

SCHLIEMANN'S EXCAVATIONS AT TROY

1870-1873

by

Donald Fyfe Easton

Thesis submitted for the degree
of PhD, at the Institute of Archaeology,
University College, London, 1989



ABSTRACT

This study is based on Schliemann's unpublished Troy excavation note books from 1870-73. It attempts to reconstruct his activities, to locate and identify the features he found, and to stratify and date the several thousand objects he recorded. There is some degree of synthesis with the later findings of Dörpfeld and Blegen, and a review, in the light of all these findings, of the chronology of the Bronze Age strata. The study covers all periods from Early Bronze Age to Byzantine, and all classes of material.

A reconstructed contour-plan permits a new and closer understanding of Schliemann's progress. Fifty-two areas of work are distinguished in each of which an outline stratigraphy can be reconstructed. Objects are assigned to specific strata, although Schliemann's frequent failure to specify from which trench which objects came can inject varying degrees of uncertainty into the operation.

The sequence of fortifications on the North side of the site is greatly clarified, especially for Troy II and VI. Buildings in the citadel interior are more closely dated, and the sequence in Troy II is substantially re-organised to allow for at least twelve building-phases. The earth-movements supposed to have demolished Troy VI are unlikely to have antedated late VIIa.

Troy I-II.4 belong to EBII (c.3000-2465); wheelmade plates and one-handled tankards first appear in II.1. Troy II.5-III belong to EBIII (c.2465-2005); two-handled cups and tankards appear in II.5 after an increase of wheelmade plain ware in II.4. Troy III is contemporary with early Middle Helladic. Troy IV-V belong to the Anatolian Middle Bronze Age (c.2005-1712), and VI-VII are purely Late Bronze Age (c.1712-1070). VIh was destroyed c.1270(?), probably around the end of LHIIIB1, and VIIa was destroyed c.1190(?) during LHIIIC.

CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF FIGURES	8
LIST OF TABLES	13
ABBREVIATIONS	14
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	21
INTRODUCTION	23
I. TROY BEFORE SCHLIEMANN	25
Travellers' Observations, c.565-1784 A.D.	26
Survey Results, 1784-1853	29
First Excavations, 1855-1865	37
Reconstruction of the Mound before Excavation	46
Footnotes	57
II. THE DOCUMENTARY SOURCES	65
Range and Extent of the Sources	66
The Question of Schliemann's Reliability	76
Footnotes	81
III. THE HISTORY OF THE EXCAVATIONS	87
1870	88
1871	89
1872	95
1st-25th April	95
1st-11th May	98
12th-22nd May	104
23rd May-18th June	105
19th June-13th July	110
13th July-4th August	115
5th-9th August	120
15th-16th September	121
1873	122
2nd-23rd February	122
24th February-6th March	127
7th-15th March	130
17th-22nd March	132
24th-29th March	134
31st March-5th April	134
7th-16th April	136
17th April-10th May	137
10th-24th May	142
26th May-14th June	145
Footnotes	150
IV. THE RESULTS OF THE EXCAVATIONS	169
Preface	170
The Northeast Trench	184
Area i, GH 2-3	190
Area ii, GH 2-4(a)	192
Area iii, GH 2-4(b)	198
Area iv, FGH 3-4(a)	202
Area v, FGH 3-4(b)	206

	Page
The North Platform	210
Area i, CDEF 2-3	219
Area ii, CDEF 3	232
Area iii, F3	240
Area iv, F3-4(a)	241
Area v, F3-4(b)	249
Area vi, DE 3	253
Area vii, CD 3-4	254
Area viii, DE 3-4(a)	260
Area ix, DE 3-4(b)	264
The North-South Trench: Northern Sector	267
Area i, D5	273
Area ii, CD 3-5	275
Area iii, CD 4	282
Area iv, D5-6	300
Area v, D4-6	302
Area vi, D3-4-5	311
Area vii, E4-5	312
The North-South Trench: Southern Sector	315
Area i, CD 8-9(a)	320
Area ii, CD 8-9(b)	322
Area iii, CDE 7-8	323
The North-South Trench: Central Sector	336
Area i, DE 6-7	340
Area ii, CDE 6-7(a)	358
Area iii, CDE 6-7(b)	364
The Southeast Trench	365
Area i, HJ 8	369
Area ii, H7-8	372
Area iii, GHJ 7-8	376
Area iv, GH 6-7	380
The East-West Trench	382
Area i, EFGH 6-7(a)	388
Area ii, EFGH 6-7(b)	390
Area iii, EF 6-7(a)	396
Area iv, EF 6-7(b)	402
Area v, EF 7	405
Area vi, G7(a)	414
Area vii, EF 6-7(c)	417
Area viii, E6	421
Area ix, G7(b)	421
The Northwest Trench	422
Area i, AB 4-5(a)	427
Area ii, AB 4-5(b)	430
Area iii, AB 4-5(c)	434
The West Trench	438
Area i, AB 5-6(a)	442
Area ii, AB 5-6(b)	445
The Western Area	448
Area i, C5	455
Area ii, C6(a)	455
Area iii, C6(b)	457
Area iv, CD 5-6(a)	461
Area v, CD 5-6(b)	474
Area vi, BC 5-6	486
The Northeast Slope, HJ 1-2	502

	Page
V. A SUMMARY OF THE FINDINGS AND THEIR SIGNIFICANCE	504
Part I: THE STRUCTURE OF THE MOUND	505
Footnotes to Part I	508
Part II: TROY I-V - THE EARLY AND MIDDLE BRONZE AGE	509
Architecture	509
Pottery	525
Metalwork and Metalworking	592
Bone Artefacts	599
Ground and Polished Stone Artefacts	601
Chipped Stone Tools	605
Figurines	606
Seals	608
Weights	609
Miscellaneous Objects of Terracotta	610
Human Remains	611
Animal Remains	615
Plant Remains	616
Footnotes to Part II	619
Part III: TROY VI-VII - THE LATE BRONZE AGE	638
Architecture	638
Pottery	644
Metalwork	649
Stone Artefacts	651
Bone Artefact	652
Small Finds of Terracotta	652
Figurines	653
Human Remains	653
Animal Remains	654
Plant Remains	655
Footnotes to Part III	657
Part IV: TROY VIII-IX - THE ARCHAIC, CLASSICAL, HELLENISTIC AND ROMAN PERIODS	664
Architecture	664
Architectural Fragments	668
Pottery	669
Metalwork	669
Other Small Finds	671
Terracotta Figurines	672
Sculptures	676
Inscriptions	676
Coins	677
Human Remains	684
Animal Remains	685
Plant Remains	685
Footnotes to Part IV	687
Part V: THE BYZANTINE PERIOD	694
Footnotes to Part V	696
Part VI: CHRONOLOGY OF THE BRONZE AGE STRATA	697
Troy I-V	697
Troy VI-VII	717
Footnotes to Part VI	724

	Page
INDICES	735
I. Index of Features	736
II. Index of Objects Illustrated in Schliemann's Diaries, 1872-73	742
III. Index of Objects Illustrated in the <u>Atlas</u>	787
IV. Index of Objects Illustrated in <u>Troy and Its Remains</u>	817
V. Index of Objects Illustrated in <u>Ilios</u>	822
VI. Index of Objects in Schmidt's Catalogue	831

TABLES I-XXXIII

FIGURES I.1 - V.60

SUBSIDIARY MATTER SUBMITTED IN SUPPORT OF THE THESIS

1. "The Schliemann Papers", BSA 77 (1982) 93-110.
2. "Schliemann's Discovery of Priam's Treasure: two enigmas", Antiquity 55 (1981) 179-83.
3. "Schliemann's Mendacity: A False Trail?", Antiquity 58 (1984) 197-204.
4. "Priam's Treasure", Anatolian Studies 34 (1984) 141-69.
5. "Hittite History and the Trojan War", in The Trojan War: Its Historicity and Context, ed. L. Foxhall, J.K. Davies (Bristol 1985) 23-44.
6. "Has the Trojan War been found?", Antiquity 59 (1985) 188-96.
7. Review of L. Deuel, Memoirs of Heinrich Schliemann, in Bull. Inst. Arch. 17 (1980) 174-5.
8. Review of H. Döhl, Heinrich Schliemann: Mythos und Ärgernis, in The Classical Review 33 (1983) 286-7.
9. Review of F. Schachermeyr, Mykene und das Hethiterreich, in The Classical Review NS 38 (1988) 303-305.
10. Review of G.A. Lehmann, Die mykenischfrühgriechische Welt und der östliche Mittelmeerraum in der Zeit der 'Seevölker' - Invasionen um 1200 v. Chr., and F. Schachermeyr, Mykene und das Hethiterreich, in JHS 108 (1988) 259-260.
11. "Hittite Land Donations and Tabarna Seals", JCS 33 (1981) 3-43.

LIST OF FIGURES

CHAPTER I

- I.1 Franz Kauffer's plan of Hisarlık, taken in 1793; reproduced from Choiseul-Gouffier, Voyage Pittoresque de la Grèce II (1822) plate 35. The drawing of the architectural remains may be the work of Dubois in 1814.
- I.2 J-B Hilaire's view of the southern spur of Hisarlık in 1814; reproduced from Choiseul-Gouffier, Voyage Pittoresque de la Grèce II (1822) plate 36.
- I.3 Three sketches of Hisarlık in 1847, after Maclaren:
1. Sketch-plan, based on Forchhammer.
2. Outline as seen from the North.
3. Outline, said to be from the Northwest, but actually from the West.
- I.4 Adolphe Laurent's plan of April 1872, published in Atlas Taf.116.
- I.5 Plan of the excavations at the end of the 1872 season; drawn by Sisilas in September 1872, published in Atlas Taf.117.
- I.6 Plan of the excavations at the end of the 1873 season; drawn by Adolphe Laurent, published in Atlas Taf.214.
- I.7 Assemblage of spot-heights, contours and pseudo-contours for the site of Hisarlık, all corrected to Dörpfeld's standard. These form the basis of the reconstructed contour-plan.
- I.8 Tentative reconstruction of Hisarlık before excavation.
- I.9 The location of Frank Calvert's trenches.

CHAPTER II

- II.1 Daily entries in the diary for 1870.
- II.2 " " " " " " 1871.
- II.3 " " " " " " 1872
- II.4 " " " " " " 1873
- II.5 A periodic résumé from the diary for 1873.

CHAPTER III

- III.1 Schliemann's excavations in 1870.
- III.2 Schliemann's excavations in 1871.
- III.3 Schliemann's excavations during 1st-25th April 1872.
- III.4 Schliemann's excavations during 1st-11th May 1872.
- III.5 Schliemann's excavations during 12th-22nd May 1872.
- III.6 Schliemann's excavations during 23rd May-18th June 1872.
- III.7 Schliemann's excavations during 19th June-13th July 1872.
- III.8 Schliemann's excavations during 13th July-4th August 1872.
- III.9 Schliemann's excavations during 5th-9th August 1872.
- III.10 Schliemann's excavations during 2nd-23rd February 1873.
- III.11 Schliemann's excavations during 24th February-6th March 1873.
- III.12 Schliemann's excavations during 7th-15th March 1873.
- III.13 Schliemann's excavations during 17th-22nd March 1873.
- III.14 Schliemann's excavations during 24th-29th March 1873.
- III.15 Schliemann's excavations during 31st March-5th April 1873.
- III.16 Schliemann's excavations during 7th-16th April 1873.
- III.17 Schliemann's excavations during 17th April-10th May 1873.

- III.18 Schliemann's excavations during 10th-24th May 1873.
 III.19 Schliemann's excavations during 26th May-14th June 1873.

CHAPTER IV

- IV.1 Key.
 IV.2 Reconstructed section of trench GH 2-3, along the line GH.
 IV.3 Reconstructed plan of trench GH 2-4(a).
 IV.4 Reconstructed section of trench GH 2-4(a), along the line GH.
 IV.5 Reconstructed plan of trench GH 2-4(b).
 IV.6 Reconstructed section of trench GH 2-4(b), along the line GH.
 IV.7 Hypothetical reconstruction of the lie of the strata in trench GH 2-4(b).
 IV.8 Reconstructed plan of trench FGH 3-4(a).
 IV.9 Reconstructed section of trench FGH 3-4(a), looking Northwest.
 IV.10 Reconstructed plan of trench FGH 3-4(b).
 IV.11 Reconstructed section of the west part of trench FGH 3-4(b), looking West.
 IV.12 Reconstructed section through the deep, central cut of trench FGH 3-4(b), looking West.
 IV.13 Reconstructed plan of trench CDEF 2-3.
 IV.14 Reconstructed section of trench CDEF 2-3, at the east end of the trench.
 IV.15 Reconstructed section of trench CDEF 2-3, through D2-3.
 IV.16 Reconstructed section of trench CDEF 3, at the east end of the trench.
 IV.17 Reconstructed section of trench CDEF 3, through D2-4.
 IV.18 Reconstructed plan of trenches CD 3-4 and F3.
 IV.19 Reconstructed section of trench F3, at the east end of the trench.
 IV.20 Reconstructed plan of trench F3-4(a).
 IV.21 Reconstructed section of trench F3-4(a), looking North-east.
 IV.22 Reconstructed section of trench F3-4(b), looking East.
 IV.23 Reconstructed section of trench CD 3-4, through D2-4.
 IV.24 Reconstructed plan of trench DE 3-4(a).
 IV.25 Reconstructed section of trench DE 3-4(c), looking East.
 IV.26 Reconstructed plan of trench DE 3-4(b).
 IV.27 Reconstructed section of trench DE 3-4(b), looking East.
 IV.28 Reconstructed plan of trench D5.
 IV.29 Reconstructed section of trench D5.
 IV.30 Reconstructed plan of trench CD 3-5.
 IV.31 Reconstructed section of trench CD 3-5.
 IV.32 Reconstructed plan of trench CD 4.
 IV.33 Reconstructed section of trench CD 4, through D2-4.
 IV.34 Reconstructed section of trench D5-6.
 IV.35 Reconstructed section of trench D4-6, at the east side of the trench.
 IV.36 Reconstructed plan of trench D3-4-5.
 IV.37 Reconstructed plan of trench E4-5.

- IV.38 Reconstructed plan of trench CD 8-9(a).
- IV.39 Reconstructed section of trench CD 8-9(a), at the east side of the trench.
- IV.40 Reconstructed section of trench CD 8-9(b), through D8-9.
- IV.41 Reconstructed section of trench CDE 7-8, at the east side of the trench, showing selected bench-marks from TI Taf.III, probable locations of selected finds, and suggested lines of strata.
- IV.42 Reconstructed section of trench CDE 7-8, at the east side of the trench.
- IV.43 Reconstructed plan of trench CDE 7-8.
- IV.44 Reconstructed plan of trench DE 6-7.
- IV.45 Reconstructed section of the central area of trench DE 6-7, along the line of the east side of the North-South trench.
- IV.46 Reconstructed section of the eastern area of trench DE 6-7, at the east side of the trench.
- IV.47 Reconstructed section of the western area of trench DE 6-7, at the west side of the trench. Section shown in mirror-image.
- IV.48 Reconstructed plan of trench CDE 6-7(a).
- IV.49 Reconstructed section of the eastern area of trench CDE 6-7(a), at the east side of the trench.
- IV.50 Reconstructed section of trench HJ 8, looking North-east.
- IV.51 Reconstructed plan of trench HJ 8.
- IV.52 Reconstructed section of trench H7-8, looking North-east.
- IV.53 Reconstructed plan of trenches H7-8 and EFGH 6-7(a).
- IV.54 Reconstructed section of trench GHJ 7-8, looking Northeast.
- IV.55 Reconstructed plan of trenches GHJ 7-8 and EFGH 6-7(b).
- IV.56 Reconstructed section of trench EFGH 6-7(a), looking North.
- IV.57 Reconstructed section of trench EFGH 6-7(b), looking North.
- IV.58 Reconstructed section of trench EFGH 6-7(b), looking West.
- IV.59 Reconstructed section of trench EF 6-7(a-b), looking West.
- IV.60 Reconstructed section of trench EF 7, looking West.
- IV.61 Reconstructed plan of trenches EF 7 and G7.
- IV.62 Reconstructed section of trench G7, looking West.
- IV.63 Reconstructed plan of trench EF 6-7(c).
- IV.64 Reconstructed section of trench EF 6-7(c), looking North.
- IV.65 Reconstructed plan of trenches AB 4-5(a) and AB 5-6(a), showing their relation to buildings of Troy VI and IX.
- IV.66 Reconstructed sections of trench AB 4-5(a): (a) the northeast face (b) the south end.
- IV.67 Reconstructed plan of trench AB 4-5(b).
- IV.68 Reconstructed section of the east side of trench AB 4-5(b), looking Northeast.
- IV.69 Reconstructed section along the centre of trench AB 4-5(b), looking Northeast.
- IV.70 Reconstructed section across the south end of trench

- AB-4-5(b), looking Southeast.
- IV.71 Reconstructed plan of trench AB 4-5(c).
- IV.72 Reconstructed section of the east side of trench AB 4-5(c), looking Northeast.
- IV.73 Reconstructed section along the centre of trench AB 4-5(c), looking Northeast.
- IV.74 Reconstructed section across the south end of trench AB 4-5(c), looking Southeast.
- IV.75 Reconstructed sections of trench AB 5-6(a): (a) the northwest face (b) the north end.
- IV.76 Reconstructed plan of trench AB 5-6(b).
- IV.77 Reconstructed section of trench AB 5-6(b), looking Northwest.
- IV.78 Reconstructed section of trench C6(a), looking Northwest. (The building shown as Deposit (2) cannot in reality be reconstructed at all.)
- IV.79 Schematic representation of relative depths of strata in C6(b), looking Northeast.
- IV.80 Very tentative reconstruction of a building of Troy VI-VII in C6(b), based on the supposition that Schliemann observed some relationship between Wall 51 and Walls 49,50.
- IV.81 Reconstructed plan of trench CD 5-6(a).
- IV.82 Reconstructed section of trench CD 5-6(a), looking through square C6 to the Northeast.
- IV.83 Reconstructed and schematic section of trench CD 5-6(a), looking to the Northwest and showing a possible Troy VI terrace.
- IV.84 Reconstructed plan of trench CD 5-6(b).
- IV.85 Reconstructed section of trench CD 5-6(b), looking Northwest.
- IV.86 Reconstructed section of trench CD 5-6(b), looking Northeast.
- IV.87 Reconstructed plan of trench BC 5-6.
- IV.88 Reconstructed section of trench BC 5-6, looking North.
- IV.89 Reconstructed section of trench BC 5-6, looking Northwest.

CHAPTER V

- V.0 Composite North-South section through the mound.
- V.1 Plan of Late Troy I.
- V.2 Plan of Troy II.1.
- V.3 Plan of Troy II.2.
- V.4 Plan of Troy II.3.
- V.5 Plan of Troy II.4.
- V.6 Plan of Troy II.5.
- V.7 Plan of Troy II.6.
- V.8 Plan of Troy III.
- V.9 Plan of Troy IV.
- V.10 Plan of Troy V.
- V.11 Plan of Troy VI.
- V.12 Plan of Troy VIIa.
- V.13 Plan of Troy VIIb.
- V.14 Plan of Troy VIII.
- V.15 Plan of Troy IX.
- V.16 Pottery of Troy I; Pottery of Late Troy I or Early Troy II.

- V.17 Pottery of Troy II.
- V.18 Pottery of Troy II, continued.
- V.19 Pottery of Troy II, continued.
- V.20 Pottery of Troy II, continued.
- V.21 Pottery of Troy II, continued.
- V.22 Pottery of Late Troy II.
- V.23 Pottery of Late Troy II, continued.
- V.24 Pottery of Late Troy II, continued; Pottery of Troy III.
- V.25 Pottery of Troy III, continued.
- V.26 Pottery of Troy III, continued.
- V.27 Pottery of Troy III, continued; Pottery of Troy II or Troy III.
- V.28 Pottery of Troy IV.
- V.29 Pottery of Troy IV, continued.
- V.30 Pottery of Troy III or Troy IV; Pottery of Troy V.
- V.31 Pottery of Troy II-V.
- V.32 Pottery of Troy VI, Troy VI-VII.
- V.33 Pottery of Troy VI-VII; Pottery of Troy VII.
- V.34 Pottery of Troy VIII; Pottery of Troy IX.
- V.35 Metalwork of Troy I-II, Troy II and Late Troy II.
- V.36 Metalwork of Late Troy II, continued.
- V.37 Metalwork of Late Troy II, Troy III, Troy IV, Troy V and Troy II-V.
- V.38 Metalwork of Troy VI-VII and Troy VIII-IX; Jewellery of Troy I and Troy II.
- V.39 Jewellery of Late Troy II, Troy III, Troy IV, Troy VI-VII.
- V.40 Moulds of stone and terracotta.
- V.41 Ground stone objects of Troy I, Troy II and Late Troy II.
- V.42 Ground stone objects of Troy III to Troy IX.
- V.43 Bone artefacts of Troy I to Troy VII.
- V.44 Stone Figurines of Troy I to Troy III.
- V.45 Stone Figurines of Troy IV to Troy IX; Bone Figurines; Terracotta Figurines.
- V.46 Seals; Terracotta Balls.
- V.47 Stone and Terracotta Weights.
- V.48 Miscellaneous Objects of Terracotta; Unpublished sculptures of Troy VIII-IX.
- V.49 Selection of Spindle-Whorls.
- V.50 Selection of Spindle-Whorls, continued.
- V.51-55 Blegen's Pottery Types for Troy I-V.
- V.56-58 Additional Pottery Types for Troy I-V.
- V.59 Conspectus of short-lived depas types.
- V.60 Map

LIST OF TABLES

- I Comparison of altitudes in published plans of the site.
- II Conversion-table for standardising altitudes.
- III List of altitudes and their conversions used to compile contour-map.
- IV Allocation of objects found during 1st-25th April 1872.
- V Allocation of objects found during 1st-11th May 1872.
- VI Allocation of objects found during 12th-22nd May 1872.
- VII Allocation of objects found during 23rd May-18th June 1872.
- VIII Allocation of objects found during 19th June-13th July 1872.
- IX Allocation of objects found during 13th July-4th August 1872.
- X Allocation of objects found during 5th-9th August 1872.
- XI Assumed Excavation-dates of objects in Atlas plates, 1873.
- XII Objects excavated in 1873: allocation to probable periods of excavation.
- XIII Allocation of objects found during 2nd-23rd February 1873.
- XIV Allocation of objects found during 24th February-6th March 1873.
- XV Allocation of objects found during 7th-15th March 1873.
- XVI Allocation of objects found during 17th-22nd March 1873.
- XVII Allocation of objects found during 24th-29th March 1873.
- XVIII Allocation of objects found during 31st March-5th April 1873.
- XIX Allocation of objects found during 7th-16th April 1873.
- XX Allocation of objects found during 17th April-10th May 1873.
- XXI Allocation of objects found during 10th-24th May 1873.
- XXII Allocation of objects found during 26th May-14th June 1873.
- XXIII Proposed re-distribution of Blegen's Troy II deposits.
- XXIV Sequence of fortifications in Troy II.
- XXV Approximate percentages of fine and coarse wares in Troy I-V.
- XXVI Approximate percentages of fine wares in Troy I-V.
- XXVII Proportions of fine wares in Troy I-V.
- XXVIII Distribution of pottery types in Troy I-V.
- XXIX Pottery types in re-distributed deposits from Blegen's Troy II.
- XXX Distribution of new pottery types in Troy I-V.
- XXXI Incidence of patterns on whorls.
- XXXII Incidence of patterns on whorls - percentages of types within each period.
- XXXIII Chronological Table, Troy I-V.

ABBREVIATIONS

- AA Archäologischer Anzeiger
AAZ Augsburg Allgemeine Zeitung
AD 'Αρχαιολογικὸν Δελτίον
AE 'Αρχαιολογικὴ Ἐφημερίς
Aegean Metalwork K. Branigan, Aegean Metalwork of the Early and Middle Bronze Age (Oxford 1974)
Aghios Kosmas G.E. Mylonas, Aghios Kosmas: An Early Bronze Age Settlement and Cemetery in Attica (Princeton 1959)
- AJA American Journal of Archaeology
Alaca 1935 R.O. Arık, Alaca Höyük Hafriyatı: 1935 Deki Çalışmaları ve Keşiflere Ait İlk Rapor (Ankara 1937)
- Alaca 1936 H.Z. Koşay, Ausgrabungen von Alaca Höyük: Ein Vorbericht über die im Auftrage der Türkischen Geschichtskommission im Sommer 1936 Durchgeführten Forschungen und Entdeckungen (Ankara 1944)
- Alaca 1937-39 H.Z. Koşay, Alaca Höyük Kazısı: 1937-1939 Çalışmaları ve Keşiflere Ait İlk Rapor (Ankara 1951)
- Alaca 1940-48 H.Z. Koşay, M. Akok, Ausgrabungen von Alaca Höyük: Vorbericht über die Forschungen und Entdeckungen von 1940-1948 (Ankara 1966)
- Alaca 1963-67 H.Z. Koşay, M. Akok, Alaca Höyük Excavations: Preliminary Report on Research and Discoveries 1963-1967 (Ankara 1973)
- Alishar I, II H.H. von der Osten, E.F. Schmidt, The Alishar Hüyük: Season of 1927, 2 parts, OIP VI-VII (Chicago 1930, 1932)
- Alishar III, IV H.H. von der Osten, The Alishar Hüyük: Seasons of 1928 and 1929, 2 parts, OIP XIX-XX (Chicago 1932, 1933)
- Alishar V, VI, VII H.H. von der Osten, The Alishar Hüyük: Seasons of 1930-1932, 3 parts, OIP XXVIII, XXIX, XXX (Chicago 1937)
- Alt-Ägina III.1 H. Walter, F. Felten, Alt-Ägina III.1: Die Vorgeschichtliche Stadt (Mainz 1981)
- AM Athenische Mitteilungen
AnSt Anatolian Studies
Argissa-Magula III E. Hanschmann, V. Milošević, Die deutschen Ausgrabungen auf der Argissa-Magula in Thessalien, Band III (2 parts): Die frühe und beginnende mittlere Bronzezeit (Bonn 1976)
- Art and Culture of the Cyclades J. Thimme (ed.), Art and Culture of the Cyclades in the Third Millennium B.C. (London/Chicago 1977)
- Asea E.J. Holmberg, The Swedish Excavations at Asea in Arcadia (Göteborg 1944)
- Asine O. Frödin, A.W. Persson, Asine: Results of the Swedish Excavations 1922-1930 (Stockholm 1938)
- At See Atlas
Athenatempel F.W. Goethert, H. Schleif, Der Athenatempel von Ilion (Berlin 1962)

- Atlas H. Schliemann, Atlas Trojanischer Alterthümer (Leipzig 1874)
- BCH Bulletin de Correspondence Hellenique
- Beycesultan S. Lloyd, J. Mellaart, Beycesultan, 3 vols., (London 1962, 1965, 1972)
- Bfw See Briefwechsel
- Bittel, Güterbock, Neue Untersuchungen K. Bittel, H.G. Güterbock, Neue Untersuchungen in der Hethitischen Hauptstadt (Abhandlungen der Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Phil-Hist. Klasse, Berlin 1935.1)
- Bittel, Kleinfunde I K. Bittel, Boğazköy, Die Kleinfunde der Grabungen 1906-1912: I Funde der Hethitischen Zeit, WDOG 60 (Leipzig 1937)
- Bittel, PFK K. Bittel, Prähistorische Forschungen in Kleinasien (Istanbul 1934)
- Boehmer, Kleinfunde R.M. Boehmer, Die Kleinfunde von Boğazköy WDOG 87, Boğazköy-Hattusa: Ergebnisse der Ausgrabungen VII (Berlin 1972)
- Boehmer, Unterstadt R.M. Boehmer, Die Kleinfunde aus der Unterstadt von Boğazköy, Boğazköy-Hattusa: Ergebnisse der Ausgrabungen X (Berlin 1979)
- Briefe E. Meyer, Briefe von Heinrich Schliemann (Berlin/Leipzig 1936)
- Briefwechsel E. Meyer, Heinrich Schliemann: Briefwechsel 2 vols. (Berlin 1953, 1958)
- Byblos I M. Dunand, Fouilles de Byblos 1926-1932 (Paris 1939)
- Byblos II M. Dunand, Fouilles de Byblos 1933-1938 (Paris 1958)
- BSA Annual of the British School of Archaeology at Athens
- CAH The Cambridge Ancient History, Third Edition
- Chronologies R.W. Ehrich (ed.), Chronologies in Old World Archaeology (Chicago/London 1965)
- Chuera H. Kühne, Die Keramik vom Tell Chuera (Berlin 1976)
- Corinth XII G.R. Davidson, Corinth XII: The Minor Objects (Princeton 1952)
- De Jesus, Prehistoric Mining P.S. de Jesus, The Development of Prehistoric Mining and Metallurgy in Anatolia, British Archaeological Reports, International Series no.74 (Oxford 1980)
- Demircihüyük II M. Korfmann (ed.), Demircihüyük - Die Ergebnisse der Ausgrabungen 1975-1978: Naturwissenschaftliche Untersuchungen (Mainz 1987)
- Demircihüyük III.1 J. Seeher, Demircihüyük III.1: Die Keramik 1 (Mainz 1987)
- Demircihüyük III.2 T. Efe, Demircihüyük III.2: Die Keramik 2 - Die frühbronzezeitliche Keramik der Jüngeren Phasen (ab Phase H) (Mainz 1988)
- Deshayes, Outils J. Deshayes, Les Outils de Bronze de l'Indus au Danube 2 vols. (Paris 1960)
- Dhimini C. Tsountas, 'Αἱ προϊστορικαὶ Ἀκροπόλεις Διμηνίου καὶ Σέσκλου (Athens 1908)
- End of the Early Bronze Age G. Cadogan (ed.), The End of the Early Bronze Age in the Aegean (Leiden 1986)

- Ephesus D.G. Hogarth, Excavations at Ephesus (London 1908)
- Etiyokuşu Ş.A. Kansu, Etiyokuşu Hafriyatı Raporu (1937) (Ankara 1940)
- Euboea G.A. Papavasileios, περὶ τῶν ἐν Ἐυβοίᾳ Ἀρχαίων Ταφῶν (Athens 1910)
- Ezero G.I. Georgiev, N.Y. Merpert, R.B. Katinčarov, D.G. Dimitrov, Ezero: Eine Siedlung aus der Frühbronzezeit (Sofia 1979)
- Fischer, Hethitische Keramik F. Fischer, Die Hethitische Keramik von Boğazköy, WVD OG 75, Boğazköy-Hattusa: Ergebnisse der Ausgrabungen IV (Berlin 1963)
- French, Anatolia and the Aegean D.H. French, Anatolia and the Aegean in the Third Millennium B.C., Cambridge University PhD Thesis, 1968
- Gejvall 1937-8 N.G. Gejvall, "The Fauna of the different settlements at Troy: preliminary report", Kungl. Humanistiska Vetenskapssamfundet I Lund, Årsberättelse (1937-8) pp.51-57
- Gejvall 1938-9 N.G. Gejvall, "The Fauna of the successive settlements of Troy: Second Preliminary Report", Kungl. Humanistiska Vetenskapssamfundet I Lund, Årsberättelse (1938-9) pp.1-7
- Gejvall 1946 N.G. Gejvall, The Fauna of the Different Settlements of Troy, Part I: Dogs, horses and cattle, duplicated typescript 1946, available at the library of the Institute of Archaeology, London University
- Gournia H.B. Hawes, B.E. Williams, R.B. Seager, E.H. Hall, Gournia (Philadelphia 1908)
- Greek Emporio J. Boardman, Excavations in Chios 1952-1955: Greek Emporio (Athens 1967)
- Hänsel, Beiträge B. Hänsel, Beiträge zur Regionalen und Chronologischen Gliederung der Älteren Hallstattzeit an der unteren Donau, 2 vols. (Bonn 1976)
- Horoztepe T. Özgüç, M. Akok, Horoztepe: An Early Bronze Age Settlement and Cemetery (Ankara 1958)
- HSKF E. Meyer, Heinrich Schliemann: Kaufmann und Forscher (Göttingen 1969)
- Huot, Céramiques J.L. Huot, Les Céramiques Monochromes Lissées en Anatolie a l'Époque du Bronze Ancien, 2 vols. (Paris 1982)
- Iasos P.E. Pecorella, La Cultura Preistorica di Iasos in Caria (Rome 1984)
- Ilios H. Schliemann, Ilios: The City and Country of the Trojans. The Results of Researches and Discoveries on the Site of Troy and throughout the Troad in the years 1871,72, 73,78,79 (London 1880, New York 1881)
- IFT H. Schliemann, Ithaka, der Peloponnes und Troja (Leipzig, 1869)
- Ist. Mitt. Istanbuler Mitteilungen
- JHS Journal of Hellenic Studies
- JNES Journal of Near Eastern Studies
- Kastanas I. Aslanis, Kastanas: Die Frühbronzezeitliche Funde und Befunde (Berlin 1985)

- Korakou C.W. Blegen, Korakou: A Prehistoric Settlement near Corinth (Boston/New York 1921)
- Korucutepe M.N. van Loon (ed.), Korucutepe 3 vols. (Amsterdam/Oxford/New York 1975, 1978, 1980)
- Kirrha L. Dor, J. Jannoray, H. and M. van Effenterre, Kirrha: Étude de Préhistoire Phocidienne (Paris 1960)
- Kültepe 1948 T. Özgüç, Ausgrabungen in Kültepe 1948 (Ankara 1950)
- Kültepe 1949 T. and N. Özgüç, Ausgrabungen in Kültepe 1949 (Ankara 1953)
- Kültepe-Kanis T. Özgüç, Kültepe-Kaniš: New Researches at the Center of the Assyrian Trade Colonies (Ankara 1959)
- Kültepe-Kanis II T. Özgüç, Kültepe-Kaniš II: New Researches at the Trading Center of the Ancient Near East (Ankara 1986)
- Kumtepe J.W. Sperling, "Kumtepe in the Troad: Trial Excavations 1934", Hesperia 45 (1976) pp.305-364
- Larisa am Hermos III J. Boehlau, K. Schefold, Larisa am Hermos: Die Ergebnisse der Ausgrabungen 1902-1934: III, Die Kleinfunde (Berlin 1942)
- Lefkandi M.R. Popham, L.H. Sackett, Excavations at Lefkandi, Euboea, 1964-66 (London 1968)
- Lindos I C. Blinkenberg, Lindos: Les Fouilles de l'Acropole 1902-1914: I, Les Petits Objets (Berlin 1931)
- Manika A. Sampson, Manika: An Early Helladic Town in Chalkis, I (Athens 1985)
- Mari I A. Parrot, Mission Archéologique de Mari I: Le Temple d'Ishtar (Paris 1956)
- Mari IV A. Parrot, Mission Archéologique de Mari IV: Le "Tresor" d'Ur (Paris 1968)
- Metalwork from Sardis J.C. Waldbaum, Metalwork from Sardis: The Finds Through 1974 (Cambridge, Mass. 1983) Oriental Institute Publications, Chicago
- OIP
- Öktü, Intermediate-Keramik A. Öktü, Die Intermediate-Keramik in Kleinasien (Munich 1973)
- Olynthus VIII D.M. Robinson, J.W. Graham, Excavations at Olynthus VIII: The Hellenic House (Baltimore 1938)
- Olynthus X D.M. Robinson, Excavations at Olynthus X: Metal and Minor Miscellaneous Finds (Baltimore/London 1941)
- Orchomenos III E. Kunze, Orchomenos III: Die Keramik der Frühen Bronzezeit (Munich 1934)
- Orthmann, Frühe Keramik W. Orthmann, Frühe Keramik von Boğazköy WDOG 74; Boğazköy-Hattusa: Ergebnisse der Ausgrabungen III (Berlin 1963)
- Orthmann, Keramik W. Orthmann, Die Keramik der Frühen Bronzezeit aus Inneranatolien, Istanbululer Forschungen Band 24 (Berlin 1963)
- Özgüç, "New Observations" T. Özgüç, "New Observations on the Relationship of Kültepe with Southeast Anatolia and North Syria during the Third Millennium B.C." in J.V. Canby, E. Porada, B.S. Ridgway, T. Stech (eds.), Ancient Anatolia:

- Aspects of Change and Cultural Development. Essays in Honour of Machteld J. Mellink (Wisconsin 1986) pp.31-47
- Palace of Nestor C.W. Blegen, M. Rawson, The Palace of Nestor at Pylos, I (Princeton 1966) III (1973)
- Palaikastro R.C. Bosanquet, R.M. Dawkins, The Unpublished Objects from the Palaikastro Excavations 1902-1906 BSA Supplement I (1923)
- Paradimi G. Bakalakis, A. Sakellariou, Paradimi (Mainz 1981)
- PBF Prähistorische Bronzefunde, H. Müller-Karpe (Gen.Ed.) (Munich)
- Phrygie III C.H.E. Haspels, Phrygie: Exploration Archéologique III (Paris 1951)
- Phylakopi T.D. Atkinson, R.C. Bosanquet et al., Excavations at Phylakopi in Melos, JHS Supplementary Paper No.4 (1904)
- Poliochni L. Bernabò-Brea, Poliochni: Città Preistorica nell'Isola di Lemnos 2 vols. (Rome 1964,1976)
- Prehistoric Aphrodisias M.S. Joukowsky, Prehistoric Aphrodisias, 2 vols. (Providence/Louvain-la-Neuve 1986)
- Prehistoric Emporio M.S.F. Hood, Excavations in Chios 1938-1955: Prehistoric Emporio and Ayio Gala, 2 vols. (Athens 1981)
- Prehistoric Mersin J. Garstang, Prehistoric Mersin: Yümük Tepe in Southern Turkey (Oxford 1953)
- Prehistoric Thessaly A.J.B. Wace, M.S. Thompson, Prehistoric Thessaly (Cambridge 1912)
- Protésilas R. Demangel, Le Tumulus dit de Protésilas: Ambassade de France à Constantinople - Fouilles du Corps d'Occupation Français de Constantinople (Paris 1926)
- RGZM Jahrbuch des Römisch-Germanischen Zentralmuseums, Mainz
- Saliagos J.D. Evans, C. Renfrew, Excavations at Saliagos near Antiparos (London 1968)
- Samos I V. Milošević, Samos I: Die Prähistorische Siedlung unter dem Heraion. Ausgrabungen 1953 und 1955 (Bonn 1961)
- Schimmel Collection O.W. Muscarella, Ancient Art: The Norbert Schimmel Collection (Mainz 1974)
- Schirmer, Nordwesthang W. Schirmer, Die Bebauung am Unteren Büyükkale - Nordwesthang in Boğazköy WVDOG 81, Boğazköy-Hattusa, Ergebnisse der Ausgrabungen VI (Berlin 1969)
- Selbstbiographie E. Meyer (ed.), Heinrich Schliemann: Selbstbiographie bis zu seinem Tode vervollständigt, herausgegeben von Sophie Schliemann (Wiesbaden 1955)
- SIMA Studies in Mediterranean Archaeology
- Sitagroi C. Renfrew, M. Gimbutas, E.S. Elster, Excavations at Sitagroi: a Prehistoric Village in Northeast Greece I (Los Angeles 1986)
- SMEA Studi Micenei ed Egeo-Anatolici
- SS H. Schmidt, Heinrich Schliemann's Sammlung Trojanischer Altertümer (Berlin 1902)

- TA
- Tagebuch 1870,1871, 1872,1873
- Tarsus
- Tgb
- The Anatolian Civilizations
- The Prehistoric Cyclades
- Thermi
- TI
- Tiryns IV
- TR
- Troad
- Troie I
- Troja
- Troja 1890
- Troja 1893
- Trojanische Gefässformen
- Trojan War
- Troja und Thrakien
- Troy
- Troy and the Trojans
- Troy and the Trojan War
- Troy SM1
- H. Schliemann, Trojanische Alterthümer (Leipzig 1874)
- Schliemann's excavation journals in the Gennadius Library, Athens. See BSA 77 (1982) p.103 nos.13,14 and Chapter II note 2 of the present work
- H. Goldman, Excavations at Gözli Kule, Tarsus, 3 vols. (Princeton 1950,1956,1963)
- See Tagebuch
- The Council of Europe XVIIIth European Art Exhibition, The Anatolian Civilisations 3 vols. (Istanbul 1983)
- J.A. MacGillivray, R.L.N. Barber, The Prehistoric Cyclades: Contributions to a workshop on Cycladic Chronology (Edinburgh 1984)
- W. Lamb, Excavations at Thermi in Lesbos (Cambridge 1936)
- W. Dörpfeld, Troja und Ilion, 2 vols. (Berlin 1902)
- K. Müller, Tiryns IV: Die Urfirniskeramik (Munich 1938)
- H. Schliemann, Troy and its Remains: A narrative of researches and discoveries on the site of Ilium, and in the Trojan Plain, transl. L.D. Schmitz, ed. P. Smith (London 1875)
- J.M. Cook, The Troad: An Archaeological and Topographical Study (Oxford 1973)
- M. Sfériadès, Troie I: Matériaux pour l'Étude des Sociétés du Nord-Est Egéen au début du Bronze Ancien (Paris 1985)
- H. Schliemann, Troja: Results of the latest researches and discoveries on the site of Homer's Troy, 1882 (London 1884)
- H. Schliemann, Bericht über die Ausgrabungen in Troja im Jahre 1890 (Leipzig 1891)
- W. Dörpfeld, Troja 1893: Bericht über die im Jahre 1893 veranstalteten Ausgrabungen (Leipzig 1894)
- C. Podzuweit, Trojanische Gefässformen der Frühbronzezeit in Anatolien, der Ägais und angrenzenden Gebieten. Ein Beitrag zur vergleichende Stratigraphie (Mainz 1979)
- L. Foxhall, J.K. Davies (eds.), The Trojan War: Its Historicity and Context (Bristol 1985)
- E. Hühns (ed.), Troja und Thrakien: Katalog zur Ausstellung Berlin-Sofia (Berlin 1981)
- C.W. Blegen et al., Troy: Excavations conducted by the University of Cincinnati 1932-1938, 4 vols. (Princeton 1950-1958)
- C.W. Blegen, Troy and the Trojans (London 1963)
- M.J. Mellink (ed.), Troy and the Trojan War (Bryn Mawr 1986)
- J.L. Angel, Troy, Supplementary Monograph I: The Human Remains (Princeton 1951)

- Troy SM2 A.R. Bellinger, Troy, Supplementary Monograph II: The Coins (Princeton 1961)
- Troy SM3 D.B. Thompson, Troy, Supplementary Monograph III: The Terracotta Figurines of the Hellenistic Period (Princeton 1963)
- Troy SM4 G. Rapp Jr., J.A. Gifford (eds.), Troy, Supplementary Monograph IV: The Archaeological Geology (Princeton 1982)
- Ur Excavations II C.L. Woolley, Ur Excavations II: The Royal Cemetery (London/Philadelphia 1934)
- WVDOG Wissenschaftliche Veröffentlichungen des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts
- Yortan Cemetery T. Kâmil, Yortan Cemetery in the Early Bronze Age of Western Anatolia, BAR International Series no.145 (Oxford 1982)
- ZA Zeitschrift für Assyriologie
- Zygouries C.W. Blegen, Zygouries, A Prehistoric Settlement in the Valley of Cleonae (Cambridge, Mass. 1928)

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

My debts, which it is a pleasure to acknowledge, are many and substantial. The Craven Fund of Oxford University generously paid for the microfilming and photocopying of Schliemann's notebooks; the microfilm is now in the library of the Ashmolean Museum. Dr. F.R. Walton, formerly director of the Gennadius Library in Athens, kindly arranged the filming of the diaries, and his successor Mrs. S. Papageorgiou granted me access to the Schliemann archive and most graciously met all subsequent occasional requests for material. Both were generous with their time and knowledge. The University of Liverpool supported me with a University Research Fellowship in 1979-82, and the University's research fund jointly with the Department of Classics enabled me to visit Athens in 1980 to work on the Schliemann archive. I am grateful to the University for its generosity and to my colleagues in the Department of Classics, and especially to Professor J.K. Davies and the Department of Ancient History and Classical Archaeology, for the warmth of their welcome. Clare Hall, Cambridge awarded me a stipendiary Research Fellowship for 1982-85 and re-elected me to a non-stipendiary Research Fellowship for 1985-88, thus providing me with a stable and very happy academic home for six consecutive years. Clare Hall, together with the Faculty of Classics, generously enabled me to attend the IVth International Congress of Thracology at Rotterdam in 1984, thereby affording me a personal inspection of the Troy and Thrace exhibition which included much of the Schliemann material now in East Berlin. To both I offer my most grateful thanks. The Dr. M. Aylwin Cotton Foundation gave me invaluable support with a Fellowship Award in 1985-86, for which I am again very grateful. Other support has come from the Department of Social Security.

Mr. D.M. Bailey provided me with copies of the Calvert correspondence in the British Museum and with permission to quote from it; Professor Geoffrey Arnott and Miss Leslie Fitton have generously furnished me with copies of Schliemann letters. Mrs. Helen Cavanagh has greatly helped me with her meticulous translation of parts of Schliemann's notes from the Greek. I have received stimulus and encouragement from correspondence and exchange of publications with other scholars interested in Schliemann, especially Professors W.M. Calder III, H. Döhl, J. Irscher, G.S. Korres, D.A. Traill, W. Schindler and K. Zimmermann; Michael Wood

has shared with me his never-flagging enthusiasm and has been open-handed with information concerning the Calvert family. It was a pleasure to meet Mr. Frederick Calvert. Others who have given of their time to help or advise me in the search for documents from Schliemann and Dörpfeld include Professor K. Bittel, Dr. H. Catling, Dr. O.T.P. Dickinson, Mrs. H. Efthymiadi, Dr. A. Furtwängler, Mr. M.S.F. Hood, Dr. A. Krug, Mr. A.C. Lascarides, Mme. Lilian Mela, Mrs. K. Palaiologos, Dr. A. Spawforth, Dr. J. Sperling, Dr. S. Stikas, Mr. Irving Stone, Mrs. D. Symington, and Messrs. J.H. Schröder Wagg - to all of whom I offer my sincere thanks. Professor T.V. Buttrey most kindly commented on the section on coins, and Dr. N.V. Sekunda has several times pointed me in the right direction in matters Hellenistic. An earlier version of my thoughts on the chronology of Troy I-V was tried out on the Mycenaean Seminar in January 1988; I greatly benefitted from the ensuing discussion and in particular from comments by Dr. E.B. French, Mr. M.S.F. Hood, Mr. J.G. Macqueen, Mrs. R.K. Maxwell-Hyslop, and Professor P.M. Warren. My gifted and inspiring teacher, Mr. James Mellaart, has throughout been a source of strength and encouragement and, too, a model of generosity and patience.

Ms. Felicity Fildes, Dr. Anthony Green and Mrs. Margaret Winterbourne all deserve my thanks for undertaking parts of the typing. But the lion's share of the task has fallen to Mrs Cheryl Denson who has somehow converted a messy and very tedious manuscript into an immaculate typescript with a high degree of professionalism. To her I am deeply indebted.

Last of all to my wife, who may not have realised that she was marrying a thesis, I offer my apologies and my gratitude for much happy companionship in between trenches.

INTRODUCTION

The need for a re-examination of the site of Troy was something which struck me in 1973, when I first began to study archaeology. Here was a pivotal site, dug by three excavators, with three sets of results which appeared only partially reconcilable. The situation seemed to require that each set of findings be dismantled into its component parts, be combined with the others, and that the whole be reassembled in the manner of a gigantic, three-dimensional jigsaw puzzle; thus a grand synthesis would emerge. This is a task which the present study only begins.

When I subsequently began research into the problem it was increasingly borne in on me that Schliemann's work, which was far more extensive than that of either of his successors, had to be taken seriously, and that for this it was necessary to consult his excavation notebooks. Of these I received copies in 1979, and in due course it became apparent that the volume and complexity of this material alone, if it was to be fully understood, would itself require a full-length study. Such is the genesis of the present work. This study aims, then, to reconstruct Schliemann's activities in 1870-73, to locate and identify the features he found, and to stratify and date the objects he recorded. I hope that it will enable scholars to refer with greater confidence to the Schliemann material, and to gain a clearer idea of its relation to the site as a whole.

It is not perhaps archaeology in the most common sense of the word. It is a work of interpretation, based largely on textual analysis through (as it were) archaeological spectacles. It is archival, text-based, as the task requires - and all the more so as the Schliemann collection is largely lost or destroyed and since what remains is hopelessly dispersed. I have not, however, ignored the later excavators. Indeed, this work of interpretation would have been impossible without having available for constant comparison the detailed and far superior reports of Dörpfeld and Blegen. Consequently the final chapter moves towards a degree of synthesis between the three sets of findings.

Schliemann recorded the progress of his excavations, and the locations of his finds, by measuring in from the side of the mound and down from

its surface; but he left no adequate contour plan by which these measurements might be understood. Chapter I therefore reconstructs the shape of the mound as it was before excavation, drawing on information from the excavators and from earlier travellers and antiquaries. The resulting contour plan provides the key, I believe, to a new and closer understanding of Schliemann's work. Chapter II describes and evaluates the documentary sources on which this re-assessment is based, and Chapter III then proceeds to define as closely as possible where Schliemann was digging, and to what depths, on what dates. Fifty-two areas of work are distinguished and all are plotted onto the contour plan. Chapter IV takes the areas of work so defined and reconstructs within each what in the way of stratigraphy it is possible to salvage from the records. Objects are catalogued and assigned, sometimes only tentatively, to the strata from which they may have come. The areas are grouped into "trenches", and for each trench I have provided an introductory summary of the sequence revealed within it. Chapter V draws together the findings of Chapter IV, and discusses all the material period by period and category by category. It covers all periods from Early Bronze Age to Byzantine, and all classes of material; the bulk, however, comes from Troy I-V. A final section reconsiders the Bronze Age chronology of the site.

In archaeology very little is certain, and in Schliemann even less. I hope that at least this study does not aggravate the problem.

CHAPTER I:
TROY BEFORE SCHLIEMANN

When Schliemann began to dig at Hisarlık in 1870 he was not broaching an unknown site. During the thirteen and a half centuries that separated its abandonment¹ from its excavation the site was seen, drawn, planned and discussed by many visitors, some of whom have left us information about its virgin appearance. The purpose of this chapter is to bring together their observations, discussing attribution and priority where necessary; and to reconstruct, so far as possible, the appearance of the mound at Hisarlık as it was before Schliemann began to dig. This last is fundamental to any attempt to unravel the tangled descriptions in Schliemann's early reports.² I have also allowed myself a little latitude to include some biographical details on the Calvert family, not otherwise easily come by; but an exhaustive treatment of that theme would have been out of place here.

It is not, then, with the history of the discussions on the location of "Homeric" Troy³ that this chapter is concerned. Nor do I propose to deal here with the broader history of exploration in the Troad, already covered so admirably and elegantly by Professor Cook; but for the most part with the more narrowly archaeological question of the record of the site before it was excavated.

I. Travellers' Observations, c.565 - 1784 A.D.

The site was probably abandoned early in the sixth century A.D., and the name of Troy was not clearly linked to the remains until 1822, when Charles MacLaren published his discussion of Trojan Topography.⁴ But the name of Troy had never been entirely lost from the region. Nicetas Choniates, writing in the early years of the thirteenth century, speaks of Armenians who came from the Troad allying themselves with Henry of Flanders in 1205 against Theodore Lascaris.⁵ The Provinciale Romanum of c.1210 lists a "Trojan" bishopric within the Archbishopric of Cyzicus, corresponding to a suffragan bishopric, ὁ Τρωάδος, which is listed in the Greek Notitiae.⁶ Nicephoras Gregoras (1295-1360) records that he was stranded for four days at the Hellespont and had the opportunity to visit the "obscure vestiges" of Troy.⁷ As late as 1657 the name Troia occurs in a purely administrative context, in a despatch from Simon Reniger, the ambassador of Leopold I to the Sublime Porte, where it simply indicates a port at the lower end of the Dardanelles.⁸

From the accounts of travellers it is clear that among the inhabitants of the Troad itself oral tradition must have preserved both the memory of the name and, with it, various rival claims for the ancient city's true location. The site shown by locals to a traveller would depend entirely on where his ship put in. If he anchored off the West coast of the Troad he would be escorted (or follow the trail of someone else who had been escorted) to the impressive ruins at Eski Stamboul (Alexandria Troas).⁹ This was the site seen by Pierre Belon (1548),¹⁰ William Biddulph (c.1600),¹¹ William Lithgow (1609-10),¹² Thomas Coryate (1613),¹³ Pietro della Valle (1614),¹⁴ Jacob Spon (1675-6),¹⁵ and, even as late as 1820, by William Rae Wilson.¹⁶ If, on the other hand, the traveller landed at Kum Kale he would be shown the site at Yenisehir.¹⁷ Zosimus the Deacon, on pilgrimage from Moscow to the Holy Land in 1419, noted that "it is precisely at the mouth [of the Hellespont] that the city of Troy was situated."¹⁸ And it was the Yenisehir site that was seen by Peter Mundy (1617)¹⁹ and Henry Blount (1634).²⁰ It seems to have been somewhere in this area again that in c. 1700 Aaron Hill came upon a tombstone masquerading as that of Hector on which he found this piece of nautical doggerel:

"I do suppose that here stood TROY,
My name it is WILLIAM, a jolly Boy,
My other Name it is HUDSON, and so,
God bless the Sailors, where ever they do go.

I was here in the Year of our Lord 1631, and was
bound to Old England, God bless her." ²¹

Those who stopped at both places were, of course, shown both sites. Thomas Dallam, while escorting to Sultan Mehmet III the organ which purported to be from Elizabeth I and which he himself had built, reached the Troad in July 1599. He anchored off the west coast opposite Tenedos and, on going ashore, looked at the Eski Stamboul ruins. After sailing to Cape Janissary he visited the Yenisehir site, where he says that he saw the ruins of Troy in more detail.²² Evidently he thought that both sets of ruins belonged to one, gigantic site. Similarly Richard Wrag, in 1594, sailed past Cape Janissary "where Troy stood," and continued with "Tenedos and Lemnos on the right hand, and the Trojan Fields on the left."²³ Vincent de Stochove (1631) was first shown the Yenisehir site, spent the night on Tenedos, and next day went to the coast opposite to revisit the ruins of Troy where he had been told that the larger part

of them was to be seen. He was assured that there were yet more ruins five or six leagues further inland.²⁴

The notion of an outsize Troy, even of one that had occupied the whole of the Troad, occurs in other sources as well. Ruy Gonzalez de Clavijo (1403), on his way to the court of Timur at Samarkand, was able from his anchorage off Tenedos to see the town wall, gateways and turrets of "the mighty and populous city of Troy" (that is, of Alexandria Troas) and, rising above them, "a high steep hill (the Çigri Dağ?) on the summit of which, it is said, stood the castle known as Ilion." But on reaching the Dardanelles he further noted that "in ancient days settlements of the city of Troy occupied the whole space of countryside between this spot and the land down even to Cape St Mary [= Baba Burun] ... which is a plain of some sixty miles in extent."²⁵

The tradition is expressed in general terms by the anglo-saxon merchant Saewulf. In 1103 he was returning from the Holy Land where he had been expiating his sins, and he records:

"After leaving Scio [Chios], we passed by the great town of Smyrna, and came to the island of Meteline, and then to Tenit [Tenedos], near which, on the coast of Romania, was the very ancient and famous city of Troy, the ruins of which as the Greeks say, are still apparent over a space of many miles."²⁶

This passage has the additional interest of suggesting (with what reliability it is hard to say) that this inflated idea of the extent of Troy's remains was a confusion not only in the minds of the western travellers but in the minds of locals as well.

The tradition occurs in a more detailed form in the Chronicle of Ramon Muntaner. Muntaner held office as the governor of Gallipoli in 1305-1309 during the time it was held by the Catalans. In describing the neighbouring area he says that the city of Troy had had a circuit of 300 miles and that it had had gates at both Cyzicus (Artaqui) and Cape Adramyti.²⁷ Both of these associations are attested elsewhere.

The association of Troy with Adramyttium perhaps turns up again in Pero Tafur's itinerary. In the autumn of 1437 this Spanish nobleman was returning from a visit to the Holy Land, Egypt and Cyprus. From Chios he went to Foca where he met up with an old friend from Seville. The friend

equipped him with horses so that he could go and look at Troy, and he rode off up the coast. After two days, he says, he came to the place they called Troy. He then went on to 'Ilium,' on the coast opposite Tenedos, where the impressive remains convinced him that this was the site of ancient Troy. The second site was clearly that of Alexandria Troas; and, in view of Muntaner's remarks, it is tempting to locate the first at Adramyttium.²⁸

The claim for a location, or extension, of the site of Troy in the North of the Troad and towards Cyzicus seems to be evidenced in Ottoman sources as well as in Muntaner. Suleiman the son of Orhan, on the brink of the first Turkish conquest in Europe in 1352, was said by the Ottoman historians to have drawn inspiration from a moonlight reverie among ruins which he believed to be those of Troy, and to have launched his attack in the same night across the Dardanelles against the castle of Tzympe, near Gallipoli.²⁹ Hammer-Purgstall placed the incident at Cyzicus, whereas Choiseul-Gouffier preferred Abydos as does Donald Pitcher.³⁰ The ruins of Ilium seen by Mehmet II during his crossing of the Troad in 1462 cannot, unfortunately, be located.³¹ Evidently, however, the passing of the Troad into Turkish hands in 1306 did not cause the oral tradition and the attendant rival claims to be entirely lost, even though Pero Tafur did find in 1437 that the Greeks of Tenedos were more informed on the subject than the mainlanders.

Hisarlık, therefore, lay within a general area to which the name of Troy had remained attached in both popular and official use, and where any or all conspicuous ruins could be ennobled with heroic associations. But this particular site seems to have escaped attention, from western travellers at least, until the end of the eighteenth century. This can be put down partly to its small size, and partly to the fact that it lay in a region that had become notorious for brigandage.

II. Survey Results, 1784 - 1853

It was Choiseul-Gouffier's appointment in 1784 as French ambassador to the Sublime Porte that set in train the events which led to the discovery of Hisarlık.³² Engineers, artillery officers and a detachment from the marine corps were placed under his direction, and he was entrusted with the task of surveying the North-East Aegean. Observatories were set up

in Pera and Tarapia, so that readings could be related to a meridian. The coastlines were determined from a corvette by a cartographical team, who also plotted in mountain peaks and principal villages. Engineers then mapped in the rest of the hinterland by trigonometrical observations on the ground. The final preparation of the maps was put in the hands of artists.³³

Among Choiseul-Gouffier's team was Jean-Baptiste Chevalier,³⁴ who, after 1791, became well known as the originator of the theory which placed Troy at Pınarbaşı.³⁵ In 1785 and 1786 he was engaged in making a map of the Troad which he later published in his Description of the Plain of Troy. Apparently he was assisted by L.F. Cassas, one of Choiseul-Gouffier's draughtsmen, who is given credit in the 1802 version of the map.³⁶ In 1791, however, Chevalier simply reported that he himself had taken the measurements while Cassas "designed all the monuments;"³⁷ and the other published maps with which Cassas is associated owe little or nothing to Chevalier.³⁸ The map which Chevalier took with him when he left Turkey for Moldavia in 1787 seems to reflect some independence in the making, even though the work on it overlapped in time with that of Franz Kauffer, with whom on occasion both Chevalier and Cassas collaborated. Choiseul-Gouffier, if he had a copy, made no use of it in his Voyage Pittoresque.

Its publication, together with Chevalier's theory, in English in 1791 and in German in 1792,³⁹ had an immediate impact and established it as a standard article in the traveller's armoury for many years. Although it showed no site at Hisarlık,⁴⁰ it did locate the temple of Thymbraean Apollo among the not too distant ruins (actually a burial-ground) outside Halileli.⁴¹ More importantly, it showed a route to Pınarbaşı ("Troy") that led from Kum Kale through Çıplak. As a result, many subsequent travellers who were keen to check his claims followed Chevalier's route and came so close to Hisarlık that its discovery soon followed. His own theory of trojan topography was later discredited; but it was Chevalier's fieldwork which led directly to the discovery of the site which, in the literature, eventually usurped from Pınarbaşı the appellation "Troy."

Credit for the discovery of Hisarlık must be given, it seems, to Franz Kauffer - as Cook has already found;⁴² for his published maps of the Troad

all mark it as a site and were the first to do so. Cook is probably also right in giving to the discovery the presumed date of 1793. Kauffer had indeed been working for Choiseul-Gouffier in the Troad in 1786 and 1787, for Choiseul's "Carte de la Plaine de Troie levée en 1786 et 1787," although emended by Barbié du Bocage, is in essence a Kauffer product;⁴³ and Barbié du Bocage confirms that Kauffer was taking measurements in 1787 and produced a volume Matériaux pour servir au treizième chapitre du Voyage Pittoresque de la Grèce.⁴⁴ Yet it is unlikely that the site was found at this time since Chevalier, who had been in the Troad in 1786 and 1787 as well and had left Choiseul-Gouffier only in 1787, knew nothing of it. The possibilities must be admitted, though, either that it was found late in 1787 after Chevalier had left, or that the very independence of Chevalier kept Kauffer's observations from him.

Kauffer's next and last known visit was in 1793 and may well have been prompted by Chevalier's publication in 1791 and 1792. The trip certainly included work in the area of Hisarlık, for the results are incorporated in Choiseul-Gouffier's "Plan de Ilium Recens et de ses Environs, levé en 1793 par F. Kauffer,"⁴⁵ where the site of Hisarlık is clearly marked and the line of its outer walls is traced. (See Fig. I.1) This visit is the most probable occasion of the discovery.

What is much more doubtful, however, is whether Kauffer ever drew the plan of the remains which appears in this map, and whether he even surveyed the site itself in any detail at all. The version of his map which was obtained by Clarke and Cripps and published by them in 1803 marks Hisarlık simply as "Ilium Pagus: Ville de Constantin."⁴⁶ Now it is perfectly true that, arguing on the basis of this map alone, it could be supposed that Kauffer had in fact known the detailed plan of the site but failed to show it. Although the map proclaims that it was made specially for Count Ludolf,⁴⁷ from whom Clarke and Cripps had received it, it has to be said that it shows every sign of being a hasty and inferior copy of some better map. It was later criticised by both Gell⁴⁸ and Rennell⁴⁹ for its inaccuracy. And we know of at least one other occasion when Kauffer warded off unwelcome attentions by handing over an inferior map: when Clarke and Cripps besieged him on his death-bed in 1802 and were palmed off with an out-of-date plan of Constantinople.⁵⁰ But there are other

maps to be taken into account, and it is a striking fact that the Hisarlık fortifications are absent from every other Kauffer map that was published before 1820. They are not in the derivative map published by Olivier,⁵¹ which does not mark a site at Hisarlık at all (although the text does allude to the Ville de Constantin⁵²). Rennell's version, which had come to him through John Hawkins, only scatters the site with stereotyped L-shaped marks to indicate the presence of buildings.⁵³ Choiseul-Gouffier's map of the coast of the Troad published in 1809 still marks the site with only a patch of dots.⁵⁴ It is true that the plan of the fortifications does appear in his "Carte de la Plaine de Troie levée en 1786 et 1787."⁵⁵ But that map notes that it was emended and added to by Barbié du Bocage in 1819, after Choiseul's death in 1817; and the plan of the Hisarlık remains here is palpably an imperfect copy of their more exact representation in the "1793" map under discussion. All this means that for up to eighteen years after Kauffer's death (1802) neither Choiseul-Gouffier nor anyone else was depicting the actual appearance of the Hisarlık site, despite the fact that Choiseul, at least, presumably had a copy of Kauffer's 1793 map already. And then in 1820 and 1822 the plan made its appearance. What happened in the interim?

In 1812 Clarke published the third volume of his Travels, in which he placed Ilium Novum at Hisarlık. In 1814 Choiseul-Gouffier, now in Paris, sent Dubois back to the Troad to collect detailed information on matters that still needed clarifying.⁵⁶ Dubois definitely spent some time at Çıplak⁵⁷ where he took notes on Hisarlık.⁵⁸ It was also a normal part of his job to take plans.⁵⁹ He was certainly not there just to draw the pictures of Hisarlık, because that was done by Hilaire.⁶⁰ It looks very much as though Clarke's publication pushed Choiseul-Gouffier into sending Dubois to make the detailed survey of Hisarlık which was lacking in Kauffer's plans. The plan must have been added to Kauffer's 1793 map without either Choiseul-Gouffier or Dubois feeling the need to acknowledge the addition; and after Choiseul's death the more scrupulous Barbié du Bocage transferred the plan, acknowledging the addition, to the map originally made by Kauffer in 1786 and 1787. Thus, while Kauffer receives the credit for first having noticed the site, to Dubois should probably go the credit for having made the first detailed survey of it. The first published picture of the site was by Hilaire (see Fig.I.2.).

Edward Clarke visited the site in 1801, accompanied by J.M. Cripps and the two artists Préaux and Lusieri, who were both engaged in making drawings for Lord Elgin, at that time British Ambassador in Constantinople.⁶¹ It was perhaps on their account that the party visited Halileli, "in whose vicinity we had been instructed to seek for remains of a temple once sacred to the Thymbraean Apollo."⁶² While in the area, they were shown a large number of coins of Ilium which had come, they were told, from Hisarlık.⁶³ These, together with the evidence of inscriptions in the neighbourhood, persuaded Clarke to propose the site's identification as New Ilium. He was not, as Cook has pointed out,⁶⁴ the first to place New Ilium in the region of Çıplak; but he was the first to place it specifically at Hisarlık and to do so for a sound archaeological reason - although Morritt later claimed that he had thought of the idea first, in 1794, only to reject it.⁶⁵ But Morritt's letters show that the site he noticed was the Çıplak burial-ground, and neither they nor his Vindication of Homer provide any support for his claim.⁶⁶

Nevertheless the first person to publish the identification was not Clarke himself but Gell. His Topography of Troy, beautifully illustrated with hand-painted aquatint plates, came out in 1804, and noted that the situation of Ilium Recens had been discovered from inscriptions on the spot.⁶⁷ Gell himself had never visited the site,⁶⁸ which explains the curiously vague and unsupported air of his statement. He gives no details of the site, no description, and not even a close view in any of his plates. Hisarlık only ever appears in the distance as one feature among others in a panoramic view.⁶⁹ The fact is that the identification cannot be attributed to Gell. But we can see where he picked it up. His survey took place in December 1801, after which he returned to Constantinople. Shortly afterwards Clarke and Cripps came back from their tour of the Holy Land, Egypt and Greece which they had begun the previous March in the Troad. On arriving at their former lodgings in Constantinople they found them occupied by Gell and Dodwell; and thereafter all four shared the same accommodation from January till April 1802,⁷⁰ and there can be no reasonable doubt that it was from Clarke that he learnt of the identification. Clarke thus lost the pleasure of announcing the discovery himself; but it may have been with a view to establishing his priority that in 1812 he included in his Travels the following note:

"We were together in Constantinople in 1800; and both visited Troas in the following year. Our journey took place in March 1801: Sir W. Gell did not arrive until December."⁷²

Gell includes in his general map of the Plain of Troy (Plate XLV) an indication of the remains at Hisarlık: a suggestion of fortification walls that follow the shape of the spur. This, too, must go back to Clarke; and published in 1804 it antedates the publication of the plan by Dubois. But it is too cursory and schematic to rank as a competitor. It was later taken over by Rennell.⁷³ Gell, however, may not have appreciated this compliment, for in the Gennadius Library in Athens there is a copy of Rennell's work which contains on p.xi a manuscript note which attributes to Gell this comment:

"Major Rennell was perfectly convinced that Troy was at Bounarbashi till about the year 1813, for in 1812 he repeatedly told me that, Dr Chandler was in his dotage when he wrote his Troy. Rennell was become a real old woman before he wrote this work."

Although Gell went into print first with, as it seems, Clarke's identification, Clarke himself was the first to publish a verbal description of Hisarlık. It is not very detailed, but perhaps deserves to be quoted in full on account of its priority and as it is in many respects quite representative of the comments of travellers who followed:

"We came to an elevated spot of ground, surrounded on all sides by a level plain, watered by the Callifat Osmack, and which there is every reason to believe the Simoisian. Here we found, not only the traces, but also the remains of an antient citadel; Turks were then employed raising enormous blocks of marble, from foundations surrounding the place; possibly the identical works by Lysimachus when he fenced New Ilium with a wall. The appearance of the structure exhibited that colossal and massive style of architecture which bespeaks the masonry of the early ages of Grecian history. All the territory within these foundations was covered by broken pottery, whose fragments were parts of those antient vases now held in such high estimation. Here the peasants said they had found the medals which they had offered to us, and most frequently after heavy rains. Many had been discovered in consequence of the recent excavations made there by the Turks, who were removing the materials of the old foundations, for the purpose of constructing works at the Dardanelles..."⁷⁵

In time the description of the site and its location was amplified by other visitors. It lay on an eminence at the end of a suite of hills, to which it was connected by a narrow ridge. On the spur itself, which was of limestone, was a large mound shaped like a truncated cone.⁷⁶ Three sides of the mound sloped gently away, but on the north side the slope was steep

and ran down to a marsh.⁷⁷

The clearest description is given by Charles Maclaren who, despite having published his Dissertation in 1822,⁷⁸ did not visit the site until 1847.⁷⁹ He incorporated his observations in the field into his later work, The Plain of Troy Described, published only in 1863.⁸⁰ His ground-plan of the site (see Fig.I.3.1), if we disregard for the moment his inclusion of walls and the like which he drew in on the authority of Choiseul-Gouffier rather than from personal observation,⁸¹ is taken from Forchhammer⁸² and shows no serious divergence from Kauffer's map of 1793;⁸³ but it has the advantage of being accompanied by a more detailed commentary. It has to be recognised, however, that in the commentary Maclaren has inadvertently transposed the descriptions of the northern spur of the site (marked 'a' on the plan) and the southern spur (marked 'b'). If this is allowed for, his account records that the southern spur lay at about 84ft above the plain and that "the top of the hill generally forms a sort of plateau at nearly the same elevation." The northern spur, on the other hand, stood about 25ft higher and formed a nearly square eminence measuring c.700ft in either direction. On its eastern side it was marked at all points by an almost vertical drop to the level of the natural hill-top, and on the West by a very steep descent to the plain 110ft below. On the south side he noted that a gentle rise in the plateau reduced the difference of level to about 10ft. But even this figure seems to indicate that here too there was a distinct edge to the higher ground. Maclaren refers to this eminence (properly on the northern spur) as the acropolis, and it is this which appears in his silhouette of the site seen from the North (see Fig. I.3.2). It is, of course, the prehistoric mound of Hisarlık.

A number of visitors after Clarke rightly saw that irregularities on the surface of the site, and in particular the distinct edges on all sides of the northern spur, attested the existence of buried city walls. Dubois believed he could trace the remains of an entire circuit;⁸⁴ and Choiseul-Gouffier, perhaps depending on Dubois, noted in his own text the existence of an enclosure and of foundations.⁸⁵ Barbié du Bocage, relying on the observations of Kauffer, Dubois, Clarke, Hobhouse, Despréaux de Saint-Sauveur and others, later stated specifically that the city walls

could be seen below the surface, and that they more or less followed the contours of the site.⁸⁶ Ulrichs, who visited the site in 1843, confirms that the city walls could be followed easily,⁸⁷ and Newton too was impressed by the obviously extensive remains below the surface.⁸⁸ While it is true that the shape of the mound on the northern spur did indeed turn out to be a rough guide to the line of the city walls (of Troy VI, not IX), unfortunately the contours of the rest of the site proved in the event much less reliable. The circuits traced by Dubois and Forchhammer, although they coincide at some points with the Troy IX walls recorded by Dörpfeld,⁸⁹ are largely illusory.

Of slightly more value are the records of upstanding remains on the site. They are described in fairly general terms by a number of travellers, often with a note that they were being depleted by local peasants who were taking the stone for building. Hammer-Purgstall saw remains of ancient monuments and masonry on his visit in 1800,⁹⁰ and both the plan by Dubois and the engraving by Hilaire are fairly specific in showing upstanding blocks of stone on the circuit of the Troy IX wall.⁹¹ These are mentioned by Barbié du Bocage also,⁹² but he is drawing his information from Dubois and Hilaire. Forchhammer, who visited the site in 1839, was able to identify "extensive ruins" including the theatre, the city wall, the aqueduct and what he interpreted as a bath.⁹³ Von Eckenbrecher, in the following year, likewise noted some large remains of destroyed buildings.⁹⁴ William Turner, on the other hand, visiting the site in 1816, was able to record only "small stones, among which are some morsels of marble and brick scattered over the hill."⁹⁵ Rather similar observations were later made by Weston (1845)⁹⁶ and Newton (1853), who noted that "the remains above ground are very trifling."⁹⁷

Taken as a whole, the accounts left by the surveyors and travellers provide us with little more than a rough impression of the site as it was before excavation. The plans are approximate - impressionistic, even; the verbal descriptions are mostly brief and lacking in detail. Only Maclaren's description comes close to precision, and even he has got his notes confused. This is hardly surprising. Hisarlık held no unique or outstanding interest for these writers, who were mostly aiming at a more general documentation of the Troad. Their legacy should not be judged out of context. But it is fair to say that to the modern archaeologist their accounts are of very limited value. For something more substantial

we must turn to the excavators, of whom Schliemann was not the first.

III. First Excavations, 1855 - 1865

At this point the Calvert family must be introduced. They were a family of English origin who had been established in the Levant, and particularly in Turkey, for several decades as landowners, diplomats, merchants and bankers. They had associations with Rhodes, Smyrna, Salonika, Alexandria and Istanbul, but were also prominent residents of the Troad and the Dardanelles.⁹⁸ Several brothers are mentioned in the literature. Frederick appears to have been the eldest and was British Consul at the Dardanelles (Çanakkale) for many years.⁹⁹ James may have been the second eldest, for he acted as British Consul in Frederick's absence.¹⁰⁰ The youngest of the three who were normally resident at the Dardanelles was Frank, who appears in the Earl of Carlisle's diary as "young Mr Calvert, the consul's brother."¹⁰¹ There were also other brothers living elsewhere. In 1857 W.N. Senior made the acquaintance of a Calvert brother in Therapia, at Constantinople. This one had apparently been born in Malta and had lived for most of his life in various parts of Turkey, including Konya and Kayseri, which he had left in 1847.¹⁰² If this brother was Edward, then it was he who later attempted to mediate for Schliemann in his request for an excavation-permit in 1870.¹⁰³ Lascarides refers to an Edmund Calvert, British Vice-Consul in Rhodes, and to a Charles Calvert, British Consul in Monastir.¹⁰⁴

Frederick Calvert had come to live in the Troad in 1834, at which time the British Consulship was held by his uncle, a Mr Launder.¹⁰⁵ There is also evidence for the existence of a younger Mr Launder (or Lander), son of the consul and British Vice-Consul, whom Napier and Welcker both met at Erenköy.¹⁰⁶ The younger Mr Launder had been in the Troad since at least 1829 and was still there in 1842, doing a thriving business in valonia. 'Launder's house at Erenköy, seen by Temple in 1834,¹⁰⁷ was in ruins from a recent fire when visited by Charles Fellows in 1838.¹⁰⁸ It appears that the father subsequently had a new house built on the same site.¹⁰⁹ To this he must have added a neighbouring house formerly owned by a Turkish Ağa,¹¹⁰ for Senior makes clear that by the time of his visit in 1857 the Erenköy property consisted of two houses joined together.¹¹¹ Its size is evident from the map of Erenköy published by Frank Calvert in

his article on Ophrynum.¹¹² By 1853 the house had come into the possession of Frederick Calvert, whose ménage at that time included not only his two younger brothers and his mother-in-law, a Mrs Abbott, but also a Wallachian refugee who was practising as an artist.¹¹³

Frederick Calvert is first met in G.F. Weston's account of his visit in 1845.¹¹⁴ He is depicted as a great sportsman, a crack shot who used to go shooting every autumn with the Paşa of Beyramıç and who was a great favourite with the Turks. His Italianate villa at the Dardanelles, still incomplete in 1871, is described by Senior;¹¹⁵ also by Stark, who there found himself in an English world of tea and conversation.¹¹⁶ In addition to this and the house at Erenköy, Frederick was the proprietor of two farms, both held for legal reasons in the name of his wife.¹¹⁷ One was in the Chersonese,¹¹⁸ but of this little is known. The other, which figures more prominently in the literature, was the Batak Farm at Akça Köy, known later as Thymbra Farm.¹¹⁹ Here in about 1847 Frederick had bought 2-3,000 acres of land in the valley and on the slopes of the Menderes Çay,¹²⁰ at the southern end of the Trojan Plain. From 1853 onwards we hear of plans to drain the marshes here,¹²¹ a task which was apparently completed by 1874,¹²² but whose rewards Frederick did not live to see.¹²³ He was active in introducing European livestock and farming implements onto his lands.¹²⁴ From his visitors come testimonies to his industry, benevolence, humour and concern for justice.¹²⁵ A less flattering view is given by John Brunton, who portrays him as grasping, devious and ill-tempered when thwarted.¹²⁶ According to the gossips of Smyrna he was only able to maintain his position by his work as an agent for Lloyds'.¹²⁷

Frederick was not the only brother to go in for farming. At some time before 1857 Frank Calvert, together with a Mr Freeman, had bought 2,000 acres of land in some other part of the Trojan Plain.¹²⁸ Senior tells us that this land was on the territory of Ilium Novum,¹²⁹ and his itinerary shows that it must have lain largely in the valley of the Dümrek Su and on the ridges to North and South.¹³⁰ The çiftlik which he mentions, apparently as Frank Calvert's farmhouse, may be the farm shown in his map as lying North of Halil Eli, just off the road from Erenköy to Kum Kale.¹³¹ The same farm appears in Spratt's and Schliemann's maps and may have been noted as a deserted site by Cook.¹³² The fields on Ilium Novum are likely to have lain on the western, and

perhaps southern, limits of Frank Calvert's land. But he never owned the entire site; for although in an unpublished letter of 24th September 1863 he was able to remind Newton:

"You are aware of my proprietorship to a large portion of the site of Ilium (Novum) which contains many remains of antiquity buried below its surface."

and to note that:

"A short time since whilst clearing out brushwood from the theatre, a torso and two forepaws of a lion were brought to light - just below the surface;"

the same letter nevertheless adds:

"The field containing the actual site, I am in treaty for, and hope soon to secure."¹³³

These negotiations met with only limited success. Speaking of events in 1864 or 1865 Calvert later wrote,

"I purchased a field comprising part of the highest mound, or acropolis..."¹³⁴

But it is clear from the history of Schliemann's excavations on the site that, although by 1870 and thereafter Calvert owned the eastern half of the Bronze Age mound and parts of the Lower Town (presumably on the eastern side), he never owned the western half.¹³⁵

To the archaeological activities of the Calverts we shall return shortly. It is their ownership of land that is for the moment important in providing the background to the first known excavations on the site of Hisarlık.

During the Crimean War the British Government wanted military hospitals built at Smyrna and Abydos. The sanitary arrangements were a matter of particular concern. To supervise the project the War Office chose a certain John Brunton, a Londoner from Canonbury Square who had graduated in Mathematics and French from London University and had trained under his father as an engineer. His earlier experience was largely in railway construction and as an adviser to a large firm of contractors headed by Isambard Brunel. On his arrival in Turkey he selected a site two miles North of Erenköy.¹³⁶ Inevitably he came into contact with the Calvert family, perhaps particularly because of Ferderick's official

role in servicing the visiting troops.¹³⁷ Brunton enters the archaeological literature as author of a map of the Erenköy region published by Frank Calvert in 1860.¹³⁸ It remained for Professor Cook to draw attention to Brunton's autobiography by which his excavations at Hisarlık in the winter of 1855-56 were revealed.¹³⁹

When peace negotiations began, Brunton was ordered to stop all works at the hospital. This left him with 150 men from the Army Works Corps unemployed. A programme of excavations was his solution to this dilemma, a solution to which the men were only partly reconciled by extra rations of stout. They camped out "on the plains of Troy, - determining to commence some excavations at the Necropolis." By "Troy" Brunton will here certainly have meant Pınarbaşı, following the identification still held at this date by almost all scholars as well as by both Frederick and Frank Calvert, neither of whom abandoned the view until 1860.¹⁴⁰ But the excavations "at the Necropolis" will have been at Hanay Tepe, which at this time the Calverts held to have been Troy's burial ground.¹⁴¹ This, not Pınarbaşı itself, is likely to have been the origin of Brunton's "Trojan" objects in the British Museum.¹⁴² Brunton's camp, and all his initial excavations, must then have been on Frederick Calvert's land.

When, therefore, we next read that he detached a section of men to excavate at Ilium Novum, the presumption will be strong that here too the digging took place on Calvert land, namely on the part of Hisarlık that belonged to Frank Calvert. Brunton's narrative, which was written to entertain his grandchildren, is not very informative. His excavations at Hisarlık may have lasted no more than a single day. At all events they seem to have been quite brief. Brunton records:

"I found the ruins of a temple, the Corinthian capital of one of the columns, evidently shaken down by an earthquake, was the most beautiful piece of carving I ever saw. It weighed over 3 tons - we had some difficulty getting it out of the hole in which we discovered it. There were no roads to the place along which a cart could be brought to convey it away - so I was forced to roll it up the mound under which I had found it, set it up on end, and to my great regret leave it there."

Very near the same spot he found some walls with coloured plaster.

"We dug a little deeper and came upon the tessellated pavement of a room. We cleared the whole area of the room. In the centre of the room was a large oval tessellated picture, - the subject a

Boar hunt, beautifully worked in variously tinted marbles." At this point the work was interrupted by despatches. Brunton and his men were ordered to return immediately to the hospital, so the excavated area was filled in again. A fortnight later he returned, only to find the mosaic gone. He contented himself with removing a piece of the bordering of the room. "This," he says, "ended my explorations at Troy."

The site of Brunton's excavations cannot be determined with any certainty, but a few indications allow us to hazard a guess at its rough location. Frank Calvert's land, on which it seems likely that the excavation took place, did not at this date include any part of the mound proper. We must therefore look for a site either on the fringes of the mound or in the lower town. Schliemann reported mosaic floors from five shafts in the lower town, all damaged.¹⁴³ In his long trench to the south side of the mound he found a portico of syenite columns with Corinthian capitals of white marble.¹⁴⁴ A location to the South or Southeast of the mound is therefore one possibility. Another possibility is that Frank Calvert later re-excavated the same trench, before he acquired the additional land, and described it again in September 1863 in his letter to Newton.¹⁴⁵ In this case the work will probably have been in square J8. Schliemann re-opened Calvert's trench here in 1873 and found large blocks of Corinthian pillars and other sculptured blocks, together with a number of inscriptions.¹⁴⁶ These later proved to have belonged to Theatre B, whose coloured floor Dörpfeld says had been removed some years earlier by local villagers.¹⁴⁷ Brunton's stolen mosaic has been traced to the church at Kalafat.¹⁴⁸

Frank Calvert's excavations, just referred to, are the next known archaeological assault on Hisarlık. In fact all three Calvert brothers had archaeological interests, although they followed them with varying degrees of intensity. James could comment with interest and some knowledge on Schliemann's excavations of 1870.¹⁴⁹ But fieldwork was apparently the preserve of Frederick and Frank. Until about 1863 they seem to have enjoyed a casual collaboration, Frank being the more active and having the more scholarly mind. Until 1860 they both shared the orthodox view of Chevalier that Troy lay at Pınarbaşı.¹⁵⁰ The collection of antiquities usually associated with Frank Calvert seems to have been begun as much by Frederick, if Carlisle's account of 1853 is to be

believed;¹⁵¹ and it was in Frederick's house at the Dardanelles that Stark saw it poorly displayed in vestibule and narrow attics in the autumn of 1871.¹⁵²

It seems to have been Frank who first dug a site, although the dates later given to his excavations and to Frederick's in The Levant Herald may not be wholly accurate.¹⁵³ Already by the time of the visits of Newton, Tozer and Carlisle in 1853, the brothers clearly had a good general knowledge of antiquities in the Troad. But their first excavations were at Hanay Tepe, on Frederick Calvert's farmland. Frank Calvert dug here in February 1853 during C.T. Newton's visit.¹⁵⁴ The excavation was written up in September 1856 and published in 1859,¹⁵⁵ apparently without any further digging. Frank Calvert later dated the excavation variously to 1856¹⁵⁶ and 1857,¹⁵⁷ but perhaps these dates reflect only the date when the report was written. The report, in Frank Calvert's usual economical style, already reveals a knowledge of the pottery sequence and of geology, together with an interest in stratification. But the section-drawing, while it superficially appears authoritative, is largely extrapolation from the limited discoveries that could be made in one vertical shaft and one horizontal trench. The report of his renewed excavations in 1878-79 under Schliemann's patronage shows the extent to which his skills of recording and interpretation had developed in the intervening 25 years.¹⁵⁸ In 1853 Frank Calvert also dug in the nearby necropolis,¹⁵⁹ where Brunton was to follow and where in 1857 Frederick - perhaps typically - entertained N.W. Senior to the excavation of some pithos-burials before lunch.¹⁶⁰ By this date Calvert had evidently dug quite a number of pithos-burials in different parts of the Troad.¹⁶¹

At some date between 1853 and 1859 the two brothers turned their interests to the region near Frederick's other house at Erenköy. By 1859 Frank had cleared out some wells, excavated a few tombs in the necropolis and identified the site of Ophrynum. Frederick had excavated a mound.¹⁶² Frank had already explored, but probably not excavated, the area at the time of Newton's visit in 1853.¹⁶³ He later gave the date of his work as 1857-59.¹⁶⁴ But the results are already shown in Brunton's map - compiled in 1855-56,¹⁶⁵ and indicate an earlier date for the work - unless some of the notes in the map were added by Frank Calvert. The observations, which again include geological and palaeontological remarks,

seem to have been carefully made and the identification to be reliable;¹⁶⁶ the excavations were never published.

