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The archaeological site of Gordion in central Anatolia is best known as the seat of King Midas of Phrygia, he of the mythical ‘golden touch,’ whose reign is documented in Assyrian texts dating to the late 8th century BCE. But while Midas is the only historically attested ruler of Phrygia, the site is a multiperiod settlement mound, surrounded by over 100 monumental earthen burial mounds, or tumuli. Archaeological excavation of these remains supports the notion that a complex polity based at Gordion was established and thrived there over the course of the Early and Middle Iron Ages, ca. 1200–600 BCE. Relatively little work has been done to elucidate the sociopolitical organization or development of such a polity, however, beyond the simplistic reconstruction of a dynasty of kings whose royal burials are preserved in the tumulus fields. In this dissertation, I re-examine the evidence for sociopolitical formation at the Gordion citadel mound in the centuries before Midas. The city’s urban plan underwent a period of rapid expansion and monumentalization between ca. 1000–800 BCE; this process of urbanization was only briefly interrupted when a massive fire swept through the city ca. 800, destroying many of its buildings and preserving their rich contents in situ. I combine diachronic analysis of the citadel mound architecture with a synchronic evaluation of the activities taking place within at the time of its destruction, focusing on the well-provisioned Terrace Complex, one of the last and most significant alterations to the city before the fire. I frame these investigations in a theoretical framework derived from feasting studies and the archaeology of performance to reconstruct the suite of collective and commensal practices associated with the emergence of a Phrygian social and political identity at this transformative moment in the city’s history. I ultimately conclude that we should conceive of Early Phrygian Gordion not as the seat of a ruler, but as a central place where group identity was negotiated in the context of communal feasts, arguing that the case of Gordion illustrates the importance of collective action to the emergence of early complex polities.
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A MOVEABLE FEAST:
PRODUCTION, CONSUMPTION, AND STATE FORMATION AT EARLY PHRYGIAN GORDION

Kathryn R. Morgan
C. Brian Rose, Lauren Ristvet

The archaeological site of Gordion in central Anatolia is best known as the seat of King Midas of Phrygia, he of the mythical ‘golden touch,’ whose reign is documented in Assyrian texts dating to the late 8th century BCE. But while Midas is the only historically attested ruler of Phrygia, the site is a multiperiod settlement mound, surrounded by over 100 monumental earthen burial mounds, or tumuli. Archaeological excavation of these remains supports the notion that a complex polity based at Gordion was established and thrived there over the course of the Early and Middle Iron Ages, ca. 1200–600 BCE. Relatively little work has been done to elucidate the sociopolitical organization or development of such a polity, however, beyond the simplistic reconstruction of a dynasty of kings whose royal burials are preserved in the tumulus fields. In this dissertation, I re-examine the evidence for sociopolitical formation at the Gordion citadel mound in the centuries before Midas. The city’s urban plan underwent a period of rapid expansion and monumentalization between ca. 1000–800 BCE; this process of urbanization was only briefly interrupted when a massive fire swept through the city ca. 800, destroying many of its buildings and preserving their rich contents in situ. I combine diachronic analysis of the citadel mound architecture with a synchronic evaluation of the activities taking place within at the time of its destruction, focusing on the well-provisioned Terrace Complex, one of the last and most significant alterations to the city before the fire. I frame these investigations in a theoretical framework derived from feasting studies and the archaeology of performance to reconstruct the suite of collective and commensal practices associated with the emergence of a Phrygian social and political identity at this transformative moment in the city’s history. I ultimately conclude that we should conceive of Early Phrygian Gordion not as the seat of a ruler, but as a central place for
the negotiation of group identity in the context of communal feasts, arguing that the case of Gordian illustrates the importance of collective action to the emergence of early complex polities.
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1. INTRODUCTION

Goals and Outline of the Dissertation

1.1 ‘The mysterious civilization of the Phrygians’: background and statement of the problem

At the heart of the numerous fledgling states that sprang up in Anatolia in the early first millennium BCE, in the few centuries between the Hittite empire’s precipitous collapse and the encroachment of Assyrian might, lies a paradox: the Iron Age polity of Phrygia, the most central of these states but among the least understood. Its centrality is both geographical and chronological: Phrygia’s capital, Gordion, is situated at the geographical heart of modern Turkey, just 80 kilometers west of the Turkish capital city of Ankara; the great conflagration that swept across its citadel mound, destroying its monumental buildings and preserving their rich contents in situ, has long provided a firm chronological anchor for the archaeological sequence of Iron Age Central Anatolia. Still, as continues to be the case for Turkey as a whole, this central position situates Phrygia uneasily at the crossroads of East and West—between the Syro-Anatolian/Assyrian and Western Anatolian/Greek cultural spheres, on the one hand, and Near Eastern and Classical scholarly realms, on the other.

The Phrygians sometimes garner mention in the (historical) myths or (mythologized) histories of their neighbors; still, they are seen only ‘through a glass, darkly,’ as minor players in others’ carefully constructed narratives. Phrygia’s own capacity for self-representation has thus far been limited, both by the challenging history of archaeological investigation and publication at Gordion, the only extensively
excavated Phrygian settlement, and by the scarcity of inscriptive evidence in its own, poorly understood language. In addition, the significance of the recent re-dating of the Destruction Level (DeVries et al. 2003; Rose and Darbyshire 2011) from ca. 700 to ca. 800 BCE—shifting the firm chronological anchor everyone thought it provided by a full century—has just begun to be explored, both at the site and in the larger region.

In this dissertation, I propose that developments at the Gordion citadel mound over the course of the 10th and 9th centuries BCE should be seen as part of an ongoing process of state formation or, arguably, regeneration—a trend observed differentially across Anatolia in the disruptive centuries following the Hittite collapse. Early interpretations of this phenomenon, including at Gordion, emphasized the role of invasions and migrations of discrete ethnic groups in the changing sociopolitical landscape of the time. Recently, intensive archaeological work in neighboring regions, coupled with new theoretical perspectives, has problematized the migration explanation, 

---

1 A number of sites exhibiting “Phrygian” characteristics, broadly construed, have been identified in central Anatolia, though Gordion remains the earliest: several Phrygian tumuli (METU I, II, III) have been excavated in the area of modern Ankara, but no associated habitation site has been excavated. In the region of Gordion, the large mound Hacitugrul was excavated briefly by a Turkish team, but the scope of these excavations was limited, largely to its fortification system; so too is its publication, though multiple building phases for the Phrygian period are reported (Mellink 1972, 1973, 1974, 1975, 1979; Tezcan 1980). It appears to date primarily to the Middle Phrygian period. More recently, excavations and remote sensing on the Kerkenes Dağ in Yozgat province have revealed architecture and material culture with strong ties to Gordion, but these date only to the late 7th century (see, most recently, Summers and Summers 2013, with references). The same seems to be true of Midas City in the Phrygian highlands, where only very scant evidence exists for Phrygian activity before the 7th century (Haspels 1971; Berndt-Ersöz 2006a, 89–98). Some Middle Phrygian-style architecture can be observed at Bogazköy in its Büyükalle II levels, but the extent to which this settlement should be characterized as “Phrygian” is debated (see discussion in Mellink 1993), and analysis of the Iron Age sequence is ongoing. In any case, the activity does not date before the 8th century BCE and certainly intensified in the 7th century (Dongen 2014). Current excavations at Sar Höyük in Eskisehir province, west of Gordion, may change this picture; thus far habitation levels dating to Middle and Late Phrygian levels have been reached in a small area underneath significant Hellenistic and Byzantine overburden (Darga 1993, 1995; Darga, Sivas, and Sivas 2002). In sum, thus far it is only at Gordion that we have datable remains from the Early Phrygian period (10th–9th century).
revealing the extent to which the processes of community and state formation are lengthy, complex, and idiosyncratic. I argue that not only is this the case for ‘Phrygian’ Gordian, but that it was as yet an incomplete process at the moment of the 800 BCE destruction. The Destruction Level, then, is a snapshot of a Day in the Life of the emerging Phrygian state: it provides a detailed record of the quotidian activities that shaped its political evolution, and a rare opportunity to deconstruct sociocultural aspects of this process from a practice-based perspective.

1.2 A rose by any other name: what’s in a state?

The study of ancient states is a challenging one, not least because the term ‘state’ is itself so slippery: indeed, an entire Oxford Handbook has been devoted to the concept in the Ancient Near East and Mediterranean alone (Bang and Scheidel 2013)! Anthropologically speaking, ‘statehood’ generally refers to the attainment of a certain rung on the evolutionary ladder of sociopolitical complexity (Childe 1950; Fried 1967; Flannery 1972; Johnson and Earle 1987; et al. For a more recent rejoinder, see Yoffee 2004; also Pauketat 2007). Complexity is demonstrated by the existence of a centrally organized and internally specialized administrative bureaucracy (Weber 2013; Wright 1977); its primary function is to manage resource acquisition and distribution, but it emerges out of and effectively also reproduces social stratification, by preserving the uneven distribution of wealth (Fried 1967; Diakonoff 1991) and defending it by the consistent threat of violence (Giddens 1990; Sanderson 1995). Other features, such as writing systems, can been added to this list; it has also been suggested that territorial expansion is a necessary counterpart to state formation, in that it provides an impetus for the delegation of authority beyond one charismatic leader, while also contributing to the expansion of the society and the economy (Spencer 2010).
In other words, broadly construed, the state has social, political, and economic aspects—any of which are ripe subjects for study, and all of which are governed by significant bodies of theoretical literature that operate within their own disciplinary boundaries. Trigger, in his influential comparative study of early civilizations, describes the ensuing challenge thus: “I could have started by examining either the economy or cultural features. An economic start would have implicitly privileged an ecological perspective and a cultural start an idealist approach to explaining human behavior” (Trigger 2003, 66). He instead ultimately alights on the ‘sociopolitical’ approach (itself a hybrid one), arguing that “all other aspects of a culture acquire their functional significance from the manner in which they are related to social organization” (67).

Meanwhile, the primacy of economic aspects in the classification of ancient states has been exhaustively argued elsewhere (Polanyi 1968, 2001; Finley 1973; Sahlins 1976; D’Altroy and Earle 1985; et al.—see discussion in Aubet 2013), while the political-ideological realm, with its links to performance and ritual, coupled with the clear spatial signature of monumental architecture, is a subject of more recent inquiry (Gilibert 2011; Ristvet 2015; Smith 2003, 2015; Osborne 2014b, 2014a).

As Smith (2003, 80) points out, this early focus on the classification of ancient polities “has left us with a surprisingly underdeveloped sense of what [they] actually do: how rulers create subjects, how regimes ensure their reproduction, how institutions establish and defend discrete spheres of power, and how governments secure legitimacy.” This is true, but one could just as well ask how subjects create rulers, why people establish institutions, and what leads them to grant legitimacy to governments—though it may require a significantly different approach to the acquisition and interpretation of archaeological data. Glatz (2009, 127) takes issue with the top-down conceptualization of political authority in her study of ancient empires: she argues
instead that “empire is both a relationship and a process that underlie recurring episodes of individual and collective interaction on a multitude of socio-political and cultural levels.” In this dissertation, I take a similar view in conceptualizing the ancient Phrygian state, from the bottom up, with the recognition that, as articulated by Trigger above, politics, economy, culture, and society, especially in emerging states, are inextricably interwoven. In this I follow Porter (2012, 2), whose study of the mobile pastoralist origins of social complexity begins with her stated belief that “human beings in all times and places do have agency (if agency is consciousness, the ability to make choices, and some degree or kind of power)... most of us are networked together in multiple series of relationships that render us—that should render us—resistant to classification.”

1.3 Gordion and the Phrygian State

The archaeological site of Gordion is a multiperiod settlement mound located in central Anatolia, roughly 100 kilometers west-southwest of the modern Turkish capital of Ankara, at the confluence of the Sakarya and Porsuk rivers (Figure 2). Deep soundings indicate that the mound was inhabited from at least the Early Bronze Age (the late 3rd millennium BCE) until as recently as the Selcuk period (Table 1), but the settlement reached its greatest extent during the Middle Iron Age, when its fortified area included, in addition to the 14 ha. Citadel Mound, a Lower and Outer Town of ca. 45 ha. each (known largely from geophysical prospection: see Rose 2017). Two outlying mounds, Kuştepe and Küçük Höyük, cover fortresses at the northern and southern extents of the Lower Town fortification wall and take their shape from siege mounds built up against them, presumably during the Persian Empire’s 6th-century conquest of Anatolia. To the east of these occupation areas, two high ridges, the Northeast and South Ridge, are dotted with dozens of monumental burial mounds, or tumuli. Of these, there are ca. 100
total; 40 have been excavated and date primarily to the 8th and 7th centuries BCE, the most famous of which is the enormous “Midas Mound,” constructed ca. 740.

In contrast to the outlying settlement, the Citadel Mound of Gordion is best known in its Early Phrygian phase, due to the historical circumstance of a catastrophic fire that swept through the city at that time, preserving many of its buildings and their rich contexts in situ. The Gordion Destruction Level, attributed by early excavators of the site to a Kimmerian raid and dated correspondingly to 700 BCE, has in recent decades been redated to 800 BCE, by a combination of dendrochronological, radiocarbon, and artefactual analyses (Rose and Darbyshire 2011). Its monumental architecture, uncovered over an area ca. 100 x 150 m. on the eastern half of the Citadel Mound, consisted of a monumental Gate Building giving onto a series of two courtyards, the “Outer” and the “Inner,” each flanked by multiple so-called ‘Megarons.’ To the west of these, a zone of “very different function” (Rose 2017, 137) was represented by two long rows of buildings on a raised terrace. These two buildings, the aptly-named Terrace Building (or TB) and the less intuitively named Clay-Cut Building (or CC)—taken together, the “Terrace Building Complex”—lay on either side of a wide street. The Terrace itself was a raised platform over 100 meters long, supported by anywhere from 2–4 meters of rubble fill. While these have long been interpreted as industrial buildings, due to their containing facilities for grain processing, along with textile production tools in vast numbers, the Terrace Building Complex represents the best evidence for large-scale labor mobilization and urban planning on the Citadel Mound prior to the Middle Phrygian period (Figures 1, 30, 31 a–b).

Traditional reconstructions of the history of the Phrygian state have considered Early Phrygian Gordion’s fortified Citadel Mound the clear product of a mature political entity: as recently as 2011, project director emeritus G. K. Sams (2011, 611)
summarized, “Gordion in the ninth century BCE was home to an impressive citadel replete with monumental buildings that only a well-organized and powerful state could have commanded.” Evidence that this ‘powerful state’ exerted itself far beyond the wider area of the city’s hinterland at this early date, however, is conspicuously lacking. As van Dongen (2014, 707) notes, “evidence for the presence of Phrygians or Phrygian cultural elements elsewhere starts to be found only in the eighth century”—that is, in the years following the 800 BCE destruction—not before (see also Wittke 2007). Indeed, even closer to home, no evidence for Early Phrygian occupation has been found in the Lower or Outer Towns, nor even on the western half of the citadel mound (with the exception of an ephemeral surface associated with Early Phrygian ceramics in one deep sounding: Voigt 1997, 5; 2013, 196). In addition, of the 100 tumuli, only 6 are dated earlier than 800 BCE.

If we accept that the remains of the Early Phrygian citadel do not in fact reflect the high point of Phrygian cultural expression or territorial expansion, we must also re-examine concomitant assumptions regarding the structure and organization of the Phrygian state at this time. These assumptions, in circular fashion, have been both derived from and used to interpret the architecture of the Gordion citadel mound and the activities that went on within it. If the Phrygian state of 800 BCE was a work in progress rather than a fait accompli, its architecture and activities should be interpreted as part of the process of establishing sovereignty, rather than its product—and therefore the result of an ongoing experiment with modes and means of acquiring legitimacy, expressing authority, and encouraging participation in the social, economic, and political life of the community.

The primary goal of the present dissertation is to situate the archaeology of the Terrace Building complex of the Gordion Destruction Level within an updated historical
and theoretical context; it represents my attempt thereby to understand the Phrygians on their own terms. The Terrace Building (TB), a monumental structure over one hundred meters long, divided into eight identically organized units, was a new and prominent addition to the Gordion Citadel Mound at the time of the 800 BCE destruction. Unlike many of the nearby ‘Megaron’ buildings, TB and its counterpart, the parallel “Clay Cut” (CC) building—its three excavated units a mirror image of those of the Terrace Building opposite—seem to have been actively in use at the time of the fire. These units are therefore excellent candidates for close contextual analysis of activities and organization in the Phrygian capital, due to the wide variety of finds and their excellent state of preservation (see Chapter 5). But while understanding what went on within the Terrace Buildings is a relatively straightforward question, the ensuing ones are more puzzling. To more clearly understand Gordion and the Phrygians, we must carefully consider the who, when, and why of the Terrace Buildings, and their implications for current constructions of the social, political and economic structures that constituted the Phrygian State.

In particular, the Terrace Building complex was identified almost immediately as the locus of intensive, concentrated production. It was so identified in opposition to the adjacent zone of ‘Megarons’: a series of free-standing units arranged around two courtyards, but sharing the same basic layout as each Terrace Building unit (central axis, shallow anteroom, deeper main room, central hearths in the latter or both; see Figure 1, Figure 31a–b). The Megarons have been interpreted as élite buildings, sometimes referred to as the “Courtyard Zone” or “Palace Quarter,” though their specific uses are unclear, due largely to a lack of finds within them; they certainly pre-date and were built at a lower level to the Terrace. Abundant evidence from the Terrace Building units for grinding, baking, and weaving on a large scale, along with some suggestion that
access to the Terrace as a whole was deliberately limited, has led to its interpretation as a low-status area used primarily by slave women (DeVries 1980, 1990). Still, architecturally speaking, it was immediately clear to excavators that the Terrace represented a major investment of time, space, and labor at the heart of the citadel mound, and a significant adjustment to the citadel plan—an investment that seemed belied by its ostensibly utilitarian functions. The project’s first director, Rodney Young, surmised that he had unearthed the palace kitchens; later scholars have posited that textile production was a cornerstone of the Phrygian economy, part of a system of wealth finance, or that the food and cloth were used to outfit a putative Phrygian army.

The result has been that the still largely unpublished Terrace Complex is both the source of ambitious models of the Phrygian political economy (DeVries 1990; Burke 2005), and something akin to a topos in the general discussion of centralized economies of ancient states (e.g. Cahill 2002; Boertien 2013; Bacelli et al. 2014). Overall, the distinction between the public, ceremonial, political function of the Megaron Courts and the attached, industrial, economic function of the Terrace—instantiated by the wall running between them—has been carefully preserved. So too has the perceived social distinction between potential users of each space. As noted above, these categories are creations of modern scholarship, not readily distinguishable within ancient cultures nor the archaeological record; they should not cause us to reify our interpretations of these spaces, which arguably share many key characteristics. Furthermore, these models stem from the basic assumption that at the time of the Terrace’s construction—long thought to be the late 8th century BCE—Phrygia was already an ‘organized and powerful state,’ with easy access to construction materials, food and labor. The recent redating of this event to no later than the middle of the 9th century BCE, however, suggests that Phrygian access at that time to resources and territory may have been significantly more
limited than previously thought. If so, then to justify such an investment, the potential value of the TB complex and the activities it housed to the Phrygian state and its constituents must have been high indeed. In this dissertation, I argue that in order to understand the Phrygians, we must interrogate the value of these activities in a more contextually embedded, culturally specific way. Viewed in context, the range of objects and production activities attested in the Terrace Building lend themselves to interpretation as ritually structured preparations for a feast, with all of the economic but also the ideological implications thereof. I suggest that their value, therefore, would have been far greater than might be expected from their humble appearance.

1.4 ‘Beer has food value, but food does not have beer value’ —Anon.

Feasting’s prominent role in Phrygian culture is indisputable: the well-known finds from Tumulus MM and other Phrygian tumuli have been termed “by far the clearest evidence for funerary banqueting in Anatolia” (Baughan 2013). These large assemblages of cauldrons, ladles, and bowls are interpreted as complete wine ‘services’ that reflect ritual drinking (DeVries 1980, 38)—and eating, based on scientific analysis of residues in the Tumulus MM vessels (McGovern 2000; McGovern et al. 1999). While much has been made of Phrygian feasting in death, however, comparatively little attention has been paid to Phrygian feasting in life—despite the well-documented occurrence, in the Terrace Building, of a similar range of vessel types and foodstuffs to those evidenced in the tumuli. Considering these through the lens of the archaeology of feasting, which emphasizes the nexus of social and political bonds formed and performed in commensal settings, rather than from a strictly utilitarian or economic point of view, goes some way toward explaining their central situation in the Phrygian city and its society (Dietler and Hayden 2001; Dietler 1999, 2011; Hayden 2014; O’Connor 2015;
Fu and Altmann 2014; Bray 2003). Anthropologically speaking, feasting events are now held by many to be of vital importance “in relation to village dynamics and social integration, the emergence of inequalities and complex societies, the pursuit of agency interests and political power, the creation of prestige objects and new technologies, the development of domesticated plants and animals, the establishment of cultural identities, and the identification of gendered activities” (Hayden and Villeneuve 2011, 434). At Gordion, the production, consumption, and deposition activities heretofore treated as separate events taking place in isolated zones (Terrace Complex, Megaron Buildings, Tumuli respectively) are better understood, I argue, as related aspects of this integrated cultural phenomenon, whose imprint is manifest across the site’s varied landscape.

The utility of applying feasting theory to this production context, in particular, is that it allows us to move beyond more simplistic, economically derived models for identifying craft specialization and interpreting its relationship to social and political organization. Such models are, in the case of Gordion, insufficient; they rely on, at best, what we now know are anachronistic assumptions about the political organization of the Phrygian state, and at worst, likely inaccurate or incomplete ones about the social status of craft producers at Gordion. More troublingly, they completely sidestep issues of local agency: in the current narrative of the rise of Phrygia, we have neither evidence for nor explanation of the means by which a straggling band of immigrants from faraway Thrace managed to rapidly assert political control, presumably over a preexisting indigenous population of Luwian-speakers?, and coerce them into surrendering their hard-won resources, time and labor.² Feasting theory, however, provides robust means and

² For a cogent summary of current narratives on Phrygia and the Phrygians, see articles by Sams and Roller in the *Oxford Handbook of Ancient Anatolia* ((Steadman and McMahon 2011). Voigt
motivation for this tried and true method of promoting resource-sharing and social integration—especially as participation in such events is rarely prompted by economic considerations alone, but more strongly by human values and belief systems. I draw here also on emerging theories of consumption related to the ritual mode of production, which I consider a more socially informed application of economic principles to acts of provisioning and consuming of the kind evidenced at Gordion (Costin 2001; Spielmann 2002; McAnany and Wells 2008; Murakami 2016). Recognizing the social and ideological aspects of concepts like ‘value’ and ‘capital’ adds significant nuance to the task of identifying the status, identity, and motivations of those who built and used the Terrace Complex.

If cultural memory is any indication, it’s not difficult to discover what the Phrygians valued: for centuries following the city’s collapse, they were remembered as passionate beer-drinkers and mother-goddess-worshipers. As Sams so delicately put it, “Archilochos, a Greek lyric poet of the seventh century B.C. … once likened a certain act of love-making to ‘a Thracian or a Phrygian drinking his beer through a tube’” ((Sams 1977, 109), while the goddess of Euripides’ Bacchae, who inspires such catastrophic ecstasies in the women of Thebes, is said to come from ‘the Phrygian mountains’ (Φρυγίων ἐξ ὀρέων, Eur. Ba. 86). Phrygians were also known long after their heyday for their cultural exploits, in music—we still refer to the Phrygian mode—and weaving.

and Henrickson’s frequently reiterated arguments for the key transitional period of ‘formation of the Phrygian state’ (Voigt and Henrickson 2000a) rely largely on tracing the evolution of ceramic styles from those associated with the Early Iron Age structures of YHSS 7A into those characteristic of the later Early Phrygian/YHSS 6B period. Voigt cites a change in the use of space in the transition between these phases and posits “increasing economic and political differentiation” (46) as an explanation (or consequence?), but freely admits that data that might account for this change are limited.
Indeed, as late as the Roman period, Ovid describes the lovely Niobe in his *Metamorphoses* as resplendent “in her Phrygian robes woven with gold” (Ov. *Met.* 6.146–203). It can hardly be coincidence that Phrygian renown in music, weaving, and alcohol consumption go hand in hand with stories of a mystery cult of fervent (and disturbingly Eastern) goddess worship. Rather, it is evident that religious encounters provide a particularly fertile realm for cultural transmission, being, following historian Richard White, one of the few spaces where a coherent ‘middle ground’ of common rituals and practices could be forged through “a process of mutual, [expedient,] and creative misunderstanding” (White 2010). If the Phrygians were for so long immediately associated with their goddess, as well as for these skills and traits, it is not farfetched to imagine that ideas and objects traveled together: that goddess-worship in Phrygia, as it did across the ancient Mediterranean, involved women weaving, drinking, and making music together—and that such activities, far from limited to the service quarter, were widely prized. As we shall see, the Terrace Complex lies at the heart of what we can know about Gordion, its economy, and its society; and at the beating heart of Phrygia is its mother goddess.

Rodney Young, Gordion’s beloved director from 1950 to 1974, closed his final site report as he often did, with an exhortation for continued work: “Much still remains to be done at Gordion” (Young 1968b, 241). The interpretations presented in the following pages are by no means definitive and archaeologists’ work at the site, some fifty years later, is still far from complete. Rather, I hope to demonstrate here that the Phrygians

---

3 For a case study exploring the potential role played by Kybele cult in the transmission of musical styles specifically from East to West, see Holzman 2016; Tanaka’s forthcoming dissertation investigates the cult’s role in cultural interactions between East and West more broadly.
need not remain as mysterious as they seem: sufficient evidence exists both to evaluate them on their own terms and to fit them into the broader discussion of Iron Age Anatolia as an integral stitch in our East-West narrative. It is my hope that as new publications of site stratigraphy and artifacts continue to appear, the fruit of many years of careful analysis by specialists, so too will data that help refine or revise the picture I’ve proposed here, bringing the Phrygians out of their Dark Age wandering and into the brightening light of the Anatolian Iron Age.

1.5 Organization of the Dissertation

In Chapter 2, I provide a brief summary of archaeological work at Gordion, and a review of the textual references to Phrygia that have informed our reconstruction of its history in the Iron Age. In particular, I highlight the persistent influence of classical frameworks in shaping expectations and interpretations of archaeological results from Gordion (see also Gunter 2012).

In Chapter 3, I engage with the broader theoretical frameworks that are reshaping current historical reconstructions of Iron Age Anatolia in the 10th and 9th centuries BCE. I review recent developments in anthropological theory that conceive of such concepts as community, territory, and identity as flexibly constructed and strategically activated by individuals and populations in diverse, multiethnic societies. In Syro-Anatolia and the Levant, where the role of ethnic migrations had long been prominent in reconstructing political and cultural developments, this revised theoretical perspective has led scholars to a more nuanced investigation of Iron Age society and practices. This region is apt for comparison with Gordion in several respects: not only would Karkemish, a glowing Syro-Hittite capital in the 9th century BCE, have been an object of emulation for any contemporary developing polity, but direct evidence for trade
interaction, at the very least, between Phrygia and the Syro-Anatolian region can be found in the assemblages of the TB complex at Gordion. I conclude that the narratives of ethnic migration and conquest that have shaped our understanding of the evolution of Phrygian political and cultural practices need similar revision.

We turn to the archaeological evidence from Gordion in Chapters 4 and 5. I first present, in Chapter 4, the architectural sequence of the Gordion citadel mound in the 10th and 9th centuries BCE, summarizing results from the Young and Voigt/Sams campaigns. This sequence, Voigt’s YHSS 6 Period, begins with the Post-and-Poros Building (PAP), which she identified as the first monumental building on the citadel mound, and seems to culminate in Megaron 4, the last building constructed atop the Terrace before the fire. I review the archaeological evidence for the use of each building, paying special attention to Voigt’s “Unfinished Project” and its consequences for our understanding of access to the various spaces of the Gordion Citadel Mound. I conclude that the current emphasis on strict spatial and status differentiation between the ‘industrial’ Terrace Complex and the ‘elite’ Outer and Inner Courts is overstated. I argue instead that the constant renovation of the Citadel Mound and the evolving relationships among the Inner Court, the Outer Court, and the TB Terrace can be best understood through the lens of performance, politics and ritual.

We shift from this diachronic view to a synchronic view of the Destruction Level in Chapter 5. Here, my goal is to elucidate the variety, scale and organization of activities in the Terrace Buildings. I first outline two case studies: I have chosen TB-7A and CC-3 as apt for practice-based analysis because they are among the most thoroughly documented in excavation notebooks, with detailed plans and findspots of individual artifacts. At its most basic, the evidence, as noted above, attests to economic activities such as preparation and consumption of food and production of textiles. Their full
setting, scale, and organization, however, as I reconstruct them, indicate that Phrygian commensal habits held significant social and political value. I suggest that the specialized formal aspects of their Terrace Building setting, and the sheer intensity of activity, indicate that these were repeated commensal events whose preparation and execution were ritualized and intended for large-scale participation. In addition, significant typological and stylistic variation exists within these assemblages, attesting to a diversity of participants and resources and permitting a more inclusive than exclusive view of the nature of these events, at least in this early period.

I go on to discuss the broader role of commensal practices in early states in the second half of the chapter, interpreting these case studies within the context of anthropological studies of feasting. I argue that the evidence does not support the reconstruction of a strict spatial or status differentiation between producers and consumers of feasts at Gordion. Rather, we should think of the Gordion citadel as the stage for a range of commensal events taking place on multiple occasions and scales. Events like these would have been crucial to the development of the emerging Phrygian state: they would have mobilized the resources of a wide range of constituents from different areas of Gordion’s hinterland, and created social connections among them, incrementally forging sociopolitical cohesion and a shared “Phrygian” cultural identity among these diverse groups.

Finally, in my conclusion, I consider the implications of this reinterpretation for the larger narrative of Phrygian Gordion as it persists through later periods. While the tumuli provide clear evidence of the existence of the emergence of a Phrygian elite beginning in the mid-9th century, the architecture of the citadel mound remains almost inscrutably non-hierarchical, while the nature and organization of the productive and consumptive activities attested in the Terrace Buildings are more clearly indicative of collective action.
than they are of a ranked society or bureaucratic state. I therefore argue that that we should conceive of Early Phrygian Gordion not as the seat of a ruler, but as a central place for the negotiation of group identity in the context of communal feasts. I ultimately conclude that the case of Gordion and its later Iron Age evolution provides a window into the important role played by collective action in the emergence of early complex polities.
2 THE HOUSE THAT MIDAS BUILT

A Brief Archaeological History of Gordion and the Phrygians

2.1 Introduction: seeing the world through gold-colored glasses

“Über keines der grossen Völker, die zu den Griechen in engeren Beziehungen gestanden haben, sind wir so mangelhaft unterrichtet wie über die Phryger.”

– Alfred Körte, Geschichte Phrygiens, 1904

Despite more than sixty years of concentrated archaeological work at Gordion, the narrative of the ‘mysterious,’ poorly understood Phrygians, set forth by the brothers Körte in the publication of their 1900 excavations at the site, has proven surprisingly enduring. This is less a function of our relative level of information about the Phrygians—which is, by any measure, significantly greater than it was in 1904—than it is, perhaps, an artifact of how we weight the information we do have. Alfred Körte, quoted above, had been trained as a Classicist; it is unsurprising that he qualified the Phrygians as just one of the great peoples ‘with whom the Greeks had close relations.’ Equally unsurprising is the site’s late, great investigator, the archaeologist Rodney Young’s, tongue-in-cheek reference to “K.M.’s golden daughter” in the first missive he sent from the site when he began excavation in April 1950—K.M. for King Midas, of Greek mythological fame (Edwards 1980). It is somewhat surprising, however, that after more than a century of scholarship, this Midas-mania persists into the present day. Recent University of Pennsylvania publications of archaeological data of Early Phrygian date are entitled The Archaeology of Midas and the Phrygians (Kealhofer 2005) and The Archaeology of Phrygian Gordion, Royal City of Midas (Rose 2012); a flagship 2016 exhibit at the Penn Museum showcasing a century of archaeological discoveries from
multiple periods at the long-lived site was nonetheless *The Golden Age of King Midas* (Rose and Darbyshire 2016).

In fact, it is not physical evidence for Phrygia or Phrygians, but King Midas who eludes us. Dendrochronological dating of the Midas Mound, the largest and most opulent of Gordion’s ‘royal’ tumuli by far and therefore long assumed to be that of Phrygia’s only historically attested ruler, places its construction firmly at 740 BCE. That date of death is at odds with the securely-dated historical references in Assyrian sources to the quite lively activities of the central Anatolian ruler Mita of the Muški—widely agreed to be King Midas of Phrygia—which cluster around 710 BCE. Furthermore, neither date synchronizes well with the now-accepted backdating of the Gordion Destruction Level to 800 BCE from 700 BCE. Sagona and Zimansky (2009, 357) are quite right to observe that “this has the dramatic consequence of separating the public buildings and other clear evidence of a powerful post-Hittite state in the Early Phrygian period from the historical Midas who interacted with the Assyrians. The tumulus mounds, whose chronological position in the 8th century is secured by dendrochronological dating, no longer have anything to do with the great capital of the Dark Age.” In short, we have too long allowed Midas’ golden touch to color our perceptions, his mythical status (and undeniable crowd appeal) to shape our scholarly narratives.

---

4 Recent discussions of the historicity and likely dates of Midas’ reign can be found in DeVries 2011, Berndt-Ersöz 2008, Sams 1995, Muscarella 1989, and Hawkins 1994; Berndt-Ersöz, in a detailed but rather uncritical review of the ancient sources, responds to this lack of archaeological evidence by multiplying Midases, arguing that no fewer than three kings of that name reigned in Phrygia in the late 8th and early 7th centuries BCE.

5 This is not strictly accurate, as several tumulus mounds date to the 9th century, but these are dated stylistically rather than chronologically: see Rose and Darbyshire 2011.
In this chapter, I trace the evolution of archaeological thought at Gordion from its discovery by the Körte brothers, through the Young and Sams/Voigt campaigns, and into the present day. As we shall see, the shadow of King Midas, and concomitant assumptions about the social and political organization of his ‘kingdom,’ loom large in shaping archaeological interpretation at the site in all periods. These assumptions, or at least their relevance to the archaeology of the Early Phrygian Destruction Level, must now be revisited. This is the case, on the one hand, for reasons of site chronology alone. On the other, it can be demonstrated that the tales of Midas’ golden touch proliferate in Greek sources in the fourth century BCE—a time when Asiatic kingship, the legendary wealth and opulence of the East, and its potential corrupting influence, were matters of some cultural anxiety to the Greeks. Such tales should be examined first from the perspective of literary criticism, rather than of history. In presenting this critical historiography of Gordion scholarship, I hope to make the case that it is high time we consider the spectacular Early Iron Age archaeological evidence from the site free from the tyranny of Midas.

2.2 Discovery: the brothers Körte

In terms of archaeological excavation at Gordion, the site’s initial excavators, the German brothers Alfred and Gustav Körte, did relatively little, and therefore receive only brief mention in most site histories. As noted above, Alfred Körte, the younger brother, was a classical philologist; his eldest brother Gustav was a classical archaeologist who worked primarily in Italy and Greece. (A third Körte brother, Werner, was a surgeon in Berlin.) It was Alfred who, in November 1893, visited ‘the point where the most significant modern trade route from Ankara to the West cuts the valley of the Sangarios [river]’ and determined that the ancient, pre-Greek “Ruinenstätte” that he saw there was
‘without a doubt’ the ‘long-sought’ city of Gordion (Körte 1897, 4). He notes, in his brief account of the event, that the archaeologist Lollig had already located Gordion there, ‘without giving his reasons.’ Körte goes on to give his own, namely, his careful study of the geography of the consul Manlius Volso’s march against the Galatians, as described by Livy (XXXVIII, 12–17). He marshals numerous other, less specific, Classical references to the location of Gordion, as well: Xenophon (Hell. I, 4); Arrian (I, 29.3 and II, 4); Plutarch (Alex. 18); Curtius (I, 1.3 and III, 1: *Gordium nomen est urbi quam Sangarius amnis interfuit*); and Strabo (XII 567). In short, his identification of the city was derived from the comments of Classical geographers, several years before he began excavating the site; and so it remains. We still do not know so much as the name the Phrygians gave themselves, let alone their city.

Alfred Körte’s sincere interest in the Phrygians is demonstrated by the thorough History of Phrygia he published in 1904 alongside the excavation results. It remains the most complete, in that he assembles in it all known literary references to the site

6 “Gerade an dem Punkt nun, wo die wichtigste moderne Handelsstrasse von Ankyra nach dem Westen, die deutsche anatolische Eisenbahn, das Thal des Sangarios schneidet, fanden Dr. Edmund Naumann und ich im November 1893, aufmerksam gemacht durch Herrn Oberingenieur Ossent die Reste einer uralten vorgriechischen Niederlassung, und wir zweifelten schon damals nicht, dass diese Ruinenstätte das lange gesuchte Gordion sei.”

7 “ohne Gründe dafür anzugeben”

8 The name “Gordion” does not seem to be an invention of the Classical tradition, though “Gordias,” its eponymous founder, may well be: the word is apparently derived from the Indo-European root meaning ‘to enclose,’ and is taken therefore to be the Phrygian word for ‘city’ (Pokorny and Partridge 1959, 1:444). This is as good an explanation as any, given the paucity of Phrygian written sources—none reach back to the 9th century BCE. Roller (1984) points out that the name Gordios, for the father of Midas, “is unknown outside Greek and Roman literature” and is therefore likely derived from the name of the city, on analogy with the names of Greek eponymous heroes, rather than the other way around. She cites Carrington (1977), who argues that interest in such heroes begins only after Phrygian contact with Greek tradition. No evidence for such direct contact exists until the mid-8th century BCE, at the earliest, and is much more robust in the 7th century, with the rise of Lydia. It remains the case that Midas is the only ruler’s name we have evidence for.
(recording that the last person to attempt this was Reiner Reineccius in 1594). It’s also noteworthy in that it makes a very clear case for the importance of archaeology in understanding Phrygian history better. Though his inquiry is clearly motivated by these scant Classical references, Alfred notes, with regret, that ‘the cultural and political heyday of [the Phrygians] was already over by the time a thirst for historical knowledge of the past awoke among the Hellenes.’ Thus the Phrygian “Reich” can only be known to us ‘through the dense veil of legend’; unlike Lydia, for which we have a king list, we do not retain ‘even the skeleton of historical development’ for Phrygia, and instead know only of ‘the tragic death of its last prince’ (Midas).\textsuperscript{9} Furthermore, he quite rightly observes that this ‘failure’ of Greek sources is compensated for in the ‘Eastern tradition’ (that is, the Assyrian sources) ‘less for the Phrygians than for other Eastern peoples.’\textsuperscript{10} So, from the beginning of archaeological work at Gordion, it was well-established that neither the Classical nor the Near Eastern historical record provided reliable information about Phrygian civilization—and the little information we do have should be regarded with great skepticism.

\textsuperscript{9} “...die kulturelle und politische Blüte jenes Volkes war schon gebrochen, als der Trieb nach historischer Erkenntnis der Vorzeit bei den Hellenen erwachte. So ist für uns die Geschichte des Phrygerreiches nur schattenhaft durch den dichten Sagenschleier zu erkennen, mit dem es die geschäftige Phantasie der Hellenen umwob; die phrygischen Götter und Heroen, die so früh in die griechische Sage aufgenommen waren, verschmolzen unlösbar mit den historischen Herrschern, keine Königsliste rettete wie in Lydien wenigstens das Gerippe der historischen Entwicklung, und nur der tragische Tod des letzten Fürsten ist durch die griechische Geschichtsschreibung festgelegt worden.”

\textsuperscript{10} „Das Versagen griechischer Quellen wird nun für die Phryger weniger als für andere Völker des Ostens durch die orientalische Überlieferung ausgeglichen.”
2.2.1 Gordion in Classical sources

For Körte, the earliest reference to the Phrygians is that found in Homer (Il. 3.184); they appear as horsemen, encamped on the banks of the Sangarios (modern Sakarya) river, allies and close relatives of the Trojans (Hecuba, wife of Priam, king of Troy, is said to be the sister of a Phrygian named Axios, son of Dymas, Il. 16.718–19). If the Iliad was in fact composed in the 8th century BCE, as is currently believed (see, e.g., R. Osborne 2004), this may be the only reference in Greek that was made contemporary with the existence of an independent Phrygian state. Its hints at a close kinship between Trojans and Phrygians are of note, then, if we take them as preserving a hazy cultural memory of a much earlier material culture connection observed by archaeologists: the similarities between handmade ‘knobbed ware’ vessels, found both at Troy and Gordion in layers dated to the Early Iron Age, and the material culture of Northern Thrace, have been used to substantiate arguments that the Phrygian ethnic group arrived thence to Anatolia in that period, in the midst of the large-scale movements of peoples that marked the end of the Bronze Age (e.g. Sams 1988, 10; Henrickson and Voigt 1998, 101; Vassileva 2005a, 227).

This view was standard before Körte, though the material evidence remains inconclusive: in Ramsay’s Historical Geography of Asia Minor, he cites unanimous but unnamed “Greek authorities” who assert that “the Phrygians are a European race, some of whom found their way across the Hellespont into Asia, while others continued to exist under the name Briges in Macedonia” (Ramsay 1890, 34). These ‘authorities’ are likely
Herodotus (VII.73)\textsuperscript{11} and Strabo (VII.3.2)\textsuperscript{12}, whose accounts date to the late fifth century and the late first century BCE respectively. Neither dwells long on the Phrygians or provides more information than Ramsay, namely, their former designation as “Briges” and their European origin. Their similarities of phrasing make it seem that Herodotus was Strabo’s source for this particular insight, but Herodotus’ is unclear: his lack of elaboration indicates that he considered it common knowledge (on Herodotus’ sources see Hornblower 2002; Fowler 2006; on Strabo’s, Prontera 2015). In all cases, this offhand knowledge is given in the context of larger geographic discussions situating Trojans, Mysians, Lydians, and Bithynians within their relative borders—as most references to Phrygia are, in Greek and Latin sources.

Körte, Ramsay, and other early explorers of Central Anatolia all wrestle with this fact: Phrygia in most cases is nothing more than a vague geographic designation for lands beyond Anatolia’s western coast. In Herodotus’ case they go largely unexplored: we learn in V.52 that a ‘royal road’ through Lydia and Phrygia has twenty stages, and that the ‘Phrygian’ portion of it ends at the river Halys; we also learn that a river Marsyas, a tributary of the Maeander (V.118), a market-city Celaenae (VII.26), a town called Anaua, a salt lake, and a great city Colossae where the river Lycus (also a tributary of the Maeander) flows into a gorge (VII.30) are located in Phrygia. Later periods offer

\textsuperscript{11} “As the Macedonians say, these Phrygians were called Briges as long as they dwelt in Europe, where they were neighbors of the Macedonians; but when they changed their home to Asia, they changed their name also and were called Phrygians.” Trans. A.D. Godley, Harvard Univ. Press, 1920.

\textsuperscript{12} “And the Phrygians themselves are the Brigians, a Thracian tribe, as are also the Mygdonians, the Bebricians, the Medobithynians, the Bithynians, and the Thynians, and, I think, also the Mariandynians. These peoples, to be sure, have all utterly quitted Europe, but the Mysi have remained there.” Trans. H. L. Jones, Harvard Univ. Press, 1924.
more specificity: beginning with Alexander’s campaigns and into the Roman period, more routes and city-names in Anatolia are documented (see especially Arrian 2.3.1–8; Curtius 3.1.11–18; Livy 38.12.1–38.27.9; discussion in Stewart 2010, 56–63). But in no case does Gordion figure as anything but a backdrop to historical events; by Strabo’s time, the city was a mere village on the Sangarios, as he describes it in XII.5.3:

Pessinus is the greatest of the emporiums in that part of the word, containing a temple of the Mother of the gods, which is an object of great veneration... Nearby, also, flows the Sangarius River; and on this river are the ancient habitations of the Phrygians, of Midas, and of Gordius, who lived even before his time, and of certain others,—habitations which preserve not even traces of cities, but are only villages slightly larger than the others, for instance, Gordium and Gorbeus … (Trans. H. L. Jones, Harvard University Press, 1924)

More importantly, the accounts that mention Gordion specifically also tend to do so with reference to Midas—whose name, then as now, enjoyed much wider renown than did that of his city. In a passing reference, Strabo records that Phrygian slaves were often called “Manes” or “Midas” by their Greek owners, who “addressed them by names that were prevalent in their countries” (VII.3.12). Indeed, Midas is the only Phrygian name for which we have robust evidence from both indigenous (that is, written in Phrygian) and outside sources.13 Still, despite a not insignificant corpus of inscriptions from Gordion (300+ exempla), reflective of the use of writing both for economic purposes (labeling jars) and for monumental inscriptions, the names Midas and Gordias never appear there (Brixhe and Lejeune 1984; Brixhe 2002, 2004). Recent archaeological work

13 With the exception of Ates/Atys/Attis, which is attested in Phrygian on the Midas Monument at Midas City (dating unclear, but probably no earlier than the 7th century, as well as in numerous graffiti from Gordion, and in Greek as the name of Croesus’ ill-fated son (Hdt. I.35), as well as the god/consort of Cybele in cultic contexts; Berndt-Ersöz (Berndt-Ersöz 2008, 166, 2006b) has suggested that Attis, both in name and in cult, is of Lydian rather than Phrygian origin, and Roller (1999, 70), although she argues that it is a common proper name in Phrygia, points out that it was a component of the names Alyattes and Sadyattes, both 7th-century kings of Lydia.
in the Midas Mound tumulus at Gordion has revealed what are believed to be several other names: Nana, Muksos, Sitsidos and [K/G/]Urunis were scratched on a roof beam; Sitsidosakor (probably two words) appears again inscribed in wax on the rim of a bronze bowl, as do the names (?) Ata, Uzd, and Aladis Url (Liebhart and Brixhe 2009; Young 1981). Many other potential anthroponyms appear as graffiti, scratched on the outside of vessels, in a practice that seems to have begun in the 8th century BCE. For the Greeks, however, practically only one name seems to exist. Even when Herodotus mentions several other Phrygians in passing, he never fails to relate them to a Midas—for example, in the story of Adrastus (Hdt. I.35.3), who claims to be “the son of Gordias the son of Midas,” banished by his father to the court of Croesus. Curiously, “Midas son of Gordias” is referred to only a few chapters earlier (Hdt. I.14.2), giving rise to Berndt-Ersöz’s (2008) suggestion that Midas was a dynastic name. Given that Herodotus’ knowledge of Phrygia seems to have been second-hand at best, it is perhaps

14 Given their context, it seems possible that most of these names have cultic significance; see Roller (1999, 69–71, and notes). “Nana” and “Ata” are evocative of Phrygian and general Indo-European roots for “Mother” and “Father,” which would be unsurprising as epithets for deities; “Ata” could also be related to Ates/Attis; furthermore, “Baba” is found twice in inscriptions at Midas City, also means ‘Father,’ and was used as an alternative name for Attis in Graeco-Roman cult, as well as an epithet of the Phrygian Zeus in Roman inscriptions. It seems quite plausible that “Ata” and “Baba” are both names for the male companion of Matar. “Muksoś” may be related to the deity or deified ancestor “Mopsos” attested both in Greek sources and in a Phoenician inscription in Cilicia (Liebhart and Brixhe 2009, 149; Hawkins 2009). Interestingly, the name Sitsidos appears again in Lycia, inscribed in bronze on a bowl in the Bayındır tumulus, also dated to the mid-8th century BCE (Liebhart and Brixhe 2009). Brixhe suggests that perhaps this is an indication of long-distance elite gift exchange (see also Brixhe 1990, 65–66; 2004, 108). Is it not equally possible that Sitsidos is the name of an unknown deity in the Phrygian pantheon? In an earlier publication, Brixhe also suggested that “sitsidosakor” (two words) may have designated the vessel and its contents, rather than being a personal name: “L’inscription semble concerner le contenu et la function du recipient” (Brixhe 1984, 100). Less is known about the words Urunis, Uzd, and Aladis Url, which may not be personal names at all; too little is known of Phrygian language, culture, or religion to do more than speculate here.

15 Croesus’ reign is dated to the mid-6th century; if we were to use the historical date of ca. 710 BCE for a King Midas of Phrygia from the Assyrian sources, this relationship would be problematic.
more likely to interpret his use of the name Midas in the Histories as shorthand to signal ‘Central Anatolian ruler,’ rather than in reference to any specific historical figure.

After all, Phrygia is not only associated indelibly with Midas in the Greek mind, but with Lydia. Midas’ dedication at Delphi is referred to only with reference first to Gyges, and it is noted that the dedicated object itself, Midas’ royal seat, is set beside Gyges’ many gold and silver offerings (Hdt. I.14). As noted above, Midas enters the Herodotean narrative again in relation to Croesus—in this case, a personal relationship between ruling families standing in for the blending of the two Anatolian polities in Greek politico-historical consciousness. Free of this narrativization of history, the geographic references in Strabo and elsewhere nevertheless all locate Phrygia in terms of its relationship to Lydia. Even Aristotle, who appears to be providing different and more specific information in relating that Midas was married to a princess of Kyme (Aristotle fr. 611.37), is in fact engaging in the same practice as Herodotus, personifying the close cultural relationship between Phrygia and Lydia as a dynastic marriage between the scions of two neighboring royal lines. In sum, then, the historical and geographical information provided about Phrygia in Classical sources reflects nothing but the haziest awareness of an early Inner Anatolian polity that enjoyed cordial relations, cultural exchange, and perhaps at some point even primacy over Lydia, but that was eclipsed by it and/or subsumed into it by the 6th century BCE at the latest. Midas and Phrygia are always at least one degree removed from the real object of inquiry; Gordion does not figure at all—except perhaps as the source for the name Gordias (see note 8 above).

2.2.2 Legends of Midas

Midas does, of course, recur frequently in later Greek myth and iconography. His legendary person has been aptly summarized by Roller (1983, 1984), who points out
that “the historical king of Phrygia and the legends associated with his name seem to be concerned with two separate characters” (1983, 299). The Greeks seem to have known almost nothing of Midas of Phrygia’s historic actions, but as a trope, his fabulous wealth and comical foolishness were literally the stuff of legend. Of the two, the wealth appears first, and the comic foolishness later: as early as in the mid-7th century BCE, the Spartan poet Tyrtaios (fr. 12, line 6) referred to the ‘wealth of Midas’ alongside other clearly familiar figures of Greek myth paired with their most noteworthy attributes. Roller observes that “in this context the wealth of Midas seems to have some negative connotation” (1983, 302) which continues in later sources, for example, in Plato’s Laws (660e). Slightly later, the story of an encounter between Midas and the wise but wine-loving satyr Silenos apparently emerged, in which Midas lures Silenos to drink from a wine-laced fountain, then captures him and questions him on the meaning of life. Iconographically, this encounter is first attested in the mid-6th century BCE, but a comprehensive written account did not emerge before the 4th century BCE; there are narrative inconsistencies as to whether the story took place in Macedonia or in Asia, and Herodotos (VIII.138) even refers to different ‘versions’ of the story. In Attic vase paintings, Silenos’ captors sometimes wear Oriental attributes, like a Phrygian cap, and Midas, who early on appears as a somber bearded figure in a long robe, by the late 5th century is the bearer of ass’s ears, in an odd twist that Roller attributes to the association of Midas with the satyrs Silenos and Marsyas. The choice of Midas as protagonist in this story is nevertheless rather odd, leading Roller to suggest that he may have been chosen for his very otherness: “… he was a barbarian king, outside the mainstream of Greek contacts… The paradox inherent in the figure of a king who has an important source of earthly happiness—great wealth—but still desires something more meaningful may have enhanced this image” (1983, 307).
Indeed, this trope recurs in Herodotus, most notably in the far more specific story of Solon’s visit to the court of Croesus of Lydia (I.30–33). Croesus, the Asian potentate, makes a display of his vast wealth to Solon, the Athenian law-maker, and vainly expects that Solon will declare him the most fortunate of men. High-minded Solon makes it a teaching moment: “The very rich man is not more fortunate than the man who has only his daily needs, unless he chances to end his life with all well,” he cautions Croesus (Hdt. I.32.5); “the god promises fortune to many people and then utterly ruins them” (I.32.9). Croesus is displeased by this, but is proved the fool in the end, losing his son, his wife, and then his kingdom, despite his vast wealth. Both the tale of Midas and Silenos and the story the golden touch figure as entries into this familiar category. The earliest reference to Midas’ golden touch is in Aristotle’s Politics, where Midas’ greed and foolishness is an opportunity to illustrate the true nature of wealth. Unlike in Ovid’s later version, where Midas learns his lesson and is redeemed, Aristotle relates that he died of hunger when everything placed before him turned to gold (Pol. 1257b.15). One cannot live on golden food. The late emergence of this, the most famous Midas tale, makes it clear that for the Greeks Midas was far more a creature of legend than of history. Any attempt to reconstruct historical information about him, or even to confirm the historical existence of any one King Midas of Phrygia, would be on shaky ground with such sources. “Midas the Phrygian” is the Greek equivalent of “Hans the German,” and the Midas stories are sketchier, metaphorical iterations of more specific ones in which Croesus of Lydia appears.

The only stories about Midas or Phrygia that appear to have some indigenous Phrygian source or specificity are those related to legend of the Gordian knot. This story appears in five Classical sources: Arrian (Anabasis 2.3), Plutarch (Alexander 18.1-4), Curtius (3.2.11-18), Justin (11.7.3-16) and Marsyas of Philippi (in the scholia to
Euripides). Each is more concerned with the legend of Alexander the Great than with Midas, unsurprisingly, but all claim to relate a local Phrygian tradition. Stewart (2010), Burke (2001), and Roller (1984) detail the internal variations among these accounts; I will not dwell on them here. The common elements of the story itself are: when Alexander visited Gordion in 333 BCE, he learned of a prophecy concerning a wagon on display on the acropolis of the city. The prophecy stated that whoever could loosen the intricate, cornel bark knot that joined the yoke to the wagon pole would become ruler of Asia (or the world, *selon* Plutarch, *Alexander* 18.1-4). The rest, of course, is history: Alexander cut the knot, fulfilled the prophecy, and went on to conquer the known world.

As for the wagon itself, the story surrounding it is muddy, and it seems unlikely that any of the sources who relate it had it from a Phrygian themselves. The rough outline goes that Midas’ father, Gordios, was a peasant, who received an oracle of bird (hawk?)/birds while ploughing one day; a beautiful young maiden, whom Gordios either sought out or conveniently ran across, interpreted the oracle to mean that he would one day be king; Gordios married the woman, who bore him a son; some time later, the trio rode out in a wagon to an assembly of the Phrygian people, who declared either Gordios or Midas king; this was because they had received an independent prophecy that a wagon would bring them a king to end their civil war. Gordios/Midas’ first act as king was to dedicate the wagon in the temple.

