

## Troy and the lower Danube region at the end of the Bronze Age

Attila László

“Foreign” pottery, sometimes designated with the general and simplifying term “Knobbed ware” (Buckelkeramik), discovered still during Schliemann’s excavations, has been repeatedly discussed by the specialists in Aegean and South-Eastern prehistory. H. Schmidt attributed this pottery to the layer VII and, later, C.W. Blegen to the VIIb1 and VIIb2 levels of Troy. Some of the vessels have been attributed by the American scholar globally to the layer VIIb, others - few of them - to the level VIIb1, and most of them to the level VIIb2.<sup>1</sup> The discussions referred on one hand, to the origin, the ways of penetration and the historical conditions of the appearance of foreign pottery in Troy, and on the other hand, to the chronology of the cultures this pottery originates in. Of course, the dating of these cultures depends greatly on the dating of Troy VII itself which, in its turn, depends on the chronology of the Aegean Late Bronze Age as well as on the relations between Troy and the Mycenaean world.

As far as the origin of the “foreign” pottery discovered in Troy is concerned, this could be better specified only beginning with the 1960s, due especially to the new archaeological researches in Romania and Bulgaria. (It is not our intention of referring now to the related discoveries made in the central region of the Balkan Peninsula and in LH III C Greece.) The problem has been repeatedly discussed in the last quarter of the century, the most profound studies being made by B. Hänsel and S. Morintz.

Hänsel had in view the presence in Troy of the pottery belonging to the Coslogeni or Čerkovna (= Zimnicea-Plovdiv) type in the layers VIIb1 - VIIb2, and of the pottery belonging to the Babadag culture and the related groups of Romania and Bulgaria in the VIIb2 level. He specifies that it especially belongs to the first

phase, with incised pottery, of this culture, but fragments of pottery also appeared, through few in number, with impressed decoration. In Hänsel’s view, Troy VIIb2 is, then, compartmented in time: this layer begins in a moment when the Coslogeni- Čerkovna (= Zimnicea-Plovdiv) horizon still exists, then it goes on through the period of the pottery with incised decoration (Babadag I), and it ends off during the existence of the pottery with impressed decoration (Babadag II, Insula Banului, Pšeničevo). The German professor considers that these three successive moments last in time between the latter half of the 12<sup>th</sup> century and the 10<sup>th</sup>, or even the 9<sup>th</sup> century B.C.<sup>2</sup>

After an initial analysis in 1964, S. Morintz has made more recent specifications concerning the origin of the Balkan-Danube pottery present in Troy, trying to establish more accurately the culture and the region the different categories of pottery come from, which, in his vision, can be chronologically arranged. Leaving aside a cup of the Tei III type, an isolated phenomenon without a certain stratigraphical position, S. Morintz considers that the oldest lot belongs to the Zimnicea-Plovdiv (Čerkovna) culture, and the following belongs to the cultural group Radovanu, the two of them being present both in the layer VIIb1 and in the layer VIIb2 of Troy. (It is worth mentioning that the Radovanu group, relatively recently defined, constitutes a mixed aspect of the Coslogeni and of the Zimnicea-Plovdiv cultures, being ulterior to the latter.) Finally, the pottery of the type Babadag, phase I, with incised pottery, but also the phase II, characterised by impressed pottery, belongs to the layer VIIb in general and to the layer VIIb2 in particular. These three waves of penetration reach Troy, in S. Morintz opinion, in the interval between the 13<sup>th</sup> and the 11<sup>th</sup>-10<sup>th</sup> centuries B.C.<sup>3</sup>

1. Blegen *at al.* 1958, *passim*.

2. Hänsel 1976, I, 229-236.

3. Morintz 1964, 114-116; 1982; 1987, 52, 62-63.

This image of the presence of Balkan-Danube elements in Troy can be completed with an anthropomorphic statuette in clay, coming from the layer VIIb (I?) of Troy and whose analogies (five pieces) have been recently found in Bulgaria, at Sava, the Varna district, in a building of cult attributed to the culture which Goranka Tončeva calls “Yagnilo-Coslogeni-Noua”.<sup>4</sup>

As far as the chronology of Troy VII is concerned, together with the reconsideration of the chronology of the Aegean Late Bronze Age,<sup>5</sup> in the last two decades sensibly lower datings have been adopted as compared to those proposed by Blegen. Thus, Nancy K. Sandars reached the conclusion that Troy VIIb1 last until the latter half of the 12<sup>th</sup> century, while Troy VIIb 2 covers the end of the 12<sup>th</sup> century, and lasts until the 11<sup>th</sup> century B.C.<sup>6</sup> Taking into consideration the chronology proposed by Sandars, B. Hänsel made a re-evaluation of the relations between the cultures Coslogeni/Zimnicea-Plovdiv and Babadag (and the respectively related groups in Bulgaria) on one hand, and Troy VIIb on the other hand. Admitting that the cultures Zimnicea- Plovdiv, Coslogenic respectively, still exist in the latter half of the 12<sup>th</sup> century, Hänsel establishes the beginning of the Early Hallstatt Period on the lower Danube (= the beginning of the Babadag I phase) at about 1100 B.C.<sup>7</sup> S. Morintz also dates the Babadag I phase in the 11<sup>th</sup> century, but he continues by considering (according to Blegen’s Trojan chronology) that the pottery of the type Zimnicea-Plovdiv and Radovanu appears in the layer VIIb of Troy during the 13<sup>th</sup> and 12<sup>th</sup> centuries B.C.<sup>8</sup> Moreover, in other recent papers the idea is also supported that the appearance in Troy VIIb of the pottery of the type Zimnicea- Plovdiv and Coslogeni may be dated beginning with the 13<sup>th</sup> century B.C.<sup>9</sup>

The interpretation of the relations discussed here has become even more difficult especially after the careful study of the Mycenaean pottery discovered at Troy, which determined Chr. Podzuweit to elaborate for Troy VI-VII a dating sensibly lower even than the datings proposed by Sandars and by Hänsel. Thus, the end of Troy VI (level h) is placed between 1150

and 1100, while the end of Troy VIIa is placed in the first decades of the 11<sup>th</sup> century. It then follows that Troy VIIb only begins sometime during the former half of the 11<sup>th</sup> century.<sup>10</sup>

As for the beginning of the layer Troy VIIb, this dating represents a discrepancy of almost two centuries in comparison with Blegen’s estimations, and of almost one century in comparison with the dating proposed by Sandars and with Hänsel’s chronological evaluations. One has thus, the right to question in what degree is this new dating compatible with the archaeological- historical reality of the Balkan-Danube region, what are its consequences for the chronology of the end of the Bronze Age and the beginning of the Iron Age on the Lower Danube? The question is, primarily, whether the dating of the cultures Zimnicea-Plovdiv, Radovanu and/or Coslogeni as well as Babadag I, placed at the end of the Bronze Age and the beginning of the Hallstatt Period, can be restrained to the last 7-8 decades of the 11<sup>th</sup> century B.C., as would be the result of the new dating of the layer Troy VIIb, in which there appear the types of pottery characteristic for the above- mentioned cultures? It is understandable that such a chronological limitation can in no way correspond to reality.

