Dating the Thera (Santorini) eruption: archaeological and scientific evidence supporting a high chronology
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The date of the Late Bronze Age Minoan eruption of the Thera volcano has provoked much debate among archaeologists, not least in a recent issue of Antiquity (‘Bronze Age catastrophe and modern controversy: dating the Santorini eruption’, March 2014). Here, the authors respond to those recent contributions, citing evidence that closes the gap between the conclusions offered by previous typological, stratigraphic and radiometric dating techniques. They reject the need to choose between alternative approaches to the problem and make a case for the synchronisation of eastern Mediterranean and Egyptian chronologies with agreement on a ‘high’ date in the late seventeenth century BC for the Thera eruption.
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Introduction

For several decades there has been a debate over the date of the Late Bronze Age Minoan eruption of Thera and the associated synchronisation of eastern Mediterranean civilisations: principally between a ‘high’ date in the later seventeenth century BC (radiocarbon \(^{14}\text{C}\) based), and a ‘low’ (or conventional) date in the late sixteenth to early fifteenth century
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BC (Warburton 2009). The ‘low’ position claims it is based on archaeological evidence and simply ignores the large body of contrary $^{14}C$ data and other contradictory scientific information (e.g. Bietak 2003, 2013; Warren 2010a & b; Wiener 2010). Some scholars thus characterise this divide as an antagonistic science versus archaeology struggle (Bietak 2003, 2013). *Antiquity* recently published a paper (Cherubini et al. 2014) and some comments (Bietak 2014; MacGillivray 2014), which continue this divisive approach.

We write to reject arguments that there are alternative choices of ‘archaeology’ or ‘science’. Instead, there is a necessity for integrated analysis (Pollard & Bray 2007). Moreover, we highlight that critical examination of the historical, archaeological and scientific evidence shows that it does not support the Aegean ‘low’ chronology. In fact, recent work across the full scholarly gamut of textual analysis, archaeology and science supports the ‘high’ chronology for the Thera eruption and the beginning of the Aegean Late Bronze Age (e.g. Höflmayer 2012a; Badertscher et al. 2014; Manning 2014; Ritter & Moeller 2014). The synchronisation of eastern Mediterranean civilisations in the second millennium BC is taking shape around a chronology consistent with the $^{14}C$ timescale for both Egypt (Bronk Ramsey *et al.* 2010; Quiles *et al.* 2012; Manning *et al.* 2013) and the Aegean (Friedrich *et al.* 2006; Manning *et al.* 2006; Bruins *et al.* 2009; Wild *et al.* 2010; Lindblom & Manning 2011; Höflmayer 2012a; Höflmayer *et al.* 2013; Manning 2014)—and with the Middle (or a near-Middle) chronology for Mesopotamia (e.g. Barjamovic *et al.* 2012; Roaf 2012; de Jong 2013)—with Babylonian records perhaps even preserving a trace of the Thera eruption’s atmospheric effects (de Jong & Foertmeyer 2010). The notable exception is the archaeological chronology for the site of Tell el-Dab’a (see below), which is at odds with the $^{14}C$ timescale from this site (Kutschera *et al.* 2012).

Critique of Cherubini *et al.* (2014)

We agree that the accurate recognition of annual growth increments in most olive wood is problematic (Cherubini *et al.* 2013). Nonetheless, even if there were no tree-ring information available, the sequence of $^{14}C$ dates on the Thera olive branch buried by the eruption clearly supports a late seventeenth century BC date for the outer edge of the olive branch (Figure 1A) (see also Friedrich *et al.* 2014). Indeed, consideration of the timespan indicated by the segments dated from the Thera olive branch in such a sequence analysis using OxCal, versus the scale of the sample, allows a reasonable estimate for the extant outside edge as before c. 1600 BC (Figure 1B & C). The olive branch—if the death of the tree was caused by the eruption (see below)—thus remains both relevant and in clear support of a ‘high’ chronology. Cherubini *et al.* (2014) otherwise mislead concerning archaeology and $^{14}C$.

