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First of all, may I express my gratitude to all the participants in the Constanța Congress for presenting papers (oral and poster). The Proceedings have been a challenge to assemble thanks to the sheer quantity of papers. Let me thank all those participants who have provided papers for publication. The editing of contributions to achieve (it is hoped) a high degree of consistency takes time, bearing in mind the need to unify styles, check footnotes and bibliographies, seek clarifications from authors and to make suggestions for the improvement of particular papers, etc. My co-editors deserve thanks for shouldering a large burden. We are sincerely grateful to David Davison, Rajka Makjanić and their colleagues at Archaeopress for agreeing to publish these Proceedings, for their technical help and their speedy production of the printed volume. It was a great pleasure that David Davison was able to attend in person and display a selection of Archaeopress’s publications.

Much hard work goes on behind the scenes, both before and during the Congress. Thanks are due and most willingly given for their assistance, participation and support to Dr Traian Cliante (the then Director of the Museum of National History and Archaeology at Constanța), Dr Irina Sodoleanu (from the Museum, who cheerfully bore day-to-day responsibility for events in Constanța), Prof. Mircea Dumitru (Rector of the University of Bucharest, who provided a stimulating defence of a Liberal Arts education during the opening proceedings), Prof. Vlad Nistor (President of the Senate of the University from Bucharest), Assoc. Prof. Emanuel Plopeanu (Dean of the Faculty of History and Political Sciences of Ovidius University in Constanța, which played host to the congress) and Dr Mircea Angelescu (Ministry of Culture and Archaeological Institute at Bucharest). In this regard, I should also like to thank my co-editors Prof. Alexandru Avram and Dr James Hargrave (both of whom read papers on behalf of absent colleagues and helped in numerous other ways), to the teams of student helpers from Ovidius University, and to the representatives of Expolitoral Turism (who organised accommodation and excursions).

Although the volume contains contributions in French and German, English predominates, thus various English-language typographical practices have been employed throughout. I hope that the authors of papers in other languages will show their forbearance.

The appendices contain the programme and the abstracts submitted. Inevitably, there are minor differences between some of the titles given there and those of the final version of the papers published in the body of the volume, just as some of those who sent abstracts were ultimately unable to attend, and some of those who attended and gave papers did not submit them for publication in this volume. The published papers have been arranged to accord with the Congress sessions, giving some structure to this large volume and easing cross-referencing with Appendix 1; the abstracts in Appendix 2 are strictly alphabetical by principal author.

Gocha R. Tsetskhladze
Message from the President of the International Organising Committee

It would be fair to say that the virtual explosion of interest in Black Sea studies which scholars have enjoyed over the last generation owes much if not everything to the series of conferences and many publications inspired by the organisation which brings you together here today, and notably to Gocha Tsetskhladze, whose foresight and tireless energy have ensured that knowledge of the archaeology of Black Sea countries and their neighbours is as well documented as most in the classical world and outside it. And to this he has added the remarkable journal, *Ancient West and East*, which is by now a worldwide treasure for its articles and reviews, as well as the *Colloquia*.

My first visit to Romania was many years ago, under a different regime. It was a magnificent opportunity to travel the country and its archaeological sites in the company of Sir Ian Richmond and local scholars. Then, and in later visits to conferences, we were regaled with scholarly papers on archaeology and visits to memorable sites. It certainly expanded and concentrated my knowledge of the area and must have done the same for many scholars. Archaeology today has learned not to be too parochial, and we learn both from what has been found in distant places and from the techniques of scholarship that have been employed to publish and explain them. At last we view Eurasia as an entity and can see what the steppes and the East have contributed to European civilisation and what we fondly call Classical culture. By now neither Scotland nor China seem totally irrelevant, and the Black Sea is an important pivot. Yet the old disciplines are still important – classification by style or subject, accurate reproduction by whatever means of appearance – scientific analysis. The computer age has added possibilities of universal record undreamed of in earlier years, but also, by its very richness, the possibility of confusion. Most of all, ease of travel (though times are difficult today) has opened the world to personal inspection.

Unfortunately I cannot be with you today, but can envy you the possibility of renewing friendships, making new ones, and enjoying together the satisfaction that sharing knowledge, proposing new solutions, and the many other advances in scholarship always bring.

Personally, I am deeply honoured by finding that this Congress has been dedicated to me. I am indebted to you all.

John Boardman
It is a great pleasure to see that we are still meeting, now 20 years since the first of these congresses.

It was in 1995, during my first visit to Bucharest, that in discussion with Prof. A. Avram, with whom I was staying (we had corresponded but hitherto not met), conversation turned to the possibility of organising some event in which all Black Sea scholars from West and East could participate. These discussions continued the following day in the office of the late Prof. P. Alexandrescu, Director of the Institute of Archaeology of the Romanian Academy of Sciences in Bucharest. The idea of holding a Black Sea congress, or Pontic congress as it was first called, was born there.

I shared this idea with Prof. Sir John Boardman upon my return to Britain. He showed a keen interest and promised to support it in any way he could. Moreover, he willingly agreed to become President of the International Organising Committee. Step by step prominent Black Sea scholars from West and East supported the idea and joined the committee.

Of course, we wanted to hold the first congress in Romania, but circumstances did not permit it. Instead, at the suggestion of the late Prof. A. Fol and through his enormous help and energy, it took place in 1997 in Varna, Bulgaria. The enthusiastic response of the many people who attended that congress suggested that we should hold more: the committee met and decided that future congresses should be held every four years, each in a different country. Archaeopress in Oxford agree to publish the volumes of proceedings.

