

COMMITTEE FOR PONTIC STUDIES

**THE BLACK SEA REGION
IN THE CONTEXT OF THE ROMAN EMPIRE**



**INTERNATIONAL SYMPOSIUM
DEDICATED IN MEMORY OF VICTOR I. SARIANIDI
(ATHENS 5-8 MAY 2016)**

ATHENS 2022

COMMITTEE FOR PONTIC STUDIES

**THE BLACK SEA REGION
IN THE CONTEXT OF THE ROMAN EMPIRE**

**INTERNATIONAL SYMPOSIUM
DEDICATED IN MEMORY OF VICTOR I. SARIANIDI
(ATHENS 5-8 MAY 2016)**

**EDITED BY
David Braund, Angelos Chaniotis and Elias Petropoulos**

ATHENS 2022

Εικόνα εξωφύλλου: Επεξεργασία από τον πίνακα «Σινώπη, εξωτερική άποψη του περι-
τειχίσματος της ομώνυμης ακροπόλεως» (Αύγουστος 1847), [École
Nationale des Beaux-Arts, Paris].

Εκδόθηκε από την Επιτροπή Ποντιακών Μελετών
με την ευγενική χορηγία της Εργοληπτικής Γαλανίδη Α.Ε.
στη μνήμη του Στέφανου Γαλανίδη

© Επιτροπή Ποντιακών Μελετών
Αγνώστων Μαρτύρων 73, Τ.Κ. 171 23, Νέα Σμύρνη, Αθήνα
Τηλ. 210-9325521 - Fax: 210-9354333 - e-mail: info@epm.gr
Ιστοσελίδα: www.epm.gr

ISBN: 978-618-84868-2-9

CONTENTS

Preface	5
Programme – Πρόγραμμα	9
<i>Christos Galanidis</i>	
Opening of the works of the symposium at the Committee for Pontic Studies	15
<i>Alexios G. C. Savvides</i>	
Address by the Vice-Chairman of the Committee	19
<i>David Braund, Angelos Chaniotis, Elias K. Petropoulos</i>	
The Pontic region and Roman Oecumene: An introduction	21
Part One: Historical Geography	
<i>Manolis Manoledakis</i>	
The southern Black Sea in the Roman geographic texts	33
<i>David Braund and Emzar Kakhidze</i>	
Reflections on the southeastern coast of the Black Sea in the Roman period	59
<i>Gela Gamkrelidze</i>	
In search of the city of Phasis	75
<i>Claire Barat</i>	
Sinop in Roman times from Pontic capital to Roman colony	85
<i>Alexander A. Maslennikov and Elias K. Petropoulos</i>	
Hellenic traditions in the rural area of Bosporan Kingdom in Roman times	95
Part Two: Political History	
<i>Pantelis M. Nigdelis</i>	
The last Sappaeian kings and cities in Roman Macedonia	107
<i>Altay Coşkun</i>	
The Bosporan Kings in-between the Mithradatic tradition and friendship with Rome: the usurpation of Asandros revisited	125
<i>Victor Cojocar</i>	
The Bosporan Kingdom, Rome, and the Polemonids revisited	149
<i>David Braund</i>	
Between Crimea, Rome and Asia Minor: Dyteutus as Orestes for the princeps	159
<i>Dan Ruscu and Ligia Ruscu</i>	
<i>Excidium Histriae</i> once again	173
<i>Sergey Saprykin</i>	
The community of Pontus on the southern Black Sea coast	181

Part Three: Material Culture and Economy

<i>Eleni T. Mentessidou, Orhan Alper Şirin, Mustafa Kolağasioğlu</i>	
Roman Amisos: a study on graves and grave findings	217
<i>E. Yu. Klenina</i>	
Amphorae of the Black Sea Region as an archaeological source on trade relations in the second–third centuries AD	231
<i>Dominique Kassab Tezgör</i>	
The Roman amphorae produced in Black Sea centers and preserved in the Museums of the Black Sea coast of Turkey	257
<i>Şahin Yıldırım</i>	
The Roman trading center on the bank of Billaios River	277
<i>Andrey Bezrukov</i>	
Transit trade in the Volga and the Kama region in the late centuries BC – early centuries AD	309

Part Four: Religion

<i>Sümer Atasoy</i>	
Some considerations on the remains of a Roman temple at Tios, Southern Black Sea coast	321
<i>Alexander Minchev</i>	
The local pantheon of Odessos and its environs in the Roman period: continuity and change in the first to third centuries AD	329
<i>Bülent Öztürk</i>	
Observations on religious and cultural life in Heraclea Pontica in the Roman Imperial period	355
<i>Dimitris J. Kyrtatas</i>	
Christianising the region of Pontus	371

Part Five: Epigraphy

<i>Alexandru Avram and Mihai Ionescu</i>	
Three new inscriptions from Callatis of the Roman period	383
<i>Emyr Dakin</i>	
The honorary decree for Karzoazos, son of Attalos (<i>IOSPE I² 39</i>). A Monument for a “new man?”	395
<i>Angelos Chaniotis</i>	
Antiphon, an Olbian statesman and orator, and his values	411
<i>Christos Galanidis</i>	
End of the Symposium works	425
List of Contributors	427

PREFACE

The Committee of Pontic Studies (EPM) in 2016 –following a custom that was very common in the East for every important event– "planted a tree", the International Scientific Symposium entitled "The Black Sea Region in the context of the Roman Empire" (5-8 May 2016). With the supervision and care of three distinguished scientists, Angelos Chaniotis, Professor at the Princeton Institute for Advanced Study, David Braund, Professor at the University of Exeter and Elias Petropoulos, Professor at the Democritus University of Thrace. At the symposium were invited and participated a number of the most significant scholars-historians from Greece and abroad, engaging with the specific historical period. The symposium was dedicated to the memory of the great archaeologist Victor Sarigiannidis, honorary member of the EPM.

The presentation to the scientific community and the general public of the proceedings of the Symposium, in a carefully edited special edition of the EPM, comes to fulfill the promise given during its closing ceremony.

Thus, the first and rather unique edition is added to the world literature with reference to the historical period of Roman rule in the Black Sea. Future efforts for the same period will be deprived of the presence of Alexandru Avram, Professor of Ancient History at the University of Le Mans (France), who was a lecturer at the Symposium and passed away recently (4-8-2021).

All the presentations of the Symposium –28 in total– were written originally in English and so this edition is presented in English. However it would be beneficial to introduce a translation in Greek language, in order to facilitate the discussion in our language. Special thanks are due to Mr. Angelos Chaniotis for editing the publication. He was assisted in the editorial work (proofreading of the texts and homogenization of bibliography and notes) by his research assistants Eric Hensley (New York University), Dr. Ioannis Linardakis (University of Thessaloniki), and Dr. Matthew Peebles (Columbia University).

It is worth mentioning that this is not the first edition of E.P.M. in English, since the following have been published in the past: 1) "Black Sea" (12th Symposium on Byzantine Studies, Birmingham 1978). 2) David Bruce Kilpatrick, "Function and style in pontic dance music" (1980) and 3) Patricia Fann Bouteneff, "Exiles on Stage. The modern Pontic Theater in Greece" (2002).

The efforts of E.P.M. to cover scientifically issues regarding Pontus Era are achieved with a lot of effort, passion and concerns for the future. The future, however, can be considered secure when there are solid foundations and actions, such as this Symposium. An important driving force, moreover, for new researches is the

Preface

satisfaction that results from scientific meetings with the characteristics of the originality and the quality of the Symposium.

This edition coincides with the one hundred year anniversary (1922-2022) of the Asia Minor Catastrophe and the uprooting of Hellenism from the grounds where they lived and grew up and is another project to keep alive the memory of our ancestors, who bequeathed their history and culture, which we must promote by raising awareness of the future generations.

Christos I. Galanidis
Chairman of the Committee for Pontic Studies

ΠΡΟΛΟΓΟΣ

Η Επιτροπή Ποντιακών Μελετών (Ε.Π.Μ.) το 2016 –ακολουθώντας ένα έθιμο που επικρατούσε στην Ανατολή για κάθε σημαντικό γεγονός– "φύτεψε ένα δέντρο", το Διεθνές Επιστημονικό Συμπόσιο με τίτλο «Ο Εύξεινος Πόντος την εποχή της ρωμαϊκής κυριαρχίας» (5-8 Μαΐου 2016). Με την επιμέλεια και φροντίδα τριών διακεκριμένων επιστημόνων, του Άγγελου Χανιώτη, Καθηγητή του Ινστιτούτου Προηγμένων Σπουδών του Πρίνστον, του David Braund, Καθηγητή του Πανεπιστημίου του Έξετερ και του Ηλία Πετρόπουλου, Καθηγητή σήμερα του Δημοκρίτειου Πανεπιστημίου Θράκης, κλήθηκαν και συμμετείχαν οι σημαντικότεροι επιστήμονες–ιστορικοί με ενασχόληση τη συγκεκριμένη ιστορική περίοδο από την Ελλάδα και το εξωτερικό. Το συμπόσιο αφιερώθηκε στη μνήμη του μεγάλου αρχαιολόγου Βίκτωρα Σαρηγιαννίδη, επίτιμου μέλους της Ε.Π.Μ.

Η παρουσίαση στην επιστημονική κοινότητα και το ευρύτερο κοινό των πρακτικών του Συμποσίου, σε μια επιμελημένη ειδική έκδοση της Ε.Π.Μ., έρχεται να υλοποιήσει την υπόσχεση που δόθηκε κατά την τελετή λήξης του. Έτσι, προστίθεται στην παγκόσμια βιβλιογραφία η πρώτη και μάλλον μοναδική έκδοση με αναφορά στην ιστορική περίοδο της ρωμαϊκής κυριαρχίας στον Εύξεινο Πόντο. Μελλοντικές προσπάθειες για την ίδια περίοδο θα στερηθούν την παρουσία του Alexandru Avram, καθηγητή της Αρχαίας Ιστορίας του Πανεπιστημίου Le Mans (Γαλλία), ο οποίος ήταν εισηγητής στο Συμπόσιο και έφυγε από τη ζωή πρόσφατα (4-8-2021).

