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ABSTRACT

Hacılar Büyük Höyük is located 27 km southwest of Burdur near the eponymous village of Hacılar. Forty of the building units (casemates) that form a carefully pre-planned multi-defence system with “saw-tooth” protrusions and two city gates have been uncovered in the western half of the city. Hacılar Büyük Höyük must have been the centre of a strong local kingdom at the beginning of the 3rd millennium BC, and would have controlled the village settlements in the surrounding region that made a living through agriculture, animal husbandry and trade on a small scale. The urban layout uncovered in the past nine years of excavations and the dimensions and ostentatious appearance of the defence system display qualities that have so far not been seen at any other centre.
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Hacılar Büyük Höyük is located 27 km southwest of Burdur near the eponymous village of Hacılar (fig. 1). The excavations of the höyük began in 2011 under my direction and are still in progress.¹

The stratigraphy of Hacılar Büyük Höyük:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Building Levels</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Early Bronze Age III (EBA III)</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Bronze Age II (EBA II)</td>
<td>EBA II / 1–3 Building Levels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Bronze Age I (EBA I)</td>
<td>EBA I / 1, 2 Building Levels</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Virgin Soil

Hacılar Büyük Höyük is situated approximately 500 m to the north of Hacılar, the mound excavated in 1957–60 by James Mellaart and a site considered to have been a turning point in the...

¹ This project is the most recent stage of the Excavations and Research Project in Burdur and the Surrounding Area that was initiated by Prof. Dr. Refik Duru (Emeritus-Istanbul University) in 1976. In the context of this project, excavations were carried out at Kuruçay (1978–1988), Höyükç (1989–1992) and Bademağaci (1993–2010) and an exploratory search for the Hacılar Necropolis (1995, 1996) took place. The Hacılar Büyük Höyük Excavations are being carried out on behalf of the Ministry of Culture and Tourism of Turkey and Istanbul University (Istanbul University, Scientific Research Projects No: SBA-2018-30674, SBA-2019-34380).
prehistoric archaeology of Anatolia. The settlement was discovered in 1956 by J. Mellaart, who was investigating a group of painted pottery that had been found at Burdur, and he began excavations here the following year. These excavations brought to light impressive and authentic finds that revealed the existence of a culture previously unknown on the Anatolian Plateau and also introduced concepts such as the Neolithic and Chalcolithic to the world of scientific research (Mellaart 1970).

The Early Bronze Age I settlement at Hacılar Büyük Höyük was uncovered during the first year of excavations in the Western Slope Trench on the western side of the mound that is 350 m long and extends in north-south direction. Traces of the same settlement are also found in the AB trench that was opened up near the middle of the mound and is around 70 m in length (figs. 2–3). In the AB trench there is part of a large multi-roomed structure measuring 4.5×8.6 m, and eight large jars were found in situ in the courtyard in front of a gate that opens to the east (figs. 2, 4). On the northern side of a 7 m long wall, just to the east of the courtyard, there are five small adjacent cells arranged in west-east direction. The average dimensions of these cells are 1.9×2.1 m and 1.8×1.6 m, and their walls have stone foundations that are 15–20 cm in width. The cells, whose function is unclear due to the lack of finds apart from an andiron, have doors that open in different directions (fig. 4).

A well-constructed megaron with dimensions of 5.6×8.5 m at the eastern end of the same trench seems to have been rebuilt several times with some minor changes to the plan. The remains of another building that was built adjacent to the western side of this building, after leaving a 2 m gap, also resembles a megaron. An interesting observation is the similarity of the plan of this megaron to the Western Gate (BK). This naturally brings to mind the possibility that the megaron could have been a gate (Propylon). However, if this building was a gate building it could not have been a city gate like the others as it is located much further inside. It is possible that this building was an entrance to the Inner Wall / Acropolis surrounding the official and religious buildings in the middle of the city (figs. 2, 5).