Archaeology

Cherubini *et al.* (2014: 268) write that the ‘low’ “dating appears to be strongly supported by the presence and sequence of Egyptian artefacts found in the Aegean as well as by large amounts of Cypriot pottery of various phases found both in Egypt and in one notable case also in the Theran volcanic destruction layer”. However, chronologically useful Egyptian items are, in fact, very rare in the Aegean in the relevant period (mature–late Late Minoan
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Figure 1. A) Thera olive branch sequence from innermost to outermost dated segments, (i) to (iv), with no supposed tree-ring information, against IntCal13 (Reimer et al. 2013) showing the most likely 68.2% probability ranges (from OxCal—Bronk Ramsey 2009a—with curve resolution = 1). B) Details for segment (iv) from A. C) The period in calendar years from the midpoints of (i) to (iv) in A. From the image of the olive branch in Warburton (2009: frontispiece), the distance between these mid-points represents c. 85% of the total branch radius, and the distance from the midpoint of (iv) to the outside edge is c. 7.5%. The allometry of tree/branch growth means we may expect more time to be represented in less distance towards the outer part of the sample. D) Nonetheless, given that 85% of the sample probably encompasses no more than 0–76 years (93.5% probability) and most likely no more than 20–62 years (see C), with a value somewhere centred around c. 45 years (see C), it seems that even a very generous allowance could not place the last extant wood of the branch more than c. 10 years after the midpoint of segment (iv). Thus, we find a last extant wood date no later than about 1622–1605 BC (68.2% probability) or 1636–1600 BC (most likely, 91.4%, range of the 95.4% probability range).

IA). Presumably, Cherubini et al. refer to the few (just three) proposed Egyptian stone vessels discussed by Warren (2009: figs. 2a–c). Even these three are not clear-cut examples. Only two of the vessels have Egyptian parallels (for the vessel illustrated in Warren 2009: fig. 2c, Warren 2009: 184 writes “no twin can be produced from Egypt”). Others regard these objects as Levantine (see Manning 2014: 37–38 and literature cited). Even if they are Egyptian, it is not clear whether they are necessarily New Kingdom (Eighteenth Dynasty) as they could be Second Intermediate Period (SIP) in date (Höflmayer 2012a: 440–41); even Warren (2010a: 68) allows late SIP for one. The parallels Warren cites are not real examples of finds in Egypt, but artistic pastiches created from fragments (Höflmayer 2012b: 177–78). Warren refers to a plate depicting stone vessel shapes originally published by Howard Carter.
in his report on tomb AN B at Dra‘ Abu el-Naga and later re-used by Lilyquist (Carter 1916: pl. 22; Lilyquist 1995: 86, fig. 24). However, according to Carter himself, he found only “d´ebris of broken stone vessels...scattered in the valley outside the entrance of the tomb, and on the floors of the interior” (Carter 1916: 151). Later, Lilyquist used the “shapes drawn by Carter from fragments found in AN B” for her publication of stone vessels from the Metropolitan Museum and notes the items and dates “[Carter] assigned to each shape” (Lilyquist 1995: 86, fig. 24). Thus, Warren’s evidence rests on what Carter thought was present in highly fragmented material scattered around a single tomb in the early twentieth century AD.

Cherubini et al. (2014: 268) refer to “large amounts of Cypriot pottery...in Egypt”. Detailed examination shows that the chronologically relevant items are quite a small subset. Nearly all items come from Tell el-Dab’a, and from redeposited (secondary and tertiary) contexts. There are only a handful of relevant clear Late Cypriot I items of the Thera eruption period, and not one from Egypt derives from a primary context. Furthermore, the publications on Tell el-Dab’a are equivocal about whether two Cypriot White Slip I sherds and one Cypriot Base Ring sherd might actually come from pre-New Kingdom (Stratum D) contexts (DAB 378, 383, 388: Maguire 2009) undermining the (only) New Kingdom date claim (Höflmayer 2012a: 442–43; Manning 2014: 39–41, 105). On critical review, this small body of archaeological material is very weak chronological evidence (Höflmayer 2011; 2012a; 2012b: 125–87; Manning 2014: 34–42).

