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ISTROS

The case of Istros may well provide a good example concerning the problem of the territories of the Greek cities. Founded by Miletos in the mid 7th century BC or soon thereafter, Istros was settled on the gulf that later became the lagoon of Razelm–Sinoe, after geomorphologic transformations changed the ancient landscape. At the time of its foundation, Istros probably had very little territory, since the emergence of a proper chora, according to the present archaeological testimony, seems to first have occurred two or three generations later.

The coming of the Greeks: the archaeological evidence

Before the coming of the Milesian colonists, the region between the Danube and the Black Sea (Dobruja) belonged to the diffusion area of the third phase of a middle Hallstatt culture, named after the eponymous site, the Babadag culture. Archaeological research has revealed the fortified sites of Babadag and Beidaud as well as a number of unfortified settlements on both sides of the Danube, which belonged to this culture (Fig. 1). None of these settlements, however, were truly located on the coast. It is known that the end of the Babadag culture was violent, even if we are still ignorant of the circumstances and the exact date (perhaps the end of the 8th or more probably the beginning of the 7th century BC). Accordingly, these sites, whether fortified or not, were destroyed. This destruction, however, seems not to have been related to the coming of the Milesians, since, on the one hand, these settlements were not in the region which came to be included in the chora of Istros and, on the other hand, nothing was found among these settlements which should be ascribed to the Greeks.

Taking this preliminary result into account, the map of the rural sites which are to be assigned to the Milesian colonisation after c. 600 BC is more than remarkable (Fig. 2). Two Archaic settlements are situated some 4-5 km from the city of Istros. At Histria-Pod, except for the horizon of the 4th century BC (on which more later), a layer quite rich in material belonging to the second half of the 6th century BC as well as a level from the end of the Archaic period were revealed. It is difficult to ascertain the character of this site. The same
is true concerning a second settlement, still poorly investigated, which is situated in the neighbourhood of the present day village of Istria and which corresponds to a necropolis (on which see below).²

Other settlements are situated at a more considerable distance from the city and seem to be concentrated along the small river Junan (or Duindji) Dere. In the vicinity of the village of Nuntași c. 10 km west of the city two settlements have been excavated. The site Nuntași II has four levels belonging to the Archaic period. First, there are some buildings from the second half of the 6th century which are oriented NE–SW, with walls of mudbricks built on socles in schist-stone. The earliest ceramics are fragments of bird-bowls and a vase in the manner of the Gorgo painter, from the beginning of the 6th century BC. Hence, Nuntași II seems to be the oldest site known until now in the territory of Istros.³
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A settlement situated about 18 km west of the city was excavated north of the modern village Tariverde. The oldest pottery found here is from the first quarter of the 6th century BC. Some habitations look like dug-outs, with an oval-shaped or rectangular plan but with rounded extremities,9 because of this, some scholars have interpreted them as a characteristic settlement of the indigenous population. Yet, quantitatively, Greek pottery dominates,10 while Getic ware represents only 10-15% of the total. Among the latter, there are some vessels characteristic for Hallstatt D. A second settlement, of the same type, was identified in the SE extremity of the same village.
Other settlements, not yet systematically explored, were discovered through field surveys. This is the case for some concentrations of ancient material situated north of the city, on the shore of Lake Sinoe: Karaburun, Sinoe-“Zmeica”, where explorations have revealed 6th century BC pottery, and Sinoe-“Insula Lupilor”, a settlement placed on a peninsula, protected to the west by a *vallum* of earth or stone, c. 2 km long and oriented approximately N-S. Other Archaic settlements are known in the southern part of the territory at Vadu, Sibioara and Cape Midia.

In addition, we know of further sites with finds datable in the 6th century BC on the southern bank of the Danube (Sf. Gheorghe, the ancient *'Ieròn στόμα* or *Πεύκη*), e.g. Murighiol (Independența) and on the shore of Lake Razelm (ancient *Halmyris*), e.g. Vișina, Enisala, and Sarinasuf. Vișina, among others, furnished a remarkable number of various types of Archaic amphorae. Yet, it is difficult to say if all these latter settlements belonged to the territory of Istros or not, because of their considerable distance from the city.

Our knowledge of the configuration of the territory of Istros in the Archaic period may be supplemented with evidence from the necropoleis identified until now. Seven inhumations were found at Corbu de Jos, among which were three with grave goods: a crown-vessel, a *lekythos* of the 581 Athens-group from the beginning of the 5th century, an Orientalizing Greek *olpe* and an Attic C-cup. Accordingly, the necropolis was established around the end of the 6th or early 5th century BC.