In the western half of the city forty building units (casemates) have so far been uncovered, and these form a carefully pre-planned multi-room defence system extending on a north-south axis with
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"saw-tooth" protrusions (figs. 2, 6, 7). It can be seen that these defence wall protrusions, called 'saw teeth', jut out to a length of around 2.00, 2.20, 2.50 m in keeping with the dimensions of the casemate / space where they are located. It is likely that, when the layout of the city was planned, these protrusions
Fig. 3. Aerial view of the Höyük (HBH Excavations – archive)
Обр. 3. Въздушна снимка на обекта (архив на разкопките на ХБХ)

Fig. 4. AB trench, multi-roomed structure (HBH Excavations – archive)
Обр. 4. Сондаж AB, структура с много помещения (архив на разкопките на ХБХ)
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Fig. 5. A well-constructed megaron in the AB trench (HBH Excavations – archive)
Обр. 5. Добре изграден мегарон в сондаж АВ (архив на разкопките на ХБХ)

Fig. 6. Aerial view of the Western Gate and casemates
(НВН Excavations – archive)
Обр. 6. Въздушна снимка на Западната порта и казематите
(архив на разкопките на ХБХ)
were intended to form a circular plan or curvature. It is understood that one of the weakest aspects of the defence system formed of ‘saw-tooth’ protrusions is the section thought to have been damaged from time to time by flood waters from the stream to the north (see the ‘Retaining Wall’).

The outer walls of the defence system are 1.50–1.60 m in width; they are constructed of medium-sized stones, and in places reach a height of 2 m when viewed from outside the city. It is understood from the rubble of the wall remains, and the substances stuck to the top row of the existing walls, that the upper part of the walls was built with mud bricks (kerpiç) but this section has not survived. Oval-shaped mud bricks and pisé pieces bearing negative traces of tree branches, found in the rubble of the buildings, give us an idea about the upper sections of the walls that did not survive up to the present day (fig. 8.A). The average dimensions of the inner walls of the sometimes slightly quadrangular spaces (casemates) that form the defence wall are 3.85×6.10, 4.5×5.5, 3.60×5.00, 4.7×7.1, 5.7×7.4 m; they are 1.10 m, 1.30 m and 1.50 m in thickness and have doors opening into the courtyards on the eastern side. The doors of some of the casemates are 1.10–1.20 m in width, and the in situ pivot stone (fig. 8.B, width 35 cm) inside the door of some of them shows the wooden door wing opened inwards. In some structures thresholds were formed by using plaques or stones of irregular shape (fig. 8.C).

On both sides of the doors of the casemates and on the axis of the longer walls of the rooms, there are short ledges / buttresses, varying in size from 1–0.80 m, that resemble an ‘ante’ wall. All these details make these buildings resemble a ‘megaron’. We think that the top sections of the casemates were covered with a flat roof made of a combination of wooden beams, tree branches and mud. Bearing in mind the conditions of that period, would it have been possible to make a roof to cover the area without placing a post in the middle of it? The compressed floors of most of the forty casemates uncovered so far were badly damaged, but we did not find a stone base for a wooden pillar that could
Fig. 8. A – an oval-shaped mud brick and pisé pieces; B – an in situ pivot stone inside the door of a casemate; C – a doorway and stone threshold of a casemate (photos by G. Umurtak)

Обр. 8. А – кирпич с овална форма и парчета от пизé; В – въртящ се камък in situ във вратата на каземат; С – вход и каменен праг на каземат (снимки Г. Умуртак)
have supported the roof in any of these areas. This being the case, we have to assume that the builders managed to close the roof area without needing to use a support post.

On the side of the defence system that faces into the city a weak, narrow stone wall extends along the defence wall; this wall marks out the courtyard section of the casemates and occasional passage openings have been left in it. This wall clearly separates the settlement from the defence area (figs. 2, 3).