Cherubini et al. (2014: 268) further state that an eruption date during the early New Kingdom “is also supported by the presence of pumice sourced to the Theran eruption in archaeological contexts in Egypt, the Near East and Cyprus (Doumas 2010), whereas all pumice found in earlier contexts has been sourced to other, earlier eruptions in the Dodecanese (Manning et al. 2006, 2009; Friedrich & Heinemeier 2009; Friedrich et al. 2009; Heinemeier et al. 2009)”. This is an odd assertion as Doumas (2010) does not discuss pumice. Neither do Manning et al. (2006, 2009), Friedrich and Heinemeier (2009), Friedrich et al. (2009) or Heinemeier et al. (2009) address this subject, and so none of the references support the claim. In fact, the pumice data are inconclusive. Although more than 350 samples have been analysed, the overwhelming majority come from New Kingdom contexts, and only a few samples derive from the SIP. As Sterba et al. (2009: 1738) conclude: “the pumice data are still not conclusive”. For a recent summary and critique of the pumice issue, and why it at best sets only a terminus ante quem for the Thera eruption, see Höflmayer (2012a: 441–42) and Manning (2014: 31, 198).

Radiocarbon

Cherubini et al. (2014: 271–72) finish by asserting “the date range of 1525–1490 BC proposed for the [Thera] eruption from numerous other 14C studies”. No references are given, and no studies support this statement. This date range is the ‘low’ archaeological position, which ignores or discounts the 14C evidence. Cherubini et al. (2014: 271) also state that ‘low’ chronology 1525–1490 BC “interconnections with the well-established Egyptian historical chronology are now confirmed by 211 radiocarbon measurements (Bietak & Höflmayer 2007; Bronk Ramsey et al. 2010;
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Warren 2010[b]; Wiener 2010). Of these citations, only Bronk Ramsey et al. (2010) cover the Bayesian modelling study of a large set of ¹⁴C dates on Egyptian samples, and that did not even discuss Aegean chronology. The other three citations criticise the use of ¹⁴C in this region. Bronk Ramsey et al. (2010) do demonstrate that ¹⁴C offers a detailed timeframe compatible with the historical Egyptian chronology—something previous scholarship sometimes questioned (e.g. Bietak 2003)—and so their work suggests that, as ¹⁴C results are consistent with historical chronologies of Egypt, ¹⁴C may reasonably be assumed to work elsewhere in the eastern Mediterranean (volcanic effects aside). In turn, we may assume that ¹⁴C can offer the correct and independent timeframe to enable the synchronisation of the various archaeological sequences across the region.

Cherubini et al. (2014: 269) claim “the oscillating nature of the radiocarbon calibration curve over the relevant period...makes it impossible to distinguish on radiocarbon grounds alone between an event around 1610 BC and one around 1525 BC”. This is incorrect. First, recent work employs Bayesian chronological modelling (Bayliss 2009; Bronk Ramsey 2009a) with a sequence of ¹⁴C dates in order to overcome the single-case potential dating ambiguity (as, e.g., Manning et al. 2006), or considers the relevant Akrotiri volcanic destruction level (VDL) data set on short-lived samples as a weighted average (Manning & Kromer 2012), or as a group of events assumed to be distributed exponentially towards the end of the final pre-volcanic eruption phase at Akrotiri using a Tau_Boundary paired with a Boundary in OxCal (Bronk Ramsey 2009a) as in Höflmayer (2012a: fig. 2) (see Figure 2). In each case, a later seventeenth century BC date range is clearly most probable (Manning 2014: 60–74, 169–75, 191–95). The exponential (Tau_Boundary) model is particularly relevant to the discussion because it assumes that all the ¹⁴C-dated samples are older than the eruption, even by a significant margin, ensuring that dates on individual residual samples or individual samples older for some other reason will not cause us to overestimate the age of the eruption. Cherubini et al. (2014) do not cite the detailed reappraisal of the evidence produced by Höflmayer (2012a), or any other relevant publication after 2010.

