POTS AND PANDEMONIUM: THE EARLIEST EAST GREEK POTTERY FROM NORTH PONTIC NATIVE SETTLEMENTS

Gocha R. Tsetskhladze
(Melbourne, Australia)

Since the publication of B.V. Farmakovskii’s studies in 1914 (The Archaic Period in Russia) and 1916 (Milesian Vases from Russia), followed by the article of T. N. Knipovich (On the Trade Links of the Greeks with the River Tanais Region in the 7th-5th Centuries BC) in 1934, the earliest East Greek pottery from native settlements of the steppes of the northern Black Sea has received considerable attention. A catalogue was produced by N.A. Onaiko in 1966, identifying and dating these finds and other pieces discovered in the previous thirty years according to what was then known. Over the last forty years a few more pieces have come to light but, more importantly, considerable advances have been made both in the dating of East Greek pottery and the identification of centres of production (see Table 1).

During the last decade or so this pottery from the northern Black Sea has received attention on a scale hitherto unknown. This welcome development demonstrates not only the progress made in the study of such pottery but also the problems that it continues to present: academics have retained the use of different chronologies, whilst some publications give insufficient information about new pieces, or what they do give is confusing or contradictory or both. The principal difficulty is methodological: how should we interpret this pottery? It is important to know how the pottery came here - was it as a result of trading relationships with nearby Greek colonies, or was it something else? There are broader implications. Every time the chronology of the pottery changes, must we revise the accepted dates of establishment of the Greek colonies? If so, how many pieces
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1 The details of their investigations and their conclusions (published in Russian) are summarised in ONAIKO 1966, 8-9.
2 ONAIKO 1966, 56, tables I-III.
of pottery need to be present to justify our doing so? How can we reconcile the dates for the foundation of colonies which we can extract from ancient written sources with those of the earliest pieces of pottery? Should we discard the old orthodoxy of ‘pots equals people’, that the find of even one piece of Greek pottery means a Greek presence in, or trade relationship with, a place? These are just a few aspects of the problem.

The aim of this article is to take a fresh look at the earliest East Greek pottery from North Pontic native settlements, primarily decorated tableware, highlighting what we know and what problems we face, and placing the Pontic area within the general framework of Greek colonisation.

The Current State of Information and Publication

In recent publications it is not unusual to find incomplete information. Often, the earliest East Greek pottery is neither properly described nor illustrated. Thus it is practically impossible to check what kind of piece is being discussed (if, indeed, there is any discussion), what its date might be (see below), and so on.

Comparatively, the collection studied most fully is that from the Nemirov settlement (Table 1, no. 1). The first lengthy publication appeared in 1996, a few others followed, but the latest still calls itself a ‘preliminary’ publication. A detailed catalogue is awaited, so that we can identify exactly how many pieces there are, of which category, their chronology, the context of finds, etc.

There are a few recent publications about the Zhabotin settlement (Table 1, no. 3), but no full publication or discussion of Greek pottery from this site. The best information remains that given by Onaiko. From existing descriptions it is difficult to identify what kind of vessel was found; thus it is safe to call it just a ‘fragment of an East Greek vessel’. According to the 1989 publication, it is simply a ‘fragment of the wall of a Rhodian-Ionian vessel of the last quarter of the 7th century BC’; another publication says nothing more precise than ‘pottery of the Late Geometric and Orientalising phase MWG I’. For the Ivane-Puste settlement (Table 1, no. 4), the information I was able to find states just ‘Chian painted pottery of the second half of the 7th century’ or ‘fragments of painted Ionian amphorae’. That given for Zalesya (Table 1, no. 5) is similarly vague. No better information can be found about Trakhtemirov (Table 1, no. 2); very often the
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4 Although I have very good access to Eastern European publications, I was unable to consult a few of potential relevance to this discussion. I cite throughout primarily the most recent publications.
5 VAKHTINA 1996.
7 VAKHTINA 2007.
8 DARAGAN 2001; 2004 a; 2004 b.
9 ONAIKO 1996, 56, no. 3.
10 KOVPANENKO et alii 1989, 52.
12 DARAGAN 2001, 52.
13 DARAGAN 2004 a, 214.
14 DARAGAN 2004 a, 214.
description given is ‘Rhodian-Ionian kylix of the last quarter of the 7th century’\textsuperscript{15} or ‘fragments of walls of a Rhodian vessel of the second half of the 7th century’ (no detailed description is provided)\textsuperscript{16}. Details about the piece from Pozharnaya Balka (Table 1, no. 8) are so vague that it is uncertain whether it should be included alongside the other early fragments. Onaiko describes it as the ‘wall of a vessel with vaguely preserved leaf-and-ray ornament, from a Rhodian-Ionian centre, 7th-6th centuries BC’\textsuperscript{17}, while a more recent publication offers it as a fragment of a vessel belonging to the Early Rhodian-Ionian group\textsuperscript{18}.

Although the discovery of early Greek pottery during the excavation of Belsk settlement (Table 1, no. 7) has been known for over twenty years, it is still unpublished. In 1987 the information given was: ‘the earliest example of Greek pottery in Belsk site is dated to the 7th century BC. This is a fragment of a bowl from a Rhodian-Ionian centre of the end of the 7th century BC. Now six such finds are known, but even earlier material has been discovered as well - fragments of decorated tableware from Rhodian-Ionian centres of the second quarter of the 7th century BC found in the Western and Eastern fortifications’\textsuperscript{19}. Another publication mentions only one fragment\textsuperscript{20}, a third talks of ‘fragments found in the Western fortifications belonging to the last third of the 7th century’\textsuperscript{21}, a fourth ‘a vessel of Orientalising style dating within 670-620 BC’\textsuperscript{22}, and a fifth a piece of Middle Wild Goat I-II\textsuperscript{23}. Only one mentions a fragment of a bird bowl of the second half of the 7th century BC\textsuperscript{24}.

For burials containing the earliest East Greek pottery (see Table 2), the state of publication and information is much better.

To summarise, there is an urgent need for the proper publication of data from settlements (such as Onaiko produced in 1966)\textsuperscript{25}.

**Chronology**

Another problem we face is the chronology of the pieces. Enormous progress has been made with the identification of the places of production of East Greek

\textsuperscript{15} KOVPANENKO et alii 1989, 52.
\textsuperscript{16} KOVPANENKO et alii 1989, 52.
\textsuperscript{17} It has required considerable effort to clarify the details presented in Table 1, no. 2. Even so, it is still difficult to be certain about piece no. 2. VAKHTINA (2004 b, 209) mentions two fragments, one a North Ionian kylix (bird bowl), the other a fragment of a decorated South Ionian vessel (oinochoe?).
\textsuperscript{18} ONAIKO 1966, 56, no. 4.
\textsuperscript{19} BANDUROVSKII 2001, 15.
\textsuperscript{20} SHRAMKO 1987, 125.
\textsuperscript{21} VAKHTINA 2004 a, 55.
\textsuperscript{22} KOPYLOV 2002, 229. The publication gives no numbers, nor any other details. It cites a typescript of B.A. Shramko’s 2000 field report kept in the archive of the Institute of Archaeology, National Academy of Sciences, Kiev. At the same time, Kopylov thanks M.N. Daragan and S.V. Polin for sending him photocopies of photographs of East Greek pottery (KOPYLOV 2002, 229, n. 33 [should be n. 2]).
\textsuperscript{23} BANDUROVSKII 2001, 15.
\textsuperscript{24} DARAGAN 2004 b, 133.
\textsuperscript{25} DARAGAN 2004 b, 133.
\textsuperscript{26} ONAIKO 1966, 56. See also KOPEIKINA 1972; BOUZEK 1990, 27, 32-34.
pottery, and with dating it\textsuperscript{27}, but difficulties remain. In particular, authors continue to use a variety of dating systems and classifications.