A possible solution would be the “sliding” in time of the period of existence of these cultures, the chronology established by Podzuweit for Troy VII as prolonged up to the 8<sup>th</sup> century permitting it.<sup>11</sup> But this “solution” is contradicted by the dating of the phase Babadag II that, taking into consideration its relations with the late protogeometric world, was already in existence in the 10<sup>th</sup> century B.C.<sup>12</sup> It follows thus that the phase Babadag I could not have surpassed too much the limit of the 11<sup>th</sup> and 10<sup>th</sup> centuries B.C. So that in Troy the already mentioned Balkan-Danube elements of the end of the Bronze Age and the beginning of the Iron Age (including the pottery of Babadag I type) should be anterior to the first decades (or at least to the middle) of the 10<sup>th</sup> century.

One would perhaps be nearer the truth if one abandons the conception dominant up to now according to which the presence in Troy of the types of pottery men-

4. Tončeva 1985; cf., also, Blegen *et al.* 1958, part 2, fig. 256/37-695 a-b-c, attributed to the layer Troy VIIb, in general.

5. Cf. Hankey and Warren 1974.

6. Sandars 1971, 18-22.

7. Hänsel 1976, I, 234-235.

8. Morintz, 1982, 152-155; 1987, 62-63.

9. Dumitrescu *et al.* 1983, 200; Dumitrescu and Vulpe 1988, 73.

10. Podzuweit 1982, 80-83.

11. Podzuweit 1982, 82; cf., in this regard, also Kimmig 1964, 248-254; Hänsel 1976, I, 234-235.

12. Hänsel 1976, I, 133-134; Morintz 1964, 115; 1987, 63.

tioned above is the result of several successive “waves” of penetration, and instead one admits that one witnesses the penetration of the elements of some cultures whose evolution were, at least partially, synchronic, in different areas. Out of them, the earliest can be considered the Zimnicea-Plovdiv (Čerkovna) culture, spread in the north of the Danube approximately between the towns of Zimnicea and Giurgiu, and southwards up to Plovdiv, in the Marica-valley.<sup>13</sup> The presence of this type of pottery in Troy VIIb could indicate at the most that the end of this culture lasted on till the 11<sup>th</sup> century, its evolution having begun, of course, much earlier. Another question that can be asked is whether the Zimnicea-Plovdiv pottery found in Troy comes from the North Balkan area of this culture or rather from the South Balkan area which is closer to it and where it could have had a longer duration. The many relations of the (late) Zimnicea-Plovdiv culture with the Coslogeni culture (phase II ?), at this time spread westwards up the basin of Mostiștea river, shows the partial contemporaneity of the two neighbouring cultures.<sup>14</sup> During the next period an actual fusion of the two cultures, Coslogeni and Zimnicea-Plovdiv, occurs, having as a result the cultural aspect Radovanu, spread in the South of Romania, between the towns of Oltenița and Zimnicea, as well as in the immediate neighbouring area of Northern Bulgaria, then in the northern part of the former Zimnicea-Plovdiv area.<sup>15</sup> In the area of the town of Bucharest (Chitila) this cultural aspect of the final Bronze Age has already come into contact with the earliest western “Hallstattian” elements, of Susani typ, originating in Banat.<sup>16</sup> To this chronological horizon, corresponding in general to 11<sup>th</sup> century, can also be admitted the evolution at least partly synchronical of the late Coslogeni culture and of the early Babadag culture (phase I). We take into consideration that the phase Babadag I was very restrictedly spread, limited to the North-East of Muntenia, the South of Moldavia and the North of Dobruđja.<sup>17</sup> In the South and South-West of this area (in the future area, much more spread, of the phase Babadag II) the com-

munities of the culture Coslogeni could survive. Such a view is supported by the recent discoveries of Grădiștea Coslogeni (Călărași district) which seem also to confirm the evolution of the Coslogeni culture up to the 11<sup>th</sup> century B.C.<sup>18</sup> The fact that the spreading, at a given moment of the area of the Babadag culture over the whole of Dobruđja did not take place peacefully is indicated by the observations made at Beidaud (Tulcea district), where the Coslogeni habitation level was violently destroyed by strong fire previous to the settling there of a Babadag community.<sup>19</sup>

The surviving of some groups belonging to the final Bronze Age (Radovanu, Coslogeni) until the time corresponding to the period of existence of the phase Babadag I could then explain the co-existence at Troy VIIb, within a limited time, of the pottery of the three cultures. At the same time, if the above conclusions are correct, they evince a gradual transition from the Bronze Age to the Early Iron Age, namely the gradual replacement, all through the 11<sup>th</sup> century, of the Noua-Coslogeni culture with the new groups of the Early Hallstatt Period in different areas of the region of Lower Danube.

Of course, the ideas mentioned above do not mean that the dating of the cultures of the Late Bronze Age on the Lower Danube, as well as their relations with the Aegean world should be restricted to the 11<sup>th</sup> century. In this respect, it is very significant one bone pin with a trumpet-shaped head and with four prominences on the neck, characteristic for the Noua culture (closely related and contemporary with the Coslogeni culture), discovered in the 13b level of Kastanas, in Northern Greece, on the valley of Axios River. The piece, associated with early LH IIIC pottery, was dated in the former half of the 12<sup>th</sup> century.<sup>20</sup> Podzuweit draws a parallel between the level 13b of Kastanas with the latest level (h) of Troy VI;<sup>21</sup> it is thus due only to chance or to the lack of contacts that in the layer VIIa of Troy (or even in the late Troy VI) there were no findings of elements originating in the cultures of the Balkan-Danube region, cultures which surely existed in the respective period.

13. Alexandrescu 1973; Hänsel 1976, I, 76-87; Morintz 1978, 55-61; Morintz 1982, 152-153; Dumitrescu *et al.* 1983, 197-198.