Two adjacent and apparently round structures (!) were uncovered in the courtyard of casemates G4 and G5. The inner diameter of one of them is 2.53 m and the other is 3.20 m, and there is a gap of 1 m between them. A section of their stone foundations, around 40 cm in height and 40 cm in width, had survived and there are two wide openings (doors!) on the east-west axis, and thick curving walls on the northern and southern sides that resemble two brackets (figs. 2, 9). A small distance from these circular structures two upright stones, one 90 cm and the other 50 cm in height and 80 cm apart, were found standing in front of a semi-circular wall. The upper section of these stone structures with slightly distorted quadrangular cross-section was broken off. These stones, which had no symbol or relief of any kind on any of the four sides, had clearly been placed in a vertical position so must have been supported by other stones placed at the base. We think it would be correct to define these stones as steles (fig. 10). The two steles, together with the circular and single semi-circular structures, do not appear to be linked in any way to the defence system but nothing definite can be said since no object, grain residue etc. that could give any insight into their function was found.

At the northern end of the defence system there is a ‘Retaining Wall’, which is around 35 m in length and constructed using a single row of very large well-placed stones to form a rough but straight line. The side facing the city had been filled with earth. It is not clear how the upper section of the wall was covered. The wall turns inward at a 90° angle in front of casemate K 18, joins the wall
of casemate K 17 and probably ends here (figs. 2, 3, 11–12). In summer 2019, in addition to the SkyView method, the Morphometry and Slope Calculations method was implemented at Hacilar Büyük Höyük by Doc. Dr. Tolga Görüm (Istanbul Technical University). The initial results obtained support our theory that the retaining wall was built to protect the defence system, and therefore the settlement, from flood waters from the still active stream to the north of the mound, although the location of the river bed has altered since then. As mentioned above, we believe the “saw-tooth” protrusions are one of the weakest aspects of the defence system. In particular, it is thought that the sand and gravel accumulation detected at the base of the saw-teeth outside casemates K 4 and K 5 may have been deposited by flood waters from the stream to the north.

Two gates were pre-planned to be used as entrances to the city; the first one is the Western Gate and the other one is the Southern Gate. The Western Gate (figs. 2, 13–14) was made into a gate room in a gap 4.00 m in width and 8.70 m in length between two rectangular casemates/towers (K 1 and G 1) and also formed a gate building with ante rooms extending into and out from the city. These side walls jut out about 6 m beyond the outer extent of the towers they are adjacent to. A transverse wall was placed in front of the propylon, which is similar in plan and general appearance to a ‘megaron’, to allow only controlled access into the settlement through a narrow gap. It is understood that the propylon, which seems to be the weakest part of the defence system, had been occasionally strengthened. The most important of these alterations is the construction, in a later phase, of a second closure wall in the interior section near the entrance to the settlement that made entering the gate more difficult.

The Southern Gate (figs. 2, 15) is similar in plan to the Western Gate, which was uncovered in the first years of the excavations. The gate room formed in the space between the two casemates
towers is approximately 15.20 m in length and 4 m in width. The rooms / towers on both sides of the gate are similar in plan to the other casemates of the defence wall, but they are significantly larger. For example, the size of the area adjacent to the Southern Gate on the northern side that has dimensions of 7.90×3.90 m is striking. The recently uncovered Southern Gate has the same plan as the Western Gate. The main difference seen in the planning of the Southern Gate is the wall on the outward facing side of the gateway that partially blocks the entrance and makes passage through it difficult. This closure wall, which is much thinner than the side walls of the gate that exceed 1.5 m in thickness, can be considered to be the main feature of this gate. Two narrow gaps near the western end of this thin wall at the front of the Southern Gate severely restrict entrance through the gate. This implementation creates the most significant difference between this gate and the Western Gate. The variations between the Western Gate and the Southern Gate suggest that these two doors were built for different purposes. We do not know anything about the door leaves, but it is thought that the door leaves of both city gates and the casemate doors would have been wooden. It is likely that both gate passages were covered over and, if it is accepted that the casemates were covered without using any supporting posts (see above), it is possible that both gates were covered using the same technique.