Όλες οι εισηγήσεις του Συμποσίου –28 τον αριθμό– έγιναν στην αγγλική γλώσσα και έτσι η έκδοση αυτή γίνεται στα αγγλικά, αν και καλό θα ήταν να υπήρχε μετάφραση στα ελληνικά, ώστε να διευκολυνθεί η συζήτηση στη γλώσσα μας. Για την επιμέλεια της έκδοσης θερμές ευχαριστίες οφείλονται ιδιαίτερος στον κ. Άγγελο Χανιώτη. Στην επιμέλεια του τόμου τον βοήθησαν οι επιστημονικοί συνεργάτες του Eric Hensley (Πανεπιστήμιο της Νέας Υόρκης), Δρ. Ιωάννης Λιναρδάκης (Πανεπιστήμιο Θεσσαλονίκης), και Δρ. Matthew Peebles (Πανεπιστήμιο Κολούμπια).

Αξίζει να αναφερθεί ότι δεν είναι η πρώτη έκδοση της Ε.Π.Μ. στην αγγλική γλώσσα, αφού και κατά το παρελθόν εκδόθηκαν: 1) «Black Sea» (12^ο Συμπόσιο Βυζαντινών Σπουδών, Birmingham 1978), 2) David Bruce Kilpatrick, «Function and style in pontic dance music» (1980) και 3) Patricia Fann Bouteneff, «Exiles on Stage. "The modern Pontic Theater in Greece"» (2002).

Οι προσπάθειες της Ε.Π.Μ. να καλύψει επιστημονικά ό,τι αφορά τον Πόντο επιτυγχάνονται με πολύ κόπο, μεράκι και αγωνία για τη συνέχεια. Το μέλλον, ωστόσο, μπορεί να θεωρηθεί εξασφαλισμένο, όταν υπάρχουν θεμέλια γερά και δράσεις, όπως το συγκεκριμένο Συμπόσιο. Σημαντική κινητήρια δύναμη, εξάλλου, για νέες αναζητήσεις αποτελεί η ικανοποίηση που προκύπτει από επιστημονικές συναντήσεις με τα χαρακτηριστικά της πρωτοτυπίας και της ποιότητας του Συμποσίου.

Preface

Η έκδοση αυτή συμπίπτει με τη συμπλήρωση εκατό χρόνων (1922-2022) από τη Μικρασιατική Καταστροφή και τον ξεριζωμό του ελληνισμού από τις εστίες που έζησε και μεγαλούργησε και αποτελεί ένα ακόμη έργο στη μνήμη των προγόνων μας, οι οποίοι μας κληροδότησαν την ιστορία και τον πολιτισμό τους, που οφείλουμε να προβάλλουμε ευαισθητοποιώντας και τις επερχόμενες γενιές.

Χρήστος Ι. Γαλανίδης
Πρόεδρος της Ε.Π.Μ.

THE PONTIC REGION AND ROMAN OECUMENE
AN INTRODUCTION

The Greek colonists who reached the coasts of the Euxeinos Pontos in the Archaic period came to a world that hardly corresponded to their nautical experiences. They were accustomed to sailing in seas full of islands and islets, in seas, such as the Aegean, the Ionian, or the Propontis (the Sea of Marmara), where the next possible anchorage was routinely visible. In the Black Sea, they encountered a huge basin, commonly calm, but from time to time disturbed by sudden and strong storms - a sea that favors coasting and not crossing, a sea where huge rivers end. Unlike most rivers in mainland Greece, these rivers were key routes of long-distance communication.¹ The Pontos is a sea of challenges, a sea that myths associated with the adventures of the Argonauts, and perhaps a sea that rewards courage with treasures. It should, therefore, not surprise that the Greek colonists on all coasts of the Black Sea would cultivate communications with the hinterland.² And yet, the Greek colonies along all Pontic coasts also developed close relations with each other, despite the long distances and political and institutional differences. They created a network of relations, both public and private, that scholarship in recent years has labelled a 'Pontic koine'.³ This network is a triumph of culture, politics, and economy over geography. It was significantly strengthened by Roman expansion in the Balkans and Asia Minor.

When around 200 AD Theokles, son of Satyros, from Olbia died, many cities sent golden crowns to honor him, because he had offered his services to their citizens during their stays in Olbia.⁴ These cities represent the greater part of the Pontic coasts: Odessos, Kallatis, Tomis, Histria, and Tyras in the west, Olbia and Crimean Chersonesos in the north, as well as Pantikapaion in the Bosporan Kingdom, Byzantion, Herakleia, Amastris, and Sinope. Other foreigners who had been assisted by the Olbian man in his city came from northern Asia Minor, from places close to the Pontos, e.g. from Nikomedeia, Nikaia, Kyzikos, Tios, and Prusa, as well as Aegean Miletos, Olbia's mother-city. In general, the sources we have from the Hellenistic era and the Imperial period confirm the impression we get from this inscription, that strong and frequent communications existed among the Black Sea cities. Such sources from the Hellenistic and Imperial periods include both inscriptions, e.g. grants of the title of *proxenos* and of citizenship by cities of the Black Sea to citizens of other cities in this region,⁵ decrees concerning embassies, honorific

¹ See the papers by Ş. Yıldırım (Bilaios River) and A. Bezrukov (Volga and Kama).

² See Mordvintseva 2016 and the papers by A. Bezrukov and A. A. Maslennikov and E. K. Petropoulos in this volume.

³ See Bresson, Ivantchik, and Ferrary (eds.) 2007. See also Sayar 2016, on the relations between the Propontis and the west coast of the Black Sea. On private networks see Dana 2013 and Ruscu 2013.

⁴ *IOSPE I*²40. Discussed by A. Chaniotis in this volume.

⁵ Cojocaru 2016a and 2016b; Ruscu 2016.

inscriptions, and epitaphs that document the presence of foreigners in Pontic cities (assembled now in Alexandru Avram' *Prosopographia Externa*),⁶ and archaeological sources, e.g. the stamps of amphorae that were exported from the various cities to cities on other shores of the Pontus,⁷ and other evidence of material culture (glass, for example. or funerary monuments that show the diffusion of the iconographic motif of the funerary banquet.⁸

Equally impressive is the maintenance of strong ties, first with mainland Greece and the areas that formed the Hellenistic world, and then the eastern Roman provinces. This is easily understandable in the case of Thrace and the southern coast of the Black Sea, which were sometimes parts and sometimes natural extensions of the Hellenistic kingdoms. It also applies to the Greek colonies of Roman Moesia, with Scythia Minor and the north coast of the Black Sea. The Greek Pontic cities generally followed (and indeed were part of) the social and political developments of the Hellenistic world, as we can infer from the information provided by decrees for political culture and political institutions.⁹ This is also true as regards cultural activities and education in the Black Sea area.¹⁰

What changes did Roman expansion bring, from the first century BC onwards? What is the specific significance of the Black Sea region for our understanding of the Roman oecumene, its organization, its economy, and its culture? Did Roman expansion contribute to the political, institutional, social, economic and cultural integration of this region into the Roman universe? A rapidly expanding scholarship addresses these questions that concern 'Roman Pontos'. This volume aims to contribute to ongoing research on the subject by assembling contributions on selected subjects pertaining to the historical geography of the Black Sea,¹¹ its political history,¹² its material culture and economy,¹³ its religious history,¹⁴ and its social and political culture¹⁵ from the Late Republic to the Late Imperial period.

⁶ Avram 2013.

⁷ See the papers by E. Yu. Klenina and D. Kassab Tezgör in this volume. For a review of recent publications on this subject see Badoud and Avram 2019. New publications are also summarized in the *Supplementum Epigraphicum Graecum*.

⁸ Glass: Boğan and Chiriac 2016. Funerary banquet scenes: e.g. Slawisch 1996 (Thrace); *SEG* LVI 920 (Pantikapaion), 941 (Tyritake); LVII 734 (Pantikapaion). On material culture see also the paper by E. T. Mentessidou, O. Alper Şirin, and M. Kolağasıoğlu (Amisos) in this volume.

⁹ Chaniotis 2017.

¹⁰ On theatrical performances, see Braund, Hall, and Wyles (eds.) 2019. On oratory see the papers by A. Chaniotis and E. Dakin in this volume. On medicine on the western coast of the Black Sea see Dana 2016.

¹¹ See the papers by M. Manoledakis, D. Braund and E. Kakhidze, G. Gamkrelidze, C. Barat, A. A. Maslennikov and E. K. Petropoulos.

¹² See the papers by C. Barat, P. M. Nigdelis, A. Coşkun, V. Cojocar, D. Braund, D. Ruscu and L. Ruscu, and S. Saprykin.

¹³ Material culture: see note 8. Economy: see the papers by E. Yu. Klenina, D. Kassab Tezgör, Ş. Yıldırım, and A. Bezrukov. See also Ejstrud 2006.

¹⁴ See the papers by S. Atasoy (Tios), A. Minchev (Odessos), B. Öztürk (Herakleia), and D. J. Kyrtatas (Christianization). For the Bosphoran kingdom see now Braund 2018.