Second, even in the case of a single date calibration, things are not as alleged. Figure 3 shows the calibrated calendar age range of the weighted average ¹⁴C date for the most appropriate 25 dates from the Akrotiri VDL on short-lived plant matter with a combined estimate (mean) of 3345±8 ¹⁴C years BP (the 28-date set in Manning et al. 2006, but excluding the 3 Heidelberg dates: see Manning 2014: 45–46 and no. 38) with arbitrarily larger measurement errors of ±15, ±20, ±25 and ±30 ¹⁴C years (the last at the level of a single modern ¹⁴C date, ignoring the fact that 25 dates are available to narrow the precision in this case). In every case, the most likely 68.2% range lies solely in the seventeenth century BC. Only when the error is more than double the (actual) calculated one does a very small sixteenth century BC range become possible at 95.4% probability, and of course 88.4% of the probability (including the most likely 68.2%) still lies in the seventeenth century BC. Even with uncertainties allowed for, the most likely 68.2% range remains solely seventeenth century BC, and the sixteenth century BC range remains under 20% probability (and ends before 1530 BC). Contra Cherubini et al. (2014), ¹⁴C does have the resolution to show that a later sixteenth century BC date is very unlikely.
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Figure 2. Modelled end of settlement (Boundary “E” = Thera eruption date) range based on 25 $^{14}$C measurements of short-lived samples from Akrotiri in Manning et al. (2006) excluding the three Heidelberg dates (see Manning 2014: 45–46 and no.38) when grouped as a Phase with a $\tau$au Boundary as the start (“T”) and a Boundary (“E”) as the end (Bronk Ramsey 2009a). There are no outliers, applying the General Outlier model of Bronk Ramsey (2009b). Calibrated ranges at 68.2% and 95.4% probability shown, from IntCal13 (Reimer et al. 2013) employing OxCal (Bronk Ramsey 2009a) with curve resolution set at 5.
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Figure 3. A) The weighted average $^{14}$C date for the set of 25 short-lived samples from the Akrotiri volcanic destruction layer (VDL) (see inset, B) = 3345±8 $^{14}$C years BP: first as calculated with standard deviation of ±8 $^{14}$C years, and then, arbitrarily, with larger errors of ±15, ±20, ±25 and ±30 $^{14}$C years. Calibrated ranges at 68.2% and 95.4% probability shown (and sub-ranges where applicable), from IntCal13 (Reimer et al. 2013) employing OxCal (Bronk Ramsey 2009a) with curve resolution set at 5. B) 25-date $^{14}$C set—see text—from the Akrotiri VDL on short-lived plant samples, 1σ errors, shown versus the weighted average of the set.
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Volcanic CO₂ has been raised as a possible issue for decades. But, as Bruins & van der Plicht (2014: 283–84) note, Cherubini et al. (2014) cite inappropriate volcanic analogies and offer no actual positive evidence. Furthermore, analysis of Aegean ¹⁴C dates for the period not from Thera, and so clearly not affected by any possible volcanic CO₂ effect, nonetheless offer very similar age ranges for the time period of the Thera eruption—see Figure 4—contrary to the assertions of Cherubini et al. (2014: 271). This also addresses the question about whether the olive branch was alive at the time of the Thera eruption (Cherubini et al. 2014: 271). This is a possible complication; olive trees can carry dead branches. However, the ¹⁴C dates on the olive branch offer conspicuously similar date ranges to the large set of ¹⁴C ages from short-lived plant material from the VDL on Thera and from several other contemporary Aegean sites linked to the time of the Thera eruption (compare Figures 1–4). Cherubini et al. ignore the reasonable circumstantial case that this was not in fact a long-dead branch (Bruins & van der Plicht 2014: 284–86). There are also a number of other arguments for why it seems very unlikely that any substantive volcanic CO₂ effect applies with regard either to the dating of the olive branch or to the Akrotiri VDL (e.g. Friedrich et al. 2009; Heinemeier et al. 2009; Manning et al. 2009: 300–304; Manning & Kromer 2012; Manning 2014: 50–60).

