

Univerzita Karlova
Filozofická fakulta

Disertační práce

Univerzita Karlova
Filozofická fakulta
Ústav pro klasickou archeologii

Disertační práce

Mgr. Petra Tušlová

Roman and Late Antique Pottery from Ancient Thrace,
Selected Assemblages from the Yambol District

Římská a pozdně antická keramika v antické Thrákii,
vybrané soubory z Jambolského regionu

Vedoucí práce doc. PhDr. Peter Pavúk, Ph.D.

2020

Prohlašuji, že jsem disertační práci napsala samostatně s využitím pouze uvedených a řádně citovaných pramenů a literatury a že práce nebyla využita v rámci jiného vysokoškolského studia či k získání jiného nebo stejného titulu.

V Praze dne 12. 02. 2020

Mgr. Petra Tušlová

Acknowledgments

In this section I would like to thank the many people who supported me and helped me while working on this thesis. First of all, my deepest gratitude goes to my family, who heard the apology ‘I cannot do this / go there as I am working on my thesis’ most often. Especial thanks belong to my husband Pablo, who had to put up with several years of lonely summers when I was in Bulgaria and who did not come up with the term ‘thesis monster’ for no reason.

My further thanks go to my colleague and friend Barbora Weissová with whom I was able to initiate the quite ambitious archaeological project in the Yurta-Stroyno *vicus* right at the beginning of our PhD studies and with whom I started to work on pottery in Bulgaria in the first place; furthermore, to Věra Doležálková, who helped me a great deal with pottery drawings and their digitalization, without her, I would probably still just be drawing; to Johana Tlustá, who spent days locked in a mouldy room taking photos of pottery and of other objects, her photos are easily recognizable within the thesis (the nice ones without my hand in them); and to other colleagues and students of archaeology who occasionally helped putting the giant puzzle of the pottery from Dodoparon together.

Great thanks also belong to Adéla Sobotková who brought me to the Yambol District as a member of TRAP. It was her who introduced me to the area and to Stefan Bakardzhiev, the current director of the Yambol Museum. With S. Bakardzhiev we started further cooperation on excavations but also, it was him who gave me the permission, but most of all, the trust, for processing the three pottery assemblages presented within the thesis. I cannot omit thanking at this point, also Todor Vulchev, my right-hand man in Bulgaria, who made things happen as without him nothing would have worked.

I would also like to thank my colleagues at the Institute of Classical Archaeology for their patience with me, as I was not always a fully dedicated member of the Institute, having my attention split between university obligations and the thesis. I would especially like to thank Peter Pavúk, the director of the Institute and the thesis supervisor in one person, who always supported my work and who created suitable conditions for me to finish the thesis on time.

There are several specialists to whom I turned for help while evaluating the material, and to whom I would also like to thank for their invaluable advice, namely Diana Dobрева, Andrei Opaïț and Sergey Vnukov.

Finally, I would like to thank Judd Burden for proofreading the text, some parts even during the Christmas holidays of 2019, just to make sure we would make it on time. I might have occasionally added some words or sentences during the last readings and as such make some grammatical mistakes within the text. These are, of course, my responsibility.

Abstract

Three pottery assemblages from the Yambol District were processed in this thesis to enrich our knowledge about the Roman and Late Antique pottery material in Ancient Thrace. The first, and most abundant assemblage, is from the Roman *vicus* called Yurta, which is located near the village of Stroyno and dated from the 1st/2nd c. AD till the Late Antiquity. This assemblage is substituted by different pottery classes which give us bases for identifying the variability of the pottery material and the different wares and fabrics in the area. In addition, it represents the main material for statistics and for a quantitative comparison of individual classes. The second assemblage includes 19 complete vessels from two burial mounds in Palauzovo, dated to the 2nd–3rd c. AD, and gives a comparative sample for the settlement contexts as well as a basis for studying the ways in which pottery was modified for special burial purposes. The last set of 57 vessels comes from a closed context dated to the end of the 6th c. AD, which was found in a collapsed house at the Dodoparon hillfort, rising above the village of Golyam Manastir. It represents a unique set of finds from the Late Antiquity, which is well dated and preserved.

The three pottery assemblages are all different, each with a distinct character, which allowed them to be processed and interpreted individually, in their own context. Nevertheless, the resulting data could also be put together with other pottery material from Ancient Thrace to create a bigger picture of the pottery development and usage in different contexts (settlements × burials), as well as in different periods (Roman × Late Antiquity), along the middle stream of the Tundzha River, as well as in Ancient Thrace.

Keywords

Bulgaria; Thrace; Thracia; pottery; Roman; Late Antique; settlement; *vicus*; hillfort; necropolis; burial mound.

Abstrakt

Do této práce byly zpracovány tři keramické soubory z Jambolském regionu za účelem obohacení naší znalosti o Římské a pozdně antické keramice z Thrákie. První, nejbohatší soubor, pochází z římského *vicu*, který je znám pod označením Jurta a nachází se nedaleko vesnice Strojno. Jeho datace je přibližně od přelomu 1. a 2. st. n.l. do pozdní antiky. V tomto souboru lze nalézat množství různých keramických skupin, jejichž rozdělení na jednotlivé morfologické typy a druhy keramické hmoty nám poskytlo představu o rozmanitosti a charakteru keramického materiálu ve zkoumané oblasti. Současně nám tento soubor nabídl statistické údaje pro studium množstevního zastoupení jednotlivých keramických skupin na konkrétním osídlení a poskytl data k jejich vzájemnému porovnání. Druhý soubor zahrnuje 19 celých nádob, které byly nalezeny ve dvou mohylách datovaných do 2. a 3. st. n.l. u vesnice Palauzovo. Kromě toho, že nám nádoby poskytují komparativní vzorek k sídlištnímu materiálu, umožňují současně sledovat trendy v úpravách keramických nádob k účelu uložení v pohřebním kontextu. Poslední soubor 57 nádob pochází z uzavřeného souboru konce 6. st. n.l., který byl odkryt v jednom domě na opevněném sídlišti Dodoparon, v blízkosti vesnice Goljam Manastir. Tato skupina nádob představuje výjimečný nález keramiky z pozdní antiky, který je velmi přesně datovaný a současně dobře dochovaný téměř do celých tvarů.

Díky tomu, že každý ze jmenovaných souborů je jiný a má svůj vlastní charakter, bylo možné každý z nich zpracovat a vyhodnotit individuálně v rámci svého vlastního kontextu. Současně, výsledná data ze všech třech souborů byla obohacena o materiál z dalších sídlí a pohřebišť jak z Jambolského regionu, tak z okolních oblastí antické Thrákie. Ve výsledku bylo možné vytvořit syntézu dat a zhodnotit charakter a vývoj keramické produkce na středním toku řeky Tundži v době římské a v pozdní antice.

Klíčová slova

Bulharsko; Thrákie; keramika; Římské období; pozdní Antika; osídlení; *vicus*; pohřebišť; pohřební mohyly.

CONTENTS

1	Introduction	8
1.1.	Pottery assemblages from the Yambol District – A brief introduction.....	8
1.2.	Pottery description and presentation methodology	10
1.3.	Pottery development background – A short history of Ancient Thrace..	12
1.4.	Main aims of the thesis	19
2	Yurta-Stroyno	21
2.1.	Introduction	21
2.1.1.	The site of Yurta-Stroyno	21
2.1.2.	Context of the pottery finds	23
2.1.3.	The pottery assemblages selected for processing	28
2.1.4.	Notes on the following text.....	28
2.2.	Red-slipped table ware	31
2.2.1.	History of research.....	31
2.2.2.	Introduction to the material.....	33
2.2.3.	Material characteristics	34
2.2.4.	Fabric characteristics	36
2.2.5.	Common red-slipped ware.....	38
2.2.5.1.	Dishes.....	38
2.2.5.2.	Dishes / Trays	48
2.2.5.3.	Bowls	48
2.2.5.4.	Cups	54
2.2.5.5.	Cups / Deep hemispherical bowls.....	56
2.2.5.6.	Kraters.....	60
2.2.5.7.	Pots.....	64
2.2.5.8.	Basins / Krateriskoi.....	64
2.2.5.9.	Vessels for water and other liquids.....	65
2.2.5.10.	Strainers	72
2.2.5.11.	Bases	73
2.2.5.12.	Decoration.....	73
2.2.6.	Marbled / Mottled ware	73
2.2.7.	Colour coated ware	76
2.2.8.	Çandarli ware	78
2.2.9.	Bases – mixture of the wares	79
2.2.10.	Thin-walled ware	84
2.2.11.	Table ware – conclusion	87
2.3.	Grey ware	91
2.3.1.	History of research – introduction to the material	91
2.3.2.	Material characteristic.....	92
2.3.3.	Fabric characteristic	94
2.3.4.	Dishes.....	95
2.3.5.	Bowls	98
2.3.6.	Cups / Deep hemispherical bowls.....	98
2.3.7.	Kraters / Pots.....	99
2.3.8.	Table amphora	100
2.3.9.	Jugs	100
2.3.10.	Frying pan (?).....	101
2.3.11.	Bases	102
2.3.12.	Lamps.....	102
2.3.13.	Grey ware – conclusion	103

