely dried lake in the south of the hill.

In terms of finding distribution, Değirmen Tepe along with the village of Birgi on the plain of Barbaros, is a unit of village. Plus, it can be considered that there is also a security unit here. The Birgi station and the Mataracı (Çipinoz) Strait, which were important in the Ottoman period road network, are within the dominance area of the hill.

The Cindersi Tepe just north of the Gülbahçe, dominates the Bay of Gülbahçe (Fig.8). The rocky hill which includes the Early Bronze finds, transformed into a small but powerfull castle in the Classical-Hellenistic process. It is seen that the eastern part of the hill which enables to get closer, was strengthened with two line fortification wall. The walls were built with big block stones (Caymaz & Emeç, 2017, p. 627).

In further north, the Erendede Tepe just at the entrance of the Balıklıova Bay, is one the zones used in the Early Bronze Age. The top of the hill amazingly controls both the mouth of the Gülbahçe Bay and the mountainous land behind it.

Yaren Tepe in the southern part, is a zone which controls the valley of Düden opening to the bay of Sığacık. The hill was a settlement which was surrounded with solid walls in the Classical period and included some monumental structures (Caymaz-İreç, et al., et al, 2019, pp. 431-432). There have been some opinions that this settlement is related with ancient *Daphnous* (Bakır, 1996, p. 22; Tuna, 1990, p. 283). The available pottery finds have proved that the hill was also used in the Early Bronze Age.

Another zone of finding in the southern part is Yağne Tepe at the cove of Demircili. The harbor and open sea are in the view of this rocky site (Caymaz-Menteşe, et al., 2020, pp. 434-435). Gözkayası at the cove of Zeytineli Yalısı in the southwestern part, dominates the valley reaching both the cove and inner part (Caymaz-İreç, et al., 2018, p. 506).

Any sufficient data about this subject has not been obtained yet in the researches of Karaburun and Çeşme. However the available data show that the peninsula was being protected with a security and defense system in the Early Bronze Age. Pottery belonging to the early phase of Troy I was not observed in the defense units. The finds indicate a process which begins in the middles of Troy I and shows intensity in the period of Troy II. Hayat Erkanal has reclaimed that Liman Tepe became the administrative and political center of the peninsula in the period of Early Bronze Age II (Troy II) and formed a regional defense system (Erkanal, 1999, p. 331; 2001, p. 313; 2008, p. 183). The defense units we know, are proper to observation function in terms of location and form. According to this, the system seems rather like an observation and communication network. Moreover some units should also have a talent of interference, obscuring and avoiding on a small scale. With this network, the natural land road in east-west direction, and the junctions on this road, and the sea entrances could have been taken under control. There has not been any detection of a unit about the main land direction yet. The need of security and defense is majorly for the sea due to the peninsula's nature. The threats leading this need, should be in different location and size from the organized force of another political power to the looter communities and smugglers. Troy, regional center in Northwestern Anatolia, was also surrounded with fortification walls from the beginning of the Early Bronze Age (Blegen, 1963, pp. 43-46, 59-63). Lerna at Greece (Caskey, 1958, pp. 132-136), Palamari on the island of Skyros at Aegean (Theochari and

Parlama, 1997, pp. 348-350) and Kastri on the island of Syros (Tsountas, 1899, pp. 115-121), have fortification systems, like Liman Tepe, but with smaller horseshoe-shaped bastions. The whole Aegean World was exposed to threats about security and defense in this period in which agricultural productivity increased, metal industry developed and regional authorities emerged. Even small agricultural villages such as Bakla Tepe at İzmir-Menderes, needed some defense systems (Özkan & Erkanal, 1999, pp. 20, 26-29).