To those familiar with the archaeology of Gordion, the tale is tantalizing, because so many of its elements ring true. The close relationship between the prophetess and the city-founder (“Gordias,” who, it seems quite likely, was invented by the Greek transcribers of the legend as the city’s eponymous founder, to explain its name; on this ‘Hellenizing detail’ see Roller 1984, 264) that parallels the frequent epigraphic concurrence of Kybele/Matar and Midas; the key role played by the appearance of birds
of prey who were so often the attributes of the Phrygian mother goddess; the fact that in these legends, the prophetess/Kybele stand-in actually is Midas’ mother; and the detail provided by Justin that the woman who gave the prophecy to Gordias was “standing in a doorway” as Matar Kubileya almost always does, confirm that a kernel of truth, of historical accuracy or at least of indigenous lore lies within these late accounts. Roller notes all of these elements in connecting the legend with Phrygian religious tradition, while allowing at the same time that the story “is cast in the form of a folk tale” (1984, 265) with generic parallels in Slavic and Irish literature, in the legend surrounding the birth of the Persian king Cyrus, and arguably in modern political practice.  

Burke goes farther in deriving the personal name Mita/Midas from the Hittite mit(t)a-, miti-, which occurs in Hittite ritual texts in reference to red-colored threads (whence the reddish cornel bark of the knot?) used to fasten things together. For Burke, “the ultimate origin of this legend is found in the period of Hittite kings in central Turkey, suggesting that the Phrygian dynasts had a ritual, possibly a foundation rite, based on Hittite predecessors” (Burke 2002, 261).

While locating the source of the Gordian knot story in a local fusion of Hittite and Phrygian myths is interesting and entirely plausible (though asserting an Anatolian origin for the prototypic Phrygian name puts a spoke in the wheel of those who want the Phrygians to have burst fully-formed from the Zeus’ thigh of Thrace), neither Burke nor

……………………………

16 The folk-tale-ish elements for Roller (1984, 265) are: “the association of the future king with the family of a herdsman (Cyrus) or peasant farmer (Gordios/Midas); a background of poverty, which enables him to pose as the champion of the people; and the divine favor marking him, which helps the new ruler establish himself against opposition by the existing government (Cyrus) or in the absence of a government (Gordios/Midas).” The appeal of this rags-to-riches tale of intrepid political outsider and self-made man as nation’s savior is certainly not limited to ancient myth or folklore.
Roller is willing to make the further assertion that Midas may not have been an historical figure at all, despite the lack of archaeological evidence for him. Following Burke, there seems to be no linguistic reason why Mita/Midas has to be a personal name: if indeed derived from the Hittite verb *mitai*, “to nail (and) secure with red (wool),” it could well be a title or an office—“the one who binds or secures,” perhaps (rather than a recurring dynastic name as some suggest).\(^\text{17}\) Roller acknowledges that Midas was initially considered a figure of legend by many, of the Greek age of heroes, or even a theriomorphic divinity (hence the ass’s ears) (e.g. Körte and Körte 1904, 12). This conclusion is taken up by Munn (2006, 79), who observes that, based on the titles of *lawagtei* and *wanaktei* inscribed on the Midas Monument, even if an historic Midas lived in the late 8\(^\text{th}\) century BCE, on the 7\(^\text{th}\)-6\(^\text{th}\)-century monument his name “is clearly invoked as an archetype of sovereignty,” one who derived his authority in some way from the Phrygian Mother goddess, Matar.

This accrual of titles in fact takes us further away from the function of the Midas of Greek myth as a Near Eastern-styled absolute monarch. In discussing the use of these titles in Bronze Age Greece, where there is more robust evidence for them, Morris (2003, 4–8) argues that the *wanax* has a religious function, involved in ritual activities concerning the *potnia* (lady or goddess), while the *lawagetas* seems to be a military figure, leader of the *laos*, a group of armed men. Morris’ overall argument is that the evidence for kingship—for royal power or identity consolidated in an individual—in

\(^{17}\) Yakubovich (2011, 539) documents a plausibly similar phenomenon wherein “Greek authors persistently misunderstood… as a personal name” the Cilician royal title ςυεννεσις; this title is maintained in Cilicia into the Achaemenid period, but reflects the Luwian *zuwannassi*, “of the dog” > hunter, attested in the hieroglyphic inscriptions of the last Hittite kings (Simon 2009). The Assyrians apparently did the same in understanding the Hittite/Neo-Hittite title Labarna/Lubarna as a personal name: see Weeden 2013, 15.
Bronze Age Greek society, whether in text or archaeology, is in fact scanty, but has nonetheless strongly influenced reconstructions of prehistoric society and its organization. On Greek kingship, she writes:

“What remained unquestioned in these models until recently, and is sustained in mythology, is the idea that some form of kingship did prevail in the Bronze Age. Archaeologists probed prehistory in search of the legends of Minos and Agamemnon, and found these figures too easily in excavation: the ‘face of Agamemnon’ appeared to Schliemann in a gold mask found at Mycenae; the ‘palace of Minos’ was soon named as it was uncovered by Evans. These early and romantic claims were eventually substantiated, it appeared, by the decipherment of Mycenaean Greek in tablets that name a pa-si-re-u and wa-na-ka, ancestors of Greek basileus (king) and wanax (lord). How plausible are they as terms for early rulers?” (Morris 2003, 2)

Morris goes on to demonstrate that royal images in art are confined to ceremonial contexts, that other ‘trappings of monarchy’ such as palaces, thrones, or scepters, are archaeologically scant, and that the political organization of Bronze Age Greece suggested by the textual evidence is a network of autonomous local communities and strong collective leadership, with the proliferation of titles reflecting dispersion of power throughout the system as befit its heterarchical nature. Kingship, even linguistically, was non-Greek; but must non-Greeks, therefore, be kings?

We have seen that Midas as the name of a charismatic individual, a barbarian king, a greedy buffoon or bearer of ass’s ears, is the creation of Greek myth. The second body of evidence for a Midas as a political actor, from the Assyrian archives, will be discussed below. Still, it cannot be argued that Körte and Young escaped the trap of ‘setting off in search of the legend of Midas, and finding him too easily.’ Rather than the Linear B texts, the inscriptions of Sargon II provided the further necessary kernel of historical ‘fact’ that allowed this Midas-mania to persist in the face of no evidence of such a man, his wagon, his throne, tomb, or palace, from Gordion itself. Roller, Burke and others make clear that most of the Classical textual record is a red herring when it
comes to interpreting the archaeology of Phrygian Gordion; to better do so, we must critically interrogate why we argue for an historical King Midas, and thereby for Phrygian kingship, at all.

### 2.2.3 Assyrian and Phrygian sources: some alternative facts.

The reason we discuss an historical King Midas, active in the late 8th century BCE, is because of his mention in a series of Assyrian historical documents dating to the reign of Sargon II (722–705 BCE). Mita, ruler of the Mushki, appears several times in Sargon II’s royal inscriptions at Khorsabad: conspiring against Sargon with Pisiri of Karkemish in 717 BCE; losing several fortresses or towns in Que (the Cilician plain) to Sargon in 715 BCE (these Midas “had held by force since distant days,” ln. 125–126, *trans.* Luckenbill 1927, 8); and losing ground in battle again to the Assyrian governor of Que, subsequently submitting to Sargon (“offering servitude and bringing tribute (and) gifts,” *trans.* Luckenbill 1927, 22) in 709 BCE. Further details have emerged subsequently, namely in a tablet from Nimrud now in the Iraq Museum: Nimrud Letter No. 39/ND 2759 between Sargon and Ashur-sharru-usur, the aforementioned Assyrian governor of Que, records Sargon’s delight at the good news that “the Phrygian [has] become our ally” (Postgate 1973, 23). According to the letter, dated to ca. 710/709 BCE, Midas had handed over to Ashur-sharru-usur an embassy of men of Que who were traveling to make overtures to Urartu, Assyria’s enemy; Sargon instructs Ashur-sharru-usur to reciprocate by relinquishing any Phrygian prisoners he may have, and to maintain a messenger at ‘the court of the Phrygian.’ Sargon further assents to an

---

18 For an exhaustive treatment of these sources see Bryce 2012, 287–89; Wittke 2004.
audience with a messenger from Urba’l’a (Warpalawas of Tuwana, a province of Tabal) and a Phrygian messenger.

This letter of Sargon, and further details from the Annals, reflect the geopolitical complexity of Central Anatolia in the late 8th century BCE. They list the numerous kings and territories of Tabal by name, reflecting Assyria’s intimate acquaintance with the region: divided into Bit-Purutas in the north, centered on the Kayseri plain, and Tuwana to the south, each was bordered (or constituted of) smaller named polities such as Istuanda, Atunna, Sinuhtu (modern Aksaray? See Weeden 2010), and Hubisna, whose precise locations are still debated. The earliest local inscriptions (in hieroglyphic Luwian, reflecting the dominance of Hittite-speaking ethnic groups in the region, or perhaps simply the cultural sway of Karkemish?) name a certain Tuatti and his son and successor Uassurme/Wasusarmas as “Great King” in the area of modern Nevsehir and Kayseri (Hawkins 1969, 107–8); Tuatti appears on a list of kings paying tribute to Tiglath-Pileser III ca. 750 BCE, while Uassarme appears withholding tribute ca. 730 BCE, and is apparently replaced by an Assyrian representative, Hulli. Sargon’s early forays into local geopolitics involve his deposing one Kiakki of Sinuhtu for withholding tribute, giving the city/city-state of Sinuhtu to Kurti of Atunna, and restoring Hulli and shortly afterward, his son Ambaris, to the throne of Bit-Purutas. Ambaris then married Sargon’s daughter Ahat-abisa and received Hilakku, a Cilician polity to the southwest of Tabal, on the border with Que, as a dowry. Despite this munificence, Ambaris and Kurti apparently sought out Rusa of Urartu and Mita of Muški as allies for the expulsion of the Assyrians

More detailed historical reconstructions of these interactions can be found in Melville 2016; D’Alfonso 2012; Postgate 1973.
from Anatolia. (This was ostensibly not out of character for Midas, who had already colluded with Pisiri of Karkemish against Sargon.) Sargon responded by taking Ambaris and his wife, Sargon’s daughter, back to Assyria, and laying waste to Bit-Purutas; Kurti of Atunna then returned to the Assyrian fold. We learn of the betrayals of Urikki of Que, who had been king of Que prior to its annexation by Assyria and the appointment of an Assyrian governor; it was Urikki who sent the embassy to Urartu that Midas intercepted. The travails of Urbal’a/Warpalawas of Tuhana appear as well, discontent because he had lost control of several cities of Bit-Purutas to Atunna and Istuanda.

Melville’s (2010) designation of the region of Tabal as a “contested periphery” is quite apt: the level of detail available to us about south-central Anatolia during Sargon II’s reign reflects its geopolitical significance to the Assyrian empire. Sargon appears extremely well-informed—and, based on the tenor of his correspondence with Ashur-sarru-usur, interested in remaining so—as to the city-states that constituted Tabal, their rulers, their familial relationships, and their infighting, which he sometimes stoked or litigated. Within these interactions, however, Midas appears rather infrequently, and almost never as an actor: at least in Sargon’s constructions, he is approached by Pisiri of Karkemish, by Ambaris of Bit-Purutas and by Kurti of Atunna, he does not seek them out. Unlike other rulers, he is sometimes referred to as “the Phrygian,” rather than by name. The interactions between Sargon and Midas are never direct—he does not go to the effort to solidify relations by arranging a dynastic marriage with Midas as he does with Ambaris of Bit-Purutas, indicating that Mušku is less important to him as an ally; he does not even appear to have sent messengers to Phrygia, although he encourages Ashur-sarru-usur to send one from Que (“let not your messenger be cut off from the
presence of the Phrygian." Only once do we hear about a direct interaction between a messenger of Phrygia and the Assyrian court, and even then the details are imprecise:

Sargon’s letter reads, ‘As to what you [Ashur-sharru-usur] wrote to me, saying: “A messenger of Urbal’a came to me for an audience, with the Phrygian messenger”—let him come.’ Finally, Sargon expresses surprise and delight at Midas’ desire for peace—presumably because he has had so little interaction with him, in battle or otherwise. The only indication of Midas’ status relative to the rulers of Tabal is in the conclusion of the letter, which reads: “… what will all the kings of Tabal (be able to) do in future? You, from this side, and the Phrygian, from that side, will squeeze them, so that soon you will tie your rope with them.” Midas’s status is no greater than the Ashur-sharru-usur’s, and Sargon had not been preoccupied with Midas as an imminent threat.

The Assyrian sources, then, though they attest to certain activities of ‘Mitā’ of mat Mušķi or ‘the Phrygian’, are not as historically useful as they first seem, in that direct interaction between the Assyrian king and Midas never occurs. One inscription of Sargon boasts that Midas submitted to him, who had never submitted to his forefathers: it is more accurate to say that prior to the reign of Sargon, Assyria had very little notion of Phrygia, and vice-versa. Tiglath-Pileser III (744–727 BCE) had expanded the northern borders of the Assyrian empire well beyond his predecessors (or at least, since

23 There are scant other Assyrian reference to a “Mushki” people that date to the 12th and 11th centuries BCE. Those Mushki appear to be settled in a geographic area far to the east of what we now consider Phrygia. Their relationship to the mat Mušķi of Sargon’s time is debated, and possibly nonexistent (Wittke 2004; see also entry in the Reallexicon der Assyriologie).
Shalmaneser III in 838 BCE), recording tribute, in 738 and 732 BCE, from the Tabalean kings of Que, Melid, Kashka, Tabal, Tuna, Tuhana, Istunda, and Hubishna, as well as Kummuhu, Damascus, Samaria, Tyre, Byblos, Karkemish, Hamath, Sam'al, Gurgum, and from ‘Zabibe, queen of the Arabs’: “gold, silver, tin, iron, elephant hides, ivory, multi-colored garments, linen garments, blue-purple (and) [red]-purple wool, ebony, boxwood, all kinds of precious things from the royal treasure, li[ve] sheep [whose wool] is dyed red-purple, flying birds of the sky whose wings are dyed blue-purple, horses, mules, oxen, and she[ep and goats, camels], she-camels, together with their young” were the goods on offer (Tiglath-Pileser 14 and 15).

It seems unlikely that, had Mushku been a militaristic territory in expansion at the time of Tiglath-Pileser’s forays to its later border-towns of Tuhana and Que, friction between the two powers would not have erupted. And yet, the Midas Mound tumulus at Gordion, with its rich contents indicative of far-flung trade contacts, dates to just this period; while it is clear from Tiglath-Pileser III’s inscriptions that Phrygia is outside the known world of his empire. Mušku and Mita do not show up on Assyrian radar screens until ten or even twenty years later, and after the Assyrian annexation of Que. Interactions between Assyria and Mušku almost exclusively occur in Que or on the Que-Mušku border, and their communication is always mediated by the governor of Que.24 While Sargon is delighted that Mita is interested in suing for peace, he nonetheless sees him as a local ruler more or less at the same rank as the Assyrian governor, rather than

24 Geographically speaking, it is hard to imagine where this shared border between Que and Mushku would be, if not in Tabal; see Weeden 2010. Our modern notions of territoriality and territorial contiguity may be anachronistic in this context, however (Osborne 2013).
as a serious rival power. Furthermore, his knowledge of Phrygia, its location, extent, or political organization, is nonexistent, nor is he preoccupied with such details—unlike he is with Tabal.

In short, the Assyrian sources, although earlier, are not much more useful than the Greek ones in reconstructing any political or geographic specificity as regards the location or organization of the Phrygian state. Conservatively, we can imagine that a ruler named Midas—or a leader who had unusually accrued to himself multiple titles usually borne by separate individuals, including *(wanax, lawagetas, and?)* midas, which was interpreted as a personal name in Assyrian communications by analogy with their custom regarding Tabalean kings—came to power in Phrygia sometime late in the third or early in the fourth quarter of the 8th century; had broader territorial ambitions than his (unnamed and unidentified) predecessors (who may have had none at all, based on the paucity of regional archaeological data attesting Phrygian military activity or conquest at

---

25 See also Wittke (2007, 344): "For the early period (eleventh to ninth centuries), we may, at best, assume a Phrygian ‘principality’, that is, a smaller political entity in the tradition of Asia Minor, and with Gordion at its centre."  

26 Weeden (2010, 44–45) makes mention of the various titles borne by rulers of Tabal and their highly-placed ‘servants’: Tuwati and Wasusarma are given the title Great King, while a certain Ruwa is called, once, ‘servant of Tuwati’, but is also given the title *tuwanis*, ‘ruler’, perhaps a governor; he also says he ‘was put in command’ and calls himself ‘house-lord’ and ‘the sun-blessed one.’ The latter title is used by Azatiwada of the Karatepe bilingual, a subordinate of the king of Adana who nonetheless had an elaborately constructed fortress and apparently a degree of local power. It seems, in Tabal and also perhaps in Karkemish (where the title of “Great King” coexists with and then goes out of use in favor of “City-Lord”; see Gilibert 2015), that a complex hierarchy of status existed, and that we should imagine its political organization around competing noble families or corporate structures, rather than centrally organized and consolidated under one ruler (see also Mora and D’Alfonso 2012). If this is the case in Tabal and in southeastern Anatolia, might it have been the case in Phrygia as well? (See Chapter 3.) In any case, despite his familiarity with the local power politics of Tabal, Sargon doesn’t defer at all to local mores by adopting a nuanced set of Assyrian titles—he just calls them all ‘king.’ It is not a stretch to imagine that he would have cared even less for any intricacies of Phrygian political organization, and therefore called Midas ‘king’ without reflection. In short, it is not because Sargon sometimes calls Midas ‘king’ that he was a king.
any time, and their complete dearth in the 9th century); began a series of campaigns to expand Phrygian influence beyond the traditional borders of Central Anatolia; bumped up against Assyrian might in Que, skirmished with them on several occasions, and finding their resistance to be greater than his power, relinquished those ambitions by ca. 709 BCE. The period in which Phrygia enjoyed this extra-regional notoriety was brief and perhaps was an historical anomaly for the polity. Certainly, the textual sources cannot tell us more: for the Assyrians, Mušku seems to be easily conflated with Tabal, in the way that for the Greeks it is the same as, but just beyond, Lydia, and later becomes conflated with Troy (Rives 2005; DeVries 2000).

The inscriptions of Sargon II’s palace at Khorsabad were first published by Hugo Winckler, who, in 1901, made the connection between Mita, king of the land of Mushku, and the legendary King Midas of Phrygia. This connection was therefore very much present during the Körte’s early work at Gordion, and influential to their interpretations. The historicity of Midas—about whose life and chronology the Greeks provided a few seemingly reliable details, even if wrapped in ‘the dense veil of legend’—was seen to be confirmed by the Assyrian record. The relative celebrity of the Midas Monument at Midas City, prompted by W. M. Leake’s 1824 publication of a description of the “Tomb of Midas” in his Journal of a tour in Asia Minor with comparative remarks on the Ancient and Modern Geography of that country, provided further confirmation. Between 1825

27 Phrygia’s apparently abrupt decision to ally with Assyria—rather than allow an alliance between a non-Assyrian-backed ruler of Que, Warikas/Urikki, and Urartu—must reflect its own calculation that an entente between Assyria and Tabal was more favorable for it than a stronger Urartu-Tabal alliance, which might have encroached on Phrygian independence. Weeden (2010) suggests that Tuwati and Wasusarma of Tabal/Bit-Purutas were ‘imitating the behavior of Assyria’ in their territorial machinations; I would argue that Phrygia is “imitating the behavior of Tabal” in its careful calculations of how to play local powers against each other, but if so, this is because its own power, military and diplomatic, must have been equally limited.
and 1900, when the brothers Körte began excavations at Gordion, more than a dozen European travelers—including Charles Texier, William Ramsay, and Alfred Körte himself—all visited the Highlands of Phrygia and published illustrated travelogues of the monuments they ‘discovered’ there (see Fiedler 2003, 33–35, for a more detailed summary). The few, mysterious, runic-looking inscriptions, in which the name Midas was nevertheless clear and present, only further romanticized the picture. The Midas Monument was the largest and most impressive of these—further confirming everyone’s expectations—but the fact that there were several such monuments argued, again, that Midas was first among equals, not a unique example. In 1898, Körte put forth the suggestion that the City of Midas had never been inhabited, but was instead a sacred site; this notion persists today in the Highlands of Phrygia. Still, between the Mita of the Assyrian texts, the Phrygian Midas to whom the Midas Monument was dedicated, and the Greek Midas of the Golden Touch—whose date of death, given by Eusebius’ *Chronicle*, in 696 BCE, corresponded so neatly with the dates of Sargon’s reign—the historical reality of a Midas, and therefore, of a Phrygian kingdom whose development reached its apogee with him, has never been seriously called into question since 1901.28

2.2.4 *The Körte excavations and the Old Chronology*

The Körtes excavated five tumuli, now termed K-I through K-V; two trenches on the citadel mound, A on the southwestern edge of the mound, and B at the northeast; and one trench, C, on the Küçük Höyük (the “Nebenhügel”). They were not overly

28 But see Wittke (2004, 2007), Van Dongen (2014), discussion in Section 2.4 of this chapter; see also DeVries (2011, 13–14), summarizing the creation of the Old Chronology.
pleased with the results, and let their disappointment be known: “Anyone who has
thought of the old center of the Phrygian kingdom as a fortress surrounded by huge
walls, in the style of Troy, will be greatly disappointed by the modest remnants
discovered by us.” They had little hope for the future, either: “Whatever more extensive
excavations and interesting finds follow, they will not bring to light impressive built
remains. … The palace of the king, which, architecturally speaking, we cannot think was
particularly splendid, must be sought elsewhere.” The excavations on the Citadel
Mound did not reach the Phrygian Destruction Level: Area B yielded nothing but scrappy
walls, while in Area A they uncovered a megaron-style building they identified as a
temple, associated with a number of architectural terracottas and the stone torso of a
bird of prey. The terracottas were decorated in a style now believed to have reached
Gordion with the Lydian expansion into the region in the late 7th or early 6th century BCE.
They identified the bird of prey as a clumsy, locally worked “siren”, and reconstructed it
as the akroterion of the ‘temple’; but were neither willing to confirm nor deny that this
‘meager tile-bedecked building’ might be “the famous temple of Zeus… in which
Alexander destroyed the legendary knot.” In other words, they allowed their

29 “Wer sich den alten Mittelpunkt des phrygischen Reiches als eine von gewaltigen Mauern
umgebene Burg nach Art Trojas gedacht hat, der wird durch die bescheidenen Reste, welche von
uns aufgedeckt worden sind, arg enttäuscht sein.” (Körte and Körte 1904, 212).

30 “Was immer ausgedehntere Grabungen an interessanten Einzelfunden ergeben mögen,
imposante Reste von Bauwerken werden sie nicht zutage fördern. … Der Palast des Königs, den
wir uns, architektonisch wenigstens, nicht besonders glänzend denken dürfen, muss an anderer
Stelle gesucht werden.”

31 “Dass kein gewöhnlicher Vogel, sondern ein menschenköpfiger, eine Sirene, dargestellt war,
lehrt die Kette, die um den Hals gelgt ist. Zweifellos ist die plumpe Arbeit einheimisch, aber nach
ostgriechischem Vorbilde gefertigt.” (Körte and Körte 1904, 168).

32 “Die sich zum Schluß auftreibende Frage: Ist dieser dürftige kachelgeschmückte Bau der
berühmte Zeustempel von Gordion, in dem Alexander den sagenumwobenen Knoten zerrieb?
lässt sich weder einfach bejahen noch verneinen.” (Körte and Körte 1904, 168).
excavations to be guided by the Classical sources—they had also hoped that surface stones they found in Area B, placed at the highest point of the mound, would turn into the palace or Zeus temple, but were again disappointed—but nothing that they found corresponded with their expectations of what the glorious city of Midas should look like. They concluded, instead, that based on their urban architecture, the Phrygian people were of “peasant, peaceful character.”

Their excavations of the Gordion ‘necropolis’ betrayed a marked contrast with the urban settlement. Stylistic dating of the artifacts from the five tumuli they investigated now allows us to date them all to the 8th century or later: K-III, the oldest, dates to ca. 780 BCE, followed by K-IV ca. 750, K-I ca. 600, K-V ca. 560, and K-II ca. 550 BCE. K-III was of the most interest to the Körtes, and for them was an unsolved mystery: they attributed it to the time of Midas because its rich finds bespoke far-flung foreign contacts (especially with Cyprus) corresponding, in their view, to Midas’ political ambitions. A leather breast-plate worn by the deceased identified him as a priest, G. Körte argued, based on a section of Polybius describing priests of the Mother in Pessinus (in the late Hellenistic period) wearing relief-moulded breastplates (ἔχοντες προσθήδια καὶ τύπους, Plb. 21.37.6). The other contents of the tomb, including wooden furniture, high-quality ceramics (both brown-on-buff and polished black wares), numerous bronze bowls and cauldrons, and iron tools, were judged of a ‘relatively high level’ of craftsmanship—but they believed the bronzes to be imports, and the other items to be the products of industries “which a farming and livestock-producing population

____________________________

33 "Dem bäuerlichen, friedlichen Charakter des phrygischen Volkes entspricht alles, was die von uns zum erstenmale unternommene Untersuchung einter seiner Städte ans Licht gebracht hat. “ (Körte and Körte 1904, 212.)
primarily required.” The bronze vessels and fibulae did allow Gustav Körte to date the tumulus stylistically to ca. 700 BCE: but so, too, did his conviction that it must have been erected during the reign of the ‘last and most brilliant Phrygian king’, Midas. Such an opulent burial would be “inconceivable” after the Kimmerian invasion, which brought on Midas’ suicide and the collapse of the Phrygian kingdom, not necessarily in that order. This first attempt at rooting Phrygian material culture in absolute chronology, in other words, depends on a casual remark in Strabo narrativizing an otherwise mythic king’s life, or really, dramatizing his death. While K-IV, less opulent, nonetheless shared stylistic elements with K-III, K-I, K-V, and K-II were all decidedly later, thereby presenting sufficient evidence of the long hiatus expected as a result of the cultural decline prompted by the Kimmerian conquest. When Rodney Young began excavations at Gordion fifty years later, this was the sole fixed point in otherwise uncharted territory: the archaeology of the Phrygian kingdom and its capital was indistinguishable from the archaeology of Midas’ glorious life and tragic death.

34 “Von gewerblicher Tätigkeit hat nur die Töpferei einen verhältnismäßig hohen Stand erreicht, auch die Bearbeitung von Holz und Eisen finden wir vertreten: die Gewerbe, deren eine Ackerbau und Viehzucht treibende Bevölkerung in erster Linie bedurfte. Dagegen nicht die Gewinnung und Verarbeitung des Kupfers bezw. der Bronze: Gefäße und Geräte aus Bronze werden vielmehr als kostbarer Besitz von aussen eingeführt...” (Körte and Körte 1904, 214.)

2.3 The University of Pennsylvania Expedition

2.3.1 Rodney Young: Gordion, not at all what Strabo led him to expect

In 1951, Rodney Young, Curator-in-Charge of the Mediterranean Section of the Penn Museum and veteran excavator of the Athenian Agora, published his first impressions of the site of ‘Yassihuyuk’, where he had begun excavations the year before, in the *Bulletin of the University Museum*. He was reluctant to call it Gordion: no proof of the site’s ancient name had yet been found; but, like the Körte brothers before him, he noted that it “fulfilled the topographic requirements” set out by Greek and Roman writers, as it lay on the Sangarios River and on the military route from the coast to the interior of Anatolia, where Alexander the Great would have passed. Furthermore, “the impressive size of the mound, together with the number and scale of the tumuli or grave mounds which surround it, give assurance that in times past this was a center of culture and of population worthy to be the capital of the dynasty of the famous King Midas,” he assured his readers (Young 1951, 3).

Young’s excavations spanned 24 years and were by no means limited to the Phrygian period. A thorough and ambitious excavator, he set out not simply to illustrate the wealth of King Midas, but to address the broad questions of “the origin and culture of the Phrygians, their impact on the Hittite Empire, their role as transmitters of Hittite culture, and their influence on the Greeks during the early formative period of Greek culture” (Young 1951, 4). But Young was pursuing these questions amid a gold rush: competition was rife among American universities to excavate the great cities of Near Eastern antiquity—Sardis (Princeton and later Harvard), Dura Europas (Yale), Nippur and Ur (Penn), Persepolis (Chicago)—and “to incorporate into their identity the greatest achievements of … the wealthiest ancient sites to which they could gain access” (Rose
2016, 6). This was surely at least part of the reason he initially chose to prioritize the excavation of tumuli over the citadel mound, digging six during the 1950 campaign alone. He turned out to be a singularly fortunate excavator: “Gold the first day!” he famously wrote to a colleague on April 1, 1950, referring to the contents of the small but richly furnished Tumulus A, the very first object of the renewed excavations’ attentions (Edwards 1980).

In the same letter, Young offhandedly suggested the tomb was that of to “a young damsel (perhaps K.M.’s golden daughter)”—K.M. for King Midas, of course. He later dated it, based on stylistic parallels, to ca. 550 BCE; this date still holds today (roughly), though it is now known to have been a period of Achaemenid Persian rule at the site, far removed from the ‘dynasty’ of Midas. And yet, the casually made connection between Midas and the tumulus occupant would prove indicative of Young’s approach to interpreting the site: alongside the literary record, the proliferation of tumuli in the site’s hinterland served as confirmation from the outset that Gordion was the seat of a prosperous royal dynasty. Despite avowedly limited archaeological exploration, the historical reconstruction he proffered in 1951 would go unchallenged for decades, and filter through the archaeology of Anatolia as a whole:

“the Phrygians, who apparently spoke a language akin to Greek, entered Asia Minor in the twelfth or thirteenth century before Christ, coming perhaps by way of Thrace and across the Hellespont and the Bosporus… [they] seem to have taken over the hegemony of western Asia Minor during the tenth, ninth and eighth centuries. They were a ruled by a dynasty of kings alternatively named Gordius and Midas, concerning whom a number of extravagant legends have come down to us through Greek sources.”

As for the archaeological evidence to accompany this basic chronology, Young’s work on the citadel mound had been more successful than the Körtes’. A 1950 deep sounding revealed six major habitation layers: one Early Bronze Age (6), one Hittite (5), one dominated by coarse grey wares (4), a later one where painted wares with
geometric patterns appeared aside the grey (3), an ‘archaic layer’ (2), and a Hellenistic and Roman layer (1). While the ‘archaic’ buildings had been “badly plundered,” the “Phrygian building of the third level” was fairly complete but covered with the debris of broken bricks, rubble, ash and cinders—“perhaps suggesting a destruction by fire which could conceivably be brought into connection with the invasion of Asia Minor by the Cimmerians at the beginning of the seventh century, bringing to an end the hegemony of the Phrygian kingdom” . Here, then, we see the first glimmer of the Old Chronology, rooted in the 700 BCE destruction.

The inaccuracy of this date has by now been sufficiently addressed elsewhere (Rose and Darbyshire 2011). But Young’s reliance on the legend of Midas was not limited to chronology: rather, its implications for the political organization of the Phrygian ‘kingdom’ led to a series of thinly veiled expectations of art, architecture, and urbanism that Gordion consistently failed to meet. In 1962, in an article for the University Museum’s magazine, Expedition, Young expresses multiple times how little we can assume about Phrygia, “a kingdom whose actual extent and power are unknown to us,” or Phrygian history, “largely a blank” (Young 1962a, 3). He nevertheless goes on to describe in great detail what the capital, “the seat of the king,” should look like:

It should be a fortified stronghold capable of withstanding attack from without or insurrection within the kingdom. It should contain barracks for the housing of a garrison to protect it; perhaps also stables for the horses of the cavalry; certainly storerooms for arms and military equipment; possibly workrooms for the production and repair of the armament. The *palace of the king* should lie within the fortifications—a building or a complex of buildings within a compound, on a large scale, with rooms big enough to serve as audience chambers, banquet halls, or courtrooms. Attached to the palace should be many storerooms for the *accumulation of tribute or of taxes* paid in kind … The palace probably had attached to it also the *workshops of the artisans* who produced its furnishings—workers in bronze and ivory, woodcarvers and cabinet-makers, leather-workers and the weavers and embroiderers who produced the hangings for the palace and raiment for its dwellers. The *complex as a whole must have been much like a feudal castle of medieval times—a self-sustaining unit revolving around the court*. The religious life of court and kingdom too
must have centered around a temple or temples of the various deities at the capital, where the king could exercise his functions as religious head of the state. For all of these functions there must have been functionaries great and small, all clustered around the seat of power; Gordion, in short, must have been the center of an extensive bureaucracy. (Young 1962a, 3; emphasis mine.)

Young is here describing ideas that were current at the time; he is essentially paraphrasing V. Gordon Childe’s extremely influential ‘ten-point model’ for early states (Childe 1950; see also M. Smith 2009), with his emphasis on a palace, bureaucracy, taxation, and craft specialization.36 His terms, however, reveal that the theoretical framework derived from the historical reality of a King Midas carried with it expectations not just for political organization, but for social organization and the political economy. While it is never so explicitly stated elsewhere, it was these expectations, more so than archaeological excavation, that allowed Young to fill in the avowed ‘blank’ of Phrygian history.

The very existence of the tumuli, together with their rich contents, provided no small degree of confirmation of the model: one could forcefully argue, on their basis, for long-distance trade, artistry of a high level of sophistication, a powerful elite and a large workforce at Phrygian-period Gordion, both before and after the Destruction. The expected palace complex, temples, and storerooms, however, were not exactly forthcoming. Rather, Young found much of the architecture of the citadel mound ambiguous and difficult to categorize, as his biannual excavation reports in the American

36 Childe’s model doesn’t include a discussion of the military; the ‘threat of violence’ exerted by the State doesn’t appear until much later (e.g. Sanderson 1995). Doubtless Young felt the need to include this because, first, there was evidence of a Lydian garrison at Gordion; and second, because of the textual references to border skirmishes between Muški and Que. Wittke (2007), on the other hand, points out that no weapons have been found at Gordion and rulers, warriors, and battle imagery are suspiciously rare in Phrygian iconography.
Journal of Archaeology reveal. To his credit, throughout these reports, Young expresses a willingness to reevaluate prior results. With the discovery of Megaron 3 in 1958, for example, he wrote:

When it first appeared the building to the west of the enclosure wall was joyfully nicknamed Megaron 3 in anticipation of a plan similar to that of the two buildings to the east. Since the plan did not materialize, the name is a misnomer; but its abbreviation, M-3, is convenient and already deeply embedded, and perhaps it will serve until we can call the building the Palace. Very little of it has been cleared to date… (Young 1958, 144)

In being so forthcoming, though, he makes his preoccupation known: where was the palace?37 The monumental “Phrygian Gate Building” was of a scale and construction technique sufficiently impressive that “it obviously must date from a period of great prosperity and power” (Young 1955, 15)—and therefore, to the reign of King Mita of Mushku toward the end of the eighth century B.C. (“(or earlier),” he allows (Young 1955, 16)). Just inside the gate, however, neither Megaron 1 nor 2—though floored with polychrome pebble mosaics, Megaron 2’s of unusual intricacy—displayed a suitable place for the bed of a throne, “as in the Bronze Age Greek megaron at Tiryns or Pylos” (Young 1957, 322). In 1960 he admitted,

Each year at Gordion we seem to find something palatial, and it becomes the palace-of-the-year. … about one fourth of the area of Megaron 3 remains to be cleared; there is always a chance that this may produce something to indicate whether the building was actually the palace, or merely palatial. (Young 1960, 240)

Megaron 3 was the largest of the Megaron buildings, and contained many luxury items; it is currently held, as it was then, to be the best contender for a palace, though the digitalGordion website suggests that it may well have been “a reception and

37 Young was probably further dismayed due to the fact that Arrian (Anab. 2.3.1) clearly describes a Palace of Gordios and Midas high on the acropolis where the Wagon of Gordias was housed during Alexander’s visit.
audience hall” for the rulers of ninth century Gordion. Having excavated three-quarters of it, however, Young was not entirely satisfied. He tended to refer to the Megaron buildings, in these early publications, as “houses”; he did the same with the first Terrace Building unit to be excavated, TB-3, dubbing it the “South Phrygian House.” Its contents—grinding stones neatly arranged on a bench, “many types” of loomweights and whorls, and great quantities of pottery, signaled its “domestic character,” either a “kitchen” or “pantry.” When Young finally turned his full attention to the Terrace—it was at first excavated only in bits and pieces as it related to the Megaron excavations—he was still unconvinced of Megaron 3’s palatial status, and considered the Terrace Complex perhaps a better contender. “Details of construction indicate that it was planned and built all at one time, evidently as an important public building. Its prominent position on a high terrace gives it a claim to have been the king’s palace rivaling that of Megaron 3,” he wrote in 1960 (242).

Young goes on to emphasize the architectural similarity between the Megaron 3’s inner room, with its elaborate system of wooden posts and beams dividing it into ‘nave’ and ‘side aisles’ and probably supporting a gallery along the walls above, and that of the inner rooms of the Terrace Building units, with postholes suggesting exactly the same arrangement. Ultimately, however, these considerations of architecture, situation, and plan were outweighed by the burden of Young’s expectations:

If it was the palace, we have opened so far only some of the work- and storerooms; and we can have little admiration for the Phrygians as neat and orderly housekeepers. In a palace, as at Knossos for example, one would expect many storerooms for the stowing of goods and equipment of all kinds; one would also expect workrooms in which the chores of daily living were performed. But one would expect at least a modicum of

38 See http://sites.museum.upenn.edu/gordion/history/iron-age-gordion/
neatness and order: one room for the storage of bronzes, six for the storage of pottery vessels, perhaps one for the archives, and as workrooms one for the grinding of flour, another for the kneading of bread, and perhaps a bake-room with several ovens. The rooms of the Terrace Building, with evidence for all kinds of different activity in each, on the other hand suggest nothing but a large and disorderly apartment house in which each family carried on its manifold daily activities in its own room or suite of rooms. Perhaps they slept in the galleries.”

In report after report, Young recorded the appearance of certain, quite unusual ceramics in the Terrace Complex—an askos painted with checkerboard pattern in one of the CC units, which “reminds us of three similar askoi found in the child’s tomb under Tumulus P” (Young 1964, 286 and pl. 88, fig. 19); a “python-cothon” and “sipping cup” decorated by a modeled bird in the anteroom of TB-4 (1962, 165); a rather rare, complete example of an Alişar IV-style krater in TB-8 (Young 1968b, 239). He distinguished TB-1 and TB-2 from the rest, not only based on the lack of grinding stations and the presence of somewhat finer ceramics, but because of the higher concentration of other imports—ivory horse-trappings, jewelry, and a group of small bronze animals, including a bird “Phrygian-doodle in style” (referring here to graffiti that covered the stones of Megaron 2; see Roller 2011, Chapter 4, and Conclusion). On further consideration, he writes that TB-1 “seems to have been an elegant apartment rather than a workroom,” despite the fact that it and TB-2, like the other units, contained “masses of pottery and doughnuts” (Young 1962b, 166)—more than 500 loom weights came from TB-2 alone (1962, 165). In other words, the distinctions that were later made to be so clear—between ceremonial and industrial, elite and service, ‘courtyard’ and ‘megaron’ and ‘terrace’—did not seem so initially: although the overall character of the building was “domestic,” there was sufficient variety within and among the units to indicate that the complex was multi-use, perhaps special-purpose, or at least, defied easy categorization.
Young was not blind to these difficulties, and was sometimes perturbed by them:

“In a properly run palace we might expect to find different categories of things stored neatly in separate rooms,” he wrote again, vexedly, in 1968. “Here, evidently, all sorts of activities went on in each room, and many of the same activities in all of the rooms” (Young 1968a, 30). The urban layout of the citadel mound, especially the interrelationship between the Terrace Building and the Courtyards, was equally irksome. The Terrace Building had no openings or doors whatsoever in its east side and could only be accessed via a circuitous route involving a staircase from the Inner Court beside Megaron 3 that led to a raised passage between Megarons 2 and 1 and the blank backs of TB3, 2, and 1 until finally reaching a gated passageway called TG or the Terrace Gate, which presumably gave access to the street between the Terrace and Clay-Cut Buildings (excavation in this area is spotty; see Figure 1, Figure 31a–b). At its north end, the street between the Terrace and Clay-Cut Buildings ends in a wide monumental staircase, much disturbed by later construction. What lay beyond it is unknown; limited excavation there has yielded only Middle Phrygian remains. It would certainly be inconvenient, however, to supply the Megaron buildings with anything produced in the Terrace Complex via the TG route; it would be equally complicated to transport the large amounts of raw goods used there in from the outside (grain for grinding, wool for spinning, etc.).

Young raises the issue at several points, only to conclude:

“Communication between the two parts of the palace must have been circuitous; but at

39 In her work on the Unfinished Project, Voigt resolved this issue of access by reconstructing a staircase leading from the Early Phrygian Gate area up to the Terrace; this particular aspect of her reconstruction is based on very thin evidence—interpretation of one photograph—which I find unconvincing (Voigt 2013, 79 and Fig. 6.12; see discussion, Chapter 4, Sections 4.2.4–5).
least the palace proper was screened off from the bustle and noise of its service quarters" (Young 1968a, 31). In a later site report, Young fell back on biography to explain inconsistencies in the plan—particularly differences between the Early Phrygian and the 'archaic' Middle Phrygian city:

The planning and building of the archaic city was a huge undertaking, presumably beyond the capacity of a younger Midas or Gordios with only the resources of a much-reduced kingdom. It required the backing of a Cyrus (or perhaps of an Alyattes), supplementing from a wider realm the skill and labor that were locally available. (Young 1964, 285)

Young may have considered the Oriental, as opposed to the European, mindset another factor: in a guide to the excavations in 1968, Young described the citadel mound as a palace “of the Topkapı type, a group of individual buildings within an enclosure, rather than a single huge building such as the Louvre or Buckingham palace” (Young 1968a, 21).

Young’s excavation techniques, his thorough record-keeping, his interest in the broad arc of Gordion’s history rather than the narrow window of the Phrygian period, and his willingness to apply a theoretical framework to its archaeology, made him a scholar ahead of his time in many ways. He did not shy away from recording data, however inconvenient, and consistently sought models and comparanda outside his own experience in classical archaeology, and outside Anatolia. I by no means want to diminish his achievement here, or to understate the debt owed him. The insistence on Midas and Gordias as historic figures is problematic for Young only insofar as it forced him to frame his archaeological discoveries within a narrative of Phrygian history that both predated and was independent both of him and of large-scale archaeological work at the site. These unspoken assumptions, and their hold on both Young and those that followed him, must be revisited in the light of more flexible, up-to-date models of community and state formation and state structures (see Ch. 3).
2.3.2 Penn, the Next Generation: DeVries and Sams

Young’s untimely death in a car accident in 1974 brought a temporary halt to excavations. The responsibility for sorting out much of the unpublished remains fell to his successors, Keith DeVries and G. Kenneth Sams, whose focus was on completing Young’s work, more so than amending it. Sams, Young’s doctoral student at the University of Pennsylvania, took on the task of publishing the Early Phrygian Pottery, up to the destruction level, complete with explanation and interpretation of the relevant contexts. DeVries, as new Project Director, reported on Young’s final, unpublished seasons of excavation at Gordion (1969–1973), continuing to hone the established narrative.

DeVries was particularly interested in the Terrace Complex, where finds were concentrated, and of which he had personally overseen the excavation of several units. In a paper for Young’s Memorial Symposium (1980), he laid out and, arguably, codified the clear distinction that Young had earlier observed between the Megaron Courts at the east and the Terrace at the west: “Finds pointing to a much different way of life and to a very different class of society came from a zone of the citadel directly to the west of that considered,” isolated spatially from the elite quarter “by a blank back wall and by indirect passageways…” (DeVries 1980 38). DeVries characterized the differences in architecture and material culture as reflective not simply of spatial function but of social class as defined by access, finding support for his analysis in Homer:

Both King Alkinoos’s and Odysseus’s households were staffed by fifty slave women, who ground grain and did the textile work. The situation described seems strikingly like that at Gordion, with its quarter devoted to just those jobs. But where Alkinoos and Odysseus had fifty women, Midas may have had (conservatively) three hundred. However, the domestic work in the Homeric poems was done by women other than just slaves. Alkinoos’s queen Arete, like her servants, spins, Helen has her spinning work brought with her when she joins Menelaos and guests in the
banquet hall, and Penelope finds a long-successful ruse in her never-ending work at the loom. Such participation in the making of fabrics by the upper-class women may be relevant on the one hand to the signs of some textile work within the free-standing megaron quarter at Gordion and on the other hand to the occasional jewelry or rich equipment in the workrooms of the TB and CC zone, which otherwise seem lacking in luxury. (DeVries 1980, 42).

The quantification of 300 workers was based on the discovery of 18 querns in one unit, and “22 separate occurrences of one or more knives” in another (CC-3): a round estimate of 25 workers per unit, in each of the 9 excavated units (but not TB-1 or TB-2, where there were no grinding stones), plus 3 more reconstructed CC units, yields 300 total. DeVries reasoned that these workers, moreover, were women, and probably slaves, based on the nature of their activities—grinding and textile work—and the “fairly tight enclosure of the work zone within the citadel” (DeVries 1980, 40). Like Young before him, DeVries was briefly troubled by the fact that there was much evidence, both for textile and food production in the buildings of the Megaron Courts, and for ‘relaxed living’ in the Terrace Building units (e.g. imported hazelnuts, astragals, fibulae, ivory-handled knives, side-spouted sieve jugs for drinking beer alongside a further “array of exceptional vessels” (Sams 1994b, 5; see also DeVries 1980, 39–40). But the firm presence of Midas in one of the Megarons starkly limits the possibilities for more nuanced interpretations of social and political organization that might accommodate these inconsistencies: just as a king must have a palace, so too must a palace have slaves.

Sams’ (1994b) evaluation of the same contexts is somewhat more circumspect; this may be partially due to the fact that his focus was pots, not people, but also because he was conscious of the architectural sequence of the buildings of the citadel mound and therefore addressed them and their contents as part of a continuum. He describes the citadel as divided into three distinct quarters (refer to Figure 1, Figures 31a–b): “a
palatial complex in the NE, a street lined with service buildings at the SW, and a multi-roomed structure to the NW, between the citadel wall and an enclosure wall for the palace and service areas” (Sams 1994b, 2). But within those areas, he registers a wide variety of architectural styles and contents: Megaron 4, sitting atop the terrace, was the last building to be constructed before the fire--apparently just after the Terrace and Clay-Cut Buildings--and contained “an abundance of large storage vessels” but lacked other standard smaller jugs and bowls; Megaron 3 was in fact “the only palatial building well provisioned and undisturbed,” and “the distribution of pottery” inside its main room “followed a general pattern familiar from the service units” of the Terrace Complex, with many vessels for eating and drinking, though with a higher concentration of fine wares than in TB or CC; Megarons 1 and 2, aside from their remarkable mosaic floors, were quite empty, but burnt, while Megarons 9 and 10 were empty and unburnt, and Megaron 12 was unburnt but had crushed pottery of Destruction Level-date beneath mudbrick tumble on its floor; and the TB and CC units, alongside their grinding platforms and piles of loom weights, contained pottery “in quantities far greater than in Meg. 3,” including those that “echo some of the palatial trappings seen in Meg. 3,” and “an array of exceptional vessels” (Sams 1994b, 4–5).

Sams tends not to generalize about social or political organization at Gordion, privileging specific observations about contexts and function: for example, he observes that TB-1 and TB-2 were “different in nature” from the other Terrace units, lacking provisions for the processing of grain, but also that TB-4 had such provisions, and nevertheless was “particularly notable” for its remarkable pots and seven side-spouted sieve jugs (which occur in such high quantities, otherwise, only in Megaron 3 and in tumuli; Sams 1994b, 5–6). This approach extends to architecture, where he emphasizes “variety in… technique and material,” attributing it to “the diachronic nature of the
complex.” The variety is nonetheless remarkable: TB and CC were built of courses of sandstone and limestone, mudbrick and wood, while Megaron 4, later, was constructed entirely of mudbrick; Megaron 1 had only a low stone socle, with a mudbrick and wood superstructure, while Megarons 2 and 3 “were constructed to a considerable height in blocks of soft, pale brown poros (limestone) and wood.” Their stones, moreover, were “for the most part well cut and dressed,” with smooth surfaces, in contrast to Megarons 6–8, which had foundations of “roughly coursed rubble.” Megarons 1 and 2 both had elaborate timbered frames; 6–8, which were filled in with the addition of the Terrace, had “a relatively simple half-timbering system” but no mudbrick. Megaron 9, a later addition on the east side of the citadel, reused carefully worked poros elements that had apparently been cut for an earlier, dismantled building; these included three double-pitched blocks and half a wing-shaped akroterion. Other such poros elements were found reused in the foundations of several Middle Phrygian (post-Destruction Level) buildings: parts of four other akroteria, and ten sculpted orthostates that show Syro-Hittite influence in style and iconography (Sams 1989, 1994a). These are all argued to be part of an earlier phase of monumental architecture concentrated in the area of the Outer Courtyard that includes the Polychrome House gate building and the Post-and-Poros Building, the first Megaron-style building on the mound, excavated by Mary Voigt in the 1988–89 seasons. Stylistically, the sculptures bear parallels with those of the Suhis dynasty at Karkemish and Zincirli’s Outer/South City Gate, and therefore should date to the 10th century BCE. If correct, this date allows for little more than a century between the construction of the Post-and-Poros building and the destruction by fire of the Terrace Complex and Megarons 1-4; the Phrygians, then, were prodigious builders indeed. (For further elaboration on this sequence, see Chapter 4.)
Sams marshals this data to argue for a sophisticated and distinctly Phrygian architectural tradition, much as he earlier had for the Phrygian painted pottery tradition (Sams 1974, 1978, 1988, 1994a). His tendency is equally to look south and east of Gordian for Syro-Hittite influence, as well as westward to Lydia and Greece, distilling a Phrygian cultural identity from these disparate sources. For Sams, the monumental and organized nature of the citadel mound architecture, however diverse, is incontrovertible evidence for political complexity: in the 1994 publication, the 9th-century architecture of the mound “would imply an early zenith in Phrygian organization and accomplishments… long before the celebrated time of Midas” (Sams 1994a, 214). By the time of the publication of the New Chronology, he judged that “the building programs of the Early Phrygian period are testaments to the power and wealth that the Phrygian rulers already held in west-central Anatolia during the 9th century” (Sams and Voigt 2011, 155). Sams and Voigt look to Shalmaneser III’s campaign to Tabal in 837 for support, arguing that if Shalmaneser “encountered an Anatolian polity that consisted of at least 20 ‘kings’ and a number of cities that were worth sacking and subjecting to tribute,” that Tabal must have had “a complex political organization, and very likely a powerful ruler, under which the two dozen or so subsidiary rulers operated” (Sams and Voigt 2011, 156). Phrygia, then, was “a contemporary, western counterpart” to the powerful polities of Tabal, Urartu, “Syro-Phoenicia,” and Assyria; and “Midas too might have been a royal overseer of at least some” of the architectural work on the Early Phrygian citadel mound of Gordian (Sams and Voigt 2011, 156). The complex political organization of Tabal and Syro-Anatolia is certainly relevant to Gordian at this time, and is discussed in Chapter 3; no one powerful ruler is currently known or, to my knowledge, has been suggested elsewhere as an organizer or ringleader of the two dozen ‘subsidiary rulers’ encountered by Shalmaneser III. The reconstruction of such a ruler
here as a parallel to Midas, along with the later reference to Midas’ personal role building the citadel, reflects an unwillingness to stray too far from the established historical framework, even in the context of revising its key chronological underpinnings.

2.3.3 Renewed excavations and recent analyses: Voigt, Burke, Kealhofer & Grave

Mary M. Voigt initiated a new set of excavations at Gordion in 1988 with the goal of clarifying the stratigraphic sequence of the citadel mound, and exploring the outlying areas of the Lower and Outer Towns; these campaigns continued until 2002. Though Voigt's published work extends to all archaeological phases at Gordion, it largely focuses on earlier and later periods than the Destruction Level, and in particular on contextualizing the arrival of a ‘Phrygian’ ethnic group at the site in the Early Iron Age; the implications of her discoveries for the architectural evolution of the citadel are addressed in Chapter 4. Meanwhile, publication and analysis of the Young excavations continued at Gordion under Sams’ direction. Relevant to this discussion is the work of Brendan Burke, who both elaborated upon Sams’ interest in political complexity and DeVries’ confidence in the significance of the Terrace Complex for decoding social and economic aspects of Phrygian state organization, as well as its Bronze Age parallels. Rather than interrogating the basic assumptions of DeVries’ casual use of 8th-century Greek poetry evoking an idealized 14th-century/Late Bronze Age Greek past to explain a 10th- to 9th-century Central Anatolian archaeological context, Burke illustrates and quantifies it—tacitly accepting not only the economic model’s political implications, but concomitant assumptions regarding gender and status.

Burke’s dissertation and later book, From Minos to Midas: Ancient Cloth Production in the Aegean and Anatolia, sets out to discuss “the economic, political, and
social implications of a well-developed, centrally controlled textile industry in three
cultural regions and chronological periods,” namely, the early second millennium
Minoans, the late second millennium Mycenaeans, and the early first millennium
Phrygians. His basic premise is clearly stated: “Within complex societies elites controlled
craft activities, including the many phases of textile production, to maintain and finance
social, religious, and military institutions.” Administrative documents attest to the scale
and complexity of these endeavors in the palatial centers of the Aegean; new research
into these archives concerning the roles women played in the palatial economy, female
textile workers among them, has made it clear that female status was by no means as
limited nor as menial as DeVries’ offhand characterization might suggest (Olsen 2014).
Furthermore, as has been noted, no comparable evidence attests to a similar level of
administrative bureaucracy at Gordion—no archives have been found; no palace has
been securely identified. Without them, it is hard to imagine such a degree of
organization or control of ninth-century Phrygia, while any notions about the
maintenance of Phrygian social, religious, or particularly, military institutions at this early
period can be shown to exist largely in the realm of speculation, if not fantasy. The
notable sparsity of such evidence, at least for ninth-century, pre-destruction level
Gordion, has led scholars such as Wittke (2007) and Van Dongen (2014) to conclude
that “the idea of a large, well-organized Phrygian ‘Empire’ is incorrect,” and that Phrygia
did not develop “into a state of supraregional political and cultural importance” until at
least the second half of the eighth century.