2.4.	Coarse ware	105
2.4.1.	History of research	105
2.4.2.	Introduction to the material	106
2.4.3.	Material characteristic	107
2.4.4.	Fabric characteristic	109
2.4.5.	Common coarse ware	111
2.4.5.1.	Casseroles	111
2.4.5.2.	Frying pans	113
2.4.5.3.	Pots	115
2.4.5.4.	Lids	122
2.4.5.5.	Bases	123
2.4.6.	Golden mica ware	124
2.4.7.	(Thracian) thin-walled ware	126
2.4.7.1.	Cups	126
2.4.7.2.	Jug(s)	127
2.4.8.	Coarse ware – conclusion	128
2.5.	Handmade pottery	130
2.5.1.	History of research	130
2.5.2.	Introduction to the material	131
2.5.3.	Material characteristics	133
2.5.4.	Fabric characteristics	134
2.5.4.1.	Quartz based fabric	135
2.5.4.2.	Fabric with dark shiny particles	136
2.5.4.3.	Mixed fabric	136
2.5.5.	Vessels of the Quartz based fabric	137
2.5.6.	Vessels of the Fabric with dark shiny particles	138
2.5.7.	Handmade pottery – conclusion	138
2.6.	Transport amphorae	141
2.6.1.	History of research	141
2.6.2.	Introduction to the material	142
2.6.3.	Eastern Mediterranean amphorae (Aegean Sea / Asia Minor)	144
2.6.3.1.	Dressel 24 / Dressel 24 <i>similis</i> / Dressel 24 Family	144
2.6.3.2.	Kapitän II Amphorae	157
2.6.3.3.	Amphorae of the Hellenistic tradition	161
2.6.3.4.	Other Aegean / Asia Minor amphorae	165
2.6.4.	Black Sea – South Pontic amphorae	172
2.6.5.	African amphorae	179
2.6.6.	Miscellaneous amphorae	182
2.6.7.	Transport amphorae – conclusion	183
2.7.	Pottery from Yurta-Stroyno – conclusion	185
3	Palauzovo	194
3.1.	Introduction	194
3.1.1.	Context of the pottery finds	194
3.1.2.	Regional (and trans-regional) parallels to the pottery	197
3.2.	Pottery finds from Palauzovo	201
3.2.1.	Mound 8	202
3.2.2.	Mound 9	207
3.3.	The characteristics of the pottery finds	220
3.4.	Pottery from Palauzovo – conclusion	222
4	Dodoparon	224
4.1.	Introduction	224

4.1.1.	Context of the pottery finds	224
4.2.	Pottery finds from Dodoparon	226
4.2.1.	Small size pots with a rounded body	229
4.2.2.	Small size pots with a broad body / Casseroles	230
4.2.3.	Pots for supplementary kitchen work	231
4.2.4.	Lids	233
4.2.5.	Bigger-size pots of different shapes.....	236
4.2.6.	Cooking pots	238
4.2.7.	Pots with rounded body and highly raised offset rim	241
4.2.8.	Pots with triangular rim section	242
4.2.9.	Mix of small size vessels in a fragmented state.....	243
4.2.10.	Jugs with one handle.....	245
4.2.11.	Table amphorae.....	248
4.2.12.	Carafes	250
4.2.13.	Storage vessels	252
4.2.14.	Transport amphorae	255
4.2.15.	Phocaeen red-slipped ware	262
4.3.	Parallels to the pottery assemblage	263
4.4.	Inner space of the house – the pottery evidence	265
4.5.	Pottery from Dodoparon – conclusion	266
5	Conclusion.....	270
5.1.	Roman and Late Antique pottery in the Yambol District	270
5.2.	Roman period vs. Late Antiquity – the pottery evidence.....	275
6	Abbreviations	277
7	Bibliography	278

1 Introduction

1.1. Pottery assemblages from the Yambol District – A brief introduction

The thesis named *Roman and Late Antique Pottery from Ancient Thrace, Selected Assemblages from the Yambol District*, presents pottery assemblages from three different archaeological sites, which all have the place of origin in common – the Yambol District. The district lies in south-eastern Bulgaria, along the middle stream of the Tundzha River. It is mostly made up of a vast arable lowland, with the foothills of the Straldzha Mountains rising at the southern-most part, directly neighbouring the Turkish border (**Thesis introduction Map 1**). The area under discussion was ruled by Thracian tribes/*ethne*, which especially flourished during the Late Iron Age; in AD 45/46 it was incorporated into the Roman province of Thrace; and, after the Diocletian – Constantine the Great reforms at the turn of the 3rd and 4th c. AD, it was incorporated into the Diocese of Thracia.

The choice of the Yambol District for the study is based on my long-term cooperation with the Regional Historical Museum in Yambol (RIM)¹ and the Tundzha Regional Archaeological Project (TRAP),² active in the area since 2009. First, as a member of TRAP, I became acquainted with the area, and, besides other material, also with the Roman period – Late Antique pottery from the field survey, which was one of the project's main objectives. Later on, as a permanent member of TRAP, I further cooperated with RIM, which led to the creation of a joint initiative – the Yurta-Stroyno Archaeological Project (SAP) –, carried out with the joint collaboration between RIM and the Institute of Classical Archaeology in Prague. Within the three-year project (2014–2016), part of the Roman *vicus* in Yurta-Stroyno, located near Elhovo town, was excavated and its immediate area surveyed.

As a consequence of the cooperation, the pottery material incorporated into the thesis is related to the above-mentioned institutions and projects, as I had the possibility to work with the material directly, either as a part of the excavation / survey team, or, during the material post-processing. All the work had to be carried

¹ Currently lead by Stefan Bakardzhiev, succeeding the previous director, Ilija Ilijev.

² Directed by Adéla Sobotková (Aarhus University) and Shawn Ross (Macquarie University, Sydney): <http://www.tundzha.org/>. TRAP is a multi-disciplinary project focused on landscape archaeology; its main areas of interest are the Kazanlak Valley, and selected parts of the Yambol District.

out abroad, consequently, the material processing took place seasonally, for several years in a row (2013–2017).

The majority of the thesis is devoted to the pottery finds from the Roman *vicus* at **Yurta-Stroyno (Chapter 2)**. The site is heavily disturbed by looting and as such, without clear stratigraphic contexts, all the finds had to be classed and dated based on parallels, represented mostly by published material from other archaeological sites from Thrace / Moesia Inferior / or even more remote areas.³ The material retrieved from the *vicus* is a multiperiod mixture, mostly containing Roman period sherds, with a much lower amount of Late Antique fragments.

A considerably smaller number of finds, but with a quite precise chronology (2nd–3rd c. AD) and fully reconstructible profiles, are represented by 19 vessels from the two burial mounds excavated near **Palauzovo** village in the north-eastern part of the Yambol District (**Chapter 3**). These mounds were investigated by RIM in 2007, the finds reconstructed, and, without further documentation or publication, exhibited in the Historical Museum in Straldzha.

The last set of finds are vessels from the hillfort of **Dodoparon**, placed on one of the few elevated hills of the Yambol District – Manastirski Vazvishenie, near the village of Golyam Manastri (**Chapter 4**). The site was excavated for 5 weeks in 2010 in cooperation between RIM and TRAP. All the vessels presented here (overall 57 pieces) were found in one house destroyed and burned down at the end of the 6th c. AD. The majority of the vessels were more or less reconstructible into the complete profiles, although some remained in fragments.

The pottery material from the three sites varies, covering a period from the Late Hellenistic to the Late Antiquity; including finds from the multiperiod settlement with mixed stratigraphy (Yurta-Stroyno); burial mounds from the 2nd–3rd c. AD (Palauzovo); and the closed context of a house from the Late Antique hillfort destroyed at the end of the 6th c. AD (Dodoparon). Consequently, the character of the pottery finds represented at each site differs, ranging from quite uniform red-slipped table ware with occasional grey or black glaze ware (Palauzovo); to abundant types of different pottery classes, wares and forms (Yurta-Stroyno); to less variable house-hold equipment of a sandy fabric without any surface cover consisting mostly of pots and jugs (Dodoparon). These individual

³ It was possible to find some other parallels in regional museums, either directly exhibited or placed in depositories.

features of each assemblage combined with the state of pottery preservation and varying quality of the prime documentation resulted in moderately different approaches to each assemblage and its description. Nevertheless, a great effort was made to collect and present as much coherent data as possible.

A statistical evaluation and comparisons regarding the amount/percentages of the represented pottery classes during the Roman period is based on the Yurta-Stroyno material, compared rather symbolically with the small number of finds from Palauzovo. For the Late Antiquity, we may turn to the material from Dodoparon. It is also substituted by quite a small number of pottery finds, which are, however, fully comparable with similarly dated assemblages from Moesia Inferior. As a result, in spite of its scarcity, it might be considered to be a fully representative sample of pottery finds, suitable for comparison and for the study of ceramic development throughout the periods.

1.2. Pottery description and presentation methodology

For the material from Palauzovo and Dodoparon, where whole vessels could be reconstructed, similar documentation processes were used as each vessel was described individually. This included a description of its fabric / surface / slip colour; percentage, amount and type of inclusions (always evaluated in hand specimen)⁴; but also the main vessel proportions – maximal or preserved height and width, diameters of the rim and base,⁵ percentage of whole vessel preservation, section of a handle, weight,⁶ and, in the case of Dodoparon, also the vessel capacity.⁷ Besides the catalogue-like entry and the overview table with the main data of each vessel, a narrative description was given in the text to discuss the specifics and characteristics of individual vessels and to refer to their parallels published elsewhere.

The abundant pottery material from Yurta-Stroyno was much more fragmented and diverse. The assemblage was thus divided into wares (Red-slipped ware, Grey ware, Coarse ware, Handmade pottery and Amphorae), and each ware was then further divided into smaller groups according to the fabric characteristics

⁴ Using a simple hand lens.

