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Preface

This volume publishes a selection of some two dozen of the papers presented at an international conference held in October 2017 at Tekkeköy in Samsun, ancient Amisos, on the Turkish Black Sea coast. The archaeology sessions included presentations not only about the Tekkeköy/Samsun region but other parts of the Black Sea by participants from Bulgaria, France, Georgia, Romania, Russia, Turkey and the United Kingdom. The selection offered here includes almost all of the contributions on archaeology and ancient history. The conference spread its wings to include folklore, museology and tourism, but we felt that a more focused publication was necessary.

The conference was the child of Ondokuzmayıs University in Samsun (whose Archaeology Department regularly organises symposia on the Black Sea), the municipal authorities of Tekkeköy and the Governor of Samsun. It is unusual to find local public authorities keen to organise events such as this, particularly inviting overseas participation. This was a personal initiative of the Governor and the Mayor and we are much obliged to both of them.

Many contributed to the success of the conference. We should like to thank in particular the Governor of Samsun, Osman Kaymak; Prof. Dr Sait Bilgiç (Rector), Prof. Dr Bekir Bati (Dean of the Faculty of Letters), Prof. Dr M. Yavuz Erler, Asst Prof. Dr Davut Yiğitpaşa, Asst Prof. Dr Tuba Yiğitpaşa and Asst Prof. Dr Akın Temür, of Ondokuzmayıs University, Samsun; and Hasan Togar, Mayor of Tekkeköy and Şeref Aydın, Director of Culture, Samsun Tekkeköy Municipality.

In addition, we thank all of the participants in the conference and, especially, those who have submitted papers to the volumes. Our gratitude to Dr David Davison and his team at Archaeopress in Oxford for prompt publication and to Dr James Hargrave for assistance with copy-editing.
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Once again about the Establishment Date of Some Greek Colonies around the Black Sea

Gocha R. Tsetskhladze

Abstract

This is a further consideration of the dating and interpretation of the earliest examples of Greek pottery found in local settlements of the northern and eastern Black Sea coasts and hinterland, and the use and misuse of this data in relation to the foundation dates of the Black Sea Greek colonies, especially those on these two coasts. In addition, attention is focused on the term *emporion*, often-used for settlements in the hinterland, taking Vetren and the Pistroi inscription as the principal example and making comparisons between *emporia* and local royal residences.

Much has been and continues to be written about the establishment of Greek cities around the Black Sea (Fig. 1), especially those of its northern littoral. I shall explain later why I am coming back to this topic yet again. First, let me summarise briefly the new developments about which Russian, Ukrainian, Romanian, Bulgarian, Turkish and Georgian scholars have written. The results of their excavations and investigations were presented a few years ago. If so much has been written about the establishment of the first Greek colonies, especially in the northern Black Sea, why am I obliged to return to this subject? The reasons will become increasingly apparent below.

This paper discusses not just the establishment of the Greek colonies around the Black Sea but many other problems connected with them: the local population, the status of overseas settlements and of the settlements of the hinterland, mainly *emporia*. Pistroi in the Thracian hinterland forms a central part of this discussion. What the term *emporion* connotes in the colonial world is still disputed, and how to identify them remains unclear.

* Pottery and colonies

Now we have a new date for the establishment of Olbia, based on the study of all the East Greek pottery from this site: 620/610-590 BC. For the present, this seems very well substantiated. After many years of excavation at Panticapaeum the Archaic levels have been reached in several trenches. This has resulted in a downward revision of its foundation date to 575-550 BC, despite previous excavations here unearthing some pottery of the end of the 7th-beginning of the 6th century BC.

Another early Greek settlement might have existed at Taganrog, now submerged completely by the Sea of Azov: what we have are pieces of Greek pottery washed up on its shore. In 2007, V. Kopylov dated the establishment of the Taganrog settlement as no later than the third quarter of the 7th century BC, and its abandonment to the third quarter of the following century. He states:

> Early pottery from the Taganrog settlement is represented by 32 fragments of cups decorated with lozenge and bird friezes. This is the most representative collection of pottery of this kind that has ever been found in the sites of the northern Black Sea littoral. These fragments are divided into two groups: one is dated to the third quarter of the 7th century BC and the other, according to the type of the painting, from the last quarter of the same century. However one should admit that these dates are rather approximate, as the vessels are very

[^1]: I should like to thank colleagues and friends for providing me with their books and articles and the most recent information: S. Atasoy, A. Avram, J. Bouzek, M. Damyanov, D. Demetriou, N. Gavrylkuk, V. Kopylov, M. Manoledakis, A. Podossinov, E. Redina, M. Rusakov, I. Shramko, M. Treister, M. Vakhitina, M. Vassileva, S. Yıldırım and S. Zadnikov.

[^2]: For a summary and previous discussion, see Avram et al. 2004, city by city, using all available evidence and providing bibliography up to 2004; and Tsetskhladze 2015 up to 2015. In this paper I am giving only what is essential. Exhaustive bibliographies in Eastern and Western European languages exist in other publications, notably those of A. Avram (for the latest, see Badoud and Avram 2019), but mainly mine. For new evidence and bibliography, see Tsetskhladze et al. 2013; 2015; Manoledakis et al. 2018; and the other papers in the present volume. The proceedings of the Sixth International Congress on Black Sea Antiquities (85 papers), held in Constanța in September 2017, will be published in 2020. A bibliography of the Black Sea is published in Cojocaru 2014; 2018.

[^3]: Tsetskhladze 2018a. See also Tsetskhladze 2015.

[^4]: For the results of this excavation, see Tolstikov 1984; 2001; 2007; 2010a; 2010b; Tolstikov, Astashova and Samar 2017; Tolstikov, Zhuravlev and Lomtadze 2004.
fragmentary and their sherds have been rounded by sea to a great extent.

But, in the next paragraph, he notes that the earliest example of pottery from this settlement is a fragment of the neck of an amphora of SOS type dated to 650 BC. There was a Russo-German project around Taganrog active until recently.

Kopylov is certain that the ancient name of the Taganrog settlement was Kremnoi, a name first mentioned by Herodotus (4. 20, 110), according to whom it was an emporion of the Royal Scythians situated on the north-western side of the Sea of Azov, or a city. Identification is problematic and different opinions have been voiced – even that it was actually Panticapaeum. Thus the location of Kremnoi is still not at all certain.

The West Pontic coast has witnessed intensive excavation. Bulgarian-French teams have been active at Apollonia Pontica. Two projects with distinct focuses can be identified: in the first phase, excavation of the funeral monuments at Kalfata on the beach of present-day Sozopol, the results of which are published; then excavation of domestic and public buildings and in the chora of Apollonia Pontica, hitherto practically uninvestigated. Rescue excavation within the city itself has unearthed East Greek pottery of the end of the 7th-beginning of the 6th century BC, demonstrating that the foundation date of Apollonia given in the written sources (Strabo 7. 6. 1; Pliny NH 4. 13, 34. 7; etc.) – ca. 610 BC – is indeed correct; and on the peninsula of Sveti Kirik it has revealed the remains of an Archaic temple which could be that of Apollo mentioned in written sources (Strabo 7. 6. 1; Pliny NH 4. 13, 34. 7, etc.). Not far from this temple is another, of later date. Thus, the area was the temenos of Apollonia Pontica. Recent archaeological investigation unearthed evidence of the earliest Greek metallurgy not far from the temples. The slags were found in so-called House 1, which is overlaid by an Archaic altar. Other slags were discovered in Pits 1, 3 and 8. These features are very well dated by the numerous pottery they contained to ca. 600 or the early 6th century BC and a pottery kiln. We have the same situation in Berezan, where a metalworking shop was discovered.

---

3 Kopylov 2011; 2018.
4 Hind 1997.
5 Hermary 2010.
6 Baralis et al. 2010; 2011; 2012; 2013; Baralis, Panayotova et al. 2016. See also Baralis and Lungu 2015; Damyanov 2015; Martinez et al. 2015, which publishes fresh evidence about Greeks and locals; etc.
7 Panayotova et al. 2014.
8 Damyanov and Panayotova 2018. See also Baralis et al. 2016: 159-60 (pottery kiln); 159 (metal workshop).
9 Domanski and Marčenko 2003.
Histrion continues to be excavated after more than a century of work, latterly on a reduced scale thanks to economic difficulties in Romania, now with a Romanian-American project in place. But the very impressive publication programme continues undiminished. At Orgame, which was established either by Ionians at the end of the 7th/beginning of the 6th century BC or as a secondary colony by Histrion, a Romanian-French team has concentrated mainly on the excavation of the chorā, finding stone buildings.

Recent excavation of Sinope has brought forth pottery of the 7th–4th centuries BC. Unfortunately, which part of the 7th century is not specified. Furthermore, there is a large quantity of handmade pottery from the Bafrā region and elsewhere, and some material from the Bronze Age. These could indicate that, as in other parts of the Black Sea, local people(s) formed part of the population in Sinope, or that a local settlement had existed here before Sinope was established, or both.

Tieion/Tios, which was probably founded by Miletus (together with Phocea?) in the early 6th century, is the only site on the southern Black Sea to have been excavated extensively because it has not been overbuilt. The work of the last ten years has recently been published; it has revealed the Acropolis, a Hellenistic temple, a Roman Street, a theatre and baths. The earliest pottery was found on the Acropolis: four East Greek pieces of the very end of the 7th/early 6th century BC. Pottery of the 5th century BC is present in substantial quantities. In 2019, an iron-working shop, dated to the last quarter of the 7th century-middle of the 6th century, was discovered near pithouses in the south of the Acropolis. These pithouses were the first to be recorded in the southern Black Sea: examples were previously known on all other Pontic shores. Furthermore, according to Ş. Yıldırım, the territory around Tios was heavily populated by locals, probably of Phrygian origin.

Amisos, like all Greek colonies on the Turkish Black Sea coast except Tios, is overbuilt. The only possible investigations are rescue excavations in the suburbs of the modern city of Samsun. Recently, about 7 km from the city centre, a rescue excavation revealed a shrine of Cybele, with much Greek and Phrygian pottery dating from the 6th century BC as well as terracotta figurines of Cybele. Some Greek sherds bear graffiti with the names Kubaba and Cybele. Greek tombstones of the 6th–5th century BC, some with Greek inscriptions, were unearthed not far from this site.

As to the existence of an earlier Chersonesos, an Ionian settlement dating to the last third of the 6th century BC, before Heraclea Pontica founded (Dorian) Chersonesos (422/1 BC), study and re-examination of the material demonstrates that this is now less certain than it once seemed. The lid of a black-figure lekane, initially identified as Boeotian and dated to the third quarter of the 6th century BC, the starting point for moving back the foundation date of Chersonesos, in reality dates to the middle/beginning of the third quarter of the 5th century and is not from Boeotia but from Attica or an Asia Minor workshop. J. Boardman had earlier expressed doubts about both its supposed Boeotian origin and date. Other materials (amphorae, other pottery, etc.) are also no earlier than the 5th century BC, and the earliest ostraca also date to the second half of that century.

I shall present below material about the suggested foundation dates of colonies along the Colchian coast, a matter in dispute for many decades.

U. Schlotzhauer and D. Zhuravlev vs G. Tssetskladze

The discovery of the earliest Greek pottery in local sites of the Ukrainian steppes is a phenomenon which has been mulled over for many times. Let me write about it again for a particular reason: during an international conference in Rome in November 2018, ‘Comparing Greek Colonies: Mobility and settlement consolidation from Southern Italy to the Black Sea (8th–6th century BC)’, Udo Schlotzhauer and Denis Zhuravlev presented a paper ‘Vom ersten Kontakt zur Formierung der griechischen Kolonien am Kimmerischen Bosporus und Kuban’. In this paper I was criticised for repeatedly dating this pottery to the last quarter of the 7th century BC when they gave a dating of the middle of the 7th century.
century or even earlier. In 1999, Michael Kerschner and Udo Schlotzhauer unveiled a new chronology of East Greek pottery, especially the early phases, including pottery from the northern Black Sea, mainly Berezan and the local Nemirov settlement but also some from the Crimea. Recognising the importance of this work for further discussion, I published it in my journal *Ancient West and East* in 2005. All the pieces presented in that article are given high (or even higher) dates. The presentation in Rome obliged me to consider these issues once again, and to remind the authors of several points.