Around 1859 the two brothers extended their explorations to the Sigeum ridge. Frank explored the coast between Alexandria Troas and Cape Lectum, identifying the sites of Coloniae and Larisa, and excavating in the necropolis on Beşik Tepe.¹⁶⁷ Frederick excavated the "Tomb of Patroclus" at the northern end of the ridge.¹⁶⁸

But the progressive draining of the marsh around Frederick's farm at Akça Köy drew their attention back to the question of Troy's location in 1860-61. Two springs, one hot and one cold, were thought to have come to light in the marsh; these the two brothers took to be the source of the Scamander. They were thus led to adopt the topography of Ulrichs, who had placed Troy at Akça Köy - the site of Frederick's farm.¹⁶⁹ Frederick Calvert remained an adherent of this view, so far as we can judge, until he died. Certainly in 1871 he still held to the identification.¹⁷⁰

Frank, however, seems soon to have abandoned the view and to have turned his attention to Hisarlık. This produced the curious situation in which the brothers, with neighbouring farms, each believed that he alone could lay claim to the authentic site of ancient Troy. At least some element of rivalry is likely to have made itself felt; and indeed from this date we find no further evidence of the friendly, if casual, collaboration of earlier days. But there was no hostility, for Frank was again digging on his brother's land in 1871¹⁷¹ and apparently inherited it.¹⁷²

1863 in fact brought the turning-point which led to Frank Calvert's excavations on Hisarlık and, ultimately, to Schliemann's. A sudden flurry of activity announces Frank's interest in the site and is perhaps to be explained by the publication in the same year of Charles Maclaren's The Plain of Troy Described,¹⁷³ arguing for Hisarlık as the site of Troy. First he carried out a series of test excavations in and around Pınarbaşı. These enabled him to discard the generally-held theory of its trojan identity.¹⁷⁴ He then immediately turned to Hisarlık, where he made a small sounding, and started to negotiate for the purchase of the mound. Hitherto it has been thought, on Calvert's own authority, that his

excavations at Hisarlık only began in 1865, under the influence of von Hahn's negative results at Pınarbaşı in 1864.¹⁷⁵ This, however, is not the case, as may be seen from the letter to Newton which has already been mentioned.¹⁷⁶ It is dated 24th September 1863 and the relevant section runs as follows:

"You are aware of my proprietorship to a large portion of the site of Ilium (Novum) which contains many remains of antiquity buried below its surface. I have discovered that the site of the temple of Pallas occupied the prominent mound which rises out of the plain - an excavation I made twelve feet long by eight feet broad and three deep, disclosed a number of fluted columns a capital, an inscription and friezes, whilst others appear underneath and on all sides. Our mutual friend Mr Waddington thinks important discoveries may be made in this temple. The field containing the actual site, I am in treaty for, and hope soon to secure. The abrupt hill affords an easy method of getting rid of the rubbish in any excavation that might be made here. A short time since whilst clearing out brushwood from the theatre, a torso and two forepaws of a lion were brought to light - just below the surface.

"Now if anything could be managed with the British Museum to carry on excavations here (and elsewhere if they desired it) I would be very happy to offer my services.

"I would allow any part of my lands to be turned over, and all objects found to become the property of the British Museum (with the exception of any duplicates which the Turkish Govt would probably claim as their right in granting the firman of excavation).

"I would however wish to have the direction of the excavation, or that my name might be attached to any discoveries made.

"My services would be gratuitous, unless the British Museum on the results of the excavations being known, might think fit to make me a compensation - but this is a matter I would leave entirely to them.

"The funds could be under the control, or not, of H.M's Consul, as the British Museum might deem preferable.

"This I think is a liberal proposal, which combined with my local knowledge and experience, that could be brought to bear favourably on the enterprise, makes me entertain a hope that the British Museum may be disposed to accept it.

"You would greatly oblige me by letting me know as soon as possible whether there is any chance of my proposal being entertained, for in the negative case, my intention is to apply to the Prussian or French Govt - as I confess my means for carrying on the excavations are limited. This is an alternative I am loath to have recourse to, preferring infinitely to serve our own Government."

Frank Calvert was too cautious, and perhaps too wily, to make direct reference in this letter to the Trojan identification of Hisarlık; but his belief in the identification is already implied by the brackets in his writing "Ilium (Novum)" and by a later reference in the letter to his belief that Pınarbaşı was not "the Ilium Vetus" of Chevalier but Gergithe.

Calvert's excavation of 1863 has to be located in his trench in J8, shown in Atlas Taf. 116 (=Troja und Ilion fig.1) and in Fig.I.9 of the present work. His finds reported in the letter to Newton correspond sufficiently well with Schliemann's later discoveries at the same point;¹⁷⁷ they derive from Theatre B of Troy IX.¹⁷⁸ There is also, as has been mentioned, a general correspondence which could suggest that this was the site of Brunton's excavations of 1855-56. Erosion or digging by villagers may explain the larger size of the trench in Laurent's plan of 1872.

Perhaps Calvert did not present his case forcefully enough; for after some delays the British Museum's refusal was communicated to him in February 1864.¹⁷⁹ By the following year, however, he had bought the field containing the northeastern part of the site, and there he started new excavations.¹⁸⁰ These excavations of 1865 were in the other three trenches shown in Atlas Taf. 116 and in Fig.I.9 and must be placed in squares G 3-4, H 3-4 and JK 4-5 (see Fig.I.9). From several brief reports we can form some idea of Calvert's findings,¹⁸¹ but as yet no more detailed report or set of notes has come to light.

Calvert records that he uncovered part of the city wall "built by Lysimachus" some of whose stones carried builders' marks. In trenches G 3-4 and H 3-4 what he found was undoubtedly part of the enclosure wall of Troy IX, and it provides evidence that it did indeed extend between IXW and IXN.¹⁸² Similar builders' marks are attested on IXN and IXM.¹⁸³ The trench at the northeastern corner of the mound will have been intended to trace further the supposed circuit wall. The angle of masonry exposed by Calvert appears in Atlas Taf. 214 (=TR Plan 2). If the trench and wall shown in the plan are correctly placed, Calvert must there have uncovered the stone superstructure belonging to the northern end of the Troy VI city wall,¹⁸⁴ rather than any part of the East Stoa of Troy IX.

Further into the mound, within the "Wall of Lysimachus," he correctly identified the Temple of Athena. Here he noted doric columns, architraves and parts of several bas-reliefs.¹⁸⁵ One was said to depict part of the figure of a gladiator. This can probably be identified as the block illustrated in Troja p.201, No. 108 and photographed in Troja und Ilion Beilage 51 No. 3. Schliemann and Dörpfeld note that it had come from Hisarlık and had stood in front of Calvert's farmhouse at Thymbra for many years.¹⁸⁶ In a letter of 1869 to Schliemann, Calvert also mentions that he found the pavement of the temple at a depth of 10 to 12 feet.¹⁸⁷ If we take it that Calvert was measuring down from the highest part of the adjoining mound-surface, at c.36.50m, then his pavement must have lain at about 32.00 - 33.50m. But it is difficult to find anything in Dörpfeld's record which might correspond with this.¹⁸⁸ If, however, we suppose the measurement to have been taken from the much lower surface within the depression formed by the robbing-out of the Temple masonry, at c.34.67m, then there is the possibility that Calvert here struck the top of the Troy II citadel wall, at a point where all the later Bronze Age deposits had been removed to lay the Temple foundations.

His excavations went to a depth of c.4-5m, but never touched virgin soil. Among the pottery Calvert found, he identified nothing earlier than seventh century. He was, however, left with the clear understanding that the site consisted of many superimposed ruins, and with the conviction that the site of Troy was there to be found. These he passed on to Schliemann.¹⁸⁹

IV. Reconstruction of the Mound Before Excavation

It is only from the time of Schliemann's visit of 1868 onwards that more detailed observations of the site become available. When taken together these allow us to reconstruct the shape of the mound as it was before excavation. A reconstruction of this sort is not simply a matter of antiquarian interest; it is an essential first step to the accurate interpretation of Schliemann's excavation-records. The reason is that, since he himself used no grid, the only method by which he could pinpoint his finds was to note their depth from the surface and their distance from the edge of the mound. To the modern reader this information is useless and confusing unless the shape of the mound has been

defined. But given an adequate reconstruction, most of the obscurities can be resolved.

As might be expected, Schliemann's earliest measurements lack precision. After his visit of 1868 he described the site as a spur roughly 40m high, standing 20m higher than the hills behind it. The summit was a four-cornered plateau measuring 233m in both length and width, with its north slope dropping "almost vertically to the plain."¹⁹⁰ The horizontal measurements must have been paced out on the plain and judged by eye; the vertical measurements are generous estimates. In his diary for 1870 he noted an altitude of 100ft, the mound standing 50ft higher than the hills and on two sides dropping to the plain at an angle of 65°.¹⁹¹ The horizontal measurements, presumably of the top of the mound, are now given as 164 x 120m;¹⁹² but a note is added that the eastern part of the summit lay 3 to 4m lower than the western part.¹⁹³ Another batch of figures was given after his work of 1871 and 1872. The summit of the mound stood at 32m above the plain and at 40m above sea-level.¹⁹⁴ This summit constituted a higher plateau; there was also a second plateau 8m below the summit and 24m above the plain,¹⁹⁵ i.e. at 32m above sea-level. The horizontal measurements, this time clearly taken again from the base of the mound, are given as 215 x 300m.¹⁹⁶ The angle of the north slope is said to be 40°.¹⁹⁷

From these diverse, early measurements a preliminary picture emerges. The plain lay at about 8m above sea-level, and the ridge of hills at about 25m above sea-level. Above these the site rose in three tiers: a lower "plateau" at about 32m, the eastern half of the summit at 36-37m, and the western half of the summit - the "highest plateau" - at about 40m above sea-level. The base of the site, where it joined the plain, measured roughly 215 x 300m; the summit of the mound measured roughly 164 x 120m, these figures evidently indicating its greatest length and greatest width. There was a steep slope on two sides, that on the north side being particularly noticeable. This body of preliminary information will be useful in providing a rough check on whatever more detailed reconstruction we may reach.

For a more precise picture we can draw on some early, but partial, contour-plans together with a fairly large number of spot-heights for

the original mound surface.

The first plan to give an indication of contours was Adolphe Laurent's plan of 1872, published as Atlas Taf.116 and reproduced here as Fig.I.4. It shows the shape of the mound at an early stage in the excavations. The dotted lines, however, do not represent genuine contours, as becomes clear if we compare them with the spot-heights and the profile on the same plate. Their purpose seems to be to show how the lie of the land struck the eye. Dörpfeld has reproduced Laurent's plan in Troja und Ilion fig.1, but he has omitted the spot-heights and the profile while adding three extra "contours" of his own. These are certainly not based on his own observation. He only arrived at Hisarlık in 1882, by which time the contours of the mound had been badly distorted by dumping: the frontispiece to Ilios shows the state of the site at the end of 1879. One is driven to the conclusion that Dörpfeld's additional contours are no more than decorative. For the more outlying parts of the site, away from the excavations on the citadel, Wolff's plan of 1883 is definitive. Published in Troja Plan VIII and reproduced (with some additions) in Troja und Ilion Taf.II,¹⁹⁸ it was the first plan to show genuine contours. But its outlines of the mound itself have been almost completely distorted by dumping. None of the undulations shown by Wolff on the north side appears in the early plans of Schliemann. To these plans we may add the testimonies of Atlas Taf.177 and 214 (reproduced as Troja und Ilion fig.2; and Troy and Its Remains Plan 2, Troja und Ilion fig.3), which, while not showing contours, do give an indication of the general shape of the summit of the mound. (See Figs. I.5,6).

Spot-heights on the original mound-surface are available from a number of sources. Several are noted in Laurent's plan, Atlas Taf.116. Atlas Taf. 117, from the end of the 1872 season, gives some more, including a useful one for the top of the "Tower." In Dörpfeld's version of the plan some of the depths are omitted and at least one is incorrectly transcribed.¹⁹⁹ The plan of the 1873 excavations, Atlas Taf. 214, is particularly valuable as it includes a large number of spot-heights on unexcavated areas. But it has its difficulties. In the four copies of the (rather rare) Atlas that I have been able to consult, the photographs are always in part badly faded, and some of the figures in Taf. 214 are barely legible even with a magnifying glass. It is not surprising that

the later reproductions of Taf.214 in TR Plan 2 and TI Fig.3 show discrepancies and omissions from the original. But precisely because of the difficulties it is essential to use the plan as it stands in the Atlas. Two of the section-drawings in Ilios, plans III and IVa, show the mound-surface at certain points and allow a rough calculation of its altitude by measuring its height above identifiable points such as the top of Wall IIa in Plan III, or the "Hellenic Wall" (of IXB) in Plan IV. In Plan IVb, shown below IVa, the measurements are incorrect - the line which marks the bottom of the excavations may have been wrongly drawn in - and this renders the section useless for our present purpose. In Ilios Schliemann reports Burnouf's calculation that the mound reached 49.43m above sea-level.²⁰⁰ This altitude is completely different from any other ever calculated for the site and should be disregarded. Wolff's plan of 1883 shows one or two spot-heights on unexcavated parts of the mound proper. The spot-heights which Dörpfeld shows around the edges of the citadel in Troja und Ilion Taf.III at first look very helpful, but in fact prove to have been affected in all cases by dumping. The architectural record in this plan is nevertheless useful, for the highest bench-marks among the excavated remains provide us with the minimum altitude below which the mound-surface must not be placed. Troja und Ilion figs 6 and 53 are composite section-drawings and are too schematic to be used with any precision. From the American excavations comes very little which might help us to reconstruct the summit of the mound: too much of it had already been dug away. But for reconstructing its sides their report is invaluable. First, it enables us to eliminate many of the outlying altitudes shown by Wolff and Dörpfeld but which derive from the dumps left by Schliemann and Dörpfeld. The Cincinnati team speaks ruefully of "the many meters of unproductive dump," the "thousands of tons of loose earth and debris" and the "enormous mass of debris deposited by Schliemann." Specifically, dumping was recognised in A 2-3-4,²⁰¹ AB8-9,²⁰² CDEF 2-3,²⁰³ C 8-9 and D 9,²⁰⁴ E 8-9,²⁰⁵ F 8-9,²⁰⁶ G 9,²⁰⁷ K 7,²⁰⁸ and ZA 4-5-6.²⁰⁹ Secondly, it allows us - if we take text, plans and sections together - to define the altitudes and locations of the original mound-surface, often in areas where the earlier spoil was removed. Spot-heights thus become available for A 3,²¹⁰ A 8,²¹¹ D 2,²¹² E 8-9,²¹³ F 8-9,²¹⁴ G 2-3,²¹⁵ J 5²¹⁶ and K 7.²¹⁷

These, then, are the sources from which we may deduce the original shape of the mound. But bringing all the information together is a complex



operation which involves several procedures. We face three difficulties. First, the plans are all drawn to different scales. This would pose few problems if the scales marked on each were entirely accurate, or if one could be certain that features were all correctly drawn in; but that is not the case. Secondly, we need to be able to give all plans the same orientation, so as to be able to superimpose one plan on another; but magnetic and true North are not always distinguished and no plan before 1890 bears a grid. Thirdly, each plan adopts a different (and often unspecified) datum for its altitudes, and we are left with the task of calculating the relationships between the altitudes of one plan and another. To this only the altitudes used in Troja und Ilion and by Blegen are an exception, for Blegen deliberately adopted Dörpfeld's standard.²¹⁸

We must begin the operation by converting all the plans to the same scale and orientation. This will enable us to apply Dörpfeld's grid to every plan and so to fix the positions of all the spot-heights. Each plan shows buildings or other features which appear also in TI Taf.III, where the grid is drawn. It is these, not the orientation-marks, which are better used. In Atlas Taf.214, despite its crude appearance, the buildings are mostly in the same positions relative to each other as they are in TI Taf.III. There is a small distortion of up to 3m at some points, but this is not enough to invalidate the plan altogether. The most useful features for comparison are the "Hellenic Well" at C 4-5, the relation of CD 5-6 to Gate FM (which is not yet fully exposed in Schliemann's plan), Propylon IXD, and the northeast corner of the Troy VI city wall in K 4. Having on this basis applied the grid to Atlas Taf.214, we can then apply it indirectly to Atlas Taf.116 and 117. Taf.116 and 117 can be related to Taf.214 by the positions of the northwest trench of 1870, together with its architecture; of the North-South trench; and of Calvert's trench on the northeast side. Taf.117 helps further by showing in its profile the "Great Tower" (Dörpfeld's Wall IIB and IIC), which also appears in Taf.214. Burnouf's plan in Ilios does not, fortunately, concern us here as it carries no spot-heights. With Wolff's plan in Troja Plan VIII we are able to return to direct comparisons with TI Taf.III. The comparisons are nevertheless not without problems. Wolff's plan of the citadel itself is on such a very small scale that it has to be greatly magnified; and with magnification what were minute errors in the original become serious inaccuracies. It seems to be the outer features of the citadel which have

been slightly misplaced: Propylon IXD, the south side of the Troy VI circuit wall and Gate FL. The temple, too, is not quite correctly drawn in. The features whose relative positions are most reliable are Gates FM, FN, FO, Megara IIA, IIB and the earth pillar in E6. It is by reference to these that Dörpfeld's grid can be applied. In bringing all these plans together a margin of error is unavoidable: it derives chiefly from the plans themselves. But it is not so large as to invalidate the results to any major degree.

Once the plans can be placed together under Dörpfeld's grid, all the known spot-heights for the mound-surface can be put on one map. This brings us to our next obstacle: the lack of a uniform standard in measuring altitudes. Here we have to resort to some arithmetic. In Table I I have extracted from each plan the altitude of any spot which is marked with an altitude in any other plan as well. By comparing these figures we can define the differences between the datum-level used in each plan, and so eventually convert all altitudes to the standard used by Dörpfeld and Blegen. Direct comparisons with either Troja und Ilion or Blegen are possible in most cases.

(i) Atlas Taf.116

Mound-surface in E 8: Blegen	37.50 ²¹⁹	
Taf.116	<u>30.34</u>	
	7.16	difference

The two figures come from points close to one another on the mound surface. Since, however, they do not come from identical points the calculation needs to be checked. This will be possible via Atlas Taf.117.

(ii) Atlas Taf.117

First of all, a direct comparison with Troja und Ilion:

Top of Tower in D 6: <u>TI</u>	30.66	
Taf.117	<u>19.50</u>	
	11.16	difference

These figures come from a solid architectural feature, and should be

reliable for comparison. Schliemann excavated the "Tower" down to the top of the masonry,²²⁰ so there should be no question of erosion between the dates of the two measurements.

Next, an indirect calculation to check the result obtained for Atlas Taf.116.

Mound-surface in D 5-6:	Taf.116	32.52	
	Taf.117	<u>28.50</u>	
		4.02	difference
		<u> </u>	

Thus

Difference between Taf.117 and <u>TI</u>	11.16
Difference between Taf.117 and <u>116</u>	<u>4.02</u>
Difference between Taf.116 and <u>TI</u>	<u>7.14</u>

Although the altitudes from D 5-6 in fact refer no more precisely to a single point than those from E 8, the virtual coincidence of the results is impressive. We will take the difference between Atlas Taf.116 and TI to be 7.15m.

(iii) Atlas Taf.214

Top of Tower in D 6:	<u>TI</u>	30.66	
	Taf.214	<u>24.36</u>	
		6.30	difference
		<u> </u>	

This should be an accurate figure. Two others, for points on the mound which are only roughly comparable, yield 6.37 and 6.62. But indirect calculation via Atlas Taf.117 and 116 yields 6.31, which seems to confirm the figure of 6.30.

(iv) Troja 1890

The comparison is very straightforward in this case, for the datum-point in D 3 is given the altitude 24.82 in Troja und Ilion.

(v) Troja Plan VIII

Here the situation is more complex. There is one figure, the spot-height for the mound-surface in E 6, which finds a direct comparison in TI Taf.III. But there is a question whether the figure, 40m, is accurate; for when it is compared with its equivalent in Atlas Taf.214 it yields a different result from the other comparison which can be made - for the mound-surface in G 4-5. The one produces a difference of 8.00m between Taf.214 and Troja; the other shows only 6.50m. Which of the figures is correct? To decide this we can apply a test, taking each set in turn.

(a) The figure of 40m for the mound-surface in E 6.

First we define the differences implied by the figure:

<u>Troja</u> Plan VIII:	40.00	
<u>TI</u> Taf.III:	38.37	(= <u>Troja</u> -1.63)
<u>Atlas</u> Taf.214	32.00	(= <u>Troja</u> -8.00)

We now re-apply these differences to a feature whose altitude is known, and, using them, calculate backwards to the altitude that ought then to be expected in Atlas 214 and 117. If the results agree with the altitudes actually given in the Atlas, then the differences must be correct. If not, they must be wrong. For the test-feature we may use the Tower.

Top of Tower in D 6:

Actual height in <u>TI</u>		30.66
Theoretical height in <u>Troja</u> VIII	(30.66 + 1.63)	31.29
Theoretical height in <u>Atlas</u> 214	(31.29 - 8.00)	23.29
Theoretical height in <u>Atlas</u> 117	(23.29 - 4.86)	18.43

The theoretical heights for the tower in Atlas 214 and 117 do not agree with the heights for the tower actually shown on the plans, so the differences we have been using must be wrong. It might be suggested that the error has arisen from the fact that E 6 was partly excavated in 1893, between the dates when Troja Plan VIII and TI Taf.III were drawn.²²¹ But Blegen rightly recognised that the E 6 pillar was hardly disturbed at all, except to uncover the walls of IXC.²²² This can be confirmed by comparing the altitudes given

for the pillar in Atlas 214 and TI Taf.III, which similarly bracket the date of its excavation. They reveal a difference of 6.37m, which is very close to the usual difference between the two plans. We therefore have to conclude that Wolff's altitude of 40m for E 6 must simply be wrong.

(b) The figure of 37m for the mound-surface in G 4-5.

Again, we first define the differences implied by the figure.

<u>Troja</u> Plan VIII	37.00		
<u>TI</u> Taf.III	[36.80]	(= <u>Troja</u>	-0.20) ²²³
<u>Atlas</u> Taf.214	30.50	(= <u>Troja</u>	-6.50)

Now we apply these to the Tower in the same way as before.

Top of Tower in D 6:

Actual height in <u>TI</u>		30.66
Theoretical height in <u>Troja</u> VIII	(30.66 + 0.20)	30.86
Theoretical height in <u>Atlas</u> 214	(30.86 - 6.50)	24.36
Theoretical height in <u>Atlas</u> 117	(24.36 - 4.86)	19.50

The figures for Atlas 214 and 117 agree exactly with those from the plans themselves, and so confirm that the difference between Troja und Ilion Taf.III and Troja Plan VIII must be 0.20m.

Table II is based on these results and shows the corrections which need to be applied when any two plans are compared. For our present purpose only the right-hand column is relevant. Using these comparisons, all spot-heights known for the original mound-surface can be justified to Dörpfeld's standard. The detailed conversions are listed in Table III.

The results can now be applied. Fig.I.7 brings together all the adjusted altitudes, the contours and pseudo-contours, and relates them to the grid. The spot-heights shown in brackets, in the southeast corner of the mound, are taken from Dörpfeld's uppermost underlying buildings. Only in this area do his bench-marks at all modify the picture given by the figures for the mound-surface.

On the basis of Fig.I.7, the tentative reconstruction in Fig.I.8 has been

made. The contours combine as far as possible the dictates of the spot-heights with the shape suggested by the outlying contours of Wolff and the pseudo-contours of Adolphe Laurent. There has been little difficulty in harmonising the three.²²⁴

It may be asked whether the reconstruction proposed in Fig.I.8 does not belong more to the realms of fantasy than of sober archaeology. To this properly sceptical question I bring several points in reply.

Certainly I will concede that the map cannot claim total accuracy. In some parts it is based on more evidence than in others; and the early plans which have contributed to its construction were themselves not wholly accurate. In a few cases the location of spot-heights may be wrong by two or three metres. The altitudes of the summit may be three or four centimetres out. But the map is drawn at a small enough scale for such errors to be of little consequence. I must add that constant application of the map to Schliemann's excavation-records, published and unpublished, has convinced me of its general validity. But certain more immediate tests can be used.

Maclaren's description, based on his visit of 1847, has been quoted earlier.²²⁵ He saw a mound measuring 700 x 700 ft. (= c.217 x 217m). Dörpfeld's grid, which neatly encloses the mound as reconstructed, measures 200 x 200m. The summit rose 100ft (c.31m) above the plain and 25ft (c.7½m) above the plateau on which it sat. On the west side there was a steep descent to the plain; on the east side there was a steep descent from the summit to the plateau. On the south side there was a gentle rise from the plateau to the summit with, at one point, a noticeable difference of 10ft. The reconstruction exhibits all these features, the description of the south slope being applicable to the terrain in FGH 8-9.

The preliminary picture which we formed from Schliemann's early descriptions confirms the new reconstruction in the same way. His measurement of the summit, 164 x 120m, fits well the surface of the reconstructed mound when measured along B-K 5 and F 3-8. The three tiers which he noted are also present: the "plateau" at 32.50m, on the southeast side of the mound; the eastern half of the summit lying at 36-37m in F-K 3-8; and the western half of the summit rising to nearly 40m in D 4-6.

The reconstruction can also be tested by comparing it, square by square, with the highest bench-marks in Dörpfeld's plan. In general the mound-surface as reconstructed fits snugly over the top of all Dörpfeld's buildings. Sometimes there is perhaps half a metre to spare, which we can put down either to error in the map or to topsoil encountered in excavation. In only one case does a figure in TI Taf.III show a greater height than that given in the map, and that is the figure of 37.40 in G 7. But this figure can be shown to have arisen from a mistake in Dörpfeld's arithmetic. It ought to have been 36.40, which is perfectly consistent with the contour-map.²²⁶

Some irregularities amongst the spot-heights in GH 3-4 may serve as a final confirmation. Here there is one curiously low altitude of 34.67, surrounded by five higher figures: 37.25, 36.76, 36.30, 36.43, and 36.80. The only explanation can be that there was a depression here. Now as it happens both Schliemann and Calvert refer to a depression in this area.²²⁷ Schliemann says that it was rectangular and measured 34 x 23m. If we take this into account, the whole feature can be drawn in quite accurately, and there is little choice over exactly where to place it. It has to be placed directly over the Temple of Athena, with a corresponding size and orientation. Even Schliemann realised that the depression had been made by peasants digging for stone.²²⁸ When the Temple was eventually excavated it was confirmed that the foundations had been entirely robbed out.²²⁹

Fig.I.8 is therefore put forward as a reasonable approximation to an accurate contour-plan of Hisarlık before excavation, in the light of what can be learned about the site from its surveyors and excavators. In subsequent chapters it will be put to use as a frame of reference around which Schliemann's excavations - their progress and their findings - can be reconstructed.

FOOTNOTES

1. In the reign of Justinian, apparently. See J.M.Cook, The Troad: An Archaeological and Topographical Study, (Oxford 1973) p.101f. It will be evident that in much of what follows I am deeply indebted to this magnificent work. A shorter survey of early travellers in the Troad may now also be found in Michael Wood, In Search of the Trojan War (London 1985) pp.29-42.
2. For example, H.Schliemann, Troy and its Remains (London 1875) p.200. The book is hereafter cited as TR. It may be noted here that this translation by Dora Schmitz of Trojanische Alterthümer (Leipzig 1874) is at many points unsatisfactory, sometimes even confused or misleading. For an accurate understanding of Schliemann's work one should normally refer to the German edition.
3. When the site of Hisarlık is referred to in this study as "Troy," this is purely for convenience. It is not meant to convey or imply any particular view either about what the site was called in the Late Bronze Age, or about the historicity of the Trojan War, or about the interpretation of the topographies of classical geographers.
4. Charles Maclaren, A Dissertation on the Topography of the Plain of Troy, (Edinburgh 1822).
5. I.A. van Dieten (ed.) Nicetae Choniatae Historia I (Berlin 1975) p.601 lines 80,83; p.617 line 73.
6. R.L. Wolff, "The Organization of the Latin Patriarchate of Constantinople, 1204-1261," Traditio VI (1948) pp.33-60, p.52.
7. Nicephorus Gregoras, Historia Byzantina XXV.26. The name does occur elsewhere in Byzantine sources, but I have not attempted an exhaustive survey of the literature.
8. P.P.Argenti (ed.) The Diplomatic Archive of Chios 1577-1841, I (Cambridge 1954) p.123f.
9. For the ruins at Alexandria Troas see J.M.Cook, The Troad pp.198-204.
10. P.Belon du Mans, Les Observations de plusieurs Singularitez et choses memorables (Paris 1553) Book II pp.82-84.
11. W.Biddulph, (ed. Theophilus Lavender) The Travels of certaine Englishmen into Africa, Asia, Troy, Bythinia, Thracia and to the Blacke Sea (London 1609) p.14. Biddulph's party did not go ashore.
12. W.Lithgow, The Totall Discourse of the Rare Adventures and Painefull Peregrinations etc. (Glasgow 1906) pp.108-114.
13. "Master Thomas Coryates travels to, and Observations in Constantinople and other places in the way thither, and his journey thence to Aleppo, Damasco, and Jerusalem," in Purchas his Pilgrimes X (Glasgow 1905) ch.xii, pp.395-414.
14. Viaggi di Pietro della Valle (Rome 1650) I pp.34-44.
15. J.Spon, Voyage d'Italie, de Dalmatie, de Grèce, et du Levant, fait aux années 1675 et 1676, (Lyon 1678) I pp.197-209.
16. W.R. Wilson, Travels in Eygpt and the Holy Land, (2nd edition, London 1824) p.357.
17. For the site, and a fuller history of its visitors, see J.M.Cook, The Troad pp. 152-159.
18. B.de Khitrovo (ed.) Itinéraires Russes en Orient, (St Petersburg 1865) p.207. Other Russian pilgrims, such as Ignatius of Smolensk (1405), the Archimandrite Grethenios (c.1400) and Epiphanes the Monk (c.1416), took the same route but did not note the location of Troy. Basil the Merchant, however, took the overland route (1465.).
19. P.Mundy, "Itinerarium Mundi," in R.C.Temple (ed.) The Travels of Peter Mundy in Europe and Asia, 1608-1667, (Cambridge 1907) I p.20.

20. "Extracts from Blount's Voyage into the Levant," in R.C. Temple (ed.), The Travels of Peter Mundy etc., I.p.157.
21. Aaron Hill, A Full and Just Account of the Present State of the Ottoman Empire in all its Branches (London 1733) pp.194-197. Others who place Troy beside the Dardanelles but who are inexplicit otherwise include Robert of Clari (1203), Cyriacus of Ancona (1445) and Sir John Maunderville (1322). See E.H. McNeal (ed.), The Conquest of Constantinople, translated from the Old French of Robert of Clari, (New York 1936) p.66; Thomas Wright (ed.), Early Travels in Palestine (London 1848) p.134; E.W. Bodnar (ed.), Cyriacus of Ancona's Journeys in the Propontis and the Northern Aegean, 1444-1445, Memoirs of the American Philosophical Society, vol 122 (Philadelphia 1976) p.35.
22. "Master Thomas Dallam's Diary," in J.T. Bent (ed.), Early Voyages and Travels in the Levant (London 1893) pp.46-49. Cook, a little unjustly, accuses him of being "no scholar" and of being "content to have two different Troys." The Troad p.157 n.1.
23. Richard Hakluyt, The Principal Navigations, Voyages, Traffiques and Discoveries of the English Nation (Glasgow 1903-1905) VI p.107.
24. Voyage du Sieur de Stochove fait es années 1630, 1631, 1632, 1633, (Brussels 1643) pp.211-216).
25. Ruy Gonzalez de Clavijo, Embassy to Tamerlane 1403-1406, transl. G.le Strange (London 1928), pp.54,58.
26. Thomas Wright (ed.), Early Travels in Palestine (London 1848) p.49.
27. Lady Goodenough (transl.), The Chronicle of Muntaner, 2 vols. (London 1920) II p.511.
28. Malcolm Letts (ed. and transl.), Pero Tafur; Travels and Adventures 1435-1439 (London 1926) pp.112-114.
29. J.Leunclavius, Historiae Musulmanae Turcorum (Frankfurt 1591) IV, cols. 205-209; with additional sources in J.von Hammer-Purgstall, Geschichte des Osmanishcen Reiches² (Pest 1840) I p.131f.
30. M.G.F.A.Comte de Choiseul-Gouffier, Voyage Pittoresque de la Grèce II. 2, (Paris 1822) p.417 n.6. D.E.Pitcher, An Historical Geography of the Ottoman Empire (Leiden 1972) p.39 and Map VIII.
31. P.Villard, "Mehmed II et la guerre de Troie (1462)," Provence Historique 93-94 (1974) pp.361-373, esp. 368.
32. M.G.F.A.Comte de Choiseul-Gouffier, Voyage Pittoresque de la Grèce, II.1, ch.13 (Paris 1809) pp.4-11; see also the "Notice sur la vie et les ouvrages de M. le Comte de Choiseul-Gouffier" by Dacier in II.2 (Paris 1822).
33. Voyage Pittoresque de la Grèce II.1, ch.14 (Paris 1820) p.208.
34. On Chevalier see J.M.Cook, The Troad p.21f; and A.C. Lascarides, The Search for Troy 1553-1874, Lilly Library Publication XXIX, (Indiana University 1977) pp.32-34.
35. J-B. Chevalier, Description of the Plain of Troy, Translated and edited by Andrew Dalzel (Edinburgh 1791).
36. J-B. Chevalier, Recueil des Cartes, Plans, Vues et Médailles pour servir au Voyage de la Troade (Paris 1802) No. XIV.
37. Description of the Plain of Troy p.38.
38. e.g. Voyage Pittoresque de la Grèce II.1 plate 19, made in 1786-87. This map is in the Kauffer tradition, as Mauduit recognised: A.F.Mauduit, Découvertes dans la Troade (Paris 1840) p.240.
39. J-B Lechevalier, Beschreibung der Ebene von Troja, transl. H.Heyne (Leipzig 1792).
40. Chevalier's Recueil des Cartes (1802) does place Ilium Recens at Çıplak, and shows Paşa Tepe also. These are additions which can be traced back at least to C.G.Lenz (ed.), Reise nach Troas oder Gemählde der Ebene von Troja in ihrem gegenwertigen Zustande, vom Burger Lechevalier (Erfurt 1800) p.178f, where Chevalier seems to be following the views of Helvig and Åkerblad, *Ibid.* pp.233,258 - although they are not there incorporated in the map.

41. On Halileli see J.M.Cook, The Troad pp.64-67, 68f.
42. Ibid. p.93.
43. Voyage Pittoresque de la Grèce II.1, plate 19; see also note 38 above.
44. Ibid. II p.333 n.4; see also p.208.
45. Ibid. II.2 plate 35.
46. A Map of the Plain of Troy and the District of Ida (London 1803).
47. Constantine, Count de Ludolf, was the Neopolitan ambassador at Constantinople. He is said to have been the owner of a fine library which he made available to both resident society and travellers. According to Robert Tweddell (ed.), The Remains of John Tweddell (London 1816) p.248, he had by 1798 been collecting a portfolio of views for many years.
48. W.Gell, The Topography of Troy, and Its Vicinity (London 1804) p.112f.
49. J.Rennell, Observations on the Topography of the Plain of Troy (London 1814), p.xix.
50. E.D.Clarke, Travels in Various Countries of Europe, Asia and Africa (London 1811-1814) vol. VIII (=part II.3) p.195; for the outdated plan see vol. III p.185. The revised version appears in Voyage Pittoresque de la Grèce II plate 68.
51. G.A.Olivier, Voyage dans L'Empire Othoman, L'Égypte at la Perse (Paris An 9 = 1801), Atlas plate 5.
52. Ibid. II p.50.
53. J.Rennell, op. cit., Map IV.
54. Voyage Pittoresque de la Grèce II.1 (Paris 1809) plate 13.
55. Ibid. plates 18, 19 in chapter 14, published in 1820.
56. Ibid. II.1 p.261 n.2.
57. Ibid. II.1 p.296 n.1.
58. Ibid. II.2 p.422 n.4.
59. Ibid. II.2, "Avertissement du Libraire-Éditeur."
60. Ibid. II.2 plate 36.
61. E.D.Clarke, op.cit., vol. III p.110 n.2 (in the 1817 edition). Préaux had previously been employed by both Choiseul-Gouffier and John Tweddell; Remains of John Tweddell p.261.
62. E.D.Clarke, op.cit. vol.III p.110.
63. Ibid. pp.130-133.
64. J.M.Cook, The Troad, p.93f.
65. "Remarks on the Troad," in R.Walpole (ed.), Memoirs relating to European and Asiatic Turkey; edited from Manuscript Journals (London 1817) p.556.
66. G.E.Marindin (ed.), The Letters of John B.S.Morrith of Rokeby (London 1914) p.141; J.B.S.Morrith, A Vindication of Homer and of the Ancient Poets and Historians who have recorded the Siege and Fall of Troy (York 1798) p.91. For the sites at Çıplak see J.M.Cook, The Troad p.106f.
67. W.Gell, The Topography of Troy, and Its Vicinity (London 1804) p.144.
68. Ibid., narrative of the journey on pp.1-17.
69. Ibid. Plates xiv, xviii, xix, xxxi, xxxvii.
70. E.D.Clarke, op.cit., vol. VIII p.131f.
71. W.Gell, op.cit., p.75.
72. E.D.Clarke, op.cit., vol.II p.137 n.1.
73. J.Rennell, Observations on the Topography of the Plain of Troy, Map 1.
74. Richard Chandler, The History of Ilium or Troy (London 1802).
75. E.D.Clarke, op.cit., vol.III (1812) p.102f.
76. Lord Broughton (= J.C.Hobhouse), Travels in Albania and Other Provinces of Turkey vol. II (London 1855) p.146; Voyage Pittoresque de la Grèce, II.2 (Paris 1822) p.422; G.F.Weston, Journal of a Tour in Europe and the East 3 vols, (London 1894) II p.111: his visit was in 1845.

77. Choiseul-Gouffier op.cit. p.421; W. Turner, Journal of a Tour in the Levant III (London 1820) p.226; H.N.Ulrichs, "An excursus on the topography of the homeric Ilium," Transactions of the Royal Society of Literature, 2nd series, II (1847) p.51.
78. Charles Maclaren, A Dissertation on the Topography of the Plain of Troy (Edinburgh 1822).
79. Robert Cox and James Nicol (ed.), Select Writings, Political, Scientific, Topographical and Miscellaneous, of the Late Charles Maclaren, II (Edinburgh 1869) p.449, note.
80. Charles Maclaren, The Plain of Troy Described (Edinburgh 1863) pp.70ff.
81. Ibid. p.71.
82. P.W.Forchhammer, "Observations on the Topography of Troy," Journal of the Royal Geographical Society 12 (1842) pp.28-44; and Beschreibung der Ebene von Troja (Frankfurt 1850). His visit was in 1839.
83. Choiseul-Gouffier, op.cit. II.2 plate 35.
84. Ibid.
85. Ibid. II.2 p.299.
86. Ibid. II.2.p.421f. The chapter is ascribed to Barbié du Bocage (l'Éditeur) on p.433, beyond which Letronne took over the writing.
87. H.N.Ulrichs op.cit. p.50f.
88. C.T. Newton, Travels and Discoveries in the Levant I (London 1865) p.132. His visit was in 1853.
89. W.Dörpfeld, Troja und Ilion (Athens 1902), II Tafel II.
90. J.Hammer-Purgstall, Topographische Ansichten Gesammelt auf einer Reise in die Levante (Vienna 1811) p.24 (visit in 1800).
91. Choiseul-Gouffier op.cit. II plates 35,36.
92. Ibid. p.422.
93. P.W.Forchhammer, Journal of the Royal Geographical Society 12 (1842) p.39.
94. G. von Eckenbrecher, "Über die Lage des homerischen Ilion," Rheinisches Museum für Philologie NF 2 (1843) p.39.
95. W.Turner, op.cit. III p.226.
96. G.F.Weston, op.cit. II p.111.
97. C.T.Newton op.cit. I p.132.
98. K.B. Stark Nach dem Griechischen Orient (Heidelberg 1874) p.173; A.C.Lascarides, The Search for Troy 1553-1874, Lilly Library Publication XXIX (Indiana 1977) p.63.
99. J.M.Cook gives the dates as 1846-1862: The Troad p.35.
100. C.T. Newton op.cit. I p.125.
101. The Earl of Carlisle, Diary in Turkish and Greek Waters I (London 1854) p.72.
102. N.W.Senior, A Journal kept in Turkey and Greece (London 1859) pp.33-44, 122-3.
103. Ernst Meyer, Briefwechsel von Heinrich Schliemann, 2 vols (Berlin 1953) I p.328 n.240; hereafter quoted as Briefwechsel.
104. A.C. Lascarides op.cit. p.63.
105. W.N.Senior La Turquie Contemporaine (Paris 1861) p.147.
106. E.Napier, "Remarks on Ancient Troy and the Modern Troad," United Service Journal 140 (1840) ii, p.297; F.G. Welcker, Tagebuch einer Griechischen Reise 2 vols. (Berlin 1865) II p.224.
107. Major Sir Grenville Temple, Bt., Travels in Greece and Turkey, 2 vols. (London 1836) I p.289.
108. Charles Fellows, A Journal Written During an Excursion in Asia Minor (London 1839) p.76.
109. C.T.Newton, op.cit. p.125.
110. Earl of Carlisle, op.cit. p.76.
111. W.N.Senior, La Turquie Contemporaine p.159.

112. Frank Calvert, "Contributions to the Ancient Geography of the Troad: On the site and Remains of Ophrynum," The Archaeological Journal 17 (1860) opp. p.287.
113. Earl of Carlisle, op.cit. pp.76, 95-7.
114. G.F. Weston, op.cit. II pp.120-4.
115. W.N.Senior, La Turquie Contemporaine p.146.
116. K.B.Stark, op.cit., p.173.
117. Earl of Carlisle op.cit. pp.76-8; W.N. Senior, La Turquie Contemporaine p.157.
118. Earl of Carlisle, op.cit. p.76f.
119. J.M.Cook, The Troad p.119f. N.W.Senior, however, appears to place the Batak Farm of 1857 not at Akça Köy but in the region of Dikeli Taş, where Cook does speculate that there may have been a çiftlik. N.W.Senior, A Journal kept in Turkey and Greece, map following p.154; J.M.Cook, The Troad p. 107. By 1874, at any rate, there was a Calvert farmhouse at Akça Köy: H.Schliemann, TR p.393 (Batak); Ilios p.706.
120. W.N. Senior, La Turquie Contemporaine pp.157,160.
121. E.g. Earl of Carlisle, op.cit. p.95f; TR pp.70,71,92.
122. TR p.51.
123. According to Cook, The Troad, p.35, he died in 1876.
124. Earl of Carlisle, op.cit. p.97; C.T.Newton, op.cit. p.125.
125. Earl of Carlisle, op.cit. pp.97,99; W.N.Senior, La Turquie Contemporaine pp. 147-150,157.
126. J.H. Clapham (ed.), John Brunton's Book (Cambridge 1939) p.71f.
127. N.W.Senior, A Journal kept in Turkey and Greece, p.208.
128. W.N.Senior, La Turquie Contemporaine p.155f.
129. Ibid.
130. Ibid.p159f.
131. N.W.Senior, A Journal kept in Turkey and Greece p.154.
132. J.M.Cook, The Troad p.82.
133. Letters from Frank Calvert to C.T.Newton, 24th September 1863. The original is in the Archive Room of the British Museum. I am very much indebted to Mr D.M.Bailey of the Department of Greek and Roman Antiquities for kindly providing me with a transcript of the letter and for permission to quote from it.
134. Frank Calvert, "Trojan Antiquities," The Athenaeum No.2454, (7th Nov. 1874) p.610.
135. E.g. TR p.144.
136. J.M.Cook, The Troad p.61.
137. N.W.Senior, A Journal kept in Turkey and Greece p.207.
138. Frank Calvert, "Contributions to the Ancient Geography of the Troad: On the Site and Remains of Colonoe," The Archaeological Journal 17 (1860) p.293 n.8.
139. J.H.Clapham, op.cit. esp.p.68f; J.M.Cook, The Troad pp.37,94f; also p.58.
140. The Archaeological Journal 18 (1861) p.363f; contrast J.M.Cook, The Troad p.137.
141. Frank Calvert, "The Tumulus of Hanai Tepeh in the Troad," The Archaeological Journal 16 (1859)p.5f.
142. J.M.Cook, The Troad pp.58, 137.
143. H.Schliemann, Troja (London 1884) p.214; cf. also Tagebuch for 1870, p.69; H.F.Tozer, Researches in the Highlands of Turkey I (London 1869) p.48. W.Dörpfeld, Troja und Ilion p.240.
144. Troja p.26.
145. See note 133.
146. TR pp.230,239.

147. W.Dörpfeld, Troja und Ilion pp.230-234; hereafter cited as TI.
148. G.Perrot, "Excursion à Troie et aux Sources du Menderé," Annuaire de l'Association pour l'Encouragement des Études Grecques en France VIII (1874) p.61; J.M.Cook, The Troad p.95; cf.C.T.Newton, op.cit.I p.131 for a similar occurrence two years earlier.
149. Briefwechsel I p.170.
150. Frederick held the view in 1845: G.F.Weston, op.cit. II p.123; in 1857: W.N.Senior, La Turquie Contemporaine p.163; Frank held the view in 1856: The Archaeological Journal 16 (1859) p.5. Both only began to question it in 1860: see above, note 140. Frank only abandoned it finally in 1863.
151. Earl of Carlisle, op.cit.p.96.
152. K.B.Stark, op.cit. p.173.
153. Frank Calvert, "Excavations in the Troad," The Levant Herald, 4th February 1873 p.90.
154. C.T.Newton, op.cit. I p.134; so also H.F.Tozer op.cit.I p.45; Earl of Carlisle, op.cit. p.92f.
155. The Archaeological Journal 16 (1859) pp.1-6.
156. The Levant Herald 4th February 1873 p.90.
157. H.Schliemann, Ilios (London 1880) p.709.
158. Frank Calvert, "Thymbra, Hanai Tepeh," Ilios pp 706-720.
159. C.T.Newton, op.cit. p.134f,355 n.62; The Archaeological Journal 16 (1859) pp.1-3.
160. W.N.Senior, La Turquie Contemporaine p.161f.
161. Ibid. p.151.
162. Frank Calvert, The Archaeological Journal 17 (1860) pp.291-296; Ilios p.655.
163. C.T.Newton, op.cit. p.132f.
164. The Levant Herald loc.cit.
165. The Archaeological Journal 17 (1860), map opp.p.287 and p.293.
166. Cf. J.M.Cook, The Troad pp.72-77.
167. Frank Calvert, "On the Site of Colonoë," The Archaeological Journal 17 (1860) pp.287-291; "On the Site and Remains of Larisa," The Archaeological Journal 18 (1861) pp.253-255.
168. W.N.Senior, La Turquie Contemporaine p.170; The Levant Herald loc.cit. Schliemann wrongly attributes the excavation to Frank Calvert in Ilios p.656 and Troja p.251.
169. The Archaeological Journal 18 (1861) pp.363-4; H.N.Ulrichs, "Über die Lage Trojas," Rheinisches Museum für Philologie NF iii (1845) pp.573-608; Transactions of the Royal Society of Literature, 2nd series, II (1847) pp 103-178.
170. TR pp.71,92.
171. TR p.70.
172. Ilios p.77, where Frank is named as the owner.
173. Charles Maclaren, The Plain of Troy Described (Edinburgh 1863).
174. Frank Calvert, "Contributions towards the Ancient Geography of the Troad: On the Site of Gergithe," The Archaeological Journal 21 (1864) pp.48-53; The Athenaeum No.2454 (7th Nov. 1874) p.610.
175. The Levant Herald, loc.cit.
176. See above, note 133.
177. TR pp.223,230,239; letter of 14th Nov. 1872 to Sir John Lubbock, H.G.Hutchinson, The Life of Sir John Lubbock, Lord Avebury, 2 vols. (London 1914), I p.143.
178. TI pp.230-4.
179. Letter of 3rd February 1864 from C.T.Newton to Frank Calvert, from the letter files of the Department of Greek and Roman Antiquities in the British Museum. I am again very grateful to Mr D.M.Bailey for providing me with a photocopy of this and other documents, and for permission to quote from them.

180. The Athenaeum, loc.cit.
181. The Archaeological Journal 22 (1865) p.337; H. Schliemann, Ithaka, der Peloponnes und Troja (Leipzig 1869) p.165f, hereafter quoted as IPT; The Levant Herald, loc.cit; The Athenaeum, loc.cit.
182. TI p.216.
183. TI pp.215,216.
184. Up to the point marked 'c' in TI p.144 fig.52; for the superstructure see p.117f.
185. Cf. TI p.223.
186. Troja p.200; TI p.433.
187. Briefwechsel I p.144.
188. TI pp.216-223.
189. IPT pp.165f; Briefwechsel I pp.140,142. The degree of Schliemann's indebtedness to Frank Calvert is rightly emphasised, and elucidated, by David A. Traill in "Further Evidence of Fraudulent Reporting in Schliemann's Archaeological Works," Boreas 7 (1984) pp.295-312.
190. IPT p.164f.
191. Tagebuch 1870, p.66.
192. Ibid. p.88.
193. Ibid.p.135.
194. TA p.46.
195. TA pp.2,6.
196. TA p.2.
197. TA p.46; but the summary in Ilios p.22 notes the angle as 45°.
198. Also in C.W. Blegen, C.G.Boulter, J.L.Caskey, M.Rawson, J.Sperling, Troy: Excavations Conducted by the University of Cincinnati, 1932-38, 4 vols. (Princeton, 1950-58), I fig.416 etc.; hereafter cited as Troy.
199. 22.5 in Atlas Taf.117 appears as 25 in TI fig.2; the depth marked 20.5 TI fig.2 may be 20.8 in Atlas Taf.117.
200. Ilios p.19
201. Troy I p.10; IV p.133.
202. Troy I pp.12, 18; III p.93f; IV p.305.
203. Troy I pp.10,11,33,34,81,196, fig.423. CDEF 2-3 was in any case the area of Schliemann's North Platform.
204. Troy III p.93f.
205. Troy IV fig.333
206. Troy I p.8, fig.470.
207. Troy I p.9f, 12, fig.95.
208. Troy III p.349, figs.497,498.
209. Troy I p.12; III p.363.
210. Troy IV p.133, fig.354 (stratum 2).
211. Troy IV p.305, fig. 378 with fig.375 (stratum 1).
212. Troy I fig.423 (stratum 6).
213. Troy IV fig.333 with figs.334-6.
214. Troy I fig.470 with III fig.449.
215. Troy III pp.107-9, figs. 83,447,501,502 (stratum 1a).
216. Troy IV p.283, fig.359.
217. Troy III p.349, figs.497,498 (stratum 2).
218. Troy, I p.20.
219. Troy IV fig.333, with reference also to fig.334-6.
220. TA pp.171,284. See also Atlas Taf.109,110 where the Tower is clearly all masonry.
221. W.Dörpfeld, Troja 1893: Bericht über die im Jahre 1893 veranstalteten Ausgrabungen (Leipzig 1894) p.72 and Taf.1; (hereafter cited as Troja 1893); TI pp.19,214.
222. Troy I p.8.
223. Calculated indirectly: the difference between Atlas Taf.214 and Troja Plan VIII is 6.50, while that between Atlas Taf.214 and TI Taf.III is

- 6.30. The 0.20 derives from the difference between these two figures.
224. One spot-height I have not been able to integrate within the contour-plan: 33.66 in D 9, deriving from Atlas Taf.117. It may already have been produced by dumping.
225. See above, note 80.
226. The plan in H.Schliemann, Bericht über die Ausgrabungen in Troja im Jahre 1890 (Leipzig 1891) shows its altitude as 11.58m, which needs to be corrected by 24.82 to reach the standard of TI Taf.III. 36.40m is the result. The mistake - for such it must be - is already present in Troja 1893 Plan I where it ought to be 28.83m but is marked 29.83m.
227. TA p.99; Briefwechsel I p.198.
228. TA p.99f; Briefe p.120.
229. TI p.217.

CHAPTER II:
THE DOCUMENTARY SOURCES

My aim in this chapter is to describe the sources, mainly documentary, from which we can gain a picture of Schliemann's work at Troy during the years 1870-1873. There is a wide range of source-materials available to us, and I shall first attempt a general outline of these. Then, as Schliemann's truthfulness has been called into question in recent years, I shall discuss how much reliance we can place on his records.

I. Range and Extent of the Sources

The range of documentary material bequeathed to us by Schliemann is most easily understood if we look systematically at how he worked: how he worked on site during excavation, and how he wrote up his findings afterwards, at home in Athens.

For excavation he preferred to employ Greek workmen rather than Turkish,¹ with the result that he developed a routine of working from Monday to Saturday and of taking Sunday off. This routine is reflected in the diaries he tried to keep during excavation. These contain daily entries written on weekdays, and periodic résumés written up usually on a Sunday or on a public holiday.²

The daily entries he aimed to write up each night after the close of work,³ although in practice he sometimes left this to the following day⁴ or even omitted it altogether. They usually run according to a formula. First comes the date, written in by Schliemann himself. He uses both the Julian (Eastern) and the Gregorian (Western) calendars, and the date is sometimes in one, sometimes in the other, and sometimes in both.⁵ After the date comes a note of the number of workmen employed that day and a record of the cost. Then follows a complaint about the weather and, hard on its heels, another complaint about the "allergrössten Schwierigkeiten" he is facing in the excavations.⁶ There may then be a brief note of where on the mound he has been working that day, and a mention of any specially notable architectural features or stratigraphic peculiarities. Finally he lists the objects he has found. Whereas in 1870 and 1871 this was done entirely verbally, in 1872 he began to use drawings. And, acting on Burnouf's advice,⁷ he included with each drawing a note of the depth at which it had been found. This practice continues into the diary for 1873 as well, and is a most fruitful source of information (see Figs.II.1-4).

We must remember, of course, that there were often trenches being dug in more than one part of the mound at once; and that Schliemann, talented though he may have been, was neither omniscient nor omnipresent. Except in cases where he himself was supervising, he must have been dependent for his information on periodic visits to the trenches, and on what was told to him by his supervisors and workmen. This to some extent explains the paucity of detail. The objects, we know, were sometimes brought to him by the workmen,⁸ and it must have been they who often provided the information as to depth. Photographs of the objects in the Atlas Trojanischer Alterthümer show how this was recorded: by marking each object with a figure in metres. Presumably this was done on the spot, as Schliemann received the object and questioned the workman. It was later, no doubt in his own hut and after dark, thus well away from the trenches, that the day's findings were recorded and the objects drawn. Here (and indeed later) there was scope for misreading the records of depth drawn onto the pieces: 6 could be read as 9, 4 as 7, and vice versa. Different readings for the depth of the same object can sometimes be found when the diaries and the Atlas are compared,⁹ but on the whole the two are consistent.

The periodic résumés are much longer affairs, and come at irregular intervals of one, two, three or even four weeks.¹⁰ Sometimes Schliemann succeeded in completing them during a single day off, but at other times their continuation can be found straggling through the next week or ten days in between the daily entries.¹¹ These résumés often give much more information about exactly where Schliemann has been digging. They can also give quite a full account of the stratigraphy and architecture as exposed at the time of writing. They are thus very useful in setting the scene for the daily entries which have preceded them, and in providing a "snapshot" of the state of the excavations on a given date. Never do they carry any drawings. But what they do quite often do is bring together the most interesting finds of the previous week or weeks, and classify them according to depth. In this way they sometimes provide verbal descriptions for objects for which, in the daily entries, there are only drawings (see Fig.II.5).

These periodic résumés are marred by crossings out, rewritings, and changes of order. The reason is that they were intended only as rough drafts of despatches later to be sent for publication by newspapers. The

fair copies were written out by Schliemann in his Penn Letter-Books.¹² From these he could tear out the handwritten bottom copy, leaving behind an upper sheet of tissue-paper which, having previously been pressed onto the original, had taken up the wet ink and reproduced the text. The duplicates of his fair copies are thus still available for inspection. The despatches themselves were sent to German or Greek newspapers, most commonly the Augsburg Allgemeine Zeitung, 'ΑΥΤΟΘΙ and 'Εφημερὶς τῶν Συζητήσεων.¹³ After publication they were sometimes picked up and used, in translation if necessary, by other journals.¹⁴

An area entirely neglected by Schliemann in 1870 and 1871 was the drawing of plans. This was to a small degree remedied by his bringing of Adolphe Laurent to the site in April 1872. Laurent was commissioned, as we have already seen, to draw a sort of pseudo-contour-map of the site, and onto it he plotted the trenches already cut in 1870 and 1871. Within them he also showed those architectural remains which were still visible at the beginning of the 1872 season.¹⁵ These, of course, are shown at only a very small scale. The same plan laid out a scheme for digging away a large part of the western half of the mound. Schliemann's excavation of the North Platform represents an abortive attempt to implement the scheme in full: excavation was thereafter conducted on a narrower front.

A further plan was drawn after the end of the 1872 season, this time by G. Sisilas, a surveyor, when Schliemann returned briefly to the site in late September.¹⁶ This plan again shows only what was visible at the end of the season. But it has the merit of showing where the spoil-heaps were accumulating and of providing a small, diagrammatic section showing clearly the line of the trench bottom and the altitudes of a few features.¹⁷

Three more plans, by Adolphe Laurent again,¹⁸ come from the end of the 1873 season. One is a plan of the entire site, including the full extent of the roman settlement to South and East.¹⁹ On this the mound is shown quite small. Another is a plan of the excavations in the mound, showing the remains visible at the end of the season, and sketching in the supposed lines of some demolished structures and their conjectural extensions in unexcavated ground.²⁰ Despite its air of

unreliability this plan is in fact very useful, not least because it gives a large number of spot-heights for excavated and unexcavated parts of the mound.

What Schliemann never did in these years was to make plans of his architectural discoveries as excavation proceeded, and before they were destroyed. A very great deal of information has been lost to us as a result.

On-site photography was used by Schliemann, but again only at the end of the season and only in 1872. On his short visit in late September he brought with him from the Dardanelles²¹ a photographer called Siebrecht²² who took twelve views of the site.²³ Seven of these are reproduced in the Atlas.²⁴

His team in 1873 was enlarged by the addition of a draughtsman, Polychronios Lempessis from Salamis.²⁵ The difference is immediately noticeable in the diary, where the scratchy and deformed drawings of 1872 are replaced by sketches of a professional standard (see Figs.II. 3,4). From the distribution of drawings in the 1873 diary it is obvious that Lempessis only gained access to the book from time to time.²⁶ But he must in the meantime have been occupied with compiling the full pages of drawings which, after photography, were subsequently published as Atlas Taf.119ff. To these Schliemann was simultaneously compiling a descriptive catalogue. The duplicate can be found in his copy-book for February-August 1873, interspersed with copies of his outgoing correspondence.²⁷ The catalogue itself was later published as a part of the text which accompanies the Atlas.

It was not just objects that Lempessis drew. No doubt it was he who made the fourteen sketches of the site later published in the latter half of the Atlas.²⁸ Some of these depict work in progress at various stages of the season; others give distant views of the mound from varying points of the compass. All are potentially useful in a general way, although none yields the kind of detailed information we should now like to have.

Schliemann was an inveterate letter-writer, and he kept up a steady flow of correspondence during excavation. A number of his letters from the

seasons of 1870-1873 have been published.²⁹ One of these, his letter of 21st April 1870, provides really useful information not available elsewhere.³⁰ The remainder for the most part only duplicate what can in any case be extracted from his diaries and publications. For this reason I have not undertaken the labour of thoroughly scouring his copy-books and his incoming correspondence for 1870-73, although both are available for study.³¹ It is certainly a possibility that they may contain the odd nugget of information not known from elsewhere.

Once excavation was over, Schliemann continued work in Athens. As early as February 1872 we hear of plans for a publication with photographs,³² and at this date Schliemann was already active in making squeezes and photographs of inscriptions and other objects which he must have brought with him from Troy at the end of 1871.³³ The theme was taken up again in October 1872, after his return to Athens,³⁴ and a proposed publication with Brockhaus was definitely envisaged in January 1873.³⁵ By this time he was systematically having photographs made of all his objects,³⁶ and it is quite clear that the majority of his finds had been assembled into a collection in Athens.³⁷ This included the Helios metope, smuggled out of Turkey in July 1872.³⁸ The resultant photographs, made between the seasons of 1872 and 1873, make up the majority of the plates in Atlas Taf.1-118. They show (not always very clearly) a large display of objects arranged on wooden shelves by class and by depth of findspot. Here we seem to be looking at Schliemann's collection as it was actually laid out in the winter of 1872-3.

More objects were shipped to Athens from the site during the course of the 1873 excavations, and a copy of a bill of lading for one such consignment is preserved in the 1873 copy-book.³⁹ "Priam's Treasure" was smuggled out in June of the same year by a strategy similar to that used in the previous year for the Helios metope.⁴⁰ Its removal from the site was actually so rapid that there was no opportunity for Lempessis to draw any of the pieces. This is why "Priam's Treasure" is documented mostly by photographs taken in Athens after the end of the 1873 season.⁴¹ Presumably Lempessis's drawings for the Atlas were photographed at the same time.

The Brockhaus book came out in French and German early in 1874.⁴² It consisted of the majority of Schliemann's despatches from 1871, 1872 and

1873, brought together with a small number of editorial changes.⁴³ Thus, while it is advisable to check the text of Trojanische Alterthümer against Schliemann's rough drafts and against his published despatches in newspapers, the book can in general be regarded as a primary source for the study of his work at Troy.

The Atlas came out at the same time⁴⁴ containing Schliemann's descriptive catalogue, the photographs and plans from 1872, the photographs made of the objects in Athens during the winter of 1872-3, and the photographs taken at the end of the 1873 season of the drawings made during the previous months. The photographs of "Priam's Treasure" were included as well.

An English translation of Trojanische Alterthümer appeared in 1875: Troy and Its Remains.⁴⁵ This includes a preface by the English editor, Philip Smith, a selection of engravings made from plates in the Atlas, and Schliemann's autobiographical preface to his earlier work Ithaka, der Peloponnes und Troja.⁴⁶ The translation was done by Dora Schmitz and is neither felicitous nor reliable.⁴⁷ The book therefore needs to be used with caution, and should usually be checked against the German original.

Schliemann himself was later responsible for a summary account of his work in these years. It appears in the Introduction to his book Ilios.⁴⁸ This account is dependent directly on the text of Trojanische Alterthümer.⁴⁹ So although it can occasionally clarify a doubtful point, it should in general be treated as a secondary, not a primary, source.

Directly dependent, in turn, on the summary in Ilios are the relevant passages in the so-called Selbstbiographie⁵⁰ and in Schuchhardt's one-volume summary of Schliemann's Excavations.⁵¹ These must on this account rank as tertiary sources and are of little value to this enquiry. The popular biographies give little detailed attention to the technicalities of the excavations and again draw mostly on previously published accounts. Ernst Meyer's documentary biography draws more extensively on unpublished correspondence and on the diaries, but cannot even so be relied upon for a clear and accurate exposition of Schliemann's archaeological progress.⁵² The summary given by Dörpfeld⁵³ is in an altogether different class benefitting, of course, from its

writer's intimate knowledge of the site and of the man. Dörpfeld's contribution here was to clarify the locations of Schliemann's trenches by reference to a grid, and to identify some of the structures he found. It is still a valuable piece. But it was a limited exercise, and it was not Dörpfeld's purpose to present a full account of Schliemann's earlier work; nor is there any sign that he had access to Schliemann's notebooks. For these reasons even his summary is of very limited value in re-assessing Schliemann's work of 1870-73.

From what has so far been said it will be obvious that manuscript sources play a considerable rôle in this study; and this may be an appropriate point at which to mention a problem concerning these.

A Schliemann archive exists in the Gennadius Library in Athens, an institution which comes under the aegis of the American School of Classical Studies. This must be the first resort of anyone seriously concerned with Schliemann's person or work. In the summer of 1980 I had the opportunity to visit the library and to compile an outline catalogue of the Schliemann archive. At the same time I was able to put together a partial history of the papers.⁵⁴ What emerged from that study was that, although the Troy notebooks for 1870-1873 and 1890 were present, those for the intervening seasons of 1878, 1879 and 1882 were not, and never had been. Moreover the related copy-books for the same dates were missing as well. These together make up just a part of an unexpectedly large gap in the archive.⁵⁵

How this gap may have arisen is something of a puzzle. But to my mind the most probable solution is suggested by an examination of where the present archive has come from. We know that after Schliemann's death his papers were fiercely guarded by his widow, Sophie.⁵⁶ It seems unlikely that she would have countenanced a division of the archive during her life-time. But it may well have been divided when she died in 1932. At this date her two children, Andromache and Agamemnon, were still alive; and so were two of her three grandchildren: Alex Melas and Leno Melas.⁵⁷ A large collection of papers (the bulk of the present archive) was lent to the Gennadeion by Andromache in 1937 and was bought by the library after her death in 1962.⁵⁸ Even during Andromache's lifetime, however, her son Leno had a further collection of papers in his own possession; and it later transpired that Alex Melas, too, had a

collection of his own. All these eventually passed to the Gennadeion.⁵⁹ We may take it that either there was a general share-out of the papers when Sophie died in 1932, or Andromache handed some on to her sons Alex and Leno before she lent her own to the library in 1937.

The one person from whom nothing in the Gennadeion derives is Schliemann's son Agamemnon. On any view it seems likely that he may have taken a part of the archive in 1932, whether there was a general division between all surviving descendants or whether there was a simple division between Sophie's two children. It is therefore an interesting coincidence that in the year following his death in 1954, a collection of papers including the Mycenae albums came onto the market.⁶⁰ Indeed, the dealer himself said that the sale resulted from the death of a member of the Melas family. Unfortunately Agamemnon Schliemann died in Paris, and French law prohibits access to the will until one hundred years have elapsed. So I have been unable to trace what may have happened to the missing volumes if he had them. Mme. Lilian Mela, the sole surviving member of the Schliemann family,⁶¹ is adamant that she herself has nothing; and all other enquiries have drawn a blank. The absence of notebooks and copy-books for the Troy seasons of 1878, 1879 and 1882 is the main reason why the present study has gone no further than 1873.

In discussing the range and extent of the sources available to us, I have so far concentrated on documentary sources which give a direct, verbal account of Schliemann's activities on the site of Troy. But there are two further types of source-material which must briefly be discussed. One is the mass of objects which Schliemann retrieved from the site; the other is the reports of the subsequent excavators.

It is not possible to construct a complete list of all the objects which Schliemann found, for the simple reason that every extant record is an incomplete one. Even the diaries record nothing more than a selection. But it may be helpful to give here a brief account of what became of the majority of Schliemann's finds.

A small proportion - seven pithoi and four sacks of stone implements - was given to the Imperial Museum at Constantinople.⁶² The contract with Frank Calvert enabling Schliemann to dig on the eastern half of the

mound should have resulted in a halving of the finds made there.⁶³ Of these he bought from Calvert his half of the Helios metope found in 1872⁶⁴ and, apparently, a half share of three inscriptions unearthed in 1873.⁶⁵ According to his own account he gave all the remainder of his 1873 finds from the eastern half of the site to Frederick Calvert, to be shared with Frank.⁶⁶ I know of no record showing what these consisted of, although the Schliemann archive may possibly contain something relevant. Any objects given to the Calverts are liable to have joined the Calvert Collection of which a part was bought by the British Museum in 1877, a part was lost in the great fire of Izmir in 1922, and another part remains in Çanak Kale.⁶⁷

Most of Schliemann's objects were taken by him to Athens and are shown in the Atlas. Some were illustrated for a second time in Ilios, a number of whose engravings derive from the Atlas photographs. Other objects may well have been given away to friends, institutions and distinguished visitors, as was customary at the time. A large part of Schliemann's own collection was given to the Königliche Museen in Berlin in 1881.⁶⁸ But this collection was broken up in 1895⁶⁹ when duplicates of many pieces were handed over to thirty-seven other institutions^{mainly} in Germany.⁷⁰ What remained in Berlin was catalogued by Hubert Schmidt.⁷¹ The Second World War further diminished the holdings in Berlin. Apparently the collection was divided into three or four parts for safe keeping.⁷² Gold pieces were stored in packing-cases in a bunker below the Zoological Station in Berlin. These were discovered when Russian forces took over the East Sector of Berlin, and an order was issued that they should be taken under heavy guard to Moscow. Their present whereabouts is unknown. Other valuables may have been stored "under a Berlin museum". A number of items were hidden in a mine. These latter were recovered by American troops, handed over to the Allied Art Treasure Commission and are now in the Museum für Vor- und Frühgeschichte in West Berlin. The bulk of the pottery was sent to Lebus Castle on the River Oder. Much was destroyed when in a late offensive the Russian army attacked the area and the castle was demolished. Some, however, was salvaged and returned to Berlin, only to be lost when the museum was bombed in February 1945. At some stage a collection of pottery, bronzes, figurines, stone artefacts and spindle whorls fell into Russian hands and was returned to East Germany in 1958.⁷³ These are now in the Museum für Ur- und Frühgeschichte in East Berlin. How far the other thirty-

seven collections in Germany ^{and elsewhere} may have been disrupted by the war has not, so far as I know, been documented.

For the present study I have not attempted to locate, study and draw all the extant objects from Schliemann's excavations. This may at first seem unconventional, even ill-advised. But there are several good reasons for the omission. First, the results would not have justified the large expenditure of time and money involved. The only value at this stage would have lain in identifying individual objects already known from the excavation records. But those found in 1870 and 1871 will be mostly unidentifiable as no drawings were made, and many of those found in 1872 will only be identifiable with great uncertainty as the drawings are poor. Only those found in 1873, when good drawings were made, will be easily identifiable; and almost all of these have been published already, if only in the unsatisfactory Atlas. Secondly, the whole exercise can more usefully be carried out when the later seasons of 1878, 1879, 1882 and 1890 have been re-examined as well. And thirdly, logical priority must in any case be given to the textual work of reconstructing the course of the excavations; for it is mostly on this basis that a re-ordering of the extant objects can be begun. It is to be expected, of course, that when the objects are all examined and catalogued (as they need to be) some errors and misunderstandings in the present work will be exposed. But the bulk of the objects belong to the fairly homogeneous corpus of Early Bronze Age material, and it is unlikely that examination of the objects themselves will in many cases show up a need for any re-dating. The catalogues in Chapter IV, therefore, bring together a digest of the information to be found in Schliemann's writings and elsewhere concerning each object, but do not rely on first-hand study by the present writer. For the purpose of cataloguing I have assigned to each drawing in the notebooks a serial number: 72-1 to 72-1987 for those recorded in the 1872 diary, and 73-1 to 73-892 for those recorded in the 1873 diary.

It is difficult to over-estimate the value of the later excavations of Dörpfeld and Blegen for understanding Schliemann's work on the same site. It is to them, and particularly to Dörpfeld, that we owe the fundamental clarification of the structure of the site on which any re-assessment must draw. But their reports are valuable in other ways as well. Both excavators encountered the remains of trenches cut by

Schliemann; the information they provide can be helpful in determining the limits of Schliemann's work. Both excavators established sequences of objects - Blegen's more refined than Dörpfeld's; these may need minor modifications in the light of the present study, but they remain very valuable as an aid to dating the deposits distinguished in Schliemann's excavations. They can only be partial aids, however, because their range of types is narrower than that in the Schliemann material. Most important of all, Dörpfeld's keen eye for architecture and Blegen's careful stratigraphic analyses provide us with invaluable comparisons when adjacent areas were dug by Schliemann.

II. The Question of Schliemann's Reliability

In recent years wide publicity has been given to claims that Schliemann was fraudulent,⁷⁴ and in the light of these it may seem unwise to attempt a reconstruction of his excavations on the basis of his own statements. The propriety of giving critical attention to Schliemann's writings, and of exposing lies where they can be detected, does not seem to me to be an issue,⁷⁵ even if it does result in a tarnishing of the image. By his own autobiographies, and his other publications, the man put himself in the public domain; his image must take the consequences. What is now an urgent task, however, is to restrain unbridled scepticism and to establish into what realms positive fraudulence does and does not extend. For this, speculation and innuendo are not enough. Proper evidence must be produced. The "only defensible scholarly procedure"⁷⁶ is not, in my view, to regard every omission and textual variant as a cause for cynical disbelief, but to take them in context, remembering the limitations imposed on Schliemann by his circumstances, his abilities and his lack of training.

It may well be the case that Schliemann swindled Rothschild's when he was buying gold-dust in California in 1852,⁷⁷ and that he used perjury to obtain his divorce and American citizenship in 1869.⁷⁸ It is certain that he smuggled antiquities out of Turkey in 1872 and 1873.⁷⁹ The American diaries of 1852 and 1867-8 do appear to contain fictitious accounts of visits to President Fillmore, the Governor-General of Panama and President Johnson.⁸⁰ Moreover, Schliemann's story of his childhood dream of excavating Troy, under suspicion since 1972,⁸¹ has now been plausibly argued to be an invention of 1875-6 designed to establish a priority of inspiration over Frank Calvert.⁸²

What evidence is there that the fraudulence extended into his archaeology? One instance has been revealed by Korres. In 1888 Schliemann claimed to have discovered a number of inscriptions in the garden of his house in Athens.⁸³ The claim was false. Several had in fact been discovered earlier and had been held in private collections till Schliemann acquired them.⁸⁴ A second secure instance has been recognised by Traill.⁸⁵ A comparison of Schliemann's 1868 diary with his book Ithaka, der Peloponnes und Troja shows that in the publication he has exaggerated the extent of his work at Pınarbaşı and has suppressed the fact of his initial belief that it was at Pınarbaşı that Troy was to be found. In fact it was Frank Calvert who opened his eyes to the possibilities of Hisarlık, and that only on the eve of his departure from the Dardanelles for Constantinople. In this second example it will be noted that it is the diary which reveals the lie. It is true that the diary is not completely untainted by it, for two entries which may have been written after the meeting with Frank Calvert are designed to suggest that Schliemann had already, at some earlier date, decided that Troy was at Hisarlık.⁸⁶ There is also a give-away page cut out.⁸⁷ Nonetheless, Schliemann was not clever or thorough enough to effect a complete cover-up; and apart from the excision there is no reason to suppose that the diary has distorted the account of what Schliemann actually did. And even the publication, though it sets up false claims for priority, does not really distort the account of what Schliemann actually found.

Much the same appears to apply in the case of the three invented 'treasures' N, R and S, found at Troy in the seasons of 1872 and 1873. I have discussed these inventions in detail elsewhere.⁸⁸ They are all quite minor collections of metalwork, with few objects involved. Yet even so Schliemann has failed to conceal the varying original circumstances of their finding. The reason is, in my opinion, that no deliberate fraud was intended. In Treasure 'N' the two collections of jewellery found in June 1872 and October 1878 may have appeared to Schliemann to have the same context: a stratum of metal pieces related to the destruction-deposits of what we now call Megaron IIA and Megaron IIE. In Treasure 'R' the finger-ring, the three earrings, the gold pin, the gold beads and the oval gold ring had, to Schliemann, all been found "near" (neben) the skeleton. (The statement that they were found "by the side of the skeleton" exists only in Dora Schmitz's inadequate

translation in TR.) What constituted "nearness"? To Schliemann - who had an undisciplined mind and no real academic training - the association of them all with Megaron IIA, and the belief that they all came from the same depth. Treasure 'S' is an even clearer case. The various constituent finds all derived from roughly the same area; Schliemann's over-active imagination re-grouped them so as to suggest the discovery of two fallen warriors. In all these cases Schliemann was bringing together objects which he believed to come from the same archaeological context. It is due to the honesty of the excavation notebooks that the inventions can be dismantled.

Traill has recently pointed to another invented association: that of the two inscriptions said by Schliemann to have been found below his wooden house in June 1873.⁸⁹ One, a list of fines,⁹⁰ is not mentioned anywhere in the diary - not in the résumé of 31st May, nor in that of 17th June, nor in any of the daily entries. To Traill this is "particularly significant". What he does not make clear, however, is that by the time serious excavation began after the house had been demolished, on 6th June,⁹¹ the résumé of 31st May had already been completed; that the résumé dated 17th June is nothing but an extended description of "Priam's Treasure"; and that the daily entries for the whole period 6th-14th June occupy no more than fifteen lines and do not even record the discovery of Treasure A2. Yet the authenticity of the latter should not be in doubt since the unbroken omphalos-bowl, SS 5868, was apparently drawn into the Atlas on site at just this point at the end of the season.⁹² That an inscription found on site on or after 6th June should not be recorded in the diary is therefore not in any way sinister or surprising. The second inscription, which deals with the sympolity established between Ilium and the Scamandrians,⁹³ was, as Traill points out, found in early February 1873 "beim Bau meines Hauses."⁹⁴ The upper part of this inscription, Frisch's fragments a and b,⁹⁵ was, it is true, found by Dubois in nearby Çıplak in 1815.⁹⁶ But this is no reason to suppose that the lower part was found anywhere other than where Schliemann says it was found. Indeed, it is quite possible that an upper part should have been moved while a lower part was left in situ. Schliemann's record that it was found "beim Bau meines Hauses" shows the reason why he reported it together with the list of fines: to him they both came from the same context - below his house. What he had forgotten was that two different houses were involved - the stone house

and the wooden house. The invented association is once again an innocent one, born of carelessness and a faulty memory. And it is revealed by the diary. The grounds for supposing the invention to be a deliberate fraud are completely inadequate.

A hoard of twenty coins is said by Schliemann to have been found in the same place, below the wooden house in square BC 5-6.⁹⁷ Traill thinks that these, too, might be a fraud: "earlier finds or purchases that Schliemann has saved up for the end."⁹⁸ But the argument rests on the pedantic supposition that Schliemann ought to have recorded them in a daily entry such as that of 5th June (the probable day of their discovery) as well as in the continuation of his draft despatch written on the same day. This is to disregard one of the main purposes of the daily entries, which was to help supply the raw material for the despatches. It is also to overlook the fact that four of the coins were in fact drawn into Atlas Taf.190 which seems to have been compiled on site during the final days of the 1873 excavation.⁹⁹ Once again the evidence for fraud is unconvincing.

"Priam's Treasure" has been, and remains, a principal target for those wishing to unearth frauds and scandals in Schliemann's archaeology. I have discussed the issue at length elsewhere¹⁰⁰ and do not propose to repeat the arguments here. It is not possible to demonstrate that every piece claimed by Schliemann to have belonged to the treasure was indeed found as he says. But that is the direction in which such evidence as we have points. And, while it is conceivable that the treasure might have been enlarged by some additions, not one of the pieces can in fact be shown to have been found somewhere else or at an earlier date. In this it is completely unlike the other inventions which Traill believes to be fraudulent. As I have said elsewhere in connection with Treasure 'R': "If this is how Schliemann works when he invents a treasure of six or more objects and a skeleton, then it is truly remarkable that of an invented treasure of over four thousand objects not a single one should appear earlier in the notebooks."¹⁰¹ The fact is that none of the other arguments in favour of its authenticity has yet been refuted, and none of those raised against it yet stands up.

I do not wish to maintain that Schliemann's archaeological writings, or even his excavation notebooks, enjoy a complete immunity from his

propensity to lie.¹⁰² What I do believe, however, is that the Troy excavation notebooks of 1870-1873 are remarkably free from deliberate fraud. Inventions and misunderstandings there are. Deliberate fraud has yet to be demonstrated.

What the present study seems to me to reveal is the surprising degree to which Schliemann's records, once unravelled and analysed, do agree with the later findings of Dörpfeld and Blegen. Buildings are continued in the right places by walls of the right size; objects come, on the whole, from the right depths; sloping strata were noticed at the right points; even marble chippings characteristic of Troy VI foundation-trenches were recorded from just the right point for a robbed-out Troy VI fortification-wall on the north side of the site. The very large number of such agreements provides a validation, of a general kind, of Schliemann's records and, I hope, justifies the pains I have taken with them.

FOOTNOTES

1. TR p.63.
2. The diaries are to be found in the Schliemann archive of the Gennadius Library, Athens. For the years 1870-1873 two diaries are involved:
 - (i) A notebook labelled "Voyage en Amérique", Cat.No.13 in BSA 77 (1982) p.103. Pages 68-90 record the work of 1870 and are in French; they contain no résumés or drawings. Pages 202-277 contain the notes from 1871, being written in German and French. Here there are five periodic résumés, but the only drawings are some crude representations of supposed inscriptions on whorls and of a mason's mark on a stone (p.259). Pages 277-499, 500-504 record the work done in 1872. The text is almost entirely in German. There are eight periodic résumés, drawings of objects begin on p.295 (3/15 April) with depths noted from p.339 (15 May) onwards. Pages 410-3, 418-24, 436-8 contain passages in Greek.
 - (ii) A notebook labelled "Henry und Sophie Schliemanns Buch," Cat. No.14 in BSA 77 (1982) p.103f. Pages 2-317 record the work done in 1873. The text is mostly in German. There are eleven periodic résumés and many pages of drawings, although few from p.224 (early May) onwards except after the entry for 12th June.

I was enabled to study the diaries in microfilm by the generosity of the trustees of the Craven Fund of Oxford University, who paid for it, and by the kindness of Dr. F.R. Walton, formerly the Director of the Gennadius Library, who gave permission for the filming and undertook to arrange it. The microfilm is now in the Ashmolean Library at Oxford.
3. Bfw I p.211.
4. E.g., the entry for 29th May 1872 describes first the work done on 27th and 28th before recounting that of 29th: Tgb 1872 pp.363-5.
5. In the late nineteenth century the two calendars were twelve days apart, with the Gregorian ahead of the Julian, so that (for instance) 7th April (Julian) was the same day as 19th April (Gregorian). Schliemann, if he was in the mood to show both dates, would express this as 7/19 April. In general it is the Gregorian dates which form the more continuous thread through the diaries.
6. No doubt the complaints were justified.
7. Bfw I No.179, letter dated Athens, 8th May 1872. Schliemann starts to note depths of objects from 15th May.
8. TR p.120.
9. E.g. 73-140 (4m) = 120-2374 (8m).
10. The résumés in 1871 are dated 18th October, 26th October, 3rd November, 18th November, 24th November. The 1872 résumés are dated 5th April, 25th April, 11th May, 23rd May, 18th June, 13th July, 1st August, 14th August. Those from 1873 are dated 22nd February, 1st March, 15th March, 22nd March, 29th March, 5th April, 16th April, 10th May, 15th May, 31st May, 17th June.

11. The résumé dated 15th May 1873 is a case in point. It begins on Tgb 1873 p.245 continuing at intervals through to p.269 where the concluding paragraph follows a daily entry for 24th May.
12. For a description of these see D.F. Easton, "The Schliemann Papers", BSA 77 (1982) p.104.
13. The 1871 despatches were published in a series of five articles in AAZ entitled "Ausbrabungen auf der Ebene von Troja": Beilage zu Nr.306 (2nd November 1871) p.5405f; Beilage zu Nr.326 (22nd November 1871) p.5757f; Nr.331 (27th November 1871) p.5851f; Beilage zu Nr.350 (16th December 1871) p.6225f; Nr.7 (7th January 1872) p.97f. G.S. Korres, Βιβλιογραφία Ἑρρικού Σλήμαν (Athens 1974) pp.7-8 lists in addition an article in Ἐφημερῖς τῶν συζητήσεων No.124, B, (23rd October 1871) pp.3-4; and articles in Ἀυτόθι No.131, B (17th November 1871) pp.3-4; No.134, B (27th November 1871) p.4; No.136, B (4th December 1871) pp.3-4; No.138, B (11th December 1871) p.4.
According to H.G. Hutchinson, Life of Sir John Lubbock, Lord Avebury (London 1914) I p.142 there are nine reports for 1872 in Ἐφημερῖς τῶν Συζητήσεων. Korres p.8 lists only those in No.203, C (8th August 1872) pp.3-4; and in Ἀυτόθι No.205, C (17th August 1872) pp.3-4. In 1873 the despatch dated 15th May in the diary was published in two parts in AAZ Beilage zu Nr.164 (13th June 1873) p.2509f, Beilage zu Nr.165 (14th June 1873) p.2527f. The despatch of 17th June, concerning "Priam's Treasure", was published in AAZ Beilage zu Nr.217 (5th August 1873) p.3309f, where it erroneously carries the date 17th July. Korres lists additional articles in CH Ἀμόλθεια (Smyrna) ΑΣΤ, No.1950 (4th July 1873) pp.2-3; Ἀυτόθι No.1952 (11th July 1873) pp.2-3; No.1954 (18th July 1873) p.2. I have been unable to obtain copies of any of the Greek newspapers. In 1873 Schliemann appears to have been sending some, at least, of his despatches to the publishers Brockhaus (Briefe p.132 n.3). It seems that there may also have been despatches to French newspapers: Briefe p.126 - though Schliemann could here be alluding to translations of reports published elsewhere. For other articles, not based on the despatches, see Korres's Bibliography pp.7-9.
14. The despatch dated 15th May 1873 appears in AAZ and also in Philologischer Anzeiger 5 (1873) pp.384ff.
That dated 17th June 1873 appears not only in AAZ but also in Philologischer Anzeiger 5 (1873) pp.473-8 and, translated, in Revue Archéologique 26 (1873) pp.196-202.
15. Atlas Taf.116; see Fig.I.4. Reproduced with some alterations in TI fig.1.
16. Tgb 1872 p.503, TR p.220.
17. Atlas Taf.117; see Fig.I.5. Reproduced with some alterations in TI fig.2.
18. TR p.357.
19. Atlas Taf.213; TR Plan I.
20. Atlas Taf.214; see Fig.I.6; TR Plan 2. Reproduced with some alterations, notably to the spot-heights, in TI fig.3. The same failing afflicts TR Plan 2.