14. Alexandrescu 1973, 80-82; Morintz 1978, 60-61; Dumitrescu *et al.* 1983, 197-200; Dumitrescu and Vulpe 1988, 72-73.

15. Alexandrescu 1973, 80, 82, 84; Morintz 1982, 153; Morintz and Șerbănescu 1985.

16. Morintz, 1987, 61, 66; 1988, 58; 1990, 134.

17. Morintz 1987, 62, 65; 1989, 262-263.

18. Neagu and Nanu 1986; 1990; Diaconu *et al.* 1987; Diaconu 1990.

19. Simion 1989, 216-217.

20. Hochstetter 1981, particularly 252-255.

21. Podzuweit 1982, 81, fig. 4: Chronologische Übersicht.

The dating of the foreign pottery of Troy VIIb in the 11<sup>th</sup> century (so that, after the end of the series of events that shook the Eastern Mediterranean basin beginning with the last decades of the 13<sup>th</sup> century) certainly has a historical significance, too. Because, if

the penetration in Troy of some elements of Balkan-Danubian origin can be also related to some movements of population, these should be considered rather as a consequence and not as a cause of the decline of the Mycenaean power in the Aegean.

## Addendum:

### Troy VII and the north-eastern Balkans in light of new research

Since writing the above paper (László 1990/1997), significant progress has been made in understanding the issue debated, especially due to new excavations and interdisciplinary research carried out in Troy under the leadership of the late professor Manfred Korfmann, as well as to the prompt publication of their results.<sup>22</sup> The purpose of our present paper is not to review the entire issue, but to point out a series of relevant aspects related to the issues discussed above.<sup>23</sup>

#### I.

Among these, we first and foremost find the new views on the historical and chronological background to be of great importance. For several decades, the fluctuation of the dates proposed for the Troy VI and VII layers sometimes misled archaeologists who were looking for chronological reference points, both concerning the Late Bronze Age and the Early Iron Age in the Balkans and in the Lower Danube area, according to their relations with the Aegean world.<sup>24</sup>

Investigation or even re-examination of the Mycenaean and Protogeometric pottery discovered in Troy, correlated with new stratigraphic observations,

enabled specialists to perform a gradual review of the chronology of the VI-VII levels. These data were complemented by information gathered by radiocarbon age determinations; however, it is thought that ceramic sequences may be more accurately dated as compared to C-14 dates.<sup>25</sup> Considering these observations, we will further refer to the data of the “historical chronology” (cross-connections dating), and we will discuss the conclusions of its comparison to radiocarbon dating separately.

Novel research revealed that Troy VI (about 1740-1300 BC) and VII a (VI i, about 1300-1190 BC: LH III B period) were a unitary civilization (*Troianische Hochkultur*), which flourished in the 13<sup>th</sup> century BC. At that time, Troy was known under the name of *Wilusa/Tru(w)isa/Taruisa* in the Hittite sources, *(W)Ilios/Troy* in the Greek sources and *Dardaniya* in the Egyptian ones, which undertook vassalage relations with the Hittite Empire.<sup>26</sup> The city was destroyed by a war that the Trojans lost. This event may correlate with other traces of destruction in the Eastern Mediterranean, and with the fall of the Hittite capital, Boghazköy (Hattusas). Some specialists connect these events, which mark the end of the Bronze Age in

22. See e.g. the volumes of *Studia Troica*, Tübingen, 1, 1991-17, 2007; the exhibition catalogue *Troia–Traum und Wirklichkeit*, Stuttgart, 2001. General presentation of the results from new research in Troy: Korfmann 2004b. About Troy VII b, summarizing the results until the 1995 excavations: Kopenhagen 1997.

23. See also László 1999; 2003.

24. See László 1990/1997; 1999.

25. Cf. Korfmann 2001a, 27. There are some specialists who

also doubt the usefulness of radiocarbon age determinations in dating succeeding phases, since these data are not only generally too high, but also have a very wide range, even in their calibrated version. See Dickinson 2007, 20-21. Manning and Weninger 1992: a critical overview of the Aegean Late Bronze Age radiocarbon evidence.

26. Korfmann 2001a, 39; 2001b, 348-352; 2002, 14; 2004a, 16; 2004b, 29-40; Becks 2003, 51; discussions. See also Blegen *et al.* 1958, 142-144.

these areas, with the “invasion of the Sea Peoples”.<sup>27</sup>

After the break triggered by these events, the Troy VII b period follows, characterized by the onset of a new culture, having obvious Balkan features, but which preserves some older Trojan traditions characteristic of the Late Bronze Age.<sup>28</sup> The archeological remains of this period, attributed to the Early Iron Age, were found both within the citadel (Upper city) and in the Lower city. In addition to the two levels known as a result of C.W. Blegen’s research, i.e. Troy VII b 1 and VII b 2, based on stratigraphic observations during the excavations of 1994-1995, a third phase, VII b 3, was defined, and is possibly followed by stage VII b 4.<sup>29</sup> These phases were mainly dated based on the locally produced Mycenaean pottery and on the imported Protogeometric pottery. Early LH III C pottery characterizes Troy VII b 1, middle LH III C pottery is characteristic of the VII b 1/VII b 2 transition, and late LH III C and sub-Mycenaean pottery characterizes Troy VII b 2.<sup>30</sup> Dates for phase VII b 3 (following directly after VII b 2) depended on Early Protogeometric pottery, especially group I amphoras.<sup>31</sup>

Without even mentioning all the beginning and ending data oscillations for the phases above, recent publications propose the following dating: Troy VII b 1: 1190/1180-1150/1120; Troy VII b 2: 1150/1120-1050/1020; Troy VII b3: 1050/1020-950 BC.<sup>32</sup> Troy VII b 1 is therefore a relatively short phase that ended in a fire, under unclear circumstances,<sup>33</sup> further to which the ruling of the city may have been taken over by the people of a related cultural group.<sup>34</sup> Troy VII b 2 also ended in a fire, probably as a result of a new war,<sup>35</sup> but not excluding the possibility of an earthquake.<sup>36</sup> As concerns the end of the Troy VII b (VII b

3) period, the Late Protogeometric and Early Geometric pottery, discovered in some stratified contexts of the D 9 area (Lower City), seems to suggest the extension of this phase to the 9<sup>th</sup> century BC.<sup>37</sup> It is generally thought, however, that between the middle of the 10<sup>th</sup> century and the creation of the Greek city of Ilion (Troy VIII), which occurred around 720/700 BC, the human population was scarce, living at the foot of the Citadel, or even completely absent.<sup>38</sup>

Given this historical and chronological background, we may reconsider the occurrence in Troy’s VII b phase, of some foreign cultural elements of Balkan-Danube and North-Western Pontic origin.