⁵ The number of all proportions given in the text are in millimetres.

⁶ Always given in grams.

⁷ The vessel capacity was measured only in the case of Dodoparon, as this is the only assemblage from them all, which represents a coherent closed context – household equipment – which might be evaluated as a whole.

and form similarities. Parallels were then searched for, either for the whole groups or for the individual forms.⁸ The transport amphorae from Yurta-Stroyno were, however, processed in the same way as the material from Palauzovo and Dodoparon – each fragment individually. This approach seemed necessary to give a proper description of the individual characteristics and types of fabric of each piece, as the set of finds proved to be quite variable. As a result, it was possible to assign the majority of the transport amphorae to the area of their origin, most of them also to known typologies and classifications, and in some cases, the given information could be enriched by their place of production, content and/or capacity of the specific type.

Regarding the descriptive parts, the fabric characterisation follows the manual *Pottery in Archaeology* published by Orton, Tyres and Vince (1993); the colour identification is based on the Munsell Soil-Color Charts (2009). The pottery drawings were originally made at a scale of 1:1, but were rescaled for the publication. The scale differs for each assemblage, as the fragmented material from Yurta-Stroyno is resized 1:2; the wholly preserved / reconstructed vessels from Palauzovo and Dodoparon 1:3; and the oversized dolia and amphorae from Dodoparon are 1:5.⁹

Each assemblage has its own numbering system for illustrations, always starting from one (1). Several different kinds of entries might be distinguished: **Fig(s)**. – black and white pottery drawings; **PI(s)**. – photos in colour, both pottery and archaeological contexts; **Tab(s)**. – tables summarising data; **Map(s)** – both black and white and in colour. The illustrations are mainly placed at the end of the text, except for a few that are incorporated into the Yurta-Stroyno chapter. The first Table (**Tab. 1**) of each ware, giving the amount overview of the pottery fragments retrieved from the six main contexts, is always placed within the text to offer a fast overview while reading.

Additionally, each sherd, within each assemblage, has its own accession number under which it might be found on the Figures, Plates and Tables. Individual vessels from Palauzovo and Dodoparon start, in both cases, with the number one (1). In the case of Yurta-Stroyno, each ware starts with the number one (1). To

⁸ This approach was inspired by the publication of the pottery material from Nicopolis ad Istrum, which avoided strict classification (FALKNER 1999).

⁹ All the Figures from Dodoparon and Yurta-Stroyno had to be additionally reduced by 80 % to fit the dimensions according to the thesis page format rules of Charles University.

avoid confusion, if referring, for example, in the text on Dodoparon to material from Yurta-Stroyno, the reference contains the full information giving the site, ware, figure, and the sherd number in the following way: **Yurta-Stroyno TW Fig. 8:106**. This division is caused by the intention to present these three assemblages separately in the future, as the Yurta-Stroyno material should be included in the final report on the Yurta-Stroyno Archaeological Project, in which each ware will be presented as an individual chapter. Also, the material from Dodoparon was recently published as a set of finds in its own right (TUŠLOVÁ 2019).

1.3. Pottery development background – A short history of Ancient Thrace

Pre-Roman Thrace

Ancient Thrace, or the territory inhabited by the Thracian tribes/*ethne* (GRANINGER 2015, 22), spread over a vast area of south-eastern Europe, including the modern countries of Moldova, the south-western part of Ukraine, the eastern and southern parts of Romania, Bulgaria, the eastern parts of Serbia and North Macedonia, a part of northern Greece and the European part of Turkey. Additionally, we may also include the islands of Thasos and Samothrace, as well as parts of Asia Minor, into which several Thracian tribes migrated (BOUZEK – GRANINGER 2015, 13; SEARS 2013, 6–8; THEODOSSIEV 2011, 2). The borders of the Thracian territory were relative, dynamic and often changing, depending on the political situation (THEODOSSIEV 2011, 2). However, the core of Ancient Thrace might be considered to be the geographically delimited area of the south-eastern Balkan peninsula with the Aegean and Marmara Sea on the southern edge, the Black Sea on the eastern edge, the Danube River / Stara Planina Mountains on the northern edge and the line of the Morava / Struma River valleys on the western edge (BOUZEK – GRANINGER 2015, 13).

During the Iron Age (starting ca. 1000 BC) the area of Ancient Thrace witnessed inner political consolidation and the rise of local tribes, which resulted in the creation of the Odrysian Kingdom in the 5th c. BC (THEODOSSIEV 2011, 4; ARCHIBALD 1998). At the same time (IA), Thrace was gradually affected by various impulses from the outside, including Greek colonisation, a Persian invasion (ZÄHRNT 2015, 36–39), Macedonian colonisation and Hellenization (DELEV 2015a; 2015b). During the subsequent wars between Rome and the Macedonian Kingdom at the end of the 3rd c. BC and, especially, in the 2nd c. BC, the Thracian territory

fell into the sphere of the Roman political interest, at that moment limited to the surroundings of Via Egnatia, the main trans-Balkan military road running from east (Dyrrhachium) to west (Byzantium) across the southern – Aegean – part of Thrace (LOZANOV 2015, 76).

During the reign of Augustus, a client kingdom was created in the territory of Thrace as a result of political cooperation of the local tribes with Rome. Around the same time, a permanent military garrison of at least two legions was stationed on the lower Danube under the command of the Macedonian governor which created a base for the soon to be Roman province of Moesia (LOZANOV 2015, 76–78).

Roman province Moesia and Thrace / Diocese of Thracia

The province of Moesia was founded at the beginning of the 1st c. AD, despite several different years having been proposed, it most probably occurred in either AD 12 or AD 15. At first, it only stretched over a tiny strip along the southern part of the Danube River (TIR 2012, 227; LOZANOV 2015, 80).

In AD 45/46, during the reign of Claudius, in the territory of a client kingdom south of the Stara Planina Mountains, the Roman province of Thrace was founded. It spread from the Black Sea to the Marmara Sea, the Aegean Sea, and to the Mesta River in the west. At the same time, the borders of Moesia moved, and extended, covering the southern part of the lower stream of the Danube River to the Stara Planina Mountains and all the way up to the Black Sea (TIR 2012, 226–237, 377–388). In AD 85/86 Moesia was invaded by the Dacians, and as a consequence of the attack, it was divided into two smaller provinces – Moesia Inferior and Moesia Superior (HAYNES 2011, 7). Moesia Inferior kept the area of northern Bulgaria and Romanian Dobrudzha (south of the Danube delta) and as such constituted a direct – northern – neighbour to Thrace. The border between Moesia and Thrace, located in the area of the Stara Planina Mountains, changed several times (at least twice, in AD 136 and AD 193). The outer borders of both provinces, however, did not significantly move until the 270s, when the eastern parts of Moesia Inferior and Thrace were incorporated into the newly created provinces of Dacia Ripensis and Dacia Mediterranea. At the end of the 3rd c./mid-4th c. AD, during the administrative reforms of Diocletian and Constantine the Great, both provinces were incorporated into a bigger administrative unit of the Diocese of Thracia which

replaced Moesia Inferior and Thracia with six smaller provinces – Scythia Minor, Moesia Secunda, Thracia, Rhodope, Haemimontus and Europa (LOZANOV 2015, 76).

In AD 395, when the Roman empire was divided under Theodosius I into two parts, Thracia remained under the Eastern empire, near its capital in Constantinople. In AD 536, under Justinian I, a new administrative unit – *quaestura excercitus* – was founded, removing the provinces of Moesia Inferior and Scythia from the Diocese of Thracia and putting them together with the Cycladic Islands, Caria and Cyprus. This new formation was administered by the prefect of Scythia from Odessos (Varna). The (rest of) the Diocese of Thracia was administered from Constantinople by the *vicarius Thraciae* (DUMANOV 2015, 92).

Major developments during the Roman and Late Antique periods

After the foundations of Moesia Inferior and Thracia, the gradual consolidation of the two provinces started. At the beginning of the 2nd c. AD, after the Dacian wars under Trajan, administrative and political changes took place, stimulating economic growth and stability which lasted until the late 230s. During this period, new urban settlements were founded, including smaller civilian sites (*vici* and *canabe*) as well as large villa estates (LOZANOV 2015, 86–87); many new roads were maintained or newly built (MADZHAROV 2009). This period was mainly peaceful and prosperous, in spite of the major incursion of the Costoboci in AD 170 (LOZANOV 2015, 87).

The crisis of the Roman empire during the 3rd c. AD struck most in AD 248–251 when a devastating invasion of gothic tribes caused extensive damage across much of the territory of Moesia Inferior and Thracia (HAYNES 2011, 8). The raids of gothic tribes continued in the second half of the 3rd c. and in the 4th c. AD resulting in the Battle of Hadrianopolis¹⁰ in AD 378, perceived as a great defeat of the Roman army, which heralded the end of the empire itself (VELKOV 1977, 35).

Continuing raids by gothic tribes were accompanied by invasions of the Huns, which started to take place at the very end of the 4th c. AD. Their attacks strengthened towards the mid-5th c. AD when they severely devastated Thracia (VELKOV 1977, 38–42). During this period, many cities in Thracia were abandoned, moved from their previous location and significantly reduced in size. Furthermore, the concept of rural villas disappeared and the dominance of the agricultural

¹⁰ Modern-day Edirne in Turkey.

economy of Thrace came to an end, with a preference for cattle breeding (DUMANOV 2015, 98–101). At the end of the 5th c. AD, Thrace suffered due to raids by the Ostrogoths, and the first invasions of the Bulgars and Slavs whose attacks strengthened in the first half of the 6th c. AD and continued thereafter. During the second half of the 6th c. AD also the Avars appeared on the scene, fighting several major battles with the Romans, especially during the late 580s. As a reaction to the unstable situation and high number of Slav and Avar raids, a new type of small-sized fortified cities located on elevated defensible places emerged during the 6th c. AD (VELKOV 1977, 47–59; DUMANOV 2015, 98–100). Further developments are obscure, resulting in the formation of the first Bulgarian empire in the late 7th c. AD (VELKOV 1977, 59).