The defense system of the Middle Bronze Age

It has been seen that Anatolian characteristics became common in the last quarter of the 3rd millennium BC at Troy (Korfmann 1997, p. 215). The data reflecting this improvement, have not been sufficient at Liman Tepe yet. However the cultural closeness with Anatolia has been clear in both parts from the beginnings of the following millennium (Aykurt, 2013, pp. 43, 49, 54). On the other hand, it has been seen that the economic and political power of Minos growing at Crete was paying attention to the coasts of Western Anatolia besides the Aegean islands in this period. When it comes to the 17th century BC, Miletus at the edge of Büyük Menderes river, completely became a minoan settlement (Graeve, 1999, p. 585; Graeve-Niemeier, 2002, p. 77). The effect of Minos also reached to the Urla Peninsula. It has been seen that the cultural elements of Minos become common within the process at Çeşme-Bağlararası which has a small coastal village (Şahoğlu-Çayır-Büyükulusoy, et al., 2014, p. 184; Şahoğlu-Çayır, et al., 2018, pp. 373-374). However there has not been any evidence about the fact how the commercial relations focusing on this harbor, reflect the other parts of the peninsula, especially Liman Tepe. On the contrary, *mat painted* pottery finds, special for Greek continent, prove that Liman Tepe's commercial and cultural relations with the Aegean World were going on (Günel, 2004, pp. 205-206). The remains of wall made thick limestones at Liman Tepe indicate that the citadel borders of the previous period were conserved (Erkanal-Aykurt, et al., 2017, p. 143). During the excavations, a part consisting of oval structures in which they were producing tools of metal and stone etc. has been detected (Erkanal-Şahoğlu, et al., 2009, p. 302, 315), however any monumental structure has not been encountered yet. The Bağlararası also has a defense system. A 25 m long part of the fortification walls built with large limestones and mudbricks was unearthed. The 1.5 m thick wall was supported by internal buildings walls. A rectangular tower belonging to the system was also identified (Şahoğlu-Çayır-Büyükulusoy, et al., 2014, pp. 181-182).

The available detections have revealed an alteration in the size and sense of defense. Kale Tepe at the western side of the peninsula was no more being used. Gökayası at the same side, has been understood to lose its importance. A limited pottery belonging to the ends of this period, has been observed (Caymaz 2008, pp. 19-20). There is also an inhabiting at Birgi Değirmen Tepe in this period. It is also possible for the village here to have a security unit. The pottery finds at the Cinderesi Tepe are far away from proving an intense activity. In further north, no find following the Early Bronze Age, has been found at the Erendede Tepe seeing the bay of Balıklıova. On the contrary, a defense unit was established at Sivrice Tepe in the east of the peninsula (Fig.9). The hill on which castle remains of Medieval Age exist, is on the junction of the roads in east-west and north-south directions. It is on a location which clearly sees both these directions and the Gulf of İzmir. The pottery found at the top of the hill (Fig.10), seems to be of the first quarter of the 2nd millennium BC (Caymaz, 2008, p. 19). There is a coastal settlement of the same period at neighbor Çalica Tepe (Caymaz, 2008, p. 18). Yaren Tepe on the line connecting the Kuşçular plain to the Sığacık bay, were also settled in this period. The pottery finds are in the parallel of Sivrice Tepe (Caymaz-İreç et al., 2019, p. 432).

According to the available data, it is hard to mention about a fortification system that covers the whole of the peninsula. Limantepe is still the biggest settlement of the peninsula. However it is doubtful that it still continues its regional administrative central position. At the western edge of the peninsula, a settlement in a close relation with Minos, occurred. But it has not

been encountered any evidence which show that the existence of Minos had a political aspect. Moreover it is remarkable that old defense units about Aegean lost their functions. In the east, some political improvements that would be clear in the following periods at the continent, were coming out. It has been understood that limited regional authorities no longer existed and it was entered into an age in which some powers dominating wider regions, would exist.

The defense system of the Late Bronze Age

The Hittite Kindom was established in the middles of the 17th century BC as a result of the political developments in the Age of Assyrian Trade Colonies in Central Anatolia. Thanks to the written documents of the Hittites, the geographical, political and ethnical elements started to be announced with their names. Also, the documents can provide information about political struggles and sources of threats.

The commercial, cultural and political domination changed hands at Aegean in the 15th century BC, and Mycenaeans which are associated with Ahhiyawa in the Hittites' sources, took the place of Minos. The Mycenaean activity was not limited with the specific settlements on the coast line in Western Anatolia, contrarily with Minos. Miletus entirely transformed into a Mycenaean colony (Niemeier, 1997, p. 531). In the Urla Peninsula, Mycenaeans were establishing colonies in the settlements where local characteristics were dominant. Bağlararası (Aykurt, 2010, pp. 24-25; Şahoğlu-Çayır Büyükulusoy et al., 2014, p. 184; Şahoğlu-Çayır et al., 2018, p. 375), Germiyan Yalısı founded in this period (Caymaz, 2006, pp. 208-209) and Liman Tepe (Erkanal, 2001, p. 315) are the settlements in which these colonies take place.