## II.

This new civilization is currently being considered more thoroughly, taking into consideration both continuous indigenous elements and allogenic components. It is obvious that traditional Trojan pottery manufactured on the wheel, such as the Grey Ware (*Grau Keramik, Anatolische Grauware, Grau-Minysche Ware*) and Tan Ware (*Troianische Tanware*), is manufactured throughout the Troy VII b phase.<sup>39</sup> In the VII b 1 phase, this continuity is also noticed in architecture and building techniques.<sup>40</sup> The novelties are the handmade cooking and storage vessels made from coarse clay, the so-called “Barbarian” or Coarse Ware (*Barbarische Ware*), which is connected to the appearance of a new population of “simple people” of Balkan origins. This is also the age of a new element in dress: the fibulae.<sup>41</sup> The general belief is that Troy VII b 1 is still strongly related to the civilization of the previous phase in spite of these changes, and therefore may be called Troy VI j.<sup>42</sup>

27. Korfmann 1996, 38; 2004b, 33-37; Becks and Thumm 2001, 419. For a recent publication about the collapse of the Bronze Age civilisations and Sea Peoples, see Dickinson 2007, 24-57, with further literature.

28. *Balkanisch geprägte Troia-Kultur*, see Korfmann 2004b, 33. About the older idea of “Balkanization” of Troy, see also Hänsel 1976, 235; Akurgal 1983, 67-68.

29. Korfmann 1995, 22; 2001b, 352; see also Koppenhöfer 1997, 295, 304-309.

30. Mountjoy 1997; 1999a; 1999b, esp. 295, 298: table. About the problems of sub-Mycenaean: Mountjoy 1993, 28-29 and, recently, Dickinson 2007, 21-23, with further literature.

31. Catling 1998, 151-152, 155; Lenz *et al.* 1998, 189, 197; Chabot Aslan 2002, 81-85, 90-96.

32. Koppenhöfer 1997, 346; Becks and Thumm 2001, 421; Becks 2003, 42; Korfmann 2004a, 16: Table; 2004b, 32-33:

Tables.

33. Becks and Thumm 2001, 421.

34. Korfmann 2001b, 352.

35. Becks and Thumm 2001, 423.

36. Chabot Aslan 2002, 84, 96.

37. Chabot Aslan 2002, 81-85, 96.

38. Koppenhöfer 1997, 295; Korfmann 1997, 3-4, 30; 1998, 3-4, 40; 2001a, 26-27; 2004a, 16: Table; 2004b, 33: Table; Catling 1998, 151-152, 155; Lenz *et al.* 1998, 189, 197; Beck and Thumm 2001, 423; Becks 2003, 42.

39. Koppenhöfer 1997, 320; Becks and Thumm 2001, 419; Becks 2003, 49.

40. Becks 2003, 45; Pieniazek-Sikora 2003, 32.

41. Koppenhöfer 1997, 309-312, 320, 333-337; Becks and Thumm 2001, 419-421; Becks 2003, 49-50.

42. Becks 2003, 41, 45, 49-50; Korfmann 2004b, 31; see also Blegen *et al.* 1958, 143-144.

Major changes, i.e. an obvious cultural break, occur in the Troy VII b 2 phase, with new types of constructions and building techniques (e.g. the use of the vertical stones in the wall foundations, so-called *orthostates*), and with the occurrence of a new category of handmade pottery called Knobbed Ware (*Buckelkeramik*), which occurs in a wider variety of shapes, including drinking vessels (cups, jugs). These changes are connected to the arrival of “new people” from the North-Eastern Balkans.<sup>43</sup>

Until recently, it was generally believed that Barbarian Ware and Knobbed Ware of Troy were locally produced, and served the practical or ritual purposes of the “new comers”,<sup>44</sup> Recent geochemical investigations (trace element and isotope analyses) performed on some samples of Troy’s Knobbed Ware and Barbarian Ware revealed that it was not made from local clays. The preliminary results show that at least part of this pottery was imported, but it is impossible to speculate the region of origin. Chemically-similar pottery has been found in Southern Bulgaria. It is possible that, further to their initial “import”, this kind of pottery was also manufactured in Troy. It is also thought that these observations do not contradict the migration theory, i.e. the settlement in Troy of a foreign population.<sup>45</sup>

Barbarian and Knobbed Ware is primarily connected with the settlement in Troy of several population groups belonging to the Noua-Sabatinovka-Coslogeni culture and, later, to the Babadag culture and related groups; however, some works speak generally of the cultures/populations of the Late Bronze Age and the Early Iron Age in the North-Eastern Balkans and North-Western Pontic world without naming them. There were probably two migration “waves”, the second larger than the first.<sup>46</sup> Also, as in the past, Barbarian Ware is generally dated beginning with the Troy VII b 1 level, and Knobbed Ware

with the VII b 2 level.<sup>47</sup> We should nonetheless point out that Barbarian Ware was often discovered together with the Knobbed Ware in certain well-stratified excavation units (Behälter), both in the Upper and in the Lower City, for instance in the Quadrates E 8/9, and D 9 and z 7 North, respectively. Moreover, transitions between Barbarian and Knobbed Ware were noticed.<sup>48</sup> These observations enable us to conclude that Barbarian Ware, initially connected to the Noua-Sabatinovka-Coslogeni culture, should be regarded as a traditional, *usual pottery category*, which managed to outlive the culture in which it occurred. We would also like to emphasize the interactions noticed between the traditional Trojan pottery categories and the foreign pottery. Thus, there occurs the so-called Troy VII Coarse Ware (*Grob Gemagerte VIIer Waren*), made of coarse clay mass, mostly on a potter’s wheel. This phenomenon was accounted for by indigenous potters taking over the technology employed by their “immigrant colleagues”.<sup>49</sup> We wonder if the opposite phenomenon was not possible: wouldn’t it be possible that the new comers had adopted the potter’s wheel technique to manufacture their traditional pottery out of coarse clay? The VII b 2 phase provides us with clear evidence of the influence of foreign pottery on the fine Trojan pottery. For instance, in Grey Ware (*Anatolische Grauware*) there are pottery shapes, and incised and impressed decorative motives, inspired by Knobbed Ware.<sup>50</sup> The transition from the pottery categories of the VII b 1–VII b 2 and VII b 3 phases/levels is therefore slow,<sup>51</sup> which leads to interesting symbioses and interactions that cannot be overlooked when studying foreign pottery in Troy, which, if our understanding is correct, cannot be rigidly classified on categories and levels. From this perspective, one should keep in mind the recent conclusions of C. Chabot Aslan, who, in discussing the Handmade Coarse Ware discovered in Troy, included in this broad

43. Koppenhöfer 1997, 320, 333, 337-341; Becks and Thumm 2001, 421; Becks 2003, 49-51; Korfmann 2004a, 16; 2004b, 31, 33.