About 2.5 km from the present day village of Istria, at the place called “Bent”, a necropolis with 104 inhumations from the 6th to the 1st century BC was exhaustively excavated. 56 burials – adults in oval or rectangular graves and children in amphorae – and three other burial complexes belong to the first phase (6th century-first half of the 3rd century BC). In 36 graves, grave goods were preserved, especially vessels for oil or drinking, but also *oinochoai*, fish-plates, lamps, etc. Oldest is grave no. 3, with a handmade dish and a bowl with rosettes from the early 6th century BC. Then come tombs from the first half of the 6th century, dated by the presence of ovoid East Greek *lekythoi*. Five graves include crown-vessels. The local pottery is represented by Istrian jugs with handles rising above the rim, while native pottery is represented by handmade vessels.

The archaeological data given above concerning the *chora* of Istros in the Archaic period allow the following conclusions:

1. The settlements and the necropoleis belonging to the first phase of the territory of Istros are located both on the coast and inland, at a distance of up to 18 km from the city.
2. The earliest finds are from about 600 BC.
3. There is no site with a pre-Hellenic level.
4. Except for the site Sinoe-“Insula Lupilor”, which seems to have had a *vallum*, and which is still unexplored, there are only open settlements, most likely agricultural in nature.
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5. The Greek character of the settlements is proved by the pottery and by the building structures (especially Nuntași II).
6. The burials of the two necropoleis (Corbu de Jos and Histria-“Bent”) are Greek, as opposed to the different cremation types illustrated by the native necropoleis situated in neighbouring or distant regions.
7. The presence of the native population in the settlements and the necropoleis is also adequately documented. Nevertheless, I believe that it is still necessary to remain cautious as to the “ethnic” attribution of the handmade pottery in a Hallstatt tradition and on the dug-outs, even if, in most of the cases, it is attractive to see these as evidence for non-Greek elements.

Historical evaluation

In order to define the character of the earliest contacts between the Milesian colonists and the natives, I think that, first of all, we must review the reconstructed maps of the region, before and after the colonization of the Greeks (Figs. 1 and 2). The change of habitation area to the coastal zone is more than instructive: not only did the Greeks not destroy the native settlements, they in fact attracted the natives to their homes. It is suitable, then, to imagine a kind of peaceful cohabitation throughout the Archaic period. There is no sign to suggest a military conflict: “pre-colonial” strata are missing everywhere, the territory’s sites are not fortified, while even the city first acquired a wall in the middle or even the end of the 6th century BC, that is more than a century after the foundation of Istros.

On the other hand, without the contributions of the native population, it is less conceivable that the territory would have been organised in the manner suggested by the archaeological data: this is additional evidence in support of the idea of collaboration between Greeks and non-Greeks.

As far as the taking over of the territory goes, I believe that the interpretation of the archaeological evidence may provide proof for the succession of supplementary waves of colonists. The territory is, for this type of investigation, much more useful than the city where the Archaic strata are still nearly inaccessible to archaeologists.

I would suggest, for example, a secondary colonisation around 600 BC. It is, in fact, the time of the true control over the territory. Is it only a coincidence that it takes place contemporaneously with the plunder of the Milesian chora by the Lydian king Alyattes (Hdt. 1.17-19)? I am inclined to think not, not least because it occurs, more or less, at the same time as the continental nucleus was settled at Olbia near the first settlement of Berezan’. Only in Apollonia is the presence of epoikoi in the Milesian colonies of the Black Sea explicitly revealed, and this in a rather obscure context (Arist. Pol. 1303a.36-38), but the model remains nevertheless possible. A second wave of colonists, about the mid 6th century BC, is also to be taken into consideration; it is suggested both by the progress noticed in the city and by the appearance of new settlements
in the territory. The possibility that allotments in the tumular necropolis were reserved for supplementary colonists\textsuperscript{30} could also provide further evidence for this wave.