Burke is not unaware of these difficulties, and his methodological considerations
are clearly articulated:

As Stein and Blackman (1993, 30-1) state, ‘the organizational context of
craft production reflects both the institutional structure of the state and the
nature of the state’s interaction with the broader, more heterogeneous
society in which it functions.’ To investigate the organization of craft
activities, the context, concentration, scale, and intensity of production require examination. Concentrated deposits of craft residues, such as raw materials, tools of manufacture, craft debris, unfinished and finished goods, are all indicative of specialized production. Administrative documents, when they can be deciphered, facilitate this investigation. (Burke 2010, 6)

In the case of Gordion, the large numbers of textile production tools and the standardized architectural space in which they were discovered are certainly strong indicators of craft specialization, of the kind described in administrative texts from palatial contexts in the ancient Near East from at least the third millennium bce onward and in Greece beginning in the second millennium bce. Burke goes on to describe this in detail:

“I believe ‘power is seen as an expression and reflection of community/state productive power and administrative control’ (Zagarelli 1986, 420). Craft specialization is defined as repeated, surplus production of one type of good (in this case, cloth) by attached, dependent specialists for exchange directed by a central authority (the palace). By quantifying the distribution of certain tools concentrated within a workshop complex of a regional center and assessing evidence for standardization we can locate specialized production. In some cases it is likely that workers were not free laborers but were slaves or prisoners captured in war and employed by the state, in other cases they may be highly skilled and valued craftspeople. Raw materials (primarily wool and flax) and component elements (dyes, perfumed oil, and decorations) are transformed into valuable property at the disposal of the ruling authority. The palace directs consumption of the finished product, for military, ideological and political purposes, and to acquire other prestige goods which serve to maintain power.” (Burke 2010, 6–7)

It’s extremely tempting to apply this model at Gordion, precisely because the documentary evidence concerning military, ideological, or political authority is so sparse, and so the archaeological evidence must be turned to this use. Burke’s approach, therefore, is to analyze the tools from Gordion quantitatively, unit by unit, in an attempt to characterize the distribution of labor and identify specialized activity zones.

And yet, problems arise when it comes to quantifying the distribution of tools and their standardization (as we shall see in greater detail in Chapter 5). For example: it is
true that loom weights and spindle whorls are found in every unit of the Terrace Buildings, but they are by no means evenly distributed. Numbers and locations of groups of weights are usually noted, more or less specifically, but rarely drawn, with the exception of the carefully excavated TB-7 and CC-3. Clusters of weights on more than one occasion number around 20, suggesting the setup for an average loom at Gordion, but just as frequently, weights were found in very large groups, numbering several dozen to several hundred, along walls or in storage jars, indicating that for the most part, these weights were not in use for weaving at the time of the destruction. Some of the largest numbers come from the units TB-1 and TB-2, with 742 and 500 loom weights in each of their respective main rooms. This is unexpected, given that these two units are identified universally as storage houses or treasuries (TB-1 was described by Young as an “elegant apartment”). In TB-1, the weights were found in five piles, one of which was a group of ‘hundreds’ of various shapes and sizes, alongside bronze cauldrons, animal-shaped protome attachments, and other trappings of a more luxurious existence. In most cases, the weights themselves do not survive—they were often discarded after excavation, and those that were kept have largely disintegrated—but the excavators often describe a range of shapes and sizes of weights. DeVries himself, in 1971, excavated the anteroom of TB7 and recorded four shapes found together: flattened, globular, pyramidal, and cylindrical. The more recent excavation of the anteroom of TB-2, undertaken as part of the Voigt 1988–1989 Stratigraphic Sequence campaign, is an exception, yielded some analytical data for these tools: Voigt found 87 “typical doughnut-shaped, clay loom weights” in the course of excavation, sixty percent of which, according to Burke, fell in the weight range of 400–700 grams. Still, “the distribution of their weights shows that standardization or uniformity was not strictly adhered to although there was a general range” (Burke 2010, 130). Both the widespread reports of varied weight shapes
from all units and Burke’s own analysis of the TB-2A weight group indicate a lack of
standardization not consistent with the advanced state of craft specialization put forth as
a model for the Phrygian political economy.

Similar arguments could be brought to bear on Burke’s analysis of spindle whorl
types and weights: he suggests, for example, that because the whorls of TB-4 were
slightly heavier, on average, than those from other rooms, plying was undertaken there;
this has social and architectural implications:

“… the task of plying already spun thread together is a fairly simple one
that may be assigned to younger, less experienced spinners as a kind of
practice. If this is indeed the case, then the central location of this
workroom, TB4, would seem to be a good place to monitor the junior
spinners. The other possibility is that this simpler task was assigned to
workers of a slightly higher status, and possibly of an older age, who
could in turn monitor the workers on either side of them.” (Burke 2010,
134)

Both Burke and Sams observe that the quality of the other finds associated with TB-4 is
higher than elsewhere in the ‘workrooms,’ citing as an example a cloth and leather piece
decorated with bronze studs, and a fine necklace. This is inconsistent with Burke’s
suggestion that younger, less experienced and, probably, therefore, less trustworthy
workers were assigned there. On the other hand, the idea that any of these units would
provide an opportunity to “monitor” the others—even if TB-4 were the central work unit,
which, if TB-1 and TB-2 were treasuries instead (as he suggests), it is not—is belied by
the fact that they are neither interconnected nor intervisible, considering their small
doorways and the careful way in which the entrances to the CC units are staggered
halfway between the entrances to the TB units. From a space syntax point of view, none
of these units can be said to “control” others, visually or spatially. What is more obvious
from Burke’s extremely useful catalogue of the Terrace Complex data is that each unit
contains a wide range of whorls, most of which most of which weigh between 0 and 50
grams, suitable for spinning fine to medium-weight thread that could have been used by
Iron Age women of different status for weaving any number of useful items. The sample size of the relevant unit, TB-4, is moreover extremely small (less than 20, compared to ~80 on average); its departure from the overall pattern is probably not significant.

Burke’s reliance on comparanda from Aegean palatial institutions leads him, like Young and DeVries, to shape his interpretations to match those assumptions. Although he, too, admits that “a great deal about Phrygian political and social organization is unknown,” ultimately, he asserts that “a powerful Phrygian army existed,” citing the few late-eight-century references to Mita and the Mushki in Assyrian historical texts, and the “militaristic aspects” found in two, quite small, ivory furniture inlay plaques that depict horses and riders with shields and spears. Therefore, the quantities of textile tools found, he writes, most likely demonstrate “the mass production of textiles by attached, dependent workers” as payment or supplies for the state’s mighty fighting force. “The political force that mobilized the labor, technology and resources necessary for building the capital of Gordion would certainly have been able to organize and maintain a standing army,” he writes (Burke 2010, 150).

Burke does propose a second possibility for the textiles at Gordion, namely, as a form of payment or medium of exchange, in keeping with the long tradition of textiles as prestige goods in Mesopotamia and throughout the ancient Mediterranean. “Comparing the organization of craft activities in Mesopotamia to that of textile production at Early Phrygian Gordion nearly two millennia later may seem a great stretch, especially since Gordion lacks the archival evidence of earlier Near Eastern centers,” he admits (Burke
Citing the proximity of the ‘workshops’ to the elite quarters and the appearance of Phrygian textiles worn by royal figures in reliefs and as dedications in Greek sanctuaries, Burke argues that textiles were a prestige item at Gordion and in Iron Age Anatolia; to this we could add the frequent and prominent appearance of Anatolian textiles as tribute in contemporary Assyrian texts and the overall iconography of Phrygian art discussed above, and agree to that proposal with certainty. Indeed, we have every reason to believe Burke is correct in asserting that Phrygian textiles “probably functioned as both a kind of currency or medium of exchange, and as a prestige good.” He does not as convincingly demonstrate that, simply because of the sheer quantities of tools uncovered, they must have been used by “attached, dependent specialists” at the behest of a ruler to produce cloth for members of a fighting force. Indeed, his own observations about the distribution patterns of the tools relative to other finds and their technical parameters do not bear out the kind of standardization and specialization that would support such a narrative. Such a characterization of the available evidence depends too strongly on outdated and anachronistic assumptions about the hierarchical structure and military power of the Phrygian state. Still, Burke’s conclusions about the textile workshop and its relationship to the structure of the Phrygian state have been enthusiastically incorporated into the overall site narrative. Indeed, the digitalGordion website declares that “the archaeological evidence from

40 It’s not clear why it’s any more or less of a stretch than his own comparison of Gordion to Minoan and Mycenaean organization of craft activities of nearly one millennium earlier, especially since they too had the archival evidence that Gordion lacks.
Gordion provides the most complete picture of organized textile production at a palace center in the Mediterranean.\(^{41}\)

Continued artefactual analyses of other classes of finds from the Terrace Buildings have already called some of Burke’s conclusions about the complex into question. For example, Vassileva (2012) catalogued the fibulae from the Destruction Level, “the most abundant group of bronze objects found at the citadel mound” (Vassileva 2012, 111): of the 41 found, 1 is from Megaron 4, 3 lack a context, and the remaining 36 are from the Terrace Complex. Fibulae were found in CC-2, CC-3, TB-2, TB-3, TB-7, and TB-8; of them, Vassileva classes 24 as local and 12 as imports from the Aegean and the Near East. Fibulae otherwise appear in such large quantities in tumuli—e.g. 34 from the contemporary Tumulus W, ca. 850 bce, and over 140 in Tumulus MM, ca. 740 bce; iconographically, typically Phrygian examples are represented on the Ivriz monument of Warpalawas, as part of the ruler’s garb, and in Assyrian palace reliefs, worn by a member of an Anatolian delegation. Vassileva notes that they also occur frequently as votives in Greek sanctuaries. Contextually and functionally speaking, then, fibulae tend to appear in elite and/or ceremonial contexts; their frequency in the Terrace Complex supports the argument that its current designation as a service quarter is overly simplistic. (For more detailed contextual analysis of TB units, see Chapter 5.)

Further evidence for a high frequency of imports into the Terrace Complex has come from Neutron Activation Analysis of ceramics from the units. Grave et al. (2009) remark on “the diversity of non-local proveniences and the range of jugs, jars, and bowls

\(^{41}\) http://sites.museum.upenn.edu/gordion/articles/artefactual-evidence/textile-production-at-gordion/
represented in the EP assemblage,” challenging the view that Gordion’s economy was based on producing exports for the larger region. While the import of ceramics and foodstuffs from outside does not exclude the export of textiles, Grave et al.’s work does indicate that production was not as centralized or tightly controlled as the palatial economy model seems to imply.\footnote{See also Sagona and Zimansky: “If these are textile factories, the industry must have organized under the auspices of the state, but we are at a loss to identify nearby trading partners who might have consumed these products in the 9th century” (2009, 355).} It also confirms the exceptional nature of Gordion, in that this pattern runs in sharp contrast to those the authors observed at other Iron Age centers, such as Kaman-kalehöyük and Bogazköy, where local production predominated. Grave et al. (2009, 2171) suggest that “elite food practices, potentially feasting, using vessels brought from a broad region, were a significant factor in Early Phrygian political dynamics. The inflow of vessels… runs counter to a view that political centres were also places for production of exports into the larger region.” The argument that we should consider Gordion primarily as a ceremonial center and look to the evidence for feasting practices to derive more appropriate models of political dynamics for the emerging center is taken up in the chapters that follow.

2.4 Discussion and directions

In this chapter, I have argued that the narrative guiding archaeological research at Gordion, and shaping its interpretation, was determined well before excavations began there. A review of the Greek, Roman, and Near Eastern sources of that narrative demonstrates that the data they provide is both indirect and biased, and their historical relevance to the development of an Early Phrygian state at Gordion in the 10th and 9th
centuries BCE is dubious. While the preponderance of evidence suggests that there likely was a late 8th-century Phrygian leader called Midas, we cannot establish a clear link between Midas and Gordion that establishes his role there, nor is there reliable information regarding the social or political organization of the state he ruled, or whose forces he led, at that time. We have no ruler-portraits; no thrones; no public inscriptions; no royal residence that we can identify—at least several of which are clearly identifiable in contemporary states (Urartu, Assyria, Tabal, Syro-Anatolia) structured along the lines we assume that Phrygia was. Most importantly, we should not project what may have been true for the 8th century into the 10th and 9th centuries BCE: one King Midas does not a dynasty make, no matter how frequently he recurs in Greek myth.

The question of whether or not a or several King Midases existed, and when, has served as something of a red herring in the history of Gordion excavations (this chapter notwithstanding). A better question is whether or not the idea of a ‘King Midas’ is useful or meaningful to interpreting the site. When Rodney Young is preoccupied with the distinction between what is “a palace, or merely palatial” (Young 1960, 24, quoted above); when Sams and Voigt feel the need to hypothesize an unattested ‘powerful ruler’ for 9th-century Tabal to make it fit with the prevailing narrative at Gordion; when Burke conjures up an archaeologically invisible ‘powerful Phrygian army’ to find a use for mass-slave-produced textiles—it begins to look as if the Midas model of political organization is restricting the range of possible interpretations, rather than just focusing or personifying them. In what remains of this dissertation, I argue that the redating of the Destruction Level to ca. 830–800 BCE provides scholars the opportunity to develop new, alternative models for articulating the processes and practices that establish and structure a state, through archaeological and architectural analyses of the stylistically and materially diverse Early Phrygian assemblage.
In the following chapter, I explore the evidence from contemporary Anatolian states of the 10th and 9th centuries, to identify the parallels and methodological frameworks that have proved fruitful there; in doing so, I respond to Gunter (2012)’s call to “… acknowledge significant continuity with LBA and even earlier traditions, and recognize greater interaction between central Anatolia and regions to the east and southeast, including the Neo-Hittite states” (Gunter 2012, 799). Afterwards, we will perhaps be able to return to Early Phrygian Gordion with fresh eyes, to see how these alternate frameworks hold up when applied to the data at hand.
3 THE GREAT ANATOLIAN MELTING POT?

Contextualizing Early Phrygian Gordion

3.1 Introduction: the Period Formerly Known As the Dark Age

In the preceding chapter, I argued that the models we currently use to interpret the archaeology of Early Phrygian Gordion are based on a series of assumptions about the structure of ancient states in general, and the Phrygian state in particular, rather than on archaeological data from the site per se. Before I turn to that archaeological data, I present in this chapter a series of case studies from contemporary Iron Age Anatolian polities, which illustrate the need for more flexible models of state development and organization than have previously been applied in the region. My goal with these case studies is to elucidate the many, varied strategies of hegemony that emerged and took root in the inchoate world of post-collapse Anatolia, of which Gordion and Phrygia were just one small part.

The Early Iron Age, ca. 1200–900 BCE, was a time of decentralization in Anatolia; at least initially, political emphasis seems to have been less on how to control people than how to attract them. With overarching, state-level systems in flux, the challenge was to communicate with the ethnolinguistically diverse groups moving through the region, to leverage their energy and resources in the service of re-establishing complex society. This was a period of experimentation and competition, where selective references to a glorious Hittite past served to make local innovations more appealing, or provided a compelling, indigenous veneer for strategies co-opted from rivals. This is also a period and a region that has seen intensive archaeological and historiographic research in recent decades, making possible the identification of localized, culturally specific traits and events, as well as their intersection with broader regional trends.
In this chapter I focus on the Syro-Anatolian city-states of modern southern and south-central Turkey (maps, Figure 2 and Figure 3), which have seen the majority of scholarly investment in the region. I highlight the archaeological evidence for evolving sociopolitical organization and practices at the key Iron Age capitals of Karkemish, Malatya/Melid, Zincirli/Samal, Tell Halaf/Guzana, and Tell Tayinat/Patina, and range it alongside the more staccato historical and epigraphic data from the broader region, including the neighboring ‘buffer states’ of Tabal, Que, and Kahramanmaraş/Gurgum. I place particular emphasis on the evidence for the distribution vs. centralization of political power (in places, individuals, or dynasties); for the relationships among political, cultural, and ethnic identities; and for the loci and means of political practice and participation—in other words, the who, what, where, why, and how of communal, political life.

These questions have provided a framework for much of the renewed exploration in the Syro-Anatolian (or Syro-Hittite, or Neo-Hittite) region, as scholars have come to recognize the unique resilience and vibrancy of its many city-states whose roots lie in the so-called ‘Dark Age.’ These states successfully navigated a period of major sociocultural transformation, between the collapse of the Late Bronze Age Mediterranean world system ca. 1200, and the rise of the Assyrian empire in the 9th century BCE—a period characterized by large-scale movements of people within and across borders, as well as environmental change. Middleton (2015, 46) describes this as a world “in which… mobility of people and hybridity of culture were a norm, and where

---

43 I follow Osborne (2011) in referring to these polities as “Syro-Anatolian,” preferring a geographic designation over a culture-historical one; but see Gilibert (2011, 5–10) for an argument for the term ‘Syro-Hittite’ as regards their material culture.
novelties in material culture... can be viewed as expressions of and claims to multiple identities by individuals and groups in Eastern Mediterranean communities.” This was almost certainly as true of Iron Age Anatolia as it is today, which is to say, very—but if so, the challenge to ancient polities and their leaders, of forging a cohesive society out of such varied parts, must have been great indeed.

What strategies did nascent states use to accommodate and appeal to such diverse constituents? As we shall see in this chapter, it is increasingly clear that they relied on a series of inclusive practices involving processions, gatherings, and commensal activities, in which shared experience served to transcend ethnic or linguistic difference.44 The monumental art and architecture of Syro-Anatolian urban centers was peculiarly well-suited to—and in some cases, appears explicitly intended for—this purpose. Accumulating archaeological evidence further supports the notion that the major social transformations we attribute to this period were echoed in a sequence of rapid urban transformations at many sites. At the same time, the epigraphic record, with

44 This argument’s origins can be traced to Tönnies’ and Durkheim’s development of the concepts of Gemeinschaft and Gesellschaft. I do not wish to overburden this chapter with exposition or critique of sociological theory: see instead Mac Sweeney (2011, 9–11). There is an inherent tension in applying the concept of community to Syro-Anatolia because, as is discussed later in this chapter, it was in many ways an intensely urban environment, and Gemeinschaft makes much of the face-to-face interactions of village life: “[t]he interpenetration of minds which the community assumes is possible only in small groups. For it is in that condition only that people are able to know each other quite intimately. As social aggregates have become larger, society weighs less heavily on the individual” (Aldous, Durkheim, and Tonnies 1972, 1196). On the other hand, the emphasis on social memory and ‘nodes of interaction’ in studies of Syro-Anatolian urbanism fits neatly into the Gemeinschaft paradigm: “What assures the cohesion of the domestic society, besides consanguinity, is the fact of living together in the same space; it is also the community of memories, a necessary consequence of a common existence. These two social bonds are able to develop even if the bond of consanguinity is weakened and may be substituted for it”(Aldous, Durkheim, and Tonnies 1972, 1196). It could be argued that Iron Age Syro-Anatolian polities were constructed around a need to bridge the gap between Gemeinschaft and Gesellschaft, to embed social interaction in the otherwise impersonal structure of the urban environment.
its proliferation of languages, names, titles, and dynasties, underscores just how many contenders there were for political preeminence at this period, and how assiduous were their efforts at claiming legitimacy. We must consider that ancient populations, too, had a role to play in choosing their leaders, and contributed to the creation and maintenance of political structures, perhaps as much by cooperation—by ‘buying in’ to a system that spoke to them—as by coercion. This is important to keep in mind when addressing internal variation among Syro-Anatolian polities, which were each quite distinct, despite broadly similar political, architectural, and cultural traits.

These lessons are equally applicable to our study of the development of the Phrygian state, which arose from the same post-Hittite milieu as its Syro-Anatolian contemporaries, even if its historical trajectory was ultimately very different. In the first section of this chapter, I briefly summarize theoretical issues related to three major themes that arise in general discussions of Iron Age Anatolia: regeneration of social complexity after collapse; Hittite heritage; and community formation. In the second, I turn to the case studies, looking at specific cases of innovation in political structures, expression, and practices. Here I focus on Tabal, Zincirli/Sam’al, and Karkemish, respectively (with selective reference to supporting examples from elsewhere in the region). Finally, in the concluding section, I consider how these themes and examples help us to (re)interpret the archaeology of Early Phrygian Gordion, and to develop a new framework for investigating the origin and structure of the Phrygian State.

3.2 Themes: what we talk about when we talk about collapse

“It was the worst disaster in ancient history.”

- Robert Drews, The End of the Bronze Age, 1993

“Most scholars have devoted more attention to the ‘rise and fall’ of civilizations than to the processes that subsequently led to a
reorganization of the population remaining in their territories. And relatively few archaeologists have studied the processes of dissolution, recovery, and reorganization, preferring instead to study the ‘golden ages’ of ancient civilizations, when those societies were ‘in full flower.’

- Joyce Marcus, “From Centralized Systems to City-States,” 1989

Marcus’ (1989) call for archaeologists to turn their attention to the complex processes of social reorganization that follow collapse has not gone unheeded in the Eastern Mediterranean in recent decades. On the contrary, with the discovery of archaeologically significant layers dating to the collapse period, ca. 1200–1000 BCE, at major sites across Anatolia\(^45\), the very notion of a ‘Dark Age’ has more or less fallen out (except as a convenient metaphor to introduce new work: e.g. Hawkins 2009, “New Light on a Dark Age;” Harrison 2009, “Lifting the Veil on a Dark Age”). As Osborne (2011, 6) recently summarized,

> “It is now quite difficult to continue accepting the hitherto assumed correlation of historical silence on the one hand, and a breakdown of social complexity on the other. It now seems quite likely that some of the largest and most powerful polities of the second and first millennia thrived during this very period, including Melid, Karkemish, and a kingdom based at Tell Tayinat in the Amuq.”

Dramatic theses of civilizational collapse in the manner of Drews (1993)(1993) and, much more recently, Cline (2014)—despite their undeniable crowd appeal—have received criticism for their weak foundations and lack of rigor. Middleton (2015, 48), for example, has pointedly argued that “on practical grounds alone any kind of ‘Dunkirk’ style or multi-stage evacuation [of Greek palatial settlements such as Pylos] can be

\(^{45}\) For an overview, see Sams 2011. Key sites in Anatolia with recently discovered Early Iron Age activity layers include Çadır Höyük (Ross 2010; Cassis and Steadman 2014); Gordion (Voigt 1993, 1994, 2000, Voigt and Henrickson 2000a, 2000b); Kaman-kalehöyük (Matsumura 2008; Omura 2011); Malatya (Manuelli 2012, 2011); Tell Tayinat (Harrison 2013; Janeway 2015); and Troy (Aslan 2009; Aslan, Kealhofer, and Grave 2014).
thought extremely unlikely,” while “Anatolia did not suddenly become an empty land conducive to the movement of thousands of refugees across it; it was still peopled with kingdoms and tribes.”

Identifying and interpreting the sociopolitical reconfiguration that certainly did take place in this still relatively obscure period has proven significantly more challenging, however. At Gordion, investigations of the ‘[f]ormation of the Phrygian State’ sought, firstly, “archaeological evidence to support or deny Herodotus’ claim that the ancestors of the Phrygian rulers at Gordion migrated into central Anatolia from Thrace” (Voigt and Henrickson 2000a, 39). They found it, mainly in the form of intrusive material culture styles (handmade dark and wheelmade buff wares) that, excavators argued, abruptly appeared at the site in the Early Iron Age (YHSS 7), replacing Late Bronze Age (YHSS 8) ceramic technology; had parallels in Thrace; and showed continuity into the Early Phrygian period (YHSS 6). The same study, however, notes that “increasing economic and political differentiation which should indicate state formation” (Voigt and Henrickson 2000a, 46), signaled by changes in architecture and in the use of space on the citadel mound, did not begin until the subsequent YHSS 6B; the Gordion Destruction Level (ca. 825–800 BCE) is YHSS 6A. The arrival of the Phrygian ethnic group, then, was not coincident with the beginning of state formation processes at Gordion; the causal relationship between the two is not explicit, and the events could even be unrelated, separated as they are by as much as a century or more. In any case, aside from a presumed relationship between Phrygian ethnicity and the architecture, language, and material cultural style of the complex polity later based at Gordion, the mechanisms of this transition, from village to city, from ‘tribe’ to State, remain largely unknown to us.

A similar phenomenon has played out in the Iron Age Near East more broadly, where explanation for social change has often been sought in the arrival of new peoples.
In coastal areas of southern Anatolia and the Levant, the discovery of Aegean-style artifacts—primarily ceramics—provoked furious debate as to their association with the so-called Sea Peoples, who have been held responsible for wide-ranging destruction and devastation, on the one hand, and cultural regeneration, on the other (Galil et al. 2012; Kaniewski et al. 2011; Yassur-Landau 2010; Bachhuber and Roberts 2009; Harrison 2008; Mazar 2008; Oren 2000; Stager 1995; Drews 1993; Ward and Joukowsky 1992). Further inland, in southeastern Anatolia and north Syria, scholars have considered it relevant to classify the (geographically described) Syro-Anatolian polities as “Neo-Hittite”/“Luwian,” or “Aramaean,” based on the presumed ethnic origin of their founders, and to debate the relative influence of sedentary Indo-European/Anatolian populations and nomadic Semitic ones in regional social and political developments (Niehr 2014; Mouton, Rutherford, and Yakubovich 2013; Liverani 2002; Sader 2000; Dion 1997). Meanwhile, as noted above, sustained archaeological and historiographic research in these regions has yielded compelling evidence for the survival or reconfiguration of local traditions in many aspects of material culture—that is, for community resilience in the face of systemic change—much as Renfrew (1984, 367) predicted it would: “invariably the progress of research makes the Dark Age less dark,” he wrote.

Cross-cultural efforts to define what we mean by collapse and, more importantly, to identify the key factors that influence subsequent societal regeneration, concur in at least one point: collapse is essentially a problem of the 1% (Schwartz and Nichols 2006; Yoffee and Cowgill 1988). It tends to affect members of the elite, and the urban-based institutions over which they preside; it does not entail the “complete end of… civilizational frameworks” (Eisenstadt 1988, 242). The exploration of post-collapse societies, then, is more a question of what survives when states fall—because people
inevitably do, even if rulers do not. Historic reconstructions that assume a complete break with the past are therefore often found, eventually, to be overly simplistic.

More useful models provide ways to weigh the degree and kind of continuity and change, whether geographic, administrative, or ideological. For example, Schwartz and Nichols’ (2006) volume, After Collapse: The Regeneration of Complex Societies, asked contributors a series of unifying questions: “Why does regeneration occur in some areas but not in others, and with different schedules of emergence? Which institutions survived collapse, and which proved instrumental in regeneration? Did collapse and regeneration entail changes to a ‘bundle’ of institutions (Yoffee 1993, 64), or, as is perhaps more probable, did some institutions or phenomena fail while others did not?” (Schwartz and Nichols 2006, 13). One response took the form of a typology of regenerative patterns that contrasted a ‘stimulus’ with a ‘template’ type of regeneration (alongside two ‘false’ types) (Bronson 2006). Bronson’s ‘template’ type relies on detailed understanding of the organization and institutions of the model state to create a precise replica; the ‘stimulus’ type capitalizes on the lack of such knowledge, depending instead on “the stimulus of diachronic hearsay, an unsubstantiated rumor that something used to be done in a particular fashion” (Bronson 2006, 138). Template types reuse bureaucratic titles and functions in strictly accurate ways; stimulus types leverage “hazy historical memories that may or may not be accurate” in the service of legitimation or prestige, “serv[ing] to convince leaders that a higher degree of centralization is possible and to make that centralization more palatable by wrapping it in the mantle of a glorious past” (Bronson 2006, 138). One example of the latter type is the United States of the 1780s, where the Founding Fathers’ choice to reuse the terminology and iconography of the Roman republic gave the veneer of antiquity to what was in fact an unprecedented experiment in governance, using an aesthetic vocabulary that both appealed and was instantly
recognizable to a broad audience (or at least their target audience of Classically educated, landowning men) (Bronson 2006, 139).

Two important points about post-collapse societies emerge from these analyses: first, that a comparison between the Syro-Anatolian city-states and Phrygia is warranted by virtue of their common origin in the post-Hittite period alone; and second, that we should not expect such a comparison to be straightforward. Due, at least in part, to the magnetic appeal of the disaster narrative, scholars in both regions have hitherto tended to assume perfect discontinuity—or at least privileged the ‘shock of the new’ (the appearance of imported decorated ceramic traditions and foreign-language inscriptions) over the recurrence of the old (continuity of coarseware ceramic traditions, too easily dismissed as ‘residual,’ or in regional settlement patterns). This trend can also be attributed to archaeological research questions and methods, which have long been biased toward the recovery of data associated with monumental architecture, major sites, and the lives of the elite. This is changing, but new approaches are not without their own challenges: the more fine-grained methodologies of the post-processual era frequently reveal episodes that are brief, difficult to interpret, and not easily folded into the broader historical narrative—in other words, in results that are messier, more confusing, and less sexy. As McAnany and Yoffee (McAnany and Yoffee 2010, 5) observed, “studying collapse… [is] fine when viewed at a distance but dissolves into disconnected parts when examined up close.”

Fledgling states likely looked both to the past and to contemporary states for effective strategies of sovereignty. What we can expect a comparison between Syro-Anatolian polities and Gordion to reveal, however, is the extent to which such broadly similar questions and challenges can garner diverse, locally specific responses. We must at least consider that while borrowing (from predecessors or neighbors) is
ubiquitous, the specific elements that are borrowed and the realms in which they are re-deployed are distinct, meaningful, and a matter of deliberate choice. The reuse or reinvention of highly visible cultural traits—stylistic, architectural, epigraphic—is therefore particularly significant in what it communicates about the loci of legitimacy and authority, and to whom. It is essential that we unpack these associations, and what they meant in practice, in order to better understand the formation of political entities and identities across Iron Age Anatolia.

3.2.1 ‘Oceans rise, empires fall…’: the Hittites and selective, collective memory

“Minoans from Crete painted for Egyptians; Mycenaean in turn colonized Crete; Hittites, defeated in battle in their native Anatolia, became Neo-Hittites, who survived, like Anglo-Indians in post-Independence India.”


A major point of divergence between Phrygia and the erstwhile ‘Neo-Hittite’ states of Syro-Anatolia lies in their reuse of Hittite precedent—or in Phrygia’s case, their failure to do so. The Syro-Anatolian cities discussed below—Karkemish, Malatya, Zincirli, Tayinat and others—self-consciously alluded to the Hittite empire in their iconography, their royal onomastic, and in the titles of rulers and administrators. Indeed, recent synthetic treatments of the region, such as Bryce’s (2012) history of the ‘Neo-Hittite Kingdoms’, emphasize the importance of the survival of the hieroglyphic Luwian epigraphic tradition across the Late Bronze-Early Iron transition as indicative of overall regional continuity, despite broader administrative collapse. While Sagona and Zimansky (2009) are more measured in their analysis, they too argue that

“[t]he Hittites loom over all other peoples in the early history of Anatolia in their broad exercise of political power and lasting cultural impact. … They were a force in the cultural development of Anatolia whose impact was felt long after their empire collapsed at the end of the Bronze Age.”
Conversely, the lack of apparent Hittite survivals at Gordion has been taken as further evidence of a complete break between Bronze and Iron there, validating the conflation of the ‘formation of the Phrygian state’ with the arrival of the Phrygian ethnic group.

It is true that the recent renewal of interest in the Syro-Anatolian region is due in large part to the discovery that a Hittite dynastic line, based at Karkemish, survived the fall of the empire and its capital, HattusHA. In 1988, J. D. Hawkins published two seal-impressed bullae from Lidar Höyük, near modern Samsat, Turkey, bearing the names and titles of “Talmi-Teshub, King of the land of Karkemish”, and “Kuzi-Teshub, King of the land of Karkemish”, his son, in hieroglyphic Luwian signs. Talmi-Teshub was a previously attested king of Karkemish in the late 13th century BCE, the last known of a line of Hittite viceroys of Syria descended from the Hittite emperor Suppiluliuma(s) I, and a contemporary of Suppiluliuma(s) II (his third cousin) and Ammurapi of Ugarit (J. D. Hawkins 1988, 101, 2009, 164). Kuzi-Teshub, his son, was largely unknown, until the discovery of the seal impression allowed for the decipherment of his name in several other hieroglyphic Luwian inscriptions (GÜRÜN, KÖTÜKALE, ISPEKÇÜR and DARENDE). In three of these he is referred to as “Hero” of Karkemish; in one, GÜRÜN, where he figures as the grandfather of the author, Run̈tiya(s), Country-Lord of Melid, Kuzi-Teshub also bears the title “Great King,” elsewhere reserved for the kings of Hattuša. In Bryce’s (2012, 85) reconstruction, “[t]his exalted title was almost certainly adopted by Kuzi-Teshub after the royal line at Hattusa had come to an end. By default, he now assumed the mantle of Great Kingship of Hatti. He may thus have been the last of the Hittite viceroys at Karkemish as well as the first of a line of Neo-Hittite Great Kings there.”

The seal impressions were the ‘smoking gun’ archaeologists and ancient historians had long sought, attesting direct dynastic continuity between the Hittite Empire
of central Anatolia and the Neo-Hittites of the southeast and northern Syria. It began to seem as if the Hittite state, rather than collapsing in 1200 BCE, had flown south for the winter, seeking warmer climes in its old age. On the other hand, the location of the discovery of the seal impressions in a destruction at Lidar Höyük, on the east bank of the Euphrates—a smaller city situated between Karkemish and Malatya—as well as the fact that claims to descent from a Great King of Karkemish were made by kings not of Karkemish but of Melid/Malatya, left lingering questions as to the extent and duration of the ‘kingdom’ of Karkemish, and its regional power. Historical reconstructions cobbled together dynastic lists from the genealogical relationships attested in scattered inscriptions; such frameworks, interpreted through the lens of Hittite political organization, have long been relied upon to fill the centuries between the more textually robust Late Bronze and Iron II periods.

Thirty years of intense focus on these historical questions in the archaeological exploration of the region have begun to reveal the insufficiency of these frameworks, especially as regards their social implications “in one of the most important areas for an understanding of the genesis of the world we live in today” (Weeden 2013, 2). Breaks in the stratigraphic and epigraphic records at Karkemish, Malatya, and the wider region; scattered evidence for a second post-Hittite “rump state” further to the west, corresponding roughly to the former Hittite appanage kingdom of Tarhuntassa; and the increasingly well-documented rise of a rival state based at W/Palastin (Tell Tayinat) in the 11th century BCE all attest to multiple moments of rupture, discontinuity, and reorganization across these centuries. Political power seems to have been wielded by and distributed among a large and varying cast of characters, whose Hittite-derived titles are not always an accurate predictor of the level of influence they exert. Models such as Bronson’s caution us to pay close attention to how the significance and uses of inherited
structures are transformed in new contexts, according to the strategies of hegemony adopted by rulers and their interpretation by the broader population over time. To what extent is it then reasonable to understand the survival of Hittite epithets as indicative of the survival of Hittite institutions? And does the presence or absence of a central authority—such as a Great King—bear any necessary relationship with social complexity?

The case studies reviewed below problematize successor states’ relationships with each other and with the Hittite past. It is no longer the case that we can argue, simplistically, for direct continuity of Hittite traditions in Syro-Anatolia; by the same token, neither the level of Bronze Age Gordian’s engagement with nor its abandonment by the Hittites is clear in the archaeological evidence. As argued in the previous section, the relationship between post-collapse institutions and ideologies and their predecessors appears as a distinguishing factor in cross-cultural attempts to model resurgent states, and Iron Age Anatolia is no exception. Still, doing so entails a case-by-case look at the archaeological and epigraphic records of individual city-states—in such a way that documents not only the existence of references to the Hittite past, but their intent and function among their Iron Age contemporaries. It also requires that we recognize the internal diversity and complex history of the Hittite empire itself, which exhibited a strong degree of regional variation across Anatolia, in ways reflective of the pluralism of imperial constituents, as demonstrated by Glatz (2009, 2011). Glatz’s more granular reconstruction of the differential application of Hittite political control and its materiality

46 “I do think there is evidence for a population migration at the beginning of the EIA, but whether or not they mixed with the preceding local population is still unclear”: C. Aslan, Gordion ceramicist and specialist in Early Iron Age ceramics, personal communication, March 4, 2017.
lends further weight to arguments that represent the ‘collapse’ of the Hittite empire as a gradual and highly localized process, one which may more properly be understood as the dis-integration of a diversely constituted whole. If being ‘Hittite’ meant different things in different places, then being post-Hittite surely did as well.

3.2.2 Creating community: the carrot, the stick and the middle ground

Human populations construct their cultures in interaction with one another, and not in isolation.


The concept of community has recently found traction among scholars working on the Late Bronze – Early Iron Age transition, as a more flexible alternative to forms of social identity that were often assumed to be firmly defined along lines of gender, ethnicity, age, or status (Mac Sweeney 2011). Feldman (2014, 2) describes her choice of the term “to capture the sense of a degree and kind of social relations that are not necessarily rigidly organized or bounded, and yet can stretch across wide networks of people. Such communities are understood to be potentially flexible, able to accommodate fluctuations in their membership.” The applicability of this concept to the more fluid nature of Iron Age population dynamics, as currently conceived, is readily

47 See also Hawkins and Weeden (2016, 9): “The extent of Hittite imperial control in the areas beyond the central Anatolian heartland is also a matter of discussion. Some scholars refrain from using the word ‘Empire’ to describe the political form taken by Hittite hegemony whether in Syria or elsewhere, eschewing the notion of a centralized economic and administrative unit for that of a network of interlocking and competing interest groups. The suddenness of the disappearance of Hittite control could be explained from this perspective by the fragility of its grip on the areas subordinated to it (Summers 2013, 316).”
apparent: communities can be complex social and/or political entities while remaining less conceptually rigid than, say, states (see also Middleton 2015; B. Porter 2013).

On the other hand, the fungible nature of ‘community’ as a concept allows its relationship to cities or states to go uninterrogated in many cases: do communities exist within states, or do they in fact constitute the state? Recent theoretical investigations of the nature of community emphasize its constructed nature: geographic proximity, while usually a prerequisite for community formation, is nevertheless insufficient for it. A sense of community has to be actively fostered through the conscious identification, acknowledgment, and celebration of commonalities. Mac Sweeney’s (2011, 21) research in social theory and psychology leads her to define the community as “a conscious mental construct, built both on and through social practice and lived experience, which is itself facilitated by residential proximity and through regular direct interaction.”

Archaeologically, one way to identify spatial aspects of community formation and maintenance processes is by looking for nodes of interaction within urban spaces, their centrality, and the traces of collective activities associated with them. It is important to remember, however, that in-group and out-group dynamics shift over time. Mac Sweeney (2011, 28) cautions:

“[t]he points at which community identity becomes salient and the moments at which it ceases to be so are of crucial importance. When and why does the identity of the community as a group become more important than the various different forms of individual identity that intersect it, such as rank, gender, or age? In what situations do these other forms of identity become more important again, at the expense of communal group identity?”

These questions of similarity and difference, and when and where they become part of ideology, are at the heart of current arguments for the evolution of political identities over the course of the Iron Age (see, e.g., Gilibert 2011).
One appealing aspect of the ‘community’ concept is that it emphasizes sameness rather than difference, in a way that has been rare but useful for understanding the period: looking for communities, archaeologically, is about identifying those strategies that yield social cohesion and facilitate belonging, rather than assuming the inevitable, usually violent, ascendance of social differentiation and hierarchy. As such, it is an equally plausible and significantly less misanthropic way of modelling the origins of complex society as those that assume the manipulation and preying upon of the weak by the strong. Still, fostering feelings of commonality seems uniquely challenging in Iron Age Anatolia, which we have long been led to believe was characterized by mass migration and hostile encounters between different groups. How do you find the sameness in so much difference?

A potential alternative to the concept of ‘community,’ one that provides more space for the internal diversity of Iron Age polities, is found in White’s [1991, 2011] notion of the ‘middle ground.’ White’s study of interactions between Europeans and Native Americans in the Great Lakes region of 18th century North America paints a picture of a “world made of fragments,” where organized groups of Algonquian-speaking Iroquoian peoples had disappeared, a result of epidemics and warfare, “[b]ut most Algonquians did not disappear. Instead, together with Frenchmen, they pieced together a new world from shattered pieces” (White 2011, 2). He describes a conceptual flexibility born of necessity, in which the existential need to forge alliances made all sides more willing to look favorably on each other’s practices. They did so by means of a series of ‘mutually beneficial misunderstandings’, inventing a ‘middle ground’ between the two cultures in which all could intelligibly and profitably interact.

White notes that early ethnologists’ efforts to describe the political structure of the Indian groups they encountered using European frameworks and vocabulary were “full
of internal contradictions because they sought to freeze and codify what was, in fact, a world in flux” (White 2011, 16). New forms of social organization, along with the ideological justification for them, were only just emerging. The situation he describes is not unlike what may have prevailed in parts of post-collapse Anatolia:

“What is clear is that, socially and politically, this was a village world. The units called tribes, nations, and confederacies were only loose leagues of villages. The nature of authority within a Potawatomi village and that within a Miami village might, at least initially, differ significantly, but in neither case did authority extend beyond the village. Nothing resembling a state existed in the pays d’en haut. The entities that the French called nations, and which were later called tribes, thus had only the most circumscribed political standing. Nations shared a common language, culture, and ethnic identity, but the various villages of a nation did not necessarily share a common homeland. Whatever distinct homelands these villagers had once possessed, the diaspora provoked by the Iroquois had made irrelevant.” (White 2011, 16–17)

The peculiarity of this historical circumstance as documented by White is a powerful counter-argument to our tendency to overstate the formality, solidity, and extent of the political structures and institutions that prevailed in Iron Age Anatolia, even those inherited from the Hittites.

The ‘middle ground’ concept provides a useful model for understanding how such institutions transform. To forge the social bonds that would result in more economically and politically complex entities, White argues, Frenchmen and Indians had to “arrive at some common conception of suitable ways of acting”; they did so through a “process of mutual invention” (White 2011, 2). Neither the French/European traders operating in the region nor the Indians had the obvious upper hand in negotiations, due to the overall lack of a strong, centralizing (state) authority and a relatively even balance of power among all parties: “[t]he middle ground grew according to the need of people to find a means, other than force, to gain the cooperation or consent of foreigners,” native or white (White 2011, 52). Doing so meant accommodating difference, adjusting expectations, and gradually shifting one’s own worldview. “To succeed, those who
operated on the middle ground had, of necessity, to attempt to understand the world and the reasoning of others and to assimilate enough of that reasoning to put it to their own purposes. Particularly in diplomatic councils, the middle ground was a realm of constant invention, which was just as constantly presented as convention,” White (2011, 52) explains. “The result of each side’s attempts to apply its own cultural expectations in a new context was often change in culture itself” (emphasis mine).

The situation White describes—an 18th century America shaken by warfare, disease, migration, fragmentation, and an influx of newcomers—is one in which it became necessary to emphasize community over individual identity, as Mac Sweeney might put it. The result was a new culture that was neither the same as nor completely different than those of its founding constituents, but which was actively constructed by both, over an extended period of interaction. Some key points of convergence between ‘community identity’ and the social space of the ‘middle ground’ are their emergence in face-to-face interactions among individuals and small groups, and their emphasis on repeated engagement in shared (if differently interpreted) practice. Gifts, alcohol, and the relation of religious experience (dreams or ‘divine revelation’) appear as fecund arenas for the suspension of disbelief, or the indulgence of metaphor, that the creation of the middle ground seems to have entailed. Unlike much of the literature surrounding communities, however, the ‘middle ground’ is extremely accommodating of internal variation: it emphasizes solutions that are pluralistic and transacculturative, rather than homogenizing, and is therefore a more appropriate guiding principle for Iron Age Anatolia.

In the case studies that follow, White’s device of the ‘middle ground’ will inform my reevaluation of the political structures and strategies at work in southeastern Anatolia, and how they transformed, and were transformed by, their constituents. These
case studies illustrate the dynamism and instability of the political entities we persist in calling ‘states’, especially those of Tabal (section 3.3.1); their multicultural populations and the complex, diverse, even contradictory social identities their constituents were empowered to express, as at Zincirli (section 3.3.2); and the increasingly elaborate efforts politicians across the region made to reshape urban space such that the middle ground could be conjured up on an ever-grander scale (section 3.3.3). Interrogating these practices, and their social function, in the richly attested world of Syro-Anatolia will make us better able to identify similar trends at Phrygian Gordion, getting us closer to understanding what it meant to be Phrygian, and how.

3.3 Case Studies

3.3.1 Tabal

We can begin to question some of our assumptions about how states necessarily have to work in looking at Tabal, an unstable, relatively decentralized, and apparently heterarchical political formation situated at the south-east of the Anatolian plateau, in the area of modern Cappadocia. Tabal is often treated as a “buffer zone” between Phrygia and Syro-Anatolia, probably because much of its material culture shows stylistic affinities with those regions; but it remains historically and geographically quite distinct from both, not least because of its location in the northern foothills of the Taurus mountain range. It is not coincidental to Tabal’s political development, vis-à-vis that of Syro-Anatolia, that the Taurus mountains functioned as a natural check to a resurgent Assyria beginning in the 9th century BCE. While Tabalean cities and their rulers were frequently the object of Assyrian interest and influence, they retained political independence for much longer, in the aggregate, than did the Syro-Anatolian states to the south. Perhaps as a result, the evidence for its political organization is more scattered, and reconstructing its historical
trajectory based on the extant sources—whether native or external—requires some interpretive leaps (though not as many as Gordion’s).

On the other hand, Tabal’s proximity to Phrygia, both geographic and conceptual (especially from the point of view of Assyria), makes it a particularly relevant case study here, insofar as it provides an opportunity to reexamine theoretical assumptions linking social and political complexity. The available archaeological evidence is meagre: the region has been surveyed and excavations are currently underway at Kınık Höyük, Porsuk/Zeyve Höyük, and Yassihöyük (Kırşehir), but few other sites have been extensively examined (with the exception of Kültepe and Acemhöyük; Kululu, Sultanhan, Tepebağları and Göllüdağ have received only cursory treatment), and contemporary remains are not well-represented even at excavated sites. The inscriptional corpus is substantial, however: Hawkins (1999) lists 52 hieroglyphic Luwian inscriptions in Tabal—all of which he dates to after 900 BCE—and several others have since been reconsidered (Lanaro 2015; Balatti 2012; Mora and Balatti 2012; Taş and Weeden 2011, 2010).

Assyrian sources are limited to one reference in the 9th century BCE but multiply considerably in the 8th, especially from the reign of Tiglath-pileser III (ca. 745–727) onward.

In Assyrian sources, Tabal is known to be a land of many kings: Shalmaneser’s annals record receiving tribute from twenty kings of Tabal in 836 BCE, though they


mention only one, Tuwatis (or Tuatti), by name (along with his son, Kikki). There is
general scholarly consensus that the region grew more politically consolidated over time,
although none agree on the precise nature of that organization. Melville (2010, 100)
notes a decrease from 20 to “a hierarchy of about nine kings and an unknown number of
vassals by the mid-eighth century B.C.”; Hawkins (2000, 425–26) distinguishes between
‘Tabal proper’, itself composed of several smaller entities, in the region of modern
Kayseri and Nevşehir, and Tuwana (classical Tyana/Tyanitis) in the area of modern
Niğde; and Bryce (2012, 141–53) makes the same distinction, but includes Atuna,
Ishtuanda, and Hupishna as distinct Tabalian polities (rather than part of ‘Tabal proper’
or ‘northern Tabal’), along with Tuwana.

One problem with this approach is that while modern scholars are anxious to
impose order on Tabal, dividing it into greater and lesser kingdoms and teasing out the
links between them, it’s not at all clear that the source material allows us to do so. In
D’Alfonso’s (2012) study of ‘Tabal’ in the Assyrian sources, he clearly demonstrates that
the term most often appears as a territorial, rather than a political, designation:

If Hatti refers to a group of countries (e.g. Karkemish, Kummuh, Gurgum,
but also Sam’al and Bit Adini, Hawkins 1975: 152), each one with a king,
in some cases the king of one of them was designated “king of Hatti”…
These passages, however, have never been used to suggest a political
supremacy of the king of Karkemish over the whole territory designated
Hatti; rather, they mark the belonging to a culture or to a territory. The
same should be valid for the kings of Tabal.” (D’Alfonso 2012, 176)

That is, while Melville, quoted above, makes a clear distinction between ‘kings’ and
‘vassals’ in Tabal, it is unclear whether Shalmaneser or Tabalians themselves did so.
‘Kings’ and even ‘Great Kings’ appear in rock-cut monuments, but so too do ‘rulers’,
example, a certain Ruwa refers to himself in KULULU 1 as “Tuwatis’s servant,” but in
KULULU 4 does not refer to Tuwatis/Tuatti at all, instead calling himself as “ruler”
(tarwanis) and “sun-blessed” (Hawkins 2000, 442–447). Weeden (2010, 44) points out that this is “an extremely high title, and sometimes occurs in combination with the title king.” In the still-murky TOPADA inscription, Wasusarma, son of Tuwatis/Tuatti and self-proclaimed Great King, contrasts three ‘friendly’ kings of Tabal with eight presumably hostile ones in an extended battle narrative (Hawkins 2000, 451–461; Weeden 2010). These inscriptions date to ca. 740 BCE, ostensibly the period of greatest centralization in Tabal, but they seem to indicate the continued existence of a number of powerful individuals acting with a high degree of autonomy. If not decentralization, we can at least observe that political power appears as distributed and shifting in central Anatolia, even at this time.

This is further corroborated by the relative lack of dynastic information in the inscriptive sources. While the authors of inscriptions frequently cite relationships and pedigree, we have almost no evidence for consolidation of dynastic power in one family for longer than a generation or two. The case of Tuwatis/Tuatti is one possible exception: we can reconstruct either one extremely long-lived, or two, Tuwatis, the latter of whom was the father of Wasusarma (for the “Tuatid” dynasty, see Weeden 2010, 39–41, with references; Bryce 2012, 142–144). It is perhaps interesting to note in this context that both Wasusarma claims the title ‘Great King’ for both himself and his father (in the TOPADA inscription)—even employing an archaizing script to do so—and that Tiglath-pileser III deposed Wasusarma and pointedly installed on his throne a certain Hulli, “son of nobody,” indicating how unfriendly he felt toward long-lived dynasties. Warpalawa of Tuwana (‘king’, ‘hero’, ‘ruler’) appears to have had both a son and a father Muwaharani, who also ruled; the former is attested in one stele only, and the latter only in an inscription of his son’s, but they provide a rare second example of a three-generation dynasty (Bryce 2012, 149–152). D'Alfonso (2012) used the term ‘cantonal
polities’ to describe the loose network of small, locally-focused districts of which Tabal seems to have been comprised, suggesting too that the name of the region—an Assyrian designation—could be derived from a mistranslation of the Hittite term 
tapariya-, tapariyali-, designating a region and/or its governor. He and Mora (2012, 395) argue elsewhere that the combination of continuity and change observed in Tabal may be attributable to “the process of political interaction between local élites and Hittite local administration within each single administrative district.” These short-lived dynasties and shifting poles of power among the small city-states of Tabal are a symptom of the renegotiation of relationships and priorities the inchoate Iron I environment may have encouraged throughout Anatolia.

The example of the kingdom of Karkemish provides an interesting counterpoint to that of Tabal, when it comes to rulership/political organization, titles, and consistency. As noted above, the title of ‘Great King’ seems to have retained its Hittite political significance at Karkemish into the 12th century. In Tabal, too, there appears to have been a Great King Hartapus, who claimed the both title for himself and for his father Mursilis (the KARADAĞ-KIZILDAĞ group); the inscriptions are problematic, but most likely date to just after the fall of Hattusha (or just before: Hawkins 2000, 433–42, 2002; Hawkins and Weeden 2016, 10–11; see also Simon 2009). Some have concluded that a Hittite rump state based at Tarhuntassa, formed in the footprint of the Hittite Lower Land, survived to rival that of Karkemish (but see D’Alfonso 2014). Whether or not this is corroborated with further evidence, however, we can observe that both in Tabal and in the land of Karkemish, this system does not appear to have survived into the 11th century. With the exception of the KARADAĞ-KIZILDAĞ group, none of the inscriptions of Tabal date from the 12th–10th centuries (and even the 9th century evidence is debated; see Lanaro 2015); at Karkemish, too, evidence from the period is slight, and a definitive
destruction at Malatya (whose political fortunes have been linked to those of Karkemish) has been dated to 1070 BCE.⁵¹

Monumental inscriptions from Karkemish pick up in the 10th century, however, and they illuminate that the balance of power had meanwhile shifted from Great Kings to a line of local Country Lords, and continued to be contested. As Gilibert (2015, 145) put it in a study examining ‘Religion and Propaganda’ at Karkemish, “[t]he Country Lords progressively imposed themselves as ruling subjects, and ultimately, in the second half of the 10th century, expedited the disappearance of the Great Kings from the political scene.” In Gilibert’s reconstruction, the Great Kings lost ideological hold on their subjects as their territorial control contracted, and relied increasingly on their governors, the Country Lords. This transition is reflected in the placement and themes of public art in the city, which shift from a strongly Hittite-derived iconography depicting royal state cult and the proximity of the king to the gods—setting him apart from the populace—to more collaborative, multi-figure images of combatants working together to kill their prey. These images also spread from urban gates into the city’s central squares, in an increase of both public access to and representation in monumental art. Denel (2007) interprets the sculptural programme of this period rather differently, seeing it as a reassertion of the distinguished status of the king in new terms, “possibly in response to a strong and

⁵¹ Aside from the Kuzi-Teššub inscriptions noted above, one of which is authored by a king of Malatya, not Karkemish, there are three other fragmentary inscriptions, reused in later contexts and dated on stylistic or paleographic grounds to the 11th century; the unprovenanced Ankara Silver Bowl has also been dated to the 12th or 11th centuries and associated with Karkemish. Two of the inscriptions name the same ‘Great King’, Tudhaliya, ‘Hero’ and ‘Labarna’; the third names an elsewhere unattested ‘king’ of the Land of Karkemish, Huwa-Sarumma; and the fourth, the bowl, is dedicated to a ‘king’ Maza-Karhuha and mentions a ‘Labarna’, a title reserved for Great Kings in the Hittite period. For discussion, see Hawkins and Weeden 2016, 10; Gilibert 2015; Weeden 2013.
pervasive threat to the office of kingship and the order it represents” (Denel 2007, 194). Still, her study and Gilibert’s concur that this was a period of general instability in which the legitimacy of the ruling dynasty was in question, the prevailing system was seen as vulnerable, and rulers had to make a strong case for their viability, or inviolability, in the face of challenges to the status quo. This instability ultimately resulted in a major political reorganization at Karkemish, part of which entailed a broader definition of who could claim power, and how (see section 3.3.3 below).52

Gilibert sees in the public art of the Country Lords of Karkemish “a new cult of the ruling dynasty, with markedly mundane images appealing to a sense of belonging and addressing the audience directly, in fact actually speaking to the audience, and requiring regular offerings” (Gilibert 2015, 147). In other words, this was a kind of rulership that in some way demanded public input. The more scattered evidence from Tabal has been interpreted in a similar light: per Mora and D’Alfonso 2012 (394), “the monuments do not only speak of divinities or military activities but also of building activities, cultivation of vines, pastures and vineyards,” and emphasize overall themes of wellbeing and prosperity, focused on the public good. The inscriptions use inclusive, not exclusive, language and iconography; they do not threaten violence, but offer membership in a community, where the king’s relationship with the god ensured peace and bounty for the population, e.g. at ANDAVAL, BOR, and IVRIZ (Balatti and Balza 2012).