At Liman Tepe, the citadel wall of the Late Bronze Age was built on the previous one. The outpart of the approximately 3 m thick wall was built with cyclopean stones and the inner part with rubble stones (Erkanal-Aykurt et al., 2017, pp. 137, 143). According to this, it has been understood that the borders of citadel determined in the period of Early Bronze II, were conserved. However the data about the existence of another defense units at the peninsula, are very limited. There are some remains which could be an observation point, at Hacıgebeş Tepe in the South of Gülbahçe (Caymaz, 2008, p. 22). This site dominates both the bay of Gülbahçe and the old road of Çeşme. Some Mycenaean pottery has been found at Yaren Tepe seeing the valley going down to the Bay of Sığacık. It is seen that this strategical site witnessed settlement and activity throughout the Bronze Ages.

The Hittites' documents prove that various kingdoms, notably Arzawa, existed in Western Anatolia, and these kingdoms had political relations changing depending on situation, with Ahhiyawa (Mycenaeans) just as the Hittites. It has been understood that the political atmosphere which becomes tense sometimes, is required to the interference of the Hittites' army. The big demolish of Miletus in around 1300 BC, is interpreted with such an interference (Graeve 1999, p. 584; Graeve & Niemeier, 2002, p. 78). When one considers Miletus entirely as a Mycenaean colony, conflicting forces are Hittite-Ahhiyawa. It is difficult to mention about the Mycenaean political activity significantly, according to the amount and rate of the Mycenaean finds at the settlements of the Urla Peninsula. It can be said that this region remained out of the conflicts among the big powers of the period with this reputation.

Conclusion

The Urla Peninsula which reaches to the Aegean Sea from the middle of Western Anatolian coasts and becomes bordered with a rift valley in the direction of the continent, is a geographical fraction that can be seen as a whole on the historical and cultural basis. The part of Urla on the body of the peninsula, has had a central location in the historical process. At the beginnings of the 3rd millennium BC, a settlement surrounded by fortification walls, was formed at Liman Tepe on the Urla İskelesi. After a few centuries, Liman Tepe became a big center with its monumental citadel, lower city protected by fortification walls and harbor. There is a significant increase in the

number of settlement in this period at the peninsula. These were expanding from the coasts to the plains and mountainous parts. Some of the settlement units was located at some strategical areas. Among these, Kale Tepe has a surveillance of the main road in the east-west direction whereas Gökayası has an inspection of both this road and the Bay of Mersin facing Samos. Yaren Tepe, the Düden valley opening to the Sığacık bay, the Cindersi Tepe and Erendede Tepe are proper areas for the Gülbahçe bay to control. A regional located security and defense system takes shape according to this. This system seems to be belonged to Liman Tepe, the biggest and organized settlement of the region. Thusly, an administrative, military and political structure covering the peninsula, comes out.

The defense units on the western side of the peninsula were out of use in the Middle Bronze Age. On the contrary, Sivrice Tepe which controls both continental directions and the Gulf of İzmir in the east, gained importance. Yaren Tepe at the edge of the valley running down to the Sığacık bay at the southeastern side, protected its significance in this period. The available data do not enable us to mention about the existence of a defense network which includes the entire peninsula. On the other hand, it is difficult to say that Liman Tepe was continuing its position of being regional administrative center. Within the process, a settlement related to the Minos culture, came out in Çeşme at the western edge of the peninsula. At the same period, Miletus just in the south, was entirely a Minos settlement. The available data show that the cultural effect of Minos remained limited with the subject settlements. It has not been encountered any trace of such an effect during the excavations of Liman Tepe at the levels of relevant period. The material culture is dominantly local at both Liman Tepe and the other settlements of the peninsula. In the political context, it has been seen that some big political powers ruling wide regions, were emerging in Anatolia and Aegean. In the following period, Mycenaean become dominant in Aegean whereas Hittites become dominant in Anatolia. What has been understood from the documents of Hittites is that there were some kingdoms which had some political relations with both two powers in Western Anatolia. Among these Arzawa-Mira is localized to the region of Central Western Anatolia (Hawkins, 1998, pp. 1-2, Fig.11). The culture at the Urla Peninsula, a part of the geography, commonly shows local characteristics. The data show that Mycenaean had commercial colony units at the settlements such as Limantepe, Bağlararası and Germiyan Yalı. In this period, there was a small unit of observation at Hacıgebeş Tepe. Yaren Tepe was also active in this last phase of Bronze Ages.