I am sure that many believed that the first congress would be the last. Even I had my doubts. But four years later we met again in Ankara, then in 2005 in Prague, 2009 in Istanbul and 2013 in Belgrade.

I hope that we shall be able to come together to celebrate 40 years of the congress, not a mere 20. In those 20 years we have lost several Black Sea colleagues who were members of the initial committee and instrumental in getting the congress off the ground: first of all, Prof. Alexandrescu, then Prof. Fol, without whom the idea would have been stillborn; and Dr M. Lazarov, Dr J. Hind, Prof. H. Heinen, Prof. A. Wasowicz and Prof. O. Lordkipanidze (and latterly Prof. J. Bouzek, in October 2020). They were not just fine scholars but caring individuals. We all are very grateful to them.

With the present congress we are celebrating not only 20 years, and finally holding it in Romania, but the 90th birthday of our President, Prof. Sir John Boardman. Unfortunately, he cannot be present. Sir John was one of the first Western Classical scholars to visit Eastern Europe in the 1950s, leading to a number of friendships with scholars, especially Prof. Alexandrescu and people at the Hermitage. He contributed a survey of 'Greek Archaeology on the Shore of the Black Sea' to *Archaeological Reports for 1962–63*. No words of gratitude are sufficient to express our debt for his help. As with all new projects, the road was sometimes rocky. His support was strong and his advice unfailingly wise.

We chose the subject of this conference deliberately to be the same as the that of the first, enabling us to focus on what has happened in the years since Varna, and to see what positive input the existence of this series of congresses has made.

It is my great pleasure to welcome all of you to our sixth congress. I wish you a successful time, and a pleasant stay in our host city, beautiful Constanța.

Gocha R. Tsetskhladze
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Opening Lectures
With this congress we celebrate 20 years since the first was held (in Varna in 1997). Thus it seems appropriate to glance at the state of Black Sea studies in the West. Often, when I meet colleagues and students, I am told that while the Black Sea is a very important area for their studies because of the wealth of material it provides, the language barrier is a great hindrance: everything is published in Russian.1 Would remark that only Russian colleagues publish in Russian: Bulgarian colleagues publish in Bulgarian, Romanians in Romanian, Ukrainians in Ukrainian, Georgians in Georgian and Turks in Turkish. This may be an unparalleled situation for the West but it is far from as hopeless as has been made out. Is so little published in the West or in Western European languages? The main aim of this paper is to reveal the comparative wealth of Western publications, thus to disprove this complaint and to demonstrate that there is no great barrier to those who wish to acquaint themselves with Black Sea archaeology.

In this paper I shall concentrate on monographs, collections of articles and conference proceedings. Even here I must be selective. My wish to be comprehensive would take me far beyond the space available. Also, I am not concerned with individual articles in journals: these are far too numerous to tackle in one piece. I take an historical perspective stretching beyond the last 20 years, since the first Black Sea congress was held (in Varna in 1997). Thus it seems appropriate to glance at the state of Black Sea studies in the West. Often, when I meet colleagues and students, I am told that while the Black Sea is a very important area for their studies because of the wealth of material it provides, the language barrier is a great hindrance: everything is published in Russian.1 Would remark that only Russian colleagues publish in Russian: Bulgarian colleagues publish in Bulgarian, Romanians in Romanian, Ukrainians in Ukrainian, Georgians in Georgian and Turks in Turkish. This may be an unparalleled situation for the West but it is far from as hopeless as has been made out. Is so little published in the West or in Western European languages? The main aim of this paper is to reveal the comparative wealth of Western publications, thus to disprove this complaint and to demonstrate that there is no great barrier to those who wish to acquaint themselves with Black Sea archaeology.

I shall start with a lengthy quotation from the late Heinz Heinen, a long-term friend to Black Sea Studies in the West, especially in Germany, and one of those present at that first congress. Writing some 20 years ago, he noted that:

The history of the Greeks and their relationship with the native peoples of the Ukraine and southern Russia is, if not completely unknown to classical students in the West, no more than a theme of rather moderate interest (notwithstanding that one of the most important monographs on the subject was written by a British scholar, E.H. Minns [Scythians and Greeks: A Survey of Ancient History and Archaeology on the North Coast of the Euxine from the Danube to the Caucasus (Cambridge)] in 1913). This lack of interest may be the consequence of the peripheral setting of the northern Black Sea coast from the point of view of classical studies, traditionally concentrated on the Mediterranean world. But there is more to it than pure geographical distance. There are other factors, no less important, that contribute to create some kind of psychological distance. Language and mentality make Russia and the Ukraine appear far away, as a different world. Moreover, the barriers often raised by the former Soviet Union have added to the difficulties, hampering Western contacts with these regions and with the scholars working there. The situation has undergone considerable changes in recent years.3

Having mentioned Minns, we should not forget the great M.I. Rostovtzeff, an outstanding specialist in the history of South Russia in antiquity.4 Left destitute in Oxford after the Russian revolution,5 he moved to the United States to become one of the(ir) most celebrated of ancient historians.6 Romania and Bulgaria shared the same fate as Soviet satellites after the Second World War, cut off from Western scholarship. At the same time, with the establishment of NATO, Turkey began intensive construction of military installations on its Black Sea coast, often at the location of ancient sites – Amisos, for instance. Thereby much of the coast became inaccessible to archaeologists and excavation. The situation changed after 1990: now we find local universities where once were military bases, and the inauguration of an ever-increasing number of archaeological projects.7

In 1958, a group of Oxford historians visited Romania. One was John Boardman, and since then he has enjoyed a strong interest in Black Sea archaeology, making lifetime friendships with local specialists. Later he journeyed to the Soviet Union and forged equally strong links with colleagues at the Hermitage. He inaugurated in Archæological Reports publication of general accounts of work being done around the Black Sea.8 The first edition of his Greek Overseas contained a short Black Sea chapter, expanded with each subsequent edition,9 and the Black Sea has found a prominent place in his other works.10 Another Briton to experience the Soviet Union at this time was the late John Hind, whose doctoral research took him to Leningrad State University for a year.