\textit{The Classical period}

The details of developments in the 5th century are still less known, not only for the territory, but also for the city. For the territory, it is notable both that the site of Tariverde, so rich in the 6th century BC, had only two phases in the Hellenistic period, and that the site of Histria-Pod shows a clear discontinuity between the Archaic horizon and the 4th century BC.\textsuperscript{31}

The 4th century BC is, in turn, much better documented (Fig. 3), mainly thanks to the results of the excavations from Histria-Pod and Nuntaşii. At Histria-Pod the excavations revealed a single complex of buildings, with many annexes disposed around a central \textit{plateia}. Three phases are to be noticed, dated, on the ground of amphora stamps (mainly Thasian), from the early 4th century BC to the beginning of the 3rd century BC. The houses were erected in raw bricks on socles of schist-stone. We are probably dealing with a farm complex.\textsuperscript{32} The site of Nuntaşii II in the Classical period presents three levels with buildings oriented N–S or E–W.\textsuperscript{33} About this time a new agglomeration (Nuntaşii I) was installed near this central site.\textsuperscript{34}

To these settlements in the proximity of Nuntaşii one may add some funerary finds made c. 1 km west of the same village and dated to the mid 4th century BC.\textsuperscript{35}

The necropolis of Histria-"Bent" mentioned above was still in use. The horizon datable to the 5th century comprises rather poor graves; they may be devoid of finds, or may contain one object only, as, for example, an Istrian \textit{lekythos}, an \textit{alabastron}, East Greek \textit{oinochoai} or those of local production.\textsuperscript{36} In the third horizon, from the 4th century to the first half of the 3rd century BC, there are some changes in the structure of the material. We may principally note the jewels, such as the Thracian fibula, the prominent place of \textit{unguentaria} compared to the \textit{lekythoi} characteristic of the earlier phases, and the practice of depositing coins.\textsuperscript{37}

\textit{The Hellenistic period}

The earlier settlements seem to have continued their existence through the beginning of the Hellenistic period (Fig. 3) but for most of them, it is difficult to ascertain more details because they have not been systematically excavated. The best known is the site of Nuntaşii II which, in its final phase (the second half of the 4th century-2nd century BC) occupied the largest area. Only part of it has been excavated, mainly a single rectangular building paved with big plates of schist and with walls of mudbricks on socles of schist-stone. In the ruins of this building destroyed by fire around the middle of the 2nd
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The Territories of Istros and Kallatis, century BC, were discovered various imported, local or handmade ceramics, a beautiful statue of an enthroned Kybele, a votive plaque representing Nike, a statuette of an ephebe, a kernos and the bottom of an amphora reused for cultic purposes (as a receptacle for a liknon). On the grounds of these and other analogies, this building was interpreted as a small rural sanctuary consecrated to Demeter with Kybele and Nike as paredroi.38

A site dating to the beginning of the Hellenistic period was discovered east of the village of Cogealac. It had three phases, in the second half of the
4th century BC, in the early 3rd century BC, and in the second quarter of the same century respectively. The limited area of the excavations allows only the provisional conclusion that it was perhaps a small hamlet. Other sites, probably from the Hellenistic period, were identified after various surveys; yet it is difficult to say something concrete concerning their character.

The Hellenistic period also coincided with the second phase of the necropolis of Histria—"Bent" (the middle of the 3rd century to the 1st century BC), to which phase 29 graves belong. The practice of depositing jewellery and coins, already noticed in the first phase, continued; yet, a certain degree of poverty for the community can be posited because of the small number of tombs with grave goods. The most recent complex seems to be grave no. 33, where, among others, a La Tène III fibula from the 1st century BC was found.

Taking into consideration the archaeological evidence presented above, the *chora* of Istros seems to have suffered the torments of the uncertain political climate typical of the late Hellenistic period, caused without any doubt by the more and more frequent raids of either the indigenous or other barbarian populations.

The epigraphic archive of Istros furnishes three exceptional records concerning this issue: a third-century decree honouring the ambassadors sent to the Geta ruler Zalmodegikos (*I. Histriae* 8), and two further decrees dating to the end of the same century, in honour of Agathokles son of Antiphilos (*I. Histriae* 15) and of Meniskos son of Theodoros, two citizens rewarded by the community for their intervention against the barbarians attacking the *chora*. There are many detailed studies of these inscriptions, so I shall not consider them further here. In turn, it is fitting to mention that the image provided both by the archaeological and epigraphic evidence agrees perfectly with the numismatic data. A recent paper concerning the diffusion of the Istrian coins proved that, compared to 35 coins of the 5th and early 4th century BC, and even more, compared to 129 specimens of the 4th century BC, the total number of finds of Istrian coins issued after c. 280 BC is disappointing, amounting to only 16 examples.