According to the available data, a Liman Tepe-centric administrative and political structure was formed in Urla Peninsula in the Early Bronze Age. This structure also includes a security and fortification system which is especially oriented to sea directions. It is seen that the peninsula was involved to the constitution of some political formations including wider regions, in the next eras of Bronze Ages. The defense units seen during this process, are limited in number. These are located in the eastern part of the region, and seen oriented to the continent rather.

References

- T.C. Maarif Vekâleti (Milli Eğitim Bakanlığı), (6-21 Haziran 1941), *Birinci coğrafya kongresi; raporlar, müzakereler, kararlar*.
- Akın, H. (1946). *Aydın oğulları tarihi hakkında bir araştırma*. Pulhan Matbaası.
- Annual Reports of the American Bible Society*. (1838). I. Reprinted for the society by Daniel Fanshaw.
- Aykurt, A. (2010). Late Bronze Age pottery from Çeşme Bağlararası. *OLBA, XVIII*, 1-63.

- Aykurt, A. (2013). An updated assessment on Western Anatolian Middle Bronze Age chronology in light of excavations of the Izmir region. *Colloquium Anatolicum*, XII, 37-77.
- Aykurt, A. & Erkanal, H. (2021). Defense systems dated to Early Bronze Age at Liman Tepe. L.K. Harrison, A.N. Bilgen, A. Kapuci (Eds.). *The Early Bronze Age in Western Anatolia*. New York-State University of New York Press. 203-216.
- Bakır, Güven. (1996). Klazomenai. F. Erim (Ed.). *Kısa Urla tarihi*. 17-33.
- Baron de Tott. (1794). *Mémoires du Baron de Tott sur les Turcs et les Tartares*. III.
- Baykara, T. (1990). Çeşme kalesi. *Belleten*, LIV (210), 603-630.
- Baykara, T. (2021), *Türk kültürü*, Post Yayın Dağıtım.
- Blegen, C. W. (1963). *Troy and the trojans*. Published by Frederick A. Praeger
- Caskey, J. L. (1958). Excavation of Lerna 1957. *Hesperia*, XXVII, 125-144.
- Caymaz, T. (2006). Urla Yarımadası'nda bir yerleşme: Germiyan Yalısı-Küçük Ada. In: A. Erkanal-Öktü et al. *Hayat Erkanal'a armağan: kültürlerin yansıması/Studies in honor of Hayat Erkanal: cultural reflections*. (207-213). Homer Kitabevi.
- Caymaz, T. (2008). Urla Yarımadası prehistorik yerleşimleri. *Arkeoloji Dergisi*, XI (2008/1), 1-41.
- Caymaz, T. & Emeç M. (2017). Urla Yarımadası güney kesimi yüzey araştırması. *34.AST*, 1, 623-646.
- Caymaz, T, Emeç M. & Erim F. (2013). *Urla kalesi / Urla castle*. Duvar yayınları.
- Caymaz, T., İreç M., Menteşe Ş., Erincik S., Akpolat M.S. & Emeç M. (2018). Urla Yarımadası Güney Kesimi 2016 Yılı Yüzey Araştırması. *35.AST*, 2, 497-515.
- Caymaz, T., İreç M., Menteşe Ş., Erincik S., Akpolat M.S. & Emeç M. (2019). Urla Yarımadası Güney Kesimi 2016 Yılı Yüzey Araştırması. *36.AST*, 3, 427-448.
- Caymaz, T., Menteşe Ş., Yıldızhan H. & Emeç M. (2020). Urla Yarımadası Güney Kesimi 2018 Yılı Yüzey Araştırması. *37.AST*. Vol.3. pp.429-450.
- Chandler, R. (1817). *Travels in Asia Minor and Greece*. I. Printed for Joseph Booker.
- Chatzimpeis, St. (1965). I Krini (Tsesmes) kai i periochi tis. *Mikrasiatika Chronika*, 12, 207-230.
- Çadircı, M. (1991). Tanzimat döneminde karayolu yapımı. *Tarih Araştırmaları Dergisi* 1990-1991, XV (26), 153-167.
- Dallaway, J. (1797). *Constantinople ancient and moderne*. Printed by T. Bensley.
- Erkanal, H. (1996). Erken Tunç Çağı'nda Batı Anadolu sahil kesiminde kentleşme / Early Bronze Age urbanization in the coastal region of Western Anatolia, In: Y. Sey (Ed.). *Tarihten günümüze Anadolu'da konut ve yerleşme / Housing and settlement in Anatolia a historical perspective*. Türkiye Ekonomik ve Toplumsal Tarih Vakfı. 70-82.
- Erkanal, H. (1999), 1997 Liman Tepe kazıları. *XX. KST*, I, 325-336.
- Erkanal, H. (2001), Liman Tepe tarihöncesi Ege kültürlerine yeni bir ışık. *Cogito*, 28, 304-316.
- Erkanal, H. (2008), Liman Tepe: new light on prehistoric Aegean cultures. In: H. Erkanal, H. Hauptmann, V. Şahoğlu & R. Tuncel (Eds.). *The Aegean in the Neolithic, Chalcolithic and the Early Bronze Age*. Ankara Üniversitesi Basımevi. 179-190.
- Erkanal, H., Artzy M. & Kouka, Ou., (2003). 2001 yılı Liman Tepe kazıları. *24.KST*, I, 423-436.