44. See Koppenhöfer 1997, 333 and note 159 with further literature; Chabot Aslan 2002, 90-93. The “barbarian” pottery discovered at Mycenae, Korakou and Menelaion-Sparta in Southern Greece is dated to the late LH III B and/or early LH III C period; and on the basis of pottery clay composition analyses it is considered locally produced by the “Northern Intruders”; see Rutter 1975, 17, 29-30; Catling and Catling 1981, 74; French 1989, 48.

45. Guzowska *et al.* 2003; Pieniazek-Sikora 2003, 36; Becks

2003, 50-52.

46. Koppenhöfer 1997, 334-337; 2002; Korfmann 2003, 16; Guzowska *et al.* 2003, 235-249; Becks 2003, 49-52; Pieniazek-Sikora 2003, 32-37; see also the older opinions of Morintz 1964, 114-116; 1982; Hänsel 1976, 229-236.

47. Koppenhöfer 1997, 316, 320, 333; 2002, 679, 702-703; Becks 2001, 419-423; 2003, 49-51; Guzowska *et al.* 2003, 235, 248-249; Pieniazek-Sikora 2003, 32-37.

48. Koppenhöfer 1997, 295, 302-310, 333.

49. Koppenhöfer 1997, 320, 333.

50. Koppenhöfer 1997, 316, 320, 333.

51. See also Koppenhöfer 1997, 295.

category both Barbarian Ware and Knobbed Ware that often cannot be clearly differentiated: “The problem with this classification system is that the shape, fabric and surface treatment vary widely within this general class of handmade coarse wares, and sherds sometimes have features that fit both Knobbed and Barbarian Ware categories”.<sup>52</sup> We also noticed, after consideration of the available information, that Barbarian Ware was present throughout the Troy VII b 1-3 period; it is, however, less clear whether Knobbed Ware occurred strictly beginning with the VII b 2 phase.

### III.

After summarizing the main results of recent work carried out in Troy, we should also examine the significance of the new discoveries and observations as considered from a “Northern perspective”. First and foremost, the emphasis of certain connections with the Aegean world allowed the establishment of a series of chronological reference points. Thus, from the very beginning the dating of the Babadag culture relied on the parallels established with Troy VII b 2,<sup>53</sup> with all the uncertainties resulting from the further changes of the Trojan chronology. Another source of uncertainty was the rough/vague division into periods of the Babadag culture, with its three initial phases. There are difficulties in defining the premises, the descent and the specific characteristics of the first phase of the Babadag culture, which is thought to have been short. In most of the studied sites, the stratigraphic differentiation of the Babadag I phase, both by the preceding discoveries of Noua-Coslogeni type and the following Babadag II phase, is difficult<sup>54</sup>.

We do not propose to repeat conclusions stated on previous occasions concerning the chronological, chorological and possible descent relations between the Noua-Sabatinovka-Coslogeni culture, the “Early Hallstatt horizon” with channeled pottery of Corlăteni-Chișinău type, the Belozerka culture, the cultural groups “pre-Babadag”, Tămăoani and the Babadag culture in different zones, more limited or more extensive, of the Lower Danube region (Southern Moldavia, North-Eastern Wallachia, Dobrudja).<sup>55</sup> The

connections and dates proposed by new research, summarized above in sections 1 and 2, enable us to draw the following conclusions regarding the regions and cultures the foreign Troy VII b pottery originates from.

a. The Coslogeni culture, probably in contact with the Zimnicea-Plovdiv/Čerkovna culture, (still) existed during the Troy VII b 1 phase, being synchronized with the early and (partially) middle LH III C period, and hence dated between the beginning and middle (or the second half) of the 12<sup>th</sup> century BC.

b. Phase I of the Babadag culture and the cultural phenomena directly preceding or related to it (“pre-Babadag”/Tămăoani, Holercani, etc.), characterized by pottery with incised decoration, (already) existed in the Troy VII b 2 phase, being synchronized with the LH III C middle (partially), late and sub-Mycenaean period, and hence dated between the middle (or second half) of the 12<sup>th</sup> century and the middle (or the second half) of the 11<sup>th</sup> century BC. The coexistence in Troy, throughout this phase, of the Knobbed and Barbarian Ware might be a sign not only of the fact that some traditional Coslogeni pottery types were still manufactured, but also of the survival of the Coslogeni culture in some zones of its area until this period.

c. The appearance in Troy of fragments of pottery with stamped decoration,<sup>56</sup> characterizing the Babadag II phase and the related cultural groups (Insula Banului, Psenicevo, Cozia, Saharna-Solonceni), indicates that the transition from the I to the II phase of the Babadag culture occurred most likely during the Troy VII b 3 phase, being synchronized with the Protogeometric period and hence dated between the middle (or second half) of the 11<sup>th</sup> century and the middle of the 10<sup>th</sup> century BC. We note that the dating of the Babadag II phase and of the related cultural groups was possible, regardless of their Trojan connections, in the 10<sup>th</sup>-9<sup>th</sup> centuries BC, due to their contacts with the Protogeometric Aegean.<sup>57</sup>

These reasons support our previous conclusions on a gradual transition from the Late Bronze Age to the Early Iron Age in the Lower Danube and the North-Eastern Balkans; in other words, the gradual

52. See Chabot Aslan 2002, esp. 90-93; the quotation: p. 91.

53. See Morintz 1964, 116.

54. See e.g. Jugănar 2005, esp. 75-83, with further literature.

55. See László 1986; 1997a; 1997b.

56. See e.g. Blegen *et al.* 1958, fig. 282/10-12; 258/8; Koppenhöfer 1997, 320 and fig. 13/10; 16/4, 7.

57. See e.g. Hänsel 1976, 1, 133-134, 139-140, 209-213; 1982, 16-18; and more recently Kašuba 2006.

replacement of the Noua-Sabatinovka-Coslogeni culture by the new cultures of the “Early Hallstatt” (Ha A-B) period, which makes it likely that a (partial) synchronism existed between the late Noua-Coslogeni culture and the emerging Babadag culture, which were in contact in neighboring areas. The occurrence in Troy first of the Barbarian Ware (in the VII b 1 phase), and then also of the Knobbed Ware (in the VII b 2 phase) would therefore not be the result of several strictly successive “waves” (of migration), as previously thought (see above), but the consequence of a quasi continuous influx to the Aegean of certain population groups belonging to the above-mentioned cultural areas.<sup>58</sup>

This pattern could also account for the apparent chronological incongruity noticed in Korakou (Northern Peloponnesos), where, in an archaeological context dated with early LH III C pottery, there were found both pottery similar to that of the Noua-Sabatinovka-Coslogeni culture and Coarse Ware belonging to Troy VII b 1 (pottery group I), and ceramics resembling that of the Babadag I culture and Knobbed Ware belonging to Troy VII b 2 phase (pottery groups II and IV).<sup>59</sup> As we showed on other occasions, the shapes of the Korakou pottery group II (especially the high swinging handle cups) are similar to those specific to the Babadag culture; however, as far as the ornamentation is concerned, there are no concentric circles with tangent lines, which are specific to the Babadag culture (and present on the Knobbed Ware of Troy). Actually, the pottery group II from Korakou best resembles the “Pre-Babadag” and Tămăoani type pottery.<sup>60</sup> We believe that the foreign pottery from Korakou, as a whole, may be connected to the late Coslogeni culture and/or to the emerging Babadag culture, which integrated some features of the Coslogeni culture.