21. Modern Çanakkale.
22. TR p.220.
23. Bfw I p.216.
24. Atlas Taf.106, 107, 108, 109, 111, 112, 113.
25. TR p.357.
26. E.g. there are almost no drawings for the whole of May 1873.
27. BSA 77 (1982) p.105, No.50.
28. Atlas Taf.127-9, 144, 153, 156, 157, 169, 170, 180-6, 211-2; reproduced in TR plates V, VI, IX, X, XIA, XIB, XII, XIII.
29. E. Meyer, Briefe von Heinrich Schliemann (Berlin and Leipzig, 1936) pp.114-40; Heinrich Schliemann Briefwechsel I (Berlin, 1953) pp. 163-246; "Schliemanns erste Briefe aus Troja", Ruperto-Carola XVII (Bd.37, 1965) pp.77-80; "Schliemann's Letters to Max Müller in Oxford", JHS 82 (1962) pp.75-105; H.G. Hutchinson, op.cit. (see above, n.13) pp.142-5.
30. Bfw I pp.163-8.
31. In the Gennadius Library, Athens. See below and BSA 77 (1982) pp.93-110.
32. Bfw I p.202.
33. Bfw I pp.198, 202.
34. Briefe p.124.
35. Briefe pp.126-7, 128.
36. Briefe pp.127, 128, 130, 131.
37. Briefe p.124, final paragraph of No.24; also pp.125, 128.
38. For details of this operation see D.F. Easton, "Schliemann's Discovery of 'Priam's Treasure': two enigmas", Antiquity 55 (1981) p.182.
39. Copy-book No.50 (BSA 77 (1982) p.105), p.190.
40. Antiquity 55 (1981) pp.181-3.
41. Atlas Taf.192-209.
42. Trojanische Alterthümer (Leipzig 1874); Antiquités Troyennes transl. A.R. Rangabé (Leipzig/Paris 1874).
43. The series of five despatches to AAZ in 1871 appear as TA chs.i-v. The notebook for 1872 contains 8 periodic résumés. With the addition of a despatch dated 28th September, these make up TA chs. vi-xiv. Of the 11 periodic résumés in the notebook for 1873, that

dated 15th May was published in AAZ but not reproduced in TA; and that dated 31st May was reproduced in TA under the date 17th June, apart from Tgb pp.273-5, describing the discovery of 'Priam's Treasure'. This passage was replaced in TA by the résumé dated 17th June in the notebook, albeit with revision and re-ordering. Otherwise the résumés of 1873 directly make up TA chs.xv-xxiii. Schliemann began sending copies of his despatches to Brockhaus in April 1873: Briefe p.130. See also notes 2, 10, 13 above.

44. Atlas Trojanischer Alterthümer (Leipzig 1874); Atlas des Antiquités Troyennes (Paris 1874).
45. H. Schliemann, Troy and Its Remains; A Narrative of Researches and Discoveries on the site of Ilium, and in the Trojan Plain, transl. L.D. Schmitz, ed. Philip Smith (London, John Murray, 1875).
46. H. Schliemann, Ithaka, der Peloponnes und Troja: Archäologische Forschungen (Leipzig 1869), Vorrede.
47. I have noted examples of poor, or misleading, translation on TR pp.93, 99, 116, 131, 134, 148, 202, 206, 210, 211, 277.
48. H. Schliemann, Ilios: The City and Country of the Trojans: The Results of Researches and Discoveries on the Site of Troy and throughout the Troad in the years 1871, 72, 73, 78, 79 (London 1880, New York 1881); Ilios: Stadt und Land der Trojaner. Forschungen und Entdeckungen in der Troas und besonders auf der Baustelle von Troja (Leipzig 1881). The summary appears on pp. 19-43 of the English edition.
49. E.g. Ilios pp.22-26 summarize TR pp.99, 127, 133, 109, 144ff, 185ff, 200f, 221f, 148, 201ff.
50. Henrich Schliemann's Selbstbiographie, bis zu seinem Tode vervollständigt (by Alfred Brückner). Herausgegeben von Sophie Schliemann (Leipzig 1892). Second edition with postscript by Ernst Meyer (Leipzig 1936). See pp.54-68.
51. C. Schuchhardt, Schliemann's Excavations: An archaeological and historical study, transl. E. Sellers (London 1891). See pp.6-8.
52. Ernst Meyer, Heinrich Schliemann: Kaufmann und Forscher (Göttingen 1969) pp.252-279.
53. W. Dörpfeld, Troja und Ilion 2 vols (Athens 1902) pp.2-9.
54. BSA 77 (1982) pp.93-110. To the list of Schliemann's original letters given there should be added: sixty-nine letters to Rust, published in H.A. Stoll, Abenteuer meines Lebens: Heinrich Schliemann erzählt (Leipzig 1958) pp.223-377; letters to Kate Field published in K.J.R. Arndt, "Schliemann's excavation of Troy and American politics, or why the Smithsonian Institute lost Schliemann's great Troy collection to Berlin", Yearbook of German-American Studies 16 (1981) pp.1-8; J.V. Luce, "Five New Schliemann Letters in Belfast", Hermathena 132 (1982) pp.8-14; some documents held by the National Bank of Greece, to be published by Dr. Kritselli; five letters in the National Maritime Museum at Greenwich; and about thirty letters originally acquired by Meyer

now said to have been placed in a library in West Berlin. In addition it should be noted that the Gennadius Library has recently received from Meyer's son a collection of letters written to Schliemann by R. Virchow. For the above details I am much indebted to Professor W.M. Calder III, Miss Lesley Fitton, Professor G.S. Korres, Mrs. S. Papageorgiou and Mr. David Traill.

55. My 'conservative' estimate that about 46 volumes were missing (BSA 77 (1982) p.99) was probably too high. This large gap must of course be distinguished from the much smaller gap caused by Meyer's removal from the Gennadeion of two or three volumes of correspondence, ibid., p.96.
56. Briefe p.21.
57. For the family tree see BSA 77 (1982) p.93.
58. Ibid., pp.95-6.
59. Ibid., pp.96-7.
60. M.S.F. Hood, "Schliemann's Mycenae Albums", Archaeology 13, 1 (1960) pp.61-5. The three albums were bought by Mr. Hood.
61. From Schliemann's marriage to Sophie, that is. There are said to be descendants in the U.S.S.R. from his first marriage.
62. TR p.53.
63. TR p.144.
64. Bfw I pp.212, 226, nos.185, 204.
65. "Dr. Schliemann's Discoveries - Division of the Spoils", The Levant Herald 10th September 1873, p.262; see also p.260.
66. Ibid.
67. J.M. Cook, The Troad pp.9, 54; A.C. Lascarides, The Search for Troy (Bloomington 1977) p.64.
68. H. Döhl, Heinrich Schliemann: Mythos und Ärgernis (Munich/Lucerne 1981) pp.39-49.
69. SS p.vi.
70. Listed in SS pp.331-336.
71. H. Schmidt, Heinrich Schliemann's Sammlung Trojanischer Altertümer (Berlin 1902).
72. I rely here on the account by L. and G. Poole, One Passion, Two Loves: The Schliemanns of Troy (London 1967) pp.245-6.
73. F. Geupel, "Das Schicksal der Sammlung trojanischer Altertümer von H. Schliemann, Troja und Thrakien: Katalog zur Ausstellung (Berlin/Sofia 1981) pp.19-20.
74. For a general summary see D.F. Easton, "Schliemann's Mendacity: A False Trail?" Antiquity 58 (1984) pp.197-204. To the bibliography

- given there must now be added D.A. Traill, "Further evidence of fraudulent reporting in Schliemann's archaeological works", Boreas 7 (1984) pp.295-316; "Schliemann's 'Dream of Troy': the making of a legend", Classical Journal 81 (1985) pp.13-24; "Schliemann's mendacity: a question of methodology", in Anatolian Studies 36 (1986) pp.91-98; W.M. Calder III, D.A. Traill (eds.), Myth, Scandal and History (Detroit 1986) and reviews by K. Zimmermann, Deutsche Literaturzeitung 109 (1988) cols.572-7, J.T. Hooker, JHS 108 (1988) p.258f; D.A. Traill, "Hisarlik, 31 May 1873, and the Discovery of 'Priam's Treasure'", Boreas 11 (1988) pp.227-34.
75. Pace M. Mellink, AJA 86 (1982) p.561; 89 (1985) p.553.
 76. Cf. D.A. Traill, Anatolian Studies 36 (1986) p.93.
 77. D.A. Traill, "Schliemann's mendacity: fire and fever in California", Classical Journal 74 (1978-9) pp.351-355.
 78. D.A. Traill, "Schliemann's american citizenship and divorce", Classical Journal 77 (1982) pp.336-42.
 79. D.F. Easton, Antiquity 55 (1981) pp.179-83.
 80. W.M. Calder III, "Schliemann on Schliemann: a study in the use of sources", Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies 13 (1972) pp.338-43.
 81. Ibid., pp.343-7, 350-2.
 82. D.A. Traill, Classical Journal 81 (1985) pp.13-24.
 83. H. Schliemann, "Attische Grabinschriften", Athenische Mittheilungen 13 (1888) pp.207-10, 429.
 84. G.S. Korres, "Inscriptions à la possession de Heinrich Schliemann", Athena 75 (1974-5) pp.54-67, 492.
 85. D.A. Traill, Boreas 7 (1984) pp.295-310.
 86. The entries for 14th and 16th August 1868; see Boreas 7 (1984) pp.301, 305.
 87. Ibid. pp.300, 304.
 88. Antiquity 58 (1984) pp.200-2.
 89. D.A. Traill, in Anatolian Studies 36 (1986) pp.95-7; TR pp.335f.
 90. SS 9664.
 91. Tgb 1873 p.290.
 92. Anatolian Studies 34 (1984) pp.148, 150.
 93. TI p.466 No.39.
 94. Tgb 1873 p.iii; cf. p.130.
 95. P. Frisch, Die Inschriften von Ilion; Inschriften Griechischer Städte aus Kleinasien III (Bonn 1975) pp.150-4.
 96. M.G.F.A. Comte de Choiseul-Gouffier, Voyage Pittoresque de la Grèce II (Paris 1822) p.413.
 97. Tgb 1873 p.288; TA p.314f.
 98. Anatolian Studies 36 (1986) p.97.
 99. See Table XI.
 100. Anatolian Studies 34 (1984) pp.141-169; Antiquity 58 (1984) p.200.
 101. Antiquity 58 (1984) p.201.
 102. Having close knowledge of neither the site nor the notebooks, I feel unable to judge Traill's assertion that the LH III figurines in Shaft Grave I at Mycenae are a fraudulent addition. Boreas 7 (1984) pp.312-6.

CHAPTER III

THE HISTORY OF THE EXCAVATIONS

1870 (Fig.III.1)

Schliemann's first season lasted only from 9th to 19th April. Because it was unauthorised and hasty, and provoked the displeasure of the Turkish government, he never afterwards spoke of it as his first season, reserving this description for his work of 1871. He tended to minimise its results. And it is true that he worked on a small scale with no more than twenty workmen.

For their understanding of the 1870 season, earlier commentators and biographers have relied chiefly on the very abbreviated account in Ilios p.20. This has repeatedly led them into the error of supposing that Schliemann excavated in only one area, at the north-western corner of the mound.¹ Careful comparison of this account with the allusions in Trojanische Alterthümer² and the Atlas³ could always have corrected the misunderstanding; a reading of Schliemann's journal for 1870⁴, of his letter of 21st April to the President of the Institute of France,⁵ and of the other relevant publications⁶ makes the situation plain. Nevertheless Meyer, in his biography, has confused matters further by interpreting the journal as though it too spoke of excavation in only the one area.⁷

Schliemann actually dug in two areas, using a total of three trenches. The first area lay on the highest part of the mound, in D 5; the other lay to the West, where Schliemann put down two trenches forming an 'L' in AB 4-5 and AB 5-6.

Over the L-shaped trench there has been no dispute as it was clearly shown in Atlas Taf.116. The southern leg was 2½m wide and 30m long;⁸ the northern leg was initially 4m wide and 19m long, but was soon extended to a width of 5m and a length of 30m.⁹ Dörpfeld correctly placed the latter trench in B 4.¹⁰

What has not been recognised is that there was also the excavation in D 5 where Schliemann in fact began the season's work.¹¹ Here, on the highest part of the mound, he exposed a rectangular building 17.90m x 13.25m,¹² which in 1871 was embraced by the trench opened that year. The position of the trench of 1871 is shown in Atlas Taf.116, and the only place within it where a building of these dimensions could fit

is at the south end, in D 5 - which should indeed, according to the reconstructed contour-plan, be the highest part of the mound. This, then, is where the initial trench was opened.

Schliemann's method in 1870 was, first of all, to dig a hole at random somewhere in the middle of the mound. When he struck a wall, he followed it. In D 5, having uncovered four walls of a building, he cleared the area between them to a depth of at least c.3m. It was out of impatience, after three days' work in D 5, that he determined to dig a deeper trench in AB 4-5.¹³ Again, on finding a wall at the innermost end he followed it; and then, when another, unrelated wall came to light, he cut an additional trench towards the South (in AB 5-6) to expose more of his new find.¹⁴ Hereafter he confined his work to the trenches already established, digging to a depth of 4m in the southern leg¹⁵ and to 8m in the northern leg.¹⁶ The outer angle of the 'L', in B5, was excavated down to only 2m.¹⁷ From the excavations he sent two crates of antiquities back to Athens.¹⁸

On board the steamer to Piraeus Schliemann succumbed either to seasickness or to what was, archaeologically, his besetting sin: haste. His letter to the President of the Institute of France (which, if it was written on 21st April, must have been composed in the first class cabin of the "Menzaleh" and not, as stated, at Çıplak) shows some serious discrepancies when compared with the journal. The most tiresome is the rotation through 90° of all the points of the compass. In the letter "North" takes the place occupied in the journal by "West."¹⁹ More disturbing, however, is the duplication of the deposits at 5m and below - including a 2m-thick wall - in AB 4-5 (where they belong) and in D 5 as well (where they do not belong.)²⁰ The letter must therefore be used with some caution, and priority should normally be accorded to the journal.

1871 (Fig.III.2)

The second season, usually referred to as the first, was conducted from

11th October until 24th November 1871 and was brought to an end by bad weather. Schliemann employed up to 83 workmen, on average about 50, and his operations were on a larger scale than in the previous year.

Obstacles have inadvertently been laid in the way of understanding this season's work by the two principal commentators, Dörpfeld and Meyer. There is, however, the consolation that Schliemann must this time have brought a reliable compass in his baggage.

Dörpfeld writes that he again worked in the northwest corner of the mound, in A 4 and B 4.²¹ He was right in thinking that Schliemann excavated in an area where he had worked the previous year, but wrong in placing this in A 4 and B 4. The error arises from his misunderstanding of the 1870 work, in which he failed to note the existence of the trench in the middle of the mound, in D 5. He has also, apparently, ignored the implications of Laurent's plan in Atlas Taf.116, which shows the 1871 excavation, even though it is reproduced on the very next page in Troja und Ilion. Dörpfeld was also incorrect - although he was not to know it - in saying that Sophie was present at the 1871 excavations. It is clear from the journals and the correspondence, as also from the despatches published in the Augsburg Allgemeine Zeitung, that she was not present at all but remained in Athens. The record of her presence is a later adjustment of the story by Schliemann himself.²²

Meyer presents a more complicated picture.²³ He is roughly correct in saying that Schliemann drove in a broad cut from the north side of the mound,²⁴ which he refers to as the "large trench."²⁵ But beyond this his account is hopelessly confused. He says that Schliemann continued work in his old "West-East trench on the south side of the hill,"²⁶ and that in it he found some simple house walls.²⁷ In fact there was no such trench. In addition he refers to work in a cutting on the north edge of the mound, to the East of the great trench.²⁸ Again, no trench existed here. Thirdly, he asserts that the limestone blocks, the pillars and sandstone found

by Schliemann "obviously" belonged to the Temple of Athena.²⁹ This despite the fact that Schliemann did not begin work on the Eastern half of the mound, which belonged to Frank Calvert, until May 1872. Meyer's statements are not quite without foundation, for they can mostly be traced back to misunderstandings of Schliemann's account;³⁰ but they are no guide to the true state of affairs in 1871.

Where, then, was Schliemann really digging? At first sight he appears to speak of work in two places: area-excavation on the summit, and a cutting made southwards from the north edge of the mound.

The area-excavation is attested in his letter of 13th October to Sophie, in which he says that he is concentrating on the "Temple of Minerva," which he wishes to expose entirely.³¹ Schliemann's identifications were sometimes fickle, and here he does not mean the building found in 1870 in the AB 4-5 trench for which at the time he gave Justizrat Plato the same possible title.³² This time he is following his conjecture that the temple must have stood on the highest part of the hill;³³ at the spot, in other words, where he had found the rectangular building in 1870.³⁴ After digging in and around this rectangular building and finding three inscriptions he later concluded, on 26th October, that it was not after all a temple but perhaps a town hall.³⁵ There is no doubt, then, that the "Temple of Minerva" in the letter to Sophie was identical with the rectangular building found in 1870, and that Schliemann was digging once more in D 5. This is fully confirmed by the journal where there are repeated references to excavation in and around the rectangular building.³⁶

But the North-South trench was not a separate operation, for Schliemann says that it too embraced the rectangular building found in 1870.³⁷ Not only is the North-South cutting described as lying 20m from the previous year's work;³⁸ the area-excavation too is spoken of in the same terms.³⁹ In fact there was simply one large trench which fulfilled both functions: a conclusion which is, again,

confirmed by the journal. Schliemann's original plan was to dig a trench from the north slope to encompass and join both his previous work in AB 4-5 and the area in D 5. Before his permit arrived he marked out a trench 25-30m wide.

"Dieser Graben, den ich von NW nach S.Ost ziehe, schliesst sowohl meinen grossen N.S.Grabens⁴⁰ als auch das grosse Gebäude mit ein welches ich auf der höchsten Fläche des Berggipfels entdeckte."⁴¹

In the event the plan was slightly modified.

"Je commençai cette fois-ci une tranchée de 10m de large du Nord Ouest au Sud-Est en commençant au bord de la pente à l'endroit où celle-ci est le plus escarpé et je visais cette tranchée en ligne oblique sur le bâtiment quadrangulaire que j'avais découvert il y a 18 mois au milieu de la cime de la colline. Cette nouvelle tranchée est à 20m de la grande tranchée⁴² que j'ai coupée en Avril 1870 et ainsi j'espère bien joindre les 2 tranchées."⁴³

The secondary sources, too, are consistent with the view that there was only the one trench. The summary in Ilios speaks of only one large trench;⁴⁴ and Alfred Brückner, in the so-called Selbstbiographie, says that Schliemann made a cut through the mound hoping to find the Temple of Athena, and that the hope was disappointed.⁴⁵

In actual fact, therefore, the work lay exactly where it is shown in Laurent's plan in Atlas Taf.116, stretching from the north slope in C 3-4 to the summit of the mound in D 5. Meyer says that he drove this trench forward southwards into the mound;⁴⁶ but for understanding Schliemann's work in this season it is essential to realise that the excavation progressed by taking off horizontal spits of soil throughout the length of the trench.⁴⁷ It is true that Schliemann did originally plan to dig upwards and inwards from virgin-soil on the north edge.⁴⁸ But the plan was never implemented. On 24th October the excavation had reached a depth of 4m in the area of the rectangular building;⁴⁹ on 26th October he claims an "average" depth of 4m.⁵⁰ By 11th November he had reached 7m,⁵¹ 8½m in some places by 14th November,⁵² and 10m by 18th November,⁵³ at which depth work continued to the end of the season.⁵⁴ The excavation at the north end tended, if anything, to get left behind; for towards the end of the season Schliemann had

to remove a "hillock" from that end of the trench to avoid rainwater running into the central area.⁵⁵

Schliemann's aim was to reach virgin soil, if possible before the winter rains set in;⁵⁶ or, as he otherwise put it, to lift the veil from homeric Troy within six weeks.⁵⁷ Since 1868 he had assumed Homer's Troy to lie at the very bottom of the deposits;⁵⁸ and he was possibly fortified in his ambition to reach the virgin soil by the advice of Stoney, the civil engineer who in September 1871 was advising Frederick Calvert on the drainage of the marshes on his farm at Batak, and with whom Schliemann seems to have struck up a brief friendship.⁵⁹ Frederick Calvert encouraged him again to the same end during a visit to the site on 2nd November when Schliemann was feeling dispirited at the lack of good finds.⁶⁰

The discovery of a well gave him, as he saw, a short cut to finding the depth at which virgin soil lay;⁶¹ and from its discovery until 3rd November he worked constantly at emptying it, sometimes also probing deeper with an augur, or pulling stones out of its wall to see whether it had yet sunk below the artificial debris of the mound.⁶² He abandoned his efforts at a depth of 11.60m with the declaration that the well must reach down as far as the level of the plain.⁶³ This may not, however, have prevented an earlier estimate of 15m for the depth of virgin soil within the mound itself⁶⁴ from lingering in his mind until the following season.

It was the continual deepening of the trench, not a progression towards the South, which was responsible for its increasing length as the season wore on. Schliemann himself explains the reason quite clearly: the north end came out onto the slope at the edge of the mound.⁶⁵ The initial length was 48m;⁶⁶ on 26th October it was 54m,⁶⁷ on 3rd November it was 56m;⁶⁸ the eventual length was 60m.⁶⁹ He did at one point extend the trench somewhat towards the South, but it is unlikely to have been by more than a metre or two.⁷⁰

If we attempt to locate the trench on the contour-plan, the initial

length of 45m places the north end at or just below the 37.50m contour in C 3. This seems to be a satisfactory location, for, measuring the distance at the same altitude, it is in fact 20m from the B 4 trench, as Schliemann describes it,⁷¹ and also it lies at the point where the north slope begins to drop more steeply towards the plain - which is, again, as Schliemann describes it.⁷² The final length of 60m places the north end at the 27.50m contour. This is admittedly 2m lower than the 29.60m which should be expected, but the discrepancy can be explained. Either Schliemann deliberately dug deeper at the north end to allow the rainwater to escape; or he dug to a uniform depth of 10m below the surface regardless of the altitude of the surface itself. A later photograph in Atlas Taf.111 does show a tendency for the north end of the trench to slope down.

The width of the trench shown by Laurent in Atlas Taf.116 is consistent with Schliemann's accounts: an initial width of 10m,⁷³ which must fall at the north end; and a maximum width of 15m,⁷⁴ which must have been to embrace the rectangular building whose width was 13.25m.⁷⁵ The trench narrowed with increasing depth.⁷⁶

The two spurs shown by Laurent and reproduced here in Fig.III.2 are the "side-passages" which Schliemann cut to enable wheelbarrows to remove spoil from the trench.⁷⁷ According to the journal, the eastern one was cut first and was directed towards the east corner of the rectangular building.⁷⁸ This tends to confirm the location and orientation which I have suggested for the building. The western passage seems to have originated on 16th October with an "entrée" which Schliemann began to dig from the central area towards the 1870 trench in AB 5-6.⁷⁹ His idea was to determine the depth of the lowest wall discovered there the previous year, but the plan was not fully carried through. By 18th October both passages were in use for carrying spoil.⁸⁰ The journal records that on 24th October a new "lateral path" was opened.⁸¹ Wherever this was, it cannot have been pursued very far, for at the end of the season there were still only two side-passages.⁸²

As the floor of the main trench was lowered, so the inclination of the side-passages had to be adjusted.⁸³ In the journal Schliemann repeatedly complains of the tediousness and waste of time involved in this operation,⁸⁴ and it was this which finally led to his refusal to cut them any deeper than 7m.⁸⁵

The fact that the north end of the trench was narrower and tended to be excavated less rapidly lends substance to an impression given by the journal that Schliemann's main interest in 1871 still lay in the area in D 5. It is probably fair, although not wholly reliable, to assume that most of the objects he records came from this south end of the trench. Equally most of the measurements of depth will have been taken from the surface at this point - that is, from the summit.

An important consequence of Schliemann's practice in 1871 of horizontal digging was that it enabled him to gain a clear, if very rough, idea of the characters of the strata through which he dug. His later technique of cutting out huge, vertical chunks made it rather more difficult to assign pottery and small finds to their proper origins. The stratigraphic divisions which he determined in 1871 remained fundamental to all his later work and, at least in outline, have been accepted as valid ever since. Schuchhardt's verdict on the season's work - that there was nothing to show for it except a Hellenistic building in the upper layer.. and ..., at a depth of 33 feet, several walls of houses made of rough brick, and numerous stone implements,"⁸⁶ - this verdict is too severe.

1872

The progress of Schliemann's third season, from 1st April to 14th August 1872, can be traced in more detail.

1st - 25th April, 1872 (Fig.III.3)

The work of 1870 and 1871 had been for the most part exploratory, but

by the end of 1871 Schliemann had uncovered "colossal remains" at a depth of 10m. These, he was sure, belonged to the Troy he was seeking to uncover.⁸⁷ So by the time he returned in 1872 the target of his excavations was clearly identified. He wanted to expose the "Trojan" stratum over a wide area as quickly as possible, to be sure of "thoroughly solving the Trojan question this year."⁸⁸

To this end he decided to tackle the entire area between his previous year's trench and Frank Calvert's field on the eastern half of the mound.⁸⁹ On the north edge of the mound this meant that he was to dig across a width of 70m.⁹⁰ The area designated for excavation is shown in Atlas Taf.116, drawn shortly after the beginning of the season; and some of the results are shown in Taf.117. Although Dörpfeld says that its northern limit was in D 2, E 2 and F 2,⁹¹ these plans show that it must have extended also into C 2, as was recognised by the Cincinnati excavators.⁹²

There was no need, Schliemann thought, to remove the strata one by one as he had tried to do in 1871, for the sole object now was to uncover the remains at 10m deep. Area-excavation could therefore be dispensed with in favour of the quicker method of driving in a horizontal platform at the required depth, beginning from the north edge of the mound. This method involved cutting away vertical spits of debris half a metre thick,⁹³ although Schliemann took the precaution of cutting the upper part of the trench-face as a slope rather than as a vertical section. He varied the angle of the slope and the height of the lower, vertical section from time to time in the light of experience.⁹⁴ Some of his techniques he owed to Adolphe Laurent, the railway engineer whom he had brought with him from Athens. It was at Laurent's suggestion that after 18th April he began a system of weakening the section-face by digging out chimneys and tunnels, and finally bringing it down with pickaxes, crowbars and winches.⁹⁵ The dangers of the system, never unnoticed,⁹⁶ were later to become painfully apparent.⁹⁷ An unhappy corollary for the archaeology was that, as Schliemann himself admitted, "it is impossible for me always to know precisely the exact depth where this or that object was found."⁹⁸ No doubt this difficulty could have been compounded by his reliance on

workmen to bring him the objects,⁹⁹ although in fact the stratification of his finds in this season as a whole has proved to be remarkably consistent with that established by Blegen. But speed was everything: he aimed to dig right through the mound in 150 working days.¹⁰⁰

Schliemann naturally believed that what he had found at a depth of 10m was only the top of the "Trojan" stratum. For the trojan remains to be fully exposed the platform had to be made at a deeper level. From the start he had always assumed that Homer's Troy was to be found at the very bottom of the deposits, on virgin soil¹⁰¹ - an assumption only discarded in 1873. When clearing the well in C 4-5 he had already made an estimate that virgin soil would lie at a depth of 15m or more.¹⁰² So it is not surprising to find that the platform was dug at a similar depth.

Over the precise depth of the platform there has been some confusion. In Trojanische Alterthümer¹⁰³ and Ilios¹⁰⁴ Schliemann gave the figure of 14m - a figure which has become embedded in the secondary literature.¹⁰⁵ In letters to Burnouf and Plato, however, the depth is given as 16m.¹⁰⁶ In fact the contradiction is only apparent, not real. For both measurements Schliemann was relying on calculations by Laurent. In his diary he notes:

"Ich bemerke ferner dass nach Hr. Laurents Messung der Gipfel des Berges sich 16m über mein Plateforme erhebt."¹⁰⁷

The parallel passage in Trojanische Alterthümer reads:

"Ich bemerke ferner dass nach Herrn Laurent's Messung die Bergfläche sich 14m über meine Plateforme erhebt."¹⁰⁸

The depth of 16m, then, was measured from the summit while the depth of 14m was measured from a point elsewhere on the mound-surface. The point in question is one of two quoted by Schliemann as altitudes assigned by Laurent to the mound-surface: 11.79m and 11.95m.¹⁰⁹ These figures both appear in the profil transversal attached to Laurent's plan in Atlas Taf.116. There they represent the supposed depth of deposit above bedrock, which is assumed to lie at 18.70m. The more northerly of the two figures, 11.79m, therefore applies to the point marked 30.49 on the plan itself, for 30.49 is the sum of

11.79 + 18.70. If we convert this figure to Dörpfeld's standard, the point lay at 37.64m A.T. Our reconstructed contour-plan shows the summit of the mound to have lain at 39.67m A.T., almost exactly 2m higher. The point at 37.64m lay on the eastern side of the platform where the steep slope began. It appears on Fig.I.7 in square G 3.

Schliemann was therefore using two systems of measurement. In the diary and in some letters he measured depths from the summit. In Trojanische Alterthümer, however, his measurements of depth are taken from the datum of 37.64m A.T., for by 25th April the southeast corner of the platform had come close to that point.

The platform, then, should have lain at 16m, not 14m, below the summit. This places it at 23.67m instead of 25.67m A.T. We may check this by reference to Blegen's excavations. His section through D 2 revealed the outer edge of Schliemann's platform cutting through a Troy IX deposit. Its initial altitude, according to the drawing, must be very close indeed to 23.67m.¹¹⁰ But it must also be recognised that the platform tended to slope up to the South. The slope appears clearly in Blegen's section through D 2-3. The floor of the platform may have risen by 2m or more. This means that where Schliemann's measurements of depth may have been calculated by measuring up from the floor of the platform, as seems sometimes to have been the case, we shall have again to subtract 2m to compensate for the unnoted rise.

The platform's progress horizontally was rapid. After one day's work it had advanced three metres into the mound,¹¹¹ and it was 10-12m broad by 20th April.¹¹² When the report dated 25th April was written, the platform reached 15m into the mound;¹¹³ the (later?) diary-entry for that day records a width of 16m.¹¹⁴

1st - 11th May, 1972 (Fig.III.4)

Easter celebrations put a stop to work for several days after 25th April, so that Schliemann was only able to start digging again on Wednesday 1st May. Throughout the next eleven days work continued on the north platform. But a violent wind and blinding dust on the

north side of the mound persuaded Schliemann to deploy some of his men on the south side as well. Work there began on 2nd May.¹¹⁵ From 6th May he resumed the clearance of the well in C 4-5.¹¹⁶ For this period we must therefore consider separately his activities in these three areas.

The work on the north platform cannot properly be understood without the help of the diaries, although they need to be supplemented by information from the published reports and letters. A letter to Justizrat Plato appears at first to give us a useful summary of events.¹¹⁷ According to this account Schliemann first pressed forward until the platform had advanced 25m into the mound. Having done this he discovered that virgin soil lay deeper. He then re-cut the platform with a slope downwards of 10°, so that he struck virgin soil at 18m below the summit and at 25m from the edge of the trench. But the letter to Plato was written more than two months later, and the strictly contemporary sources suggest a different sequence of events.

Schliemann at first continued to dig the platform, as he thought, horizontally. His letter of 2nd May to Frank Calvert shows him still digging at 16m.¹¹⁸ This depth must be taken from the summit, for in the diary too nothing lower than 16m is recorded until 8th May;¹¹⁹ and here there is no doubt that measurements of depth for the north platform are related to the summit of the mound rather than to the datum in G 3.¹²⁰ The new plan of cutting the platform at an angle down into the mound was introduced on 6th May, a Monday morning. Initially the idea was to make a very steep slope that would drop 1m over a distance of 10m.¹²¹ By 8th May an additional drop of 1m had been achieved,¹²² and by 10th May a depth of 18m below the summit had been reached.¹²³

This slope was not, however, cut along the entire length of the platform. In Trojanische Alterthümer he explains that the slope was made only over a length of 20m.¹²⁴ Its location is not absolutely clear, but the diary appears to show that it was at the west end of the platform¹²⁵ and that he was attempting to extend it towards the East.¹²⁶ A location at the west end certainly seems to be consistent

with the stratigraphy there. The lowering of the platform may be reflected in Blegen's section for squares D 2-3.¹²⁷ There is evidence here for a dip of roughly 2m at an angle of roughly 10°. A hint of the same dip is possibly to be seen in the section of D 3-4 as well.¹²⁸ If these dips are correctly identified, their position is consistent with the view that Schliemann here re-cut the floor of the trench over some of the breadth that had already been exposed before 25th April.

It seems unlikely that, at this stage, the platform penetrated the full 25m into the mound suggested by the letter to Plato. We may calculate, rather, that by 11th May Schliemann must have advanced the west end of his platform about 21.50m into the mound. This figure is based on the volume of soil that, on 11th May, he says he would have had to move in order to lower the platform if he had dug horizontally instead of at an angle.¹²⁹ On the line DE this must have brought the platform's south edge to about 10m north of the line 3/4. This again agrees very closely with the southern limit of Schliemann's platform as shown in Blegen's sections.¹³⁰ This calculated figure of 21.50m appears also to be confirmed by Schliemann's later mention, in the same connection, of 21m.¹³¹ How far the east end of the platform had advanced is not clear. It seems likely that its progress had lagged behind slightly, but there is no direct evidence.

Schliemann's discovery of bedrock in fact came later than his initiation of the slope. It did not precede it. The slope was begun on 6th May, and at the same time work was resumed on clearing out the well in C 4-5.¹³² By 8th May it was established that it was walled as far down as 18m (wrongly corrected in Trojanische Alterthümer to 16m¹³³), below which it entered rock.¹³⁴ The result of this was that when, three days later, the north platform reached a depth of 18m below the summit, Schliemann declared that there too, at the west end, he had found bedrock.¹³⁵ In actual fact the testimony of the American excavations is quite clear that he found nothing of the kind.¹³⁶ He seems simply to have been dazzled by the figure of 18m. Ironically, it is also clear that he was not really digging at 18m below the summit.

His platform had accidentally sloped upwards as it was dug into the mound, and his new lowering of it took it down only to c.24.00m A.T.-15½m below the summit. The account in Trojanische Alterthümer implies that, having found bedrock, Schliemann worked forward at the same depth of 18m below the summit "for several days."¹³⁷ Blegen's section appears to confirm that he did indeed abandon the idea of digging deeper and went forward instead at the same level.¹³⁸ But the journal shows that the "several days" is an exaggeration: he only resumed horizontal digging on the day of the report itself.¹³⁹

The platform on the south side of the mound, begun on 2nd May, was situated "exactly as shown on the plan"¹⁴⁰ - that is, in Atlas Taf.116. Its location can also be seen in Atlas Taf.117 and 214. The outer edge lies in CD 9, not just D 9 as Dörpfeld implies.¹⁴¹ The cut was made at 5m below the mound-surface according to Trojanische Alterthümer;¹⁴² at 10m below the summit according to the diary.¹⁴³ The measurement below the mound-surface is probably taken, as on the north side, from one of Laurent's spot-heights in Atlas Taf.116: perhaps the 27.77 mark (=34.92m A.T.) in E 9. A cut 10m below the summit would in any case put the platform at c.29.67m A.T. Granted a little latitude, this is more or less consistent with its location in Fig.III.4.

The extent of digging by 11th May can be judged from the fact that by that date the south platform had reached a "splendid bastion" which lay very much in the way.¹⁴⁴ Can this "splendid bastion" be identified? Both Dörpfeld and Ludwig took it to be the southeast corner of Building VIM.¹⁴⁵ Atlas Taf.117, which was drawn by Sisilas some weeks after the end of the 1872 season, does show a "Bollwerk aus der Zeit des Lysimachus" at letter K which ought to be a part of VIM; and at the same date Schliemann too refers to this feature as a bastion.¹⁴⁶ There is therefore a case for the identification if we refer directly to the records made at the end of the season. But the puzzle is that Schliemann really ought to have come across the Troy VI citadel wall. He says that his south platform was dug with an inclination of 12° (or 14°) downwards to the North;¹⁴⁷ but even with horizontal digging the wall should have come to light. Dörpfeld

realised this problem, yet said he could find no reference to the wall in Schliemann's reports.

There are in fact three references which allow us to identify the "splendid bastion" of 11th May as the Troy VI city wall. First, Schliemann's earlier draft of the despatch dated 11th May actually describes the wall concerned as a "Stützmauer."¹⁴⁸ In the published version it is called a "Bollwerk." The term "Stützmauer" would certainly be more apt as a description of a circuit wall than as a description of the corner of a building. Secondly, in the very next published report (of 23rd May 1872) he does in fact speak of a circuit wall ("Ringmauer") on the south side of the mound.¹⁴⁹ This, like the "splendid bastion" of 11th May, is attributed to the time of Lysimachus, which suggests that we are dealing with the same feature. Thirdly, the Troy VI city wall is clearly depicted in this trench in Atlas Taf.214, drawn in 1873, although Schliemann had not dug again in that area in the intervening period. Once again it is dated to the time of Lysimachus.

It is curious, though, that the wall should re-appear in Atlas Taf.214, drawn in 1873, when it is absent from Taf.117, drawn at the end of the season when it was found. How can this be explained? Schliemann left the site on 14th August at the end of the 1872 season. Atlas Taf.117 was only drawn a month later, when Schliemann returned on 10th September to make a plan of the excavations. With him he brought Sisilas, the surveyor, who was a newcomer to the site. In the intervening month there had been very heavy rains and two metres of soil had been washed into the south trench.¹⁵⁰ It is possible that in this way the wall had been covered up again. Sisilas, being new to the site, would have drawn only what he actually saw. Its inclusion by Laurent in the later plan, Atlas Taf.214, must have been from memory, for Schliemann did not dig in that area again in the interim. This may explain why in the later plan it is not accurately placed. It was certainly not visible in 1882, according to Dörpfeld.¹⁵¹ After September 1872 it may well have remained buried until 1894.

If we accept that the "splendid bastion" of 11th May was actually the Troy VI city wall and not the corner of VIM, we have to concede that the discovery of the southeast corner of VIM went unmentioned in Schliemann's published reports. This, I think, is understandable and can be attributed to two factors. In the first place Schliemann's attention was mostly concentrated on the north platform where he himself was taking charge. The south platform, under the direction of G. Photidas, is much less carefully recorded. In the second place, Schliemann seems to have viewed the corner of VIM, when it came to light, as only another part of the "bastion" already discovered. In this case he may have felt justified in waiving any special mention of its discovery.

The limits of Photidas' south platform on 11th May, defined on the north side by the line of the Troy VI city wall, are shown in Fig. III.4. At its widest point it extended roughly 15m into the mound, on average perhaps 10m. There is conflicting evidence concerning the slope and projected length of the trench. The journal speaks of a 12° slope designed to bring the trench down to bedrock (i.e. to 18m below the summit) after a length of 60m.¹⁵² Trojanische Alterthümer changes these figures to 14° and 75m.¹⁵³ Only the former can be correct, provided that the angle of 12° is measured relative to the slope of the mound-surface and not relative to the horizontal. In this case the 12° slope would indeed bring the trench to c.21.67m A.T. (=18m deep) after 60m. The 75m mentioned in TA may indicate the ultimate target of Schliemann's investigations at bedrock: the area below the summit in D 5, and the point shown in Atlas Taf.116 where the north and south trenches were planned to join. The figure of 14° may, however, be a note of the slope at which the trench was actually cut. On this assumption, the deepest end of the trench should by 11th May have reached c.28.50m. In fact Schliemann says that by this date it was 6m deep,¹⁵⁴ which agrees well with my calculations, if we assume that he was measuring down from the datum on the mound-surface at c.34.92m A.T.

12th - 22nd May 1872 (Fig.III.5)

Out of the next eleven days Schliemann was able to use only seven for digging.¹⁵⁵ During this time work continued on the north platform but not, it seems, on the south platform. The daily entries in the diary contain no reference at all to any work on the south platform, and the entry of 29th May shows that even by that date the platform had gained only another half metre in depth since 11th May,¹⁵⁶ an advance which can be attributed to work on the 23rd- 29th May. Trojanische Alterthümer does, it is true, contain a passing reference which seems to imply that work had continued on the south platform.¹⁵⁷ But every detail of this very brief report derives from earlier discoveries¹⁵⁸ or from the revision of the draft report on or about 29th May.¹⁵⁹ The reason for this temporary abandonment of the south platform was that its foreman, Photidas, was being used on the north platform to introduce a system of excavation by terraces which he had developed on the south platform.¹⁶⁰

The north platform had been left on 11th May with its floor at c.24.00m A.T. at the western end and at perhaps c.25.00m A.T. at the eastern end. But Schliemann continued to assign to them the purely theoretical depths of 16m and 18m below the summit (as quoted in the diary) or 14m and 16m below the datum on the mound-surface (as quoted in the published reports).

To make the work safer and quicker, he now concentrated on cutting smaller platforms at a higher level, with the object of breaking them down to the lower level only in a second operation. A 3m-wide terrace was first cut at each end of the trench.¹⁶¹ The two terraces were then apparently to be extended until they met in the middle of the trench. In fact, however, neither exceeded 20m in length by the date of the report.¹⁶² The upper deposits seem to have been cut at an angle as before,¹⁶³ presumably emerging onto the mound-surface 6-8m further South. The lower deposits were hardly broken down at all: the operation had only begun on 21st May.¹⁶⁴

Both east and west terraces must have been cut at c.30.00m A.T. In the diary their heights are given as 6m at the east end and 8m at the west end.¹⁶⁵ These are the heights above the theoretical depths of 16m and 18m, and show that Schliemann intended to cut both platforms at an identical depth of 10m below the summit. In Trojanische Alterthümer they have been changed to 5m and 6m respectively.¹⁶⁶ These figures seem to reflect the actual height of the terraces above the platform floor. For the western terrace, at least, the depth of 10m is confirmed by the note that it adjoined the trench cut in 1871.¹⁶⁷ It may be remembered that that trench, too, had been dug to a uniform depth of 10m below the summit.

23rd May - 18th June 1872 (Fig.III.6)

The published report describing the activities of this period was first drafted on 18th June and still bears that date. But the text for the final version must have been revised some days later, certainly no earlier than 23rd June, and it includes references to discoveries made later than 18th June.¹⁶⁹ Such later interpolations will be ignored here. The report is a lengthy one, but much of it summarises results previously obtained both earlier in the season and in 1871. The "stratigraphic" divisions used in it (0-2m, 2-4m, 4-7m, 7-10m) are largely a repetition of the previous year's findings. For these and other reasons the report is liable to be misleading, and, as ever, the primary sources for understanding Schliemann's work in this period must be his notebooks and letters.

On 21st May a serious accident had taken place at the west end of the north platform. A part of the section fell, burying two men who were very lucky to be rescued almost unharmed.¹⁷⁰ Schliemann was clearly shaken, although Sophie's arrival from Athens on the 24th will no doubt have given him fresh courage. No more work was done at the east end, and Schliemann resolved in future to cut all sections, i.e. even the lowest parts, with a slope.¹⁷¹ He also decided on a new strategy: to make first a narrower cut through the entire mound joining up north and south platforms, and to leave open for the moment the question how to complete his previous plan for a wider trench.¹⁷²

The position and dimensions of the cut can be seen in Atlas Taf.117. At the north end it starts from the western end of the north platform. In its southward course it spreads into the North-South trench of 1871 but also extends further to the East. Schliemann apparently intended it to be 30m wide at the top and 20m wide at the bottom.¹⁷³ In fact it seems to have been only 23m wide at the top, even when measured from the western edge of the 1871 trench. This figure, given in a letter to Frank Calvert,¹⁷⁴ is confirmed by Atlas Taf.117 and by the position of the eastern edge of the trench in Dörpfeld's plan.¹⁷⁵ The early figure of 30m must date from the start of Schliemann's work on the new trench, and was probably taken across CD 4, measuring from the western limit of the 1871 trench to the eastern limit of the north platform's western "terrace."

The report in Trojanische Alterthümer says that work on this new North-South trench was begun straight-away along its entire length.¹⁷⁶ This seems to be a very loose way of expressing what really occurred, for against it we must set several points carrying a different implication. First, Schliemann does not yet seem to have reverted to his 1871 practice of horizontal excavation. When he eventually did so he commented specially on it, in unfavourable terms;¹⁷⁷ and for the moment there seems to be no change in his methods - he is still working forward, taking out large, vertical bites with levers, chains and winches.¹⁷⁸ Secondly, he reports on 13th July that the length of the trench had increased to 80m,¹⁷⁹ which certainly does not suggest simultaneous excavation on all areas of the projected trench. Thirdly, in his letter of 23rd July to Plato he actually says that he began to dig simultaneously from north and south ends.¹⁸⁰ Yet even this seems to be not quite accurate, for there is evidence that work was carried out in not two but three areas of the trench.

The first of these was at the north end, in what had been the western end of the north platform. Until 4th June Schliemann concentrated on extending his terrace at c.30.00m A.T. so as to expose more of the large building which he had found at that level,¹⁸¹ a building which can be identified as Megaron IIA.¹⁸² He extended

the terrace until he found the building to be a "room" taking up most of the terrace. This implies a southward extension of the terrace by approximately 9m, as far as the northern cross-wall of IIA reconstructed by Dorpfeld in TI Taf.III. At the same time, however, he was busy cutting away the "lower earth wall" to expose what he hoped would be the lower courses of the building.¹⁸³ In doing so he was in fact extending the platform at its depth of c.24.00m A.T. By 4th June he had found that the building actually rested on remains of earlier structures and had a depth of only $\frac{1}{2}$ m.¹⁸⁴ He thereupon lost interest in extending the terrace any further at the 30.00m level.

At the same time, but for a different reason, he also gave up digging the platform to the depth of 24.00m A.T. During an altercation with Schliemann, Photidas, who evidently had spells of idleness, claimed that he was digging $3\frac{1}{2}$ m into virgin soil. Schliemann was swayed by his arguments, for he found that amongst the lowest deposits containing charcoal, bones and boars' teeth there was indeed much "pure virgin soil" as well; and he accepted that it was useless to dig to such a depth. He therefore decided to raise the platform. The diary says that it was to be raised by 3- $3\frac{1}{2}$ m, to a theoretical depth of $14\frac{1}{2}$ m.¹⁸⁵ The published report gives the figure as 2m.¹⁸⁶ The rise can actually be seen in Troy I Fig.423, where it measures c.3m. The new limit of excavation lay at 27.00m A.T. In Fig.424 it is wrongly called "Schliemann's Secondary Terrace." Fig.423 shows the real secondary terrace at 30-31m A.T. The measurements of depth in this part of the North-South trench can become a little confusing. In general it seems that for depths up to 10m they are reliably measured down from the summit. Lower depths tend to be affected by the theoretical level of the platform at $14\frac{1}{2}$ m deep (actually at c. $12\frac{1}{2}$ m deep) and need to be treated with caution.

The second area of excavation within the North-South trench can be less certainly located. Schliemann speaks of a "middle" platform,¹⁸⁷ and of excavation in the "middle of the mound."¹⁸⁸ The most likely situation for this is adjoining the south end of the 1871 trench

working either towards the North, to meet the trench from the north platform, or perhaps more probably towards the South, to meet the south platform. The initial task will presumably have been to bring adjacent parts of the mound down to the 10m depth of the 1871 trench.

The third area of excavation within the projected North-South trench was on the south platform. Work here was at best sporadic and was in fact discontinued on 12th June.¹⁸⁹ It received only 13 days' work in this period. A depth of 6m had already been attained when excavation here was resumed. Yet on 29th May the trench had only reached 6½m. Clearly the advance was not very rapid. The Troy VI fortification wall was, of course, in the way and was not to be demolished;¹⁹⁰ Schliemann may have worked at exposing the south face of the wall to a greater depth. But in the diary he does refer also to an upper terrace which had been dug at a depth of 2m and which, with only one more day's work to go before its abandonment, had been extended 7m further into the mound.¹⁹¹ The remnants of a system of terraces can be seen in Atlas Taf.117 where, however, the trench is at a much more advanced stage. But what is the depth of 2m measured down from? One possibility is that Schliemann was again measuring down from the datum at c.34.92m A.T. In this case the terrace will have been cut directly into the mound-surface 2m above the top of the Troy VI wall, at c.32.92m A.T. (see Fig. IV.39). But it is perhaps more likely that the terrace was cut into the trench face from the top of the Troy VI wall itself, its floor being formed by the top of the wall. In this case the 2m will have been measured down from the mound-surface directly above the point where the terrace began, and the terrace will have lain at c.31.00m A.T. Two pieces of evidence favour this interpretation. First, Schliemann does note that the fortification wall was covered entirely with earth¹⁹² - which implies complete excavation of the overburden. Secondly, both Dörpfeld and Blegen found the existing surface in C 8 to lie at c.31.00m,¹⁹³ the upper deposits clearly having been removed. For the northward extent of excavation we must assume a figure slightly in excess of 7m from the south face of the Troy VI wall.

In December 1871 Frank Calvert had drawn Schliemann's attention to a "deep hollow" which lay in his own land on the east side of the mound.¹⁹⁴ It must be identical with the rectangular depression later noted for that area in Trojanische Alterthümer.¹⁹⁵ In the reconstructed contour-plan I have located it in GH 3-4 where it proves to overlie the Temple of Athena exactly. During April and May 1872 Schliemann had become increasingly intrigued by the eastern half of the mound,¹⁹⁶ partly spurred on by Calvert's own interest and partly for reasons of his own. Having in the previous year failed to find the Temple of Minerva on the summit of the hill, he was now disposed to regard the ash deposits found at the east end of his north platform as sacrificial remains from an undiscovered temple nearby.¹⁹⁷ The many fragments of marble lying on the eastern half of the mound seemed to point to the same conclusion.¹⁹⁸ Eventually, on 12th June, he began a new platform on the northeast side of the mound.¹⁹⁹ The location of the completed platform can be seen in Atlas Taf.117 and 214. It also appears in Ilios plan I. Dörpfeld correctly says that it lay in GH 2-3.²⁰⁰ To judge from the plans, its outer edge must have lain close to the 25.00m contour; but for the platform's depth there are some divergent figures. Trojanische Alterthümer speaks of a platform lying at 12m below the mound-surface.²⁰¹ For this figure the original draft had 15m below the summit.²⁰² We may assume that Schliemann is here following his established practice of converting measurements that apply to excavations in the northeastern area to measurements from the surface, and that the two figures are equivalent. The area around the depression did not lie much higher than 36.50m A.T. This will give us an altitude of c.24.67m for the platform, which agrees well with its position on the plan. There is the difficulty that in Atlas Taf.214 the platform's altitude is given as 20.48 which, when the appropriate conversion is applied, is 26.78m A.T. In H 3, however, Blegen's team seems to have found undisturbed strata only below the level of 24.50m A.T.²⁰³ How an incorrect figure for the platform might have arisen in Atlas Taf.214 one cannot now say, but it does not seem to be the result of dumping. The testimony of three independent sources is, then, persuasive that this platform must be placed at c.24.67m A.T. But there is also evidence for an upper terrace²⁰⁴

which, if we here make use of Atlas Taf.117, lay 5½m higher, that is at c.30.17m A.T. It may be this terrace that is alluded to in the diary's statement²⁰⁵ that the trench was laid out so as to be cut at a depth of 9m. But Sisilas's plan in Atlas Taf.117, assigning to the trench a total depth of 10m below the surface, is clearly using a datum from the surface in the immediate neighbourhood of the trench, and it is possible that the diary's 9m may be based on a similar datum.

Initially the trench was laid out with a width of only 12m.²⁰⁶ Probably it was designed to join up the two trenches left from Calvert's excavations in 1865, although their depth was only 4-5m originally.²⁰⁷ Its extension can be seen in Atlas Taf.117 protruding to the South of the rest of the platform. But, perhaps after the discovery of the Helios triglyph, Schliemann soon widened the lower platform to 31m and the upper to 34m.²⁰⁸ His purpose was clearly to include the whole of the rectangular depression within the trench.

By 18th June Schliemann had only had three days' work on the northeast platform. He cannot have advanced very far - perhaps 2 or 3m on each terrace: probably far enough, at any rate, for the upper terrace to be cut into the slope rising above the lower one.

One last operation must be mentioned: a trench opened by Sophie Schliemann. It was begun on 7th June with two workmen²⁰⁹ and was on a small scale. It is marked Z in Atlas Taf.117 and lay in square C 5.

19th June - 13th July 1872 (Fig.III.7)

Schliemann in this period continued to extend the trenches which he had already opened. He gives little information about progress in the northern sector of the projected North-South trench. His comment in the despatch in Trojanische Alterthümer that in "several places" excavation had reached a distance of 80m from the edge of the mound²¹⁰ can, however, only refer to this part of the

work. It implies that, on the surface at any rate. the trench now reached well into D 6 and as far as it ever went. Work must therefore have been continued in the "middle platform" of the trench, in D 5-6, although Schliemann never specially refers to it. In his letter to Plato, Schliemann allowed it to be assumed that the trench's width remained 30m throughout.²¹¹ Atlas Taf.117, 214 and TI Taf.III nevertheless make it clear that in its southern reaches the trench attained a width of no more than 12 or 13m. In the diary-entry for 29th June, Schliemann records that one of the foremen had undertaken to continue the excavation of the trench at bedrock as far as the end of the 1871 excavations, and to do so in 15 days.²¹² This entry clearly has in mind the more northerly part of this sector, where the north platform was already being extended southwards, supposedly at bedrock level. It envisages excavation in D 4-5, largely in an area where the previous year's work had reached a depth of only 10m. What depth did Schliemann now have in mind when prescribing excavation to bedrock? The theoretical depth of bedrock in this trench was, as we have already seen, 14½m.²¹³ Summing up his achievements in the North-South trench, Schliemann later spoke of its depth as 15-18m,²¹⁴ which we may take as loosely consistent with this and his previous work. But the actual altitude of the bottom of the trench in this area was initially, again as we have already seen, c.27.00m A.T.²¹⁵ It seems likely that for the most part it remained at this level, for Sisilas' section shows the depth of the trench as 13m,²¹⁶ and the walls of Early Troy I seem to have remained mostly undisturbed. It is not clear precisely how much of his task the foreman fulfilled by 13th July, but probably the larger part of it.

There is direct evidence in the diary for continued work on the south platform, the southern sector of the projected North-South trench. On 22nd June Schliemann had reached a depth of 8m,²¹⁷ and had gone below the 9m level by 5th July.²¹⁸ He explicitly says that he was still adhering to his earlier practice of digging the trench at a slope,²¹⁹ and Atlas Taf.117 confirms that, after digging down behind the Troy VI wall scarcely at all, he continued the slope of the trench downward to the North. Later in 1872 the trench in D 7

was carried to a depth of 14m below the mound-surface, just South of the so-called "Tower" (Dörpfeld's Walls I Ib and I Ic).²²⁰

This achievement was preceded by the digging of a two-metre-deep pit to a depth of 13m.²²¹ Atlas Taf.117 confirms that there was a hole just to the South of the "Tower." If it reached a depth of 13m when two metres deep, the bottom of the trench from which it was dug down must have lain at 11m below the surface, i.e. at c.27m A.T. This figure allows us to determine the line of the bottom of the trench for the period in hand, as in Fig.IV.41. The altitude for the trench-bottom can be derived from Atlas Taf.214, and, after allowance has been made for the presence of washed-in soil, all three are consistent with the line proposed: 30.56m in the southern sector of D 8,²²² 28.22m at the edge of the pit,²²³ and 24.80m at the bottom of the pit.²²⁴ When, therefore, Schliemann says early in the period that he has reached a depth of 8m, and later records finds to a depth of 10m, this can only mean that he was measuring depths from a point on the surface that must have lain at approximately 38m A.T., where the surface flattened out in D 7.

From Schliemann's correspondence we know that by 19th July the trench extended 50m into the mound.²²⁵ Setting this against the 9m depth already reached on 5th July, we can estimate that by 13th July the trench may have advanced 20m or more into the mound from the point at which it had previously been left. This will have brought it well into D 7. The trench's width is made clear by both Atlas Taf.117 and Atlas Taf.214. It was approximately 23m, as in the northern sector of the North-South trench; but this includes two terraces. The central, deeper part of the trench had a width of only c.10m. Atlas Taf.214 allows us to calculate the altitudes of the two terraces. The western one lay at c.34.15m A.T., and the eastern one at c.34.74m A.T.²²⁶ The western terrace passed over the top of the east end of the Building VIM, whose southeast corner it exposed.²²⁷ The eastern terrace must have passed by the structures of Troy VII and DE 8, shown in TI Taf.III, exposing only a wall at the extreme northeast corner of the platform.²²⁸

More detail is given of progress in the northeast platform, which Schliemann refers to as the "Temple area."²²⁹ Two terraces had already been started, one at c.30.17m A.T. and the other at c.24.67m A.T. From the depths of finds recorded in the diary, it can be seen that during 18th-22nd June Schliemann was engaged in extending the upper terrace.²³⁰ From 24th June to 9th July he was extending the lower terrace while still continuing work on the upper terrace.²³¹ The eventual extent of the upper terrace can be seen in Atlas Taf.117. It is still 34m wide, as before, but (when measured to include the sloping face at its southern end) has penetrated c.38m into the mound. The lower platform, also referred to as the large platform, remained 31m wide, but now penetrated 25m into the mound.²³² Judging from Atlas Taf.117 and 214, this measurement was taken along the west side of the platform and included the width of the slope on the south side. For the depth of the lower platform Schliemann gives a bewildering series of figures. In the daily entries of the diary it is 9m deep;²³³ in the résumé in the diary it is 15m below the summit;²³⁴ in Trojanische Alterthümer it is 12m below the summit.²³⁵ But the same variation has already been found, and in the equivalent places, in the records for 24th May - 18th June.²³⁶ The depth of 9m may be a measurement from top to bottom of the cutting at the northern end of the trench. The depths of 12m below the surface (at c.36.50m) and 15m below the summit (at c.39.67m A.T.) again point to an altitude of c.24.67m A.T. for the floor of the platform.

On 9th July Schliemann stated his intention to dig the "large platform" - that is, the lower one - 8m deeper than it had been dug so far.²³⁷ This plan was not carried out, as it was subjected to two revisions. Schliemann soon realised the enormity of such a task, and decided instead (the first revision) to make only a narrow cutting which would go 8m deeper than the lower terrace. He began work on this project. It was to be 4m wide at the bottom, 6m wide where it cut through the lower terrace floor, and 8m wide where it cut through the upper terrace floor.²³⁸ Its total depth, as noted

in the diary, would be 17m (i.e. 9m + 8m). But even this plan was not fully carried through, for in fact (second revision) the narrow cutting was sunk to an extra depth of only 5m, i.e. to c.19.67m A.T. This is the figure eventually given in Trojanische Alterthümer,²³⁹ and it agrees with the information in Atlas Taf.117. Also, from Atlas Taf.117 and 214 we may estimate that the northern end of the cutting must have lain at approximately the 20.00m contour, which tends again to confirm the 5m depth of the trench. The cut can be clearly seen on these plans, as well as in Ilios Plan I where it is marked "W."²⁴⁰ It lay in the middle of the lower platform.²⁴¹

Schliemann's decision to dig 8m deeper was sparked off by his belief that on the lower platform he was still only in the remains of "the historical period."²⁴² He may have been misled by the sloping deposits of Troy VIII and IX which covered the north face of the mound to a considerable depth in this area.²⁴³ His apparently arbitrary seizing on the figure of 8m must derive from his experience of 1871 when he found what he took to be the remains of the earliest settlement 8m below the bottom of the Greek settlement. His reduction of this figure to 5m may have been prompted by the thought that a total trench-depth of 17m would be a depth of 2m below the surface, there being a difference of 3m in the respective datum points. He would have expected a cutting 17m below the surface to serve his purpose well enough, considering his experience in the North-South trench.

We do not know how much, at this stage, of the narrower cutting had been excavated. The plan only materialised on 9th July, and between then and 13th July, when the first draft of Trojanische Alterthümer ch.xi was written, there was work only on the 10th. So it cannot have progressed very far. In that chapter he does say, however, that he was digging the trench "from below," that is, from the north slope, and at the same time on both terraces.²⁴⁴ This clearly indicates that he began work simultaneously at several places along its whole length, at least as far as the southern-most extent of the upper platform. There is no sign that the further extension to the South was yet begun.

13th July - 4th August 1872 (Fig.III.8)

Chapter xii in Trojanische Alterthümer is dated 4th August 1872,²⁴⁵ this being the date on which the fair copy of the text as it now stands was eventually despatched from the site. The rough draft can be found in the diary between the two entries dated to 25th July.²⁴⁶ But it has been written later than 25th July on pages which must have been left blank, for at the end of the entry there remains one page unused.²⁴⁷ The rough draft actually bears the date 1st August. The final draft of 4th August still bears a few features of the earlier draft which ought to have been altered.²⁴⁸ In other respects, however, the text has been updated. On 1st August the north side of the "Tower" had not yet been exposed; three days later it had been, and the appropriate revision was made.²⁴⁹

In the northeastern trench, in the "temple area," Schliemann continued work on the narrower cutting that was to penetrate 5m below the floor of the lower terrace. In GH 2-3, where a beginning had already been made, the bottom of the trench lay at c.20m, as we have already seen, with a theoretical depth of 17m. This figure recurs in the diary during this period,²⁵⁰ and Schliemann does say that he continued to cut the trench horizontally into the mound.²⁵¹ It may, however, have sloped upwards slightly as it was dug. The evidence for this will be given shortly. Extension of the trench southwards was brought to a halt by the discovery of a wall 2m thick and 3m high lying East-West across the line of excavation.²⁵² A variety of measurements is given for its depth and its distance from the mound's edge, but the difficulty of using these to locate the wall is removed by the certainty of its location in the plans. Schliemann spoke of it as a Trojan wall,²⁵³ on account of its depth and size, and it is shown in Atlas Taf. 214 as the Outer Wall of Troy, where it lies close to the line GH 3/4. Ilios p.24 No.2 shows its relation to the underlying fortification wall (A) which was found only later and which appears both in Atlas Taf.117 at the letter P and in Atlas Taf.214 numbered 28. There is no doubt that Dörpfeld was right to identify this wall with his wall BC,²⁵⁴ which overlies the batter of the fortification wall of Troy II in GH 3-4.

This identification makes it easier to cut through the tangle of measurements given by Schliemann. Several figures are given for its distance from the edge of the mound. The largest are 50m²⁵⁵ and 40m.²⁵⁶ These must be two different attempts to measure its lateral distance from the foot of the mound in H 1. Next is the figure of 35m.²⁵⁷ This must be a rough measurement from the point on the north slope where the trench floor cut in at c.20m A.T. Finally there is the figure of 31½m.²⁵⁸ This appears to be a more strictly horizontal measurement to the north slope.

There is also a bewildering variety of measurements of the wall's depth. These, too, must be unravelled if we are to understand the system by which depths are assigned to objects in this trench. The wall was originally said to be 11m below the surface.²⁵⁹ Once it had been found itself to have a height of 3m,²⁶⁰ Schliemann gave its vertical depth variously as 10½-13½m (in Trojanische Alterthümer)²⁶¹ and 12-15m (in the diary).²⁶² A number of bench marks are recorded for Wall BC,²⁶³ and we can estimate that the upper surface where Schliemann brought it to light must in fact have lain at approximately 26.00m A.T. Only the depth of 10½-13½m can be an accurate measurement from the surface which at this point lay at c.36.50m A.T. - although the original figure of 11m may pass as a rough measurement of the same distance. How Schliemann arrived at the figure of 12-15m is more of a puzzle. There seems no reason why he should have taken a datum of c.38m A.T. on the surface of the mound. It is more likely, I think, that in the diary Schliemann made use of a theoretical figure. The floor of the trench was supposed to lie at 17m deep; and the foot of the wall was 2m higher.²⁶⁴ The wall itself should then have been at 12-15m deep. In reality, however, the foot of the wall must have lain at c.23.00m A.T., and the floor of the trench at c.21.00m A.T. This means that the trench floor must have sloped up by approximately 1m from c.20.00m A.T., where it had originally been 6m deeper than the top of the wall- as Schliemann implies.²⁶⁵ It also means that in this period other, lower depths that are noted in the diary - for instance, for objects - may have been calculated in a similar way.

Although Schliemann was not able to continue digging at this depth, he did work on an extension of the trench southwards to a shallower depth. By 18th July the trench had been extended far enough South to expose, to the South of the Temple, two courses of a large wall.²⁶⁶ For Schliemann the "Temple area" was defined by the depression in the mound-surface in GH 3-4, and he must therefore have reached at least as far South as the south wall of the Temple of Athena. The wall concerned is unlikely, however, to have been the south wall of the Temple itself, all the masonry of which seems to have been robbed out at some earlier date.²⁶⁷ It does in fact appear in Atlas Taf.214 where it is numbered 30 and described as a Hellenic Wall. Here it lies almost parallel to, and just North of, the line G 4/5, some 4m South of where the southern wall of the Temple lay. It may be a continuation of the building marked VID on Dörpfeld's plan.²⁶⁸ Certainly Atlas Taf.117 shows the trench reaching just far enough for this to be possible. In both Atlas Taf.117 and 214 the width of the trench appears to be c.10m at the surface of the mound and, as before, c.4m at the bottom. The depth of the trench is shown in Atlas Taf.214 as 20.34. With the +6.30 correction, the altitude will have been 26.64m A.T. This means that the trench was cut more or less horizontally from the top of Wall BC.

At the same time, Schliemann continued work on the south platform. Here he continued to dig northwards from the position in D 7 at which the trench had arrived on 13th July. Its total width, if we may judge from Atlas Taf.117 and 214, appears now to have been c.16m. This figure includes the width of the western terrace, originally dug at c.34.15m A.T. but now possibly rising higher; with the narrowing of the trench the eastern terrace has disappeared. The deeper cut, now lying on the east side of the trench, seems to have been c.10m wide as before.

Various figures are given for the trench's length. In the journal Schliemann speaks of its northern end lying 70m from the edge of the hill.²⁶⁹ In the published despatch the figure is 60m.²⁷⁰ In his letters, however, he quotes a distance of 50m.²⁷¹ The latter two, at least, are easy enough to understand. They are both measurements

of the length of the trench, the first along its eastern side, the second along its western side, following the line of the platform's edge. The figure of 70m is harder to understand and must be a measurement from some point on the mound-surface to the South of the southern entrance to the trench. These interpretations can be stated with some certainty since we do know exactly how far the trench progressed: it was taken northwards until its path was blocked by what Schliemann called the "Tower:"²⁷² the structure which turned out to be the fortification-walls later numbered by Dörpfeld as I Ib and I Ic. The exact position of the southern face of this architectural mass is known from TI Taf.III.

At its deepest point the south trench reached a depth of 14m below the surface, as is explicitly stated in two sources.²⁷³ This depth was measured in a hole which Schliemann dug against the south side of the "Tower."²⁷⁴ The surface at this point lay at c.38m A.T. according to the contour-plan, so the hole must have gone down to c.24m A.T. The figure is confirmed by Atlas Taf.214, from which we can derive the figure of 24.80m A.T.,²⁷⁵ and by TI Taf.VIII where the figure is given as 24.40m. The figure in Atlas Taf.214 has, of course, been affected by silting during the winter rains of 1872-1873. But from what depth was the hole dug down? When Schliemann began to dig the hole he recorded that he had dug it two metres deep, to a depth of 13m. Its upper limit must therefore have lain at a depth of 11m below the surface, that is at c.27m A.T. This is the depth to which the south trench should have reached in the northern quarter of D 7. When translated onto a section, as in Fig.IV.27, it implies a slope in the trench floor of about 1 in 7, which is exactly the figure mentioned by Schliemann.²⁷⁶ From Atlas Taf.214 we can derive a figure of 28.22m A.T. for the depth of the trench at the deepest part of the slope;²⁷⁷ but this depth, like that in the pit, has been affected by silting.

The North-South trench was continued, too, from the North and had struck the north side of the "Tower," that is, the north face of Dörpfeld's Wall I Ic, by 4th August,²⁷⁸ although it had not yet done so on 1st August.²⁷⁹ The width of the trench seems, as before, to

have been c.12 or 13m.²⁸⁰ Over the depth of the trench it is difficult to reach any firm conclusion. Atlas Taf.117, in the section, shows a depth of 12½m below the surface which here lay at c.39m A.T. This places the bottom of the trench on the north side of the "Tower" at c.26.50m A.T. Schliemann himself records that the "Tower" lay 8m below the surface²⁸¹ (Dörpfeld provides a bench-mark of 30.66m A.T. for IIc), and that he dug to a depth of 5m in front of its north face.²⁸² This brings the depth of the trench here to 25.66 or c.26.00m A.T. On the other hand, Schliemann also records finds at depths of 14m,²⁸³ 15m,²⁸⁴ and even 16m.²⁸⁵ These may all be calculated from the summit (39.67m A.T.), but the last two figures should probably be dismissed as no more than theoretical. This again leaves us with a figure of c.25.67m A.T. A rather lower figure is required by Atlas Taf.214, where the altitude of 18.70 must be corrected to 25.00m A.T. A still lower one is demanded by Ilios Plan III which shows the depth as 15m below (presumably) the summit. That figure works out at 24.67m A.T. The range, then, seems to be 24.67 - 26.50m A.T. To some extent the varying figures can be explained by the fact that the trench floor sloped upwards to the South, as may be seen in Atlas Taf.117 and in Ilios Plan III. The greater depths of 14, 15 and 16m are all mentioned by Schliemann on or before 1st August when he had not yet reached as far South as the "Tower." The depth of 13m (a straight addition of 8m to the "Tower" and 5m below it) only makes its appearance after the "Tower" has been reached.

The day after the discovery of (Dörpfeld's) Wall IIb, which first came to light on 9th July, horses and carts were brought round to the north side of the area to begin its clearance from the mound-surface downwards.²⁸⁶ This plan gradually expanded in scope. A few days later Schliemann was planning to dig a run-off channel to deflect away from the wall the water that ran down the south trench.²⁸⁷ This channel was to extend to the west edge of the mound²⁸⁸ and was to be 3m deep - which suggests that it originated as an extension of the hole on the south side of the "Wall." But by 27th July Schliemann had begun to interpret the wall as a "Tower," and so began to think of clearing it not only on north and south sides, but

to East and West ("left" and "right" respectively²⁸⁹) as well.²⁹⁰ The run-off channel was apparently subsumed within this expanded trench.²⁹¹ At this stage, and presumably for the rest of the period in hand, the dimensions proposed for the "Tower" trench were 20m in width and 20m in length.²⁹² But Atlas Taf.117 shows that these dimensions were not entirely achieved. A length of 20m (from North to South) does appear on the eastern side of the trench, but not on the west; and even so the figure must be understood to include the work being done at the south end of the north trench. The east end of the "Tower" trench had reached a depth of at least 4m by 4th August.²⁹³ The west end may have penetrated deeper, possibly to 8m.²⁹⁴ The whole trench effectively joined up the northern and southern sectors of the projected, and now completed, North-South trench.

Small excavations were put in hand in two other parts of the site. On the north platform Schliemann dug a deeper, 2m-wide trench from North to South to see whether he could locate any circuit walls.²⁹⁵ The trench is shown in Atlas Taf.117, marked S, where it is described as a drainage channel. Also, on 19th July Schliemann began to mark out and dig a long trench in the Theatre, which he had looked at eleven days earlier.²⁹⁶ The location of the trench can be seen in Atlas Taf.213.²⁹⁷ No findings are recorded from either trench, except a note that no circuit wall was found below the north platform.²⁹⁸

5th - 9th August 1872 (Fig.III.9)

The season's excavations were brought to a close after a final day's work on Friday 9th August.²⁹⁹ Schliemann remained on the site until 13th August, the remaining days being taken up with clearing washed-in soil out of the south trench, packing up, writing and receiving a visit from the Calvert brothers.³⁰⁰ In ceasing work on 9th August, Schliemann was not adhering to any preconceived plan. The end of the season was brought about by the fact that he, his three foremen and his servant had all contracted malaria, aggravated in Schliemann's case by exhaustion and a troublesome abscess on the leg.³⁰¹ "My days

are numbered," he wrote to Curtius a fortnight later, with characteristic hyperbole.³⁰²

On the last day of work some men were assigned to dig both in the "temple" area, GH 2-4, and on the north platform, as well as to clear out the south trench.³⁰³ The object seems to have been as much to keep everyone busy as to continue serious excavation, and no records of the work were kept. Otherwise all work in this short period was concentrated on the trench around the "Tower" in CDE 6-7. The eventual state of the excavations here may be seen in Atlas Taf.117. The length of the trench from East to West was increased to c.32m. Where it crossed the North-South trench its width was c.20m, narrowing to c.12m at the west end and to c.18m at the east end. In the east and west arms excavation was carried down to the top of the "Tower" at c.30m A.T. (=8m deep).³⁰⁴ On the north side of the "Tower," in the North-South trench, excavation ceased at c.28m A.T. (11m deep).³⁰⁵

15th - 16th September 1872

For two days Schliemann revisited the site after the end of the season.³⁰⁶ With him came Sophie, Sisilas the surveyor who drew the plan in Atlas Taf.117, and Siebrecht, a photographer from the Dardanelles who took twelve views of the site.³⁰⁷ In Schliemann's absence some stones had been removed from the "Bastion of Lysimachus" on the south side - i.e. from VIM - and the rains of 14th August had left two metres of soil washed into the pit in front of the "Tower" in the south trench. He set some men to re-expose the south face of the "Tower," and he built a protective wall in front of it.³⁰⁸

The rain had also exposed a new wall at the bottom of the northeast trench. Initially it was found 2m below the Wall BC,³⁰⁹ but was later found to lie behind it.³¹⁰ It corresponds to the battered fortification-wall of Troy II shown by Dörpfeld in G 3 of his plan.³¹¹ There is some looseness in Schliemann's description of its location: 40m, or 50m, from the edge of the mound.³¹² But the identification is not in doubt. A small amount of work was done to expose it more fully. In Fig.IV.6 it appears as Deposit (7), Wall 29.

1873

Schliemann's fourth season, from 2nd February to 14th June, is again documented in considerable detail.

2nd - 23rd February 1873 (Fig.III.10)

His work in the previous year had convinced Schliemann that the Temple of Athena was to be found on the northeast side of the mound, and since at least September 1872 it had been his firm intention to continue work in that area.³¹³ It was to this task that he first turned when excavations began in 1873.

Schliemann's starting-point is clearly specified in Trojanische Alterthümer: on the north side of the hill, at 40m from the edge, 2m below the "Trojan" wall, at the spot where a wall of white stones rose at 40°, ³¹⁴ with the east edge of the mound lying 80m away.³¹⁵ This point must have lain against the lower face of Wall 29 (the Troy II fortification wall) and below Wall 30, in the deep cut in square H 4 or G 4 (see Fig. IV.5). The emphasis on this starting-point, even in the résumé of 22nd February when work had been in progress, albeit interrupted, for three weeks, is a result of Schliemann's desire to expose more of Wall 29. But he does also say that he was aiming to reach the temple by digging simultaneously on two sides using five terraces.³¹⁶ The second of these two areas lay in F 3-4, at the east end of the north platform, where Atlas Taf.214 shows two terraces. We can therefore assume that Schliemann was using three terraces in the first trench in GH 2-4. This is consistent with the evidence of the diary, which speaks of an "upper terrace," and a "second terrace" and a "lower excavation" in the northeast trench.³¹⁷

Where were these terraces? If we compare Atlas Taf.214, which shows the excavations at the end of the 1873 season, with Atlas Taf.117, made a year earlier, it is clear that no work was done on the two more easterly terraces in H 2-4. It is also clear that little additional work can have been done in the deep, central cut of the area: Atlas Taf.214 gives two altitudes for the trench bottom which, when corrected, coincide very closely with the state of this deep cut at the end of 1872.³¹⁸ Only in the western part of the trench

does Atlas Taf.214 show any change. Here the lower terrace, lying at c.26.66m A.T.,³¹⁹ has been extended nearly 20m to the south, if we include the area where Wall 29 was revealed; and the upper terrace, lying at c.30.59m A.T.,³²⁰ has been extended 17-18m southwards, and also westwards to join the trench from the north platform. The terraces are in fact extensions of the terraces left in the trench at the end of 1872.³²¹

The trench was abandoned on 1st March, after only about 16 days' work.³²² Perhaps 10 days' work had been done by 23rd February. This allows us to estimate roughly how far the trench had progressed during the first period, and there is some additional information to help. On the upper terrace, Schliemann had already advanced 2m beyond the boundary of Frank Calvert's field by 10th February.³²³ The exact, western limit of the field is not recorded, but on the north side of the mound it certainly lay between the trenches in F 3 and G 3, perhaps along the west edge of the rectangular depression in GH 4. The North-South line bisecting the mound in Atlas Taf.116 may represent the western limit of Calvert's land as well as the eastern limit of the excavations proposed by Schliemann for 1872. On the lower terrace, Wall 29 was first uncovered on 26th February, and had not yet been reached on 23rd.³²⁴ We know little of work in the deep cut, save that it took place.³²⁵ Taking these figures into account, we can estimate that by 23rd February the lower terrace had been extended southwards by 9-10m, and the upper terrace westwards by c.10m and southwards by c.12m.

The altitudes noted for objects found in this trench appear, at this stage, to be calculated from the surface, which here lay at 36.50m A.T. The point where the wall of white stones (Wall 29) was first revealed is said to have lain at a depth of 15½m, and 2m below Wall 30.³²⁶ This reiterates the measurements of 13½m deep for the base of Wall 30 in August and September 1872 in Trojanische Alterthümer³²⁷ which, as I have shown, must have been related to the local mound-surface.³²⁸ The same system was probably in use in the diary, for a depth of 15m is mentioned on several occasions during this period, and no deeper figure occurs.³²⁹

The new trench at the east end of the north platform was begun at the same time, likewise to be abandoned on 1st March.³³⁰ The trench can be seen in Atlas Taf.214, 215, Ilios Fig.4 on the left, and, apparently at a more developed stage, in Ilios Plan I at the letters PP to the South of point C. Its width is said in Trojanische Alterthümer to have been 13m.³³¹ This agrees with Atlas Taf.214, if we assume that the measurement applies to the cut at its north entrance. Further South the width diminishes to c.10m. Atlas Taf.214 shows that excavation took place at two levels, which must ultimately have lain at c.24.80m A.T. and 30.59m A.T.³³² These two levels constitute the two "terraces" which, together with the three in the northeast trench, make up the five terraces mentioned by Schliemann for the temple area.³³³ If we assume that Schliemann was measuring his depths here from the neighbouring mound-surface at c.37.50m A.T., in F 4, then his statement that he cut the upper platform to a depth of 7m³³⁴ agrees closely with the altitude shown in Atlas Taf.214. His record that, in this period, the lower platform was cut only 3m deeper, to 10m,³³⁵ is more difficult to reconcile with the figure of 24.80m A.T. There is, however, no evidence from February 1873 that a level deeper than 10m was attained. On 24th February finds from this trench are still being reported from no greater depth than 9m.³³⁶

The distance to which excavation on these two terraces had advanced by 23rd February can only be estimated. Perhaps 9 days' work had been done by that time, and a further 6 were to follow before their abandonment on 1st March. On 10th February Schliemann was expressing the hope that the upper terrace would join the upper terrace of the northeastern trench in two days' time.³³⁷ The upper terraces must certainly have joined, then, by 23rd February. From the lower terrace, the discovery of a wall 9m deep at 25m from the edge of the mound marks the distance achieved by 22nd February.³³⁸ The wall seems to be the one shown at the south end of the lower terrace in Atlas Taf.214. The 25m has been measured along the west side of the trench. During this period, therefore, the upper terrace must have advanced roughly 25m to the South, and the lower terrace roughly 11m, again measuring along the west side of the

trench. The upper terrace is an extension southward of the 2m-wide terrace left in F 3 on 22nd May 1872 (see Fig.IV.19).

During the season of 1872, Schliemann's attention had been drawn to a wall made from corinthian column fragments which was visible in Calvert's old excavation in square J 8. "I am sure," he wrote to Sir John Lubbock, "that from the modern Apollo Temple derive all those Corinthian columns which you will have noticed in the small excavation, and almost at the surface, at the foot of the southeast corner of the Mount."³³⁹ On his return to the site in 1873 he opened a trench in this area in squares HJ 7-8, beginning on 10th February.³⁴⁰ The trench may be seen in Atlas Taf.214, 215, Ilios Plans I, IVa, and Troja und Ilion Taf.III.

Although Schliemann does not mention what width he gave to the trench, we can see from Atlas Taf.214 that at the southeast entry it must have been about 21m. Further into the mound, however, it could narrow to as little as 10m. He is more specific as to its depth. In the diary he says that he intended to make the trench 6m deep in the hopes of finding in it the continuation of the "Tower" and perhaps a Temple of Apollo.³⁴¹ Against this we must set the record of Trojanische Alterthümer, where he explains that he cut the trench at a considerable slope in order to attain a depth not of 6m but of 8m on reaching the "Tower."³⁴² Now Schliemann obviously expected to find the continuation of the "Tower" in square H 7: that is clear both from the line of his trench and from the orientation of the "Tower" structure exposed in 1872. And here, if we consult the contour map, the surface lay at c.36.00m A.T. The depth of 6m proposed in the diary, if we take it to be measured down from the surface, implies a final altitude of c.3000m A.T. for the bottom of the trench. This corresponds approximately to the altitude of the "Tower's" surface in D 6-7. The depth of that surface had in the previous season been calculated down from the mound surface in E 6-7 which lay at c.38.50m, and had therefore been found to be 8m deep. The contradiction of the figures in 1873 is consequently no more than apparent: the figure of 8m has simply been repeated by Schliemann as a standard figure for the depth of the "Tower." The altitudes are

otherwise measured down from the mound surface in HJ 7-8, and the trench was given a slope down to an eventual depth here of c.6m, as Meyer accepted.³⁴³ That this really is the case is confirmed by Atlas Taf.214 where the altitude shown for the deepest part of the trench is 23.60, which, when corrected, amounts to 29.90m A.T. The line of slope, of c.12° from the horizontal, is confirmed by the figure of 27.57 towards the south end of the cut; when corrected it becomes 34.17m A.T. The trench floor began, then, at c.35m A.T. at the southwest end, and reached c.30m A.T. at its deepest point towards the North. Its eventual length was 34m.³⁴⁴

But how far had Schliemann advanced by 23rd February? We know that by 22nd February he had almost completed his breaking-through of what he identified as the "Wall of Lysimachus."³⁴⁵ This wall, as Dörpfeld rightly saw, is to be identified with the north wall of Theatre B,³⁴⁶ and lay quite near the mouth of the trench. But it seems that in the meantime Schliemann had also been clearing at least part of the area to the North of this, for on the same date he also says that in excavating further he came upon one housewall after another, whose removal gave him great difficulties.³⁴⁷ The pattern of later work in this trench, too, does seem to support the idea that progress here came through area-excavation: he records the increasing depths of 5m on 6th March and 6m on 7th March.³⁴⁸ The housewalls seem likely to have been walls of Troy VII, parts of which he certainly cut away in this trench.³⁴⁹ But it is impossible to arrive at a proper estimate of the extent of these excavations beyond the "Wall of Lysimachus." The shaded area in Fig.III.10 represents no more than a guess.

One final area of activity in this period must be noted. Schliemann's plans on returning to the site in 1873 included the intention to expose the circuit walls to right and left of the "Tower."³⁵⁰ Accordingly on 11th February he set four men to begin a "gallery" in the unexcavated ground to the West of the "Tower," that is, in square C 6.³⁵¹ On the following day excavation was conducted in the same area from the mound surface with nine men, with the making of two "galleries" in view.³⁵² Work here was apparently then dropped

again until it was resumed on 1st March and again on 10th March.³⁵³
 Little can have been done, and it is impossible to specify the extent of the work within the final dimensions of the trench.

24th February - 6th March 1873 (Fig. III. 11)

The résumé published as Trojanische Alterthümer ch. xvi bears the date 1st March in both the published and the unpublished versions.³⁵⁴
 This is the date on which it was begun. But it was not finished until 6th or 7th March, for in the diary it is interrupted by entries for 3rd, 4th, 5th and 6th March.³⁵⁵ It is therefore possible that the latter part of the text may include some information from work between 1st and 6th March, and 6th March is for that reason taken as the most convenient point at which to make a division.