52 See, for example, Denel’s arguments about Yariris, the eunuch who was regent for the king’s son, Kamanis, in the early 8th century BCE. She points out that he raises the status of eunuchs, long an invisible part of Near Eastern bureaucracies, by depicting a group of them on the Royal Buttress, inserting them into the political hierarchy of the city. He also claims legitimacy for his office by virtue of his intellectual skills, e.g. his ability to speak twelve languages, rather than simply his relationship with the king or gods. He upholds the ceremonial aspects of kingship and his loyalty to the royal family, while underlining his ability to act with autonomy (Denel 2007, 195–196).
Nor does this narrative of peace and bounty appear [unfounded] to be fake news: the KULULU texts document, on lead strips, an economic network of dozens of smaller cities and towns (Hawkins 1987). Survey data from Tuwana/the plain of Bor (Mora and D’Alfonso 2012), Karkemish (Wilkinson 2016), as well as the area of Gurgum/modern Kahramanmaraş (Dodd 2007), all indicate long-term stability in settlement patterns from the Late Bronze into the Iron Age. Bryce (2012, 126) notes that the inscriptions of MARAŞ, like those of Tabal, feature a wide array of gods and titled individuals and dwell on agricultural development and reconstruction projects, concluding that Gurgum too “seems to have pursued a policy of peaceful coexistence with its neighbors.” Mora and D’Alfonso (2012, 393) have even argued for the maintenance, well into the Iron Age, of a “complex territorial organization of pottery production … created during the Hittite Empire,” in their survey area in the plain of Bor. These data indicate that overall, political change and instability had few negative effects on the socioeconomic organization or cultural development of much of southern Anatolia, instead affording a (brief) opportunity for local populations to look inward to their own networks and needs.

Wilkinson (2016, 102) characterized the landscape around Karkemish as “dominated by small nucleated strongholds, which not only continued for long periods of history, but also probably [were] occupied by long-lived communities that possessed a strong local identity.” The following case studies explore strategies for the creation and maintenance of this strong local identity, especially in the face of the unquestionable demographic changes taking place at this time. For the Iron Age kingdom of Gurgum, Dodd (2007, 213) has highlighted the role of Hittite heritage in this project:

“Significantly, the later assertions of Hittite-ness by élites whose inscriptions and names were written in Luwian in the Iron Age kingdom of Gurgum and whose gods, goddesses and funerary practices reflected multiple cultural origins (Bonatz 2000; Hutter 2003: 277) are a measure of the successful integration and management of this region by the Hittites. From this perspective, the Hittite administration of their southern
territories was not invasive in a manner that created a collective memory of dislocation or disenfranchisement in the local mind. On the contrary, the imperial symbols of Hittite prestige and wealth were revived even though effective Hittite power had been destroyed, and a Hittite legacy was created anew in the Iron Age."

But it seems possible that, construed more broadly, the symbols of Hittite prestige to which Dodd calls attention were perhaps less important in creating a productive multicultural environment than were the religious and cultural practices associated with those symbols. This may indeed have been the case for Gordia, where Hittite- or Syro-Anatolianizing iconography was short-lived, but other collective practices persisted.

3.3.2 Zincirli: monuments, multiculturalism, and the politics of language

Aro (2010, 4) has stated, “One of the most interesting phenomena [of the post-collapse period] is the continuity of certain Hittite artistic features combined with the exclusive use of the Hieroglyphic Luwian language and writing system…” Arguably, a more revealing phenomenon is the non-exclusive use of Hieroglyphic Luwian in association with such artistic features: these post-collapse societies exhibit a functional multiglossia in their public and private monuments that speaks to people’s comfort/familiarity/multiculturalism, their fluency in multiple cultural constructs. The site of Zincirli, long the poster child for the new, ‘Aramean’ urban foundations of the 9th century, has produced official royal inscriptions in Phoenician, Aramaic, and its own local dialect, Samalian; but nearly half of its historically attested rulers bear Luwian names, and hieroglyphic Luwian inscriptions have been found at the site and in its hinterland, in
contexts both official and domestic. These discoveries make it abundantly clear that
Samalian society—and Syro-Anatolian society generally—was neither mono-ethnic nor
monolinguistic. Still, Zincirli/Samal is relatively unique in that archaeological
investigations there since 2006 have sought to clarify the ways this diversity manifested
itself socially and spatially. Contextual analysis of the city’s monuments allows us to
consider the question of who writes inscriptions and for whom—or, put even more
broadly, what social or political work inscriptions are meant to do. This is important
because of what inscriptions can reveal about the distribution of power and local
strategies of negotiating ethnic plurality and social complexity. But it also allows us to
definitively decouple language from its constant companion, ethnicity, and thereby to
problematicize the relationship between language and identity—whether that language is
Luwian, Aramaic, or Phrygian.

Zincirli’s long history of excavation and scholarship makes it well-suited to this
discussion. Unlike many ancient inscriptions, the majority of those presented here were
found in situ, either by the site’s initial excavators, the German Orient-Comité, between
1888 and 1902, or in the renewed efforts under Schloen, Fink and Herrmann of the
University of Chicago’s Oriental Institute, since 2006. This has contributed to a shift in
scholarly focus toward the construction of inward-looking local and regional histories,
away from traditional approaches that privileged external factors such as the ethnic
origins of city-founders, whether native Anatolian or intrusive Aramaic, on the one hand,
and the role of Assyrian imperial expansion, on the other, as defining characteristics

53 There actually appear to be multiple local dialects of Aramaic attested in the inscriptions of
Zincirli: see Pardee 2014, 45.
Herrmann’s recent reconstruction of the history of Samal emphasizes the existence “of a complex world of local and regional politics, in which the almighty Assyrian king only plays the role of a supporting character” (Herrmann forthcoming, 18–19). These efforts to take a more internally-focused view of political developments have been furthered by a proliferation of multiscalar analyses that place buildings and monuments within the context of urban neighborhoods (Gilibert 2011; Osborne 2012; Harrison and Osborne 2012; Pucci 2008a, 2008b), upper and lower towns (Casana and Herrmann 2010; Mazzoni, D’Agostino, and Orsi 2010; Osborne 2014c, 2017), and regional settlement hierarchies (Osborne 2013; Wilkinson 2016). Such approaches help clarify the social patterning of Syro-Anatolian polities, rather than dwelling on architectural or artistic conventions. Herrmann and others working in the region see shared regional trends in political organization, religion, settlement patterning, and material culture as innovative solutions to the evolving sociopolitical challenges posed by multiethnic societies (Herrmann 2017; see also Brown 2008).

Royal inscriptions from three of the kings of Samal—Kulamuwa, Panamuwa I, and Barrākib—alongside those of the Assyrian kings Shalmaneser III, Tiglath-Pileser III, and Sargon II provide a basic historic scaffolding for Samal from the mid-9th to the mid-7th century BCE, in the form of a king list. The multiethnic nature of Samal’s society and even its royal house is immediately apparent from the exercise: the earliest inscription discovered at the site, that of the Luwian-named Kulamuwa, dates to ca. 830 BCE and cites as dynastic founder a certain Gabbār, whose name is West Semitic for ‘hero’. Kulamuwa is the first of the known rulers of Samal—certainly of those he cites—to bear a Luwian name, but his inscription was written in Phoenician, and his father and brother,
who ruled before him, both have West Semitic names. Its contents, too, describe further social divisions among the Samalian populace:

I am Kulamuwa, the son of Ḥayyā. Gabbār ruled over Y'DY, but he achieved nothing. BNH also (ruled over Y'DY), but he achieved nothing. Then my father Ḥayyā, but he achieved nothing. And then my brother Ša'īl, but he achieved nothing. But I am Kulamuwa, son of TML—what I achieved, (my) predecessors had not achieved.

The house of my father was in the midst of mighty kings. Each one stretched forth his hand to fight. But I was in the hand of the kings like a fire consuming the beard and like a fire consuming the hand. The king of the Danunians was more powerful than I, but I engaged against him the king of Assyria. A young woman was given for a sheep and a young man for a garment.

I am Kulamuwa, son of Ḥayyā. I sat upon the throne of my father. During the reigns of the former kings, the muškabīm were living like dogs. But I was to some a father; and to some I was a mother; and to some I was a brother. Whoever had never possessed a sheep, I made a lord of a flock. Whoever had never possessed an ox, I made owner of a herd and owner of silver and lord of gold. Whoever from his childhood had never seen linen, now in my days wore byssos. I took the muškabīm by the hand and they showed (me) affection like the affection of a fatherless child toward (its) mother.

Now, whoever of my descendants (lit. "sons") sits in my place and damages this inscription—may the muškabīm not honor the ba'rirīm and may the ba'rirīm not honor the muškabīm. And whoever strikes out this inscription, may Baal Šemed, (the god) of Bamah, and Rākib-El, the lord of the dynasty (lit. "house"), strike his head. (trans. Hallo and Younger 2000, 147–48)

The use of the toponym Y'DY for Samal is one point to note: in Assyrian documentation, the city is always referred to as Kur Samalla, but Y'DY is used in local inscriptions up until the reign of Barrākid. The origins and vocalization of the toponym are unknown, but Starke (1999, 525) has proposed the Luwian Yādiya, suggesting it represents the pre-Aramaean name for the region. The more obvious distinction made here, however, is that between the similarly enigmatic muškabīm (mškbm) and ba'rirīm (b'rnm). These terms clearly refer to two socioeconomic groups, one formerly downtrodden, the other rather better off; scholarly consensus has been that the ba'rirīm
were intrusive, seminomadic Aramaean “roamers” and muškabīm, “those who lie down,” the subjugated and/or sedentist Luwian local population. Whether or not these divisions were as clear-cut as he makes them out to be, Kulamuwa, who calls himself the son of Hayyā but also of “TML,” may have been the son of a Luwian mother himself, and therefore, uniquely positioned to wage a social justice campaign on the Luwians’ behalf. Whether or not this is the case, and the details of related events, are immaterial (literally: they have left no further material traces). What does matter is that Kulamuwa’s inscription survived, prominently placed at the entrance to Palace J on the Zincirli citadel (von Luschan and Jacoby 1911, 374), almost as long as the city did; and that generations later, kings and prominent officials in Samal continued to bear Luwian names and integrate Anatolian gods into their personal pantheons, even as they expressed themselves in the local West Semitic dialect.

The success of Kulamuwa’s venture, if indeed it reflects the integration of Luwian- and Aramaic-speaking ethnic groups into a ‘Samalian’ civic identity, can be seen in the recently discovered mortuary stele of Katamuwa (Herrmann and Struble 2009; Pardee 2009; Herrmann and Schloen, eds., 2014). The stele is an arch-shaped basalt monument inscribed with a 13-line inscription accompanied by the relief image of a banqueting figure, presumably Katamuwa himself. In the inscription, Katamuwa calls himself “servant of Panamuwa,” referring in all likelihood to the later of the two known kings of Samal who bore that name, who ruled ca. 743/733–733/732 BCE. A scant century on from Kulamuwa, then, we have the elegant monument of a Luwian-named non-royal official, of a Luwian-named king, whose preferred language of inscription is nonetheless a local dialect of Aramaic (one of several; Pardee 2014, 45, 2009). Its contents detail, in traditional fashion, sacrifices to be made to Katamuwa’s personal pantheon, and to himself: “a bull for Hadad Qarpattali, a ram for NGD/R ŠWD/RN, a ram
for Šamš, a ram for Hadad of the Vineyards, a ram for Kubaba, and a ram for my ‘soul’ that (will be) in this stele)” (trans. Pardee 2014, 45). Of these deities, Hadad, the storm-god, and Šamš, the sun-god, are familiar from other inscriptions as part of the Samalian royal pantheon, but Kubaba, the most Anatolian of goddesses, with her important cult center at Karkemish, is an outlier. These particular epithets of Hadad, too, have Anatolian resonances: Qarpatalli remains enigmatic, but Tarhunt of the Vineyards was a popular contemporary manifestation of the Anatolian storm-god in nearby Tabal, appearing in 8th-century rock-cut monuments from SULTANHAN, BOR, and IVRİZ (Hutter 2003, 224). Meanwhile, from an artistic standpoint, the style and iconography of the monument fit well within a well-studied group of mortuary banquet stelae from the Syro-Anatolian region (Orthmann 1971; Bonatz 2000), but Katamuwa’s two attributes—a phiale in one hand, a conifer cone in the other—are unique to him. The phiale, as a distinctive luxury good of the 8th century, may simply reflect Katamuwa’s elite status, but the pinecone seems to refer to the coniferous trees of the Amanus mountain range, a nod to a desirable local resource and perhaps, it has been suggested, to Katamuwa’s vocation (Bonatz 2014; Herrmann and Struble 2009, 24–25 and 32–33).

The Katamuwa stele was the first such Syro-Anatolian mortuary monument to be found in situ; its archaeological context therefore is of considerable significance. Much to the surprise of excavators, the stele was found in a small room of an apparently fairly modest private residence in Samal’s lower town (Herrmann 2014). Herrmann (2014, 49)

54 See also D’Alfonso 2014.
55 Herrmann and Struble (2009, 32) also suggest a connection to fertility, and to the goddess Kubaba, citing a representation of a conifer cone found near Karkemish that was dedicated to that deity (Hawkins 1981).
observes that the building was “probably too humble in formality and size at only 9 x 12–13 meters to have housed a wealthy courtier like Katamuwa himself”; instead, the context has been interpreted as a mortuary chapel, situated adjacent to a small neighborhood temple (though the deity to which it was devoted remains unknown; Herrmann (2014, 53) suggests the first deity mentioned, the enigmatic Hadad Qarpatalli). Still, the general surroundings of both chapel and temple, a block of houses excavators have dubbed Complex A, were decidedly plebian in both architecture and function: they contained bread ovens, cooking pots, and other evidence for food and textile production—the general detritus of daily domestic life (Herrmann 2011). The location of an ‘elite’ stone-carved monument in such a context lends further nuance to the arguments put forth above for a democratization of access to power, or at least its trappings, in the Syro-Anatolian political milieu.

The practices associated with the monument—namely the presentation of offerings to deities and the deceased as part of the same rite—are more generally associated with royal mortuary cult, in Samal and elsewhere (Niehr 2014, 2006; Herrmann and Struble 2009, 39). Niehr (2014, 60) therefore concludes that Katamuwa was of “royal status,” echoing Bonatz’s earlier position that the appearance and proliferation of such monuments in the late 10th through the 8th centuries was an instance of emulation of royal practices linked to dynastic legitimation. Syro-Anatolian mortuary monuments, however, have been documented in a wide variety of spatial settings, from citadel mounds to lower towns to extramural cemeteries at Karkemish, Tell Halaf, Tell Ahmar, Kahramanmaraş, and Tell Rifa’at, as well as in smaller cities whose urban character is unknown (Struble and Herrmann 2009 39–42 and note 43; Bonatz 2000). In other words, they are not strictly associated, within the urban environment, with temples,
gateways, royal precincts, or other politically charged locales, nor is their distribution even limited to capital cities. In Herrmann and Struble’s (2009, 40) analysis,

[This spatial differentiation stands out as perhaps the most significant social distinction in mortuary practice, as fundamental similarities (across a range of elaboration) between elite/non-elite or intramural/extramural burials in the postmortem treatment of the body, the basic form of the burial, grave goods, funerary or mortuary offerings, and even the erection of stone memorials suggest that beliefs and practices relating to death and the afterlife were otherwise shared broadly throughout this society.]

We should not, then, consider Katamuwa’s monument in light of what it communicates about his elite identity or even his Luwian identity; rather, we should consider what it can tell us about Samalian social identity. The emphasis, in both the inscription and the iconography of the associated image, is on the individual, his pantheon, and his progeny. He states only briefly, and in the simplest terms, his relationship to the king (we have seen above that other such monuments sometimes do not even go that far). The situation of the monument, in an unassuming neighborhood building, further demonstrates that the intended audience was a local one, accessible and notable only to descendants or dependents. Katamuwa’s choice of attributes, his linguistic and religious preferences, and the localization of his monument, all reflect the degree to which he was able to craft his own identity, express it, and proudly entrust it to the maintenance of his local community (of family, friends, neighbors?). Botanical and faunal remains from the surrounding rooms suggest that they did so, for several generations at least (Herrmann 2011, 2014, 54–55).

The Katamuwa stele provides a compelling example of the elements of choice present in local expressions and negotiations of social identity in 8th-century Samal. The recent publication of a fragmentary hieroglyphic Luwian inscription from nearby Pancarlı Höyük dating, tentatively, to the 10th or early 9th century, casts this discussion into sharper relief, particularly from a linguistic standpoint. Herrmann et al. (2016, 64–65)
argue, based on the dimension of the stele and its contents, that it was likely part of a royal memorial inscription, probably the skirt of a standing statue. If so, it is an exemplum of a type familiar from the region: parallels include a large statue of the storm-god Hadad with an inscription of Panamuwa I in a local Samalian dialect, discovered at nearby Gerçin, likely site of a temple to the storm-god, and dating to the mid-8th century BCE (Von Luschan et al. 1893, Taf. 6); a large statue of the storm-god Baal-KRNTRYŠ with an inscription of Azatiwada, ruler of Azatiwadiya who elsewhere claims loyalty to Awariku of Que, in Phoenician from Karatepe-Aslantaš, dating to the late 8th century (Çambel and Özyar 2003; Hawkins and Çambel 2000); and the recently discovered statue of the Patinean king Suppiluliuma from the citadel of Tell Tayinat, engraved with an inscription in hieroglyphic Luwian and dating to the mid-9th century, among others. The widespread popularity of the iconographic type is clear from these exempla, even as they highlight the ethnolinguistic diversity of the region. The PANCARLI fragment in question is however unique for the region of Samal in its use of hieroglyphic Luwian in an official context. Herrmann et al. (2016, 70) provide two equally intriguing explanations for this: it must either represent “the first concrete evidence for a Luwian-speaking kingdom in the İslahiye valley (perhaps an offshoot of the Hittite rump-state at Karkemish [sic.]) that was replaced by the Aramaean dynasty of Gabbār,” or evidence that “the earliest Aramaean kings of Samal borrowed the Hieroglyphic Luwian epigraphic tradition from their neighbors.”

Herrmann et al. prefer the former scenario, arguing that a Neo- or post-Hittite kingdom has long been suspected for the valley; both Kutamuwa himself and Kulamuwa’s muškabīm have been identified as residual evidence of such a regime (see also Herrmann 2017). But the latter possibility, that Kulamuwa’s use of Phoenician in his late 9th century royal inscription marked an act of departure from his forefathers’
adoption of the local Hieroglyphic Luwian tradition, finds support in patterns of language usage from the region of Que, modern Cilicia. There, Hieroglyphic Luwian and Phoenician inscriptions appear side-by-side on a series of monuments commonly dated to the 8th century BCE (INCIRLI, KARATEPE and ÇINEKÖY). Yakubovich (2015) argues forcefully for the primacy of the Phoenician version of these inscriptions, despite the Luwian name of the commissioner of the great KARATEPE 1 inscription (Azatiwada, mentioned above). He construes the use of Luwian as a concession to the native population of Que, while the main Phoenician text represents “the assertion of a separate cultural identity by the new elites, in contrast to the rulers of the neighboring states” (Yakubovich 2015, 36). In a parallel situation at Samal, the earliest West Semitic kings would initially have adopted the pre-existing Hieroglyphic Luwian epigraphic tradition and only later sought to re-assert their difference with the use of Phoenician, or perhaps adopted it as it became more prevalent as the lingua franca of the period, in an increasingly interconnected region.

Yakubovich’s reconstruction of the politics of language in Que is further complicated by his assertion that the new elites who were employing Phoenician in their inscriptions were not West Semitic at all, but Greek. Phoenician would have been strictly a chancery language, whose sole purpose was to underline cultural difference, by declaring a cultural identity distinct from that of neighboring and preceding Luwian-

56 Though he admits that the royal house may no longer have been Greek-speaking—perhaps only “semi-speaking”—by the 8th century; this argument is related to the tantalizing claim by Awariku, ruler of Que, ‘author’ of the ÇINEKÖY inscription, to descent from the “House of Mopsus,” a seer- or philosopher-figure of Greek legend. See (J. D. Hawkins 2009; Lanfranchi 2005, 2007, 2009). He goes so far as to suggest that Que was the locus of transmission of the alphabet, not only from Phoenician to Greek, but also to Phrygian: Yakubovich 2015, 50; see also Lemaire 2008, 51–52. If true, this would be a further indication that Phrygians were exposed to and influenced by the political practices and beliefs of this corner of Syro-Anatolia.
speaking dynasties. At the same time, the architectural contexts and media in which that message was deployed—relief orthostats and sculpture in the round in Syro-Anatolian style—believe that message of difference, attesting rather to broad cultural similarities and shared practices and beliefs across the region. Under such conditions, the attribution of adversarial motives to the creation of bilingual inscriptions, rather than inclusive ones, seems out of sync. Elsewhere in the region, hieroglyphic Luwian seems to have been employed by non-Luwian rulers as a vehicle of prestige and legitimation, as in the West Semitic king Taita of Patina’s inscription in the Aleppo temple (Kohlmeyer 2009); it is hard to imagine that in Que its use was a mere sop to a commoner population.

Trying to identify a clear historical trajectory for Samal or the region—one in which, for example, Luwian elites were displaced and superseded by West Semitic interlopers, who then co-opted their methods and in some cases, perhaps after considerable struggle, welcomed certain of their members into the new political order—or even just a vague one, in which a gradual shift away from the trappings of Hittite statehood (including the use of Hieroglyphic Luwian) toward more dynamic and flexible modes of political expression (including alphabetic scripts)—is in many ways a thankless task, due to a constant stream of emerging data causing sands to shift beneath scholarly feet; it is in any case beyond the scope of the present work. Searching for primacy of Luwians and Aramaeans is, for our purposes, besides the point; what is more important is the clear indication in the epigraphic data from Samal and across Syro-Anatolia that language use is a choice, whether a strategic or a symbolic one. It does not bear any necessary relationship with ethnicity. Coming from a Phrygian milieu, this point alone should give us pause; the relative rarity of Phrygian writing, and the frequent religious or ceremonial character of the contexts in which Phrygian inscriptions are discovered, may indicate that the use of Phrygian was confined to certain events or purposes, and not to
ethnically (or even ‘socially’) Phrygian individuals. If the ethnolinguistic makeup of central Anatolia in the Early and Middle Iron Age was anything like that of southern and southeastern Anatolia, we should expect far more heterogeneity than has previously been looked for in the archaeological evidence from Phrygian Gordion. Furthermore, the relative homogeneity of Phrygian material culture is paralleled in the artistic output of the Syro-Anatolian polities, who, despite their ostensible ethnolinguistic differences, appear unselfconscious in sharing and borrowing from a common cultural and iconographic vocabulary in both public architecture and private monuments.

The functions and practices associated with that architecture in Syro-Anatolia are explored in the next section. One lingering question regarding the politics of language, however, emerges when we consider not just what these inscriptions communicate, but to whom they are directed. This is not so much a question of public vs. private as it is of literacy: what difference does the choice of language really make if the majority of a monument’s audience cannot read it? Surely, especially in the case of public architecture—as with the Karatepe-Aslantas bilingual—the style and content of the relief-carved images associated with the inscription were a far more important signifier than either inscription. One can imagine that a literate viewer of such a monument might be pleased to find one’s own language expressed—might feel that much more implicated in

57 Or even eastern or western Anatolia: the high degree of cultural variation in coastal Ionia has never been in doubt, but current research on the Urartian empire also underscores the underlying diversity of the understudied East (Smith 1999, 2015; Smith and Leon 2014).

58 Even within the ‘dynasty’ of Gabbār, it seems that continuity was not overstated or emphasized: Kulamuwa does not mention any familial ties other than those between himself, his brother, and his father, Ḥayyā; the relationship between Gabbār, his successor BNH, and Ḥayyā is unknown. Nonetheless, from the Assyrian perspective, all kings of Samal were ‘sons of Gabbār’. See Herrmann forthcoming, 12.
its message—but not that an illiterate viewer would feel excluded or take offense at the presence of an inscription in a language not his own, given how much more emphasis is placed on the visual components of such monuments. Therefore, if the goal were truly to express difference, in ethnic, linguistic, social or cultural terms, one would expect far greater stylistic innovation than we find among Syro-Anatolian polities. (Notably, we do find it in Phrygia.) After all, a picture is worth a thousand words. The implications of this conclusion for the political goals of Iron Age states are addressed below.

3.3.3 Karkemish: urbanism, theater, and the performance of politics

The “scenographic” character of Iron Age Syro-Anatolian cities is well-established as a distinctive cultural feature of these societies (Mazzoni 1997; Pucci 2008a). The earliest investigations of such sites as Zincirli/Samal, Karkemish, and Tell Halaf/Guzana in the late 19th century rewarded excavators with dozens of relief-carved stone orthostats in a distinctive style that recalled Hittite art, earning them the moniker “Neo-Hittite,” and widespread fame. While their style was considered somewhat more rudimentary than that of the Assyrian palace reliefs to which they were inevitably compared, the extreme exteriority of focus denoted by the location of the monuments was and continues to be an object of some interest. They were found to cluster around gateways but also decorating courtyards, processional ways, and public buildings throughout the city—making their audience the citizenry, writ large. Current scholarship on Syro-Anatolian urbanism is preoccupied with the ways in which these urban transformations both shaped and were shaped by larger processes of community and political identity formation, especially as excavations continue to reveal the near-constant elaboration, modification, and reuse of these monuments in different settings throughout the Iron Age (Denel 2007; Gilibert 2011, 2013, 2015; Harmanşah 2013;
Herrmann 2017; Osborne 2014c, 2012; Pucci 2008a, 2008b). The application of theories of monumentality (Osborne 2014a), memory (Harmanşah 2013), and performance (Gilibert 2011), which emphasize the experiential and discursive aspects of ancient urbanism, at Zincirli/Samal, Karkemish, and Tell Tayinat/Patina, has yielded new insights into the material and spatial traces left by the interaction of political actors and audiences, and thereby into the development of Syro-Anatolian society.

For Gilibert (2013, 39 and note 19), the ceremonial plaza, defined as "any open and, at least upon specific occasions, easily accessible urban space lined by buildings and devised to ‘host structured or communal activities’ (Kostoff 1992, 124),” “stands out as the most significant feature of the Syro-Anatolian ‘hard space’.” Plazas, courtyards, and other ‘enclosed open spaces’ (see Pucci 2006) dominate Iron Age Syro-Anatolian cities, facilitating large gatherings of people. These plazas cannot be considered in isolation, however; access to them was controlled, and the emotional experience of moving toward them heightened, by the structured elaboration of viewsheds and pathways, and invitations to engage in ritual performance along the way. Gilibert describes the access to the late 10th/early 9th-century palace of Kapara at Guzana in this way (2013, 45):

A broad paved street leading from the city straight through the main gate, intersecting the lower plaza, passing through the Gate of the Scorpions, taking a turn into the upper plaza and coming to a halt in front of the ceremonial façade of the Palace mapped the connection between the key elements of this urban re-planning. The culmination of the street in front of the terrace and the porticoed entrance of the Palace coincided with the highest point of the natural mound (Cholidis and Martin 2010, 70, fn. 213). Thus, the experience of the visitor coming from outside was one of inward progression, underlined by the increasing absolute height and dramatized step by step by an attentive use of buffer zones, thresholds, platforms, ramps, staircases, curtain walls, lighting, and monumental artwork. Visitors climbed further and further up and into the architectural system surrounding the Palace, until they reached what theatre people refer to as “the point beyond which one cannot go” (McAuley 1999, 50), a sort of “magical area” (Mackintosh 1993, 144) that is built to capture the gaze of the visitor, suspend his or her disbelief and create “a space for
concentration which permits every gesture to carry its full weight of meaning” (Peter Brook, quoted by McAuley 1999, 36). In a theatre building, this place is the interface between audience space and actors’ stage; at the Palace of Kapara, the ‘magical area’ in the theatrical sense was the terrace in front of the palace and the upper plaza surrounding it.”

The elaboration of gates, such as Zincirli’s South Gate—one of three access points to the city through its two, perfectly circular, concentric walls—rendered even the initial transition into the city from the outside laden with meaning. Pucci (2006, 2) considers that the thematic content of Zincirli’s South Gate orthostats—battle scenes, hunting, ceremonies, and the underworld—emphasizes in-group/out-group divisions: the “we” of the town and the “others” of the wilderness outside are reflected in the binaries of civilization/wilderness (hunting and ceremonies), life/underworld, us/enemies (battle scenes). Access to the upper mound and to the palace areas within it was controlled by a further series of gates, elaborated by more carved orthostats as well as sculpture in the round, at least one of which—a standing statue—had cup-marks cut into the base, probably for the purpose of libation rituals (Ussishkin 1975). Gilibert (2011, 100) notes such cut marks appear frequently at Karkemish, on or around raised platforms that would have served as foci of ritual performance. Indeed, at Karkemish, the avenues of access between the Water Gate, the King’s Gate, and the main ceremonial open area at the city center adjacent to the Temple of the Storm God and known as the Lower Palace Area (which itself featured a Great Staircase and Long Wall of Sculpture), were all elaborated with sculpture. Gilibert (2011, 103) estimates that the entire precinct could have accommodated a crowd of around 7500 individuals—a “very significant number for an Iron Age city-state.”

Given what we have established about the heterogeneous makeup of the Syro-Anatolian polities, it seems a significant hurdle for architects of urban spaces to allow for the harmonious engagement in civic ritual of so large and diverse a constituency. It is in
this light that the repetitive nature of Karkemishean orthostat iconography becomes comprehensible: the so-called Processional Way, depicting parties of men and women bearing offerings of rams, calves, and agricultural produce, is instructive, intended for the purposes of conditioning behavior (Geertz 1973). So, too, are the prominently placed platforms for libation; both allow ‘out-group’ members to see exactly what ‘in-group’ behavior consists of, for next time. Meanwhile, the heightened emotions that accompany the process of processing through the city en masse would have been further strengthened by the increasing formality of the spaces closer to the city center. In the case of Guzana, Gilibert sees the less formal lower plaza as a non-confrontational “sort of public common room,” but once the visitor passed through the ceremonial Scorpion Gate, he would turn a blind corner to find himself confronting, at eye level, the high terrace on which the Palace of Kapara was constructed:

In front of the visitor, the terrace would elevate itself as a place of crossing gazes: the gaze of the spectators, the gaze of the actors, and the fixed, wide, unblinking gaze of the sculptures at the magnificent backdrop of the scene.

Gilibert’s attention to the sensorial aspects of this experience—the heightened drama afforded by the white eyes of the dark basalt sculptures fronting the bīt-ḫilāni structure of Kapara’s palace at Guzana—further nuances arguments put forth in Osborne’s (2012) comparative space syntax analysis of bīt-ḫilāni structures at Zincirli (Building J/K) and Tell Tayinat (Building I/VI). Osborne (2012, 57) qualifies the throne room suite of Building I/VI, Tayinat’s bīt-ḫilāni palace, as “being both socially integrated and, at the same time, having a tendency toward spatial control”: the architectural layout of the palace, and the ḫilāni suite in particular, facilitated its inhabitant’s ability to control access to and visibility of loci of authority. That is, the ruler could reveal himself—or whatever he chose to reveal—when he chose to, and disappear just as quickly; there is a decided element of political theater involved in such an architecture. The fact that this
particular spatial profile is associated with the quintessentially Syro-Hittite building form, the ḫilāni, is well in line with the deeply performative aspects of Syro-Anatolian urbanism underlined in current scholarship.59

The overall guiding principle behind Syro-Anatolian urbanism seems to be to engineer moments of ‘hiding/revealing’; it was apparently applied both at the scale of the city and in individual buildings, in a kind of Russian-doll effect. The alternation of dark, constricted spaces, often decorated with ideologically charged imagery, and broad, bright, open spaces (lower towns, courtyards), would have had a dizzying emotional impact on the viewer/visitor, especially if (s)he was one of a great (drunk?) crowd. A 2013 article by Augusta McMahon attempting to reconstruct the ‘sensory experience’ of the Assyrian capital city of Khorsabad, built in the late 8th century BCE, hypothesizes that comparable uses there of ramps, tunnels, and courtyards there employed darkness and light as ‘building materials’ to create “an unusual and memorable experience involving strong and disorienting contrasts” (McMahon 2013, 173–174). She observes that this principle has a long pedigree in Mesopotamia, pointing to bent-axis temple architecture of the fourth and third millennia BCE as an early example of dramatic hiding/revealing to encourage deeper penetration into and emotional engagement with the space (McMahon 2013, 170). But Sargon’s palace is as likely to have been influenced by his time in Anatolia as by deep Mesopotamian traditions: it is now generally acknowledged that Assyrian use of large-scale decorative orthostats, beginning in the 9th century with Ashur-Nasirpal, was inspired by Assyrian campaigns into Syro-Anatolia and admiration of their cities (Winter 1993; see recent discussion in Harmanşah 2013). Gilibert (2013, 59)

See Novák 2004, 344–46 for discussion of the ḫilāni form, with references.
50, note 59) notes that “the extraordinary success of Syro-Anatolian urban and visual tradition in the neighboring regions, from Assyria to Greece” might be better explained by the emotional impact these monuments inspired on the viewer, more than other aesthetic considerations.

How did this ‘scenographic’ principle contribute to the creation of a Syro-Anatolian social and political consciousness? Beginning with a series of articles by Winter (1981, 1982, 1983, 1989), the monuments of Karkemish and their evolution over time have served as key data points in discussions of the office of kingship in southeastern Anatolia and northern Syria. For Denel, the public areas of the city were devoted primarily to ceremonies related to royal ancestor worship:

the manipulation of the monumental urban infrastructure at Karkemish [sic.]—the creation and installation of monumental inscriptions and visual representations and the configuration of public spaces—constituted an integral part of elaborate rituals or ceremonies of kingship that were designed to legitimate individual rule, maintain local and regional power, and diminish threats to the office and status of kingship. (Denel 2007, 179)

This general insistence on the importance of individual rule and the primacy of the person of the ruler—in ‘l'etat, c’est moi’ fashion—is the same thread running through, for example, arguments summarized above relating Katamuwa’s personal monument to royal mortuary cult, and even in the ‘Midas-mania’ highlighted in the last chapter. In the case of Karkemish, however, the insistence on dynasty does not necessarily make sense: as noted above (Section 3.3.1) we have sufficient historical information to inform us that dynastic rule there was unstable, discontinuous, and contested throughout the Iron Age. Ura-Tarhunzas, the last of the dynasty of Great Kings descended from the Hittite emperors, was deposed in the 11th or 10th century; an inscription of the late 10th/early 9th-century king, Katuwas, of the house of ‘Rulers’ or ‘Country Lords’, refers obliquely to the resistance Ura-Tarhunzas’ grandsons continued to offer to his rule
(Hawkins 2000, 95 A11a; 103, A11b; Denel 2007, 191). Finally, some of the most famous monuments of Karkemish were erected by the eunuch Yariris, who ruled as a regent in the early 8th century and probably was not of royal descent—he seems instead to have founded a new dynasty (Denel 2007, 194, following Hawkins 2002, 229–232), and replaced some of Katuwas’ central monuments with his own (reusing one as a ramp: Woolley et al. 1952, 203).

For Denel (2007), these strategies of expressing power through monumental, public ancestor worship are a response to, and therefore evidence of, repeated threats to royal legitimacy by rival dynasties: deified ancestors who feast with the gods would have been powerful ideological allies in the fight to maintain sociopolitical superiority over ambitious elites. But considering the elite class as the primary audience for these iconographic messages is inconsistent with their highly public localization, their scale, and even their content, all of which signal a preoccupation with much more broadly inclusive public gatherings and social cohesion. Gilibert (2015) notes that public art under Suhis II and Katuwas, the first of the Country Lords, was relocated from urban gates—a tradition inherited from Hittite cities—to the walls of the city’s central square. This relocation was accompanied by a shift in content toward what she terms ‘visual propaganda’ with a generally inclusive message: “[w]arriors, women, young people are represented together with the king and the queen in joint celebration,” Gilibert writes (2015, 147). This ‘age of civic ritual’ is also reflected in the reliefs of Zincirli’s South Gate, mentioned above: while somewhat more conservative in style, they nonetheless feature compressed versions of the processions of offering-bearers and banquet scenes realized on a far grander scale at Karkemish (Gilibert 2011, 119–124; Herrmann 2017).

Taken together, we can observe a greater emphasis on audience reception that
indicates the high value placed on social legitimacy, more so than dynastic legitimacy, at this period.

In a recent study of the contemporary relief program of Zincirli’s South Gate, Herrmann (2017, 267) has proposed that the continuity of the practice of creating architectural sculpture across this turbulent period, “otherwise riddled with the instability and disjunction seen in the archaeological record—through political fragmentation and reconsolidation, population movements and ethnogenesis, settlement dispersal and new urbanization, and technological change”, can be explained by the power of those monuments to help mediate disjunctive, potentially transformative events. In her analysis, which draws on Sewell’s concept of “eventful” history, these monuments are “an active means of social reproduction,” providing an official version of the kinds of events that alter social and spatial structures (city foundations; military victories; coronations). Implicitly, this interpretation reinforces the importance of audience response in these monuments’ success: they offer a way for viewers to understand their present and potentially to navigate social and political change.

Gilibert’s performance perspective, however, reminds us that the monuments alone are not enough: “a paradoxical property of monumental art and monuments in general… is that their signifying power, if left untouched, tend [sic.] constantly to decrease: eventually, monuments lose their aura and become invisible, particularly if their numbers increase.” Syro-Anatolian urbanism is unique and innovative not in the space it allocates for such gatherings—public squares are a common feature of much urban architecture—but in the way the elaboration (and constant renovation) of those spaces rendered the experience of such ceremonies memorable and lasting. The emotional experience of being in a large crowd is heady and unpredictable: as an adage of political theory goes, “if a fight starts, watch the crowd, because the crowd plays the
decisive role” (Schattschneider 1975, 2, quoted in Gilibert 2011, 121). It is at times like these that the middle ground can be created. The emotional manipulation of crowds in the context of civic rituals, through architecture, light, and performance, allowed for the lasting messages of these monuments to be embodied and reproduced by individual citizens, who, in moving through the city even on more humdrum occasions, would experience again a visceral connection to their civic identity, regardless of other, more exclusive, ethnic or linguistic affiliations.

3.4 Discussion and directions

“... I was in love with the city, the way you love the first person who ever touches you and you never love anyone quite that way again. I remember walking across Sixty-second Street one twilight that first spring, or the second spring, they were all alike for a while. I was late to meet someone but I stopped at Lexington Avenue and bought a peach and stood on the corner eating it and knew that I had come out of the West and reached the mirage. I could taste the peach and feel the soft air blowing from a subway grating on my legs and I could smell lilac and garbage and expensive perfume and I knew that it would cost something sooner or later—because I did not belong there, did not come from there…”

- Joan Didion, “Goodbye to All That”

Didion’s famous ode to New York City precisely articulates the emotional and sensual experiences that we encode into the urban fabric, and how we use them to stitch together our personal narratives. Even though she remembers all those early springs as alike, the specific moment stands apart in her memory: distinct sensorial experiences of taste, sight, touch, smell, are entangled both with a specific place and viewshed—the corner of 62nd St. and Lexington Ave.—and with a heady cocktail of mixed emotions—love, wonder, and familiarity, but also alienation. 60 1960s New York is

60 With apologies to Proust.
a long way from the cities of Iron Age Syro-Anatolia, but they share the reputation of epitomizing a unique, extreme, quintessentially urban experience for their visitors. For Didion, experiencing the city alone intensified her feeling of alienation; for Iron Age visitors to Karkemish or Zincirli, moving through the city as one of a large group, performing actions whose depiction in stone on all sides underscored their sanctity and rightness, would have had quite the opposite effect. The emotional satisfaction derived from sharing the experience with so many others (including those imagined to have participated before and after) would have created powerful feelings of civic pride and social cohesion, and above all, a desire to return and do it again.

It is important to recognize this quality in Iron Age Syro-Anatolian urbanism because it is so revealing as to the challenges presented by the sociopolitical transformation of Anatolia at the time. Our tendency has been to see these practices as part of a unidirectional strategy by rulers to consolidate their own power and prestige, whether personally or as part of a dynasty. But reconsidering the urban environment as an emotional, theatrical, participatory experience shifts focus to the audience, reminding us how powerful, unpredictable, and necessary its role can be. Furthermore, while the effects of a play can be long-lasting in the viewer’s memory, the play itself—much like political authority in the Iron Age—does not exist outside the theater, or in this case, the city. Making political authority felt outside of the city center, and maintaining it beyond a generation or two, was a challenge that Iron Age rulers struggled to meet—which is perhaps a reason their way of life was so short-lived (Osborne 2013). The constant fluctuation in the size and constitution of Iron Age Syro-Anatolian communities created a situation in which common ground could not be assumed, but had to be performed; these communities, then, were in a state of perpetual reinvention. It is in part for this
reason that we fail when we try to apply more static models of political structures to this dynamic period.

The case studies above illustrate the rewards of sustained effort to deal with data from these times in-between, long considered to be “an annoying interlude, their study a chore necessary to understand the renaissance that follows” (Tainter 1999, 988). We can now recognize the variety of approaches to community and identity formation and social integration that were experimented with in Iron Age Syro-Anatolia. Some of these were discarded, others instantiated in society through art, architecture, and sustained practice, despite considerable disjuncture and political discontinuity throughout the period. The example of Tabal reveals our tendency to overstate the importance and stability of state structures and centralized authority in facilitating cultural continuity or change. The evidence from Zincirli further underlines this apparent shift in the loci of authority in the Iron Age: power was not necessarily consolidated in one person or even one group of people, nor was it derived explicitly from a relationship to the ruler. Rather, we observe the development of social identities and means of expressing them, the dynamism of which was reflected not just in the range of individuals commissioning monuments for that expression, but in the pluralistic audience to whom they seem to have expressed it. At Karkemish, Zincirli, Guzana, and Tayinat, the impact of those social ways of being was played out at the scale of the city, with constituents and social memory reshaping the urban environment.

We should anticipate a similar degree of experimentation at Early Phrygian Gordion, whose populations similarly integrated a staccato flow of newcomers alongside survivors of the old regime, whose leaders were similarly charged with communicating and appealing to diverse groups, and which arose in the same environment of societal fluidity and fragmentation, where finding ways to work together was key to long-term
survival. The Early Phrygian destruction level represents a fixed point in this process: one event, one day, in the life of a city that, if anything like its contemporaries, was truly a work in progress, not static but dynamic, and subject to constant renovation, by political actors and subjects alike. In the next chapter, I review the evidence for the evolution of the architecture of the Gordion citadel mound over the course of the Early Iron Age. Rather than looking for traces of the consolidation of individual power, I interrogate the social dimensions of Phrygian urbanism. How did Gordion’s monumental buildings, gateways and gathering places facilitate Phrygian social reproduction? What practices and experiences can we associate with the city? In what ways was Phrygian-ness a social or political (rather than linguistic or ethnic) identity?

Gordion and Phrygia have long been held apart from the Iron Age urban societies of Syro-Anatolia. The initial reason for this was chronological, since Gordion’s apogee was dated to 700 and later, when Syro-Anatolia and Tabal were already under Assyrian dominion; but the division has persisted, even as the re-dating of the destruction level, as well as the existence of several earlier monumental phases in the life of the city, became widely known. One major difference between Gordion and Syro-Anatolian cities appears in its apparent rejection of the Hieroglyphic Luwian writing tradition and Hittite artistic forms; but this is a superficial rubric. It is quite clear, on the one hand, that the use of Luwian even in Syro-Anatolia was not a passively inherited tradition but a choice, informed by contextual considerations and in some cases rejected in favor of Semitic scripts. On the other hand, even if some Hittite traditions were spurned at Gordion, other Anatolian cultural elements do recur, not least of which are the name Mita itself and the Kubaba-derived iconography of the primary deity of the Phrygian pantheon, Matar. Furthermore, there is direct evidence that Phrygians were mixing with Syro-Anatolians in Tabal, Que, and at Karkemish. To better understand the
sociocultural transformations taking place across Iron Age Anatolia, Phrygia must be part of the conversation; but to better understand what it was to be Phrygian, we must apply the lessons of Syro-Anatolia to Gordion.
4 FUMBLING TOWARDS COMPLEXITY

Architecture and the Performance of Politics at Early Phrygian Gordion

4.1 Introduction: To see a World in a Grain of Sand

Archaeologists generally agree that a city’s architecture and urbanism reveal important aspects of the sociopolitical organization of its inhabitants. In particular, the presence of monumental architecture and/or urban planning are taken, almost universally across cultures, as signs of the consolidation of political power by elites who control the labor force, and thereby as proxies for social complexity (Trigger 1990, 2003; Smith 2010). At its most basic, this line of reasoning can be distilled into the simple formulation “the bigger the building, the more powerful the builder” (Osborne 2014b, 5). At the broader level of the city, the spatial patterning of activities, institutions, and socioeconomic groups across the urban landscape has been interpreted as typologically indicative of prevailing structures of political power (e.g. ‘corporate’ city-states vs. ‘exclusionary’ territorial states: Stone 2008) or economic organization (e.g. ‘primary economy’ vs. ‘luxury and defence’ [sic.] management: Frangipane 2010). It further

61 because just as every man has a will to power, every civilization has a will to complexity, the natural and inevitable result of both of which is apparently the subjection of the many by the few.

62 Stone (2008) contrasts the urban footprint of territorial states that were governed according to principles of ‘exclusionary domination’, in which powerful institutions were spatially concentrated in elite enclaves, surrounded by dependent populations, with that of the ‘corporate power strategy’ adopted by city-states, in which political, religious, and economic institutions represented different power bases and therefore were physically separated. Neighborhoods in the latter case should be socioeconomically mixed, because community affiliation was not determined exclusively by social status. See also Zuiderhoek 2017 on the particularities of the Graeco-Roman city.

63 The argument put forward in Frangipane (2010, 84) in fact contrasts Mesopotamian ‘urban’ society with ‘non-urban’ western Anatolian societies: the former consisted of ‘elites who centralized primary goods and labour, accumulated wealth in the form of staple products, and established a system of regular reinvestment in various activities by redistributing these staple
stands to reason that changes in one reflect changes in the other, whether in the form of top-down planning or more organic, bottom-up developments.

This dissertation is concerned with Gordion’s Terrace Building, which represents a major change in the urban plan of the city, and therefore very likely a point of transition in Phrygian society. Notably, its probable construction in the mid-9th century makes it roughly contemporary with that of Gordion’s first monumental tumulus, W. But it is also concerned more generally with the structure and development of the Phrygian state, clues to which must lie in the evolution of the architectural organization of the citadel mound over time. In this chapter, I present a detailed review of the architectural sequence of the Gordion citadel mound in the 10th and 9th centuries BCE, summarizing results from Young’s, Voigt’s, and my own excavations there. This diachronic approach will establish, first, the extent to which a pre-Terrace ‘urban plan’ can be reconstructed at Gordion, and second, the significance of the Terrace Building in terms of its relationship to, or departure from, it.

products, or part of them, to increasingly broader sections of the population in the form of remuneration for their labour,” leading to the birth of the bureaucratic state. The Anatolian financial system, on the other hand, was that of a “weakly hierarchical” and ultimately non-urban society of political/military leaders of small territorial units, who consolidated and maintained their ideological advantage through control of trade routes for raw materials and craftsmen producing luxury goods, but who did not interfere in the basic production system of the general population. Bachhuber (2012, 593–5) also contends that urbanism is not native to the Anatolian plateau, and cities only thrived there under exceptional conditions.

In the case of the Hittite empire, cities seem to have functioned almost exclusively as ideological centers of monuments and propaganda—for example, Hattusa, the capital, had only 30 ha. of inhabited space, compared to 120 for monumental purposes (Glatz 2009, 132)—while resilient, economically diversified villages remained the locus of economic production and settlement on the Anatolian plateau over the longue durée. This model of empty, monumental cities goes hand-in-hand with the notion of a (?non-)state organized along principles of wealth finance, where urbanism was simply another of the luxury goods whose production, and ideology, elites controlled. See Burgin (2016) for a detailed discussion of the applicability of a wealth finance model to the organization of the Hittite state and its administration.
The question of monumentality underlies both these avenues of investigation. As argued in preceding chapters, it is the monumental architecture of the ninth-century Gordion citadel mound that constitutes our best evidence for the existence of a “well-organized and powerful” Phrygian state at that time (Sams 2011, 611). It is, in no small part, architectural distinctions between the Terrace and the Megaron Courts, especially those concerning urban plan and access, that have spurred scholars to view Phrygian society as characterized by the socioeconomic disparity typical of a highly stratified regime (DeVries 1980; see also Section 2.3.2). Architecture, in short, is important at Gordion; it is important to our conception of the Phrygian state. To better track its evolution, we must therefore ask not simply whether monumental architecture and centralized planning existed at Gordion, but when it emerged, whether it was sustained or sporadic, how it changed over time, and in what ways it was similar to or different from that of other ancient states. What do we mean when we talk about monumentality at Gordion, and what did monumentality mean to the people of Phrygian Gordion?

For example, if the Phrygian political economy was organized along the same lines as other centralized, redistributive palatial economies, as Burke and others argue (see Section 2.3.3), it seems a fundamental oversight not to address why its ‘monumental’ footprint is so different than that of all other such regimes in the ancient Mediterranean, before or after. These differences are distinct and significant: I am referring not only to Gordion’s lack of any architecture that could be deemed ‘palatial’ by ancient Near Eastern or Aegean standards, but also the absence of a tradition of monumental sculpture or inscriptions that can be clearly associated with an individual ruler, ruler-cult,
or deity in the Early Phrygian period. While the former may indicate a relatively low level of centralization at Gordion, where activities were not concentrated under one roof but distributed among different buildings, the latter is more puzzling. It is undeniable that monumentality in some form existed at Gordion by the mid-9th century, but unlike elsewhere, evidence for its motivating ideology is conspicuously absent.

In this chapter, therefore, I consider the implications of the somewhat unconventional hypothesis that at Gordion, the city was an ideology unto itself, with monumentality its iconography—or at least, that in the absence of other evidence, we should proceed as if this were the case. This is not as fanciful as it may first appear; it has been argued for many periods in Anatolian history that urbanism was ‘unnatural’ to the plateau and unsustainable in the long term, with Anatolian cities serving a primarily ceremonial function rather than as population or production centers (see Bachhuber (2012) for the Early Bronze Age; Glatz (2009), Frangipane (2010), and Burgin (2016) for the Hittite period; discussion in note 63, above, and in previous chapter, of Iron Age Syro-Anatolian urbanism). In the absence of any clear contemporary evidence for a belief system, it seems reasonable to proceed with the evidence we do have, i.e. with an argument for urbanism-as-culture. Thus I take Gordion’s architecture as one of early Phrygia’s more distinctive cultural products; reconstructing the practices and experiences associated with the Early Phrygian city should correspondingly be

64 with the possible exception of tumulus burial, which begins at any rate in the last quarter of this period. Rose (pers. comm.) has pointed out that the Midas Inscription at Midas City represents an exception to this statement, though it dates to the Middle Phrygian period; also in a slightly later period, the Lydians have the same epigraphic/sculptural absence of ruler commemoration, though the state of archaeological investigation and preservation of the Lydian capital, Sardis, is of course quite different from Gordion’s. For example, we can have no knowledge of whether or not there was a palace there.
revelatory of Phrygian sociopolitical identity, as it has proved in contemporary Syro-Anatolia (see Sections 3.3.3 and 3.4).⁶⁵

4.2 Architecture and Phasing on the Gordion Citadel Mound

The Destruction Level is the best-preserved and best-studied of Gordion’s architectural phases, but deep soundings on the mound have allowed the construction of a four-thousand-year occupational history stretching from at least the Early Bronze Age into the Selcuk period. The major architectural periods and their dates appear in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>YHSS</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Late Bronze Age</td>
<td>YHSS 8</td>
<td>1500–1200 BCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Iron Age</td>
<td>YHSS 7 (B-A)</td>
<td>11C – ca. 950 BCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Phrygian*</td>
<td>YHSS 6 (B-A)</td>
<td>ca. 950–800 BCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Destruction Level**</td>
<td>end of YHSS 6A</td>
<td>ca. 800 BCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Phrygian</td>
<td>YHSS 5</td>
<td>ca. 800–540 BCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late Phrygian</td>
<td>YHSS 4</td>
<td>ca. 540–330 BCE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

⁶⁵ See Krsmanovic 2017 for a different approach to reconstructing political authority in this period: through storage jars & facilities. Krsmanovic studies the ceramics from the Voigt campaign in detail, as I do not here, and thus offers more insight on the Early Iron Age at Gordion; he relies on published material for the Early Phrygian period/Middle Iron Age, however, yielding data that is somewhat problematic, for reasons I discuss in Chapter 5. Nonetheless, his observations are in line with those presented here: e.g., that “political authority in the context of Gordion was not centred on the ‘kingly body’ in the same way as was practiced in neighboring contemporary cultures”; that a “specific agenda was pursued at the site which eschewed this particular means for materializing the political authority narratives.” He also notes, based on the ceramic and paleobotanical evidence, that there is evidence of “control over nutrition exercised by groups” at Gordion; see note 106, below (p. 216).

⁶⁶ These dates are those used by Rose in a forthcoming volume on Middle and Late Phrygian Gordion, with the exception of the Late Bronze Age, which Rose does not include; those dates are taken from Voigt 2013, Table 1.
Hellenistic | YHSS 3 | ca. 330–50 BCE

* encompasses 4 subphases: “Early Monumental”, “Pre-Terrace,” “Terrace” and “Unfinished Project.” Voigt places the first in her phase YHSS 6B and the latter three in YHSS 6A.