1 At least this is what monoglot Anglo-Saxon students falsely believe. One such came to my office wanting to write a PhD on Italy and was surprised when I asked about the state of her knowledge of Italian, fondly believing that everything necessary would be available in English.

2 My concern in this paper is mainly with archaeology and ancient history. On epigraphy, see A. Avram’s paper immediately following. On numismatics, see, for instance, Frolova and Ireland 2002; Abramzon and Frolova 2019; and Kovalenko’s two Colloquia Antiqua volumes (nos. 3 and 11) given below at p. 4.

3 For the translation into French of one of his major works, see Rostovtseff 2004.

4 For the southern Black Sea coast, see Kassab Tezgör 2013. On the northern Black Sea, see Tsetskhladze 2001.

5 Boardman 1994, 182-224.

6 See, for instance, Frolova and Ireland 2002; Abramzon and Frolova 2019; and Kovalenko’s two Colloquia Antiqua volumes (nos. 3 and 11) given below at p. 4.

7 For example, Boardman 1994, 182-224.
Since 1963, several surveys of archaeological discoveries have appeared, mainly in *Archaeological Reports*,12 one in the American Journal of Archaeology,13 a few in other collections of articles.14 Dialogues d’Histoire Ancienne publishes annually the results of joint Franco-Bulgarian and Franco-Romanian projects. In 1971 came the German translation of V.F. Gaidukevich’s hefty volume on the Bosporan kingdom, still the best ever written about this polity;15 and four years later, Gaidukevich’s hefty volume on the Bosporan kingdom, still the results of joint Franco-Bulgarian and Franco-Romanian of articles.14

A very important year for Soviet-Western collaboration was 1980, thanks to the publication of Heinen’s German translation of several articles by Soviet scholars, revealing to the West the depth and extent of their scholastic achievement.17 The 1980s and 1990s added many publication projects to the tally. The late Wolfgang Schuller of the University of Konstanz established *Xenia: Konstanzer althistorische Vorträge und Forschungen* as a departments publication. The first volume (in 1981) was a paper by Y.G. Vinogradov. Further Black Sea-related material followed:


Subsequently, Schuller established a new series, *Schwarze meer-Studien*, published in Amsterdam. Seven monograph volumes appeared, all bringing Eastern scholarship to the West:


John Fossey also started his own series, also published in Amsterdam: *Antiquitates Proponticae, Circumponticae et Caucasicae*. Only two volumes appeared.18

The contribution of the late Pierre Lévêque and his centre in Besançon must be given due prominence. He published three volumes on Georgia plus other Black Sea material19 (see below for Besançon conference publications).

More prolific was the University of Halle (MLU), with joint projects in Romania and Georgia. Its series, Schriften des Zentrums für Archäologie und Kulturgeschichte des Schwarzmeeerraumes, published in Langenweißbach, produced 22 works, a mixture of collections and monographs:

Another fecund centre of publication was Aarhus University, where the Centre for Black Sea Studies brought forth a rich array of publications during its decade of existence, including, but not limited to, the 16 in its Black Sea Studies series:


In 1996, I established another new series, *Colloquia Pontica*, initially published by Oxbow in Oxford and then taken over by Brill of Leiden:


After I had set up the journal *Ancient West and East* in 2002, *Colloquia Pontica* became its monograph supplement. When the journal moved to Peeters of Leuven, I took the opportunity to broaden the scope of the monograph supplement to align it more closely with the journal, renaming it *Colloquia Antiqua* to reflect this. Nevertheless, the Black Sea remains a central concern of the series as the following volumes indicate:

More and more conferences have been organised, regional or international, and, in general, their proceedings have been published. One stands out: that on the ancient history of the Black Sea littoral organised in Ts Khal’tubio and Vani. The first Vani symposium, in 1977, was limited to Soviet scholars; it subsequently expanded to include Eastern European academics and then Western. These symposia made a huge impact because many Westerners saw excavations and materials first-hand for the first time. The papers of the first symposia were published in Tbilisi by the Georgian Academy of Sciences, those of later ones were translated, thanks to Pierre Lévéque, and from the fifth symposium onwards they have been published in Besançon:


The proceedings of our Black Sea congresses have a mixed record. After the first congress in Varna (1997), the International Organising Committee decided to divide papers by language and appoint separate 'language' editors to prepare them for publication. This was at a time when technology was less advanced than now and it threw up many technical problems with unreadable/un-openable disks, unreachable authors, few of them willing to send replacements or answer queries, etc., etc. Many of the papers from Eastern Europe were incomprehensible, the language editors despaired, everything ground to a halt. The same problems beset publication of the 2001 congress in Ankara. Thanks to the initiative of Jan Bouzek, the papers of the third congress (Prague 2005) were published in two issues of *Eirene*, the periodical of the Institute of Classical Studies of the Czech Academy of Sciences, Prague. Unfortunately, to achieve quick publication, they appeared as they had been submitted, unedited. A few more papers and the abstracts found a home in *Studia Herculia*, a publication of Charles University, Prague. Since then, congress proceedings (Istanbul 2009; Belgrade 2013) have, like the present volume, appeared with Archaeopress in Oxford.