Yambol District during the Roman period and the Late Antiquity

The Yambol District is located in the lowlands of the eastern edge of the Upper Thracian Plain (**Thesis introduction Maps 1–2**). The main axis of the district is the Tundzha River, which divides it into two halves. The river was navigable in antiquity, and a Roman road was built along its banks during the reign of Trajan (MADZHAROV 2009, 237). First, during the Roman period, the whole area of the Yambol District belonged to the province of Thrace, while, after the reforms at the end of the 3rd/mid-4th c. AD, when the Diocese of Thracia was created, the part to the east of the Tundzha River was assigned as the Haemimontus province (with its capital in Hadrianopolis) and the part to the west of the river as the province of Thracia (with its capital in Philippopolis) (TIR 2012, 144; TIR map Roman province borders). Putting the three sites contained in this thesis into perspective, Yurta-Stroyno was founded during a peaceful period in the Roman province of Thrace, after the reforms, it was located in Haemimontus; the burial mounds from Palauzovo, dated to the 2nd–3rd c. AD, were piled up in the Roman province of Thrace; and the Dodoparon hillfort, founded after the reforms, was located in the province Thracia, the Diocese of Thracia.

The main Roman period installation in the district is the military camp of auxiliary unit cohort II Lucensium (equitata) at Kabile, founded in AD 135/136, during the reign of Hadrian. Besides the camp in Kabile, only one more permanent military installation was existent in the Province of Thrace, the camp Germania

(Germaneia),¹¹ in the upper Struma River Valley. Kabile was located on the spot of an older Thracian settlement, and, during the Roman period, on the junction of two roads – one running from Anchialus to Augusta Trajana, and another one, going from north to south in the direction to Hadrianopolis (TIR 2012, 68–69). As the major military installation in the area, the establishment of the camp attracted newcomers as well as encouraging the return of the Roman veterans of a local origin after their military service and gave rise to the creation of a *vici* in its hinterland (BOYANOV 2007, 73).¹²

No other major Roman-period installation is known from the Yambol District,¹³ and it seems likely that the Roman presence in the area was represented mainly by the rural settlements of the newcomers attracted by the camp in Kabile, and/or by the Roman army veterans, who settled strategically along the middle stream of the Tundzha River. One such example is the *vicus* in Yurta-Stroyno, where a bronze diploma of Classis Misensis veteran dated to AD 152–158 was found (BOYANOV 2007).

In contrast to the (lack of) major cities, the rural areas of the Yambol District seem to be densely inhabited. Within a perimeter with a radius of 3.5 km from Yurta-Stroyno, several other Roman period settlements are located. Two are situated to the north, near the villages of Karavelovo and Robovo. A site near Karavelovo is spread over a vast area of 28 hectares, while one in Robovo is much smaller in size, covering just 1 hectare. However, the field survey conducted on both settlements in 2019¹⁴ uncovered the same pottery types, glass fragments and agricultural tools (quern stones, whetstones) as the ones known from Yurta-Stroyno. Consequently, we may expect the same chronology and likely also character of all these three sites. Another such settlement is situated 1.5 km south of Yurta-Stroyno in the area called St. Ilija. It was excavated by Daniela Agre, Deyan Dichev and Hristo Hristov in 2014 (and published in 2015) and the finds

¹¹ Modern-day Sapareva Banya.

¹² As confirmed by finds of bronze military diploma fragments (BOYANOV 2007) and inscriptions mentioning Roman army veterans found in the Yambol District (HEŘMÁNKOVÁ in preparation).

¹³ It is, however, expected, that near the village of Karavelovo, there might be located the ancient settlement of Orudisza ad Burgum, a road-station in the section running from Kabile to Hadrianopolis (TIR 2012, 274).

¹⁴ In cooperation between RIM (Todor Vulchev, Stefan Bakardzhiev) and the Institute of Classical Archaeology, Prague (Petra Tušlová, Viktoria Čist'akova). The report of the field season has not yet been published.

again have the character of the above-mentioned ones.¹⁵ Additionally, a geomagnetic prospection conducted there in 2019 revealed a villa-like ground plan.¹⁶

During the turbulent period of the Late Antiquity the settlements moved from the flat lowlands to elevated positions, their dimensions decreased, and they were heavily fortified. Since the Yambol District is mostly flat, the concentration of Late Antique settlements in the area is scarce.¹⁷ A great example is, however, the Dodoparon hillfort, the only elevated Late Antique settlement (or *refuge*) excavated and published from the district (SOBOTKOVA – LONGFORD – BAKARDZHIEV 2018).

Current state of the Roman pottery studies in the Yambol District

The history of the studies of each pottery class included within the thesis (Red-slipped ware, Grey ware, Coarse ware, Handmade pottery and Amphorae) in the area of the south-eastern Balkan peninsula, is discussed at the beginning of each ware class in the **Chapter 2** on Yurta-Stroyno. A list of relevant publications regarding the specific finds from various settlements, necropolises and production / kiln sites are also presented there, as it seemed to be the most relevant place for it to be, giving the context to the following studies focused on individual pottery classes. For the same reason, in the **Chapter 3** on the burial mounds from Palauzovo, the maximum number of finds from funeral contexts relevant to the investigated area were gathered.

In this introduction, I do not wish to repeat all the information again, but I would like to focus more narrowly on the specific publications of the Roman – Late Antique pottery assemblages which were found directly in the Yambol District (**Thesis introduction Map 2**), and to outline the current state of their studies.

The most important Roman period settlement in the area of the Yambol District is the military camp at Kabile, whose excavation started in 1972 as a joint effort of the Archaeological Institute with Museum, Institute of Thracology (both under the Bulgarian Academy of Science), Archaeological Institute of Sofia University “St. Kliment Ohridski” and the Regional Historical Museum in Yambol

¹⁵ The report did not show any of these, but since the excavations were running in parallel with the ones in Yurta-Stroyno, I had the chance to observe and to compare the material.

¹⁶ Information given to me by Stefan Bakardzhiev in autumn 2019.

¹⁷ There are, in total, ten known Late Antique settlements in the Yambol District, they might be found in the catalogue of DIMITROVA – POPOV 1978 under the following numbers: 5, 12, 23, 41, 59, 65, 82, 83, 114 and 166.

(VELKOV 1982, 5). Two collective monographs were published to present the results of the excavation of the Hellenistic and Roman settlements, one in 1982 (IVANOV ed.), the other in 1991 (VELKOV ed.). In each of these publications we may find one article on relevant pottery material. The first one, a report on the excavation of Basilica I, presents black and white pictures of the Roman and Late Antique pottery (DIMITROVA 1982, 118–131); the second one, a report on the excavation of a western fortification wall, publishes drawings of mixed Hellenistic and Roman period pottery, with two sherds dated, based on the parallels, to the 2nd–4th c. AD (DOMARADSKI 1991, oбp. 33, 39–40).

The excavations at Kabile continue to this day, they are currently carried out by two teams, the first one from Sofia University “St. Kliment Ohridski” and the second one from the Regional Historical Museum in Yambol. Reports of the excavations are annually published in *AOP*, in which, on occasion, several pottery fragments might also be given for illustration (i.e. LOZANOV – BAKARDZHIEV 2008, 421, oбp. 1 with four drawn sherds; LOZANOV – RAYCHEVA 2012, 362, oбp. 3 with 25 drawings of Hellenistic, Roman and Late Antique sherds).

Despite there being other known settlements from the Roman and Late Antique periods in the Yambol District (DIMITROVA – POPOV 1978), none of them has been systematically excavated. Consequently, knowledge of the relevant pottery from the settlement contexts is limited to surface finds connected with the preparation of a rescue excavation, such as from the field survey of the Nabucco gas pipeline near the village of Bolyarovo (BOYADZHIEV 2013, oбp. 3).

Regarding the Roman period necropolises, several of them were excavated within a ca. 1.5 km radius around Kabile, creating clusters in different cardinal directions from the camp. The first one excavated was the southern necropolis. The finds were presented in the form of black and white photos of complete vessels and several terracotta lamps (GETOV 1982, таб. XIX–XXI). Furthermore, from the southern area, one burial mound was investigated within a rescue excavation caused by the construction of the Thracian highway; the excavation report includes photos in colour of two complete vessels and of two terracotta lamps (LOZANOV – CHRISTOV 2010, oбp. 2). Another five colour photos of complete pottery vessels were published from a mound of 25 graves also located south of Kabile (BAKARDZHIEV – MIKOV – DZHANFEZOVA 2014, oбp. 3).

Another necropolis of Kabile, the eastern necropolis, yielded over 62 graves. Their excavation was covered by two reports, which included altogether one plate with 11 pottery drawings (CHANDZHIJSKA – RABADZHIEV 2009, обр. 2:1–11; CHANDZHIJSKA – YANKULOV 2010). The last known necropolis of Kabile is located in the north-west of the city. From the two graves found there, one jug and one terracotta lamp were published in drawings (BAKARDZHIEV 2012, обр. 2).