Some date the earliest piece of pottery from Nemirov to the last third of the 7th century BC\textsuperscript{28}, while the new classification for East Greek pottery (see below) dates one fragment of amphora (initially identified by M.Y. Vakhtina as an oinochoe) to 650-630 BC\textsuperscript{29}. Even this does not place the earliest pottery in the last third of the 7th century unless we take the very lowest part of the date range.

In some publications the fragment of a bird bowl from Trakhtemirov (Table 1, no. 2.1) is dated to the second half of the 7th century BC\textsuperscript{30}, another assigns it to the first third of that century\textsuperscript{31}, and yet another to the third quarter of the century\textsuperscript{32}. Similar bird bowls have been dated to the middle-second half of the 7th century\textsuperscript{33}. It is very difficult in these circumstances to be certain. The best solution seems to lie in dating this piece to the last quarter/second half of the 7th century, like the vast majority of other early East Greek pottery from native sites.

Publications also offer different dates for MWG I. The piece from Zhabotin (Table 1, no. 3) is assigned to this group and dated to 665/60-650/45 BC\textsuperscript{34}. In the publication of the Nemirov pottery the same style is dated to the end of the third quarter of the 7th century\textsuperscript{35}, but MWG II is dated to the end of the third quarter-last quarter of the 7th century\textsuperscript{36}. One piece from Belsk (Table 1, no. 7.2) is assigned by some to MWG I-II\textsuperscript{37}, whilst others date it to 670-620 BC\textsuperscript{38} or to the last third of the 7th century\textsuperscript{39}.

Early pieces from Iviene-Puste are dated by one publication to the second half of the 7th century BC\textsuperscript{40}, by another to the end of 7th-first half of 6th century\textsuperscript{41}.

According to one publication, the earliest East Greek pottery found in native sites of the forest-steppe dates to 640-600 BC and comes from Nemirov, Trakhtemirov, Belsk and the burial near the village Boltyszka (Table 2, no. 3)\textsuperscript{42}.

In 2005, based on painstaking study, M. Kerschner and U. Schlotzhauer published a new classification scheme for South Ionian pottery\textsuperscript{43}. In this, R.
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\textsuperscript{27} See, for example, \textsc{Cook}, \textsc{Dupont} 1998; \textsc{Boardman} 1998, 141-176. Delated bibliography is given in \textsc{Kerschner}, \textsc{Schlotzhauer} 2005, 1-9.

\textsuperscript{28} \textsc{Vakhtina} 2004 a, 55.
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\textsuperscript{38} \textsc{Bandurovskii} 2001, 15.

\textsuperscript{39} \textsc{Kopylov} 2002, 230.
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\textsuperscript{43} \textsc{Kerschner}, \textsc{Schlotzhauer} 2005. The first version of this article appeared in German in \textsc{Cobet et alii} 2007, 295-317 (this was initially a paper presented to the symposium on Ionia held in September 1999; publication was delayed).
Cook’s Early Orientalising and Early Wild Goat style correspond to the new South Ionian Archaic Ia (SiA Ia: ca. 670-650 BC), his MWG I to SiA Ib (ca. 650-630 BC), MWG II to SiA Ic (ca. 630-610 BC), and MWG II advanced examples and MWG III to SiA Id (ca. 610-580 BC).

It is obvious that this classification favours higher dating, by at least ten years, if not more. For example, the Milesian painted oinochoe from Temir-Gora (Table 2, no. 2), previously dated by all to 640-630 BC44, becomes 650-630 BC45. The neck of an East Greek oinochoe from the Boltyshka burial (Table 2, no. 3), dated by some to the late 7th century46 and by others to the end of 7th-first third of the 6th century47, now too falls within 650-630 BC48. The piece from Alekseevka (Table 1, no. 9) once dated to 620-590 BC is now 630-590 BC49.

Kerschner and Schlotzhauer’s new system of classification is a ‘step towards a “common language” for East Greek pottery studies’50, although, as the authors themselves observe: ‘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’51.

Thus, despite considerable advances in our knowledge of East Greek pottery, there is still much room for improvement.

It should be mentioned that changes in chronology resulting in higher dating are not limited to East Greek pottery. The formulation of a new absolute chronology for the whole Mediterranean Iron Age is in progress, based on scientific methods52. One consequence, through the use of radiocarbon data, has been to raise the date of the Phoenician presence in Spain, and Phoenician expansion in general, by between fifty and one hundred years, pushing it back into the 9th century BC. Another, flowing from a revision to the Central European chronology based largely on dendrochronology, is that the dates of the Iron Age phases in Italy have been raised by some seventy to eighty years. However, chronology in southern Italy is linked to the Mediterranean. And the continued adherence of many scholars to the established chronology has led to double dating of every event in the Orientalising period. Meanwhile, there are two chronologies proposed for the Levant, one lowering Palestinian Early Iron Age II

44 See, for example, KOPEKINA 1972; BOARDMAN 1998, 143, fig. 285; COOK, DUPONT 1998, 36, fig. 8.5.
45 KERSCHNER, SCHLOTZHAUER 2005, 17, no. 22.
46 BOARDMAN 1999, 244, fig. 283.
47 KOPYLOV 2003, 136, table, no. 7.
48 KERSCHNER, SCHLOTZHAUER 2005, 17, no. 23.
49 KERSCHNER 2006 a, 242, n. 111.
50 KERSCHNER, SCHLOTZHAUER 2005, 52. Indeed, as this section clearly demonstrates, we need a common language for the classification and dating of East Greek pottery. See also J.-P. Morel’s paper in Cabrera Bonet and Santos Retolaza 2000, 11-26.
51 KERSCHNER, SCHLOTZHAUER 2005, 52.
52 See NIJBOER 2005; ATTEMA et alii 2005; BARTOLONI, DELPINO 2005; GONZÁLES de CANALES et alii 2006; NIJBOER, VAN DER PLICHT 2006; GILBOA, SHARON 2000; GILBOA 2005; For more information and bibliography, see TSETSKHLADZE 2006 a, XXXI-XXXVIII, XLVIII-XLIX.
to the 9th century, the other raising it. Whilst radiocarbon and
dendrochronological evidence from Gordion indicate that the so-called
Cimmerian destruction level should be shifted from ca, 700 BC to 830-800 BC,
with implications for the whole of Anatolia. This too has met with opposition.

Change is also underway to the chronology of the Scythian antiquities of the
steppes, again chiefly using radiocarbon dating. The reassessment of the
absolute chronology of ‘Scythian’ monuments of the Archaic period in the
northern Black Sea and Caucasus, begun as long ago as the 1980s, has pushed this
period back to the second half or end of the 8th century BC, at least for ‘European
Scythia’. These changes have an impact on the present discussion, especially for
the contextual evaluation of the finds of Greek pottery (see below). It is difficult to
use the terms ‘Scythia’ and ‘Scythian culture’ for the 8th-7th centuries BC; they
are taken largely from Herodotus’ later description of the peoples living on the
European steppes. And even in his time the Scythians were not a monolithic
ethnic entity, rather a grouping of many different tribes under the general
description of ‘Scythians’. The material culture of the European steppes in the
Archaic period displays strong regional variations, displaying some strong
features of the neighbouring Hallstatt culture. There is also some serious
confusion about the information given by Herodotus (4. 99) with regard to
‘Archaic Scythia’. It was not until the second half/end of the 6th-first half of the
5th century that the ‘Scythians’ finally occupied the steppes of the northern Black
Sea, and there is still disagreement as to whether a settled or nomadic/semi-
nomadic population had previously dwelt these territories. Thus, references in
this article to ‘Scythia/Scythian/Scythians’ are to an ethnically diverse local
population of the 7th-first half of 6th century BC whose real name(s) we do not
know.

