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Özet


Due to the scarcity of prehistoric research that has been carried out in coastal Western Anatolia, our knowledge of the region’s prehistory has remained scanty for years. Troy, with its important geographical location in coastal northwestern Anatolia and its research history spanning more than a century, has become a key site for Western Anatolian prehistoric research. Other investigations were largely unsystematic or short term and have remained largely unpublished. As these investigations have failed to provide reliable or significant contributions to our knowledge of the Western Anatolian coastal region, the Troad remained the focus of interest and was treated as the main source for the Aegean relations of Western Anatolia.

Recent work, however, conducted by the İzmir Region Excavations and Research Project (IRERP) under the direction of Prof. Dr. Hayat Erkanal, has started to provide a completely different view of the prehistoric periods of coastal Western Anatolia south of Troy.

As a result of the archaeological investigations carried out since the beginning of the 1990’s at the three IRERP sites, all located around the gulf of İzmir - namely Panaztepe, Bakla Tepe and Liman Tepe - we now have important data about the nature of
the region's cultural developments and its contacts with adjacent areas from the Neolithic Period until the end of the Late Bronze Age\(^1\) (Map).

This paper will present some preliminary observations on the Early Bronze Age maritime contacts of the Izmir region with the rest of the Aegean, in the light of new data, especially from Liman Tepe.

Liman Tepe was inhabited from the Neolithic period until the end of the Late Bronze Age and continued into the Classical period as when it was known as Clazomenai. The excavations at the site have provided us with important data, especially about the character of the Early Bronze Age settlement.

As a result of the excavations carried out so far, we now know that there was a fortified settlement at the beginning of the Early Bronze Age\(^2\) which was then transformed, in the Early Bronze Age II, into a fortified citadel with a surrounding lower-town\(^3\) (Fig. 1).

The Early Bronze Age II settlement at Liman Tepe is surrounded by a massive fortification wall. This includes a ca. 25m wide horse-shoe shaped bastion\(^4\) (Fig. 1a) resembling those of Lerna\(^5\), Syros-Kastri\(^6\), Naxos-Panormos\(^7\), Aegina\(^8\) and Palamari-Skyros\(^9\) but is larger in size and has differences in terms of its construction technique\(^10\). Recent investigations carried out under water have shown that the fortification system probably continues here as well, forming an oval shaped citadel (Fig. 1). The part of the fortification system which is now submerged also possesses bastions smaller than that which has already been excavated (Fig. 1b-c). The north-western corner of the fortification projects approximately 100 m under water, forming a pier (Fig. 1d), with a smaller breakwater attached to it from the southwest\(^11\) (Fig. 1e). This arrangement creates favourable harbour conditions at the north-western edge of the town. The prehistoric topography and the plan of the fortification system suggest that this area might indeed have been used as a harbour (Fig. 1).

A building complex within the citadel of Liman Tepe seems to be the focus of the settlement during the Late Early Bronze Age II. This complex consists of an open courtyard and two rectangular storerooms and a multi-roomed structure connected to it to the north. The two rectangular rooms lying on a northwest – southeast axis, measuring ca. 14.50m\(^12\) in length\(^13\) (Fig. 1f; Fig. 2). The area of the courtyard topographically belongs to the lowest part of
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1. See IRERP homepage for full bibliography on the project's work. (www.geocities.com/irerp_tr)
4. Caskey 1958, fig. 1, pls. 33a, 34a-b.
5. Bossert 1967, plan 2; Marthari 1998, figs. 15 and 16, 26-27 (the latter three for the colour photographs of the fortifications).
8. Theochari-Parlama 1997, figs. 1-2, pic. 5.
11. The excavation of this structure is impossible at the moment due to the modern and ancient structures surrounding it.
Liman Tepe during the Late Early Bronze Age II period. The southern wall of the storerooms was built as a terrace wall facing the north, thus creating a secure place for an open courtyard at the centre of the settlement.

The pottery and small finds which have been found in situ within the storerooms in the courtyard and in House-11 to the north of the courtyard, provide us with evidence for the function and date of this “central complex” at Liman Tepe. An important group of stone phallic objects, a pan like vessel (?) and a fragment of a bull rhyton were unearthed within the Liman Tepe “central complex” suggesting a cultic function for these structures, while an olive green serpentine seal, again found in the same context, might be considered as an indicator for the administrative character of this complex. The “central complex” at Liman Tepe must have been in use at least during the Late Early Bronze Age II period.