** analysis of short-lived C-14 and dendrochronological samples places the destruction between 830 and 800 BCE, with 800 the latest possible date: see Manning and Kromer 2011.

It is tempting, due to the nature of planographic representation, the complexity of site stratigraphy, and other factors, to think of the architecture of Early Phrygian Gordion as that of the Early Phrygian Destruction Level. Both on site, where the Destruction Level has been privileged for site presentation due to its state of preservation, and in the commonly used phase plan of the citadel, where pre-destruction architecture all appears in different shades of red, it is difficult to distinguish between later and earlier additions to the mound. This has the conceptual effect of flattening Early Phrygian Gordion, making its architectural layout appear, at first glance, intentional, complete, and static. The fact that this plan was copied, more or less faithfully, when the city was rebuilt in the Middle Phrygian period only strengthens this impression.

But this gives too little credit to the Phrygians, who in a scant century and a half built two distinct city walls and modified their monumental entrances three times; all of these were out of use by the time of the destruction, signaling the builders’ intention (realized post-destruction, in the Middle Phrygian period) to erect yet another wall and gate (see Rose 2017). Modifications inside the citadel were similarly extreme, with buildings and exterior spaces going out of use, being refurbished, expanded, or subdivided almost constantly throughout the period. In this section, I decompress the
architecture of Early Phrygian Gordion, in part to demonstrate that construction of the city’s public spaces was an ongoing project from as early as 1000 BCE onward; as such, the plan as a whole is not the product of centralized planning, but of gradual accumulation over time. This is not to say that certain elements of the plan did not require massive labor mobilization and organization; on the contrary, they certainly did, for reasons not just of size but of elaboration. These cases will be examined individually, in order to reconstruct the goals and significance of these major modifications, which surely were culturally and temporally specific.

4.2.1 Early Iron Age/YHSS 7

Plan: Figure 32.

When Mary M. Voigt resumed excavations on the Gordion citadel mound in 1988, her stated goal was “to obtain a detailed stratigraphic record for the site, from the present surface of the mound down to the Bronze Age” (Voigt 1994, 265). Voigt’s operations were successful in this regard, allowing her to establish the Yassihöyük Stratigraphic Sequence (YHSS). Evidence for Early Iron Age occupation comes from Voigt’s ‘Lower Trench Sounding,’ an area of about 200 m² set within the citadel’s Outer Court. Excavation began at the Destruction Level, the end of Voigt’s YHSS 6A, and proceeded beneath it into earlier phases, revealing strata dating to the Late Bronze as well as the Early Iron Age. While this work has shed some light on the murky question of Phrygian origins, the limited sample size afforded by these trenches has led Voigt to caution that “our picture of this settlement is both biased and incomplete” (Voigt and Henrickson 2000a, 39).
4.2.1.1 **YHSS 7B**

The earliest Iron Age, YHSS 7B, architecture is domestic in character. It consists of two to three small, semi-subterranean, agglutinative structures, christened the CKD, SSH, and WFL Structures. These were constructed of reed walls coated in mud plaster; in some places, stone slabs or orthostats were used to line the wall face. These houses contained small horseshoe-shaped ovens and storage bins, and were surrounded by open courtyards containing bell-shaped pits for grain storage, later used as dumps for domestic trash (Voigt 2000b, 333). The accompanying ceramic assemblage is Early Iron Age handmade ware, consisting primarily of bowls, wide-mouth jugs, and large-mouth pots, some with incised decoration (Henrickson 1994, 106–108). It has been suggested that parallels for these shapes can be found at Thracian sites in the Balkans, strengthening the Herodotean hypothesis for the location of the Phrygian homeland in Thrace (Sams 1988, 1994b, 19–22, 126).

While the YHSS 7B settlement as excavated by Voigt is quite small—ca. 200 m²—she argues, based on ceramic evidence and excavation notes, that an additional pit house went unrecognized as such by Machteld Mellink, in the Megaron 12/NCT

---

67 Voigt and Henrickson seem to find the ceramic evidence on its own inconclusive, if plausible: “This Early Iron Age handmade ceramic assemblage is part of a widespread and diverse handmade dark ware phenomenon in late second millennium southeastern Europe and northwest Anatolia. In Anatolia, dark handmade assemblages are known from a growing number of sites including Troy VIIb, Kaman-Kalehöyük, and survey sites in Thrace discovered by Özdogan, but parallels tend to be generic or poorly dated (Koppenhöfer 1977; Pilides 1994). Given their diversity, the Anatolian assemblages are best regarded as a co-tradition, ultimately derived from a common origin. Nevertheless, typological parallels, such as shapes and specific details of incised or impressed decoration, are sufficient that Thracian and more distant southeastern European origins for Gordion Early Iron Age handmade ware are plausible” (Voigt and Henrickson 2000a, 43). Voigt writes elsewhere that the linguistic evidence for a migration from the Balkans—that is, the observation that Phrygian is more closely related to the Greek than it is to the Anatolian branch of Indo-European—is more compelling; it is this combination of ceramic and linguistic data that lend weight to the ‘historical’ evidence provided by Herodotus.
Sounding she dug in the early 1950s. If correct, this would more than double the size of the settlement, extending it at least 70 m. to the north. The evidence from faunal and botanical analyses nonetheless suggests that this was a small, isolated community with an agropastoral economy (Voigt and Henrickson 2000b, 333; Voigt 2013, 186).

Voigt has framed her investigations into Late Bronze (YHSS 8) and Early Iron Age (YHSS 7) Gordion in terms of ethnicity, taking language as the most significant ethnic marker (Voigt 2000b, 329–332). Using multiple lines of evidence, including “house form and construction techniques, storage facilities, ceramic style and technology, and subsistence systems” (Voigt and Henrickson 2000b, 332), she has determined it most likely that Phrygian speakers arrived at Gordion at the beginning of YHSS Phase 7. By this she means that sufficient evidence for cultural continuity exists between the residents of the YHSS 7 settlement, dating to ca. the 11th century BCE, and the builders of Tumulus MM, in which the earliest Palaeo-Phrygian inscriptions, dating to 740 BCE, appear (Voigt 2013, 184). It is important to note, then, that the arrival of Phrygian speakers at Gordion did not correspond with the arrival of a monumental style of building, stone and mudbrick construction, or the distinctive megaron layout; those things came later, and should thus be decoupled from the notion of Phrygian ethnicity, and considered a local development, rather than one of outside origin.

4.2.1.2 YHSS 7A

The transition to a later Early Iron Age phase, YHSS 7A, is marked by the arrival of a new ceramic technology and set of construction techniques, the most significant of which are associated with the “anomalous” “Burned Reed House” (BRH) Structure (Voigt and Henrickson 2000a, 46). The Burned Reed House Structure was oriented differently than the YHSS 7B houses, and unlike them, had a more substantial wooden framework
with posts, was lined throughout with plaster (floors as well as walls), and had elaborate interior furnishings including an oven with a chimney and a platform with bins. Restorable vessels associated with the floors of this house were exclusively Early Iron Age Buff ware, making them "the earliest vessels representing the ceramic tradition that is characteristic of the succeeding Early Phrygian or YHSS 6 chronological phase" (Voigt and Henrickson 2000a, 46). The fact that these vessels were kiln-fired and of limited standardization suggested to Voigt and Henrickson that the presence of "part-time specialist potters working on a modest scale of production" (Voigt and Henrickson 2000a, 46; see also Voigt and Henrickson 2000b, 343–351). It follows by extension that the settlement had reached a sufficiently high level of socioeconomic organization to support such an operation.

At the same time, however, the pit-house construction and handmade pottery traditions of YHSS 7B continued throughout YHSS 7A. A structure built in YHSS 7B was reused in YHSS 7A, and restorable vessels of both Early Iron Age Handmade and Early Iron Age Buff ware appeared side-by-side in trash pits. For this reason, Voigt and Henrickson (2000b, 341) posited a second migration, in which the new arrivals were “assimilated” relatively quickly with the pre-existing local population.

Voigt continued to qualify the YHSS 7A settlement as domestic, calling the BRH Structure a “large, single-roomed house” (Voigt and Henrickson 2000b, 338). It contained the residue of numerous domestic tasks, including grain-grinding (a saddle quern) and textile production (a set of clay loom weights), with quantities of burned barley scattered across the floor (for a detailed account, see Voigt 1994, 269–70). Nonetheless, she also wrote:

“That this building had some significance for the people at Gordion is clear. At the abandonment of other YHSS 7 houses, pits are dug and walls are robbed. After the BRH Structure was destroyed, the area above it was not reoccupied nor used in any discernable way. The structure was
left intact, eventually filling in with water-laid deposits and leaving a smooth surface bordered to the north and east by houses and courtyards which continued to be occupied.” (Voigt and Henrickson 2000a, 46)

Voigt subsequently identified, in Young’s notes, a potential second structure with similar orientation and construction techniques to the BRH Structure, beneath YHSS 6A Megaron 5 (Voigt 2013, 185–6). If correct, this makes the BRH Structure less ‘anomalous’ and therefore perhaps less likely to be of special significance to the people of Gordion. On the other hand, subsequent architecture in this area—namely the YHSS 6B “Post-and-Poros” building—does seem, more emphatically, to be public/communal, rather than private; and both the activities and the ceramics that appear in the BRH Structure are comparable to those associated with YHSS 6A buildings of the Pre-Terrace (Megarons 6, 7, 8) and Terrace (CC and TB) Phases. I therefore consider the YHSS 7A BRH Structure as a transitional feature, bridging the gap between the wholly small-scale, domestic settlement of 7B and the more monumental public buildings of YHSS 6B. That this was quite a rapid development is evidenced by the continued use of one YHSS 7B structure, whose materials cannot have been long-lived, until the end of 7A; Voigt estimates no more than a century, terminating ca. 950/900 BCE, for this period (Voigt 1994, 270; 2013, 184), but more precise C14 dates are forthcoming (Voigt, personal communication).

Manning and Kromer 2011 published a series of dates for YHSS 7A from long- and short-lived C-14 samples (Table 6.1, p. 133): these are 900–810 (barley); 1200–920 (charcoal); 1040–890 (charcoal); 1090–890 (pine charcoal); 930–810 (bitter vetch); 1010–850 (pine charcoal); 920–815 (wheat); 920–830 (pine charcoal); 925–820 (wheat); and 980–830 (wheat). An end date for YHSS 7A around 920/900 BCE is therefore suggested by these samples—leaving little more than one century to encompass all the significant developments of YHSS 6 through the Destruction Level, dated in the same paper to “most likely 826–808 BC” (Manning and Kromer 2011, 148). This is shockingly constricted, given the scale of the changes witnessed in this phase. It also contradicts proposed stylistic dating for the stone-carved orthostats of YHSS 6B, which Sams (1989) has
4.2.2  Early Monumental/YHSS 6B

Plan: Figures 34–35.

Frustratingly, it is this period, so fundamental to understanding the origins of the Phrygian state, that remains the most enigmatic at Gordion. The first monumental fortification wall, the “Early Citadel Wall” (ECW), was built during this period, along with a first gate, the “Early Phrygian Building” (EPB), modified several times during its tenure, followed by a second, quite different one, the Polychrome [Gate] House.69 Inside the fortification, several other buildings are attributed to this “Early Monumental Phrygian” Phase—Megaron 10; the “Post-and-Poros” (PAP) Building; the Square/Northwest Enclosure70—but the stratigraphic relationships among them are complex and difficult to reconstruct. With the exception of Megaron 10, all were out of use by the time the flagstone-paved Outer Court associated with Megarons 1, 2, and 9 was installed (“Floor 1” in Sams 1994b).71 These latter were themselves already largely out of use at the time compared to orthostat sculptures from Karkemish and Zincirli. Herrmann has recently dated the relevant examples from Zincirli to the early 10C BCE (Herrmann 2017, 260).

69 Young initially dubbed this building the “Polychrome House,” and this nomenclature was followed by Voigt in certain publications (e.g. Voigt and Henrickson 2000a, 2000b; Voigt 2012, 70). Due to its “gate” function, however, and because polychrome masonry appears with some frequency at Gordion, most recent publications now use the expanded term “Polychrome Gate House” for clarity’s sake.

70 Young does not name this structure when he first reports its existence in his report on the 1963 excavations; he describes it as a “nearly square enclosure which has the orientation of the early gate and city wall,” by which he presumably means the EPB (Young 1964, 291). Voigt (2013, 188) calls it the “Square Enclosure,” but the same building on Pizzorno and Darbyshire’s phase map (in Rose 2012) is labeled the “Northwest Enclosure.”

71 This leaves ambiguous the question of the use-life of the Polychrome Gate House—i.e., when in the relative sequence it was installed, and when it went out of use. It does not seem to me, from a practical standpoint, that the Polychrome Gate House and the Stone Enclosure Wall could have been in contemporary use. Furthermore, Young’s earliest reports on the Polychrome Gate House report that its floor level was already lower than that of the flagstone pavement, and was not raised, while the Stone Enclosure Wall, based on photographs, sat on top of the flagstone
of the destruction, and the flagstone pavement partially removed, leaving a very short use-life for the YHSS 6B (and the initial YHSS 6A) buildings.

4.2.2.1 YHSS 6B Architectural Sequence and Organization

See Early Phrygian Building Plan, Figure 33a–b.

The buildings attributed to this phase are all located at the eastern half of the excavated citadel, and share a general orientation, opening to the west/northwest. The Post-and-Poros Structure, the Square/Northwest Enclosure, and Megaron 10 were built of the soft local limestone called “poros” (with varying use of wood elements as posts and foundation supports; Voigt and Henrickson 2000a, 48; see also Voigt 2013, Fig. 20). This stone appears frequently throughout the Early Phrygian period: as chips in leveling fills; as construction material, e.g. for Megaron 2 (which Young initially referred to as the “West Phrygian House”); and, most notably, as the Phrygians’ preferred medium for architectural ornament, which took the form of relief-sculpted orthostats and acroteria, beginning in YHSS 6B (Sams 1994a). The Early Phrygian Building, by contrast, in its first phase, had walls of gray sandstone preserved to a height of 1.80 m.; some of the sandstone blocks were up to two meters in length, and a leveling course of horizontal timbers appeared at a height of ca. 1 m. (Young 1966, 273–4). Finally, the Polychrome (Gate) House, true to its name, was of polychrome “rubble” masonry—red, grey, and dark blue basalt as well as white poros blocks, bedded on wooden beams (Young 1956, 240–1). I therefore conclude that the Polychrome Gate House went out of use, at the latest, when the Stone Enclosure Wall was installed—i.e. before the beginning of the Unfinished Project, where it is currently placed. The related question, of when the Stone Enclosure Wall was installed, is equally difficult to pinpoint.
So were stretches of the Early Citadel Wall associated with it: Young (1964, 291) describes the “earlier wall” underneath the south wall of the north court of the Early Phrygian Gate Building as having “a slightly different orientation—apparently that of the Polychrome House… [and] layered courses of white poros, red poros, and yellow sandstone, each layer of three courses separated by a wooden balk set horizontally in the face of the wall (pl. 90, fig. 31).” Young hypothesized that this was an ‘outbuilding’ associated with the Polychrome House—possibly a predecessor of the North Court—but describes it as in line with the Early Citadel Wall.

The YHSS 6B sequence of construction is roughly as follows:

- The Early Phrygian Building (EPB) and Early Citadel Wall (ECW) represent the first fortification of the Citadel Mound. Young cannot establish a direct stratigraphic connection between them due to later disturbance, but they are associated based on alignment and function.
- The Square/Northwest Enclosure and the Post-and-Poros Building (the PAP) are constructed.*
- The Polychrome Gate House is installed; the EPB is modified to a narrow passageway.**
- Megaron 10 is built.
- The EPB is leveled and filled, as is the PAP. Sams refers to this as the “EPB V Construction Program” (1994b, 10). End of subphase.

72 Polychromy in architecture is generally associated with the Middle Phrygian Period at Gordion; it is somewhat anomalous here.
- Megaron 10 continues in use, with modifications, in subsequent YHSS 6A.

Stratigraphic remarks:

* The PAP and the Square/Northwest Enclosure are the earliest buildings in this phase and therefore must be associated with the ECW, but stratigraphically we do not know which of them came first. The Square/Northwest Enclosure is particularly problematic because of its location in the Outer Court; stratigraphically, we can only say that it was buried by the cobble pavement associated with Megaron 3 (YHSS 6A). Its orientation and poros-stone construction connect it most closely to the PAP, although its flagstone anteroom/threshold\textsuperscript{73} is echoed by that of Megaron 10 in its latest phase.

** It seems logical that the old gate was modified when the new one was installed, but this cannot be proven stratigraphically. The cobbled surface (Young’s and Sams’ “Floor 2”; see Sams 1994b) taken to be the first associated with the Polychrome Gate House is also linked to the Post-and-Poros building,

\textsuperscript{73} As rendered on the Gordion Citadel Phase Plan (Pizzorno and Darbyshire in Rose 2012; Figure 1 here), the Square/Northwest Enclosure appears to be \textit{facing} northwest, like the PAP and the EPB, with its back at the southeast. Neither Voigt (2013, 188) nor Young (1964, 291–2 and fig. 32) is conclusive on this point, however, and drawings of the structure show wooden beams lining the building on three sides (the NE, NW and SW), but a wider, flat, well-laid stretch of pavement on the fourth (SE) side (see photograph, Voigt 2013, p. 187, Fig. 20). The floor of the PAP was similarly paved (Voigt and Henrickson 2000a, 48), as was the floor of the anteroom of Megaron 10 (Sams 1994b, 10). Reconstructing the \textit{front} of the Northwest/Square Enclosure as \textit{facing} those of the EPB and the PAP allows us to imagine the YHSS 6B structures as a cohesive ensemble arranged in roughly circular fashion around a central courtyard—potentially closed by Megaron 2, or an earlier antecedent of it.
making the two at least partial contemporaries, while Megaron 10 postdates Floor 2, making it slightly later.74

Our window into the earliest monumental building program at Gordion is thus a very small one, limited as it is to the area surrounding the Early Phrygian Building. It is not clear why, or how, the residents of the YHSS 7 Structures decided to abandon their habitations and pool their resources towards this effort. If we accept Voigt’s hypothesis that the Burned Reed House Structure held some special, perhaps communal significance to the YHSS 7 community, the change in the use of space (from private to public) was only an incremental one; but the introduction of a new style of architecture, in stone, and the emphasis on architectural elaboration with relief-carved elements, is significant, representing as it does a new level of investment in monumentality.

Before discussing the YHSS 6B relief program further, I wish to make two general observations about YHSS 6B architecture. First, we must note the diversity of construction techniques employed on the mound, which persists also in YHSS 6A. This diversity is of materials, of dimensions, and of design: unlike later, when all buildings are of the general “Megaron” type—in the Middle Phrygian period, even their dimensions are remarkably consistent—no two YHSS 6B buildings are the same. Such variety points toward the cumulative nature of the plan (with changes in technique due to building technology, availability of materials, or intended function), the diverse origins of the builders, or both.75

74 Young’s excavations in Megaron 10 revealed a short-lived mudbrick structure that he associated with the cobbled Floor 2; Megaron 10 is therefore a later addition, but only slightly so, because it clearly takes its orientation from the EPB, and therefore was most likely built before the EPB went out of use.

75 See Sams 1994a, 211: “The citadel in the time of Midas offers a cumulative plan, with buildings that belong to a number of different constructional phases. The diachronic nature of the complex
On the other hand, especially if we accept the orientation of the Northwest/Square Enclosure as facing (rather than with its back to) the Early Phrygian Building (see note 73 above), we can nonetheless ascribe some level of planning to the YHSS 6B builders, whose structures were arranged around the edges of, and facing into, a central courtyard (that this central space, above/sealing the Burned Reed House, was left empty was established in Voigt’s 1988–89 excavations: see Voigt 1994, 270–72). The Early Phrygian Building, in its earliest phase, at least, consisted of a ramped passageway, open to the sky, which opened into a wide forecourt flanked by stone walls (Young 1966, 274 and Fig. 17). This formal entrance would have been flanked at left by the Post-and-Poros Building, whose north face would be visible to the entrant; the Northwest/Square Enclosure would appear opposite the entrant, slightly off-center to the right, sitting on a rise due to the slope of the earlier mound. Directly opposite is where Megarons 2 and 3 now sit, and we could entertain the notion that Megaron 2, or its antecedent, was already in place at this time: Megaron 2 is also built of poros blocks, many of which bear etched designs that echo the relief-carved orthostats of YHSS 6B in style and iconography (see Roller 2009, 2011, and discussion below), and although its date of construction is unclear, the building is known to have had several phases of use. Still, with or without Megaron 2, we can reconstruct the YHSS 6B settlement plan with a formal grey sandstone entrance that would have channeled visitors into an open courtyard fit for use as a communal gathering-space, surrounded on several sides by

goes far in explaining why the structures also show a variety of materials and architectural techniques.” See also Voigt 2013, 192: “Segmentation may also tell us something about how labor was mobilized: perhaps the wall was a result of corvée labor, with each segment constructed by people from a different part of Phrygian territory.”
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white poros-stone buildings of small to medium size, with open porches/anterooms\textsuperscript{76} and some architectural elaboration.

4.2.2.2 \textit{YHSS 6B Architectural Sculpture}

Returning, then, to the sculptural program associated with the settlement thus described, we should investigate what indication it gives of either function or ideology ascribable to these buildings, this earliest monumental iteration of the YHSS 6 citadel, or Phrygian society in general. The relevant items include a series of ten, fragmentary, relief-carved orthostats depicting humans, animals, and mythical beasts (Sams 1989); two lion-head protomes, carved in the round (Young 1956, 262 and Figs. 42–43); two complete wing-shaped /voluted akroteria (Young 1956, 261 and Fig. 44) resembling those crowning architectural façades in the Phrygian Highlands (Berndt-Ersöz 2008) and in doodles on Megaron 2 (Roller 2011), and three other fragments of differently sized examples of the same (Sams 1994a, 213); and more than a dozen shaped blocks with sloping, double-pitched, or lunette-shaped surfaces (Sams 1994a, 212). Due to their material, style, and subject matter, I also briefly consider the Megaron 2 doodle-stones as part of this discussion; Roller (2005, 127) suggests that they may have originally

\textsuperscript{76} By this I mean that, unlike other, later Megaron buildings on the citadel (starting with Megaron 3, and including the TB and CC units), the anterooms of these early buildings (the PAP; the NW/Square Enclosure; Megarons 2, 9, 10) do not appear to have closing walls (perhaps prompting the term Northwest/Square "Enclosure" rather than "Structure" or "Building"). The plan of, e.g., the PAP building (which Voigt (2013, 188) describes as a "megaron"), is more like that of a Greek temple \textit{in antis}, with a square "cella" or main room whose side walls protrude beyond to create a porch. The distinction is important because it makes any activities taking place on the porch visible to those assembled in the courtyard, and therefore suggests that one purpose of the building was public-facing and intended to frame display of some kind. It is further worthwhile, in this particular case, to ask what the necessary characteristics of a "Megaron" are; the PAP does not show signs of having a central hearth, nor of a division into ‘nave’ and ‘side aisles’ within the main room, so its shallow porch and squarish plan appear to be the only traits it has in common with Gordion’s later Megarons.
belonged to an earlier building and later reused in Megaron 2, whereas I think Megaron 2 could very well be an early building, but these arguments both stem from our shared suspicion that the stylistic and thematic overlap between decorative programs is not coincidental.

An in-depth treatment of these objects is beyond the scope of this dissertation (though one is long overdue: Harmanşah is due to publish them, but until then, see summaries in Sams 1989, Roller 2008). For our purposes, the major points agreed upon in the literature regarding the orthostats are these: 1) the architectural use of relief-carved orthostats in general, and the iconography of these in particular, is derived from that of contemporary Syro-Hittite cities, including Karkemish and Zincirli but also Tell Halaf and Kültepe (Sams 1989; Roller 2007); and 2) although all were found reused as building material or fill (dating from both YHSS 6A and YHSS 5, i.e., both before and after the destruction), they should certainly be attributed to YHSS 6B, and were probably originally displayed in the Polychrome Gate House, the PAP, or both (Sams 1994a, 213; Voigt 2013, 189).77 To these I add the important 3) this type of architectural elaboration at Gordion was both short-lived and poorly executed, and should be regarded as a failed experiment, never to be attempted again. Nor were the dismantled examples treated with the respect one sometimes finds elsewhere, e.g., ritually buried as the lions of Zincirli’s “Lion’s Pit” (von Luschan 1902, 230–236) or the recently discovered lion and

77 Young initially hypothesized that they might have been part of an interior gate between the Inner and Outer Courts; Sams acknowledged this possibility, but it is generally more speculative than the PAP hypothesis. Voigt cites the discovery of “a single carved flake of poros found in stone-working debris next to the PAP structure” featuring incised wing decoration identical to that of one of the orthostats as confirmation that the PAP was the initial, if short-lived, home of the fragments (Voigt 2013, 188). The fact that some were found in Middle Phrygian fill must indicate that at least a few were still visible during YHSS 6A, however, whereas the PAP was destroyed in YHSS 6B.
hero/ruler sculptures of Tell Tayinat (Harrison and Denel 2017). Rather, their reuse as construction materials parallels that of the inscriptions of rulers at Karkemish who fell out of favor (e.g. KARKAMIŠ A11b+c, attributed to the reign of Katuwa (early 9C) but found reused as paving slabs at the threshold of the King’s Gate; see Gilibert 2011, 110; Aro 2013, 237).

The very existence of these reliefs, their position at or beside the gateway to the citadel, and the suggested parallels with Syro-Hittite urban traditions, make it clear that they were intended for public consumption. The meaning they conveyed to that public, whether by stylistic or iconographic means, is rather less clear. Subjects depicted include several that are common in Syro-Hittite art, especially in its earlier phases, and in Late Bronze Age Mesopotamian/Hittite visual culture more generally: a standing griffin in profile with upraised arms (eye, beak and arm preserved); a male figure (lower half preserved, wearing a kilt and shoes with upturned toes) facing an upside-down lion (head preserved), both in profile, suggestive of a Master of the Animals motif; a “hoofed animal under attack by a clawed creature”; a second hoofed animal, perhaps a bull?, standing (hind legs preserved); a winged creature/figure (only a fragment of wing preserved); a seated figure with feet on a low stool (only a fragment of chair and stool preserved) (for Gordion see Sams 1989, 447–9; Roller 2008, 190; for Syro-Hittite art see Gilibert 2011; Herrmann 2017; Mazzoni 1997; Pucci 2015). One stylistic trait common to both these and Syro-Hittite sculpture is the presence of deeply bored eyes, made to receive inlaid material (Sams 1989, 449). In well-known Syro-Hittite examples, such as the ensemble from the Tell Halaf/Guzana temple façade, the contrast between the black basalt of the figures' bodies and the bright white of their inlaid eyes had the effect of starkly emphasizing the statues' ever-watchful, unblinking gaze (see discussion,
Chapter 3, Section 3.3.3, and Gilibert 2013). We can imagine that at Gordion, where polychromy was certainly part of the visual vocabulary, they had a similar effect on the viewer, rendering the transition into the citadel space conscious and laden with meaning.

On the other hand, Sams remarks on “the use of wide, prominent margins to enclose the subjects on a slab, as though to imply individual pictorial images or panels rather than a close thematic continuity across adjacent orthostates [sic]” (Sams 1989, 449). At the same time, Roller (2008, 215) notes the Phrygian tendency to selectively borrow only a limited range of individual figures and motifs—e.g. snarling lions, bulls, fabulous creatures—from their southeastern neighbors, arguing that those chosen “advertise power but not a distinct cultural identity.” Both in the Gordion orthostats and continuing into the Phrygian painted ceramic tradition, these figures appear framed by wide registers of (in the case of ceramics) elaborate geometric patterns, isolated and removed from any narrative context. The static, generic nature of the resulting images would appear to preclude their being engaged with in the transformative ways suggested for Syro-Hittite architectural sculpture, i.e., for the assimilation of disruptive political events to an official narrative and/or in the context of social memory and identity formation, as discussed in Chapter 3.

Indeed, Sams (1993, 554) concludes that “it is impossible to ascertain … whether adopted iconographic types, especially fabulous creatures, carried with them their

78 Until recently, replicas of this magnificent ensemble guarded the entrance to the National Museum of Aleppo.
79 This notion is spiritually akin to Feldman’s ‘International Style’ of the Late Bronze Age, where, she argues, luxury goods made for gift exchange for the ‘international’ market steered clear of culturally specific motifs in favor of more generic ones capable of appealing to many different audiences (Feldman 2002, 2006).
original numinous qualities or were simply curious artistic motifs devoid of any real meaning in their new setting. The effort that even acquiring the necessary skills or artisans to create such monuments would entail argues against their being a mere curiosity, as does the recurrence of the motifs in the Megaron 2 doodlestones. Still, it is equally hard to argue, with Voigt, that “the adoption of images and styles associated with eastern states suggests a strongly hierarchical social and political system at Gordion during YHSS 6B” (2013, 189). Not only does the selective import of certain motifs not imply the wholesale adoption of the corresponding political system—if it did, we would have to argue that the dismantling of those monuments in 6A entailed a corresponding wholesale political change—but, as we have seen in the previous chapter, the ‘eastern states’ whose cities displayed similar imagery hardly constituted a monolithic or, necessarily, strongly hierarchical political entity at this time.

We could instead see, in the conservatism of the adopted images, what Herrmann (2017, 268) argues for 10th–9th-century Zincirli, namely, the effort to make an audacious claim to sovereignty (in Zincirli’s case, by Aramaean newcomers in a predominantly Luwian/Hittite administrative milieu) and the construction of a new capital more palatable to the local community through the use of hypertraditional motifs chosen from the “old apotropaic repertoire” (in contrast to those of contemporary Karkemish, which emphasize new civic rituals). This early relief program thus represented, at Zincirli, an appeal for legitimacy to the local public, on whom such legitimacy depended. While the Aramaean newcomers did not lack a political structure, any more than the Hittite-descended rulers of Karkemish did, the limited reach of the ‘strength’ or ‘hierarchy’ of either, at this turbulent time, can be inferred by the different persuasive strategies employed in both places to acquire and maintain broader social legitimacy.
At Gordion, the ‘old apotropaic repertoire’ featured in the orthostats may have been less familiar, and therefore lacked a similar appeal; the latter at least is suggested by the unceremonious abandonment of this style of architectural elaboration. This analysis has nonetheless established that it was likely intended, first, to demarcate and enhance the viewer’s experience of visiting the citadel through its presence and placement, and second, to be intelligible to a broad audience through its generic iconography. Implicit in both these intents is the desirability, even the necessity, of an audience for these monuments; visitors to Gordion would have been rewarded by the public architecture available for their consumption, and encouraged to return to participate in, and, more importantly, contribute to, future civic activities or rituals. While the sculptures themselves may have been deemed of little use in furthering this goal, subsequent modification of the citadel’s architecture, discussed below, shows that it continued to be pursued in other ways, with some success.

Before moving on, one final point to note is that unlike Zincirli and Karkemish—where, it has been argued, the ‘social mandate’ of these earlier relief programs evolved into a more exclusive one emphasizing the power of elites and the luxuries of courtly life (Gilbert 2011)—Gordion never developed “a sculptural program that emphasizes individual rulers or other human figures, nor any use of narrative figured art that might tell of a story of activities of the gods or great deeds of kings” (Roller 2007, 217).” The initial convergence of iconographic programs between the two regions makes this departure all the more surprising; Phrygians did not lack means or models of expressing

80 Although there is a Hittite rock relief at nearby Gavurkale/Gavurkalesi, and some of the Hittite-period ceramics discovered at Gordion bear Luwian inscriptions, suggesting that the preexisting local population was probably generally familiar with the Hittite cultural milieu.
such themes, but rather, apparently, the will to do so. The visual culture that subsequently found currency in Phrygia instead emphasized complex geometric motifs. These were usually displayed on smaller-scale, portable luxury goods (ceramics; wooden furniture; textiles; see Sams 1994b, Simpson 2010), but they also appear in the rock-cut relief façades of the Phrygian Highlands, and are there associated with the worship of the Phrygian mother goddess, Matar/Kybele (Berndt-Ersöz 2006; Roller 1999). While it is generally agreed that these motifs were somehow culturally meaningful for the Phrygians, and possibly of religious significance—Roller (2007) and Simpson (1998) both speculate that they “represent a form of religious symbolism that depicted a deity in aniconic form” (Roller 2007, 215)—the evidence for this remains inconclusive. In any case, iconography (or inscriptive evidence) related to an individual ruler or dynasty has yet to be identified at Gordion.

4.2.2.3 Final Modifications of the YHSS 6B Citadel

The latest additions to the YHSS 6B Citadel, Megaron 10 and the Polychrome Gate House, both continued in use in the subsequent YHSS 6A period. Megaron 10, made of poros stone, is similar to the Post-and-Poros Building in both materials and dimension. It was likely built around the same time as the Early Phrygian Building was modified from a wide, unroofed passageway to a narrow, covered one, i.e. when the Polychrome Gate House was installed, providing an alternative entrance to the citadel. At that time, the southern half of the wide courtyard into which the Early Phrygian Building opened was modified to house a small building, open at the front (Sams’ “the EPB SW Room”). Megaron 10 was the counterpart of this building on the north side of the Early Phrygian Building courtyard, though it was somewhat larger; its south wall continued the line of the Early Phrygian Building passageway, and its east wall backed
onto the Early Phrygian Building, which would have had the effect of lengthening the Early Phrygian Building passageway. Together, these buildings would have narrowed the visitor’s initial view into the heart of the citadel, spurring his or her movement further into the center of the mound before getting a sense of its full layout. On the other hand, if the Early Phrygian Building once modified served primarily as an exit rather than an entrance, the two buildings would have blocked much of the available light, making descent from the mound via that route a dark and forbidding process.81

The Polychrome Gate House marks a more significant departure for the YHSS 6B citadel. Young initially described it as “a sort of passageway connecting the inner gate with the inner town” (1960, 234), and in that it was not dissimilar to the Early Phrygian Building. Its polychrome masonry, however, consisting of “blocks of bright red poros bedded on blocks of white poros” in its north wall and “rough blocks of a hard slate-blue stone” at west and south (1960, 234), was a visual scheme not repeated in Gordion architecture until the post-destruction/Middle Phrygian period (YHSS 5). At roughly 1.3 m. wide, its walls were significantly more substantial than those of any prior construction on the mound, and its foundations employed rubble fill rather than poros blocks throughout (although the presence of small postholes lining both north and south walls is reminiscent of the Post-and-Poros Building construction: see plan, Young 1960, Fig. 57).

81 One further indication that this was no longer a heavily trafficked zone is the presence of a large, stone-lined trash pit dubbed the ‘Latrine’, built against the north wall of the EPB SW building. This pit contained ceramics in large quantities (34 reconstructible vessels, the catalogue of which includes 8 bowls, 6 large trefoil jugs, 3 storage jars; all monochrome), some stained a yellowish-green that, Young and later Sams argued, left little doubt as to other kinds of refuse deposited here (Sams 1994b, 9; 180).
The most curious thing about the Polychrome Gate House, however, is its position, which makes no logical sense from the perspective of either the YHSS 6B or the YHSS 6A settlement as they are currently known. In the case of YHSS 6B, the Polychrome Gate House is far to the south of what I have reconstructed above as the heart of the settlement—perhaps indicating a desire to enlarge the settlement and/or to shift its focus; expanding the citadel was certainly an activity in which Gordian’s builders invested significant effort, as described below. But in the (relatively well-attested) YHSS 6A period, the Polychrome Gate House still seems awkwardly placed: the visitor would enter to confront the blank side wall of Megaron 1; reaching the Outer Court would require a hard turn to the right; whatever lay at the left remains buried by the Terrace. However illogical it may appear to us, this choice was certainly deliberate, as the building remained in use throughout the subsequent period, and there is very little evidence for an intermediate period in which the Polychrome Gate House was in use but Megarons 1 and 2 were not. If we apply the principles of hiding/revealing and “scenographic” urbanism discussed in Chapter 3, we can see the potential dramatic effect caused by forcing visitors to make a circuitous passage along blank walls before, finally, arriving in a wide, paved courtyard surrounded by large buildings. The validity of

82 Voigt and Sams both express similar puzzlement about this arrangement: Voigt (2013, 191) muses “[i]t is hard to understand why visitors to the king’s residence would be directed into a blind corner, but it may be that the Phrygians placed a greater value on the view symbolizing the accomplishments of a past ruler than they did on a view of buildings currently in use.” Young initially thought the Polychrome Gate House was a late addition to the Gate Building (Young 1956, 260; 1960, 235).

83 though we imagine it must have existed: Voigt (2013, 191) writes “those entering the YHSS 6B Citadel would presumably move into some kind of open space bordered by buildings parallel to or at a right angle to the gate passage,” but that this orientation changed in YHSS 6A.
this interpretation is investigated at greater length in the following sections, where the architectural sample size is larger.

4.2.3 YHSS 6A: Pre-Terrace

Plan: Figure 36. See also DeVries 1990, Fig. 4, p. 374

The layout of the YHSS 6A citadel is significantly better-known than that of YHSS 6B. Still, the relative sequence of construction has gone unstudied. A general summary is as follows:

1) The EPB V Construction Program, which put the Early Phrygian Building out of use, involved filling and levelling the eastern part of the Outer Court area (except Megaron 10), which had previously sloped downward to the east. The retaining wall for this operation was the Early Phrygian Citadel Wall. The addition of the Gate Complex, with its North and South Courts, to the Polychrome House therefore also took place at this time. The placement of the Early Phrygian Citadel Wall roughly 10 m. to the east of the ECW had the effect of significantly expanding the area of the citadel mound.
   a. The North Court had at least two phases of use, attested by two floors. In the first of these, the space was entirely devoted to storage, with several rows of large pithoi sunken into the floor (53 vessel shadows; see plan, Young 1956, Plate 87, Fig. 25). No such similar function is attested in the second phase.

2) Megaron 9 was built on this fill, atop the Early Phrygian Building.

3) Megarons 1 and 2 and the Outer Court. It is not clear exactly when Megarons 1 and 2 were built (i.e. before or after the Early Phrygian Citadel Wall and/or Meg 9; it does seem that of Megs 1 and 2, Meg 2 was built first, and possibly
already in YHSS 6B, as suggested above). However, we can establish that Megarons 1, 2, 9, and 10, as well as the Polychrome Gate House, were all in contemporary use early in the period, based on the fine flagstone pavement ("Floor 1") that spanned the Outer Court. Though diverse in construction techniques (Megaron 1 was built of unbaked brick; Megaron 2 of shaped poros blocks with an elaborate timber frame; Megaron 9 of reused poros blocks; Megaron 10 of poros with no frame), all four had patterned pebble mosaic floors; Megaron 2’s was the most elaborate of these. To ensure continued access to Megaron 10, whose interior floor level was lower than the pavement, a staircase was added; this was constructed of reused poros blocks, presumably from the Post-and-Poros Building.

a. Drainage was apparently a major consideration in the area of the Outer Court when it was paved (and continued to be so later; see section 4.2.5 on the Unfinished Project); several finely constructed drains, one made of reused poros blocks, have been associated with flagstone Floor 1 and Megs 9 & 10.

b. At some point, two small storerooms (Houses X and Y) were built behind Megaron 2 (Young 1958, 145). Young suggests that they were annexes to Megaron 2: House X, at the south, was built of unfired mudbrick and timber, and contained a round stucco hearth; House Y, at the north, was

—

84 Megaron 2 was built of the local poros stone, whereas Megaron 1 was constructed completely of mud brick. In addition, the position of the figural and abstract designs engraved on its exterior walls, so similar in theme and style to the YHSS 6B orthostats, indicate that it was, at some point, free-standing—most likely at a time when the orthostats were still visible.
built of rubble, but poros blocks on either side of the door bore doodles like Megaron 2’s. In addition, their walls cover some of the doodles scratched on the back of Megaron 2, meaning that these buildings were likely added after a period where Megaron 2 was free-standing; they were later filled in by the Terrace, although Megaron 2 continued in use.

4) Megaron 3. Megaron 3’s date of construction relative to that of Megarons 1 and 2 is likewise unknown. Megaron 3 is much larger than either Megaron 1 or 2, and in its construction, with interior posts dividing it into ‘nave’ and ‘side aisles’, it is more closely paralleled by the (later) Terrace Building units than any of the other Megarons; for these reasons I place it later in the sequence.

5) The Inner Court. A substantial enclosure wall separating Megaron 2 from Megaron 3 was discovered beneath Terrace Fill, marking a pre-Terrace formal separation between Megarons 2 and 3 and the Inner and Outer Courts. Unlike the Outer Court, however, whose flagstone pavement, Young (1956, 261) observed, was “quite as monumental in its own way as is the Phrygian gate,” the Inner Court had a simple pebble surface. The excavated extent of the Inner Court is only slightly larger than the Outer Court, but it has been reconstructed as much larger, and L-shaped. Parts of three other Megarons—5, 11, and 12—have been excavated around the Inner Court and attributed to the Pre-Terrace phase (DeVries 1990, 383); all three are oriented perpendicular to Megaron 3. Megaron 4, which appears alongside Megaron 3 in plans of the Destruction Level (see Figure 31a–b), sits on a late extension to the Terrace and is therefore the very last building constructed in YHSS 6A. It is possible, but entirely unconfirmed, that a predecessor sat below it.
6) *Megarons 6, 7, and 8.* This row of small Megaron buildings sat at the northwest edge of the citadel mound, lying, like Megarons 5, 11, and 12, at a perpendicular angle to the much larger Megaron 3. All were buried by the installation of the Terrace, unlike adjacent Megaron 5 (which was not burned by the destruction, but may already have been out of use: Young (1966, 271) reports that at the Destruction Level its walls were “badly plundered”). The narrow Megaron 6 (only 6.5 m. wide) was separated from Megarons 7 and 8 by a poorly-preserved enclosure wall; this wall made a corner with a perpendicular wall that ran behind all three. Megaron 6 had no contents to speak of (at least, Young mentions none: 1966, 272), but both Megarons 7 and 8 were furnished with ovens, allowing DeVries to conclude, in his first publication on the subject, that “the strong differentiation in functions between different parts of the citadel so characteristic of the Destruction Level… when food preparation was concentrated in the TB and CC Buildings on the terrace, had already appeared at this earlier phase, when Megarons 7 and 8 stood where the terrace would be” (DeVries 1990, 376).\(^{85}\) Their orientation, of course, was quite different to that of the Terrace, as was their layout: Megaron 7’s oven is in the back room, while Megaron 8’s is in a narrow middle (?) room (the front of Megaron 8 is unexcavated, so its full layout is unknown, but the room with the oven was flanked by rooms at NW and SE).

\(^{85}\) He goes on to note that “Below Megaron 5, however, there is a building with an oven; thus, this division by area had not been observed in still earlier times.” This building with oven is the one that Voigt argued was similar to the PAP Structure in construction, and so perhaps belonged to the YHSS 6B citadel, providing, among other things, a tentative, if vague, *terminus post quem* for the construction of this series of buildings.
More noteworthy even than this relative lack of standardization, uncharacteristic for Gordion (the ovens are also differently shaped), is the fact that the recorded floor level of Megaron 8 is more than a meter lower than that of Megaron 7, indicating that these ‘service buildings’ were marching down a slope, and therefore at the limit of the citadel mound, or beyond it. Excavations beneath TB Unit 6, just northwest of Megaron 3, which I conducted in 2014, confirmed that the pre-Terrace surface level in this zone was significantly lower, and that it was at least partially devoted to large trash pits in this phase (see further discussion of these results in Chapter 5).

The pre-Terrace Gordion Citadel Mound thus exhibits a hodgepodge of architectural styles, and by no means gives the overall impression of centralized planning that is conveyed in the following phase, with the addition of the Terrace. If we accept that the YHSS 6B citadel was smaller, with circularly-arranged buildings facing inward toward a central courtyard, the YHSS 6A citadel in its earliest phase both monumentalized that plan in the Outer Court—retaining several buildings, adding others, experimenting with building construction and decoration but upgrading considerably with the addition of a fine flagstone pavement—and expanded it, appending a second courtyard (the Inner Court) flanked by moderately-sized buildings and a large hall (Megaron 3). The overall similarity of layout between the Inner and Outer Courts hints at a reduplication of functions: the buildings, in general, do not expand, nor are they added onto in agglutinative fashion, as is common in palatial architecture, where rooms are devoted to specialized activities, but kept under one (symbolic) roof. At Gordion in YHSS 6A, Megarons proliferate, but for the apparent purpose of accommodating more, similarly-sized, groups, engaging in similar activities, with nonetheless distinct ideas.
regarding proper construction technique. Meanwhile, the courtyard space, the public

gathering space, doubles in size in this phase.

The orientation of the Polychrome House and the Gate Building stands out as

starkly in YHSS 6A as it did in 6B; its oblique angle makes for an awkward entrance into

the Outer Court. Moreover, its viewshed, onto the blank side of Megaron 1, emphasizes

the least impressive of these buildings: Meg 1 is the only building of the Outer Court to

be constructed entirely of mudbrick, rather than stone. But from a performance

perspective, it might have had a powerful effect on the visitor to force a long, confusing

progression into the heart of the citadel, before finally revealing order. By the same logic,

the addition of a second courtyard concealed behind a curtain wall—in lieu of the

expansion of the first courtyard—would have prolonged this experience of discovery for

the visitor. He or she would thus feel the anticipation and release of this hiding/revealing

principle not just once, but twice in succession. By heightening the sense of progression

through space, rather than simply expanding the impression of space, the visitor might

remember the citadel as larger and more impressive in memory than in reality.

At the same time, spaces devoted to production and storage, rather than

ceremony (the North Court, Megarons 7 and 8, and Houses X and Y behind Megaron 2),

were relatively few, located at the outer edges of the citadel, and hidden from view. This

would suggest that most visitors brought what they needed with them. Still, all were

situated such that their contents were at the immediate disposal of the courtyard-users;

this is particularly important in the case of the North Court, whose dozens of half-sunken

pithoi may well have contained liquid, quite possibly beer—further enhancing the visitor

experience to Gordion (this is speculation, but see Chapter 5).

One further indication that YHSS 6A Gordion’s builders were mindful of what its

visitors would and would not see can be found in the orientation of the Gate Passage.
Voigt and Sams (2011, 159) observe that the axis of the ramp leading up to the Polychrome Gate House is oriented not to it, nor with the citadel wall, but rather, “if extended eastward, bisects Tumulus W, roughly 3 km. distant” (see photo, their Fig. 7.7). The expansive view, while exiting through the Gate Complex, of Gordion’s hinterland—marked as it would have been by the relatively recent addition of an enormous man-made earthen mound, the first of its kind—was surely intended as a statement of ownership or belonging, linking the Gordion citadel—and perhaps the Outer Court most closely—to a broader ceremonial landscape. Furthermore, this commanding perspective stands in stark contrast to the closed view and limited perception of the Outer Court that the visitor entering the citadel by the same route would have been afforded. While the Gate Building could naturally have functioned as both entrance and exit, its more important function was clearly the latter.

For this reason, and because of certain stratigraphic considerations in later subphases (see Unfinished Project, below), it seems likely that the Early Phrygian Gate Building that we know was already a secondary entrance, even at this early date. (We could add to these considerations that it was never likely to have served a primary defensive purpose, as the Sakarya River flowed on this side of the citadel during the Iron Age, providing a natural barrier.) This conclusion carries with it the implication that the so-called “Outer” Court was in fact more remote of access than both the Inner Court and, later, the Terrace. The heightened elaboration of both the buildings and the exterior space of the Outer Court make it, despite its smaller size, a more monumental

____________________________

86 Tumulus W is dated, by stylistic analysis of its contents, to the mid-9C BCE (ca. 850).
87 Young and Voigt have also drawn this conclusion, though for different reasons: see Voigt 2013, 98.
undertaking than the Inner, while its access to the commanding view of the tumulus fields lends it greater symbolic capital, as well. I will revisit this and discuss further implications in my Conclusions.

4.2.4 I.4 YHSS 6A: Terrace

Plan: Figures 37–38. See also DeVries 1990, Fig. 7, p. 376.

The addition of the Terrace Building, Clay-Cut Building, and Megaron 4 to the citadel, as represented in plan, fails to do justice to what the installation of the Terrace on which they stood would have represented in practice. The Terrace Building, over one hundred meters long, divided into eight identical units nearly twenty meters deep, reflects in its organization and scale the kind of centralized planning long sought by Gordion’s excavators elsewhere. Building the equivalent of eight megarons at once, under one roof, would already have necessitated a far greater and more immediate expenditure of labor and resources than would building twelve individual megarons over a period of years. But it is the Terrace itself, more so than the buildings, that conveys the ambition of the undertaking: underneath TB, CC and Meg 4 lies at least 1.5 m, and in some places up to 3.5 m, of rubble fill, transported to the mound from at least 5 km. distance to provide firm, if ultimately invisible, footing for this new construction project.

In practical terms, the Terrace nearly doubled the available building space on the citadel mound. Surface level of CC is slightly lower than that of TB, so even after this

88 In excavating the Terrace in 2014, many of the rubble blocks we removed were of the local limestone called “Kızılkayası,” which comes from a mound of the same name ca. 5 km. distant from Gordion. Many more were of the local ‘poros’ limestone that is used for construction; the source of this stone is unknown, but there are no likely candidates closer than Kızılkayası, so 5 km. is in fact a low estimate.
construction project the mound still sloped downwards to the southeast—but imperceptibly, not precipitously (as it had in the Pre-Terrace phase between Megarons 7 and 8). This was not the first major earth-moving endeavor that the Gordian citadel-builders had engaged in; the operation is strikingly similar to the EPB V Construction Project at the beginning of YHSS 6A. There, the Early Phrygian Citadel Wall was built out, some ten meters behind the ECW, and the intervening area (behind Megaron 10) filled in, to house Megaron 9 and the North Court of the Gate Complex. We do not know how far to the NE the project extended; the area is unexcavated. In the case of the Terrace, we know that on its northeast side, the Terrace was filled against the side wall of Megaron 5; the back wall of Megaron 3; a retaining wall added between Megarons 3 and 2; the back wall of Megaron 2; and a second retaining wall behind Megarons 2 and 1 that continued beyond the latter, finally making a strange, oblique return to the southwest, just before it would have intersected with the South Gate. Small sections of retaining wall have also been excavated at the southwest and northwest. At the northwest, the retaining wall is broken by a well-constructed, eight-meter-wide, fifteen-step flagstone staircase (DeVries' “grand stairway”) that must have been intended as the primary access point to the Terrace, though it has not been so interpreted; I return to this point below (see photos and plan, DeVries 1990, Figs. 11, 14, 15).

Megaron 4 stands on a slightly later addition to the Terrace (Young 1964, 286–288), accessed by a narrow, three-flight staircase at its northwest. A narrow stair giving access to the Terrace was also built against the retaining wall between Megarons 2 and 3; passage in this case was via a circuitous route between the still-standing Megarons 2 and 3 and then behind Megarons 1 and 2, through a square, walled structure with doors on three sides called the “Terrace Gateway”, and then, after a U-turn, to TB and CC. It is this route that DeVries described as “by a blank back wall and by indirect passageways”
guaranteeing a “fairly tight enclosure of the work zone within the citadel” (1980, 40), and that led a puzzled Young to express his relief that “at least the palace proper was screened off from the bustle and noise of its service quarters” (Young 1968, 31) (see discussion, Chapter 2).

The functional distinction between the Terrace and the Inner and Outer Courts is an important one: the Terrace represents an investment in production space, not gathering or ceremonial space. In this sense it reflects a change in priorities on the citadel mound, where production space had previously been limited and hidden, as noted in the previous section. The evidence of a “grand staircase” at TB’s northwestern end (alongside two more temporary-seeming access points), especially when coupled with the previous section’s suggestion that we should look elsewhere than the Early Phrygian Gate for the citadel’s main entrance, belies the notion that the Terrace was in any way ‘screened off’ or ‘tightly enclosed’. Young himself contradicted this notion in describing TB’s “prominent position on a high terrace” (Young 1960, 242). Finally, reconstructing the main access to TB from the northwest supports Sams’ interpretation of TB -1 and TB-2 as treasuries (as discussed in Chapter 2): it stands to reason that the units with the most valuable contents would have been situated farthest from the door, not right next to it (see also Chapter 5).

If we accept that the citadel’s main entrance was elsewhere in this phase, then in terms of plan and access, the most isolated zone in the Terrace Phase continued, in fact, to be the Outer Court. Multiple stairways facilitate interchange between the Inner Court and the Terrace; the Outer Court, on the other hand, was enclosed by thick walls and gates on all three sides. This layout was reiterated in the post-destruction, YHSS 5 plan—presumably built all at once, after the fire, rather than in stages like YHSS 6: in YHSS 5, thick walls surrounded the Outer Court, but between the Inner Court and former
Terrace (post-destruction, both were at the same surface level), a slimmer wall with a central doorway permitted direct, not circuitous, access between the two spaces.89

This observation of mutual accessibility and interchange between the Terrace and the Inner Court, supported by the evidence of its continuity in YHSS 5, encourages us to consider these zones as two complementary parts of a system: accessible by the same people, but for different purposes. Contextual analysis of these contexts, in Chapter 5, supports this reinterpretation of the YHSS 6A citadel. This reinterpretation would not, however, have been possible without DeVries and Voigt's attempts to disentangle more confusing aspects of the ever-evolving architecture of the citadel mound during what they termed the “Unfinished Project.” I briefly note their key observations below, but what is most important for our purposes is to understand that the Terrace itself was Part I of the Unfinished Project. This program of renovation and standardization that indeed, does reflect a high degree of centralized organization, planning, and execution, had begun already in the mid-9th century, with ambitions to raise the level of the citadel mound, expand its area, and provide additional space for production of whatever it was that ever-increasing numbers of people were so tempted to consume. It follows that to start with the Terrace, i.e. the addition of production space, is reflective of its priority in the citadel-builders' hierarchy of needs.

89 It is further noteworthy that in the YHSS 5 citadel, the buildings are more standardized in size and shape, not less, and any spatial hierarchy is even more difficult to distinguish: e.g. Building H, which replaced Megaron 3, is smaller than Megaron 3, and almost the same size and shape as adjacent Building M, which replaced Megaron 4. YHSS 5 Megarons differ from Terrace Units in that Terrace Units are narrower and have anterooms almost as deep as their main rooms; on the other hand, they are freestanding, not attached. See Figure 1 (Gordion Color Phase Plan).
4.2.5 YHSS 6A: Unfinished Project

Plan: Figure 39. See also Voigt 2013, Fig. 6.6, p. 73.