**Topographical review of the territory of Istros in the pre-Roman period**

It is certainly daring to reconstruct the frontiers of the *chora* of Istros. An interesting record in many ways, although unfortunately of a late date, the ὀρθοθεσία of the Roman governor Manius Laberius Maximus of 25 October 100 AD (*I. Histriae* 67 and 68) provides some data. This document confirms for the inhabitants of Istros “the borders of their ancestors” (τὰ τῶν προγόνων ὀρια) which extended as far as the southern bank of the Danube (Πεύκη = Sf. Gheorghe). We may, then, see proof here that the ancient *chora* of Istros was bordered to the north by the Danube Delta. There is, however, a major objection to this theory: the excavations in progress at Cape Dolojman, ancient Orgame (Hect. *FGrHist* 1 F 72: Ὁργάμη πόλις ἔπι τῶν Ἰστρῶν), pro-
duced finds of a very early date, even earlier than those of Istros. In more recent periods, Orgame was probably integrated into the territory of Istros. In the Archaic period, however, (and possibly in the Classical period too), we may suppose that it was an independent polis.

The western boundary of the chora remains unknown. It may be surmised that the region of the Altân Tepe plateau, which furnished copper for first the “arrow-head” coins and later for the local monetary bronze issues, as well as the zone of the village of Fântânele, which, in the Imperial period, was attested as the source of the aqueduct of Istros, already belonged to the chora of the city.

The southern border of the territory is equally a problem. Tomis is attested as a polis beginning only in the Hellenistic period, and the border between the two cities fluctuated. So, one should not forget the difference between the chora stricto sensu and the chora as dominio di influenza of a city. It is, by the way, the probable sense of the word πρόσχωρος, which occurs in a fragmentary context in a Hellenistic decree from Istros (I. Histriae 18).

KALLATIS

The foundation of Kallatis is briefly exposed by Ps.-Skymnos (vv. 760-763) who, in his Pontic section, used the evidence furnished by the local historian Demetrios of Kallatis: “(The city of Kallatis) colony of the Herakleians, as the result of an oracle. They founded it while Amyntas received the command of the Macedonians”.

The foundation of Kallatis by colonists from Heraclea Pontike – also recorded in other sources – has never been doubted by modern scholars. The date of the foundation, however, still admits of two possibilities: the epoch of Amyntas I in the second half of the 6th century BC, or that of Amyntas III (393-370/69 BC). I have elsewhere adduced the evidence in favour of the first of these two variants, namely the foundation of Kallatis at the end of the 6th century BC. However, resolving this question is not so important, because, as for the territory, there is no doubt about the time of the city’s control over it, i.e. the beginning of the 4th century BC. So, either more than a century went by before the Kallatians took over their chora, or the foundation of Kallatis was more or less contemporary with the settling of its rural territory.

The archaeological evidence

Only one site, an important one in many ways, has been systematically excavated in the territory of Kallatis. It is the settlement situated on a plateau 2 km SW of the village of Albești c. 15 km west of Kallatis, which occupied an area of c. 12 ha. Its centre is constituted by a rectangular fortification of c. 40 × 40 m, extended later to 45 × 45 m, with a corner-tower of 9 × 9 m. The excavations,
which are still in progress, have revealed three phases both for the fortification and for the civil settlement around it. The first phases correspond to the first and the second half (or the last quarter) of the 4th century BC respectively, while the third phase, in which the fortification was expanded towards the south, is dated to the 3rd century BC. The walls of the fortification are of local limestone with an *emplekton* of uncut limestone, bound with clay.\(^{55}\)

Among the rich finds, besides the stamped and unstamped amphoric material,\(^{56}\) the Hellenistic and native pottery (including handmade vessels), a certain category of North Pontic pottery and the coins can be mentioned. The terracottas found in two habitations of the third phase, from the first decades of the 3rd century to about 240 BC merit a special mention: Aphrodite accompanied by two Erotes, Kybele on a throne, and especially a ceramic altar with reliefs representing Poseidon, Nike, Dionysos and Apollo in the first complex, and a fragmentary statuette of Kybele, fragments from another ceramic altar, as well as representations of Demeter and Aphrodite with a pignion in the second complex.\(^{57}\) These objects testify to the practice of private cults; it is possible that the research in progress may result in the discovery of sanctuaries proper.\(^{58}\)