Work was continued in the northeastern trench, FGH 3-4(b), until it was abandoned on 1st March.³⁵⁶ By this date a further six days' work had been done. The final state of the trench can be seen in Atlas Taf.214. The upper terrace, which lay at c.30.59m A.T., had been extended southwards by another 6-7m. The second terrace, at c.26.66m A.T., was continued southwards by only another two metres or so before the "retaining wall" - Wall 29 - came to light in it on 26th February.³⁵⁷ Atlas Taf.214 shows that here in the western part of the trench Wall 29 was left intact; Dörpfeld's plan, in Troja und Ilion Taf.III, shows the same. So the second terrace advanced no further South than the north face of this wall. Some effort was nonetheless put into exposing the wall to its full height, which was achieved by 1st March.³⁵⁸ The mass of stones which can be seen in Atlas Taf.214, numbered '28,' probably represents the battered north face of the wall and not its top. Some work was also, apparently, continued in the deep, central cut of the northeastern area. Here, working at c.21.74m A.T., Schliemann tore down a part of the "Trojan" wall (Wall 30) to gain access to Wall 29.³⁵⁹ The gap in this former wall, Dörpfeld's BC, can be seen in TI Taf.III. Wall 29 was partly exposed behind it on 26th February, but never, it seems, to its full height.³⁶⁰ Schliemann says that it had been broken through over a width of 4m - the width of the central cutting itself.³⁶¹ This feat must have been accomplished in 1872. The trench bottom in the southernmost

sector of the deep cut, where Wall 29 had been removed, remained untouched at c.26.64m A.T. where it had been left at the end of 1872.³⁶² This southernmost sector qualified, because of its depth, to be considered as an additional part of the "second terrace;" and there seems to be evidence for limited excavation, perhaps an extension of only 1½m southwards, in this area. We must assume, then, that in this central cutting work progressed no more than c.5m further to the South in the lower part, and perhaps no more than 1½m further South in the higher part during the six days of excavation.

Depths in this area seem once again to have been measured down uniformly from a point on the surface at c.36.50m A.T. To this there is one clear exception: the note that the top of Wall 29 lay at 8m below the surface.³⁶³ From TI Taf.III we should expect that its top here lay at c.30.91m A.T., not at the height of 28.50m A.T. which Schliemann's figure seems to imply. We must assume either that in this case he was quoting from another datum, such as the summit, perhaps for the sake of comparison with the "Tower;" or that he had not yet really found the top of the wall. The former possibility seems to be the correct one, since other measurements of depth in the same entry (for 1st March = "17th February") are best understood if we assume that they, too, were calculated from the summit.

The adjoining area, at the east end of the north platform, was likewise dug until it, too, was abandoned on 1st March.³⁶⁴ A further six days' work was done. Again, the final state of the trench can be seen in Atlas Taf.214. The upper terrace, which by now merged with the upper terrace of the northeast trench, must have been lengthened to the South by 6 or 7m. It may also have been widened slightly towards the West at its south end. It remained at c.30.59m A.T.,³⁶⁵ 7m below Schliemann's datum on the surface³⁶⁶ which, for this trench, must have lain at c.37.50m A.T. The lower terrace seems to have been advanced no further South than the wall which had already been found on 22nd February.³⁶⁷ But it was probably cut to a deeper level, for although it had been begun at a depth of 10m (i.e. at c.27.50m A.T.), Atlas Taf.214 shows that it was left at nearly 13m deep (i.e. at c.24.80m A.T.³⁶⁸). It is conceivable that

this depth was only reached during May, when the north platform was being dug down to 14m below the local datum of 38.50m in square E 4.³⁶⁹ But as there seems to be at least one, and possibly a second, reference to work in the lower part of this area,³⁷⁰ we may assume that at any rate some progress was made during this period towards the eventual depth of 24.80m A.T.

On 26th February Schliemann opened a new trench on this south side of the mound. It was to connect the old "Tower" trench of 1872, in DE 6-7, with the newly-made trench at the southeast corner of the site.³⁷¹ Work on this new, connecting trench may at first have been rather slow; but it received the attentions of the entire workforce once the trenches on the north side had been abandoned.³⁷² Its purpose was to expose the rest of the "Tower" and to follow up the city wall, presumed to adjoin it, until the Scaean Gate should come to light.³⁷³

The trench, in its eventual state, can be seen in Atlas Taf.214 and 215 and in TI Fig.3, where it is marked Q. It appears again in Ilios Plan I and is shown in section in Ilios Plan IVa. Schliemann gave its proposed length as 80m.³⁷⁴ This figure must include the full width of the southeast trench, to which the new trench was to join. The different figures of 90m, 96m and 100m are also given at various times.³⁷⁵ These must have included the full width of the "Tower" trench dug in 1872. The actual length of the trench, however, from the east side of the "Tower" trench to the northwest end of the southeastern trench, must have been closer to 60m. Its eventual width can be seen from Atlas Taf.214 to have been c.20m. But Schliemann began by digging a trench that was only 1½m wide.³⁷⁶ This must have been along the southern edge of the trench, for it exposed the north wall of the Roman building IXB almost immediately.³⁷⁷ This seems to have been the first step towards giving the trench its projected width of 20-24m,³⁷⁸ the full extent of which was subsequently dug "all at once."³⁷⁹ There is also a brief note that fourteen men were again set to dig on the west side of the "Tower" on 1st March.³⁸⁰

At this early stage Schliemann must have been aiming to dig the trench to a uniform depth of roughly 1½m. This is the figure given for the initial, 1½m wide trench,³⁸¹ and on 7th March he had still reached a depth of only 2m.³⁸² In apparent contradiction to these depths stands out the statement of 6th March that certain walls in the trench had been traced to a depth of 5m.³⁸³ But these are most probably the walls of Building VIG found not in the new East-West Trench, but in the Southeast Trench.

Schliemann's method of excavation remained the same as before: to leave the trench face at a slope - this time of 55°.³⁸⁴ He refers to the construction of eight side-passages to help remove the spoil,³⁸⁵ but these cannot now be located, with the exception of a 4m-wide ramp in F 6-7 which is still visible even in Troja Plan VII.

7th - 15th March 1873 (Fig.III.12)

Schliemann's work was now almost entirely concentrated on the south side of the mound, where he was attempting to uncover the continuation of the "Tower" and the city walls which he expected to be associated with it.

The southeast trench, in GHJ 7-8, which had already reached a depth of 6m on 7th March,³⁸⁶ was taken down a further 1½m³⁸⁷ before it was abandoned for good on 14th March.³⁸⁸ The final state of the trench is shown in Atlas Taf.214, from which it is clear that the deepest point in the trench lay at c.29.90m A.T.³⁸⁹ As the surface in H 7 lay at only c.36.50m A.T., some of the depths in this trench, which is said finally to have reached 8m, must have been measured down from a datum elsewhere of c.38m A.T., perhaps on the east side of the old "Tower" trench. Before abandoning the southeast trench, Schliemann believed that he had identified a continuation of the "Tower" in the deepest cut at 34m from the end of this trench.³⁹⁰ This structure cannot, however, have been any part of Dörpfeld's Troy II citadel wall, which lay much further North. It may have been a building associated with Blegen's IIS, or possibly a structure of Troy IV. Schliemann also records that he worked on an "upper gallery" close to this point but on "this side" of it, and found nothing.³⁹¹

By "this side" he may mean the west side, nearest to his house in square C 6.³⁹² If so, the "upper gallery" may have been the area just to the East of Propylon IXD which, to judge from Atlas Taf.214, was never dug below c.33.47m A.T.³⁹³ It may, alternatively, refer to that whole area of the East-West trench which lay East of Propylon IXD. In either case the depth is unlikely to have exceeded 4½m.

In the meantime work was also continued in the main part of the new East-West trench in EFGH 6-7. A short section of wall running East-West in Square E 6 had come to light,³⁹⁴ and was taken to be the north wall of the Temple of Minerva,³⁹⁵ matching the supposed south wall found previously. Further to the East, the west wall of Propylon IXD had been exposed by 13th March.³⁹⁶ This Schliemann took to be a part of a reservoir.³⁹⁷ These two structures he proposed to leave intact; and by 15th March he was planning to dig only the western end of the trench down as far as 8m, where he expected to find the surface of the "Tower:"³⁹⁸ the area of excavation was to be contained within the "north" and "south" walls of the "Temple," and to the West of the "reservoir." On 13th March he had reached a depth of 4m;³⁹⁹ by 15th March he may have reached 4½m, at least in parts of the east end of this area.⁴⁰⁰ These depths appear to have been measured down from a datum at c.38.50m A.T.

Schliemann now took up again the work which in mid-February he had tentatively begun, and abandoned, on the west side of the former "Tower" trench. From 10th March he began to excavate an area 14.30m long and 14.40m wide,⁴⁰¹ whose object was again to expose more of the "Tower" and its adjoining walls. The location of this trench is not made entirely clear either in the diary or in Trojanische Alterthümer; but bearing in mind its purpose, we can assume that it is most likely to have formed a direct extension Northwestwards of the cutting already made into C 6. This finds some confirmation from Schliemann's statement in Ilios that the new trench lay close to his wooden house.⁴⁰² The wooden house itself lay at the northwest corner of square C 6.⁴⁰³ By 15th March Schliemann was here recording finds from depths of up to 4m.⁴⁰⁴ These depths were presumably

measured down from the neighbouring mound-surface, as usual; the highest adjacent point here lay at nearly 38.50m A.T.

One final area of work must be mentioned for this period. Ever since he had found the marble triglyph in 1872, Schliemann had been hoping to find a second one to match it. On 14th March he began a positive search by planning to dig a platform 30m wide close to where he had found the first triglyph. The platform was to be dug into the foot of the mound.⁴⁰⁵ Clearly it must have lain somewhere in GHJ 1 or 2. But the plan seems to have been modified, for in Trojanische Alterthümer we read that the trench was only 18m wide.⁴⁰⁶ Perhaps this modification was caused by the enormity of the preliminary task of shifting the build-up of seven metres of his own spoil.⁴⁰⁷ Work did continue, sporadically, on this project; but we never hear much about it, and the trench was never shown on any plan.

17th - 22nd March 1873 (Fig.III.13)

During the six days covered by this period, Schliemann worked again in three areas: the East-West trench in EFGH 6-7, which he called the Temple of Minerva; the west side of the "Tower" in C 6; and on the north side of the mound in HJ 1-2.

The horizontal dimensions of the East-West trench remained the same as before, and Schliemann's efforts were directed to deepening the cut that already existed. It seems that, on 15th March, the depth of the trench had nowhere exceeded 4-4½m below the datum of c.38.50m A.T. We now read of excavation reaching first 5m deep⁴⁰⁸ and eventually, in some places, 8m deep.⁴⁰⁹ At this point we are also able to gain a closer idea of Schliemann's method of excavation in this trench. First, he makes it clear that the deepest excavation was taking place in the northern part of the trench. Here he made a trench within the trench in order to be able to reach the surface of the "Tower" more quickly.⁴¹⁰ By 22nd March he believed that he had already exposed it in several places.⁴¹¹ Secondly, he appears to distinguish an eastern sector and a western sector, for Trojanische Alterthümer records his plan to expose the "Tower" completely - within three weeks on the east side, and within a week and a half on the west side.⁴¹² The dividing-

line between these two areas is likely to have been the ramp of unexcavated soil that ran northwards into the trench in F 6-7 and served as a path for workmen and wheelbarrows. It is indicated on the plans in Atlas Taf.214, 215, Ilios Plans I, IVa and even still in Troja Plan VII. It can also be seen in the views shown in Atlas Taf. 157 (TR plate IX), Taf.170 (TR plate XIA) and Ilios fig.144. This, if correct, provides us with a division into four areas:- an east sector and a west sector, each having a higher area and a deeper trench. It therefore comes as no surprise to read Schliemann's statement that he had now made a division of the trench into four terraces the lowest of which was constituted by the surface of the "Tower."⁴¹³ But work seems to have been concentrated only on cutting the deeper 'terrace' in the western area, for a depth of 5m was first reached in the eastern area only later, on 4th April.⁴¹⁴

On the west side of the "Tower," in square C 6, the horizontal dimensions of the trench may likewise have remained unaltered while the trench was deepened. There is no very clear evidence of what depth was reached here by 22nd March. It is certain that the "Tower" surface was not yet reached, a target which Schliemann did not expect to achieve before the end of the month.⁴¹⁵ The depth of 9m was not reached until 9th April.⁴¹⁶ It is also clear that, even though a depth of 4m had already been reached in some places by 15th March,⁴¹⁷ work was still being done at a depth of 3m, and even of only 30cm and 1m, in others.⁴¹⁸ As before, depths can be assumed to have been measured down from a datum of c.38.50m A.T. A reference to a wall stratified below the building in D 5 excavated in 1871,⁴¹⁹ may, however, indicate that excavation was extended along the northwest fringe of the old Tower trench in D 6. The extent of such work is not clear.

Schliemann frankly admitted that his excavations in the third area, the trench in HJ 1-2, were "purely to enrich my collection" by, as he hoped, bringing to light a second triglyph.⁴²⁰ A small number of men was set to work there on 18th and 19th March, but not apparently on the other days. Schliemann later explained that he only dug here when he had workmen to spare.⁴²¹ The work seems to have consisted mostly, if not entirely, in moving the previous year's spoil-heap.⁴²²

24th - 29th March 1873 (Fig.III.14)

During these six days progress was hampered by bad weather and a shortage of workmen. Little work was done.⁴²³ There is nothing in either the diary or Trojanische Alterthümer to suggest that Schliemann excavated anywhere other than in the deeper part of the west sector of the East-West trench, in squares EF 6-7. It is most unlikely that any digging took place in the eastern sector, for when work was resumed there on 3rd April⁴²⁴ a depth of 5m had still not been reached.⁴²⁵ Similarly there is complete silence on the trench West of the "Tower" in square C 6 until 9th April, although it must be admitted that by that date a depth of 9m had been reached.⁴²⁶

The horizontal dimensions of the trench in EF 6-7 remained unchanged. Most work, it seems, was done at a depth of 8m⁴²⁷ - a depth which will again have been measured down from the datum of c.38.50m A.T. Enough work was done on the surface of the "Tower" here for Schliemann to note once more that a packing of loose stones lay between (Dörpfeld's) Walls IIb and IIc.⁴²⁸ But the depth of 8m cannot yet have been uncovered across the full width of this western sector, for the building with pithoi in EF 7, overlying Gate FN, was not exposed until 4th April.⁴²⁹

31st March - 5th April 1873 (Fig.III.15)

Schliemann had a good supply of workmen all week, an average of 116,⁴³⁰ and was able to achieve much more. He appears to have worked in three areas.

First, he continued to dig in the western end of the East-West trench, in EF 6-7. This was where his efforts were primarily directed. By now he was widening out the deep cut to include the whole width of the trench. As a result he soon exposed the network of walls overlying Gate FN, shown in Atlas Taf.214 and 215.⁴³¹ They first came to light on 31st March;⁴³² by 5th April Schliemann believed he had here dug down to the surface of the "Tower."⁴³³ The spot-heights recorded for this area in Atlas Taf.214, however, suggest that in places he may not have penetrated below 31.42m A.T. A datum of c.38.50m was probably in use.

Secondly, on 3rd April he began work again in the east end of the East-West trench.⁴³⁴ It seems that this area had probably been lying unattended since 15th March, when it had been taken down to a maximum depth of c.4½m below a datum of c.38.50m A.T. - i.e. to c.34m A.T.⁴³⁵ Schliemann must now have begun working from the West, for the first feature to come to light was the 'altar' just East of the ramp, in square G 7.⁴³⁶ The upright stone was found first, at a depth of 5m. Since the stone itself was only half a metre tall, and since the stone on which it rested lay only 1m above the level of the "Tower," the top of the stone must have been found at c.31.50m. The depth of 5m has therefore now been measured down from the surface immediately above, at c.36.75m A.T., and no longer from the more distant datum of c.38.50m A.T. Schliemann apparently dug to a depth of over 1m below the altar, that is, down to c.30m A.T.⁴³⁷ But Atlas Taf.214 shows that he reached this depth only in a small hole no more than 4 or 5m in diameter. The surrounding area is marked with final spot-heights of 26.48 (= 32.78m A.T.), 25.03 (=31.33m A.T.) and 27.50 (=33.80m A.T.). These depths may already have been reached by 5th April, for what little work was subsequently done in this trench seems to have been concentrated in square H 7.

It is uncertain whether, thirdly, Schliemann also worked in the trench in C 6 during this period; but three factors suggest that he may have done. The increased number of workmen might have posed difficulties if consigned only to the East-West trench - especially in view of the difficulties of moving spoil out of the trench. There is, too, the rapidity with which a depth of 9m was reached in C 6 after 7th April.⁴³⁸ And there is, in the diary entry for 5th April, a passing reference to a drain which had been found "on the west side of the Tower."⁴³⁹ If these points may be taken as suggesting, tentatively, that excavation still proceeded in C 6, we are still left in ignorance as to what took place there. Presumably the length and breadth of the trench remained unaltered, but the depth may have been increased to, say, 7m below the likely datum of c.38.50m A.T. - a halfway-house between the states of affairs on 22nd March and 9th April.

7th - 16th April 1873 (Fig.III.16)

Once again, much of Schliemann's work was in this period directed towards the excavations in the East-West trench. In the western sector, in EF 6-7, the surface of the "Tower" at 8m deep was cleared⁴⁴⁰ and a number of walls exposed.⁴⁴¹ Among these were the northwest angle of Dörpfeld's Wall IIB, where it turned South to form part of Gate FN;⁴⁴² a wall running NNW-SSE, shown as No.27 in Atlas Taf.214, which appears to have been a part of the eastern half of Gate FN;⁴⁴³ and a mudbrick wall 8m wide and 3m high which lay just to the South of the building with the pithoi.⁴⁴⁴ This last may have been related to the similar, massive mudbrick structures found by Dörpfeld overlying the Troy II remains in squares G 4-5.⁴⁴⁵ Work was also continued in the eastern sector, as far as the northern end of the southeast trench. Here the wall previously thought to have been a continuation of the "Tower," in H 7, was identified instead as an early circuit-wall.⁴⁴⁶

It was his discoveries West of the "Tower," in square C 6, which caught Schliemann's attention during this period. A depth of 9m having been reached here on 9th April,⁴⁴⁷ Gate FM immediately began to come to light. As Dörpfeld shows a spot-height of 29.58m A.T. for this upper part of the paved street which Schliemann first exposed at 9m deep, we have some confirmation that depths here were calculated down from a datum of 38.50m A.T. The gateway was cleared, so far as it lay within the confines of the trench, by 16th April.⁴⁴⁸

As soon as the gate appeared on 9th April, Schliemann jumped to the conclusion that a royal palace must lie immediately to its Northeast. He therefore decided without further ado to open a new cutting which would run from his North-South trench of 1871-72 to the northeast side of the trench in C 6.⁴⁴⁹ It was begun on 10th April,⁴⁵⁰ and its object was to remove the entire block of earth which lay between the well in CD 4-5 and Schliemann's wooden house in C 6. It was this trench which was later to expose "Priam's palace," and its northeastern limit can easily be seen in Atlas Taf.214 and 215. Schliemann's original plan stated that

the cutting was to be 20m wide.⁴⁵¹ This must have been a measurement taken along the southwest face of the North-South trench in CD 5-6. But the eventual dimensions are recorded as 24 x 24m.⁴⁵² The width was extended to the Northwest, and the length must be measured at the northwest end of the cutting and must include the 10m-deep terrace left on the west side of the North-South trench from the excavations in 1871. The depth of 10m, to which the new trench was cut,⁴⁵³ was selected as it was the depth at which the adjoining terrace had been left in 1871. Men were set to dig away this huge block of earth simultaneously from top and bottom.⁴⁵⁴ It is from the early work at the north end of this trench that two workmen stole the metal objects which were later seized by the Turkish authorities.⁴⁵⁵ The finds were apparently made on the "east" (i.e. northeast) side of the "palace" and very close to the well in squares CD 4-5. The date of late March, mentioned by Schliemann as the date of this theft, is evidently a Julian date - as would naturally be the case if it derived from a confession by the culprits.

Besides the work in these areas on the summit and south side of the mound, a limited amount of work was done on the north side, possibly in two areas. A diary entry for 9th April records that on the previous day Schliemann had set four men to dig on the north side - but purely to try to find objects.⁴⁵⁶ This recalls Schliemann's earlier purpose in starting the trench in HJ 1-2, and may imply that the work was again in that area. Another entry, for 16th April, notes that excavations were being continued on the north side and that the old platform was being covered again with spoil.⁴⁵⁷ If spoil was now being tipped on the old North Platform, then we are clearly dealing here with a trench other than the one in HJ 1-2. The statement appears, rather, to foreshadow the later indication that the North Platform itself was being extended Southwards at the depth of 10m.⁴⁵⁸ If so, excavation must have concentrated first on removing the block that still protruded, with a sloping north face, into squares DE 3.

17th April - 10th May 1873 (Fig.III.17)

The Greek Easter celebrations meant that no excavation took place

between 16th and 23rd April.⁴⁵⁹ By 10th May Schliemann had nevertheless done a further 14 days' work,⁴⁶⁰ and that with an average of 95 workmen.⁴⁶¹

A limited amount of work was done in the East-West trench and on the "Tower." In the eastern half of the East-West trench, according to an entry in the diary for 29th April,⁴⁶² Schliemann had the interior of Propylon IXD cleared.⁴⁶³ In the western half of the trench, he worked on exposing two walls which lay in the northern part of the cutting. These he spoke of as constituting part of a two-storey building founded on bedrock.⁴⁶⁴ The walls can be seen in Atlas Taf.214 where they are numbered '12.' The trench between them carries the spot-height 20.12 which, when corrected, becomes c.26.42m A.T. Schliemann therefore dug here to a depth of over 12m below his local datum of c.38.50m A.T. If we seek to locate this deeper pit on Dörpfeld's plan of the site,⁴⁶⁵ it has to be placed in square E 6 just to the South of the remaining earth 'pillar' and just to the West of the IID phase of Gate FN - in the area shown by Dörpfeld as masonry belonging to phase IIC of the gate. But it is clear from the plan that at this point Wall IID had been dug away at some earlier stage, for Dörpfeld indicates it only with broken lines. The massive block of masonry from phase IIC shown in the plan must therefore certainly be a reconstruction, at least in part; and it seems likely to be an erroneous reconstruction.

The work on the "Tower" was restricted to cleaning off the surface of (Dörpfeld's) Walls IIB and IIC. In square D 6 Schliemann found the depression between the two walls:⁴⁶⁶ and in squares DE 7 he had previously found three superimposed banks of stones bonded with mud. These he had taken to be remnants of a superstructure, an interpretation which he now doubted.⁴⁶⁷ Both features are shown in Atlas Taf.214.⁴⁶⁸

We are not very well informed about the progress of excavations in squares CD 5-6, the important area West of the "Tower." The shape of the trench does not seem to have been altered, but it will certainly have been carried to a greater depth. On the northwest side of the trench it can be assumed that the sloping southwest

face of the old, 1871 trench had been cut away and the new trench extended at a depth of 10m by at least the width of that slope. That the trench-bottom did here eventually reach a depth of 10m is confirmed by the spot-heights of 23.44 and 23.50 shown in Atlas Taf.214.⁴⁶⁹ These, when corrected, yield altitudes of 29.74 and 29.80m A.T., which are roughly 10m less than the height of the mound-surface in this area. Immediately to the Southwest, however, Schliemann exposed to 7m deep a group of buildings whose top lay at 6m deep.⁴⁷⁰ These are among the structures numbered "7" in Atlas Taf.214, and are the walls which overlay the building identified as Priam's palace.⁴⁷¹ The complex must have been partly cut away in the excavations of 1871, for it is preserved only as far as the edge of the 1871 trench. But it is uncertain how much of this had come to light on the northeast side by 10th May. On the southwest side, in square C 6, Schliemann continued clearing Gate FM on the "left" side,⁴⁷² by which he must mean either the east or northeast side. In following it up he unearthed, on 9th May, the second, and more northerly, of the two sets of projecting piers in the Gate.⁴⁷³ Beyond these he brought to light the southern side of the walls just mentioned. In the gateway excavation reached down to c.30.04m A.T.,⁴⁷⁴ and among the walls to c.32.50m A.T.⁴⁷⁵

Excavation on the North Platform was resumed on 2nd May.⁴⁷⁶ Schliemann appears to speak of work on two levels. On the one hand several house-walls were exposed at 6-10m deep.⁴⁷⁷ These house-walls are said to have been in the "upper levels."⁴⁷⁸ On the other hand, a colossal wall of stones and earth was exposed in the lowest 5 or 6 metres.⁴⁷⁹ This wall is said to have been in the "lower layers."⁴⁸⁰ It seems, then, that there was an upper terrace at 10m deep and a lower terrace at 15 or 16m deep. The only place on the North Platform where Schliemann could now have dug a terrace at 10m below the surface lies in DE 3-4: the unexcavated wedge that protruded northwards between the North-South trench and the Northeast Trench in F 3-4. This, as has already been suggested, must be where he was digging. The decision to cut a terrace at 10m below the surface (here at c.39.50) was not a caprice. It recalls Schliemann's discovery of monumental remains at the same depth in 1871,

and the temporary terraces he dug, again at the same depth, in F 3 and D 3-4 during the 1872 season. In practice, however, the depth of 10m was not kept to, for Atlas Taf.214 shows several spot-heights for this area which, when corrected, indicate that for the most part the terrace lay at an altitude of up to c.30.90m A.T.⁴⁸¹ At the northeast corner of the terrace there is a solitary spot-height of roughly the right order.⁴⁸² The depths of 15 or 16m (below 39.50m A.T.) for the lower terrace are identical with the depth at which the base of the North Platform had been left in 1872: at the west end it lay at c.23.67m A.T.,⁴⁸³ and at the east end at c.24.67m A.T.⁴⁸⁴ This shows that the new, lower terrace begun on 2nd May 1873 was conceived simply as a continuation of the earlier work. To judge from Atlas Taf.214, the lower 'terrace' can never have advanced very far. It is more difficult to judge how much progress was made on the upper terrace during this period: work continued there probably until 24th May, although conceivably until the end of the season.⁴⁸⁵ The shading in Fig.III.17 represents no more than a guess.

While working in the trench in C 6, Schliemann noticed that a fortification-wall extended West-North-West from Gate FM, but was unable to trace it beyond the western end of the trench without demolishing the ground on which his own quarters stood.⁴⁸⁶ He decided to try to expose it further to the West, and in order to do so he began a new trench on the northwest side of the mound.⁴⁸⁷ The trench can be clearly seen in Atlas Taf.214 and 215, where it lies in squares AB 4-5. It is also depicted in Ilios Fig.10, and Ilios Plans I (Z') and IV (Z'West). It was, as Schliemann himself pointed out, essentially a broadening and a lengthening of the trench dug in the same spot in 1870. Whereas the original trench had been 5m wide and 30m long,⁴⁸⁸ his re-excavated version was intended to be 10m wide and 43m long.⁴⁸⁹ The plan in Atlas Taf.214 shows that the trench must have attained, or nearly attained, this size by the end of the season.

The datum from which depths were measured down in this trench must have lain at c.38.50m A.T. - the highest adjacent point on the

mound surface - for Schliemann notes that the "Wall of Lysimachus" was covered with 5m of debris.⁴⁹⁰ By this he means not that there was a vertical accumulation of 5m on the top of the wall, but that, in the same general area, the mound had increased 5m in height. The "Wall of Lysimachus"⁴⁹¹ is clearly the wall marked RM in Dörpfeld's plan;⁴⁹² and in that plan it bears the spot-height 33.70m A.T.

Schliemann states that the trench was dug to a depth of 10½m.⁴⁹³ This should have produced an altitude at the trench bottom of c.28m A.T. The spot-heights shown in Atlas Taf.214 are broadly consistent with this, if we assume that the trench was worn down at the mouth and sloped upwards towards the centre of the mound: the altitudes to be derived from the plan are at 27.41m A.T. at the mouth of the trench and 29.78m A.T. at its junction with the later west trench.⁴⁹⁴ The means by which this depth was reached are, however, not very clear. There is mention of a "small platform" cut into the mound slope at 10½m deep.⁴⁹⁵ This may possibly be identical with the "lower platform" in the excavation of which the full height of the "Wall of Lysimachus" was exposed.⁴⁹⁶ In any case, this "small platform" at 10½m deep must have formed the nucleus, as it were, of the entire trench. But Schliemann also alludes to three "galleries."⁴⁹⁷ By "gallery" Schliemann usually means a temporary cutting at a higher level than that eventually intended for the trench as a whole. Atlas Taf.214 shows the top of Wall 4 exposed to a width of several metres; one "gallery" may perhaps have lain at the height of the top of Wall 4 and have been dug further into the northeast side of the trench. If so, it would have lain at c.33.50m A.T.⁴⁹⁸ There may have been a second, similar cutting to broaden the trench to the Southwest. The third "gallery" may have lain at the same depth at the southeast end of the trench. If Schliemann was, as he says, working on all three galleries, he may therefore have been widening the trench on northeast and southeast sides to a depth of 33.00m A.T., and extending it at its southeast end at the same depth. By 10th May he had exposed Wall RM and was in the process of breaking away the exposed parts of Megaron VIB.⁴⁹⁹

During this period Schliemann also had several small soundings dug on the plateau to the South of the mound. Two are mentioned in the diary on 2nd May.⁵⁰⁰ These may be the two mentioned in Trojanische Alterthümer⁵⁰¹ which seem to correspond to the soundings later numbered 6 and 12 on Atlas Taf.213 (=TR Plan I). They are again included, apparently, among the three soundings mentioned in the diary entry for 9th May,⁵⁰² the third being the one later numbered 13 in Atlas Taf.213. In the entry for 8th May, however, we are faced with five soundings.⁵⁰³ No.6 of Atlas Taf.213 appears here as the fifth, and Nos.12 and 13 among the first three again. The additional two mentioned in this entry appear to be those marked as No.5 and - perhaps - No.14 in Atlas Taf.213. The published résumé, however, speaks of a further fifteen soundings (in addition to Nos.6 and 12).⁵⁰⁴ Unfortunately these fifteen cannot be individually identified on the plan.

Finally, it must be recorded that it was during this period that a trench was opened on the "Tomb of Batiela," Paşa Tepe.⁵⁰⁵ Schliemann's letter of 24th May published in the Augsburg Allgemeine Zeitung mentions that the work (which was carried out on 28th, 29th, 30th April and 1st May) was supervised by Sophie.⁵⁰⁶ It seems possible that the mound contained material of Late Bronze Age date, and some archaic material as well (possibly on the surface).⁵⁰⁷ Schliemann himself was insistent in his early publications that he had there found a "mass" of Early Bronze Age sherds.⁵⁰⁸ But in the light of his diary entries which speak only of a "few pieces," "very few sherds" and "not the least thing,"⁵⁰⁹ this should probably be written off as an exaggeration. The few E.B. sherds may have been stray pieces already in the soil before the mound was raised.

10th - 24th May 1873 (Fig.III.18)

The next résumé after that for 10th May was begun on 15th May and, in the diary, bears that date at its head.⁵¹⁰ But the rough draft in the diary is interspersed with daily entries of which the latest is dated 24th May.⁵¹¹ As this is also the date given to the published version of the report in the Augsburg Allgemeine Zeitung,⁵¹² we may take it to be the date on which the report was finished. It is up to this date, therefore, that the next period may most conveniently be taken.

It seems that during this period there was no more work either in the East-West trench, or in the trenches to the West of the "Tower" in C 6 and CD 5-6. But there was some intense excavation in two adjoining areas. The first of these was the northwest trench in squares AB 4-5, which Schliemann, picking up a phrase coined by his workmen, sometimes calls the μάμμη, "the grandmother of the excavations."⁵¹³ The horizontal dimensions proposed for the trench did not change; but the trench did make significant progress towards the Southeast. By 16th May the "upper terrace" (at c.33.50m A.T.?) reached as far as the south end of the trench, near Schliemann's wooden house.⁵¹⁴ By 23rd May the same point had been excavated to a depth of 8m, and had revealed "Treasure B."⁵¹⁵

On 15th May Schliemann began another trench on the west side of the mound, in squares AB 5-6.⁵¹⁶ This trench, which is on occasion confusingly referred to as "the northwestern excavation"⁵¹⁷ or as "the cutting from the northwest side,"⁵¹⁸ was intended to be 32m long.⁵¹⁹ Some impression of the shape of the trench can be gained from Atlas Taf.214 where, however, the eastern end of the trench has been much widened out. The west end shows a trench 2-4m wide running more or less East-West. Prolonged for 32m in a straight line this would have reached Schliemann's wooden house in C 6, as the trench is expressly stated to have done.⁵²⁰ The wider area shown in square B 5-6 has partly been caused by the intersection of the new, west trench with the old, 1870 trench in B 5. The depth of the trench was to be, again, 10½m⁵²¹ - as Schliemann said, roughly 6m deeper than the old trench in B 5,⁵²² which had been dug to only c.4m deep. Although a reference to a "lower" cutting implies that it was dug on a terrace-system,⁵²³ by 24th May Schliemann could ruefully note that he had broken through a huge, 6m-high "fortification" wall which passed under his wooden house from Gate FM to the Northwest.⁵²⁴ This wall is visible on Atlas Taf.214, where it is numbered '33;' and it is quite certainly the northeast wall of Dörpfeld's complex IXA. Dörpfeld, too, shows this wall to have been nearly 6m high: he gives the bench-marks 30.65 and 36.49 for its bottom and top.⁵²⁵ The fact that Schliemann knew that it had a height of 6m shows that he himself had

in this area already reached a depth of c.30.50m by this date. To judge from Atlas Taf.214, the deepest digging - which caused the breach in the wall - must have taken place both at the east end of the new trench, and in the adjoining part of the old B 5 trench. But the presence of later buildings in the plan suggests that higher terraces, too, were left on north and south sides at this eastern end. At the same time, on 24th May, Schliemann could still note that the western trench had not yet reached the (Troy II) wall leading off from Gate FM.⁵²⁶

Excavation continued on the North Platform. There is little information. The diary notes a quantity of superimposed domestic walls built of stones and earth, from depths of 4-10m.⁵²⁷ This implies that the 'terrace' at "10m deep" (i.e. at c.30.90m A.T.) was being extended Southwards. But some work was also done on the lower 'terrace' further North, for several walls were exposed at 14m deep, and also part of a 'pavement' of white stones.⁵²⁸ If Schliemann calculated the depth of these by measuring 4m down from the terrace at c.30.90m A.T., this 'pavement' may have been a continuation of the stratum of stones previously met in D 3-4 at c.27m A.T.⁵²⁹ It is probable that after 24th May little or no work was done on the North Platform. The one, later reference⁵³⁰ is of a very general, retrospective nature. In Fig.III.18, therefore, I have shown the work taking the trench to its fullest extent, as shown in Atlas Taf.214 and 215.

Two notes in the diary show that Schliemann had also resumed work in the North-South trench of 1872. The entry for 16th May records that he was having the trench walls broken down over a long stretch and was digging outwards.⁵³¹ An entry for the following day notes that a house was coming to light.⁵³² The results of the renewed excavations in the North-South trench can be seen in Atlas Taf.214, where (in squares DE 4) an additional terrace has been extended to the East. Its total width is c.14m, but not all of it was previously unexcavated soil. A spot-height shows that digging here ceased at c.31.12m A.T.⁵³³ A later reference shows that excavation in this area continued beyond 24th May,⁵³⁴ so the shaded area on

Fig.III.18 represents no more than an estimate of the area uncovered to c.3lm A.T. in this period.

Schliemann continued to make soundings on the plateau, but the number quoted still does not exceed fifteen.⁵³⁵ Of these, the ones numbered 5, 13 and 14 in Atlas Taf.213 may already have been opened; Nos. 6 and 12 had also been dug and bring the total to seventeen. A sounding on the east side of the site at 200m from the citadel, mentioned on 16th May,⁵³⁶ can only be No.15, even though the diary records bedrock there at 2m rather than 2.50m. A sondage on the west side in which Schliemann thought to find the Wall of Lysimachus as well as another, earlier wall,⁵³⁷ may be No.9 on the plan. The trench on the southwest side that lay closest to the citadel and which reached a depth of 5m⁵³⁸ must be No.11. The third of the group of three trenches in this area, mentioned on 16th May,⁵³⁹ is likely to have been No.10. The remaining eight trenches, of which four were begun on 12th May,⁵⁴⁰ cannot be identified.

26th May - 14th June 1873 (Fig.III.19)

The area which chiefly held Schliemann's attention during the final weeks of the 1873 season was the area to the Northwest of the 'Scaean' Gate, FM. Here he continued to investigate first the circuit wall, and later an extension of the structures he interpreted as Priam's palace. Initially the work was all done at the east and southeast ends of the west and northwest trenches. From these the excavation began to be extended eastwards, back towards Gate FM, to the West of which, however, there still stood an unexcavated block of earth with Schliemann's wooden house on top. Meyer was therefore wrong to imply that Schliemann here continued to work in an arc towards the Northwest, exposing the citadel wall at an ever-increasing distance from the gate.⁵⁴¹

We hear little of his new activities in the west trench (in AB 5-6), although retrospective résumés of his work there are given on several occasions.⁵⁴² There is a note that during the 27th - 29th May he had been engaged in trimming the section faces in his west and

northwest trenches.⁵⁴³ On Friday 30th May he was exposing the (Troy II) citadel wall at the east end of the trench.⁵⁴⁴ Atlas Taf.214 shows that the depth eventually reached was 29.78m A.T.⁵⁴⁵ If Schliemann believed that this achieved, or nearly achieved, his target of a 10½m depth for the trench,⁵⁴⁶ he can only have been measuring down from the summit. But in view of his practice in the northwest trench, where he clearly used a local datum of c.38.50m A.T., it seems more likely that he simply failed to dig the trench to its full depth.

In the northwest trench, likewise, Schliemann had exposed the (Troy II) circuit wall by the time he wrote his résumé dated 31st May in his diary.⁵⁴⁷ Here he had evidently reached a depth of 9m below the local datum of c.38.50m - a figure which roughly coincides with the spot-height of 29.78m A.T. for the junction of these two western trenches. It was at the south end of this trench that Schliemann found the collection of metalwork which he called "Priam's Treasure." It has been suggested that this discovery was, at least in part, a fraud.⁵⁴⁸ This suggestion in the final analysis rests solely on two curious features of Schliemann's earliest report of the find: his description of the gold sauceboat as a *depas*, and his failure to mention the jewellery.⁵⁴⁹ For these features, which are admittedly odd, alternative explanations are available which do not involve fraud; and on other grounds both the textual and the archaeological evidence weigh heavily against the theory.⁵⁵⁰ The view adopted here is therefore that the discovery was authentic.

It must be admitted that the evidence for the date of the discovery is nonetheless contradictory. According to a diary-entry dated 17th June 1873 it was found on 7th June;⁵⁵¹ and a date at the beginning of June is indicated by a letter written to Schliemann on 19th July⁵⁵² and by the report published in the Augsburg Allgemeine Zeitung.⁵⁵³ A later statement, however, refers to "the end of May 1873,"⁵⁵⁴ and certainly the earliest note of the discovery is to be found in a résumé in the diary dated 31st May 1873. The differences may partly be explained by Schliemann's use of both

Julian and Gregorian calendars and by his very well-attested confusion of mind over all matters of dating towards the end of the 1873 season. But a further possibility is that, in quoting 7th June, Schliemann was taking up the date on which he had found not the bulk of the Treasure but the silver bowls that he regarded as completing it.⁵⁵⁵ The date of their discovery is not certain as it is not explicitly mentioned in the diary before the résumé dated 17th June. But it cannot have been before 3rd June when Schliemann first tackled the area in which they were found, and probably not before 6th June when he first tackled it in earnest.⁵⁵⁶ Perhaps the most likely date for the earlier part of the discovery is 31st May; but certainty is not to be had.⁵⁵⁷

The findspot, however, is very clearly described. Schliemann was working at the time "behind" the second wall of the "hellenic Tower"⁵⁵⁸ - that is, to the Southeast of Megaron VIB - and was digging either on or near the circuit wall.⁵⁵⁹ If it was on 27th May he is likely to have been straightening the section-face.⁵⁶⁰ The treasure was found at between 8 and 9m deep⁵⁶¹ - a figure later rationalised to 8½m deep⁵⁶² - and therefore probably at an altitude of c.29.50 - 30.50m A.T. It lay at the foot of Schliemann's own wooden house at the northwest corner of the square C 6⁵⁶³ and directly below a 6m-high wall which must be identified as the north wall of Dörpfeld's building IXA.⁵⁶⁴ These details enable us to pinpoint the findspot to the extreme southwest corner of the trench, in the trench face and in the bottom metre of the exposed deposits. This is more or less exactly the spot shown in Atlas Taf.214 and 215 (= TR Plans 2,IV). The spot is, as Traill has pointed out,⁵⁶⁵ on the outer edge of the circuit wall, or even just outside it. The contemporary evidence given by Schliemann's foreman Yannakis to William Borlase suggests that the latter may be the more correct.⁵⁶⁶ Schliemann says that he found the treasure in a narrow space enclosed by two walls.⁵⁶⁷ In these walls he thought at first to see an extension of 'Priam's palace,'⁵⁶⁸ although later he usually described the spot as having been, simply close to Priam's Palace.⁵⁶⁹ Buildings of a later date than the circuit wall could have reached out to this point. Yannakis' testimony, however, "that it was

contained in a little place built round with stones, and having flat stones to cover it,"⁵⁷⁰ suggests at least a cist and possibly a cist grave.⁵⁷¹ The wooden chest deduced, though never actually observed, by Schliemann was probably a piece of wishful thinking designed to make the discovery conform with Priam's household treasure as described in Iliad XXIV, 228.⁵⁷² The "key" may have been a fraudulent addition,⁵⁷³ and later examination showed in any case that it was very far from being a key.⁵⁷⁴

Into his published report Schliemann inserted a single sentence acknowledging his wife's help in the excavation of the treasure.⁵⁷⁵ But thanks to David Traill's work⁵⁷⁶ in unearthing some unpublished correspondence and in drawing attention again to Borlase's article, it now seems very likely that in reality she was in Athens at the time and that her name was introduced, as Schliemann indeed later admitted,⁵⁷⁷ "to give her a zest for archaeology."

The discovery of "Priam's Treasure" spurred Schliemann on to expose the rest of the building he identified as Priam's palace. His intention to do this is stated in his résumé of 31st May,⁵⁷⁸ and the plan has been initiated by 3rd June.⁵⁷⁹ The plan involved breaking away the remaining block of earth, c.10m x 12m, which still stood between the area opened up by the two western trenches, and the area West of the "Tower." It also involved the demolition of Schliemann's wooden house which stood on the block.⁵⁸⁰ The block of earth was attacked from three sides and the spoil was carried away across Gate FM, which was bridged over for the purpose.⁵⁸¹ Progress was fast. At some stage three silver bowls were found at a spot $\frac{1}{2}$ m below the findspot of Treasure A.⁵⁸² The one undamaged bowl was later habitually included in Treasure A.⁵⁸³ By 14th June the excavation had reached down to the pavement on the north side of the (Troy II) circuit wall, and the circuit wall itself was now fully exposed from Gate FM to the northwest trench.⁵⁸⁴ The block of earth was entirely removed, and the circuit wall, at least to some extent, uncovered on both its outer and inner sides.⁵⁸⁵ The north wall of building IXA was in the process broken away over a stretch of $17\frac{1}{2}$ m,⁵⁸⁶ although a section was left in the remaining block

of earth just to the West of Gate FM⁵⁸⁷ and can be seen in Atlas Taf.214. Excavation reached down to a depth of c.31.09m A.T. on the north side of the citadel wall⁵⁸⁸ and c.29.78m A.T. on the south side.⁵⁸⁹

One brief reference indicates that work continued on the eastward expansion of the North-South trench.⁵⁹⁰ Many more house-walls were brought to light, and the final state of the trench may be seen in Atlas Taf.214. Meyer's statement,⁵⁹¹ that in the North-South trench Schliemann now struck virgin soil and exposed some thin cross-walls belonging to Troy I, cannot be confirmed. The walls were not discovered until 1879.⁵⁹²

A further three sondages appear to have been made in the lower town, for in his résumé of 31st May Schliemann speaks of a total of twenty sondages.⁵⁹³ The full number is shown on Atlas Taf.213 (=TR Plan I), but the final three sondages cannot be identified.

After a final blessing by a priest from Yenisehir, the excavations were closed on the evening of Saturday 14th June "for ever."⁵⁹⁴

FOOTNOTES

- 1 E.g. Ernst Meyer (ed.), Heinrich Schliemann Selbstbiographie bis zu seinem Tode vervollständigt, herausgegeben von Sophie Schliemann (Wiesbaden 1955), p.54, hereafter cited as Selbstbiographie; C.Schuchhardt, Schliemann's Excavations, transl. E.Sellers, (London 1891) p.6f; TI p.2.
- 2 TA pp.2,6.
- 3 Atlas Taf.116.
- 4 Tagebuch 1870, pp.63-90, in French.
- 5 Briefwechsel Ip.163.
- 6 "Ausgrabungen in Troja im Frühjahr 1870," Augsburg Allgemeine Zeitung, Beilage zu Nr.144, 24th May 1870, p.2301f; The Times, 28th May 1870, p.11; Preussischer Staats-Anzeiger, 16th June 1870, Nr139, p.2360.
- 7 Ernst Meyer, Heinrich Schliemann, Kaufmann und Forscher (Göttingen 1969) pp.252-4, hereafter cited as HSKF.
- 8 Tagebuch 1870, p.76f; Briefwechsel Ip.165.
- 9 Tagebuch 1870, pp.80, 90; Briefwechsel I pp.165, 167.
- 10 TI p.2.
- 11 Tagebuch 1870, pp.65-9, 74, 81; Briefwechsel I p.164f.
- 12 TA p.6 (measured in 1871); Tagebuch 1870 has 20 x 14½m; Briefwechsel I p.164 has 20 x 14m.
- 13 Tagebuch 1870 p.70.
- 14 Ibid. p.71.
- 15 Briefwechsel I p.166.
- 16 Tagebuch 1870, p.89; Briefwechsel I p.167.
- 17 Tagebuch 1870, p.88; Briefwechsel I p.166.
- 18 Tagebuch 1870, p.89.
- 19 Thus e.g. the AB 4-5 trench opened, according to Tagebuch 1870 p.71, "from the West edge towards the East" ran according to Briefwechsel I p.165f "to the northern edge of the summit of the hill."
- 20 Briefwechsel I pp.165,167; cf. Tagebuch 1870 p.87. In writing the letter Schliemann may have been misled by the beginning of his entry in Tagebuch 1870 p.87 for 7/19th April: "Nous continuâmes aujourd'hui l'excavation dans la grande tranchée.." In context this clearly refers to the AB 4-5 trench. Taken in isolation it could have been thought to refer to the trench in D 5.
- 21 TI p.2.

- 22 HSKF p.429 n.148. See Tagebuch 1871 p.210, Briefwechsel I pp.189ff, 191; also Augsburg Allgemeine Zeitung (hereafter AAZ) Beilage zu Nr.306, 2nd November 1871, p.5405f. Contrast TA p.4, Ilios p.21, Selbstbiographie p.55, TI p.2.
- 23 HSKF pp.257-265.
- 24 Ibid. p.259
- 25 Ibid. p.261.
- 26 Ibid. p.259.
- 27 Ibid. p.261.
- 28 Ibid. pp.262, 263.
- 29 Ibid. p.260f.
- 30 Thus (1) the supposed West-East trench on the South side of the hill may go back to Tagebuch 1871 p.229: "je fis ouvrir un nouveau chemin lateral et je fis considérablement élargir mon excavation du côté Sud," combined with a misunderstanding of the letter to Curtius, Briefwechsel I p.199. (2) The imaginary eastern cutting on the north slope seems to arise out of a misunderstanding of Tagebuch 1871 p.239: "Viel Zeit ging verloren durch die Erneuerung oder besser Erniedrigung des rechten Seitenwegs," after which follows the first account of the "stone-age" finds. This must be the source of Meyer's belief that the stone-age finds were to the East of the great trench, a statement not otherwise made by Schliemann in the letter which Meyer quotes, Briefwechsel I p.194. But (3) if Meyer means that Schliemann also worked in the area of the real Temple of Athena, this is simply erroneous guesswork.
- 31 Briefwechsel I p.191. So also Tagebuch 1871 p.216.
- 32 Briefwechsel I p.169; Ernst Meyer, "Schliemann's Erste Briefe aus Troja," Ruperto Carola XVII Bd37 (1965) p.77.
- 33 TA p.6.
- 34 Briefwechsel I p.165.
- 35 TA p. 12f, although this passage does not appear in the original draft in Tagebuch 1871 pp.231-7 or in the earlier published version in AAZ Beilage zu Nr.326, 22nd November 1871, p.5757f.
- 36 Tagebuch 1871 pp.215, 218, 219, 226, 229.
- 37 TA p.6, and Briefwechsel I p.199.
- 38 TA p.6.
- 39 TA p.22, and Briefwechsel I p.199.
- 40 "NS Graben" here probably refers to the trench in AB 5-6. Initially the term "large trench" was used by Schliemann to designate any of his three 1870 trenches. Thus the AB 4-5 trench: Tagebuch 1870 p.87, 1871

pp.214, 218; the AB 5-6 trench: Tagebuch 1871 p.206f; the D 5 trench: Briefwechsel I p.165, based on a misunderstanding of Tagebuch 1870 p.87 - see above note 19. Only with its use in Tagebuch 1871 p.226 on 19th October and thereafter does it usually refer to the central North-South trench.

- 41 Tagebuch 1871 p.206f, 30th September.
- 42 Probably the trench in AB 4-5 is meant.
- 43 Tagebuch 1871 p.214, 11th October.
- 44 Ilios p.21.
- 45 Selbstbiographie pp.57f, 64.
- 46 HSKF p.261, "vordrang."
- 47 Explicitly stated in TA p.47.
- 48 Tagebuch 1871 p.207; Briefwechsel I p.188f.
- 49 Tagebuch 1871 p.229.
- 50 TA p.9. But Schliemann's "averages" have a way of being quotations of the most impressive figure, not real averages at all, e.g. in Ilios p.21 the average number of workmen was said to be 80, which was in fact nearly the maximum for that year.
- 51 Tagebuch 1871 p.256; Briefwechsel I p.193f.
- 52 Briefe p.118; cf. Tagebuch 1871 p.259 for 16th November.
- 53 TA p.28.
- 54 TA p.39; Briefwechsel I p.196.
- 55 Tagebuch 1871 p.260f.
- 56 TA p.4.
- 57 Briefwechsel I p.191.
- 58 IPT p.166.
- 59 Tagebuch 1871 pp.204-210, cf.p.242; HSKF pp.259, 260; Briefwechsel I p.188f.
- 60 Tagebuch 1871 p.243.
- 61 Tagebuch 1871 p.226 (19th October), 227 (20th October); TA p.9.
The well is the one marked Bg in TI Taf.III, in C 5.
- 62 Tagebuch 1871 pp.228, 239, 240, 241; Briefe p.117.
- 63 Tagebuch 1871 p.250 - draft of an article for AAZ, but omitted from the equivalent text in TA ch.III; Briefwechsel I p.192; Briefe p.118;
TA p.40.
- 64 Briefe p.117.
- 65 TA p.6.
- 66 Briefwechsel I p.194, Cf. Tagebuch 1871 pp.214, 228.
- 67 Tagebuch 1871 p.231.

- 68 TA p.22.
- 69 Briefwechsel I p.194; 199
- 70 Tagebuch 1871 p.229.
- 71 TA p.6.
- 72 Tagebuch 1871 p.214, quoted above.
- 73 Tagebuch 1871 p.214.
- 74 Tagebuch 1871 pp.228, 231; Briefwechsel I p.194.
- 75 TA p.6; Tagebuch 1871 p.219.
- 76 Tagebuch 1871 pp.239, 253.
- 77 TA pp.7, 37.
- 78 Tagebuch 1871 p.218, 15th October.
- 79 Tagebuch 1871 p.219.
- 80 TA p.7.
- 81 Tagebuch 1871 p.229.
- 82 TA p.27 = Tagebuch 1871 p.271.
- 83 TA p.7.
- 84 Tagebuch 1871 pp.229, 239, 240, 253, 256.
- 85 TA p.37; Tagebuch 1871 pp.256, 257f.
- 86 C.Schuchhardt, Schliemann's Excavations p.7.
- 87 TA pp. 39, 44; Briefwechsel I p.197; Tagebuch 1871 p.270.
- 88 TR p.99.
- 89 Tagebuch 1872 p.277.
- 90 TA p.46.
- 91 TI p.2.
- 92 Troy I pp.11,33f.
- 93 Briefwechsel I p.208.
- 94 Tagebuch 1872 pp.280, 296; TA pp.46, 68.
- 95 Tagebuch 1872 pp.297f,311; TA p.68.
- 96 TA p.46.
- 97 TA p.103.
- 98 Briefwechsel I p.208.
- 99 TA p.75.
- 100 Tagebuch 1872 p.295.
- 101 IPT p.166.
- 102 Briefe pp.117, 118; TA p.40; Briefwechsel I p.192; Selbstbiographie
p.58f.
- 103 TA p.46.

- 104 Ilios p.22.
- 105 e.g. HSKF p.265.
- 106 Briefwechsel I p.208; Ruperto-Carola XVII Bd.37 (1965) p.79.
- 107 Tagebuch 1872 p.309.
- 108 TA p.70.
- 109 TA p.70.
- 110 Troy I fig.423.
- 111 Tagebuch 1872 p.278.
- 112 Tagebuch 1872 p.300.
- 113 TA p.60.
- 114 Tagebuch 1872 p.313.
- 115 Tagebuch 1872 p.320.
- 116 Tagebuch 1872 p.324.
- 117 Ruperto-Carola XVII Bd37 (1965) p.79.
- 118 Briefe p.120.
- 119 Tagebuch 1872 pp.319-324.
- 120 E.g. 18m in Tagebuch 1872 p.332 is adjusted to 16m in TA p.77.
- 121 Tagebuch 1872 p.324.
- 122 Tagebuch 1872 p.325: "17m unter des Berges Gipfel."
- 123 Tagebuch 1872 p.327f.
- 124 TA p.83.
- 125 Tagebuch 1872 p.329.
- 126 Tagebuch 1872 p.326.
- 127 Troy I fig.423.
- 128 Troy I fig.422.
- 129 TA p.82 f.
- 130 Troy I figs.422,423.
- 131 TA p.104.
- 132 Tagebuch 1872 p.324.
- 133 TA p.77; for the mound-surface in C 4-5 virtually coincides with the summit.
- 134 Tagebuch 1872 p.325.
- 135 Tagebuch 1872 p.329; cf. TA pp.83,84.
- 136 Troy I p.82 and figs.419-423.
- 137 TA p.83
- 138 Troy I fig.423.
- 139 Tagebuch 1872 p.329.

- 140 Tagebuch 1872 p.320.
- 141 TI p.4.
- 142 TA p.82.
- 143 Tagebuch 1872 p.336.
- 144 TA p.82.
- 145 TI pp.4ff; Emil Ludwig, Schliemann of Troy, the Story of a Goldseeker (London and New York 1931), p.173.
- 146 TA p.180.
- 147 14° in TA p.82; 12° in Tagebuch 1872 p.336.
- 148 Tagebuch 1872 p.336.
- 149 TA p.96; see also p.176.
- 150 TA p.180; for a similar, earlier incident see Briefwechsel I p.197
- 151 TI p.6.
- 152 Tagebuch 1872 p.336.
- 153 TA p.82.
- 154 Tagebuch 1872 p.336.
- 155 TA p.86. The report must have been drafted on 22nd May and put into fair copy on or about 29th May.
- 156 Tagebuch 1872 p.365.
- 157 TA p.95.
- 158 For measurements of the pithoi from the "Greek strata" and details of those from pre-Greek times, see Tagebuch 1872 p.327 (10th May).
- 159 For the number of pithoi from the "Greek strata" - ten - cf. Tagebuch 1872 p.336. The original draft on p.356 mentions only four.
- 160 TA pp.82,86.
- 161 TA p.90.
- 162 TA p.90.
- 163 Atlas Taf.117 shows a slope on the south side of the platform.
- 164 Tagebuch 1872 p.359; TA p.90.
- 165 Tagebuch 1872 p.350.
- 166 TA p.86.
- 167 TA p.88.
- 168 Tagebuch 1872 pp.390-413; TA Ch.X.
- 169 E.g. the "Trojan Wall" (TA p.110) was only found on the 23rd (Tagebuch 1872 p.417) and is not mentioned in the draft at Tagebuch 1872 p.398.
- 170 Tagebuch 1872 p.360; TA p.103 f.
- 171 Tagebuch 1872 p.360.
- 172 TA p.104.

- 173 TA p.104; Ruperto-Carola XVII Bd.37 (1965) p.79.
- 174 Briefwechsel I p.210.
- 175 TI Taf.III.
- 176 TA p.104.
- 177 TA p.164.
- 178 TA p.140.
- 179 TA p.140.
- 180 Ruperto-Carola XVII Bd.37 (1965) p.79.
- 181 Tagebuch 1872 p.363.
- 182 See Chapter IV, North Platform, Area 7, Deposit (8).
- 183 Tagebuch 1872 pp.366-8.
- 184 Tagebuch 1872 p.372; TA p.110.
- 185 Tagebuch 1872 p.374. See also Briefwechsel I p.210.
- 186 TA p.104.
- 187 Tagebuch 1872 p.363.
- 188 Tagebuch 1872 p.366.
- 189 Tagebuch 1872 p.381.
- 190 TA p.82, contrary to the intention expressed in Tagebuch 1872 p.336.
- 191 Tagebuch 1872 p.378.
- 192 Tagebuch 1872 p.366.
- 193 TI p.122 fig.39; Troy III p.166 and fig.511.
- 194 Briefwechsel I p.198.
- 195 TA p.99.
- 196 Briefe p.119f.
- 197 Briefe p.119f; TA p.61.
- 198 TA p.99f.
- 199 Tagebuch 1872 p.383.
- 200 TI p.6.
- 201 TA p.99.
- 202 Tagebuch 1872 p.390.
- 203 Troy I p.253.
- 204 Tagebuch 1872 p.386; TA p.99.
- 205 Tagebuch 1872 p.384.
- 206 Tagebuch 1872 p.384.
- 207 The Levant Herald, 4th February 1873, p.90.
- 208 TA p.99.
- 209 Tagebuch 1872 p.379.
- 210 TA p.140.

- 211 Ruperto-Carola XVII Bd.37 (1965) p.79.
- 212 Tagebuch 1872 p.428.
- 213 Tagebuch 1872 p.374.
- 214 Briefwechsel I p.212 (50-60ft); Ruperto-Carola loc.cit.
- 215 See discussion in previous section.
- 216 Atlas Taf.117, section.
- 217 Tagebuch 1872 p.418.
- 218 Tagebuch 1872 p.435.
- 219 Tagebuch 1872 p.425.
- 220 Atlas Taf.117, section.
- 221 Tagebuch 1872 p.466.
- 222 24.26, with correction of +6.30.
- 223 21.92, with correction of +6.30.
- 224 18.50, with correction of +6.30.
- 225 Briefwechsel I p.212.
- 226 27.85 and 28.44, both with correction of +6.30.
- 227 Labelled "Interior bastion of Lysimachus" in Atlas Taf.214, and marked "K" in Atlas Taf.117.
- 228 Marked as No.2 in Atlas Taf.214.
- 229 TA p.140f.
- 230 Tagebuch 1872 pp.414-417.
- 231 Tagebuch 1872 pp.423-441.
- 232 Tagebuch 1872 pp.441, 446; TA p.140; Atlas Taf.117,214.
- 233 Tagebuch 1872 pp.430,441.
- 234 Tagebuch 1872 p.446.
- 235 TA p.140, clearly an error for "below the surface," as in TA p.99.
- 236 Tagebuch 1872 p.384 (9m deep); Tagebuch 1872 p.390 (15m below summit); TA p.99 (12m below surface).
- 237 Tagebuch 1872 p.441; cf. Briefe p.122.
- 238 Tagebuch 1872 p.441; Briefe p.122.
- 239 TA p.141.
- 240 Ilios p.24.
- 241 TA p.141.
- 242 Tagebuch 1872 pp.427,441; TA p.141.
- 243 Troy III p.158, figs.83,502.
- 244 TA p.141.
- 245 TA p.157.
- 246 Tagebuch 1872 pp.472-80.

- 247 Tagebuch 1872 p.481.
- 248 E. g. "vorgestern" TA p.167, refers to 30th July, Tagebuch 1872 p.483f.
- 249 TA p.159; cf. Tagebuch 1872 p.473.
- 250 Tagebuch 1872 p.470.
- 251 TA p.158.
- 252 Tagebuch 1872 p.469f., 481; TA p.157f.
- 253 TA p.158.
- 254 TI p.6 and fig.13.
- 255 Tagebuch 1872 p.472; Briefwechsel I p.213.
- 256 TA p.157.
- 257 Tagebuch 1872 p.470.
- 258 Tagebuch 1872 p.481.
- 259 Tagebuch 1872 p.470.
- 260 Tagebuch 1872 p.481.
- 261 TA p.157f.
- 262 Tagebuch 1872 p.472f.
- 263 TI Taf.III.
- 264 TA p.158.
- 265 Tagebuch 1872 p.470.
- 266 Tagebuch 1872 p.461.
- 267 TI p.217 f.
- 268 TI Taf.III.
- 269 Tagebuch 1872 pp.462,473.
- 270 TA p.159.
- 271 Briefwechsel I p.212; Ruperto-Carola XVII Bd.37 (1965) p.79.
- 272 Tagebuch 1872 p.463; TA p.159.
- 273 Atlas Taf.117; TA p.159.
- 274 Atlas Taf.117 and 214 show the hole; Tagebuch 1872 p.466 mentions it.
- 275 18.50 with correction of +6.30.
- 276 Tagebuch 1872 p.473.
- 277 21.92 with correction of +6.30.
- 278 TA p.159.
- 279 Tagebuch 1872 p.473.
- 280 Atlas Taf.117, 214.
- 281 Tagebuch 1872 p.462.
- 282 TA p.159.
- 283 TA pp.159,167.
- 284 Tagebuch 1872 p.478.

- 285 Tagebuch 1872 p.473
- 286 Tagebuch 1872 p.463.
- 287 Tagebuch 1872 p.468; TA 159.
- 288 TA p.175.
- 289 "East" in TA p.165 replaces "left" in Tagebuch 1872 p.476.
- 290 Tagebuch 1872 p.482; Briefe p.122f; Briefwechsel I p.213; TA p.159.
- 291 TA p.159.
- 292 Tagebuch 1872 p.482.
- 293 TA p.166.
- 294 TA p.167, if these finds are attributable to the west end of the trench.
- 295 Tagebuch 1872 pp.461,462.
- 296 Tagebuch 1872 pp.438,462.
- 297 Atlas Taf.213 is reproduced in TR as Plan 1.
- 298 Tagebuch 1872 p.466.
- 299 Tagebuch 1872 p.493.
- 300 Tagebuch 1872 pp.493-502.
- 301 TA p.171; Briefwechsel I p.337 n.296; Ruperto-Carola XVII Bd.37 (1965) p.80. The original draft of TA ch.xiii, in Tagebuch 1872 p.493, does not mention Sophie, who had in fact left the site on 27th June (Tagebuch 1872 p.425). The reference to her in TA p.171 appears to be a falsification.
- 302 Briefwechsel I p.215.
- 303 Tagebuch 1872 pp.491,493.
- 304 Tagebuch 1872 p.491.
- 305 TA p.172. The original draft in Tagebuch 1872 p.496 makes it clear that this applies to the north side of the "Tower," although the depth given there is 13m.
- 306 Tagebuch 1872 p.503f; TA p.179; HSKF p.268.
- 307 Briefwechsel I p.216.
- 308 TA p.179f.
- 309 Tagebuch 1872 p.504; TA p.181; Ilios p.24 and No.2, wall A.
- 310 TI p.6.
- 311 TI Taf.III.
- 312 Tagebuch 1872 p.504; TA .181; Briefwechsel I p.216.
- 313 TA p.182f.; Briefe No.24, pp.123f.; Briefwechsel I pp.216f.; H.G. Hutchinson, The Life of Sir John Lubbock, Lord Avebury, 2 vols. (London 1914) I, p.142; H. Schliemann, "Ausgrabungen in Troja," Allgemeine Zeitung (Augsburg), Beilage zu Nr.1, Wednesday 1st January 1873, pp.11-12.

- 314 TA p.186.
- 315 TA p.187; Tagebuch 1873 p.12.
- 316 TA p.186; Tagebuch 1873 p.(iii).
- 317 Tagebuch 1873 p.9.
- 318 15.44 +6.30 = 21.74m A.T.; 20.34 +6.30 = 26.64m A.T. Cf.Fig.IV.6
for the situation at the end of 1872.
- 319 20.36 +6.30.
- 320 24.29 +6.30.
- 321 For the two western terraces, cf. Fig.IV.4, where the middle terrace
may be placed too low.
- 322 Tagebuch 1873 p.58; Briefwechsel I p.223.
- 323 Tagebuch 1873 p.9.
- 324 Tagebuch 1873 p.41.
- 325 Tagebuch 1873 pp. 5,6,9.
- 326 TA p.186.
- 327 TA pp.157f.,181.
- 328 See above, 13th July - 4th August 1872.
- 329 Tagebuch 1873 pp.4,5,6.
- 330 Tagebuch 1873 pp.iii,58; Briefwechsel I p.223.
- 331 TA p.188.
- 332 18.50 +6.30; 24.29 +6.30.
- 333 TA p.186.
- 334 Tagebuch 1873 p.9.
- 335 Tagebuch 1873 p.10.
- 336 Tagebuch 1873 p.26.
- 337 Tagebuch 1873 p.9.
- 338 Tagebuch 1873 p.24.
- 339 H.G. Hutchinson, Life of Sir John Lubbock, Lord Avebury, 2 vols.
(London 1914) I p.143; cf. Briefe pp.123f.; TA p.183.
- 340 Tagebuch 1873 p.10.
- 341 Ibid.
- 342 TA p.191.
- 343 HSKF p.270.
- 344 TA p.214; Atlas, Taf.214.
- 345 Tagebuch 1873 p.24.
- 346 TI p.9.
- 347 Tagebuch 1873 p.24.
- 348 Tagebuch 1873 pp.62,74.
- 349 Cf. Troy IV Figs.338,339.

- 350 Briefwechsel I p.217; Briefe pp.123f.; H.G. Hutchinson, Life of Sir John Lubbock, Lord Avebury, 2 vols. (London 1914) I p.143; "Ausgrabungen in Troja," Allgemeine Zeitung (Augsburg), Beilage zu Nr.1, Wednesday 1st January 1873, p.12.
- 351 Tagebuch 1873 p.11.
- 352 Tagebuch 1873 p.12.
- 353 Tagebuch 1873 pp.58,77; Ilios p.33.
- 354 Tagebuch 1873 p.58; TA p.194.
- 355 Tagebuch 1873 pp.62-3.
- 356 Tagebuch 1873 p.58; Briefwechsel I p.223.
- 357 Tagebuch 1873 p.41.
- 358 TA p.194.
- 359 Tagebuch 1873 p.41.
- 360 Tagebuch 1873 pp.41,46.
- 361 TA p.195; Atlas Taf.214.
- 362 Spot-height marked 20.34 in Atlas Taf.214.
- 363 Tagebuch 1873 p.57; TA p.194.
- 364 Tagebuch 1873 p.58; Briefwechsel I p.223.
- 365 24.29 in Atlas Taf.214, +6.30 correction.
- 366 Tagebuch 1873 p.9.
- 367 Tagebuch 1873 p.24.
- 368 18.50 in Atlas Taf.214, +6.30 correction.
- 369 Tagebuch 1873 pp.269,284; "Ausgrabungen in Troja," Allgemeine Zeitung (Augsburg), Beilage zu Nr. 165 (14th June 1873), p.2528.
- 370 Tagebuch 1873 p.45, and perhaps p.40.
- 371 Tagebuch 1873 p.41.
- 372 Briefwechsel I p.223.
- 373 Tagebuch 1873 p.45; Briefwechsel I p.223.
- 374 Tagebuch 1873 p.41; cf.p.46.
- 375 Briefwechsel I pp.223-4; TA p.199.
- 376 Tagebuch 1873 P.41.
- 377 Tagebuch 1873 p.46.
- 378 Briefwechsel I p.223; TA p.199.
- 379 TA p.199.
- 380 Tagebuch 1873 p.58.
- 381 Tagebuch 1873 p.41.
- 382 Tagebuch 1873 p.74.
- 383 Tagebuch 1873 p.62.

- 384 TA p.199.
- 385 TA p.199; Ilios p.27; but in the rough draft in Tagebuch 1873 p.68
he says there were ten side-paths.
- 386 Tagebuch 1873 p.74 "
- 387 Tagebuch 1873 p.84.
- 388 Tagebuch 1873 p.86.
- 389 23.60 +6.30 correction
- 390 Tagebuch 1873 p.86; TA pp.213f.
- 391 Tagebuch 1873 p.86.
- 392 Cf. his use in 1872 of "left" to mean "East."
- 393 27.17 +6.30 correction.
- 394 Atlas Taf.214, No.11; a part of Dörpfeld's IXC.
- 395 Tagebuch 1873 p.76.
- 396 Tagebuch 1873 p.83.
- 397 Atlas Taf.214, No. 15.
- 398 TA p.213.
- 399 Tagebuch 1873 p.83.
- 400 TA p.215.
- 401 Tagebuch 1873 p.77; TA p.219.
- 402 Ilios p.33.
- 403 Atlas Taf.116, No.1; Taf.117, letter A.
- 404 TA p.220.
- 405 Tagebuch 1873 p.86.
- 406 TA p.222.
- 407 Ibid.
- 408 Tagebuch 1873 p.104.
- 409 Tagebuch 1873 p.117; TA p.224.
- 410 Tagebuch 1873 p.104.
- 411 TA p.224.
- 412 Ibid.
- 413 Ibid.
- 414 Tagebuch 1873 p.162.
- 415 Tagebuch 1873 p.117.
- 416 Tagebuch 1873 p.176.
- 417 TA p.220.
- 418 Tagebuch 1873 pp.104f.; TA p.229.
- 419 Tagebuch 1873 p.114f.
- 420 Tagebuch 1873 p.104.
- 421 Ilios p.39f.

- 422 Tagebuch 1873 p.104.
- 423 TA p.231.
- 424 Tagebuch 1873 p.158 "
- 425 Tagebuch 1873 p.162.
- 426 Tagebuch 1873 p.176.
- 427 TA pp.231-4.
- 428 TA p.240.
- 429 Tagebuch 1873 pp.162-3.
- 430 Not 150 as he says: TA p.243.
- 431 Tagebuch 1873 pp.162-3; TA pp.243-4; Briefwechsel I p.226, No.203;
"Ausgrabungen in Troja," Allgemeine Zeitung (Augsburg), Beilage zu
Nr.164 (13th June 1873), p.2509.
- 432 Tagebuch 1873 p.152.
- 433 Tagebuch 1873 p.166.
- 434 Tagebuch 1873 p.158.
- 435 Although Propylon IXD may have been exposed on the east side to a
depth of 5m: see under 24th February - 6th March 1873.
- 436 Tagebuch 1873 p.162; Atlas Taf.214.
- 437 TA p.245.
- 438 Tagebuch 1873 p.176.
- 439 Tagebuch 1873 p.166.
- 440 Tagebuch 1873 p.176.
- 441 Tagebuch 1873 pp.176,188.
- 442 TA p.256.
- 443 TA p.257; Tagebuch 1873 p.188. WNW must be an error for NNW.
- 444 TA p.258.
- 445 TI Taf.III; pp.77-8.
- 446 TA p.258.
- 447 Tagebuch 1873 p.176.
- 448 Tagebuch 1873 p.189.
- 449 Tagebuch 1873 p.176.
- 450 Tagebuch 1873 p.182: in the diary, dated Thursday 29th March
according to the Julian calendar.
- 451 Tagebuch 1873 p.176.
- 452 TA p.254; Allgemeine Zeitung (Augsburg), Beilage zu Nr. 164 (13th June
1873), p.2509.
- 453 TA p.254.
- 454 Ibid.

- 455 Ilios pp.43,485.
- 456 Tagebuch 1873 p.177.
- 457 Tagebuch 1873 p.189
- 458 TA p.282.
- 459 Tagebuch 1873 p.205; TA p.268.
- 460 TA p.268; "Four" in TR p.300, is an error.
- 461 Not the 150 Schliemann claims: TA p.268.
- 462 Tagebuch 1873 p.208.
- 463 He still refers to Propylon IXD as a cistern or reservoir.
- 464 Tagebuch 1873 p.205; "Ausgrabungen in Troja," Allgemeine Zeitung (Augsburg), Beilage zu Nr. 164 (13th June 1873), p.2509.
- 465 TI Taf.III.
- 466 Tagebuch 1873 p.210; TA p.284.
- 467 TA p.284.
- 468 At numbers 5, 6.
- 469 The spot-heights in the plan are often difficult to read " 23.44 appears to have been wrongly transcribed in TR, plan. 2, as 23.62. A number of spot-heights are wrongly reproduced there as well.
- 470 TA p.271; 32.50 and 33.50m A.T. respectively.
- 471 The later walls are shaded darker in Atlas Taf.214, but lighter in TR plan 2.
- 472 Tagebuch 1873 p.205.
- 473 Tagebuch 1873 p.224.
- 474 23.74 (Atlas Taf.214) +6.30.
- 475 39.50 (datum) - 7.00.
- 476 Tagebuch 1873 p.209.
- 477 TA p.282.
- 478 Tagebuch 1873 p.209.
- 479 Ibid.
- 480 TA p.282.
- 481 Spot-heights: 24.54, 24.09, 24.60, all +6.30.
- 482 23.76 +6.30 = 30.06m A.T.
- 483 Cf. Fig.IV.33.
- 484 Cf. Fig.IV.19.
- 485 Tagebuch 1873 p.284: the only reference later than 24th May, but probably retrospective.
- 486 TA p.282.

- 487 TA p.282; Tagebuch 1873 p.225.
- 488 Tagebuch 1870 pp.80,90; Briefwechsel I pp.165,177.
- 489 TA p.282; Allgemeine Zeitung (Augsburg), Beilage zu Nr.165 (14th June 1873), p.2528; Ilios p.40.
- 490 TA p.283.
- 491 Shown in Atlas Taf.214 as the outermost wall.
- 492 TI Taf.III.
- 493 Allgemeine Zeitung (Augsburg), Beilage zu Nr. 165 (14th June 1873), p.2528.
- 494 21.11, 23.48, both +6.30.
- 495 TA p.282.
- 496 TA p.283.
- 497 TA p.282.
- 498 See Figs.IV.65,66.
- 499 TA pp.282-3.
- 500 Tagebuch 1873 p.210.
- 501 TA p.272.
- 502 Tagebuch 1873 p.226.
- 503 Tagebuch 1873 p.223f.
- 504 TA pp.272,286.
- 505 Tagebuch 1873 pp.207-9; TA pp.268-9.
- 506 Allgemeine Zeitung (Augsburg), Beilage zu Nr.165 (14th June 1873), p.2527-8. Sophie left the site on 7th May: Tagebuch 1873 p.223.
- 507 See the discussion in J.M.Cook, The Troad, pp.107-8, 133-4.
- 508 TA p.269; Allgemeine Zeitung (Augsburg), loc.cit.
- 509 Tagebuch 1873 pp.208,209.
- 510 Tagebuch 1873 p.245.
- 511 Tagebuch 1873 pp.268-9.
- 512 "Ausgrabungen in Troja," Allgemeine Zeitung (Augsburg), Beilage zu Nr.164 (13th June 1873), p.2509.
- 513 TA p.282; Tagebuch 1873 pp.251, 266.
- 514 Tagebuch 1873 p.250.
- 515 Tagebuch 1873 p.268; Allgemeine Zeitung (Augsburg), Beilage zu Nr.165 (14th June 1873), p.2528; H.Schmidt, Heinrich Schliemann's Sammlung Trojanischer Altertümer (Berlin 1902), p.237.
- 516 Tagebuch 1873 p.246.
- 517 Tagebuch 1873 p.250.
- 518 Tagebuch 1873 p.269.

- 519 Tagebuch 1873 p.263; Allgemeine Zeitung (Augsburg), Beilage zu Nr.165 (14th June 1873), p.2528.
- 520 Tagebuch 1873 p.250.
- 521 Tagebuch 1873 p.263.
- 522 Tagebuch 1873 p.250.
- 523 Ibid.
- 524 Tagebuch 1873 p.268; Ilios p.40.
- 525 TI Taf.III.
- 526 Tagebuch 1873 p.264.
- 527 Tagebuch 1873 p.264.
- 528 Tagebuch 1873 p.269; cf. Allgemeine Zeitung (Augsburg), Beilage zu Nr.165 (14th June 1873), p.2528.
- 529 See Fig.IV.33; possibly to be equated with Atlas Taf.214, No.26.
- 530 Tagebuch 1873 p.284.
- 531 Tagebuch 1873 p.250.
- 532 Tagebuch 1873 p.251.
- 533 Atlas Taf.214: 24.82 +6.30.
- 534 Tagebuch 1873 p.269.
- 535 Allgemeine Zeitung (Augsburg), Beilage zu Nr.164 (13th June 1873), p.2510; letter of 20th May to Lubbock; H.G.Hutchinson, op.cit.I p.149.
- 536 Tagebuch 1873 p.249.
- 537 Tagebuch 1873 p.252.
- 538 Tagebuch 1873 p.266; cf.p.252.
- 539 Tagebuch 1873 p.249.
- 540 Tagebuch 1873 p.243.
- 541 E.Meyer, HSKF p.270.
- 542 Tagebuch 1873 p.269 (referred to as the cutting from the northwest side), and pp.270,271-2
- 543 Tagebuch 1873 pp.269-70.
- 544 Tagebuch 1873 p.270.
- 545 23.48 +6.30 correction.
- 546 Tagebuch 1873 p.263.
- 547 Tagebuch 1873 p.273.
- 548 D.A.Traill, "Schliemann's 'discovery' of 'Priam's Treasure,'" Antiquity 57 (1983), pp.181-86.
- 549 Tagebuch 1873 pp.273-5.
- 550 D.F.Easton, "Schliemann's Mendacity: A False Trail?" Antiquity 58 (1984) pp.197-204; 'Priam's Treasure,' Anatolian Studies 34 (1984) pp.142-169.

- 551 Tagebuch 1873 p.300.
- 552 Briefwechsel I.p.234.
- 553 "Der Schatz von Priamos," Beilage zur Allgemeinen Zeitung, Nr.217 (5th August 1873), p.3309, reproduced in Philologischer Anzeiger 5 (1873), pp.473-8, and Revue Archéologique (2nd series) 26(1873), pp.196-202. The date of 17th July at the head of the letter is an error for 17th June, but may indicate that, despite the intended fictitious date, the report was actually written during July.
- 554 Troja p.57.
- 555 Tagebuch 1873 p.305; TA p.303.
- 556 Tagebuch 1873 pp.281,290.
- 557 D.F.Easton, "Schliemann's discovery of 'Priam's Treasure': two enigmas," Antiquity 55 (1981), pp.179-181; D.A.Traill in Antiquity 57 (1983), p.183; D.F.Easton Antiquity 58 (1984), p.200; Anatolian Studies 34 (1984) p.144.
- 558 Tagebuch 1873 p.273.
- 559 There is some uncertainty of description in the reports. TA pp.289,295, 296,303; Allgemeine Zeitung (Augsburg), Beilage zu Nr.217 (5th August 1873), p.3309; Briefe p.135; Briefwechsel I pp.233,234,235; a letter to Max Müller (JHS 82 [1962], p.83); and Ilios pp. 41,453, Plan I all place it "on" the wall. Tagebuch 1873 p.300, places it "near" the circuit wall, as do Atlas Taf.214,215; but since the same report speaks of its discover "on" the wall (pp.303,305), we must assume that Schliemann here used the terms more or less synonymously.
- 560 Tagebuch 1873 pp.269-70.
- 561 Tagebuch 1873 p.273; p.281 gives 8m.
- 562 Tagebuch 1873 p.300; Allgemeine Zeitung (Augsburg), Beilage zu Nr.217 (5th August 1873), p.3309; Briefwechsel I p.233; Ilios Fig.14.
- 563 Tagebuch 1873 pp.275,281.
- 564 Tagebuch 1873 p.304; TA p.297; Briefwechsel I p.235; JHS 82 (1962) p.83; Ilios pp.40-1.
- 565 D.A.Traill, Antiquity 57 (1983), pp.182,184.
- 566 William C. Borlase, "A Visit to Dr Schliemann's Troy," Fraser's Magazine 17 (Feb.1878), p.236.
- 567 Tagebuch 1873 p.300.
- 568 Tagebuch 1873 pp.273,300.
- 569 TA p.289; Briefe p.135; Briefwechsel I pp.233,234,235; Ilios pp.40,453.
- 570 Borlase, loc.cit.

- 571 As pointed out by Traill, Antiquity 57 (1983), p.184. See also
D.F.Easton, Anatolian Studies 34 (1984) pp.146-9.
- 572 Tagebuch 1873 p.303; Allgemeine Zeitung (Augsburg), Beilage zu Nr.217
(5th August 1873), p.3309; Briefwechsel I p.234; TA pp.295-6; Ilios
p.41: these all make clear that the chest's existence was deduced.
Briefe p.135, puts it more positively.
- 573 Borlase, loc.cit; unless Yannakis was thinking of the iron key, Ilios
No.1476.
- 574 H.Schmidt, Heinrich Schliemann's Sammlung Trojanischer Altertümer
(Berlin 1902), No.5824.
- 575 Allgemeine Zeitung (Augsburg), Beilage zu Nr.217 (5th August 1873),
p.3309; TA p.290; later repeated in the summary in Ilios p.41.
- 576 D.A.Traill, Antiquity 57 (1983), p.184.
- 577 Borlase, op.cit., pp.235-6.
- 578 Tagebuch 1873 p.275.
- 579 Tagebuch 1873 p.281, entry erroneously dated 4th June.
- 580 Tagebuch 1873 pp.281,304; Ilios p.42.
- 581 Tagebuch 1873 p.290.
- 582 Tagebuch 1873 p.305; TA p.303; Ilios p.43.
- 583 TA p.303; Ilios p.453, No.786, Fig.14; Schmidt, op.cit. Nos.5868-70.
See D.F.Easton, Anatolian Studies 34 (1984) p.150.
- 584 Tagebuch 1873 p.299; Atlas Taf.214.
- 585 Tagebuch 1873 p.299.
- 586 Tagebuch 1873 p.304; TA p.302.
- 587 Ibid.
- 588 24.79 (in Atlas, Taf.214) +6.30.
- 589 23.48 (in Atlas Taf.214) +6.30.
- 590 Tagebuch 1873 p.269: "bei weiterer Abgrabung vom gr. Einschnitt."
- 591 E.Meyer, HSKF p.270.
- 592 Ilios p.54.
- 593 Tagebuch 1873 pp.275-6,279; TA pp.304-5,307.
- 594 Tagebuch 1873 p.298; cf.TA p.318.

CHAPTER IV:
THE RESULTS OF THE EXCAVATIONS

PREFACE

It is the aim of this chapter to present, so far as may be possible, the detailed excavation-reports which we should now like Schliemann to have written. That is to say, this chapter takes each of the areas distinguished in Chapter III, and reconstructs within it a sequence of soil-deposits, buildings and objects. I have attempted to describe, and account for, these sequences in an orderly way, by assigning to each deposit a number and by discussing each deposit in turn. The description of each deposit is followed where appropriate by a catalogue of the objects which seem to have been found in it. Reconstructed "section-drawings" and plans are provided as visual aids.

The order followed in this chapter is not the same as that in Chapter III. Chapter III provided a chronological account of the excavations. In this chapter, however, I have grouped the many, different areas of excavation together into "trenches". Some of these will already be well-known by name - the North-South Trench, and the North Platform, for instance. Others, such as The Western Area, are newly distinguished. Each "trench" is then subdivided into a number of "areas", and each area into a number of deposits. Usually the sequence in which I have placed the areas within any one trench is the sequence in which Schliemann dug them. This division of trenches into "areas" yields, I hope, a fairly detailed picture of Schliemann's findings; but it has the obvious disadvantage of fragmenting the overall picture. To remedy this I have prefaced the report of each trench with a synthetic summary of the main findings within it. An overall description of the site, period by period, is reserved for Chapter V.

In describing Schliemann's findings I have aimed to present the full information on which the reconstructed sequence within any one area is based. But it has not usually been possible to recount in full the process of reasoning involved. It may therefore help if some general comments are made here.

Relevant information is of several different kinds. Sometimes Schliemann himself makes direct statements about the stratification of soil-types or architectural features. Sometimes the position of a given feature within the area can be inferred from the date on which it was found; this pre-

supposes the possibility of gauging Schliemann's progress day by day from the diaries. Sometimes this can be done; sometimes it cannot. Within each area the distribution of objects by depth is usually very helpful, provided that the dates of manufacture for some, at least, of the pieces are known from the excavations of Dörpfeld or Blegen. The homogeneity of much of the Early^{and Middle} Bronze Age material makes for difficulty here, and it is rare that the objects alone permit a secure division into deposits of Troy II, III, IV or V. But for these strata there can often be helpful information from the excavation of adjacent, or neighbouring, areas, whether by Schliemann or by one of his successors. It is fortunate that across the centre of the site the E.B.^{and M.B.} deposits are known to have displayed an accumulation that was regular and more or less horizontal (cf. Troy I figs.449-50,465). The rather crude technique of extrapolating divisions between strata from one area to the next therefore has some validity, as well as some obvious pitfalls.

I cannot say that the way in which the information from all these sources has been brought together is wholly "scientific". For each area I have attempted to consider the evidence as a whole, and to reconstruct around it a stratigraphy that would account for as much of it as possible. It has been a process of trial and error: of putting all the facts into a mental kaleidoscope, shaking them up time and time again, until a satisfactory pattern has emerged. Usually I have seen only one realistic way of reconciling all the facts; but I must admit the possibility that there are other, better solutions which I have missed.

