“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 VIIb2.1 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, Psenicevo). The German professor considers that these three successive moments last in time between the latter half of the 12th century and the 10th, or even the 9th century B.C.2

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 13th and the 11th-10th centuries B.C.3

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 (??) 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-Nouă”.4

As far as the chronology of Troy VII is concerned, together with the reconsideration of the chronology of the Aegean Late Bronze Age,3 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 VIIb last until the latter half of the 12th century, while Troy VIIb 2 covers the end of the 12th century, and lasts until the 11th century B.C.6 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 12th 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.7 S. Morintz also dates the Babadag I phase in the 11th 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 12th and 12th centuries B.C.8 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 13th century B.C.9

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 11th century. It then follows that Troy VIIb only begins sometime during the former half of the 11th century.10

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 archaeologival-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 11th 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 8th century permitting it.11 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 10th century B.C.12 It follows thus that the phase Babadag I could not have surpassed too much the limit of the 11th and 10th 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 10th 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.
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. The presence of this type of pottery in Troy could indicate at the most that the end of this culture lasted on till the 11th 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. 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. 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 type, originating in Banat. To this chronological horizon, corresponding in general to 11th 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 Dobrudja. In the South and South-West of this area (in the future area, much more spread, of the phase Babadag II) the communities of the culture Coslogeni could survive. Such a view is supported by the recent discoveries of Gradăștea Coslogeni (Călărași district) which seem also to confirm the evolution of the Coslogeni culture up to the 11th century B.C. The fact that the spreading, at a given moment of the area of the Babadag culture over the whole of Dobrudja 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.

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 11th 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 11th 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 12th century. Podzuweit draws a parallel between the level 13b of Kastanas with the latest level (h) of Troy VI; 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.

15. Alexandrescu 1973, 80, 82, 84; Morintz 1982, 153; Morintz and Șerbănescu 1985.
21. Podzuweit 1982, 81, fig. 4: Chronologische Übersicht.
The dating of the foreign pottery of Troy VIIb in the 11th century (so that, after the end of the series of events that shook the Eastern Mediterranean basin beginning with the last decades of the 13th 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:

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. 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.

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.

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 layers. 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. 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 13th century BC. At that time, Troy was known under the name of Wilusa/Tru(w)isa/Taruisa in the Hittite sources, WIIlos/Troy in the Greek sources and Dardaniya in the Egyptian ones, which undertook vassalage relations with the Hittite Empire. 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

23. See also László 1999; 2003.
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”.

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. 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.

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. Dates for phase VII b 3 (following directly after VII b 2) depended on Early Protogeometric pottery, especially group I amphoras.

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 b 3: 1050/1020-950 BC.

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. In the VII b 1 phase, this continuity is also noticed in architecture and building techniques. 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. 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.
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.43

Until recently, it was generally believed that Barbarian Ware and Knobbled Ware of Troy were locally produced, and served the practical or ritual purposes of the “new comers”.44 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.45

Barbarian and Knobbled 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.46 Also, as in the past, Barbarian Ware is generally dated beginning with the Troy VII b 1 level, and Knobbled Ware with the VII b 2 level.47 We should nonetheless point out that Barbarian Ware was often discovered together with the Knobbled 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 Knobbled Ware were noticed.48 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 Gemagerter 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”.49 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 Knobbled Ware.50 The transition from the pottery categories of the VII b 1–VII b 2 and VII b 3 phases/levels is therefore slow,51 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

---

44. See Koppenhöfer 1997, 333 and note 159 with further literature; Chabot Aslan 2002, 90-93. The “barbarian” pottery discovered at Mycenae, Korakou and Menelao-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.
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”. 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 parallelisms established with Troy VII b 2, 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.

We do not propose to repeat conclusions stated on previous occasions concerning the chronological, chronological 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). 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/Cerkovna 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 12th century BC.

b. Phase I of the Babadag culture and the cultural phenomena directly preceding or related to it (“pre-Babadag”/Tâmăoani, 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 12th century and the middle (or the second half) of the 11th 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, characterizing the Babadag II phase and the related cultural groups (Insula Banului, Psenicevo, Cozia, Saharna-Solonenzi), 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 11th century and the middle of the 10th 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 10th-9th centuries BC, due to their contacts with the Protogeometric Aegean.

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.
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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 Kasuba 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.58

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).59 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 Tâmaoani type pottery.60 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.61 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 b 1 phase, is specific to the VII b 2 phase and disappears in the VII b 3 phase, which proves its intrusive nature.62 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.63 Starting with the information mentioned above, connections have been made between the spreading of the orthostate building technique in Troy VII b 2 and the occurrence of the Knobbed Ware in this phase.64

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.65

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

60. László 1999, 30; see also László 1986.
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 ± 60, 2930 ± 60 and 2850 ± 50 BP.66 This small series of radiocarbon data lies between the series concerning the early Troy VII bl phase (3043 ± 29, 2988 ± 26, 2963 ± 31, 2950 ± 48 BP) and the series available for the end of the Troy VII b/ Troy VII b 3 phase (2820 ± 55, 2812 ± 56, 2795 ± 32 and 2786 ± 42 BP).67 Considering this information, the existence (or part of the existence) of the Coslogeni settlement of Durankulak was partially synchronous both with the Troy VII bl 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.68

Our intention is not to discuss here the consequences 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 14C 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.69 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.
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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-
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