Context

To gain a proper understanding of pottery it is necessary to know the context
in which it was discovered, especially when it is found in settlements. Recent
publications have not provided much detail. In Ivane-Puste, fragments of Chian
painted ware were discovered together with Thracian grey-clay wheel-made and
handmade local pottery. The earliest East Greek pottery in Nemirov was found
alongside a large quantity of ceramics connected with the Feriegele culture, the
successor to the Basarabi culture.
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54 MUSCARELLA 2003; KEENAN 2004; etc.
55 See ALEKSEEV 2003, 15-37.
56 See, for example, SMIRNOVA 1999, 44.
57 MELYUKOVA 1989, 10-28, 33-79.
58 For the latest discussion, see HIND 2005.
60 DARAGAN 2004 a, 214.
61 SMIRNOVA 1998, 86, 97. Some pottery was discovered in dugouts 1 and 2. The
pottery assemblage of the Nemirov settlement, which existed from the end of the 8th
to the 6th century BC, displays the strong influence of Eastern Hallstatt (and its eastern periphery,
the Carpatho-Danubian area). Indeed it may even be of Eastern Hallstatt origin
In Zhabotin, a piece was unearthed in Trench 7 among local pottery, in a level of the Zhabotin III Horizon. Its presence has been used by some to suggest that a clay altar found here was possibly made by Greeks, or influenced by Greek art, because it bears decoration reminiscent of that on Orientalising-style East Greek pottery. The evidence seems too slight to carry this conclusion. One author also mentions a ‘large quantity of Ionian pottery’ of the Orientalising style dating to the pre-colonial period. In fact only seven fragments of Greek pottery have been discovered in Zhabotin, and only one of these can be identified and dated (see Table 1 no. 3) - the other six are so small that all that can be said is that they come from some kind of amphora(e); they are impossible to date. Furthermore, the details of the altar are even more uncertain than hitherto supposed.

At Trakhtemirov, a fragment of a bird bowl was discovered on the remains of a clay altar forming part of a subterranean cult complex (shrine). The bowl belonged in a depression in the middle of the altar, where it was surrounded by the crushed fragments of a handmade bowl. The altar had scroll decoration.

The fragment from Motroninske was found in Trench 6 in the eastern part of the inner fortification. The level contained four semi-pithouses, two above-ground buildings, twenty-four storage pits, etc. If we turn to the piece from Alekseevka, no context is given. One may suppose that it was found during a survey of this settlement - no excavations have been carried out here, just surveys that yielded a large amount of local pottery.

Thus, not much can be said in detail about context. As mentioned above, the collection from Belsk still awaits publication. The other pieces were discovered alongside local ware.

Interpretation

To summarise, the information given in Table 1 presents the following picture. Eight native settlements (two of them questionable) have yielded examples of the earliest East Greek decorated tableware. The exact quantities from Nemirov, Ivane-Puste and Zalesya are unknown; from the rest we have just eight specimens (which does not suggest that these other sites will contain many). From burials there are two more (Table 2, nos. 2-3). Therefore, we may have some fifteen pieces, twenty at most. The settlements fall into three distinct areas: the Middle Dnieper and environs, the Crimea, and the western Kuban. The last is
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63 RUSYAEVA 1999, 96.
64 ZUEV 1993, 43.
65 DARAGAN 2001, 51.
67 KOPPANENKO et alii 1989, 41, 52, 60, 71-74; BESSONOVA 1996, 30-31, fig. 4.
68 BESSONOVA, SKORYI 2001, 10-11, 82-83.
69 SALOV 1986. This settlement was situated on three hills. It is thought that it became part of the chora of the Greek settlement established in the middle-last quarter of the 6th century BC on the site of modern Anapa (known as Gorgippia from the 4th century BC) (ALEKSEEVA 1997, 22).
included here despite the comparatively late date of the sherd from Alekseevka (Table 1, no. 9) because that piece predates the appearance of Greek colonies in the neighbouring Cimmerian Bosporus, where the earliest settlements are Panticapaeum on the Kerch Peninsula (turn of the first and second quarters of the 6th century BC) and Hermonassa on the Taman Peninsula (ca. 580-570 BC). The problems of dating some pieces are obvious (see Table 1). 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 (Table 1, no. 2.1). 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, myself 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’?

The exact dates of the establishment of the first Pontic colonies are still problematic. We can distinguish two sets of dates: one provided by ancient authors, the other by archaeological material, primarily the earliest East Greek pottery. Needless to say, the dates given by written sources arefavoured by ancient historians, whilst those provided by archaeological evidence are favoured by archaeologists. One recent tendency should be emphasised: the new classification of East Greek pottery trends towards higher dating, probably in an attempt at reconciliation with the foundation dates given in literary sources. A feature to be noted is that it is commonly the upper date in a range that is raised while the lower date stays the same: for example, as I have already mentioned, the Milesian painted oinochoe from Temir-Gora previously dated to 640-630 BC becomes 650-630 BC (Table 2, no. 2). I must repeat that just as some favour the
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71 DUPONT, SKARLATIDOU 2002; 2005.
72 DUPONT, SKARLATIDOU 2002, 52.
73 DUPONT, SKARLATIDOU 2002, 51.
74 For discussion, with bibliography, see TSETSKHLADZE 1994, 111-113.
upper part of the range, others, as I do, favour the lower. Both positions are entirely reasonable, but the latter is more logical, especially when we consider that the vast majority of the earliest East Greek pottery known falls within the range of the last quarter/last third of the 7th century BC.

These discrepancies have been discussed many times⁷⁵, so there is no need here for me to repeat the arguments in detail. For the northern Black Sea, the establishment date of Berezan (ancient Borysthenes) is the principal problem. According to Eusebius, it was 646/5 BC. If we turn to the archaeological evidence, our main source is East Greek pottery, which has long indicated that this settlement was founded no earlier than the last third of the 7th century. In 1986 L.V. Kopeikina published some statistics from excavations at Berezan between 1962 and 1979 for sector G and the north-west sector combined. These were repeated by J. Bouzek in 1990, who added background information from other sources⁷⁶: Wild Goat (i.e. Milesian, Clazomenian and North Ionian together) - 1083; Fikellura - 200; Chian - 123; Ionian banded ware - 526; Clazomenian Black Figure - 43; Corinthian - 125; Attic Black Figure - 552; Attic Red Figure - 8. More recent studies⁷⁷ of the Archaic Ionian pottery found on Berezan confirm the last third of the 7th century as the date of the earliest pieces, and break down its origins as: South Ionian 71%, North Ionian 28%, Aeolian 1%.

Another colony whose foundation date has been hotly disputed is Olbia, founded by Miletus. Fourteen different opinions have been expressed, ranging from 655/4-645/4 BC down to the second half of the 6th century BC⁷⁸. Recently, the East Greek pottery from this site has been published, composed mainly of material found in the last few decades in the south-east part of the Upper City⁷⁹. The earliest examples date between 600 and 580 BC⁸⁰; one publication favours an establishment date of ca. 590 BC⁸¹, another ca. 580 BC⁸².

If we turn to the Taganrog settlement on the Sea of Azov, there is only a collection of pottery washed up on the shore: the settlement itself is submerged⁸³. The previously accepted foundation date was the 630s BC⁸⁴; now it is presumed to be the 640s BC, probably in view of the revised chronology for East Greek pottery with its extended upper range⁸⁵.

---


⁷⁷ POSAMENTIR 2006, 160, 162. See also POSAMENTIR, SOLOVYOV 2006; KERSCHNER 2006 b.


⁸¹ ILINA 2004, 81.

⁸² BUJSKIKH 2007, 506.

⁸³ For the Taganrog settlement, see now LARENOK, DALLY 2002.