Other sites, no doubt like that of Albeşti, were identified in the same region, but they have not yet been methodically excavated.\(^{59}\) Beside these fortified sites, we can mention more settlements of agricultural character (Fig. 4): Tuzla,\(^{60}\) Costineşti-”Mănăstirea”,\(^{61}\) Schitu,\(^{62}\) 23 August,\(^{63}\) 2 May,\(^{64}\) Vama Veche,\(^{65}\) Ţabla,\(^{66}\) Hagieni,\(^{67}\) Albeşti-”La vie”,\(^{68}\) Cotu Văii-”Via lui Avram”,\(^{69}\) Arsa,\(^{70}\) Dulceşti,\(^{71}\) Moşneni,\(^{72}\) and Pecineaga.\(^{73}\) There is, finally, a rural sanctuary recently excavated at Durankulak, in the southern part of the *chora* of Kallatis.\(^{74}\)

Some isolated findings, at Comana\(^{75}\) and Neptun,\(^{76}\) may attest the existence of necropoleis. Among the burials, the most striking peculiarity is a series of tombs with vaulted funerary chambers and *dromos*. Their diffusion concerns only a limited area around Kallatis.\(^{77}\) All these tombs are from the early 3rd century BC and we here recognise a construction type of Macedonian origin. One recent discovery needs to be mentioned: a tomb with a vaulted chamber of rectangular form (3.56 × 3.62 m) and *dromos*.\(^{78}\)

**Historical considerations**

The territory of Kallatis was composed of two parts: an allotted territory around the city including the *kleroi* of the citizens\(^{79}\) and a larger zone inhabited by Greeks and especially by non-Greek people. Some fortifications attested by literary testimonies\(^{80}\) or by inscriptions\(^{81}\) could be identified with settlements like Albeşti or other fortifications not yet excavated in the area west of Kallatis. These fortifications may suggest the western limit of the territory and they find solid parallels in the *chora* of the other Herakleian foundation in the Euxine area, the Tauric Chersonesos.
Another feature of the territory of Kallatis concerns the presence of a Scythian population, well attested by the literary and numismatic evidence. Particularly instructive is the Elder Plinius (NH. 4.44) who mentions some oppida held by the Scythae aroteres around Kallatis. Nevertheless, the archaeo-

Fig. 4. Sites in the territory of Kallatis.
logical evidence concerning a Scythian presence in this area is extremely poor. Therefore, I have suggested that there was an enclave of colonised Scythians, perhaps as a kind of klerouchoi in the forts on the western frontier of the territory of Kallatis.\textsuperscript{83} It is very likely that an élite of Scythian “kings”,\textsuperscript{84} with a status more or less similar to the attested perioikoi of the territory of Herakleia Pontike, controlled a semidependent population (similar to the οἱ τὴν χώραν γεωργούντες from Herakleia).\textsuperscript{85}

The presence of such a Scythian élite could also justify the graves with vaulted funerary chamber and dromos of “Macedonian” type in an area restricted to the neighbourhood of Kallatis. Such monumental graves are clearly incompatible with the democratic régime in Kallatis, as suggested by the Hellenistic inscriptions, but were rather common in the North Pontic Scythian area. They have obviously been erected by Greek masters\textsuperscript{86} but their owners were without doubt non-Greeks and it seems attractive to suggest the same colonised (?) Scythae aroteres who also held the oppida mentioned by Plinius.

Notes

1 Avram 1990; 2001, 593-612.
4 The term occurs in inscriptions from the end of the 3rd century BC (\textit{I. Histriae} 15) and from the 1st century BC (\textit{I. Histriae} 54). One should add a fragmentary decree concerning an embassy (\textit{I. Histriae} 42, 2nd century BC.; l. 3, to read [πρε]σβευτ[ον]), where I could identify [τὴ]ν χώρα[ν] (l. 10) (χώρια, Pippidi).
6 Zimmermann & Avram 1987, 11.
7 Avram, Bounegru & Chiriac 1985, 114.
8 Domăneanțu 1993, 59.
10 A systematic publication of the material of Tariverde is missing. See, for some Archaic ceramic objects, Alexandrescu 1976, 122-123, cat. nos. 59-62; Alexandrescu 1978 a, cat. nos. 257, 272, 292, 349, 410, 437, 626, 650, 713, 731, 734, 739; Mănucu Adameșteanu 1995-1996 (Black Figure crater, possibly local).
13 Suceveanu & Angelescu 1988, 146.
16 Unpublished excavations. See Alexandrescu 1976, 122, cat. nos. 55 (Korinthian skyphos), 56 (Attic cup-skyphos), 57 (Attic C-cup).
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Bucovală & Irimia 1971.
Alexandrescu 1978a, cat. no. 698 bis.
Alexandrescu 1978a, cat. no. 331.
Alexandrescu 1978a, cat. no. 518.
Teleagă 1999, with a detailed examination of the finds and a revised dating.