This “central complex” must have served a function similar to the well known “corridor houses” of the Greek mainland familiar from sites such as Lerna (“House of the Tiles”) and “Building BG”), Thebes (“Fortified Building”). Akovitika (“Megaron A and B”), Aegina (“Haus am Felsrand” and “Weisses Haus”), and possibly Zygouries (“House of the Pithoi”) and Tiryns (“Rundbau”). The Liman Tepe “central complex” must have been used as a communal area rather than a domestic one. The small finds and pottery found within the complex suggest a religious as well as an administrative character for this complex. The Liman Tepe “central complex” can be compared to the “corridor houses” of the Greek mainland in terms of the function; it played as a “special function area” within the citadel of the settlement.

As a result of excavations during 1980-1981 and since 1992, a large local pottery assemblage of the Early Bronze Age has been unearthed at Liman Tepe. Some imported pottery, stone vessels and various clay objects found along with local cultural material, provide us with important evidence about the maritime contacts of the settlement.

When the distribution of these finds within the settlement is considered, the most important group is from the Late Early Bronze Age II “central complex” (Fig. 1; Fig. 2). A second area is located immediately to the north of the Early Bronze Age I
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14 See Erkanal-Günel 1997, çizim 3 and resim 10, the latter for the stone phallus with a monkey’s head.
18 The bell-shaped seal is being prepared for publication by Prof. Armağan Erkanal.
19 This period coincides with the LMT B V-2 and LMT B V-1b phases of the local Liman Tepe stratigraphy. See Şahoğlu 2002, Levha 116, for the chronology chart.
20 See Pullen 1986, fig. 4, for same scale plans of the known EBA “corridor houses” of the Aegean.
21 Caskey 1954, 1955a, 1955b, 1956, 1957, 1959, especially 1958, fig. 1, pl. 31a for a plan and view of “House of the Tiles”.
22 Wiencke 1986, 41-45, see fig. 33 for a plan of “Building BG”.
23 Aravantinos 1986, 57-63, figs. 53-54, pls. Id, Iia-c.
25 Felten 1986, 21-28, fig. 7-11.
26 Pullen 1986, 73-78, fig. 71-73.
27 Kilian 1986, 65-71, fig. 57-59.
28 See Caskey 1955b, various articles in Hägg & Konsola 1986, Shaw 1987, Wiencke 1989 and Shaw 1990, for various comments on the function of the “corridor houses”.
29 See Erkanal-Erkanal 1983; Erkanal-Günel 1996; 1997; Erkanal 1997 (for colour photographs) and Erkanal 1998 for short comments on Liman Tepe EBA pottery. See Şahoğlu 2002 for the latest work on this material.
fortification (Fig. 1g)30. While a third area, where goods reflecting overseas contacts have been unearthed, is in the building found within the Early Bronze Age II lower-town in front of the bastion (Fig 1b). Imported finds from other areas within the settlement are largely isolated and few in number.

Urfimis sauceboat sherds from a local Early Bronze Age II context form the most important group reflecting the maritime contacts of Liman Tepe31. Until now, the presence of this pottery type in Anatolia was represented only by a group of sherds from Troy32. The examples from Liman Tepe, found in secure stratified contexts, form the largest and possibly the most informative group excavated in Anatolia to date.

Urfimis sauceboat sherds have been uncovered in nearly every part of the settlement. All of the sherds are fine ware and very well fired. Nearly all the fragments have a pinkish-buff fabric. Another distinguishing characteristic is a bluish-gray core present in most sherds. Their surface has a mottled red to black colour while the application of “Urfimis” is visible through the brush marks. All of the sherds have a metallic look and are of high quality. The thickness of the biscuit varies between 0.3 and 0.5 cm. The homogeneity of a large portion of this ceramic type is likely to be an indication that the vessels are products of a single workshop33.

Although a complete sauceboat has not yet been unearthed at Liman Tepe, there are plenty of rims (Fig. 3a-d, 10), handles (Fig. 10), bases (Fig. 10) and spouts (Fig. 10), along with body fragments. Sherds preserved with a handle have a relief band placed on both sides of the handle, possibly in imitation of metal vessels. Similar relief-band decoration is also known from elsewhere in the Aegean34.