Some other conferences have taken a comparative approach to developments in the Mediterranean region and the Black Sea. Thus, the theme of the 2000 Taranto conference was a comparison of colonial *chorai* in the West and the Black Sea. The previous year saw a conference on Ionia, its special session in Ioniens around the Black Sea attended by a large number of Eastern European specialists. November 2018 witnessed a conferences organised by the German Archaeological Institute in Rome to compare the Greek colonies and colonisation of Italy with those of the Black Sea: its proceedings will be published by De Gruyter in 2021.

One workshop has emerged as a regular fixture: that held at the International Hellenic University outside Thessaloniki every three years since 2012. The papers of each have been published.

Together with all of the events and developments mentioned above, various individual conferences with their proceedings as well as a number of edited volumes have helped the collaborative and comparative study of the Black Sea area, not only in the West but in the East too. A wide range of monographs have been published on all parts of the Pontus. One aspect to this is the number of them written by Eastern European colleagues but published in Western Europe in a Western European language, thereby making first-hand material information available to Western colleagues. Some of these monographs (or sometimes collection of articles) contain the results of archaeological excavations and surveys.

**Histria remains the best published Black Sea site; 15 volumes have appeared since the 1950s.** Although these are published...
VI.36 The fruits of ten years of study of the Black Sea Greek foundation in fortification wall, built upon or very soon after the colony's finds: first of all, a massive and well-preserved mud-brick published site in Russia. It has yielded quite unexpected Sea colony, has latterly become the most studied and best in the Centre's final publication. It lists all Greek settlements by the Copenhagen Polis Centre may be found in many of its separate volumes, but also as a lengthy chapter colonies by the Copenhagen Polis Centre may be found in

in Bucharest, they are widely distributed in the West through de Boccad of Paris. One volume in particular deserves individual mention: Petre Alexandrescu's long-awaited magnus opus publishing the results of the excavation of the temenos from 1915 to 1989. 32

Phanagoria on the Taman Peninsula, the only Teian Black Sea colony, has latterly become the most studied and best published site in Russia. It has yielded quite unexpected finds: first of all, a massive and well-preserved mud-brick fortification wall, built upon or very soon after the colony's foundation in ca. 542 BC; an Achaemenid inscription; 33 and a well-preserved shipwreck from the time of Mithradates VI. Previously, three collections of articles that, inter alia, included many papers on Phanagoria, appeared in the West, 34 while several volumes of Phanagoria excavation results have been published in Russia(n). My series Colloquia Antiqua is currently embarking on publication of a subseries of several volumes of Phanagorian Studies.

General accounts of the Black Sea, intended as much for students as for academics, appear from time to time and give as much fresh information as possible. Examples are the two chapters by John Hind in the distinguished Cambridge Ancient History: on the Bosporan kingdom, 35 and on Mithradates VI. 36 The fruits of ten years of study of the Black Sea Greek colonies by the Copenhagen Polis Centre may be found in many of its separate volumes, but also as a lengthy chapter in the Centre's final publication. 37 It lists all Greek settlements classified as poleis, and for each individually provides up-to-date information (to 2004), all kinds of evidence and a comprehensive bibliography.

Three very welcome developments should be mentioned. The first is the establishment in 1994 of Il Mar Nero: Journal of Archaeology and History, published by Edizioni Quasar in Rome, and initially edited by Petre Alexandrescu and Şerban Papacostea, now by Alexandru Avram and Ovidiu Cristea. It publishes articles not just on antiquity but for periods since. The latest issue (no. 9, for 2012-18) appeared in 2019. Another journal is Ancient West and East, founded by me (as noted above) in 2002, first published by Brill and since 2007 by Peeters. The Black Sea is one of its core areas of interest and its extensive reviews section covers much that is published about the ancient Black Sea in the West and the East. The first issue of Ancient Civilizations from Scythia to Siberia appeared in 1994. This journal is largely a vehicle for republishing in English articles that first appeared in the long-established Russian journal Vestnik Drevnei Istorii.

Catalogues to accompany exhibitions are also most useful, not just for the photographs and descriptions of objects but for their introductory sections, where thoroughly updated summaries of the state of research may be found. 38

It is essential to remark that Eastern European colleagues are now publishing more and more in Western languages, especially English, in their home countries. But this raises a series of new problems: how to know who has published what, where it has been published and how copies may be obtained. There is no distribution network (whatever the language of publication). Authors usually pay for/towards publication, and they usually retain the bulk of the print-run. Thus one needs to know the authors or know someone who does: intermediation on the grapevine. It requires the expenditure of much time and effort to track down (the existence of) publications and then locate their authors. There are bookshops in St Petersburg, Moscow and Sofia where publications are available – but it needs specialist local knowledge to locate such shops and to know which ones might carry which publications. The books themselves are very important for research. Let me use as an example some volumes from the series Pontica et Mediterranea, published in Cluj, Transylvania:


Victor Cojocaru spends a lot of his own time and resources distributing personally these handsome volumes, even sending them to select libraries. Two hefty volumes are a bibliography of writings, East and West, on the ancient Black Sea. They are essential tools (although, like every bibliography, something will have slipped through the net).