In 2012, I published a long article dedicated to early Greek pottery from Berezan, local sites of the Ukrainian steppes and other northern Black Sea regions (Table 1; Fig. 2), including in it a short survey of early Greek pottery in the eastern and southern Black Sea where it is found in the ‘Halys Bend’ – see Table 2 (Fig. 3). My article gave, wherever possible, the contexts in which the pottery was found, chronology and interpretation, as well as illustrations of most of the pieces. Expecting criticisms of my dating from supporters of the high chronology, I provided explanations for my own chronology as well as answering them with their own statement. Let me repeat (yet again) the statement of Schlotzhauer and Kerschner from their *Ancient West and East* article:

The proposed classification should be regarded as no more than a framework awaiting further detailed studies at different production centres as well as wherever East Greek pottery might be found in the future. The aim of this draft is merely to achieve clarity and unambiguity of the terminology and to make comparisons between different classes of pottery easier.

I had assumed that, as the authors promised, this high chronology would be developed further with additional proofs. I also expected other colleagues to question it and debate it. But I was to be disappointed. On the contrary, only some Russian and Ukrainian scholars have taken up the new chronology, avidly and uncritically, and have started to date the early pottery according to it. I shall explain why below. Other colleagues working on the Black Sea and the Mediterranean have met it with practically complete silence or do not use it. To explain yet again my own opinion:

The problems of dating some pieces are obvious. They range from the first third to the last quarter/second half/end of the 7th century BC. According to Kerschner, the earliest is a fragment of a bird bowl from Trakhtemirov. Others date this to the middle-second half of the 7th century. I have already observed that the later date should be favoured in line with pieces from the other settlements under discussion. All the chronological ranges given – 650-630 BC, 640-630 BC, 630-590 BC, last quarter of the 7th century BC, second half of the 7th century BC, middle-second half of the 7th century BC – fall, in some degree or other, within the last third of the 7th century. In short, it is entirely reasonable to assign all our examples to this latter, single period, rather than looking to over-refine the differences within a very limited body of evidence. Just as some favour the upper range of dates, others, me included, favour the lower (which is compatible with the archaeological data we possess for the foundation of the first Greek colonies). As well as tableware, amphora fragments have been found. Recently, a mid-7th century date has been given to the very small number of fragments of early East Greek trade amphorae found at Black Sea sites. The authors remark that this date ‘fits quite well with that of “Middle Wild Goat I” finds and provides us with a supplementary chronological marker for the Greek penetration of the Black Sea’. But this seems to contradict what they said previously, namely that ‘The earliest pottery finds in the Black Sea area consist of Milesian Middle Wild Goat I of ca. 630, of North Ionian bird bowls of the last third of the 7th century and of South Ionian cups of Vallet-Villard A1-A2 types, some of which possibly date back to the mid-7th century.’ But can ‘ca. 630’ be considered ‘middle’?

In these circumstances, I am very surprised at the criticism when, in reality, I already answered it in my 2012 piece. The Rome presenters had not paid attention to this initially and their response now is very belated. My question to them was: if this pottery from local sites of the Ukrainian steppes is really as early their chronology supposes, how and why did it get to where it was found before there were any Greek colonies thereafter? My question remained unanswered, which is understandable since there is...
no reasonable answer. Another colleague commented that Byzantium and a few other colonies existed at the relevant time. Again, my question: why should they go so far away (the northern Black Sea hinterland) when there is the West Pontic coast almost next to these cities, and in that region no single piece of Greek pottery has been found that is earlier than the foundation of the Greek colonies. This too went unanswered. Some colleagues also reminded me about currents: but the Black Sea current reaches the western shore before the northern, and no early pottery has been discovered in the western Pontus (at least so far). Another question is why Greeks should go to local settlements far inland before they had set up their own coastal colonies. It is impossible to answer. There were no metals in the steppes, and, in the Archaic period, there was no grain or slave trade from the Black Sea.34

34 Tsetskhladze 2008a; 2008b.
Local settlements and Greek pottery

Now let me briefly pay attention, yet again, to early Greek pottery and why it was found in local settlements, in the hope that I will not be criticised for banging this particular drum too loudly and too often – but it has serious consequences for dating the establishment of Greek settlements. I do so deliberately, otherwise colleagues will be left confused in the fog of the debate without appreciating its basic features.

Table 1 presents the settlements of the hinterland where early Greek pottery has been discovered. It also gives the number of pieces insofar as this can be deduced from the publications, and the different datings of these pieces suggested by different authors at different times – the highest dates, of course, are those given by Kerschner and Schlotzhauer in their 2005 paper. The table is a simplified version of that which I presented in

---

Table 1. Early Greek pottery from the inland of Amisos.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Greek Pottery</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Akalan (18 km inland of Amisos)</td>
<td>Fragments of two Milesian jugs, Middle Wild Goat II</td>
<td>End of 7th century BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Village of Dalsaray near Mecitözu</td>
<td>Complete North Ionian bird bowl</td>
<td>Third quarter of 7th century BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Alişar</td>
<td>Fragment of Milesian vase</td>
<td>Early 6th century BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Boğazköy</td>
<td>Small number of Milesian and Corinthian pottery</td>
<td>Mid-7th century BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Kaman-Kalehöyük</td>
<td>1. Some pottery fragments of Protogeometric period</td>
<td>1200-800 BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Fragment of Attic krater</td>
<td>6th century BC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

Table 2. Early Greek pottery from the Halys Bend.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Greek Pottery</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Village of Dalsaray near Mecitözu</td>
<td>Complete North Ionian bird bowl</td>
<td>Third quarter of 7th century BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Alişar</td>
<td>Fragment of Milesian vase</td>
<td>Early 6th century BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Boğazköy</td>
<td>Small number of Milesian and Corinthian pottery</td>
<td>Mid-7th century BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Kaman-Kalehöyük</td>
<td>1. Some pottery fragments of Protogeometric period</td>
<td>1200-800 BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Fragment of Attic krater</td>
<td>6th century BC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2012, where there is extensive bibliography and details of who dated what and when. As I have written, all the pottery was discovered in large settlements, which, based on the other material unearthed from them, were political and economic centres from which local rulers controlled the surrounding territory.

Table 3 shows amphorae and pottery found in kurgans. These pieces accord with the dates of tableware in settlements.

The vast majority of tableware has been discovered at two settlements: Nemirov and Belsk (Gelonus). Until recently we lacked a clear picture of the former settlement and its pottery, be that Greek or local. But now, thanks to a large article and recent book by M. Kashuba and M. Vakhtina, we are placed in a much better position, both about the settlement as a whole and the context of the finds of Greek pottery. It must be said that the excavation was on a small scale, and had it continued, more pottery would undoubtedly have been found.

This large settlement on the Southern Bug, Nemirov, was one of the political centres of the local chiefs. It occupies a plateau and the adjacent flat territory, overall 110 ha, all surrounded by a ditch and rampart up to 9 m in height/depth, 32 m in width and extending to 4.5-5.5 km. The site is known primarily for the discovery of about 100 fragments of Greek pottery (tableware and amphorae), the vast majority of it from the 6th century BC, with the early pottery dating from the last third/last quarter of the 7th century (Fig. 4). The production of the North Ionian centres is represented, while the amphorae are from Aeolia, Chios and Clazomenae. The pottery was found in pithouses 1 and 2; altogether three pithouses are known. It is interesting that there is a complete lack of Attic pottery at Nemirov. This is explained by the city-site existing from the end of the 8th to the beginning/first third of the 6th century BC. The archaeology of Nemirov has now been divided into two main phases: pre-colonisation and colonisation period.

There are 17 main types of vessel; the late G. Smirnova identified 19 different sub-types. Some pottery is close to the Chernolessk and Zhabotin cultures of the middle Dniester and middle Dnieper regions. There is locally produced pottery as well, showing different cultural influences, especially Hallstatt; further pottery which, according to typology and production technology, is actual Hallstatt (end of HaB-HaC) of the burial grounds of eastern Austria and adjoining regions of Hungary and Slovakia; and another type of pottery resembling Carpatho-Danubian Hallstatt (pottery of the Basarabi and Bîrsești-Ferigile cultures). It is believed that pottery of the so-called Early Scythian culture has also been found. This culture, of the middle Bug region, is divided into three phases: beginning, pre-colonisation and colonisation.

Figure 3. Distribution map of early Greek pottery in the Halys Bend (L. Summerer).
There is some confusion in this and other publications on Nemirov. The site has been variously dated and described as Early Iron Age, period of Early Scythian Culture, Early Scythian and Scythian. This can be explained by the very complicated ethnic situation on the site. What is meant by Early Scythian culture or the beginning of Scythian culture? How Scythian are these periods? The Scythians were nomadic at the time that this settlement was established and existed; and it is very difficult, if not impossible, to identify nomadic cultures archaeologically. In this period there were, as we know, no Scythians on the Ukrainian steppes; the terms Pre-Scythian and Early Scythian are coinages of modern scholars. Nomads do not build settlements or erect dwellings.\(^4\)

How Scythian or Early Scythian was Nemirov? It existed for a relatively short period, from the end of the 8th to the beginning/first third of the 6th century BC, as a centre of local chief-men. According to Kashuba and Vakhtina, it belongs to the Early Scythian period and represents one of “the administrative, economic and ideological centres of European Archaic Scythia”.\(^4\) The materials known so far do not confirm that it was Scythian in general, let alone Early Scythian. It is obvious that it was a hub of different cultures; perhaps those of peoples of the ‘Early Scythian’ period, peoples that were not Scythian, were included in this hub. If not Scythian, what kind of settlement was it? It reminds me very closely of large Hallstatt settlements that were also the political and economic centres of different chief-men. The most striking parallel is the Hallstatt hilltop settlement of Heuneburg,\(^4\) with a large amount of Greek pottery, even Greek craftsmen living there (which can be proposed for Nemirov as well), Greek-type mud-brick fortifications, etc. The only difference is that dwellings and public buildings in Heuneburg have wooden superstructures, whereas in Nemirov the dwellings are subterraneous. Thus, it would not be a mistake to consider or propose that Nemirov was a Hallstatt settlement.\(^4\) Indeed, study of the material demonstrates that the steppes and the northern Black Sea werepopulated by Hallstatt people(s).\(^4\)

Let me turn to Belsk – better studied than Nemirov and with an on-going excavation – which is the largest local site in Europe: it occupied 4020 ha, had a defensive perimeter of 25 km and an estimated population of 4000-5000. The ramparts were 9 m high and ditches over 5 m deep.\(^4\) It included three forts – Western (72 ha), Eastern (65.2 ha) and Kuzeminskoe (15.4 ha), each with its own fortifications – and about nine other populated places. It has been excavated successfully for many years. The earliest tableware and amphorae, found before 1988, were mentioned in

---

\(^{4}\) On the absence of Scythians in this and other areas, see Gavrilyuk 2017; Kopylov and Rusakov 2016a; 2016b.

\(^{4}\) Kashuba and Vakhtina 2017: 225.
Figure 4. Selection of early Greek pottery from Nemirov (M.Y. Vakhtina).
my 2012 piece (see Table 1; the quantities and dating are given as far as the publications allow). They are studied by S. Zadnikov, a Greek pottery specialist. Of course, as the excavation proceeds, more pieces will be uncovered. So far, about 40–50 pieces of East Greek tableware of the last quarter of the 7th–first half of the 6th century BC have been discovered (and with amphorae of the same date the overall number is about 100). All of the Greek pottery at Belsk comes from the Western Fort, exclusively from ash-hills. In total, about 7000 pieces of pottery were found in Belsk, including from the Classical period. According to the late B.A. Shramko, this pottery, by origin, is 16% Ionian, 12.6% Chian (including amphorae), 7.8% Thasian amphorae, 3.7% Attic (a little painted, mostly black-glaze), 1.7% Lesbian amphorae, 38.1% amphorae of unidentified origin.