The pottery finds from the necropolises have not yet been published in any other form than these short reports. Nevertheless, at least a selection of finds from several of the mounds / graves is currently exhibited at the Museum of archaeological park of Thracian and Ancient city of Kabile.¹⁸

The best processed Roman pottery material from the Yambol District is represented by finds from the five burial mounds excavated between the Straldzha and Charđa villages (hereafter in the text called Straldzha¹⁹ necropolis). Complete pottery finds – both from the graves and the embankments – are presented in the publication, including fabric and colour description of each vessel (ALEXANDROVA 2013; 2016).

Further finds from the necropolises of the Yambol District are captured on seven drawings of vessels found in the Mound 5, north-west of the village of Mogila (ALEXANDROV *et al.* 2019, обр. 3); by twelve drawings of vessels, this time also with the fabric description and dimensions, from the mound at Lyulin village (VELKOV 1996, 126–127; таб. I); and by the four drawings of vessels, one also with a black and white photo, from Koz Bunar mound, located near the *vicus* of Yurta-Stroyno (AGRE 2013, 354). The material from the latter mound is exhibited in the Ethnographic-archaeological Museum Elhovo.

1.4. Main aims of the thesis

The current state of the Roman – Late Antique pottery research in the Yambol District is far from ideal. The potential of the area is however great, as the region is placed along the middle stream of the Tundzha River, which represents a strategic position within inner Thrace, as the river was navigable in antiquity and came with

¹⁸ up to date as of: autumn 2019.

¹⁹ Based on the name of the excavation book: *Могилен некропол от римската епоха край град Стралджа, Ямболско* [Burial mound necropolis of the Roman period near Straldzha, Yambol District], see CHOLAKOV *et al.* 2016.

one of the main roads running along its stream. The flat relief with arable land and the vicinity of the Black Sea and the Aegean Sea also shaped its character, as well as the presence of the camp in Kabile, one of only two military installations in the Roman province of Thrace.

Consequently, the main aim of this thesis is to process and make available several pottery assemblages from the district to enlarge our knowledge about the different pottery classes, types and wares which might be found in the area, both in the settlements and necropolises. Each of the pottery assemblages is different and as such also treated separately as an individual entity, as they have their own potential and research questions. Despite this, and thanks to the wide time range covered by the material, spanning from the Late Hellenistic/Early Roman period until the Late Antiquity, it also offers a great possibility to study the pottery development and its changes throughout the periods, as well as its modification for specific purposes, such as the placement of items into graves during the Roman times.

2 Yurta-Stroyno

2.1. Introduction

2.1.1. THE SITE OF YURTA-STROYNO

The archaeological site of Yurta is located in the Yambol District, Elhovo Municipality, about 1.5 km north-east of the village of Stroyno (**Introduction Map 1**). The site was described for the first time in 1978 when it was included in the Gazetteer of archaeological sites of the Yambol District (DIMITROVA – POPOV 1978, 26). The first excavations had to wait for some time, as they took place in 2006 and 2007 as a reaction to the large-scale looting that was affecting the whole archaeological site. The research was conducted by the Regional Historical Museum in Yambol (RIM) in the form of a short (two weeks in total) rescue excavation, placing several smaller trenches focused on establishing the site chronology (BAKARDZHIEV 2008, 471–473; BAKARDZHIEV 2007, 238–241). In 2009, the area of the site was systematically field surveyed within the Tundzha Regional Archaeological Project (TRAP), which noted that the looting was still in progress and a large part of the site had already been destroyed (ILIEV *et al.* 2012; ROSS *et al.* eds. 2018). As a reaction, the Yurta-Stroyno Archaeological Project (SAP) started in 2014, designed as a three-year investigation focused on gathering as much information as possible before the site's complete destruction (TUŠLOVÁ – WEISSOVÁ – BAKARDZHIEV 2014; 2017; 2018; TUŠLOVÁ *et al.* 2015).

Many smaller and bigger size objects were discovered at the site of Yurta-Stroyno prior to any excavations. More than 50 items which originated from the site are supposed to be stored in the depository of RIM. From these, the most important is the part of a bronze military diploma of classis Misensis (fleet of Misenum) veteran, dated between the years AD 152 and 158 (BOYANOV 2006, 239; BOYANOV 2007, 69–74), on the basis of which it is assumed that Yurta-Stroyno is a *vicus* of Roman military veterans. Another important discovery is a part of a marble slab with a depiction of a Thracian horseman bearing an inscription in Greek mentioning the Latin name *Avilii* (BAKARDZHIEV 2008, 472). A person with the same name is known from the military camp in Kabile, located about 45 km north of Yurta-Stroyno, and some researchers take it as a sign of a connection between these two installations (e.g. BOYANOV 2008, 214). The last find, which is worth mentioning here, is the marble Roman-Doric capital of a Type I dated to the second

half of the 1st c. / early 2nd c. AD (DIMITROV 2004, 221), which represents the oldest find of a secure date found at the site prior to any excavations. The problem with architectural components is, however, that they are often re-used for later construction, as, for example, was also this type of capital in Dioclecianopolis (modern Hisarya), where it was incorporated into the Late Antique basilica (DIMITROV 2004, 221–222). We do not know the finding context of the capital, but still, it would not have been brought from such a distance and its presence itself suggests that if not directly in Yurta-Stroyno, then in its hinterland there might have been a Roman installation of this date.

After the rescue excavation conducted by RIM, the site's chronology was established spanning from the turn of the 1st / 2nd c. AD until the 3rd–4th c. AD. Only single small finds were published within the excavation reports, the pottery was only briefly mentioned (BAKARDZHIEV 2007, 240; BAKARDZHIEV 2008, 472).

Excavations of 2014–2016

The three years of excavations brought to light the stone foundations of a five-room house located on the south-western part of the site, with a courtyard to the north (**Introduction Map 3**). The individual rooms of the house were named from west to east using capital letters for better orientation (A–E). During the excavation it turned out that Rooms A, B, C and E had been completely looted, featuring reverse stratigraphy with roof tiles thrown on the bottoms of the trenches, covered by mixed soil filled mostly with pottery material and small finds (any valuable metals were taken; only six coins were found, all of which were bronze). Only room D seems to preserve the original floor of the house, which was covered by gravel containing a sunk terracotta water tube. To the north of the house, in the area of the presumed courtyard delimited on the east by a long wall, a levelling / drainage layer was found containing a huge amount of material with fragments from one vessel spread over an area of about 15 m and in several dozen horizontal centimetres of the layer. This seems to be an ancient procedure, contemporary with the house construction, when presumably settlement waste was used to level the area because in the layer there was found a huge amount of pottery, fragmented roof tiles and bricks, production waste, glass fragments, animal bones and various small finds of different materials (TUŠLOVÁ – WEISSOVÁ – BAKARDZHIEV 2014, 2017, 2018; TUŠLOVÁ *et al.* 2015).

Field survey of 2016

The intensive field survey of TRAP in 2009 identified 31 hectares with a raised amount of surface material which could be associated with the settlement, from which 3 hectares of the highest concentration of finds were identified as the settlement core (ILIEV *et al.* 2012, 21–22; ROSS *et al.* 2018; site 6018). This core area is placed directly on the Dereorman River, it is not cultivated (compared to the other 28 ha), and it is covered by dense vegetation and bushes.

While excavating the site, the rest of the core area was occasionally walked, and random objects and interesting pieces of pottery were found. These small discoveries led to another survey being conducted in 2016, focusing on a complete – urban – surveying of several squares placed across the core of the site in the shape of a cross-section (**Introduction Map 2**), and of the intensive surveying of the remaining squares (see TUŠLOVÁ – WEISSOVÁ – BAKARDZHIEV 2017, fig. 1). As a result, statistical data regarding pottery and architectural ceramics are available from eight squares (of the urban survey). Their original dimensions were 20×20 m, for the survey, however, they were divided into smaller sections of 10×10 m each. Thanks to this, we can compare the amount of finds and types of wares from the excavation and the field survey (**Introduction Tabs. 1 and 2**).

2.1.2. CONTEXT OF THE POTTERY FINDS

Pottery finds from the excavations

The state of the site preservation revealed by the excavations is very far from being plausible for material processing. The finds are out of context, which is caused either by modern activities – treasure hunters digging out the original soil from the rooms and completely destroying the stratigraphy, or by the levelling / drainage layer of settlement waste placed north of the house on its presumed courtyard during antiquity. Despite this, it was necessary to choose some representative samples from the excavated part of the site, consequently, the following six layers / ‘contexts’ were selected:

[SU001] from the Rooms A, B and C. [SU001] is a number throughout the site used for the soil excavated by the treasure hunters. In connection with these three rooms it contains all the material found in the Rooms A, B and C, as they were excavated by the looters around the same time and filled back in with the same soil.

It is clearly visible from the sections, that the trenches were dug first along the perimeter walls of the house and then the interior was identified and further excavated, but not the exterior, which was left untouched. As was mentioned above, the inside of Room D was mostly preserved, however very little material was found there. It is very interesting that it did not even attract the looters' attention, who only dug a small 'test' trench there and left it further unexcavated (TUŠLOVÁ – WEISSOVÁ – BAKARDZHIEV 2017).

This set of finds from Rooms A, B and C is delimited to the north by the foundation wall and the courtyard, to the east by Room D, the western part ends in the Dereorman River, and there were no further treasure hunters' trenches located to the south. Consequently, it was chosen as a sample representing, presumably, the house inventory as the find assemblage from inside the rooms also included roof tiles of low fragmentation suggesting the house, before the looters' intervention, was sealed by the rooftop fallout. The average dimensions of a room are 4.90×4.70 m.