As emphasized above, it can be seen that entrance and exit to the city took place through two gates with similar plan in different locations. Due to the presence of a retaining wall to the north and the land structure outside the city, the likelihood of a gate in this northern section is not very high. However, a third gate in the eastern part of the settlement should be considered a strong possibility. In addition to this, the outward-facing walls of some of the casemates (such as G 6, G 7, G 17, K 6 and K 7) that constitute the defence system were not completely closed, meaning that some basic gaps were seemingly intentionally left so that the people who worked in the fields and gardens and
those who went hunting, and even people carrying water and animal herds, could leave and enter the settlement (figs. 2–3). These may also have been structures left unrepaired whose function altered for some reason after the outer walls they were attached to had been destroyed, although the rulers and residents of the city must have calculated the disadvantage such entrances constituted for the city’s defence.

The earth on the floors of the casemates had been well compressed and smoothed over, but it did not survive in that condition to the present day. In the middle section of some of the buildings the remains of a horseshoe-shaped hearth can be seen. In other buildings there are supports / raised platforms on the stone-paved floor adjacent to the southern wall, which were used to place large jars on (fig. 16.A–C). In many of the buildings in situ grinding stones were found along with a large amount of burnt grain scattered on the floors. In addition to these, all types of daily use pottery (figs. 17–18), and sometimes items such as stone and terracotta seals (fig. 19.A), baked clay (fig. 19.B–C) and stone idols (fig. 19.D), ‘pubis’ models (?) made from pebbles, metal needles and metal cutters were also found in the casemates. In the courtyard section of the casemates, earthenware jars and large pots were found embedded in the floor, and these sometimes contained burnt grain particles and fruit such as figs, and a large number of small jugs, plates, and bowls. All this indicates that the casemates were used for residence, as well as having a defensive function. It can be said that a rich and active daily life continued in these buildings.

Such a complex defence system must have been thought out and thoroughly planned in advance. The resultant plan was applied to the landscape with great care and attention to detail. Refik Duru thinks that the plan outline produced by the ‘architect’ who designed the defence system may have been drawn on perishable material that would not have survived to the present day, and then
implemented together with a team of highly experienced assistants and experts in wall construction. In addition, when building such an orderly chain of structures in keeping with the landscape on an extensive piece of land hundreds of metres in width, the ‘architects’ and building experts must have used some kind of measurement system. For example, from the West Gate onwards the casemates gradually get smaller in both directions in keeping with a particular plan, and the large saw teeth facing outward from the settlement change direction at an angle of 180 degrees in one out of every four to five casemates (figs. 2–3). This would only have been possible with the use of accurate measurements. It would not have been possible to plan such a well-developed defence system unless the ‘architect’ and / or at least some of the construction experts had seen the implementation of a similar system in another place or gained previous experience. It would have taken months to remove tons of stones from the surrounding quarries and move them to the settlement. If the time required for the construction is taken into account it must have taken years to build a city of this size, not just the defence system.