Let me conclude by returning to the main question: is the study of the Black Sea still terra incognita for the West? As this paper and its bibliography demonstrate, the answer must surely be ‘no’. 39 Perhaps the Black Sea is peripheral to a Mediterranean ‘centre’, but the centre will always have a periphery and cannot forget it: without it, it is incomplete. Ancient Greeks considered the Black Sea to be the border between Europe and Asia, but they settled it just as they settled the Mediterranean; and they maintained their way of life in both.
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The Black Sea region was for long a kind of Cinderella area for Greek and Latin epigraphy. Of course several documents had been known since the 19th century and were included not only in regional corpora but also, sometimes with improved editions, in Dittenberger’s Syllae, the third volume of the Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum (CIL), or other standard corpora or selections of Greek or Latin inscriptions. The problem was elsewhere: on the one hand, scholars from Soviet Union, Romania and Bulgaria were isolated behind the Iron Curtain, seldom participating in international conferences, while Western scholars travelled little to these countries. On the other hand, several inscriptions were published by local scholars in journals with limited international circulation and, with some notable exceptions in Romania (in particular Dionisie Pippidi, Ion Josif Russu, Constantin Petolescu, Ioan Piso), in Bulgaria (in particular Georgi Mihailov, Veselin Beshevliev, Boris Gerov and Christo Danov) or in Russia (Yuri G. Vinogradov), mostly in the vernacular. It is true that important material became known due to Jeanne and Louis Robert’s Bulletin épigraphique (and less due to the Supplementum Epigraphicum Graecum, which was somewhat incomplete for much of the 1960s and 1970s) and that they were diffused a second time by improved editions given by the authors themselves or by several Western scholars in French, English or German. This is the case of the well-known Achillodoros letter from Berezan and some beautiful decrees from Istron/Hiseria or Olbia. Nevertheless, poor direct access to local antiquities, limited diffusion of Eastern publications and the eternal linguistic barrier – advanced sometimes in excess as an excuse by some Western scholars – limited knowledge and exploitation of the epigraphic potential of these regions.

The situation spectacularly changed after the political events of 1989. Our Pontic congress, whose first iteration took place 20 years ago in Varna, became itself possible in the context of a new open society cultivating European traditions and values. Therefore, a review of Pontic epigraphic studies from Varna 1997 to Constanţa 2017 coincides more or less with the new era of the integration of the Black Sea area in the oikoumene of classics. One of the barometers is the position of sections devoted to the Black Sea region and its hinterland (including Thrace, Moesia and the Scythian and Sarmatian world) in standard publications monitoring what’s new in epigraphy such as the Bulletin épigraphique, the Supplementum Epigraphicum Graecum (SEG), L’Année épigraphique (AE) or, more recently, the Epigraphic Bulletin for Greek Religion. Even sometimes incomplete or, as for the Bulletin épigraphique, voluntary selective, the chapters under the heading ‘Black Sea region’ offer every year a substantial panoramic view of the scholarly output in this field.

What allowed such an important change? First of all, new strategies of academic life in the countries around the Black Sea. Many universities and research institutes or centres planned more accurately their activities following international standards: research projects with concrete scientific aims and evaluations, international collaborations, careful publications of preliminary or final results in central rather than in regional or local journals or in volumes mostly edited in good technical conditions, with satisfactory illustrations. Secondly, a beneficial penchant for that type of fundamental epigraphic work, which remains the corpus (not only for the ‘great epigraphy’ but also for the so-called ‘minor epigraphy’, such as amphora stamps, inscribed tiles or jewellery, seals, etc.), a question I will develop later. And last but not least, a crucial change in the optics governing the so-called ‘linguistic’ strategy cultivated by both research centres and editors: ever more studies and volumes published in international languages (in particular in English, of course, but also in French, German or Italian). We now have specialist international journals where Pontic monuments including inscriptions are well represented, for example Ancient West and East, Il Mar Nero or Ancient Civilizations from Scythia to Siberia. Even before Varna 1997 we already had Colloquia Pontica, which became thereafter, in order to be more comprehensive, Colloquia Antiqua but which continues mostly to be focused on the regions around the Black Sea (including Turkey). Recently, the famous Russian journal Vestnik Drevnej Istorii changed its linguistic strategy to allow foreign contributions in English. The Danish Research Foundation published in English for more than ten years an impressive collection of Black Sea Studies. The University of Halle contributed with its Zentrum für Archäologie und Kulturgeschichte des Schwarzmeerraumes and its series of volumes in German. In Romania, Dacia successfully continues to publish since 1957 only in international languages, and in Bulgaria we have now Archæologia Bulgarica of the same standard. Beside a lot of local publications in Turkish, the newly discovered inscriptions in this country are systematically published generally in English or German in the remarkable Epigraphica Anatolica. Many other examples could be added.

The new conditions have opened the way to an increase in epigraphic publications of high quality. I will start with a short review of the main epigraphic corpora.