Yet again, as an example, let me give some information about the earliest Greek tableware and amphorae and their context. The situation at Belsk changed when the excavation passed into new hands. Studies in 1988 and 2008 yielded new pieces of East Greek pottery. These were discovered in ash-hills (zol’nik) 5, 10, 11, 12 and 13, which are located in the central and eastern parts of the Western Fort. I have tried to count the numbers; with difficulty, I arrived at a total of about 15 pieces dating from the last quarter of the 7th to the first half of the 6th century BC. Two fragments of (separate) bird bowls were discovered in ash-hill 5, dated by the publishers to 650–615 BC; ash-hills 5, 12 and 13 produced several fragments of Middle Wild Goat (MWG) I oinochoai, dated to 640–630 BC; and ash-hill 10 one fragment of an oinochoe of MWG II, dated to 615–600 BC.

It should be mentioned that Belsk, like Nemirov, has yielded Basarabi pottery dated to the first half of the 7th century BC. Basarabi influence is still visible in the middle-third quarter of the 7th century. Despite this pottery and Basarabi influence, until the arrival of the Greek the population of Belsk comprised local agricultural tribes.

What kind of settlement was Belsk, the city of Gelenus? Here it is appropriate to give again the information of Herodotus, describing his own time:

The Budini are a great and numerous nation; the eyes of all of them are very bright, and they are ruddy. They have a city built of wood, called Gelenus. The wall of it is 30 furlongs in length on each side of the city; this wall is high and all of wood; and their houses are wooden, and their temples; for there are among them temples of Greek gods, furnished in Greek fashion with images and altars and shrines of wood; and they honour Dionysus every two years with festivals and revels. For the Geleni are by their origin Greeks, who left their trading ports to settle among the Budini; and they speak a language half Greek and half Scythian. But the Budini speak not the same language as the Geleni, nor is their manner of life the same (Herodotus 4. 108).

The discoveries in Belsk, especially from the Western Fort, show that Herodotus, in this instance, should be trusted. It looks as though the Greeks were living only in the Western Fort, the earliest of the three (the others were established later, in the 6th century BC). Unfortunately, the vast majority of the settlement’s kurgans were looted in antiquity or in modern times.

It is important to mention one other site among several of this type, i.e. centres of economic and political power and the domicile of the local elites.

During the excavation of the Motroninskoe settlement, 65,000 fragments and about 50 complete and archaeologically complete examples of local handmade pottery were found. The Greek pottery consists of more...
than 7500 fragments, 96% of them from amphorae, and five archaeologically complete vessels. Overall, the Greek pottery forms 15.5% of all pottery found, and the vast majority of it comes from the last third of the 6th-first quarter of the 5th century BC.59

Motroninskoe spread over 200 ha, of which 70 ha is enclosed within fortifications formed of earthen ramparts 10.5 m high and a ditch/moat 4-6 m deep and 10-15 m across. Outside the fortifications are three burial grounds with 60 kurgans.60 Trakhtemirov extended to 500 ha, defended by earthen ramparts, ditches and a wooden fortification structure.

Thus, there are very good grounds for suggesting not only that locals formed part of the population of Greek colonies from the very beginning, but that Greeks were living in the political and economic centres of local rulers.61 This phenomenon is very well known from the western Black Sea and throughout the Mediterranean.62

In 2000, Jane Bouzek introduced the term ‘Greeks over land’, demonstrating that Greek pottery had even reached as far as Bohemia. He updated his list in 2019.63 Thus Greek pottery reaching so far into the hinterland is not only a characteristic of the northern Black Sea. A most striking site is Krševica in central Serbia, which yielded a vast quantity of Greek pottery, especially amphorae, some of them with stamps, that the publishers felt able to suggest the existence here of an emporion.64 Goods in amphorae reached the Kharkov area in the distant hinterland of the Ukraine, demonstrated by the discovery of amphora fragments and stamps from some centres of the northern Black Sea.65 It is most likely that they reached here from Belsk, which is quite close by.

We frequently use the term emporion,66 often to describe a type of trading settlement that existed in the colonial world in circumstances where the Greeks were unable to establish full colonies because of the existence of a strong local polity. They existed not only in the western Mediterranean67 from the Archaic period but also around the Black Sea.68 Were emporia really just trading settlements, intermediate between the Mediterranean and Black Sea and local societies, or did they, like Naukratis, for instance, contain production facilities?69

Eusebius’ dates. ‘Pre-colonial’ links again?

Now it is time to address the question of some scholars’ firm belief in Kerschner and Schlotzhauer’s chronology. Discussion is concentrated on the establishment of the first Greek colony in the northern Black Sea: the Berezan settlement, now on an island but in ancient times a peninsula, and, in the Classical period, an emporion of Olbia (Herodotus 4. 17), as Piraeus for Athens, the only example from mainland Greece.

Eusebius gives an establishment date of Berezan as 647 BC (Chron. 95b), and some would like this to be true. Indeed, this date fits quite well with the high chronology,70 and the pottery found about 500 km distant in the local settlements of the hinterland would, taking this high chronology, have reached them from Berezan. But, as has been pointed out several times though ignored, Eusebius’ dates cannot in general be trusted and should not be used. Once again, I give another long citation explaining why his establishment dates are flawed:

...the tendency to move away from giving foundation dates of colonies in the form of chronology relative to another Greek or Near Eastern event, or a king (Hdt. 4.144 on Kalchedon/Byzantion; Ps.-Skymnos 730ff, on a string of Pontic colonies), and towards the practice of using Olympiads and their four-yearly cycle. Eventually, in the Christian writers of the later Roman Empire, the era of Abraham was added as well. The dates in Eusebius and Jerome have an aura of exactness about them that is misleading (Chron. 95b), being based on a chain of previous pagan tradition that was very late in finding its tabular form. For colonies within the Pontos three dates have gained common acceptance: Istros in 657, Olbia in 647, Sinope in 631. But these should be regarded as dates arrived at by being put belatedly into tabular form, and not as a canon, sanctified by the Christian Fathers. A fourth date, found in the Armenian version of Eusebius, relating to Trapezous (757, ann. Abr. 1260) is to be discounted as a mistake, referring to the city of Kyzikos in the Propontis... Setting aside the exaggerated numbers of Milesian colonies and the (misleading) seeming exactitude of the few colonial dates provided by the chronographers, we may now turn to the

58 Bessonova and Skoryi 1999: 37. The Greek pottery is still unpublished.
60 Tsetskhladze 2003. In two articles the authors had expressed this same opinion: Fabritsius 1951: 71 (he dates the presence of the Greeks and the existence of the local populations in the hinterland to the end of the 7th-end of the 6th century BC); and Gavriljuk 2007. Gavriljuk writes: ‘There is no doubt that the Greek dealers penetrated deep into the territory occupied by local tribes from the middle of the 7th century BC. Greek handicraftsmen or dealers visited and probably also lived in the territory for some time, for example, on the Bel’sk hillfort (the Left Bank Forest-steppe) or Pastyrskoe, Shapovskoe or Motronino (the Right Bank Forest-steppe)’ (2007: 639).
61 Tsetskhladze 2002; and see now Tsetskhladze 2014 (both with bibliography).
63 Popović 2009; Popović and Vukadinović 2011.
64 Boiko 2008; Gutsalov 2009; Koloda 2009.
65 Hansen 2006; Demetriou 2012; Gaillédrat et al. 2018; et al.
66 Gaillédrat et al. 2018.
68 For Naukratis, see Demetriou 2012: 105-52. For the latest, see Möller 2019.
69 Perhaps Eusebius’ work influenced the high dating of pottery from the northern Black Sea.
distribution, character and development of the *poleis* in the Pontic region.\(^{70}\)

For instance, he gives the foundation date of Histria as 657 BC (*Chron. 95b*).\(^{71}\) Fallacious. There, primary attention has been given to several dozen pieces of early East Greek pottery and not to the account of Eusebius.\(^{72}\)

Special study of the East Greek pottery from Berezan by R. Posamentir has demonstrated that there is nothing earlier than the last quarter of the 7th century BC,\(^{73}\) yet again ignored by those who believe in Eusebius’ date for Berezan’s establishment.

It must be emphasised that V.M. Otreshko found a solution in 1989 (albeit published just in an abstract of his paper).\(^{74}\) Based on the methodology employed by other scholars, who had examined evidence from the Near East about Lydia relating to the dates of known historical events and those given for them by Eusebius, and had shown that Eusebius’ dating was 20 years too early, he applied the same to the establishment dates of Berezan and Histria, bringing those of Eusebius forward by the same 20 years. Thus, Berezan was founded ca. 625 BC and Histria in ca. 637 BC, and the disparity between Eusebius’ dates and those given by archaeology is reconciled. Otreshko’s opinion has been completely ignored.

Furthermore, some go so far as to give even earlier dates to pottery. One piece from Berezan has recently been published by A.V. Buiskikh.\(^{75}\) It was found by V.V. Lapin in 1963 but lay forgotten for half a century despite its enormous potential importance for the discussion of the foundation dates of Greek colonies in the northern Black Sea area. Buiskikh identifies it as a skyphos in Subgeometric style of probably Milesian origin. She dates it to the second third of the 7th century BC, based on the high chronology proposed by Kerschner and Schlotzhauer. In the chronology more generally used this piece would be dated some 20-30 years later.\(^{76}\) Buiskikh introduces into her discussion as comparisons for dating a fragment of a vessel from Nemirov\(^{77}\) and a fragment of a bird bowl of North Ionian production from Trakhtemirov city-site,\(^{78}\) both of which she dated similarly to the Berezan piece. Vakhchina dated the Nemirov fragment to possibly the third quarter of the 7th century and that from Trakhtemirov may be dated to the middle-second half of the 7th century.\(^{79}\)

The Berezan piece was not found *in situ* but during the cleaning of the wall of the Building with an Apse, which is dated to after the middle of the 6th century BC. The author concludes that this piece demonstrates ‘pre-colonial’ links and also the validity of Eusebius’ date for the establishment of Berezan. I have already discussed this piece at length.\(^{80}\) Here it is sufficient to remark that her dating is problematic, and that the true date of this and the other two pieces is inconsistent with ‘pre-colonial’ contacts. It must be said that the notion of pre-colonial links has receded as more evidence comes to light from both the eastern\(^{81}\) and western\(^{82}\) regions of Greek overseas settlement.

Pre-colonial contacts around the Black Sea had been discussed many times but were forgotten. Then, in 1990, controversy flared up again. A.J. Graham accepted the establishment of Sinope by Miletus as dating to before 756 BC, and of Trapezus as a colony of Sinope in 756 BC.\(^{83}\) These dates were taken from written sources. In support of the appearance of the Greeks in the Black Sea as early as the 8th century BC, Graham cited pottery: the rim of an LG kotyle (a Euboean copy of a Corinthian type dated to ca. 750-720 BC) allegedly coming from Histría; a small geometric hydria, allegedly from Berezan, bought from a dealer (called Attic of Atticising and assigned to MG II; dated ca. 800-760 BC); and two fragments of Cypriot ‘White Painted IV’ ware of the Cypro-Archaic period (ca. 740-660 BC) found at Histria and Berezan. Boardman, in his 1991 paper,\(^{84}\) convincingly demonstrated that this earliest pottery and its origins in Histria and Berezan were false. After this, the matter of pre-colonial links in the Black Sea once again fell silent.

It is obvious from the dating of the earliest pottery from Berezan that it lies in the same range as the earliest East Greek tableware from local settlements; and it is logical that such pottery reached them from Berezan and did so in the form of gifts from newly arrived Greeks to local rulers in pursuit of friendly relations and economic benefit.\(^{85}\) The question is why it travelled

---

\(^{70}\) Avram et al. 2004: 924-25 (with bibliography).