¹⁵ Society (through the lens of epigraphy): see the papers by A. Avram and M. Ionescu, and E. Dakin. political

The specific significance of the Black Sea region in ‘Roman times’ – that is, in the period in which Rome was the dominant power in the Mediterranean, the Pontic region, and the Near East – turns on its heterogeneity. In this closed geographical region, areas that were under direct provincial administration co-existed with autonomous cities and allied kingdoms; we find traditional Greek cities, Roman colonies, and communities of indigenous populations, including a range of pastoralist and non-urban societies. It is in this particular context that the impact of Roman rule emerges as a significant historical force, accommodating and integrating variety across time and extensive (and distinctly varied kinds of) space, including steppe, sea and the mountains of the Caucasus, Crimea and Pontic Alps.

What at first glance distinguishes the period of Roman rule from the earlier Hellenistic period is a gradual incorporation into an over-arching administration of areas that had been autonomous states or parts of (semi-) independent kingdoms. By the time of the Severan dynasty, almost all of the shores of the Black Sea were either directly or indirectly under Roman provincial administration, with the notable (and partial) exception of the Bosporan Kingdom. In the north-west Olbia and Crimean Chersonesos fell to the governor of Lower Moesia. On the south coast of the Black Sea, we have the province of Bithynia et Pontus, and Cappadocia, whose governor acquired responsibility for Colchis, famously visited by Arrian in the wake of Hadrian’s visit to Trapezous, with its supply-line south to the eastern frontier of the empire.

What we see in the Severan years around 200 AD, is only the last phase of a long process. Roman rule reached the shores of the Black Sea at different times, in different ways, and under special conditions, sometimes with military conquests, sometimes on the basis of treaties, and sometimes after the death of allied kings. For example, Bithynia came under Roman rule in 75/4 BC on the basis of King Nikomedes IV’s bequest, while Thrace became Roman provincial territory from AD 46 after the death of its king, Rhoimetalkes III. Consequently, the impact and pace of Roman involvement can be observed at different times in the various areas. For instance, around AD 100 in Crimean Chersonesos we find civic reform in the administration of justice under the apparent influence of Roman institutions,¹⁶ Bithynia and Pontus had already been under Roman rule for more than 150 years; in Bithynia and Pontus, Roman influence on law and political institutions had already been applied very directly by Pompey, and can be seen subsequently in the correspondence of Pliny, the province’s governor, with the Emperor Trajan.¹⁷ For this reason, “Roman Pontos” is an abstraction that entails many different facets, developments, and local peculiarities. In 8 AD, Ovid’s exile in Tomis seemed to the Roman poet a journey to the end of the world; half a century later, things looked very different, even if this most urban and urbane of Rome’s poets would most likely have remained unimpressed.

culture: see the papers by D. Braund, E. Dakin, and A. Chaniotis.

¹⁶ SEG LV 838. See Kantor 2012.

¹⁷ References to Pompey’s *lex provinciae* in Pliny, *Letters* 10.79, 112, and 114. See also Kantor 2020.

Let us consider some of the consequences of this gradual process. The late integration of certain areas into the Roman administration had a significant impact on their exposure to dangers and wars, on the development of urban life, on the existence or non-existence of Roman colonies, on the migration of populations from Italy and Rome, and on the degree of their integration into a homogeneous culture. For instance, in Thrace, which became part of the Roman Empire about a century after Bithynia, wars continued to present a problem until the end of the first century BC – such as the conflict with the Bastarnae in 29–28 BC, the catastrophic invasion of the Scordisci in 16 BC, and a little later the revolt led by Vologases of the Bessi from 15 to 11 BC. The fact that Olbia was left unprotected in the last years of Mithridates' reign and later by the victorious Romans, resulted in its exposure to the attack of the Getae, often linked with Burebista. According to Dio of Prusa, who claims to have visited Olbia around 100 AD, the signs of decline were very evident there, at a time when the cities of Asia Minor were experiencing a period of prosperity and general peace.

A second consequence of the gradual and uneven expansion of Rome in the Black Sea region is the presence (and absence) of Roman colonies, and with them the introduction of Roman institutions.¹⁸ The establishment of colonies was usually (but not exclusively) the result of military conquest. Pompey had already settled veterans in Nikopolis and Pompeiopolis in Paphlagonia in 63 BC. A great wave of colony-foundations followed under Caesar and Augustus - that is, at a time of limited Roman presence in the west, east and north coasts of the Black Sea, where we do not find colonies of Roman citizens. Caesar turned Sinope into a Roman colony (*Colonia Iulia Felix Sinope*)¹⁹ and Augustus renamed Apamea Myrleia in Bithynia as *Colonia Iulia Concordia*. Of course, the absence of Roman colonies in some areas was counterbalanced by the presence of numerous settlements, fortresses, and stations, especially in Dacia and Lower Moesia, and also by the settlement of Roman army veterans in cities of the Balkan provinces and in Asia Minor. This migration resulted in the presence of Latin speakers. In 9 AD, Ovid, complained that there was not a single person who spoke Latin in Tomis. However we interpret him, the fact is that three generations later he would have had no difficulty in finding people with whom he could communicate in Latin, though whether he would have found enough people appreciative of his verses is another matter. From the time of Trajan onwards, the number of Latin and bilingual inscriptions increased in the areas that joined the Roman oecumene relatively late.²⁰

Despite such local peculiarities, there were important factors that contributed to the integration of the Pontic cities into the fairly homogeneous culture of the developing Roman oecumene. The most important among them is the movement of populations, and with them the movement of ideas, religious beliefs, art forms,

¹⁸ On Roman colonies in the Balkans and Asia Minor see more recently Brélaz (ed.) 2017.

¹⁹ See the paper of C. Barat in this volume.

²⁰ For Lower Moesia see Loungarova 2016.

culture, and customs. Depending on geographical and political conditions, population movements have different causes and forms.²¹ The most organized form is the presence of the Roman army in the Balkan provinces as far north as Dacia; mixed marriages (formal or not) with women from the local population contributed to the spread of the Latin language and Roman customs, which also offered the hope of success in life under Rome. Migration from Asia Minor to the Danubian provinces was also motivated by economic interests – e.g. for the exploitation of mines in Dacia, where settlers from Asia Minor also brought their local cults.²² The cult associations of ‘Asians’ (Ἀσιανοί) reveal the presence of such immigrants, who kept a form of local identity.²³

A special form of population movement is the settlement of Jews in the cities of the Black Sea. Organized synagogues are known mainly from the epigraphic sources in the kingdom of the Bosphorus, but Jewish inscriptions exist in other areas as well;²⁴ sometimes we recognize the presence of people of possible Jewish origin from their name (e.g. Σαμβατίων). In addition to organized population movements, large-scale periodic movements of professionals of all kinds – merchants, craftsmen, artists, actors, poets, gladiators, and athletes – contributed to the more cosmopolitan character of the Black Sea cities in the Imperial period.

Apart from the phenomenon of migration, which is a general phenomenon in the Roman Empire, in some areas of the Black Sea, especially on the north coast, we may have mixed marriages with non-Greek populations of the hinterland – Scythians, Sarmatians etc. – and the naturalization of members of non-Greek population, perhaps meeting problems of demographic decline and in result of long co-existence. Much depends on the evidence and interpretation of names in inscriptions there.²⁵

The participation of the inhabitants of the Pontic cities in cults in Panhellenic sanctuaries and in mystery cults is also a significant development, along with other innovations in the area of religion. We mention only two examples. The first is the presence of people from the Black Sea among the initiates in the cult of the Great Gods in Samothrace.²⁶ The inscriptions that list the mystae mention several visitors from the cities of the west and north coast. The second example is the worship of the snake god Glykon Neos Asklepios. This cult was established (rather as Lucian’s satire has it) by Alexander, the ‘false prophet’, in the Paphlagonian city of Abonou Teichos (renamed Ionopolis) around 140 AD. It soon became a magnet for worshipers who came to the sanctuary for divination, cure, and initiation into a

²¹ See e.g. the study of Cojocaru 2009, on foreigners in the cities of the west and north coasts of the Black Sea.

²² See the recent studies on the presence of miners from Galatia in Dacia: Mitchell 2017; Piso 2018.

²³ See e.g. *SEG* LIII 726 (Nikopolis on Istros); *IGBulg* I 23 (Dioysopolis); *IGBulg* II 480 (Montana); *IGR* I 787 (Perinthos).

²⁴ See the collection by Noy, Panayotov, and Bloedhorn 2004.

²⁵ See Heinen 2006, 65 (on Olbia) and the onomastic studies of Cojocaru 2004 and Hupe 2005. See also the paper of E. Dakin in this volume.

²⁶ See the publication of these texts by Dimitrova 2008.

mystery cult.²⁷ Textual sources and archaeological finds show the spread of Glykon's worship beyond Asia Minor to the west coast of the Black Sea.