The fact that the city is surrounded by such a strong defence system built with great effort under arduous conditions shows that, firstly, there must have been great wealth to be protected inside it, and secondly, implies a high level of external threats. What kind of wealth would compel these people to build such a strong defence? The answer to this question is likely to be revealed, at least to some extent, once the public buildings and the houses of the rulers in the inner section of the city have been excavated. Although the excavations have been in progress for nine years, we are not yet able to define what the livelihood of the people could have been apart from agriculture and livestock (Umurtak, Duru 2013a, 21; 2014, 16, 17) or assess the extent of trade relations. We do not think that this region was full of external threats at the beginning of the 3rd millennium BC, or that the location of the settlement would have been at an intersection of certain roads. Where were the enemy /
Important information about pre-EBA defence systems in Burdur and its surroundings is available to us. On the eastern slope section of Bademağacı Höyük there is a casemate-shaped rectangular structure belonging to the Early Neolithic Period that has grid-shaped walls adjacent to it. Due to the EBA II megarons above it we were not able to investigate this system, but it is thought to belong to a defence system that protected the EN II / 3 and / or EN II / 2 settlements (Duru, Umurtak 2019, Pl. X). In the late stages of the Neolithic Period the defence system belonging to level 11 at Kuruçay Höyük, with its semi-circular towers along the defence wall 1.10–1.20 m in width, and gate entrance to the settlement, is a well-planned example of architecture and defence that remains unparalleled (Duru 1994, Pl. 15). In the Early Chalcolithic Period, the Hacılar II settlement is surrounded by a defence wall 1.5–3.00 m in width, and has simple entrance gates in the north and south (Mellaart 1970, Fig. 20, 25). In level I of the same settlement, which was excavated in a very limited area, a thick saw-tooth defence wall was uncovered that appeared to form a circular plan (Mellaart 1970, Fig. 29, 35). As mentioned above, the Hacılar site is 500 m to the south of Hacılar Büyük Höyük. Although the chronological gap between the two settlements is considerable, the appearance of a more-or-less circular plan with a saw-tooth implementation at both sites is extremely interesting. In the Late Chalcolithic levels 6 A₂ and 6 A₃ at Kuruçay it is understood that the defence system of the settlement, which has three gates with different functions, was formed by placing the houses in the outer ring of the settlement adjacent to each other. Could the Kuruçay Eastern Gate, with its sophisticated plan designed as a gate building 1.5 m in width and 6 m in length between houses no. 13 and 14, be a prototype for the Hacılar Büyük Höyük gates? (Duru 1996, Pl. 32, 34, 41, 42).² The continu-

² The similarities between the Kuruçay Late Chalcolithic and the Hacılar Büyük Höyük Early Bronze Age settlements are not restricted to the gate plan, as there are also some striking similarities between the pottery of these two centres
ation of the defence wall, which appeared intermittently in the northern and southern sections of the Early Bronze Age II settlement at Bademağacı, could not be traced in other parts of the mound. While entrance to the city took place through simple gaps, the megarons were arranged in a row adjacent to each other and formed an outer ring surrounding the entire settlement. The outermost part of the city, which is understood to be oval in plan, was surrounded by a stone-paved slope (Duru 2008, Fig. 312–317; 2016, Fig. 228, 229). At Karataş-Semayük, in the south of the region, the wall surrounding the large building dating to the beginning of the EBA, the plain gate entrances and the row of buildings just outside the terrace section indicate a different type of defence system (Mellink 1966, Ill. 1, 2). A comparison with Beycesultan and Kusura, close neighbours of Hacilar Büyük Höyük, is not possible at this stage.

In addition to the circular settlement plan observed at centres pre-dating the Early Bronze Age in Western Anatolia, the Early Chalcolithic settlement at Aktopráklık Höyük was surrounded by ‘boundary buildings’ placed alternatively to the front and back and located in an area separated by a ditch and parallel to it (Karul 2017, Fig. 112a, b). A similar layout is seen at Ilpinar in level VI (Cookson 2009, Fig. 19).

At Küllüoba in the Inner Western Anatolian Region, the architecture of the period called ‘the Transition to the Early Bronze Age’ is represented by an integrated schematic plan that consists of a mudbrick defence wall with clearly identifiable zigzag formations surrounding the settlement and houses, rectangular or trapezoid in shape, leaning against the wall (Fidan 2012, Fig. 7). There is no

(Umurtak, Duru 2014, 11).
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Fig. 16. A-C – the raised platforms used to place large jars (photos by G. Umurtak)

Обр. 16. А-С – издигнати платформи, използвани за поставяне на големи съдове (снимки Г. Умуртак)
similarity between the layout of the building groups and the settlement entrance gates that constitute the EBA II architecture at this settlement (Fidan 2012, Fig. 21) and the defence system at Hacilar Büyük Höyük. In the same period, houses at Demircihöyük were radially positioned in keeping with the circular shape of the settlement, and the saw-tooth protrusions facilitated the turning of this defence system (Korfmann 1983, Fig. 343). At the Keçiçayıırı settlement, which is almost oval in shape, the defence system seems to have been reinforced by a series of structures that support the outer wall (Fidan 2016, Fig. 5, 6). It is not possible to compare the defence system at Hacilar Büyük Höyük with that of the settlement dating to a later period at Seyitömer Höyük (Bilgen 2015).