**Key recent evidence supporting the ‘high’ chronology**

**Khayan**

The Hyksos king Khayan comprises a key element in the chronology of Tell el-Dab’a (he is purportedly linked to a palace complex of late Stratum E/1 and early Stratum D/3) and the ‘low’ Aegean chronology (e.g. Wiener 2010: 374–75; Bietak 2013: 84–86). Khayan is dated c. 1600–1580 BC by Bietak and usually placed towards the end of the Fifteenth (Hyksos) Dynasty. However, recent finds of a number of sealings of Khayan at Tell Edfu in Egypt, in near association with those of the Thirteenth Dynasty king Sobekhotep IV, indicate that this king instead dates some 80 years earlier (Moeller & Marouard 2011)—and a recent report from Tell el-Dab’a also indicates his place in the early Fifteenth Dynasty (Forstner-Müller & Rose 2012–2013). If the dates for Khayan are moved back, then the dates for the Tell el-Dab’a stratigraphy would match the ¹⁴C dates from the site (Kutschera et al. 2012) (see Figure 5). However, such a significant revision of the Tell el-Dab’a chronology would also impact on inferences drawn from the ‘low’ Tell el-Dab’a chronology (Bietak 2013)—such as the arguments for dating Hazor via Tell el-Dab’a to lend support for the low Mesopotamian chronology (Bietak 2013: 81–84). Conversely, given the strong recent evidence for a solution in favour of a Middle or near-Middle Mesopotamian Chronology (see above), the find of a cuneiform letter fragment of later Old Babylonian type from the Khayan palace context at Tell el-Dab’a (Bietak & Forstner-Müller 2009: 115–18; Bietak 2013: 84) supports revision of the Tell el-Dab’a chronology in line with the site’s ¹⁴C evidence.

The new information about Khayan has key relevance to the Aegean chronology. A vessel lid with Khayan’s cartouche was found at Knossos in a (most likely) Middle Minoan IIIB context (Macdonald 2005: 134; Höflmayer 2012b: 172–75). Instead of being an argument for the ‘low’ chronology (above), this now becomes further evidence supporting the ‘high’ chronology, as Khayan is (now) to be dated around 80 years earlier.
### Dating the Thera (Santorini) eruption

Figure 4. Calibrated calendar date ranges for the VDL at Akrotiri on Thera, or the immediately subsequent eruption, from short-lived plant samples (different approaches) and comparisons with the calibrated calendar date ranges for several other samples and contexts of approximately the same period from Thera, Crete, Rhodes and mainland Greece, and two approximate terminus ante quem (TAQ) ranges for the Thera VDL period (from Aigina and mainland Greece). The earliest possible date (TPQ) for the accession of Ahmose is also shown. Data from OxCal (Bronk Ramsey 2009a) and IntCal13 (Reimer et al. 2013) with curve resolution set at 5.
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Egyptian chronology

The start of the New Kingdom of Egypt has usually been placed at c. 1550 BC or 1540 BC in conventional scholarly assessments over the past three decades (e.g. c. 1548 BC in Schneider’s thorough review of 2010). Recent historical, astronomical and \(^{14}\)C work indicates either similar or slightly earlier dates (e.g. a 95.4% probability range of 1570–1544 BC: Bronk Ramsey et al. 2010: tab. 1) and highlights that a couple of decades of error/flexibility remain (Bronk Ramsey et al. 2010; Huber 2011; Quiles et al. 2012; Aston 2012–2013; Gautschy 2013; Manning 2014: 20–23, 116–33, 181–83). The very latest work indicates likely adjustments to some of the reign lengths employed by the Bronk Ramsey et al. (2010) analysis (especially Tuthmosis IV) (Aston 2012–2013). If the Bronk Ramsey et al. (2010) model is re-run, employing the subsequent IntCal13 calibration dataset (Reimer et al. 2013) and revised with a combination of Aston’s (2012–2013) ‘high’ critical historical assessment of Eighteenth Dynasty internal chronology and otherwise Schneider’s (2010) standard New Kingdom historical chronology, this suggests a 95.4% range for the accession of the first king, Ahmose, as early as 1585–1563 BC (Manning 2014: 184). Such dates are only a couple of decades earlier than the previous standard dates, but make a big difference. Higher dates
for Ahmose remove much of the previous apparent ‘gap’ between a late seventeenth century BC date for the Thera eruption, versus the ‘low’ archaeological synthesis. Since claims for exclusive Eighteenth Dynasty associations for Cypriot White Slip I and some stone vessels are not sound—discussed above—a higher date for Ahmose permits most evidence to be consistent with the ‘high’ Aegean chronology.