\(^{71}\) See, for instance, Avram et al. 2004: 933, no. 685.

\(^{72}\) Ps-Scymnus fr. 6 gives a later foundation date.

\(^{73}\) Posamentir 2010.

\(^{74}\) Otreshko 1989; republished in Otreshko 2009.

\(^{75}\) Buiskikh 2015a; 2015b.

\(^{76}\) Even Udo Schlotzhauer also has doubts about Buiskikh’s dating (pers. comm.).


\(^{78}\) Buiskikh 2015b: 244-46.
so far. What about the local peoples in the immediate vicinity of Berezan and Olbia? The answer is that there were none until the end of the 6th/beginning of the 5th century BC: the Greeks were the first people to settle in this and other areas. Moreover, the absence of a local population around Berezan, Olbia and other places before then has serious implications when we consider the ethnic composition of the Archaic Greek colonies, especially from the end of the 7th century BC to the first half of the 6th century. Discussion has long continued about the earliest domestic architecture of the Milesian Black Sea Greek colonies – subterranean and semi-subterranean dwellings known in Russian and Ukrainian literature as pithouses and semi-pithouses, of which the largest number, over 200, are from Berezan. Some scholars consider them indications of a strong presence of local people within the colonies; these were their dwellings. Another aspect, much discussed, is the high proportion of handmade pottery in these colonies, again taken as an indicator of a large local presence. But how can this be when there was no local population thereabouts? The vast majority of the handmade pottery is cooking pots, very often with traces of fire. It must have been produced by the Greeks (of course the pottery is cooking pots, very often with traces of fire). Handmade pottery was known in Miletus,89 typical Greek fine tableware also found was not used for cooking). Handmade pottery was known in Miletus,89 and Barbarians of the Northern Black Sea took place in the 7th-first half of the 6th centuries BC. It was the acquainted stage of interaction’s process between the bearers of antique civilization and a native population of the Northern Black Sea area. Luxury goods such as ceremonial pottery utensils (weapon, fine ware, other craft goods) appear on the sites of the forest-steppe as the most populated regions of the Northern Black Sea. Volumes of such supplies are insignificant, the quantity of goods is not great and there may have been several deliveries (or even single arrivals) of ceremonial utensils. It is possible that the objects of Greek manufacture from sites of the Northern Black Sea were not goods, but gifts of the first Greek settlers, to separate representatives of the Scythian nobility' (Gavrilyuk 2007: 655-56).

87 Gavrilyuk and Tymchenko 2015: 'The results of research on new networks of finds of handmade pottery, as well as reprocessing old collections using modern methods of date-base treatment, allow us to take a fresh look at the problem of the origin and further development of Olbia and Berezan. Olbia’s handmade pottery (from the sectors Temenos, UZA, NGS; Berezan and chora settlements) of the Archaic period was divided into several groups. These were similar to the ceramic complexes of the Dniestar-Danube basins and the forest-steppe of the northern Black Sea area. Museum collections and a mass material from field schedules (more than half a million pieces and unbroken vessels) were analysed. A special “bathymetric” method of analysing the mass material was developed. Handmade pottery appeared in Olbia at the turn of the 6th/5th centuries BC. A Thracian group was classified; functional types of pottery and its distribution within the Archaic chora of Olbia were identified; pathways of infiltration of carriers of Thracian culture into the Olbian district were examined. The results obtained may suggest that, in the initial phase of colonisation, the principal attraction of the Berezan-Olbia hinterland was the existence of extensive, free and rich natural resources, and uninhabited territory with favourable conditions for agriculture behind the Dnieper-Bug boundary. The choice of location was strategically very successful. Within a few decades Olbia’s hinterland had expanded considerably and it became possible to develop trade with the vast barbarian world (mainly) between the lower reaches of the Danube, Dniestar, Southern Bug and Dnieper rivers and the forest-steppe under future nomadic control.'

88 See Kopylov and Rusakov 2016a; 2016b; Gavrilyuk 2017: 186-87.


and Barbarians of the Northern Black Sea took place in the 7th-first half of the 6th centuries BC. It was the acquainted stage of interaction’s process between the bearers of antique civilization and a native population of the Northern Black Sea area. Luxury goods such as ceremonial pottery utensils (weapon, fine ware, other craft goods) appear on the sites of the forest-steppe as the most populated regions of the Northern Black Sea. Volumes of such supplies are insignificant, the quantity of goods is not great and there may have been several deliveries (or even single arrivals) of ceremonial utensils. It is possible that the objects of Greek manufacture from sites of the Northern Black Sea were not goods, but gifts of the first Greek settlers, to separate representatives of the Scythian nobility' (Gavrilyuk 2007: 655-56).

Another criticism by Schlottzauer and Zhuravlev was of my using a piece of pottery from Alekseevka that predates – though they do not accept it – the establishment of Greek colonies in the Taman Peninsula and the Kuban (Table 1.9; Fig. 5).91 The Alekseevka settlement is situated not far from Gorgippia and it is possible that it was subsequently incorporated into the latter’s chora. The piece dates to 630/620-590 BC, while the establishment of the Greek colonies actually began from the beginning of the 6th century BC (Table 4). Thus their criticism is very strange and without grounds – or are they now taking low dates and not high ones!

Emporion or royal residence?

The terminology used to define the status of Greek overseas settlements is not necessarily clear.92 Above, I have mentioned emporion a few times.93 We sometimes use this term for settlements such as those where Greeks lived in the residences/political centres of local chiefs and kings or as part of a local settlement.94 But where should we draw the line? The best example comes from Thrace: this is the important site of Adyjska Vodenitsa

94 About pithouses, the Greek and handmade pottery recovered from them, and comparative material, see Tsetskhladze 2004.

91 The ancient geography of the Taman Peninsula is a matter of debate. The present peninsula is a single landmass of some 1200 km². In antiquity, it is thought that it was three or five islands (see, for example, Strabo 11. 2. 9-12). Obviously this affects the nine Greek colonies of the peninsula: which were on which island(s). Since 2006, a Russo-German project has been actively studying the ancient geography. The conclusion is, indeed, that the peninsula was once an archipelago, but it was formed of a principal island (on which Hermonassa, Phanagoria, Kepoi and some others were situated) plus two small ones. This pattern followed the post-glacial regression of 5000 cal. BC. There was then a broad channel, the ‘Kuban Bosporus’, where now the Kuban Delta is to be found, providing another passage between the Black Sea and the Sea of Azov. Sea levels changed over time (by between 2 and 5 m – see papers in Baralis, Bivolaru et al. 2016) and cliffs were eroded, lagoons formed and islands were linked, coastal settlements that had been on promontories when they were established in the 6th century were cut off from the open sea by sand spits during the 4th-2nd centuries BC (Tsetskhladze 2016b, with discussion and bibliography: see table 1 on p. 47 showing all colonies on the present-day Taman Peninsula; also discussion of fluctuations in sea levels and the effects on the cities and on their investigation – parts are submerged). Thirteen settlements now inland have been investigated with varying degrees of thoroughness (see Tsetskhladze 2010: 52, table 2) and the evidence suggests that some were originally on the sea. The settlements were all established at different times in the 6th and even the beginning of the 5th century BC. For the extensive trade between the Greek colonies of the Taman Peninsula and the Kuban, see Instone, Ulitin 2013.

92 Tsetskhladze 2006b, xxxviii-xl.


94 See, for instance, Demetriou 2012: 24-152; Gaillard et al. 2018: 55-190.
(Vetren), situated on the Maritsa river, the ancient Hebros, about 200 km inland from the Black Sea in the municipality of Septemvri in Central Bulgaria. The river, which was navigable, has changed its course over time and washed away some part of the settlement. Excavation of the site has continued for over 30 years and the results have been published extensively. Indeed, Pistiros/Vetren demonstrates the problem very well: was it an *emporion* or the residence of a local minor king? Until the discovery of the Pistiros inscription at Asar Deme, about 2 km to the south-east, lying at the edge of a field not far from architectural remains (it is obvious that it had been reused in the construction of some building) belonging to Lissae, a station on the Roman road of the beginning of the 4th century AD, the site was interpreted from an archaeological point of view as a settlement. Afterwards, Bulgarian and Czech colleagues with few exceptions interpreted it through the inscription and considered it Emporion Pistiros. The settlement itself existed from the late 5th to the early 2nd century BC.

Let me again pay attention to the Vetren settlement and the Pistiros inscription.

The inscription indeed mentions Emporion Pistiros (Fig. 6). I will not dwell on it: this has already been done many times. I merely note that not all is/was clear. Different dates have been suggested for its creation, even the beginning of the 3rd century BC. The reading and interpretation of it also provoked discussion. It is now strongly suggested that the decree dates after 359 and before 352 BC, being issued by Amadokos II to confirm an agreement already in force between theemporitans and his predecessor, Kotys I.

To go back to the settlement: several phases have been identified. The first, before 400 BC, demonstrates that Vetren did not arise in empty land, based on an increasing amount of evidence: finds of some Greek painted pottery including fragments of Panathenaic

---

67 Velkov and Domaradzka 1996; Avram 1999; Dossier Pistiros 1999; Domaradzka 2002b. See now Demetriou 2012: 158-69. Since the inscription is not only important but unique, I provide a translation: *(If anyone should swear by) Dionysos and [ ...] he will owe a due. If any of the [ [5] emporitai has a cause to plead against another, they will be judged each among his own [ relatives, and with respect to such things as are owed] [by the emporitai at the Thracians,] no cancellation of debts is to be [ [10] made. The land and pasture belonging to the emporitai shall not be taken from them. The epaulitai shall not be sent to the emporitai. No garrison is to be placed at Pistiros, neither by him [ [15] nor should (any) be handed over to another. The kleroi of the inhabitants of Pistiros are not to be changed nor handed over to another. Neither shall the possessions of the emporitai be appropriated by him or by any of his people. [ [20] No dues shall be levied on the goods which are imported to Maroneia from Pistiros or from the] emporia, or from Maroneia to Pistiros and to the emporia Belana of the Prasenoi. [ [25] The emporitai the wagons to open and close. At the same time valid is as in Kotys’ time: ‘I will not send over any citizen of Maroneia; nor will I | I will kill him, nor will I let his property be confiscated, [ [30] neither during his lifetime nor after his death, neither I myself nor any of my people. Nor (will I) kill any of the Apollonians, nor the Thasians who are at Pistiros, [ [35] nor will I (imprison any of them) nor will I deprive any | man of his property, neither alive nor dead, neither I myself nor any of my people... [ [40] (nevertheless, if any) of the dwellers [ ... of the empor- | are | if not | neither alive nor dead, | neither I myself nor any of my people... [ [45] (nevertheless, if any) should commit a crime (against another) [ ... every year [ [49] ...] Translation: Domaradzka 2002b. For the latest discussion, with minor changes in the reconstruction of the inscription and translation, see Demetriou 2012: 161-62.


69 Domaradzka 2002b.
amphorae, fibulae, etc., even a lamp nozzle of ca. 500 BC, a bronze bowl and a fragment of a fibula of the 6th century BC.

Thus, the archaeological evidence shows that the settlement at Vetren as we now know it was founded in the third quarter of the 5th century BC, which is when typically Greek fortification walls with a gate were erected, built mainly by architects from Thasos (Figs. 7-8).