The resultant stratigraphies can be regarded as no more than rough ones. Given the nature of the sources, - not to mention the character of the excavations - fine stratigraphy is, of course, quite out of the question. While some obvious cases of intrusion have been spotted, it is difficult - usually impossible - to make sufficient allowance for pits and other irregularities which may have affected the sequence of objects as Schliemann found them. Equally difficult to allow for is the possibility that Schliemann was given incorrect information by his foremen; or that objects from higher strata, once exposed, fell to the bottom of the trench and were recorded among those from lower strata. For these reasons the indices at the end of this work claim only to note the date of the deposit in which each object is likely to have been found, not the date of the object itself.

The section-drawings which accompany this chapter are as rough as the reconstructed stratigraphies. They do not pretend to be drawings of real, but vanished, sections. Rather, they are a visual presentation of my interpretation of what Schliemann says he found. Their purpose is to provide a visual framework within which to place the available information. I hope and believe that they have a validity of a general kind; but it is too much to hope that any one of them gives a truly accurate picture of the area to which it relates.

Schliemann's technique of recording has already been described in Chapter II. His field-notes were kept in diary-form, with drawings of objects added before or after the record of each day's work. This can provide quite a useful sequential account of the excavations. But what Schliemann never really saw the need for was a fully separate account of the work in each area. The result is that from 1872 onwards, when he was usually digging in more than one area at once, there can be difficulties in separating the findings of one area from those of another. This applies less to Schliemann's record of the stratigraphy and architecture than it does to his record of the objects. His account of the stratigraphy and architecture is usually fairly clear in its attributions of deposits and buildings to individual areas; and even ambiguities can normally be sorted out without too much heartache. But the real problem comes with the objects.

Schliemann's work of 1872 is divided into seven periods, in all but two of which there was simultaneous excavation in more than one area. In these five periods there can be serious difficulties in deciding which object came from which area. There are many cases where allocations can be made with some confidence. A direct statement in the diary, Trojanische Alterthümer, or some other source may describe an object and say which area it was found in. Or the depth at which it was found may preclude an origin in all but one of the areas. Sometimes the date on which it was found and drawn can also be a relevant factor: it may come from a day when Schliemann was working in only one area, or in only one area at the right depth. These sound quite straight-forward criteria, but even so there can be snags. In Trojanische Alterthümer Ch.xii, for example, there is a long list of objects found near the "Tower" in the central area of the North-South Trench. The list begins (p.164f) with the observation that on the east side of the Tower (i.e. in E 6-7) pre-

Hellenic objects were found at the unusually slight depth of 1 metre. A list of pre-Hellenic objects from around this depth follows, together with a note of classical artefacts from higher strata. Clearly these are all to exemplify the situation described, and must derive from the east side of the "Tower". The same theme is continued at the beginning of the next paragraph (p.165), and the east side of the "Tower" is again mentioned. The catalogue of objects and motifs from unexpectedly high deposits continues until a depth of 4 metres is mentioned.

"In dieser letztern Tiefe fand ich in der Ausgrabung an der Westseite des Thurmes einen höchst sonderbaren, 20 Centimeter hohen Becher..."

And of the immediately following item Schliemann says

"Ebendasselbst fand ich eine merkwürdige Vase..."

From this it could easily be assumed that Schliemann was now embarking on a comparable list of objects from the west side of the "Tower". But this is probably not the case, for the remainder of the list (pp.166-169) takes us progressively deeper, from 4m to 14m, without any further mention of either the east or the west side of the "Tower". Even the "Ebendasselbst" is ambiguous. Does it mean "In the same place", i.e. to the West of the "Tower", as assumed in Troy and Its Remains p.207? Or does it mean "At the same depth" without any reference to East or West? In the light of what follows, I suspect it means the latter. Thus out of this entire catalogue of over fifty objects only twenty or so can be assigned to the eastern area, and only one (the curious cup, 72-1655) to the western area. All the rest must be allocated simply to the central area of the North-South Trench with no further attempt at refinement. It is always essential to keep a sharp eye on the structure and sense of Schliemann's texts and to deduce only what it is possible to deduce.

These, then, are cases where objects from the 1872 excavations can be allocated to an area with some certainty. But certainty is often not possible. Even so, one can often suggest an allocation that is at any rate plausible.

Sometimes, for instance, it is our sketchy knowledge of Schliemann's day-to-day progress that hampers us. But if a plausible estimate can be made of the depths reached in Schliemann's various trenches over a series of days, then the depth at which an object was found, and the date of its

discovery, can permit an allocation which is also plausible.

On other occasions the context of a given drawing in the diary can be suggestive. A small group of drawings comes, for instance, at the very end of the entry for 11th May 1872 (Tgb 1872 p.331). I have numbered the drawings from 72-229 to 72-304. Now on 11th May Schliemann was digging in only two areas: the South Platform, which went down to a depth of 6m, and the North Platform, which went to a depth of 18m. Of this small, isolated group of objects the first and last must derive from the North Platform because of their depths - 18m for 72-229; 8m for 72-304 (according to Atlas 10-323). This makes it tempting, and plausible, to suppose that the intervening objects likewise come from the North Platform, even though their depths, all being of 6m or less, give nothing away.

Sometimes again it may be the arrangement of drawings in the diary that provides us with a clue. During 1872 Schliemann was particularly interested by the designs on spindle-whorls - so much so that in each day's drawings he took to putting the whorls first and other, to us more interesting, objects later. The tendency becomes really noticeable from 15th May onwards, although it is not always adhered to with rigidity. This idiosyncrasy, not in itself particularly noteworthy, becomes of interest in a diary-entry such as that for 12th June 1872. Here there is a first set of drawings (not including any whorls), said to derive from the Northeast Trench, followed by a second set, said to derive from the North-South Trench. Those from the North-South Trench begin with a selection of whorls. The same pattern appears in the entry for the following day. The suspicion is thus aroused that Schliemann was sometimes drawing his objects in groups, by trench; and that when, in a long series of drawings, a group of whorls appears, it may indicate the beginning of a new group. Take the entry for 5th July 1872 (Tgb 1872 pp.433-4). Here there are two pages of drawings with almost no text. There are five objects in the middle of the series, Nos.72-1262 to 72-1266, which Schliemann says were found in the Northeast Trench. They are followed by a large group, 1267-1290, of which the first twelve items are whorls. One immediately suspects that they might come from another trench; and indeed there are two objects which, by reason of their depth, can only have been found in the North-South Trench. Preceding the five pieces from the Northeast Trench is another large

group, similarly beginning with a series of nineteen whorls: Nos.1239-1261. Not one of these objects comes from a depth greater than 10m. This allows us to assign all of this first group to the one, remaining area under excavation at the time: the South Platform. In this manner the entire collection of objects drawn in the entry for 5th July divides easily and naturally into three groups: the first from the South Platform, the second from the Northeast Trench, and the third from the North-South Trench - the three areas that we know Schliemann was then digging. The allocations are far from certain, but I think they are plausible.

Take another kind of case. During 1st-11th May Schliemann was digging in two areas. One was on the North Platform, "wo ich commandire", as Schliemann says of himself (Tgb 1872 p.337); the other was on the newly-begun South Platform, where Photidas was in charge (TA p.82). From this period very few of the objects recorded in the diary are known to have come from the South Platform, while nearly all of the securely-allocated finds are from the North Platform. Indeed, there is in general much more information given us about the latter area. The inference is obvious: Schliemann records most from the area he is watching most closely. Areas under someone else's supervision tend to get poorly reported. Now in the following period, 12th-22nd May, there were again two areas under excavation: the east end of the North Platform, and its west end. We are told (Tgb 1872 p.359) that a workman called Theodore was directing operations at the east end; and it is striking that Trojanische Alterthümer Ch.IX, which gives us a full account of the findings at the west end, says next to nothing about the excavations at the east end. In fact every one of the explicitly allocated objects from this period derives, without exception, from the west end. It seems a reasonable conjecture that it was Schliemann himself that supervised work at the west end. This will then encourage us to assign most other objects found during this period to the west end of the North Platform. Again, the allocations cannot be certain; but taken all in all they may be plausible.

Additional problems arise when we turn to the objects found in 1873. In this season I have distinguished ten periods of excavation, and during all but one of these Schliemann was again digging in more than one area at a time. As before, explicit statements in the diary, Trojanische

Alterthümer or the Atlas allow some objects to be allocated with certainty to this or that area. But a change in the pattern of diary-entries makes other allocations more difficult. In 1872 objects were often drawn into the diary on, or shortly after, the day they were found. But in 1873, and especially towards the end of the season, daily entries became more infrequent, and the periodic résumés grew longer, being written over more and more extended periods. At the same time the drawings were now entrusted to an artist who, it seems, got access to the diary only from time to time. They now make their entry in sudden gushes, and in no apparent order. In between there may be long pages of notes devoid of all illustration. These irregularities in the diary rob us of the ready means of dating individual discoveries afforded us by the 1872 records. It is now harder to be sure of the date on which any given object was found. Sometimes it is not even clear at first into which period of excavation its discovery should be placed. Allocation of objects to areas, therefore, becomes that much more of a problem.

But these difficulties are not insuperable. As if to compensate for the irregularity of the drawings, Schliemann is now more liberal with his descriptions of objects found. Sometimes these descriptions, or allusions, occur in the daily entries, sometimes in the periodic résumés, and sometimes in both. In most cases the description can be matched up with a drawing. This means that for any individual object it is usually possible to record the earliest attestation and so to gain at least a terminus ante quem for its discovery. To take an example: the small marble pyramid which I have numbered 73-367 appears in a collection of drawings that fall between the entries for 25th and 26th March (Tgb 1873 p.129). But it is actually described in the entry for 22nd March (Tgb 1873 p.116) and in the résumé bearing the same date (TA p.225). Thus while its drawing appears to fall in the fifth period of excavation in 1873, the descriptions show that it was actually found at the end of the fourth period. The opposite can also occur. For example, the figurine which I have numbered 73-102 is drawn into the diary just after the entry for 22nd February (Tgb 1873 p.24) and five pages before Schliemann began his rough draft of the despatch describing his first period of work (TA ch.xv). It is also described in the daily entry of the same date. But in the despatches, or periodic résumés, it is not described until 1st March (TA p.195). Thus while from the despatches it would appear to have been found only in the second period of excavation,

from the drawing and the daily entry it is clear that it must have been found instead in the first period.

The dates of excavation arrived at in this way can help provide an additional, indirect source of information. Throughout the 1873 season Schliemann's artist was not only drawing objects into the diary; he was also continuing to compile the Atlas. Whereas plates 1-118 were compiled in Athens at the end of the 1872 season, plates 119-217 were for the most part compiled on the spot at Troy during the 1873 season. Their progress is attested in Schliemann's copybook for February to August 1873, where a draft of the Atlas text is interspersed with copies of outgoing letters (see BSA 77 (1982) p.105 No.50). Once a terminus ante quem has been established, in the way just described, for the discovery of any object, that object can then be identified in the Atlas. When this has been done for all dateable objects, a pattern emerges in which we can see the period of excavation during which each plate in the Atlas was compiled. This can in turn enable us to suggest excavation-dates for otherwise undated objects, or doubtfully dated objects, which appear in the Atlas. For example, Atlas 148-2902 shows a piece of copper moulded at one end into the shape of an animal-head. It is not drawn in the diary, and is not described in either any of the daily entries or any of the periodic résumés. Its date of excavation is therefore not recorded. But the 32 other pieces illustrated in Atlas Taf.148 can all be seen to have been found during Schliemann's seventh period of excavation, thereby dating the compilation of Taf.148. It is a fair assumption that 148-2902 was found in the same period.

Another example will help to confirm the reliability of this method. Schliemann's second period of excavation in 1873 ended on 6th March. After the diary-entry for 6th March but before that of 7th March comes a series of sixteen drawings which I have numbered 73-201 to 73-216 (Tgb 1873 pp.71-2). Should these objects be reckoned with the finds of the second period of excavation, or with those of the third? Six of the objects, 73-211 to 73-216, appear again in the Atlas, in Taf.125. Now on the Atlas plate there are illustrations of another twenty-seven objects. For one of them, 125-2504, there is no external evidence of its date of discovery. But of all the rest there is not a single one for which the diary or despatches do not clearly point to Period III as the date of discovery. We can assume, then, that Atlas Taf.125 shows objects found

in the third period of excavation, that this is when 73-211 to 73-216 were found, and that 73-201 to 73-210 may have been found at the same time as well. This last conclusion can actually be confirmed, for 73-202, 203, 205 and 207-210 all have their discovery recorded in the daily entries of the diary, and those entries fall during Period III - namely on 7th and 8th March (Tgb 1873 pp.74-5). Thus of the sixteen objects whose illustrations fall between the writings of Periods II and III in the diary, seven can be firmly dated by later diary-entries, and another six are independently dated by the Atlas; and the dates agree. What must have happened is that, after the end of Period II, Schliemann left three blank pages in his diary, pp.71-73, before beginning his record of Period III. Objects found during the early days of Period III were drawn into the blank pages while the written account was continued a few pages further on. Confirmation of this comes from Page 73, which is still blank, and from Page 72 which was never completely filled.

Towards the end of the 1873 season the Atlas becomes particularly important as a source of excavation dates. Schliemann's ninth period of excavation lasted from 10th May to 24th May. His daily record may be found in pp.232-269 of the diary. But within these pages not a single object is illustrated. What objects did he find? Some are described in the rough copy of the despatch dated 31st May which sprawls through pp. 271-290 of the diary and was later used to form part of Trojanische Alterthümer ch.xxiii. And some are mentioned in daily entries of Period IX. Together these sources provide us with about thirty-two pieces which have a firm date of discovery in Period IX. In the Atlas they are illustrated in plates 171-176. But half of them are illustrated again in a batch of drawings on pages 291-298 of the diary, towards the end of Schliemann's tenth period of excavation. This raises the question how many more of these apparently Period X drawings, Nos.73-828 to 73-892, might be late illustrations of objects actually found in Period IX. When we trace this collection of late drawings to the Atlas we find that, like the known Period IX pieces, every one of them is also illustrated within plates 171-176. Indeed, if we examine plates 171-176, and disregard as possibly misleading the apparent Period X date of 73-828 to 73-892, we find that every piece with a firm date of excavation was found during Period IX. It thus becomes very plausible to suggest that not only 73-828 to 73-892 but all one hundred and nineteen pieces shown in Atlas Taf.171-176 are the objects found during Period IX.

Of course the issues are not always so clear-cut. But these examples will suffice to show the sorts of methods by which each object found in 1873 has been given a date of excavation. Detailed discussion of every case would have been most undesirable. But Table XI attempts to show the periods over which I believe each Atlas plate, from Taf.119 onwards, was compiled; and Table XII lists the resulting allocations of objects to their period of excavation.

Once the excavation-dates are established for the objects found in 1873, those objects may be allocated - either securely or plausibly - to the proper trenches by much the same means as were used for the 1872 finds. Once again, to have discussed in detail the allocation of every object found in 1872 and 1873, amounting to well over 3000 pieces, would have been most undesirable. The allocation of each object has in fact been decided individually, taking into account, I hope, all the relevant factors. But the results are displayed in a series of synoptic tables: Tables IV-X, XIII-XXII. These tables distinguish clearly between allocations which are secure and those which are merely plausible; and they attempt to give some indication, of a general sort, of the grounds on which the allocations have been made. We can assume, of course, that not all of the "plausible" allocations will in fact be correct. But from my knowledge of the material and of the methods I have used (but without, I am afraid, any sophisticated statistical analysis), I should rate their chances of correctness as being generally in the region of 70%.

This distinction between secure and plausible allocations - a distinction of obvious importance - is preserved in the trench reports in the following chapter. Within the catalogue of objects found in any given deposit, those whose attribution to the area in question is only plausible are marked with an asterisk. It should not be supposed, however, that the presence of an asterisk need always call into question an object's date of origin. For example, the objects found at a depth of 4m and listed under Deposit (2) of Area 4 of the North Platform would have to derive from Troy III whether or not they were really found on the North Platform. For given their depth and date of excavation the only alternative findspot for them would have been in the Northeast Trench, and there too the deposits from 4m seem to belong to Troy III (see Table XIII and Figs.IV.9,21). Objects such as these, which can claim a firm date of origin despite the uncertainty of their allocation, have their

asterisks contained within brackets, thus: (*).

In the preceding pages I have tried to describe the methods I have used for deciding which object may have come from which area. I have done so at some length because the issue is a critical one, and the problems are complex. Now, however, I should like to turn to another question: the allocation of objects to strata.

The stratigraphy of a given area has sometimes to be reconstructed almost exclusively from the evidence of the objects found within it. While this procedure may be a hazardous one, in that the reconstruction can only be very rough and ready, it is at least quite simple provided, as is often the case, that the strata are likely to have accumulated in regular, horizontal bands one on top of another. The lines separating the strata can then be drawn round the objects. Matters can become more complicated, however, when the objects have to be fitted into a stratigraphy.

The problem lies in Schliemann's use of round numbers to measure depth. Whether he is noting changes in the character of deposits or the find-spots of objects, he quotes figures such as 5m, 6m, or 7m. Only rarely will he use intermediate figures such as 5½m, 6½m, or 7½m. But if 5m is the depth at which a change of deposit is noted, should an object also said to have been found at 5m deep be assigned to the deposit above the 5m line, or to the one below it? It depends on the circumstances. Let us look at three examples.

In February 1873 Schliemann was digging Area 4 of the North Platform, in squares F 3-4, to form an upper terrace at c.7m deep (30.59m A.T.) and a lower terrace at 10m deep (c.27.50m A.T.). There is one object given a depth of 10m, and clearly this can only be assigned upwards into Deposit (4) since no greater depth was reached. Rather the same applies to the objects from 7m. As may be seen from Fig.IV.21, much less work was done below the depth of 7m than above it. This is reflected in the numbers of objects found at varying depths within the trench:

4 or 4½m : 21

5m : 14

6m : 30

7m : 24

8m : 8

9m : 8
 10m : 1

Clearly the objects from 7m must mostly have been found above the level of the 7m terrace floor. It is most unlikely that they all derive from that small portion of Deposit (3) which may have gone down to 7½m deep.

Higher in the same trench, however, there is a different situation. Schliemann says practically nothing of the strata at 0-4m deep, while he explicitly discusses those at 4-7m deep. He also refers to the good quality of the pottery which came from the latter depths. Should the nineteen objects from 4m deep be assigned upwards to Deposit (1), or downwards into Deposit (2)? Apart from the items from 4m, only nine objects are otherwise attributable to Deposit (1), whereas there are seventy-one others from the deposits at 4-7m deep. It looks as though the large number of objects from 4m deep reflects Schliemann's greater interest in, or the greater harvest from, the lower levels. I have therefore assigned them downwards to Deposit (2).

Yet another situation arises in the next area of the same trench: Area 5, excavated in the last days of February 1873. Once more Schliemann was digging to two depths: to c.7m on the upper terrace, and perhaps to 13m on the lower terrace. It is unlikely, however, that there was any digging between the depths of 7 and 10m. It is therefore curious that seven objects appear to come from a depth of 8m. The answer is not that they are wrongly allocated to this area, for one of them (73-181) has an allocation that is certain. Nor is it that the upper platform was dug deeper, for Atlas Taf.214 shows that it was not. Nor again is it that Schliemann could have been using a higher datum-point, for the contour-plan and Fig.IV.22 show that, if anything, the surface in this area of the mound lay lower than in Area 4. It must simply be that some irregularity crept into Schliemann's system of measurement. That irregularity creates a pressure, in this case, to allocate objects upwards. As there is virtually no information about the stratigraphy of the area, the divisions in Fig.IV.22 having simply been extrapolated from those in Fig.IV.21, there is no further control on the allocations. So the policy of "upward-allocation" has been pursued in this trench from 8m upwards.

The situation in each area - and often for each deposit - has, therefore,

to be judged on its own merits. Sometimes we must imagine Schliemann, as it were, "looking down" from the top of the trench. Having found the top of a newly-discovered deposit at, say, 7m deep, he would in such a case say that the objects found just below the top of that deposit had come from 7m deep. At other times we must imagine him "looking up" from the bottom of the trench and doing the reverse. I have not, I am afraid, set out the reasoning behind every decision that has been made in the following reports. I have, however, recorded the depth to which Schliemann assigns each object so that the reader can re-allocate the finds for himself should he consider it necessary. In cases where I have found myself completely without guidance I have assigned objects of doubtful stratification upwards. This follows the normal archaeological practice aimed at avoiding spurious early datings.

The problems are rather different in the two cases of the Northeast Trench and the southern sector of the North-South Trench. Here we are faced with the complicating factor of sloping deposits. In the Northeast Trench I have been unable to overcome this difficulty, and many objects remain un-allocated, even though the lie of the strata can be fairly well estimated. In the southern sector of the North-South Trench, however, we can do better. Here Schliemann's daily progress can be determined and the findspots of many of his objects can be plotted in on a skeletal section-drawing. From this, and other information, I have reconstructed a stratigraphy and have been able to propose allocations for over two hundred and fifty objects. The method is described in the report and need not be repeated here. It is a unique case.

One final point must be added. Throughout the Troy publications of Schliemann, Dörpfeld and Blegen there are variations in the way in which the divisions within Troy II-V are conceived. A number of revisions can be traced through the work of Schliemann and Dörpfeld. And it only takes a comparison of Blegen's sections of the pillars in E6 and F 4-5 with those of Dörpfeld (Troja und Ilion Taf.VIII) to see that Blegen, too, has numbered the strata differently. His Troy III includes the Troy III and IV of Dörpfeld; while Dörpfeld's Troy V is divided by Blegen into IV and V. Since Blegen's excavations provided a typology that, when necessary, I have used in the dating of artefacts, I have for the sake of consistency adopted his division of the strata also. The strata of Troy II, III, IV and V distinguished in the following reports can there-

fore he assumed to link up with the strata of Troy II, III, IV and V of Blegen.

In the catalogues, pottery has been classified according to the typological scheme devised by Blegen. The types for Troy I-V are illustrated in Figs.V.51-55. There are, however, many additional types, and the scheme has been extended to include these. The new types are illustrated in Figs.V.56-58 and are all numbered from 200 onwards so as to be distinguishable from Blegen's. Also used in these catalogues are Blegen's classificatory schemes for figurines and pins, and Schmidt's for spindle-whorls (see TI pp.204-224). None of these schemes is entirely satisfactory, but all have the advantage of being known and understood.

THE NORTHEAST TRENCH

On the east side of the mound lay the field bought by Frank Calvert in 1864 or 1865. Calvert himself had dug two trenches here in 1865 (see Fig.I.9) attracted, it seems, by the presence of a large rectangular depression in the mound-surface and by the numerous pieces of marble that lay scattered and exposed. He believed it to be the site of the Temple of Athena, and in this he was shown much later by Dörpfeld to be perfectly right. In 1872 Schliemann took over Calvert's identification, believing it to be confirmed by thick deposits of ash found on the North Platform. These he supposed to derive from temple sacrifices. In June, July and August 1872 and in February 1873 he therefore excavated a large area, encompassing Calvert's old trenches, which extended nearly 60m southwards from the north face of the mound and had an overall width of about 40m. The final state of the trench may be seen in Atlas Taf.214, 215, Ilios Plan I and in Fig.III.11 of the present work.

The excavation was conducted by means of a rather complicated system of terraces, of which an impression may be gained from Atlas Taf.113. Essentially there were two, wide terraces which ran East-West and which were dug southwards into the mound. The upper one lay at c.30.17m A.T., sloping up to c.30.59m A.T.; the lower one lay at c.24.67m A.T., sloping up to c.26.66m on its south side. Bisecting these was a long, narrow, North-South cut which was deeper and reached down to c.19.67m A.T. at its north end, but which stepped up to c.26m A.T. at its south end. In 1873 the areas East of the long cut were neglected, while the western terraces were pushed southwards and westwards to join up, in an arc, with a trench being driven eastwards from the North Platform. This left a curious pinnacle of soil unexcavated in squares FG3.

The structure of the mound in this Northeast Trench seems to have been determined by two overriding factors. One factor was the presence at a deep level of a northeastern sector of the Troy II citadel wall, running diagonally through the excavated area from Northwest to Southeast. Above this wall, and to the Southwest of it, subsequent occupation had laid down a series of more or less regular, horizontal deposits. Outside it, however, to the Northeast, all subsequent deposits sloped down to the North and East, following the drop of the wall's outer face. Later buildings were placed further Northeast to only a very small extent. This is accounted for by the nearness of the Troy II citadel wall to the steep, natural slope of the promontory on which Troy was built. A second

factor was that of later disturbance. Foundations of Troy IX structures - particularly of the Temple of Athena - cut deep into the underlying deposits, at some points perhaps even penetrating the topmost strata of Troy I. Much of the deposits from Troy IV and later may have been affected by this, for there is some evidence that within the Temple the disturbance went down to c.33.91m A.T. In addition the temple masonry had at some stage been robbed out, including most of the foundations; Calvert had dug his two trenches; and it seems that he had been followed by further robbing out of at least the Troy IX, and conceivably the Troy VI, retaining walls.

Calvert's trenches of 1865 had exposed what must have been a part of the enclosure wall of Troy IX, extending between Dörpfeld's Walls IX W and IX N. He found masons' marks on the stones. But, by the time that Schliemann dug here there was no more than a small segment to be found, at the west end of the upper terrace, just below the surface (Area ii, Deposit 4). But it was enough to indicate a thick wall built of large, hewn stones, preserved up to c.35.80m A.T.

Although Schliemann often spoke of the Northwest Trench as the "Temple Area", he was worried by the absence of any obvious structure here and never in these years convinced himself that the Temple of Athena had been found. It was only Dörpfeld who later recognized the robbed-out foundation trenches and their significance. But it is nevertheless clear that the foundation-trenches at the west end of the Temple were encountered by Schliemann, and recorded by him, even though they were not recognized. In two areas which cannot be specified exactly he found the same deep packing of sand, to a depth of c.28.59m A.T. (Area v, Deposit 2). And he several times comments on the mixture of thick deposits of black earth with marble chippings, which Dörpfeld found characteristic of the fill in the upper levels of the foundation trenches (Area iv, Deposit 1a; Area v, Deposit 1). Unlike Dörpfeld he also had the good fortune to find a few large, sandstone blocks still apparently in situ (Area iv, Deposit 1a). These he did suspect of being a part of the Temple foundations, and he may well have been right. Additional remains of the Temple - fragments of sculpted marble, architectural pieces and, of course, the famous Helios Metope - were found in the deposits which had accumulated down the north slope of the mound, together with other remains from Troy VIII-IX: inscriptions, figurines, lentoid weights and a terracotta plaque.

From Schliemann's records there emerges no indication that he found in this area any deposits of Troy VII. This corresponds with Sperling's later observations in the same area (Troy III p.158; figs.83,502).

A large part of the remains of Troy VI will have been removed to make way for the Temple of Athena when it was built. But outside the Temple, structures of Troy VI seem to have been preserved almost to the surface of the mound. This is certainly the case on the south side, in square H4, where Dörpfeld identified a Troy VI building, VI D, preserved up to 36.45m A.T. It is therefore quite likely that Wall 28 (Area iii, Deposit 5), found by Schliemann at the southernmost end of his central cutting a little too far South to be a part of the Temple, is an additional piece of VI D. It appears in Atlas Taf.214 as No.30, a 'Hellenic Wall', and consisted of two courses of large, hewn blocks of limestone.

The same was probably true to the North of the Temple, for in squares FG3 Blegen found a short section of Troy VI citadel wall preserved up to 36.32m A.T. (Troy III pp.108f,158; figs.84-86,447,501). In the Northeast Trench Schliemann did not find any of the masonry from this wall, which may have been removed either when IX W was built or by the peasants robbing the area after Calvert's excavations. But close to the probable line of Wall IX W in GH3 it seems very likely that Schliemann came across the undisturbed fill of the Troy VI footing-trench. Here he found tell-tale alternating strata of brown soil and marble chippings, as later found by the American excavators in other foundation-trenches of Troy VI (Area ii, Deposits 5-9).

No doubt some material dating from Troy VI was found on the north slope, as it was by Blegen. Some of the pottery found in Deposit (3) of Area ii seems to confirm this; but the evidence is not plentiful.

From the Early and Middle Bronze Age, Schliemann here dug through thick deposits and made plentiful finds, although they are not easily divisible between Troy II, III, IV and V. As was the case with the remains of Troy VI, those of Troy IV and V seem to have been seriously cut into either by the Temple of Athena or at an earlier date by the builders of Troy VI, for within it EB-MB material is not clearly attested above a depth of 6m (30.69m A.T.: see Area iii, Deposit 6). To the North of the Temple, however, we know from Blegen's investigation that Troy V deposits were

preserved up to 32.80m A.T. (Troy III pp.107,158). This corresponds with Schliemann's observation that mudbrick debris was to be found immediately below the Troy VI footing-trench (Area ii, Deposit 11). In both cases we are concerned with a point where EB-MB deposits had built up in horizontal succession over the old Troy II citadel. Presumably Troy IV-V material had also spilled down the north face of the mound, but it is difficult to distinguish from E.B. material and Schliemann did not separate the sloping strata in excavation (see Figs.IV.6,8).

Deposits dating to Troy II and III were found more or less intact except where the Temple foundations had penetrated into them. Schliemann records thick deposits of yellow and red ash, stones and burnt debris reaching up to c.33m A.T. and sloping down to North and East. Here it is not clear what belongs to III and what to II. But below these deposits he found what we now know to be a part of the citadel wall of Troy II. It may first have been noticed in 1865 by Frank Calvert, who in 1869 mentions a 'pavement' at a depth of 10-12 feet (Briefwechsel I p.144) - the correct depth for the top of the wall if he were measuring down from the interior of the depression within the Temple. But this is not certain. It is possible that Schliemann came upon the wall, called Wall 29 in the present work, in August 1872 (Area iii, Deposit 7) and inadvertently dug a 4m-wide hole through it; but it was first recognized when exposed by rain in September 1872, and was only excavated in 1873. Much of the battered north face was cleared in the western and central parts of the trench and is depicted in Atlas Taf.214 and 215. Schliemann describes it as a wall of white stones rising at 40° out of the trench floor and reaching to 8m below the surface (i.e. below the summit). The width of the wall was not determined at the top, although the upper, western terrace was cut in over its top. A measurement of its thickness was, however, taken at a deeper point, at the south end of the central cutting where the 4m breach had been made and where Schliemann could see the wall in section. There it appeared to have a thickness of ½-1m (Area iv, Deposit 7; Area v, Deposit 6).

Of a later date than Wall 29 is Dörpfeld's Wall BC (here called Wall 30), which Schliemann found resting against the north face of Wall 29 at c.23-26m A.T. He describes it as built of large and small hewn stones joined with mortar. It appears in Atlas Taf.214 as the "Outer Wall of Troy", and in Ilios p.24 No.2 where it is Wall B, the "Trojan" wall. It was cut

away to give access to Wall 29, as may be seen from the plan in TI Taf. III (see Area iii, Deposit 8; Ch.III, 13th July-4th August 1872).

Schliemann may just have penetrated into deposits of Troy I when digging behind Wall 29 at the south end of the central cut. Here he records finding deposits of green ash mixed with mussel shells but without stones (Area v, Deposit 7).

The work in the Northeast Trench may be divided into five "areas". These correspond to the areas which Schliemann tackled during the five relevant periods distinguished in Chapter III. The areas of work are represented in Figs.III.6-8,10-11, and are discussed individually in the following pages.

AREA 1: GH 2-3

Figs.III.6; IV.2.

Excavation in this area took place during the period 12th-18th June 1872. The site of the trench can be seen in Atlas Taf.117 and Ilios Plan I. The floor of the trench lay at c.24.67m A.T., its outer edge thus lying close to the 25m contour in GH2. Its width was initially 12m, and at this stage the trench was probably designed to lie between and to join the two old trenches left by Frank Calvert's excavations (see Fig.I.9). Very soon, on the first or second day of work, an upper terrace was also cut, at c.30.17m A.T. By 18th June the two terraces had been widened so that the lower measured 31m from West to East, and the upper measured 34m. There is no evidence to show clearly how far Schliemann had advanced these terraces into the mound by 18th June. I have assumed that, as only six days' work was involved, progress was probably fairly modest.

Schliemann gives no information about the character of the soil in his excavations in GH 2-3, and it has been possible to do no more than to separate Deposit (1) as the deposit removed in the upper terrace and Deposit (2) as the deposit removed in the lower terrace. But in view of Troy III fig.502 it should be remembered that the division is an artificial one and that the deposits here probably sloped down from the top of the mound. The material is largely of Troy VIII-IX date, although there are also a few earlier objects as well. It seems likely that depths of only 1-5m were measured down from the top of the trench, while greater figures - certainly those of 14m - were calculated down from the summit of the mound.

Deposit (1). This is the material removed in the upper terrace.

OBJECTS FOUND

METALWORK

72-818 Socketed spearhead (2m). Fig.V.38.

WHORLS

GIA 72-859 (2m)
 RIA 72-886 (3m) cf. Atlas 8-240.
 RIIIA 72-932 (2m)

FIGURINES

72-885 Head from terracotta figurine of Kybele type with polos (5m).

WEIGHTS

- 72-820 Lentoid weight with two holes. Fig.V.47.
 72-887 Clay(?) lentoid weight with two holes (2m). Fig.V.47.
 72-819 Lentoid weight (2m).

INSCRIPTIONS

- 72-888 Fragmentary Greek inscription (1-2m). Atlas 34-843, TI p.468, No.40r, SS 9668.

SCULPTURES

- 72-816 Marble piece depicting human figure (40cm). Fig.V.48.

ARCHITECTURAL FRAGMENT

- 72-817 Marble piece with foliate design, possible antefix (31cm). Fig.V.48.

Deposit (2). This is the material removed from the lower terrace of the trench.

OBJECTS FOUND

POTTERY

- D33 72-935 Funnel (8cm). Atlas 66-1485? Fig.V.31.

METALWORK

- 72-860 Piece of lead, possibly a strigil (8m). Atlas 99-2112?? Fig.V.38.

POLISHED STONE

- 72-938 Shaft-hole axe(?) (8m). Fig.V.42.

WHORLS

- GIA 72-928 cf. Atlas 11-350.
 RIC 72-929
 RIA 72-930 (8m) cf. Atlas 8-240.
 RIC 72-931
 GIB 72-933
 RIC 72-934
 72-937 Terracotta disc with central hole (14m).

FIGURINE

- 3G 72-936 Marble figure-of-eight figurine (14m). Fig.V.45.

SCULPTURE

- Helios Metope (Tgb 1872 p.386). Atlas 30,31; TR plate III, Ilios p.623, SS 9582.

AREA ii: GH 2-4(a)

Figs.III.7; IV.3,4.

This area was excavated during 19th June-13th July 1872 and was at the time referred to by Schliemann as the "Temple Area". An upper terrace at c.30.17m A.T. was 34m wide and penetrated c.38m into the mound. A lower terrace at c.24.67m A.T. was 31m wide and penetrated c.25m into the mound. Schliemann had also begun a deeper cut through the middle of the area, reaching to a depth of c.19.67m A.T. This latter cut attained a width of 4m at its bottom, and of 8m where it cut through the floor of the upper terrace. Atlas Taf.117 and 214 show slopes at the sides of the terraces. In view of Schliemann's earlier practice (Tagebuch 1872 p.296; TA pp.46,68), we can probably assume that he aimed at an angle of 50° for these slopes.

Schliemann's own information about the stratification in this area is, when taken in isolation, incomplete and baffling. But fortunately it can be supplemented and illuminated by the reports of the other excavators. In 1937 the American excavators cleaned the western face of Schliemann's trench in GH 2-3. This revealed that the north slope of the mound had here been covered by sloping deposits of material which had trickled down its face during Troy VI and VIII-IX and which together had a thickness of over 6 metres (Troy III p.158; figs.83,502). Schliemann, when digging through these deposits, noticed that material from the latest settlements was occurring at a surprisingly great depth, but did not understand the cause. After several days' work on the upper terrace he still found a hellenistic figurine at a depth of 4m (Tagebuch 1872 p.415); and again, after several days' work on the lower terrace, at 9m deep, he was dismayed to find himself still in deposits of "the historical period" (Tagebuch 1872 p.427,430; TA p.141).

Further into the mound, although we have little information from Schliemann about the character of the deposits, we at least know from Blegen's findings that below the sloping strata were horizontal folds of material from Troy V and earlier. In G3, by the fortification-walls of Troy VI, these deposits were preserved up to c.32.80m A.T. (Troy III pp. 107,158). Above the 32.80m A.T. level, the situation is much more confused. Schliemann evidently did not find his path barred by the enclosure wall of Troy IX (IXW), although he did find a part of it at the

left (=West) edge of the trench. But Calvert had found it in 1865 in his two trenches in GH 3-4, and had described it as the city wall "built by Lysimachus". The stones must have been removed by peasants once they were exposed. Similarly, Schliemann does not record any trace here of the fortification-walls of Early and Late Troy VI of which neighbouring evidence was found by Blegen (Troy III pp.107-9). They must originally have followed a course almost identical to that of IXW and may have been robbed out at the same time. Interestingly, however, there seems among Schliemann's records to be evidence for the footing-trench of the Late VI wall (Deposits 5-9) which must have remained partly undisturbed. Dörpfeld, in Troja und Ilion pp.217-8, has already explained why Schliemann failed to find the Temple of Athena in this trench: once again, all the masonry had been robbed out. From Dörpfeld's observations (TI pp.217-220) we can supply a part of the reconstructed section-drawing.

For this period it is, as usual, a delicate task to select from the diary those objects which may have been found in this area. When drawing the day's finds, Schliemann did not always clearly distinguish which objects came from which area. But within the drawings for any one day it is often possible to distinguish several groups, the introduction of a new group being marked by the drawing of a new set of spindle-whorls, to which Schliemann usually gave first attention. Sometimes the origin of a group is specifically noted; in other cases the depth at which the objects were found may help us to assign them to a particular area. The situation with trench GH 2-4 is made much easier by two factors. The first is Schliemann's repeated complaint throughout the period that he was still excavating in the debris of the "historical period". He was quite capable of recognizing prehistoric material when it arose (e.g. Tagebuch 1872 p.425), so this complaint must be taken seriously. It is indeed made perfectly plausible by the stratigraphy revealed by Blegen's work. Most objects in the diary for this period are in fact prehistoric and must therefore be assigned to other areas. The second factor is Schliemann's agreement with Frank Calvert to share the finds that were made on his land (TA p.99). It was probably because of this agreement that Schliemann explicitly noted in his diary that certain finds had come from the "Temple Area" or had been found "auf Frank Calvert's Feld". The following catalogue includes only those objects which can quite certainly be assigned to GH 2-4.

Deposit (1). Judging from the dimensions of the trench shown in Atlas Taf.117, Schliemann must have dug far enough South to encounter the line of the north wall of the Temple of Athena. His diary and letters give no record of the deposits at this point, but the information can be made good from Dörpfeld's report, which tells us that the masonry had been robbed out to the very last stone and that only the sand-filled footing-trench remained undisturbed. In Fig.IV.4, deposit (1a) therefore represents the modern fill of the robber trench, and deposit (1b) the undisturbed sand foundations of the original wall.

(TI pp.217-220)

Deposit (2). I have here reconstructed a second robber trench, which I assume to have been responsible for the removal of the fortification-walls of Early and Late Troy VI which were identified in adjacent areas by Blegen. Stratum (2) in Fig.IV.4 represents the fill of this presumed robber trench. It is, however, possible either that the walls were already destroyed in this area when the enclosure wall of Troy IX (IXW) was built; or that at the one point where Schliemann saw IXW, at the west end of the upper terrace, it was so closely built on the walls of Troy VI that Schliemann failed to distinguish them. It now makes little practical difference which of these alternatives was actually the case, as no finds are attributable to the deposit.

(Troy III pp.107-9)

Deposit (3). From Blegen's work in this part of the site we know that the north slope of the mound here was covered by 6m of sloping deposits dating from Troy VI and VIII-IX. These constitute deposit (3). They are not directly described by Schliemann, but are reflected in his complaints that he was still only digging in the "historical period" even on 9th July.

(Troy III p.158; figs.83,502; Tagebuch 1872 pp.428,430,441)

OBJECTS FOUND

POTTERY

D46(?)	72-1099	Animal head in terracotta. Fig.V.32.
	72-1148	Fluted sherd.
	72-1262	"Beaker" with "mouse-head" at one end (<u>Tgb 1872</u> p.436) (9m). Fig.V.34. Intrusive from VIII-IX?
	-	Painted sherds with zigzag decoration (<u>Tgb 1872</u> p.428)
	-	Sherd with red design (<u>Tgb 1872</u> p.418)

METALWORK

- 72-942 Pin, type 2 (4m). Fig.V.39.
 72-1077 Pin, type 5. Fig.V.39.
 72-953 Piece of ribbed copper sheeting, 3cm x 5cm (4m).
 72-1100 Lead whorl (½m).

CHIPPED STONE

- 72-1263-5 Blades (9m).

BONE ARTEFACTS

- 72-941 Bone(?) awl (5m).
 72-1038 Fragment of bone(?) plaque decorated with two parallel lines and 14 circles or holes (3m). Fig.V.43.

WHORLS

- GIXD 72-939 (3m). Atlas 6-203, SS 5455.
 RIIC 72-940 (2m). cf. Atlas 5-139.
 RIIC 72-954 (5m). cf. Atlas 5-135.
 RIIC 72-1036 (3m).
 RIIA 72-1102 cf. Atlas 5-135.

WEIGHTS (?)

- 72-955, -1037 Spherical stone weights(?) or balls (3m,7m).
 72-1266 Lentoid clay weight with two holes and stamped design (2m). Atlas 18-530?

FIGURINES

- 72-996 Fragment of hellenistic terracotta figurine, perhaps a lion from the figure of an enthroned Kybele with lion on lap. Cf. Troy SM3 Nos.19-25 (3m).
 - Figurine of female figure with robe covering head and body, jewellery on chest and neck. Traces of red paint (Tgb 1872 p.415).

INSCRIPTIONS

- Fragments are recorded (Tgb 1872 p.428).

TERRACOTTA PLAQUE

- 72-995 Terracotta plaque representing swan's head(?) and various geometric ornaments (2½m). Fig.V.48.

ARCHITECTURAL FRAGMENT

- 72-1058-9 L-shaped corner-stone decorated with two circular designs, one of rosette style and the other of two central circles with an outer ring of bent rays. Each circular design is 34cm in diameter. (Tgb 1872 p.425) (½m). Atlas 155-3057; Fig.V.48.

HUMAN/ANIMAL REMAINS

- 72-1101 A tooth (7m).

Deposit (4). On the "left" side of the upper terrace (that is, apparently, on the west side where they were also visible to Dörpfeld and Blegen) very thick fortifications constructed of large, hewn stones came to light on 22nd June. Schliemann records that they were covered by scarcely 30cm of debris. This places their upper surface at c.35.80m A.T.

He did not, apparently, find any extension of the wall across the trench, but this may be because it had been robbed out by peasants after having first been exposed by Calvert in his trenches here in 1865. Schliemann, following Calvert, attributes the wall to the time of Lysimachus. We may probably identify it as an extension of IXW, our wall 12+, the enclosure wall of Troy IX, with which it seems to be aligned and with whose upper altitudes (36.47 and 36.20 in G3; 33.35 in J3) it is consistent. There is, however, no detailed information about the wall's dimensions to be gleaned from the diary.

(Tagebuch 1872 p.417; TI Taf.III; The Levant Herald 4th February 1873 p.90; The Athenaeum No.2454, 7th November 1874 p.610).

Deposits (5)-(9). These deposits, when taken together, provide a remarkable example of Schliemann's capacity for detailed stratigraphic observation and of its apparent confirmation by the later findings of Blegen. They are recorded in the entry for 22nd June, and must therefore be located in the region of the robbed-out wall IXW and therefore also of the robbed-out fortification-wall of Troy VI (Wall 13). Schliemann records that from the surface to a depth of 2½m there was a stratum of humus - deposit (5). Below this, at 2.50-2.80m, he found a thin stratum of marble chips 20-30cm thick - deposit (6). Below deposit (6), at c.2.80-3.50m deep, was a second stratum of humus and debris 70cm thick - deposit (7), followed at c.3.50-3.60m deep by a second stratum of limestone chips c.5-10cm thick - deposit (8). Below this there must have been a further deposit at c.3.60-4.00m, perhaps of humus again, but of this - deposit (9) - there is no direct information. At 4.00m deep, 30-40cm deeper than deposit (8), Schliemann found that he was among mudbrick debris - deposit (11).

At first sight this is a puzzling sequence, until we search Blegen's report for comparable examples. Similar alternations of strata of loose earth and stone chips were found at a number of points in the American excavations, and usually in the fill which accumulated against the foundations of buildings of Troy VI. The phenomenon is explained by suggesting that stonemasons trimmed the stone blocks of which the walls were built once they were placed in situ, repeating the operation from time to time as the walls grew higher. There seems, then, a strong likelihood that these strata derive from fill in a footing-trench

against one of the fortification-walls of Troy VI that we know to have lain in this area. The deposits will have remained undisturbed when the wall itself was robbed out, and offer a striking testimony to its original presence here.

(Tagebuch 1872 p.417; Troy II fig.318; III pp.149f,156,167f,245,247,249,326f,364 and figs.468,469,470,488,492,493,496,506,511).

Deposit (10). This deposit has been shown on Fig.IV.4 in order to make the reconstructed section theoretically complete. It is not directly attested. We know from the American excavations that the deposits of Troy V were preserved up to c.32.80m A.T. in this region. Deposit (10) therefore represents whatever deposits of Troy VI and later may have remained overlying the Troy V strata, undisturbed by foundations of Troy VI walls and the activities of later builders and robbers. Clearly, however, the whole area was badly disturbed, for Schliemann reports that on the upper terrace he found many stray marble blocks and bits of inscriptions which he took to derive from the temple.

(Tagebuch 1872 pp.426,427,430; Troy III p.107)

Deposit (11). At 4m below the surface, i.e. at c.32.40m A.T., Schliemann came upon a stratum of mudbrick debris 5-10cm thick. Being mudbrick debris, this deposit is unlikely to have formed a part of the fill in the footing-trench for Wall 13; and its altitude is too low to permit an attribution to Troy VI. I am therefore inclined to see in it one of those horizontal strata of Troy V which reached up to at least c.32.80m in G3, and which Sperling found below the walls of Troy VI and the sloping strata of VI-IX. The top of the deposit which included this stratum of mudbrick debris is consequently taken to have lain at c.32.80m here also. There is no information of any kind to allow the subdivision of the other underlying strata, and deposit (11) is therefore the designation given to all strata underlying (3), (9) and (10) as far as the bottom of the trench. Schliemann says that at 6.10m deep (=c.30.30m A.T.) he found a thin stratum of sherds of unpainted, wheelmade pottery. This may confirm that in deposit (11) we are among the later Early ^{or Middle} Bronze Age strata.

(Tagebuch 1872 pp.417,425; Troy III pp.107,158)

AREA iii:GH 2-4(b)

Figs.III.8; IV.5,6,7.

This area was excavated by Schliemann during the period 13th July-4th August 1872. The width of the trench, at the mound surface, was c.10m, and it extended southwards nearly as far as the line G4/5, roughly 4m South of the southern wall of the Temple. At its greatest depth the trench reached to c.20m A.T., but this depth was opened up only as far South as Wall BC. From Wall BC southwards excavation was continued to a depth of only c.26m A.T.

Deposits (1) and (2). Not noticed by Schliemann in 1872, but recorded by Dörpfeld, are the trenches where the north and south walls of the Temple of Athena were originally laid and from which the masonry had at some time been robbed out. The stone foundations originally descended to 31.61m A.T. The depression on the surface of the mound in GH 2-3 has been caused by the robbing out of all that remained of the temple.

(TI pp.217-223)

Deposits (3) and (4). These deposits, again not noticed by Schliemann, have been reconstructed here from the information given by Dörpfeld. They are the base of sand in the foundation trenches for the north and south walls of the Temple of Athena. According to Dörpfeld, the foundation-trenches were cut to a depth of 27.92m A.T.

(TI pp.217-223)

Deposit (5). In the diary, although not in Trojanische Alterthümer, Schliemann records that on the south side of the temple he found a wall, or the remains of a wall, consisting of two courses of large, hewn limestone blocks. This wall, which is here numbered Wall 28, seems to be the wall which appears marked '30' in Atlas Taf.214. It lies just to the North of the line G4/5, and may be a continuation of the building marked VID on TI Taf.III.

(Tagebuch 1872 p.461)

Deposit (6). In this deposit we must include all material excavated in the trench which cannot be identified as a distinct feature, such as a wall or a robber-trench. From Schliemann's own observation it is clear that the strata here sloped down to the North, as is to be expected from

the position of Dörpfeld's Troy II fortification wall (Wall 29) and the outlying strata of Troy VI-IX. This, combined with the lack of any evidence which might clarify the stages in which Schliemann tackled this area, has made it impossible to subdivide the deposits and to allocate individual objects to particular strata. The following catalogue has, however, listed the depth at which each object was found - for what the information is worth. Depths are measured down from a datum of c.36.50m A.T. Fig.IV.7 has gone beyond this information to sketch in, tentatively, the approximate lines which the deposits of individual periods may be expected to have followed.

OBJECTS FOUND

POTTERY

- | | | |
|--------|----------|--|
| A39 | *72-1704 | One-handed tankard with rounded base (6m). <u>Atlas</u> 48-1159? Fig.V.31. |
| B11 | *72-1756 | Small, squat jug or sauceboat with flat base and rim drawn out to form mouth; handle from rim to body (7m). <u>Atlas</u> 56-1294; Fig.V.31. |
| B201 | *72-1703 | Piriform jar with flat base and straight neck with two perforations at the rim (10m). <u>Atlas</u> 9-1888? Fig.V.31. |
| B219 | *72-1715 | Brown burnished lentoid flask with rounded base, tall narrow straight neck, and two large handles from shoulder to body (7m). <u>Atlas</u> 56-1310, <u>Ilios</u> No.1113, <u>SS</u> 430; Fig.V.31. |
| C27(?) | *72-1735 | Squat jar with flattened base, cylindrical body and narrower hole mouth. Two vertical lugs are set on opposing sides (10m). Fig.V.31. |
| C28 | *72-1755 | Globular jar with narrow, straight neck and two vertical lugs on opposing sides of the body (10m). Fig.V.31. |
| C35 | *72-1716 | Piriform jar with three short legs, short straight neck and two vertical lugs on opposing sides of the body (11m). <u>Atlas</u> 89-1848? (10m), <u>Ilios</u> No.280, <u>SS</u> 406; Fig.V.31. |
| C209 | *72-1727 | Squat, globular jar with flat base and hole mouth. Two vertically perforated handles rise from body. Upper half decorated with (incised?) diagonal lines in three registers (7m). Fig.V.31. |
| D1 | *72-1714 | Plain, cylindrical lid with flanged top and slightly flaring body (11m). Fig.V.31. |
| D13 | 72-1702 | Face-lid (11m). Fig.V.31. |
| D- | *72-1393 | Sub-rectangular miniature box (9m). <u>Atlas</u> 79-1678; Fig.V.31. |

POLISHED STONE

- *72-1717 Millstone(?). Fig.V.42.

CHIPPED STONE

- *72-1762 Blade (5m).
 *72-1706 " (10m).

BONE ARTEFACT (?)

- 72-1392 Awl? (9m).

WHORLS

RIB	*72-1509	(3m)	
RIIIA	72-1451	(4m)	
RIIA	*72-1760	(5m)	
RIIC	*72-1710	(6m)	
RIC	*72-1718	(6m)	
GIXD	*72-1743	(6m)	
RIIIC	*72-1747	(6m)	<u>Atlas</u> 4-123.
GIA	*72-1758	(6m)	cf. <u>Atlas</u> 10-325, <u>SS</u> 5080.
GIC	*72-1473	(7m)	
RIA	*72-1474	(7m)	cf. <u>Atlas</u> 8-246.
GVIIIC	*72-1708	(7m)	cf. <u>Atlas</u> 11-350.
RIIIA	*72-1709	(7m)	cf. <u>Atlas</u> 3-72.
RVIIBd	*72-1711	(7m)	<u>Atlas</u> 3-83.
RIIA	*72-1712	(7m)	
RVIB	*72-1713	(7m)	cf. <u>Atlas</u> 6-171.
RIIIA	*72-1722	(7m)	
GIII/X	*72-1725	(7m)	<u>Atlas</u> 2-56, <u>SS</u> 5506.
RVIIDc	*72-1726	(7m)	
GIA	*72-1728	(7m)	
RVIB	*72-1729	(7m)	cf. <u>Atlas</u> 10-315.
GID	*72-1742	(7m)	
RIA	*72-1748	(7m)	
GIA	72-1452	(8m)	
RIVA	72-1454	(8m)	cf. <u>Atlas</u> 3-86.
RIIIB	*72-1475	(8m)	cf. <u>Atlas</u> 1-18.
GVII	*72-1721	(8m)	<u>Atlas</u> 8-241.
RIB	*72-1724	(8m)	
RVIIDc	*72-1733	(8m)	
GX	*72-1734	(8m)	
RIIA	*72-1759	(8m)	cf. <u>Atlas</u> 5-135.
RIIA	72-1450	(9m)	
RVIIC	*72-1478	(9m)	cf. <u>Atlas</u> 6-173.
RIIA	*72-1480	(9m)	cf. <u>Atlas</u> 5-135.
RIIA	*72-1510	(9m)	cf. <u>Atlas</u> 5-135.
GIC	*72-1723	(10m)	cf. <u>Atlas</u> 10-322.
GIC	*72-1731	(10m)	cf. <u>Atlas</u> 10-328.
GIC	*72-1732	(10m)	
GIC	*72-1737	(10m)	
RIVA	*72-1738	(10m)	cf. <u>Atlas</u> 3-86.
RVIIDc	*72-1741	(10m)	
RVA	*72-1745	(10m)	
RIA	*72-1746	(10m)	cf. <u>Atlas</u> 8-240.
GIA	*72-1749	(10m)	
GIA	*72-1753	(10m)	cf. <u>Atlas</u> 10-325, <u>SS</u> 5080.
GIC	*72-1761	(10m)	
RVIIDc	*72-1705	(11m)	cf. <u>Atlas</u> 4-115.
GIC	*72-1707	(11m)	
GIC	*72-1730	(11m)	
RIVA	*72-1740	(11m)	cf. <u>Atlas</u> 3-86.
GIA	*72-1752	(11m)	
GID	*72-1798	(11m)	
RIB	*72-1750b	(12m)	
GVIIIC	*72-1751	(12m)	<u>Atlas</u> 1-15.
RIVA	*72-1799	(12m)	cf. <u>Atlas</u> 3-88.
RIIIA	*72-1792	(14m)	<u>Atlas</u> 3-70, <u>TR</u> No.328, <u>Ilios</u> No.1828.
RIIA	72-1793	(16m)	
RID	72-1794	(16m)	<u>Atlas</u> 3-90, <u>SS</u> 4506.

RIIA 72-1795 (16m)
 GIC 72-1796 (16m) Atlas 4-131, SS 5144.
 RVIIBd 72-1797 (16m)

WEIGHTS

*72-1481 (3m) Lentoid clay weight with two holes. Fig.V.47.
 72-1453 (4m) " " " " " " Fig.V.47.
 *72-1482 (4m) " " " " " " Fig.V.47.

TERRACOTTA DISC (?)

*72-1739 (11m) (Identification uncertain)

FIGURINES

3G *72-1736 Figure-of-eight shaped figurine of marble (7m). Atlas 99-2140; Fig.V.45.
 3G *72-1757 Figure-of-eight shaped figurine of marble, decorated at upper end with three small circles each containing a dot (10m). Atlas 21-587, TR No.26, Ilios No.220, SS 7363; Fig.V.45

INSCRIPTION

72-1601 Block measuring 1.57 x .80 x .80m, with two indentations on the top where the feet of a statue had been placed. (Tgb 1872 p.461; TA p.162f; Ilios p.637) (2m).

Deposit (7). A feature which may have been struck by Schliemann in this period, but which is not clearly recorded, is the fortification wall in GH 3-4 which Dörpfeld attributes to Troy II. Its top, as preserved, lay at c.30.91m A.T., according to TI Taf.III. There may be an obscure reference to the battered north face of this wall, here numbered Wall 29, in Schliemann's observation that a large quantity of stones lay beside the wall to be described under Deposit (8). Wall 29 came clearly to light only when Schliemann revisited the site in mid-September 1872.

(Tagebuch 1872 p.504; TA pp.157,181-3; Ilios p.24)

Deposit (8). Wall 30 was discovered at c.26m A.T., where it blocked the trench from West to East. It was found to be 2m wide, descending to c.23m A.T. It was built of both small and large hewn stones, joined with mortar. It can be positively identified as Dörpfeld's Wall BC, as has been stated in Chapter III.

(Tagebuch 1872 pp.469f,481; TA pp.157f; Atlas Taf.214 "outer wall of Troy"; Ilios p.24 No.2: Wall B; TI pp.6,59,fig.13)

AREA iv: FGH 3-4(a)

Figs.III.10; IV.8,9.

This area was excavated during the period 3rd-23rd February 1873, and is variously referred to by Schliemann as the "Temple" area and as "George's trench" - this latter because it was under the supervision of George Photidas. Schliemann's plan, on resuming work here at the beginning of the 1873 season, was to extend the terraces which he had already begun in the previous year. On this western side of the "Temple" area, they still lay as they had been left on 13th July 1872 (see Fig.IV.4), with the exception that the deep, central cut had later been extended (Figs.IV.5,6). The uppermost terrace, which was also the most southerly, was now extended southwards by c.9-10m and westwards to a total width of c.20m. The floor of this upper terrace lay at c.30.59m A.T. The second terrace was likewise extended c.9-10m to the South, but retained its initial width of c.13m. Its floor now lay at c.26.66m A.T.: it must have been dug with a slope upwards, for the original terrace in 1872 had lain at c.24.67m A.T., almost two metres deeper. What work was done in the deepest cut that ran through the centre of the 1872 terraces is not clear. Certainly there was some, for it is explicitly mentioned. Possibly the north face of Wall 30 had only been exposed over a very small area in 1872, and Schliemann now widened the trench to 5m. Depths were measured down from a datum of c.36.50m A.T.

For building up a view of the stratification here, I have extrapolated from the divisions shown in Fig.IV.7, making allowance for the fact that the Troy II fortification-wall, Wall 29, should here lie relatively further to the North (Troja und Ilion Taf.III). I have also taken into account Blegen's division of the strata in the neighbouring area of F 4-5 (Troy I fig.465). The results coincide well with the information given by Schliemann.

Deposit (1a). The dimensions of the trench imply that a large proportion of the upper terrace was taken up by the robber-trenches from the west and north walls of the Athena Temple. The trench from the Temple's south wall, too, must have been encountered. Schliemann did not recognize that this was what he was dealing with; but he does record repeatedly that on the upper terrace he was digging mainly through black earth mixed with chips of marble. These marble chips are perhaps to be equated with the

stone chippings mentioned by Dörpfeld as having been used to fill up the foundation-trenches after the Temple foundations had been laid. Much of this fill will have remained in the trench after the masonry was robbed out. On one occasion, the 7th February, Schliemann even noted a number of large, hewn sandstone blocks which he found lying one on top of another; and he speculated that they might be part of the Temple foundations. It seems quite possible that a few blocks might have been missed by those who robbed away the rest of the Temple. Certainly these blocks, if they were of sandstone, cannot have belonged to any part of the Temple superstructure which seems all to have been in marble.

(Tagebuch 1872 pp.6,9,26; TA pp.186-7;
TI pp.218-220, fig.85)

Deposit (1b). I have included this deposit with some hesitation. Dörpfeld described a packing of sand in the bottom three metres of the foundation-trenches of the Temple of Athena, and this is what would constitute Deposit (1b) - if it was actually present in this area. But there must be some doubt on the point. If the Temple foundations were uniform on all sides, the stratum of sand should have lain at c.31.61-c.27.92m A.T. But Dörpfeld's plan shows that in this area the underlying structures of Troy II were apparently undisturbed at c.30.59-30.91m A.T., which means that the Temple foundations cannot here have been dug to the same depth as elsewhere. It is possible, however, that a thinner layer of sand, a metre or less in thickness, may have overlain the Troy II remains; and it is also possible that there were pockets where it reached a greater depth - for instance, towards the southwest corner of the Temple. The deposit has been included on that account.

(TI p.218f, Taf.III)

Deposit (2). Schliemann says that mixed up with the black earth and marble chips he found many fragments of sculpted marble. Some of these he took to come from a Temple ceiling. In general he attributed them to the Doric order. He notes that practically no domestic objects were found. We may assume that these fragments derive from a disturbed, topmost deposit in the trench which, on the evidence of Deposit (3) in FGH 3-4(b), descended to approximately 33.91m A.T.

(Tagebuch 1873 pp.6,9,26; TA pp.186-7)

Deposit (3). We may assume, by extrapolation from Fig.IV.7, that at the

north end of the area, in the deep cut, Schliemann would probably have encountered some deposits of Troy V sloping down to the North. These have been shown in Fig.IV.9 as deposit (3). There are no objects clearly attributable to them, but any which may derive from them have been included in the objects listed under deposits (5) and (6).

Deposit (4). The existence of this deposit, too, is inferred by extrapolation from Fig.IV.7, where it is dated to Troy IV. Schliemann would probably have encountered such a deposit in the deep, central cutting. It is conceivable that he may also have met it on the upper terrace, where it would have had a thickness of up to 2 metres; but the uppermost stratum within and around the Temple is likely to have been very disturbed, for Schliemann repeatedly records finding stones and sculptured marble blocks. Those finds which may be attributable to the deposit are also possibly attributable to deposits (5) and (6), under which they are listed.

(Tagebuch 1873 pp.6,9,26; TA p.186)

Deposits (5) and (6). On all three terraces, and below deposits (1a) and (1b), Schliemann found a deposit of yellow and red ash which included some stones and burnt debris. Apart from Walls 29 and 30, to be mentioned in a moment, no other deposits are recorded from the lower two terraces. These ash deposits must be identical with the ashy strata described by Schliemann as overlying the "retaining-wall" (the Troy II fortification-wall, =Wall 29) and sloping down to North and East at an angle of 50-60°. This is in general agreement with the picture to be derived from Figs.IV.7,9, and, if we extrapolate from Fig.IV.7 and from Blegen's work in F 4-5, the deposits should date from Troy II and III in Blegen's terms. The few finds which can be assigned to them are entirely consistent with that dating, although those finds may equally belong to deposit (4) or even (in the case of 73-88 and 73-90) to deposit (3). Ashy deposits are a characteristic of the destruction layer of Troy II throughout the site. Schliemann notes that the sloping strata were no longer present to the West of the border of Frank Calvert's field - i.e. roughly to the West of the line F/G. This is explained by the fact that the strata sloped down because they lay over the outer face of the Troy II citadel wall. West of the line F/G Schliemann was excavating within the perimeter of that wall, in an area where the strata had built up horizontally over the Troy II citadel remains.

(Tagebuch 1873 pp.6,9,12,20; TA pp.187,188)

OBJECTS FOUND

(Some of the following objects may derive from Deposits (3) and (4).)

POTTERY

- C30 73-37 Jar with out-turned rim, flat base and two tall, wing-like projections. Decorated with eyebrows, eyes, nose and ears in relief on the neck, and with two knobs on the body (15m). Atlas 119-2332, Ilios No.158, SS 1072, TI Beilage 33 No.V; Fig.V.27.
- C35 73-40 Red polished jar with out-turned rim and three feet; two (?) small perforated lugs on the body (15m). Atlas 119-2333, SS 1918; Fig.V.27.
- D209 73-38 Cylindrical pyxis with broadened base, two swellings and narrowed neck (15m). Atlas 119-2331, TR No.65, Ilios No.61; Fig.V.25.

METALWORK

- 73-43 Copper object of elongated ovoid shape; described by Schliemann as a "slingstone" (15m). Atlas 121-2382, Ilios No.609, SS 6901; Fig.V.37.

WHORLS

- GIA (*)73-82 Depth 4m, therefore from deposit (5). Atlas 122-2412.
- RVIIBd 73-88 (12m). Atlas 122-2422.

FIGURINES

- 3B 73-90 Greenstone figurine; (11m). Atlas 122-2416; Fig.V.44.

Deposit (7). By 20th February Schliemann was complaining of finding only a large number of stones where he had previously been finding burnt debris. The same complaint is repeated on 24th, this time with specific reference to the second terrace. Judging from Troja und Ilion Taf.III, he should have come across parts of the Troy II fortification-wall (Wall 29) on the upper terrace and also on the second terrace, probably towards the end of this period of excavation. The body of stones may have been a part of, or derived from, that wall. They are here designated as deposit (7).

(Tagebuch 1873 pp.20,26)

AREA v: FGH 3-4(b)Figs.III.11; IV.10,
11,12.

Excavation in this area continued in 1873 from 24th February until it was abandoned on 1st March. The upper terrace, which lay at c.30.59m A.T., was extended a further 6 or 7m to the South. The second terrace, at c.26.66m A.T., was continued until Wall 29 was fully exposed. An additional area, also at c.26.66m A.T. and on that account also referred to as the second terrace, was dug for some small distance at the south end of the central cut. Here Wall 29 had inadvertently been demolished during the work towards the end of the 1872 season. In the deeper part of the central cut, too, there was some further work at c.21.74m A.T., in which Wall 30 was broken away and the foot of Wall 29 was exposed. Depths were measured down from a datum at c.36.50m A.T.

Schliemann says, in the notebook, that a "mass of whorls" was found in this area, but not much besides (Tagebuch 1873 pp.43,45,46). A few items are specifically assigned to this trench, but the material from the neighbouring deposits at the east end of the north platform seems to have been more plentiful (Tagebuch 1873 p.45). In Trojanische Alterthümer ch.xvi a number of objects are said to have come from the "Temple" area (pp.195-9). Normally one would take this to mean FGH 2-4; but in this case some items are known from the diary to have been found in the neighbouring trench (73-181,73-182,73-187). The list in Trojanische Alterthümer seems, in fact, to cover both areas; but most of its objects probably come from the more westerly trench.

Deposit (1). On 26th February Schliemann records that from (at least) 2m above the upper terrace he was digging in black earth mixed with marble chips. This deposit must clearly be equated with Deposit (1a) of FGH 3-4(a), which we have taken to be the remaining fill of the foundation-trench of the Temple of Athena. Fig.IV.10 shows that Schliemann would at this stage very probably have encountered the remains of this foundation-trench. The deposit is not mentioned again, and there are no finds which may be assigned to it.

(Tagebuch 1873 p.43)

Deposit (2). At two places "above" Wall 29 Schliemann found deposits of

sand. These he investigated and found to go at least 2m deep. This must mean 2m below the floor of the upper terrace. The deposit must be equated with the packing of sand found by Dörpfeld in the foundation trench of the Athena Temple. It is impossible to say where the sand was found exactly; perhaps the most likely places are the points at the south end of the second terrace to East and West of the top of Wall 29.

(Tagebuch 1873 p.57; TA p.195; TI p.218f)

Deposit (3). At 3m above Wall 29, i.e. at c.33.91m A.T., lay the bottom of a stratum containing a mass of stones. Particularly noted are pieces of marble and pieces of marble columns. Schliemann describes this layer as the debris of the Greek temple, so presumably it reached to the surface. There are no objects clearly attributable to it.

(Tagebuch 1873 p.58)

Deposits (4) and (5). These two deposits, like deposits (5) and (6) in FGH 3-4(a), cannot clearly be separated. At one point in the diary Schliemann notes that a stratum of stones overlay Wall 29 to a height of 1½m; elsewhere the figure is 2m. Red ash and red earth are frequently mentioned in this connection as well, and they too were found, with many stones, on the second terrace. Here they clearly belonged to strata which had been tipped down the outside of Wall 29. It is these tipped strata which must have contained the 'many red pots' noted at 7-10m deep. It is not clear whether the red ash and the stones belonged to one mixed deposit, or whether the red ash was stratified over the stones and should be counted separately as deposit (4). If they were mixed and both formed deposit (5) - as is perhaps more likely - then we have no information about the character of the overlying deposit (4). It is, however, possible to distribute some of the finds between the two strata by examining the depths at which they were found.

(Tagebuch 1873 pp.40,41,43,45,57,58;
TA p.195)

OBJECT FOUND IN DEPOSIT (4)

WHORL

GVB *73-162 Atlas 126-2541, SS 5233.

OBJECTS FOUND IN DEPOSIT (5)

POLISHED STONE

73-179 Diorite celt. Atlas 126-2557; Fig.V.41.

WHORLS

RIIA *73-163 Atlas 126-2542.
 GIVB *73-166 Atlas 126-2544; Fig.V.50.

OBJECTS FOUND IN DEPOSITS (4) OR (5)

POTTERY

C10 73-191 Tall ovoid jar with rounded base, slender neck slightly flaring towards the rim, and two vertical loop-handles on mid body (7m). Atlas 124-2473, (similar to Ilios No.1119); Fig.V.27.
 D14 73-178 Lid, probably flat or slightly conical on top, with incised radial decoration of straight lines, wavy lines and rows of circles. The shape of the lower part of the lid is unknown. Atlas 126-2555, TR No.164; Fig.V.27.
 - Many red pots at 7-10m (Tgb 1873 p.57).

POLISHED STONE

73-189 Diorite celt. Atlas 123-2470; Fig.V.42.
 - Granite quern. Tgb 1873 p.46.

WHORLS

GVIIIA *73-165 Atlas 126-2543.
 RVIIC *73-176 Atlas 126-2554, TR No.455, SS 5031.

FIGURINE

3E 73-180 Large marble figurine. Atlas 126-2560, TR No.163, Ilios No.197, SS 7522; Fig.V.44.

Deposit (6). Wall 29, which constitutes deposit (6), was encountered in two parts of the trench. On the second terrace it was exposed behind deposits (4) and (5) which also overlay it on the upper terrace. Here it reached to "8m below the surface" - a calculation which must have been taken from the summit of the mound, for we know from Dörpfeld that the wall was preserved to c.30.9lm A.T. Schliemann also records that at one point he had unintentionally broken through the wall over a width of 4m. Atlas Taf.214 shows that this must have been in the other area referred to as the "second terrace", at the south end of the central cut of 1872. It must have been in 1872 that the structure was removed, although a reference to "many stones", apparently in this area, on 28th February could indicate that a remnant was left for 1873. The absence of the wall from this part of the central cut may explain why Schliemann was unable to trace how high the wall went when investigating it from the "lower excavation". It was, presumably, examination of the wall in section here which showed it to be ½-1m thick. The foot of the wall was, however, exposed in the "lower excavation" itself. According to Blegen, bedrock here lay at 23.75m A.T.

(Tagebuch 1873 pp.41,45,46,57; TA p.194-5; Atlas Taf.214; TI Taf.III; Troy I p.253)

Deposit (7). In the diary there are several rather puzzling references to a deposit of green ash, containing some mussel-shells but no stones. It is first noted on 27th February, when Schliemann says that on the second terrace there was red ash with many stones and then ("darauf") green ash with no stones. It is noted again on 28th February, once more as a deposit found on the second terrace, and this time is said to resemble virgin soil. On 1st March there is a note that in two places "above" Wall 29 - i.e. probably on the floor of the upper terrace - Schliemann found sand into which he dug holes without finding soil, but that "otherwise" the mound consisted of green ash mixed with mussel-shells. By the "mound" Schliemann here means the deposits enclosed by Wall 29. The green ash should therefore have lain behind the wall, to its South. This appears to be confirmed by a passage in Trojanische Alterthümer which says that green-coloured virgin soil was found after Wall 29 had been broken through over a width of 4m. The green deposit has, in view of this, to be placed at the south end of the "second terrace" in the central cut - behind where Wall 29 would have been had it not been broken away in 1872. It was cut away to a (horizontal?) depth of 1½m. Presumably it was located a few metres to the East of Blegen's Wall IW and South of Tower T.

(Tagebuch 1873 pp.45,46,57; TA p.195)

Deposit (8). Schliemann gives no information about the material in the "lower excavation" which had to be cleared away in order to expose Wall 29. There was presumably a deposit lying between Wall 30, which had previously been exposed, and Wall 29, which had not yet been reached.

Deposit (9). This deposit, Wall 30, has been described already and need not be discussed again, except to note that a part of it was torn away to give access to Wall 29. The break can be seen in Dörpfeld's plan, TI Taf.III.

(Tagebuch 1873 p.41)

THE NORTH PLATFORM

The North Platform was excavated in April and May of 1872, and again in February, April and May of 1873. The area in question lay on the northern edge of the mound between the North-South trench begun in 1871 (Fig.III.2) and Calvert's trenches in GH 3-4. The mound surface here rose gently from c.37m A.T. to c.39.50m A.T. from East to West across the summit, but dropped steeply down to the North. The work of 1872 consisted largely in cutting a more or less horizontal platform into the north face of the mound; that of 1873 in excavating below the flatter mound surface that lay a little further South.

The progress of the North Platform can be seen in Figures III.3-5,10-11, 16-18. Atlas Taf.214 gives an indication of its state at the end of 1873. A view of the operation as it was in 1872 is given in Atlas Taf. 106; Taf.180,185 and 186 show the work done in 1873. The area covered is a roughly rectangular one 70m long and 30-40m wide. As elsewhere, Schliemann worked by means of a system of terraces which can be difficult to follow. On the northern edge he cut a horizontal platform at c.23.67m A.T. At the eastern end this probably sloped up to c.25m A.T., but was cut down to c.23.67 again in parts of the west end. In squares F 3-4 the trench was extended southeastwards in a tongue which met the upper platform of the Northeast Trench. This tongue was 10-13m wide, and in F4 was cut down to c.30.59m A.T. In F3, however, the lower depth of the North Platform as a whole was maintained, and the trench was excavated down to c.24.80m A.T. At the western end, in squares DE3, a 20m-wide terrace at c.30m A.T. was begun in 1872 (Fig.III.5) to adjoin the North-South trench of 1871. The continuance of this work southwards is described in the section of this work devoted to the North-South trench. Towards the end of the 1873 season the remaining central block, in squares DEF3, was cut away mostly to form an extension of the terrace at 30m A.T., but with some further work to extend the cutting at c.23.67m A.T. To avoid the possibility of sections collapsing, Schliemann dug the upper parts of his trench walls at an angle of 50°.

On this side of the mound there is no evidence of the gradual stepping down of strata that may be seen on the south side. The deposits of Troy III-VII, if not of VIII-IX as well, appear to continue out horizontally almost to the very edge of the mound. Here they are overlaid only by a thin layer of material washed down from Troy VIII-IX on the top of the mound. No fortification walls of Troy III-V survive on this north side.

Whatever there was has clearly been eroded or robbed away. But the proximity of the steep, north slope of the natural promontory here certainly makes it very unlikely that any substantial wall could have been built further out than the great fortification work of Troy II - Walls 14 and 15. Indeed, the Troy VI citadel wall was built a little further in at a higher level. The likelihood is, therefore, that any fortifications of III-V were built on the foundation of the earlier citadel wall of Troy II. All this superstructure has disappeared, leaving only the remnants of the Troy II wall below which the old, Troy I strata had straggled over the crest of the mound and down the north slope.

For the remains of Troy VIII-IX we have little detailed information in this area. At about 20m in from the north edge of the trench, that is in CDEF3, Schliemann found walls all along the south side of the trench, and especially at the east end (Area i, Deposit 2). These were built of shelly limestone, hewn, and bonded with mortar. They reached at all points to a depth of 2m below the surface - to c.37.67m A.T. at the west end, and to c.35.67m A.T. at the east end. Presumably they were preserved almost to the mound surface. These seem likely to have been structures from the Hellenistic or Roman period. Some may be related to Dörpfeld's Wall IXW, and a part of the reconstruction in Fig.IV.13 has assumed this. As to the others, we can only guess. It is a plausible speculation that Schliemann came across parts of a northern circuit wall linking up with Wall RM and Wall 78 in squares AB4, and determining the contours of CDE 2-3. A little further South a lentoid clay weight with stamped design is attested at a depth of 2m and suggests again a depth of 2m (or more) for these late deposits (Area ii, Deposit 2). Various pieces of marble sculpture came to light as well, but their depth is not recorded. No doubt they will have come from a layer close to the surface (Area iv, Deposit 1). At the edge of the mound a thin layer of material from VIII-IX had washed down the north face where it lay directly over a fortification structure of Troy II and other EB and MB deposits previously eroded or in part removed. This applied in the western and central sections of the North Platform. At the east end the accumulation of wash from VIII-IX was much thicker: 2-3 metres (Area 1, Deposit 1). This was because at this point the underlying Troy II circuit wall, and subsequent Early and Middle Bronze Age fortifications of Troy III-V, had all taken a southward turn in squares E 2-3 while the natural contours of the promontory did

not make the corresponding southward turn until squares FG 2-3. There was thus a more level area in squares EF 2-3 where the later wash of VIII-IX could accumulate to the North of the Troy II citadel wall.

There is some sparse evidence to suggest the presence of deposits of Troy VII. A jug, possibly of VIIa date, was found at a depth of 3m in CD 3-4 (Area vii, Deposit 2). And along the north edge of the trench, probably in the western and central sectors, there was a 2m-deep deposit overlying a wall which can almost certainly be dated to Troy VI. This deposit (Area i, Deposit 3) contained a large pithos - characteristic of Troy VIIa strata - and some small pots "of crude workmanship". These might well derive from VIIb2, or indeed from the handmade burnished ware of VIIb1. It is possible that here as elsewhere some of the structures of VI were re-used as foundations in VII, and this could apply to the citadel wall in this area.

Of Troy VI rather more was preserved. At 5-6m below the summit, but just below the surface on the north slope in CDE 3, Schliemann found 'defensive walls' built of large, well-hewn limestone blocks without any clay or cement. These appear to be aligned with the fragments of Troy VI circuit wall known from Blegen in squares FG 3 and A 4-5; also with those which seem to have left traces of a footing-trench in Schliemann's Northeast Trench, already discussed. The altitudes, c.33.67-34.67m A.T., are consistent with those recorded for the segment in FG 3 (Troy III pp.108f,158; figs. 84-6,447,501). The wall, in Area i Deposit 4, underlies what may be a deposit of Troy VII material, and certainly overlies deposits from the Early and Middle Bronze Age. It is likely to be the remains of a citadel wall of Troy VI.

Parallel to this citadel wall but further into the mound, and at the west end of the North Platform in square D4, Schliemann found another large wall - Wall 20 (Area vii, Deposit 5). Its top lay at c.36.67m A.T. and it was preserved to a height of 3 metres. It was 17½m long; and its position and orientation can be fixed fairly precisely by reference to the state of the excavations at the time of its discovery. It was built of well-dressed blocks of shelly limestone joined with clay, and it was 1.90m thick. The dimensions, the orientation, the style of construction and the stratification make it virtually certain that this derives from a building of Troy VI. The plan of the building cannot be reconstructed

with any certainty as the remaining walls are unrecorded. There is little other evidence from the North Platform for the presence of Troy VI material, except that in the eastern tongue of the North Platform a jar of possible Troy VI date was found at a depth of 2m apparently among otherwise M.B. deposits (Area v, Deposit 1a). As elsewhere on the site, there is a suggestion that the builders of Troy VI dug down into the underlying deposits of Troy V and maybe even into Troy IV.

Deposits of the Early and Middle Bronze Age are harder to differentiate. The major building works of Troy II are quite easy to identify and will be discussed shortly. But some of the overlying deposits of II-V are not easily distinguished one from another because of the homogeneity of the material. The task is simplified, however, if we recognize that all these deposits had here accumulated horizontally. For this we have the explicit evidence of Schliemann (Tagebuch 1873 p.12; TA p.189) as well as the observation by Sperling in the neighbouring area of FG 3 (Troy III p.158). The reason is that all these strata lay within the circuit of the old Troy II fortification-wall, and had built up steadily over the roughly level platform laid out for Troy II.

In fact a number of strata do eventually emerge from Schliemann's accounts of the North Platform. A clear break was noted at 30.00 to 30.50m A.T., marking the lower limit of Troy II, above which there were deposits of ash (Area iv, Deposit 2; Area vii, Deposit 7; Area viii, Deposit 3). A second break emerges at c.31.67-32m A.T. In Area ii, Deposit 7 this is detected on the basis of the objects, rather tentatively; certainly in the 'island' in F3 Blegen found that Troy II was preserved to at least 31.75m A.T., and probably higher. The hint of a change in strata at 7m deep in Area i (Tagebuch 1872 p.301) may reflect either a transition between subphases within Troy III or more probably the use of a different datum, but at 32.67m A.T. is unlikely to represent a change from III to IV. That break is clearly attested at c.33.50-33.67m A.T. In squares F 3-4 this marked the top of a thick deposit of yellow and grey ash (Area iv, Deposit 2). A similar horizon was seen in DE 3 (Area vii, Deposit 6). For the uppermost limit of Troy IV the figure of 34.50m A.T. at first suggests itself, this being the height to which a number of walls were preserved in Area viii (Deposit 4). But Blegen's investigations in the 'islands' in F 4-5 and E6 showed that Troy IV was normally preserved to at least 35.50m A.T., there being

in places up to half a metre of destruction-deposit over the wall-stubs of Troy IV (Troy II figs.261,285). This higher figure is indeed reflected in Area ix Deposit 2, where the house-walls reach up to c.35.50m A.T. In Areas ii, vi and possibly viii the M.B. deposits were preserved up to c.36.67m A.T. where they were cut into by foundations of Troy VI. These highest strata may derive from Troy V.

In squares DEF 3-4 in 1873 Schliemann exposed part of a complex of house-walls: Walls 60-68 and 84-88 (Area viii, Deposit 4; Area ix, Deposit 2). These he describes as "Trojan houses and later walls built upon them"; they appear to have gone down to c.30.50/30.90m A.T. and to have been preserved up to c.34.50-35.50m A.T. Wall 67 alone is an exception, belonging it seems to the east wall of Megaron IIA. The plan of these walls is given in Atlas Taf.214 and 215 and in Figs.IV.24,26 of the present work. It yields a fairly coherent layout if Walls 65 and 66 are disregarded.

To what date should these walls be assigned? Given the architectural evidence of Blegen's excavations in F 4-5 and E6, it is most unlikely that the walls were built and rebuilt in perfect alignment through four or five metres of deposit from Troy II to Troy IV, despite the height to which they appear to stand in the views given in Atlas Taf.185,186. The walls may to some degree have been 'created' by Schliemann in excavation. They do not accord with the other walls of Troy II shown by Dörpfeld in TI Taf.III, nor with the walls of Late Troy II (otherwise known as III) depicted by Burnouf in Ilios plan I. Blegen did, however, find some consistency of alignment between the walls of III and IV, so it is possible that Schliemann's walls may derive from both Troy III and Troy IV. A Troy V date is precluded by the altitudes to which they were preserved. The descent into deposits of Troy II may possibly have been caused by eagerness on Schliemann's part to trace the walls down to the 'Trojan' level at 30m A.T.; or alternatively by the presence of foundations sunk by the builders of Troy III.

The sequence of deposits in Troy I and II is greatly illuminated by Blegen's excavations in squares CD 2-3 and F3. These picked up almost exactly where Schliemann left off, and show that in D 3-4 he penetrated no deeper than Blegen's If (Troy I fig.422), and that in F3 he barely touched Blegen's IIA (ibid. p.251; fig.434). Schliemann's work, it is

true, extended some way North of Blegen's and sometimes reached a slightly lower altitude; but these factors are largely offset by the certainty that around this north side of the mound contemporary buildings were terraced down the slope during Troy I and Early Troy II (note the variation in floor-levels in e.g. Troy I pp.171,258).

The earliest feature found by Schliemann in this area was, indeed, most probably the retaining-wall to a terrace. This was Wall 70 (Area viii, Deposit 6) which appears to have been a continuation into square E3 of Blegen's Wall m. Like Blegen's wall it was essentially a southward-stragglng packing of stones with a well-laid north-facing front. Blegen places it in Late Troy I. Among the deposits of Late Troy I which must be stratigraphically later than Wall 70, Area ii, Deposit 11 (Fig.IV.17) is of particular interest in containing what seems to be a sherd of Early Cycladic II black-on-buff ware: 72-235 (Fig.V.16).

Along the northern edge of the platform, in several places, Schliemann found what was clearly a continuation of the Late Troy I fortification noted by Dörpfeld in C 2-3 and by Blegen in D2 and F3: a sloping embankment of limestone blocks joined with (and, Blegen found, resting on) clay. This is Wall 14, (Area i, Deposit 7). It was not a wall in the normal sense of the word, though; rather, a casing of clay and stones laid over the face of the hill - a glacis. Presumably it led up to the base of a vertical wall. The date of this glacis is not certain because so little material was stratified over it. Blegen estimated that in C3 it probably overlay deposits of Late Troy I, and the evidence in F3 seemed consistent with this (Troy I pp.195,196). On the other hand in style of construction it is closely related to all the Troy I fortifications on the south side of the site, none of whose associated deposits contain any traces of the tell-tale lustre ware which is such a clear marker of the beginning of Troy II. Wall 14, then, should probably be dated to a late phase of Troy I (as by Blegen) rather than to an early phase of Troy II. There is nothing in Schliemann's accounts to suggest that it overlay any earlier structures of the same kind.

Immediately to the South of Wall 14, and apparently following the same course, Schliemann found a second stone wall, Wall 15, that rose perhaps four metres higher (Area i, Deposit 8). This again was certainly a

fortification-work; and in both its location and its relation to the underlying glacis it corresponds extremely well with the Troy II fortification-wall recorded by Dörpfeld (TI Taf.III) and Blegen (Troy I figs.209,211,212). Whether this wall was erected in Troy II or was built at the same time as Wall 14 seems an open question.