The higher date for Ahmose has another important aspect: there is an unusual text from his reign (the Tempest Stela of Ahmose). This inscription suggests a possible association with the Thera eruption and its regional impacts (Ritner & Moeller 2014). Previously, with the accession of Ahmose c. 1550 BC or 1540 BC, the account in the Ahmose Tempest Stela seemed c. 50–75 years younger than the 14C date for Thera. Now, with the date of Ahmose raised, and the eruption of Thera placed in the late seventeenth century BC, it is much more reasonable to consider an association of the Ahmose Tempest stela with the effects of the eruption, whether with Ahmose as a direct witness at the start of his reign or life, or as including a dramatic event from a little before.

Tell el-Dab’a

We have noted the discrepancy between the historical and archaeological chronology and the 14C dates from the site (Kutschera et al. 2012). A critical review of the literature reveals additional issues. In particular, it is argued that four links (‘datum lines’) between Tell el-Dab’a and Egyptian kings structure the site’s chronology (e.g. Bietak 2013: 80): a) stela mentioning the fifth year of Sesostris III for the start of Stratum K; b) palace of Khayan from late Stratum E/1 and early Stratum D/3; c) conquest (abandonment) by Ahmose at the end of Stratum D/2; and d) from Stratum C/2 “numerous scarabs from the Eighteenth Dynasty with the latest from Tuthmosis III and Amenhotep II” (Bietak 2013: 80). None of these datum lines seems, however, to be secure.

a) It is unclear whether the stela mentioning the fifth year of Sesostris III relates to the original building of the temple (Stratum K), or to an enlargement only, nor whether the stela was brought to the site from elsewhere, or that it necessarily belongs to this temple and not another proximate structure, or even that it is an original Sesostris III document (Czerny 2012: 61).

b) Assuming that the Khayan association is correct for the late Stratum E/1 and early Stratum D/3 palace—the link is less than certain as the key sealings come from a secondary context in a large offering pit (Bietak et al. 2012–2013: 25)—we have already discussed the recent finds which require a radical earlier re-dating of Khayan (compatible with the 14C evidence).

c) There is no positive evidence for the supposed Ahmose link with the end of Stratum D/2—it is just an assumption based on the dramatic change in occupation in the area of Ezbet Helmi from a citadel to a large storage facility. The name of Ahmose is not attested.

d) The find contexts of the New Kingdom scarabs are from after the supposed Tuthmosid palace structures—thus, the association and dating of these buildings as Tuthmosid is questionable, and the older 14C dates from these strata indicate that a rethink is necessary (Figure 5). These scarabs, some 30 of them inscribed with royal names from Ahmose to Amenhotep II, were retrieved from a small building compound, “the walls of which abutted...
on the eroded eastern ramp attached to Palace (F)” (Bietak et al. 2007: 27). The so-called Tuthmosid Palaces are not associated with any kings’ names. The excavator then goes on: “[t]his was one of the reasons why, at the inception of the excavation, Palace (F), which was built before the supposed workshop, was dated pre-Ahmose” (Bietak et al. 2007: 27). The $^{14}$C evidence suggests that this initial diagnosis was in fact perhaps correct (Figure 5).

Given these complications, and the evident problems in the interpretation of the archaeological chronology of Tell el-Dab’a, this site should not be used as a firm chronological foundation or as a basis for arguments against $^{14}$C, or for (re-)interpretation of other archaeological evidence (contra Bietak 2013; Porter 2013).

White Slip I

Bietak (2014: 281) repeats claims that Manning (1999) argued that White Slip I started in northern Cyprus 150 years before the south of the island. This is not the case. There is certainly a regional pattern on Cyprus, with eastern Cyprus adopting some of the new Late Cypriot I package later than the north-west (and this may even reflect separate political entities (Brown 2013: 130–31), but the chronological gap Bietak refers to is a product only of his low dating of residual material at Tell el-Dab’a. As discussed above, evidence at Tell el-Dab’a may even suggest that White Slip I ante-dates the New Kingdom—thus, on current evidence, a date before perhaps c. 1564 BC (Gautschy 2013: 67) or before c. 1585–1563 BC from $^{14}$C (95.4% range: Manning 2014: 184). The White Slip I bowl from pre-eruption Thera in the later seventeenth century BC is, therefore, not 150 years earlier, as observed by Höflmayer (2012a) (for a brief re-statement of the White Slip I issue, see Manning 2014: 39–41).