Local and regional identities were constructed and displayed anew in this new stage of a Roman oecumene, but also in the context of long multicultural traditions, migrations, and both friendly and hostile contacts with non-Greek peoples. The civic identity and the local pride of citizens of Greek *poleis* co-existed with a sense of belonging to a broader Pontic community. Already in the early first century AD, an honorific decree of Byzantion for Orontas of Olbia provides direct evidence for such a Pontic identity, when he is characterized as "a man of principal position not only in his own fatherland but in the entire Pontic ethnós."²⁸ The specific bonds between colonies and mother-cities was another important form of identity. The author of the Chersonesian honorific decree for Thrasymedes of Herakleia (first or second century AD) compares his attitude in Chersonesos to that of a good father towards affectionate sons (οἷα πατέρων ἀγαθῶν πρὸς υἱοὺς φιλοστόργους [εἰχ]εν <ε>ῦνοϊαν).²⁹ He calls Herakleia "our mother". A similar vocabulary of affection is found in a decree of Chersonesos for Herakleia (mid-second century AD), in which the Herakleiotēs are called "most pious fathers" (εὐσεβέστατοι πατέρες).³⁰ The overlap of identities is a particularly complex phenomenon in the case of immigrants, who could develop a sense of loyalty toward two fatherlands; this idea is expressed in the epigram for Heliodoros from Amastris, who died at a young age in Pantikapaion (first century AD): "now I have two fatherlands (*patrides*); the one that earlier raised me, and the present one, in which I stay."³¹ In this new Roman universe of multicultural contacts the traditional Hellenic identity was not forgotten, but surfaced in a variety of contexts, not only as an identity that differentiated between the inhabitants of Greek cities and non-Greek peoples but also as an identity founded in education and culture. Meanwhile, of course, it remained all too easy for Greeks of the Mediterranean heartlands - and especially in the great cities which claimed the best Hellenism, most obviously Athens - to judge their Pontic cousins in more critical fashion. As the Black Sea world became more multicultural, its forms of Hellenism were easily characterized by critics as diminished, not enhanced. Perhaps the most striking indication of that kind of response from the centre to the Black Sea periphery is the remarkable fact that we know of no Greek city of the Euxine which was included in Hadrian's Panhellenion, wherein proper Hellenism was key to membership.³²

²⁷ Victor 1997; Miron 1996; Sfameni Gasparro 1996 and 1999; Chaniotis 2002.

²⁸ *IOSPE* I² 79. On the Pontic koinon see the paper by S. Saprykin in this volume.

²⁹ *IOSPE* I² 357.

³⁰ *IOSPE* I² 362.

³¹ *CIRB* 134: ἔχω δὲ πατρίδας νῦν δύο τὴν μὲν πάλαι ἐν ἧ τέθραμμαι τὴν δὲ νῦν ἐν ἧ μένω. Discussed by Dana 2013.

³² On this Black Sea absence and related cultural snobbery, see Braund 1998; 2021.

REFERENCES

- Avram, A. (2013) *Prosopographia Ponti Euxini Externa*, Leuven.
- Badoud, N. and A. Avram (2019) Bulletin archéologique – Amphores et timbres amphoriques grecs (2012-2016), *REG* 132, 129–151.
- Boțan, S.-P. and C. Chiriac (2016) State of the Art and Prospective Research Directions on Hellenistic and Roman Glass from the Pontus Euxinus, in Cojocaru and Rubel (eds.) 2016, 101–115.
- Braund, D. (1998) Greeks and Barbarians: the Black Sea Region and Hellenism under the Early Roman Empire, in S. Alcock (ed.), *The Early Roman Empire in the East*, Oxford, 121–36.
- (2018) *Greek Religion and Cults in the Black Sea Region: Goddesses in the Bosphoran Kingdom from the Archaic Period to the Byzantine Era*, Cambridge.
- Braund, D. (2021) “Colchians Did not Like to Write”: Reflections on Greek Epigraphy in the Eastern Black Sea Region and its Hinterland, in M. Manoledakis (ed.), *Peoples in the Black Sea Region from the Archaic to the Roman Period*, Oxford, 131–140.
- Braund, D., E. Hall, and Wyles (eds.) (2019) *Ancient Theatre and Performance Culture Around the Black Sea*, Cambridge.
- Brélaz, C. (ed.), *L'héritage grec des colonies romaines d'Orient: interactions culturelles dans les provinces hellénophones de l'empire romain*, Paris.
- Bresson, A., A. Ivantchik, and J.-L. Ferrary, eds. (2007) *Une koinè pontique. Cités grecques, sociétés indigènes et empires mondiaux sur le littoral nord de la mer Noire (VII^e s. a.C.-III^e s. p.C., Bordeaux.*
- Chaniotis, A. (2002) Old Wine in a New Skin: Tradition and Innovation in the Cult Foundation of Alexander of Abonouteichos, in E. Dabrowa (ed.), *Tradition and Innovation in the Ancient World (Electrum, 6)*, Krakow, 67–85.
- (2017) Political Culture in the Cities of the Northern Black Sea Region in the ‘Long Hellenistic Age’. The Epigraphic Evidence, in V. Kozlovskaya (ed.), *The Northern Black Sea in Antiquity: Networks, Connectivity, and Cultural Interactions*, Cambridge, 141–166.
- Cojocaru, V. (2004) *Populația zonei nordice și nord-vestice a Pontului Euxin în secolele VI-I a. Chr. pe baza izvoarelor epigrafice*, Iași.
- (2009) “Fremde” in griechischen Städten Skythiens und Kleinskythiens auf Grundlage der epigraphischen Quellen bis zum 3. Jh. n.Chr. Forschungsstand und Perspektive, in A. Coşkun, H. Heinen, and S. Pfeiffer (eds.), *Identität und Zugehörigkeit im Osten der griechisch-römischen Welt. Aspekte ihrer Repräsentation in Städten, Provinzen und Reichen*, Frankfurt, 143–172.
- (2016a) *Instituția proxeniei în spațiul pontic / Die Proxenie im Schwarzmeerraum*, Cluj-Napoca.
- (2016b) Das Forschungsprojekt “External Relations of the Pontic Greek Cities in Hellenistic and Roman Times” (PN-II-ID-PCE-2011-3-0054). Ergebnisse und Perspektiven, in Cojocaru and Rubel (eds.) 2016, 21–40.
- Cojocaru, V. and A. Rubel, eds. (2016) *Mobility in research on the Black Sea Region* (Proc. Intern.Symp. (July 5-10, 2015), Cluj-Napoca.
- Dana, M. (2013) Ἐχω δὲ πατριῶδας νῦν δύο (CIRB 134). Relații și rețele între cetățile grecești din studi Mării Negre și vecini lor pontici, in F. Panait-Bîrzescu, I. Bîrzescu, F. Matei-Popesci, and A. Robu (eds.), *Poleis in the Black Sea Area: Inter-Pontic Relations and Local Productions*, Bucharest, 45–86.
- (2016) Les médecins dans les provinces danubiennes, *REA* 118, 99–123.

- Dimitrova, N. M. (2002) Inscriptions and Iconography in the Monuments of the Thracian Rider, *Hesperia* 71, 209–229.
- (2008) *Theoroi and Initiates in Samothrace. The Epigraphical Evidence*, Princeton.
- Ejstrud, B. (2006) Size Matters: Estimating Trade of Wine, Oil, and Fish-sauce from Amphorae in the First Century AD, in T. Bekker-Nielsen (ed.), *Ancient Fishing and Fish Processing in the Black Sea Region*, in 171–181.
- Heinen, H. (2006) *Antike am Rande der Steppe. Der nördliche Schwarzmeerraum als Forschungsaufgabe*, Mainz/Stuttgart.
- Hupe, J. (2005) Der Dedikantenkreis des Achilleus als ein Gradmesser von Akkulturationsprozessen im kaiserzeitlichen Olbia. Ein Beitrag zur olbischen Onomastik, in F. Fless and M. Treister (eds.), *Bilder und Objekte als Träger kultureller Identität und interkultureller Kommunikation im Schwarzmeergebiet. Kolloquium in Zschortau/Sachsen vom 13.2.–15.2.2003*, Rahden Westf., 43–52.
- Kantor, G. (2012) Local Courts of Chersonesus Taurica in the Roman Age, in P. Martzavou and N. Papazarkadas (eds.), *The Epigraphy of the Post-Classical City*, Oxford, 69–86.
- (2020) Navigating Roman Law and Local Privileges in Pontus-Bithynia, in B. Czajkowski and B. Eckhardt (eds.), *Law in the Roman Provinces*, Oxford, 185–209.
- Loungarova, P. (2016) Bilingual Inscriptions from the Province of Lower Moesia, in *Monuments and Texts in Antiquity and Beyond. Essays for the Centenary of Georgi Mihailov (1915-1991) (Studia Classica Serdicensia V)*, Sofia, 162–172.
- Miron, A. V. B. (1996) Alexander von Abonuteichos. Zur Geschichte des Orakels des Neos Asklepios Glykon, in W. Leschhorn, A. V. B. Miron, and A. Miron (eds.), *Hellas und der griechische Osten. Studien zur Geschichte und Numismatik der griechischen Welt. Festschrift für Peter Robert Franke zum 70. Geburtstag*, Saarbrücken, 153–188.
- Mitchell, S. (2017) Two Galatian Cults in Dacia, *Gephyra* 14, 15–21.
- Mordvintsrva, V. (2016) Barbarians of the North Pontic Region and their Contacts with Centers of Antique Civilization from the 3rd Century BCE to the Mid-3rd Century CE (According to the Research of Elite Burials), in Cojocaru and Rubel (eds.) 2016, 387–438.
- Noy, D., A. Panayotov, and H. Bloedhorn (2004) *Inscriptiones Judaicae Orientis. Volume I. Eastern Europe*, Tübingen.
- Piso, I. (2018) Kleinasiatische Götter und Kolonisten in Dakien, *Gephyra* 15, 37–70.
- Ruscu, L. (2013) The Relations of the Western Pontic Apoikiai with their Greek and Barbarian Neighbours in the Hellenistic and Roman Periods, F. Panait-Bîrzescu, I. Bîrzescu, F. Matei-Popesci, and A. Robu (eds.), *Poleis in the Black Sea Area: Inter-Pontic Relations and Local Productions*, Bucharest, 11–44.
- (2016) Griechen, Römer und Einheimische in Poleis von Thrakien und Pontos, in Cojocaru and Rubel (eds.) 2016, 301–321.
- Sayar, M. (2016) Die Beziehungen zwischen der Bevölkerung der griechischen Poleis des Propontis-Gebietes und der westpontischen Küste von der hellenistischen Zeit bis zum Ende der römischen Kaiserzeit, in Cojocaru and Rubel (eds.) 2016, 289–300.
- Sfameni Gasparro, G. (1996) Alessandro di Abonutico, lo ‘pseudo-profeta’ ovvero come costruir-si un’identità religiosa. I. Il profeta, ‘eroe’ e ‘uomo divino’, *Studi e Materiali di Storia delle Religioni* 62, 565–590.
- (1999) Alessandro di Abonutico, lo ‘pseudo-profeta’ ovvero come costruirsi un’identità religiosa. II. L’oracolo e i misteri, in C. Bonnet and A. Motte (eds.), *Les syncrétismes religieux dans le monde méditerranéen antique. Actes du colloque international en l’honneur de Franz Cumont*, Bruxelles/Rome, 275–305.