In square F3 Schliemann's findings from Late Troy I and Early Troy II coincide remarkably well with Blegen's. Some house walls of small stones and mud found at c.25.67m A.T. were probably the northern continuation, one step down, of Blegen's building of Ij (Area i, Deposit 10; cf. Troy I p.171). A green-stained drain found at c.26.67m A.T. (Area i, Deposit 10; Area iii, Deposit 7) recalls both the stone channel found by Blegen on the north side of his IIa building (Troy I p.251) and the green-stained passage adjoining the south side of his IIb building (Troy I p.258); the altitude of Schliemann's find, if correct, would better suit the IIb structure; but the nearby house built of large hewn and unhewn stones (Area iii, Deposit 7) agrees better with that of IIa. A disordered mass of small stones found over a twenty-metre width at c.26.67m A.T. is probably a continuation of the pavement underlying Blegen's walls of IIb (Area i, Deposit 11; cf. Troy I p.258; figs.279-281).

Pavements, particularly of white stones, seem to have been a feature of this side of the site during Early Troy II: others were found at the west end of the platform at c.25.17m, at c.26.67m and at an unstated depth in E3 (Area i, Deposit 10; Area ii, Deposit 10; Area ix, Deposit 5). It is conceivable that these were all contemporary and that the differences in altitude reflect the terracing of the north slope. A briefly-mentioned wall, Wall 16, which lay just South of Wall 15, may possibly have been a retaining-wall associated with the pavement at 25.17m found just to its South (Area i, Deposit 9).

Above these deposits of Early Troy II Schliemann found, in the western and central areas of the North Platform, a stratum which included many large blocks of stone. Its top lay at c.30m A.T. (Area ii, Deposit 8; Area vii, Deposit 9; Area viii, Deposit 5). The stratum is clearly visible in Blegen's section, Troy I fig.422, where it is labelled 'Strata of Troy II'. Blegen found no trace of this in F3, and Schliemann makes no specific mention of finding it there either. So the statement that it

extended across the entire width of the platform (TA p.83) may be a bit of Schliemann hyperbole. At its north edge, and reaching to the same altitude, was a 20m-wide wall of limestone blocks, Wall 17 (Area i, Deposit 12). This appears in Atlas Taf.214 (= TR Plan 2) as the demolished "Outer Wall of Troy". Its stratification over the deposits of Early Troy II and below others of Troy II secures its date. Most likely it and the stratum of stones represent levelling and terracing after the earliest phases of Troy II. Further East, in F3, the levelling is represented by the thick deposit of mudbrick debris overlying Blegen's IIB building (Troy I p.258). Wall 17 may well have stood contemporaneously with Wall 15, the circuit-wall some metres to the North. The space between them was filled with debris of Troy II which, Schliemann noted, had clearly been 'thrown down' from above (Area i, Deposit 10a): it may derive from the end of Troy II.

To a somewhat later date in Troy II, probably, belongs Wall 32 - apparently an additional crosswall to Megaron IIR in F3 (Area iv, Deposit 5), and a drain on its northern side (Area i, Deposit 5). Parts of the east wall of Megaron IIA can be identified (Area vii, Deposit 8; Area viii, Deposit 4); and so perhaps can the northeast corner of Megaron IIB (Area viii, Deposit 7). All these were overlaid by a two-metre thick deposit of ash and other debris, reaching up to c.32m A.T. (Area i, Deposit 5; Area ii, Deposit 7; Area iv, Deposit 3; Area vii, Deposit 7). In this Schliemann found samples of carbonised grain, slag (as he identified it), and Treasure 'R'.

Schliemann's work on the North Platform is divided for convenience into nine "areas". These correspond to the areas tackled by Schliemann in the nine relevant periods of work distinguished in Chapter III. They are represented in Figures III.3-5,10-11,16-18, and are discussed individually in the following pages.

AREA 1: CDEF 2-3

Figs. III.3; IV.13,14,15.

This area, which represents the beginning of Schliemann's work on the north platform, was excavated during the period 1st-25th April 1872. The platform was cut in horizontally from the north slope, its base lying initially at 16m below the summit, i.e. at c.23.67m A.T., but rising by perhaps 2m as it progressed to the South. The trench was 70m wide and, in this period, its base penetrated 16m southwards into the mound. The southern edge of the trench will, however, have emerged onto the mound-surface some 8 or 9m further South, slightly beyond the 37.50m contour; for deposits lying higher than 5m (initially 2m, then 2½m, finally 5m) above the platform floor were cut away at an angle of 50°.

A number of major architectural features were encountered by Schliemann in this trench. We cannot locate them all with certainty. But in several cases there has proved to be close agreement between what can be deduced from the diaries, and certain features noted either in Atlas Taf. 214 or in the later reports of Dörpfeld and Blegen. The results are valuable in helping to clarify the confusion which has always existed over what fortifications were built on the north side of the mound.

In trying to define the other deposits I have been able to make only the broadest divisions, such as emerge relatively clearly from the diary. Further subdivisions could have been made in excavation and are hinted at by Schliemann. But in re-listing the objects he found, it would have been impractical to aim for greater precision: the information is not detailed enough. Even as things stand it is by no means always easy to assign an object to its correct deposit, for Schliemann had not yet adopted the habit of clearly specifying the depth at which each find was made. But an informed guess can usually be made. The context in the diary at the point where the object is described, and an estimate of the distance to which the trench had penetrated the mound - these sometimes have to suffice. At other times the depth or archaeological context of the find is specifically noted, and then there are fewer problems. First impressions gained from the diary have sometimes to be corrected by more detailed information in the published reports. At the same time a new source of information now becomes available, for it was in this season that Schliemann first began to make drawings of the objects he found. His

drawings are crude and small; the objects we should have liked to see drawn are often ignored in favour of tedious and repetitive documentation of the designs on the numerous spindle-whorls with which, for the moment, Schliemann was obsessed. Nonetheless, when the drawings are there they are usually clear enough to allow a rough identification at least.

During excavation Schliemann quoted the depths of his deposits and his finds sometimes as depths below the summit of the mound and sometimes as depths below a datum-point 2m lower. In fact, however, some of the lower measurements seem to have been arrived at by calculation upwards from the floor of the platform - which, of course, rose higher as it reached further South, but without Schliemann realising it. In the following description I have tried to compensate for these variations, and all figures have been adjusted to read as depths below the summit at c.39.67m A.T.

Deposit (1). A stratum of topsoil or "humus". At the western end of the trench this deposit formed only a very thin layer overlying Wall 14. Towards the eastern end, however, where Wall 14 was found further into the mound than in the West, it attained a thickness of 2-3m. We may assume that it also overlay Walls 15, 13 and 12⁺, as well as deposits (3), (5) and (10); but there is no direct evidence to substantiate this. It appears to include washed-down deposits from Troy IX.

(Tagebuch 1872 p.279; TA pp.48,61)

OBJECTS FOUND

POTTERY

- Sherd from a vessel decorated with leaves and flowers.
- Unspecified vase.
- Roman lamp. (Tgb 1872 p.278)

Deposit (2). On 20th April, and therefore well towards the southern limit of the trench, walls were noted at all points along the south side of the trench, and especially at the east end. Schliemann records that they were found at all points to a depth of 2m below the surface, i.e. to c.37.67m A.T. at the west end, and to c.35.67m A.T. at the east end. They were built of large blocks of shelly limestone, hewn and bonded with mortar. Schliemann refers to them as Roman. For the sake of reference they are here noted as Walls 12⁺, but it seems possible that more than

one structure was involved. Some of the walls at the eastern end may have been related to Dörpfeld's IXW, and the reconstruction of the course of the walls at that end of the trench (Fig.IV.13) has been made with this in mind. Of the walls in the western and central parts there are no details. The reconstruction in Fig.IV.13 of an extension of the enclosure wall in squares AB 4 (walls RM, 78 etc.) is entirely speculative. But it has the merit of being consistent with the unexcavated contours of the mound in CDE 2-3.

(Tagebuch 1872 p.300)

Deposit (3). A 2m-deep stratum of debris overlay Wall 13, whose top was found at c.34.67m A.T., and reached to the surface of the mound. The upper surface of the deposit lies therefore at the 36.67m contour and southwards. But the position of this deposit and of Wall 13 along the southern edge of the trench is not clear. It seems likely, though, that they were found either in the central or western sections, for Schliemann's descriptions of the east end stress the almost exclusive predominance of deposit (5). The material may derive from Troy VII, overlying a wall of Troy VI as it does, and containing a pithos (characteristic of VIIa) and small crude pots (characteristic of VIIb).

(Tagebuch 1872 p.293)

OBJECTS FOUND

POTTERY

- C39 - Pithos 1.60m high x 1m diam, found broken.
 - Small broken pot inside the pithos.
 - Several very small pots of crude workmanship.
 (Tgb 1872 p.293)

Deposit (4). The top of Wall 13 lay at 5m below the summit (= c.34.67m). Its position may be deduced partly from this fact and partly from the date of its discovery, 10th April; it is likely that it was unearthed only just below the surface. Schliemann says that it was built of large, well-hewn limestone blocks without clay or cement. He thought it was "probably the remains of a tower", which suggests that it must have been an imposing feature - possibly one which projected towards the North, although Schliemann tended to be over-hasty in identifying "towers". A reference ten days later to defensive walls which reached to a depth of 6m (i.e. to c.33.67m A.T.) may well be a further allusion to the same

feature. In this case he noted a construction of stone flags 1.00 x 0.50 x 0.20m, again without cement. There is perhaps an implication here that the defensive walls stood to some more considerable height, maybe being preserved to a greater height than was first noted for Wall 13. If so, there is no necessary contradiction. The more preserved parts may have been found further into the mound where the mound-surface lay higher. For reasons explained in the notes on deposit (3), it is perhaps most likely that Wall 13 was found in the central and western areas of the trench.

The wall can almost certainly be identified as the fortification wall of Late Troy VI. Dörpfeld and Blegen found a very short section of the wall in FG 3. Here on the south side its lower surface lay at 35.45m and its top at 36.32m A.T. On the north side, however, it was traced down to 34.08 with its top preserved only to 34.90m A.T. These figures and the description coincide closely with what is known of Wall 13. Wall 13 can also be very satisfactorily joined up in plan with the fragments of wall found by Schliemann and Blegen in A4, FG 3 and GH 3, so as to form part of a circuit. The underlying deposits (No.5) are clearly of E.B. III date. The overlying deposit (No.3) is of uncertain date, but may derive from Troy VII.

(Tagebuch 1872 pp.293,300; Troy III pp. 108f,158, figs.84-86,447,501)

Deposit (5). A large stratum of "domestic refuse" and, over an area of 20m towards the eastern end, of ash, overlay Wall 17 and, it seems, deposit (10). Its lower limit can therefore be placed at c.30.67m, descending at some points to 28.67m A.T. Schliemann seems to have regarded 35.67m (=4m deep) as marking the top of the deposit, in which case it probably lay below Wall 12. Wall 13 may have cut into it: their relation is obscure. Some difference in the nature of the deposits and their contents may have been seen at c.32.67m (=7m deep), but we do not have enough detail to be specific. When the deposit was discovered on 18th April, it apparently reached to the top of the trench as it then was. Among the eastern parts of this deposit, at c.29.67m (or perhaps 31.67m), was found what Schliemann at first identified as a roughly-worked cornice but later as a drain.

(Tagebuch 1872 pp.297,299,312,313)

OBJECTS FOUND

Only in a few cases did Schliemann note precise depths of objects found in this deposit. The material has therefore to be treated as a whole and cannot be subdivided. Apart from one or two items which may be intrusive, it seems to derive entirely from Troy II-V. The pottery shows no features from Troy VI or later, so far as it is possible to judge.

POTTERY

- A2 - Many wheel-made plates at 9-10m deep (Tgb 1872 p.311, TA p.67).
- A5(?) - Tumbler-shaped cup (Tgb 1872 p.292).
- A45 - Depas, many examples (Tgb 1872 pp.292,294).
- B3 72-95 Fluted jug of brownish sandy clay, reddened in places, with incised branch-motif around the neck, Atlas 87-1822 (10m), Ilios No.389, SS 2263; Fig.V.17.
- B15 72-1 Jug with flat base, cutaway spout and three rivets at base of neck (Tgb 1872 p.311). Fig.V.31.
- B18 - Beakspouted jugs with long necks, protruding bodies, and sometimes two or three nipples on the body (TA p.67).
- B20 - Beakspouted jugs, especially at 8-10m (Tgb 1872 p.307).
- C1 - Jars with two nipples (Tgb 1872 pp.292,311).
- C26/27 - Many small jars with pierced rims and vertically perforated lugs (Tgb 1872 p.292).
- C30 - Many examples (Tgb 1872 p.307, TA p.65), including 72-94 (fragt.).
- C31(?) - Small jars with vertical, perforated lugs. Some are crudely made and only very small - 4cm high (Tgb 1872 pp.298,301).
- C34/35(?) - Tripod vases with two handles, sometimes with vertically perforated lugs (Tgb 1872 pp.279,281,298,301).
- C39 - Several pithoi were found standing upright (Tgb 1872 p.306). One was at 7m deep at the east end of the platform. Another measured over 1½m in height (Tgb 1872 p.293). One example, 72-2, found at 11m deep, was 2m high and 1m in diameter; it was decorated with a pattern of incised zigzags and impressed circles (Tgb 1872 p.315; TA p.63f); see Fig.V.16.
- C203 72-115 Small, two-handled jar (7m). Atlas 100-2246(?); Fig.V.25.
- C211 72-100 Flat-bottomed, bulbous jar with narrow neck and two pointed lugs, horizontally perforated, at the neck; fabric reddish-brown, with greenish-brown slip. Atlas 68-1511 (8m), Ilios No.242, SS 2143; Fig.V.18.
- D13 - Many face-lids (Tgb 1872 p.311).
- D34(?) - Objects described as small terracotta lamps; actually crucibles? (Tgb 1872 p.279).

METALWORK

- Iron "key" with three teeth (intrusive?) (Tgb 1872 p.279), Ilios No.1476?; Fig.V.38.
- Small iron arrowhead (intrusive?) (Tgb 1872 p.296).
- Small lead plate (Tgb 1872 p.296).
- Two lead whorls, types 4,11 (Tgb 1872 p.311).
- Lump of metal, possibly silver (Tgb 1872 p.296).
- Many copper pins, one of type 2 (Tgb 1872 pp.293,296, 301).
- 72-3 Copper blade, broken, with wide central flange; possibly

- from triangular dagger (Tgb 1872 p.311); Fig.V.37.
- 72-4 Curved copper or bronze knife-blade, with single hole in hilt (Tgb 1872 p.310); Atlas 90-1872? (10m), SS 6205; cf. TI fig.268c; Fig.V.35.
- Copper knife-blade, heavily gilded, found at c.31.67m (Tgb 1872 p.292); Atlas 26-703? (13m), TR No.86, Ilios No.120. Analysis on Ilios p.251; Fig.V.35.
- 72-97 Copper flat axe (Tgb 1872 p.311); Fig.V.37.
- Copper ring (Tgb 1872 p.279).
- 72-96 Bronze disc with two holes; Atlas 98-2037 (8m); Fig. V.38.

STONE MOULDS

- Several moulds for weapons and tools (Tgb 1872 p.293).
- 72-18a Micaschist mould for pins et al., (8m) (Tgb 1872 p.296; but cf. TA p.62, Atlas 22-592, TR No.71, Ilios No.103, SS 6774 which give the depth as 14m. There is no apparent reason for the discrepancy. Fig.V.40.

CHIPPED STONE

- Obsidian blades (Tgb 1872 pp.296,301).
- Many flint blades, in brown and also white flint (Tgb 1872 pp.278,279,293,296,301).
- 72-93 Green agate knife-blade (Tgb 1872 p.311).
- Stone "spear-head" (Tgb 1872 p.311).

POLISHED STONE

- "Diorite" axes (Tgb 1872 pp.278,296).
- Small "diorite" hammer with hole (Tgb 1872 p.293).
- "Diorite" hammers and other unspecified "diorite" tools (Tgb 1872 pp.281,293,294,296).
- Diorite spit-rest with hole through, and groove cut into top (Tgb 1872 p.279), Ilios No.606?, SS 6799? Fig.V.42.
- 72-5 Granite "hammers" i.e. axe-heads (Tgb 1872 pp.300, 301); Fig.V.42.
- Spherical mace-head (Tgb 1872 p.299).
- Whetstones(?) (Tgb 1872 pp.296,311).
- Many querns, sometimes of pumice (Tgb 1872 pp.279,281, 293,296,300).

BONE ARTEFACTS

- Bone pins (Tgb 1872 pp.296,310; cf. TR No.98).
- Bone awl(?) (Tgb 1872 p.310).
- Sharpened roe-deer antlers (Tgb 1872 p.279).
- Sharpened boars' teeth (Tgb 1872 p.296).

COINS

- Several copper coins, including one of Sigeum. (All intrusive from deposit (1)?) (Tgb 1872 p.311).

WHORLS

- GIA 72-6 (7m) Atlas 13-422(?), TR No.342, Ilios No.1842.
- GID 72-7
- GIA 72-8
- RIA 72-9
- GVB 72-10 (8) Atlas 9-275, SS 5273 (2822); Fig.V.50.
- RIB 72-11 cf. Atlas 1-4, TR No.318, Ilios No.1818.

RIB	72-12	cf. <u>Atlas</u> 1-4, <u>TR</u> No.318, <u>Ilios</u> No.1818.
GVI	72-13	(10m) <u>Atlas</u> 9-294, <u>TR</u> No.370, <u>Ilios</u> No.1870, <u>SS</u> 5295 (2784).
RIC	72-14	(5m) <u>Atlas</u> 12-401(?).
RIIA	72-15	cf. <u>Atlas</u> 8-238.
GIA	72-16	(10m) <u>Atlas</u> 10-340(?).
RVA	72-18	(10m)
GID	72-19	(9m) <u>Atlas</u> 10-338(?).
RIIIB	72-21	cf. <u>Atlas</u> 1-21, <u>SS</u> 4669.
RID	72-22	(10m) <u>Atlas</u> 1-6(?); Fig.V.49.
RIIIA	72-23	cf. <u>Atlas</u> 5-150(?), <u>SS</u> 4641.
RIIA	72-24	(3m) <u>Atlas</u> 5-167(?).
RIVB	72-25	(10m) <u>Atlas</u> 4-113(?), <u>SS</u> 4724.
RVB	72-26	cf. <u>Atlas</u> 10-335.
RIA	72-27	cf. <u>Atlas</u> 8-240.
GIXD	72-28	(7m) <u>Atlas</u> 8-268.
RVC	72-29	(6½m) <u>Atlas</u> 9-283, <u>SS</u> 4755.
RVIAb	72-30	cf. <u>Atlas</u> 10-335.
GVI	72-31	(7m) <u>Atlas</u> 9-282, <u>TR</u> No.356, <u>Ilios</u> No.1856, <u>SS</u> 5294.
RIB	72-32	(10m) <u>Atlas</u> 3-82, <u>SS</u> 4520 (2598).
RIA	72-33	cf. <u>Atlas</u> 8-240.
RID	72-34	
RIIB	72-35	
RIIB	72-36	
RIIIA	72-37	cf. <u>Atlas</u> 5-150, <u>SS</u> 4641.
RIB	72-39	cf. <u>Atlas</u> 1-5.
GIA	72-40	
RIIA	72-41	
RID	72-42	(8m) <u>Atlas</u> 11-351.
RVIIBd	72-43	(7m) <u>Atlas</u> 13-418(?), <u>TR</u> No.344, <u>Ilios</u> No.1844, <u>SS</u> 4948.
GVA	72-44	
GIVB	72-45	
GVA	72-46	(7m) <u>Atlas</u> 2-34, <u>Tgb</u> 72-68; <u>TR</u> No.381, <u>Ilios</u> No.1881, <u>SS</u> 5235.
GVA	72-47	
GIB	72-48	cf. <u>Atlas</u> 11-352.
RIIIB	72-49	cf. <u>Atlas</u> 1-21, <u>SS</u> 4669.
RIB	72-50	cf. <u>Atlas</u> 1-4, <u>TR</u> No.318, <u>Ilios</u> No.1818.
RIIA	72-51	cf. <u>Atlas</u> 5-135.
GI	72-52	cf. <u>Atlas</u> 10-325, <u>SS</u> 5080.
RIB	72-53	cf. <u>Atlas</u> 1-4, <u>TR</u> No.318, <u>Ilios</u> No.1818.
GIA	72-54	(6m) <u>Atlas</u> 13-412(?).
GIA	72-55	
RIIB	72-56	(7m) <u>Atlas</u> 7-209.
RIIIA	72-57	(10m) <u>Atlas</u> 3-80(?), <u>SS</u> 4647.
RIIIB	72-59	cf. <u>Atlas</u> 1-21, <u>SS</u> 4669.
RVIAb	72-60	
RIIA	72-61	cf. <u>Atlas</u> 5-135.
RIIC	72-62	(8m) <u>Atlas</u> 11-349.
GID	72-63	(9m) <u>Atlas</u> 12-410(?), <u>TR</u> No.391, <u>Ilios</u> No.1891.
RVIAb	72-64	
GIB	72-65	cf. <u>Atlas</u> 10-322.
RIC	72-66	(8m) <u>Atlas</u> 1-25.
RIA	72-67	(6m) <u>Atlas</u> 8-248.
GVA	72-68	(7m) <u>Atlas</u> 2-34(?), <u>Tgb</u> 72-46; <u>TR</u> No.381, <u>Ilios</u> No.1881, <u>SS</u> 5235.
RIA	72-69	
RIVA	72-70	(6m) <u>Atlas</u> 3-86(?).

RVB	72-71	(8m) <u>Atlas</u> 11-359(?), <u>SS</u> 4753.
GIII	72-72	(9m) <u>Atlas</u> 2-42, <u>TR</u> No.410, <u>Ilios</u> No.1910, <u>SS</u> 5205.
GIA	72-73	cf. <u>Atlas</u> 10-325, <u>SS</u> 5080.
RIIB	72-74	
RIIB	72-75	(8m) <u>Atlas</u> 2-43.
GID	72-76	
RIVA	72-77	
GIC	72-78	cf. <u>Atlas</u> 4-110.
RIIIC	72-79	
RIB	72-80	
RIA	72-81	
RIVA	72-82	
RIA	72-83	cf. <u>Atlas</u> 8-240.
RIIA	72-84	
RIA	72-85	(6m) <u>Atlas</u> 7-220, <u>SS</u> 4505.
RIA	72-86	cf. <u>Atlas</u> 8-246.
RIVA	72-87	cf. <u>Atlas</u> 3-73.
RIIIA	72-88	(7m)
RIB	72-101	cf. <u>Atlas</u> 1-2.
RIA	72-102	cf. <u>Atlas</u> 8-240.
GID	72-103	
RIA	72-104	
GIII	72-105	
RIIA	72-106	
GIII	72-117)	
GIII	72-118)	(10m) <u>Atlas</u> 2-44; Fig.V.50.
RIA	72-119	cf. <u>Atlas</u> 8-240.
RIA	72-120	cf. <u>Atlas</u> 8-246.
RVIA	72-121	cf. <u>Atlas</u> 3-73.
RIIIA	72-122	
RIB	72-123	cf. <u>Atlas</u> 1-2.
-		Terracotta discs with central hole and swastika design (<u>Tgb</u> 1872 p.279f, 297).
-		Stone disc with central hole (<u>Tgb</u> 1872 p.311).

TERRACOTTA BALLS

72-17	Incised terracotta ball (5m), <u>Atlas</u> 14-455(?); Fig.V.46.
72-107	" " " (8m), <u>Atlas</u> 15-461; Fig.V.46.

TERRACOTTA HOOK

-	One example found (<u>Tgb</u> 1872 p.279 cf. <u>TI</u> fig.371).
---	---

LOOM-WEIGHTS

-	Many stone weights attested. One pyramidal example with two holes. (<u>Tgb</u> 1872 pp.278,281,299,311).
---	---

FIGURINES

3G	Flat, marble figurine (<u>Tgb</u> 1872 p.299).
3H	72-99 Flat, marble figurine with incised eyebrows, two dots for eyes, and four lines across neck (3m). <u>Atlas</u> 99-2174b, <u>Ilios</u> No.1301; Fig.V.45.
3D(?)	Flat, marble, bottle-shaped figurines (<u>Tgb</u> 1872 p.279).
3D	72-89 Flat, bone, bottle-shaped figurines, described as spoons (<u>Tgb</u> 1872 pp.299,310) (8m). <u>Atlas</u> 99-2191g(?), <u>Ilios</u> No.223, <u>SS</u> 7603; Fig.V.45.
7(?)	- Small marble plaque with engraving of a woman (<u>Tgb</u> 1872 p.281) (intrusive?).

MISCELLANEOUS

- Large piece of terracotta decorated with (incised pattern of?) three "nails"
- Large piece of terracotta decorated with "symbolic signs" (Tgb 1872 p.279)

ANIMAL REMAINS

Mussel shells, "sharks' vertebrae", antlers, boars' teeth (Tgb 1872 pp.292,293,298,299,301,311).

Deposit (6). This deposit was recognized only on 24th April, and was therefore scarcely excavated at all. It was a mass of burnt debris which Schliemann found to the South of Wall 17 in the centre of the platform at 16m from its north edge: in other words at the southern limit of excavation.

(Tagebuch 1872 p.314)

Deposit (7). At several places along the northern edge of the northern platform, and overlain by Deposit (1), Schliemann found remains of Wall 14. Its western extension, 20m long, came to light almost immediately the trench was opened. Its eastern parts were only discovered rather later, on 8th April. This probably implies that the eastern end of the wall lay further into the mound than the western end. Since Schliemann later referred to Wall 14 as the "Roman circuit wall", he seems to have had no doubt that one, continuous structure was involved.

The wall itself, although very irregular, was built of large blocks of shelly limestone joined with clay mortar. It rested against the underlying deposits at an angle of 60°. It was covered by only a thin layer of topsoil and so must have been preserved to a height of perhaps 26m A.T., and perhaps more at the eastern end of the trench. Its base must have lain at c.23.67m or lower.

There can be little doubt that Wall 14 is a part of what Blegen considered to be a defensive system on the north side of the mound related to Wall IZ on the south side. Dörpfeld found a broadly sloping wall below the fortifications of Troy II in squares C 2-3. When examined by Blegen it rose to at least 24.90m A.T., descending to 23.40m A.T. or lower. In the eastern half of square D2 Blegen found a steep slope formed by an embankment of yellow clay. On this rested an immense 'cascade' of unworked stones, large and irregularly shaped. Its bottom

lay at 19m A.T., and its top was preserved up to 24.25m A.T. - which must be where it was cut into by Schliemann's North Platform. The stratum overlying it contained pottery of Late Troy I or Early Troy II. Something similar was found in square F3, in the northeast corner. Here again there was a facing of unhewn stones laid on a widely sloping clay embankment. In this case the face could be followed down to 24.55m A.T., though it went deeper; and the top was preserved to 25.75m A.T., where it underlay an upper wall with a slight batter. The stone facing here was more or less aligned with some sloping masonry shown by Dörpfeld in squares GH 3-4.

Blegen took the entire embankment to be the substructure of a defensive work of Troy I, and realised that most of it had been removed by Schliemann. That Wall 14 and the northern fragments of "IZ" formed a stone-faced glacis encasing the entire northern face of the mound from c.19m A.T. to 25 and 26m A.T. seems very likely.

(Tagebuch 1872 pp.279,292,303; TA pp.47f; TR p.100; TI fig.11, Taf.III; Troy I pp. 188,194-6, figs.57,209,211-213).

Deposit (8). Wall 15 is the second of the three retaining walls which Schliemann found one behind the other along the north side of the trench within the first 8-10m of excavation. It was discovered in the western and central parts of the trench behind Wall 14 but was not, apparently, found at the extreme east end. Possibly it originally made a southward turn in E3 or F2 as Wall 14 too must have done. It would then have entered the south face of the trench perhaps in F2; but Schliemann did not record such a course. In this area it may have been eroded away. The wall, where preserved, stood to a height of 5m above the platform, i.e. to c.29.67m A.T., with its base lying at c.24.67m or lower. It was built of rough-hewn blocks of shelly limestone, often irregularly shaped, joined with mortar. Wall 15 seems to agree in orientation and altitude with the probable course of the Troy II fortification walls. Dörpfeld's hypothetical line for these, in TI Taf.III, is 10m to the North of where I have placed Wall 15. But Dörpfeld may have been misled by ignorance of the original contours along the north side and by a desire to make his Troy II citadel roughly circular.

Tagebuch 1872 pp.293,296f,298)

Deposit (9). The third of the three retaining walls on the north edge of the trench was Wall 16. Schliemann gives no specific information about it other than that it existed. Like Wall 15, it was not definitely traced to the east end of the trench but was quite apparent in the central and western areas.

(Tagebuch 1872 p.293)

Deposit (10). Under this heading are subsumed all the deposits stratified below (1) and (5) but lying between and over Walls 14, 15, 16 and 17 to a height of 5m above the platform, i.e. to c.30.67m A.T. Schliemann's notebooks provide a certain amount of contradictory evidence about this deposit, but it seems possible to resolve the problems by recognizing that two, separate deposits are involved which he did not clearly distinguish.

The first, (10a), was found to the South of Walls 14 and 15 in the western and central parts of the platform, at 10-12m from the north edge of the trench. At the eastern end, however, where Walls 15, 16 and 17 were not preserved, it was found to extend over an area 25m wide to the edge of the trench, being bounded only by Wall 14. The soil here was soft, and Schliemann says repeatedly that it had all been "thrown down" from a greater height. Presumably he noticed striations sloping down to the North. It is probably fair to assume that this represents material pushed over the edge of Wall 17 in a levelling operation. Wall 17 appears likely to be of early Troy II date; and the dateable objects of Deposit (10) seem also to derive from Troy II.

The second deposit, (10b), is something rather different. In Area i this was found only at the east end of the trench, and at a later date than (10a) - so further to the South. It was stone-hard and ashy, with a clay-like appearance, containing bits of charcoal, bones, small shells and occasional pieces of brick. But a similar deposit was found in Area ii behind Wall 17 (see below: Area ii, Deposit 9). The probability is that it represents an earlier series of horizontal deposits, laid down in regular succession and cut into by Wall 17.

Several architectural features came to light within these deposits, but

none can be located precisely. Occasional walls were seen lying at right-angles to the retaining-walls and disappearing into the south face of the trench as it was at the time of excavation (19th April) - i.e. to the North of Wall 17. In the easternmost 25m of the trench, at 14½m from the platform's edge and at c.26.67m A.T. (or perhaps at c.28.67m A.T.) a channel of green sandstone 20cm wide x 18cm high was found. This was probably a drain. At c.25.67m (or perhaps 27.67m) in the same area Schliemann found small housewalls built of small stones joined with mud. At c.25.17m (or perhaps 27.17m), a notional depth of 14½m, in the western area, was a pavement of small, white pebbles.

(Tagebuch 1872 pp.292,297,298,300,303,310,312,370; Briefe p.119; TA pp.48, 61f,102f)

OBJECTS FOUND

The material found in this deposit probably derives mostly, if not entirely, from Troy II in Blegen's terms. Among the pottery, shape C34 is not attested later than Troy II in Blegen's excavations, although D33 there occurs no earlier than Troy III. Overlying Wall 17 as it does, this deposit points to a very early date for that wall.

POTTERY

- | | | |
|-----|--------|--|
| B3 | 72-116 | Jar with straight neck and flat base; Fig.V.16. |
| C34 | 72-114 | Black polished jar with straight neck, three feet (restored), two lugs and four vertical ribs on each side (10m). <u>Atlas</u> 91-1887(?), <u>Ilios</u> No.268, <u>SS</u> 876; Fig.V.16. |
| C39 | 72-125 | Dark red pithos 1½m tall x 1m diam (14m). <u>Atlas</u> 114-2325, <u>TR</u> No.72, <u>Ilios</u> No.156; Fig.V.16. |
| D33 | - | Crude terracotta funnel (<u>Tgb 1872</u> p.313). |

METALWORK

- Silver pin with fluted spherical head (Tgb 1872 p.300) (14m). Atlas 26-705, TR No.87, Ilios No.121, SS 6424; Fig.V.38.

CHIPPED STONE

- Many flint blades (Tgb 1872 pp.297,313).

POLISHED STONE

- Querns; stone balls (Tgb 1872 p.297; TA p.48).

WHORLS

- | | | |
|-----|-------|---|
| RIC | 72-20 | (12m) <u>Atlas</u> 7-218, <u>SS</u> 4547. |
|-----|-------|---|

GIB	72-38	(14m) <u>Atlas</u> 4-110(?)
RIIA	72-58	(11m) <u>Atlas</u> 4-114(?)
GID	72-108	(9m) <u>Atlas</u> 11-362
GID	72-109	
RIIB	72-110	cf. <u>Atlas</u> 1-17
GIA	72-111	
RIB	72-112	
GIC	72-113	(10m) <u>Atlas</u> 12-377

WEIGHTS

- Stone weights (Tgb 1872 pp.297,311).

FIGURINES

- Many small idols of fine marble, with and without "owl-face" and girdle (TA p.48).

ANIMAL REMAINS

- Mussel shells, sharks' vertebrae, wild boars' teeth, and other bones unidentified (Tgb 1872 pp.280,297, 301,310).

Deposit (11). A disordered mass of small stones was found over an area 20m wide at the eastern end of the trench. The deposit was first noticed on 19th April and must therefore have lain 10-12m into the mound. Its upper limit lay at 1m above the base of the platform, that is at c.26.67m. These stones are probably a northern continuation of the IIB pavement found by Blegen at c.26.75m A.T. It is also conceivable that material from the collapse of Wall 15 is included amongst them.

(Tagebuch 1872 p.299; Troy I p.258)

Deposit (12). Wall 17 is the designation which I have assigned to a mass of stones discovered by Schliemann on 22nd April. Unlike the stones of Walls 14 and 15 which could be found over a 45m-wide section of the trench, these were found over an area only 20m wide in the central part of the platform. They continued to be exposed until on 24th April Schliemann penetrated at one point behind them to Deposit (6). The stones were a formidable mass which reached to 5m above the platform, 9m below the summit - i.e. to c.30.67m A.T. The depth at which they were founded is unknown, but the wall either overlay or cut into pavements of Troy I or Early Troy II on its North and South sides (Area i, Deposit 10; Area ii, Deposit 10). The wall consisted of blocks of shelly limestone, more or less hewn, but with no lime or cement. Schliemann believed it to be the fortification wall of Troy II. Its dimensions and its position appear to coincide perfectly with

the wall shown in Atlas Taf.214 (=TR Plan 2) as the "Outer Wall of Troy" that had been demolished. Its stratification behind Deposit (10a), of Troy II date in Blegen's terms, will require for it a date in Troy I or Troy II.

(Tagebuch 1872 pp.310,313; TA p.61f)

AREA ii: CDEF 3

Figs.III.4; IV.16,17.

This area was excavated during 1st-11th May 1872, when the southward thrust of the north platform was being continued. The width of the trench was 70m and by the end of the period it had advanced approximately 21m into the mound when measured at the floor of the trench. Because of the slope cut into the deposits which lay higher than 5m above the platform, the southern side of the trench must have emerged onto the mound-surface roughly 6m further South. Throughout most of the trench the floor remained at c.25.67m A.T. (notionally at 16m below the summit, but not actually so). But over a stretch 20m wide the floor of the trench was cut on a slope down to c.24.00m A.T. (notionally 18m below the summit). The area in which this deeper cutting was made is unlikely to have lain in the eastern part of the trench.

As in CDEF 2-3 Schliemann quotes depths according to two different systems, and both are vitiated by the unobserved rise in the level of the platform floor. In the following discussion I have tried to compensate for these variations by relating all measurements of depth to the summit and by using altitudes Above Tide (A.T.) where practicable; but only approximations are possible. In this as in all other matters there is woefully little information about what was found in this area.

Deposit (1). A stratum of "nice debris" and decomposed mudbrick was

found immediately Schliemann began to make the deeper cut into the 20m-wide area of the platform. It is contrasted with the hard debris overlying it and previously found in CDEF 2-3 Deposit (10). The point at which the slope of the cut began can be seen in Blegen's section (Troy I fig.423): it lies about 2m North of the line D2/3. Deposit (1) must therefore have underlain Deposit (10) of CDEF 2-3. Whether it also lay up against the foot of Wall 17 is unknown.

(Tagebuch 1872 p.325)

OBJECTS FOUND

BONE ARTEFACTS

Bone "curlers" (Tgb 1872 p.325).

Deposits (2)-(7). Under this heading are gathered all the deposits overlying Wall 17 and Deposit (8). Schliemann gives no information about the character of the soil here; but a number of objects are attributed to these layers, and these enable the outlines of a stratigraphy to be reconstructed. The stamped weight 72-228, found at 2½m deep, attests the presence of Troy VIII-IX deposits reaching down to c.37.67m A.T. These will have been associated with Walls 12⁺. There is no direct evidence for any deposits deriving from Troy VI or VII. If any survived, they will probably have lain at c.36.67 to 37.67m A.T., but may also, like the Troy VI citadel wall, have cut deeper into the deposits of Troy V. Troy V deposits appear to be preserved up to c.36.67m A.T., and Troy II to 31.67 or c.32m A.T. - 8 or 7½m below the surface. Divisions between the deposits of III, IV and V have been extrapolated from those found in the neighbouring areas of the North-South Trench and from Blegen's findings in squares F 4-5.

For some of the objects found here there are no depths stated. These are listed in the following catalogue. Most, if not all, appear to be of E.B. or M.B. date.

OBJECTS FOUND

POTTERY

A229	72-216	Deep conical tankard with flat bottom and narrow neck; two large handles from neck to body. Fig.V.31.
B17(?)	72-215	Jug with globular body and flattened base; slightly rising spout. Fig.V.31.

- C39(?) *72-298 Decorated fragment with incised(?) chevrons and impressed(?) circles. Fig.V.31.
 C207 72-227 Flat-bottomed globular jar with very narrow, short, straight neck. Fig.V.31.
 D7 72-141 Cylindrical lid with three surmounting bands and central knob. Fig.V.31.

METALWORK

- Many copper pins (Tgb 1872 p.323).

CHIPPED STONE

- 72-213 Blade
 - Many other two-edged flint blades (Tgb 1872 p.325).

BONE ARTEFACTS

- Bone pins (Tgb 1872 p.323).

WHORLS

- RIIA 72-127
 GIA 72-128
 RIIA 72-169
 RVA 72-170
 GVI 72-171
 RIVA 72-172
 RIIA 72-175 cf. Atlas 8-240
 RIA 72-176 cf. Atlas 8-246
 RIIA 72-177
 GVI 72-178
 RIA 72-179 cf. Atlas 8-246
 RVIB (72-180
 (72-181
 RIIA 72-182 cf. Atlas 8-240
 RIIA 72-186 cf. Atlas 8-238
 RVIB 72-187
 GIA *72-201 cf. Atlas 2-53, TR No.329, Ilios No.1829.
 RVA 72-207
 RIB 72-208 cf. Atlas 1-25
 RIA 72-209 cf. Atlas 8-240
 GIC 72-210
 RIIA 72-211 cf. Atlas 8-236
 RIIA 72-219
 RVA 72-220
 RIA 72-223 cf. Atlas 8-240
 RIA 72-224 cf. Atlas 8-246
 RIA *72-300 cf. Atlas 8-240
 GIA *72-301 cf. Atlas 2-53, TR No.329, Ilios No.1829.
 RIA *72-302 cf. Atlas 8-246

TERRACOTTA DISC

- 72-188 With two holes. Cf. Atlas 99-2152.

FIGURINE

- 3C 72-189a Bone figurine. Fig.V.45.

ANIMAL REMAINS

- "Shark bones" (Tgb 1872 p.323)

Deposit (2). This is the material which descended from the mound surface to c.37.67m A.T. and which was presumably associated with Walls 12⁺. There is just the one object.

OBJECT FOUND

WEIGHT

72-228 Clay weight with stamped design and two holes (2½m)
Atlas 18-526, SS 8335ff.

Deposit (3). There may have been a deposit of Troy VI-VII material reaching down at some points to c.35.67m A.T., where it would have cut into underlying deposits of Troy V. If so, it may have been related to Wall 13, the fortification wall of Late Troy VI, or to one of its predecessors. No objects can be assigned to it.

Deposit (4). We may tentatively reconstruct a horizon of Troy V deposits lying at c.35.67-c.36.67m A.T., although there is no detailed information concerning them.

OBJECTS FOUND

POTTERY

A33	72-197	Cup with flat bottom, spreading rim and high handle (4m). <u>Atlas</u> 39-943(?). Fig.V.30.
C28	72-196	Round-bottomed jar with straight neck and two vertically pierced lugs. Decorated with three horizontally incised(?) lines around base of neck, and chevrons over two horizontal lines around the body (4m). Fig.V.30.
D13	*72-297	Face-lid of Troy V type (1m). Fig.V.30.

WHORLS

RIIB	72-131	(3½m) <u>Atlas</u> 11-368.
RIVA	72-154	(3½m) <u>Atlas</u> 3-84, <u>SS</u> 4716.
RIA	72-205	(3m) <u>Atlas</u> 12-386.
RIIA	72-222	(4m) <u>Atlas</u> 5-163.
GIXD	*72-303	(3m) <u>Atlas</u> 6-176, <u>TR</u> No.389, <u>Ilios</u> No.1889, <u>SS</u> 5439.

Deposit (5). A horizon of Troy IV material may, again, tentatively be reconstructed at c.33.67-35.67m A.T.

OBJECTS FOUND

POTTERY

- B203 72-226 Globular jar with flaring neck; upper half of body decorated with incised(?) vertical lines and a dot between each line, all contained in one register between two horizontal lines (5m). Fig.V.29.
- D207 72-198 Yellow, cylindrical lid with three small horns on top, and two holes in the rim (6m). Atlas 49-1181, Ilios No.1031, SS 1476; Fig.V.29.

WHORLS

- GIA 72-184 (5m) Atlas 4-101(?).
- GVIIIA 72-168 (6m) Atlas 7-224, TR No.337, Ilios No.1837, SS 5370 (3028).
- RIIA 72-212 (6m) Atlas 8-262.

Deposit (6). Troy III material may be supposed to have lain at c.32-33.67m A.T.

OBJECTS FOUND

POTTERY

- A224 72-203 Black polished tripod cup with two large vertical handles. Body is globular with widened neck. Decorated with four incised horizontal lines (7m). Atlas 84-1762 (9m), TR No.53, Ilios No.326, SS 2334; Fig.V.24.
- B15 72-166 Jug with flat base and cutaway spout (7m). Fig.V.25.
- C35 72-229 Brown tripod jar with globular body and straight neck; lugs restored. Lower half of body decorated with incised chevrons and vertical rows of dots (7m). Atlas 56-1300, Ilios No.1029, SS 2340a; Fig.V.26.
- C203 72-214 Miniature jar with flat base, slightly splayed rim, and two perforated, vertical lugs (7m). Atlas 57-1315(?); Fig.V.25.
- D13 72-194 Face-lid (7½m). Fig.V.27.

POLISHED STONE

- 72-165 Red stone object, of phallic shape (7m). Atlas 64-1424(?). Fig.V.42.

WHORLS

- RVIIBd *72-200 (7m) Atlas 11-372, SS 4943.
- RIC 72-206 (7m) Atlas 8-236(?).

Deposit (7). The Troy II material may be reconstructed in a horizontal layer overlying the top of Wall 17 and reaching up to perhaps c.32m A.T.

OBJECTS FOUND

POTTERY

- A41 72-195 Biconical cup, handle restored (8m). Atlas 75-1626(?), SS 1872; Fig.V.22.

A39	72-138/9	Tankard with round body, flattish base, and tall straight neck (8m). <u>Atlas</u> 76-1637(?); Fig.V.22.
B8(?)	-	"Pilgrim flask" with five nipples, 12cm x 10cm (8m) (<u>Tgb</u> 1872 p.320).
B17	72-190	Jug with globular body and rising spout (10m). <u>Atlas</u> 87-1825? Fig.V.17.
C28	72-193	Brown globular jar with grey-brown slip and burnish; straight neck and two pairs of vertically perforated lugs, and two holes in the lip (9m). <u>Atlas</u> 79-1673(?), <u>SS</u> 565; Fig.V.18.
C34	72-137	Tripod jar with globular body, straight neck and two pierced lugs (8m); Fig.V.23.
C35	72-192	Black tripod jar with globular body, straight neck, two pierced lugs and perforations in the lip (8m). <u>Atlas</u> 67-1508; Fig.V.23.
C39	72-232	Pithos, similar in shape to <u>TI</u> fig.250, 1.10m x 0.68m (8m). Contained carbonised grain (<u>Tgb</u> 1872 p.327); Fig.V.21.
D29	72-191	Flat-bottomed askos with slightly cutaway spout and five nipples (10m). Fig.V.18.

METALWORK

-	A stratum of slag or molten metal, very fragile, is reported at 10m deep. It was several inches thick. (<u>Tgb</u> 1872 p.327).
---	--

WHORLS

RVIIDd	72-129	(9m) <u>Atlas</u> 10-319; Fig.V.49.
GX	72-130	(9m) <u>Atlas</u> 6-202, <u>SS</u> 5537.
RIIIB	72-150	(8m) <u>Atlas</u> 7-231(?), <u>TR</u> No.336, <u>Ilios</u> No.1836.
GIVB	72-151	(10m) <u>Atlas</u> 10-333, <u>SS</u> 5193.
GIVB	72-157/8	(9m) <u>Atlas</u> 5-166, <u>TR</u> No.334, <u>Ilios</u> No.1834, <u>SS</u> 5219.
GIXD	72-162	(10m) <u>Atlas</u> 11-344, <u>TR</u> No.387, <u>Ilios</u> No.1887, <u>SS</u> 5438.
GIA	72-167	(9m) <u>Atlas</u> 10-338(?).
RIB	72-174	(10m) <u>Atlas</u> 11-369(?).
RIB	72-183	(8m) <u>Atlas</u> 1-8(?).
RIVA	72-185	(8m) <u>Atlas</u> 1-29, <u>SS</u> 4714.
GIB	72-189	(8m) <u>Atlas</u> 11-352(?).
RIIB	72-221	(8m) <u>Atlas</u> 1-14.
GIB	72-304	(8m) <u>Atlas</u> 10-323(?).

TERRACOTTA BALL

72-202	One, incised (8m). <u>Atlas</u> 19-542? Fig.V.46.
--------	---

SEAL

72-136	Conical clay stamp-seal with incised design, and hole in the top (8m). <u>Atlas</u> 19-556, <u>TR</u> No.78, <u>Ilios</u> No.492, <u>SS</u> 8858; Fig.V.46.
--------	---

PLANT REMAINS

-	Carbonised grain found in the pithos 72-232 (8m).
---	---

Deposit (8). To the South of Wall 17 lay a stratum of debris which extended across the entire 70m width of the North Platform, its top lying at 6m above the platform floor, i.e. at c.30m A.T., and at 10m below the

summit. Among this deposit Schliemann found many large, single blocks of stone. These seem to have been noted and more accurately described in the adjoining Area i of the North-South trench and in Troy I fig.422. In Figs.IV.16,17 they have been drawn in accordance with the information from these later sources as a separate stratum in their own right. They form Deposit (8).

(Tagebuch 1872 p.328; TA p.82f)

Deposit (9). This is the stratum of debris, as distinct from the stones of Deposit (8), which extended all the way across the North Platform to the South of Wall 17. Presumably, in the light of the stratigraphy in the North-South Trench, it lay below the stones at c.28m A.T. Its northerly limit, behind Wall 17, can be estimated from the fact that Schliemann only ceased removing the stones of the wall a few days before 11th May. The deposit was damp and hard, consisting of ashes, small shells and bones. Schliemann compares it closely with the strata found in CDEF 2-3 Deposit (10), the eastern part of which may indeed be a continuation of it.

(Tagebuch 1872 p.328; TA p.82f)

OBJECTS FOUND

POTTERY

B1	72-144	Jug with flat base and straight neck (14m). See Fig. V.16.
B20	72-147	Fragment from black polished beakspout jug (13m). See Fig.V.16.
B201	72-143	Small flask with tall, straight neck (14m). See Fig.V.16.
D1	72-146	Simple cylinder-lid with flat top (14m). See Fig.V.16.
	-	Pedestal bases.

POLISHED STONE

	72-142	Two hammers, both from "16m" (14m). (<u>Tgb 1872</u> pp.319, 321). Fig.V.41.
--	--------	---

BONE ARTEFACTS

	72-145	Flat, trapezoidal plate of bone, decorated with incised circles and two holes (14m). <u>Atlas</u> 25-664, <u>Ilios</u> No.141, <u>SS</u> 7807. Fig.V.43.
--	--------	--

WHORLS

GIA	72-148	
RIID	72-149	
RIA	72-152	
GID	72-153	
GIA	72-155	
RIIIB	72-156	cf. <u>Atlas</u> 1-21, <u>SS</u> 4669.

RIIA 72-159
 GIB 72-160 cf. Atlas 4-110
 RVIAb 72-161
 RIA 72-163
 RIIB 72-164 cf. Atlas 1-4, TR No.318, Ilios No.1818

Deposit (10). At "15m" deep, apparently meaning c.26.67m A.T. rather than 24.67m A.T., lay what is described as a pavement of round, white pebbles.

(Tagebuch 1872 p.327)

Deposit (11). Because of his method of excavation Schliemann treated separately the strata which lay in the lower-cut part of his platform, at the west end, below the notional 16m level. It is clear that the general character of the soil here was little different from that of Deposit (9). But it underlay the pavement of white pebbles and Schliemann lists his finds from these bottom two metres of the trench separately; for these reasons the subdivision is reproduced here. There is no direct information about the relation of Deposit (11) to Wall 17 or to Deposit (1). The material appears to be of Troy I date.

(Tagebuch 1872 p.328; TA pp.83ff)

OBJECTS

POTTERY

Wares are brilliant black, and sometimes red or brown. Incised decoration is frequent. Quality of pottery is better than in higher levels.

C39 72-233/4 Pithoi with incised decoration (Tgb 1872 p.327) (16m)
 See Fig.V.16.

72-235 Fragment of black-on-white painted vase
 (16m). Atlas 27-722, TR No.1, Ilios No.1433; Fig.V.16.

- Vase-fragment painted with black (Tgb 1872 p.324).

72-299 Rectangular fragment, incised and white-filled, with holes for attachment of some kind. Appears to be a part of Atlas 20-578a (16m), TR No.77, Ilios No.55, SS 248; Fig.V.48.

METALWORK

- Copper pins (Tgb 1872 p.327).

POLISHED STONE

- Hammers (Tgb 1872 p.327).

WHORLS

Shape H *Almost flat, no thicker than buttons. Of better workmanship than in higher levels.

WEIGHTS

- Are attested (Tgb 1872 p.327).

ANIMAL REMAINS

- Mussel shells, boars' teeth, other large teeth, unspecified bones. (Tgb 1872 pp.326,327,328).

AREA iii:F3

Figs.III,5; IV.18,19.

This area was excavated during 12th-22nd May 1872 under the direction of G. Photidas. Digging took place over an area of 20m x 3m, mostly down to the 30.00m A.T. level (=c.10m deep). The south face of the trench was cut away at an angle of 50° and so emerged on the mound-surface approximately 6m further South. In some parts which cannot be located the "terrace" was broken away and excavation was carried down to the floor of the north platform, i.e. to c.25.00m A.T. Little information is given about work in this area, probably because Schliemann himself was fully occupied in supervising work in CD 3-4 at the time.

Deposits (1)-(6). The existence of these deposits is not explicitly attested; but they are tentatively drawn in on Fig.IV.19 on the assumption that the stratification here was similar to that in Area ii (see Fig.IV.16) and in F 4-5. An exception to this must be the stratum of stones at c.28-30m A.T. on which Schliemann is now silent and which Blegen did not observe in his adjoining excavations in square F3. No finds are clearly attributable to F3.

Deposit (7). In the report of 25th April Schliemann had already noted a green-stained sandstone channel which he took to be a drain (TA p.61). It had lain at c.26.67m A.T. and was found in the easternmost section of trench CDEF 2-3 at 14½m from the edge of the north platform (see Deposit (10) of CDEF 2-3). The drain must have lain roughly North-South, for Schliemann was evidently able to follow it and to report on it again when

his excavations had progressed further South. On 17th May he reports that he had come to the house which it had served, and there found a stone threshold and the remains of a house of large hewn and unhewn stones. The drain and the wall or walls (Wall 22⁺) constitute Deposit (7). The walls and drain can be related to features found by Blegen in square F3. The drain is at the right altitude to have belonged with Blegen's I Ib building, and must have lain to the North of the building. But Schliemann's observation of stone-built walls accords better with the underlying building of IIa than with the entirely mudbrick structure of I Ib. He may have dug away some I Ib walls without noticing.

(Tagebuch 1872 pp.345,349; Troy I pp. 251f,258f; figs.277-281,434,435)

AREA iv: F 3-4(a)

Figs.III.10; IV.20,21.

This area, variously referred to by Schliemann as "the east end of the North Platform" and "the Captain's trench" (an allusion to G. Tsirogiannis, its supervisor), was excavated during 3rd-23rd February 1873. It adjoined the area FGH 314 in the Northeast Trench. The trench had a width of c.10m at the south end and c.13m at the north end. It was cut in two terraces. The floor of the upper terrace lay at c.30.59m A.T. This terrace, which was taken c.25m southwards during this period, was an extension of the terrace left in F3 in 1872 (see Fig.IV.19). The floor of the lower terrace lay at c.27.50m A.T., although it may have sloped upwards to the South. This terrace was perhaps advanced c.11m southwards. This was not an extension of any previous terrace, although it does find a parallel from 1872 in CD 4 where a terrace was cut at the other end of the North Platform, at c.27m A.T. (see Fig.IV.29). The idea of digging a terrace to adjoin the North Platform at this depth was not, therefore, a new one.

Unlike the strata in the adjoining area FGH 3-4, the strata in F 3-4 did not slope away to North or East but lay horizontally (Tagebuch 1873 p.12; TA p.189). This indicates that we are dealing with an area of habitation within the circuit described by the Troy II citadel walls. The deposits cannot easily be divided on the basis of Schliemann's information about the objects found at specified depths: there is a more or less homogeneous collection of Early and Middle Bronze Age material. Depths appear to be measured down from a datum of c.37.50m A.T.

Deposit (1). Schliemann makes specific mention of the strata at 4-7m deep (=c.33.50-c.30.50m A.T.), and in doing so implicitly makes a distinction between them and the overlying strata at 0-4m deep. These overlying strata, which cannot on the internal information from Area 4 be subdivided, constitute Deposit (1). Presumably they, like the underlying strata, are the subject of Schliemann's general remark that the debris on the "great platform" consisted of calcined rubbish. With the exception of the pieces of sculpture, the objects appear to be of EB-MB date. The depths suggest that they mostly derive from Troy IV. But there may have been an overlying deposit of Troy V, not detected by Schliemann.

(Tagebuch 1873 pp.6,10)

OBJECTS FOUND

POTTERY

- | | | |
|------|--------|---|
| B202 | *73-96 | Flask with globular body, flattened base and tall cylindrical neck. (3m) <u>Atlas 120-2356</u> ; Fig.V.28. |
| C8 | 73-123 | Jar with flattened base and tall, cylindrical neck. Two pointed lugs on the shoulder, two pointed plastic knobs and a larger, flatter knob below them decorate the body. The <u>Atlas</u> notes four similar jugs from 1 and 2m (3m). <u>Atlas 120-2367</u> , <u>Ilios No.1294</u> , <u>SS 1846</u> ; Fig.V.29. |
| D30 | 73-79 | Ring-shaped vessel with three feet, one spout, and handle connecting spout with opposite side of the ring (3m). <u>Atlas 120-2352</u> , <u>TR No.160</u> , <u>Ilios No.1392</u> , <u>SS 3246</u> , <u>TI Fig.209</u> ; Fig.V.29. |

POLISHED STONE

- | | | |
|--|--------|--|
| | *73-93 | Diorite celt (1m). <u>Atlas 122-2433</u> ; Fig.V.42. |
|--|--------|--|

WHORLS

- | | | |
|-------|---------|---|
| RVIAa | *73-12 | (3m) <u>Atlas 121-2387</u> ; Fig.V.49. |
| GX | *73-36 | (3m) <u>Atlas 121-2381</u> . |
| GIII | *73-78 | (3m) <u>Atlas 122-2439</u> . |
| GIA | *73-86 | (2m) <u>Atlas 122-2415</u> , <u>SS 5091</u> . |
| GIC | *73-114 | (3m) <u>Atlas 122-2436</u> . |

SCULPTURES

Many sculptured marbles, Tagebuch 1873 p.4.

Deposit (2). Schliemann notes that from the strata at 4-7m deep (= c.33.50-30.50m A.T.) there came fragments of good quality pottery. This suggests that he felt able to distinguish some change in the deposits at c.33.50m A.T. Such a change appears to have been noticed in 1872 in the related strata in CD 3-4 (see Fig.IV.27) and has been assumed for F3 (see Fig.IV.19). At these depths (c.33.67-c.30.00m A.T.) in CD 3-4 Schliemann observed yellow and brown ash. Here in F 3-4 he records yellow and grey ash and calcined debris on the upper platform. There is no direct evidence for making a further division of the deposit at c.32.17m A.T., but such a division has been extrapolated from CD 3-4, so that Deposit (2) consists only of the strata between c.33.50m and c.32.17m A.T.

(Tagebuch 1873 p.10)

OBJECTS FOUND

POTTERY

- | | | |
|--------|-----------|---|
| A12 | (*)73-4 | Shallow bowl with flat base and incurving rim (4m). Fig.V.24. |
| A225 | (*)73-27 | Tankard with narrow, flat base, narrowed neck and flaring mouth. Two large loop-handles run from mouth to body (4½m). Fig.V.24. |
| A225 | (*)73-51 | Tankard with globular body, flat base, flaring neck, and two large loop-handles (restored) from rim to body (4½m). <u>Atlas 119-2339</u> ; Fig.V.24. |
| B20(?) | (*)73-46 | Jug with globular body and rounded base. Neck and mouth missing, but were joined by loop-handle to upper part of body (4m). <u>Atlas 119-2337</u> ; Fig.V.25. |
| B24 | (*)73-108 | Neck, mouth and upper part of body of trefoil-mouthed jug. Stub of a handle from back of spout (4m). <u>Atlas 120-2359</u> ; Fig.V.25. |
| B207 | (*)73-15 | Ovoid vessel with three short feet and short, simple (or broken?) neck. There may be a vertical handle or lug on the shoulder (4m). <u>Atlas 119-2327</u> ; Fig.V.26. |
| C32 | (*)73-92 | Globular vessel on low pedestal-base, with hole-mouth or missing neck in top of vessel. Two V-shaped tab-handles are on the sides of the vessel and are vertically perforated (4m). <u>Atlas 120-2355</u> ; Fig.V.26. |
| D8 | (*)73-122 | Flaring cylindrical lid with flanged top, surmounted by two crossed loops and central knob (4m). <u>Atlas 120-2366</u> ; Fig.V.27. |
| D24 | 73-105 | Ovoid vessel with rounded base, short-vertical neck, three tall legs, one or more lunate horizontal lugs on body, and heavy vertical loop-handle on upper |

half of body (5m). Atlas 120-2362, TR No.161, Ilios No.1033, SS 2808; Fig.V.26.

METALWORK

- (*) 73-126 Iron arrowhead with ribbed, quadrilateral head, stout haft, and ring at junction of haft and blade (4m). Atlas 119-2344, SS 6502; Fig.V.38. Intrusive.

POLISHED STONE

- (*) 73-72 Broad, nearly square diorite celt blade (4m). Atlas 121-2412; Fig.V.42.

BONE ARTEFACTS

- 72-121 Incised bone plate. One edge is straight, the other two are curved and the general effect is roughly triangular. There are seven holes along the straight edge. The whole is covered with incised decoration (4m?). Atlas 122-2435, TR No.9, Ilios No.520, SS 7962. It is uncertain whether the original depth was 4m or 7m. A pencilled note on the object itself may have been unclear. Fig.V.43.

WHORLS

GVI	*	73-11	(5m)	<u>Atlas</u> 121-2377?
RVIIDc	*	73-18	(5m)	
GIC	*	73-23	(5m)	
RIA	*	73-24	(5m)	<u>Atlas</u> 121-2404, <u>SS</u> 4520.
GVB	(*)	73-25	(4m)	<u>Atlas</u> 121-2386, <u>SS</u> 5273.
GVIIIIC?	(*)	73-32	(4m)	<u>Atlas</u> 121-2394.
GVI	(*)	73-34	(4m)	<u>Atlas</u> 121-2389, <u>TR</u> No.454, <u>SS</u> 5291.
GIC	*	73-80	(5m)	<u>Atlas</u> 122-2442, <u>TR</u> No.435, <u>SS</u> 5225.
GIA	(*)	73-81	(4m)	<u>Atlas</u> 122-2443.
GVII	*	73-83	(5m)	<u>Atlas</u> 122-2413, <u>SS</u> 5325.
RVIIDc	*	73-84	(5m)	<u>Atlas</u> 122-2414.
RVIAb	(*)	73-85	(4m)	<u>Atlas</u> 122-2427.
RIIIA	(*)	73-87	(4m)	<u>Atlas</u> 122-2417.
RVIIBb	(*)	73-89	(4m)	<u>Atlas</u> 122-2418; Fig.V.49.
GVA	*	73-100	(5m)	<u>Atlas</u> 122-2429, <u>SS</u> 5236.
RVIIBb	*	73-103	(5m)	<u>Atlas</u> 122-2423.
GXII	*	73-117	(5m)	<u>Atlas</u> 122-2430, <u>SS</u> 5606; Fig.V.50.
GID	(*)	73-119	(4m)	<u>Atlas</u> 122-2431.
GX	(*)	73-120	(4m)	<u>Atlas</u> 122-2440.
RVIIE	*	73-131	(5m)	<u>Atlas</u> 122-2449, <u>SS</u> 5043.
RVIB	*	73-134	(5m)	<u>Atlas</u> 122-2446, <u>SS</u> 4820; Fig.V.49.
GIB	*	73-136	(5m)	<u>Atlas</u> 122-2441.

FIGURINE

- (*) 73-112 Terracotta figurine, or upper part of figurine, crudely cruciform. The front is incised with dots and horizontal lines, the back with vertical lines (4m). Atlas 122-2432, TR No.171, Ilios Nos.1403-4, SS 7632; Fig.V.45.

Deposit (3). This deposit consists of the remaining strata of ash between c.32.17m and c.30.00 or 30.50m A.T. - that is, to the depth of 7m

which Schliemann mentions. Blegen found that in the adjacent deposits in the "island" in F3 the remains of Troy II extended up to 31.75m A.T. and higher, there being a thick topmost stratum of red, burnt earth. The material from this deposit in F 3-4 is broadly consistent with such a dating, although it is not specific enough to require it.

(Tagebuch 1873 p.10; Troy I p.372)

OBJECTS FOUND

POTTERY

- A217 * 73-3 Tankard with rounded body, flat base, very flaring mouth, and large loop-handle from rim to body (7m). Fig.V.17.
- A222 (*)73-41 Globular jar with flat base, low flaring neck, and two large loop-handles from rim to lower half of body, rising above level of the mouth (6m). Atlas 119-2334, Ilios No.1094? Fig.V.22.
- B3 * 73-73 Small globular jug with rounded base, straight neck and horizontal mouth. A loop-handle (restored) runs from base of neck to middle of body (7m). Atlas 119-2347; Fig.V.17.
- B15 * 73-52 Ovoid jug with flat base, tall straight neck cut away at the back. A handle (restored) runs from neck to middle of body (7m). Atlas 119-2340, SS 1785; Fig.V.18.
- B201 (*)73-74 Flask with rounded base, slight carination around middle of body, chimney neck and horizontal mouth. One (or more) V-shaped lugs on the shoulder, and two perforations just below the mouth (6m). Atlas 119-2348.
- B208 (*)73-13 Ovoid flask with flattened base, short straight neck developing into two pinched-out spouts on either side of the mouth (6m). See 73-16, below.
- B208 (*)73-16 Ovoid flask very similar to 73-13; or possibly a duplicate drawing of the same flask (6m). Atlas 119-2328 (7m!); Fig.V.22.
- C28 (*)73-42 Globular jar with flat base, short straight narrow neck, one or two crescent handles on the sides, and two pointed lugs (6m). Atlas 119-2336; Fig.V.22.
- C30 73-47 Neck of a face-jar. The neck has a slightly flaring rim, and is decorated with plastic ears, eyes, eyebrows and nose (7m). Atlas 119-2341; Fig.V.19.
- C35 (*)73-48 Jar with three short feet, tapering neck and two pointed lugs set on the shoulder (6m). Atlas 119-2338; Fig.V.23.
- C222 (*)73-14 Jar narrowing towards a flat base. Neck broken off. On one side of the body there is a double lump, the remains of either a lug or a handle (6m). See 73-17.
- C222 (*)73-17 Globular jar with rounded base. The neck is broken off. A lump on one side of the body may be the remains of a lug or handle (6m). Atlas 119-2329 (7m!). Fig.V.22. May be the same as 73-14.
- D13 73-104 Slightly flaring cylindrical face lid with rounded top and plastic decoration of eyes, eyebrows and very short nose placed on and just below the edge of the rounded top (1m). Atlas 120-2358, SS 1852; Fig.V.21.
- D15 * 73-29 Low, cone-shaped lid decorated with radial incisions and two holes near edge (7m). Atlas 121-2398; Fig.V.21.

- D31 73-124 One jar from a multiple vessel. Globular with two small pointed feet and one pointed and vertically-perforated lug on side of body. The low neck leads up to a mouth which appears to slant, but which may be broken (7m). Atlas 120-2368; Fig.V.19.
- D46 (*)73-111 Fragment of a grey "Snake's head" handle showing head, mouth, two eyes, two "horns" and ribs around neck. Probably intrusive from Troy VI (6m). Atlas 120-2363, TR No.170, Ilios No.1402, SS 3258; Fig.V.32.
- D212? (*)73-31 Shallow bowl with rounded base and nearly upright sides (6m). Fig.V.22.
- D212? (*)73-44 Shallow bowl with flat base and flaring sides (6m). Atlas 119-2335; Fig.V.22.
- D215 * - Miniature globular jar with rounded base and hole mouth (7m). Atlas 119-2346; Fig.V.18.

TERRACOTTA MODEL

- 73-45 Brilliant red, theriomorphic pot, depicting a hippopotamus or similar creature. Four stubby legs, folds on the neck, short tail (7m). Atlas 119-2330, TR No.159, Ilios No.340, SS 1760; Fig.V.21.

METALWORK

- 73-55 Ovoid copper weight (7m). Fig.V.35.

POLISHED STONE WEIGHTS

- 73-2 Alabaster, ovoid (6m). Atlas 121-2383? Fig.V.41.
- 73-30 Elongated, biconical (6m?). Ilios No.610; Fig.V.41.
- 73-49 Elongated, biconical, green (7m). Atlas 121-2396, SS 6867; Fig.V.41.
- 73-50 Ovoid, diorite (7m). Atlas 121-2397; Fig.V.41.

WHORLS

- RVA (*)73-5 (6m) Atlas 121-2378.
- RVIIF (*)73-6 (6m) Atlas 121-2376, SS 5075.
- GIVB (*)73-7 (6m) Atlas 121-2379 (=73-21).
- GVB? * 73-8 (7m) Atlas 121-2380.
- GVI (*)73-9 (6m) Atlas 121-2385, SS 5276.
- (*)73-10 (6m) " " "
- GIC (*)73-19 (6m) Atlas 121-2388.
- RVIIC (*)73-20 (6m) Atlas 121-2384, SS 4953.
- GIVB (*)73-21 (6m) Atlas 121-2379 (=73-7).
- RVIIAa (*)73-22 (6m)
- GVA (*)73-33 (6m) Atlas 121-2393, TR No.367, SS 5238.
- GVA (*)73-35 (6m) Atlas 121-2392, TR No.451, SS 5251.
- RVIIDc (*)73-56 (6m) Atlas 121-2400.
- GIVA (*)73-58 (6m) Atlas 121-2403, SS 5216.
- GIXD * 73-60 (7m) Atlas 121-2402 (5m!)
- GVIIIA * 73-66 (7m) Atlas 121-2407; Fig.V.50.
- RVIIBa * 73-67 (7m) Atlas 121-2409, SS 4904; Fig.V.49.
- RVIIDc * 73-69 (7m) Atlas 121-2406.
- RIIIB (*)73-91 (6m) Atlas 122-2421.
- GIVA (*)73-95 (6m) Atlas 122-2428.
- GVIIIB * 73-99 (7m) Atlas 122-2420, 122-2425.
- GIXD * 73-101 (7m) Atlas 122-2437.
- GIXD (*)73-113 (6m) Atlas 122-2434.
- RVIIDc * 73-116 (7m) Atlas 122-2424.
- GIA (*)73-118 (6m) Atlas 122-2426.

RVIIE * 73-132 (7m) Atlas 122-2450, SS 5051; Fig.V.49.
 RIB * - (7m) Atlas 121-2390.
 RVIIDc * - (7m) Atlas 121-2391.

TERRACOTTA BALL

* 73-68 (7m) Atlas 121-2408; Fig.V.46.

FIGURINE

73-102 Crude terracotta figurine with two small, pointed arms. On the front, three incised circles and a V-shaped line; on the back, vertical incised wavy lines (7m). Atlas 122-2438, TR No.165, Ilios Nos.195-6, SS 7629; Fig.V.45.

Deposit (4). This deposit is defined as consisting of all the material found on the lower terrace, between the depths of c.30.50 and c.27.50m A.T., with the exception of the wall to be discussed under Deposit (5). There are no clear descriptions of this deposit, but Schliemann does at one point say that he came upon stone-hard debris. Elsewhere there is a reference to "the unburnt layers on the east side of the great platform". These layers are said to contain mussel shells, bones, "sharks' vertebrae" and querns of pumice. The unburnt character appears to distinguish these strata from the material on the upper terrace (although it is not to be expected that the deposits on the upper terrace were, in reality, all burnt); and the rest of the description roughly accords with the character of Deposit (9) in CDEF 3, found in 1872, below the 30m level.

(Tagebuch 1873 pp.17,20)

OBJECTS FOUND

POTTERY

A200 *73-125 Simple bowl, hemispherical, with rounded base and plain rim (9m). Atlas 120-2369; see Fig.V.16.
 A210 *73-61 Shallow cup or dipper with rounded base and large loop-handle from rim to lower part of body (9m). Atlas 119-2342, SS 2731; see Fig.V.16.
 B15 *73-28 Jug with globular body, slightly flattened base, tall straight neck cut away at the rear. Loop-handle from rear of mouth to body (8m); see Fig.V.16.
 B203 *73-75 Flask with ovoid body, flat base and straight neck rising to slightly out-turned quatrefoil lip. Decorated with three pairs of incised (?) lines around middle of body and eight lines around neck (9m). Atlas 120-2349; see Fig.V.16.
 C35 * - Jar with globular body, three short feet, tall straight neck and two pointed lugs on the shoulder (8m). Atlas 120-2357; see Fig.V.16.

- C1 *73-107 Rim sherd from storage jar, decorated with impressed circles and incised herringbone (8m). Atlas 120-2361; see Fig.V.16.
- D3 73-97 Slightly flaring flanged cylinder-lid surmounted by single loop-handle (8m). Atlas 120-2354, Ilios No.332, SS 466; see Fig.V.16.

METALWORK

- *73-127 Silver pin with rolled head (8m). Atlas 120-2364; Fig. V.38.

POLISHED STONE

- *73-53 Quadrangular greenstone flat axe (8m). Atlas 121-2395, Ilios No.675? Fig.V.41.
- *73-71 Marble celt decorated with two horizontal lines and four dots across the upper, narrower end (9m). Atlas 121-2411; Fig.V.41.
- *73-106 Broken ovoid carnelian bead (8m). Atlas 120-2353, SS 7759, TI Fig.387a; Fig.V.41.
- 73-115 Macehead (?) of black stone, having a central depression surrounded by five rounded lobes (9m). Atlas 122-2444, TR No.167, Ilios Nos.224-5, SS 9267; Fig.V.41.

WHORLS

- GID *73-57 (9m) Atlas 121-2401.
- RVIAb *73-59 (9m) Atlas 121-2399.
- RVA *73-94 (8m) Atlas 122-2419.
- GII *73-135 (9m) Atlas 122-2445, SS 5162; Fig.V.50.

FIGURINE

- *73-70 Marble figurine incised with two dots and a vertical line, for eyes and nose (10m). Atlas 121-2410; Fig.V.44.

Deposit (5). On the lower terrace, at a distance of 25m from the edge of the mound, Schliemann found a wall of large stones at a depth of 9m. This wall, here called Wall 32, constitutes Deposit (5). According to Schliemann it was mostly in ruins and had only three courses in place. It stood to a maximum of 1m high, but there were loose stones at its foot ("below" it) which Schliemann took to derive from its collapse. The wall ran roughly East-West and is probably to be identified as the wall shown at the south end of the terrace in Atlas Taf.214. Despite his initial belief that the wall was a continuation of Wall 30, which lay in the "Temple" trench to the East, he actually found that it extended no further than the east side of the trench.

What structure this wall might have belonged to cannot be decided for certain. It must have lain c.5m North of the crosswall of Megaron IIR, a

location which coincides with Blegen's observation of the point at which Schliemann's southward excavation of the strata below IIR came to an end. The traces of Schliemann's trench can be seen in the gap cut through the middle of the building of Blegen's Troy "IIB" (Troy I figs.432,435). But to which phase, in Blegen's terms, might the wall belong? The building of "IIa" was stratified too deep and was undisturbed by Schliemann (Troy I fig.276). If it was the top of Wall 32 that was found at 9m deep (=c.28.50m A.T.) the wall could have belonged among the Troy "IIB" structure whose south room was paved at c.27.25m A.T. But the walls of the "IIB" building apparently contained few, if any, stones, and it is difficult therefore to fit this stone wall into the plan. The remaining possibility is that it was the foot of Wall 32 that lay at c.28.50m A.T., and that its top was preserved to no higher than c.29.50m A.T. In this case it might have formed an additional crosswall to Megaron IIR, for which there are other benchmarks of 29.46 and 29.24m A.T. (TI Taf.III), and whose other walls were found by Blegen to stand to an average of 60cm high (Troy I p.265). This is an attractive possibility, for Dörpfeld records that the walls of IIR were built of particularly large stones - a characteristic noted by Schliemann for Wall 32. I have therefore tentatively supposed that this is the building to which Wall 32 should be assigned, and that it must have been its foot which was found at c.28.50m A.T.

(Tagebuch 1873 pp.24,26; TA p.188; Atlas Taf.214; TI p.96; Troy I pp.251,258,265 and figs.276,432,435)

AREA v: F 3-4(b)

Figs.III.11; IV.22.

This area was excavated from 24th February to 1st March 1873, when work here was abandoned. The upper terrace already discussed under F 3-4(a) was extended some 6 or 7m towards the South, at c.30.59m A.T. The lower terrace was probably not taken further South but was cut deeper, possibly

to as much as 24.80m A.T.

Schliemann gives broad information about the deposits on both upper and lower terraces, but nothing which would enable them to be subdivided. The subdivisions shown in Fig.IV.22 are therefore hypothetical and are merely extrapolated in the same way as those shown for F 3-4(a). Within these subdivisions, therefore, the objects are listed by depth in the following catalogues.

Deposits (1), (2) and (3). These deposits, all on the upper terrace, consisted "mostly" of numerous horizontal strata of domestic refuse, much of it burnt.

(Tagebuch 1873 pp.40,45)

Deposit (1a). Objects which would be attributable to such a presumed deposit are listed below. There is one item which may derive from Troy VI (73-148); otherwise they all appear to be of E.B. or M.B. date.

		POTTERY
	<u>1-2m</u>	
B3	*73-150	Globular jug with flattened base, horizontal rim and handle from neck to body (2m). <u>Atlas</u> 123-2456; Fig.V.30.
B204	*73-149	Globular flask with small, flat base. Neck restored. Two very large, flaring tubular lugs placed vertically on the shoulders, each with a plastic ring encircling the narrow part of the lug (1½m). <u>Atlas</u> 123-2457, <u>Ilios</u> No.299 (restored, and attributed to 26 ft. deep), <u>SS</u> 1503; Fig.V.30.
C30(?)	* -	Terracotta vase with breasts, navel and arms but no face (1-2m). <u>TA</u> p.198.
C64	*73-148	Ovoid jar with flat base, short straight neck and slightly flaring rim. Two horizontal loop handles on the body and one (or two) squared, rising lugs or short wings in between (2m). <u>Atlas</u> 123-2455, (Troy VI). Fig.V.32.
		POLISHED STONE
	*73-144	Toggle or reel (?) of black stone (2m). <u>Atlas</u> 120-2375; Fig.V.47.
		WHORLS
	<u>2-3m</u>	
RIC	*73-167	(3m) <u>Atlas</u> 126-2545
RIC	*73-170	(3m) <u>Atlas</u> 126-2551
		FIGURINES
3G	*73-138	Marble figurine (3m). <u>Atlas</u> 120-2370; Fig.V.45.

Deposit (1b)

- 3-4m POTTERY
- A8 *73-159 Small hemispherical bowl with low, pedestal base (4m). Atlas 123-2458, SS 290; Fig.V.28.
- B3 *73-146 Jug with flat base, tall neck and horizontal mouth. Handle from neck to body (4m). Atlas 123-2452; Fig.V.28.
- B24 *73-158 Jug with flat base, narrow neck, slightly flaring pinched mouth, and handle from rim to body (3½m). Atlas 123-2460; Fig.V.28.
- C30 *73-147 Jar with flat base, horizontal neck, two wings (restored), and plastic decoration of face (without mouth) on the neck, and three knobs on body (4m). Atlas 123-2453; Fig.V.29.
- METALWORK
- One arrowhead (4m). (Tgb p.68; TA p.199).
- WHORL
- RIIIC *73-157 (4m) Atlas 126-2535, SS 4691
- SMALL FINDS
- *73-140 Terracotta cone with three holes in flat side (4m; but Atlas 120-2374 says 8m!). Atlas 120-2374, SS 7703, TI fig.453a,b; Fig.V.48.
- *73-143 Terracotta ball (4m). Atlas 126-2531; Fig.V.46.
- FIGURINES
- 3G *73-139 Marble figurine. (4m). Atlas 120-2373; Fig.V.45.

Deposit (2)

- 4-5m POTTERY
- A4(?) (*) 73-142 Simple bowl with rounded (?) base (5m). Atlas 120-2372; Fig.V.24.
- METALWORK
- (*) 73-192 Sickle (4½m). Atlas 124-2478, Ilios No.1418, TI fig. 383, SS 6454; Fig.V.37.
- WHORL
- GIII (*) 73-145 (4½m) Atlas 126-2533, SS 5207.
- 5-6m METALWORK
- (*) - Thin copper pins with rounded head and bent head (5-6m). TA p.199.
- BONE ARTEFACTS
- * 73-160 Short bone pin with ornamental head (6m). Atlas 123-2454; Fig.V.43.
- WHORLS
- GVII * 73-151 (6m) Atlas 126-2534, SS 5310.
- GVII * 73-153 (6m) Atlas 126-2536, SS 5332
- RIID * 73-154 (6m) Atlas 126-2537.
- RIVA * 73-156 (6m) Atlas 126-2540.
- GVII * 73-171 (6m) Atlas 126-2552, SS 5333.

FIGURINES

3A (*)73-164 Stone (?) figurine (6m). Fig.V.44.

Deposit (3)

- 6-7m POTTERY
- B213 73-187 Globular jug with flat base, neck bent back and cut-away spout. Handle from rear of spout to body (7m). Atlas 123-2467, TR No.166, Ilios No.365; Fig.V.18.
- B215 * 73-185 Jug with rounded base, slanting spout with highest point at rear; handle from neck to body (7m). Atlas 123-2466; Fig.V.18.
- C28 * 73-161 Jar with flattened base, straight neck and flaring rim. Two vertically perforated lugs on the body. Atlas shows a low pedestal or ring-base; but Tgb does not (7m). Atlas 123-2459, SS 420; Fig.V.18.
- C34 73-182 Globular vessel with three small feet, short straight neck encircled by ring at base, two vertically perforated lugs on the body. Incised (?) decoration on upper half of body - branch-designs in between vertical lines (7m). Atlas 123-2463; Fig.V.19.
- C- * 73-183 Biconical vessel with flat base, neck broken off (?), and two horizontal strap-handles on the shoulder (7m). Atlas 123-2464. Intrusive from VI. Fig.V.32.
- D30 * 73-184 Ring-vase with spout and basket-handle (7m). Atlas 123-2465, SS 3247; Fig.V.19.

METALWORK

- * - Copper saw (7m). Atlas 123-2462, cf. TI fig.270(b); Fig.V.35.
Two spearheads (7m). (Tgb 1873 p.68, apparently miscopied in TA p.199).

WHORLS

- GIA * 73-152 (7m) Atlas 126-2539, SS 5079.
- RIVB * 73-155 (7m) Atlas 126-2538.
- RIIIC * 73-168 (7m) Atlas 126-2546, SS 4684.
- GVII * 73-172 (7m) Atlas 126-2553.
- GVIIIB * 73-173 (7m) Atlas 126-2548; Fig.V.50.

- 7-8m POTTERY
- B13 * 73-188 Jug with flattened base, rising spout, and handle from neck to body (8m). Atlas 123-2468; Fig.V.17.
- B205 * 73-190 Globular flask with narrow, straight neck (partly restored) and two bulbous (crescentic?) handles on body (8m). Atlas 123-2469; Fig.V.19.
- C28 73-181 Globular grey-brown jar with tall straight neck, flattened base, and two vertical lugs on the body. Incised decoration of zigzags and dots around body and dots around base of neck (8m). Atlas 123-2461, Ilios No. 1016, SS 2345; Fig.V.18.

STONE

- * 73-141 Diorite hammer (8m). Atlas 120-2371; Fig.V.41.
- * 73-174 Diorite, elipsoid (8m). Atlas 126-2549; Fig.V.41.
- * 73-175 Diorite, elipsoid (8m). Atlas 126-2550; Fig.V.41.

WHORL

RVIIAa * 73-177 (8m) Atlas 126-2556, SS 4851; Fig.V.49.

Deposit (4). Schliemann notes that the strata at the bottom of the terrace lay horizontally and were of hard, grey ash. There were occasional pieces of polished black or red pottery, but none of the illustrated pieces can safely be assigned to this area.

(Tagebuch 1873 pp.40,45,47)

OBJECTS FOUND

METALWORK

- Lead pin with large head. Tgb 1873 p.40.

WHORL

GIA 73-169 (10m) Atlas 126-2547.

AREA vi: DE 3

Fig.III.16.

There is a brief note that Schliemann was continuing excavations on the north side of the mound in the period 7th-16th April 1873. This on its own could indicate work in HJ 1-2. But an additional remark that the "old platform" was being covered 2m deep with spoil places the work securely in DE 3, where Schliemann may have been extending either the terrace at c.30m or the platform at c.24.50m A.T. There are no objects which derive clearly from this trench.

(Tagebuch 1873 p.189)

AREA vi: CD 3-4

Figs.III.5; IV.18,23.

This area was excavated as a part of Schliemann's work on the North Platform during 12th-22nd May 1872. Digging was mostly concentrated on making a "terrace" 3m wide and 20m long, with its floor lying at c.30.00m A.T., adjoining the North-South trench of 1871. The deposits above the terrace floor were cut away at an angle of 50°, leaving a slope up to the South, where the excavation reached the mound-surface. But Schliemann does also say in his diary-entry for 21st May that he tried to reach virgin soil "almost everywhere" (Tagebuch 1872 p.359). So we must allow for a small part of the northern edge of the terrace having been dug away to the level of the rest of the north platform. Depths quoted in the catalogue are measured from the summit.

Deposits (1)-(2). Schliemann does not distinguish, or provide any information about, the character of strata overlying Wall 20 to a depth of 3m below the summit. But a few objects are attributable to a stratum at 3m, including a jug which may be dated to Troy VIIa if Blegen's sequence is correct.

OBJECTS FOUND

POTTERY

B29(?) *72-409 Jug with flattened base, spreading horizontal rim, and single handle from rim to body (3m). Atlas 35-875, SS 2190; Fig.V.33. Troy VII?

WHORLS

RIIA	*72-316	(3m)	
RIA	*72-317	(3m)	cf. <u>Atlas</u> 8-240.
RIIA	72-448	(3m)	cf. <u>Atlas</u> 5-135.
RIA	72-449	(3m)	cf. <u>Atlas</u> 8-240.

Deposits (3)-(4). Although no description is given of the strata surrounding Wall 20 at c.33.67-36.67m A.T., Schliemann does imply that a change in the soil could be seen at 33.67 (=6m deep) and below. The objects found in the levels between that and 36.67m A.T. must therefore be treated separately. They may derive from Troy IV-V in Blegen's terms. As in Fig.IV.17 a tentative division may be made between the objects from 4m deep (Troy V-Deposit (3)) and those from 4½-5m deep (Troy IV-Deposit (4)).

OBJECTS FOUND

TERRACOTTA

- D- 72-360 Terracotta rattle with loop handle (restored) and stones inside (5m). Atlas 46-1108, SS 7691; Fig.V.29.