Voigt’s (2012) contribution to Rose’s Phrygian Gordion volume, detailing the components of the “Unfinished Project of the Gordion Early Phrygian Destruction Level,” was the culmination of many years of speculation about modifications to the Outer Court of the citadel mound that were underway at the time of the destruction.\textsuperscript{90} The most prominent of these—which puzzles first-time visitors to the site to this day (the author included)—is a large drain channel that curves down from the paved Outer Court to culminate in a wide, deep basin in the middle of the Polychrome Gate House, and extending slightly into the Gate Passage. This gaping hole in the middle of the Early Phrygian Gate is difficult to reconcile with grandiose ideas about Midas and the Phrygians. Equally disconcerting at the time of excavation, though it has been dismantled since, was the narrow “Dam Wall” closing off the Gate Passage itself, and effectively precluding its use as an access point to the citadel. By the time of the destruction, then, both the Polychrome House and the Early Phrygian Citadel Gate had definitively gone out of use, in favor of another entrance.

This may have happened some time before—a third component of the Unfinished Project is the Stone Enclosure Wall, which ran between Megarons 1 and 9, closing off the Outer Court from the gate area. The wall sits on top of the flagstone pavement in front of Megaron 1 and thus postdates it, but by how long is unknown. By the time of the Unfinished Project, the wall had been partially dismantled and pieces of it integrated into the aforementioned drain, while a narrow mudbrick wall running parallel

\textsuperscript{90} The term itself was coined by Keith DeVries in 1990.
to the Stone Enclosure Wall at its northwest had presumably taken over its function. But it was quite substantial in its period of use, measuring up to 1.9 m. in width; DeVries described the stone masonry as “the most imposing known at the site” (1990, 388). The wall may have had an opening in the middle, allowing continued access to the Gate Building, at least for storage, but this is debated.

This is not the place for a detailed dissection of the many complexities of the Unfinished Project sequence: for that, see Voigt’s close analysis of unpublished excavation records from Young’s campaigns. For our purposes, the salient points are these: two terraces had been installed at either end of the Stone Enclosure Wall (the “Eastern Terrace” and the “Stepped Terrace” in the plan above), and retained fill up to the level of the TB Terrace; the Dam Wall across the Early Phrygian Gate Passage and North Court was also retaining fill to the southeast, and its orientation and location line up with the back wall of the subsequent YHSS 5 Gate Building; and, while Megarons 1 and 2 had merely been cleared of most of their contents, Megaron 9 had been dismantled, and most of the flagstone paving of the Outer Court removed, by the time of the destruction. In other words, the work of raising up the TB Terrace was being extended to the northeast, in both the Inner Court (in the form of Megaron 4) and the Outer (in the form of the Terraces).

At Gordion, earth-moving was an ongoing project: if the TB Terrace was Part 1 of the Unfinished Project, whose goal was to raise up the entirety of the citadel mound, this objective was only temporarily derailed by the late-9th century fire. The fact that the Dam Wall already had the orientation of the YHSS 5 Gate indicates that we can take the YHSS 5 plan as indicative of the Unfinished Project planners’ intentions. This last point is particularly instructive as concerns the relationship of the YHSS 5 Gate to the Outer Court buildings, and in confirming the interaccessibility observed above between the (no
longer) Terrace(d) Zone and the Inner Court (divested of any building whose proportions might be called "palatial"). But this review of Gordion’s YHSS 6 architecture has hopefully communicated, too, that the Gordion citadel was subject to almost constant modification, from the arrival of the Phrygians onward. The Terrace and the Unfinished Project represent a difference in scale, but not in spirit, of this peculiarly Phrygian preoccupation.\textsuperscript{91}

4.3 Summary & Analysis: Monumentality and Performance at Gordion

“Instead of being a solid thing, the city is a becoming, through circulation, combination and recombination of people and things.”

M. Crang, “Rhythms of the city: temporalized space and motion,” 2001

In summarizing the above review of the architectural evolution of the Gordion citadel mound, the following general observations can be made about Phrygian urbanism:

- The transition from YHSS 7 to YHSS 6 is marked by a change in the use of space from private/domestic to public/ceremonial. This use is maintained throughout YHSS 6 and into the subsequent YHSS 5 period.
- The preferred architectural form at Gordion from YHSS 6 onward is the megaron, which features a rectangular or square hall with a central hearth, fronted by a shallow porch or anteroom.
- YHSS 6 is broadly characterized by constant but gradual elaboration and expansion of public/ceremonial space.

\textsuperscript{91} Much like Tumulus MM, which is exponentially larger, but otherwise no different, in construction technique or types of contents, than any of the dozens of others constructed during the Early Phrygian period.
This entails the addition of new buildings, which share superficial aspects of the megaron plan, but which differ in details of construction, suggesting perhaps that different groups oversaw their construction; the overall similarity of layout and plan is more accurately described as “reduplication” than “progression.”

This also entailed, at discrete intervals, episodes of large-scale earth-moving and terrace-building that leveled and expanded the mound surface, for reasons both practical and—given the centrality of earth-moving to Phrygian monumental burial practices—possibly symbolic.

Until the addition of the TB Terrace, surface area devoted to exterior/courtyard space in the excavated area was significantly greater than that given over to covered/megaron space.

To revisit one of the questions posed at the beginning of this chapter, then, does the Terrace represent continuity or change in Gordion’s urban plan? Inevitably, the answer is both: it represents a new level of organization and ambition in what was an established practice (of terrace-building and expansion). It represents an addition, all at once, of what had previously happened gradually (the addition of units of megaron plan). Scholarship has tended to focus on the ways in which TB and CC departed from the norm, namely, that they were spaces for production in a context where such banal activities seemed to have no place. But these productive activities should in no way be disassociated from the ceremonial ones that the citadel had long been organized to accommodate. The addition of TB and CC did not change Gordion’s nature as a symbolic capital and central place; the buildings’ contents instead offer a window onto...
how such an identity was maintained in practice, as it gained adherents. I expand upon this in the following chapter.

I have yet to address the larger question, however, of what this architectural progression, newly formulated here but by no means path-breakingly so, reveals about the sociopolitical organization and evolution of Phrygian society over this period. The difficulty in doing so lies in the distinction between identifying the experience of *monumentality* at Gordion, rather than simply what is monumental there. Monumentality, Osborne (2014b, 13) has recently argued,

> “is something more than the shape, or size, or visibility, or permanence of the monument—though these variables absolutely carry their own significance. Monumentality lies in the meaning created by the relationship that is negotiated between object and person, and between object and the surrounding constellation of values and symbols in a culture.”

Applying a performance perspective to the evolving arrangements of the Gordion citadel mound provides a framework for reconstructing that relationship; increasingly over time, we can recognize deliberate attempts to create an unusual or memorable experience for the visitor through architecture. At Gordion, this did not involve building a bigger building, but rather, expanding the city and channeling movement through it in constantly changing ways, such that it felt both new and, by the manipulation of viewsheds to emphasize the landscape, rooted in a shared set of traditions.

In the previous chapter, I summarized current research on Syro-Hittite capitals arguing that the ultimate goal of such strategies was to forge social cohesion in newly constituted, multiethnic polities. While this goal was likely also shared in Phrygian Gordion, the tradition of ceremonial cities has deep roots in Anatolia, and is at least in part a result of environmental factors. In Burgin’s (2016) dissertation on aspects of religious administration in the Hittite kingdom, he points out that on the Anatolian plateau, “the slim agricultural margins of the landscape, low population density, and lack
of navigable rivers precluded a robust market economy such as occurred in Mesopotamia in some periods" (Burgin 2016, 61). These conditions encouraged self-sufficiency at the level of the family unit that evolved into interdependence at the level of the village, resulting in an economy "at least partially regulated by social norms, so that self-sufficiency at the village level uses social and not just market resources" (Burgin 2016, 62). The same circumstances also made the accumulation of agricultural surplus and therefore wealth in one individual both environmentally and socially unlikely, naturally discouraging the entrenchment of stratification and hierarchy in the long term (see Frangipane 2010; discussion in note 63 above).

To harness the productivity of these small communities and encourage resource-sharing, feasts were important: Burgin demonstrates how they became a cornerstone of the Hittite political economy, but they were very likely a longstanding feature of pre-Hittite societies. Hittite cities like Hattusha therefore did not concentrate production or population, which remained distributed in self-sufficient villages across the hinterland; they instead functioned as ceremonial backdrops for an intense and diverse calendar of festivals that drew participants from towns across Anatolia. Burgin cites textual evidence indicating that “festivals were not celebrated by permanent temple staff but rather by local citizens fulfilling obligatory religious service”; participants “were supplied food and presumably lodging for the duration of the celebration.” The self-sufficient villagers had no need to trade for staple goods, but were motivated to acquire luxury items, which they could admire, and barter for, in feasting contexts. The Hittite state apparatus, therefore, focused on the control of trade routes and the acquisition of resources (including artisans) for the production of luxury items, to be used and displayed in such high-value/high-visibility contexts. Phrygian preoccupation with the monumentalization of routes using tumuli, and their emphasis on portable luxury items like bronzes, fibulae,
and textiles, align closely with these concerns. So too does the architecture of the ‘empty city’ of Gordion, where the multiplicity of megarons offered ample space to wine and dine, but relatively little for work or sleep.

But while the principles of wealth finance thus demonstrated for the Hittite state are useful for conceptualizing Phrygian society within its Anatolian context, Hittite cities do not provide compelling architectural parallels for Gordion. They are studded with expansive temples, lack the public squares so prominent in Gordion and Syro-Anatolian architecture, and except in some rare cases, exhibit no evidence of planning (Mielke 2011). A far more compelling comparison for Gordion in terms of layout and guiding principles can be found in the Karian sanctuary of Labraunda, on Anatolia’s west coast. Like Gordion, Labraunda is organized around a series of courtyards, flanked by stately buildings. Like Gordion, Labraunda’s evolution from simple cult place to monumental sanctuary involved tremendous excavations, terracing, and realignment to emphasize specific features of the surrounding landscape. The similarities are even more apparent in Christina Williamson’s description:

“The complex was clearly built to impress the worshipers as they were guided through paths and staircases along several stately buildings before they were ‘permitted’ to approach the main ritual space before the temple. The sacred way led onto the first terrace, supported by an imposing retaining wall, which leveled the ground near the formal propylaea, or gateways, for those coming either from Mylasa (South Propylon) or Alinda (East Propylon). Beyond this, one moved up the grand staircase onto the next terrace to the west, and then immediately through a much smaller staircase to the north; this bottleneck must have created some congestion, heightening the anticipation of reaching the next level.” (Williamson 2014b, 93)

The next level housed a series of dining facilities; some were in the less exclusive stoa, subdivided into six units, others in the rather more grand *andrones*, which the excavator suggests served both as banqueting chambers and reception halls.
(Carstens 2009, 89). Still more banqueters were likely accommodated outside, in the open-air courtyards.

Williamson (2014a, 2014b) has applied performance principles to the sanctuary, which she argues tacks between ‘inward-facing circles’ and ‘ceremonial progression.’ Concentric space, such as that of an open court enclosed by buildings, creates a focus for stationary rituals; linear space, including processional ways and sightlines, creates a sense of community through shared action and trajectories (Williamson 2014b, 90). She asserts that one of the most valuable things inside the andron of Maussollos was its breathtaking panorama over Mylasa and the territory of the Hekatomnids, who built it: “the same panorama could be enjoyed from most of the sanctuary, but it is significant that it was occasionally framed, as was literally the case through the andron’s windows” (Williamson 2014b, 94). Framing the view from the Gordian citadel’s Outer Court to the recently constructed Tumulus W underlines the same connection between city and hinterland, rooting the visitor in the spaces of Phrygian identity. Williamson’s analysis of the architecture of the Karian sanctuary in terms of its role in creating a Hekatomnid political identity lends weight to the emphasis I place on the ceremonial/ritual aspects of the architecture of the excavated half of the Gordian citadel: it is perhaps more like a sanctuary more than a city, even if the line between the two is blurred.

To this point, one final aspect of Williamson’s analysis provides food for thought: she writes “it is … highly significant that nearly all of the structures that defined this space were conspicuously labeled with the name of either Maussollos or Idrieus. Hekatomnid identity was merged with that of Zeus Labraundos and it is difficult to discern which may have been more prominent during the rituals” (Williamson 2014b, 96). As in Syro-Hittite cities, the increasing elaboration of spaces for public ritual at Labraunda was linked, explicitly, with both deity and dynasty; the two were inextricable.
At Gordion, the evidence for such an ideology is elusive. Even the megaron form, in its natural habitat in Mycenaean palaces, is usually reconstructed as the throne room of the wanax, although it probably served a variety of religious and political functions. In Mycenaean palaces, however, megaron suites were usually unique, embedded within suites of agglutinated rooms devoted to other functions. At Gordion, they were free-standing, and numerous. The contextual analysis of Gordion’s Destruction Level that follows in Chapter 5 goes some way toward elucidating the function of megaron architecture at Gordion, but reaching its motivating ideology still requires a leap of faith.
5 **Burning Down the House**

*Production and Consumption in the Early Phrygian Destruction Level*

5.1 **Introduction: put not your trust in princes (Psalm 146:3)**

In the previous chapter, I argued that the architecture of Early Phrygian Gordion evolved over time to accommodate increasingly large and diverse groups, conducting activities that enhanced their sense of group solidarity and belonging, in part by making the experience of those activities exciting and memorable. In this chapter, I present what evidence there is for the specific nature of those activities. This evidence—which is in fact copious—comes primarily from the Early Phrygian Destruction Level of the late 9th century BCE, and is concentrated in, though not limited to, the Terrace Complex’s Terrace and Clay-Cut Buildings (henceforth TB and CC). Based on close study of the inventories of individual units of each of these buildings—TB-7 and CC-3, respectively—I reconstruct their partial use, at the time of the fire, as breweries, where, among other things, beer was being produced in large quantities for communal consumption. This conclusion is aligned with that of the architectural analysis of the previous chapter, where I emphasized the fitness of the citadel for public gatherings. Together, they strongly indicate that we should reconceive 9th-century Gordion, or at least its excavated remains on the eastern citadel, as not the exclusive-access residence of a ruler, but rather, a central place for the diverse communities of the surrounding landscape to build ties and exchange resources within the rubric of an emergent and still loosely-defined ideology.

The implications of this conclusion for sociopolitical organization at Early Phrygian Gordion are significant: while this production may well have been overseen or sponsored by a high-status individual or individuals, as we shall see, there is little
evidence to suggest that a strict socioeconomic hierarchy existed between the producers of the beer and its consumers. In his seminal article on feasting in Mycenaean society, Wright (2004, 136) points out that the practice is an exceptionally useful tool for group identity negotiation for precisely this reason: feasting “is effective in encompassing all members of a social group and even those outside it, while still reserving special places for subgroups (especially elites) to differentiate themselves. In other words, feasting allows for the reinforcement of egalitarian horizontal relationships while simultaneously facilitating the construction of hieratic or hierarchical and vertical ones.” The TB and CC contexts represent a window into these negotiations at Gordion, yielding insights into who was involved, how, and why.

The case studies here presented highlight the typological and stylistic diversity of the TB and CC assemblages. Scholars have long recognized therein a ‘standard’ set of finds that later became characteristic of Phrygian cultural identity, i.e. fibulae; textiles/textile production tools; drinking paraphernalia. The heretofore unexamined variation among these, however, points to diversity and decentralization among the groups and individuals using the TB and CC units to engage in these identity-forming activities. The tension between (superficial) standardization on the one hand and (individual) variation on the other—which extends to the larger contrast between the highly standardized, monumental setting of the Terrace and the relative disorder within—reinforces the interpretation of this moment in Phrygian political formation as one in which roles and hierarchies were emergent rather than established.

This chapter has two main parts. The reader is by now familiar with the basic organization of the Early Phrygian citadel. I therefore begin directly with the case studies in Part I, describing TB-7 and CC-3 in detail, summarizing their previous publication, and outlining some of the benefits and challenges of establishing complete inventories for
these units. I present basic analyses of their contents in light of select archaeological and ethnographic comparisons in order to quantify and contextualize the food, textile, and beer production to which they were devoted. In Part II, I address the parallel issue of consumption, comparing TB-7 and CC-3 assemblages to that of the Destruction Level overall and of 9th century Gordion more broadly, encompassing other TB and CC units, Megarons, and tumuli. I underline artefactual connections between the Terrace and the Megaron Courts, reconstructing a deeper functional history for the latter through evidence from trash pits dating to the pre-Terrace period of the citadel. Specific ritual associations with the Terrace activities are investigated through parallels with the funerary assemblages of the early tumuli, W and P.

To conclude, I propose a synthesis of these data through the feasting lens, weighing the Gordion evidence against common paradigms. Ethnographic and theoretical literature on the feast ranges in emphasis from the social/ideological to the more practical virtues of the practice (Hayden and Villeneuve 2011): feasts can promote both communal solidarity and individual prestige; the work feast is an effective means of raising a voluntary labor force (Dietler 2001; Dietler and Herbich 2001); feasting facilitates the redistribution of resources necessary in environments like Anatolia’s, where rainfall agriculture is unreliable and diversified subsistence strategies are necessary to guarantee survival (Marston 2017). These practical considerations were likely as important to the early Phrygians as the less tangible benefits of feasting.

5.2 Case Studies: TB-7 and CC-3

5.2.1 History of excavation and publication

TB-7 and CC-3 lie almost directly opposite each other, at the far northwest edge of the 100-meter-long terrace whence the Terrace Building derives its name. The first TB
unit (of 8 total) to be excavated was TB-4, in 1957; Young’s initial conviction that this was “an important public building,” due both to its “prominent position on a high terrace” and the fact that “details of construction indicate[d] that it was planned and built all at one time” (Young 1960, 242), led to concentrated activity in the TB area during the subsequent 1959 season. His realization that of the “very extensive” Terrace Building (Young 1960, 241), the three rooms excavated that year (TB-3, TB-4, and TB-5) “were all precisely alike” (Young 1962, 164) cooled his ardor somewhat, and work on the Terrace slowed to the rate of approximately one unit per year, with the result that TB-7 was not excavated until 1965, nor its anteroom until 1971. CC had been discovered much earlier—the moniker “Clay-Cut Building” is derived from that of a deep sounding made in 1952 (into the clay layer demarcating the pre-/post-Destruction divide)—and CC-1 and CC-2 were explored in the 1956 season in preliminary fashion. True to form, Young remarked on how “extensive” its rooms were, but, observing how many “objects of domestic use” were found there, debated whether “kitchen” or “pantry” was a better designation (Young 1956, 262–4); the rather isolated spot was not revisited until 1973, when CC-3 was dug.92

92 It is somewhat ironic that despite his generally dismissive comments, it is the discoveries from CC-1 and CC-2 that informed Young’s (and therefore our) conception of Phrygian material culture. He illustrated, in this early publication, several extraordinary vessels from the context, among them a “tall sieve-spouted jug, elaborately decorated with geometric and orientalizing ornament… in shape and style… the same as vessels found in Koerte’s [sic.] Tumulus III”, and a large painted amphora, red and black on white slip, “so warped from the heat” that it could not be completely repaired (Young 1956, 263). (He also lamented that “among all this mass of pottery not one Greek sherd was found to serve as a guide to the chronology.”) More generally, his observations about the assemblage overall—that it included representatives of a great variety of styles and fabrics; that it seemed to be equally composed of coarse and fine polished, incised, or otherwise decorated wares; and that the Phrygians’ “favorite shapes” appeared to be trefoil-mouthed jugs, round-mouthed jugs with high handles, and shallow bowls—now appear incredibly perspicacious. I would add only that it is not coincidence that all three of the favorite forms Young
Perhaps this delay was fortuitous: both CC-3’s main room and the TB-7 anteroom—henceforth TB-7A—were excavated and recorded by Keith DeVries, who went on to take over direction of the site after Young’s death shortly afterward. DeVries was a keenly observant excavator, and more importantly, a meticulous note-taker; indeed, the level of detail captured in DeVries’ notebooks has made the present study possible. The same cannot be said of the main room of TB-7, for example, where documentation by excavators David Owen and Phyllis Pollack consists mainly of numbered lists of pottery, metal, and small finds, and sketch plans of some of the former, but very little narrative explanation aside from a final summary description of the room. For this reason, my analysis of TB-7 focuses largely on TB-7A, while my analysis of CC-3 is by necessity limited to the main room; its anteroom remains unexcavated. Still, DeVries’ thorough inventories of artifacts and findspots in both rooms, albeit of distinct Terrace units, allow for a general reconstruction of the kinds of activities undertaken in the Terrace Complex as a whole, as well as their scale and spatial distribution. Such a close look provides essential context for the broader discussion of sociopolitical dynamics of production and consumption at Early Phrygian Gordion that is the goal of the present work.

The reliability of the information in the excavation notebook is crucial here because, especially by 1965, so much material from the Destruction Level was being systematically discarded. DeVries recorded 850 individual small finds in the excavation observed are related to drinking; and that the badly burned amphora may well have suffered so in the conflagration because it contained a highly flammable liquid—beer.

93 Excavation of the burned stratum in CC-3 is recorded in NBs 164 and 167; of TB-7A, in NBs 157 (from p. 55) and 156.
of CC-3; of these, only 72 were kept. In the case of TB-7, a mere 23 of 269 recorded objects were officially registered. The situation for the ceramic assemblage was similar: 114 of a total 312 pots were registered from CC-3; of these, 45 appear in Sams’ 1994 catalogue. In the case of TB-7A, a mere 26 (of 140) were registered, of which Sams catalogued 12. The reasons for this were manifold. Beyond the storage problems plaguing all excavations, the nature of the assemblage was (and remains) a conservation challenge: metal artifacts were often lost to corrosion, tagged in the notebooks as ‘too sick to save’. The ubiquitous “doughnuts”—unbaked clay loom weights—were not only a dime a dozen, but could easily disintegrate into dust, depending on how they had fared in the great fire. When it came to the hundreds of ceramic vessels in each terrace unit, attempts were frequently made to repair smaller pots (especially if decorated), but large storage jars that had been crushed into what DeVries called ‘streams of sherds’ were almost uniformly discarded.

If understandable, this state of affairs is nonetheless problematic when it comes to the interpretation of the Terrace Complex, in part because it makes *ad hoc* observations by the excavators difficult to quantify. In 1962, Young wrote of TB-3, TB-4, and TB-5:

“The two westernmost—and probably the central—suites of rooms were evidently service areas, the inner rooms equipped for the wholesale grinding of grain, the outer for the cooking of food. The great mass of pottery found in them was also intended for daily use in cooking, in the bringing of water, and for storage—the two vessels noted above [a “python-cothon” and a “sipping cup” decorated by a modeled bird] were quite exceptional. It was noted in 1959 that the pottery found in M 3 was much finer, and included a larger percentage of painted ware, than that found in the three rooms of the Terrace Building.” (Young 1962, 165)

How much larger a percentage, however, remains unclear. In the article cited above, Young went on to describe that, similarly to Megaron 3, the “quality of finds” in TB-2 was generally high—despite its containing a “mass” of “mostly coarse” pottery and over 500
unbaked clay “doughnuts”—because alongside these were a number of special finds, including a set of zoomorphic bronze cauldron attachments, some North Syrian-style ivory horse frontlets, and several fibulae. If a certain percentage of special finds is enough to tip the balance away from “service” and toward “quality,” the necessity of such quantification for every unit, as a means of characterizing the whole, becomes apparent.

The first point Young made in favor of TB-2’s exceptionality vis-à-vis the other Terrace units, however, was not based on artifacts, but furniture: “it had neither hearth nor grinding-stand,” he wrote (Young 1962, 165). It was not the presence of luxury, then, so much as the absence of work that Young found diagnostic—or at least its spatial limitation: he described the “workaday” finds as concentrated on the west side of the TB-2 main room (left of the entrance: see Fig. 5.9), while the finer ones clustered at the north and east (back-right). Spatially speaking, TB-2 was otherwise much like the rest of the TB units: roughly 11.5 m. in width by 13.5 m. deep, fronted by an anteroom ca. 7.5 m. deep; without the central hearth ca. 1.5 m. in diameter, but sharing the arrangement of postholes that suggested a wooden gallery ca. 2.5 m. wide had once run along three sides of the room (left, right, and back). True, TB-3, TB-4, TB-5, TB-6, TB-7, TB-8, and CC-2 all contained extensive facilities for the grinding of grain: Pollock describes, in TB-7, “a large grinding platform” of mud brick, nearly 5 m. wide and 1.7 m. deep, standing 50 cm. from the back wall of the building, with 6 nether-stones for grinding in situ, and an additional, smaller platform adjacent that held 3 more (NB 120, p. 88ff.). Quantitatively speaking, however, in a room with an area of ca. 150 m² (215 m² with the addition of the anteroom), this ‘workaday’ activity permanently occupied less than 10% of the available space. Even in unexceptional Terrace Complex units, then, space could have been found for many things, even luxury. But was it?
Published material on the Terrace Complex obscures the answer to this question somewhat. Each Terrace Unit was described upon excavation in general fashion in the series of Gordion Annual Reports, published biannually in *AJA* (whence, e.g., the Young quote above.)\(^{94}\) These reports are qualitative and impressionistic (as most preliminary reports are), noting only exceptional finds on a case-by-case basis. Further study has proceeded along typological lines: pottery, textile tools, and worked bone from the Destruction Level all formed the subject of doctoral dissertations (of G. K. Sams (1974), B. Burke (1998), and P. Sheftel (1974) respectively; the former two were later published as monographs: Sams 1994b, Burke 2010). Study of the iron and bronze assemblages, by G. Darbyshire and M. Vassileva, is ongoing, though each delivered papers at a recent (May 2017) workshop that called into question the characterization of the Terrace Complex as an “industrial area.” Vassileva’s paper noted, among other things, that 40 fibulae were found in Terrace Complex units, while only 2 came from Megarons 3 and 4; CC-3, meanwhile, had a comparable number of bronze objects to TB-2, though many of them were too badly preserved to catalogue. Darbyshire, conversely, observed that large iron tools best suited to construction or agricultural purposes appeared “in a lot of rooms, including the more supposedly prestigious”—TB-2 and Megaron 3.

By definition, however, none of these typological studies has focused explicitly on the Terrace Complex, nor on spatial patterning in general, with the exception of Burke’s study of textile tools. As discussed in Chapter 2, the huge numbers Burke catalogued thereof were unquestionably concentrated in the Terrace Complex, leaving the

---

impression that the area was mainly devoted to textile production activities. This impression can only be maintained for as long as one remains unaware of the equally impressive numbers of ceramic vessels therein—Terrace Complex units invariably yielded at least 200 complete pots, and many more smashed ones—and especially of (largely destroyed, therefore unregistered and unpublished) storage jars, which almost certainly sat on (or embedded in) the floor and occupied space there. Had they been published first, we would probably be speaking about the Terrace Buildings as a series of storage magazines. That too, of course, would be something of a mischaracterization: Sams’ pottery catalogue focuses on the origins and development of Phrygian ceramic production, especially on certain shapes and decorative styles, more so than it does functional analysis of shapes or spaces, and therefore privileges the exceptional over the ‘workaday’—but these are as likely, if not more so, to come from the Terrace Complex as they are from a Megaron building. In short, single-context quantitative analysis of complete inventories through a functional lens is long overdue, if

95 Young in fact did initially characterize them as ‘work- and storerooms’: cf the quote in Ch. 2, p. 22 (Young 1960, 242–243), where he lamented the Phrygians’ disorderly housekeeping. The source of his dismay was apparently the multipurpose nature of these spaces, which defied easy characterization: "[i]n a palace, as at Knossos for example, one would expect many storerooms for the stowing of goods and equipment of all kinds; one would also expect workrooms in which the chores of daily living were performed. But one would expect at least a modicum of neatness and order: one room for the storage of bronzes, six for the storage of pottery vessels, perhaps one for the archives, and as workrooms one for the grinding of flour, another for the kneading of bread, and perhaps a bake-room with several ovens. The rooms of the Terrace Building, with evidence for all kinds of different activity in each, on the other hand suggest nothing but a large and disorderly apartment house in which each family carried on its manifold daily activities in its own room or suite of rooms. Perhaps they slept in the galleries." What Young is really lamenting here, of course, is the lack of evidence for a central authority or organizing mechanism, aside from that of the architecture. Burke encountered similar difficulties with regards to the standardization and spatial patterning of textile production tools, i.e., the lack thereof.
our goal is to resolve the vexed question of the use, for what and by whom, of the prominent, monumental Terrace Complex.

5.2.2 Methodology

To my mind, the fact that TB-7 and CC-3 were the latest excavated units of the Terrace Complex meant that the excavators were sufficiently well-acquainted with Phrygian material culture to know what they were looking at. In other words, I have made the choice, in general, when compiling my inventories, to trust DeVries’ judgment when he identifies something, in the notebook, as “cooking pot” or “storage jar” or “trefoil jug” or “fibula.” I have assumed this to be the case, in particular as far as the ceramic typology was concerned, for the purposes of consistency—this is one further reason I selected two units dug by the same excavator—and because in most cases we have no other choice; we can take the notebook’s word for it, or give up the information for lost.

Where possible—i.e., when pots or small finds were officially registered—I have compared DeVries’ descriptions with the excavation card catalogue entry, and/or with Sams’ catalogue entry, if he selected it for publication. In no case has the registration information contradicted DeVries’ description; usually, it simply provides greater detail. Much more frequently, however, such detail is unavailable; in those cases, for the purposes of my inventory, I fell back on Sams’ extremely useful designation, “Ambiguous Jug.”

96 DeVries’ notes always record pot numbers, but sometimes the vagaries of time and conservation made him unable or unwilling to qualify the item at hand further. In those cases, he invariably described it as “perhaps a jug?”—a notation I came across so frequently I was tempted use it as the title of this chapter.
My process was the following: I began by transcribing the sections of Gordion Notebooks 156, 157, 164, and 167 recounting excavation of “the burned stratum.” This yielded a certain number of insights into DeVries’ excavation habits, which were perhaps those of the project more generally. They would first clear the general area down to the level of the burned stratum: it was fairly easy to distinguish from the thick clay layer that had been used to seal it at the beginning of the Middle Phrygian period; in the case of TB-7A, DeVries found that a layer of “blond earth and broken stone” (NB 157, p. 145) appeared at the top of the burned stratum, i.e. under the clay but before any burned material appeared. The regular size of the TB units made it simple to delineate overall trench boundaries. Perhaps to establish better spatial control, however, the burned stratum was then subdivided into a series of smaller rectangular “cuts,” ranging 2–8 m. a side. These would be excavated down to floor level; the floor would be cleaned, sometimes photographed, and the objects on it studied and planned. Removal of these objects would then proceed, usually while excavation of the upper layers of the next cut had already begun.

TB-7A—interior dimensions 11.70 m. wide x 7.60 m. deep—was divided into 9 cuts of inconsistent size (Figure 4), the smallest of which (Cut 1) was 3.3 x 2.5 m., and the largest (Cut 4) 3.6 x 4 m. The much larger CC-3 was divided into only 7 (Figure 5), ranging in size from 4.05 x 7.47 m. (Cut 2) to 3.35 x 3.70 m. (Cut 6). For our purposes, the major drawback of this excavation technique is that detailed plans, in general, were drawn cut-by-cut, rather than of the room overall (see Figure 4); at no one time was the entire destruction-level room cleared to floor level with objects in situ, nor was it ever photographed in that state. (The collated franken-plan of TB-7A, Figure 4, is a further testament to these disadvantages.) On the other hand, it offers a major advantage in that objects both above and on the floor, even if they do not appear on the plan, can be
assigned a spatial subdivision based on the cut in which they were found. The graphs below that display ceramic assemblage and small finds by “zone” do so based on this information.

Small finds—predominantly loom weights, spindle whorls, and iron tools large and small, alongside a wide range of other artifacts in smaller numbers—were simply recorded in the notebooks as they came up; if on the floor, they were sometimes drawn on the final plan of the room, but otherwise, they were not assigned a number or analyzed in any way unless in a good enough state of preservation to be registered. I recorded these in my database by general type and then, where information was available, by subtype (see Tables 2–5; for complete inventory, see Appendix 1).

Pottery was quite a different matter: DeVries assigned either numbers (CC-3) or letters (TB-7A) to every distinct vessel he could distinguish, whether on or above the floor. In some cases, he assigned letters/numbers to “complexes” of sherds which then, upon further study, resolved themselves into multiple vessels, yielding designations like 224 bis. In others, it was realized that what had appeared to be two vessels was only one, as in the case of k’’’ and l’’’ in TB-7A, where the latter turned out to be the shoulder of the former, a large storage jar clustered together with a trefoil (m’’’’) and a round-mouthed jug (n’’’’). Clustering patterns such as these recur frequently in TB-7A and CC-3, leading me to believe these types were functionally related. While the constraints of time and space did not allow me to pursue in-depth functional analysis of individual ceramic types here, I did assign basic types and functions to the vessels that DeVries described.

I sorted the vessels recorded in notebooks into the following general types:

- Bowl
- Round-mouthed jug
- Trefoil jug

- Ambiguous jug (a catchall term where lip was not preserved or shape indeterminate: therefore encompasses dinoi and other medium-sized “jars”)

- Pinch pot (handmade pot)

- Cooking pot

- Large trefoil jug

- Storage pot

- Large storage pot (only so designated when specifically described as “large” or “very large”)

- Special (any painted or decorated vessel)

I then assigned each type a function. Bowls, round-mouthed jugs—with their high, arching handles clearly made for dipping into kraters/cauldrons—and trefoil jugs were unambiguously used in drinking, hence classed as “Drinking/Dining/Serving.” In a similarly straightforward way, I classed storage pots and large storage pots simply as “Storage.” Though they might well have been used for food preparation (especially in the case of brewing), and certain wide-mouthed specimens could also have been serving vessels, this route seemed to be paved with the fewest assumptions. In any case, the known examples of wide-mouthed kraters that we speculate were used for serving wine (e.g. the Alisar IV example from TB-9: see Rose and Darbyshire 2016, p. 107) were usually painted, and fragments thereof classed as “Special.” (“Special” vessels remained their own class.) Pinch pots, cooking pots, and large trefoil jugs, I classed as “Food Preparation”: cooking pots were straightforward and handmade ‘pinch pots’, I feel confident, based on their appearance and findspots, were used as scoops or measures for grain, but large trefoil jugs are somewhat more ambiguous. Their shape clearly
indicates their use for pouring, but their large capacity (13 L. on average) means that they would have been too heavy to transport easily or use conveniently for daily commensality. In addition, they were on occasion found to contain the carbonized remains of grain or barley: therefore “food preparation” is their best-attested use (see also Sams 1994b, 58).

Finally, the category of “Ambiguous Jug” required some thought. Because this likely included trefoil and round-mouthed jugs used for drinking or serving, as well as small- to medium-sized jars more suitable for food preparation or short-term storage, I made the decision, when calculating overall functional distribution of shapes, to divide their numbers between “Food Preparation” and in “Drinking/Dining/Serving.” I thought this would be less likely to distort their overall significance in the assemblage. When it came to the analysis of activities by zone, I did not include “Ambiguous Jugs” in the calculations: for the purposes of investigating spatial patterning of dining vs. food preparation vs. storage activities within the units, I preferred to use vessels whose functions were, I felt, entirely unambiguous.97

I present the results of these various analyses alongside detailed descriptions of TB-7A and CC-3 below.

97 See Appendix 1 for complete inventory of vessels, including notebook description, Sams or registration card designation, and my assigned type and function. These functional categories are based on a combination of my own observations and those made by Sams for individual types in his 1994 catalogue. They could certainly be debated or refined, and are intended here only as a starting point for future research.
5.2.3  TB-7A

DeVries provides a comprehensive summary of the anteroom architecture and features in NB 156, pp. 119–131; I paraphrase it in these first two paragraphs. (See also Figure 6: TB-7A Final Plan.) The anteroom measured 11.70 m. in width by 7.60 m. in depth. At its highest, in the northwest corner, the preserved height of the walls was 1.36 m. The walls, which averaged 1.2 m. in thickness, were constructed of a timber beam course surmounted by six masonry courses of red sandstone, two rows thick, with mixed pebble and earth packing; a second “string” course of wood; and atop those, mud bricks. The whole was coated in a layer of plaster (apparently mud plaster) up to 2 cm. thick. The walls at “notebook north and south”—those with doorways—bore the additional feature of “footing slabs”—irregular low blocks underneath the lowest timber beam course that projected into the room to various degrees; these blocks formed a low shelf, 60 cm. wide, in the southeast corner of TB-7A, and continued across both doorways as flagstone thresholds. The outer doorway measured ca. 2.44 m., while that between the anteroom and the main room was slightly narrower—2.17 m.

The room had a beaten earth floor, the eastern two-thirds of which had apparently subsided quite considerably; Young speculated, probably correctly, that the western third of the room was being upheld by the earlier buildings, Megara 7 and 8, below. It was also roofed, with a combination of beams and reeds topped by clay, considerable sections of which were found over the course of excavation: DeVries describes “a thick stratum of burned reed running the whole width of the anteroom” (NB 156, p. 78), and documented the dimensions of 18 burned timbers in the notebook.

In terms of permanent fixtures, roughly the entire western half of the room was occupied by facilities for cooking. To the immediate left of the entrance stood a large beehive oven, roughly 3 m. in diameter, with its door opening to the northeast, toward
the center of the anteroom. It was preserved to only slightly above its floor level, which stood .62 m. over the floor of the room. A second mudbrick structure, likewise over 60 cm. high, and termed in the notebook a “subsidiary oven,” was built up alongside it. Like the beehive oven itself, this feature was a familiar one in other TB anterooms; it was sometimes dubbed a “horseshoe,” due to its curving three-sided construction around a central mud brick pillar (DeVries 1990, 384). Suggested functions include as a “broiler” for grilling meat (Young 1962, 165), or a “burner” on a stove, in tandem with the clay “kneading trays” often found nearby, which could have served as cooking surfaces (one of these trays was found plastered onto the top of the “horseshoe” in neighboring TB-8: DeVries 1990, 384). In TB-7A, three “kneading trays” were discovered, all in this area (one registered: MC 290); one was sitting atop a clay bench, 30 cm. high, which ran behind the oven-and-horseshoe complex, along the west and southwest walls of the anteroom. The other two were propped up against the walls in the northeast corner of the anteroom, beside the large (ca. 1.7 m. in diameter) oval hearth there. It had a raised clay rim 10 cm. high, and alongside it were two iron tools: a shovel or paddle (ILS 665), perhaps for gathering embers to heat the oven, and a long (80 cm.), hollow rod with a curved blade at one end (ILS 666) (NB 157, p. 136).

A large pithos, pot b (P4349 a), had once sat there as well, between the doorway to the main room and the hearth; it had collapsed into the hearth during the destruction, breaking some of the hearth rim. DeVries suggested that it may have held water; on the opposite side of the hearth, globular pot a, toppled on its side, could have been its dipper. Less suggestively, parts of three iron rods had been sitting on its rim, and were found wedged between its sherds and the anteroom wall. Clustered beside pot b were two other large storage jars, pots h (“a large amphora” with ledged rim) and i (“unusually large and coarse for this anteroom” NB 156, p. 148), and several smaller ones, including
the decorated pot s (red with black geometric painted motifs); cooking pots u and x; and four bowls, y, z, a', and h'. This type of concentration of jars of various sizes and apparent functions, which belies easy categorization, recurs again and again throughout both TB-7A and CC-3.

The opposite corner of the anteroom, at the northeast, is where the densest concentration of artifacts occurred (see Figures 20, 21). Although they were not described as “permanent fixtures” in the manner of the cooking apparatus, they may as well have been: DeVries referred to the large storage pots in this corner, his Cut 6, as “a solid phalanx,” embedded in the floor and organized into two main rows with “in part, an intermediate row squeezed between them” (NB 156, p. 60). The plan of Cut 6 makes it appear that rather than standing in neat rows, the pots cluster around the main pot w', which, notably, contained “much burned grain” (NB 157, p. 185). Pot w' was surrounded by pots s'' (a large storage pot), t'' (a standard storage pot), w'' and w'' bis (a large one-handled jug jammed together with another similar one) and g' (a large amphora), the latter containing, in turn, pots f', a trefoil jug, a'', a small, red-burnished jug, and b'' (P4343), a bowl. Pots s' and t'' were both embedded in the ground 10-15 cm, as were, slightly further to the east, large storage pots d'' and v''. Tumbled amongst these were smaller jugs and cooking pots: x'', y'', fragmentary u'' and e''', round-mouthed jug d''' (which contained 13 spindle whorls), and trefoil jug j'''.

It seems likely that these smaller vessels were on a shelf or hanging on the walls above; a small iron hook was found not far off from these, and a total of 5 iron rings or loops came from Cut 6. More interestingly, when the large pots were lifted, they revealed a dense series of stones, slabs, and “doughnuts”, which must have sat underneath the pots at the time of the destruction. It was clear to excavators that the stones and slabs served as supports for the large storage jars: for example, it was observed of pot l'"
slightly to the west of those listed above, that “two flat stones, set down at a right angle, touch it on two sides and help keep it in position.” Of pot s”, DeVries wrote, “it becomes clear that stones were deliberately placed between it and t” and w’. Between it and w’, they are stacked 3 high. It would seem more accurate to describe the stones as ‘wedged between’ rather than placed between.” (NB 156, p. 88). The same must have been true of the group of 51 doughnuts, stacked three high in the corner, and the nine wedged between w’, w”, and g’. Clearly not in use as loom weights, given their position, they were repurposed to stabilize this phalanx of storage jars, whose contents must have rendered them precarious.

At least two other such concentrations of vessels recur in Cut 6 alone, though none so dense. Inside large storage jar l”, to the west of those described above, handmade mug l” bis was recovered, and alongside it were bowls m”, n”, and large trefoil jug p”. To the south of the w’ cluster, side-spouted sieve jug i’ sat atop jugs j’ and k’ and large storage jar n”; bowl m’ and small burnished jug o’ sat on the floor alongside them. Similar clusters can be identified further to the south, in the relatively sparse Cut 7: surrounding large pot i”” at the eastern wall of the trench were trefoil jug t””, containing grain, and shallow bowl r””; to the west of these, another large storage pot containing wheat, a””, nestled alongside white-slipped jug m””, its base embedded in the floor. In the far southeast corner, in Cut 9, three more clusters appear: k””/l””, in fact one large storage jar, supported by stones on either side, held pot m”””, a round-mouthed jug, and was flanked by another one, n””; large storage jar d⁵ was associated with the “pyxis-like” pot g⁵ and bowls e⁵/f⁵ and h⁵. The third of these is the most notable: bowls c⁵, k⁵ and l⁵ and the “pyxis-like” b⁵ were associated with a stack of three large pots, y”””, z”””, and j⁵.
Despite their designation as “storage jars”, it is hard to imagine that the recurrence of these clusters represents their use for long-term storage. The stacking of jugs, for dipping and pouring, and bowls, for drinking, alongside them, in case after case, instead strongly suggests that the stores these jars held were being frequently dipped into. The distance of the “phalanx” from the grinding facilities at the far end of the main room is a strike against their being used for grain storage, while the fact that many of the largest vessels were embedded into the floor, and supported with stones, indicates that efforts were being made to keep them cool, still, and stable. All signs—including the presence of grain in several; the fact that bowls or jars seemed to be stacked in larger-mouthed vessels to seal or close them; and the excavators’ observation that the fill in Cut 6, where storage jars were concentrated, was more intensely burnt, and the burned stratum reached higher, than elsewhere—point to the conclusion that fermentation was taking place in these vessels.

It cannot be said that quantitative analysis of the ceramic assemblage either confirms or denies this conclusion. Overall functional distribution of shapes in TB-7A shows an even split between Dining/Drinking/Serving and Special vessels, with 49% of the assemblage, and Storage and Food Preparation, with 51% (Figure 18). The fact that “Special” vessels are the fourth most numerous individual type, after storage pots, bowls, and “ambiguous jugs”, is rather remarkable (Figure 19), and says something about the users of this space, in terms of what they had access to, and its relative emphasis on productive vs. consumptive activities. Further specificity as to the spatial patterning of these habits, however, is not forthcoming (Figure 20). We can observe that activities clustered on the eastern side of the anteroom—not specific activities, but all activities—and that where ceramics did appear, they did so in relatively even typological ratios of storage to food preparation to dining. The one point of interest that emerges
from the spatial analysis of the TB-7A ceramic assemblage is the clustering of “special” vessels in Cut 7, apparently at the expense there of “normal” drinking and dining paraphernalia. This might indicate that the relatively free space represented by Cut 7 was set aside for these objects, or rather, for the people who used them.

Ceramics are just one part of the TB-7A assemblage, though they are by far the most illustrative one, as it turns out. A total of 269 small finds were recorded in the excavation notebooks; of these, most cluster in Cut 6, reinforcing the impression that they, along with some of the smaller vessels, were stored there, perhaps on an upper shelf. 236 of the 269 can be associated with textile production (loom weights; spindle whorls; iron needles; a bone shuttle). While I strongly believe, and believe the above observations clearly demonstrate, that unfired clay doughnuts were put to a variety of uses in this and many other contexts in the ancient world, TB-7A is nonetheless famous in the small world of Gordion researchers as the unit where clear evidence for loom weights in use on a loom was finally recovered (see Figure 8). As Sheftel wrote in her 1974 dissertation:

“For a long time one of the most persistently puzzling items from this [the Terrace] building was the great numbers of unbaked clay doughnuts (in one room over 893 were found). A solution to the problem was uncovered during the excavation of the anteroom of the seventh room of the Terrace Building in 1971; two neat rows of 21 unbaked doughnuts were found just as they had fallen when the loom and the threads to which they were tied had burned. They stretched in a line approximately 1.60m long, presumably indicating the width of the loom. They lay in a very practical and convenient
position for weaving, close and perpendicular to the front door for good lighting, but far enough to the side to keep from blocking the passageway."98 (Sheftel 1974, 217)

Textile production was undeniably going on in TB-7A at the time of the destruction, then; but if the ideal space for a loom—quite possibly the only place where there was enough light, unless the back wall of the Terrace Building had windows—was taken, how were the remaining 130 loom weights employed? One loom does not an industry make.

As interesting to me as the loom itself is the cluster of spinning and weaving implements assembled on the low “shelf” formed by the projection of the footing slabs into the southeast corner of the anteroom, in Cut 8. These are a group of 11 pyramidal weights, 4 doughnuts, and 8 spindle whorls; nearby was a cluster of three needles. Textile tools frequently appear in the Terrace units as chance finds: lone spindle whorls or doughnuts in burnt fill above the floor are extremely common, and while they are often associated/presumed to have been stored in the bowl or jar nearest them, it seems just as likely that they fell in from above.99 This little bench, however, seems an appropriate nook for sitting and spinning in the corner, and perhaps even for undertaking the somewhat more specialized weaving to which pyramidal weights were suited. It is perhaps of note that, aside from the bronze item discussed below, all the small finds in

98 For whatever reason, this account appears, almost verbatim, in DeVries’ excavation notebook; in his 1990 report on the context; and in Burke’s dissertation and subsequent book.

99 The discovery of such items as needles or whorls inside jars is less frequent than it may appear, e.g. from Sams’ catalogue, mostly because more effort seems to have been made to repair and register vessels that contained something than vessels that did not: on perusing the registered finds, it can start to look as if every jar contained an odd tool, but this is largely because the (rare) jars that contained odd tools were frequently kept, while the (common) ones that didn’t were frequently discarded.
this cut were textile-related. The lone bone tool from TB-7A, a bone point or shuttle (BI 563), came from the border between cuts 7 and 9 (as the needles did).

The bronze item found in this cut was a tiny nail head with “domed cap,” 0.08 cm. in diameter (NB 156, p. 112; see Figure 9). The item was not catalogued, so it is pure speculation when I say that it resembles the metal bosses that adorned Phrygian belts of the kind that occur with some frequency in tumuli. Its status as a chance find makes it more likely to have been an item of personal adornment than evidence of craft production. Bronze finds were otherwise rare in TB-7A, but two fibulae (in cut 6) and one fibula pin (in cut 5) were recorded, as was a pair of tweezers: a rare find in the Destruction Level, which nonetheless finds parallels in TB-2 and in Tumuli KY and J (Kohler 1995, 79). Curiously, both fibulae were found on the floor: one (B1936) was buried under the pile of 51 loom weights in the NE corner, and the other (B1937) was not noticed until final cleaning of the cut. It is possible that the latter had been stored on a high shelf, and fell; this was likely the case for the other small iron tools (blades and needles) found in TB-7A, nearly all of which come from Cut 6. But why store fibulae, valuable items of personal adornment, in a work area? The CC-3 context, discussed below, sheds some light on this issue.

5.2.4 CC-3

At 11.66 m. wide by 13.5 m. deep, the CC-3 main room was slightly less than twice the size of TB-7A. As CC was on the opposite side of the street to TB, the building opened to “notebook north” rather than “notebook south” (cardinal NE-SW); references to the “south” of the room therefore refer to its far end/back, rather than to the front as they do above. As in TB-7A, the walls were generally preserved to a height of one meter,
and retained many traces of their plaster facing. The doorway, at the center of the north wall, was 2.23 m. wide, and again like in TB-7A, in front of it several timbers had fallen.

The artifact distribution, with major concentrations in the front-right/NW and back-left/SE corners of the room (Cuts 2 and 4), seems more meaningful in CC-3 than it did in TB-7A; this impression must be due in part to the greater numbers of finds (312 pots; 850 small finds), and their greater variety. They are somewhat more difficult to parse, however, because postholes indicate that a gallery, roughly 2.5 m. wide, ran around three sides of the room (the left and right-hand sides, and along the back); this is presumed to be the case in every Terrace Complex unit, as all share a consistent arrangement of postholes: see Figures 28, 30, 31b. What this gallery was used for is unknown: the most logical assumption is storage, but Young also proposed sleeping (Young 1960, 243). It is consistent with this reconstruction that the central aisle, with its 1 m. round hearth slightly north of center, was relatively clear of finds. More puzzling, though, was the discovery of a number of burned objects inside the post holes: one, in Cut 1, contained a cache of metal objects that included an iron knife with ivory handle (ILS 684), 5 (!) bronze fibulae (B 1977a–e), a glass bead (G 380), an incised spindle whorl (MC 302), and two large iron tools, an axe (ILS 743) and a mattock (ILS 734), the latter sloping into the hole from the floor. Another, in Cut 2, held two small jugs (Pots 123 and 124). Did these objects fall in from the galleries above when the posts collapsed, or were they pushed in from where they sat next to the posts along the floor? The latter seems more likely, but it is difficult to say.

The arrangement of CC-3 departs from that of the other Terrace Complex main rooms in one significant way: it does not have a grinding platform at the back. DeVries claimed to see traces of it “manifested through partial lines of stones, raised areas, and apparent cuttings” (NB 167, p. 118), but these were frequent throughout the room, and
even if it was a grinding stand, it would have been quite small: only 1.3–1.5 x .85–.90 m. (less than one-quarter the size of, e.g., TB-7’s). The back of the room instead housed a large bin, 1.44 x 1.68 m., formed of grinding stones and stone slabs set on their edges to a height of .37 m., with traces of plastering on the inside, and an opening or disturbance ca. .80 m. wide at the northeast. Traces of a possible second, much more fragmentary, bin, appear alongside it. Grinding stones otherwise appear in large numbers in CC-3: 20 fragments in all, including identifiable pieces of 7 netherstones and 10 saddles. Curiously, though, they cluster in Cut 3 (in front of the door; 7 examples, including 4 complete nether-stones). Cuts 2, 5, and 7 at the back-left, back-center, and back-right, had 2, 3, and 4 examples respectively (the last all saddles), but Cut 4, at the front-right of the room, also had 3, of which 2 were complete nether-stones, and those in Cut 2, a mix of nether-stones and saddles, were found closer to the north of the trench/the middle of the room. Notably, in both Cuts 2 and 4, the grinding stones were associated with areas of burnt grain (73-BOT-3 on the floor in Cut 2; 73-BOT-4 in large storage pot 149, and another pocket of burnt barley above the floor: NB 167, p. 40). This distribution of grinding stones could be due to later disturbance, as the excavators suggest was the case for the grinding stand itself, but to me it is more suggestive of smaller-scale grinding taking place in the midst of other food preparation in different parts of the room; see further discussion of foodstuffs below.

The final remarkable aspect of the back of the CC-3 main room was the discovery of two nearly-complete skeletons of young cows (NB 167, pp. 111–113; see also DeVries 1990, 386). At first, it was thought they may have been tethered to the back-right post and perished in the conflagration; subsequent study revealed “the complete absence of certain parts, notably the right front leg in both cases,” which DeVries interpreted as evidence “that butchering had already begun,” noting too that
their straight positioning was an indication that these were carcasses (rather than animals in distress). It should be noted, though, that in both cases heads and horns were still present. These skeletons represent the only evidence for meat preparation known in the Terrace Complex or, as far as I am aware, in the Destruction Level as a whole—though CC-3 did yield several examples of animal bones inside or near pots (all in Cut 4). The rarity of the find makes the absence of the right front legs of both all the more intriguing. In the lower town of Iron Age Zincirli, faunal remains associated with the courtyard of a neighborhood temple showed a significant emphasis on right limbs, while those in the street outside showed an emphasis on left pelvis fragments (Herrmann 2014, 55; Marom forthcoming). Similar phenomena of body-part preferences have been documented in an archaic temple (8th–6th centuries BCE) at ancient Kourion (right hind limbs), and in cultic loci at Early Iron Age Tell Qiri, Israel (right fore-limbs) (Davis 2008). The high status of cattle as sacrificial animals throughout the ancient world is also well attested (see, e.g., McInerney 2010). It is therefore, to my mind, quite likely that the absence of the right limbs of both of these cows bespeaks their special significance in some way.

CC-3 contained quite a number of special finds to reinforce this argument. 25 bronzes were recovered: 19 fibulae, 2 fragmentary vessels, and 3 tack heads, like the one I have argued above may have come from a belt. Strangely, but as is reported elsewhere in the Terrace Complex, the fibulae often appeared in clusters: the aforementioned mass of 5 in the cut 1 posthole (B 1977 a–e); 5 in Cut 2 (B 1971–2), of which 3 were associated with a burned cloth fragment, a bronze pin, several fragmentary iron blades, two spindle whorls, and a pinch pot (NB 164, p. 161), and 2 more (B 1976 a–b) lay on the floor near the back wall; 4 in Cut 4 (B 1988 a–d); 4 more on the floor in Cut 6, near a “fragmentary bronze vessel with traces of cloth inside,” an iron knife and
an iron rod, and a large storage jar, pot 285, associated with a nest of 18 doughnuts (52 more found loose in the burned fill above) (NB167, p. 98). Only one was found on its own, a fibula “with swollen bow”, presumably the leech type (B 2006) (see Vassileva 2013). For comparison, 34 fibulae were found in Tumulus W; in the other pre-destruction tumuli, only a handful (less than 3 each) were found, but several of these had been looted; of the other “great tumuli,” 144 were found in MM, but only 14 in P. In other words, the CC-3 context is the second-most-significant source of fibulae of pre-destruction/Early Phrygian Gordion, and the third-most-significant of Gordion overall. In a recent paper (Gordion TB Workshop, May 2017), Vassileva remarked that prestigious bronze items found in the destruction level, such as the zoomorphic cauldron attachments found in TB-2 (see Section 5.1.1 above) but also the CC-3 fibulae, seem to have been cautiously wrapped in fabric, just as they were in the tumuli; I return to this point below (Section 5.2.1).