- Slawisch, A. (2016) Reading the Image? Ambiguities in the Interpretation of Banquet Scenes on Grave Stelae from Roman Thrace, 591–625.
- Victor, U. (1997) *Lukian von Samosata - Alexander oder der Lügenprophet: Eingeleitet, herausgegeben, übersetzt und erklärt*, Leiden.

TRANSIT TRADE IN THE VOLGA AND THE KAMA REGION
IN THE LATE CENTURIES BC – EARLY CENTURIES AD

It is important and challenging undertaking to perform an analysis of trade and economic relationships of the Volga and Kama Rivers Region, the peripheral areas of Eastern Europe, with the Roman and Byzantine Empires, relying mainly on the study of objects of Roman and Byzantine origin found in the territory, as covered by our research.

The essence and trends of early trade relations are evident among the most sophisticated and topical aspects in the ancient history of the peripheral area of the Eastern Europe on the whole, and the Volga and Kama Rivers Region in particular, considering some scanty written testimonies. The trade relations could be determined by various aspects of their societal life, including the exchange of raw materials, livestock and goods, cultural interchange, and so on.

The history of the population of the steppe and forest-steppe zones of Eastern Europe in the late BC to early centuries AD comprises a number of important and sophisticated issues which have been poorly analyzed so far and undeservedly neglected.

The issues that are least examined by researchers relate to the study of mutual relations between nomads and the Roman Empire. One of these specific aspects is the way the products manufactured in Greece, western Rome, and the Byzantine Empire as well as Italic goods were spread beyond Italy into areas that were not linked with central regions, with the exception of the Dnieper, the Don and the Kuban regions which have now been studied for over one hundred years.

The geographical and chronological frames of the study cover a certain cultural and historical region and period which has been determined by the location of imported items. The geographical names 'the Ural Region,' 'the Volga Region,' and 'the Kama Region' are mostly used for convenience of the reader. These names define, respectively, the territories of the Cisurals, the Middle and Southern Ural River region, Trans-Urals, the Kama river region, the Lower and Middle Volga river region.

According to traditional ancient writings, the eastern neighbors of the Scythians were nomadic tribes who had a way of living similar to that of the Scythians. These tribes were known to the Greeks as "Sauromatians" and later "Sarmatians" which were already mentioned in Herodotus' *History*. The reference to Herodotus is not occasional, since all his successor historiographers, both Greek and Roman, refer to Herodotus' information about the tribes and peoples populating the steppes and forests of Eastern Europe from the Dnieper to the Urals.

The political history of the Sarmatian tribes and the nature of their relationships with Rome are presented only generally in the writings by Roman authors. As the Sarmatian tribes were approaching the Greek cities of the Northern Black Sea region and the borders of the Roman Empire, the Greek authors became much more

informed about them. However, these data points remain quite controversial and less informative when covering the areas further east of Rome.

This was a special epoch for the Iranian-speaking nomads of the Eurasian steppes, but it left virtually no traces in written records where it is incredibly difficult to find either an overview of the nations inhabiting the steppes or a clear story about commercial or cultural contacts. F. Bosi explains this incompleteness by the “loss of the major part of the historical and geographical literature,” and also by the idea that “the new intellectual environment of the Hellenistic period had to give less attention to the nations known since the ancient times, such as the Scythians and the Sarmatians.”¹

Important information about the commercial ties of the Eastern European nomads in the Hellenistic period is contained in Polybius’ *The Histories* (4.38):

For as regards necessities, it is an undisputed fact that the most plentiful supplies and best qualities of cattle and slaves reach us from the countries lying round the Pontus, while among luxuries the same countries furnish us with abundance of honey, wax, and preserved fish, while of the superfluous produce of our countries they take olive-oil and every kind of wine. As for corn, there is a give-and-take, they sometimes supplying us when we require it and sometimes importing it from us.

Not going into details, it is difficult to speak with certainty about some specific areas of the Pontus, but most probably, this indication by Polybius can be related to the entire Bosphorus, which is famous, in particular, for the significant scope of the fishing industry and for the large slave market in Tanais.

Later in his description of the trade between Tanais and the neighboring Meoto-Sarmatian tribes, Strabo (11.2.3) gives interesting information about the nature of these relations:

Recently, however, it was sacked by King Polemon because it would not obey him. It was a common emporium, partly of the Asiatic and the European nomads, and partly of those who navigated the lake from the Bosphorus, the former bringing slaves, hides, and such other things as nomads possess, and the latter giving in exchange clothing, wine, and the other things that belong to civilized life.

Special attention should be paid to Strabo’s indication about the trade of the “upper Aorsi,” which were mentioned only in Strabo’s writings and, probably, occupied the areas of the western Caspian Sea region (Strabo 11.5.8):

... The Aorsi... could import on camels the Indian and Babylonian merchandise, receiving it in their turn from the Armenians and the Medes, and also, owing to their wealth, could wear golden ornaments.

The researchers were not able to find a common understanding with regard to this episode. Traditionally, it is assumed that the Aorsi carried out an independent intermediary trade.² It seems more convincing that the Aorsi did not practice

¹ Bosi 1997, 109.

² Lukiashko 1984, 164.

intermediary trade because such interpretation contradicts Strabo, who wrote about the nomads' primitive barter system.³ The tribe became wealthy because it occupied the old trade route from India and Babylonia via Media and Armenia to Tanais; the merchants' payments gave them significant funds and ability to generously pay the Bosporan Greeks for wine, clothes, and precious items.⁴

Ptolemy's *Geographia*, for the first time ever, shows the Volga, Ural, and Kama rivers on geographic maps, although earlier the Volga (then unnamed) was included into the Greeks' geographical horizon.⁵

This part of Ptolemy's map is especially interesting in relation to the trade route because the map gives a detailed and, most important, accurate description of the Northern Caspian Sea region, Trans-Caspian countries, the flow of the Volga, and the Ural.

Later Ammianus Marcellinus laid out interesting data about a medicinal plant bearing the same name as the Ra River on which banks it grew and was widely used in medicine (Amm. Marc., XXII.8.28).

Thus, the presented data from ancient writings lends evidence to the conclusion that there existed steady river ways and land trade roads which tied the regions of the Ural, the Volga, and the Kama with the ancient cities and states during various chronological periods starting from the 6th c. BC until the Early Middle Ages.

The earliest known finds in the category of imported objects were discovered in Astrakhan region (Krivaya Luka, Chernoyarskiy district) in a rich woman's burial of the 3rd c. BC, where a black varnish vessel and an amphora of Greek origin were found with a Heraclea hallmark, both vessels dated to the 1st half of the above century.⁶

In 1999, an Early Hellenistic Herakleian amphora was discovered in burial No. 1 of barrow 3 in the Novomusinokurgan necropolis (Meleuzovsky District of Bashkiria, the Southern Urals), which even today remains the easternmost find of Greek amphorae in the territory of Eurasia. In the opinion of Monakhov, it correlates with the first two issues (II-A-1 and II-A-2), which allows us to assume strongly a date within the last years of the 4th century BC to the first two decades of the 3rd century BC, and the burial must be dated to the first decades of the 3rd century BC.⁷

Besides, ring-fence 1 – group V from the cultic complex of the same burial site contained light-clay sherds of walls, a few fragments of the neck, complexly profiled handles, and a small narrow foot as an annular tray; according to D.B. Shelov, they belong to light-clay narrow-necked amphorae of type C dated to the 2nd c. AD and relate to the products of Sinope.⁸

³ Bezrukov 2008, 129.

⁴ Rostovtseff 1918, 130; Vinogradov 1994, 163.

⁵ Shramm 1997, 80.

⁶ Bulatova, Dvornichenko, Zilivinskaia, Fedorov-Davydov 1989, 5.

⁷ Monakhov 2006, 92.

⁸ Shelov 1978, 20; Moshkova 1984, 197; Vnukov 2003, 117.

No ceramic utensils of proper Italic production were unearthed. Quite possibly, this can be explained by the fact that in the Bosphorus itself, Italic ceramics were found in much smaller quantities than, for instance, in Olbia or Chersonesos, although most of the imported ceramics reached the Sarmatians of the Volga region and Cisurals via Bosphorus and Tanais.

The products from Bosporan, Don, Kuban and various Middle Asian centers prevail among the imported ceramics found in the region under review. Such products seem to have been brought there (along with ancient imported ceramics) in the Prokhorovka period (4th c. BC) until the middle of the 3rd c. AD (the conventional upper border of this chronological period is obviously the defeat of Tanais by the Goths in the middle of the third centenary), thereafter the inflow of imported pottery basically ceases.

As for proper imported ceramic ware, in our understanding, considering the quantity, composition, and dynamics of its inflow (the range of items was steadily growing and expanding, but this is valid only for ceramic ware of the Don, the Kuban, and the Central Asian centers), in the subject region during the specified chronological period the imported ancient ceramics were not used as goods which could originally have been meant for trade with representatives of either the local tribal elite or the ordinary population. This category of imported articles probably represents products which arrived occasionally together with the ceramic ware that was used for bartering, or they could be objects for the merchants' personal use. They were found in the Volga and the Kama River regions due to various reasons, not necessarily linked with commercial interests of their owners (left items, gifts, etc.).