When the sauceboat sherds from Liman Tepe are considered as a whole, they resemble some other examples from Mainland Greece, the Cyclades, Aegina and Troy. All the Urfimis sauceboat examples found in Liman Tepe to date, are from Later Early Bronze Age I and Early Bronze Age II contexts. The best preserved examples though come from the Early Bronze Age I contexts especially from House 2 behind the Early Bronze Age I fortification wall.

One of these finds is the best preserved sauceboat found in Anatolia to date (Fig. 3d, 11). This vessel was discovered under a sealed ash layer in a burnt context35 together with pedestalled bases, Troy A6 and A12 type ceramics (A6 types predominate). This context conforms to the chronology of the sauceboat sherds from Troy36.

Other finds from Liman Tepe supporting this chronology are two imported painted sherds of the Keros-Syros Culture of the Cyclades37. The sherds are very well fired and have a fine fabric (Fig. 3e). They have
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30 Recent excavations have shown that this area belongs to the southern half of an Early Bronze Age 1/2 long house rectangle in plan.
32 Blegen et al. 1950, Some “Early Aegean Ware” sherds from Middle and Late Troy I fig. 251, nos. 4, 10, 11; fig. nos. 3-6, 9, 17.
33 Analysis of these sherds is currently in progress within the course of the “Kastri Group Pottery: The Transmission of Style and Technology in the Early Bronze II Aegean” project, and the preliminary results suggest that Liman Tepe sherds are most probably products of the same workshop.
36 Blegen et al. 1950, cf. figs. 251 and 252.
37 Locus 1070. See Şahoğlu 2002, Levha 11b-d.
black geometric designs applied on a white-cream slip.

A surprising find contributing to this subject was unearthed at Bakla Tepe, south of Izmir. The latest occupation of the settlement on the high mound is contemporary with Troy I, with the characteristic Troy A6 and A12 ceramic types. Within these levels was found a silver amphoriskos headed pin (Fig. 8), also well known from the Early Cycladic II period in the Cyclades, especially from Naxos. The evidence so far suggests that the culture, which we have assigned to the Early Bronze Age I period in Liman Tepe and Bakla Tepe, partly overlaps with the Early Cycladic II period.

The “Late Early Bronze Age II” period at Liman Tepe is marked by the appearance of a new group of well made fine ceramics found along with the continuing earlier Early Bronze Age II types. This new ceramic assemblage mainly consists of two distinct ware groups:

1. Black slipped and burnished fine wares;
2. Red slipped and burnished fine wares.

The black slipped and burnished wares have grey coloured fabric with mica and small stone and white inclusions. They are all well fired and well burnished. The red slipped and burnished ceramics have an orange-brown / buff fabric with either no or fine inclusions. This group’s most characteristic feature is the red-washed outer surface.

*In situ* pottery from the “central complex” of Liman Tepe dating to the Late Early Bronze Age II period both help to date the building and also provide evidence for the maritime contacts of Liman Tepe with the Aegean and Eastern Mediterranean.

Sherds of two handled cups and an incised pyxis have been found in the western compartment of this building (Fig. 1g). The best preserved of the two handled cups can be termed “bell-shaped” (Fig. 4a, 13). This example is the first bell-shaped cup to have been found on the Western Anatolian coastal region.

The “bell-shaped cup” of Liman Tepe is in the black burnished group and can be compared to those found at Tarsus in southern Turkey, Ayia Irini, Naxos and Delos-Mt. Kynthos in the Cyclades, Samos-Heraion, Lefkandi and Manika.
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38 For other published amphoriskos headed pins in the Cyclades see Doumas 1977, pl. Ld (Rhodinadhos Cemetery in Naxos); Marangou 1990, 62, no. 35 (Naxos Museum).
39 This label is partly or totally contemporary with “Kastri Group” assemblages of the Cyclades, “Lefkandi I” assemblages of the Greek mainland and EBA III early period of Central Anatolia.
42 The term “bell-shaped” is used here to distinguish this two handled cup from the others that don’t have the “s” profile that characterise the well known “bell-shaped” profile of the Late EB2 Aegean. The other two handled cups found at the site from the same contexts form a variation of this shape and are a new feature in the known Late EB2 assemblages of the Aegean. See Şahoğlu (in print) for a more detailed discussion of this shape.
43 See Wilson 1999, 98-99 for the distribution table of this shape.
45 Caskey 1972, fig. 6, C.2, C.41.
46 Marangou 1990, 88, No. 85.
47 Plassart 1928, fig. 39-40; MacGillivray 1980, 19-20, fig. 7, No. 64, 421, 425, 429, 436.
48 Milojicic 1961, taf. 47, no. 8, 12.
49 French 1968, fig. 7, no. 6.
50 Sampson 1985, fig. 60, no. 20-22, pic. 87a.
in the Greek mainland. The “bell-shaped cup” of Liman Tepe is an important discovery for the establishment of secure chronological correlations between the Aegean and Anatolia.