There is no similarity between the polygon plan settlements with strong, thick massive walls at Troy, where the development process can be followed from the beginning of the 3rd millennium BC, and the defence system at Hacilar Büyük Höyük that consists of casemates. The gates of Hacilar Büyük Höyük, formed from a tall building designed to provide passage between the two casemates / towers, do not resemble the Troy I gate model that consists of massive protrusions / towers on either side of the gate passage. Similarly, there is no exact parallel between the Hacilar Büyük Höyük gates and the propylon design of the Troy II settlement gates (Blegen et al. 1950, Fig. 417; Korfmann, Mannsperger 1998, Fig. 41, 42, 45; Mellaart 1959, Fig. 2–9; Naumann 1971, Fig. 346–348, 350–353).

A defence system with very small saw-tooth casemates and a well-developed gate plan for the period is known from level XVI at Mersin Yumuktepe in Çukurova (Garstang 1953, Fig. 79, 80a). In the EBA II settlement at Tarsus Gözlükule in the same region, there is a large saw-tooth plan defence wall 2.80 m in thickness and a simple ‘L plan’ entrance gate. However, there are no rows of rooms adjacent to the city wall, in other words no casemates at Gözlükule (Goldman 1956, Pl. 6).
is no evidence of any interaction or influence between either of these two examples and the EBA I
defence system at Hacılar Büyük Höyük.

A wall with indentations and protrusions belonging to the Early Bronze Age defence system
at Alişar citadel in Central Anatolia is noteworthy. Here the gateway is in the form of a simple
passage between two massive towers (?) that then becomes a long irregular passageway (Von der Osten
1937a, Fig. 212, 214). In the first half of the 2nd millennium BC, the development of the old defensive
wall at Kültepe was achieved by alternately placing outward-facing protruding sections along it to
form a wall system that does not resemble the saw-tooth technique (Özgüç 1999, Pl 1, 3). Saw-tooth
defence walls together with casemates are seen at centres such as Alişar (Von der Osten 1937b, Pl.
12) and Tilmen Höyük (Duru 2003, Pl. 16; Marchetti 2010, Fig. 1) in the same period, and the same
type of wall would be built at the Hittite capital a few centuries later (Bittel 1970, Fig. 12; Naumann
1971, 309 ff, Fig. 369, 370, 412, 440; Neve 1993, Fig. 19, 20, 43, 96). The indentations and protrusions
that formed the saw-teeth probably continued to be built for millennia out of necessity because
they enabled the wall to turn in keeping with the landscape. However, it is difficult to explain how
the defence system formed from rows of adjacent casemates continued for such a long time or how
it came to be implemented in distant regions.

A defence system consisting of a row of casemates adjacent to the inside of a large wall form-
ing saw teeth is not a common practice in the pre-2nd millennium BC architecture in Anatolia. De-
fence systems in Burdur and its surroundings, which were formed by placing casemates alternately
to the front and back as at Hacilar I, or adjacent to each other as in levels 6A₁ and 6A₂ at Kuruçay,
were replaced in EBA I at Hacilar Büyük Höyük by a system consisting of a saw-tooth defence wall
formed with casemates, and in EBA II at Bademağacı by a similar system that was formed by placing
megaron side by side. It is possible to see a similar change in the neighbouring regions (see above), but the geographical distance and sometimes the chronological gap between Burdur and its surroundings and these settlements makes it difficult to generalise any connection. If the forerunners of the EBA I culture can be reached in the levels not yet uncovered in the excavations at Hacılar Büyük Höyük, more concrete answers can be given to some of the unanswered questions.