The peak inflow of imported ceramic ware was seen in the 1st to 2nd c. AD – the period of most active trade between the ancient cities and states on the one hand, and the nations inhabiting the Ural, the Volga, and the Kama regions on the other hand, when the Roman empire and, therefore, international trade were flourishing, and also was a time of relative stability in the steppes.

Bronze vessels of diverse shapes, types, and functional applications represent a significant share among various categories of imported products found in rich burials. These items were produced in the artisan workshops of Italy and also in other regions of the empire – in Gaul, the Rhine region, Frakia, and Pannonia.⁹

The earliest finds of imported bronze vessels occurred in rich burials of the Lower and Middle Volga region and the Kama region. During the excavations led by V.P. Shilov in 1954, within the famous burial 55/8 of Kalinovsky burial site a bronze vessel was found which turned out to be a product of Italic, namely, Campanian craftsmanship and has numerous analogies among vessels which originate from South Italy.¹⁰

Among the recent finds, we believe it is worth mentioning the bronze ladles from the burial dated to the late 2nd c. to the first third of the 3rd c. AD discovered in the

⁹ Bezrukov 1999, 57–58.

¹⁰ Shilov 1956, 45.

summer of 2010 in Agapovka district, Chelyabinsk region, in kurgan 21 of Magnitny burial site where “the largest part of the grave goods consisted of metallic items which could be considered as the Roman ‘wine set’”: a jug, ladle, strainer, scoop, and cup.¹¹

Bronze ladles with horizontal handles were one of the most widely spread categories of Roman imports in Eastern Europe, and the bronze ladle found in the burial is similar to the bronze amphora from burial 1 of kurgan 9 of the Valovy I burial site. The authors of the publication of the materials from this burial site point out that this rare find was not typical for Roman imports. The object was probably made in the Danube region provinces of the Roman Empire.¹²

The presence of imported glass, silver, and bronze articles produced in the Italic or Northern Black Sea regions is typical for rich burials of Sarmatian nobles from the 1st c. BC to the 1st c. AD. To a certain extent, it can probably be associated with the overall process of movement of the Sarmatian tribes to the west and intensification of their activities in the Northern Black Sea region up to the Danubian borders of the Roman Empire.

The insufficient quantity of archeological materials does not allow us to give a clear answer to this question. It may also be that some imported items, in particular the inexpensive bronze utensils, arrived at the settlements of Sarmatians of the Cisurals and the Volga region by the northern branch of the Great Silk Road which stretched through the South Cisurals and Lower Volga region. On the return route in Roman Syria, it was possible to purchase glassware, silver articles, and Italic bronzeware. In this case, the Sarmatians received a major portion of imported bronze articles as payment for caravans crossing their territory and for their escort along the route.

Silverware represents a significant quantity of imported objects found during archeological work, or by accident. Proper Roman products are represented by individual finds in rich Sarmatian burials in the Volga and the Ural regions. In 1953 during the dig led by V.P. Shilov at Verkhnee Pogromnoe village (Bykovsky district, Volgograd region) in a Sarmatian burial (kurgan 1), two silver semi-spherical bowls of Syrian production were found which dated from the 1st c. BC along with a silver jug discovered in grave 8 of kurgan 55.¹³

Thus, silver articles of Roman production penetrated into the Trans-Volga and Ural regions as a result of normal trade contacts via the intermediation of the Bosporan cities and through an intertribal exchange with related Sarmatian tribes of the Don and Kuban regions.

A large group of Byzantine silver vessels found in the Kama region and in the Cisurals contained a great number of items of various types, shapes, and themes of images. I mentioned above that imported objects of Byzantine origin were present in

¹¹ Botalov, Ivanov 2012, 269.

¹² Botalov, Ivanov 2012, 276–277.

¹³ Shilov 1959, 78; Kropotkin 1970, 89.

these regions, but we do not have concrete data about direct ties between the Kama region and the Cisurals with Byzantium, or about direct exports from the workshops of Constantinople or other Byzantine crafts centers to those regions. Nor anything about the manufacturing of such goods for the purpose of export to the Cisurals and the Kama region.

Thus, the majority of Byzantine silver vessels penetrated into the territory of the Kama region and the Cisurals from Middle Asia together with other Middle Asian coins and artistic goods from various centers. The route from Middle Asia obviously ran via the Ustyurt plateau to the Caspian Lowland and the Lower Volga region, and then down the Volga, Kama, and the Chusovaya rivers to the north of the Kama region, or to the south to the Sylva river basin.¹⁴

The conclusion that the most probable communication routes ran on the Volga and the Kama rivers is supported by the places where the majority of the Byzantine vessels were found: in the basins of the Kama, Vyatka, Cheptsya, Belaya, and Ural rivers, i.e. in the Middle, Upper, and Lower Kama region and in South Cisurals. Only a small part, for example, two Byzantine vessels from the Bartym complex, could arrive via the route from Transcaucasia using the Volga or from the Northern Black Sea region, from the Byzantine Chersonesos.

The coins from Olbia and other cities of the Black Sea region were the earliest finds of ancient coins in the territories of the Ural, the Volga, and the Kama rivers. In South Cisurals, ancient coins were discovered during archeological excavations. During the excavation of a kurgan cemetery near Ishtuganovo (Meleuzovsky district, Bashkortostan), for example, coins were found in a nomad's grave.¹⁵ Thus, the composition of coin finds, on the whole, shows the occasional and irregular nature of their transport to the Volga region and to the Cisurals.

The earliest finds of Roman copper, bronze, and silver coins are date to the second half to late 2nd c. BC to 1st c. AD when the Roman republican denarius was in active circulation and widely used in international trade. Such a long-time functioning is explained by the fact that silver denarii were used not only as a payment means, but also symbolized a defined social status of the owner of such coins.

Only single Roman golden coins were found in the Volga region and in Cisurals. In the Astrakhan region, on the right bank of the Volga river at Zamyany village (Enotaevsky district), a golden coin of Eudocia (408–414), wife of Theodosius II (408–450), was found along with a well-preserved golden coin of Theodosius I (379–395) from a burial discovered in Ufa.¹⁶

Golden Roman coins arrived in the Volga region and in the South Cisurals through a complex exchange within the territory in the period when golden Roman coins were brought from the Danube and the Dnieper regions to Crimea and the Bosphorus.

¹⁴ Bezrukov 2015, 262.

¹⁵ Akbulatov, Obydenov 1984, 46–54; Kropotkin, Obydenov 1985, 242.

¹⁶ Kropotkin 1961, 48.

These coins do not represent historical evidence of the economic relations between the ancient cities and the barbarians since golden coins could not have played a serious role in international commerce and money circulation in the adjacent territories, and certainly not in the peripheral lands. A majority of such coins have lugs for appending or holes, i.e., they were basically used as decorations. Moreover, the mass inflow of Roman silver coins during a relatively long chronological period did not result in the creation of a local monetary-weighting system.

Finds of Byzantine copper, silver, and golden coins with the prevalence of silver hexagrams of Heraclius of the 7th c. discovered on the outskirts of the barbarian world lend evidence to the ambiguity of the socioeconomic and political processes which took place on the outskirts of the ancient world in the late antique and in the early medieval periods. Byzantine golden solidi of the 7th c. were present in the finds from the Lower Volga region and the South Cisurals.¹⁷ As for the routes taken by golden coins into the Volga region and South Cisurals, we cannot define any single path. It is quite possible that the coin found near Orsk was brought along the steppe road from Middle Asia, which was used to transport almost all artistic imported goods from Khorezm and basically the entire Orient, including Byzantium. This hypothesis is backed by the fact that in Middle Asia there are known finds of mainly golden solidi, but no Byzantine silver coins.¹⁸

In the Kama region, we know about three hoards of Byzantine silver coins. In Perm region, at Bartym village (Berezovsky district) in 1950 a Sassanidian silver vessel with two hundred sixty Byzantine silver coins was found; in an exploratory shaft nearby, an additional twelve Heraclius' hexagrams of the same type were found which were minted in Constantinople in 615–629.¹⁹ Thus, penetration of Byzantine coins into the territory of the regions under review, as we have seen, was generally insignificant and irregular, and did not lead to the creation of a local monetary-weight system, or the establishment of monetary circulation among the nations of the Cisurals, Kama, and Volga regions.

It is often mentioned in numismatic literature that the striking affinity of coin hoards found in Transcaucasia and in the Kama, region is valid proof for the hypothesis concerning the existence of close ties between the Transcaucasian and Kama regions which took place through direct contacts via the Volga and Kama rivers. Therefore, the majority of Byzantine gold and silver coins reached the Volga region, the Kama region, and the Cisurals via the trade route from Transcaucasia along the Volga and the Kama rivers during a relatively short time span (second half of the 5th to the middle of the 7th c. AD).

In conclusion, I would like to highlight a few fundamental factors relating to the routes and ways of ancient import and distribution into the peripheral lands, the format of trade, and main trends in the quantitative and qualitative composition of

¹⁷ Kropotkin 1962, 26.

¹⁸ Masson 1951, 94; Shtatman 1972, 32–94.

¹⁹ Bader, Smirnov 1954, 19.

the imported products. The nomadic people were in constant contact with other settled tribes (in the south, nomadic tribes and settled agricultural nations of Middle Asia; in the north, Ananino tribes; in the west, settlements of the Scythians, the Meotes, and the Greek cities of the Northern Black Sea region), and the particularities of their economy provide for continuous trade between them along with the search of the most optimum and convenient format of bartering.