Three fills were found inside the house covered by the treasure hunters' soil. They were dug into a yellow sandy layer [SU007] – presumably virgin soil – and missed by the robbers as they all showed up at the considerable depth of 70–80 cm from the ground. In Room B we found [SU021], in Room C [SU008] and [SU057]. Since they were made before the (the most recent) treasure hunters' ditches²⁰, they were included in the representative assemblage of pottery finds, also because some of them feature interesting pieces of pottery finds.

[SU008] 100E-100N (SW) a fill found in Room C. Its dimensions are 145×104 cm (N-S×E-W), depth 65 cm. The fill – of the largest dimensions of the three – was, besides the pottery, very rich in small finds, including three blue beads, one red-stone bead, a complete bone pin and a small marble head of a bearded male, presumably Asclepius.

²⁰ It is impossible to say when these ditches were dug, it could be from Antiquity until quite recently as the settlement is locally well-known and its looting might have started a long time ago. Consequently, we could be dealing here with old treasure hunters' trenches which were quite recently extended by new ones.

[SU021] 95E-100N (SE), found in Room B, a trench of dimensions 70×45 cm (N-S×E-W), and a depth of about 20 cm. The fill was located next to a grown bended tree which likely prevented illegal excavations on the spot. Besides the pottery and various small finds, several interesting fragments of lamps were found there, including the three ones made in Grey ware (**GW Pl. 2:SY14_031, SY14_132 and SY14_140**).

[SU057] 100E-105N (SE) located on the northern part of Room C, directly next to the foundation wall. Its upper dimensions were 1.4×1.1 m. The fill contained a 1.2 m deep deposit full of charcoal and with some burned fragments of vessels. Besides the other finds, a coin of Ioulia Domna minted in Anchialos between AD 193–217 was retrieved (TUŠLOVÁ *et al.* 2015, 245–246).

The ‘levelling’ layers I and II mark the area outside the house to the north, where the levelling, or drainage, layer was placed. It was located below ca. 50 cm of a dark brown topsoil, and it consists of a 35–40 cm thick grey layer filled with heterogenous archaeological material and stones, resting on the yellow sandy layer [SU007], probably virgin soil. The dimensions of both excavated trenches were 2.5×2.5 m. The **[Levelling I] in trench 100E-105N NE** was excavated in the year 2015 completely to the end – up to the layer [SU007] – and brought many interesting finds. Consequently, in the year 2016 one more trench was added directly to the north of the first one, marked as the **[Levelling II] in a trench 100E-110N SE**. The latter one was not completely excavated (about ca. 10 cm of a hard, stony surface stayed *in situ*). This layer features a far lower amount of material than the previous one, partly because of it not being fully excavated, but also, there was much less material in general. These two layers – Levelling I and II – are a representative sample of the outer (outside of the house) material.

Pottery class	Red-slipped w.		Grey w.		Coarse w.		Handmade		Transport amphorae		Total	
	pcs.	g.	pcs.	g.	pcs.	g.	pcs.	g.	pcs.	g.	pcs.	g.
SU001	3244	33187	44	406	788	9511	74	1695	106	5552	4233	50363
Levelling I	3090	21371	65	555	732	5233	75	1327	188	4201	4115	34251
Levelling II	1135	10987	26	361	338	2673	135	1532	135	2371	1769	17924
SU008	386	3237	9	89	240	2427	4	61	29	1200	660	8461
SU021	88	1451	0	0	14	102	17	398	14	443	135	4996
SU057	255	1984	3	37	72	689	7	152	4	28	343	2890
Total	8198	72217	147	1448	2184	20635	312	5165	476	13795	11255	118885

Introduction Tab. 1: Overview of the pottery finds from the six selected contexts; SU001 from the Rooms A, B, C; Levelling I and II located north of the house (in the courtyard); SU008, SU0021 and SU057 from three pits located inside of the house. Abbreviations: pcs. – number of fragments, g. – weight in grams.

Pottery finds from the survey

Several different sets of finds are included in this group, as single pottery fragments discovered prior to the systematic survey, which are in the tables (**TW Tab. 2**, **GW Tab. 3**, **CW Tab. 2**, **HM Tab. 2**, **Amphorae Tab. 2**) except for the ‘trench’ (= square); sherds collected during the urban survey of the eight squares (these include the full information); and fragments found within the intensive survey of the remaining squares of the settlement core, which are, again in the same tables as above, except for the sector as they are marked only by the square number. The field survey material in general served for the material comparison (different chronology, classes, forms) and to enrich the collection of the core finds.

Pottery class	Red-slipped ware		Grey ware		Coarse ware		Handmade		Transport amphorae	
	pcs.	g.	pcs.	g.	pcs.	g.	pcs.	g.	pcs.	g.
D13_NE	530	2701	25	138	238	1377	77	667	12	191
D13_NW	1342	7470	48	243	565	2672	125	1098	62	765
D13_SE	1198	8137	37	262	354	2219	181	2102	62	912
D13_SW	1046	7719	48	346	331	2424	104	1125	94	2200
E12_NE	257	1376	10	56	164	965	50	477	25	322
E12_NW	284	1044	27	122	159	718	34	279	16	143
E12_SE	442	2961	15	80	189	1123	93	1344	38	1160
E12_SW	504	2589	58	286	301	1742	62	457	49	423
F13_NE	302	1561	28	175	163	938	32	301	14	162
F13_NW	416	1047	12	145	135	1243	62	687	52	623
F13_SE	293	2360	3	64	134	1043	58	379	45	1047
F13_SW	268	1563	15	127	85	681	41	416	20	421
G12_NE	742	8824	19	190	116	1143	36	378	94	1991
G12_NW	233	1878	0	0	44	402	26	280	13	496
G12_SE	368	1736	9	56	49	398	26	274	16	205
G12_SW	279	1773	12	77	464	1803	64	500	20	206
H13_NE	453	4044	6	27	169	1931	20	165	60	1388
H13_NW	322	1744	0	0	48	851	20	182	34	362
H13_SE	293	3389	8	94	99	1380	18	287	47	1136
H13_SW	471	3015	0	0	202	1131	64	527	42	553
I09_NE	226	855	1	6	104	537	50	376	9	100
I09_NW	332	1561	12	57	139	768	37	394	18	228
I09_SE	316	3229	3	5	117	955	37	407	29	346
I09_SW	266	1677	3	12	82	555	41	878	18	314
I12_NE	74	432	0	0	46	244	1	13	12	145
I12_NW	192	841	0	0	67	466	5	64	5	30
I12_SE	166	1366	0	0	52	466	26	302	40	1081
I12_SW	218	2433	0	0	68	456	16	243	30	500
J13_NE	122	1327	1	18	30	240	11	235	9	242
J13_NW	101	470	0	0	41	208	13	140	8	98
J13_SE	192	1572	1	7	17	145	27	262	23	306
J13_SW	157	1380	1	11	34	188	5	70	20	237
Total	12405	84074	402	2604	4806	31412	1462	15309	1036	18333

Introduction Tab. 2: Overview of the pottery material found during the urban survey of the eight squares (D13, E12, F13, G12, H13, I09, I12, J13) divided into smaller transects of 10×10 m oriented based on the cardinal directions. Abbreviations: **pcs.** – number of fragments, **g.** – weight in grams.

2.1.3. THE POTTERY ASSEMBLAGES SELECTED FOR PROCESSING

The core of the pottery included within the thesis is represented by the six layers / ‘contexts’ from the house and the courtyard, which are also used for the statistical comparison of the individual wares present at the site (**Introduction Tab. 1**). Eight squares from the field survey, each divided into four sub-squares, which were all completely surveyed, and their material counted, create another comparison for the excavated and surface material (**Introduction Tab. 2**).

All the sherds from the six layers / ‘contexts’ are included in the drawings, unless they were of a very low diagnostic value, or they repeated in a high number of the same form – then a representative selection was made.

The rest of the excavated and the field survey material served for comparison. All the pottery was evaluated and used to complement the core finds. Special wares, which were not highly (or at all) represented in the core assemblage – as were the Grey ware, Colour coated ware, Çandarli ware, Marbled ware, Thin-walled ware or Thracian grey ware were searched for in the extended material and selected for post-processing. Similarly, all the transport amphorae were taken for further processing and presentation. Individual sherds of special forms, otherwise not present in the core assemblage, were also searched for in the rest of the material, including also the red-slipped ware, coarse ware and hand-made pottery.

As a result, the pottery material represented here should give an idea of the frequent finds located in the settlement (the core assemblage), but also offer extended knowledge of individual wares represented by small amounts of fragments in general, and to provide a full description and range of its morphological diversity. The transport amphorae were included within this group of special pottery finds (i.e. all detected fragments were included) as they are the direct witnesses of trade and exchange and as such very important while evaluating the site dynamics and chronology.