Iron was also recovered in large quantities from CC-2. Unlike in TB-7A, where only a few large tools were found, and those in association with the cooking apparatus where they were doubtless used, large iron tools appeared in every cut in CC-3. 20 total were recovered, of which 11 were found in Cut 1, to the left of the door. Small iron tools were even more numerous: 56 were found, 36 of them knives or blades, but of the 36, only two bore signs of being hafted. Like the large iron tools, blades were most numerous in Cut 1 (12), followed by Cut 2 (10) and Cut 5 (8). This could mean that blades were stored on the east side of the room, or that the activities on the west side did not require them. Iron needles, the second-most-numerous small iron tool (11 total), were found exclusively in cuts 1, 2, and 5, however, leading me to believe in this case that the material was more significant than the function.
Iron implements frequently appear in clusters in CC-3: the three most significant, all in Cut 1, include the group cited above (near pots 6/7/8 on CC-3 sketch plan, Figure 14) with an iron knife (ILS 684), mattock (ILS 734), and “large iron chopper/iron ax” (ILS 743) alongside a bead, spindle whorl, and mass of 5 fibulae—two iron rods, found later, can be added here as well; a group near pots 3/4 with two iron knives, an iron hook, iron tongs (? tweezers? neither registered nor sketched), an iron rod, and two iron mattocks (one registered: ILS 707); and toward the south of the cut, near large storage jar 35, a group including a two-tined fork (ILS 714), an awl, two knives (one with a ivory handle: ILS 711), and some iron needles. A cluster in Cut 4, to the right of the door, spread over the area between pots 214–223 at the east and 226–227 at the west, included two blades, a needle, “other iron,” a whetstone (ST 816), and two iron chisels (ILS 741), along with a bone shuttle, 17 spindle whorls, and a knucklebone. Several more knives, a long iron rod, and another whetstone (ST 801) were found slightly to the northeast of this group, very close to the door (see plan, Figure 14).

Some of these groups make sense—especially that nearest the door, where the whetstone and blades were found atop a block embedded in the ground, by all appearances being used as a work surface. Other tools reflect activities that we have good reason to think were going on at Gordion: the chisels and awl found in CC-3 are woodworking tools, of the kind that would be necessary for crafting the exquisite inlaid furniture found in the tumuli and, less well-preserved, in the Destruction Level (e.g. Megaron 3: see Young 1960). But the tool types in many of these clusters don’t sit well together: needles, knives, and a fork? needles and chisels? These have sometimes been referred to as textile workers’ “tool kits” (Burke 2010, 119), and this may be the case for certain isolated groups. But like Vassileva, Darbyshire observed, in his paper at the May 2017 TB workshop, that needle sets—which in some cases included both
bronze and iron examples—as well as other small iron objects (such as a pair of arrowheads with bent tangs) were found wrapped in textiles in many units. It is possible that they were simply wrapped up for storage or safekeeping, and that CC-3 represents their primary use context; but the weight of the evidence increasingly suggests that these tools were destined for dedication, or another form of reuse.

The one productive activity for which CC-3 provides incontrovertible evidence is that of food preparation. Grain—both wheat and barley—were found all over CC-3, but so too were lentils, chickpeas, hazelnuts, and animal bones, in most cases tidily stowed away in pots. Here, the ceramic and small find assemblages agree: food preparation was certainly concentrated in Cut 4, which boasted by far the largest number of cooking pots (24) and both the most frequent attestations and widest variety of foodstuffs (wheat, barley, lentils, chickpeas, and animal bones). All these finds were concentrated in the lower half of the cut, towards the center of the room: wheat tended to be in large vessels—at least one open-mouthed storage jar (pot 173/P4661), and two others described as “storage pot” and “amphora” (149 and 236 respectively)—while barley was found in a narrow-necked amphora (pot 235/P 4608; for transportation? and/or storing liquid), and sheep bones, lentils, and chickpeas, in trefoil jugs (the latter two mixed together in one: pot 179).

Loose pockets of wheat and barley were also discovered throughout the room. This may attest to their storage in baskets, rather than jars—the remains of such baskets, containing grain, were found in TB-7—indicating they were going to be used quickly. The details of precisely how they were prepared for use are ample in CC-3. Hulled barley (Cut 1), sprouted barley (Cut 1), and jars containing chaff (Cut 4, pot 250), lemmas (Cut 7, pot 395), and straw (Cut 2, pot 102) peeled from barley during the hulling process, are attested around the room. Of these, the sprouted barley is the most
indicative, as it is the key ingredient (malt) for brewing beer; the wheat found in the bottom of storage jars may have been sitting in water in order for it to sprout, as well. A recent *History of Beer and Brewing* describes “the remains of a number of buildings, within the confines of what was Gordian… which were patently breweries/bakeries (called ‘service rooms’); containing, as they did, evidence of grinders, ovens and the remains of charred grain. There is also evidence of germinated grain” (Hornsey 2007, 129). The germinated grain, remnants of hulling, and grinders scattered throughout the main room of CC-3 leave little doubt that this was a major occupation in the room; the discovery of three side-spouted sieve jugs (22/P4678, 73/P4676, 132/P4614), one painted, suggests that production as well as consumption was taking place here (for reference, Sams writes that Megaron 3 yielded 7 side-spouted sieve jugs: Sams 1994b, 4). As in TB-7A, we can observe clustering, such as the small trefoil jug 247 hanging on the shoulder of large storage jar 182, that further the impression of sustained use.

Hazelnuts represent another luxury good seemingly consumed here: DeVries (1990, 386) writes that “a considerable quantity” were found “in a large broad-mouthed jug along with three spindle whorls and some surviving bits of thread,” musing that “the nuts, no doubt, were snacks for a worker or workers in the building.” The only other place where we have evidence such snacks were consumed, of course, is Megaron 3. And while the overall ceramic assemblage is more heavily weighted toward storage and food preparation than TB-7A was (61% rather than 49%), CC-3 nonetheless yielded 31 bowls, 29 round-mouthed jugs, and 26 trefoil jugs—drinking apparatus for at least 60 individuals. Nor is the proportion of special vessels—6% (compared to 8% in TB-7A)—insignificant, and several of CC-3’s “special” vessels are truly special. Pot 40 (P4564a–c), described in the notebook as a “large badly burned storage jar,” though vitrified, preserved a raised lion protome decoration on its upper shoulder. Two other large
storage jar sherds (141 \textit{bis}/P4680 and 141/P4681) bore different stamped decorations. Sams (1994, 3) associates stamped storage jars most closely with Megaron 4, relating this feature “perhaps… to a particular function of the hall,” though he does not elaborate on what that might be. Stamped vessels are nonetheless relatively rare in the Early Phrygian citadel, with only 65 known examples, of which roughly two-thirds (ca. 43) come from the destruction level. Two more of these come from CC-2: a round-mouthed jug, and a small trefoil jug, both of which bear zones of triangle-zigzag stamping. The round-mouthed jug, pot 232/P4606, is the only example of the type to bear stamped decoration; the trefoil jug, pot 292/P4577, has only one parallel, in TB-1. A range of shapes exhibiting the relatively more common Phrygian decorative technique of painting occur as well, most notably a large wide-mouthed amphora, pot 259/P4580.

The final activity which bears mentioning in CC-3 is textile production. As in TB-7A and elsewhere, “doughnuts” predominate, and are found in clusters around (or inside) storage jars or above the floor that suggest they fell from a high place. The clusters in CC-3 were generally quite large: DeVries recorded 22 groups of 8 weights or more, the largest of which numbered over 50. In one such group—again in Cut 4, toward the middle of the right-hand side of the room (near pot 172 on plan, Figure 14)—seven were found to have threads preserved in their holes. Of this, DeVries wrote in his notes: “Thus they truly are loomweights” (NB 167, p. 76). Most in these group, however, were of the rarer pyramidal type—41 of 49—whose function was never in doubt; they can only be used as weights. Eight were of doughnut type, of which one had threads preserved in the hole. These latter probably represent quickly-made supplements to the set, either to replace broken weights or to make a slightly wider textile than normal.

Despite their numbers, in no case does DeVries suggest that the weights were set up on a loom, as he did in TB-7A. On the plan (Figure 14), possibilities for looms, in
the form of fairly linear alignments of “doughnuts” in relatively uncongested spots, occur in two places: towards the middle of the west wall (32 doughnuts drawn), and in the far southeast corner, near a pair of fibulae and a spindle whorl on the floor (19 doughnuts drawn). In the former case, the “loom” would have been quite narrow, and the four-row arrangement of weights would indicate a fairly complex loom setup, for which we have no other evidence; but in the latter case, the weights are rendered as two parallel rows ca. 1.5 m. long, or roughly comparable to the TB-7A example. Still, if DeVries did not come to this conclusion himself, there was probably a good reason.

Other evidence for textile production comes in the form of balls and braids of thread and fragments of cloth. DeVries sometimes refers to the latter as cloth “preparatory to weaving” (e.g., NB 164, p. 182); it is unclear what this means, since cloth is, by definition, woven. As noted above, cloth fragments were usually discovered alongside metal finds (not coincidentally, since the latter contributes to the preservation of the former), and probably represent only a tiny fraction of the cloth that was formerly in the room. More evocatively, of the 179 spindle whorls found in the room, a group of 5 were found, with braided batches of thread, inside a carved wooden box (W119) decorated with geometric motifs (see DeVries 1990, 386, Fig. 20) near the doorway on the west side. Though obviously not in use, they had been thoughtfully stored for easy access.

5.2.5 Comparative summary & remarks

To summarize, the anteroom of TB-7A contained, to the left of the entrance, facilities for cooking, and to the other, mixed-use space for storage, food production, food consumption, and textile production. Large and medium-sized storage jars were arranged in several rows at the back right, propped up by a mix of slabs, stones, and
clay doughnuts. Along the wall on the right-hand side and in the southeast corner, large and medium-sized jars for storage clustered in groups with jugs and bowls for serving and drinking. Both in the southeast corner and in the relatively free space at center-right, textile production was taking place. The TB-7A assemblage shows an even split between productive and consumptive activities, though the floor plan (Figure 6) leaves relatively little space free for consumption.

In the back room of CC-3, activities were concentrated in the corner to the right of the door, and toward the back of the room on the left-hand side. Food production, especially the preparation of barley for beer production, was a major component of both these zones, but its traces were scattered around the room. Despite the large numbers of storage jars, evidence for semipermanent storage installations in any one place, like in the anteroom, is lacking in the main room. There are a few linear alignments of large jars (especially #214–223), but in general, the arrangement of isolated large vessels surrounded by smaller ones predominates, and the large ones are not as likely to be embedded in the floor as they were in TB-7A. Patterning in the ceramic assemblage throughout the room shows quite an even distribution among storage, food preparation, and drinking/dining/serving vessels, within each cut and in the room overall (Figures 22, 24). The greatest number of vessels (and objects in general) occurs in Cut 4, to the right of the doorway: the ease of access of this zone relative to others (e.g., Cut 2) could be taken to indicate that production here was partially intended for outside use—consumption in the anteroom or outdoors—as opposed to the concentration toward the back-left of the room in Cut 2, which was for in-house use. The patterning of specialized craft activities, such as it is, supports this: evidence for more portable activities, like spinning, and the preparation of tools (iron knives) on a whetstone (for wood carving?), took place next to the door (cf also the numbers of large iron tools in Cut 1, to the other
side of the door). Farther at the back, in undisturbed spaces, e.g. in the quiet back-left corner beyond the clusters of pots, a loom may have stood, where it wouldn’t be jostled. Still, the consistent presence of “special” vessels and items, like bronze fibulae, throughout all of the rooms, and that of the (ritually) slaughtered young bulls in CC-2, argues that the organizing principle behind this bustle of activity had greater ideological significance than simple daily subsistence, even for the household of a king.

What more does this close analysis contribute toward our understanding of the Terrace Complex, and of Phrygian society as a whole? For one thing, it goes a long way toward filling these spaces, or toward understanding the ways in which they were full. The frequent representation of these units, in plan, as so many identical squares, makes it easy to envision them filled with a corresponding number of idealized worker bees. This state of affairs has long obscured their rather charming messiness. The archaeological reality is that a great deal of work was going on in this complex—not in an organized fashion, replicated over and over in the same way, but in a great many ways, in pockets and nooks that resist our efforts to parse them.

The major activities, the kinds of work, we recognize in this analysis—food and textile production—remain the same as they ever have been. To these, I would add a third—beer production—whose scale and importance has not been fully recognized. I will return to this point below (see Section II.2). The problem with previous characterizations of the Terrace Complex has not been the recognition of these activities but the labels we uncritically put to them: they have been classed as “domestic,” those who undertook them “workers,” and the organizational principle behind it all involuntary “service.” The statement is already a contradiction in terms, since the very use of the term “domestic” implies that the architecture and features so described were built by the people residing in and using them (cf Voigt 2000, 332), while “service” and “workers”
imply the opposite, namely, people being forced to reside in and use facilities not of their choosing for purposes that do not directly benefit them.

The utility of the close study engaged in above, for me, has been on the one hand to humanize the Terrace Complex—to reconstruct the Destruction Level as the detritus of so many individual actions and decisions, whether hanging a jug on the handle of a storage jar after having a drink or settling down on a bench in the corner to do some spinning—but also, conversely, to underline just how remarkable the Terrace operation was in terms of its scale and intensity. It is the innate contradiction of these two things that vexes me, as it has all prior students of this context—probably because resolving it requires disentangling my own socially constructed notions of relationship between function and status.

5.3 Analysis

5.3.1 Production, consumption, & social organization, in theory

These questions about the Terrace Complex are rooted in long-standing debates about the nature of “attached” vs. “independent” specialization, the former of which, Costin (1991, 322) argued, in her initial publication on the subject, “appears to evolve along with social inequality.” Early models of the relationship of craft production and social organization, including those applied at Gordion, relied on a basic assumption that attached production was conducted at the behest of political elites in stratified societies, where it served as a means of controlling, among other things, “the ideology of power.” In the decades since, many, including Costin (2001, 334; see also 2007, 151–3) herself, have pushed back against “portrayals of ‘attached’ specialists as universally exploited and dependent,” arguing that we should make a distinction between social status or
identity of artisans as individuals, and the conceptualization of ‘attached’ production as referring to a social relationship between producer and consumer.

Costin has proposed that describing the social relations of production along a continuum between ‘attached’ and ‘independent’ “allows us to think about the purpose/function/rationale behind different modes of production” (2001, 335) without making assumptions about the socioeconomic status of individual artisans. More recently, Murakami (2016) has focused attention on the process and contexts of consumption, alongside those of production and exchange, as “essential for understanding the formation of both inequality and equality,” and by extension, the political economies of ancient states.\(^{100}\) Underlying both Costin’s emphasis on the purpose of specific production modes and Murakami’s interest in consumption practices is the notion of value and the ways in which it is determined or conveyed (see also Clark 2007). These are now widely acknowledged to be multivalent, subjective, and culturally specific—but they are surely conditioned by a combination of material properties, acts of production, exchange, and consumption, and the agency of producers, intermediaries, consumers, and other groups of people: what Murakami (2016, 61) terms a “regime of value.” Deconstructing such regimes—understanding how material objects were valued—is essential to interpreting the negotiations of power and identity that structure sociopolitical processes.

That a broader definition of value is necessary is particularly clear in explorations of the ritual mode of production, where, as Spielmann (2002) has pointed out, “the goal is not profits but rather, acceptable, often superlative performance and participation.”

\(^{100}\) For a more robust theoretical overview of the notion of consumption, see Graeber 2011.
Goods produced for consumption in communal rituals may acquire a “social value” very different from their objective one; their production may be intense, spatially concentrated, and/or large-scale—and therefore, specialized—without necessarily reflecting a hierarchically organized society where top-down control of production or resource acquisition by elites prevails, motivated by their exclusive demand for prestige items. Demand for socially valued goods, and a willingness or obligation to participate in their production, may be distributed throughout whole populations, it is not limited to aspiring leaders (Spielmann 2002, 196); and such demand may motivate cooperation, collective action, and shared access to resources. All of these contribute to the successful operation of polities, especially small-scale or emerging ones, where widespread participation in communal rituals like feasts makes them an opportunity for performing and negotiating a broad range of hierarchical and non-hierarchical social bonds.

To bring us back to the matter at hand, namely, the relationship of the spatial arrangement of productive activities to the social organization of production, let me sum up: the spatial arrangement of production, in particular its spatial concentration, is one major indicator of the presence of craft specialization, archaeologically. Craft specialization has been linked to increased sociopolitical complexity and is often assumed to entail unequal power relationships between producers and consumers. Analysis of the conditions of production alone, without reference to their circumstances of consumption, is insufficient for reconstructing these social relations, which are based on a culturally determined regime of value. The case studies above permit the vivid reconstruction of conditions of production at Gordion, but also provide indirect hints as to their circumstances of consumption; I will tease these out further below. First, I highlight
two comparative examples—one ethnographic, one archaeological—that serve to make these issues more concrete.

5.3.2 Production, consumption, & social organization, in practice

At Gordion, the concept of craft specialization is usually in explicit reference to the production of high-status textiles as a luxury good. Ethnographic and ethnoarchaeological studies, however, attest that alcohol, including beer, is also a luxury item, and access to it a marker of status, in many societies, related as it is to the ability to host feasts and therefore wield influence in the arena of commensal politics (Dietler 1990; Blitz 1993; Chicoine 2011; Fleisher 2010; Hayashida 2008; Jennings et al. 2005; Luley 2016; Reinhart 2015; Rosenswig 2007). Among these, Arthur’s work among the Gamo people of southern Ethiopia upends traditional ideas about the power relationship between producers and consumers of beer. Beer production among the Gamo, whether for daily or ritual use, is an exclusively elite activity, and greater intensity of production is correlated with higher status areas (Arthur 2003, 2014). Access to its consumption is extended to the lower echelons only in specific contexts: work feasts are one such occasion (Arthur (2003, 518) writes that “[t]he Pondo of South Africa rate beer feasts higher than meat feasts, because beer makes the work seem more like a party”; see also Hunter 1979), but so are all manner of political and religious ceremonies (on work feasts, see Dietler 2001; Dietler and Herbich 2001; Pauketat 2002).

Arthur (2003) outlines the significant labor and time commitments required for the production of beer, which in African societies is usually women’s work (as it was in the ancient Near East: see Ebeling and Homan 2008 and infra.). The first step in the process is to let grain sprout in a damp pot; the sprouted grain is then combined with additional grains and ground on a stone for hours. When the flour/malt is ready, it is
mixed with large quantities of water that have been brought for the purpose: this water has either been brought to the boil already, in which case it is mixed with the flour in a large mixing bowl, or the flour and water are brought to the boil together in large pots. In either case, however, once mixed, the beer is transferred to a beer jar or gourd to ferment for five days or more (Arthur 2003, 519).

The Gamo are a caste-based society, wherein the highest-status caste group, the mala, is composed of farmers and merchants. That this social group evolved to exercise political and religious control is a direct result of its access to farmland and therefore to the primary resource necessary for beer production: grain. Beer is an essential means of acquiring status, without which political control is impossible. In order to rise to the prestigious rank of halaka, “ritual-sacrificer,” the chosen candidate must organize two beer feasts, one at his house and one in a communal gathering space, for up to 300 guests each—a feat requiring 800 kg. of wheat, for ca. 2000L of beer, on each occasion. Once the role is acquired, its duties include the regular performance of animal and beer sacrifices, necessitating ongoing production of beer on a large scale. This is in addition to the beer the household brews for its own needs: the Gamo consider beer as a type of food, and those who can afford to consume it on a daily basis, as well as in ritual contexts (Arthur 2003, 519–522).

In terms of archaeological signatures that denote the use of beer, Arthur (2003, 522–523) suggests the general presence of larger pots, more grindstones, and a higher ubiquity of grains than expected in an average domestic context (though he observed vessels with volumes as small as 2.8L and as large as 124.7L being used for beer-making; average volume was 33.6L). He also emphasizes the spatial requirements: both the storage space for the large jars of fermenting beer (among the Gamo, this is usually along the outer edge of the interior of kitchen/storage buildings: see Figure 15), as well
as a sufficiently large area for people to congregate in order to consume the beer. Household inventories are a further indicator of feast-hosting status: on average, ritual-sacrificer households had 3x as many drinking vessels, 4.5x as many large storage vessels, and more than 2x as many grinding stones as non-ritual-sacrificer households (though even ritual-sacrificer households had only 2.8 grindstones per household—far fewer than the Terrace Complex units).

One conclusion Arthur drew from his study was that the archaeological evidence of beer production would be easier to recognize than consumption; all the African societies he surveyed had special vessels for drinking beer, but these were frequently made of organic materials (gourds among the Gamo; vine-stem straws among the Luo of Kenya) (Arthur 2003, 524). Production, however, left surface attrition on the interior of fermentation vessels, making them easy to spot in discard heaps.\(^\text{101}\) For our purposes, it is most important to note that precisely because of its social value among the Gamo, the production of beer was a high-status activity, controlled by the elite; free access to the consumption of beer, then, was an implicit marker of status. For the rest of society, the promise of beer consumption was a major motivator and prerequisite for participation in communal affairs. Arthur compares this practice to those of other African societies, such as the Baganda of Uganda and the Chagga of Tanzania, where beer production was not so tightly controlled. Rather than controlling the means of production or raw materials, Baganda chiefs would accept beer as tribute; the Chagga acquired it through taxation.

\(^{101}\) Incidentally, Sams 1994b, 31, noted that “spalling or pitting of the surface” was especially prevalent among vessels from the Destruction Level, but also occurred in pre-destruction contexts and even in tumuli: he attributed these faults to the firing process, but could they be due to fermentation? This would require a separate study; in many cases it would be impossible to tell, given the secondary firing and even vitrification of Destruction Level vessels.
Nonetheless, once acquired, it was regularly redistributed in the context of feasts. Gutmann (1926: 346) reports that this was a tax “the people were happy to pay” in order to socialize with the chief; whether or not this is true, it created a system of reciprocal obligations between commoners and leaders that was rewarding to both, while strengthening social bonds (Arthur 2003, 518).

By analogy with the Gamo, the combination of the undeniably high-status architectural context of the Terrace Complex and the evidence for fairly free and frequent access to/consumption of luxury goods—beer, bronzes, hazelnuts, decorated finewares—inside should make us think twice about its characterization as a service area. (I am choosing to sidestep the thorny issue of gender and its intersection with status for the time being; but see the Conclusion.) But while the fine-grained spatial signature of the Terrace units, with the reduplication of activities over and over again rather than their spatial concentration, is decentralized in a manner reminiscent of household organization, it is difficult to imagine that activities of this intensity and scale took place in the absence of an organizing authority or other motivating factor. To illustrate the disparity in scale: Gamo ritual-sacrificer households had an average of 3 grinding stones; CC-3 alone had 10 complete nether-stones. Household ovens in the Iron Age lower town at Zincirli were an average of 60 cm. in diameter (Herrmann 2011, 360–365), for an average surface area of .28 m.; the oven in TB-7A was 18x that size (for more on ovens, see Baadsgard 2008; Parker 2011). In other words: the scale of the operation is princely; but neither the organization of labor nor the commensal habits in evidence are those of any single household, even that of a King Midas.

A useful paradigm for thinking about the subtleties of commensal practices, and their archaeological footprint, has emerged from the destroyed Late Bronze Age (14th/13th centuries BCE) settlement of Tall Bazi in northern Syria. Nearly two-thirds of the
residential western lower town, as well as the citadel, dominated by a big temple, have been excavated; these two areas were destroyed and collapsed in the same burning event, and offer “a snap-shot of intensively used rooms” just before the time of their ultimate demise (Otto 2015, 207). Otto reconstructs activities within the different houses, communal areas, and the temple through the lens of commensality, drawing on contemporary texts from the nearby site of Emar to build up her argument for a continuum between daily commensal practices and ritual commensality. Commensality at Tell Bazi, Otto argues, was neither public nor private, religious nor profane, but at times was all of these; the same basic suite of artifacts and outline of activities could be sized up or down to accommodate a range of different social groups and functions, distinguishable by subtle (and not-so-subtle) differences of context and scale.

Otto first establishes the characteristics of a standard household at Tell Bazi, based on the excavation of 30 well-provisioned houses. Houses consisted of a main room, with a row of secondary rooms on one side, and above them, an upper-story room. The secondary rooms served for “passive” use, or storage; the main room housed “various domestic, cultic, economic, and handicraft activities” in a pattern familiar from the Terrace units above. Cooking took place on hearths and in ovens (50–70 cm. in diameter, as the Zincirli examples); each main room also contained at least one bread oven, placed close to the outer house wall due to the smoke it produced, and some had a second bread oven outside the house that Otto interprets as a “summer tannour” (Otto 2015, 208). Brewing was an important domestic activity, which took place in vats inside every house; grinding of barley or malt took place in the upper-story room or on the open roof, with the exception of two grinding installations placed in secondary rooms (in House 17 and House 44). Grinding never took place in the main room, in a pattern that parallels its relegation to the far end of Terrace Complex units.
For Otto, identifying commensal habits in the archaeological record requires combining the evidence of vessel function, identifiable special-purpose items (such as, at Tall Bazi, the drinking tube—equivalent to the Phrygian side-spouted sieve jug), and spatial considerations: commensal areas required sufficient light, ventilation, space for people to assemble, and freedom from permanent installations such as ovens, storage jars, or bins (Otto 2015, 209). By her analysis, both main rooms or upper-story rooms at Tall Bazi were appropriate for daily commensality, and many preserved the traces of the meals taken there—mostly barley, but also scant amounts of lentils, peas, and fruits were found, while residue analysis of certain vessels has signaled the presence of wine and beer. Only a few houses showed evidence of meat consumption; among these, smaller houses had more mixed-meat diets, while larger ones could apparently afford to consume the meat of one whole animal. As for the spatial patterning of commensal activities within the house, small- and medium-sized ceramics, including rare painted vessels, occurred with greater frequency near the plastered mud-brick-and-stone bench that almost always ran along one side of the main room; this was the only area of the house not filled with installations, jars, or tools. Interestingly, textile working frequently took place in the same area. Otto labels this private daily commensality (Otto 2015, 211).

Other forms of commensality also took place in the houses, however: at the small end of main rooms, clusters of “exceptional pots”—especially pouring vessels, such as kernoi—“jewellery, and bones” were found, often close to “a table-like protrusion or a real stone table” (Otto 2015, 2011). The form of these ‘altars’ varied from house to house, and they were not surrounded exclusively by ritual vessels: the remains of meals were offered in common cooking pots, and plain beakers, the standard drinking vessel, were usually associated with them as well. Otto labels this “ritual commensality in a
private context.” But she hypothesized that still another form of commensality took place in some of the larger households, which I will term semi-private ritual (or ritual/political) commensality: that of the extended kin group, referred to in the Emar texts as “the brothers,” who assembled on the occasion of ritualized private-law transactions such as property sales (Otto 2015, 213; Beckman 1996). Otto writes of House 7—at 213 m², one of the largest and earliest houses of the western lower town, and almost exactly the same size as a Terrace Complex unit—that it not was not only more spacious than most, with extraordinarily long bench, 13 m. in length, in the main room, but that, while the usual drinking vessels were found near the bench and a sacrificed bull’s head by the altar, its food processing activities (cooking, baking, brewing) were relegated, unusually, to an attached room to the north (where two spindle whorls and a bracelet were also found: Otto 2015, 213 and note 16). On a daily basis, this large house would have been used by one family; on special occasions, though, she speculates that women and children would have taken their meals in the annex, while the main room was given over to the ritual/political purposes of the “brothers.”

Beyond the level of the individual household, evidence for public commensality at the neighborhood or community level comes in the form of an additional large bread oven in the western lower town, ca. 3.4 m. in diameter—thus comparable in size to the TB-7A example. The oven was situated amidst houses along the main road, but belonged to no one house in particular; Otto cites similarly sited examples at contemporary Tall Munbaqa/ancient Ekalte (Machule et al. 1993, 91–92), Middle Bronze Age Tall Brak (Oates et al. 1997, 22), and at the palaces of Mari (Margueron 2004, 492) and Tuttul (Miglus and Strommenger 2007, 62–63). A second one-room building in the lower town (House 2) contained a unique concentration of mills, basins, and vats, and has been interpreted as a brewery. Otto therefore concludes that these overflow baking
and brewing facilities were probably communally operated to meet increased demand on special occasions. Textual evidence indicates this demand would have been great indeed: “at the yearly festival for the city goddess Ishara, 1500 liters of flour was made into bread, and these 1500–3000 portions of bread were distributed to the inhabitants” (Otto 2015, 214; see also Sallaberger 2015). The flour would have been ground in individual houses (which each had 1–2 grinding stones), and contributed to the festivities, along with the brewed beer, as a form of tax.

The final, highest level of commensality observed at Tall Bazi took place within the temple of the city. At 38m long by 16m wide, it was rather deeper, though just as wide, as Megaron 3 (26 x 15m), and like Meg 3 was divided into two rooms, a shallower ‘porch’ and a deeper main room (this was the standard plan of many North Syrian temple, e.g. at Ain Dara, Aleppo, even Assyrian-period Tell Tayinat) (for the Tall Bazi temple, see Figure 16 and Einwag and Otto 2012). At the time of the destruction, only the anteroom, Room A, was being used for ritual purposes, and though its inventory had been intentionally destroyed, the total vessel count is estimated at several hundred. Of the inventory, Otto writes:

“[t]his is amazing, if we take into account that Room A is not larger than the main room of some houses in the Weststadt, where seldom more than about 20 vessels were found. Especially striking is the high number of medium-size jars and small beakers. In a single house generally between two and six beakers were found, in the temple at least 40.” (Otto 2015, 215)

Vessels found in the temple were more frequently decorated, especially pot stands, but otherwise, the temple assemblage did not differ strongly from that of the houses in terms of types. The beakers, however, were remarkable not only in their numbers but in their variety: they exhibit considerable variation in size, ware, and form, which Otto interprets as related to “the number of individuals who brought them here.” Residue analysis indicates that many of these contained beer: both included miniature
vessels, suitable for offering to the god, as well as large jars and small bowls. Several bronze filter tips, the remains of drinking tubes, were also found amidst the sherds—a strong indicator that drinking was taking place, as well as offering.

Otto argues that the temple was similar to the main rooms of the houses in terms of its spatial arrangements as well as its assemblage: “they have a similar layout, similar installations such as benches, podia, and altar, and even similar size, which in turn could result from similar functions of the rooms.” Textual evidence from Emar is more explicit: “on the occasion of religious ceremonies, e.g., the installation of Baal’s high priestess, numerous people, including the inhabitants of the city, assembled in the temple area and received food, wine, and beer. Meat, bread, and beer for other people, e.g. the deceased priestess, were laid out on several tables set up in the temple area. … And while only a certain group of people consumed their share inside the temple room proper, others enjoyed it in the open-air part of the temple compound.” That sacrificial animals were slaughtered and consumed in the open-air courtyards in front of the temple is attested archaeologically at Tall Bazi by “heaps of animal bones and sherds… clearly not intact vessels, but refuse which accumulated [in front of the temple of Tall Bazi] over time.” (Otto 2015, 217). Indeed, the weight of evidence from the Emar texts demonstrates that during important ritual events, bread, meat, wine, and beer were consumed almost exclusively (Otto 2015, 218).

Otto’s comparative analysis of the Tell Bazi material allows her to reconstruct commensal practices there in remarkable detail. She ultimately concludes that, contrary to our expectation “that daily practices were bound to houses and ritual practices to temples,” considerable overlap existed between the two—"the boundaries between ritual and daily commensality are often floating" (Otto 2015, 219), and many more existed
besides.\textsuperscript{102} We are somewhat less fortunate at Gordion in that we lack examples of Early Phrygian houses in which to root any study of Phrygian commensal practices; but in this we are hardly alone—very few Iron Age lower towns have been excavated in Anatolia, and fewer of these are at all well-preserved.\textsuperscript{103} The Tell Bazi comparison nonetheless opens up a number of useful directions in which to take study of the TB-7A/CC-3, the Terrace Complex, and Early Phrygian Gordion generally.

First, it provides a useful means of understanding the high-quantity, high-intensity, but generally domestic nature of the Terrace Complex assemblage, as well as the overall similarity in layout between the Megarons—Meg 3 in particular—and the TB and CC units. If we place commensal activities on a continuum between private and public, and between daily and ritual, where Megaron 3\textsuperscript{104} is at the far end alongside the Tell Bazi temple, then on the basis of their assemblages, by the numbers alone, TB-7A and CC-3 belong significantly closer to the public/ritual end of the spectrum than the daily/private one. But Otto’s demonstration of the significant overlap at Tall Bazi between daily and ritual, public and private, assemblages, at least in terms of vessel types and quality, dissolves the inherent contradiction between the sophisticated veneer of the Terrace Buildings and their “domestic” interiors. Ritual activity at Tall Bazi is not different

\textsuperscript{102} As my mother never tired of reminding me when I was a teenager, “there are more things in heaven and earth, Horatio, than are dreamt of in your philosophy” (W. Shakespeare, \textit{Hamlet}, Act I, Scene 5).

\textsuperscript{103} I have had the good fortune of excavating one: for Iron Age Zincirli, see Herrmann 2011. See also Osborne 2017 on the Tell Tayinat lower town survey. The lower town of Ayanis has also been excavated: see Stone 2005; Stone and Zimansky 2003. The remains of some Middle Phrygian houses (or so they have been interpreted) were discovered underneath later tumuli; though extremely fragmentary, there was evidence for spinning and grinding: see Anderson 1980, 2012. Voigt also deep conducted soundings in the Outer and Lower towns that may have turned up domestic remains, but as yet they are unpublished.

\textsuperscript{104} and perhaps even more so Megaron 2, but sadly we do not have its assemblage to work with.
in nature than domestic activity: it is the same, only more so, and demarcated, perhaps in space, or perhaps only in time, from normal events.\textsuperscript{105} In the same way, the Terrace Units look like houses because they are houses, but more so—although not houses to live in. Perhaps the best parallel for TB-7A/CC-3 is Tell Bazi House 7, the house of the “brothers”: these are amphibious buildings, appropriate for conducting standard household activities on a daily basis, but also to house the ritual activities of larger corporate groups should the occasion call for it—as well as to ramp up production for communal gatherings on a still larger scale, whether for consumption in the nearby courtyards, or in the tumulus fields beyond.

5.3.3 Contexts, consumers & consumption at Gordion

5.3.3.1 Terrace Complex

This cognitive shift goes some way toward clarifying certain puzzling aspects of the general Terrace Complex assemblage. The vagaries of notetaking, registration, and discard of these contexts make meaningful quantitative comparison of different units impossible, but one cannot help but notice that Young’s biannual excavation reports invariably feature photographs of at least one exceptional vessel from the Terrace Complex Destruction Level: I have already mentioned the exceptional painted side-spouted sieve jar CC-2, which found a direct parallel in later seasons in Tumulus W; but what of the beautiful painted askos with checkerboard decoration, nearly identical to one

\textsuperscript{105} See also Dietler 2011, 186: “… the meaning of a feast event both derives from and plays upon the meaning of consumption in the context of daily meals, but is, at the same time, dramatically transformed by the symbolic framing devices that distinguish it as a theatre of ritual action.” (186)
from Tumulus P, found in TB-4 in 1959 (Young 1960, Fig. 29), or the strange, striped “python-cothon” pouring vessel (Young 1962, Fig. 20) from the same context in 1959? Anyone who has excavated a true “domestic context” knows how uncomfortably these vessels would sit in such an assemblage.

Quantitatively speaking, however, it is possible to make some remarks about standardization within the assemblage. In his more general discussion of types, Sams observed that “distinctions of basic design and scale were but the major guidelines within which Phrygian potters worked, for in the execution of their products, and with few exceptions, the keynote was variety. Their creative approach to potting shows forth most clearly in the Destruction Level, where the variety within certain standard categories is extensive” (Sams 1994b, 41). This creativity of shapes extended to ware types and decorative motifs: Sams judged Early Phrygian painted wares to be “considerably varied,” with “no fewer than five varieties of buff ware” represented in pre-destruction contexts, and a similar lack of homogeneity in red and tan painted vessels. “These disparities are perhaps to be explained through the differing processes of individual potteries in and around Gordion and farther afield in Phrygia, if not beyond,” he wrote (Sams 1994b, 37).

Neutron activation analysis of vessels from the destruction level has quantified the extent to which this was this case: compositional profiles of the sampled vessels were so varied that the researchers could not identify a local compositional profile. They concluded that “the diversity of non-local proveniences and the range of jugs, jars, and bowls represented in the EP assemblage suggests that elite food practices, potentially feasting, using vessels brought from a broad region, were a significant factor in Early Phrygian political dynamics” (Kealhofer & Grave 2009, 2171). That the inhabitants of this region shared a common cultural vocabulary and set of practices is attested by the
relatively narrow range of basic shapes (bowls, round-mouthed jugs, trefoil jugs, side-spouted sieve jugs, one-handled utility pots, amphoras, and jars: Sams 1994b, 41), but the lack of standardization in every aspect of production is a strong indicator of the number and diversity of the groups operating within the cultural sphere centered at Early Phrygian Gordion.

The journey was not over for these vessels or their contents once they arrived at the citadel; there is also evidence that they continued to circulate within it. Sams was frequently able to identify ‘families’, or more often pairs of ‘siblings,’ within the Destruction Level assemblage, but they were invariably distributed across different units, rather than clustered in one—of a family of three bowls, for example, one was found in TB-4, one in TB-1, and one in Meg 3. The frequent recurrence of this phenomenon suggests considerable freedom of movement within and among the Terrace and Megaron zones. That Megaron 3 and the Outer Court were not provisioned entirely by the Terrace Buildings—i.e., that the units were not simply storage for the Megaron Courts—is demonstrated by the evidence of the Terrace Gateway Pottery Depot, which stood just off the circuitous back passageway between TB-1/ the Terrace Complex and Meg 3/the Inner Court. This was a well-stocked depot with at least 135 “thoroughly utilitarian” vessels at the time of the destruction; none was painted, and they were clearly for mass consumption, given that several stacks of bowls—as many as 28 in a group—were discovered above the remains of the burnt wicker baskets that had held them. The location of this depot makes the conclusion that these were the Phrygian equivalent of red Solo Party Cups, in storage until they were needed again in the Inner Court, inescapable.
5.3.3.2 Megaron 3 and the Megaron Courts

Aside from the Terrace Gateway Pottery Depository, the major argument for feasting in the Megaron Courts is, to my mind, their architectural form, as noted in Chapter 4. Archaeological evidence for feasting in the pre-Terrace period—i.e., that the practice of feasting was well-established at Gordium before the Terrace was built, and therefore provided part of the rationale, and workforce, for its construction—is not prolific; but neither are pre-Destruction contexts generally (with the exception of M-7 and M-8, which did contain grinders and loom weights: see DeVries 1990). Still, two major trash

106 While not directly addressing the issue of feasting, Krsmanovic (2017, 262–265) examines the issue of the generation of surplus and its redistribution. Based on a combination of ceramic and paleobotanical evidence, he notes that "the wider hinterland of Gordium played an important role during the period leading up to and beyond the 9th century destruction event, and if the generation of surplus took place in this setting, it may have been a means by which the wider hinterland was integrated within Gordion's sphere of political influence," and raises the question of whether "control of different communities was more important than the landscape itself in terms of territorial extent, which also touches on the issue of the discursive paradigms which continue to maintain the existence of a Phrygian kingdom or empire." Linked to this is "the increase in emphasis on cultivation in YHSS 5, aided by a degree of climatic amelioration, [which] may coincide with political initiatives governing the reconstruction of the citadel and the numerous tumuli which date to the 8th century." In other words, there is a change at Gordium in the Middle Phrygian period, a shift toward increased cultivation that likely reflects more centralization in political authority/consolidation of the political economy, which was not so evident at Gordium in earlier periods. In a recent presentation at the University of Pennsylvania, S. Manning also suggested that a spate of bad climactic years in Central Anatolia in the mid-9C BCE—a dry spell of roughly a decade—represent conditions that may have been "historically forcing." It is interesting that this period corresponds roughly with the construction of Tumulus W and the Terrace Complex. We could speculate that year after year of bad harvests made smaller communities vulnerable, as well as exacerbating the inequalities within them (between those whose harvests failed and those whose succeeded). Such conditions might have been enough to encourage previously independent groups to band together, in search of both practical and ideological solutions and solace (provided them by the charismatic leader buried in Tumulus W?). When climactic conditions ameliorated in the second half of the century, the need receded, and corporate groups returned to their state of relatively heterarchical competition, making smaller investments to the center (represented by the smaller, similarly-sized tumuli), but the seed was then planted for greater centralization, that would grow to fruition in later years.
deposits dating to the pre-destruction period have been excavated, and their contents are suggestive.

The first is the so-called “Latrine Deposit,” part of the Early Phrygian Building sequence. Both its size and location run counter to the implications of its name. It was a 4.3 m. long x 2.8 m. wide, 1.8 m. deep stone-lined pit situated right in the middle of the approach to the Early Phrygian Building (the main gate to the city before the Polychrome House): not a private or out-of-the-way affair. Upon discovery, furthermore, it was filled “practically to the brim” with ash, animal bones, and copious sherds of 34 vessels, of which 29 appear in the Sams catalogue (Sams 1994b, 9). The material was supposedly stratified, according to excavators, indicating a gradual build-up, but was not excavated as such, so I remain unconvinced. Sams treats it as one unit, remarking that “it represents a definite period of use and discard,” one representing “an advanced stage in Phrygian wheelmade production” without a trace of either Bronze Age or Early Handmade pottery (which are residual in most pre-destruction contexts) (Sams 1994b, 9). Of the 29 vessels, 11 are bowls; 2 are round-mouthed jugs; 6 are trefoil jugs (1 small, 5 large); 4 are amphoras; 6 are fragments (2 handles, 4 feet). 45% of this small assemblage, in other words, consists of vessels for drinking; only one—a lone one-handed utility pot for cooking—cannot be considered so. The further association of these vessels with ash and animal bones, and its location adjacent to, but at the outskirts of, the Outer Court, makes its identification as a feasting deposit highly probable.

The second pit is one I excavated myself in the summer of 2014, in a sondage underneath TB-6 that reached Early Bronze Age levels. We were surprised to discover that between the Terrace floor and EBA settlement layers were, first, nearly 4 meters of rubble fill, and underneath that—even at that great depth—Early Phrygian trash
deposits. It soon became clear that these deposits were of interesting character: they contained large amounts of charcoal and ceramics, but more so than either of these, an extremely high concentration of bone. Preliminary analysis of these finds suggests that they were significant both in their sheer number as well as in the age distribution of the specimens (see Figures 26 and 27 respectively). The pit contained a high number of caprids, mostly sheep, almost half of which were slaughtered at an age that suggests their exploitation for tender meat (Meat A and Meat B, Figure 27).

The bones from this deposit were furthermore very well-preserved, not subject to gnawing or weathering. This indicates that the trash was generated quickly, likely from one event. Ceramics from the deposit clearly date it to immediately before Terrace construction began, and include remains of a large Alisar IV-style krater and a stamped, pattern-banded storage jar, vessel types that, as previously noted, are strongly suggestive of commensal drinking practices. Like the Latrine Pit, these remains may well represent the detritus of a feasting event, possibly associated with terrace construction; given their location behind Megaron 3, it is equally possible that this trash was generated on other feasting occasions. (Analyses are still ongoing: see Morgan, Marston and Çakır, forthcoming; on feasting pits, see Pauketat 2002; Wallis and Blessing 2015.)

5.3.3.3 Tumuli

In several places throughout this chapter, I have called attention to the artefactual links between the Terrace Complex and the tumuli. Fibulae occur in large numbers in tumuli, in the Terrace Complex, but not elsewhere. The finest ceramic vessels from the Terrace Complex find their best parallels in tumuli. We can even identify the presence in the Terrace Complex of the food items in Midas’ funerary feast: meat; pulses; barley beer (McGovern 1999, 2000). To this list, I would add one other
direct link: I believe that the tumuli were the destination for the textiles produced in the Terrace Complex in such great numbers.

In a recent paper (Gordion TB Workshop, May 2016), Vassileva remarked that prestigious bronze items, such as the zoomorphic cauldron attachments found in TB-2 (see Section I.1 above) but also the CC-3 fibulae, seem to have been cautiously wrapped in fabric, especially when placed in a vessel or container. Those found in postholes, she speculated, may have been hanging within bags that were attached to the posts. Her conclusion is that these items were intended for elite burials. Given that the tumuli are by far the best-attested contexts at Gordion for fibula “consumption” at Gordion in this early period, and that, as previous chapters have shown, we have very little evidence for long-distance trade or gift exchange at this (9th-century) date, this seems the best explanation. Darbyshire noted a similar phenomenon for the small iron finds, though he drew no conclusion from it.

It is certainly the case that the metal vessels found in tumuli were invariably wrapped in textiles; Young remarked upon it in Tumulus W (Young 1981, 197), and several cauldrons found in the Great Tumulus at Ankara still retain their wrappings (see Figure 17a–b). What is surprising about the textiles from the tumulus assemblages is that they are all so very plain: the fragments that survive are woven in the simplest weave possible, the tabby weave, and appear to be undyed and undecorated. Textiles found in Megaron 3, by contrast, though less well-preserved due to their conditions of deposition, bear intricate dark-and-light geometric designs recalling brown-on-buff Phrygian pottery (Rose and Darbyshire 2016, 100, and illustration p. 44; Bellinger 1962; Ellis 1981). If luxury textile production fit for tribute or gift exchange was the object of the Terrace Complex weaving operations, then surely they were making the latter kind of textile, not the former. But the coarse, heavy doughnut weights that predominate in
Terrace Units do not lend themselves to this kind of weaving—whence Burke’s suggestion that the resulting textiles were more likely used to outfit a putative Phrygian army (see chapter 2, section 2.3.3; Burke 2010). They do, however, lend themselves to the production of coarse tabby weaves, of the sort that wrapped these metal vessels (Martensson et al. 2009). Given that so many of the objects in the Terrace Complex appear appropriate, if not destined, for deposition in tumuli, this seems an incredibly logical explanation for the use of these tools, in such a location and at such a scale.\textsuperscript{107}

5.4 Discussion & conclusions

In light of the above arguments, I would like to conclude by framing this broader discussion of the three major contexts of Early Phrygian Gordion—the Terrace Complex, the Megaron Courts, and the Tumuli—in terms of the continuum of commensal practices that we can reconstruct from them. Rather than considering them to be isolated zones, devoted to production, consumption, and deposition respectively, I have found it more fruitful to conceive of them as spaces for increasingly ritualized commensality (or specialized consumption, in some sense).

Commensal practices in the Terrace Buildings are decentralized and relatively \textit{ad hoc}; they took place among small- to medium-sized groups of 30–60 people, who shared a general cultural sense of the kinds of things that you needed to do the kinds of things that were appropriate to the context: loom weights – spindle whorls – needles – knives – fibulae – bowls - round-mouthed jugs – side-spouted sieve jugs for a handful of

\textsuperscript{107} It remains possible that more complex textiles were being produced here also, perhaps using the smaller pyramidal weights.
special people. But there was room for a great deal of variation, of individuality, within this broad rubric: a chisel in CC-3; tweezers in TB-7A; bronze cauldrons in TB-4; an Alisar IV krater in TB-8. Each unit has its unique one-offs—small testaments to independence, not subservience—while adhering to the general pattern, which must have been culturally prescribed.

Commensal practices in the Megaron Courts were more specialized. They employed a higher percentage of special vessels, and a higher degree of spatial concentration: Megaron 4, with its emphasis on storage jars and scarcity of drinking vessels, was probably a storage annex (this also explains its uncharacteristically shallow anteroom and deep main room), for occasions that called for beer in festival quantities. Megaron 3 had the most luxurious furniture, some of it upholstered in luxury textiles, and, like the temple at Tall Bazi, would have been a place where only the privileged few entered, during feasts—maybe the side-spouted-sieve-jug drinkers from each Terrace Unit, heads of household, corporate group leaders, ‘ritual sacrificers’, could go in—while the hoi polloi, including the Terrace Building users and others, ate their portion in the courtyard outside. I do not mean for this to come across as an argument for extreme social differentiation, or segregation of elites from non-elites: one of the functions of feasting is to reinforce social bonds, and my view is that the relative geographic isolation of Gordion, and the relative precarity of life on the Anatolian plateau, made the solidarity-building aspects of feasting both necessary and appealing.

Its lack of an assemblage makes speculation about the Outer Court, especially Megarons 2, more difficult, but the antiquity and architectural elaboration of the building and the courtyard suggest that access to them was more difficult and rare. One likely occasion for it would have been during funeral feasts, when, as I argued in Chapter 4, processions would have moved through the Inner and Outer Courts—perhaps pausing
to take in the well-framed view as they reached the Gate Building—and then out into the Phrygian hinterland, toward the tumulus fields. Perhaps such a feast was in the offing at the time of the destruction, the intended destination of the slaughtered sheep, the carefully wrapped figurines and fibulae, and the liters of barley brew, now left to us to interpret.

Feasting has drawn such a following among archaeologists because it provides us a way of modeling the intersection of the domestic and political economies, where we so frequently—e.g., at Gordion—have evidence of one but not the other. Feasts are also generally agreed to be, potentially, both context and catalyst for social change. The tantalizing truth about the Gordion destruction level is that it provides us a static glimpse of a city in transition—a city whose plan was faithfully replicated after the destruction, and was hardly altered again for several centuries. If the lesson to be taken is that Early Phrygian Gordion, so closely replicated in the Middle Phrygian plan, after so much renovation in its early years, had almost achieved its perfect form, feasting was the means by or which it did so. By the time of the destruction, the siren call of the city was being heard by a wide range of diverse groups, who willingly came, bringing their hard-won resources and their quirkiest drinking vessels, to share in what was offered. And what was on offer? We cannot know for sure, but as they say among the Baganda, a good chief owes his people “beer, meat, and politeness” (Mair 1934, 183, quoted in Arthur 2003, 518).
6 CONCLUSION

“There is never any ending to Paris and the memory of each person who has lived in it differs from that of any other. We always returned to it no matter who we were or how it was changed or with what difficulties, or ease, it could be reached. Paris was always worth it and you received return for whatever you brought to it.”

E. Hemingway, A Moveable Feast

This dissertation, in its title, purports to investigate state formation at Early Phrygian Gordion, through the dual lens of the rapid architectural development of its urban core, and the array of productive and consumptive activities attested therein. Implicit in this formulation, however, is the assumption that cities, such as Gordion, are developmentally related to states, e.g. the Phrygian state—a vexed connection that can be traced back to V. Gordon Childe (1950), or, in the case of Gordion, to Rodney Young, as we have seen (Section 2.3.1). I myself have framed this discussion of Gordion, in the Introduction to this work, within a summary of the study of ancient states, albeit a somewhat critical one (Section 1.2).

This dissertation, however, is only a study of the Phrygian “state” insofar as it has attempted to draw attention to the ways in which the urban built environment at Gordion, and the practices it supported, contributed to the constitution of a Phrygian social and political order (Campbell 2009, 822). Strictly speaking, it is a study not of the state, but of the city—and to limit its pretensions further, a study only of the two-hectare portion of the Early Phrygian city that has been excavated. There is currently no evidence for Early Phrygian architecture elsewhere: neither on the western half of the citadel mound, nor in the lower or outer towns, though a newly discovered, fortified gate complex giving access to the western half of the citadel mound has an Early Phrygian phase (with rather
more monumental Middle and Late Phrygian modifications: Rose 2017). In any case, ongoing work at Gordion may prompt significant revision of the observations proffered here.

Leaving aside the Phrygian state for a moment, what kind of a city was ninth-century Gordion? Who lived in it and used it, and what kinds of social interactions did it facilitate? The extant architecture, with its reduplication of courtyards and megarons, does not lend itself to reconstruction as a centralized bureaucratic and population center in the manner envisioned by Young, modeled on Mesopotamian cities of the late third millennium BCE. We have no evidence for a palace, bureaucratic documentation, or even centralized storage (Krsmanovic 2017), not to mention any unambiguously domestic contexts. The function of the Early Phrygian architecture revealed to date instead seems to have been largely ceremonial, whether one likens the megaron form to its Bronze Age Greek namesake, to the Hellenistic andrones of Labraunda, or to a basic temple plan. So too do the productive activities attested in the Terrace Buildings, with their emphasis on a specific range of products, many perishable, i.e. for consumption, produced in large quantities in a highly formalized setting.

M. E. Smith (2017, 154–56), following Trigger, has defined the city more broadly, as 'a settlement that serves as the setting for institutions and practices that affect a larger, regional hinterland.' The important, interdependent relationship between Early Phrygian Gordion and its hinterland, and the settlement's role as a node in a regional

108 In the lowest levels of Voigt’s Operation 12 deep sounding, on the western half of the citadel mound, she came across what she believed was a surface, with associated Early Phrygian pottery, but no architecture (Voigt 2013, 196; Voigt et al. 1997, 5; Voigt and Sams 1995, 375). Whether or not we can consider this limited sample evidence of occupation is, I think, debatable.
network, can be observed both at the microlevel, in the diversity of decorative styles and compositional signatures of the Destruction Level ceramic assemblage, most of which was apparently brought into Gordion from outside (Sams 1994; Grave et al. 2009); and at the macrolevel, in the initiation of a program of monumentalization of routes between the city and outlying settlements through the placement of burial mounds along them, beginning with Tumulus W ca. 850 BCE (Stephens 2018). Early Phrygian Gordion was indisputably a central place, in which social, political, and economic relationships were negotiated, and bonds formed. The rapid expansion and elaboration of the monumental spaces of the eastern citadel mound over the course of the tenth and ninth centuries, culminating in the roughly contemporaneous construction of Tumulus W and the Terrace Building, is a reflection of the city’s attractive power, its success in fostering those relationships.