Table 4. Greek colonies on the Taman Peninsula.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Colony</th>
<th>Foundation date according to earliest pottery</th>
<th>Mother City</th>
<th>References in ancient authors</th>
<th>Site identification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Corocondame</td>
<td>580-560 BC</td>
<td>Ionians</td>
<td>Strabo 11. 2. 8-9, 14; Ps.-Arrian PPE 64; Steph. Byz s.v</td>
<td>Around Cape Tuzla. Settlement itself completely washed away. Part of the necropolis survives. Identification not firm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Hermonassa</td>
<td>Middle 6th century BC</td>
<td>Ionian/Aeolian</td>
<td>Arrian Bith fr. 55 Roos = FGrH 156 fr. 71; Steph. Byz. s.v Eustathius Comm. 549 = GGM II 324; Hecataeus FGrH 1 fr. 208; Ps.-Scymnus 886-891. Name derives from the wife of the oikist after he had died (Arrian Bith. fr. 55 Roos = FGrH 156 fr. 71)</td>
<td>Village of Taman, but no firm evidence found. Much of site washed away by the waters of the Taman Gulf.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Kepoi</td>
<td>580-560 BC</td>
<td>Miletus</td>
<td>Ps.-Scymnus 899; Pliny NH 6. 18; Strabo 11. 2. 10; Ps.-Scylax 72</td>
<td>3 km north-east of Phanagoria. Identification not firm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Patraeus</td>
<td>Middle 6th century BC</td>
<td>Miletus?</td>
<td>Strabo 11.2.8; Steph. Byz s.v.</td>
<td>Village of Garkusha. Identification not firm. Large part is under the Taman Gulf.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Phanagoria</td>
<td>ca. 542 BC</td>
<td>Teos</td>
<td>Ps-Scymnus 886; Dionysius Periegetes vv. 549-551; Strabo 11. 2. 10; Arrian Bith fr. 55 Roos = FGrH 156 fr. 71; Ps.-Scylax 72; Hecat. fr. 212 apud Steph. Byz. 657. 8. The oikist Phanagoras as is known (Arrian Bith. fr. 55 Roos = FGrH 156 fr. 71)</td>
<td>Village of Sennaya, confirmed by two inscriptions found on site: CIRB 971; Y.G. Vinogradov and M. Wörle in Chiron 22 (1992), 160-61. About 25 ha of the 75 ha site is under the waters of the Taman Gulf.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Sindice/Sindic Harbour/ Gorgippia</td>
<td>Middle-last quarter of 6th century BC</td>
<td>Miletus</td>
<td>Herodotus 4. 8. 6, 4. 28. 1; Strabo 7. 4. 6, 11. 2. 12, 14; Ps.-Scymnus 886-889; Arrian Periplus 18. 4-19. 1; Anon. Periplus 62; Ptolemy Geog. 5. 8. 8; Steph. Byz. s.v.</td>
<td>Large site beneath modern city of Anapa. Part well excavated as a result of rescue excavation. Identification as Sindice/Sindic Harbour is not firm at all. Gorgippia as Anapa is very well documented from 4th century BC.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Tyramba</td>
<td>End of 6th century BC</td>
<td>Ionians?</td>
<td>Strabo 11. 2. 4; Ptolemy Geog. 5. 8. 4</td>
<td>Not far from the town of Temryuk. Identification not firm at all. The local museum holds complete Greek vessels from the Tyramba? necropolis.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

100 Bouzek 2016b: 21.
102 Bouzek 1996a.
103 Bouzek 2016b: 21.
in Thrace as a burial place of a local ruler: the Vetur tomb is a typical example of such a royal tomb. Indeed, it is one of the earliest examples of them, dating to ca. 400 BC. The second phase starts from the beginning of the 4th century. The settlement had Hippodamian planning, stone-paved streets appeared, one of them the main street, stone houses, etc. There are also stone drainage channels. Thus, it indeed looks Greek, populated by Greeks, but detailed study of the material presents a different picture. I have already discussed the question of whether the settlement at Vetur was a thriving emporion in two previous articles. I repeat here what is most striking: the absence of Greek altars or anything to point to the existence of a Greek shrine or temple; whereas there are several typical Thracian clay altars with geometric decoration. It has been claimed that two ‘shrines’ existed at the gate, but are they really shrines or Greek? It is very difficult to know since we still await their publication, proper drawings and details of what material they contained. So far we have only a brief mention. I remain sceptical.

As evidence for an extensive trade relationship and Greek residency let me turn first to the Greek pottery: altogether about 15,000 sherds of Attic pottery have been found, dating from the second half of the 5th-early 4th century BC, among them 12,800 of black-glazed vessels and 2200 of painted ones. This pottery is concentrated primarily in two areas connected to buildings with stone foundations, which may demonstrate where the Greeks were living; in addition, it spreads even outside the fortification walls. There are several pits in which some Greek pottery has been discovered. Other characteristic features of Greek life such as terracottas and lamps are found in limited number, likewise amphorae, and only a handful of amphora-stamps. There are other features indicating

Figure 6. Pistiros inscription (L. Domaradzka).
Figure 7. General plan of the Eastern Gateway area, Emporion Pistiros (J. Bouzek and L. Domaradzka).

Figure 8. Plan of the Eastern Gateway, Emporion Pistiros (J. Bouzek and L. Domaradzka).
that the whole settlement was not populated by Greeks, but I shall not give details here, except to mention the enormous quantity of local pottery that has been discovered. I must underline that I am judging the Pistiros material purely from what has been published.

There are some 250 graffiti on Greek and local potsherds, the vast majority dating from the first half of the 4th century BC and several from the mid/late 5th century. Some hold the opinion that there are a few ‘ostraka’, but the names on them can be interpreted in several ways. There are four, possibly five, inscriptions, including the famous Pistiros inscription itself. These have yielded 24 proper names, of which 17 are of Greek and seven of Thracian origin. It is possible to interpret them in many ways, one of which is that they belong to Greek artisans and others who were living in Adjyska Vodenitsa, as they lived in many other local settlements where their skills were required. One graffito in Greek reads ‘Athenagores salary for a day’. This surely is further evidence that Greeks were employed by local rulers.

Let us turn to coins. One publication gives a number of about 1500; another around 1800. Those minted by Thracian kings are: Amadokos I – 27; Kotys I – 42; Amadokos II – 14; Ksersebleptes – 1; Teres II – 9; and Seuthes III – 3. There are some foreign coins – silver from Parion, the Chersonese, Mesembria and Apollonia Pontica. The overwhelming preponderance is of Macedonian coins, including a hoard of 552, in a clay vessel, dateable to the 280s BC, now published, all from a period in which the area was dominated by Macedonia.

The settlement at Vetren was the site of various productive activities, which is just to be expected in such cases of Greek craftsmen dwelling in a place of royal residence: pottery (kiln for the production of local wares have been found outside the fortification wall), textiles, bronze-working (plaques and fibulae) and possibly terracotta figurines.

What I have presented is just a short overview of the site. I believe that the settlement at Vetren is not Emporion Pistiros but was the seat of a local ruler whose residence was built by the Greeks.

113 See Tsetskhladze 2000; 2011 (with references).
114 L. Domaradzka kindly informed me that there is unpublished material, which I have not seen, in the depot. See also Domaradzka 2005.
view, namely ‘that the city could be a royal residence of the sub-king of the Upper Maritsa valley’. Domaradzki changed his mind, again thanks to the inscription. But nowadays more have come to doubt that Vetren was the thriving Emporion Pistiros of the 4th century BC and several have arrived at the same interpretation that I expressed in my two articles. I give just one example:

In his article, however, G. Tsetskhladze disputes the identification, in my opinion persuasively. The archaeological remains indicate that Vetren was a non-Greek community, whereas the inscription shows that Pistiros was a mixed settlement with a strong element of Greek settlers among its inhabitants. According to Tsetskhladze, Pistiros has not yet been found.

Previously, the period before 400 BC was not included in the phasing of the Vetren settlement; now it is called Phase I and, indeed, the then settlement is interpreted as the residence of a minor king. A big question is what happened after 400 BC, and why Vetren ceased to be such a residence. Of course, it continued to exist: there is no evidence to demonstrate otherwise.

Royal residences were nothing new for Thrace: Seuthopolis, Kabyle and a few others looked very much like Greek poleis and contained inscriptions in Greek. The same can be said about the Greek-type fortified Getic capital at Sboryanovo in north-eastern Bulgaria: its necropolis was Sveshtari. (Excavation of Sboryanovo revealed Greek pottery including amphorae and amphora-stamps, stone buildings with tiles, etc.) But most striking is Vasil Levski, where not only was Late Archaic Greek pottery found but also a large building constructed with ashlar masonry, as well as Corinthian/Corinthian-type tiles.

A revealing comparison comes from Seuthopolis, the capital city of Seuthes III. It was situated on a readily defensible spur of land on a bend of the River Tundja. This site, unique for Thrace, is now unfortunately submerged by a dam. As the plan reproduced here shows (Fig. 10), it was nearly square and had a fortification system with towers. Among other public places it had an agora. Nobody has ever called this site an emporion, although there is a foundation inscription. Like Vetren, it had regular planning and stone buildings. If Vetren really had an agora (and a colonnade), as we can see from Seuthopolis, this is still no reason to consider Vetren as anything other than the residence of a local king.

For me, Vetren has striking similarities to Ullastret, about 40 km inland, not far from Ampurias in Spain: Ullastret was the residence of a local ruler, it had typically Greek impressive fortifications, all buildings in the settlement were constructed of Greek-type stone masonry and nearly all rooms excavated yielded large numbers of Greek pottery fragments, etc. (Figs. 11-12). Furthermore, there are traces of the production of local pottery, mainly imitating Greek (Fig. 13), metalworking, etc.

126 Domaradzki 1993; cf. Domaradzki 1996a. I was not aware of these publications when writing my 2000 article. Domaradzki is not the only one to change his mind. Z.H. Archibald doubted the identification of Vetren with Pistiros: ‘Vetren, regional centre of the Odrysian kings of the mid-5th until the 2nd centuries B.C. …’ (Archibald 1998: 343; see also Archibald 2002b). Her book appeared after I had given my paper (Tsetskhladze 2000) at the Pistiros conference and submitted it for publication. In Archibald 2004: 895–96, however, she considered Pistiros to have been as a polis, which is stretching the evidence beyond the reasonable (although it had a fortification system, this was erected while the site was the residence of a local king before the supposed Pistiros was established; later it enjoyed regular planning and stone-paved streets, but these cannot be considered as indicators of polis-status; while it did not emit coins, there were no magistrates, and no agora [although one has been suggested, without proper proof, likewise a colonnade – Bouzek 2016c] or public buildings, etc. – which are characteristic and defining features of a polis per Hansen and Nielsen 2004a), and the Vetren settlement and Pistiros to be one and the same.


128 See bibliography in Tsetskhladze 2011: 15, n.6. These other authors were, as far as I know, unaware of my article.


130 About the existence of Thracian minor kings, according to Herodotus (5. 3), the Thracians were the largest people in the world after the Indians, and they had many names, each tribe according to its region. The exact number of these tribes is not known: Strabo 7. fr. 47 (48) gives it as 22, while Pliny the Younger (NH 4. 11. 40) wrote that Thrace was divided into 50 administrative units, and Ploemey (3. 11. 6) that it was divided into 14. Whatever their number, the Thracian tribes formed quite a diverse group and it is rather difficult to identify them archaeologically, especially in the Iron Age. Thus, the later Odrysian kingdom was neither strong nor centralised. Hence, there were many local minor kings and rulers. The manner in which Odrysian kings conducted their affairs is described by Thucydides (2. 97): ‘As for the tribute which came in from the barbarian territory and from all the Hellenic cities over which the Odrysians acquired sway in the time of Seuthes – who, succeeding Sitalces on the throne, brought the revenues to a maximum – its value was about four hundred talents in coin, and was paid in gold and silver; and gifts in equal value to the tribute, not only of gold and silver, but besides all these manner of stuffs, both embroidered and plain, and other articles for household use, were brought as offerings to the King, and not for him only, but also for the subordinate princes and nobles of the Odrysians. For these kings had established a custom which was just the opposite of that prevailing in the kingdom of the Persians, namely, to take rather than to give; indeed it was more disgraceful for a man not to give when asked than to ask and be refused. This custom was observed among the other Thracians also; but the Odrysian kings, as they were powerful, followed it more extensively; indeed it was not possible to accomplish anything without giving gifts’. See also Polybius 4. 45. On Thrace, with a discussion of the major issues and problems, see, for example, Theodosiev 2011 (with exhaustive bibliography). The Getic lands show the same situation as in Thrace (Arami 2011) and other parts of the Black Sea and the Mediterranean (see Zournatzi 2000; Tsetskhladze 2010).