⁸⁵ KOPYLOV 2004, 62.
There is also a disparity between the written and archaeological sources for the date of establishment of Histria. Eusebius gives 657/6 BC; Pseudo-Skymnos, the late 7th century BC. The earliest East Greek pottery, altogether thirty-six examples of MWG, places it between the two literary dates at about 630 BC\(^4\). Orgame has latterly received much attention\(^8\). Some think this settlement was established directly by Miletus, another that it was a secondary colony of Histria\(^8\). Five fragments of MWG I oinochoai suggest a foundation date of 640-630 BC\(^9\). The necropolis at Orgame has yielded a large tomb of the third quarter of the 7th century (TA 95)\(^9\); the involvement of the hero cult with it runs from some time later until the 3rd century BC\(^9\). Recent rescue excavations and finds of East Greek pottery at Apollonia Pontica once again confirm that this colony was established in ca. 610 BC, as we know from written sources\(^8\).

The Black Sea is not the only area for which there is a discrepancy between the archaeological and literary evidence for foundation dates of Greek colonies\(^9\). Sicily, where dates are based mainly on Thucydides, but with some data from Eusebius as well, is one such instance. There have been several efforts to reconcile the dates provided by the earliest pottery with that from written sources. Thucydides’ dates are largely reliable (see Tables 3-4)\(^8\). In contrast, the literary foundation date of Carthage, 814/13 BC, cannot be confirmed by conventional absolute chronology (see Table 5) but has been using scientific methods\(^9\). There are problems with the Greek colonies in the Iberian Peninsula as well (see Table 6). Furthermore, as J. Vanschoonwinkel’s studies demonstrate with respect to Asia Minor, the dates provided by the written record of Greek settlement generally accord with those of the (Protogeometric) Greek pottery found along the western coast of Anatolia, whilst acknowledging the limitations of literary-mythological stories on the one hand and a pottery-based (and pottery-biased) material perspective on the other\(^6\).

To understand the presence of Greek pottery in a native milieu, it is very important to know the context in which it was found. A stage has been reached in our investigations at which it is necessary to reject many orthodox views, for instance that pots equals people, or that the presence of even a single Greek pot is
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\(^{86}\) For a summary of publications, see BOUZEK 1990, 21-22; TSETKHLADZE 1994, 117.

\(^{87}\) MANUCU-ADAMESTEANU 2000; 2003; LUNGU 2003; etc.

\(^{88}\) AVRAM 2003, 286-287; AVRAM et alii 2004, 940.

\(^{89}\) MANUCU-ADAMESTEANU 2000. Kerschner gives slightly different dates, again pushing them back. One piece is classified as SiA Ib or Ic, and the others as North Ionian Archaic I: KERSCHNER 2006 a, 233, Abb. 7-8, 234, Abb. 9, 236, Abb. 11.


\(^{91}\) LUNGU 2002.

\(^{92}\) NEDEV, PANAYOTOVA 2003, 96-101.

\(^{93}\) See table 6 in TSETKHLADZE 2006 a, LXVII-LXXIII, which gives information on the literary foundation dates for colonies around the Mediterranean and the Black Sea and the earliest archaeological evidence from them, as well as indicating the presence of local peoples in the vicinity of a colony.

\(^{94}\) See, for example, DOMÍNGUEZ 2006 a. For southern Italy, see YNTEMA 2000.

\(^{95}\) For Carthage, see now NIEMEYER et alii 2007.

\(^{96}\) VANSCHOONWINKEL 2006 a; 2006 b.
evidence of a trading relationship with Greeks (since such a pot could only have been brought by Greeks)\(^97\). Although there is a long way to go, it is obvious that the local population looked at Greek pottery differently from the Greeks; nor was it used in the same way in local settlements as in Greek cities. A few pieces alone could not indicate a trading relationship - they might just as easily have been brought by locals as by Greeks, for pots travel in various ways and for different reasons\(^98\). Particularly in early periods such as the 7th century, the use of pots as a form of ‘diplomatic gift’ cannot be excluded\(^99\). The few early pieces from the northern Black Sea might be viewed as examples of this, especially when we consider that the first colonists were few in number and their initial settlements very small and not yet self-sufficient: it would be natural to seek good relations from the outset with the local population in areas where there was one, and to use gifts as a means of securing this\(^100\). One piece of information from Strabo may be relevant, when he says: ‘... the Nomads are warriors rather than brigands, yet they go to war only for the sake of the tribute due to them... for if the tributes were paid regularly, they would never resort to war...’ (Strabo 7. 4. 6).

The position in other places could be different, as it was with Massalia and the local population thereabouts. According to the legend about the origins of Massalia, the Greeks were given a welcome reception by the local chief (of the Celto-Ligurian tribe of the Segobriges). His daughter married a Greek and he offered his son-in-law the land on which the new town was to be built\(^101\). From an archaeological point of view we know about the VIX crater, interpreted as a ‘diplomatic gift’\(^102\). In general, we are re-examining our understanding of local peoples: nowadays they seem much less ‘barbarian’ than we thought\(^103\). More and more evidence is coming to light to demonstrate that, from the start of colonisation, locals played an important role (even in the laying down of colonies), and that the relationship between the indigenous population and the incomers was not simply one of trade but was more sophisticated and complex\(^104\).

When we focus on the Black Sea, we can see that, overall, the locals tended more to be ‘collaborators’ with the Greeks in the colonial venture than opponents of it\(^105\). Indeed, this a common thread in Ionian colonial settlement everywhere, not just around Black Sea\(^106\).

If a few pieces of pottery are insufficient to prove the existence of trade
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\(^97\) BOARDMAN 2001; CABRERA \textit{et alii} 2004; MARCONI 2004; RATHJE \textit{et alii} 2002; RÜCKERT, KOLB 2003; SCHEFFER 2001; SCHMALTZ, SÖLDER 2003. For further discussion and more bibliography, see TSETKHILADZE 2006 a, LIII-LIV.

\(^98\) Cf. TSETKHILADZE 2005.

\(^99\) For the latest discussion about gift exchange, see VAN WEES 1998; WAGNER-HASEL 2006.

\(^100\) A ‘diplomatic gift’ could take the form of any object or commodity. It may not have survived, indeed it might have been something consumable and/or perishable.

\(^101\) MOREL 2006, 365.

\(^102\) MOREL 2006, 396-399.

\(^103\) For discussion and bibliography, see TSETKHILADZE 2006 a, LI-LVI. See also HODOS 2006.

\(^104\) See, for example, DE ANGELIS 2003; MALKIN 2002.

\(^105\) ANTONACCIO 2007, 214. See also TSETKHILADZE 2002.

\(^106\) TSETKHILADZE 2002.
relations, how many do we need? I shall give examples from two local settlements. Belsk yielded over 10,000 fragments of Greek pottery during eighteen years of excavation, the vast majority of them from the middle of the 6th-5th century BC. During the excavation of the Motroninskoe settlement, 65,000 fragments and about fifty complete and archaeologically complete examples of hand made pottery were found. The Greek pottery of consists of more than 7500 fragments and five archaeologically complete vessels, 96% of it amphora fragments. 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. Our general understanding of the nature and pattern of trade in the Archaic period is also undergoing change.

What kind of settlements were those in which the pottery discussed here was discovered? All were large and important, identified as centres of local administration. Nemirov covered 110 ha; its ramparts were 8 m in height; in the middle of the settlement lies an acropolis with an area of 12.5 ha. 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 containing sixty kurgans. Trakhtemirov extended to 500 ha, defended by earthen ramparts, ditches and a wooden fortification structure. The largest was Belsk, which occupied 4020 ha; it had a defensive perimeter of 25 km and an estimated population of 4000-5000. The ramparts were 9 m high and the ditches over 5 m deep. During excavation of Belsk shrines, a large sanctuary, workshops, dwellings, etc. were uncovered. The site actually included three smaller settlements - western (72 ha), eastern (65.2 ha) and Kuzeminskoe (15.4 ha), each with its own fortifications - and about nine other populated places.

