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This is a tremendously important volume for understanding one of the best documented and most thoroughly published of prehistoric Aegean centres. S.’s painstaking and detailed documentation, and penetratingly insightful interpretation of its complex record, are a testament to the breadth of interest, open-mindedness and commitment she brought to the project, and make this an exceptional resource for addressing a very wide range of questions in southern Aegean prehistory.
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This volume presents the revised dating evidence for the Early Phrygian destruction level and the burial Tumulus MM at the Phrygian site of Gordion. The volume is divided into seven chapters written by members of the Gordion excavation team and specialists in dendrochronology and radiocarbon dating. Although many of the chapters could stand alone as articles, the editors have skilfully arranged the volume so that together they form a narrative. The book reads somewhat like a detective story, beginning with false assumptions, followed by new clues emerging from scientific studies, and then, finally, the new dates provide solutions to various conundrums and loose ends. It is both the story of an excavation and the story of developments in radiocarbon and dendrochronological dating. It is also a cautionary tale about building an elaborate system of entwined interpretations on flimsy foundations.

Gordion is a large, multiphased site in central Anatolia with a citadel mound, lower city and large burial tumuli. The Phrygian-period citadel was destroyed in a conflagration that marked the end of the Early Phrygian phase. For decades scholars have accepted the date of this destruction level (c. 690–695 B.C.) as one of the few relatively secure Iron Age dates in Anatolia, thinking that the destruction could be linked to the death of King Midas during the Cimmerian attack on Gordion. The volume overturns that supposedly secure date with evidence from dendrochronology and short-lived radiocarbon samples, describing the process and reasoning by which scholars came to their new conclusions about the chronology.

The introduction concisely sets out the new dating sequence at Gordion and briefly considers the impact of the new dates. The Early Phrygian destruction level on the citadel has now been dated to the late ninth century. The construction of Tumulus MM, previously dated to the early seventh century, is now dated to c. 740 B.C. Adjustments are made for the sequence of other tumuli and for the overall site phases, with the Early Phrygian phase now dated to 900–800 B.C. and the Middle Phrygian phase to after 800–540s B.C.

The first three chapters are among the most interesting, showing how archaeological interpretations can become deeply entrenched and hard to challenge. In Chapter 1, K. DeVries discusses how the original date of the destruction level was established. Inferences were made from two main textual sources: first, that King Midas died during the Cimmerian invasion (based on Strabo 1.3.21), and second, that King Midas died in
696 or 695 B.C. (based on the Chronicle of Eusebius). After discovering the Early Phrygian destruction layer in the 1950s, excavation director Rodney Young first tentatively suggested that the destruction was caused by the Cimmerians and thus could be dated to the late seventh century B.C. Over time, this suggestion became generally accepted and was only rarely questioned. Arguments about dating other structures, such as the tumuli, were based on the assumed late seventh-century date for the destruction of the citadel and the death of King Midas. Chapter 2, by M. Voigt and DeV., describes some of the mounting problems with the evidence that finally prompted scholars to revisit the sequence. In Chapter 3, DeVries starts to pull apart the faulty underpinnings of the original dating, evaluating the textual evidence for King Midas and the Cimmerian attack in much more detail. What emerges is that the textual evidence is far from conclusive in both dating King Midas and placing him at the same time as the Cimmerian attacks. DeV. casts significant doubt on the accuracy of Strabo’s account of Midas and the Cimmerians; in fact, there seems to be little textual or archaeological evidence for the Cimmerians causing a destruction at Gordion, despite the troubles they caused elsewhere.

In Chapter 4, K. Sams considers the compatibility of artefact dates with the new chronology. Special attention is given to carved orthostates, bronze bowls, fibulae, arrowheads and pottery. As S. shows, the new chronology helps account for some previous problems in the sequencing of finds from the citadel and the tumuli. The re-dating of the artefacts will have repercussions for scholars working at other sites, especially for dating certain fibulae types. This chapter also highlights the extent of Gordion’s wealth and trade connections, which now must be understood within the ninth and early eighth century B.C. One wishes that this chapter could have been longer, with more extensive discussion and illustration of artefact types, their sequence and dating.