WHORLS

- RVIAb (*) 72-357 (4m) Atlas 6-171(?)
 RVIAb (*) 72-375 (4m) cf. Atlas 6-171.
 RIA (*) 72-386 (4m)
 RIVA 72-455 (4m)
 RIVA 72-458 (4m)
 RIIIA 72-463 (4m)
 RIIIA 72-464 (4m)
 RIIIA 72-465 (4m)
 RIIIA 72-466 (4m)
 RIIIA 72-467 (4m)
 RIIIA 72-469 (4m)
 RIVA 72-470 (4m)
 RIIIA 72-472 (4m)
 RIVA (*) 72-306 (4½m)
 RIA (*) 72-364 (5m)
 RIIA (*) 72-371 (5m)
 GVII (*) 72-379 (5m)
 RIVB (*) 72-387 (5m) cf. Atlas 1-33, SS 4724.
 RIA (*) 72-394 (5m) cf. Atlas 8-240.
 RIA (*) 72-395 (5m) cf. Atlas 8-240.
 RIIIC (*) 72-444 (5m) Atlas 4-103, SS 4693.

Deposit (5). Wall 20, identified by Schliemann as belonging to a house, was found at c.36.67m A.T. (=3m deep). The preserved part was 17½m long and came to light just East of the area excavated in 1871. The position and orientation of the building can therefore be very closely fixed, as the length of the wall requires the building to have extended along the slope of the trench. The walls were constructed of hewn blocks of shelly limestone joined with clay, and presented a smooth surface. None of the blocks was more than ½m long. The walls were 1.90m thick and reached down to c.33.67m A.T. (=6m deep). The dimensions of this building, together with its style of construction, its orientation parallel to Wall 13, and its stratification over deposits that are predominantly E.B., and under deposits which may include some Troy VII material, make its attribution to Troy VI a virtual certainty. It must be the north wall of a hitherto unknown building. There is no clear evidence to show how the rest of the building should be reconstructed. The attempt in Fig.IV.18 is more or less arbitrary. Smith, in TR p.132, wrongly identifies the wall as No.24 on Plan II.

(Tagebuch 1872 p.348, TA p.88)

Deposit (6). Below Wall 20, at c.33.67m A.T. (=6m deep) Schliemann distinguished a stratum consisting of large heaps of burnt debris, mostly of yellow and brown ash. This may tentatively be assigned to Troy III in Blegen's terms, for it overlays a further four layers of ash and household debris descending to a depth of 10m (=c.30.00m A.T.), which must be assigned to Troy II. The depth of the division between the two is not given; but if we extrapolate from neighbouring areas, it may be placed at c.32m A.T.

(Tagebuch 1872 p.348; TA p.88)

OBJECTS FOUND

POTTERY

- B3 (*)72-406 One-handled jug (6m). Fig.V.25.
 B3 72-474 Ovoid jug with straight neck and three knobs on the body (6m). Fig.V.25.
 B201 (*)72-408b Globular flask with narrow, straight neck, no handles, decorated with horizontal lines (7m). Fig.V.25.
 B210 (*)72-407 Globular flask with ring-base, short cylindrical neck (restored), and two lugs (7½m). Atlas 56-1296; Fig. V.26.
 C1 (*)72-404 Coarse-ware jar with rounded base, straight neck and two vertical-loop handles (7m). Atlas 56-1306, Ilios No.1088, SS 2676; Fig.V.24
 C5(?) (*)72-473 Two-handled jar with no neck (missing?) but two knobs on the body (6m). Fig.V.26.
 C39(?) (*)72-408a Incised sherd with herringbone decoration (6m). Fig. V.27.
 D34 (*)72-361 Lamp or crucible (6m). Atlas 49-1196(?). Fig.V.26.

CHIPPED STONE

- Many small flint blades (Tgb 1872 p.349).

WHORLS

- RIIC (*)72-311 (6m)
 GIB (*)72-336 (7m)
 RIIIA (*)72-346 (7m)
 RIC (*)72-347 (7m) cf. Atlas 10-316.
 GIB (*)72-352 (7m)
 GIB (*)72-368 (7m)
 RIB (*)72-370 (7m) cf. Atlas 1-4.
 GVA (*)72-373 (7m) Atlas 9-298, TR No.383, Ilios No.1883, SS 5242.
 RIA (*)72-381 (7m) cf. Atlas 8-246.
 GIA (*)72-389 (7m)
 RIB (*)72-401 (6m) cf. Atlas 1-4.
 GIA (*)72-431 (7m)
 RIVA (*)72-435 (6m)
 RIIIA (*)72-436 (7m)
 RIB (*)72-443 (7m) cf. Atlas 1-4.
 RVIIIBa (*)72-446 (7m)
 RIIIA 72-447 (7m)
 RIVA 72-450 (7m)
 GIA 72-451 (7m) cf. Atlas 2-53, TR No.329, Ilios No.1829.
 RVIIDa 72-452 (6m) Atlas 4-120 (9m!); Fig.V.49.

RIVA	72-456	(7m)
RIVA	72-457	(7m)
RIVA	72-459	(7m)
RIIIA	72-461	(7m)
RIIIA	72-471	(7m)

Deposit (7). As this deposit, dating probably to Troy II, we may assign the four layers of ash and household debris which Schliemann detected below the yellow and brown of Deposit (6), and which he says descended to a depth of 10m.

(Tagebuch 1872 p.348; TA p.88)

OBJECTS FOUND

POTTERY

A4(?)	(*) 72-362	Bowl (8m). cf. <u>Atlas 67-1503</u> ; Fig.V.22.
A220	(*) 72-410	Two-handled cup (10m); see Fig.V.17.
B5	72-484	Ovoid bottle with short neck and out-turned rim; brown, slipped and burnished. (9m). <u>Atlas 82-1737</u> , <u>Ilios No.410(?)</u> , <u>SS 603</u> ; Fig.V.18.
C28	(*) 72-475	Globular jar with flat base, straight neck and vertical lugs (8m). Fig.V.22.
C34	72-482	Tripod jar with vertically perforated lugs and pierced, tapering neck (9m). <u>Atlas 79-1671(?)</u> ; Fig.V.19.
D.7	(*) 72-411	Coronet-lid (8m). <u>Atlas 72-1583(?)</u> ; Fig.V.24.
D33	(*) 72-405	Terracotta funnel (8m). <u>Atlas 66-1474</u> ; Fig.V.23.
D34	(*) 72-363	Lamp or crucible (10m). cf. <u>Atlas 86-1807</u> ; Fig.V.21.

METALWORK: TREASURE 'R'

The association of this small collection of metalwork with the skeleton later found in square D5 (Atlas p.24, TA p.168, Ilios p.272) is certainly false. What is not entirely clear is the depth at which it was found. The entry in the notebook (Tgb 1872, p.349) has 14m, but this is written over an earlier 9m. The 9m-figure is corroborated by the statement that it was 3m below the house (of Troy VI) with colossal walls, and helps to explain the later association with the skeleton, also from 9-10m deep. The figure of 13m, in the publications, can be disregarded as a rationalization. So probably can that of 14m. See further Antiquity 58 (1984) pp. 200-201 where, however, the 9m origin is probably wrongly dismissed.

72-478	Spiral ring of gold wire. <u>Atlas 17-522</u> , 98-2073; <u>Ilios No.150</u> , <u>SS 6142</u> ; Fig.V.38.
72-479	Open-ended ring of gold wire. <u>Atlas 17-516</u> , 98-2072a; <u>Ilios No.149</u> , <u>SS 6143</u> ; Fig.V.38.
72-480	Open-ended ring of gold wire. <u>Atlas 17-520</u> , 98-2072b; <u>Ilios No.148</u> , <u>SS 6144</u> ; Fig.V.38.
72-481	Golden shell earring, with six segments. <u>Atlas 17-517</u> , 98-2074a; <u>SS 6141</u> ; Fig.V.38.
72-477	Electrum pin with spherical head. <u>Atlas 17-514</u> , 98-2071; <u>Ilios No.151</u> , <u>SS 6145</u> ; Fig.V.38.

STONE MOULD

(*) 72-358/9	Circular stone mould for barbed arrowhead(?) (9m); Fig.V.40.
--------------	--

CHIPPED STONE

- Many small flint blades (Tgb 1872 p.349)

WHORLS

GVA	(*) 72-305	(9m) <u>Atlas</u> 9-289 (6m), cf. <u>TR</u> No.372, <u>Ilios</u> No.1872, <u>SS</u> 5247.
RIB	(*) 72-307	(8m) cf. <u>Atlas</u> 1-4.
RIB	(*) 72-313	(10m) cf. <u>Atlas</u> 1-3.
RIIB	(*) 72-321	(9m) <u>Atlas</u> 2-57, <u>TR</u> No.42, <u>Ilios</u> No.506.
RIIIB	(*) 72-331	(8m)
RIIA	(*) 72-337	(8m)
GIA	(*) 72-338	(8m) cf. <u>Atlas</u> 10-325, <u>SS</u> 5080.
RIIIA	(*) 72-342	(8m) cf. <u>Atlas</u> 5-150, <u>SS</u> 4641.
GIA	(*) 72-343	(8m) cf. <u>Atlas</u> 10-325, <u>SS</u> 5080.
RIIIC	(*) 72-348	(9m) Fig.V.49.
RIIA	(*) 72-349	(8m)
GIA	(*) 72-350	(8m) <u>Atlas</u> 11-350.
RIIA	(*) 72-353	(8m)
RIIA	(*) 72-354	(9m)
RIA	(*) 72-356	(9m) cf. <u>Atlas</u> 8-246.
GIA	(*) 72-365	(10m) <u>Atlas</u> 11-357, <u>SS</u> 5094.
RIIID	(*) 72-380	(9m) <u>Atlas</u> 12-387 (6m); Fig.V.49.
GIA	(*) 72-385	(10m) <u>Atlas</u> 12-389.
RIA	(*) 72-391	(9m) Fig.V.49.
GID	(*) 72-392	(10m) <u>Atlas</u> 11-353.
RIIIC	(*) 72-398	(9m) cf. <u>Atlas</u> 1-26.
RIIB	(*) 72-399	(9m)
RIIB	(*) 72-402	(8m)
RIB	(*) 72-413	(8m) cf. <u>Atlas</u> 1-4.
RIIC	(*) 72-414	(8m)
GIB	(*) 72-415	(9m)
RIB	(*) 72-416	(8m) cf. <u>Atlas</u> 1-3.
RVIAb	(*) 72-417	(10m)
GIB	(*) 72-418	(10m) cf. <u>Atlas</u> 10-328.
RIVA	(*) 72-419	(8m)
GVIIIIC	(*) 72-421)	(8m)
	(*) 72-422)	
RIIA	(*) 72-423	(10m)
RIIA	(*) 72-424	(10m)
RIIIA	(*) 72-425	(10m) Fig.V.49.
RIC	(*) 72-427	(9m)
RIA	(*) 72-428	(10m) cf. <u>Atlas</u> 8-246.
GIB	(*) 72-432	(10m) cf. <u>Atlas</u> 11-352.
RVA	(*) 72-433	(10m) Fig.V.49.
GIB	(*) 72-434	(10m)
RIIA	(*) 72-437	(10m)
RIB	(*) 72-438	(9m) cf. <u>Atlas</u> 1-3.
GIA	(*) 72-441	(10m)
RIIA	(*) 72-442	(9m)
RIIIA	(*) 72-445	(9m)
GIA	72-462	(8m) cf. <u>Atlas</u> 13-412.
RIIA(?)	72-483	(9m) Fig.V.49.

ANIMAL REMAINS

- Oyster shells (rarely) (Tgb 1872 p.349).

Deposit (8). Immediately above the 10m-deep terrace was Wall 21, a wall built of large, shelly limestone blocks, roughly hewn. The wall was 1.40m thick, but only a small part of it seems to have been exposed. Its lower courses seem not to have been uncovered. The exposed part of the wall can be identified as the upper courses of the north end of the east wall of Dörpfeld's Megaron IIA, the stone socle of which was 1.40-1.45m wide like its mudbrick superstructure. (The foundations were wider and measured 1.70m.) Towards the north end the floor of the building as recorded by Dörpfeld lay at 30.65m A.T., and the socle stood 20cm higher, i.e. to c.30.85m A.T. Schliemann's discovery of the north end of the building at this date implies that the building was up to 2½m longer than Dörpfeld suggested in his reconstruction.

(Tagebuch 1872 p.349; TA p.89; TI pp.85, 89f, fig.28, Taf.III)

Deposits (9)-(10). Little information is given about the deposits below Wall 21, at c.24.00-30.00m A.T.; probably not much was excavated here. Schliemann does, however, mention that these "lower earth walls" were very hard and contained many large stones. These are likely to be the continuation of Area ii, Deposit 8, and are here numbered as Deposit (9). A few finds are recorded, all deriving from the underlying Deposit (10). There is no reference to the pebble pavement at c.26.67m A.T., which may or may not have continued through Area vii.

(Tgb 1872 p.359; TA p.90)

OBJECTS FOUND

POTTERY

- (*) 72-476 Dark grey polished sherd, incised with wavy lines. Probably intrusive from VI (17m). Atlas 26-721a,b; TR No.79, Ilios No.53, SS 3194; Fig.V.33.
- D202 (*) 72-485 Simple coronet-lid. (16m). Atlas 102-2281; see Fig.V.16.

STONE MOULDS

- (*) Mould for seven weapons and tools, not illustrated (16m). (Tgb 1872 p.361).

AREA viif: DE 3-4(a)

Figs.III.17; IV.24,25.

Schliemann dug in this area during the period 17th April-10th May 1873. His object here was to remove the block of earth which protruded northwards between the North-South trench and the Northeast trench in F 3-4. Most work was directed to cutting a terrace at 10m deep, although since the mound-surface in this area lay at c.39.50m A.T. and the terrace was in fact cut at c.30.85m A.T., the terrace's depth was in reality closer to 9m. There was also some attempt to extend southwards the old North Platform at c.23.67m-24.75m A.T., but this was not much pursued. The block of earth must have been 20-30m wide. There is no indication of how far into the mound the excavation progressed in this period. I have estimated the distance to be a possible 10 metres.

There is some confusion over the way Schliemann calculated the depths of features and finds in this trench. Objects are recorded from depths of ½m, 3m, 4m, 5m, 6m, 7m and 8m. This is a continuous sequence, more or less, which peters out before the 9m-depth at which the terrace was cut (although two isolated objects may come from 10m and 11m). It seems likely, then, that the depths of these objects were correctly measured from the surface of the mound. By contrast, Schliemann also records a number of house-walls in "the upper levels" at 6-10m deep. Here it is most likely that the figure of 10m is the purely theoretical figure for the depth of the terrace. If so, then the 6m-figure will simply indicate that the walls reached to 4m above the terrace. In reality the depths of these features may be 5-9m.

Schliemann says that he found here "a mass of interesting objects" (Tagebuch 1873 p.209). Unfortunately very few items can be assigned to the trench with certainty. Nevertheless Schliemann is explicit in attributing large numbers of objects to the Northwest Trench and to the trench CD 5-6 during the same period. Others seem, in the Atlas, to be grouped either with the finds known to have come from the Northwest Trench or with those known to have come from CD 5-6. After all these have been excluded, there remains a very small number of objects whose provenance is uncertain. I have taken the liberty of assuming that these may derive from DE 3-4. Such objects are marked in the catalogue with an asterisk. But it is unlikely that they constitute the full tally of

material found in this trench.

Deposit (1). There is no information about the topmost strata in the trench. Judging from the finds, however, it seems that Troy VI-VII and VIII-IX were all stratified above the 4m-level, or higher (=c.35.50m A.T.). From a depth of 4m and below, the recorded objects are all of E.B.-M.B. date. I have therefore made a division of the strata at c.35.50m A.T., in Fig.IV.25, and taken this as the lower limit of deposit (1).

Deposit (2). To this deposit are assigned the M.B. objects found at 4m-deep (=c.35.50m A.T.), and overlying the walls found at c.30.50-c.34.50m A.T. There is no information about the character of the soil. The finds should be attributable mostly to Troy V in Blegen's terms.

OBJECTS FOUND

POTTERY

- A209 73-694 Tall chalice with hollow, fenestrated pedestal, conical bowl and restored loop-handle set on rim (4m). Atlas 158-3063, TR No.231, Ilios No.1185, SS 264; Fig.V.30.
- B21 (*) - Squat jug with wide, flattened body, three short feet and funnel neck leading to cutaway spout. Handle from mouth to body, and two lugs on the side of body (4m). Atlas 167-3267, Ilios No.1048(?), SS 2785; Fig.V.30.
- B22 (*)73-739 Red-polished piriform jug with rounded base, tall neck and trefoil mouth; two vertical loop-handles on body, and handle from neck to shoulder (4m). Atlas 160-3081, Ilios No.1143, SS 1533; Fig.V.30.
- B221 (*) - Conical jar with flattened base and narrow hole mouth; two long spouts rise diagonally out of the body, and one (or two) pointed "wings" (4m). Atlas 167-3268, Ilios No.1177, SS 1507; Fig.V.30.
- C5(?) (*) - Piriform jar with rounded base and horizontal rim; two loop-handles set vertically on shoulders. Decorated with plastic bucrania and impressed (?) dots (4m). Atlas 168-3275; apparently not the same as Ilios No. 1188, SS 2225; Fig.V.30.
- C218 (*) - Squat jar with three short feet, short cylindrical neck, and two volute-handles set on sides (4m). Atlas 168-3284; Fig.V.30.

WHORLS

- GVA (*)73-710 (4m) Atlas 162-3105, SS 5248.

WEIGHT

- (*)73-700 Circular piece of flat terracotta with two holes near one side (4m). Atlas 162-3101; Fig.V.47.

Deposit (3). This is the material which was found surrounding the walls to be mentioned under Deposit (4), and in the presumed destruction-deposit overlying them. It lay at c.30.50-c.35.50m A.T. Schliemann says that it consisted of burnt debris. It will probably have derived from Troy II-IV.

(Tagebuch 1873 p.209)

OBJECTS FOUND

POTTERY

- B5 * - Bottle with pointed base, narrow neck and slightly flaring mouth (6m). Atlas 167-3263, Ilios No.1129(?); Fig.V.29.
- B13 (*) - Squat jug with rounded base, broad neck and rising spout. Handle from rim to body; decorated with incised vertical lines in groups of three from neck to base (5m). Atlas 167-3272, SS 2292; Fig.V.28.
- B202 (*) - Tall narrow neck perhaps from flask; two holes just below mouth (5m). Atlas 162-3133; Fig.V.28.
- C28 (*) - Globular jar with flat base, concave neck above carination at the shoulder, out-turned rim. Two vertically-perforated lugs on the shoulder (5m). Atlas 168-3277, SS 1259; Fig.V.29.
- C210 (*) - Globular jar with narrow, flat base and narrow hole mouth surrounded by impressed dots. Two vertical loop-handles set on body (5m). Atlas 167-3265; Fig.V.29.
- D15 * - Flat pot-lid with central pointed knob, two holes in rim, and radial decoration of incised (?) lines (7m). Atlas 164-3201; Fig.V.27.

WHORLS

- GVII (*) 73-713 (5m) Atlas 162-3109.
- GVII (*) 73-714 (5m) Atlas 162-3111, TR No.363, Ilios No.1863, SS 5303.
- RVIB (*) 73-765 (5m) Atlas 162-3123.
- RIIA (*) - (5m) Atlas 164-3189, TR No.431, Ilios No.1931.
- GVII * - (6m) Atlas 164-3187, TR No.366, Ilios No.1866, SS 5300.
- RVA * - (7m) Atlas 164-3194.
- GIB * - (7m) Atlas 164-3195.
- RVA * - (8m) Atlas 164-3188.
- GID * - (8m) Atlas 164-3190.

FIGURINES

- 2B *, - Flat marble figurine with incised eyebrows and dotted eyes (8m). Atlas 164-3203; Fig.V.44.
- 2C * - Flat marble figurine with incised eyebrows (8m). Atlas 165-3209; Fig.V.44.
- 3G * - Flat marble figurine with incised nose and dotted eyes (8m). Atlas 165-3210; Fig.V.44.

Deposit (4). Under this deposit are grouped together all the walls found by Schliemann on the terrace, "in the upper levels". Their

theoretical depth was 6-10m; their actual depth was probably 5-9m. i.e. c.30.50m-c.34.50m A.T. The walls to which Schliemann refers must be those shown in Atlas Taf.214,215 and described there as "Trojan houses and later walls built upon them". They are shown on Fig.IV.24, and are numbered Walls 60-68. The variety of orientation amongst these walls suggests what Schliemann noted - that they derive from more than one period. Considering the depths of the deposit, they have a possible range of Troy II-IV. It is ^{mostly} impossible now to date them with any certainty. Wall 67 can almost certainly be identified as the east wall of Megaron IIA, even though the walls seems in Atlas Taf.214 to be oriented rather differently from the megaron. The remaining walls, however, do not seem to coincide with the other Troy II walls shown in TI Taf.III, or to link up with walls shown in Burnouf's plan in Ilios Plan I - walls which may date from a late phase of Troy II or an early phase of Troy III. Probably they all derive from later periods - that is, from Troy III-IV (in Blegen's terms), and perhaps from two or more phases. It is impossible now to decide which wall might belong with which.

(Tagebuch 1873 p.209; TA p.282)

Deposits (5) and (6). Schliemann records that in the "lower levels" of the trench, i.e. at c.25-30m A.T., a colossal wall of earth and stones had come to light. It was not much investigated, but he speaks of it as being apparently a large fortification wall. This allows us to identify it as the wall marked '27' in Atlas Taf.214 (TR Plan 2), "Wall of Fortification anterior to the time of Troy", as the wall just South of X in Ilios Plan I, and as the wall of City II discussed at Ilios p.268f. From this last we learn that it has "real masonry" only on the outside and consisted "for the rest of loose stones". We can thus be fairly sure that it was a retaining-wall, or part of a retaining-wall, holding in place the rubble from a levelling operation. The two most likely walls with which it might be connected are Wall 'm' and Wall 17. Its location seems to favour an identification with Wall 'm', as Wall 17 probably lay about 10m further North. Its 'colossal' character, on the other hand, rather favours an identification with Wall 17. The explanation is perhaps provided by Ilios Plan III, the North-South section, where we are referred to the feature marked 'V'. There are two such, the lower of which looks irresistibly like Wall 'm' in Blegen's section (Troy I fig.422) while the upper looks very much like the stratum of stoney rubble which lay to the South of Wall 17. Schliemann thought he

was faced with a wall 5 or 6m high; actually it was Wall 'm' overlain by rubble belonging to Troy II. The continuation of Wall 'm' here is called Wall 70 and regarded as Deposit (6). The overlying strata are dubbed Deposit (5), from which there are two objects.

(Tagebuch 1873 p.209; TA p.282; Ilios pp.24,40,268-9; Plans I,III)

OBJECTS FOUND

WHORLS

GX * 73-808 (10m) Atlas 166-3241.
GVIIIIC 73-802 (11m) Atlas 166-3240.

Deposit (7). Atlas Taf.214 shows a second wall overlying the two previous deposits but going off at right-angles to them. This could be either the north end of the east wall of Dörpfeld's Megaron IIB, or a part of Dörpfeld's building of Troy II.2. It might, then, have been preserved to an altitude of c.30.83 or c.30.17m A.T. as shown by Dörpfeld for neighbouring parts of these buildings. Here it is numbered Wall 69.

(Atlas Taf.214; TI Taf.III)

AREA ix: DE 3-4(b)

Figs.III.18; IV.26,27

This area was excavated during the period 10th-24th May 1873. The terrace at c.30.90m A.T. - notionally at a depth of 10m - was extended southwards by up to 10m. There was also some work on the lower terrace at "14m" deep; this work cannot be located or quantified. The datum

probably lay at c.39.50m A.T. Few objects can be attributed to the trench with any certainty.

Deposit (1). We have no information about the material found at 0-4m deep.

Deposit (2). At "4-10m" deep, i.e. at c.35.50-c.30.90m A.T., Schliemann found a "mass" of housewalls, one on top of another, built of stones and earth. He gives no detailed description of these, but they are shown in Atlas Taf.214, and have been reproduced in Fig.IV.26. Probably Walls 61, 62,64 and 68 were further exposed, while Walls 84-88 were newly discovered. No very firm conclusions can be reached on their date; they must be from Troy III-IV in Blegen's terms, and possibly from more than one phase.

(Tagebuch 1873 pp.250,264; Atlas Taf.214)

Deposit (3). There is no information about the deposits surrounding the walls mentioned under Deposit (2). But three objects can be attributed to these layers. All are double-necked jugs, the only three such from the excavations.

OBJECTS FOUND

POTTERY

- | | | |
|------|---------|--|
| B217 | - | Jug with globular body, slightly flattened base, double neck and rising spouts with "rivet" on each side. Handle from mouth to body (7m). <u>Atlas 174-3367, Ilios No.1176(?)</u> , <u>SS 873; Fig.V.25.</u> |
| B217 | - | Squat, grey jug with rounded base and body, double neck and two rising spouts. Single handle from neck to body (8m). <u>Atlas 175-3390, TR No.286, Ilios No.359, SS 627; Fig.V.18.</u> |
| B217 | *73-888 | Necks of double necked jug with rising spouts (7m). <u>Atlas 175-3383; Fig.V.25.</u> |

Deposit (4). A deposit of Troy II material must be presumed to have overlain Deposit (5), but there is no information about it.

Deposit (5). In the lower platform Schliemann found a deposit of white stones which he took to be a continuation of the supposed platform of white stones previously found in D 3-4 at c.27m A.T. It may be this feature which is shown in Atlas Taf.214 at No.26, described as a mosaic antedating the time of Priam.

(Tagebuch 1873 p.269; Atlas Taf.214)

Deposit (6). Schliemann records that he found several walls at a depth of 14m. This presumably means that the walls were found on the lower platform, with their bases at c.25m A.T. or lower. Unfortunately none is shown on Atlas Taf.214 and there is no further information about them or about the deposits surrounding them.

(Tagebuch 1873 p.269; AAZ Beilage zu Nr. 165, 14th June 1873, p.2528)

THE NORTH-SOUTH TRENCH:
NORTHERN SECTOR

1950
1951
1952
1953
1954
1955

By the end of his 1873 season, Schliemann had completed a trench which cut all the way through the western half of the mound from squares CD 2 to CD 9. This famous, even notorious, North-South trench was a large undertaking; but it divides naturally into three areas which it will be convenient to consider separately: a northern sector, a southern sector and a central sector. Here we will be concerned with the northern sector, which may be defined as that part of the North-South trench which extended from the northern edge of the mound to the middle of square D6 where it met the East-West trench (see figs.III.7,18).

The trench was laid out across the summit of the mound and embraced most of the area that lay at 39m A.T. and above. But it also cut through a part of the slope on the northwest face where the surface lay at only 27.50m A.T. It developed in a rather haphazard way. Initially there was Schliemann's 3m-deep hole dug into the summit of the mound during three days' work in 1870 (Fig.III.1). In 1871 this was incorporated into a trench 60m long and 10m deep, reaching from the summit in D5 to the northwest face of the mound (Fig.III.2). In the following year the trench was widened to the East, by making a cutting southwards from the west end of the North Platform; and the trench was also extended further South into square D6 (Figs.III.6-7). Schliemann was by now digging mostly at a depth of c.27m A.T. and in fact deepened the eastern half of the area already dug by a further 3m to meet this target. Views of the trench in this state are given in Atlas Taf.108,111. Here the main body of the trench was left, except that in May and June 1873 he exposed an area to the east of the trench, in DE 4, cutting down to a level of c.31m A.T. (Figs.III.18-19). The trench in its final state, therefore, had a western strip cut down to c.30m A.T., an eastern platform cut to c.31m A.T., a central length cut to c.27m A.T.; and to the North of this last lay the west end of the North Platform cut to c.24m A.T. The overall length will have been in the region of 75 metres, and the width over 30m at its widest point in squares CDE 4.

The structure of the mound in this northern sector of the North-South trench seems to present few problems, exhibiting a fairly even, horizontal accumulation of deposits throughout. This is because the area fell entirely within the limits of the Troy II fortifications and rested on the horizontal platform laid out at that time.

Deposits of Troy VIII-IX nevertheless do seem in this trench to reach down to uneven depths. In Areas iii and v there is evidence that they penetrated to a depth of at least 1m. In Area ii there were lentoid clay weights and sculptures at 2m deep, and three inscriptions besides. But in Area i it seems clear that deposits of VIII-IX went down at least to 3m deep, for Deposit (8) includes not only a coin of C.4th B.C., but lentoid clay weights as well. Area i produced the only well-attested building of VIII-IX, Building 1. Unfortunately Schliemann appears to have excavated only its interior in 1870, and to have demolished it in 1871. We therefore do not know whether the rectangular, stone-built chamber in D5 was simple and free-standing, or whether it was a part of some more elaborate structure. No paved floor was found, but a stratum of lime lay just at the base of the drafted masonry and just above the foundations of boulders (see Fig.IV.29), so Schliemann was probably right to see in this a floor. This suggests some not very elevated function for the building which, if the stratigraphy is to be believed, overlay a coin of C.2nd-3rd A.D. (Deposit 6). It is therefore possible that Building 1 was no more than a late barn, or some such structure. On the other hand its alignment with Dörpfeld's Building IXA is striking and suggests some earlier, more exalted purpose. In this case one could suppose that an original paved floor had been robbed out and replaced by a secondary, lime floor. But this is speculative. In Area ii, in 1871, Schliemann again mentions buildings of large, hewn stones in Deposits (1) and (2), but it is not clear whether he is referring again to Building 1 which he was now demolishing, or whether he had found additional structures of the same date.

No structures of Troy VII can be reconstructed in this trench. But there is some slender evidence for the (one-time?) presence of deposits of VIIb. In Area ii, Deposit (2) fluted sherds were found at 1-2m deep among material of VIII-IX, but overlying a well probably of Troy VI. Schliemann says they were sherds of the C.2nd A.D., but his identifications are unreliable and there is a possibility that they were pieces of Knobbed Ware from VIIb2. More secure examples occur at 1-2m deep in Area iii, Deposit (1b) and perhaps at 3m deep in Area v. It is possible that in Area iii, Deposit (1c) a deposit of VIIa-VIIb1 should be identified at 2-3m deep.

Similarly there are no major structures recorded from Troy VI. The south wall of Building 6 (Area iii, Deposit 2) is pure reconstruction. But something of this sort is required; moreover between it and Wall 20 to the North deposits of Troy VI descend at least to 4m and possibly to 5m deep (Area iii, Deposit 1); these may be from the interior of the building. Elsewhere, too, in the trench there is evidence of Troy VI pieces even at 4-5m deep (Area ii, Deposit 5). Two wells were found, both of which may have been used in Troy VI: Well 1, found complete with capstone at 2m deep in C 4-5 (Well Bg in TI Taf.III); and Well 2 with its top at 4m deep in square D4, apparently in Building 6 (marked "Pa" in Atlas Taf.117). Well 2, at least, seems to have been abandoned after Troy VI; but Well 1 may have survived into Troy VII or VIII, to judge from the altitude of the capstone.

Middle Bronze Age deposits were, however, preserved to a higher level - to only 2 or 3m deep in places (Area ii, Deposit 4; Area iii, Deposit 1c; Area v, Deposit 3). This can only mean that Troy VI structures were dug into the underlying deposits, sometimes removing all trace of Troy V, as in Area iii where Building 6 rests directly on, or even in, material probably deriving from Troy IV. Some traces of Troy V were found, though, at c.35.67-36.67m A.T., but little is recorded of them. Schliemann mentions finding stones with signs of scorching (Area ii, Deposit 4), but otherwise there is no architectural detail.

The rather crude observation of 1871, that a 3m-deep stratum could be discerned at 4-7m deep (=32.67-35.67m A.T.) showing walls of small, unhewn stones joined with clay, can probably be taken to indicate roughly (but only roughly) the limits of Troy III and IV (Area ii, Deposit 5). Areas iii and v, taken together with Blegen's results from the pillars in F 4-5 and E6, further refine the stratigraphy. The horizon dividing IV from III must occur around 33.50m A.T. (33.47/33.67), and that dividing III from II at around 32m A.T. (31.67-32.17m A.T.). Some mudbrick buildings of Troy IV, together with what may have been a pavement of small stones, were found in Area iii (Deposits 5,6); otherwise there are no features certainly attributable to Troy IV. Neither are there any certainly of Troy III. But a number of walls found on the east side of the trench in 1873 must belong either to Troy III or to Troy IV, or to both: Walls 62, 68, 90-93, 95, 97, 98 (see Areas vi and vii). The walls may be seen in Atlas Taf.214,215 and in Figs.IV.36-37 of the present work.

They continue the complex found on the North Platform in 1873 (see Figs. IV.24,26).

Of Troy II, it is clear that a large part of Megaron IIA was found and recorded. The north end may be the "room" noted in Area iii, Deposit (10); and in Areas vi and vii the northern cross-wall and the east and west walls were found - Walls 67, 89, 94. They can all be seen in Atlas Taf.214 and in Figs.IV.36,37. Megaron IIA will have been but one of the large buildings of stone noted at 10m deep at the bottom of the trench in 1871 (Area ii, Deposit 7). Overlying these remains were immense masses of burnt mudbrick debris in which Schliemann recognized, but did not fully record, mudbrick house-walls resting on stone foundations (Area ii, Deposit 6); many stones were encountered too. At a depth of 9½m (=c. 30.17m A.T.) and surrounding the north end of Megaron IIA was a stratum of yellow ash. It was in this that Treasure 'N' was discovered. At a slightly higher depth, apparently, the platform on the east side of the trench revealed what Schliemann called a 'stratum' of slag (Area vii, Deposit 5). The identification of the substance as slag seems to have been confirmed by visiting archaeologists, but it seems unlikely that Schliemann could have found a continuous stratum of the stuff. Two other features may be attributable to Troy II. One is a fragment of wall running East-West, found on the East side of the trench and described by Schliemann as a "Wall of Troy" (Wall 96: Area vi, Deposit 4); this may be another piece of the retaining-wall of Troy II.1 shown by Dörpfeld in square EF 5 of his plan. The second is a stratum of large stone blocks with its top at a depth of 10m (=c.29.67m A.T.). This was observed in Area iii (Deposit 11) and again in Area v (Deposit 7). It seems likely to be a continuation of the stratum of stones backing Wall 17 in two areas of the North Platform. If so, then it may provide further evidence for the existence of a platform of rubble laid out across the citadel in Early Troy II, with Wall 17 as its northern limit and retaining wall.

Not much is recorded of Troy I. In Area v was found a wall of small, roughly hewn stones joined with mortar (Deposit 7). This may have been at c.26.67m A.T. and, if so, will have derived from Troy I. Its exact whereabouts are not recorded. In Area iii Schliemann failed to find any continuation of the white, pebble pavement found earlier on the North Platform. But it appears that below the platform of stones at 10m deep

he did find, at c.13-14 $\frac{1}{2}$ m deep, a thick stratum of red ash (Area iii, Deposit 12) containing further deposits of slag; and, below that, a further mass of stones which may have been an additional stretch of the stone fill to the South of Blegen's wall 'm' (Area iii, Deposit 13). To its North, where Schliemann had dug down to c.24m A.T., he found 'stone-hard', ashy deposits typical of Troy I. It was among these that the two jars from a possible cist grave were found (Area iii, Deposit 14).

The northern sector of the North-South Trench has been divided into seven areas. These correspond to the areas tackled by Schliemann in the seven relevant periods distinguished in Chapter III, and they are represented in Figs.III.1-2, 6-7, 18-19. The results from each area are discussed individually in the following pages.

AREA I: D5

Figs.III.1; IV.28,29.

This was the first trench opened by Schliemann in his first season. Its location is shown in Atlas Taf.116. The trench, whose existence has not previously been noted by biographers and commentators, was placed on the highest part of the mound. The measurements of depth must therefore be taken from the summit at c.39.67m A.T. or thereabouts. The account in Briefwechsel I No.131 is confusing in its suggestion that excavation in this area penetrated below 3m. It did not. In the letter Schliemann has wrongly transferred to this trench the deposits below 3m which, in his notes, clearly belong to the trench in AB 4.

Deposit (1). Topsoil was encountered to a depth of 25cm.

(Tagebuch 1870 p.66)

OBJECTS FOUND

POTTERY

Unspecified sherds only

Deposit (2). Below the thin stratum of topsoil Schliemann found a rectangular building to which he eventually gave the measurements 17.90 x 13.25m. This is Building 1. The walls consisted of two upper courses of sandstone blocks 60cm x 1.43cm with a total height of 65cm, resting on limestone boulders which were 69cm high. The tops of the walls were preserved to various heights ranging from c.39.02 to 39.42m A.T. (=0.25-0.65m deep). One wall, possibly on the southeast side, is reported to have had a doorway 2.65m wide. Given the shape and size of the trench shown in Atlas Taf.116, only one orientation is possible for Building 1: an orientation which corresponds very closely to that of IXA. Building 1 was destroyed during the excavations of 1871, and it was never established whether or not the building extended behind this one, large chamber.

(Tagebuch 1870 pp.66,67,69,81; Tagebuch 1871 p.219; TA p.6; Bfw I p.164; Ilios p.21)

Deposit (3). Within Building 1, to a depth of 1m (=c.38.67m), was a stratum containing large stones, sherds and bones. It presumably underlay deposit (1).

(Tagebuch 1870 p.69)

OBJECTS FOUND

POTTERY

Unspecified sherds

ANIMAL REMAINS

Many bones

Deposit (4). At c.38.67m (=1m deep), below deposit (3), was a stratum of tough, nasty lime which Schliemann took to be the remains of a floor.

(Tagebuch 1870 p.69)

Deposit (5). Below deposit (4), and therefore at c.38.67m or a little deeper, was a stratum containing large stones, sherds and bones.

(Tagebuch 1870 p.69)

OBJECTS FOUND

POTTERY

Unspecified sherds

ANIMAL REMAINS

Many bones

Deposit (6). A stratum of ashes and other burnt matter, found by Schliemann at c.38.47m (=1.20m deep) below deposit (5).

(Bfw I p.164)

OBJECTS FOUND

COINS

1 coin of Hector Ilieon. (Dateable to 117-260 A.D.: cf. Bellinger types T147-T291).

Deposit (7). Below deposit (6) and at an unspecified depth lay an accumulation of ten more strata of burnt matter mixed with habitation debris. The lower limit of these strata was found at c.36.67m (=3m deep).

(Tagebuch 1870 p.74; Bfw I p.164)

Deposit (8). At a depth of 3m (c.36.67m A.T.), at the bottom of the trench, was a deposit containing many bones and sherds. It is not clear whether this formed a separate deposit or whether the note of it is only

an additional description of deposit (7).

(Bfw I p.165)

OBJECTS FOUND

POTTERY

Unspecified sherds

COINS

Coin of Ancient Sigeum (Dateable to 355-334 B.C.)
cf. Bellinger p.164

WEIGHTS

Terracotta pieces with two holes

ANIMAL REMAINS

Large masses of bones, including some identified
as "wild boars' teeth"

AREA ii: CD 3-5

Figs.III.2; IV.30,31.

This was the trench on which Schliemann concentrated all his efforts in October-November 1871. It was designed to run from the northern edge of the mound to the summit, where it embraced the previous year's excavation in D5. The length of the trench was initially 48m, increasing to 60m as greater depth brought the north end to a lower, and more distant, position on the north slope. At the north end its width was 10m, at the south end 15m. Excavation was carried to a depth of 10m below the summit, except in the two side-passages in C5 and DE 4, where excavation stopped at 7m. The side-passages were originally cut to give access for wheelbarrows to the main trench, but were abandoned when their maintenance became too time-consuming. The position of the trench is shown in Atlas Taf.116.

Deposit (1). To a depth of 1m (c.38.67m A.T.) was a stratum containing buildings of hewn stones joined with lime mortar.

(TA p.40)

OBJECTS FOUND

POTTERY

Unspecified coarse sherds (Bfw I p.194).

COINS

Copper coins of Ilium, Sigeum and Alexandria Troas. (Tgb 1871 pp.214,215,219; TA pp.7,9,40).

WEIGHTS

Many stamped lentoid clay weights with two holes. Wares are red, yellow, grey and black. (Tgb 1871 pp.216f,231; Bfw I p.195; TA pp.10,40).

SCULPTURE

Marble hand (30cm) (Tgb 1871 p.242).

ANIMAL REMAINS

Mussel shells, Oyster shells, Fish bones, Boars' tusks (TA pp.11,40).

Deposit (2). Below deposit (1), at c.38.67 to 37.67m (=1-2m deep), was a stratum containing buildings of large, hewn stones. Schliemann's reports differ as to whether or not they used mortar. It is not clear how far his descriptions of deposits (1) and (2) may be generalisations based on the rectangular building of D5 found in 1870.

(Tagebuch 1871 p.275; TA pp.9,40)

OBJECTS FOUND

POTTERY

Fluted sherds "of C.2nd A.D." (Tgb 1871 p.226).

METALWORK

Remains of an iron "sword" (Tgb 1871 p.219).

WEIGHTS

Many stamped lentoid clay weights with two holes. In red, yellow, grey and black wares. (Tgb 1871 pp.216f,231; TA pp.10,40; Bfw I p.195).

SCULPTURE

Head from a marble statue (c.1½m) (Tgb 1871 p.217).

INSCRIPTIONS

Three inscriptions in Greek, in the vicinity of the rectangular building of D5 found in 1870. Dateable to 350-200 B.C. TR pp.67-8, Ilios p.638, Tgb 1871 pp.216,217,225; Bfw I pp.198,201.

Atlas 28-751

Atlas 29-752

Atlas 29-753

Brückner No.26 (TI p.465), SS 9656.

Brückner No.27 (TI p.466), SS 9657.

Brückner No.1 (TI p.462), SS 9658.

ANIMAL REMAINS

Mussel shells, Oyster shells, Fish bones, Boars' tusks (TA pp.11,40).

Deposit (3). At c.37.67m A.T., apparently stratified below deposit (2), Schliemann found the top of Well 1. It was covered with a capstone measuring 98 x 76 x 36cm. The well itself was built of stones joined with mortar, and was 1m in diameter. It is marked 'Th' in Atlas Taf.117, and is described in Taf.214 as a hellenic well. In TI Taf.III it appears as Bg, situated at C 4-5. The well was cleared to a depth of 11.40m in 1871.

(Tagebuch 1871 pp.227,228; Bfw I p.192; Briefe p.117; TA pp.9,40)

Deposit (4). Stratified below deposit (2), at c.37.67m and reaching to c.35.67m A.T. (=2-4m deep), was a stratum which Schliemann identified as a mass of burnt matter. Here he found a few stones, often showing signs of scorching, but no large blocks such as were found in the higher levels.

(Tagebuch 1871 pp.229,230,275; Bfw I pp.199,332 no.266; TA pp.9,40f)

OBJECTS FOUND

POTTERY

The wares were handmade and very coarse. None of the pottery was painted.

B24?

Small pots with mouths sometimes "pinchée en arrière".

C30

Owl-face vase (3-4m).

C30/D13

Sherd with human face in low relief, thought by Schliemann to be Egyptian or Phoenician (4m).

(Tgb 1871 pp.224,228,230; Bfw I pp.196,199,202f; TA pp.11,41,42; Ilios p.21).

WHORLS

Stone whorls incised with circles. Of blue stone; and one of marble (3m).

Clay whorls are conical and biconical, usually incised on one side only.

(Tgb 1871 p.229; Bfw I p.195; TA pp.10f,23f,40).

ANIMAL REMAINS

Mussel shells, Oyster shells, Fish bones, "Sharks' vertebrae", Boars' tusks.

(Tgb 1871 p.229f; TA pp.11,40).

Deposit (5). At c.35.67m, below deposit (4), was a stratum 3m deep (to c.32.67m A.T.) in which Schliemann noted walls of small, unhewn stones joined with clay. At c.35.67-34.67m (=4-5m deep) the stones were "fairly well worked". It was this stratum which, because of the large numbers of stone implements, Schliemann at first took to represent the stone age.

(Tagebuch 1871 pp.242,275; Bfw I p.332 n.266; TA pp.26,34,41; Ilios p.21)

OBJECTS FOUND

POTTERY

Despite occasional (Mycenaean?) sherds with painting "in the Greek manner", found at c.35.67-34.67m, the pottery was in general coarse and handmade. At 34.67-32.67m (=5-7m deep) the wares were monochrome grey, black, red or yellow. (Ilios p.21; Selbstbiographie p.60).

A45?	Two-handled goblets.
A212?	Small cup with very large handle.
A-	Small goblet (4-5m).
B20?	Globular jugs with long necks.
B21?	Globular jugs with long necks and tripod bases.
C30	Jars with owl-face decoration, frequently (4-5m).
C32?	Jar with two raised arms.
C35?	Large jar with three small feet.
C39?	Pithoi.
D3	Bell-shaped lids ("goblets") (6m).
D7/8	"Coronet" lids.
D13	Owl-face lids.
D-	Miniature terracotta "canoes" (4-5m).
D-	Miniature "hearth" (4-5m).
D-	"Whetstones" (4-5m).
D-	Oval basin 2m in diameter.

(Tgb 1871 pp.224,238-241,252-3; Bfw I pp.195,196; TA pp.25-6; Selbstbiog. pp.60f).

METALWORK

Silver pin (5m).
 Copper knife 17½cm long (6-7m).
 Copper spearhead 16½cm long (6-7m).
 Copper armband (6-7m).
 Copper pins:
 2 (4-4½m).
 1, 9cm long (6m).
 2 with twisted heads (6m).
 1 with round head (6-7m).
 (Tgb 1871 pp.219,240,252,254-6; TA pp.21,25,42).

CHIPPED STONE

Flint blades in large numbers, including one long, flint knife (6-7m).
 (Tgb 1871 pp.230,241,256; TA p.29).

POLISHED STONE

Many implements of black stone (diorite?).
 Stone balls of various sizes (6m).
 Hammers, axes, granite weights, slate whetstones,
 querns of pumice and granite.
 Pounders.
 Pieces of large marble vessel (6-7m).
 (Tgb 1871 pp.230,239,244,253,255; Bfw I p.197;
TA pp.21,25-6,41).

BONE ARTEFACTS

Many bone needles, one with small decorative design.
 Bone "spoon".
 Pointed bone "knives" (4-5m and 6-7m).
 Bodkins.
 (Tgb 1871 pp.245,254; TA p.26).

WHORLS

These are more frequent than in higher strata.
 Conical and biconical types are attested. Decoration
 is incised and white-filled.
 Whorls are made of clay, stone, or broken sherds.
 Round flat stones with central hole, total diam. 2",
 painted red on one side.
 Large conical white marble whorl (6m).
 (Tgb 1871 pp.230,240,241,244,245,252,253; TA pp.
 23-4).

SMALL FINDS

Clay: terracotta "priapus" 10cm long; weights
 7-12cm long.
Stone: "priapus" of striped marble 1 inch long.
 Marble cylinder with central hole, 8 x 6½cm.
 Stone ball decorated with lines and circles.
 Marble weights.
 (Tgb 1871 pp.239,252,253,255; TA pp.24-5).

FIGURINES

Piece of hard stone representing a human/owl's
 face.
 Small "divine statue" of terracotta.
 (Tgb 1871 pp.240,242,244).

PLANT REMAINS

Burnt grain in a jar (4-5m).
 Burnt grain associated with querns (6-7m).
 (Tgb 1871 pp.241,255).

ANIMAL REMAINS

Mussel shells, Fish bones, Sharks' vertebrae(?),
 Boars' tusks.
 (Tgb 1871 p.255; TA p.40).

Deposit (6). Below deposit (5) Schliemann identified a 3m-thick deposit at c.32.67-29.67m A.T. (=7-10m deep). Here he found immense masses of calcined mudbrick debris and, amongst it, house-walls of mudbrick on stone foundations. Stone thresholds were noted. The house-walls were "the meanest I ever saw". Large numbers of stones were noted from c.32.67 to 31.17m, becoming larger and more troublesome with increasing depth.

(Tagebuch 1871 pp.258,275; Bfw I p.332 n.266; Briefe p.118; TA pp.34,42f; Ilios p.21)

OBJECTS FOUND

POTTERY

Schliemann noted that the pottery at this depth tended to be more elegant than in the higher levels. Wares were polished black, red, yellow and green.

A45?	Two-handled goblets.
A45	Depata.
B24?	Large jugs with necks bent back.
C28??	Jars with vertical lugs and pierced rims.
C30	Owl-face jars.
C32?	Large, two-handled jars with raised wings.
C34?	Small jars on tripod bases.
C39?	Pithoi.
D7/8	"Coronet" lids.
D-	Cylinders 8½cm x 6½cm. (<u>Tgb 1871</u> pp.254f,260f; <u>Bfw I</u> p.203; <u>TA</u> pp.32f,42).

METALWORK

Large spherical piece of iron(?) at 7m.
Small copper axe (8½m).
2 copper "spearheads" (8½m).
Copper knives (8½ and 9m).
Copper pins (8½ and 9m).
(Tgb 1871 pp.256,258f,260; Briefe p.118).

CHIPPED STONE

Flint blades.
Two-edged obsidian blades.
(TA pp.29,42).

POLISHED STONE

Hammers. Axes, sometimes of black stone. Weights. Querns. Micaschist moulds (8-10m).
(Tgb 1871 pp.256,259; TA pp.29,33f,42).

WHORLS

These are mostly biconical, with only a few instances of the conical type.

One clay whorl was thought to bear an inscription, illustrated in Atlas 2-61, TR Nos.326,482, =Ilios No.1982, =SS 5295.

Terracotta disc 2.3" in diam., painted white on one side, with markings thought to be "Phoenician".

(Tgb 1871 p.258; Bfw I p.196; TA pp. 30-2,42,94).

SMALL FINDS

Many clay weights 4-5" x 3-4".

(TA p.33).

FIGURINES

Small (stone?) idol (c.9m).

(Tgb 1871 p.260).

ANIMAL REMAINS

Mussel shells. Boars' tusks. Fish bones.

(TA p.40).

Deposit (7). The trench was excavated to a depth of 10m. Exposed in the bottom of the trench by the end of the season were large buildings of stone. The size and construction of these was at this stage not clear; stones came to light wherever Schliemann dug and, as usual, he attributed the confusion to a putative earthquake. The walls were without mortar; the stones themselves were generally unhewn, but were rough-hewn on occasion. The measurement of 10m depth (c.29.67m A.T.) cannot - in view of Blegen's stratigraphy for CD 4 and D5, together with Dörpfeld's bench-marks - apply to the upper surface of these remains of Dörpfeld's Troy II.1. It simply alludes to what was visible at the bottom of the ten-metre trench.

(Tagebuch 1871 pp.269,270,275; Bfw I pp. 196,197f,332ff n.266; TA pp.37f,43f; Ilios p.21; TI Taf.III; Troy I figs.431, 437)

OBJECTS FOUND

POTTERY

A45?

B14

Goblet with two handles.

Small brown globular tripod jug with incised decoration on body

5½cm tall (10m).
Atlas 89-1847, Ilios No.441, SS
2437; Fig.V.17.
(Tgb 1871 pp.260,269; TA p.38).

METALWORK

Copper spearhead.
 2 copper arrowheads.
 Lead plate 1½" x 1½", with incised
 character and a hole in one corner.
(Tgb 1871 pp.260,270; TA p.38).

POLISHED STONE

Black stone ball.
(Tgb 1871 p.260).

WHORLS

One conical clay whorl.
(TA p.38).

ANIMAL REMAINS

Mussel shells. Fish bones. Boars'
 tusks.
(TA p.40).

AREA iii: CD 4

Figs.III.6; IV.32,33.

This area was excavated during 23rd May-18th June 1872 as the northern end of Schliemann's newly-established North-South trench. The trench was 23m wide and originated as an extension of the western terrace on the recently abandoned north platform. There was some initial work carried down to the two levels of c.30.00m and 24.00m A.T., the levels of the old terrace and platform floor respectively. The terrace was extended southwards by approximately 9 metres. But from 4th June Schliemann adopted a new policy of excavating to the 27.00m level - a theoretical depth of 14m. It is not clear how far South he was able to carry this work by 18th June: far enough, at any rate, to have demolished nearly to the level of the trench floor, but no further, the newly discovered well in D4. His published report in Trojanische Alterthümer has included a

repetition of the stratigraphic divisions he had recorded for the North-South trench in 1871. They were not newly observed and are not recorded at all in the diary for this period in 1872. They will therefore be ignored in the description of deposits which follows. In so far as they belong anywhere they are probably included by Schliemann to give an account of the strata in the "middle platform" of the North-South trench in D 5-6. Relatively few objects can be allocated to this area with certainty. A number can be placed here with plausibility. This includes all those pieces which seem to provide evidence for a deposit of Troy VIIb2 material in Stratum (Ib). It must be admitted that, from the information given by Schliemann, they could equally well derive from squares CD 8-9, the South Platform. But the reconstructed stratigraphy of that area suggests that VIIb2 deposits would there more probably have occurred at 2-4m than at 1-2m, whereas the latter depth would be suitable on the north side of the mound. Also there is the testimony of what seems to be a VIIb2 Buckelkeramik bowl (A104). It was found, undoubtedly, in the lowest deposits of CD 4. Here it must have been out of context, but suggests the presence in the same area of other VIIb2 material.

A rather large body of material has, in addition, been assigned to this trench which may in fact derive either from CD 4 or from D 5-6 (the continuation of the North-South trench in the middle of the mound), or which may be a mixture of the two. I have chosen to catalogue the objects under CD 4 as this seems to have been the area where more work was done and where Schliemann was personally more involved. Although this decision could be mistaken, in practice such a mistake would be of little consequence, as the broad divisions in CD 4 and in D 5-6 seem to have been very similar.

Deposit (1). Apart from the information repeated from the findings of 1871, Schliemann tells us nothing about the character of the soil between the surface (39.67m A.T.) and the depth of 5m. But a sufficiently full record of his finds can be posited to allow us tentatively to subdivide these strata into four periods of deposition.

OBJECTS FOUND

Stratum 1a: 39.67-38.67m A.T. (=0-1m deep)
Material which can be assigned to Troy VIII-IX.

WEIGHTS

- (*) - Terracotta pieces with flat top and two holes.
 72-487 Impressed with design of bee(?) and square; Fig.V.47.
 * 72-690 Impressed with unidentifiable design. Cf. Atlas 17-513?, TR No.37, Ilios No.1469, SS 8322; Fig.V.47.
 72-707 Plain lentoid terracotta weight with two holes. Fig. V.47.

FIGURINES

- * 72-693 Head of figurine, possibly of a youthful Pan with basket on head (under 1m). Atlas 34-853, SS 9540.

Stratum 1b: 38.67-37.67m A.T. (=1-2m deep)

The material in this stratum may be compared with that of Blegen's Troy VIIb2.

POTTERY

- A- * 72-498 Simple cup with rounded base, slightly narrowed mouth, and handle from rim to body (2m). Fig.V.33.
 A102 * 72-552 Tankard with flat base and one large handle (1m). Fig.V.33.
 A105 * 72-500 Black handmade cup or jug with horizontal ribs around neck and vertical ribs on body; projecting knob at front (2m). Atlas 33-799, Ilios No.1374, SS 3587; Fig. V.33.
 A106 * 72-499 High-handled cup with projecting knob at front (2m). Fig.V.33.
 C- * 72-594 Large, hole-mouth jar with two small handles set vertically half way up body on either side (1m). Fig. V.33.

CHIPPED STONE

- (*) 72-638 Flint blade 12cm long (2m).

WHORLS

- RIIB * 72-509 (2m)
 GIXD * 72-567 (2m) cf. Atlas 13-425.
 GID * 72-569 (2m) cf. Atlas 11-354.
 GIB * 72-572 (2m)
 GIA * 72-573 (2m) cf. Atlas 10-325, SS 5080.
 GX * 72-574 (2m) Atlas 13-416?
 GIB * 72-575 (2m) cf. Atlas 10-322.
 GIA * 72-578 (2m)
 RIIA * 72-603 (1m)
 GIA * 72-605 (1m)
 RVIAb * 72-606 (2m)
 RIA * 72-607 (1½m)
 GIA * 72-683 (2m) cf. Atlas 11-350.
 RIIA 72-705 (2m)
 GIB * 72-730 (1.30m)
 RIIIB (*) 72-740 (2m) cf. Atlas 1-3.
 RIIA (*) 72-797 (2m) cf. Atlas 5-135.
 RIB (*) 72-810 (2m) cf. Atlas 1-2.
 GX * 72-822 (2m) Atlas 12-384, TR No.428, Ilios No.1928, SS 5532.
 RIIA * 72-829 (2m) cf. Atlas 5-135.
 RVIAb (*) 72-868 (1m) cf. Atlas 10-335.
 RIA (*) 72-870 (2m) cf. Atlas 8-246.
 RVIAb (*) 72-871 (2m)
 RIA (*) 72-875 (2m)

SEAL

- * 72-611 Conical terracotta stamp-seal (2m). Atlas 19-547?
Ilios No.495, SS 8860; Fig.V.46.

Stratum 1c: 37.67-36.67m A.T. (=2-3m deep)

The material in this stratum may partly derive from Troy VIIa-VIIb1, although some (e.g. 72-748) is probably of earlier date.

POTTERY

- A48? * 72-850 Wheelmade bowl with 15cm diameter (3m). Atlas 36-917; Fig.V.33.
C48 (*) 72-881 Globular jar with straight neck, rim and two handles (2m). Atlas 32-774?? TR No.131; Fig.V.33.
C205 * 72-835 Conical, hole-mouth jar 7½m tall (2½m). Maybe MB. Fig.V.31.
C205 * 72-837 Conical, hole-mouth jar with two horizontal lines towards top (3m). Maybe MB. Fig.V.31.
D8 (*) 72-748 Red polished coronet-lid with two incised lines around body and three superposed straps with central knob (2m). Atlas 76-1646 (8m!), Ilios No.1322, SS 1960. Probably MB. Fig.V.31.
D33 * 72-858 Funnel, 7cm long (3m). Fig.V.33.

METALWORK

- * 72-849 Knife-blade (2½m). Fig.V.38.

CHIPPED STONE

- (*) 72-554 Conical flint core (??) (3m).

POLISHED STONE

- * 72-848 Marble disc with central hole, diam. 7cm (3m). Atlas 99-2129? Fig.V.42.
* 72-857 Diorite hammer (3m). Fig.V.42.

WHORLS

- RIB (*) 72-540 (3m)
GID (*) 72-541 (3m)
GIB (*) 72-546 (2½m) cf. Atlas 11-352.
GVII (*) 72-579 (2½m)
GX (*) 72-591 (2½m) Atlas 5-147.
RIA (*) 72-592 (2½m) cf. Atlas 8-251.
RIA * 72-617 (2½m) cf. Atlas 8-246.
GIA (*) 72-624 (2½m) cf. Atlas 9-301.
GIA (*) 72-628 (3m) Atlas 10-329, SS 5108.
RVIB (*) 72-731 (3m)
RIIA (*) 72-809 (3m)
GIA? (*) 72-811 (3m)
GIB * 72-823 (3m)
RIIIA * 72-825 (3m)
GIA * 72-826 (3m)
RIIC (*) 72-862 (3m)
GIXD (*) 72-865 (2½m)
RIIIA (*) 72-866 (3m)
RIA (*) 72-877 (3m) cf. Atlas 8-240.
RIA (*) 72-889 (2½m) cf. Atlas 8-246.
RIIA (*) 72-894a/901 (2½m) Atlas 6-183.
RIA (*) 72-897 (2½m) cf. Atlas 8-246.
RIA (*) 72-898 (3m) Atlas 9-302.
RIIA (*) 72-904 (2½m)

GIA (*)72-913 (2½m) cf. Atlas 11-350.
 RIB (*)72-917 (2½m)

TERRACOTTA DISC

* 72-856 With one central hole. Fig.V.48.

TERRACOTTA BALL

* 72-595 With four incised encircling lines (3m). Fig.V.46.

Stratum 1d: 36.67-34.67m A.T. (=3-5m deep)

This level certainly includes one item of Troy VI date (72-741). The A33 cup could be of Troy IV or V date, but the type is known from Blegen's excavations to have survived into VI. The date of the B203 jar ought to be EB-MB, but the possibility of survival of the type into VI cannot be precluded.

POTTERY

A33 (*)72-922 Squat cup with flat base, splayed rim and rising handle (4m). Fig.V.32.
 B203 (*)72-751 Globular jar with flattened base and slightly flaring neck (4m). Possibly pre-VI. Fig.V.31.
 D46 * 72-839 Grey slipped terracotta horsehead (4m). Atlas 18-540, TR No.290, Ilios No.1391, SS 4002; intrusive from IX; Fig.V.34.
 - (*)72-741 Yellow clay figure of a pig painted with bright red crosses (4m). Atlas 18-537, TR No.162, Ilios No.1450, SS 3563, Fig.V.32.
 - (*)72-598 Sherd with incised herringbone decoration (4m). Fig.V.33.

METALWORK

(*)72-564 Barbed and tanged arrowhead (5m). cf. Atlas 99-2113; Fig.V.38.

WHORLS

RIIIA (*)72-506 (4m)
 RIA (*)72-576 (4m) cf. Atlas 8-240.
 GIA (*)72-577 (4m)
 RVIB (*)72-593 (5m)
 RIA (*)72-658 (4m)
 RIC 72-698 (4m)
 RIIA 72-703 (4m)
 GX 72-708 (4m)
 RIA 72-711 (4m) cf. Atlas 8-246.
 GIB (*)72-723 (4m)
 GIA (*)72-729 (4m)
 RIVA (*)72-890 (5/4m)
 RIVB (*)72-892 (4m)
 RIIA (*)72-894 (5m)
 RIVB (*)72-896 (4m)
 RIVA (*)72-903 (4m)
 GVII (*)72-908 (4m) Atlas 12-400.
 RIVA (*)72-912 (4m)

TERRACOTTA BALLS

* 72-691) Incised ball with eight fields (5m). Atlas 14-450,
 * 72-692) 92-2155, TR No.493, Ilios No.1993, SS 8904; Fig.V.46.
 72-714 Decorated with incised dots in eight fields (5m). cf. Atlas 15-464; Fig.V.46.
 72-720 Incised (5m). Atlas 14-452, TR No.491, Ilios No.1991, SS 8899; Fig.V.46.

SEAL

- (*)72-907 Conical terracotta stamp-seal (5m). Atlas 19-550; Fig.V.46.

Deposit (2). The existence of this deposit is not directly reported by Schliemann, but may be inferred. It is the south wall of the building (Building 6) of which Wall 20 is the north wall. We may now note that in TA p.119 Schliemann explicitly refers to walls, in the plural, at 3m below the surface, having the character of Wall 20, and forming a building which was not yet entirely demolished.

Deposit (3). The top of Well 2, walled with stones and mud mortar, was discovered at 35.67m A.T. (=4m deep) on 7th June. During excavation of CD 4 the well was almost entirely removed down to the level of the trench floor. It appears in Atlas Taf.117, where it is marked 'Pa', and lies in Square D4. Unless Schliemann failed to identify the upper parts of the structure, it seems that the well must have been abandoned during Troy VI. Its position within Building 6, if Building 6 is correctly reconstructed, is curious and unparalleled in the case of the other Troy VI wells (Ba, Bb, Bc). One probably postdates the other.

(Tagebuch 1872 p.390)

Deposit (4) consists of the material surrounding the walls to be referred to under Deposit (5), part of which must constitute the related occupation deposits, and part the destruction deposit. These strata, which Schliemann himself does not isolate, lie at c.34.67m with a depth of approximately one metre, their bottom lying at c.33.67m A.T. (=5-6m deep). They must derive from Troy III or IV.

OBJECTS FOUND

POTTERY

- | | | |
|------|-----------|---|
| A212 | (*)72-558 | Grey rounded cup with loop-handle attached to rim of cup at one end (5m). <u>Atlas</u> 47-1128, <u>SS</u> 672; Fig.V.30. |
| A228 | * 72-600 | Grey-slipped 'hourglass' tankard with two handles (restored) and four lines around stem (6m). <u>Atlas</u> 51-1234; <u>Ilios</u> No.1080?, <u>TI</u> fig.132, <u>SS</u> 1880; Fig.V.30. |
| B13 | * 72-601 | Jug with rounded base and rising spout; handle and spout broken (6m). <u>Atlas</u> 49-1180; Fig.V.30. |
| B210 | (*)72-597 | Pedestal flask with two lugs, similar in shape to <u>Ilios</u> No.304 (6m); Fig.V.30. |
| C28 | (*)72-924 | Globular jar with straight neck, holes in lip, and two vertically perforated lugs; 7cm high, 6½cm diam. (6m). <u>Atlas</u> 50-1216?; Fig.V.30. |
| D26 | (*)72-735 | Squat sieve or colander with flattish base and splayed rim (6m); Fig.V.30. |
| D203 | 72-718 | Lid with two pierced horns (5m). Fig.V.30. |
| D- | * 72-838 | Terracotta cylindrical box, 6cm x 4cm (5m). Cf. <u>Ilios</u> No.472; Fig.V.30. |

CHIPPED STONE

(*)72-781 Chipped stone blade (5½m).

POLISHED STONE

(*)72-584 Macehead(?) or spherical hammer (6m). Fig.V.42.

WHORLS

RIIA (*)72-490
 GIA (*)72-492
 RIVC (*)72-507 (6m) Fig.V.49.
 RIA (*)72-524 cf. Atlas 8-240.
 RIB (*)72-630 (6m) cf. Atlas 1-4, TR No.318, Ilios No.1818.
 GIA (*)72-633 (6m) cf. Atlas 11-350.
 RIVA (*)72-635 (6m)
 RIVA (*)72-636 (6m)
 RIA * 72-669 (6m)
 RIA * 72-670
 RIB * 72-674 (6m)
 RVIAb * 72-675 cf. Atlas 8-267.
 RVIAb * 72-676 cf. Atlas 8-267?
 RIIA * 72-678
 RIIC * 72-680
 RIC 72-700
 RIB (*)72-891 (6m) cf. Atlas 1-4, TR No.318, Ilios No.1818.
 RIIIA (*)72-893
 RIIA (*)72-894b
 RIIA (*)72-900
 RIB (*)72-902 cf. Atlas 1-4, TR No.318, Ilios No.1818.
 GIA (*)72-914
 RIA (*)72-915

MISCELLANEOUS

(*)72-923 Clay cylinder 7cm x 6cm, with longitudinal hole (6m). Fig.V.48.

Deposit (5). At c.34.37m A.T. or higher Schliemann found the remains of a mudbrick building whose walls were 45cm thick and preserved to a height of one metre. Their base lay on deposit (6) which itself is recorded as lying 3½m above Wall 21. Depending on the thickness of deposit (6) - here arbitrarily given an assumed thickness of 20cm - the top of deposit (5) may be higher or lower than 34.37m A.T.

(Tagebuch 1872 p.367)

Deposit (6). Underlying the mudbrick building (deposit (5)) Schliemann found a stratum of small stones at 3½m above Wall 21, i.e. at c.33.17m.

(Tagebuch 1872 p.367)

Deposit (7). We may treat separately the material underlying deposit (6) and reaching down to a depth of 8m below the summit (=31.67m A.T.), where

Schliemann himself seems to have observed some difference which caused him to treat it as a dividing line. This division may correspond with that previously noted at 7½m below the summit (32.17m). The character of the soil is not described; the objects appear to be characteristic Blegen's Troy II-V. The jug 72-550, found at a depth of 7m, is of a type (B17?) not attested later than Troy III in Blegen's excavations. The jar 72-752, also found at 7m, would not, so far as is known, be at home later than Troy III. Considering the stratification established for the adjoining deposits (see Fig.IV.33), an allocation to Troy III will be the most probable.

(TA p.104)

OBJECTS FOUND

POTTERY

- (6½m)
- C28 * 72-620 Globular jar with flat base, flaring neck separated from body by two horizontal lines. Two small perforated lugs on upper part of the body and two perforations in lip. Atlas 50-1219? Fig.V.26.
- (7m)
- A2 72-719 Shallow plate or bowl. Atlas 64-1439? Fig.V.24.
- A33 (*) 72-563 Cup with high handle, flat base and slightly splayed rim. Atlas 61-1379? Fig.V.24.
- A43 (*) 72-879 Hourglass tankard with two handles. Atlas 58-1331; Fig.V.24.
- B3 (*) 72-749 Straight-necked jug with flat base and one handle (restored). Atlas 64-1421? Fig.V.25.
- B17 (*) 72-550 Jug with ovoid body and slightly pinched spout. (Atlas 57-1317?). Fig.V.25.
- B201 (*) 72-752 Jar with ovoid body and straight neck. Fig.V.25.
- C205 72-717 Squat piriform jar with narrow neck and two knobs. Cf. shape C8, but without the wings. Fig.V.25.
- D13 (*) 72-517 Black burnished face-lid. Atlas 65-1441, SS 325; Fig. V.27.
- D33 (*) 72-640 Funnel 7cm x 4cm. Atlas 57-1326? Fig.V.26.

METALWORK

- (*) 72-769 Pin, type 1. (7m). Fig.V.39.

WHORLS

- RIA (*) 72-488 (7m) cf. Atlas 8-246.
- RIVB (*) 72-503 (7m) cf. Atlas 1-33, SS 4724.
- GIB (*) 72-504 (7m) cf. Atlas 11-352.
- RIIIA (*) 72-513 (7m) cf. Atlas 1-2.
- RIB (*) 72-518 (7m) cf. Atlas 1-2.
- RIB (*) 72-531 (7m) cf. Atlas 1-4, TR No.318, Ilios No.1818.
- GIA (*) 72-532 (7m) cf. Atlas 2-53, TR No.329, Ilios No.1829.
- RIC (*) 72-543 (7m) cf. Atlas 12-391.
- RVIB (*) 72-548 (7m) cf. Atlas 11-354.
- GID (*) 72-565 (7m) cf. Atlas 11-354.

RIB	(*) 72-566	(7m) cf. <u>Atlas</u> 1-2.
GIVA	* 72-609	(7m) <u>Atlas</u> 13-432, <u>TR</u> Nos.292,496, <u>Ilios</u> No.1996, <u>SS</u> 5212; Fig.V.50.
	* 72-610	
RIIA	* 72-612	(7m) cf. <u>Atlas</u> 5-135.
RIB	* 72-614	(7m) cf. <u>Atlas</u> 1-4, <u>TR</u> No.318, <u>Ilios</u> No.1818.
RIIIB	* 72-615	(7m) cf. <u>Atlas</u> 1-21, <u>SS</u> 4669.
RIA	(*) 72-631	(7m) cf. <u>Atlas</u> 8-246.
RIIA	(*) 72-632	(7m)
GIA	(*) 72-634	(7m) cf. <u>Atlas</u> 10-328.
RIVA	72-651	(7m)
GX	(*) 72-662	(7m) <u>Atlas</u> 13-424, <u>TR</u> No.346, <u>Ilios</u> No.1846, <u>SS</u> 5538.
RIIB	* 72-671	(7m)
RIA	* 72-673	(7m)
RIVC	* 72-679	(7m)
RIB	* 72-681	(7m) cf. <u>Atlas</u> 1-3.
RIC	72-704	(7m)
GIA	(*) 72-738	(7m)
RIB	(*) 72-861	(7m) cf. <u>Atlas</u> 1-4, <u>TR</u> No.318, <u>Ilios</u> No.1818.
GIA	(*) 72-864	(7m)
RIA	(*) 72-911	(7m)
GVI/VIII	(*) 72-918	(7m)

WEIGHTS

- * 72-786 Grooved circular stone weight (7m). Fig.V.47.

Deposit (8). Underlying Deposit (7) we may distinguish a separate stratum which must overlie Deposit (9) of which Schliemann explicitly speaks. This confines the deposit within the levels 8-9 $\frac{1}{2}$ m deep (=31.67-30.17m A.T.). Once again Schliemann provides no specific information about the character of the soil, but numerous objects were recovered from these depths. The material can be no earlier than Troy II (types A45, C5, D13 are attested) and perhaps no later than Troy III (type D3 is present).

OBJECTS FOUND

POTTERY

(8m)		
A39	* 72-842	One-handed tankard, but with neck not flaring as much as in A39. <u>Atlas</u> 66-1460? (handle restored). Fig.V.22.
A45	(*) 72-587	Depas. Fig.V.22.
A45	* 72-821	Red polished depas. <u>Atlas</u> 77-1653? Fig.V.22.
A45	72-643	Red polished depas. <u>Atlas</u> 77-1652? Fig.V.22.
A212	* 72-501	Shallow cup with flat base and wide mouth; small loop handle curves down from rim. Fig.V.22.
B3?	* 72-495	Globular jug with flat base; broken neck has two "rivets" at base. Fig.V.22.
B3	* 72-496	Globular jug with flat base and rising spout. <u>Atlas</u> 76-1645, <u>Ilios</u> No.376, <u>SS</u> 369; Fig.V.22
B6?	(*) 72-880	Jar with flat base, narrow neck and simple mouth restored as two-handed flask. <u>Atlas</u> 73-1601? Fig.V.23.
B17	72-653	Brown slipped jug with flat base and rising spout. <u>Atlas</u> 73-1599, <u>SS</u> 403; Fig.V.22.

- B204 * 72-834 Globular jar with rounded base, straight neck, two vertical lugs and a knob; 10cm high. Fig.V.22.
- C5 (*) 72-747 Globular jar with rounded base and straight neck; two loop-handles set low on body, and bucrania-like curved plastic decoration; Fig.V.23.
- C28 * 72-695 Globular jar with flat base, short neck and two lugs on body. Atlas 78-1664? Fig.V.22.
- C28 (*) 72-743 Pale brown globular jar lightly burnished, with rounded base, tall narrow neck and two perforated vertical lugs. Atlas 71-1573, Ilios No.287, SS 416; Fig.V.22.
- C28 (*) 72-668 Globular jar with rounded base, collar neck and two perforated vertical lugs. Atlas 72-1580; Fig.V.22.
- C30 (*) 72-753 Fragment of a face-jar.
- C200 (*) 72-742 Fragment of jar(?); globular body, flattened base decorated with three incised(?) horizontal lines around middle of body, and groups of three vertical lines down lower part of body. Fig.V.22.
- C223 (*) 72-764 Ovoid, hole-mouth jar with one vertical lug(?). Fig. V.22.
- D3 (*) 72-775 Flanged lid with one loop-handle. Cf. Atlas 67-1506? Fig.V.24.
- D13 (*) 72-516 Yellow slipped face-lid. Atlas 75-1624, Ilios No.991, SS 328; Fig.V.23.
- D29 (*) 72-582 Brown & green slipped and polished theriomorphic vase on three legs, with open, cutaway spout, loop-handle from spout to top of body. A tail is present at the other end of the body. Top of body decorated with incised chevrons. Atlas 74-1613, Ilios No.333, SS 2432; Fig.V.22.
- D200 (*) 72-486 Circular lid, incised. Diam. 9cm. Fig.V.23.
- D216 * 72-840 Globular jar with tapering neck and one horizontally perforated lug. Fig.V.22.
- (8½m)
- C28 (*) 72-920 Globular jar with rounded base, tall tapering neck and two vertically perforated lugs. 7½cm high x 7cm diam. Fig.V.18.
- D200 (*) 72-777 Circular lid with two holes. Atlas 98-2055?
- (9m)
- A2 * 72-841 Shallow bowl, 17cm diam. Fig.V.17.
- B3 (*) 72-588 Tall, ovoid jug with straight rim and flat base. Atlas 82-1742; Fig.V.17.
- B18 * 72-549 Ovoid jug with flat base and rising spout. Atlas 83-1752? Fig.V.17.
- C27 * 72-836 Globular jar with straight neck and one horizontal handle, lug or spout. Fig.V.18.
- C28 (*) 72-585 Globular jar with rounded base, tall neck with holes in rim and two horizontally perforated(?) lugs. Atlas 79-1676?? Fig.V.18.
- C28 72-715 Globular jar with flattish base, flaring neck (restored) and two perforated lugs. Atlas 80-1700? Fig.V.18.
- D1 72-586 Flanged lid with three holes(?) in top. Fig.V.21.
- D13 (*) 72-767 Fragment of plain polished face-lid. Atlas 84-1758, SS 326; Fig.V.21.
- D13 (*) 72-776 Black polished dome-shaped lid(?) with plastic ornament of three bars forming three sides of a square,

- (*) 72-583 and one knob in the centre. Atlas 84-1761; Fig.V.21.
Sherd with plastic decoration of ridge, triangle and circle.

METALWORK

(8m)

- (*) 72-773 Bronze or copper knife blade. Atlas 69-1539, TR No. 45e, Ilios No.962; Fig.V.37.
(*) 72-785 Lead ring. Atlas 98-2030? Fig.V.39.

(9m)

- 72-641 Three flat axes of copper. Atlas 84-1766,1767; Fig. V.35.
- Two copper flat axes (Tgb 1872 p.372).
72-642 Copper knife blade. Fig.V.35.
* 72-694 Copper blade from long dagger. Fig.V.35.
72-716 Curved copper knife. Fig.V.35.
(*) 72-721 Copper pick-axe, Stronach type 1. Atlas 93-1912?? (10m), Ilios No.958? Fig.V.35.

STONE AND CLAY MOULDS ETC.

(8m)

- (*) 72-754 Broken mica-schist mould for two objects. Atlas 69-1553, TR No.46, Ilios No.602, SS 6766; Fig.V.40.
(*) 72-755 Mica-schist mould for flat axe and spearhead. Atlas 69-1546, SS 6732; Fig.V.40.
(*) 72-756 Clay mould for flat axe. Atlas 70-1562? SS 6761? Fig.V.40.
(*) 72-778 Mould for dagger blade(?) Fig.V.40.
(*) 72-882 Mica-schist mould for flat axes et al. Atlas 69-1554?? Fig.V.40.

(9m)

- (*) 72-779 Fragment of stone mould for ingot(?) Atlas 93-1974; Fig.V.40.
(*) 72-774 Lump of slag(?)

POLISHED STONE

- (*) 72-757 Pounder (8m). Atlas 66-1487? Fig.V.41.
(*) 72-759(?) Shafthole double-hammer (8m?). Fig.V.41.
(*) 72-761 Celt (8m) Fig.V.41.
(*) 72-762 Hammer-stone (8m). Atlas 69-1524? Fig.V.41.
(*) 72-780 Celt (8m). Atlas 66-1467; Fig.V.41.
(*) 72-784 Celt (8m). Fig.V.41.
(*) 72-760 Black stone pendant, foetus-shaped (8m). Atlas 24-646, TR No.50, Ilios No.651, SS 7796; Fig.V.41.

BONE ARTEFACTS

- (*) 72-770 Knife (8m). Fig.V.43.
(*) 72-639 Ring of mother-of-pearl (8m). Atlas 98-2062? Fig.V.43.

WHORLS

- RIIA (*) 72-489 (8m)
RIA (*) 72-491 (8m) cf. Atlas 8-246.
RIB (*) 72-505 (8m) cf. Atlas 1-3.
RIB (*) 72-510 (8m) cf. Atlas 1-2.
RIB (*) 72-523 (8m) cf. Atlas 1-3.
RIIC (*) 72-528 (9m) cf. Atlas 5-135.

GIA	(*) 72-535	(8m)	cf. <u>Atlas</u> 2-53, <u>TR</u> No.329, <u>Ilios</u> No.1829.
GIA	(*) 72-542	(9m)	
RIIIA	(*) 72-568	(9m)	
RIIIB	(*) 72-570	(8m)	cf. <u>Atlas</u> 1-21, <u>SS</u> 4669.
GIA	(*) 72-571	(8m)	cf. <u>Atlas</u> 2-53, <u>TR</u> No.329, <u>Ilios</u> No.1829.
GIXA	(*) 72-589-590	(9m)	<u>Atlas</u> 10-313?? <u>SS</u> 5410; Fig.V.50.
GIA	(*) 72-616	(9m)	cf. <u>Atlas</u> 11-350.
RIA	(*) 72-625	(8m)	cf. <u>Atlas</u> 8-240.
RIA	(*) 72-626	(9m)	cf. <u>Atlas</u> 8-240; Fig.V.49.
RIIA	72-637	(8m)	cf. <u>Atlas</u> 8-238.
RIVA	72-645	(9m)	cf. <u>Atlas</u> 3-86.
RIIC	72-648	(9m)	Fig.V.49.
RIB	72-649	(8m)	cf. <u>Atlas</u> 1-3.
RIB	72-652	(8m)	
RIIIB	(*) 72-661	(8m)	
GID	* 72-677	(9m)	<u>Atlas</u> 4-128.
RIVB	72-697	(9m)	
RIB	72-712	(8m)	
RIVB	(*) 72-724	(9m)	
RID	(*) 72-725	(8m)	<u>Atlas</u> 10-307, <u>TR</u> No.339, <u>Ilios</u> No.1839.
RIIIA	(*) 72-727	(8m)	cf. <u>Atlas</u> 5-150, cf. <u>SS</u> 4641.
RIIB	(*) 72-728	(8m)	cf. <u>Atlas</u> 1-16.
RVIIDc	(*) 72-733	(9m)	Fig.V.49.
RIA	(*) 72-734	(8m)	
GIB	(*) 72-736	(8m)	
GIA	(*) 72-737	(8m)	cf. <u>Atlas</u> 2-53, <u>TR</u> No.329, <u>Ilios</u> No.1829.
RIA	(*) 72-739	(8m)	cf. <u>Atlas</u> 8-240.
RIIA	(*) 72-788	(9m)	cf. <u>Atlas</u> 5-135.
RVIIDd	(*) 72-789	(8m)	
RIIIB	(*) 72-790	(8m)	cf. <u>Atlas</u> 1-18.
RIB	(*) 72-791	(8m)	cf. <u>Atlas</u> 1-2.
RIA	(*) 72-792	(8m)	
RIIA	(*) 72-793	(8m)	
GVII	(*) 72-794	(8m)	
RIC	(*) 72-795	(8m)	<u>Atlas</u> 12-383? <u>SS</u> 5503.
GIB	(*) 72-798	(8m)	
RIVB	(*) 72-799	(8m)	
RIIIC	(*) 72-800	(8m)	
GIB	(*) 72-801	(8m)	
GID	(*) 72-802	(9m)	Fig.V.49.
RIC	(*) 72-804	(8m)	
RVIIBb	(*) 72-806	(8m)	cf. <u>Atlas</u> 1-8.
RVIIDc	(*) 72-807	(8m)	<u>Atlas</u> 4-129.
GIA	(*) 72-812	(9m)	
RIA	(*) 72-813	(9m)	<u>Atlas</u> 9-300? (10m)
RIC	(*) 72-814	(8m)	
RVB	* 72-824	(9m)	
RIB	* 72-828	(8m)	cf. <u>Atlas</u> 1-2.
RIA	* 72-830	(8m)	cf. <u>Atlas</u> 8-246.
RIIIB	(*) 72-869	(8m)	cf. <u>Atlas</u> 1-21, <u>SS</u> 4669.
RIB	(*) 72-872	(8m)	cf. <u>Atlas</u> 1-4, <u>TR</u> No.318, <u>Ilios</u> No.1818.
GVB	(*) 72-873	(6m)	<u>Atlas</u> 9-279 (9m), <u>TR</u> No.338, <u>Ilios</u> No.1838.
GIA	(*) 72-876	(9m)	
GIA	(*) 72-895	(8m)	
RIC	(*) 72-899	(8m)	

TERRACOTTA BALLS

- (*) 72-805 (8m?) Plain.
 (*) 72-581 (9m) Incised with cross. Fig.V.46.

WEIGHTS

- (*) 72-512 Sandstone net-sinker, with two horizontal incisions (8m). Atlas 98-2086, TI fig.445, SS 8365; Fig.V.47.
 (*) 72-783 Rectangular schist net-sinker with hole at one end (8m). Atlas 98-2087? Fig.V.47.
 (*) 72-758 Stone weight with lateral hole. Fig.V.47.

SEALS

- (*) 72-745 Terracotta stamp seal (8m). Ilios No.493, SS 8857ff; Fig.V.46.
 (*) 72-551 Terracotta stamp seal (9m). Atlas 19-561; Fig.V.46.

FIGURINES

- 2A (*) 72-771 Marble(?) figurine (8m). Fig.V.44.
 3C (*) 72-782 Bone figurine (8m). Fig.V.45.

MISCELLANEOUS

- (*) 72-765 Marble disc (8m), cf. Atlas 99-2125; Fig.V.41.
 (*) 72-772 Terracotta phallus(?) (8m). Fig.V.48.
 (*) 72-556 Rectangular granite tablet with incised cross (9m). Atlas 83-1750, SS 8402; Fig.V.41.

ANIMAL REMAINS

- * 72-843 Ox horn (8m).
 - Large number of mussel shells at 8-9m (Tgb 1872 p.376).

Deposit (9). At c.30.17m A.T. (=9½m deep) Schliemann found a stratum of yellow ash which appears to have surrounded Megaron IIA and to have overlain Deposit (11) at c.29.67m. The material is comparable with that of Blegen's Troy II.

(Tagebuch 1872 pp.370,379,403; TA p.117)

OBJECTS FOUND

POTTERY

Wares: polished black and red, well made; vessels rarely intact (Tgb pp.374,381)

- A39 * 72-559 Tankard with flat bottom, straight wide neck and single handle from neck to body (10m). Atlas 87-1828? Fig.V.17.
 B3 (*) 72-666 Brown globular jug with flat base, straight narrow neck and single handle from neck to body. Handle and rim restored. Network of incised lines on upper half of body, not shown in 72-666 (10m). Atlas 91-1896? SS 2227? Fig.V.17.
 B17 * 72-655 Piriform jug with rounded base, sloping mouth (restored), long narrow neck, and handle from rim to body (10m). Atlas 85-1779? Fig.V.17.
 B201 (*) 72-667 Globular flask with collar neck (10m). Fig.V.18.
 C10 (*) 72-750 Ovoid jar with narrow neck and two vertical handles set half way up body (10m). Atlas 92-1906; Fig.V.20.
 C27 72-562 Brown slipped globular jar with flat base, short neck, two vertical, perforated lugs and decoration of three vertical herringbones on at least one side (10m).