It is obvious that these centres controlled large areas of the steppes, and highly likely that the first colonists, having established their settlements on the northern Black Sea coast, came to them as they set out to explore the hinterland and establish contacts with the local population and their elite. Discussion continues about whether the areas of the immediate hinterland adjacent to the earliest Greek settlements in the northern Black Sea had a settled or a nomadic population, or, as many believe, were unpopulated. Maybe this last could explain why the early Greek pottery is found in settlements of the deep hinterland several hundred kilometres from the Black Sea coast.

The Nemirov settlement stands out; so too does the pottery found there in
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107 SHRAMKO 1987, 121-126, 174-179. By origin: Ionian 16%; Chian (including amphorae) 12.6%; Thasian amphorae 7.8%; Attic 3.7% (little painted, mostly black glaze); Lesbian amphorae 1.7%; amphorae of unidentified origin 38.1%.
109 See, for example, FOXHALL 1998; CABRERA BONET, SANTOS RETOLAZA 2000.
112 BESSONOVA, SKORYI 1999.
113 MELYUKOVA 1989, 68.
114 SHRAMKO 1987; MELYUKOVA 1989, 74-75.
115 See, for example, MELYUKOVA 2001.
both quantity and character. It has long been supposed that this was where Greek pottery came first for onward distribution to other parts of the steppe. M. Vakhtina states that the bulk of the oinochoai at Nemirov show a chronological and stylistic uniformity; she believes that most of the pottery reached here in the second half of the 7th century BC as part of a single consignment. This is, of course, possible, but it is not the only explanation. In some cases the clay looks ‘orthodox Milesian’. However, the clay of several pieces which I saw in the Hermitage in April 2002 does not look particularly East Greek. Of course, this is just a surface impression; to be certain, a chemical analysis of the clay is required. Might this not demonstrate that some pottery could have been produced in Nemirov itself by a migrant potter, as I have already proposed elsewhere?

Vakhtina herself suggested that it was likely that such a potter existed, producing grey wheel-made pottery which is not in the local tradition but which is widespread not only in Nemirov but in other native settlements where early Greek pottery is found. The appearance of such ware was contemporary with the foundation of the Greek colonies. Its disappearance came at the end of the 6th-first third of the 5th century, when life in many steppe-settlements ceased.

A little later we have far more evidence of Greek craftsmen residing and working in local political centres, despite their distance from the seaboard colonies, not only around the Black Sea but in other colonial areas as well. Why should it not be the case that a few pursued this course of action in the early stages of colonisation?

Let us turn to Berezan. Many publications consider that the early pottery discussed in this article reached the native settlements through this Greek colony, a site in many respects unique for the northern Black Sea. I shall discuss here only one aspect: the possibility that pottery of East Greek type was actually produced in Berezan (an idea already proposed in the literature but often overlooked). Since then, however, new publications of the Ionian pottery found here oblige us to revisit this question. The neutron activation analysis of 111 pottery samples from Berezan demonstrated that not all the East Greek pottery here originated from Ionian workshops. So far, it is difficult to identify from where the rest of it came. We know of only two centres outside Ionia that were producing East Greek-type pottery: one workshop, located somewhere in the Hellespontine area, manufactured Milesian-type pottery; the other, at Aeolian Kyme, produced pottery in North Ionian style. A recent suggestion is that there was a third, situated on Berezan. This would not be surprising when we consider that local centres of pottery production existed from the early 6th century BC onwards in
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Histria, Nymphaeum, Panticapaeum, Phanagoria, Gorgippia, Sinope, Chersonesus, etc.125. Once again, no remains of kilns have been found in Berezan, but why should we not suggest that such production might have been undertaken soon after the initial settlement was established? - it would not be surprising, for it happened elsewhere126. Maybe some if not all of the earliest Greek pottery found in native settlements was made in Berezan. Of course, this is just a hypothesis. We need more hard evidence. For context, we should not forget that there were metal workshops in Berezan from the end of the 7th century BC127. So why not potters?

Back to the question of how this pottery reached native settlements, and how the local population regarded it. Much attention has been paid to how the Temir-Gora oinochoe found its way into Scythian possession and came to repose in a Scythian grave in the Crimea128. One idea129 canvassed previously was that since Temir-Gora lay in the path of the seasonal Scythian migration from the Crimea to the Taman Peninsula, the vessel most probably passed into Scythian hands somewhere in the Berezan area, or even in the western Black Sea130. The belief that such a Scythian migration took place relies upon the evidence of Herodotus (4. 28)131. Recent studies demonstrate, however, that even if some kind of migration across the Kerch Strait had taken place in the time of Herodotus, this was not so for the time at which the Temir-Gora oinochoe was made132. A new explanation proposed by T.M. Kuznetsova looks plausible and deserves very serious consideration: that the grave containing the oinochoe was most probably that of a Scythian who had returned from the Near Eastern campaign and brought the object with him133. This is more than possible. We know that other Scythians who came back from this campaign brought with them several Near Eastern objects

125 TSETSKHLADZE 1998 a, 42-43 (with literature).
126 It is known now that the initial settlement in Emporion began to produce pottery soon after the foundation (see CABRERA BONET, SANTOS RETOLA 2000, 347-360). For local pottery production in Massalia, Gravisca and elsewhere, see CABRERA BONET, SANTOS RETOLA 2000, 101-123.
128 See VAKHTINA 1991; 2002. KUZNETSOVA 2002 provides a discussion of all existing opinions and an extensive bibliography.
130 The discovery of Scythian tombs in the northern Dobrudja gave rise to the opinion that there were two streams of Scythian migration to this region. In one of the burials a fragment of an Ionian vessel was discovered, dated by SIMION (2003 [1992]) to ‘after the establishment of Histria’ (the date Simion gives for this is 638 BC) = the second half-end of 7th century BC. MELYUKOVA (2001), who studied in detail the grave-goods from these tombs, is convinced that the tombs should be dated to the 6th-beginning of 5th century BC. She disagrees with Simion and with Marchenko and Vakhhtina (1997), providing convincing reasons to question that Scythian migration took place at such an early date and casting doubt on the validity of Herodotus’ information about ‘Old Scythia’ or ‘Archaic Scythia’. It should be mentioned that, as a rule, scholars studying Scythian and other local sites and objects use the finds of Greek pottery as a means of dating them both, often without paying much attention to how else the local objects might be dated. Moreover, a Greek pot may end up in a local grave long after it was made.
131 VAKHTINA et alii 1980.
133 KUZNETSOVA 2002.
(furniture, ritual vessels and cult objects, armour, ceremonial arms and symbols of power, horse furnishings) which ended up in their tombs in the northern Caucasus.\textsuperscript{134}.