- Erkanal, H.-Aykurt, A., Büyükelusoy, K., Şahoğlu, V. & Tuğcu, İ. (2014). Liman Tepe 2012 yılı kara ve sualtı azıları, *35.KST*, 3, 499-513.
- Erkanal, H., Aykurt A., Büyükelusoy, K., Tuğcu, İ., Tuncel, R. & Şahoğlu, V. (2017). Liman Tepe 2015 yılı kara ve sualtı kazıları, *38.KST*, 3, 133-150.
- Erkanal, H. & Günel, S. (1996). 1994 Liman Tepe kazıları. *XVII.KST*, 1, 305-327.
- Erkanal, H., Şahoğlu, V., Aykurt, A., Kouka, Ou. & Tuğcu, İ. (2012). Liman Tepe 2010 Yılı kara kazıları. *33.KST*, 4, 463-478.
- Erkanal-Şahoğlu, V., Tuncel, R., Kouka, Ou., Keskin, L. & Tuğcu, İ. (2009). Liman Tepe 2007 kazıları. *30.KST*, 1, 299-322.
- (2010), Liman Tepe 2008 yılı kara kazıları. *31.KST*, 4, 347-360.
- (2011). Liman Tepe 2009 kazıları. *32.KST*, 4, 446-462.
- Ersoy, Y., Güngör Ü. & Cevizoğlu, H. (2011). 2009 yılı Klazomenai kazısı. *32.KST*, 4, 169-182.
- Evliyâ Çelebi, (1935). *Evliyâ Çelebi Seyahatnamesi. Cilt 9: Anadolu-Suriye-Hicaz 1671-1672.* Maarif Vekâleti Milli Talim ve Terbiye Dairesi
- Fontanier, V. (1829). *Voyages en Orient.* Librairie Universelle.
- Genelkurmay Harp Tarihi Başkanlığı. (1969). *Türk İstiklâl Harbi. II.Cilt Batı Cephesi. 6.Kısım. III.Kitap Büyük Taarruzda Takip Harekâtı.* Gnkur Basımevi.
- Graeve, V. Von, (1999), 1996/1997 Milet çalışmaları. *XX.KST*, 1, 583-605.
- Graeve, V. von & Niemeier, W.D. (2002). 1998/2000 Yılı Milet çalışmaları. *23.KST*, 2, 75-88.
- Günel, S. (2004). Orta Hellas dönemi mat boyalı seramiği ve Liman Tepe’de ele geçen mat boyalı seramiğin Ege arkeolojisi kültürel gelişimindeki önemi. *TÜBA-AR, VII.* 197-214.
- Hawkins, J.D. (1998). Tarkasnawa king of Mira “Tarkondemos”, Boğazköy sealing and Karabel. *Anatolian Studies*, 48, 1-31.
- Hayta, N. (2002). *Tarih araştırmalarına kaynak olarak Tasvir-i Efkâr gazetesi (1278/1862-1286/1869).* T.C. Kültür Bakanlığı Yayınları.
- İzmir İli Daimi Encümeninden (İlân). (1938, 28 Şubat). *Cumhuriyet.* pp. 9.
- Korfmann, M. (1997). Troia 1995 kazıları. *XVIII.KST*, 1, 213-229.
- Kütükoğlu, M. (2010). *XVI.asırda Çeşme kazasının sosyal ve iktisadî yapısı.* Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi.
- Lemerle, P. (1957). *L’Emirat d’Aydın Byzance et l’Occident.* Presses Universitaires de France.
- Mac-Farlane, Ch. (1829). *Constantinople et La Turquie en 1828.* Moutardier, Libraire-Editeur.
- Macgill, Th. (1808). *Travels in Turkey, Italy and Russia, during the years 1803, 1804, 1805 and 1806.*
- Mater, B. (1982). *Urla Yarımadasında arazinin sınıflandırılması ile kullanılışı arasındaki ilişkiler.* İstanbul Üniversitesi Edebiyat Fakültesi Matbaası.
- Milioris, N. E. (1955). *Ta Vourla tis Mikras Asias. Meros 1^o: Istorika.* Athinai.
- (1970). *Ta Ellinika choria tis periochis ton Vourlon M. Asias. Mikrasiatika Chronika, 14,* 177-225.