Sofular speleothem

Geochemical analysis of the Sofular Cave speleothem (northern Turkey) offers a coherent package of changes in specific trace elements (bromine, molybdenum, sulphur) very likely indicating a major volcanic impact (Badertscher et al. 2014). It is argued that bromine may be the most sensitive indicator, offering a clear, short-lived peak at 1621±25 BC, with molybdenum following at 1617±25 BC and sulphur later at 1589±25 BC—the observed sequence (Br, Mo, S) in the speleothem relates to differences in retention rates in the soil above the Sofular Cave. It is important to note that there are no such indications in the trace elements in the later sixteenth to early fifteenth centuries BC (Badertscher et al. 2014: fig. 5). Given the pattern of, and dates for, these changes, and the geographic situation with just one very large volcanic eruption in the proximate region around this time, the enormous Thera eruption (Johnston et al. 2014) seems the obvious (but not proven) candidate.

Radiocarbon

At present, the only direct dating evidence for the Thera eruption and the associated Aegean periods comes from $^{14}$C. Since the demonstration that $^{14}$C analysis can achieve a coherent chronology consistent with the approximate historical Egyptian chronology for the second and earlier first millennia BC (Bronk Ramsey et al. 2010), there is every reason to expect $^{14}$C to provide a valid chronology for Aegean prehistory (independent of the step-wise logic
transfers inherent in the archaeological and art-historical modes of chronology building). 14C dates from Thera, and from locations well away from Thera, offer the same chronology for the later Late Minoan IA period around the time of the eruption (Figure 4)—excluding any volcanic CO2 or other ‘offset’ claim, while Bayesian analysis of an archaeologically defined time-series of 14C dates overcomes any single-case dating ambiguities caused by the history of past atmospheric levels of 14C (the wiggly shape of the calibration curve) (e.g. Manning et al. 2006; Wild et al. 2010; Manning 2014: 66–74, 191–95). Repeated measurements at different laboratories employing slightly different protocols have achieved very similar 14C results for samples from the Aegean and from Egypt—notably as detailed in the studies of Manning et al. (2006) and Bronk Ramsey et al. (2010). Therefore, although a few Aegean ‘low’ chronology scholars have repeatedly suggested that there must be problems with 14C dating (e.g. Wiener 2010, 2012), we dismiss such concerns and regard the 14C-based chronology as sound.

The 14C evidence from the VDL on Thera and other contemporary sites yields a clear and coherent timeframe indicating a probable date in the late seventeenth century BC (Figures 1–4). The sequence of 14C dates (no tree-rings) on an olive branch found buried in the Minoan eruption pumice also indicates a late seventeenth century BC date (Figure 1). If we narrow our dataset down to the recent AD 2000s, 14C measurements from Akrotiri on short-lived samples—13 dates on plant matter (Manning et al. 2006), one date on insect chitin (Panagiotakopulu et al. 2013)—the dataset clearly indicates a seventeenth century BC date (Figure 4 nos. 3–4 & 14). Even subjectively choosing to consider just the group of the nine latest dates from this set (very much biasing the situation to the latest possible date), as discussed in Manning & Kromer (2012), either a Tau Boundary model or the weighted average still overwhelmingly indicate a seventeenth century BC date range—see Figure 4 nos. 5–6—and not a date range in the late sixteenth century BC as required by the ‘low’ chronology.

Conclusions

The Thera debate has come full circle. What began as a belated element of the (second) 14C revolution in the Aegean in the 1970s and led to something of a divide between the approaches of conventional archaeology and archaeological science, now finds approximate resolution in a body of consistent information from recent archaeological finds, renewed textual and astronomical analysis, and science-based work. It is now time for the archaeology and history of the second millennium BC Aegean and eastern Mediterranean to be responsibly analysed, taking account of the increasingly coherent chronology based on 14C and the latest archaeological and scientific research.
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