The Ionian painted tableware discussed in this article has animal decoration: running goats, grazing goats, birds, a griffin, dogs chasing a goat, etc. Could this be why it was valued by locals, especially by Scythians? Again, this is quite possible: Scythian art is well known for its distinctive Animal Style, and Scythians may have valued the pottery for its echoes of their own art and lifestyle.\textsuperscript{135} If we seek a market for Ionian-style decorated pottery in Berezan, then the Scythians and other peoples of the steppes come to mind alongside the Greeks living in Brerazan and in the other settlements of the northern Black Sea. The piece in Alekseevka most probably reached there via the Taganrog settlement.\textsuperscript{136}

Can the pottery discussed here be interpreted as an indication that Greek colonisation was driven by trade, as is often supposed? (A case of ‘trade before the flag’?)\textsuperscript{137} This is a very complex matter, but overall it is better to think of trade as one of the outcomes of colonisation, not one of the reasons for it.\textsuperscript{138} All the discussion above demonstrates how difficult it is to interpret this small amount of pottery. If the objects were examples of trade, might we not expect them to be more abundant even at such an early period? And what was traded in return? - something else open to speculation for want of any evidence. Despite this, the first colonists have been characterised as hungry Ionians, particularly Milesians, wandering around the northern Black Sea looking for fish, timber, metals and grain in order to take these commodities back to their homeland to palliate the awful economic situation there caused by conflict with the Lydians.\textsuperscript{139} At the same time they had sporadic meetings with locals and set up seasonal trading-posts and contacts, before establishing permanent settlements.\textsuperscript{140} Some early traders infiltrated local settlements, living in dugout dwellings modified to accord with their way of life and habits, taking local wives, and acquainting themselves with

\textsuperscript{134} See TSETSKHLADZE 1999, 476-477 (with literature).

\textsuperscript{135} TSETSKHLADZE 1998 a, 12-13; POLIDOVICH 1999.

\textsuperscript{136} KOPYLOV 2002; 2004.

\textsuperscript{137} For a recent opinion supporting trade as the motive: ‘These finds are important not only as Early Greek Pottery finds but also for the history of colonization of the Black Sea area. So we have a clear horizon of pottery of the third quarter of the 7th century which we did not have from 100 years of excavation, not from Histria - we have no bird kotyle like Trachtemirov, not from Berezan and even not from Taganrog. And as you showed, that ended somewhere in the 6th century. So for me that has the implication that trade must have been the first thing the Greeks wanted there. They traded with the indigenous chiefs from the hinterland. Then, as there were good possibilities for rich agriculture, they changed the intentions. But the original point of movement was trade’ (M. Kerschner in the discussion of M. Vakhitina’s paper published in COBET et alii 2007, 517).

\textsuperscript{138} TSETSKHLADZE 1998 a, 9-10; 2005; KOLB 2004, 594.

\textsuperscript{139} SOLOVYOV 1999, 30; 2004, 334-335.

\textsuperscript{140} SOLOVYOV 2004, 334-335.
the local lifestyle. Others paint the early settlers as ‘working class and poor’, again wandering the area in their ‘attempt to make the so-called Greek miracle reality’. I do not think there is much one can say about these interpretations.

It is hard to see why Ionians should have come so far to find fish and timber, present in abundance in East Greece and neighbouring areas (including the southern Black Sea - fish; and the eastern Black Sea - timber). The search for metals as an explanation is debased by the ample supply of them in Anatolia and they definitely cannot be found in the steppelands inhabited by the local population of the northern Black Sea. Again, we know that there was no grain trade between the Scythians and Greeks in the Archaic period. What is meant by seasonal trading-stations and occasional contact? Were Greeks journeying to and fro between the northern Black Sea and Ionia at least twice a year? How practical was this? The reasons for colonisation are complex. Previously accepted theories about overpopulation, the search for food, metals, etc. have gradually fallen by the wayside. The Greeks had no shortage of land, food or metals in or close to their homeland. When they had to colonise, it was usually in response to some kind of natural disaster, external pressure or threat, or internal conflict, etc. To establish a colony was a major undertaking, not entered upon casually. To borrow a phrase: ‘It’s murder to found a colony’. In other words, ‘... founding a colony overseas can be as dangerous and as violent as war. ... the Greeks often settled territory occupied by native populations, and Thucydides
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141 SOLOVYOV 2004, 335. I fail also to understand the following (the original Russian is opaque): ‘Monuments of archaeology and epigraphy contain reliable data about the existence of Greek traders among the local population even at this stage [the early period of colonisation?] of the relationship... The question is: how to extract this data, insofar as the criteria for distinguishing it are insufficiently worked out in classical studies, especially classical archaeology’ (SOLOVYOV 2004, 335). Many works have appeared in the West that seek to identify the presence of Greeks in native contexts, locals in Greek colonies, the archaeological evidence of inter-marriage, etc. See, for example, SHEPHERD 1999; HODOS 2006; TSETS KHLADZE 2006 a, XLVIII, all with extensive bibliographies. I have further difficulties with the statement that the Graeco-barbarian relationship was dominated by the ‘stereotypical ethnic psychology’ of the Greek colonists in the northern Black Sea, because only Greeks possessed the ‘foremost cultural potential’ (SOLOVYOV 2004, 336). In plain language, this probably means that Greek culture was superior, and the Greeks knew it (a return to an old orthodoxy). (For the latest discussion of our understanding of the problem of identity, see TSETS KHLADZE 2006 a, LI-LVI, LIX-LXII, with bibliography).


143 Petropoulos 2005, 128.

144 As new studies demonstrate, Ionia was quite a prosperous territory despite Lydian and other pressures (see the papers on Ionia COBET et alii 2007).


146 TSETS KHLADZE 1998 c, 54-63 (with literature).

147 TSETS KHLADZE 2006 a, XXVIII-XXX (with literature); Descoeudres forthcoming.


149 DOUGHERTY 2003.
shows us how dangerous and violent confrontations with local peoples could be; his account of the founding of Syracuse... mentioned the native Sikels, who had been expelled to make room for the Greeks. Two poets, contemporaries of the archaic colonization movement, also mention confrontations between the Greek colonists and local populations. Mimnermos, in a fragment from the Nanno, describes the violence of the settlement of Kolophon and the *hybris* of the colonists... Archilochos also recalls the hostility between Greeks and Thracians when Paros colonized the island of Thasos’.

Within the Pontic region the earliest East Greek pottery has also been found in the eastern Black Sea, where it allegedly predates the establishment of Greek colonies, considered by many to have been established in the middle of the 6th century. The main problem we face is that none of the Greek cities has been located, except for Dioscurias (which is known to be partly under the modern city of Sukhumi, thus inaccessible, and partly underwater), let alone undergone archaeological investigation. Excavation of the Simagre local settlement, situated not far from the alleged location of Greek Phasis (modern Poti), has yielded a small a number of fragments of rosette bowls of the beginning-first half of the 6th century BC, a fragment of a Fikellura-style jug of the middle 6th century, a fragment of the neck of an amphora decorated with wide red bands and the foot of a Chian amphora (both first half of the 6th century). Some East Greek pottery made its way into the hinterland along the River Phasis (fragment of a Chian chalice-style bowl in Vani, and a fragment of a rosette bowl not far from Kutaisi, both first half of the 6th century). Interpreting these in relation to the foundation date of Phasis, in one place O.D. Lordkipanidze rightly notes that ‘... the discovery of imported Greek wares at such settlements may signal the existence of colonies - but not always: imported wares at barbarian settlements may have also appeared as a result of the activity of temporary trading factories, or even individual visiting merchants. Owing to the want of other data, any conclusions we make regarding Phasis can only be hypothetical’, but in another he states that Phasis was established between 600 and 570 BC.

A small quantity of pottery of the first half of the 6th century BC, such as fragments of an East Greek oinochoe, rosette bowls, fragment of an amphora with wide red bands, etc., is also known from other native sites in Colchis, such as Batumis Tsikhe, on the outskirts of modern-day Batumi, and Eshera (where, in 2003, three pieces of North Ionian LWG of the beginning/first third of the 6th
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150 DOUGHERTY 2003, 187-188.
151 For the Greek colonies and colonisation of Colchis, see TSETSKHLADZE 1998 b, 5-70, with bibliography.
152 KACHARAVA 1995, 64-65, 68; LORDKIPANIDZE 2000, 60.
154 LORDKIPANIDZE 2000, 59.
155 LORDKIPANIDZE 2000, 61. Different dates have been proposed for the foundation of Phasis, a Milesian colony: end of the 7th-beginning of the 6th century, first half of the 6th century, second half of the 6th century, middle of the 6th century, end of the 6th century, and end of the 5th-beginning of the 4th century. For a summary, see LORDKIPANIDZE 2000, 61, n. 325.
156 KACHARAVA 1995, 64-65, 68.
century BC were found), an inland settlement not far from Sukhumi\textsuperscript{157}. It is very difficult to interpret this pottery in a Colchian context. We cannot have a clear date for the establishment of Greek settlements here until the Greek colonies themselves are located and studied. Vani and Eshera were local settlements considered to have been the residences of the local aristocracy (Vani)\textsuperscript{158} or tribal chiefs (Eshera)\textsuperscript{159}. By the beginning of the 6th century BC some Greek colonies had been founded in the northern and southern Black Sea\textsuperscript{160}. It is not impossible that these few pieces originated there and thus have nothing to do with the Greek colonies in Colchis itself.