The peak inflow of imported goods of Roman origin was seen in the 1st to 2nd c. AD – the period of the most active trade between ancient cities and states on the one hand, and the nations inhabiting the Ural, the Volga, and the Kama regions on the other hand, when the Roman empire and, therefore, international trade were flourishing, and relative stability existed in the steppes.

We can confidently state that the main trend in the development of Greek-Roman-Barbarian ties until the middle of the 3rd c. AD had slow, but continuous growth. Possibly, direct relations were interrupted from time to time due to military conflicts, migrations of tribes, and the general unstable political situation in the steppes. But as soon as the situation became stable, the trade routes resumed their functioning immediately, because it was first and foremost in the interests of the tribal elite.

The overall reduction of the imported goods flowing in from the West clearly began immediately after the Gothic invasion in the 30–40-s of the 3rd c. AD and the around the destruction of Tanais, when the city lost its dominant position in the trade with the barbarians. Since then, other routes for purchasing imported goods were established, bypassing the Northern Black Sea region. The destruction of the ancient centers of the Northern Black Sea region and consequent pirate raids on the entire Black Sea coast led to a significant reduction of the volume of international trade, although it did not cease completely. Instead, it switched to exchange in kind to a much greater extent than in the 1st to 2nd c. AD. Once of secondary importance, the trade roads from Gaul, Dacia, and Pannonia started to play a more important role.

The almost complete cessation of inflow of imported articles to the Ural, Volga, and Kama regions from the Roman Empire in the 4th c. AD had a few causes: Firstly, the invasion of the Huns, followed by the destruction of the Bosphoran cities which were traditional intermediaries in the trade between the Roman Empire and the barbarians – unprecedented in the history of the Greek colonies in the Northern Black Sea region. Secondly, the overall socioeconomic and political crisis in the Roman Empire created a major disruption. Thirdly, the centers of the large Sarmatian tribal unions shifted to the west, therefore, the Volga region and Cisurals turned into remote peripheral lands.

Thus, the overall unstable situation in the steppes ceased further development of trade contacts. To a large extent, it can be explained by the fact that the Sarmatians, as the stabilizing military and political power in the steppes of the Northern Black Sea region, lost their dominating position, except the strong Alanian tribal union, and consequently the epoch of dominance of the Iranian-speaking nomads came to an end. The following period then saw the rise of numerous Turkic peoples and tribes on the historical scene.

REFERENCES

- Akbulatov I.M., Obydenov, M.F. [Акбулатов, И.М., Обыденнов, М.Ф.] (1984) Pogrebeniia kochevnikov nachala nashei ery iz zony Ishtuganovskogo vodokhranilishcha [Погребения кочевников начала нашей эры из зоны Иштугановского водохранилища], *Pamiatniki kochevnikov Yuzhnogo Urala*, Ufa, 46–54.
- Bader, O.N., Smirnov, A.P. [Бадер, О.Н., Смирнов, А.П.] (1954) “Serebro Zakamskoe” pervykh vekov nashei ery [“Серебро Закамское” первых веков нашей эры], *TGE [ТГЭ]* 13, 21–54.
- Bezrukov, A.V. [Безруков А.В.] (1999) Rimskaya bronzovaya posuda na territorii Urala, Povolzhya i Prikamya (po materialam arheologicheskikh kompleksov I v. do n.e. – IV v. n.e.) [Римская бронзовая посуда на территории Урала, Поволжья и Прикамья (по материалам археологических комплексов I в. до н.э. – IV в. н.э.)], *Problemy istorii, filologii, kultury [Проблемы истории, филологии, культуры]* VIII, 54–61.
- Bezrukov, A.V. [Безруков А.В.] (2000) Sarmaty Yuzhnogo Priuralia i Nizhnego Povolzhya na Velikom shelkovom puti [Сарматы Южного Приуралья и Нижнего Поволжья на Великом шелковом пути], in A.V. Bezrukov (ed.) *Problemy istorii, filologii, kultury [Проблемы истории, филологии, культуры]* IX, Magnitogorsk, 149–156.
- Bezrukov, A.V. [Безруков А.В.] (2008) Torgovo-ekonomicheskie svyazi Volgo-Kamya po dannym pismennykh i arheologicheskikh istochnikov (VI v. do n.e. – VII v. n.e.) [Торгово-экономические связи Волго-Камья по данным письменных и археологических источников (VI в. до н.э. – VII в. н.э.)], *Problemy istorii, filologii, kultur [Проблемы истории, филологии, культуры]* 1, 127–137.
- Bezrukov, A.V. [Безруков А.В.] (2015) Importnye rimskie i vizantiiskie izdelia na territorii Volgo-Kamya (po materialam arheologicheskikh kompleksov I v. do n.e. – V–VII vv. n.e.) [Импортные римские и византийские серебряные изделия на территории Волго-Камья (по материалам археологических комплексов I в. до н.э. – V–VII вв. н.э.)], *Problemy istorii, filologii, kultury [Проблемы истории, филологии, культуры]* 3, 253–263.
- Botalov, S.G., Ivanov, A.A. [Боталов, С.Г., Иванов, А.А.] (2012) Novyy kompleks kochевой aristokratii gunno-sarmatskogo vremeni v Yuzhnom Zauralie [Новый комплекс кочевой аристократии гунно-сарматского времени в Южном Зауралье], *Problemy istorii, filologii, kultury [Проблемы истории, филологии, культуры]* 4, 268–278.
- Bosi F. (1994) The Nomads of Eurasia in Strabo, in: B. Genito (ed.), *The Archaeology of the Steppes. Methods and Strategies. Papers from the International Symposium held in Naples, 9–12 November 1992, Napoli*, 109–122.
- Bulatova, N.M., Dvornichenko, V.V., Zilivinskaya, I.D., Fedorov-Davydov, G.A. [Булатова, Н.М. Дворниченко В.В., Зиливинская, И.Д., Федоров-Давыдов, Г.А.] (1989) *Sokrovishcha sarmatskikh vozhdov i drevniye goroda Povolzhia [Сокровища сарматских вождей и древние города Поволжья]*, Moscow.
- Kropotkin, V.V. [Кропоткин, В.В.] (1961) *Klady rimskikh monet na territorii SSSR [Клады римских монет на территории СССР]*, Moscow.
- Kropotkin, V.V. [Кропоткин, В.В.] (1962) *Klady vizantiiskikh monet na territorii SSSR [Клады византийских монет на территории СССР]*, in *Arkheologiya SSSR. Svod arkheologicheskikh istochnikov/ Akad. nauk SSSR. In-t arkheologii. Pod obshch. red. akad. B. A. Rybakova [Археология СССР. Свод археологических источников/ Акад. наук СССР. Ин-т археологии. Под общ. ред. акад. Б. А. Рыбакова]* Вып. Е [Вып. Е] 4-4, Moscow.

- Kropotkin, V.V. [Кропоткин, В.В.] (1970) Римские импортные изделия в Восточной Европе (II в. до н.э. – V в. н.э.), 89–91.
- Kropotkin, V.V., Obydenov, M.F. [Кропоткин, В.В., Обыденнов, М.Ф.] (1985) *Nahodka antichnykh monet v pogrebenii kochevnika na Yuzhnom Urале* [Находка античных монет в погребении кочевника на Южном Урале], *SA [СА]* 2, 228–223.
- Lukiashko, S.I. [Лукьяшко, С.И.] (1984) О karavannoi trgovle aorsov [О караванной торговле аорсов], in *Drevnosti Evrazii v skifo-sarmatskoe vremia* [Древности Евразии в скифо-сарматское время], Moscow, 61–65.
- Masson, M.E. [Массон, М.Е.] (1951) К вопросу о vzaimootnosheniakh Vizantii i Srednei Azii po dannym numizmatiki [К вопросу о взаимоотношениях Византии и Средней Азии по данным нумизматики], in *Tr. SU. XXIII.4*, 92–106.
- Monahov, S.Y. [Монахов, С.Ю.] (2006) О хронологии сарматского погребения с гераклейской амфорой из Башкирии, *Rostov-na-Donu: UNC RAN [Ростов-на-Дону: ЮИЦ РАН]*, Krasnodar, 89–93.
- Rostovtsev, M.I. [Ростовцев, М.И.] (1918) *Ellinstvo i iranstvo na Yuge Rossii* [Эллинизм и иранство на Юге России], Petrograd.
- Shelov, D.B. [Шелов Д.Б.] (1978) *Uzkgorlye svetlogliniane amfory pervykh vekov nashei ery. Klassifikatsiia i khronologiia* [Узкогорные светлоглиняные амфоры первых веков нашей эры. Классификация и хронология], *KSIA [КСИА]* 156, 53–60.
- Shilov, V.P. [Шилов, В.П.] (1956) *Pogrebeniia sarmatskoi znati I v. do n.e. – I v. n.e.* [Погребения сарматской знати I в. до н.э. – I в. н.э.], *SGE [СГЭ]* IX, 42–45.
- Shilov, V.P. [Шилов, В.П.] (1959) *Raskopki Elizavetovskogo mogilnika v 1954 i 1958 gg.* [Раскопки Елизаветовского могильника в 1954 и 1958 гг.], *IROMK [ИРОМК]* 13, 78–83.
- Shramm, G. [Шрамм, Г.] (1997) *Reki Severnogo Prichernomoria (istoriko-filologicheskoe issledovanie ikh nazvaniy v rannikh vekakh)* [Реки Северного Причерноморья (историко-филологическое исследование их названий в ранних веках)], *Vzgliad izdaleka. Nemetskie istoriki o proshlom Vostochnoi Evropy* [Взгляд издалека. Немецкие историки о прошлом Восточной Европы], Moscow, 75–81.
- Shtatman, I.L. [Штатман, И.Л.] (1972) *Volzhskii put postupleniia vizantiiskikh miliarisiev v Vostochnuiu Evropu i Pribaltiku v X veke* [Волжский путь поступления византийских миллиарисиев в Восточную Европу и Прибалтику в X веке], in *Istoriia i kultura slavianskikh stran* [История и культура славянских стран], Leningrad, 32–36.
- Vinogradov Iu.G. [Виноградов, Ю.Г.] (1994) *Ocherk voenno-politicheskoi istorii sarmatov v I v. n.e.* [Очерк военно-политической истории сарматов в I в. н.э.], *VDI [ВДИ]* 2, 161–165.
- Vnukov, S.U. [Внуков, С.Ю.] (2003) *Prichernomorskie amfory I v. do n.e.–II v. n.e. (morfologia)* [Причерноморские амфоры I в. до н.э. – II в. н.э. (морфология)], *Institut Arheologii RAN [Институт археологии РАН]*, 115–123.