Returning to Troy, lately there have been opinions noticing possible North-Western Pontic influences in the domain of architecture, which may be even more significant than the changes remarked in the production or import of portable artifacts.<sup>61</sup> We are talking of a new building technique: use of flat stones placed

vertically at the foundation of walls (the so-called *orthostates*). This technique is employed exceptionally in the Troy VII b1 phase, is specific to the VII b 2 phase and disappears in the VII b 3 phase, which proves its intrusive nature.<sup>62</sup> Prototypes of this building technique may be found in the Northern Pontic steppe areas, in the stone architecture of the Catacomb, Mnogovalikovaya, Sabatinovka and Belozerka cultures. As for the Coslogeni culture, the stone architecture is at present proven only by way of exception in Durankulak (Southern Dobrogea, Bulgaria), and this is the North-Western Pontic site nearest to Troy, where *orthostates* were used.<sup>63</sup> Starting with the information mentioned above, connections have been made between the spreading of the *orthostate* building technique in Troy VII b2 and the occurrence of the Knobbed Ware in this phase.<sup>64</sup>

The weakness of this reasoning is the fact that the Coslogeni cultural environment, which is the presupposed origin of the *orthostate* technique, is the source of the Barbarian Ware, characteristic of Troy VII b 1 phase, while the Babadag culture, connected to the Knobbed Ware in Troy VII b 2, is not familiar with stone architecture (except of covering with flat stones the earth walls of some defense works). This lack of concordance (that reminds us of J.B. Rutter’s dilemma, related to the Korakou foreign pottery), may be settled only if we admit, as suggested above, the existence of certain complex interconnections (and at least a partial synchronism) between the late Coslogeni culture and the emerging Babadag culture. The simultaneous occurrence of Barbarian Ware and fibulae in Troy during the VII b 1 phase, may be another sign of these contacts, as no certain fibulae discoveries have been acknowledged in the Noua-Sabatinovka-Coslogeni culture. This new type of dress ornament spread in that area during the following “Early Hallstatt” period, with the first Western (Central-European) and Southern (Mediterranean) influences, conventionally dated in the Ha A phase.<sup>65</sup>

Since we have no other direct and unequivocal proof, we could rely on *conventional* radiocarbon dates, in order to be able to set *relative chronology*

58. See László 1990/1997, 92-93; 1999, 28-29; 2003, 108-109.

59. Rutter 1975.

60. László 1999, 30; see also László 1986.

61. Pieniazek-Sikora 2003.

62. Pieniazek-Sikora 2003, 32, 36; Becks 2003, 47-49.

63. Pieniazek-Sikora 2003, 31-33.

64. Pieniazek-Sikora 2003, 35-36.

65. About the “early Hallstattian”, “western” influences, eventually originating from the Banat in the genesis of Babadag culture, see László 1997a.



relations. There is no C-14 dating for the Babadag culture, but a data series exists for the Coslogeni settlement of Durankulak–Golemia Ostrov. Leaving aside the deviated dates obtained for dwelling 15, we refer here to the conventional C-14 dates concerning the dwellings 4, 1 and 5, determined by the Berlin Laboratory (BlN-2570, 2571, 2569):  $2960 \pm 60$ ,  $2930 \pm 60$  and  $2850 \pm 50$  BP.<sup>66</sup> This small series of radiocarbon data lies *between* the series concerning the early Troy VII b1 phase ( $3043 \pm 29$ ,  $2988 \pm 26$ ,  $2963 \pm 31$ ,  $2950 \pm 48$  BP) and the series available for the end of the Troy VII b/ Troy VII b 3 phase ( $2820 \pm 55$ ,  $2812 \pm 56$ ,  $2795 \pm 32$  and  $2786 \pm 42$  BP).<sup>67</sup> Considering this information, the existence (or part of the existence) of the Coslogeni settlement of Durankulak was partially synchronous both with the Troy VII b1 and VII b 2 phases, the latter, in its turn, being synchronized with the Babadag culture. This statement supports our conclusions above (see especially paragraph b) and may account for some late Coslogeni influences in the Troy VII b 2 phase.<sup>68</sup>

Our intention is not to discuss here the conse-

quences of radiocarbon dating on *absolute chronology*. As we said in the first part of this paper, calibrated C-14 dates are significantly higher and cover wider time ranges, as compared to the data of historical chronology. More precise is the dendrochronological <sup>14</sup>C wiggle-matching method, which depends on the existence of dendrochronological sequences to provide us with samples for radiocarbon dating. The method was successfully employed in the dating of the Assiros settlements phases 3-2 (Macedonia), thus setting the beginning of the Protogeometric period at about 1100 BC or even earlier, instead of the traditional dating of 1050/1025 BC.<sup>69</sup> If we accept this dating, this means that the “historical” dates (including those appearing in this paper) should be at least 50-75 years higher.

**Acknowledgment:** The elaboration of this paper would have been impossible without our documentation in foreign libraries. Therefore we would like to particularly thank the Department of Ancient History and the International Office of the University of Konstanz (Germany) for their valuable support.

66. See Bojadžiev 1992, 17.

67. See Koppenhöfer 1997, 314-315.

68. For the position of the Durankulak C-14 data series in the framework of the radiocarbon dates available for the Noua-Sabatinovka-Coslogeni and Belozerka culture settle-

ments and layers 18-10 in Kastanas, as well as for some issues of the Late Bronze Age chronology of Eastern-Central Europe, see László 1993, esp. fig. 1-4; 2006, esp. fig. 7.