\textit{Conclusions}

This article has focused on the difficulties of using a small number of early pots as a foundation for constructing grand interpretations of Greek colonial activity and the reasons for it in the northern Black Sea. As I have tried to demonstrate, this has echoes in other areas of Greek expansion. We long considered the Pontic region to be something unique, but the problems we face there are much the same as those encountered in other parts of the ancient world. It is true that there is local diversity within a particular region and throughout the Greek world, but this is balanced by unifying process that we still call colonisation.

To explain why we find early Greek pottery in local settlements, especially in very remote ones, which is the case for the northern Black Sea, proves to be very difficult. First of all, the problems with the reliability and extent of the information about these pieces and the dating of them are obvious. We still do not speak the same language when talking about chronology, classification, etc. It is, of course, much easier to explain the appearance of these pots as a result of a trading relationship. But, as I have tried to demonstrate, there are many other possible explanations. Until we can all agree about many methodological problems, it seems to be rather unwise to change the foundation dates of the first colonies every time the chronology of pottery is revised. Only when we have a firm and recognised system of dating and classifying pottery should we attempt to do this. As I have shown, the pottery examined in this articles fits very reasonably with the archaeological dates for the establishment of the earliest Pontic colonies, at least. Pottery is unique primary data for archaeologists, but like all other types of evidence, it has its limitations.

The term pre-colonial contacts was once used to explain finds in local settlements of small numbers of Greek pots which predated the establishment of the first Greek colonies\textsuperscript{161}. As more evidence gradually comes to light in both

\textsuperscript{157} TSETSKHLADZE 2006 c, 106-107.
\textsuperscript{158} LORDKIPANIDZE 2000, 60.
\textsuperscript{159} TSETSKHLADZE 2006 c, 108, with bibliography.
\textsuperscript{160} TSETSKHLADZE 1994, 117-120.
\textsuperscript{161} See, for example, GRAHAM 1990.
the eastern\textsuperscript{162} and western\textsuperscript{163} regions of Greek overseas settlement, this explanation has receded\textsuperscript{164}.

\textbf{TABLE 1}

Earliest East Greek Tableware from the Settlements of the Local Population

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NO.</th>
<th>SITE</th>
<th>REGION</th>
<th>GREEK POTTERY</th>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>BIBLIOGRAPHY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Nemirov/ Nemirovskoe</td>
<td>Upper South Bug</td>
<td>About 70 pieces of Archaic East Greek pottery, mainly painted</td>
<td></td>
<td>Onaiko 1966, 56, nos.2, 5-6;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. One fragment previously identified as a fragment of an oinochoe, now</td>
<td>2. According to Kerschner and Schlotzhauer 2005, 17, no. 26 - 650-630 BC, SiA Ib</td>
<td>2004a; 2004b; 2007;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>believed to be of an amphora</td>
<td></td>
<td>Kerschner and Schlotzhauer 2005, 17;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3. Fragment of Milesian (?) cup</td>
<td>3. According to Vakhtina 2007, 511 - second half of 7th century BC;</td>
<td>Kerschner 2006a, 236-237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>according to Kerschner 2006a, 236 - middle-second half of 7th</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{162} See, for example, TSEKHLADZE 1998 a, 10-15.

\textsuperscript{163} See, for example, RIDGWAY 2000; cf. MOREL 2006, 364.

\textsuperscript{164} I would like to express my thanks to Sir John Boardman, Anthony Snodgrass, David Ridgway and John Hind for their comments on this piece.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2</th>
<th>Trakhtemirov/Trakhtemirovskoe</th>
<th>Middle Dnieper</th>
<th>1. Fragment of bird bowl</th>
<th>1. First third of 7th century BC (Kerschner 2006a, 239) or second half of 7th century BC (Daragan 2004b, 133) or similar bird</th>
<th>Onaiko 1966, 56, no. 7; Kovpanenko et alii. 1989, 52; Bessonova 1996, 30-31; Daragan 2004b, 126, Abb. 50.2-4, 133;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4. Vast majority belong to pinochoai (round-mouthed and trefoil) of MWG I-II produced in southern Ionia</td>
<td>century BC (South Ionian)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. According to Vakhtina 2007, 513 - 630-600 BC. Some have depictions of a dog chasing a deer reminiscent of depictions of third-beginning of fourth quarter of 7th century BC. According to Kerschner and Schlotzhauer 2005, 17, 25, 33 - Cook’s MWG I corresponds to their SiA Ib (650-630 BC), MWG II to their SiA Ic (630-610 BC), and MWG II advanced examples and MWG III to their SiA Id (610-580 BC)</td>
<td>Pottery of 6th century is not so numerous</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Site/Region</td>
<td>Region</td>
<td>Item Type</td>
<td>Date Range</td>
<td>References</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Fragment of Samian WG crater</td>
<td>For a possible analogy, see Boardman 1998, 146, fig. 325 or South Ionian oinochoe (Vakhtina 2004b, 209)</td>
<td>Bowls are also dated to middle-second half of 7th century BC (Cook and Dupont 1998, 26)</td>
<td>Vakhtina 2004a, 55-56; 2004b, 209; Kerschner 2006a, 239</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Zhabotin/ Zhabotinskoe</td>
<td>Middle Dnieper</td>
<td>Fragment of East Greek vessel</td>
<td>Last quarter of 7th century BC</td>
<td>Onaiko 1966, 56, no. 3; Kovpanenko et alii. 1989, 52; Daragan 2001, 51; 2004a, 213-214; 2004b, 126, Abb. 50.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Ivane-Puste</td>
<td>Middle Dnieper</td>
<td>Fragments of Chian painted pottery (number not given)</td>
<td>Second half of 7th century BC or end of 7th- first half of 6th century BC</td>
<td>Melyukova 1989, 73; Daragan 2001, 52; 2004a, 214; Vakhtina 2004a, 56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Zalesya</td>
<td>Middle Dnieper</td>
<td>Fragments of Chian painted pottery (number not given)</td>
<td>Second half of 7th century BC</td>
<td>Melyukova 1989, 73; Daragan 2004a, 214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Motroninskoe</td>
<td>Middle Dnieper</td>
<td>One fragment of Milesian oinochoe</td>
<td>640-600 BC</td>
<td>Bessonova, Skoryi 2001, 83, fig. 54.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Belsk/ Belskoe</td>
<td>Vorskla Basin</td>
<td>One fragment of Bird bowl</td>
<td>1. Middle/last quarter of 7th</td>
<td>Shramko 1987, 125; Kopylov</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>North Ionian</td>
<td>2. One fragment of MWG I-II vessel/South Ionian vessel (oinochoe?)</td>
<td>2. Last quarter of 7th century BC. According to Kerschner and Schlotzhauer 2005, 17, 25, 33 - Cook’s MWG I corresponds to their SiA Ib (650-630 BC), MWG II to their SiA Ic (630-610 BC), and MWG II advanced examples and MWG III to their SiA Id (610-580 BC)</td>
<td>2002; Bandurovskii 2001, 15; Daragan 2004b, 133; Vakhtina 2004b, 209</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Pozharnaya (?) Balka</td>
<td>Vorskla Basin</td>
<td>One fragment of ‘Rhodian-Ionian vessel’</td>
<td>Early Rhodian-Ionian group</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bandurovskii 2001, 15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Alekseevka/ Alekseevskoe</td>
<td>Not far from Greek Gorgippia (modern Anapa)</td>
<td>One fragment of bird bowl</td>
<td>630-590 BC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kharaldina Novochikhin 1996, 349-350, fig 2; Kerschner 2006a, 242, n. 111</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 2