In Chapter 5, P. Kuniholm, M. Newton and R. Liebhart provide an extensive presentation of the dendrochronological evidence. They begin with a historical overview of dendrochronological research at Gordion. It is important to note that Gordion’s sequence of 1,028 years is the longest for one site in the Aegean and Near East and that it forms the basis for second- and first-millennium B.C. dendrochronology in the region. L. uses a variety of evidence to argue that the logs for Tumulus MM were probably felled specifically for this construction project and that the date of 740 B.C. can now be seen as a secure chronological point for the construction of the tumulus. The wood samples from the citadel are missing their outer rings and bark and therefore cannot provide such precise dating, but instead can give terminus post quem dates in the eleventh to ninth centuries B.C. for the construction or repair of various structures on the citadel. The chapter ends with a useful catalogue of dendrochronological samples from Gordion, their context, preservation and date.

Chapter 6, by S. Manning and B. Kromer, considers the radiocarbon dating evidence. Again, this chapter begins with a history of radiocarbon dating at Gordion. The dating for the destruction level is based primarily on short-lived seed samples that point to a date range of 835–795 B.C. for the destruction. A positive feature of this chapter is that the authors discuss in detail various possible objections or issues with the C-14 results and attempt to resolve or address them.

This volume can be seen as a rather brave endeavour in that it admits that an excavation team was wrong about a key interpretation. As a result, the revised chronology will encourage scholars to look again at the Gordion material in comparison with other sites. The revised dating means that many of the most impressive Phrygian buildings and artefacts were earlier than previously thought, and scholars will need to re-evaluate interpretations of Iron Age Anatolia in the ninth and eighth centuries B.C. Likewise, the developments at Gordion will also need to be reframed in reference to the growing scholarship and new
discoveries from the Neo-Hittite kingdoms. For these reasons, this volume stands as an important contribution to Iron Age studies.
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This fascicule presents 134 Attic red-figured and white-ground vases in the collection of the Archaeological Institute of the University of Göttingen including several generous loans from the Staatliche Museen in Berlin. A good variety of large and small vessels, many fragmentary, comprise the collection, some acquired long ago through purchase and private donations, others more recently (p. 7). J. Ruppel, the conservator for the Institute, expertly restored the vases and S. Eckardt provided the superb digital photography. Several of the fragments join others in various museums, indicating how easily fragments may become separated; the photo montages of these vases are a valuable contribution (see p. 8, and Beil. 17, 3; 19, 1–2; 21; 24–9).

Each entry follows the format established for the CVA: provenance (if known); dimensions; bibliography. The descriptions are meticulous, beginning with the condition; then details of drawing, such as relief line, the character of the glaze, its colour, thinness or thickness, and features of the shape; next, ornamental and figural decoration, followed by comparanda for the painter, shape, ornament and representation. Thus, the reader knows exactly what to expect from each entry and the excellent colour plates illustrate many details not visible in black-and-white photographs. A special bonus: unless specified, nearly all the fragments and small vases, as well as the drawings and graffiti, are presented at a scale of 1:1.

The text begins with large shapes: amphorae, a loutrophoros, pelikai and hydriai (pls 1–7, 1–2 and 10). A fragment of an amphora by the Berlin Painter shows a woman holding a dolphin, perhaps Amphitrite (K 601: pl. 2, 1), and another fragment depicting a frontal youth is near Onesimos (K 603: pl. 2, 3). Beazley attributed to the Villa Giulia Painter a well-preserved pelike depicting two acolytes on the obverse (K 605: pl. 3, 1, 3 and 5). Next come hydriai, all very fragmentary. Quite enigmatic is the unattributed late-fifth-century fragment preserving part of a woman and the trunk of a palm tree (K 614: pl. 7, 1). At this point, the catalogue does not continue with large vessels but switches to small ones: oinochoai, pyxides, an epinetra, lekythoi, a guttus, a feeder and askoi. This is not the usual arrangement in a CVA; why the change? The oinochoai are very fragmentary. Interesting are the dignified bearded man with a staff (K 617: pl. 7, 4) and a fragment of a little chous with part of a go-cart laden with an oinochoe (K 621: pl. 7, 8), a reference to the Anthesteria. A well-preserved unattributed pyxis Type A depicts preparations for a wedding: the bride with attendants and Erotes (K 624: pl. 8 and Beil. 20, 1). K 629 (pl. 9, 8–11) is an elegant black-glazed pyxis Type A. An epinetron fragment (K 630: pl. 9, 12) shows part of a woman standing before a door, a wool basket on the ground in front of her. Of interest among the lekythoi is K 635 (pl. 13) by the Achilles Painter.