This necropolis was excavated in the 1960s (only one brief report: Zirra 1970) and the results are now published on the basis of the documentation inherited from the late Vlad Zirra by Emilian Teleagă: Teleagă & Zirra 2003.

Also a grave in a larnax (end of the 6th century BC).

Concerning this type, see Alexandrescu 1978a, cat. nos. 681-689.
Alexandrescu 1978a, cat. no. 738.
Avram 1991a = Avram 1996.

I developed this idea in the report I gave at the Second International Congress on the Archaeology of the Black Sea (Ankara, September 2001).

Alexandrescu 1999, 64.

Once again the parallel with Olbia is instructive. Its chora had more than 100 settlements in the Archaic period but “à la fin du premier tiers du Ve s., la plupart des établissements ruraux furent abandonnés et la vie se concentra dans les villages plus proches de la cite”. “Au dernier tiers du Ve s., la vie reprit dans quelques établissements seulement, mais la recolonisation du territoire rural recommença dans des proportions plus importantes dès la fin du Ve s. et au début du IVe. C’est peut-être à ce moment qu’apparurent près d’Olbia des fermes isolées” (Kryjickij & Bujskih 1999, 274).


Domâneanţu 1993, 59.
Domâneanţu 1980.
Rădulescu 1961, with the chronology established by Teleagă 1999, 38-42.
Teleagă & Zirra 2003, catalogue.

Graves 1, 19 and 45. This is a very rare practice in Getic or Scythian necropoleis and can consequently be used as a supplementary argument for the Greek character of the necropolis of Istria—“Bent”.

Domâneanţu 1993, 59-78.

Unpublished excavations. For the amphora stamps and the chronology, see Avram 1999, 217-219 and 223-224.

Milaev 2002.

For such an attempt, see Avram 1990 and 1991c.

For some (very different) opinions concerning the status of early Orgame see Avram 1995, 197; Avram 2003, 286-287 and 307, note 163; Alexandrescu 1999, 24; Buzoianu 2001, 206; Ruscu 2002, 259-261.

For the territory of Kallatis, Avram 1991b; I. Kallatis, introduction, 11-22; Avram 2001, 614-632 (in all these studies I discussed in detail the epigraphic and numismatic evidence, so I do not insist further here); Oppermann 2000.


Irimia 1989.


Slobozianu & Țicu 1966, 671 and fig. 1.

Vulpe 1943, 14; Slobozianu & Țicu 1966, 679; Irimia 1980, 96-97, no. 9. See also the hoard of Roman Republican coins discovered near this settlement: Mitrea 1970.


Boroneanț 1977, 324, no. 25.

Boroneanț 1977, 324, nos. 27-28.

Lazarov 1998, 93; Oppermann 2000, 140. To be added is an unpublished hoard of Kallatian bronze coins discovered near Šabla.


Irimia 1980, 89, no. 7.


Irimia 1980, 102, no. 13.
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75 Aricescu 1961, 81; Ocheșeanu 1969, 224.
77 Tafrali 1925, 242, fig. 2; Pârvan ² 1974, fig. 81; Preda 1962; Irimia 1983, 118-123; Irimia 1984, 67-72.
78 Ionescu & Georgescu 1997, 164.
80 Plin. NH. 4.44: oppida. One of these sites, Parthenopolis (area of Schitu and Costinești), is also mentioned by Eutropius 6.10 as taken (cepit) by M. Terentius Lucullus Varro in 72/1 BC during the second Mithridatic War. This might suggest that it was a fortified settlement.
81 A pyrgos occurs in I. Kallatis 55.
82 See the testimonies (Ps.-Scymn., 756-757 etc.) collected and commented in I. Kallatis, introduction, 19-21; cf. Avram 2001, 628-631.
86 Tsetskhladze 1998b. For the possible similarity between this type of vaulted construction and the cult building (antron) of the Bacchic thiasos of Kallatis, see I. Kallatis 35 (commentary, pp. 297-301); Jaccottet 2003, I, 151-155.
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