- Niemeier, W.D. (1999). 1994/95 Yılı Milet, Myken-Minos dönemi kazıları. In: V.von Graeve. 1994/95 yılı Milet çalışmaları. *XVIII.KST*, 1. 529-553.
- Özkan, T. & Erkanal, H. (1999). *Tahtalı barajı kurtarma kazısı / Tahtalı dam area salvage project*. Pirî Reis. (1988). *Kitab-ı Bahriye. I*.
- Selânik-i Mustafa Efendi. (1989). *Tarih-i Selânikî. 1.Cilt. 971-1003 / 1563-1595*. M.İşpirli (Ed.). İstanbul Üniversitesi Edebiyat Fakültesi Yayınları.
- Sonnini, C.S. (1801). *Voyage en Grèce et en Turquie. 2*. F. Buisson, Imprimeur-Libraire.
- Şahoğlu, V., Çayır-Büyükulusoy, Ü., Erbil, Y.H., Erkanal, H. & Tuğcu, İ. (2014). 2012 yılı Çeşme Bağlararası kazıları. *Anadolu/Anatolia*,40. 179-198.
- Şahoğlu, V., Çayır, Ü., Gündoğan, Ü. & Tuğcu, İ. (2018). Çeşme-Bağlararası: Batı Anadolu sahil kesiminde bir Tunç Çağı yerleşimi. *Anadolu/Anatolia*,44, 371-389.
- Texier, Charles. (1862). *Asie Mineure*. Firmin Didot Frères, Fils et C. Editeurs.
- Theochari, M.D. & Parlama, L. (1997). Palamari Skyrou: I ochiromeni poli tis Proimis Chalkokratias. In: Chr. D. Doumas-U. La Rosa (Eds.). *I Poliochni kai i Proimi Epochi tou Chalkou sto Voreio Agaiou*. Athina.
- Tsountas, Chr. (1899). Kykladika. *Ephimeris Archaialogiki*, 75-134.
- Tuna, N. (1988). İzmir ili arkeolojik yüzey araştırmaları, 1988, *VII.AST*,279-294.
- Tuncel, R. (2008). The Izmir region excavations and research project (IRERP) survey program: new prehistoric settlements in the Izmir region. In: H. Erkanal-H. Hauptmann-V. Şahoğlu-R. Tuncel, (Eds.). *The Aegean in the Neolithic, Chalcolithic and the Early Bronze Age*. Ankara: Ankara Üniversitesi Basımevi. 581-592.
- Uzunçarşılı, İ. H. (2011). *Osmanlı tarihi. II*. Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi.
- Vlamos, K. A. (1946). *Ta Alatsata tis Ionikis i Erythraias chersonisou 1640-1914*. Ekdotikos Oikos Mich. Triantafyllou.
- Wilkinson, C. (1806). *A Tour through Asia Minor and the Greek island*. Printed and sold by Darton and Harvey.

Abbreviations

- AST Araştırma Sonuçları Toplantısı
KST Kazı Sonuçları Toplantısı

Fig.1: Ottoman period roads in Urla Peninsula

Fig.2: The Bronze Ages security and defense units in Urla Peninsula

Fig.3: Liman Tepe Early Bronze Age I fortification system and long houses (Aykurt & Erkanal, 2021)

Fig.4: Liman Tepe Early Bronze Age II fortification system and buildings (Aykurt & Erkanal, 2021)

Fig.5: Kale Tepe on the Urla-Çeşme road

Fig.6: Kale Tepe Early Bronze Age pottery

Fig.7: Glkayası

Fig.8: Mustafa S. Akpolat on Cinderesi Tepe

Fig.9: Sivrice Tepe

Fig.10: Sivrice Tepe Middle Bronze Age pottery