

## POTTERY FROM TROY

MOUNTJOY (P. A.) *Troy VI Middle, VI Late and VII. The Mycenaean Pottery*. (Studia Troica, Monographien 9.) Pp. 464, ills, maps. Bonn: Dr Rudolf Habelt, 2017. Paper, €95. ISBN: 978-3-7749-4067-3. doi:10.1017/S0009840X18001592

In this monographic treatment of the Mycenaean Pottery from Troy, M., the renowned authority on the subject, presents a synthesis of the Mycenaean pottery found at the site during the Blegen excavations of 1932 to 1938 and the most recent Korfmann excavations. Reference is also made to some unstratified material from the Schliemann excavations.

M.'s earlier work on the Mycenaean pottery of the Blegen excavations is incorporated in the volume in the form of reprints of three separate articles from *Studia Troica* 7 (1997): 'Troy VI<sup>f</sup> and Phase VI<sup>g</sup>: the Mycenaean Pottery', and *Studia Troica* 9 (1999): 'The Destruction of Troy VI<sup>h</sup>' and 'Troy VII Reconsidered'. In these studies M. combined the presentation of the pottery with an analysis of relevant deposits in order to provide a sound basis for dating the Trojan phases under discussion. The newly published material presented derives exclusively from the Korfmann excavations and comprises around two thirds of the book. The Mycenaean pottery is studied according to its find locations and contexts, such as the Citadel, the Lower Town abutting the citadel and the different parts of the Lower Town. The detailed analysis of the Mycenaean pottery found during the Korfmann excavations confirmed the LH IIIA2 date of the VI<sup>h</sup> destruction horizon (most probably caused by an earthquake), suggested by M. on the basis of her study of the Blegen material.

By integrating in one volume all the Mycenaean pottery finds of Troy, M. offers a complete picture of the Mycenaean pottery regarding both its typological and its geographical distribution. The Blegen excavations uncovered the largest amount of Mycenaean deposits around the Citadel area, while the bulk of material from the Korfmann excavations was found in the Lower Town.

Chronologically, Mycenaean pottery was found in the Middle and Late Phases VI and Phase VII of Troy. In Mycenaean chronological terms, Phase VI<sup>d</sup>, VI<sup>e</sup> and VI<sup>f</sup> represents the Early Mycenaean, i.e. Late Helladic (LH) IIA–IIB, Phase VI<sup>g</sup> the LH IIIA1 periods, while Phase VI<sup>h</sup> destruction deposits provide a large number of LH IIIA2 material. Phase VII<sup>a</sup> deposits and its destruction layers represent the LH IIIB and the Transitional LH IIIB2–C periods and Phase VII<sup>b</sup>1 and VII<sup>b</sup>2 correspond to the LH IIIC Middle and Middle-Late period of Mycenaean pottery production. The earlier phases (VI<sup>f</sup> and VI<sup>g</sup>) are best represented on the Citadel (Blegen excavations). The LH IIIA2 Phase VI<sup>h</sup> destruction deposits could be isolated on both the Citadel and in the central Lower Town (Korfmann excavations). Stratified deposits of the LH IIIB2–C Phase VII<sup>a</sup> destruction were also encountered both on the Citadel, in the area abutting the Citadel and in the central Lower Town.

M.'s intention, as stated in the preface, was to link the deposition of pottery to the stratigraphy of the site. However, for technical reasons, this was not possible. Moreover, the Mycenaean ceramic material found at Troy constitutes only a small part of the total assemblage and is in a very fragmentary state. This makes it difficult to assign the sherds to a specific shape and their decoration to a particular motif. Another difficulty that pottery specialists of the site were faced with is that it was extremely difficult to separate the Phase VII Mycenaean pottery from the Iron Age material as both, and especially the fragments with linear decoration, had a similar appearance. For this reason no statistical analysis of the shapes and motifs could be carried out.

As Neutron Activation Analysis (NAA) has demonstrated, from the earliest appearance of Mycenaean pottery in Troy (LH IIA in Phase VI*d*) the largest amount was locally produced. Local production, imitation and adaptation of Mycenaean pottery is a widespread phenomenon in areas outside mainland Greece, that is why the term 'Aegean-style pottery' is now generally used to define this class of pottery. However, due to the long history of research at Troy and thus for reasons of unity, M. decided to continue using the term Mycenaean in this volume.

Imported Mycenaean pottery is also present at the site. In the case of the LH IIA to IIIA2 pottery, one clay group, A-Troy, had a very similar clay composition, but not the same as the Mycenae/Berbatı group, therefore NAA could not establish with certainty whether pottery made of this clay was imported or locally produced. LH IIIB and IIIC, Troy Phase VIIa to VIIb2 pottery is dominated by local production (B-Troy group). From phase VIIb1 (LH IIIC Early phase extending to early LH IIIC Middle) assemblages NAA has isolated imports from different areas of Mainland Greece, the Aegean islands including Euboea, Aegina and Crete, testifying that Troy was part of broad exchange networks that were not affected by the palatial collapse in Mainland Greece.

Following the two analytical chapters (i.e. the three reprinted articles and the detailed study of the Mycenaean pottery finds of the Korfmann excavations), the last part of the book contains a detailed overview of the pottery consisting of a comparative typochronological analysis of the finds from the earlier and the more recent excavations (pp. 354–439), and three shorter essays on the distribution of Early Mycenaean pottery at Troy (p. 440), on Mycenaean shapes imitated in local Grey and Tan ware highlighted by the Blegen excavations (pp. 440–8) and on the ceramic connections of Troy in the LH IIIC Early and Middle phases as part of the East Aegean–West Anatolian Interface (pp. 448–58). This last part of the book is especially relevant for the more general reader as it gives a complete overview of the local and imported Mycenaean pottery found at Troy. Characteristic of Troy is the widespread local production of Mycenaean pottery from the earlier periods (Phase VI*d* LH IIA) onwards, which can be easily distinguished by the use of local clay containing gold mica. The local production is especially apparent in the large corpus of the long Phase VIIa (LH IIIB–LH IIIC Early) when, besides the imports and local manufacture of Mycenaean pottery including Mycenaean shapes imitated in Grey and Tan Ware, Mycenaean style decoration was also adapted on the local Grey and Tan Ware forms. In the last essay M. places Troy and its ceramic production in its wider Aegean context, the so-called East Aegean–West Anatolian Interface, a term introduced by M. (*Regional Mycenaean Decorated Pottery* [1999], pp. 967–9). Troy is situated at the northern end of the Interface, where the number of excavated and published sites of the period are few in number, thus the comparative ceramic material from the surrounding area is limited. This explains the rather peripheral position of Troy concerning the Aegean-style pottery.

The discussion of the pottery throughout is richly illustrated by line drawings and accompanied by plans of the find contexts. However, photographic illustrations of the pottery, including section photographs showing the most common fabrics, are not included. These would have been a welcome addition as they would have provided a better visual understanding of the appearance of the Mycenaean / Aegean-style pottery found at Troy.

This volume is an important contribution to Mycenaean pottery studies and especially in the understanding of the local production of Mycenaean / Aegean-style pottery in the wider North-East Aegean region of the Late Bronze Age.

*The Hague, The Netherlands*

JUDIT HAAS-LEBEGYEV  
[ljuditl@gmail.com](mailto:ljuditl@gmail.com)