In many ways, the goal of this dissertation has been to elucidate the means of that success, which I also understand as the context for the formation of a distinctly Phrygian political and cultural identity. The premise of my Chapter 1 is that we have too long used the notion of ‘King Midas’, and much more so, his putative dynasty, as the black-box source of that success. This is not because I deny the existence of a Phrygian elite. If anything, I have argued that all the activities we can identify on the citadel mound are, to some extent, ‘elite’—at least in the sense that ceremonial activities in all societies are usually considered to be governed by an ideology which elites control; therein lies their power (Geertz 1973, 1983). I do not, however, believe that evidence can be found at Early Phrygian Gordion for “a powerful charismatic ruler who serves as the singular intermediary between society and the forces of tradition and nature, thus inhabiting an extrahuman existence that would be unimaginable to ordinary mortals” (Blanton 2016, 24). It is not governance in general, but this specific manner of autocratic rule, with
which I take issue as an appropriate model for political organization at Early Phrygian Gordion, at least in its initial stages. I do so especially because this interpretation is so patently rooted in a biased and anachronistic Greek historical tradition interested in differentiating its own, more collective systems of authority from that of their despotic Asian neighbors, writ large.

DeVries’ and others’ arguments about limited access to the citadel and its various ‘zones’, and Young’s and Sams’ unwillingness to dwell on the significant overlap among the Terrace Complex, Megaron, and tumulus assemblages, betray a discomfort with our inability to more clearly identify in the archaeological record what Krsmanovic (2017) has called the “particular means for materializing the political authority narratives” at Early Phrygian Gordion. That such narratives existed is evidenced by the monumental scale of both the citadel mound architecture and that of the tumuli, and their consequent labor demands. But the need for them was perceived as more pressing due to the historical fact of Midas himself. After all, if Phrygia was a state with power to rival Assyria’s, and Midas its charismatic leader, then he, like the Assyrian king, must have had the coercive power that comes from the ability to inflict violence and the ideological justification for doing so. Such power requires and reifies significant distance between divinely sanctioned rulers, such as the Mesopotamian kings, and their subjects. At Gordion, the creation of that distance has long been attributed to the walls of the Terrace Complex.

The lengthy digression into Syro-Anatolia in Chapter 2 is intended to provide a multipronged counterpoint to teleological narratives of the evolution of political authority heretofore applied at Gordion. The first are chronological and geographical: the redating of the Gordion Destruction Level makes its monumental architectural evolution contemporaneous, not with the late eighth-century King Midas, but rather with the period.
of regeneration of complex society that saw the innovative urbanism of the Syro-Hittite states in the tenth and ninth centuries. The role and function of the city at this place and time seems to have been quite different from that of both earlier Mesopotamian and contemporary and later Assyrian urban formations, providing an alternative model for the means and motivations of urbanization at Gordion from that imposed by Young. It is also perhaps more applicable to the Anatolian context, where populations as a general rule were more distributed throughout the landscape and engaged in diversified subsistence strategies, rather than highly specialized and concentrated in one place.

As noted above (Section 4.1, note 63), these environmental conditions have given rise to arguments that urbanism is not natural to the Anatolian plateau, and cities only thrived there under exceptional conditions (Bachhuber 2012, 593–95; Frangipane 2010). If that is the case, understanding the specific historical and geographical conditions that gave rise to urbanism at Gordion is essential to reconstructing its nature, in terms of the social and political structures that accompanied it. In the ancient Near East, it is a truth universally acknowledged—going back at least as far as Gilgamesh—that walls create cities. Furthermore, cities create citizens, in that the particular urban form the city takes then shapes and directs the kind of social and political interactions that generate communities.

The arguments I have summarized for Syro-Anatolia emphasize the ways in which diverse groups of constituents were appealed to and accommodated in the construction of Syro-Hittite cities. Bilingual and trilingual inscriptions, accompanied by monumental relief orthostats that alternately featured familiar, universalizing mythological themes or processions of citizens performing the civic rituals in which the viewer himself might well have been participating, sent powerful messages of inclusion and belonging. When paired with the use of curtain walls and alternating narrow
passageways and broad courtyards to engineer sharp contrasts between light and dark, expansion and contraction, hiding and revealing, this constellation of sensory stimuli might well have been overwhelming for the participant, prompting an emotional rather than a rational apprehension of events. It is this emotional connection to the physical city, as well as to fellow-participants in the event, whatever their ethnic origin, that created citizens in Syro-Anatolia: citizens in the sense of political subjects whose communal identity was rooted in a shared experience of the city itself. It was further the promise of such experiences that gave Syro-Hittite cities their attractive power, drawing in and ensuring the continued loyalty of their scattered constituencies, and requiring their continual modification.

Finally, the participation in such ceremonies of the ruler himself, and his occasional appearance in relief orthostats alongside not just deities but citizens, betrays a shift in the loci of political authority in Iron Age Anatolia, where such authority was construed as a relationship between people and their rulers, as well as between rulers and deities. As we have seen, Early Phrygian Gordion as an urban foundation had neither the monumental inscriptions, nor the relief orthostats of its Syro-Anatolian contemporaries (with one short-lived, anomalous exception, discussed in Section 4.2.2.2). It further lacks figural representation of either deities or rulers. But as I argued in Chapter 4, the evolution of the architecture of the citadel mound reflects a similar investment in communal (courtyard) space fit for solidarity-building ceremonies or civic rituals, in which the physical distance between ruler and ruled, though likely maintained, was nonetheless not so very great. Such activities would have been both socially and economically expedient, as they both require and encourage the mobilization of labor and goods from outlying settlements into the center.
From relatively simple origins—a few open-faced megaron buildings surrounding an oval courtyard in the Early Monumental phases (Figures 1, 32–39)—the surroundings for such rituals became increasingly elaborate, an indication of their likely success. I have argued that the Outer Court, which was the older, was also more monumental than the Inner Court, in terms of its elaboration; it was therefore, I believe, more ritually significant, though smaller, than the Inner Court, with its lavishly furnished Megaron 3. I also concur with Young and Voigt’s previous observations that there must have been at least a second gate to the eastern citadel, and that the Early Phrygian Gate Building that we see today was not the primary entrance at the time of the destruction. I would hypothesize that the second gate was added at the time of the addition of Megaron 3 and/or the rest of the buildings of the Outer Court; further work in this area would be required to establish a relative sequence for those buildings. In any case, the final addition to the citadel mound, the Terrace, was by far the most labor-intensive, and reflects a new level of investment in civic ritual at Gordion, in that it greatly expanded the formal preparation space for the required products.

If we can take the plan of the Middle Phrygian citadel as an indication of the intended layout, post-Unfinished Project, of the city, movement between the Inner Court and the Terrace Building was direct and unimpeded (Figure 1). It is the Outer Court which has elaborate gateways at both north and south, the viewshed of the latter of which is deliberately channeled toward a monumental, unexcavated tumulus on the South Ridge, SR-1 (Rose 2017, 172). We might therefore envision a sequence of events, or punctuated procession, moving along the Terrace Complex street, into the Inner Court, then the Outer, and finally through the Early Phrygian Gate Complex and out to the tumuli. While this might not have had the same dramatic effect of the orthostat-lined gates and passageways of Zincirli or Karkemish, it shares the principles
of expansion and contraction, and the disorienting contrasts: the long street between TB and CC; the narrow opening between Terrace Complex and Inner Court (or, in the Early Phrygian period, the circuitous passageway); the broad, bright Inner Court, where some of the luxury items housed in Megaron 3 might have been on display, and consumption of the beer fermenting in Megaron 4 would have made them all the more impressive; a second narrow opening, and moment of contraction and delay, before accessing the bijou Outer Court, with its ancient buildings and decorated façades; and a final moment of contraction in the Gate Passage, before passing eventually into the peculiarly Phrygian cultural landscape of the tumulus fields. The use of curtain walls and subdivisions has the same effect of channeling movement, limiting options, and controlling viewsheds, that it would have in Syro-Hittite cities. The function of Gordion’s walls, I argue, was not to control or divide people, but rather to bring them together, to create within them a community bound by shared experience.

This interpretation is, I believe, supported by the archaeological evidence from the Terrace Buildings reviewed in Chapter 5. Such a concentration of grinding stones alone is far more indicative of beer production that it is of bread, due to the fact that beer, once fermented, must be consumed within a few days. The production of beer in sufficient quantities for a feast, even for a few hundred people, must therefore have been precisely timed, and required simultaneous preparation by many people. This is why, for example, Arthur (2003, 517) describes the Pondo women of South Africa each bringing their own grindstone to a specific household and “grind[ing] grain together long into the night.” Meat, lentil and chickpea stew, textiles, and textile-wrapped fibulae, all played a role in Phrygian ritual activity, as attested by the funereal assemblages of the excavated tumuli, and all were at home in the Terrace Complex. Whether this is suggestive of a
direct link between the Terrace Complex and the tumuli, or were simply key elements of Phrygian ritual activity in all its forms, is unclear.

The more pressing question remains: at whose behest do we imagine all this flurry of activity taking place? I find it uniquely compelling that the architecture of the citadel mound is almost inscrutably non-hierarchical, and that its most commonly attested activities both require and encourage collective action (group grinding, group drinking, group burial). The patterned pebble mosaic that paves Megaron 2, which represents elaborate, geometrically-patterned, woven textiles, is one more link to the distinctive decorative traditions of Phrygia, as well as to the activities attested in the Terrace Buildings, but it is also a representation of collective enterprise. The mosaic does not represent one centralized, idealized carpet or vision, but many different ones, the fruit of many women’s (?) labor, overlapping to cover the whole. One might interpret the tumuli in the same way: though they are cited as evidence of social differentiation, and certainly indicate the existence of a Phrygian elite, they too are in many ways a testament to collective enterprise and humble origins. They are built of mainly of earth, their construction requires broad participation but few skills, and they contain drinking accoutrements not for the decedent alone, but for a larger group.

This is not to say that there was no hierarchy at Gordion, but more so that whatever hierarchy did exist was framed within and tempered by a cultural system whose structured communal activities promoted and reinforced group cohesion and integration. This is really not so radical: to create a functioning political community, governing elites and commoners must cooperate to some degree (Levi 1988). A recent cross-cultural analysis by Blanton and Fargher (2008) ranking premodern states in terms of their degree of collective action, from egalitarian to coercive, concluded that rulers are more likely to negotiate equitably with non-ruling groups, and provide them public
services, in cases where they provide substantial revenue (in the form of taxes). When the source of state funds is instead, for example, privately administered royal estates, rulers are less likely to invest in or conform to obligations placed by constituents.

In the case of Early Phrygian Gordion, the current dearth of evidence for centralized storage on the citadel mound (with the possible exception of Megaron 4, the capacity of which was quite limited), the heterogeneity of the Early Phrygian ceramic assemblage and its aforementioned diversity of ceramic sources, and the general incompatibility of the climate and topography of the Anatolian plateau with large-scale territorial control or agricultural intensification (Marston 2017; Miller 2011), are suggestive of a high degree of participation by the communities of the hinterland in provisioning the center, and therefore of reliance by rulers on the financial contributions of their subjects. Blanton (2016, 25) writes that “in these societies, the taxpaying compliance of subjects is based on their sense of trust that rulers and others in positions of authority will act in a manner consistent with collective benefit and less so based on a notion of the inherent legitimacy of rulership.” This notion of the negotiated legitimacy of specific rulers, via social contract, rather than the inherent legitimacy of rulership conveyed by dynastic and divine affiliations, is furthermore more in step with the historical reality of post-Hittite Anatolia, and provides some explanation for the lack of ruler-cult or iconography of kingship that is so puzzling at Gordion.

In this reconstruction, then, we can envision a segmentary political structure for Early Phrygian Gordion based around corporate groups, defined perhaps by geography or kinship. We can perhaps find the signature of these groups in the individual Terrace Complex units, as well as in clusters of tumuli. We can likely reconstruct competing elites, or members of competing corporate groups, who derived their privileged status and accrued prestige through feasting activities; such practices allowed them to not only
cement ties within their own corporate groups, but perhaps also to create wider social networks. While we cannot know the regularity or scale of all such feasts, we have a snapshot of the preparation for one such event in the Destruction Level. They likely occurred at celebrations of major life events; certainly we have evidence that they were involved in funerary rituals. As Wright (2004, 136) puts it:

“[f]easting is a fundamental social practice that marks most celebrations of life stages and natural cycles when people gather and in varying ways display, reaffirm, and change their identities as individuals and as members of groups. It is an integral part of ritual and religious practice, occurring nearly universally as a component of other activities; the universality of its practice underscores its importance in the formation of identity.”

For Wright, the formation of Mycenaean material culture was the result of a process by which specific regional traditions, represented at feasts, eventually achieved supra-regional prominence. So too at Early Phrygian Gordion can we see the confluence of diverse local signatures laying the groundwork both for a set of actions and for their physical expression in what would become “Phrygian” culture. Due to the inconsistent nature of the evidence, I hesitate to attribute specific functions to specific Megarons, especially those of the Outer Court. The size of Megaron 3 and the Inner Court, and the suggestion that Megaron 4, alongside it, was used for a limited amount of communal storage, might indicate that it was used in the case of the largest-scale, most inclusive public gatherings. Leaders of corporate groups might have feasted inside, while the general populace assembled in the courtyard. Perhaps some had access to Megarons 11 and 12. The Outer Court, I would argue, was the setting for more exclusive gatherings. It is possible that these took place only on certain occasions, i.e. for certain types of life events, and/or that responsibility for/access to them was shared among a
number of equally powerful elite households. However we reconstruct the political structure of ninth century Gordion, we have to take into account that the most viable and widely held explanation for the use of Gordion’s megarons is as ritual feasting halls, and feasting is not a solo activity.

This reconstruction, however, relies in large part on the very specific view of Early Phrygian Gordion provided by the day-in-the-life snapshot that the Destruction Level represents. Social and political structures are dynamic and change over time. For example, the mid-ninth century at Gordion seems anomalous in that one of these groups seems to have been able to monopolize this system in such a way as to promote the ascension of a single individual, buried in Tumulus W—the first tumulus, and by far the largest, until the construction of MM. In a recent presentation at the University of Pennsylvania, Sturt Manning suggested that a spate of bad climactic years in Central Anatolia in the mid-9C BCE—a dry spell of roughly a decade—represented conditions that may have been “historically forcing.” It is highly suggestive that this period corresponds roughly with the construction of both Tumulus W and the Terrace Complex. We could speculate that year after year of bad harvests made smaller communities vulnerable, as well as exacerbating the inequalities within them (between those whose harvests failed and those whose succeeded). Such conditions might have been enough to encourage previously more independent groups to band together, in search of both practical and ideological solutions and solace, provided them by the charismatic leader buried in Tumulus W.

109 A comparable political structure has been proposed, for example, for the Maya in the Pre-Classic period (Simova, Mixter, and Le Count 2013).
When climactic conditions ameliorated in the second half of the century, the need or ability to consolidate resources receded, and corporate groups returned for a time to their state of relatively heterarchical competition, making smaller investments to the center (represented by the smaller, similarly-sized tumuli: see Stephens 2018, Table 5). In the Middle Phrygian period, though, a degree of renewed climactic amelioration seems to have corresponded with an increased emphasis on cultivation in the Sakarya River valley (Miller 2010, 66). This shift, which Krsmanovic (2017, 262–265) notes “may coincide with political initiatives governing the reconstruction of the citadel and the numerous tumuli which date to the 8th century,” is also in keeping with Blanton’s observation that as rulers consolidate sources of revenue—in this case, by implementing irrigation agriculture in the Sakarya river valley directly adjacent to Gordion—the polities they oversee tend increasingly toward autocracy. We might speculate that the addition of the Persian-Phrygian Building to the citadel mound at this time is reflective of the need to create space for the large-scale storage of agricultural surplus within the city. We can certainly attribute the construction of the Midas Mound tumulus to this period.110 These later political developments, however, have no bearing on the interpretation of the origins or development of the Phrygian state in the tenth and ninth centuries BCE, as I have attempted to reconstruct here in a manner faithful to the archaeology of the Early Phrygian citadel.

110 Rose would also date the Midas Monument inscription at Midas City to this period (pers. comm.)
### Table 2. CC-3 Artifact Assemblage: Artifacts by Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Object type</th>
<th>Subtype</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Loom weight</td>
<td>doughnut</td>
<td>430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>pyramidal</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>total</td>
<td>508</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spindle whorl</td>
<td>biconical</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>incised</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>unspecified or other</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>total</td>
<td>179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iron tool, small</td>
<td>needle/needles</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>knife/blade</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>knife, hafted</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>chisel</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>other</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>total</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iron tool, large</td>
<td>mattock</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>axe</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>shovel/paddle</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>rod</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>other</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>total</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iron</td>
<td>unidentified</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bone tool</td>
<td>shuttle</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>awl</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>total</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bronze</td>
<td>vessel</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>fibula/pin</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>tack head</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>other</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>total</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grinding stone</td>
<td>upper</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>lower</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unspecified</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>total</strong></td>
<td><strong>20</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Knucklebone</strong></td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Truncated clay cone</strong></td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cloth Fragment</strong></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Thread</strong></td>
<td>ball(s), braids</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Whetstone</strong></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Enigmatic Clay Plaque</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Glass bead</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **TOTAL ARTIFACTS** | **850** |
| **Total Registered** | **72** |

Table 3. CC-3 Artifact Assemblage: Artifact Distribution by Cut

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cut</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6 + 7</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Loom weights (Doughnuts)</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loom weights (Pyramidal)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spindle whorls</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iron: needles</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iron: blades</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iron: large tools</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bone tools</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knucklebones</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grinding stones</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bronzes</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4. TB-7A Artifact Assemblage: Artifacts by Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Object type</th>
<th>Subtype</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Loom weight</td>
<td>donut</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>pyramidal</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>total</strong></td>
<td><strong>141</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spindle whorl</td>
<td>biconical</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>other</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>total</strong></td>
<td><strong>85</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iron tool, small</td>
<td>needle</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>blade</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>loop/hook</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>nail</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>total</strong></td>
<td><strong>21</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iron tool, large</td>
<td>paddle/shovel</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>hoe</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>rod</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;blade-like at end&quot;</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>total</strong></td>
<td><strong>4</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iron</td>
<td>unidentified</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bronze</td>
<td>tweezers</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>fibula/pin</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>tack head/nail</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>other (pellets)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>7</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grinding stone</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kneading tray</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stone tool</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bone tool</td>
<td>Shuttle</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL ARTIFACTS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>269</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Registered</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>23</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5. TB-7A Artifact Assemblage: Artifact Distribution by Cut

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cut</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8 + 9</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Loom Weights (Doughnuts)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loom Weights (Pyramidal)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spindle Whorls</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>85</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iron: Needles</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iron: Blades</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iron: Large tools</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stone tools</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kneading trays</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grinding stones</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bronzes</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>269</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FIGURES

*If not explicitly noted, source of image is the Gordion Archive.*

*All notebooks courtesy Gordion Archive.*

Figure 1. Color phase plan of Gordion citadel mound.
Figure 2. Map of Anatolia, 10C–7C BCE.
Source: The New Pauly Online.
Figure 3. Syro-Anatolia and neighboring regions in the 9C–8C BCE.

The area of Phrygia is labeled “Musku,” northwest of Tabal.

Source: The New Pauly Online.
Figure 4. TB-7A: Cuts
Clockwise from top left: Cuts 1, 4, 6, 7, 9, 8, 5, 3, 2

Figure 5. CC-3: Cuts
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Figure 6. TB-7A Final Plan

Figure 7. TB-7A section
Figure 8. TB-7A “loom”
(NB 156, p. 115)

Figure 9. Sketch of bronze pin with domed cap
(NB 156, p. 112)
Figure 10. Excavation in the Terrace Buildings, 1961
TB-5 (Megaron 3 in background)
Figure 11. Excavation in the Terrace Buildings, 1963
TB-8A in foreground; TB-7 in back left

Figure 12. Completion of excavation in Megaron 3, 1961
(TB-4 and TB-5 in background)
Figure 13. “Workaday” finds along west side of TB-2, 1961
Figure 14. CC-3 Final Plan
Figure 15. Beer fermenting in a Gamo household, southeastern Ethiopia

Source: Arthur 2003, Plate 2

Figure 16. “Building 1,” the Temple, at Tall Bazi


Plan of the temple showing its three phases (Einwag-Otto 2012)
Figure 17a–b. Textile pseudorphs on cauldron and detail of textile fragments from the Great Tumulus at Ankara (now housed at METU).

Photo credit: Gebhard Bieg.
Figure 18. TB-7A Ceramic Assemblage: Functional Distribution

TB 7A ASSEMBLAGE: FUNCTIONAL DISTRIBUTION

Figure 19. TB-7A Ceramic Assemblage: Typological Distribution

TB 7A ASSEMBLAGE: TYPOLOGICAL DISTRIBUTION
**Figure 20. TB-7A Ceramic Assemblage by Zone**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zone</th>
<th>Storage</th>
<th>Food Preparation</th>
<th>Dining/Drinking</th>
<th>Special</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SE (Cuts 8-9)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mid-E (Cut 7)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NE (Cut 6)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Center-South (Cut 5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Center-North (Cut 4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SW (Cut 3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mid-W (Cut 2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NW (Cut 1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 21. TB-7A Small Finds by Zone**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SE (Cuts 8-9)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mid-E (Cut 7)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NE (Cut 6)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Center-South (Cut 5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Center-North (Cut 4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SW (Cut 3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mid-W (Cut 2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NW (Cut 1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 22. CC-3 Ceramic Assemblage: Functional Distribution

CC 3 ASSEMBLAGE: FUNCTIONAL DISTRIBUTION
- Storage: 35%
- Food Preparation: 33%
- Drinking/Dining/Serving: 26%
- Special: 6%

Figure 23. CC-3 Ceramic Assemblage: Typological Distribution

CC 3 ASSEMBLAGE: TYPOLOGICAL DISTRIBUTION
- Storage Pot: 23
- Large Storage Pot: 58
- Amphora: 9
- Large Trefoil Jug: 27
- Pitch Pot: 19
- Cooking Pot: 15
- Ambiguous Jug: 53
- Bowl: 31
- Round-mouthed Jug: 29
- Trefoil Jug: 26
- Special: 22
Figure 24. CC-3 Ceramic Assemblage by Zone

**CC 3 CERAMIC ASSEMBLAGE BY ZONE**

- **Back-Right**: 7 Storage, 4 Food Prep, 4 Drinking/Dining/Serving, 2 Special
- **Front-Right**: 36 Storage, 24 Food Prep, 33 Drinking/Dining/Serving, 6 Special
- **Back-Center**: 5 Storage, 6 Food Prep, 10 Drinking/Dining/Serving, 2 Special
- **Front-Center**: 8 Storage, 6 Food Prep, 5 Drinking/Dining/Serving, 2 Special
- **Back-Left**: 21 Storage, 11 Food Prep, 18 Drinking/Dining/Serving, 7 Special
- **Front-Left**: 13 Storage, 8 Food Prep, 15 Drinking/Dining/Serving, 2 Special

Figure 25. CC-3 Small Finds by Zone

**CC 3 SMALL FINDS BY ZONE**

- **Back-Right (Cuts 6 and 7)**
- **Front-Right (Cut 4)**
- **Back-Center (Cut 5)**
- **Front-Center (Cut 3)**
- **Back-Left (Cut 2)**
- **Front-Left (Cut 1)**
Figure 26. Gordion 2014, Area 2: Early Phrygian Trash Pit (Period B1), Number of Individual Specimens of Major Contributors by Phase.

Source: Janine van Noorden, Faunal Report, 2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Caprids</th>
<th>Cattle</th>
<th>Pig</th>
<th>NISP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A: Terrace Fill</td>
<td>61.1%</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1: Early Phrygian</td>
<td>54.2%</td>
<td>24.8%</td>
<td>20.9%</td>
<td>660</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2: EIA &amp; Early Phrygian</td>
<td>57.4%</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
<td>20.4%</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CD: Early Bronze Age</td>
<td>80.2%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 27. Gordion 2014, Area 2: Early Phrygian Trash Pit (Period B1), Distribution ovis NISP.

Source: Janine van Noorden, Faunal Report, 2014

---

Figure 6: Distribution ovis NISP, applying the method of Helmer, Courichon and Vila [2007]
Figure 28. TB-7A

Figure 29. CC-3
Figure 30. Architect’s plan of Early Phrygian Gordion
pre-TB-8, TB-7A, CC-3 excavations:
from left, CC-1–2; TB-1–7; Megarons 1–4; Megarons 9, 10, 12
Figure 31a–b. Plans of the Early Phrygian Destruction Level
Figure 32. Early Iron Age Gordion.
Clockwise from L: the BRH, WFL, CKD, and SSH Structures
(SSH, at bottom, is two rooms)
Source: Voigt and Henrickson 2000a, Fig. 3, p. 43

Figure 33a–b. EPB before (L) and after (R) modifications
Source: Young 1966, Figs. 17 and 16
Figure 34. Early Monumental 1 Plan.

Author: Lucas Stephens
Figure 35. Early Monumental 2 Plan

Author: Lucas Stephens
Figure 36. Pre-Terrace Plan.

Author: Lucas Stephens
Figure 37. Terrace 1 Plan.

Author: Lucas Stephens
Figure 38. Terrace 2 Plan.
Author: Lucas Stephens
Figure 39. Unfinished Project Plan.

Author: Lucas Stephens
# APPENDIX 1: CC-3 MAIN ROOM CERAMIC INVENTORY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POT #</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>SIZE</th>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
<th>REG #</th>
<th>SAMS TYPE/REG AS</th>
<th>FUNCTION</th>
<th>CAPACITY</th>
<th>CUT #</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>large reddish storage pot</td>
<td>Large</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Storage</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>143</td>
<td>small round-mouth storage pot with rolled rim</td>
<td>Small</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Storage</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>144</td>
<td>fairly large polished jug with doubled handle, incised double wavy line on body.</td>
<td>Large</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>145</td>
<td>large bowl with modified ring base, strongly carinated rim</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>146</td>
<td>part of lid (?) with knob on which a “star of David” pattern is incised</td>
<td></td>
<td>11278 P 4658</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>apparently a large trefoil jug; white slip.</td>
<td>Large</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>base of large reddish storage pot</td>
<td>Large</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Storage</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>base of similar pot (to 3), next to it</td>
<td>Large</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Storage</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Size</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>bowl with shallow ring base</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>large red-ware storage pot</td>
<td>Large</td>
<td>Storage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>a similar pot to 6, to its immediate south</td>
<td>Large</td>
<td>Storage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>an apparently distinct large pot to the immediate southeast of 7.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>a large red storage jar</td>
<td>Large</td>
<td>Storage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>a white-slipped jug</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td><em>(no description)</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>probably a storage pot</td>
<td>Large</td>
<td>Storage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>small bowl with inturned rim</td>
<td></td>
<td>Dining</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>a flat, squat globular jug</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ambiguous Jugs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>a small chytra-like jug</td>
<td>Small</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>a thin, brown-ware round-mouthed jug</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 bis</td>
<td>second small jug with biconical body, ring foot</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>a thick bowl (?)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Dining</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Size</td>
<td>Remarks</td>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Quantity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>a badly burned jug (?)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>a smallish red storage pot (?)</td>
<td>probably much like pot 20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Storage (?)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>a jug on its side</td>
<td>Flat base, round mouth</td>
<td>11030 P 4517 red one-handled cooking pot</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cooking</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>a &quot;neckless&quot; trefoil jug</td>
<td>11243 P 4640 fragmentary small wide-mouthed trefoil jug</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>small strainer jug</td>
<td>11308 P 4678 fragmentary buff sieve-spouted jug</td>
<td>Drinking; Special</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>broad round-mouthed jug, with red gritty fabric</td>
<td>Fairly large Very similar to 20</td>
<td>11061 P 4528 red one-handled cooking pot</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cooking</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>bowl with sharply carinated rim</td>
<td>11053 P 4523 no desc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>badly burned large pot</td>
<td>Large</td>
<td>large confused mass of apparent tumble (maybe multiple pots)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>another large pot</td>
<td>Large</td>
<td>Atop pots 100, 101</td>
<td></td>
<td>Storage</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>a very large storage pot</td>
<td>Very large</td>
<td>Ledge-rimmed Lightly raised bands on body</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>bowl with carinated rim</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>a small jug, round-mouthed</td>
<td>Small</td>
<td>painted</td>
<td>11029 P 4516 Round-Mouthed Jugs, Small and Medium-Sized</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>round-mouthed, high necked jug with squat globular body</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11028 P 4515 buff round-mouthed jug</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 bis</td>
<td>round-mouthed, high necked jug with squat globular body</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11031 P 4518 buff round-mouthed jug</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Quantity</td>
<td>Location/Reference</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>red-fabric pot</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>jug (?), flat-based</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>pinch pot</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>held knucklebones</td>
<td>11011 P 4503 Crude Handmade Pottery</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>red polished lid</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Inside 35</td>
<td>held whorls, pot 33 w/knucklebones, pots 34, 36, and 37, some iron implements (fork, awl, knife, ivory handle, iron needles), doughnuts (? 8)</td>
<td>11106 P 4546 Bowls with Articulated Rims</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>large red pot on its side</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>pinch pot</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Inside 35</td>
<td></td>
<td>11010 P 4502 pinch pot</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>pinch pot</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Inside 35</td>
<td></td>
<td>11108 P 4548 small handmade pot</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>small round-mouthed jug with short neck</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>badly burned</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>high above floor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>139</td>
<td>bowl with upturned rim</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11365 P 4704 fragmentary buff bowl</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>140</td>
<td>large mixing bowl with dinos profile</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>4 vertical strap handles with knob on each and knob above</td>
<td>11255 P 4652 Miscellaneous Amphoras</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>large badly burned storage jar</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>plastic animal head (lion) protome; 4-pronged plastic ornament; raised ridges on body; ledged rim</td>
<td>11146 P 4564 a-c Wide-Mouthed Storage Jars</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>large short-necked trefoil jug</td>
<td>Large</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>round-mouthed jug</td>
<td>high neck; squat globular body; disc base</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>badly burned painted jug</td>
<td>11282 P 4662</td>
<td>Ambiguous Jugs</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>pinch pot</td>
<td>11033 P 4519</td>
<td>Crude Handmade Pottery</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>brown-ware jug</td>
<td>“squat-globular” body; low tapering ring foot</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Red-ware large jug or the like</td>
<td>On the floor</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>a large jug (?)</td>
<td>On the floor; very badly burned.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>A red-ware (?) fairly coarse jug; handmade; small cooking pot type</td>
<td>Cooking</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>jug similar to the above (47); small cooking pot type</td>
<td>Cooking</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>light-colored jug</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>badly burned red-ware storage pot or the like</td>
<td>Spindle whorl inside 13 more whorls nearby—spilled out?</td>
<td>Storage</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>brown ware, perhaps a jug, represented only by part of its base</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>base of a jug or the like</td>
<td>Raised ridges at base of neck; disc base; among assorted sherds</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Size</td>
<td>Details</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>a large badly scorched round-mouthed jug</td>
<td>Large</td>
<td>contained hazelnuts (73-BOT-11), 3 spindle whorls, piece of cloth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11441 P 4766</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>large black/red round-mouthed jug</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>a crushed red-ware trefoil jug</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>a handmade round-mouthed jug</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>a pot in the mouth of which pot 55 rests</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>fine painted jug</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11135 P 4553</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Side-Spouted Sieve Jugs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Drinking; Special</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>trefoil jug, crushed and partly burned</td>
<td>Fairly</td>
<td>contained bent iron blade</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>large</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>large storage pot</td>
<td>Large</td>
<td>Ledge-rimmed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Storage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>dark-faced round-mouthed jug, painted</td>
<td>checkerboard design</td>
<td>11148 P 4566</td>
<td>Ambiguous Vessels, Miscellaneous</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>large tumbled jug (?)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>small storage pot</td>
<td>Ledge-rimmed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Storage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>fine painted trefoil jug</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11069 P 4534</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Narrow-Necked Trefoil Jugs, Small and Medium-Sized</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>small brown-ware jug</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>fairly large red-ware pot, probably a storage pot</td>
<td>Large</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Storage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>small brown-ware pot</td>
<td>Crushed under 66</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>small biconical jug</td>
<td>Crushed under 66</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Notes</th>
<th>Storage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>large trefoil jug</td>
<td>Needle inside (11039 ILS 705)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>very fragmentary storage pot</td>
<td></td>
<td>Storage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>large jug, apparently very like 69</td>
<td>8 spindle whorls and an iron needle inside (11040 ILS 706)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>large crushed storage pot with vertical strap handles</td>
<td></td>
<td>Storage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>small strainer jug</td>
<td>11306 P 4676 buff sieve-spouted jug</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>badly crushed quite large trefoil jug</td>
<td>Large</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>bowl with flat base lying upside down</td>
<td>Scraps of unburned cloth found inside; also iron knife, 2-3 needles</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>large crushed pot</td>
<td>Large</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>quite large trefoil jug</td>
<td>Large</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>trefoil jug similar to 77</td>
<td>Large</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>large trefoil jug</td>
<td>Beside 77 &amp; 78 11225 P 4622 buff globular trefoil jug</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>large similar pot to 79 (trefoil)</td>
<td>Below it, large circular zone of burned barley (73-BOT-3)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>very large storage pot</td>
<td>wide-mouthed; ledge-rimmed; raised ridges on neck</td>
<td>Storage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>tumbled jug</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Remarks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>small jug (?)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>very fragmentary small jug</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>bowl with a low ring base</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85 bis</td>
<td>no description</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>badly smashed, quite large jug, probably trefoil</td>
<td>Large</td>
<td>iron needle among sherds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>badly scorched and smashed flat-based jug, quite large</td>
<td>Large</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>small round-mouthed jug</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>small red-ware biconical jug with conical base</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>storage pot, badly burned, with grooved neck</td>
<td>Ledge-rimmed</td>
<td>Storage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
<td>flat-based jug</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>fairly small trefoil jug with conical base</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td>quite large flat-based jug</td>
<td>Large</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>another similar to 94</td>
<td>Large</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96</td>
<td>quite large jug, white-slipped and trefoil-lipped</td>
<td>Large</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97</td>
<td>small red ware jug with conical base, “squat globular” body</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98</td>
<td>small jug with ring base</td>
<td></td>
<td>Storage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td>small pinch pot</td>
<td></td>
<td>pinch pot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td>storage jar; ridges on neck; broad mouthed</td>
<td>White slip; mouth D. of ca. 26m.; ledged rim; vertical handles; inside, much straw? 73-BOT-12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103</td>
<td>quite large storage jar</td>
<td>vertical handles; raised ridges on neck; ledged rim</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104</td>
<td>fairly large globular trefoil jug</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>small coarse ware pot</td>
<td>Under 26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>pinch pot</td>
<td>Under 26; inside 100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101 bis</td>
<td>thick, large bowl</td>
<td>Mixed with pot 80 11195 P 4592 bowl (buff/gray)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>large, burned jug, trefoil</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106</td>
<td>red ware storage pot</td>
<td>Ledge-rimmed, very broad mouth of ca. 27 m.; vertical strap handles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106 bis</td>
<td>storage jar</td>
<td>Burnt to the point of vitrification</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
<td>a jug?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108</td>
<td>a badly burned jug, apparently</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123</td>
<td>pinch pot</td>
<td>among group of 19 &quot;doughnuts&quot; 11055 P 4525 Crude Handmade Pottery</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Size</td>
<td>Remarks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109</td>
<td>upside-down base with hole through its middle</td>
<td>.13 m. in diameter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>small brown jug, perhaps trefoil; handmade</td>
<td>Small</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111</td>
<td>white-slipped trefoil jug</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
<td>a fairly coarse round-mouth (?) red-ware jug</td>
<td>beneath “stream of sherds”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113</td>
<td>pinch pot</td>
<td>inside pot 112</td>
<td>11067 P 4532</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114</td>
<td>biconical jug, round mouth</td>
<td>needle at bottom</td>
<td>11303 P 4673</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>another biconical jug</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116</td>
<td>similar biconical jug to 115</td>
<td>poorer fabric than 115</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117</td>
<td>Trefoil jug</td>
<td>beneath pot 40</td>
<td>11241 P 4638</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118</td>
<td>bowl with inturned rim</td>
<td>near pot 59</td>
<td>11188 P 4585</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119</td>
<td>fairly coarse (?) jug</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>biconical round-mouthed jug</td>
<td>Badly burned, H. .11 m., mouth D. .096</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121</td>
<td>a very fragmentary, apparently similar jug to 120</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122</td>
<td>fragmentary small squat globular jug with raised zigzag</td>
<td>Small</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123</td>
<td>badly burned squat globular jug</td>
<td>D. .125 inside post hole Row 2 #5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124</td>
<td>small fine round-mouthed jug</td>
<td>Small</td>
<td>.072 high inside post hole Row 2 #5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125</td>
<td>large storage pot (?) with horn (?) handles</td>
<td>Large</td>
<td>Fragmentary Found high above floor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125 bis</td>
<td>large storage pot with flat outturned rim</td>
<td>Large</td>
<td>Max D. .40 Found high above floor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>126</td>
<td>fairly large red-ware jug</td>
<td>Large</td>
<td>Found high above floor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>127</td>
<td>slim coarse buff amphora</td>
<td>.30 m. high, .15 D</td>
<td>11205 P 4602 Miscellaneous Amphoras</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>141</td>
<td>pithos or the like with stamped lozenges</td>
<td></td>
<td>11311 P 4681 Ambiguous Storage Jars</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>141 bis</td>
<td>pithos or the like with stamped circles</td>
<td></td>
<td>11310 P 4680 stamped pithos sherd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>142</td>
<td>storage jar with ridges on neck, double cylindrical handle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128</td>
<td>light-slipped storage pot</td>
<td>Not far above floor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>129</td>
<td>trefoil jug, light-slipped</td>
<td>Just above floor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130</td>
<td>storage pot with ridges on neck</td>
<td>Just above floor Ledge-rimmed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131</td>
<td>hole-mouthed cooking pot with out-turned rim, very burned</td>
<td></td>
<td>Five grooves around shoulder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131 bis</td>
<td>small jug</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>132</td>
<td>strainer jug</td>
<td>11217 P 4614 gray round-mouthed jug</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Location/Type</td>
<td>Quantity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>133</td>
<td>an apparently complete cooking pot toppled on its side</td>
<td>11137 P 4555 One-Handled Utility Pots</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>134</td>
<td>upright complete “compressed globular” trefoil jug</td>
<td>11121 P 4550 Wide-Mouthed Trefoil Jugs</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>135</td>
<td>apparently a light-slipped trefoil jug</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>136</td>
<td>large trefoil jug</td>
<td>inside is found “ball of thread preparatory to weave</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>137</td>
<td>ring base of squat biconical jug</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>138</td>
<td>tiny jug (miniature round-mouthed jug)</td>
<td>11068 P 4533 Round-Mouthed Jugs, Small and Medium-Sized</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>139</td>
<td>Fine red-polished bowl on rather high flaring base. Carinated rim.</td>
<td>11196 P 4593 footed red bowl</td>
<td>Dining</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>148</td>
<td>Lid. Rather coarse loop handle on top. Quite flat.</td>
<td>11244 P 4641 coarse buff lid</td>
<td>Storage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>149</td>
<td>large reddish storage pot contains wheat (73-BOT-4); triticum durum?; base D. .25</td>
<td></td>
<td>Storage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150</td>
<td>small brown-polished jug</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>151</td>
<td>small flat-based jug, apparently trefoil</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>152</td>
<td>badly burned small round-mouthed jug with conical base smashed by fall of timber 22</td>
<td>11213 P 4610</td>
<td>buff/black round-mouthed jug</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>153</td>
<td>amphora with flat base, two vertical handles</td>
<td>11203 P 4600</td>
<td>red shoulder amphora</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>154</td>
<td>amphora, white-slipped, with two vertical handles</td>
<td>11206 P 4603</td>
<td>Narrow-Necked Amphoras</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>154 bis</td>
<td>small storage (?) pot Outturned flattish rim, neck ridging</td>
<td>11364 P 4703</td>
<td>coarse rim and neck fragment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>155</td>
<td>jug with out-turned flat rim</td>
<td>11182 P 4579</td>
<td>Necked Jars</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>155 bis</td>
<td>No description</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>156</td>
<td>badly smashed red ware storage pot with ridges on its neck</td>
<td>Ledge-rimmed</td>
<td>Storage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>157</td>
<td>Small amphora upright on floor</td>
<td>11204 P 4601</td>
<td>Narrow-Necked Amphoras</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>158</td>
<td>perhaps a jug</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>159</td>
<td>Large trefoil jug with “double cylinder” handle</td>
<td>11230 P 4627</td>
<td>buff globular trefoil jug</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>160</td>
<td>fairly large storage pot with vertical strap handles</td>
<td>Ledge-rimmed</td>
<td>Storage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>161</td>
<td>trefoil jug</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>162</td>
<td>“perhaps a jug”</td>
<td>11207 P 4604</td>
<td>red globular jar with lugs at rim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>163</td>
<td>round-mouthed jar, painted</td>
<td>11184 P 4581</td>
<td>Low-Necked Jars and Dinoi, Large</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Object Code</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>164</td>
<td>jug with strap handle, white-slipped, rather large</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>165</td>
<td>once again perhaps a jug</td>
<td>Animal bone</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>166</td>
<td>rather large pinch pot</td>
<td>11158 P 4572</td>
<td>pinch pot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>167</td>
<td>rather coarse large bowl with a strangely carinated rim</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>168</td>
<td>badly burned large jug with a “double-cylinder” handle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>169</td>
<td>badly burned and fragmentary jug</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>170</td>
<td>storage jar</td>
<td>Storage</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>171</td>
<td>bowl with ribbed inturned rim</td>
<td>11192 P 4589</td>
<td>Bowls with Articulated Rims</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>172</td>
<td>tumbled trefoil jug</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>173</td>
<td>short-necked storage jar with incised double lines on its shoulder (wave pattern)</td>
<td>wheat inside</td>
<td>11281 P 4661 fragmentary red amphora</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>174</td>
<td>perhaps a large jug</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>175</td>
<td>large trefoil jug Large bones inside (sheep?)</td>
<td>11229 P 4626</td>
<td>Narrow-Necked Trefoil Jugs, Large</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>176</td>
<td>large trefoil jug Large also w/animal bones</td>
<td>11231 P 4628</td>
<td>red globular trefoil jug</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>177</td>
<td>small and perhaps intact trefoil jug long, broken iron needle inside</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Size</td>
<td>Details</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>178</td>
<td>bowl lying face down</td>
<td></td>
<td>When turned over, much cloth is found adhering; also spindle whorl, much bone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>179</td>
<td>large trefoil jug with ridge at the base of its neck</td>
<td>Large</td>
<td>lentils and/or chickpeas inside (73-BOT-2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>180</td>
<td>badly smashed small jug or the like</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>181</td>
<td>another jug, badly burned</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>182</td>
<td>storage pot with vertical strap handles.</td>
<td></td>
<td>on shoulder, pot 247; inside, pot 250 – a jug containing a whorl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>183</td>
<td>trefoil jug</td>
<td>Large</td>
<td>barley-like grain inside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>184</td>
<td>apparently another large jug, probably trefoil</td>
<td>Large</td>
<td>sherdS of another larger storage jar found underneath (245 bis)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>185</td>
<td>perhaps another large jug</td>
<td>Large</td>
<td>= 194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>186</td>
<td>jug</td>
<td></td>
<td>Tumbled on its side, against west wall; fibula (11454 B 2006) and “enigmatic” t.c. plaque (11116 MC 303) inside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>187</td>
<td>small brown polished biconical</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>188</td>
<td>jug, probably round-mouthed</td>
<td>large storage jar</td>
<td>vertical strap handles, ridges on its neck, ledged rim; inside, 189 and 190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>189</td>
<td>intact handmade mug</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>190</td>
<td>handmade mug with missing handle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>191</td>
<td>coarse red jug with cooking pot profile, small, badly smashed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>192</td>
<td>storage jar</td>
<td></td>
<td>vertical strap handles and ridges (quite high and pronounced) on the neck; bowl inside 192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>193</td>
<td>badly burned bowl with carinated rim</td>
<td></td>
<td>inside 192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>194</td>
<td>storage jar</td>
<td>= 185</td>
<td>Storage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>195</td>
<td>smashed storage pot</td>
<td></td>
<td>doughnuts inside? (33)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>196</td>
<td>small biconical round-mouthed jug with a conical base</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>197</td>
<td>large trefoil jug</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>198</td>
<td>large storage jar</td>
<td></td>
<td>broad-mouthed with ledged rim; 2 vertical strap handles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Catalog</td>
<td>Type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>199</td>
<td>carinated bowl, inside 198</td>
<td>11193 P 4590</td>
<td>burned bowl (yellow/black)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200</td>
<td>large trefoil jug</td>
<td>11228 P 4625</td>
<td>buff globular trefoil jug</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201</td>
<td>another large jug</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>202</td>
<td>large jug, apparently trefoil, ca. .33 high</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>203</td>
<td>large red jug</td>
<td>11386 P 4718</td>
<td>buff globular trefoil jug</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>203 bis</td>
<td>small handleless jar</td>
<td>11212 P 4609</td>
<td>Low-Necked Jars and Dinoi, Large</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>204</td>
<td>small intact trefoil jug</td>
<td>11141 P 4559</td>
<td>small red polished trefoil jug</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>205</td>
<td>a fine bowl</td>
<td>11191 P 4588</td>
<td>red burnished bowl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>206</td>
<td>one-handled cooking pot</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>207</td>
<td>small trefoil jug</td>
<td>11144 P 4562</td>
<td>small red polished trefoil jug</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>208</td>
<td>small round-mouthed jug</td>
<td>by pot 158</td>
<td>small red round-mouthed jug</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>209</td>
<td>broad-mouthed jug, wavy line on shoulder</td>
<td>by pot 162</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>210</td>
<td>small round-mouthed jug</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>211</td>
<td>small round-mouthed jug</td>
<td>.065 m. in D.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>212</td>
<td>larger round-mouthed jug</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>213</td>
<td>small jug (?)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>214</td>
<td>1 of 4 large jugs on floors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>215</td>
<td>1 of 4 large jugs on floors</td>
<td></td>
<td>constricted neck</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>303</td>
<td>fine painted jug</td>
<td>mixed with 214, 215</td>
<td>11187 P 4584</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>216</td>
<td>1 of 4 large jugs on floors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Category</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>217</td>
<td>1 of 4 large jugs on floors</td>
<td>beneath it, large iron blade (11362 ILS 740)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>218</td>
<td>large jug or storage pot</td>
<td></td>
<td>Storage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>219</td>
<td>large jug or storage pot</td>
<td></td>
<td>Storage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>220</td>
<td>large jug or storage pot</td>
<td></td>
<td>Storage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>221</td>
<td>large jug or storage pot</td>
<td></td>
<td>Storage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>222</td>
<td>large jug or storage pot</td>
<td>Beneath it, two iron chisels (11363 ILS 741), bone shuttle, spindle whorl</td>
<td>Storage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>223</td>
<td>large jug or storage pot</td>
<td></td>
<td>Storage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>224</td>
<td>cooking pot shape</td>
<td>11220 P 4617 one-handled cooking pot</td>
<td>Cooking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>224 bis</td>
<td>cooking pot</td>
<td>11221 P 4618 one-handled cooking pot</td>
<td>Cooking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>225</td>
<td>small pinch pot</td>
<td>11157 P 4571 buff pinch pot</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>226</td>
<td>large trefoil jug</td>
<td>11233 P 4630 Narrow-Necked Trefoil Jugs, Large</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>227</td>
<td>tumbled open-mouthed (?) pot</td>
<td>Contained knucklebones; spindle whorl, and 15 outside may have spilled from it (11374 MC 308); iron knife, iron needle, whetstone (11377 ST 816)</td>
<td>Necked Jars</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>228</td>
<td>small jug with low ring base</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>229</td>
<td>badly smashed jug</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>230</td>
<td>small round-mouthed jug</td>
<td>nestled by 227</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>231</td>
<td>small trefoil jug</td>
<td>11240 P 4637</td>
<td>Narrow-Necked Trefoil Jugs, Small and Medium-Sized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>232</td>
<td>small jug, round-mouthed, biconical, near 207 zigzag decoration</td>
<td>11209 P 4606</td>
<td>footed red round-mouthed jug</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>233</td>
<td>painted pot</td>
<td>Large 11185 P 4582</td>
<td>warped painted jar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>234</td>
<td>small broken jug</td>
<td>11208 P 4605</td>
<td>squat buff jar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>235</td>
<td>large trefoil jug</td>
<td>Large 11224 P 4621</td>
<td>creamy buff globular jar; trefoil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>236</td>
<td>large and very badly smashed jug – amphora?</td>
<td>Large 11211 P 4608</td>
<td>Narrow-Necked Amphoras</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>237</td>
<td>still another jug</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>238</td>
<td>jug</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>239</td>
<td>small jug, biconical body, flaring ring foot</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>240</td>
<td>tumbled and smashed fairly large jug</td>
<td>Large</td>
<td>iron knife underneath (or in) it</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>241</td>
<td>smashed small jug</td>
<td>next to 174</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>242</td>
<td>very fine small trefoil jug</td>
<td>set of 5 bronze &amp; iron needles upright inside 11151 P 4569</td>
<td>Narrow-Necked Trefoil Jugs, Small and Medium-Sized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>243</td>
<td>small coarse pot or mug</td>
<td>11372 P 4711</td>
<td>Crude Handmade Pottery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>244</td>
<td>badly smashed jug</td>
<td>11372 P 4711</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>245</td>
<td>round-mouthed brown-polished jug</td>
<td>11242 P 4639</td>
<td>small brown wide-mouthed trefoil jug</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>245 bis</td>
<td>large storage jar/amphora</td>
<td>ca. .335 m. in D. at rim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>246</td>
<td>No desc.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>247</td>
<td>jug on shoulder of very large storage jar 182</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>249</td>
<td>Parts of several large jugs picked up together</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>250* 248?</td>
<td>jug inside very large storage jar 182</td>
<td>found inside pot 182; inside it, a spindle whorl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>250</td>
<td>jug or storage pot</td>
<td>Chaff from husks of hulled barley found inside it (73-BOT-6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>251</td>
<td>small, probably round-mouthed jug</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>252</td>
<td>small pinch pot</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>252 bis</td>
<td>biconical round-mouthed jug with conical base</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>253</td>
<td>small biconical brown-ware jug</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>254</td>
<td>yellow-brown plate with incurved rim, low ring base</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>254 bis</td>
<td>second bowl w/254</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>255</td>
<td>fragmentary “brown-polished” small biconical jug with ring foot</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>256</td>
<td>fragmentary one-handed cooking pot</td>
<td>By timber 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>257</td>
<td>Bowl with conical base, flaring carinated rim</td>
<td>11194 P 4591</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>258</td>
<td>Painted jug</td>
<td>11277 P 4657</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>259</td>
<td>Painted storage jar or the like with ledged rim</td>
<td>upright on floor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>260</td>
<td>Pinch pot</td>
<td>Found full of grain (wheat); lying in patch of loose wheat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>262</td>
<td>Pinch pot</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>304</td>
<td>black-polished bowl with carinated strongly flaring rim</td>
<td>11198 P 4595</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>263</td>
<td>reddish painted jug</td>
<td>Frags collected together with pot 258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>264</td>
<td>fairly large storage pot or jug</td>
<td>Large</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>265</td>
<td>large white-slipped trefoil jug with a “double cylinder” handle</td>
<td>upright on floor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>266</td>
<td>Bowl with low ring base, lightly incurved rim</td>
<td>upside down on floor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>267</td>
<td>large wide-mouthed storage pot</td>
<td>Large</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>268</td>
<td>Red bowl with conical base and strongly carinated rim</td>
<td>11197 P 4594</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>269</td>
<td>A bowl apparently similar to 268</td>
<td>11199 P 4596</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>270</td>
<td>pinch pot</td>
<td>Upright on floor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>271</td>
<td>pinch pot</td>
<td>11160 P 4574</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>272</td>
<td>pinch pot</td>
<td>11245 P 4642</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>273</td>
<td>bowl with slightly swollen rim</td>
<td>upright just above the floor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>274</td>
<td>bowl very similar to 273</td>
<td>just above the floor, but it is upside down.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>275</td>
<td>large, badly smashed trefoil jug</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>276</td>
<td>badly smashed jug with its base up</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>277</td>
<td>probably a jug; lying on its side</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>278</td>
<td>small biconical and probably round-mouthed jug</td>
<td>11215 P 4612</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>279</td>
<td>small biconical trefoil jug</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>280</td>
<td>a bowl, with a conical base lying on its top</td>
<td>in “stream of sherds”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>281</td>
<td>fairly large trefoil jug</td>
<td>beneath “stream of sherds”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>282</td>
<td>large jug with flat base</td>
<td>Cluster w/283 and 284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>283</td>
<td>large jug similar to 282</td>
<td>Cluster w/282 and 284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>284</td>
<td>storage jar or the like with a ridged neck</td>
<td>Cluster w/282 and 283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>285</td>
<td>Large storage pot, broad-mouthed, ledged rim</td>
<td>Group of 18 doughnuts around and spilled into it On floor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>286</td>
<td>fragmentary small jug with flat base and biconical body</td>
<td>On its side</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>287</td>
<td>very fragmentary jug or the like</td>
<td>Just above floor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>288</td>
<td>Storage pot: amphora with ledge rim, ridges on neck, double-cylinder handles</td>
<td>On its side</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>289</td>
<td>fairly small jug of the cooking pot type</td>
<td>On its side</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>290</td>
<td>cooking pot like 289</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>291</td>
<td>Fine painted jug with ridge on neck, out-turned rim</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>292</td>
<td>Fine small trefoil jug with zigzag pattern in champ-levé around shoulder</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>293</td>
<td>Broad-mouthed storage jar</td>
<td>Upright along the south wall. Max. D. of ca. 0.45 m.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

289
| 294 | a storage pot |  | Storage | 7 |
| 295 | small round-mouthed jug | Inside, considerable amount of lemmas (husks) peeled from grain of hulled barley | 11214 P 4611 | small footed red round-mouthed jug | Same type as Sams #530/P3286 | 7 |
| 296 | large white-slipped trefoil jug | toppled on its side | 11235 P 4632 | red globular trefoil jug | 10,810 | 7 |
| 297 | large trefoil jug identical to 296 | upright | 11226 P 4623 | Narrow-Necked Trefoil Jugs, Large | 10,810 | 7 |
| 298 | badly smashed and fragmentary storage pot with ridges on neck |  |  |  |  | 7 |
| 299 | fragmentary jug, probably trefoil |  |  |  |  | 7 |
| 300 | trefoil jug | 11232 P 4629 | buff globular trefoil jug |  |  | 7 |
| 301 | storage jar, with tabs projecting from its rim | lies tumbled above floor; rope-decorated |  | Storage | 7 |
| 302 | jug or storage pot |  | Storage | 7 |
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