131 Bouzek 2002b; 2005. For the latest on the important Seuthopolis inscription, see Graninger 2018 (with previous bibliography).

132 Stoyanov 2002.

133 Stoyanov 2003.

134 Bouzek 2002b.

135 Dimitrov and Čičíkova 1978.

136 See n. 126. I am not opposed to the presence of an agora and colonnade at Vetren, but I should prefer to see them clearly: a proper drawing rather than a pile of stones in an illustration.

Figure 10. Plan of Seuthopolis
(D.P. Dimitrov and M. Čičikova).

Figure 11. Ullastret. Plan of the settlement
(A. Martín i Ortega).
Another site which might be used for comparison (and has been) is Semibratnee (Labrys) in the Sindian hinterland, known from an inscription. The Greek-type fortifications at this site have been known for a considerable time and it has been interpreted as the residence of the Greek Bosporan king in the land of the local Sindians. A recent publication uses the settlement near Vetren for comparison, suggesting that the fortifications of Labrys were built by architects from Thasos, as is the case with the settlement near Vetren. Those at Semibratnee were erected for the Greek Bosporan king as a result of the gradual Bosporan penetration and ultimate annexation of Sindian territory in the first half of the 4th century BC. The excavator of Semibratnee has compared it with Pistiros and posed the rather strange question: was it an emporion? Certainly the presence of princely tumuli suggests its status as a royal residence. If it were a royal residence, then Greek craftsmen and traders would naturally have settled there, especially since Sindian territory was agriculturally extremely rich. The most recent excavations have clearly demonstrated the strong Greekness of Labrys, with its stone buildings and even a temenos.

---

Figure 12. Ullastret. Fortification walls and stone houses (A. Martí i Ortega).

---

118 SEG XLIII, 515; Graham 2002: 95-99. The inscription was discovered in the territory of Semibratnee in 1985 during ploughing. I shall give the translation from Graham (2002: 97): ‘In accordance with his vow, Leucon, son of Satyrus, archon of Bosporus and Theodosia, set up this statue for Phoebus Apollo-in-Labrys, the guardian of the city of the Labrytans, having driven out by battle and force from the land of the Sindians Octamasades, the son of Hecataeus, king of the Sindians, who, after expelling his father from his ancestral rule, confined (?) him in this city.’

119 The existence of the local Sindian kingdom and coins has long been disputed. For the latest, see Kuznetsov 2018.

140 Goroncharovskii 2009; Bouzek 2009. For the Greek pottery from Semibratnee, see Vdovichenko 2006.

141 Goroncharovskii 2009.

142 There is some disagreement about dating the tumuli. For the latest, see Goroncharovskii 2019.
An attempt has been made at comparing Pitsiros with Elizavetovskoe city-site of the sedentary Scythians on the Don (the ancient Tanais). Most striking here are the existence of a Greek temple on the Acropolis of the Scythian settlement, and a designated quarter in which the Greeks used to live. The Greek presence here declines in the 270s BC. Thus, this city-site demonstrates the penetration of Greek in local settlements, which is quite different from the position at Vetren. Furthermore, Elizavetovskoe city-site has yielded about 235,000 amphorae – indicating revealed a bronze-working workshop and the production of beads. See Kopylov and Kopylov 2019.

Kopylov 2015; Kopylov and Kovalenko 2012. Recent excavations

Figure 13. Pottery from Ullastret imitating mainly Greek shapes (A. Martín i Ortega).
that every year some 1750-1900 amphorae were brought.\footnote{Brashinskii 1980: 92. About the abundant quantity of painted and plain black-glazed pottery, see Brashinskii 1980, passim. See also Kopylov and Marchenko 2017. Fragments of amphorae and amphora-stamps have been found in 197 sites in Getic lands, for example: amphorae from Thasos at 63 locations; from Rhodes at 78; Heraclea Pontica 36; Sinope 29; Cos 14; Cnidus 12; Chios 11; and Chersonesos 4 (Sirbu 1985; Teleaga 2008, passim).}

To move on to another important site, Kamenskoe, in the far hinterland of the northern Black Sea: not only was it the centre of a sedentary Scythian administrative/political entity,\footnote{Like the Thracians, the Scythians were not a monolithic people or culture. The name Scythian is Greek. The Greek sources also give us the names of the different Scythian tribes. Each had its own chief-man’s residence and these were, at the same time, economic and administrative centres of their areas.} it revealed rich remains of bronze- and iron-working. Material excavated from the site strongly suggests that Greek goldsmiths were active here – punches, reject gold objects in Greek style, etc. But the most remarkable aspect is the number of amphora fragments recovered from the settlement and the surrounding area: more than 42,000, which is almost double the number of those of Scythian handmade pottery found here. The amphorae came from Sinope, Heraclea Pontica, Thasos, etc., although it is hard to imagine that they had done so directly; rather, they had reached Kamenskoe through the Greek colonies of the northern Black Sea coast. Furthermore, about 40 4th-century BC coins were found at Kamenskoe, all from a variety of Black Sea Greek colonies and Macedonia, and all in the area identified as the supposed Greek quarter/emporion, which again demonstrates that goods were coming from the Black Sea colonies, not directly from the Mediterranean. To put this in the wider context of the Dnieper delta: from the 4th century BC Greek tableware gradually but almost completely supplanted local handmade tableware in Scythian settlements. In sites that show evidence of the Scythians having become sedentary, amphorae account for 30-40% of all finds; in settlements this rises to 53-60%; and in Kamenskoe, exceptionally, it is 66.3%.\footnote{For new investigations of Kamenskoe city-site and the surrounding area, and study of the economy, including pottery etc., see now Gavrylyuk 1999, passim.}

All local settlements mentioned in this paper were situated on (in ancient times) navigable rivers, along which Greek goods travelled. Before, we thought that they were brought by Greeks, but there is a very strong possibility that locals were also involved. Very interesting evidence comes from Peshchannoe in the Ukraine, 500 km from any Greek city: a boat was discovered, large and simple, made from the trunk of a single oak. The skull of the boatman suggested that he was of Mediterranean origin. In the boat were 15 magnificent Greek gold-plated bronze vessels (amphorae, jugs, dishes, buckets, plates, etc.). A fragment of a boat containing amphorae was found in the Dnieper; many amphorae of the 5th-3rd centuries BC, whole or fragmented, were found nearby between 1971 and 1990. It seems probable that Kamenskoe had its own riverside port area.\footnote{For the latest, Demetriou 2012: 153-87.}

Back to the Pistiros inscription and the site at Vetren: I give the conclusions drawn by M. Tacheva, who was given access to the unpublished material:

As clearly seen from the text of the inscription, Pistiros and its inhabitants are mentioned separately from the emporia and the emporitai, and the provisions do not confirm the earlier view that Pistiros was an emporion. Insofar as other archaeological proof is missing, the settlement discovered near the village of Vetren can be identified for the time being with the inscription found near it, i.e. it would be more correct to call it ‘the inscription about Pistiros’....

In my opinion, the reason [why the settlement at Vetren is not rich in numismatic evidence] should be sought in the character of the settlement until the mid-4th century BC. The limited numismatic complex in the settlement with the tower (tyrsis) near Vetren, as well as its strategic location, suggest a fortified royal residence in the system of the Odrysian administrative and political organisation ....

As we can see, she has independently come to the same view as me: she was unaware of my 2000 article.\footnote{Tsetskhladze 1998b: 65 (with references).}

If we think of an emporion as a trading place, then logically it had it be trading with somebody. Royal settlements, of course, were emporia for the surrounding locals. The same can be said about poleis in the colonial world: locals used to come from afar for trade and to exchange goods. As I have tried to demonstrate, within such residences, be they around the Black Sea or the Mediterranean, there were Greek craftsmen, merchants, etc. serving the kings there resident. We also know that Soutopolis, Ullastret and several other places look very Greek. This is because the resident rulers employed those Greek craftsmen to create their own royal art. This does not mean that the rulers became Greek: the architecture (in our case) was just a means of underlining their status and wealth. To conclude: as before, I consider Vetren to have been another such residence of a local king who made use of Greek architects, etc.

Indeed, the interpretation of the inscription about Pistiros, which is not the site at Vetren at all and which awaits discovery not far from where the inscription was found, is very difficult.\footnote{Tacheva 2007: 591-92.}

\footnote{Tsetskhladze 2000.}
Pistiros is not explicitly called an *emporion*, but from the term *emporitai* and the reference to other emporia in the neighbourhood (lines 22-24) it seems safe to infer that the place was an *emporion*, an inference supported by Stephanus of Byzantium’s note: ‘Pivstiro’, *etymovrion Qravkh*” (524. 11).\(^{154}\)

The *emporion* of Pistics was an inland trading station, originally founded by merchants coming from the *polis* of Pistics, a dependency of Thasos situated on the Thracian coast (Herodotus 7. 109).\(^ {155}\)

It is, of course, possible to suggest different explanations which fit the information provided by the new inscription. Yet I note that, according to the above reconstruction, Pistics seems to have been organised more or less like Naukratis: both were Greek urban settlements surrounded by an indigenous population and under the suzerainty of a non-Greek king; they were organised partly as a dependent *polis* of respectively Pistireni and Naukratinai, and partly as an *emporion* inhabited by citizens from a number of other Greek *poleis* and, to some extent, with their own separate institutions. Loukopoulou (1999: 366-68) makes the same comparison, but does not share my view that Pistics and Naukratis were *poleis* as well as *emporia*.\(^ {156}\)

To sum up:

In Pistics, a multi-ethnic emporion situated in a non-Greek land, the close encounters among different Greek groups and between Greeks and Thracians also led to the expression of several levels of collective identities: Greeks identified in terms of their *polis* of origin in relation to other Greeks, they had a strong political identity as Pistireni vis-à-vis the other Greek communities in the Thassian *perai*; and they probably also saw themselves as Greeks when encountering Thracians; the Thracians, on the other hand, adopted Greek perceptions of themselves and thus distinguished among the various Greek groups and even called themselves Thracians, rather than specifying their intra-Thracian group.\(^ {157}\)

In the western Black Sea, thegetic lands contain most interesting sites such as Albeşti, in the hinterland of Tomis. It had a mixed local-Greek population. It is square, defended by stone fortifications, and all buildings are constructed of stone and roofed in tile. Many materials unearthed here (even a few fragments of Colchian amphorae) demonstrate that it was a very active trading settlement. Furthermore, it was also a production centre for pottery, metalworking, etc.\(^ {158}\)

I have mentioned trade many times throughout this paper. It is essential to know what was traded (exports and imports), especially between the Mediterranean and the Black Sea colonies, between those colonies and the political and economic centres of the local population, and finally thence to the peoples of those areas. I have already remarked on the discovery in local settlements of Greek pottery, including amphorae, and other objects. These could not have been exported directly from the Mediterranean; rather, they arrived via the Greek colonies around the Black Sea.\(^ {159}\) The best information was have is that given by Polybius (4. 38. 4-6):

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 around the Pontus, while among luxuries, the same countries furnish us with an abundance of honey, wax and preserved fish; from the surplus of our countries they take olive oil and every kind of wine. As for grain, there is give-and-take – with them sometimes supplying us when we require it and sometimes importing it from us.

It is obvious that the composition of imports and exports was changing all the time. The most disputed questions concern the grain\(^ {160}\) and slave\(^ {161}\) trades.

The Colchian Black Sea coast

We should now turn to the eastern Black Sea littoral, known in antiquity as Colchis (Fig. 14). Here the earliest Greek tableware and amphorae discovered in native sites helps to suggest the establishment dates of the Colchian Greek colonies, in contrast to the northern Black Sea. These were Phasis, Gyenos and Dioscurias – a few smaller Greek settlements were founded much later than these cities. We have practically no archaeological evidence for these colonies. Phasis has never been located, mainly because the coastal area was marsh/wetland, in antiquity (information from Ps.-Hippocrates *Airs, Waters, Places* 15)\(^ {162}\) as it is

\(^{154}\) Hansen 2006: 20.