2.1.4. NOTES ON THE FOLLOWING TEXT

The pottery material was divided into the classes of Red-slipped ware, Grey ware, Coarse ware, Handmade pottery and Transport amphorae. Despite an attempt to follow the same pattern of material description, it was not always possible, as each type of ware is different and needs a specific approach. The differences might be noticed as early as in the first section of each material description, the ‘History of

research', which might either go into detail or be quite generic, in both cases reflecting the state of the recent studies. In some cases, it was possible to refer more directly to the studies from Bulgaria or even from Thrace as in the case of the Common red-slipped ware which is well researched in the area. In most of the other cases, it was, however, necessary to expand into other neighbouring provinces for comparative material, besides Moesia Inferior, frequently also into Moesia Superior, Pannonia, Macedonia, Achaia or Asia - the western coasts of the Aegean Sea. A very specific pottery class is the Transport amphorae of widely used and accepted typologies applicable to the material found in the different corners of the Roman empire. In this case, a bigger reference area for the amphorae provenance was considered, expanding also into the Black Sea, the Eastern Mediterranean and Northern Africa, while a lower amount of amphorae finds from Thrace was consulted, basically for their scarcity (not so much for their non-existence but rather for the current state of publishing).

Within the pottery classes, different fabrics were clustered and described in batches. Regarding the transport amphorae, only two main groups could be divided (of Dressel 24 Family and Kapitän II amphorae), from the rest, almost each sherd was described separately to provide detailed information of its fabric, chronology and typology; in this matter, the way of description was unified with the vessels found in Dodoparon and Palauzovo.

The main aim of processing and presenting the Yurta-Stroyno pottery material is to show the diversity and variability of the wares, to point to the site connections (through imported wares), as well as to help to set up its development in time and overall chronology based on a quantitative approach. On the other hand, there is no attempt to create new typologies or to gather reference to all existing typologies. In Bulgaria, for almost every settlement or every excavated material a new typology is created,²¹ often with very little or no consultation with the same or similar types from elsewhere. As a result, a huge number of typologies with no real value (besides the 'home' site), or a wider-area use, is created. Consequently, only the most frequent and/or relevant types for each specific ware and sherd(s) are referred to in the text, otherwise individual sherd(s) (parallels) of the same or similar form found elsewhere are referred to.

²¹ In my observation the largest amount of different types regards coarse ware.

The pottery finds from Yurta-Stroyno were sorted based on the form similarities of individual vessels within each of the ware class, but no numbering / naming system was given. One of the reasons is the above-mentioned number of typologies already created for individual sites, another, no less important reason is the character of the finds which were discovered in disrupted contexts and as such they are unsuitable for creating typologies as pottery of different chronologies could have been (and likely was) mixed together.

2.2. Red-slipped table ware

2.2.1. HISTORY OF RESEARCH

The red-slipped table ware in the area of Moesia Inferior and Thrace – compared to the other wares we are dealing with in this thesis – is the best studied one. The large amount of published material from closed contexts, either from excavations or necropolises (mostly burial mounds) is sufficient for a comparative approach. In contrast to the coarse ware, which is well researched for the Late Antiquity, the majority of the published table ware from Thrace (Southern Bulgaria) is focused on the Roman period, i.e. dated from the 1st till the 4th–mid-5th c. AD.

A huge advantage is the knowledge of several kiln sites, and, especially, their products, which are mostly red-slipped table ware with a much lower quantity of coarse ware. In the nearby area of the Yambol District, we may find such production centres in Stara Zagora (i.e. Augusta Trajana), active during the 3rd c. AD (KALCHEV 1991), in Karanovo near Nova Zagora, active from the mid-3rd c. AD possibly until the beginning of the 4th c. AD (BORISOV 2013), and at Nova Nadhezda in Haskovo District, active from the mid-2nd till the mid-3rd c. AD (HARIZANOV 2016). The most important – large-scale – pottery production centres come, however, from Moesia Inferior, including Pavlikeni, Butovo and Hotnica (SULTOV 1976, 1985; KABAКCHIEVA – SULTOVA – VLADKOVA 1988; VLADKOVA 2011) active during the 2nd–4th c. AD, with the pottery typology recently re-evaluated in the PhD thesis of Ivanov defended in 2018 *Типология и хронология на червенолаковата керамика от производствените комплекси между Дунав и Балкана (II-III в.)* [Typology and chronology of the red-slipped ware of production centres between the Danube River and Stara Planina Mountains (2nd–3rd c. AD)] and published in the form of an article (IVANOV 2019b). In the area of Moesia Inferior we can also find smaller kiln sites, from which the pottery material was published, like from Durostrorum (modern Silistra) on the Dunabe River, dated from the beginning of the 2nd to the beginning of the 4th c. AD (MUŞEŢEANU 2003); Karavelovo in Shumen District, dated to the end of the 2nd till the mid-3rd c. AD (IVANOV 2019a) or from the village of Leschnica, near Lovech, dated to the 3rd c. AD (IVANOVA 2003).

Because of quite an abundance of published table ware material, finds from nearby archaeological sites / burial contexts were primarily considered for comparison, if they were not suitable or available, the area was extended to the rest

of Thrace, Moesia Inferior, or even further afield to the Roman provinces (especially Moesia Superior and Pannonia).

Regarding south-eastern Thrace during the Roman period, besides the already mentioned production centres, several complex studies on pottery from closed contexts have been written, including finds from the Villa Armira near Ivaylovgrad, dated from the 2nd till the 4th c. AD (KABAKCHIEVA 1986); Villa Chataalka near Stara Zagora and its necropolises (BUYUKLIEV 1980; *Chataalka* 2015), dated from the mid-1st till the beginning of the 3rd c. AD; finds from two burial mounds near Stara Zagora dated to the 3rd–4th c. AD (KALCHEV 1994); the necropolis in Vratitza, Bourgas District, dated from the turn of the 1st / 2nd c. to the 3rd c. AD (STOYANOV – NIKOV – STOYANOVA 2015); the Straldzha necropolis located north-east of Kabile dated to the 2nd–3rd c. AD, although the study also presents finds from the mound's embankment, which are dated based on the parallels to the 1st to 4th / 5th AD (ALEXANDROVA 2013; 2016); and a publication *Проучвания на надгробни могили в новозагорско* including several articles dealing with burial mounds (and the finds) from the Nova Zagora region, covering the period from the 1st till the beginning of the 4th c. AD (IGNATOV 1996a; KANCHEV – KANCHEVA-ROUSSEVA 1996).

Suitable parallels could also be found in other places in Thrace, such as in the Roman villa in Krlev Dol, Pernik District, dated to the end of the 4th c. AD (NAJDENOVA 1985), or the tumulus necropolis of Suchija Saz near Velichkovo in Pazardzhik District spanning from the 2nd till the 4th c. AD (GIZDOVA 2005). At this point, we should also mention the narrowly focused pottery studies as a typology of the red-slipped bowls from Thrace by Kabakchieva (1983) and of small-size table amphorae from north-east Thrace by Kovachev (1998).

In Moesia Inferior, besides the mentioned production centres, most of the comparative material comes from Novae (DYCZEK 1991; KLEINA 2006, 2016; BIERNACKI – KLENINA 2015), where the pottery typology, both of locally made and imported ware, dated from the 3rd till the 6th c. AD, was made by Klenina (2006); and from the Roman and Late Antique Nicopolis ad Istrum, with finds spanning from the 2nd till the 6th c. AD, published by Falkner (1999). Among the smaller scale studies, the most useful proved to be finds from the Roman *vicus* near the village of Gorsko Ablanovo, Targovishte District, dated from the mid-2nd to the mid-3rd c. AD (RUSEV – RUSEV – VRBANOV 2015), finds from the praetorium of Sostra,

Lovech District, dated to the 2nd–3rd c. AD (HRISTOV 2015a) and a typological study on small jugs from the area of Ulpia Oescus and its hinterland (Pleven District) also dated to the 2nd–3rd c. AD (AVRAMOVA 2005).

Pottery assemblages of the Late Antique period in south-eastern Thrace (the area of the Tundzha River Valley) are in general not that well documented. A good base is the ‘classical’ study of Kuzmanov (1985) on the early Byzantine pottery from Thrace and Dacia and an article by Borisov (1988) on the Early Byzantine pottery from the Sliven District. The material from the 6th c. AD hilltop site of Dodoparon, located near Golyam Manastir in Yambol District also represents a good comparative sample for this period in south-east Thrace. Nevertheless, the Late Antique period is much better documented in the Lower Danube area, where it is necessary to look for comparisons, such as in the material from Iatrus (e.g. BÖTTGER 1978, 1982); Sadovets (KUZMANOV 1992); Novae (e.g. KLENINA 1999); Castra Martis (KUZMANOV 2005) or Gradishteto near Dichin (KUZMANOV 2009).

As in the cases of the other wares, an extended area might be considered while looking for parallels, namely to Moesia Superior (CVJETIĆANIN 2003, 2004, 2010) with finds from Singidunum (BOJOVICH 1971; NIKOLIĆ-ĐORĐEVIĆ 2000); Scythia (OΠΑΙΤ 1996, 2004) with finds from Tomis (BÄJENARU 2013); Macedonia (HAYES 2008; MALAMIDOU 2005) with finds from Stobi (ANDERSON – STOJANOVIĆ 1992); Lower Pannonia (BRUKNER 1981); the north Pontic regions (ZHURAVLEV 2002, 2009) and Asia Minor, especially Ilion (HEATH – TEKKÖK 2006–2009).

2.2.2. INTRODUCTION TO THE MATERIAL

Under the table ware material attested in Yurta-Stroyno is classed a wider group of finds of a date spanning from the 1st c. until the 6th c. AD. The early finds have parallels in the North Italian and South-Gallic *terra sigillata*, such as the Marbled ware (237–247), Colour coated ware (248–253) and the Thin-walled ware (292–306), while some shapes of the Common red-slipped ware might be inspired by forms of the western, eastern and Pontic *terra sigillata*. A special case is the solitary find of a chalice under 307 which seems to be modelled on a form of Late Hellenistic – early Roman metal vessels.