- C28 (*)72-665 Atlas 86-1803, Ilios No.293, SS 2425; Fig.V.18.
Globular jar with flattened base, tall straight neck and two vertical perforated lugs on body (10m). Atlas 87-1823; Fig.V.18.
- C39 - Mass of pithoi at 10m, one containing bones (Tgb 1872 p.387).
- C39 (*)72-808 Pithos-fragment decorated with circles and herringbone design (10m). Fig.V.21.

METALWORK

- (*)72-722 Ribbed and tanged dagger or knife-blade, slightly curved (10m). Atlas 90-1876, SS 6161. Analysis in Gale 1984, p.39. Fig.V.35.
- * 72-852 Pin with spherical head (10m). Fig.V.38; and other copper 'nails' (Tgb 1872 p.378).

TREASURE 'N' (9½m)

- Atlas 98-2070 Closed circular silver bracelet, rhomboid in section, SS 6130; Fig.V.38.
- Atlas 98-2078 Bundle of three silver bracelet-wires, Ilios No.861, SS 6132.
- Atlas 98-2079 Open spiral bracelet of silver, Ilios No.862, SS 6131; Fig.V.38.
- Atlas 98-2075 Gold shell earring with five rows of longitudinal granulation; found adhering to Atlas 98-2078? = Atlas 17-523, SS 6126; visible on Ilios No.861? Fig.V.38.
- Atlas 98-2076) Two bundles of silver shell earrings with one, five and
" 98-2077) six lobes; also various unidentifiable items of silver jewellery, all corroded together. SS 6128,6129.
- One silver shell earring with five or six lobes, attached to 98-2078. TR p.164, SS 6127.
- Eleven silver shell earrings with five lobes, Ilios p.492.
- One silver earring resembling "a pair of tongs", Ilios p.493.
- Large number of gold beads, Ilios p.493.
- One cylindrical electrum bead, Ilios p.493.
- Twenty sections of necklace or torque, with small silver rings encasing surved pieces identified as ivory, Ilios Nos.863,864; Fig.V.38.
- Many (more than 158) small loose silver rings from necklace or torque, Ilios p.492.
- A "very artistic ornament" attached to 98-2078. No counterpart to the gold shell earring SS 6125, assigned by Schmidt to Treasure N, can be found in the 1872 diary, the Atlas, Trojanische Alterthümer or Ilios. On Treasure 'N' see further Antiquity 58 (1984) p.201.

STONE MOULDS

- (*)72-746 Grooved lid(?) of mica-schist "mould" (10m). Atlas 90-1879(?) Fig.V.40.

CHIPPED STONE

- Many flint points (Tgb 1872 p.376).

POLISHED STONE

- (*)72-533 Stone flat axe (10m). Atlas 93-1942; Fig.V.41.
- 72-654 Pounder, 30cm x 13cm (10m). Atlas 86-1798; Fig.V.41.

BONE ARTEFACTS

- Awl (Tgb 1872 p.376).

WHORLS

RIA (*) 72-521 (10m) cf. Atlas 8-240.
 RIA (*) 72-522 (10m) cf. Atlas 8-246.
 GIA (*) 72-623 (10m) cf. Atlas 13-412; Fig.V.49.
 RVIAb (*) 72-627 (10m) Fig.V.49.
 RIVB 72-646 (10m) Atlas 6-189?
 RIA 72-647 (10m) cf. Atlas 8-240.
 RIIC (*) 72-657 (10m) cf. Atlas 5-135.

Below 10m Whorls are usually undecorated and are not so common as in higher levels (Tgb 1872 pp.372,376).

ANIMAL REMAINS

* 72-844 Ram's horn (10m).
 - Mussel shells (Tgb 1872 pp.376,379).

Deposit (10). In his excavations in CD 4 Schliemann was able to trace further the structure (Megaron IIA) of which Wall 21 was a part. He records that he found a "room" which took up nearly the whole terrace. This "room" is likely to have been the exterior northern end of the megaron. The foundations attained a depth of only ½m, which is noticeably shallower than the 1.30m noted by Dörpfeld for the southern end of the building.

(Tagebuch 1872 pp.363,372; TA p.110; TI p.89f)

Deposits (11)-(14). Below Megaron IIA, and stretching from below its northern walls towards the northern edge of the terrace, Schliemann found a confused sequence of deposits which he does not distinguish very clearly. He says that between 10 and "18"m deep the deposits were hard and damp, although including some ash near Wall 21; that there were only ash and stones in "the lowest 8 metres". Yet a subdivision of these deposits seems possible. Schliemann had in mind the possibility that he might find a continuation of the white pebble pavement discovered earlier on the North Platform. He did not in fact do so, but this did not stop him from using its anticipated position 3½m above the trench floor (=c.27.50m A.T.) as a point of reference. Above it the stones were large blocks, below it they were comparatively small. Above it there was also a large deposit of ash. This appears again in what must be a general description of the deposits, where Schliemann refers to red, light ash and terrible masses of stones forming a deposit 4-5m high. Elsewhere we hear of a 3½m-thick

layer of stones at 10m deep.

Allowing for some confusion, these accounts seem to coincide with the picture to be derived from the section-drawing in Troy I fig.422 where a thick layer of large stones labelled 'strata of Troy II' overlies, and is separated from, the stone fill behind wall 'm' of Troy I by some strata of earth. The overall measurements of depth including both lots of stones do vary from 3½m to 5m. This interpretation has therefore been adopted in the account which follows.

(Tagebuch 1872 pp.370-385)

Deposit (11). Below Megaron IIA, stretching from below its northern walls towards the northern edge of the terrace, Schliemann found a mass of irregularly placed stone blocks. Bones and ash could be found between them. The top of the deposit lay at c.29.67m A.T. (=10m deep). The depths noted for strata and objects below this level are rather confused, but it seems that the deposit must have reached down to perhaps c.28.00m A.T., where it overlay deposit (12), although the upper limit of this latter deposit is not in fact recorded.

(Tagebuch 1872 pp.372,374f,381,385)

Deposit (12). Over deposit (13), which lay at c.27.50m A.T., and therefore below deposit (11), Schliemann found a large deposit of red, light ash. It is not clear how deep this deposit was, but it can perhaps be identified in Troy I fig.422 below the mass of stones marked "Strata of Troy II". Within this deposit he also found two layers of what may have been slag - "metallic-like material which as been poured out". The depths given by Schliemann for these lowest deposits are rather erratic; but as deposit (11) is said to lie at 10-13m deep (Tgb p.385) and deposit (13) at 14½m deep (Tgb p.370), we may assign to deposit (12) those objects said to derive from depths of 13-14m. They seem mostly to be from Troy II, although some (such as the A12 bowls) could derive from Troy I.

(Tagebuch 1872 pp.378f)

OBJECTS FOUND

POTTERY

Wares are usually black, often with decoration on the inside of the vessel (Tgb 1872 p.385)

- | | | |
|-----|---|--|
| A12 | - | Two black bowls with horizontal lugs on rim (<u>TA</u> p.106). <u>Atlas</u> 105-2310 (14m), <u>Ilios</u> No.38, <u>SS</u> 24; see <u>Fig.V.16</u> . |
| A26 | - | Red pedestal cup with high handle (<u>TA</u> p.106). <u>Atlas</u> |

- A104 - 105-2311 (14m), Ilios No.51, SS 161; see Fig.V.16.
Large yellow bowl with one handle and three large, curved ram's-horn projections (TA p.106). Atlas 103-2297 (14m?), Ilios No.1369, SS 3611. Intrusive from VIIb2? Fig.V.33.
- B218 - Red double jug with beakspouts (restored) (TA p.106). Atlas 104-2298 (14m), TR No.105, Ilios No.161, SS 1927; see Fig.V.16.
- C28 - Red globular jar with four lugs and restored neck. Atlas 104-2301 (14m); see Fig.V.16.
- C28(?) 72-696 Fragment of black vessel? Or miniature jar? (13m).
- C35 - Black polished tripod jar with two lugs, wide chimney-neck, and incised decoration of zigzags and dots (TA p.106). Atlas 103-2296 (14m), TR No.106, Ilios No.163, SS 2349; see Fig.V.16.
- C- - Black globular (wheelmade?) jar with rounded base and two sets of double vertical lugs (TA p.106) (14m). Atlas 105-2312, Ilios No.23, SS 2081; see Fig.V.16.
- D8 - Cylinder lid surmounted by four straps and central knob (13m). Atlas 104-2307; see Fig.V.16.
- D15? * 72-925 Unidentified object, possibly a flat lid with two holes; decorated with chevrons (14m). Fig.V.21.
- * 72-831 Sherd with incised zigzags on a background of parallel lines (14m). Cf. Atlas 27-735.

METALWORK

- * 72-846 Razor or fragment of knife-blade (14m). Fig.V.35.

POLISHED STONE

- * 72-832 Cylindrical vessel with concave neck (13-14m) Fig.V.41.
- 72-926 Saddle quern (14m). Atlas 102-2293? (16m), TR No.103, Ilios No.75.
- Hammer (Tgb 1872 p.385).
- Marble 'phallus' (TA p.109).

BONE ARTEFACTS

- Bone 'dagger' (TA p.105).
- Bone knife with decoration of incised "suns" (TA p.105) (14m). Atlas 25-665, TR No.14, Ilios No.142, SS 7624; Fig.V.43.
- Bone rings (TA p.105).

WHORLS

Not so common as in higher levels. Usually biconical and undecorated (Tgb 1872 pp.372,385).

WEIGHTS

- Stone weights are attested (Tgb 1872 p.385).

FIGURINE

- Broken terracotta figurine (14m). Atlas 20-562, TR No.109, Ilios No.71; Fig.V.45.

HUMAN REMAINS(?)

- (*)72-766 Tooth (14m).

ANIMAL REMAINS

- Many bones (Tgb 1872 p.385).

- 72-833 Ox horn (14m).
 - Boars' tusks, rams' horns, antlers, 'sharks' vertebrae', shells (TA pp.107-9).

Deposit (13). Among the 4-5m - (or alternatively 3½m -) high agglomeration of stones and ashes, it seems that Schliemann did distinguish a lower stratum of smaller stones below the ash of deposit (12). This can probably be identified as the fill shown in Troy I fig.422 stretching South from Blegen's wall 'm' with its upper surface at c.27m A.T. There are, however, some difficulties in joining Blegen's wall 'm' to Dörpfeld's which, in TI Taf.III and fig.7, seems to lie several metres further North. It seems possible, though hardly certain, that Blegen's team could have made a wrong identification and that their wall 'm' was actually a different structure from Dörpfeld's. But this can now only be a matter of speculation. The line of the wall drawn in on Fig.IV.32 is at all events a matter of guesswork.

(Tagebuch 1872 pp.370,374; TI fig.7; Troy I figs.422,424)

Deposit (14). From the very lowest strata of the excavations Schliemann records 'stone-hard' deposits of bones, ash, charcoal and many stones. No continuation of the pavement of white pebbles was found. At a supposed depth of 15m he found what he described as a small, private burial-ground. It seems to have been a small cist grave, for three stones enclosed the burial: two vessels with ash, one containing the remains of a six-month old foetus.

(Tagebuch 1872 pp.369,373,376,381; TA p.107)

OBJECTS FOUND

POTTERY

Wares are polished and black or red (Tgb 1872 p.367)

- A7 72-621 Fragment of pedestalled cup or dish (18m). Several other such fragments are attested (TA p.106).
 A 207 72-599 Black cylindrical pot-stand (18m). Atlas 114-2323; see Fig.V.16.
 D24 - Tripod vessel with strap handle from rim to body. In it was found an infant burial (TA p.107f) (15½m). Atlas 103-2294, TR No.107, Ilios No.59, SS 1; see Fig.V.16.
 " - Similar vessel to 103-2294, but larger. Found with it, and said to contain human ashes (TA p.107f) (15½m). Atlas 103-2295, SS 2; see Fig.V.16.

METALWORK

- Copper pin (Tgb 1872 p.371).
- Pair of copper bracelets (TA p.105).

CHIPPED STONE

- 72-557 Stone blade 4½cm long (17m).
- Other flint blades (TA p.106).

POLISHED STONE

- Unspecified tool of green stone (Tgb 1872 p.369).
- Quern (Tgb 1872 p.372).
- Other stone tools, no details (Tgb 1872 p.371).
- Large and small axes (TA p.108).
- Hammers (TA p.108).

BONE ARTEFACTS

- Bone "knitting needle" (Tgb 1872 p.371).

WHORLS

Not very common and usually undecorated (Tgb 1872 p.371f).

72-613 (18m)

WEIGHTS

- Round stone weight(?) (Tgb 1872 p.369).
- Granite weights (TA p.108).

HUMAN REMAINS

- Infant burial in a pot (Atlas 103-2294), found together with another, similar vessel said to contain human ashes. Both were found enclosed in a miniature cist-grave formed by three stone slabs (TA p.107-8) (15½m).

ANIMAL REMAINS

- Bones; boars' teeth (Tgb 1872 pp.369,373).

AREA iv: D 5-6

Figs.III.6; IV.34.

In the period 23rd May-18th June 1872, when Schliemann began his scheme of working on a narrower North-South trench which would join the north and south platforms, excavation was started in a "middle platform". Its location is not definitely known, but it is likely to have adjoined the

old North-South trench of 1871, which had been excavated to a depth of 10m. Its purpose must have been to extend the 1871 trench either northwards to the North Platform or southwards towards the South Platform. The latter is the more likely plan for Schliemann to have adopted, for here there was a much greater distance to be covered before the trenches were joined, towards which conclusion Schliemann was pressing keenly. I have therefore tentatively assumed a location in D 5-6, at the southern end of the 1871 trench.

How far the excavations progressed during this period is not known. Work on the "middle" platform is only mentioned on a few occasions, and was certainly not a dominant factor in Schliemann's plans. Progress was perhaps fairly modest. The limits shown in Figs. III.6 and IV.34 are no more than estimates. There is equally no clear evidence of the depth to which excavation was carried, but it is likely to have been to a depth of 14m, where Schliemann expected to find virgin soil. In this case he may have deepened the 1871 trench also.

In the diary information about the stratification and finds in this trench is extremely scanty. To a large extent this is because Schliemann was primarily interested in recording the evidence from the area where he himself was supervising and tended to neglect other areas. But it is also possible that among the objects I have assigned to CD 4 there may be some which were actually found in D 5-6. In Trojanische Alterthümer, ch. x includes much stratigraphic information taken over from his previous year's description of the North-South trench of 1871. This may be intended to provide the necessary details of stratification in the "middle" platform which was, after all, an extension of the 1871 trench; but it does not rest on fresh observation and will be ignored here. There is no new information at all about the deposits below c. 37.67m A.T.

Deposit (1). Schliemann gives no information about the stratum at 0-1m deep, except to note an absence of two-holed lentoid clay weights ("ex-votos"), and the presence "on the surface" of spindle-whorls with "sun-ray" designs.

(Tagebuch 1872 p. 365)

Deposit (2). For the strata at 1-2m deep (=38.67-37.67m A.T.) there is again no information about the character of the soil, and only minimal

information about finds.

OBJECTS FOUND

POTTERY

- C- 72-555 Deep, straight-sided jar with rounded base, two vertical loop-handles half way up body, and a protruding knob on middle of body. Coarse ware. (Tgb 1872 p.366) (1m). Atlas 33-798? (2m). Fig.V.33.

ANIMAL REMAINS

- Mass of boars' teeth (Tgb 1872 pp.364,366).

AREA v: D 4-6

Figs.III.7; IV.35

This area was dug by Schliemann during the period 19th June-13th July 1872 as a continuation of his attempt to dig a North-South trench that would join up with the South Platform. Much of the trench lay in the area that had been dug in 1871. Here he deepened the bottom of the trench from c.30m A.T. to c.27m A.T. In other parts of the trench the same depth had to be attained by digging down from the surface of the mound. By 13th July the trench had apparently reached a distance of 80m from the north edge of the mound. It seems to have been c.18m wide in D4 and c.12m wide in D6.

Schliemann's notes provide almost no direct record of the stratification in this area. But some deductions can be made from the finds which are tentatively attributed to it. The inscribed slingstone found at a depth of 1m (72-1023) suggests that here as elsewhere the deposits of Troy VIII-IX reached to at least 1m deep. A cup found at 3m deep (72-1354) may be in Knobbed Ware, and may therefore suggest that deposits of VII could be found as deep as c.36.67m A.T., with the remains of Troy VI no doubt lying deeper. On the other hand, M.B. material is still found at

c.36.67m A.T. (the lid, 72-1374), and is strongly in evidence at 4m deep (72-1020, 72-1344). This suggests that Troy VI in this area was, at least partly, dug into the remains of Troy V and perhaps even of IV, and that between the depths of 3-5m (c.36.67m-34.67m A.T.) Schliemann found a mixture of Middle and Late Bronze Age material. Below 4m (c.35.67m A.T.) the objects are clearly of Early and Middle Bronze Age date, but the deposits are not easily subdivided into periods. At 7m deep the material appears to be of Troy II-III date (72-1225), as it is also at 8m (72-1021, 72-1352, 72-1353, 72-1379). At 14m deep it is of Troy I date (72-1334).

We can have some confidence in these deductions because they find close parallels in a number of adjoining areas. In Area iii, CD 4, the deposits of VIII-IX were found to a depth of 1m, as here. The deposits of Troy VII descended to c.3m deep, again as they seem to here; this included material of Troy VIIb2 which was found in the strata at 1-2m deep as in D 5-6. Taking the evidence of CD 4 together with that of CD 3-4 on the North Platform, it is clear that the structures of Troy VI were dug well into the remains of Troy IV and V and that much of the Troy V deposits must have been removed in the process. Troy VI deposits are found to a depth of 4m in CD 4. In CD 3-5, Area ii, excavated in 1871, Deposit (4) certainly contained some E.B. or M.B. pottery at 3-4m deep. Deposit (5), however, although principally containing E.B.-M.B. material, still included some sherds with painting "in the Greek manner" at c.35.67-34.67m A.T. (=4-5m deep); these I take to be mycenaean sherds from Troy VI. The pinnacle in E6, excavated by Blegen, immediately adjoins the D 4-6 trench with which we are dealing. Here the deposits of Troy V were preserved up to 37.39m A.T. at their highest point, although their more general upper limit here must have been in the region of 36.64m A.T. This latter figure agrees well with that found in CD 3-4 and D 4-6. In E6, however, Blegen found the Troy V stratum to be overlaid with deposits reaching up to almost 38m A.T. which were attributed to Troy VI. This seems on the face of it to be at variance with the evidence of the adjoining regions - in so far as it is known - and it may be worth considering whether this material could belong instead to Troy VIIa-VIIb1. Such an attribution would bring the stratigraphy into almost perfect harmony with the neighbouring areas. A depth of 4m (=35.67m A.T.) for the top of the Troy IV deposits is broadly consistent, again, with Blegen's findings in both F 4-5 and E6. In F 4-5

the figure must have been c.35.59m A.T.; and in E6 the highest point for Troy IV deposits lay at 36.24m A.T., but they must mostly have reached c.35.94m A.T. The two pinnacles also provide us with altitudes for the upper and lower limits of the Troy III strata. In F 4-5 their top lay at 33.69m A.T., reaching at one point to nearly 34m A.T., and their bottom lay at 31.75-31.84m A.T. In E6 their bottom lay at 32.19m with their top reaching at its highest point to c.34.62m A.T., but more generally to c.33.84m A.T. These figures allow us to make an approximate division between the strata of Troy III and IV in D 4-6 at a depth of 6m (=33.67m A.T.) and between those of Troy II and III at a depth of 7½m (=32.17m A.T.). The same depth for the bottom of the strata of Troy III has been noted previously for CD 3-4 and CD 4. In CD 3-5, in 1871, Schliemann noted a soil-change at 7m deep (=32.67m A.T.) which may correspond with the same division. As in CD 3-5, CD 4 and D 5-6, Schliemann found a stratum of stones at 10m deep (=c.30m A.T.). Below this level, Blegen's section of CD 4 shows the stratification among the Troy I deposits in the west side of the trench. Bedrock here must have lain at c.25.26m A.T. although no figure is actually quoted in Blegen's report.

In Fig.IV.28 I have brought all this stratigraphic evidence together in diagrammatic form, and have made divisions in the excavated area of D 4-6 accordingly. One important consequence is that, if this reconstructed stratigraphy is correct, then Dörpfeld and Blegen were both wrong in supposing that in this area of the mound the buildings of Troy VI rose in terraces to a central peak and were cut away in hellenistic and roman times by a platform that was laid out at c.36.50m A.T. Such a platform was laid out on the eastern half of the site but not, apparently, on the western half. Here the buildings of Troy VI seem to have been dug into the remains of Troy IV and V and to have been cut down, but not wholly removed, in order to make way for Troy VII - whose deposits formed a further 2m accumulation before being dug into and overlaid by the structures of Troy VIII and IX.

(Tagebuch 1872 p.435; TI pp.18f,108f, fig.6, Taf.VIII; Troy I figs.431,449,450, 465; II pp.37,89,210,262,270,271; III p.172)

Deposit (1). (0-1m = 39.67-38.67m A.T.) Probably dating to Troy VIII-IX.

OBJECT FOUND

* 72-1023 Slingstone, inscribed EPI (1m). Fig.V.38.

Deposit (2). (1-3m = 38.67-36.67m A.T.) Probably dating to Troy VII.

OBJECTS FOUND

POTTERY

A- * 72-1354 Shallow cup with flattish base, rising loop-handle from rim to knob on body of cup (3m). Fig.V.33.

WHORLS

GIA * 72-997 (2m) cf. Atlas 4-101.
 RIIA * 72-1014 (2m)
 RIIA * 72-1229 (3m)
 RIIA * 72-1342 (3m)
 RIIA * 72-1343 (3m)

Deposit (3). (3-4m = 36.67-35.67m A.T.) Probably deriving from Troy V, with remains of Troy VI cut into it.

OBJECTS FOUND

POTTERY

D13 * 72-1374 Face-lid (3m). Fig.V.30.

WHORL

GVII * 72-1331 (3½m)

Deposit (4). (4-6m = 35.67-33.67m A.T. or over) Dateable to Troy IV in Blegen's terms.

OBJECTS FOUND

POTTERY

(4m)
 A215 * 72-1373 Piriform cup with rounded base, plain mouth and handle from neck to body. Fig.V.28.
 B3 * 72-1355 Globular jug with flattish base, straight wide neck and handle (broken) from base of neck to lower half of body. Fig.V.28.
 C7 * 72-1020 Brown burnished piriform jar with rounded base, short tapering neck, small vertical loop-handles on shoulder, and three decorative knobs on body. Height 27cm. Atlas 41-1003, TR No.70, SS 1081; Fig.V.29.
 C28 * 72-1344 Globular jar with flat base, short straight neck and two rising lugs on body. Fig.V.29.
 D30 * 72-1019 Grey and brown burnished ring-vase with micaceous slip, three tall nozzles and three short, pointed feet. Height 10cm, width 12cm. Atlas 41-996, TR No.130, Ilios No.1110, SS 610; Fig.V.29.
 D200 * 72-1381a Saucer-shaped lid(?) with two holes. Fig.V.29.
 D203 * 72-1280 Lid(?) with short, straight sides and two superposed perforated lugs. Fig.V.29.
 D- * 72-1363 Coarse, sub-rectangular box. Atlas 41-1002; Fig.V.29.

- (5m)
- A33(?) * 72-1235 Cup with rounded body, slightly flaring rim, flat base and large handle from rim to body. Atlas 46-1109; Fig. V.28.
- A39 * 72-1284 Deep tankard with very slightly indented neck, handle (restored) from neck to lower body. Atlas 47-1135? Fig.V.28.
- A43 * 72-1285 Brown, partly reddened, 'hourglass' tankard with rounded base, narrowing neck and flaring rim. Two handles from rim to body (4½m). Atlas 41-993? SS 1207; Fig.V.28.
- A219 * 72-1376 Deep pale buff tankard with flat base and slightly flaring neck. Decorated with incised lozenges around the body, contained between two horizontal lines above and two below. Atlas 43-1031, Ilios No.1020, SS 2327; Fig.V.28.
- B5 * 72-1375 Bottle, cf. TI fig.247, but without a pronounced rim. Fig.V.29.
- B15 * 72-1279 Jug with wide (lentoid?) body, rounded base and tall straight narrow neck set forward on body. Slightly rising spout, open at the rear. Handle from neck to rear of body. Atlas 45-1087; Fig.V.28.
- B200 * 72-1236 Piriform flask with tall, slightly tapering sides leading to plain rim. Two large, vertical lugs half way up vessel. Height 20cm. Atlas 47-1132, Ilios No.1008; Fig.V.29.
- C35 * 72-1368 Globular yellow jar with three curled feet and tapering neck. Two pierced lugs on body. Body is decorated with two registers of incised lines, the upper in groups of three vertical lines, the lower in groups of two vertical lines, each group separated from the next by a panel of four or five dots. These two registers are contained within a total of three horizontal lines, with a fourth around the base of the neck and a fifth around the lower half of the body. Atlas 43-1032, Ilios No.1019, SS 2336; Fig.V.29.
- C200 * 72-1369 Globular jar with wide, slightly out-turned neck. Fig.V.28.
- D- * 72-1380 Sub-rectangular box. Atlas 46-1116; Fig.V.29.

METALWORK

- * 72-1282 Straight metal(?) pin (4m). Fig.V.39.

CHIPPED STONE

- * 72-1005 (4m), *-1343 (5m): Blades.

WHORLS

- (4m)
- RIA * 72-998 cf. Atlas 8-240.
- RIA * 72-1000 cf. Atlas 8-240.
- RIVA * 72-1001 cf. Atlas 3-86.
- RIA * 72-1004
- GIC * 72-1008
- RIA * 72-1011 cf. Atlas 3-67.
- GIA * 72-1012 cf. Atlas 11-350.
- RIIA * 72-1015
- RIIA * 72-1017 cf. Atlas 5-135.
- RIC * 72-1238
- RIA * 72-1362

RIIIA * 72-1365
 RIIA * 72-1367

(5m)
 RIIA * 72-1220 cf. Atlas 5-135.
 RIIIA * 72-1221
 RIIIA * 72-1222
 GIA * 72-1223 cf. Atlas 10-325, SS 5080.
 RIA * 72-1273 cf. Atlas 8-240.
 RIIIB * 72-1274 cf. Atlas 1-21, SS 4669.
 RVB * 72-1275
 RIA * 72-1276 cf. Atlas 8-246.
 RIVA * 72-1341 cf. Atlas 3-86.
 RIIIA * 72-1347 cf. Atlas 3-72.
 RIA * 72-1348 cf. Atlas 8-240.
 RIB * 72-1349 cf. Atlas 1-2.
 GVII * 72-1357 Atlas 8-252?
 RIIIB * 72-1358

MISCELLANEOUS

* 72-1119 Clay(?) cylinder with longitudinal hole (4m). Fig.V.48.

Deposit (5). (6-7½m=33.67 and over - 32.17m A.T. and below). Dateable to Troy III in Blegen's terms.

OBJECTS FOUND

POTTERY

(6m)
 A45 * 72-1333 Red polished depas. Atlas 84-1769? (9m), Ilios No.319? Fig.V.24.

(7m)
 A45 * 72-1372 Red polished depas. Atlas 56-1302; Fig.V.25.
 A203 * 72-1225 Bowl with three small feet, similar shape to A30. Fig.V.24.
 B3 * 72-1110 Neck fragment broken away from jug with tall narrow neck and handle on neck. Fig.V.25.
 B205 * 72-1118b Globular flask with flaring neck and two small lugs on body. Atlas 65-1448; Fig.V.26.
 D200 * 72-1381b Ovoid lid with two holes. Fig.V.27.
 D212 * 72-1288 Oblong dish or box, described as a "canoe".

METALWORK

* 72-1117 Barbed arrowhead (7m); Fig.V.38. (Intrusive from VI?)

GROUND STONE

* 72-1283 Shafthole hammer (7m); Fig.V.42.

WHORLS

(6m)
 RIVB * 72-1228 cf. Atlas 6-173.
 RIB * 72-1268
 RIVA * 72-1326

RVIIDc * 72-1360

(7m)

RIIIA * 72-1016

RIA * 72-1108 cf. Atlas 8-246.

GVIIIIC * 72-1120 }
* 72-1121 } Atlas 7-210.

RIB * 72-1224 cf. Atlas 1-4, TR No.318, Ilios No.1818.

RIIA * 72-1227 cf. Atlas 5-135.

RIA * 72-1272

RIIIB * 72-1277 cf. Atlas 1-18.

RIIA * 72-1328

RIA * 72-1345 cf. Atlas 8-240.

RIIA * 72-1346 cf. Atlas 8-238.

GVI * 72-1361

FIGURINES

3G * 72-1287 Marble(?) figurine (6m). Fig.V.44.

2H * 72-1022 Marble(?) figurine with pointed head and squared body (7m). Atlas 99-2136; Fig.V.44.

MISCELLANEOUS

* 72-1234 Clay ring, diam. 6cm (6m). Cf. Atlas 66-1496; Fig.V.48.

* 72-1118a Clay cylinder (7m). Fig.V.48.

Deposit (6). (7½m-10m=32.17-29.67m A.T.) Dateable to Troy II in Blegen's terms.

OBJECTS FOUND

POTTERY

(8m)

A33 * 72-1237 Cup with out-turned rim, rounded body, and high handle from rim to body. Atlas 70-1558? Fig.V.22.

A43 * 72-1379 Deep tankard with slightly bulbous body, flat base and plain rim. Two handles from below rim to body. Atlas 78-1665? Fig.V.22.

A45 * 72-1352 Depas. Atlas 74-1615; Fig.V.22.

A205 * 72-1383 Narrow beaker with flat base and wider rim. Fig.V.22.

B3 * 72-1113 Jug with globular body, rounded base, straight neck and handle from neck to body. Height 20cm. Atlas 76-1641; Fig.V.22.

B3 * 72-1378 Similar, but with wider neck. Atlas 78-1668? Fig.V.22.

C10 * 72-1370 Tall jar, shape similar to B4 but with two handles. Atlas 78-1669; Fig.V.23.

C19 * 72-1377 Globular jar with wide mouth; two handles from below rim to body; Fig.V.23.

D3 * 72-1353 Cylindrical lid with flanged top and single loop-handle. Fig.V.24.

D200 * 72-1289 Oval lid with two holes. Fig.V.23.

D214 * 72-1021 Miniature bowl 2cm high x 3½cm wide; Fig.V.22.

D- * 72-1336 Crucible or sub-rectangular box; Atlas 98-2040; Fig.V.23.

- (9m)
 A2 * 72-1371 Shallow dish or plate. Atlas 79-1693/4; /4; Fig.V.17.
 C28 * 72-1281 Coarse grey jar with rounded base, short slightly flaring neck with holes in rim, and two vertically-placed lugs on body. Atlas 50-1217? (6m!), SS 1261; Fig.V.18.
 D33 * 72-1106 Funnel. Fig.V.21.

METALWORK

- * 72-1382 Fragment of blade(?) (8m). Fig.V.37.

MOULDS

- * 72-1115 Rectangular terracotta mould 19 x 12cm with indentations for five ingots (8m). Atlas 70-1563, Ilios No. 605, SS 6758; Fig.V.40.
 * 72-1126 Broken triangular clay mould, 27 x 27 x 27cm, with indentations for three flat axes (8m). Atlas 70-1566, SS 6760? Fig.V.40.

CHIPPED STONE

- * 72-1290 Blade (10m).

POLISHED STONE

- * 72-1114 Flat axe of red porphyry (9m). Fig.V.41.

BONE ARTEFACT

- * 72-1112 Knife (8m). Atlas 66-1479? Fig.V.43.

- (8m) WHORLS
 GVA * 72-1009 Atlas 8-257, SS 5250.
 GIB * 72-1010 cf. Atlas 11-352.
 RIA * 72-1018 cf. Atlas 8-240.
 RIIIA * 72-1230
 GID * 72-1269 cf. Atlas 11-354.
 RID * 72-1271
 GVI * 72-1278 cf. Atlas 10-308.
 GIXD * 72-1325
 RIA * 72-1340 cf. Atlas 8-246.

- (9m)
 RVA 72-1007

- (10m)
 RIA 72-1002 cf. Atlas 8-240.
 RIIB 72-1122 Fig.V.49.
 GVIIIC * 72-1324 Fig.V.50.
 RIA * 72-1339 cf. Atlas 8-246.

ANIMAL REMAINS

- * 72-1013 Vertebra of tunny-fish(?) (8m).

PLANT REMAINS

Much burnt grain (Tgb 1872 p.435) (8m).
 (Tgb 1872 also mentions burnt sesame without specifying the depth at which it was found.)

Deposit (7). (10-14 $\frac{1}{2}$ m=29.67-c.25.17m A.T., bedrock). From the top of this deposit, as elsewhere at a depth of 10m, Schliemann records that he found many flat stones lying horizontally. From lower in the deposit, perhaps at c.26.26m A.T., he records a wall of small, roughly-hewn stones joined with mortar. The stones were 30-50cm long x 15-30cm wide. It is now impossible to identify the wall, but, among other possibilities, it may be either one of the walls of Troy I shown in TI fig.7, or one of the rather higher walls (153,154) shown in Troy I fig.431. The material is dateable to Troy I.

(Tagebuch 1872 pp.417,435)

OBJECTS FOUND

POTTERY

(14m)
 A31 72-1226 Miniature cup in nubbly ware with flat base, straight sides and handle from rim to base. Height 2 $\frac{1}{2}$ cm. Atlas 100-2227; see Fig.V.16.
 D1 * 72-1356 Plain, cylindrical lid. See Fig.V.16.
 D11 72-1334 Flat lid with short, pointed central knob and, at the edge, four pointed lugs with perforations. Atlas 21-583, Ilios No. 26, SS 188; see Fig.V.16.

("15m")
 - 72-1109 Fragment of pedestal vessel.

POLISHED STONE

* 72-1364 Double hammer with shafthole (14m). Fig.V.41.
 * 72-1366 Pestle (14m). Atlas 21-579, Ilios No.77, SS 9203; Fig. V.41.

WHORLS

GIVA 72-1232 (11m)
 RIC * 72-1107 (12m) cf. Atlas 7-228.
 GIA 72-1267 (12m) cf. Atlas 11-350.
 72-1327 (12m) undecorated.
 72-1329 (13m) undecorated.
 GID 72-1270 (14m) cf. Atlas 11-371.
 GIA 72-1330 (14m) undecorated.
 * 72-1350 (14m) Atlas 97-2027b? Biconical, undecorated.
 * 72-1351 (14m) Atlas 97-2027c? Biconical, undecorated.
 According to TA p.143, the whorls found at 11-14 $\frac{1}{2}$ m were of brilliant black terracotta and were most frequently shaped like large, flat buttons; but conical whorls were also present.

WEIGHT?

72-1130 Pendent weight or whetstone (12m). Fig.V.47.

AREA vi: D 3-4-5

Figs.III.18; IV.36.

Excavation here took place during 10th-24th May 1873. The work consisted in cutting a platform at c.31m A.T. on the east side of the North-South trench. The area may have had an approximate width of 9m and a length of 20-28m. The datum must have lain at c.39.50m A.T. Schliemann has left no record of the stratigraphy, and very few finds can be assigned to the trench with any assurance. We can list little more than a few features, all of which are included in Schliemann's general observation that "on the side of the great canal, a house is coming out" (Tagebuch 1873 p.251). We have to rely entirely on Atlas Taf.214 for any more detailed information.

Deposit (1). Atlas Taf.214 shows a number of walls in this area which seem to be unrelated to the known remains of Troy II and which should, therefore, derive from either a late period of Troy II or from Troy III-IV (in Blegen's terms). Into this category fall Walls 90,91,92,93 and 95. They may belong to more than one period; certain dating is now impossible.

(Atlas Taf.214)

Deposit (2). In this deposit I have included Walls 67,89 and 94 which seem, inescapably, to belong to Dörpfeld's Megaron IIA. Wall 67 extends at its north end into an area where deposits overlying IIA had already been dug away; it is also (according to Atlas Taf.214) an extremely long wall - like the side-walls of IIA. Wall 94 is shown parallel to it, or almost parallel to it, 10m away; and Wall 89 goes off at right-angles. These two fit very snugly as IIA's southwest and northwest walls respectively. We know from Dörpfeld that IIA was preserved even in his day up to 31.10m A.T.; so it is quite possible that the tops of the walls were exposed by Schliemann in 1873, even though they are no longer clearly visible in Ilios plan I. The identification of these walls with parts of Megaron IIA does, admittedly, entail the assumption that their orientation in Atlas Taf.214 is a little out of true; but no-one would wish to spend much time defending the accuracy of that plan.

(Atlas Taf.214; Ilios plan I; TI Taf.III)

Deposit (3). We have no information about the deposit surrounding the

walls discussed under Deposits (1) and (2). But a few objects came from these layers.

OBJECTS FOUND

POTTERY

- D30 73-889 Red ring-vase with three short feet, and three vertical nozzles the middle one of which was joined by a loop-handle to the far side of the ring-body. Handle and one nozzle restored. (6m in Atlas; 4m in TA p.312). Atlas 175-3384, TR No.287, Ilios No.1111, SS 823; Fig.V.30.
 - Some jugs and vases. Tgb 1873 p.250.

METALWORK

- * 73-862 "Copper" chisel (8m). Atlas 172-3331; Fig.V.37.

POLISHED STONE

- Some axeheads. Tgb 1873 p.250.

WHORLS

- Many whorls. Tgb 1873 p.250.

*

Deposit (4). Shown in Atlas Taf.214, at No.23 ("Wall of Troy") is a short section of wall on the east side of the North-South trench: Wall 96. Its description implies that it lay slightly deeper than the other walls discussed above. Schliemann does not recount its discovery or describe it in the text of any diary or report; but it could be either a part of Dörpfeld's Wall "c" of Troy I, or an extension of the retaining-wall dated by Dörpfeld to Troy II.1 and shown in squares E-F 5 of his plan. Granted that Walls 67 and 94 may be slightly out of alignment, it is difficult to place Wall 96 exactly.

(Atlas Taf.214; TI Taf.III)

AREA vii: E 4-5

Figs.III.19; IV.37.

From 26th May-14th June 1873 there is only one clear indication of any

work on the North-South trench, and that is from the diary entry for 26th May. It is possible that digging continued there until 31st May; but after the discovery of Treasure "A" Schliemann concentrated on the removal of the block of earth in square C6 and it seems unlikely that, with the decreasing number of workmen available, he should have kept up the work in the North-South trench.

The final state of the trench is shown in Atlas Taf.214. Schliemann may have extended it a further 6m to the East over a length of about 17½m. The datum must have remained at c.39 or 39.50m A.T. There is very little information about the findings, and in the absence of stratigraphic details the deposits are defined in a manner similar to that adopted in the adjoining area DE 3-4(b) (cf. Fig.IV.27).

Deposit (1). There is no information about the deposits at 0-4m deep. Only one object can be attributed to these strata.

OBJECT FOUND

POTTERY

C7	73-892	Small jar with globular body, rounded base, collar neck and two restored vertical loop-handles on body; three plastic knobs on the body (2½m). <u>Atlas 175-3387</u> , <u>SS 1077</u> ; Fig.V.31.
----	--------	---

Deposit (2). On 26th May Schliemann recorded that "more and more" housewalls were coming to light. Some of them can be seen in Atlas Taf. 214, and they must have included the south ends of Walls 62 and 68, as well as the newly-exposed Walls 97 and 98. These four walls constitute deposit (2), and may belong to Troy III-IV in Blegen's terms. There may have been other walls which do not appear on the plan.

(Tagebuch 1873 p.269; Atlas Taf.214)

Deposit (3). Atlas Taf.214 shows that Schliemann must have uncovered the southward extension of Wall 67, the east wall of Dörpfeld's Megaron IIA. This wall, which dates to Troy II, is taken as Deposit (3); but Schliemann gives no further information about it.

Deposit (4). We have no information about the deposits around the walls mentioned in Deposits (2) and (3), and which must have lain at c.31-

35.50m A.T. One object certainly derives from here; a jug and five axes, whose depths are not recorded, may also do so.

OBJECTS FOUND

POTTERY

A large jug, not described. Tgb p.269.

MOULD

- Fragment of mica-schist mould (7m). Atlas 174-3382; Fig.V.40.

POLISHED STONE

- Five axes, not described but presumably of stone. Tgb p.269.

Deposit (5). In his résumé of 31st May, Schliemann records that Adolphe Laurent and visiting archaeologists had confirmed that a stratum of slag at 9m deep, visible in section throughout the mound, derived from smolten ores of lead and copper. This may imply that the slag was visible in the North-South trench.

(Tagebuch 1873 p.280; TA p.309)

THE NORTH-SOUTH TRENCH:
SOUTHERN SECTOR

The southern sector of the North-South trench may be defined as that part of the trench which extended from the southern edge of the Bronze Age citadel mound, in square D9, to the middle of square D7 where it met the East-West trench. The surface here ran down from c.38m A.T. to c.30m A.T. over a distance of roughly 40m: a slope of 1 in 5, on average. The eventual dimensions of the trench, visible in Atlas Taf.214, show a cutting about 37m wide at the south end, narrowing to approximately 17½m at the north end, having a length at its west side of about 35m, and about 42m at its east side.

Schliemann dug here in May, June and July 1872, but the excavation is not very fully recorded as its supervision was for much of the time entrusted to others. An outline account of the work can nevertheless be extracted from the records. Schliemann's intention was to reach bedrock below the summit of the mound; this southern trench was therefore cut so as to lead down to a depth of 18m below the summit over a projected length of 60m by sloping the trench floor down to the North. The first week's work (Area i) went according to plan until the Troy VI citadel wall was found to block progress across the entire width of the trench. By this time the north end of the trench had probably reached a depth of c.28.92m A.T., the south end having been cut into the mound-face at c.30m A.T. In the second period of work, during 23rd May-12th June (Area ii), the base of the Troy VI citadel wall was exposed by a further half metre, and a horizontal terrace running in over the top of the wall at c.31m A.T. was excavated a further 7m northwards into the mound. From this point the trench floor was once again (in Area iii) given a slope downwards to the North, but only in a 10m-wide central cutting. At its deepest, most northerly point this reached down to c.28m A.T. On the west and east sides a system of horizontal terraces was introduced, as may be seen in Atlas Taf.109,117,214. The western terrace was cut at 34.15m A.T., so as to expose the top of Building VIM; the eastern terrace lay at the similar altitude of 34.74m A.T. At its northernmost end the trench had an overall width, including both terraces, of c.30m. But the eastern terrace was cut partly as a separate, northward tongue; the remainder of the trench narrowed to about 17½m.

Schliemann gives little direct information about the stratigraphy in this area, but reconstruction shows that the deposits all ran down to the South. Their lie appears to have been determined in the first

instance by the strata of Troy III which here extended some 20m south of the citadel wall of Troy II, reaching up to a uniform altitude of c.32m A.T. This extension of Troy III, at first surprising, implies the presence of substantial remains outside the citadel wall; Building IIS in squares EF 7-8, which perhaps survived from Late Troy II into Troy III, provides an obvious comparison. Against the southern edge of the Troy III deposits the inhabitants of Troy IV had built their citadel wall. The strata of Troy IV-V then accumulated horizontally over those of Troy III, running down to the South over the wall of IV. During Troy VI, however, much of Troy V may have been dug away when a large building was constructed in squares D 7-8. The construction of this building introduced an additional horizontal terrace into the stratification - a terrace which seems to have persisted through the deposition of the strata of Troy VII-IX.

Troy VIII-IX yielded little in the way of architectural remains. Atlas Taf.214 shows that a part of the west wall of Dörpfeld's Theatre C was found skirting the eastern edge of the trench in square D9 (Area i, Deposit 2: Wall 18). Lentoid weights and hellenistic figurines give further evidence of the presence of VIII-IX deposits (Area i, Deposit 1; Area ii, Deposit 1). Also in the eastern part of the trench was a monumental wall, Wall 23, of which Schliemann exposed a length of six or more metres between 35 and 36m A.T. This presumably derives from Troy VIIa (Area iii, Deposit 3). To the same period we may perhaps assign the "huge mass of large house-walls" which overlay the Troy VI citadel wall (Area ii, Deposit 3). The note that they all lay crooked - a circumstance which Schliemann attributed to the weight of the overburden (not very great here) - recalls the subsidence which affected Troy VIIa structures adjoining the old Troy VI citadel wall on the south and south-east sides of the site. The same deposit included eight or nine pithoi, again a characteristic of VIIa remains. Troy VIIb is rather slenderly attested, by the VIIb2 cup 72-218 in Area i, Deposit 1.

To Troy VI we may assign the citadel wall, Wall 19, which was built of well-hewn limestone blocks on a foundation of loosely-packed stones. Schliemann exposed the wall to a height of 3m across the whole width of the trench (Area i, Deposit 3; Area ii, Deposit 2). On the western terrace the southeast corner of Building VIM was brought to light, although it was not closely described. Its walls may have been dug down

into deposits of Troy IV or V, for they were founded at c.28.89m A.T. They were preserved to an altitude of c.34.22m A.T. on the south side (Area iii, Deposit 5). The stratification in squares D 7-8 shows the deposits of Troy VI descending via a terrace c.15m wide, already mentioned. This suggests the reconstruction here of a large building, or at least of two parallel walls; but no architectural remnants are actually recorded, so the suggestion must remain tentative (Area iii, Deposit 4). Atlas Taf.214 reveals the existence of a well, Well 3, in square D7. Schliemann has left no record of its discovery, and nothing is known of its date or manner of construction. In view of the dates of the other wells on the site we may suppose that it derives from Troy VI or later (Area iii, Deposit 6). A reference to "Greek" pottery in Area i, Deposit 1 may indicate the presence of mycenaean wares among the strata accumulated outside the Troy VI citadel wall.

The deposits of Troy V have for the most part been inferred from the evidence of objects, and are not directly attested. But Wall 26, a wall of irregular masonry bonded with white mortar concerning which we have few details, may belong to this period (Area iii, Deposit 8). To judge from its date of discovery, its position is such that it should have overlain the circuit wall of Troy IV and therefore could conceivably have been a part of the Troy V fortification wall (cf. Troy II p.297). This is entirely uncertain, but it does agree with Blegen's belief that there were rebuildings over a long period of the Troy IV fortification wall on the south side of the site (Troy II p.139).

To Troy IV we may with reasonable confidence assign the mass of large stones, Wall 27, first found at c.30.50, A.T. in square D8. This is comparable to a structure found by Blegen in square F8, and may well be an extension of his fortification-wall of Troy IV. It appears to have underlain Wall 26 to which it may have been a predecessor. (Area iii, Deposit 10). Also to Troy IV must be assigned a 2m-thick stratum of red and yellow ashes interspersed with mudbrick walls and containing E.B. pottery (Area iii, Deposit 9). The markedly burnt character of the deposits here finds comparisons in some of the strata of Troy IV in squares F 7-8 excavated by Blegen (Troy II pp.140,180,205,207).

A deep deposit, apparently all of Troy III material, was found at the bottom of the trench below c.32m A.T. (Area iii, Deposit 11). This

included a burnt mudbrick wall concerning which we have no detailed information. It is possible, as has already been mentioned, that some large, mudbrick structure similar to the heavily burnt IIS (cf. Troy I p.374) lay here and was responsible for the wide extension of Troy III remains beyond the citadel wall of Troy II. Deposits of Troy II and Troy I seem not to have been encountered.

The southern sector of the North-South trench has been divided into three "areas". These correspond, as before, to the areas excavated by Schliemann during the three relevant periods distinguished in Chapter III. In the following pages the findings from each area are presented in turn.

AREA i: CD 8-9(a)

Figs.III.4; IV.38,39.

This area was excavated during the first ten days' work on the south platform in 2nd-11th May 1872. Work was begun here because of the fierceness of the wind and dust on the north side of the mound, and took place in the area designated in Atlas Taf.116 so as ultimately to meet up with the platform being driven in from the north side. The outer edge of the platform lay at c.30.00m A.T. and the floor was cut at an angle of 12-14° relative to the mound-surface. By the end of the period the trench had penetrated c.10m into the mound at its western end and c.15m at its eastern end. Depths are taken from the datum at 34.92m A.T. Schliemann has recorded few finds from this trench, and little other information. The reason is probably that Schliemann himself was fully occupied in supervising work in the north platform. Supervision of the south platform was entrusted to the foreman Photidas.

Deposit (1). Under this heading are included all deposits in the trench with the exception of two architectural features mentioned under (2) and (3). Because depths are mostly not noted for the objects found here, it is not clear how far the deposit was a mixed one, and how far it may have contained distinct strata that passed unobserved. The material ranges from Troy V to Troy VIII or IX. Schliemann mentions that several walls were found already by 4th May. Otherwise he simply notes that it consisted of light debris unlike that found on the north platform.

(Tagebuch 1872 pp.320,322,326,327,329)

OBJECTS FOUND

POTTERY

A107	72-218	"Greek" pottery constantly found; but also: Squat, black two-handled cup with rounded base, splayed rim and diagonal ribbing around lower half (2m). <u>Atlas</u> 33-793(?), <u>Ilios</u> No.1376, <u>SS</u> 3568; Fig.V.33.
B20	72-263	Brilliant red jug, slipped and burnished, with rounded base, long beakspout and crescent-shaped handle set horizontally on side of the body. Incised and white-filled lines run horizontally around body and base of neck. (8m) <u>Atlas</u> 77-1658(?), <u>Ilios</u> No.360, <u>SS</u> 1867; Fig.V.30.
C30	72-260	Fragment of neck from grey face-jar (2m). <u>Atlas</u> 33-806, <u>Ilios</u> No.1292(?), <u>SS</u> 1845.
C39	72-230) 72-231)	Two large pithoi (3m). Cf. <u>TI</u> fig.246 (<u>Tgb</u> 1872 p. 327). Fig.V.32.

STONE MOULDS

- 72-258 Mica-schist mould for circular pendant (2½m). Atlas 17-512, TR No.142, Ilios No.1268, SS 6771. (Atlas assigns it a depth of 2½m; Ilios inexplicably places it at 4-5m deep). Fig.V.40.
- 72-262 Fragment of mica-schist mould for 10 objects (9m or 6m). Atlas 83-1749, SS 6734; Fig.V.40.

POLISHED STONE

- Crude stone tools; marble slab of uncertain purpose. (Tgb 1872 pp.320,322).

COINS

- Various "medallions", one thought by Schliemann possibly to be Persian. (Tgb 1872 p.320)

WHORLS

- Many whorls, all undecorated (Tgb 1872 p.320)

WEIGHTS

- 72-261 Grooved spherical weight. Fig.V.47.
- 72-257 Stamped clay weight with two holes (2½m). Cf. Atlas 18-526, SS 8335ff.
- Other stamped clay weights (Tgb 1872 p.322; TA p.82).

FIGURINES

- 72-217 Head of female terracotta statuette, possibly dancer, wearing kalathos stephane.
- 72-259 Head of female terracotta statuette. with stephane (1m). Atlas 100-2214?

MISCELLANEOUS

- 72-135 Terracotta piece decorated with human face.

Deposit (2) is not reported in the journal or in Trojanische Alterthümer, but is visible in Atlas Taf.214 and Troja und Ilion Taf. III. It is Wall 18 that skirts the eastern edge of the trench over a length of 3-4m in D9. It can be identified fairly certainly as a part of the west wall of Theatre C. TI Taf.III shows the walls of the theatre elsewhere standing to c.30.50m A.T., which would agree closely with the altitude required for this wall to have been discovered in the trench at the appropriate place. According to Dörpfeld the wall was elsewhere preserved to 1.30m high.

(TI p.234, Taf.III; Atlas Taf.214)

Deposit (3). By 11th May the trench had reached the "splendid bastion" or "retaining wall" that blocked the trench. Reasons have been given in Chapter III for identifying this feature, Wall 19, as the Troy VI circuit wall. Schliemann describes it as built of finely-hewn blocks of

limestone without mortar. He attributes it to the time of Lysimachus. It is visible in Atlas Taf.214 and TI Taf.III, which shows it to be preserved to c.31.00m A.T. in this area.

(Tagebuch 1872 p.336; TA p.82)

AREA ii: CD 8-9(b)

Figs.III.6; IV.40.

This area is the part of the South Platform where work was carried on sporadically from 23rd May until it was discontinued on 12th June 1872. The base of the Troy VI fortification-wall was cleared by another half metre, to c.28.42m A.T. The deposits immediately over the wall were removed, and a platform 7m wide was cut into the mound at the depth of c.31m A.T., the level of the top of the wall. There is little information about either the stratigraphy or the objects which were found.

Deposit (1). Schliemann dug the bottom of the trench to a depth of 6½m below the datum of 34.92m A.T., i.e. to c.28.42m A.T., whereas on 22nd May it had been at 6m below the datum. The half metre removed in this period constitutes Deposit (1), but there is no information as to its character.

(Tagebuch 1872 p.365)

OBJECTS FOUND

WHORLS

All undecorated (Tgb 1872 p.365)

Deposit (2). Revealed by the removal of Deposit (1) was a further ½m of the south face of Wall 19, the Troy VI fortification-wall. Schliemann notes that its footing consisted of loosely-packed stones.

(Tagebuch 1872 p.365)

Deposit (3). The strata overlying Wall 19 are not subdivided by Schliemann. As he began to excavate northwards he found the deposit to consist entirely of earth, with 8 or 9 pithoi amongst the debris. With further excavation he began to complain of a "huge mass of large house-walls", all lying crooked because of the weight of the overburden. Schliemann noted that the debris here included "prehistoric objects", ash and bones, and had all been "thrown down from above".

(Tagebuch 1872 pp.366,378)

OBJECTS FOUND

POTTERY

B31	* 72-664	Globular jug with wide, flaring neck and handle (restored) (cf. A43) (2m). <u>Atlas</u> 34-866? Fig.V.32.
C39	-	8 or 9 pithoi all 1-2m high (<u>Tgb 1872</u> p.366).
D26	* 72-656	Sieve made from globular jar with narrow neck; no handles (2m). Fig.V.32.

WHORLS

GID	* 72-525	(0.7m)	probably one piece.
GID	* 72-526	(0.7m)	
GIA	* 72-527	(1m)	
GIA	* 72-530	(1.70m)	cf. <u>Atlas</u> 11-350.
GIA	* 72-534	(1m)	cf. <u>Atlas</u> 11-350.
RVB	* 72-536	(½m)	
RVIIAb	* 72-537	(1½m)	Fig.V.49.
GIA	* 72-538	(1m)	
RIA	* 72-539	(1½m)	cf. <u>Atlas</u> 8-246.
GIA	* 72-544	(1½m)	cf. <u>Atlas</u> 11-350.

MISCELLANEOUS

	* 72-663	Terracotta rattle (2½m). Fig.V.48.
--	----------	------------------------------------

AREA iii: CDE 7-8

Figs.III.7; IV.41,42,43.

This is the area that was excavated by Schliemann when he extended his South Platform during the period 19th June-13th July 1872. The trench had a total width of approximately 23m, and may have extended nearly as

far North as the 38.00m contour. Within the trench there were two terraces cut at a higher level, one on the west side of the trench and one on the east side. The former lay at c.34.15m A.T., and the latter at c.34.74m A.T. Between these two terraces was a deeper cut approximately 10m wide whose depth is uncertain. It was cut with a slope down to the North, and its deepest point may have reached c.28.22m A.T. Depths recorded by Schliemann in this area appear to have been calculated down from a datum on the surface at c.38m A.T.

Lack of detailed information means that, initially, the stratification of the trench seems quite obscure. But a tentative outline, at least, can in fact be reconstructed if we plot onto a blank section of the trench the probable limits of excavation on certain dates, and the depths of selected, diagnostic objects found on these dates. I have done this in Fig.IV.41. On this figure the diagonal, dotted lines show the probable extents of excavation on 22nd June, 27th June, 1st July, reaching to depths of 8m, 8½m, and 9m respectively, as attested in Tagebuch 1872 pp.418,425,429. The lines for 3rd and 4th July have been put in by guesswork, bearing in mind that the trench was already producing finds from a depth of 10m by 5th July (Tagebuch 1872 p.433). The lines are placed diagonally on the assumption that Schliemann was still cutting his sections with a slope of 50° to the horizontal. Using this chronological framework, a selection of finds has been plotted in. Each is indicated by its serial number and, in brackets, its probable period of origin. In the top four metres of the section, six additional figures have been included. These are bench-marks from buildings of Troy VI and VII shown in the adjoining area to the East of the trench in TI Taf.III. A rough stratigraphic division can be sketched in around these points, and the stratification in F 8-9 (Troy I fig.470) can be used as a broad guide. The resulting diagram displays the sort of sloping strata that might be expected for Troy III-V, and the figures require the same kind of stepped descent for the strata of Troy VI-IX as is found in F 8-9.

In the following list of deposits I have included both those strata which have been tentatively defined on the basis of the finds contained within them, and also the few features and deposits clearly attested by Schliemann. The catalogues list the finds which may tentatively be attributed to each stratum.

Deposit (1). Schliemann gives no information about this stratum. It is reconstructed in Figs.IV.41 and 42 on the basis of bench-marks in the adjoining area to the East which mark the top of structures of Troy VII in TI Taf.III. On the analogy of the stratification in F 8-9 (Troy I fig.470), we can expect that features of Troy IX were dug into the deposits of Troy VIII. It is therefore impractical to try to separate them here, and deposit (1) is taken to include material from both.

OBJECTS FOUND

CHIPPED STONE

- * 72-945, *-947, *-975 Blades (2m).

WHORLS

- GIA * 72-956 (2m)
- GIA * 72-979 (2m) cf. Atlas 11-350.

WEIGHTS

- * 72-1157 Plain lentoid weight with two holes (1m). Fig.V.47.
- * 72-1192 Lentoid clay weight with two holes and stamped design (2m). Atlas 17-519? TR No.38? Ilios No.1470? Fig.V.47.
- * 72-1193 Plain lentoid weight with two holes (2m). Fig.V.47.

Deposit (2). The existence and dimensions of this deposit of Troy VII material are, again, inferred from, rather than directly attested in, the excavation records. The line of the top of the deposit is reconstructed by reference to the bench-marks in DE 7-8 of TI Taf.III indicating the tops of the Troy VII structures. The line of the bottom of the deposit is deduced from the altitudes of the tops of the Troy VI buildings in the same plan, and from the possible location of what appears to be a Troy VIIa bowl, No.72-1024, which was found at a depth of 3m on 22nd June. There is no information about the character of the deposit. Three jugs, all incomplete, may be of earlier date.

OBJECTS FOUND

POTTERY

- A41? * 72-973 Bottom half of biconical tankard or jug, handle and upper half restored. A groove(?) runs around the narrowest part of the body (3m). Atlas 36-899? Fig. V.31. Possibly out of context.
- A77 * 72-1024 Shallow wheelmade bowl with straight neck and slightly bulbous base (3m). Atlas 36-903; Fig.V.33.
- B4? * 72-992 Grey burnished ovoid jug(?) with straight neck broken at top(?), flat base, and broken handle rising from

- body (3m). Atlas 35-886, SS 2092; Fig.V.31. Probably out of context.
- B20? * 72-966 Piriform vessel restored as beakspouted jug with flattened base (3m). Atlas 35-877; Fig.V.31. Possibly out of context.
- C57 * 72-960 Brown, micaceous alabastron with flat base, short straight neck and two loop handles on opposing sides of the body (3m). Atlas 36-924, SS 3495.
- C- * 72-991 Grey polished squat pyxis with short neck and flat base, two vertically perforated lugs, one on each side of the body and perforations in the rim (2m). Atlas 32-765, SS 1743; Fig.V.33.
- C- * 72-959 Small jar with globular body and concave neck. Incised and white-filled decoration of horizontal and wavy lines around neck (4m). Atlas 39-941, SS 2243. (cf. A38); Fig.V.33.
- C- * 72-965 Ovoid jar with narrow, straight neck and flat base. Two lugs or handles on the shoulders, placed vertically. The body is decorated (both sides?) with three diagonal flutings. Height 28cm (3½m). Fig.V.33.
- D13 * 72-990 Face-lid (2½m). Atlas 32-775, TR No.10, Ilios No.1296, SS 1850 (out of context); Fig.V.31.
- D- * 72-1075 Funnel pierced with holes and originally attached to a larger vessel (2m). Atlas 32-786, TR No.137, Ilios No. 1303, SS 2860; Fig.V.33.

METALWORK

- * 72-950 Bent pin 8½cm long (3m). Fig.V.39.
- * 72-951 Copper pin with double furled head, 12cm long (3m). Atlas 99-2111; Fig.V.39.

CHIPPED STONE

- * 72-948, *-949, *-962, *-1056 Blades (3m).

WHORLS

- RIB * 72-943 (3m) cf. Atlas 1-3.
- GIA * 72-944 (3m)
- RIA * 72-952 (3m) cf. Atlas 8-246.
- GIXD * 72-963 (3½m) cf. Atlas 13-425.
- GIA * 72-972 (2½m) cf. Atlas 11-350.
- RIA * 72-977 (3½m) cf. Atlas 8-246.
- RIA * 72-980 (3m)
- RIIB * 72-981 (3m)
- RIA * 72-983 (3½m)
- GIA * 72-985 (3½m)
- RIA * 72-986 (3½m) cf. Atlas 8-246.
- RIA * 72-987 (3½m) cf. Atlas 8-246.
- RIIA * 72-988 (3½m)
- GIXD * 72-989 (3½m)
- RIVA 72-1065 (2m)
- RIVA 72-1066 (2m)
- RVIIDc 72-1068 (2m)
- RVIIAa 72-1170 (2m)

WEIGHTS(?)

- * 72-946, *-961. Circular or spherical objects said to be weights (3m).

Deposit (3). Not mentioned in Schliemann's excavation notes but clearly shown in Atlas Taf.214 is a wall in the far northeastern terrace of the trench. It is probably an extension of the more southerly wall of Troy VII which appears, L-shaped, in square E8 in TI Taf.III. It appears to have been covered over again by later dumping. The altitude shown just to the North of the wall in Atlas Taf.214, and which may be corrected to 37.10m A.T., applies to the mound-surface and not to the wall itself. The altitudes of the wall itself are unknown, but may be assumed to lie between c.35.00 and c.36.00m A.T. A length of six or more metres must have been exposed by Schliemann. The style of construction may have been monumental, for in Atlas Taf.214 the wall is described as a "Great Hellenic Construction". The wall will here be known as Wall 23.

(Atlas Taf.214; TI Taf.III)

Deposit (4). Here again is a deposit, this time of material attributable mainly perhaps to Troy VI, whose existence and dimensions are not directly attested by Schliemann, but which may be inferred from the available sources. The top of the deposit is defined in the same way as the bottom of deposit (2). The bottom of deposit (4) is defined partly by a bench-mark of 36.25m from square E7 in TI Taf.III, and otherwise partly by a rough estimation of its likely position between the upper limit of Troy VI deposits and the upper limit of Troy IV deposits. The line shown in Figs.IV.41,42 is therefore only tentative. There is no information about the character of the soil. There does seem, however, to be evidence enough to require a sharp step down in the stratum at one point in D7, and again at another in D8. This could best be explained by the presence of ^alarge, Troy VI wall dug into the underlying deposits. Analogies may be found in Troy I fig.470. In the plan in Fig.IV.43 I have therefore tentatively drawn in two such walls. These may possibly form part of a single structure of Troy VI. They will be numbered as Walls 24 and 25. Despite all these calculations, however, the two items of pottery look as if they may derive from an earlier period.

OBJECTS FOUND

POTTERY

- | | | |
|------|----------|--|
| B3 | * 72-993 | Deep vessel with straight neck and flat base. Height 22cm (4m). Handle restored to make jug. <u>Atlas 40-977?</u> Fig.V.31. May be out of context. |
| C200 | * 72-976 | Globular jar with rounded base and short, straight neck (5m). Fig.V.31. May be out of context. |

METALWORK

- * 72-1196 Plain needle or pin (3m). Fig.V.39.

CHIPPED STONE

- * 72-1034 Blade (4m).

WHORLS

- RIIIA * 72-957 (4m)
 GVB * 72-958 (4m) Atlas 4-133, TR No.330, Ilios No.1830.
 GIII * 72-967 (4m) Atlas 2-59(?).
 GID * 72-969 (4m)
 GIA * 72-970 (4m) cf. Atlas 2-53, TR No.329, Ilios No.1829.
 GIA * 72-971 (5m)
 RIA * 72-978 (4m) cf. Atlas 8-246.
 RIIIA 72-1040 (4m)
 RIIA * 72-1060 (3m)
 GIA * 72-1067 (3m)
 RIA 72-1078 (3m) cf. Atlas 8-246.
 RIIIB 72-1079 (3m) cf. Atlas 1-18.
 RIIIB 72-1084 (3m) cf. Atlas 1-18.
 RIC 72-1085 (3m)
 RIVA * 72-1091 (3m) cf. Atlas 3-86.
 GVII * 72-1179 (3m)
 * 72-1201 Marble, undecorated (3m). Atlas 99-2180.
 GVII * 72-1384 (1m)

WEIGHT (?)

- * 72-974 Circular or spherical stone(?) object (5m).

FIGURINE

- 3G * 72-1072 Stone figurine, height 7cm (3m). Fig.V.25

Deposit (5). In Atlas Taf.117 and 214 it can be seen that the excavations in this area exposed the southeast corner of Building VIM, which is described there as a bastion of Lysimachus. The discovery was not reported in the excavation notebook at the time, but is later alluded to in TA p.180 and Atlas Taf.117. Building VIM is fully described by Dörpfeld in TI pp.155-161. The walls of the southeast corner must have been founded well within the deposits of Troy IV or V, for their lower limit is shown as 28.89m A.T. The upper surface, however, with an altitude of c.34.22m A.T. on the south side, clearly lay within the levels at which other remains of Troy VI were preserved in this area.

(Atlas Taf.117,214; TA p.180; TI pp.155-161 and Taf.III)

Deposit (6). This deposit, again not attested in Schliemann's diary, consists of Well 3. Its presence is known only from Atlas Taf.214, where it is shown in the middle of the deepest part of the trench. There is no evidence as to its period or manner of construction. In Fig.IV.42 I have assumed it to belong to Troy VI or later, like the other wells

on the site.

(Atlas Taf.214)

Deposit (7). This is another stratum, of Troy V material, whose existence and dimensions have to be inferred from the available sources. It is not directly attested. Fig.IV.41 shows that its lower limit has been defined by reference to the locations of four more or less diagnostic objects among Schliemann's finds, although other, less obviously diagnostic, pieces have also been taken into account. The upper limit is largely unknown, except for one bench-mark in E7, and has been reconstructed in the manner noted for the lower limit of Deposit (4). In the northern part of D8 there is little more than the depth of one metre to accommodate the deposits of both Troy V and VI between the top of Troy IV and the bottom of Troy VII. This suggests that the deposits of Troy V may here have been removed to make way for buildings of Troy VI - as can be seen elsewhere on the site.

OBJECTS FOUND

POTTERY

- | | | |
|-----|-----------|---|
| A41 | * 72-1190 | Hourglass-shaped vessel with flat base, restored as tankard with handle (2m). <u>Atlas</u> 32-770; Fig.V.30. |
| B3 | * 72-1070 | Jug with short, straight neck, flattened base, and handle from neck to body (4m). Fig.V.30. |
| B24 | * 72-1074 | Piriform vessel with tapering neck and rounded base. Two sets of horizontal lines, perhaps incised, surround the vessel: an upper group of two lines, and a lower group of three lines (4m). <u>Atlas</u> 41-1001; Fig.V.30. |
| C7 | * 72-1071 | Large, globular vessel with short, straight narrow neck and flat base. Two vertical handles are attached to the body, one on each side. One side of the pot has three protruding knobs. Height 28cm (4m). Cf. <u>Atlas</u> 41-1003; Fig.V.30. |
| C10 | * 72-1073 | Deep, ovoid jar with short straight neck and flat base. Two vertical handles are attached half way up the body, on opposite sides. Height 60cm, width 50cm (4m). Fig. V.30. |
| C- | * 72-994 | Broken-off neck of a jar. It is straight and narrow, with an out-turned flange at the top (8m). Fig.V.30. |

CHIPPED STONE

- * 72-1031 (5m), *-1035 (7m), -1044 (5m), *-1054 (4m), *-1057 (4m). Blades.

BONE ARTEFACT

- * 72-1076 Rectangular decorative plaque with 3 holes and 6 circles on one surface. Length 13cm (4m). Ilios No. 541, SS 7925; Fig.V.43.

WHORLS

GVB	*	72-968	(8m)	<u>Atlas 2-65</u> (7m), <u>TR No.413</u> .
GVII	*	72-982	(8m)	
RVB	*	72-1027	(5m)	cf. <u>Atlas 6-179</u> .
RIIIB		72-1039	(7m)	cf. <u>Atlas 1-19</u> .
RVIIBd	*	72-1051	(4m)	
RIIA	*	72-1061	(4m)	cf. <u>Atlas 5-135</u> .
RIIIB	*	72-1297	(3m)	cf. <u>Atlas 1-18</u> .
RIVA	*	72-1305	(3m)	

FIGURINE

2B	*	72-1052	Marble(?) figurine (4m).	Fig.V.45.
----	---	---------	--------------------------	-----------

Deposit (8). In the diary entry for 28th June Schliemann records that he found a wall constructed of fairly large and of fairly small stones bonded with white mortar. No depth is given, but the wall is said to have been stratified over the deposit which is here numbered as (9). For reasons to be explained, Deposit (9) as described by Schliemann should probably be equated with the strata of Troy IV. The wall, which we here call Wall 26, may belong to Troy V. It is possible that it could instead be identical with Wall 25, whose existence we have posited at a similar point stratigraphically. But the style of construction is certainly consistent with that known for other walls of Troy V in this part of the site, and a Troy V date is for that reason preferred. Bearing in mind the likely location of work on the day concerned, Wall 26 may therefore be placed in the northern sector of square D8 among the Troy V deposits at c.33.00-34.00m A.T.

(Tagebuch 1872 p.426; Troy II pp.252,271f, 283)

Deposit (9). Stratified below Wall 26, Schliemann found a stratum of red and yellow ashes, with half-burnt mussels. Within the stratum he found evidence of mudbrick walls, but he does not give enough information for us to be able to locate them. Deposit (9) overlay Wall 27, and Schliemann notes that it contained pottery similar to that found at 10-7m depth on the north side of the site: that is, in Troy II. This does not need to be too strictly interpreted. Probably he simply recognized pottery of Early or Middle Bronze Age date. And as reasons will be advanced for supposing that Wall 27 may have been of Early Troy IV date, it is legitimate to see in Deposit (9) some overlying strata of Troy IV.

(Tagebuch 1872 pp.425,426)

OBJECTS FOUND

POTTERY

- A2 * 72-1208 Open shallow bowl or plate with rounded base (5m). Atlas 47-1144; Fig.V.28.
- A33 72-1087 Cup with out-turned rim, rounded base, and handle (restored) from rim to body (5m). Atlas 46-1099; Fig.V.28.
- A33 * 72-1144 Similar (6m). Atlas 54-1279a? Fig.V.28.
- A33 * 72-1205 Cup with slightly out-turned rim, rounded base, and large rising handle from rim to body (5m). Atlas 46-1100; Fig.V.28.
- A33 * 72-1216 Ditto (5m). Atlas 46-1110; Fig.V.28.
- A33 * 72-1219 Ditto (5m). Atlas 46-1111; Fig.V.28.
- A212 * 72-1025 Cup with straight side, rounded base and handle from rim to base (8m). Fig.V.28.
- A222 * 72-1206 Broad, globular cup with wide mouth, slightly out-turned rim, and rounded base. Two large rising handles from rim to body (5m). Atlas 45-1092; Fig.V.28.
- B3 * 72-1095 Jug with short, straight neck, flattened base, and handle from neck to body (4m). Fig.V.28.
- B15 * 72-1143 Spout broken from beakspouted jug. The spout is cut away at the back and preserves the top of a handle descending from the rear edge of the spout (4m). Fig.V.28.
- C7 * 72-1103 Grey globular jar with narrow, tapering neck, rounded base, and two wings (restored) rising from the shoulder. One side is decorated with raised volutes converging on the middle from the wings, and with two knobs (4m). Ilios No.231, SS 1044; Fig.V.29.
- C25 * 72-1317 Globular jar with hole mouth, rounded base and two vertical lugs on the upper part of the body (5m). Fig.V.29.
- C28 * 72-1184 Deep jar with tall, flaring neck, flat base and two pointed lugs rising from the middle of the body. Perforation in lugs and rim (4m). Fig.V.29.
- C36 * 72-1217 Open jar with slightly out-turned rim and two lugs on body (5m). Atlas 46-1101? Fig.V.29.
- C200 * 72-1096 Globular jar with short, straight neck and rounded base. The drawing may indicate a lug, spout or vestiges of a handle on one side of the body (4m). Fig.V.28.
- C205 * 72-1255 Conical pyxis (4m). Fig.V.28.
- C215 * 72-1318 Globular vessel with hole mouth and three small feet (4m). Fig.V.29.
- D13 * 72-1069 Face-lid (5m). Atlas 43-1022, SS 1856; Fig.V.29.
- D13 * 72-1142 Face-lid (5m). Fig.V.29.

CHIPPED STONE

- * 72-1032 (8m), *-1033 (8m), -1042 (8m), *-1053 (7m), *-1055 (7m), *-1098 (6m): Blades.

POLISHED STONE

- 72-1026 Slingstone(?), pear-shaped (8m). Fig.V.42.

WHORLS

- RIIB * 72-1028 (8m)
- RVIAb * 72-1029 (8m) cf. Atlas 10-335.
- GIXD * 72-1045 (7m) cf. Atlas 6-180.

RIC	* 72-1046	(8m)	
RVIAb	* 72-1047	(6m)	
RIC	* 72-1048	(8m)	
RIA	* 72-1049	(8m)	cf. <u>Atlas</u> 8-246.
GID	* 72-1062	(8m)	
RIA	72-1080	(5m)	cf. <u>Atlas</u> 8-246.
RIIA	72-1081	(4m)	
RIIIA	72-1082	(5m)	
RIB	72-1083	(4m)	cf. <u>Atlas</u> 1-7.
RIIA	72-1086	(4m)	
RVIIBd	* 72-1089	(4m)	
RIB	* 72-1092	(4m)	cf. <u>Atlas</u> 1-2.
RIIIA	* 72-1093	(7m)	
GX	* 72-1153	(4m)	
RIA	* 72-1154	(4m)	
GX	* 72-1158	(4m)	
RIIID	* 72-1183	(5m)	
GVI	* 72-1239)		
	* 72-1240)	(4m)	cf. <u>Atlas</u> 8-237, <u>TR</u> No.352, <u>SS</u> 5275.
GVI	* 72-1241	(4m)	cf. <u>Atlas</u> 8-237, <u>TR</u> No.352, <u>SS</u> 5275.
RIIIA	* 72-1243	(4m)	
RIIIA	* 72-1244	(4m)	
GVI	* 72-1245	(4m)	cf. <u>Atlas</u> 8-237, <u>TR</u> No.352, <u>SS</u> 5275.
RIIIA	* 72-1246	(4m)	
GIA	* 72-1247	(4m)	
RVIAb	* 72-1250	(4m)	
GVI	* 72-1251	(4m)	cf. <u>Atlas</u> 8-237, <u>TR</u> No.352, <u>SS</u> 5275.
GVI	* 72-1252	(4m)	cf. <u>Atlas</u> 8-237, <u>TR</u> No.352, <u>SS</u> 5275.
RVIAb	* 72-1253	(4m)	
RIIIA	* 72-1254	(4m)	
RIIB	* 72-1257	(4m)	
RIA	* 72-1258	(4m)	cf. <u>Atlas</u> 8-240.
RIIB	* 72-1293	(5m)	
RIIA	* 72-1295	(4m)	
RIA	* 72-1296	(4m)	cf. <u>Atlas</u> 8-240.
GID	* 72-1299	(5m)	
GID	* 72-1301	(4m)	cf. <u>Atlas</u> 7-211.
RIA	* 72-1304	(5m)	cf. <u>Atlas</u> 8-240.
RIIIA	* 72-1314	(5m)	
RIIID	* 72-1385	(4m)	

WEIGHT

- * 72-1090 Spherical with two holes. Possibly out of context?
(4m). Fig.V.47.

SEAL

- * 72-1311/1316 Incised stamp seal(?) (5m). Fig.V.46.

FIGURINE

- 2I * 72-1323 Marble figurine (5m). Fig.V.45.

Deposit (10). On 27th June at a depth of 7½m (=c.30.50m A.T.)

Schliemann came across a mass of large stones, some hewn and some unhewn. The depth and the date show that this mass of stones has to be located among the deposits of Troy IV (see Fig.IV.41). Schliemann

records that it was overlain by the red and yellow ash here described as Deposit (9). Further East, in square F8, Blegen found a mass of fallen stones resting on a stone platform and rising to at least 31.60m A.T. but descending below 30.10m A.T. This he identified as a possible fortification wall or retaining wall of Troy IV (Troy II p.139 and fig. 309 Nos.3-4). Unfortunately there is no information on the eventual appearance of Schliemann's mass of stones after it had been exposed, so we know no more of its dimensions than that it was initially found at c.30.50m A.T. We do not, for instance, know where the top of the deposit lay. But in view of its similar character and stratigraphic position, so far as we know them, to Blegen's mass of stones, it seems very possible that both were parts of the same wall. The section found in CDE 7-8 will be called Wall 27.

(Tagebuch 1872 p.425; Troy II p.139, fig.309)

Deposit (11). There is very little information about this deposit, whose existence and location emerge from Fig.IV.41, where it is equivalent to the deposits of Troy III. Schliemann does record that on 5th July at a depth of 8m (=c.30.00m A.T.) he found a mudbrick wall which had been burnt; also that at 9m (=c.29.00m A.T.) there was a mass of interesting whorls and pots. Otherwise we have only the following catalogue of objects which may be tentatively assigned to this stratum.

(Tagebuch 1872 pp.435,436)

OBJECTS FOUND

POTTERY

- A33(?) * 72-1097 Cup with out-turned rim, rounded base, and spout - or large handle from rim to body (8m). Fig.V.24.
- A45 * 72-1141 Red polished depas amphikypellon (9m). Atlas 84-1770? TR No.112? Ilios No.322? Fig.V.24.
- A45 * 72-1145 Ditto (9m). Atlas 84-1768? TR No.111? Ilios No.321? Fig.V.25.
- A45 * 72-1321 Ditto (10m). Atlas 92-1903? Fig.V.25.
- B17 * 72-1204 Globular jar with wide, straight neck, flattened base and handle from neck to body (9m). Atlas 79-1680? Fig.V.25.
- B206 * 72-1189 Piriform flask with wide, flaring neck and flat base (8m). Atlas 66-1462; Fig.V.25.
- C29 * 72-1214/5 Deep wheelmade jar of buff fabric with dark red slip and burnish, with straight neck and out-turned perforated rim, flat base, two inward-curling perforated handles rising from the body (6m). Atlas 54-1272, Ilios No.1007, SS 1512; Fig.V.26.
- C30 * 72-1261 Fragment of face-vase (10m).

- C35 * 72-1146/ Globular red slipped jar with tall, straight neck, three small feet and two large curling wings placed vertically on the body. Four horizontal lines around base of neck, three horizontal lines around body below handles, and groups of vertical lines, each with dots in between, filling the intermediate space on the body of the pot (8m). Atlas 16-473 (10m), TR No.149, Ilios No.261, SS 2337; Fig.V.26.
- D1 * 72-1187 Buff polished cylindrical lid with flanged top painted with red interlocking circles and pierced with holes (8m). Atlas 67-1501,68-1515,76-1642,78-1662, Ilios No. 264, SS 1739; Fig.V.27.
- D3 * 72-1185 Cylindrical lid with single loop-handle on top (6m). Atlas 48-1179; Fig.V.27.
- D8 * 72-1207 Cylindrical lid with flanged top and two crossed-loop handles (7m). Atlas 64-1428; Fig.V.27.
- D13 * 72-1218 Face-lid (8m). Atlas 75-1662, SS 319; Fig.V.27.
- D207 * 72-1315 Cylindrical lid with slightly concave profile and three knobs on top (7m). Fig.V.27.
- D209 * 72-1186 Buff polished flanged cylindrical pyxis bottom with three curled feet and two holes in the rim (8m). Atlas 67-1501,68-1515,76-1642,78-1661, Ilios No.265, SS 1740; Fig.V.27. Perhaps belongs with 72-1187.
- D- * 72-1307 Circular dish or crucible with straight sides (7m). Atlas 62-1398; Fig.V.26.
- D- * 72-1322 Ditto (10m).
- D- * 72-1308 Sub-rectangular dish or crucible (7m). Atlas 62-1399.
- * 72-1256 Black sherd with incised and white-filled decoration: three parallel lines forming three sides of a rectangle and containing a swastika (10m). Atlas 27-732 (16m), TR No.110, Ilios No.247, SS 227; Fig.V.27.

STONE MOULD

- * 72-1209 Fragment of mould for pointed blade (6m). Fig.V.40.

CHIPPED STONE

- * 72-1188 (8m), *-1194 (7m), *-1195 (6m), *-1388-90 (6m): Blades.

POLISHED STONE

- * 72-1210 Shaft-hole hammer (7m). Fig.V.42.
- * 72-1211 Flat axe (6m). E.g. Atlas 51-1244; Fig.V.42.

BONE ARTEFACT

- * 72-1320 Disc or whorl with central hole. Four lines at right-angles radiate to four small circles with central dots (9m). Atlas 16-478 (8m); Fig.V.43.

WHORLS

- RIA 72-1094 (8m) cf. Atlas 8-246.
- RIIA 72-1127 (8m) cf. Atlas 8-246.
- RIIB 72-1128 (8m) cf. Atlas 1-19.
- RIA 72-1129 (7m) cf. Atlas 8-240.
- GVA 72-1131 (6m) Atlas 2-35, TR No.380, Ilios No.1880, SS 5243.
- RIA 72-1132 (8m)
- GVB 72-1133 (7m) Atlas 9-295, TR No.362, Ilios No.1862, SS 5266.
- RVIAb 72-1134 (7m)
- GIA 72-1135 (8m) cf. Atlas 10-325, SS 5080.
- RVB 72-1136 (8m)
- RIVC 72-1137 (6m) Fig.V.49.

RIIIB	72-1138	(9m)	<u>Atlas</u> 4-126, <u>SS</u> 4674.
RIA	72-1139	(7m)	cf. <u>Atlas</u> 8-246.
RIA	72-1140	(6m)	cf. <u>Atlas</u> 3-85.
RVIAb	72-1149	(6m)	cf. <u>Atlas</u> 10-335; Fig.V.49.
RIIA	72-1150	(7m)	
RIC	72-1151	(9m)	
RVIAb	72-1152	(9m)	cf. <u>Atlas</u> 10-335.
GIA	72-1156	(9m)	<u>Atlas</u> 12-404?
RIA	72-1160	(8m)	cf. <u>Atlas</u> 8-240.
RIVA	72-1161	(8m)	
RIVA	72-1162	(8m)	
RIVA	72-1163	(8m)	
RIVA	72-1164	(8m)	
RIA	72-1165	(8m)	cf. <u>Atlas</u> 8-246.
GIXC	72-1166	(8m)	cf. <u>Atlas</u> 10-335.
RIA	72-1167	(8m)	cf. <u>Atlas</u> 8-240.
RIIA	72-1168	(8m)	
GIXC	72-1169	(8m)	<u>Atlas</u> 4-99, <u>SS</u> 5419.
GIA	72-1171	(8m)	cf. <u>Atlas</u> 10-325, <u>SS</u> 5080.
GIA	72-1172	(8m)	cf. <u>Atlas</u> 10-325, <u>SS</u> 5080.
RIA	72-1173	(8m)	cf. <u>Atlas</u> 8-240.
RVB	72-1174	(8m)	
RVIIDc	72-1175	(8m?)	
RVIAb	72-1176	(8m)	
RVB	72-1177	(8m)	
RIIA	72-1178	(8m)	
RIVA	72-1180	(7m)	
RIIA	72-1181	(8m)	
GIA	72-1182	(7m)	
RVIIDc	72-1197	(9m)	
RIVC	72-1198	(9m)	
RIIIA	72-1199	(9m)	
RIIIA	72-1200	(9m)	
RIIIA	72-1202	(9m)	
RIA	72-1213	(7m)	cf. <u>Atlas</u> 8-240.
RIA	72-1242	(9m)	cf. <u>Atlas</u> 8-246.
RIIA	72-1248	(8m)	
GIB	72-1249	(9m)	
RIIIA	72-1259	(9m)	
GVI	72-1260	(9m)	
GIA	72-1291	(9m)	
RIIIA	72-1292	(8m)	cf. <u>Atlas</u> 5-150, <u>SS</u> 4641.
RIVA	72-1294	(7m)	
RIIC	72-1298	(7m)	
GID	72-1302	(8m)	
GIB	72-1303	(7m)	
RIA	72-1306	(8m)	cf. <u>Atlas</u> 8-240.
GIA	72-1309	(8m)	
GIA	72-1310	(9m)	
GX	72-1312	(8m)	
RVIAb	72-1313	(8m)	cf. <u>Atlas</u> 10-335.
GIXC	72-1386	(10m)	

FIGURINE

2J(?) * 72-1391 Marble figurine (7m). Atlas 99-2137? Fig.V.44.