END OF THE SYMPOSIUM WORKS

Dear friends,

Our three-day journey between the past and the present has come to its end. A past that is manifested by the numerous monuments, which, in ruins most of them, are scattered throughout the Euxinus region and which you so brilliantly documented in your presentations, monuments, which were created in a period when Hellenism constituted a dominant and decisive element among the people of this region; and the present, which is represented by us here in Greece, descendants of the people of that region and all the other peoples which, under different state entities, live in the Black Sea countries. All of us now have a duty to protect and bring to light these monuments because they are part of the world's cultural heritage and belong to all humanity, irrespective of who manages and maintains them today.

The Committee of Pontic Studies always has and is still moving along the direction of fulfilling this duty and today, with the end of the works of this Scientific Symposium, we feel the need to warmly thank you for your presence here and congratulate you for your excellent collaboration and your high standard presentations. We would also like to inform you that the proceedings of the Symposium have been recorded and filmed on DVD and that your presentations will be published in a special volume of our Committee's journal "Archeion Pontou – Pontus Archives" both of which will be sent to you by post.

Closing, alongside our respect and appreciation for your work and contribution in this field, please accept some mementos. An album for the 550 years from the fall of Trabzon (1461-2011) which was published by the Committee for Pontic Studies and is accompanied by a DVD presenting the founding history, the publishing work and the Museum of the Committee. A folder with engravings, maps and coins of Pontus in English and Greek. A gold-plated medal with the one-headed eagle, emblem of the Committee, on one side and on the other side a personalized dedication "with compliments" for your participation in the Symposium. Finally, I want to leave you with the wish to return safely to your countries and the saying in the pontic dialect «Υίαν κι Ευλο(γ)ίαν», να είμαστε ούλ καλά και να ευρούμεσ σ' άλλον μίαν.

Health and Blessings.

May we all be well and meet again.

Christos Galanidis
Chairman of the Committee for Pontic Studies

ΛΗΞΗ ΤΩΝ ΕΡΓΑΣΙΩΝ ΤΟΥ ΣΥΜΠΟΣΙΟΥ

Αγαπητοί φίλοι,

Το τριήμερο οδοιπορικό ανάμεσα στο χθες και το σήμερα έφθασε στο τέλος του. Ένα χθες που το μαρτυρούν τα άπειρα μνημεία, που, ερείπια τα πιο πολλά, ευρίσκονται διασκορπισμένα σ' όλες τις περιοχές του Εύξεινου Πόντου και τα οποία τα παρουσιάσατε τεκμηριωμένα κατά έξοχο τρόπο στις εισηγήσεις σας, μνημεία που φτιάχτηκαν σε μία περίοδο που ο Ελληνισμός αποτελούσε κυρίαρχο και καθοριστικό στοιχείο ανάμεσα στους κατοίκους αυτής της περιοχής, και το σήμερα που το αποτελούμε εμείς εδώ στην Ελλάδα, απόγονοι των κατοίκων αυτής της περιοχής, και όλοι οι λαοί που, κάτω από διαφορετικές κρατικές οντότητες κατοικούν στις χώρες του Εύξεινου Πόντου. Όλοι εμείς λοιπόν σήμερα, έχουμε χρέος να προστατεύσουμε και να αναδείξουμε αυτά τα μνημεία γιατί αποτελούν μνημεία παγκόσμιου πολιτισμού που ανήκουν σ' ολόκληρη την ανθρωπότητα, ανεξάρτητα ποιός τα διαχειρίζεται σήμερα.

Στην κατεύθυνση αυτού του χρέους κινήθηκε και κινείται η Επιτροπή Ποντιακών Μελετών και σήμερα, με τη λήξη των εργασιών αυτού του Επιστημονικού Συμποσίου, αισθάνεται την ανάγκη να σας ευχαριστήσει θερμά για την εδώ παρουσία σας, να σας συγχαρεί για την άψογη συνεργασία σας και για τις υψηλού επιπέδου εισηγήσεις σας, και να σας ενημερώσει ότι οι εργασίες του Συμποσίου μας που έχουν ηχογραφηθεί και βιντεοσκοπηθεί, θα γίνουν DVD, όπως επίσης οι εισηγήσεις σας θα εκδοθούν σε ειδικό τόμο του περιοδικού συγγράματός μας «Αρχαίον Πόντου» και θα σας αποσταλούν ταχυδρομικά.

Κλείνοντας, μαζί με τη μεγάλη εκτίμηση για το έργο και την προσφορά σας, δεχθείτε παρακαλώ κάποια αναμνηστικά δώρα. Το Λεύκωμα για τα 550 χρόνια (1461-2011) από την πτώση της Τραπεζούντας που εκδόθηκε από την Ε.Π.Μ. και συνοδεύεται από DVD για το ιστορικό ίδρυσης, το εκδοτικό έργο και το Μουσείο της Ε.Π.Μ. Μία έκδοση με γκραβούρες, χάρτες και νομίσματα του Πόντου στα ελληνικά και αγγλικά. Το επίχρυσο ανάγλυφο μετάλλιο με το μονοκέφαλο αετό, έμβλημα της Ε.Π.Μ., από τη μία όψη και από την άλλη όψη ονομαστική αφιέρωση στον καθένα «Τιμής Ένεκεν» για τη συμμετοχή σας στο Συμπόσιό μας, με την ευχή να επιστρέψετε καλά στον τόπο καταγωγής σας, και το λόγο στην ποντιακή διάλεκτο «Υίαν κι Ευλο(γ)ίαν», να είμαστε ούλ' καλά και να ευρίουμες σ' άλλον μίαν.

Υγεία και Ευλογία, να είμαστε όλοι καλά και να ξαναβρεθούμε.

Χρήστος Γαλανίδης
Πρόεδρος της Επιτροπής Ποντιακών Μελετών

LIST OF CONTRIBUTORS

† **Alexandru, Avram**

Professor of Ancient History, University of Le Mans, France

Atasoy, Sümer

Emeritus Professor of Classical Archaeology, Karabük University, Turkey

Barat, Claire

Maître de conférences en histoire ancienne et archéologie classique, Université de Valenciennes et du Hainaut-Cambrésis, France

Bezrukov, Andrey

Assistant Professor of Ancient History, Nosov Magnitogorsk State University, Russian Federation

Braund, David

Emeritus Professor of Ancient History, University of Exeter, UK

Chaniotis, Angelos

Professor at the Institute of Advanced Study, Princeton, USA

Cojocaru, Victor

PhD in Archaeology, Senior researcher at the Institute of Archaeology of the Romanian Academy, Iasi Branch, Romania

Coşkun, Altay

Professor of Ancient History, Waterloo University, Canada

Dakin, Emyr

Instructor in Classics, College of New Jersey, USA

Gamkrelidze, Gela

Chief Researcher at the Centre of Archaeology of the Georgian National Museum, Tbilisi, Georgia

Ionescu, Mihai

Researcher, Callatis Archaeological Museum, Mangalia, Romania

Kakhidze, Emzar

Associate Professor of Classical Archaeology, Batumi State University, Georgia

Klenina, E. Yu.

Head of research department, the State Museum-Preserve "Tauric Chersonese", Russian Federation

Kolağasioğlu, Mustafa
Amisos Museum, Turkey

Kyrtatas, Dimitris J.
Professor of Ancient History, University of Thessaly, Greece

Manoledakis, Manolis
Associate Professor of Classical Archaeology, International Hellenic University, Greece

Maslennikov, Alexander A.
Professor of Classical Archaeology, Institute of Archaeology, Moscow, Russian Federation

Mentesidou, Eleni T.
PhD candidate at Democritus University of Thrace, Greece

Minchev, Alexander
Dr. of Archaeology, Archaeological Museum of Varna, Bulgaria

Nigdelis, Pantelis M.
Professor of Ancient History, Aristotle University of Thessaloniki, Greece

Öztürk, Bülent
Assistant Professor of Ancient History, Sakarya University, Turkey

Petropoulos, Elias K.
Professor of Ancient History, Democritus University of Thrace, Greece

Ruscu, Dan
University of Babeş-Bolyai, Cluj-Napoca, Romania

Ruscu, Ligia
University of Babeş-Bolyai, Cluj-Napoca, Romania

Saprykin, Sergey
Professor of Ancient History, Moscow State University M.V. Lomonosov, Russian Federation

Şirin, Orhan Alper
Samsun Museum, Turkey

Tezgör, Dominique Kassab
Professor of Classical Archaeology, Bilkent University of Ankara, Turkey

Yıldırım, Şahin
Assistant Professor of Classical Archaeology, Karabük University, Turkey