Hacılar Büyük Höyük must have been the centre of a strong local kingdom at the beginning of the 3rd millennium BC, and would have controlled the village settlements in the surrounding region that made a living through agriculture, animal husbandry and trade on a small scale. The urban layout uncovered in the past nine years of excavations (Umurtak, Duru 2012a–b; 2013a–b; 2014; 2015; 2016a–b; 2017; 2018; 2019) and the dimensions and ostentatious appearance of the defence system display qualities that have so far not been seen at any other centre. The urban fabric, the casemates
and the gates that constitute the defence system were undoubtedly the result of a combination of the will and command of the ruler of the city and the prior knowledge of architecture and its implementation gained by the construction experts.
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Бележки относно отбранителната система от ранната бронзова епоха I на Хаджилар Бююк Хьоюк (Бурдур, Турция)

Гюлсюн Умуртак

(резюме)

Хаджилар Бююк Хьоюк се намира на 27 km югозападно от Бурдур, близо до епонимното село Хаджилар (обр. 1). Селището от РБЕ I е открито през първата година на разкопките в сондаж на западния склон на могилата, който е ориентиран север–юг и достига дължина 350 m, като в сондаж АВ, който е близо до средата на могилата и е с дължина около 70 m (обр. 2, 3). В западната половина на обекта досега са разкрити 40 строителни единици (каземати), които формират предварително и внимателно планирана система за отбрана, състояща се от много помещения, простиращи се по оста север–юг. Челната линия е изключена и оформя множество назъбени издатъци, наречени „зъби на трюон“, които варират на дължина около 2,00/2,20/2,50 m в съответствие с размерите на каземата – пространството в което са интегрирани (обр. 2, 6, 7).

Две порти – Западна и Южна – са предварително планирани да бъдат използвани като входове. Западната порта (обр. 2, 13, 14) е изградена като помещение с ширина 4 m и дължина 8,70 m между два правовъглини каземата / кули (K 1 и G 1.) Входът към помещението е предварително планиран, простиращи се навътре и извън стената. Южната порта (обр. 2, 15) е подобна на западната, с размери 15,20 m на 4 m. Помещенията (кулите от двете страни на порта) са подобни на помещенията на западната порта, но са значително по-големи. Следователно входът и изходът от града се е извършвал през две порти с подобен план на различни места. Поради наличието на подпорна стена на север и характера на терена извън града, вероятността за порта в този северен участък не е много голяма. Трета порта в източната част на селището обаче трябва да се счита за много вероятна.

Отбранителната система, състояща се от редица от каземати, които се допират до вътрешната страна на укрепителна стена, образуваща „назъбена линия“, не е често срещана архитектурна практика преди II хилядолетие пр. Хр. в Анадола. Системите, отворени в Бурдур и околните му селища, които са формирани чрез поставяне на каземати последователно отпред и отзад, както е при Хаджилар II, в съседство – в пластове 6 A1 и 6 A2 в Куручай, са замениeni през РБЕ I в Хаджилар Бююк Хьоюк със система, състояща се от защитна „назъбена“ стена оформена с каземати. През РБЕ II в Бадемджъ е налице подобна система, която е образувана чрез изграждане на мегарони един до друг. Възможно е да се проследи подобна промяна в съседните региони, но географското разстояние, а в някои случаи и хронологичната разлика между обектите около Бурдур и по-отдалечените селища, затрудняват характеристизирането на тази връзка. Ако предшествениците на РБЕ I бъдат достигнати в нивата, чието проучване на Хаджилар Бююк Хьоюк предстои, то на някои от повдигнатите въпроси могат да се дадат по-конкретни отговори.

Хаджилар Бююк Хьоюк най-вероятно представлява център на малко местно царство в началото на III хилядолетие пр. Хр., което е контролирало по-малките селища в околната регион, препитващи се чрез селско стопанство, животновъдство и търговия в малък мащаб.
Градоустройственото оформление, разкрито при проучванията през последните девет години (Umurtak, Duru 2012a-b; 2013a-b; 2014; 2015; 2016a-b; 2017; 2018; 2019), както и размерите и внушителният външен вид на отбранителната система показват качества, които досега не са познати от нито един друг център. Градоустройството, казематите и портите, които съставляват отбранителната система, несъмнено са резултат от комбинацията на владетелската воля и власт с натрупанияте архитектурни познания и умения на строителните експерти.