\(^{155}\) Hansen 2006: 22.

\(^{156}\) Hansen 2006: 22-23.

\(^{157}\) Demetriou 2012: 186.

\(^{158}\) Rădulescu et al. 2002; Buzoianu and Bărbulescu 2008.

\(^{159}\) Tsetskhladze 2013.

\(^{160}\) Tsetskhladze 2008a (with previous literature).

\(^{161}\) Tsetskhladze 2008b (with previous literature).

\(^{162}\) “Concerning those in Phasis, the land is marshy, hot, humid and wooded. In every season the rains here are frequent and heavy. Here men live in the marshes. The dwellings are of wood and reed, constructed in the water. They seldom go on foot in the *polis* and the *emporium*, but canoe up and down in dug-outs, for there are many canals. The water they drink is hot and stagnant, corrupted by the sun and swollen by the rains. The Phasis itself is the most stagnant of rivers and flows most sluggishly. And all the crops which grow here are bad, of poor quality and without taste, on account of the excess of water. Consequently they do not ripen. Much mist enshrouds the land, owing to the water. And for the same reason the Phasians have an appearance different from that of other men. As to size, they are large and corpulent in body. Neither joint nor vein is evident. They have a yellow flesh, as if victims of jaundice. Their voices are deeper than other men’s: the air they breathe is not clear, but humid and
G.R. Tsetskhladze: Once again about the Establishment Date of Some Greek Colonies

The establishment of Greek colonies is a complex matter. What ancient written sources we have date murky. As to physical labour, they have a rather idle nature. The seasons do not vary much, either in heat or in cold. The winds are mostly moist, except one breeze peculiar to the country, called kenkhrn, which sometimes blows strong, violent and hot. The north wind makes little impact, and when it blows it is weak and feeble.' See now Licheli 2016.

In the 1930s and since, drainage of the wetlands has been undertaken for agricultural purposes, but some marshland still exists (Licheli 2016).

Figure 14. Map of Colchis showing major sites (not to scale) (author’s map).
Figure 15. A Colchian settlement according to Ps.-Hippocrates. Reconstruction. I. Plan of excavated man-made hill; II. Section (G. Lezhava).
No. | Site | Region | Greek Pottery | Date          |
---- |------ |-------- |--------------- |--------------|
1.  | Batumis Tsikhe/Batumis (Batus?) | South-west Colchis | 1. Fragments of banded oinochoe and 32 of East Greek pottery 2. A few fragments of Chian banded amphora | End of 7th-first half of 6th century BC End of 7th-first half of 6th century BC |
2(?). | Pichvnari | South-west Colchis | Fragment of Ionian kylix, known only from publication | Allegedly first half of 6th century BC |
3.  | Petra Fortress/Tsikhisdziri | South-west Colchis | Fragments of ‘Ionian pottery’ | First half of 6th century BC (known to me from literature) |
5.  | Vani | Central Colchis | Fragment of Chian chalice-style bowl | First half of 6th century BC |
6.  | Chognari (12 km from Kutaisi) | Central Colchis | Fragment of rosette bowl | First half of 6th century BC |
7.  | Krasnyi Mayak (next to Sukhum/Dioscurias) | North-west Colchis | ‘Fragments of a Greek vessel’ found in the 1930s, since lost | ‘End of 7th century BC’ |
9.  | Merkheuli (not far from Dioscurias) | North-west Colchis | Some fragments of closed vessel, North Ionian Late Wild Goat | Beginning/first third of 6th century BC |
10. | Ochamchira (Gyenos) | North-west Colchis | Fragments of Chian amphorae and of Ionian pottery | First half of 6th century BC |
11. | Vereshchagin Hill (not far from Dioscurias) | North-west Colchis | 8 fragments of East Greek pottery | First half of 6th century BC |

Table 5. Earliest Greek pottery in Colchis.

former, marshy in the latter. From the beginning, Greeks had friendly relationships with the surrounding local populations and much Greek pottery was found in the residences of the local chief-men: indeed, at Ullastret, Greek architects built fortification walls, which is also the case at Heuneburg, where, again, a large quantity of Greek pottery was discovered. In Colchis, echoing local practice, colonies were built on artificial hills. At Chersonesos in the Crimea, set amidst rocky surroundings, the Greek population cut pits in the rocky territory of the near *chora*, filled them with earth, and planted vine and fruit trees.

Thus, based on consideration of the earliest Greek pottery at native sites in Colchis (Table 5), we can suggest that Phasis was established in ca. 600-570 BC, Gyenos within the same date range and Dioscurias in ca. 610-570. The latter seems to have been the earliest Greek settlement in the eastern Black Sea. Batumis Tsikhe, on the outskirts of the modern city of Batumi (Table 5.1), has yielded very interesting evidence: 32 pottery fragments dated to the end of the 7th-first half of the 6th century BC, far outnumbering those from all other Colchian settlements combined. It is obvious that some Greek settlement existed not far from it, perhaps at a location now beneath Batumi. No archaeological material is known from Batumi itself (except for a stamped Heraclean amphora); the modern city has overbuilt the area, a considerable amount of land has been reclaimed from the sea, and the marshy land towards the airport has been drained, part laid out as a park, and new buildings erected on the rest.

Batumi has been identified, on the basis of a mention in the *Tabula Peutingeriana* (10), as the Roman 'Pontus Altus'. It has been suggested that Batumi/Batumis Tsikhe, which was on a small hill not far from the coast and next to the river, was called in Greek Βάθυς, based on the expression ίδια kalouvmena Baqu;ς found

---

164 Tsetskhladze 2014 (with bibliography).
167 Kimmig 2000; Rolley 2003; Kurz 2007; etc.
168 For details, see Tsetskhladze 2018b: 512.
in Aristotle’s *Meteorology* (350 A: 4351 A). Furthermore, the name of the River Batis in the south-western part of the Black Sea region is mentioned by Pliny (*NH* 6. 12), Adrian ($^7$) and in the Anonymous *Periplus* ($^2$). The geographical situation of Batis described in the works of ancient authors and the present location of Batumis Tsikhe/Batumi provide some basis for such an assumption.$^{169}$ In other words, Βαθὺς is held to be the Greek name for the modern city of Batumis/Tatumis Tsikhe, Roman Portus Altus.$^{170}$ It is highly probable that another early colony existed: Batus, with an establishment date approximately the same as that of Dioscurias.

The situation in Colchis regarding the establishment of Greek colonies was, therefore, like that in other parts of the Black Sea. They were founded half a century (or more) earlier than had been thought previously, i.e. the middle of the 6th century BC. Dioscurias (and probably Batus) fits very well in date with the earliest Greek colonies on the other shores of the Black Sea. Thus we can no longer accept that the Greek colonisation on Colchis took place later than in the rest of the Pontus. What is clear, however, is how differently the earliest Greek pottery in the northern and eastern Black Sea can be used and interpreted: in the north its presence accords with Greek settlement; in the east it helps to date it.

**Conclusions**

The evidence once again presented here demonstrates, however, the unsustainability of criticism of my publications by Schlotzhauer and Zhuravlev. At the same time, my present piece brings together in these tables, especially Table 6, what we have for the establishment of the major Greek colonies of the Black Sea littoral.

We should remember that finding Greek pottery$^{171}$ in local settlements does not always betoken a trade relationship or direct contacts between the locals and the Mediterranean world. The pottery could arrive for different reasons, and it might have been carried not only by Greeks but by locals too.$^{172}$ We are facing here a very familiar problem: pots and people.$^{173}$ A key question is whether trade followed the flag or vice versa. Logically, I believe the former.$^{174}$

---

$^{169}$ Batumis Tsikhe is situated on a natural hill. As numerous finds of local pottery here demonstrate, it was the residence of a local chief-man.


### Table 6. Main Archaic Greek colonies and settlements in the Black Sea.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Settlement</th>
<th>Mother city/cities</th>
<th>Literary dates for foundation</th>
<th>References in ancient authors</th>
<th>Foundation dates according to earliest pottery</th>
<th>Earlier local population</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amisos</td>
<td>Miletus (and Phocaea)</td>
<td>End of 7th-beginning of 6th century BC</td>
<td>Ps.-Scymnus 957, 961-962; Strabo 12. 1. 3; Theopompos fr. 389 apud Strabo 12. 3. 14; Hecataeus fr. 199 apud Strabo 12. 3. 25; Ephor. fr. 162. 12; etc.</td>
<td>ca. 600-575 BC</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Beneath modern Samsun. Rescue excavations in the city’s suburbs revealed pottery and other material of the 6th century BC.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apollonia Pontica</td>
<td>Miletus</td>
<td>ca. 610 BC</td>
<td>Ps.-Scymnus 730-733; Steph. Byz 96. 2-4, 160. 2; Aelianus <em>Var. Historia</em> 3. 17; etc.</td>
<td>Late 7th century BC</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Beneath modern Sozopol. Only rescue excavations are possible. Necropoleis of the Classical and Hellenistic periods are situated on the beach, which may indicate that the Archaic necropolis is already underwater.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Batus (Batumi/ Batumis Tsikhe)</td>
<td>Miletus</td>
<td>End of 7th-first half of 6th century BC (610-570 BC)</td>
<td>Aristotle <em>Met.</em> 350 A, 435. 1A; Pliny <em>NH</em> 6. 12; <em>Tabula Peutingeriana</em> 10; Arrian <em>Periplus</em> 7, Anon. <em>Periplus</em> 2</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Batus/Batumi is overbuilt by the modern city of Batumi. The only archaeological material is a stamped Heraclean amphora from the marshes. Batumis Tsikhe, situated on a hill next to the river, is the site of a restaurant. Only small-scale rescue excavation has been possible.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

$^{171}$ Pottery was much cheaper than metal vessels. At the same time, it is more important to archaeologists for dating etc. than it was to the ancient peoples who made and used it (Bouzek 1990).

$^{172}$ For details, with bibliography, see Tsetskhladze 2013.

$^{173}$ For discussion, see Boardman 2002; Hall 2007: 106-10; Gates 2001: 44-45, etc.