For Turkey I mention the volumes concerning cities situated on the south coast of the Black Sea or in its close hinterland in the well-known series of Inschriften griechischer Städte aus Kleinasiien. First of all, Adam Łajtar’s corpus of Byzantium,1 which as counterpart of the older corpus of

---

1 Łajtar 2000 (SEG 50, 663).
Chalcedon from Reinhold Merkelbach and his collaborators now introduces us to questions of Pontic epigraphy in the same way as in antiquity both cities opened the gate of the Black Sea to sailors coming from the Aegean. If more than 20 years ago the south coast had in the same series only one corpus, that of Heraclea Pontica, now we also have a corpus for the other leading city of this region, i.e. Sinope. Moreover, the rather poor corpus of Heraclea (strangely few inscriptions in comparison with the importance of this city in antiquity, a situation which can be explained by the lack of large archaeological excavations) has been supplemented on several occasions by new finds published mostly by Biilent Öztürk. The same scholar published many inscriptions from Tios and, I am informed, is preparing a corpus of inscriptions revealed by this city. Beside Sinope with its corpus already mentioned and some other cities (Amastris, Amaseia, Pompeipolis, etc.) whose inscriptions had been included as appendix and commented upon by Christian Marek in his splendid Stadt, Ara und Territorium in Pontus-Bithynia, Paphlagonia, a region whose epigraphic crop continues to be appreciated through the very old, although mostly useful Studia Pontica III from 1910, began to reveal new finds: we now have a corpus for the inscriptions of Hadrianopolis. Marek has worked for many years on a corpus of inscriptions from Pompeipolis. Perhaps, one day, why not, a corpus for Amisos?

Now, crossing the Straits to Thrace, a region whose epigraphic crop was dispersed from the end of the 19th century in many publications sometimes difficult of access; now no longer. We have at our disposal the impressive corpus of inscriptions from Aegean Thrace (mostly Greek but also Latin documents). I can add the useful repertory of Greek and Latin inscriptions from the middle Strymon Valley. The inscriptions of Lower Moesia are not collected in a new corpus, therefore, we must continue to use Mihailov’s corpus of Greek inscriptions and hope, on the other hand, to be able to manage the dispersed publication of Latin inscriptions. In contrast, for Novae we have at our disposal two corpora, the one collecting only the Latin inscriptions, the other including both Latin and Greek inscriptions with valuables comments in French.

For the west shore the greatest achievement of the last decades is that the big project announced by Pippidi in 1959 concerning Greek and Latin inscriptions from Scythia Minor (ISM) has been successfully completed. After Istoros/Histria and Tomis, the third city on the Romanian Black sea coast, i.e. Callatis, received a corpus. On the other hand, beside the inscriptions of the Lower Danube, we have now a volume devoted to the inscriptions from the south-western Dobruja, in particular from Tropaeum, Sacidava and Durostorum. But habenta sua fata libelli! Through systematic or rescue excavations in the last decades hundreds of new inscriptions can now be added to these corpora. Therefore, Romanian epigraphists decided to produce a series of supplementa to the five volumes published between 1980 and 2015. The first of them, under the heading ISM VI.2, which is a large supplementum to the corpus of Tomis (addenda et corrigenda to the already known inscriptions and 278 new numbers including instrumentum), by Maria Bărbulescu, Livia Buzoianu and me, has already appeared. Moreover, archaeological works like those produced for the sculptural monuments (many of them inscribed) from Istoros/Histria, for the funerary steles of Moesia Inferior, for the same category of monuments in Thrace or for the Greek steles of the West Pontic cities to the end of the Hellenistic period, have added the necessary iconographic commentaries and successfully contributed to a finer dating of the relics. In Bulgaria Nikolai Sharankov, the leading scholar of the younger generation, who has already edited for two decades an impressive quantity of newly discovered inscriptions from Thrace and Moesia Inferior, including the coastal cities, is preparing a large supplementum to Mihailov’s excellent five-volume Inscriptiones Graeciae in Bulgaria repertae. He recently offered a rich selection in a paper, where he improved the reading and the restorations of many documents and even picked up in many cases pieces published separately. Let me mention also an important supplementum to the inscriptions from Mesambria Pontica.

As for the north coast of the Pontus Euxinus, a big project led by Askold Ivantchik claims to remake entirely Vasiliy Latyshev’s famous Inscriptiones antiquae orae septentrionalis Ponti Euxini Graecae et Latinae, a really Herculean task. There is now only the fifth volume which appeared online (Andrei Vinogradov’s corpus of proto-Byzantine inscriptions, 2015). Igor Makarov, who published with valuable commentaries many unedited inscriptions in the last decades, is, as I am

16 ISM V.
17 ISM IV.
18 In 2018 (ISM VI.2).
19 Alexandrescu Vianu 2000 (SEG 51, 932).
20 Conrad 2004 (SEG 54, 656).
21 Slawisch 2007 (SEG 57 606 bis).
22 Petrova 2015.
23 I give here only a selection of the publications of this very productive epigraphist: Sharankov 2005a (SEG 55, 726-763); 2005b (SEG 55, 753-761, 766-767); 2005c; 2007a (SEG 57, 619); 2007b (SEG 57, 635); 2009; 2011 (SEG 62, 500); 2013a; 2013b (SEG 58, 679, 63, 480); 2014; 2015; 2016a; 2016b; 2017a; 2017b. See also the newly discovered inscriptions from Dionysopolis published by the same scholar in the collective volumes cited at n. 70.
25 Sharankov 2016a.
27 For a complete epigraphic bibliography to 2014, see detailed references in Cojocaru 2014.
28 See http://iospe-ich.kcl.ac.uk/index.html, an on-line third edition of the corpus of ancient Greek and Latin inscriptions from the northern coast of the Black Sea, continuing the legacy of the original IOSPE. For early inscriptions from Olbia, see also Dubois 1996.
29 Let us hope that this electronic edition will be accompanied by a printed corpus soon.
30 I give just a selection: Makarov 2005 (SEG 55, 839); 2006a (SEG 56, 871-878); 2006b (SEG 56, 880); 2007a; 2007b (SEG 55, 838; 57, 696); 2007c
informed, very advanced with his corpus of Chersonesus Taurica, as well as Ivanitchik with his corpus of Tyras. For the Bosporan kingdom let’s mention the illustrated album of the famous Corpus inscriptionum Regni Bosporani from 1965. On the other hand, very fine iconographic studies were proposed for some exceptional categories of monuments as the funerary reliefs from the Bosporan kingdom or the painted steles from Chersonesus Taurica. We can add several corpora devoted to stamps on amphorae or tiles due in particular to Sergei Monakhov, Vladimir Kats and Nikolai Fedoseev.