A sherd of an incised pyxis from the same context (Fig. 1g) as the bell-shaped cup, though resembling examples of the incised pyxies from the Cyclades and mainland Greece, show some differences in terms of the shape of its handles51 (Fig. 4b, 15). But when the incised zig-zag decoration on its shoulder is considered, there seems to be much similarity with examples from Cycladic sites like Delos-Mt. Kynthos52 and Syros-Kastrí53 and Manika54 on the Greek mainland.

A cut-away spouted jug fragment from the Late Early Bronze Age II structure in front of the bastion from the lower-town of Liman Tepe (Fig. 1h) is black burnished and has the characteristic fabric and surface treatment of the Late Early Bronze Age II black slipped and burnished wares unearthed in the “central complex”. This sherd belongs to the spout of the vessel and is slipped and burnished both on the interior and exterior. The shape of the spout resembles similar examples from Manika55, Ayia Irini56 and Bakla Tepe57.

These Late Early Bronze Age II elements have been found in the “central complex” together with some Urfinnis sauceboat sherds as in Rapheina58 and Pefkakia59 in mainland Greece and Keos - Ayia Irini60 in the Cyclades. A stone sauceboat crudely fashioned and made from local limestone was also found alongside the Late Early Bronze Age II material in the western storeroom of the “central complex” (Fig. 5, 9). The stone sauceboat is yellowish-beige in colour. The oval shaped body narrows towards the spout and ends with an out-turned rim at the end of the spout. This half-preserved example is the first of its kind in Western Anatolia.

The data currently available suggest that the “central complex” at Liman Tepe, which must have been used for a long period of time, was in use at least until the end of the Early Bronze Age II. Detailed investigations to establish the date of construction of these multi-phased structures have not yet been undertaken; the limited data at hand suggests a phase early in the Early Bronze Age II61.

Apart from the “Kastrí Group” examples from within the “central complex”, a black slipped and burnished tankard sherd (Fig. 4c) closely resembles examples from Mt.
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51 The Liman Tepe example probably belongs to a triple composite pyxis group joined along their sides and have a common basket handle. For a similar example from Bakla Tepe see Erkanal 2003, 126, top photo.
52 MacGillivray 1980, 18-19, fig. 5, no.56, 433, 419, fig. 6. See Karantzali 1996, fig. 44 MD 7589 for a drawing of MacGillivray’s fig. 6.
53 Bossert 1967, fig. 5, no.2.
54 Sampson 1985, fig. 64a, no.57, pl. 97.
55 Cf. Sampson 1985, fig. 57.
56 See Wilson 1999, 100 for the distribution of this shape.
57 Similar cut-away spouted jugs recently unearthed at Bakla Tepe also share the same typological features with the Liman Tepe, Manika and Ayia Irini examples.
58 See ceramic inventory of House A in Theocharis 1952, 142, 145, fig. 10.
60 Wilson 1999, 134.
61 Erkanal-Günel 1997, 244.
Kynthos in Delos\textsuperscript{62}. When a finely made dark grey burnished depas sherd from the same area is also taken into consideration (Fig. 6a, 12), nearly all the elements of the “Kastri Group” ceramic assemblage are found in levels dated to the end of the local Early Bronze Age II at Liman Tepe.