$^{174}$ For discussion, see Tsetskhladze and Hargrave 2011.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Settlement</th>
<th>Mother city/ cities</th>
<th>Literary dates for foundation</th>
<th>References in ancient authors</th>
<th>Foundation dates according to earliest pottery</th>
<th>Earlier local population</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Berezan/ Borysthenes</td>
<td>Miletus</td>
<td>647 BC</td>
<td>Eusebius <em>Chron.</em> 95b; Herodotus 4. 17-18, 24</td>
<td>Last quarter of 7th century BC</td>
<td>Not until end of the 6th/start of the 5th century BC</td>
<td>Peninsular in antiquity; now an island. From Classical period an emporion of Olbia.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Callatis</td>
<td>Heraclea Pontica</td>
<td>Late 6th century BC. Re-foundation by Heraclea Pontica in late 5th century. Initial coloniser unknown</td>
<td>Ps.-Scymnus fr. 4; Strabo 7. 6. 1; Menmon <em>FGrH</em> 434 fr. 13 (21); Pompon. 2. 2. 22; Arrian <em>Anabasis</em> 6. 23. 5; Diodorus 19. 73. 1, 20. 25.1; etc.</td>
<td>4th century BC</td>
<td>Yes? Overbuilt.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chersonesos Taurica</td>
<td>Heraclea Pontica</td>
<td>422/1 BC</td>
<td>Ps.-Scylax 68; Ps.-Scymnus 822-830; etc.</td>
<td>525-500 BC</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>525-500 BC was given by M. Zolotariev and Y.G. Vinogradov. New study of the material on which they based their conclusion demonstrates a date of middle/second half of 5th century BC.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dioscurias</td>
<td>Miletus</td>
<td>Ps.-Scylax 81; Strabo 1. 3. 2, 11. 2. 12, 16, 19; Arrian <em>Periplus</em> 10. 4; Steph. Byz. 233. 15; Pliny <em>NH</em> 6. 15-16; App. <em>Mithr.</em> 101; etc.</td>
<td>Late 7th century BC/early or first third of 6th century Greek pottery (local inland settlements) (610-570 BC)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Identified with modern-day Sukhum(I). Archaic and Classical period city is most probably under the Black Sea; Hellenistic and Roman period under modern city.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gyenos</td>
<td>Miletus</td>
<td>Ps.-Scylax 81; Pompon. 1. 110</td>
<td>First half of 6th century BC (600-570 BC)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Situated on man-made hills, surrounded by marshes and wetland. Only small-scale rescue excavation was possible.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heraclea Pontica</td>
<td>Megara and Boeotians</td>
<td>554 BC</td>
<td>Ps.-Scymnus 1016-1019; Strabo 12. 3. 4; Pausanias 5. 26. 7; Ap. Rhod. 2. 841-850; Ephor. fr. 44b; Xen. <em>Anabasis</em> 5. 6, 10, 19; 6. 2. 1, 18-19; 6. 4. 23; Thucydides 4. 75. 2; Aen. Tact. 12. 5; Ps.-Scylax 91; etc.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Mostly under modern town of Eregli. Part submerged.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hermonassa</td>
<td>Miletus and Mytilene</td>
<td>Arrian <em>Bith</em> fr. 55 Roos <em>FGrH</em> 156 fr. 71; Steph. Byz. 278. 10-12; Eustathius <em>Comm.</em> 549 = <em>GGM</em> II 324; Hecataeus <em>FGrH</em> 1 fr. 208; Ps.-Scymnus 886-891; etc. Name derives from the wife of the oikist after he had died (Arrian Bith. fr. 55 Roos = <em>FGrH</em> 156 fr. 71)</td>
<td>575-550 BC</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Village of Taman, but no firm evidence found. Much of site washed away by the waters of the Taman Gulf. More is lost each year.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6. Continued.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Settlement</th>
<th>Mother city/cities</th>
<th>Literary dates for foundation</th>
<th>References in ancient authors</th>
<th>Foundation dates according to earliest pottery</th>
<th>Earlier local population</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Histria</td>
<td>Miletus</td>
<td>657 BC</td>
<td>Eusebius Chron. 95b; Herodotus 2. 33; Ps.-Scyrmnus fr. 6; Aristoteles Politics 1305b-6; Diodorus 19. 73. 2; etc.</td>
<td>ca. 633-630 BC</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Not overbuilt in modern times.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kepoi</td>
<td>Miletus</td>
<td>Mid-6th century BC</td>
<td>Ps.-Scyrmnus 899; Pliny NH 6. 18; Strabo 11. 2. 10; Ps.-Scylax 72; etc.</td>
<td>580-560 BC</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>3 km north-east of Phanagoria. Identification not firm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mesembria</td>
<td>Megara, Byzantium, Chalcedon</td>
<td>493 BC</td>
<td>Herodotus 4. 93; 6. 33; Ps.-Scylax 67; Strabo 7. 6. 1; Ps.-Scyrmnus 739-742; Anon. Periplus 83-84; etc.</td>
<td>ca. 500 BC</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>In antiquity on a peninsula; now an island. Most of ancient city is under modern one. Only rescue excavation possible. Part of Hellenistic, Roman and Byzantine fortification with gate survives very well</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myrmekion</td>
<td>(Miletus or) Panticapaeum</td>
<td>Middle-second half of 6th century BC</td>
<td>Ps.-Scylax 68; Strabo 7. 4. 5, 11. 2. 16; Steph. Byz. 464, 1; etc.</td>
<td>575-550 BC</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Panticapaeum may have established other cities: Tyritake and Porthmeus.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nymphaeum</td>
<td>Miletus</td>
<td>Middle of 6th century BC</td>
<td>Ps.-Scylax 68; Ktretos FGrH 242 fr. 8; Aeschin. 3. 171; Strabo 7. 4. 4; etc.</td>
<td>580-570 BC</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Odessos</td>
<td>Miletus</td>
<td>585-539 BC</td>
<td>Ps.-Scyrmnus fr. 1; Strabo 7. 6. 1; Pliny NH 4. 11. 45; Ps.-Scylax 67; Diodorus 19. 73. 3. 20. 112. 2; Hippoc. Periplus 50; Diodorus 12. 31. 1; Ephor. fr. 158; etc.</td>
<td>ca. 560 BC</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Beneath modern-day Varna. Roman and Byzantine remains survive well.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olbia/ Borysthenites</td>
<td>Miletus</td>
<td></td>
<td>Herodotus 4. 21. 3. 4. 24. 1. 4. 78. 3. 4. 78. 5. 4. 79. 5; Strabo 7. 3. 17; Ps.-Scyrmnus fr. 10; Steph. Byz. 176. 14-16; etc.</td>
<td>620/610-590 BC</td>
<td>Not until end of the 6th/ start of the 5th century BC</td>
<td>Not overbuilt. Some parts are underwater.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orgame</td>
<td>Miletus or secondary colony of Histria. More and more evidence demonstrates that it was an independent foundation of Ionians.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Steph. Byz. 494. 16; etc.</td>
<td>Second half of the 7th century BC (Middle Wild Goat style ware)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Urban remains of 6th-4th centuries BC are poor as early levels destroyed by Late Roman citadel. Tumular cemetery produced remains from 7th-4th centuries.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panticapaeum</td>
<td>Miletus</td>
<td>Beginning of 6th century BC</td>
<td>Strabo 7. 4. 4. 11. 2. 10; Pliny NH 4. 26. 86; Ammianus Marcellinus 22. 8. 36; Ps.-Scylax 68; Herodotus 4. 20. 1; Anon. Periplus 50; Diodorus 12. 31. 1; Ephor. fr. 158; etc.</td>
<td>575-550 BC</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Some pottery dates from the end of 7th-beginning of 6th century BC. Established three secondary colonies (see Myrmekion).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patraeus</td>
<td>Miletus?</td>
<td></td>
<td>Strabo 11. 2. 8; Steph. Byz. s.v.; etc.</td>
<td>Middle of 6th century BC</td>
<td></td>
<td>Village of Garkusha. Identification not firm. Large part is under the Taman Gulf.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6. Continued.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Settlement</th>
<th>Mother city/cities</th>
<th>Literary dates for foundation</th>
<th>References in ancient authors</th>
<th>Foundation dates according to earliest pottery</th>
<th>Earlier local population</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Phanagoria</td>
<td>Teos</td>
<td>ca. 545/542 BC</td>
<td>Ps.-Scy whole 886-889; Dionysius Periegetes vv. 549-551; Strabo 11. 2. 10; Arrian <em>Bith</em> fr. 55 Roos = <em>FGrH</em> 156 fr. 71; Ps.-Scylax 72; Hecataeus fr. 212 apud Steph. Byz. 657. 8; etc. The oikist Phanagoras is known (Arrian <em>Bith</em>. fr. 55 Roos = <em>FGrH</em> 156 fr. 71)</td>
<td>ca. 542 BC</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Village of Sennaya, confirmed by two inscriptions found on site: CIRB 971; Y.G. Vinogradov and M. Wörmler in <em>Chiron</em> 22 (1992), 160-61. About 25 ha of 75 ha site is under the waters of the Taman Gulf.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phasis</td>
<td>Miletus</td>
<td>Ps.-Scylax 81; Strabo 11. 2. 17, 12. 3. 17; Herodotus 4. 86. 2; Heracl. Lemb. 46; Pompon. 1. 108; Steph. Byz. 661. 1; Arrian <em>Periplus</em> 9; Hippoc. <em>Acr.</em> 15; etc.</td>
<td>First half of 6th century BC (600-570 BC)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Not located. Pottery comes from surrounding settlements of the local population, especially Simagre.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sindice/Sindic Harbour/Gorgippia</td>
<td>Miletus</td>
<td>Herodotus 4. 8. 6. 4. 28. 1; Strabo 7. 4. 6. 11. 2. 12; 14; Ps.-Scy whole 886-889; Ps.-Scylax 72; Arrian <em>Periplus</em> 18. 4-19. 1; Anon. <em>Periplus</em> 62; Ptolemy <em>Geoq.</em> 5. 8. 8; Steph. Byz. s.v; etc.</td>
<td>Middle-last quarter of 6th century BC</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Large site beneath modern city of Anapa. Very well excavated as a result of rescue excavation. Identification as Sindice/Sindic Harbour is not firm at all. Gorgippia as Anapa is very well documented from 4th century BC.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sinope</td>
<td>Miletus</td>
<td>1 pre-657 BC 2 631/30 BC</td>
<td>Ps.-Scy whole 981-997; Eumelus <em>FGrH</em> 451; Herodotus 1. 76. 1. 4. 12. 2; <em>Xen. Anabasis</em> 4. 8. 22. 5. 5. 7-8. 13. 23; Ps.-Scylax 89; Aen. <em>Tact.</em> 40. 4; Strabo 12. 3. 10-11; Plutarch <em>Luc.</em> 23; Plutarch <em>Per.</em> 20; <em>Diodorus</em> 14. 31. 2; <em>Polybius</em> 4. 56; etc.</td>
<td>Last third of 7th century BC</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Situated under modern Sinop. Established three secondary colonies: Trapezus, Kottyra and Cerasus. Secondary colonies paid tribute to Sinope.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taganrog settlement</td>
<td>Miletus?</td>
<td>Last quarter/ end of 7th century BC (32 pieces of pottery of this date)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Settlement completely submerged by Sea of Azov. Large amount of pottery washed up on sea shore.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theodosia</td>
<td>Miletus</td>
<td>550-500 BC</td>
<td>Ps.-Scylax 68; Strabo 7. 4. 4. 6; Arrian <em>Periplus</em> 19. 3; Anon. <em>Periplus</em> 51, 77; <em>Dem.</em> 20. 33</td>
<td>580-570 BC</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Overbuilt.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tienion/Tios</td>
<td>Miletus (and Phocaea)</td>
<td>Late 7th-beginning of 6th century BC</td>
<td>Strabo 12. 3. 5. 10; Ps.-Scylax 90; Pompon. 1. 104; Ps.-Scy whole 1005; Memnon <em>FGrH</em> 434; Steph. Byz. 624. 20-23; etc.</td>
<td>Four pieces of East Greek pottery dating from the end of 7th-early 6th century BC</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Only one of the southern Black Sea colonies not overbuilt, but most of land is in private hands. Acropolis revealed Greek pottery, early and from later periods. Excavated for the last 10 years.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toricos</td>
<td>Miletus</td>
<td>Ps.-Scylax 74</td>
<td>Second half of 6th century BC</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Not far from city of Gelendzlik. Identification not firm.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6. Continued.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Settlement</th>
<th>Mother city/cities</th>
<th>Literary dates for foundation</th>
<th>References in ancient authors</th>
<th>Foundation dates according to earliest pottery</th>
<th>Earlier local population</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trapezus</td>
<td>Sinope</td>
<td>557/6 BC</td>
<td>Eusebius Chron. 95b; Xen. Anabasis 4. 8. 22-23, 5. 1. 11, 5. 4. 1-2, 5. 5. 15; Ps.-Scylax 85; etc.</td>
<td>No archaeological excavation or material exist</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Paid tribute to Sinope (like other two sub-colonies).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tyramba</td>
<td>Ionian?</td>
<td>Strabo 11. 2. 4; Ptolemy Geog. 5. 8. 4; etc.</td>
<td>End of 6th century BC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Not far from the town of Temryuk. Identification not firm at all.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tyras</td>
<td>Miletus</td>
<td>Mid-6th century BC</td>
<td>Ps.-Scymnus fr. 9, 799-800; Steph. Byz. 622. 4-5, 642; 7-8; Alex. Polyh. fr. 138 (FGrH 273); Anon. Periplus 62; Ptolemy Geog. 3. 10. 7-8; Ps.-Scylax 68; Strabo 7. 3. 16; Pliny NH 4. 12(26). 82; etc.</td>
<td>Second half of 6th century BC</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6. Continued.
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