This work has been accompanied by the publication of several important contributions to onomastics and prosopography. I only mention here the fourth and fifth volumes of the monumental Lexicon of Greek Personal Names (2005 and 2010) edited in Oxford under the direction of late Peter Fraser and Elaine Matthews and with the collaboration of many other scholars, Dan Dana’s commented repertory on Thracian personal names, as well as his numerous contributions in Thracian onomastics, my own Prosopographia Ponti Euxini externa. Nikolai Nikolaev’s essays on Olbian prosopography and several onomastic studies due to Sergei Tokhtashev. On the other hand, several thematic corpora have been already produced and many other interesting projects have been announced: Madalina Dana is preparing as a habilitation at Paris a corpus of the letters on lead or ceramics (with a substantial Pontic contribution), Aleksei Belousov works on a corpus of the defixiones found on the North shore of the Black Sea, while Johannes Nollé and Marta Oller Guzmán already announced their intention to compile, after the model of the well-known Steinepigrapmen aus dem griechischen Osten, a corpus of the epigrams furnished by the cities of the West and North shores of the Black Sea (ca. 1000 texts).

We can add several contributions to problems concerning political, social, economic, cultural and religious history of the West and North Pontic areas based largely on epigraphic material.

It is, therefore, allowed to speak about remarkable progress in the systematic editing of the Greek and Latin inscriptions of the Pontic area. As for the predictable perspective, I think that a new task for all of us is to integrate at least a part of this impressive epigraphic crop into the standard ‘universal’ corpora: Inscriptiones Graecae for the Greek inscriptions of the western and northern shores and, for the Latin inscriptions, Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum, whose very old third volume, including inter alia Thrace, Moesia Inferior and the North Pontus, must be re-edited imperatively.

Among the inscriptions discovered and published in the last 20 years I would mention first of all some rarities which could define a real peculiarity of Pontic epigraphy: the lead letters and the defixiones, mostly from the Archaic and Classical periods. It is true – and I make no apology – that many of these pieces which of late have appeared especially in Russian publications are due to illegal excavations made by occasional ‘archaeologists’ with metal detectors and belong to rather suspect private collections. The same phenomenon can be detected in the strange number of Roman military diplomas which appeared for some decades, mostly given as coming from ‘the Lower Danube’, ‘Bulgaria’ or ‘former Yugoslavia’, which means without any doubt that they had been detected on these territories, robbed and sold on the Western antiquities market. Unfortunately, countries around the Black Sea cannot successfully control on all occasions their own patrimony. The presence of such pieces in private collections is now a terrible reality. I do not discuss here the legal problems but, insofar these pieces have already been extracted from their initial archaeological context, I express my opinion that the only way to preserve at least a part of information is for collectors to open the door to epigraphists. There are obviously two distinct questions: the legal status of these objects and their scientific value as published monuments accessible to the scholars.

Many of the private lead or ceramic letters concern the slave trade. This category of documents already reveals five terms for designating slaves: beside the classical dōloi/dōtai (in the already known, since 1971, and largely commented upon letter of Achillodoros from Berezan from the second half of the 6th or the first quarter of the 5th century BC, and, more recently, as douloi, in a letter from Panticapaean, from the end of the 5th or the beginning of the 4th century BC), we find pais (letter from Olbia, ca. 540-535 BC); letter from Phanagoria, ca. 530-510 BC), paidion (or paidiskos) (letter from Gorgippia, ca. 350-325 BC), ókōtai (letter from
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21 Belousov 2012 (SEG 63, 591).
23 Nollé and Oller Guzmán 2016.
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Olbia from the end of the 6th century BC)\(^{53}\) and andrapodon (in a newly published letter from Patrasys from the second half of the 5th century).\(^{54}\) Nevertheless, as I have tried to demonstrate,\(^ {55}\) all these documents concern the slave trade and do not inform us about employment of servile manpower in the Pontic cities. We can confirm that the Black Sea constantly supplied the Mediterranean world with slaves but we continue to ignore the people concerned with the agriculture and workshops of the Pontic cities: free labour or, in some cases, as in Byzantium or Heraclea Pontica, where we have some literary evidence, dependent native communities, are in my opinion to be preferred as possible answer to this question.

As for the defixiones,\(^{56}\) beside their contribution to the study of magic in the Greek world, we have the chance to detect a huge onomastic stock: rare, even new Greek, Scythian or Anatolian names which are now to be added to A Lexicon of Greek Personal Names IV.