Scythian Kurgans (Tumuli/Barrows) with Earliest East Greek Pottery of the 7th Century BC
(adapted from Kopylov 2003, 136)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Site Description</th>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Greek Pottery</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Burial ground Krasnogorovka III, kurgan 14, grave 5</td>
<td>Lower Don</td>
<td>Samian (1) and Chian (1) transport amphorae</td>
<td>Third quarter-end 7th century BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Kurgan Temir-Gora</td>
<td>Crimea</td>
<td>Milesian painted oinochoe</td>
<td>640-630 BC. According to Kerschner and Schlotzhauer 2005, 17, no. 22 - 650-630 BC (SiA Ib)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Burial Boltyshka</td>
<td>Tyasmin Basin</td>
<td>Neck of East Greek oinochoe</td>
<td>650-630 BC (according to Kerschner and Schlotzhauer 2005, 17, no. 23 [SiA Ib]). Date given by Kopilov is end of 7th-first third of 6th century BC. Late 7th century is given by Boardman (1999, 244, fig. 283)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Kurgan 1 near the village of Kolomak</td>
<td>Vorskla Basin</td>
<td>Two Chian transport amphorae</td>
<td>Third quarter of 7th century BC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 3

Relative Chronology of Sicilian Foundations  
(after Morris 1996, tabs. 1-3, fig. 1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SITE</th>
<th>DATES OF EST. PER THUC. (6.3-5)</th>
<th>CHEVRON SKYPHOI</th>
<th>THAPSOS WARE</th>
<th>EPC (720-680)</th>
<th>MPC (680-650)</th>
<th>LPC (650-610)</th>
<th>EC (610-590)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Naxos</td>
<td>734</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syracuse</td>
<td>733</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leontini</td>
<td>729</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Megara Hyblaea</td>
<td>728</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gela</td>
<td>688</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selinus</td>
<td>628</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key: EPC - Early Protocorinthian; MPC - Middle Protocorinthian; LPC - Late Protocorinthian; EC - Early (Ripe) Corinthian.

### TABLE 4

Earliest Ceramics and the Foundation Dates of Some Greek Colonies on Sicily  
(Foundation Dates According to Thucydidies and Eusebius)  
(After Nijboer 2005, 257, table 1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COLONY</th>
<th>DATE THUCYDIDES</th>
<th>DATE EUSEBIUS</th>
<th>EARLIEST CORINTHIAN POTTERY Settlement</th>
<th>EARLIEST CORINTHIAN POTTERY Sanctuary</th>
<th>EARLIEST CORINTHIAN POTTERY Cemetery</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Naxos</td>
<td>734</td>
<td>741/736</td>
<td>LG skyphos</td>
<td>Some LG + EPC aryballoi ceramics</td>
<td>EPC aryballoi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syracuse</td>
<td>733</td>
<td>736/734</td>
<td>LG-EPC. Thapsos style: several skyphoi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leontini</td>
<td>729</td>
<td></td>
<td>3 fragments LG Thapsos style</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Megara Hyblaea</td>
<td>728</td>
<td></td>
<td>Many fragments of LG ceramics: Thapsos style</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zancle</td>
<td>After 734</td>
<td>Before 717</td>
<td>LG kotyle fragments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mylae (Chersonesus) | 717 | EPC aryballoï/kotyle
Taras | 706 | EPC aryballos
Gela | 688 | Some EPC ceramics
     | 690 | Some EPC and MPC ceramics

Key: LG - Late Geometric; EPC - Early Protocorinthian.

**TABLE 5**

Greek Fine Wares from the Earliest Settlement Layers of Carthage so far Excavated (after Nijboer 2005, 260, table 2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STRATIGRAPHY</th>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>GREEK FINE WARES</th>
<th>DATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Phase I</td>
<td>ca. 760-740</td>
<td>1 Euboean LG skyphos</td>
<td>ca. 750-715</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Layer IIA</td>
<td>ca. 740-725</td>
<td>1 Euboean LG skyphos</td>
<td>ca. 750-715</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 Cycladic (?) LG open vessel</td>
<td>ca. 750-715</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 Pithekoussan Aetos 666 kotyle</td>
<td>ca. 750-715</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 Pithekoussan LG flat bowl or plate</td>
<td>ca. 750-715</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 Greek open vessels</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Layer IIB</td>
<td>ca. 725-700</td>
<td>5 sherds of Euboean LG skyphoi</td>
<td>ca. 750-715</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 Pithekoussan juglet</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 6

List of Greek Settlements in the Iberian Peninsula  
(after Domínguez 2006b, 484-485)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>TYPE OF SETTLEMENT</th>
<th>PROVENANCE OF COLONISTS/METROPOLIS</th>
<th>LITERARY DATE OF FOUNDATION</th>
<th>EARLIEST GREEK ARCHAEOLOGICAL MATERIAL</th>
<th>REMARKS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EMPORION</td>
<td>Initially emporion; later polis</td>
<td>Phocaea (Livy 34.9) Massalia (Strabo 3.4.8; Ps.-Skym. 204-205)</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>End of 7th/beginning of 6th century BC</td>
<td>The only true Greek polis in Iberia (perhaps from 5th century BC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RHODE</td>
<td>Initially emporion; later polis</td>
<td>Emporion (Strabo 3.4.8) Massalia (Ps.-Skym. 205-206) Rhodes (Strabo 3.4.8; 14.2.10)</td>
<td>Before the establishment of the Olympic Games (Strabo 14.2.10)</td>
<td>End of 6th/beginning of 5th century BC</td>
<td>Perhaps a polis from 4th century BC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HEMERO-SKOPEION</td>
<td>Polichnion</td>
<td>Phocaea (Steph. Byz. s.v.) Massalia (Strabo 3.4.6)</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td>Not identified with certainty; the region of Denia-Jávea has been proposed as place of location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALONIS</td>
<td>Polis (Steph. Byz. s.v.) Polichnion ?</td>
<td>Massalia (Steph. Byz. s.v.; Strabo 3.4.6 ?)</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Some pottery of 6th century BC; more from beginning of 5th century BC</td>
<td>Perhaps one of the three cities cited by Strabo (3.4.6). Santa Pola has been proposed as place of location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNKNOWN</td>
<td>Polichnion</td>
<td>Massalia (Strabo 3. 4. 6)</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Nothing is known about its name or localisation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAINAKE</td>
<td>Polis (Strabo 3. 4. 2; Ps.-Skym. 146-147)</td>
<td>Phocaea (Strabo 3. 4. 2)</td>
<td>Massalia (Ps.-Skym. 146-147)</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>On the coast of Màlaga, there is much Greek pottery from the end of 7th/ beginning of 6th century BC. It would be a polis according to both authors; today nobody thinks of Mainake as a Greek city</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAGUNTUM</td>
<td>Emporion? Enokismos? Zacynthus (Pliny NH 16. 216; Livy 21. 7. 2; Strabo 3. 4. 6; Appian Iber. 7)</td>
<td>200 years before the Trojan War (Pliny NH 16)</td>
<td>Ca. 580 BC</td>
<td>Almost certainly not a Greek city</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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