69. See Newton *et al.* 2005.

## REFERENCES

- Akurgal, E., 1983. ‘Das dunkle Zeitalter Kleinasiens’, in *Griechenland, die Ägäis und die Levante während der „Dark Ages“ vom 12. bis zum 9. Jh. V. Chr.*, Wien, 67-78.
- Alexandrescu, A.D., 1973. ‘La nécropole du bronze récent de Zimnicea (départ. de Teleorman)’, *Dacia*, N.S. XVII : 77-97.
- Becks, R., 2003. ‘Troy VII: the transition from the Late Bronze Age to the Early Iron Age’, in *Identifying Changes: the transition from Bronze to Iron Ages in Anatolia and its neighbouring regions. Proceedings of the International Workshop Istanbul*, Nov. 8-9. (ed. by B. Fischer *et al.*), Istanbul, 41-53.
- Beck, R. and Thumm, D., 2001. ‘Untergang der Stadt in der Frühen Eisenzeit. Das Ende aus Archäologischer Sicht’, in *Traum und Wirklichkeit. Ausstellungskatalog*, Stuttgart, 419-424.
- Blegen, C.W., Boulter, C.G., Caskey, J.L. and Rawson, M., 1958: *Troy*. Vol. IV. *Settlements VIIa, VIIb and VIII*. Part 1-2, Princeton.
- Bojadžiev, J.D., 1992. ‘*Chronologija na praistoričeskite kulturi na teritorijata na Dobrudža*’, *Dobrudža. Istoričeski Muzej v Dobrič i v Silistra*, 10-19.
- Catling, H.W. and Catling, E.A., 1981. ‘“Barbarian” Pottery from the Mycenaean Settlement at the Meneleion, Sparta’, *BSA* 76, 71-82, Pl. 5-8.
- Catling, R.W.V., 1998. ‘The typology of the Protogeometric and Subprotogeometric Pottery from Troia and its Aegean context’, *Studia Troica* 8, 151-187.
- Chabot Aslan C., 2002. ‘Ilion before Alexander: Protogeometric, Geometric, and Archaic Pottery from D’, *Studia Troica* 12, 80-129, Plates 1-28.

- Diaconu, P., 1990. 'Harpoane de bronz caracteristice culturii Coslogeni', *Symposia Thracologica* 8: 122-123.
- Diaconu, P., Neagu, M. and Basarab, D.N., 1987. 'Date noi despre periodizarea și cronologia culturii Coslogeni', *Symposia Thracologica* 5: 59.
- Dickinson, O., 2007. *The Aegean from Bronze to Iron Age. Continuity and change between the twelfth and eight centuries BC*, London-New York.
- Dumitrescu, Vl., Bolomey, A. and Mogoșanu, F., 1983. *Esquisse d'une préhistoire de la Roumanie*, Bucarest.
- Dumitrescu, Vl. and Vulpe, Al., 1988. *Dacia înainte de Dromichete*, București.
- French, E.B., 1989. 'Possible Northern Intrusions at Mycenae', in *Thracians and Mycenaeans. Proceedings of the fourth International Congress of Thracology. Rotterdam, 24-26 September 1984* (Ed. By J.G.P. Best and N.M.W. de Vries), Leiden-Sofia, 39-51.
- Guzowska, M., Kuleff, I., Pernicka, E. and Satir, M., 2003. 'On the origin of Coarse Ware of Troia VII', in *Troia and the Troad. Scientific Approaches* (ed. by A. Wagner, E. Pernicka, H.-P. Uerpmann), Berlin-Heidelberg, 233-249.
- Hankey, V. and Warren, P., 1974. 'The absolute chronology of the Aegean Late Bronze Age', *BICS* 21: 142-152.
- Hänsel, B., 1976. *Beiträge zur regionalen und chronologischen Gliederung der älteren Hallstattzeit an der unteren Donau. Teil 1, Text; Teil 2, Tafeln, Karten und Beilage mit Erläuterungen* (Beiträge für Ur- und Frühgeschichtliche Archäologie des Mittelmeer Kulturraumes 16/17), Bonn: Habelt.
- Hänsel, B., 1982. 'Südosteuropa zwischen 1600 und 1000 v. Chr.', in *Südosteuropa zwischen 1600 und 1000 v. Chr.* (PAS, Band 1), Berlin, 1-38.
- Hochstetter, A., 1981. 'Eine Nadel der Noua-Kultur aus Nordgriechenland. Ein Beitrag zur absolute Chronologie der späten Bronzezeit im Karpatenbecken', *Germania* 59: 239-259.
- Jugănar, G., 2005. *Cultura Babadag*, I, Tulcea-Constanța.
- Kašuba, M., 2006. 'Fibeln mit Bügelkugeln in der Moldau und Anmerkungen zum ägäischen Einfluss im 10.-9. Jahrhundert v. Chr.' *PZ* 81/2, 213-235.
- Kimmig, W., 1964. 'Seevölkerbewegung und Urnenfelderkultur. Ein archäologisch-historischer Versuch', in R.V. Uslar and K.J. Narr (eds), *Studien aus Alteuropa*, I (Köln: Böhlau): 220-283.
- Koppenhöfer, D., 1997. 'Troia VII-Versuch einer Zusammenschau einschliesslich der Ergebnisse des Jahres 1995', *Studia Troica* 7, 295-353.
- Koppenhöfer, D., 2002. 'Buckelkeramik und Barbarische Ware in Troia: Anmerkungen zur Herkunft', *Mauerschau. Festschrift für Manfred Korfmann*, Band 2 (Hrsg. R. Aslan et al.), Remshalden, 679-704.
- Korfmann, M., 1995. 'Troia-Ausgrabungen 1994', *Studia Troica* 5, 1-38.
- Korfmann, M., 1996. 'Troia-Ausgrabungen 1995', *Studia Troica* 6, 1-64.
- Korfmann, M., 1997. 'Troia-Ausgrabungen 1996', *Studia Troica* 7, 1-71.
- Korfmann, M., 1998. 'Troia-Ausgrabungen 1997', *Studia Troica* 8, 1-70.
- Korfmann, M., 2001a. 'Troia/Wilusa-Ausgrabungen 2000', *Studia Troica* 11, 1-50.
- Korfmann, M., 2001b. 'Der prähistorische Siedlungshügel Hissarlik. Die "zehn Städte Troias" – vom unten nach oben', in *Traum und Wirklichkeit. Ausstellungskatalog*, Stuttgart, 347-354.
- Korfmann, M., 2002. 'Die Arbeiten in Troia/Wilusa 2001', *Studia Troica* 12, 1-33.
- Korfmann, M., 2004a. 'Die Arbeiten in Troia/Wilusa 2003', *Studia Troica* 14, 3-31.
- Korfmann, M., 2004b. 'Troia in Light of New Research', *Keynote lecture at the Dies Academicus 2003 at Trier University, 12 November. Reden an der Universität Trier*, 2. English Edition (Ed. by H. Neyes), 9-70.
- László, A., 1986. 'Grupul Tămăoani. Asupra "orizontului" hallstattian timpuriu cu ceramica incizată din sudul Moldovei', *Memoria Antiquitatis* 12-14 (1980-1982), 65-91.
- László, A., 1990/1997. 'Troy and the Lower Danube region at the end of the Bronze Age', *Studia Antiqua et Archaeologica* 3-4 (1996-1997), 89-96. Paper prepared for the International Congress *Archaeology and Heinrich Schliemann. A Century after his Death*, Athens, Greece, April 14-22, 1990.
- László, A., 1993. 'Dates radiocarbone et chronologie de la civilisation Noua-Sabatinovka-Coslogeni', *Culture et Civilisation au Bas Danube* 10, 23-42.
- László, A., 1997a. 'On the origin, development and chronology of the first Iron Age at the Lower Danube', *Prima epocă a fierului la gurile Dunării și în zonele circum-pontice. Lucrările Colocviului Internațional, Tulcea, Septembrie 1993*, Tulcea, 67-84.
- László, A., 1997b. 'De l'âge du bronze à l'âge du fer ancien dans la région isto-pontique. Quelques observations à propos de certains ouvrages récents', *Thracia Pontica* VI/1. Sozopol, 137-145.
- László, A., 1999. 'La fin de l'âge du bronze au Bas-Danube et le monde mycénien. Relations et chronologie', *The Periphery of the Mycenaean World. Proceedings of The 1st International Interdisciplinary Colloquium, Lamia 1994*, Lamia, 27-33.
- László, A., 2003. 'The Periphery of the Periphery: the Lower Danube and Northern Aegean World from the Bronze Age to the Early Iron Age. Cultural interrelations: a short review', *The Periphery of the Mycenaean World. Proceedings of the 2nd International Interdisciplinary Colloquium, Lamia 1999*, Athens, 107-112.