I would like to mention two other categories of inscriptions on metal which have been revealed in the Pontic area in particular in the last two decades. On the one hand, sling bullets with their names which could be sometimes identified with historical personalities such as Alexander the Great or his generals. We have such finds in Olbia, in the Dobrudja and in Bulgaria.\(^{57}\) On the other hand, inscriptions on silver objects from Thracian treasures, in particular the sensational discovery of the tomb of king Seuthes III from Golyama Kosmatka mound with its vessels containing interalia weight notations, which opened the door to interesting metrological studies.\(^ {58}\) Both sling bullets and silver vessels from Thrace represent fully new chapters in the Pontic epigraphy.

As for stone inscriptions, my selection can only be subjective. I will start with so-called ‘historical’ inscriptions which give us new valuable information on political events imperfectly known through literary testimonies. First of all, a ‘pierre errante’ found many years ago in the Medieval necropolis from Pliska, in Bulgaria, but coming, I would say, without doubt from Istrus/Histria, informs us about the first razzias of Mithradates' last wife, which spectacularly confirms Plutarch's story (Pompeius 32, 8) about her bravery which attracted a masculine form for her name. A basis for a statue from Callatis erected for Cn. Cornelius Lentulus Augur, patron of the city,\(^ {59}\) to which we can recently add another inscription from Dionysopolis,\(^ {60}\) clarifies the context of the important military operations at the Lower Danube between ca. 9 and 6 BC and a decree from Istrus/Histria\(^ {61}\) mentions the activities of the governor L. Pomponius Flaccus and his primipilaris C. Iulius Vestalis, both mentioned in Ovid's poems, about AD 19. Therefore, the ‘prehistory' of the Roman province of Lower Moesia begins to reveal its secrets step by step. Finally, I would mention as a rather rare epigraphic class the fragmentary enkomion from Panticapaeum for a noble companion of a Bosporan king who might be identified with Sauromates II or III.\(^ {62}\)

Other inscriptions offer new data on the administrative and military organisation of the Roman provinces of Thrace and Lower Moesia, for example the beautiful series of monuments from Philippiopolis concerning the Thracian koinon,\(^ {63}\) the documents from Dionysopolis or from the middle Strymon Valley revealing names of new strategies in Thrace\(^ {64}\) and many others (Latin or Greek) about the distribution and activities of Roman military units or of the Claris Flavia Moesica. Perhaps the most spectacular discovery of the last decades is the temple of the Pontic Mother of Gods from Dionysopolis.\(^ {65}\) We have the opportunity, since it is rather well preserved, not only to examine the architecture of this region during the Hellenistic period but also to discuss an impressive collection of epigraphic material, only partially published until now:\(^ {66}\) beautiful decrees entirely preserved, inscriptions concerning Thracian kings and strategies, dedications to several gods and goddesses made by various associations, etc. Let's add, for their beauty, their antiquity (5th-4th centuries BC) and their importance for onomastic studies the impressive collection of funerary steles from Apollonia Pontica bearing a lot of rare Ionian names.\(^ {67}\)

For the cultural life in the Pontic cities I can mention some interesting epigrams from Philippiopolis\(^ {68}\) or from coastal cities, in particular that for an actor from Byzantium who performed and died in Tomis\(^ {69}\) and a Christian epigram from Philippopolis concerning the Thracian koinon,\(^ {70}\) the koinon of epigraphic material, only partially published until now: 71 a fragmentary decree from Istrus/Histria for a strategy of the king,\(^ {72}\) a titulus honorarius for another one from Olbia,\(^ {73}\) a fragmentary proxeny decree from Olbia\(^ {74}\) and, in particular, a very spectacular monument from Phanagoria bearing the inscription ‘Hypsikrates, wife of king Mithradates Eupator Dionysos, farewell'.\(^ {75}\) Not only do we learn that the queen died in Phanagoria but attention is required by the masculine name of Mithradates' last wife, which spectacularly confirms Plutarch's story (Pompeius 32, 8) about her bravery which attracted a masculine form for her name. A basis for a statue from Callatis erected for Cn. Cornelius Lentulus Augur, patron of the city,\(^ {76}\) to which we can recently add another inscription from Dionysopolis,\(^ {77}\) clarifies the context of the important military operations at the Lower Danube between ca. 9 and 6 BC and a decree from Istrus/Histria\(^ {78}\) mentions the activities of the governor L. Pomponius Flaccus and his primipilaris C. Iulius Vestalis, both mentioned in Ovid's poems, about AD 19. Therefore, the ‘prehistory' of the Roman province of Lower Moesia begins to reveal its secrets step by step. Finally, I would mention as a rather rare epigraphic class the fragmentary enkomion from Panticapaeum for a noble companion of a Bosporan king who might be identified with Sauromates II or III.\(^ {79}\)
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Finally, among the Latin inscriptions the most important would be perhaps the treaty between Rome and Callatis, the only one we know in Latin in the whole series of documents belonging to this class. The treaty was long known but a complete edition with an attempt to re-construct the whole text was given by me in 1999.76

Last but not least, we cannot forget the graffiti. Some of them, in particular those discovered in expressive archaeological contexts, as in the Western temenos from Olbia, are full of information about cults (including new epikleseis for some divinities), religious associations, and interesting personal names not attested by inscriptions on stone. The most important graffiti have been found in Olbia (where, due to Anna Rusyaeva, we have since 2010 a corpus at our disposal),77 Nymphaeum (in particular on the well-known fresco)78 and Panticapaeum and its *chora*.79

I would conclude with the hope that our Pontic Greece will continue to produce interesting new epigraphic evidence able to attract prominent specialists world wide.
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