A few marble bowl fragments found in the citadel area of Liman Tepe can be compared to those of the Early Cycladic II period\textsuperscript{63}. The Liman Tepe examples consist of a rolled rim, conical bodied bowl (Fig. 6b, 14) and the flat base of another bowl (Fig. 6c). A recent surface collection from the Kukülazlar marble workshop near Manisa by Rafet Dinç suggests that the site was used from the “Late Neolithic (?) to the Early Bronze Age 2\textsuperscript{64}.” This site seems to be a major production centre for the beakers\textsuperscript{65} and bowls\textsuperscript{66} (Fig. 7) as well as the Kiliya type idols all widely known in the Aegean\textsuperscript{67}. Most of the fragments are unfinished while some of them reflect high quality finishes. The tools used in the production of these vessels were also found in the survey\textsuperscript{68}. The source of the marble is suggested by Dinç to be at Mt. Harmandali to the north of the site. The discovery of this workshop brings to mind the possibility that at least some of the marble vessels distributed in the Aegean in the Neolithic and Early Bronze Age, - and widely accepted to be “Cycladic” in origin - might indeed have been produced on the Anatolian mainland and then distributed around the Aegean via a maritime exchange network. Future investigations no doubt will provide us with more data about the production and the distribution of these goods and the role of Western Anatolia in these processes.

During the excavations between 1992 and 1999 the Early Bronze Age levels at Liman Tepe have only been reached in seven 10x10m trenches. The preliminary analysis of the data demonstrates that Liman Tepe, surrounded by a fortification wall with horseshoe shaped bastions, was a well-organised urban trade centre with administrative buildings, massive fortifications, lower-town and a probable harbour complex during the Early Bronze Age.

The Urfrunis sauceboats, which must have been in use for a long time at Liman Tepe, demonstrate that the settlement must have had overseas contacts from at least the end of the Early Bronze Age I. These sherds appear at the end of the local Early Bronze Age I and continue throughout the Early Bronze Age II period and into the late Early Bronze Age II, which is defined by the appearance of new pottery shapes alongside the continuing Early Bronze Age II pottery tradition at the site\textsuperscript{69}. The “Kastri-Group” elements found at Liman Tepe include nearly all of the diagnostic forms of this group. The fact that elements of this group, which have

\textsuperscript{62} Cf. MacGillivray 1980, fig. 5, nos. 58, 119, 299, 434.
\textsuperscript{63} Cf. Thimme 1977, nos. 297-303 for EC II rolled rim marble bowls.
\textsuperscript{65} Dinç 1996, 20-21, çizim 5, nos. 85-87, 89-107; 1997, 262-263, resim 14. The long vertical strip which is typical for these shapes is also attested in the Kulaksızlar fragments; see especially Dinç 1997, resim 14, no. 33 for a fully worked fragment with a lug hole on the vertical strip.
\textsuperscript{66} Dinç 1996, çizim 5, nos. 78-83. Some of these shapes could have had a finish in a rolled rim bowl fashion especially nos. 80 and 82. But the published fragments are all unfinished except for no. 81 and the published data is not sufficient to make final comments on this matter.
\textsuperscript{67} Cf. Coleman 1977, pl. 23, no. 103 for an “Aegean Late Neolithic” marble beaker from Kephala in Keos.
\textsuperscript{68} Cf. Dinç 1996, 24-25, resim 16-17; 1997, 263, resim 15-16.
\textsuperscript{69} Cf. Şahoğlu 2002, Levha 115 for the appearance of the new shapes after phases and Levha 116 for a comparative chronology chart.
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been long-known in the Cyclades, mainland Greece and other Aegean islands, and which is of Anatolian origin, have been found together with some Urfinnus sauce-boat sherds in a local Late Early Bronze Age II Anatolian context, provides us with important information about interregional contacts. They will in turn help us to determine both the chronological limits of certain ceramic forms and refine the chronological correlations within the Aegean world.70

Liman Tepe, situated in a central location within the Aegean, must have played an important role in the northern and southern trade networks of the Aegean during the Early Bronze Age. The data so far available suggests that this settlement must have been one of the most important trade centres of the Early Bronze Age.

The promising new finds at Liman Tepe, Bakla Tepe and now at Miletus71, have provided us with the first strong evidence that the Western Anatolian coastline south of Troy must have been an important participant in the “International Spirit” of the Aegean during the Early Bronze Age.

Dr. Vasih Şahoğlu,
Ankara Üniversitesi, Dil ve Tarih–Coğrafya
Fakültesi Arkeoloji Bölümü
06100 Sihhiye-Ankara
e-mail: sahoglu@humanity.ankara.edu.tr

71 Von Graepe 1999, 586, Resim 11.
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