- László, A., 2006. 'Über die Beziehungen, die kulturelle und chronologische Lage der Bronzefunde vom Typ Ópályi-Uriu-Drajna de Jos-Lozova-Pobit Kamäk', *Bronzezeitliche Depotfunde—Problem der Interpretation. Materialien der Festkonferenz für Tivodor Lehoczky zum 175. Geburtstag, Ushhorod, 5-6. Oktober 2005*, Užgorod, 124-143.
- Lenz, D., Ruppenstein, F., Baumann, M. and Catling R.W.V., 1998. 'Protogeometric pottery at Troia', *Studia Troica* 8, 189-222.
- Manning, S.W. and Weninger, B., 1992. 'A light in the dark: archaeological wiggle matching and the absolute chronology of the close of the Aegean Late Bronze Age', *Antiquity* 66 (1992): 636-663.
- Morintz, S., 1964. 'Quelques problèmes concernant la période ancienne du Hallstatt au Bas-Danube à la lumière des fouilles de Babadag', *Dacia, N.S.* 8, 101-118.
- Morintz, S., 1978. *Contributii arheologice la istoria tracilo timpurii. I. Epoca bronzului în spațiul carpato-balcanic*, București.
- Morintz, S., 1982. 'Les Thraces de la Troie dans le dernier quart du II- de millénaire av. n. e.', in *Thracia Pontica I: premier symposium international: La Mer Noire et le monde Méditerranéen, Sozopol, 9-12 octobre 1979* (Sofia: Centre d'Histoire Maritime et d'Archéologie Sous-Marine): 151-155.
- Morintz, S., 1987. 'Noi date și probleme privind perioadele hallstattiană timpurie și mijlocie în zona istro-pontică', *Thraco-Dacica VIII*: 39-71.
- Morintz, S., 1988. 'Aspecte și probleme ale Hallstattului timpuriu din sud-vestul României', *Symposia Thracologica* 6: 58-60.
- Morintz, S., 1989. 'Aspecte și probleme noi referitoare la cultura Babadag', *Symposia Thracologica* 7: 262-265.
- Morintz, S., 1990. 'Probleme privind perioada hallstattiană timpurie în centrul Cîmpiei Române', *Symposia Thracologica* 8: 134-135.
- Morintz, S. and Serbănescu, D., 1985. 'Rezultatele cercetărilor de la Radovanu', *Thraco-Dacica VI* : 5-28.
- Mountjoy, P.A., 1993. *Mycenaean Pottery. An Introduction*, Oxford.
- Mountjoy, P.A., 1997. 'Local Mycenaean Pottery at Troia', *Studia Troica* 7, 259-267.
- Mountjoy, P.A., 1999a. 'The destruction of Troia VI h', *Studia Troica* 9, 253-293.
- Mountjoy, P.A., 1999b. 'Troia VII reconsidered', *Studia Troica* 9, 295-346.
- Neagu, M. and Nanu, D.B., 1986. 'Considerații preliminare asupra așezării eponime de la Grădiștea Coslogeni, județul Călărași', *Cultură și civilizație la Dunărea de Jos II*: 99-128.
- Neagu, M. and Nanu, D.B., 1990. 'Probleme ale studierii tracilor timpurii la Dunărea de Jos', *Symposia Thracologica* 8: 124.
- Newton, M., Wardle, K.A. and Kuniholm, P.I., 2005. 'Dendrochronology and radiocarbon Determinations from Assiros and the beginning of the Greek Iron Age', *To Archaikologiko ergo ste Makedonia kai ste Thrake* 17, 2003, Thessaloniki, 173-190.
- Pieniazek-Sikora, M., 2003. 'Some comments on Northwest Pontic and North Aegean settlement architecture in the last quarter of the second millennium BC', in *Identifying Changes: the Transition from Bronze to Iron Ages in Anatolia and its Neighbouring Regions. Proceedings of the International Workshop Istanbul*, November 8-9, 2002 (ed. by B. Fischer et al.), Istanbul, 29-39.
- Podzuweit, C., 1982. 'Die mykenische Welt und Troja', in *Südosteuropa zwischen 1600 und 1000 v. Chr.* (Berlin: Moreland): 65-88.
- Rutter, J.B., 1975. 'Ceramic evidence for Northern Intruders in Southern Greece at the beginning of the Late Helladic III C Period', *AJA* 79/ 1, 17-32, pl. 1-3.
- Sandars, N.K., 1971. 'From Bronze Age to Iron Age: a sequel to a sequel', in J. Boardman, M.A. Brown and T.G.E. Powell (eds), *The European Community in Later Prehistory: Studies in Honour of C. F. C. Hawkes* (London: Routledge and K. Paul): 3-29.
- Simion, G., 1989. 'Geneza civilizației geto-dace (sec. VI-V î.e.n.)', *Symposia Thracologica* 7: 213-223.
- Tončeva, G., 1985. 'Problèmes de l'art de l'âge du bronze récent en Bulgarie du nord-est', in *Thracia Pontica II, deuxième simposium[sic]international: Le littoral Thrace et son rôle dans le Monde ancien, Sozopol 4-8 octobre 1982* (Jambol): 297-306.