The overwhelming majority of the table ware pottery is red-slipped, a characteristic which seems to be common from the beginning of the Roman pottery occurrence in Moesia Inferior and Thrace until around the mid-5th c. AD, as

suggested by the chronological span of the comparative red-slipped material. Consequently, when a red-slipped sherd has very few or no parallels, a wider span of the 1st till the mid-5th c. AD is applied as an orientation chronological data. The same time span might also be called pottery of the Roman period, from many different views a very debatable term for the period in question; it is however, used here to reflect the basic pottery appearance – a fine fabric of red / orange sherd coated with red / orange slip – a characteristic which did not change during this period. The later table ware products – here understood as the Late Antiquity – are of a coarser sandy fabric of light brown / beige colour without any slip, dated to the 5th–6th c. AD, perhaps even later. The latter group is very little represented at the site although the sherd **273** is its exact example. Sometime during the 5th c. AD changes were undertaken and together with a switch in the technology of the pottery making, also the variability of forms decreased and was reduced mainly to pots and table amphorae / jars (c.f. chapter on Dodoparon).

2.2.3. MATERIAL CHARACTERISTICS

The table ware is the most abundant pottery class both in the excavated material as well as in the field survey. From the excavation, there are 8,198 fragments of 72 kgs and from the survey 12,405 fragments of 84 kgs (**Introduction Tabs. 1–2**). The material was in its initial phase kept separately as fine ware and common ware, which proved to be confusing as the line of division between the two wares, based on the sherd thickness and slip quality, was not always clear, and some forms appeared in both groups. Consequently, all this material was put together under the heading ‘table ware’. The majority of the table ware found in Yurta-Stroyno is made of one type of ware – which is called here the Common red-slipped ware. This is the only ware represented in the assemblage by a sufficient number of diagnostic fragments of morphological forms which commonly repeat (although not always). Consequently, the six basic contexts were enough to provide a good idea of the material appearance. However, when interesting sherds of a new form were found among the other contexts or material from the field survey, they were added to the catalogue as well.

All table ware material from the six contexts amount to 6,553 body fragments, 929 rims, 364 bases, 183 handles, 8 lids and 143 decorated fragments (**TW Tab. 1**). From the 1,293 diagnostic rims and bases (929+364), the vast

majority is created by the Common red-slipped ware (1,275 pcs.: 98.6 %), a much lower amount is represented by other wares – the so-called Marbled ware (4 pcs.), Çandarli ware (4 pcs.), Coarse red-slipped ware (2 pcs.), and a mixture of individual fragments of different fabrics (5 pcs.).

Stroyno Pottery 2014–2016			EXCAVATION - TABLE WARE							
Context										
SU	Trench	Sector	Body	Rims	Bases	Handles	Lids	Decor	Total (pcs.)	Weight (g.)
SU001	ROOMS	A, B, C	2585	345	171	100	1	42	3244	33187
Levelling I	100E-105N	NE	2554	333	92	48	5	40	3072	21371
Levelling II	100E-110N	SE	836	167	65	21	2	44	1135	10987
SU008	100E-100N	SW	303	52	14	6	0	11	386	3237
SU021	095E-100N	SE	77	8	2	1	0	0	88	1451
SU057	100E-105N	SE	198	24	20	7	0	6	255	1984
Total amount:			6553	929	364	183	8	143	8180	72217

TW Tab. 1: Amount overview of the table ware pottery fragments retrieved from the six main contexts.

After evaluating the remaining material from the excavations and the field survey, the less represented wares were enriched by eight more pcs. of the Marbled ware; two pcs. of the Çandarli ware; three pcs. of the Coarse red-slipped ware and by one fragment of a different fabric. Quite surprisingly, within the core assemblage of the six contexts are completely missing any fragments of the Colour coated ware, which is represented here by six fragments from elsewhere (excavations and field survey).

The Common red-slipped ware (253 pcs.), not counting bases (18 pcs.), is represented here mainly by dishes (64 pcs.), bowls (47 pcs.) and cups / deep bowls (43 pcs.), in lower amounts by table amphorae (19 pcs.), jugs (19 pcs.), kraters (17 pcs.), cups (10 pcs.), pots (2 pcs.), dishes / trays (2 pcs.) and basins / krateriskoi (3 pcs.); 5 pcs. might relate to lids, and 4 pcs. to strainers. The **Marbled ware** (12 pcs. in Figs.) is dominated by dishes (8 pcs.), with another 3 pcs. of deep bowls; the **Colour coated ware** (6 pcs. in Figs.) contains two types of bowls (5 pcs. in total) and one dish; the **Çandarli ware** (5 pcs. in Figs.) is represented by two types of bowls; the **Thin-walled ware** (15 pcs. in Figs.) by several forms of cups and bowls and one specific chalice, of a form inspired by metal ware; and from the **Coarse**

red-slipped ware (5 pcs. in Figs.) there are 4 different bowls and 1 table amphora (for all see **TW Tab. 4**).

In conclusion, the Common red-slipped ware is much more abundant in the number of fragments and (perhaps as a result) in the variability of forms. The other wares are basically represented by dishes and bowls / cups only – which are however, also the most frequent set of finds made in the Common red-slipped ware.

2.2.4. FABRIC CHARACTERISTICS

I. Common red-slipped ware completely dominates the pottery assemblage. It regards vessels with a hard to soft sherd, smoothed surface and a fine fraction. The majority of the sherds are evenly fired. The fabric is very well sorted (4) with up to 10 % of inclusions with a size of 0.3 mm to 0.5 mm; rarely with occasional bigger pellets (1–2 mm). The predominant inclusion is lime (often of a bigger size – up to 2 mm), few are soft red-brown inclusions (grog?) and flakes of silver mica; quartz is rare (**TW Pl. 1**). Some of the vessels are of a thicker sherd, which is consequently often unevenly fired resulting in a sandwich fraction of a grey core (such as **TW Fig. 1:14**, **TW Fig. 4:49**, **TW Fig. 5:62–63**, the whole of **TW Fig. 8** and some fragments from **TW Fig. 11–16**). These features could at first sight be considered to be different products, however the fabric characteristics are the same as of the fragments with a thinner sherd and as mentioned in the introduction, their separation into Common ware did not really work as the line of division was far from clear. Consequently, both thicker and thinner sherds are presented all together under the one fabric.

The slip on the outer surface of the vessels reaches to its mid or lower part, not covering the whole container. Inside, the coverage differs for closed vessels, with only a partly slipped rim inside, and for open vessels, with full coverage of the inner surface. Except for some of the table amphorae (**TW Fig. 15** and **16**), the slip is applied by dipping into the diluted clay and quite often we may encounter “double dipping” marks, appearing when the vessel is dipped twice into the clay substance. It results in a darker slip in the place of the double coverage – generally the tip of the rim and the upper body of the vessel into which the dripping slip drips after flipping the vessel into the normal position (**TW Pl. 2:71, 122, 134**). About half of the table amphorae in **TW Fig. 15** and **16** are covered by slip applied by a brush, leaving stroke marks on the surface. Again, at the places where the clay substance

is applied in more layers, it results in a darker colouring after firing, creating a mottled effect (**TW Pl. 2:203**). The slip of the Common red-slipped ware – in both the above-mentioned ways of application – is mostly of low gloss, or even matt.

The fabric colour ranges in tints of light red and red (light red: 2.5YR 6/6 and 6/8; red: 2.5YR 5/8) rarely also reddish yellow (7.5YR 5/6); the slip is generally just a tint darker than the fabric, which is in the same colour scale as mentioned for the fabric. The double dipping is of a darker red colour, ranging from weak red (10R 4/4) to dusky red (10R 3/2).

The Common red-slipped ware description also applies for the **Thin-walled ware** (**TW Fig. 22**), which is just of a thinner sherd, otherwise of the same fabric characteristic.

Different types of the table ware than the Common red-slipped ware, are very seldom represented in the Yurta-Stroyno assemblage. There are either single sherds, each of its specific fabric, such as **48, 216, 236, 273** and **307**; or smaller groups of a similar shape and fabric as the four bowl fragments of the **Coarse red-slipped ware** (**102–105**) or three un-slipped bases of unguentarium / amphora stoppers (**247–276**). These are incorporated in the tables among the Common red-slipped ware based on their morphological form (i.e. coarser ware bowls with a flaring rim are among the Common red-slipped ware bowls with a flaring rim etc.). In the description of such sherd(s), or the group, it is noted how the fabric is different from the Common red-slipped ware; they are also marked in the tables.

There is a different situation, however, with bigger groups of specific wares of a higher number of finds, either characteristic for its fabric, morphological form or for a combination of both. Here we may class: **II. Marbled ware** (**TW Fig. 18:237–247, TW Fig. 21:291**); **III. Colour coated ware** (**TW Fig. 18:248–252, Fig. 19:253**); **IV. Eastern sigillata C – Çandarli ware** (**TW Fig. 19:256–260, perhaps also TW Fig. 21:277–280**) and **V. Thin-walled ware** (**TW Fig. 22:292–236**). Sherds of these groups (or rather pottery classes) were searched for in the whole finding assemblage of Yurta-Stroyno to provide more information on the material variability available in the settlement. Consequently, some of the sherds are very fragmented, barely diagnostic, but their presence at the site itself is very important and interesting to be noted and pointed out too. Each pottery class is described separately in the following text in the order of the TW tables.

2.2.5. COMMON RED-SLIPPED WARE

2.2.5.1. DISHES

TW Fig. 1:1–14; 2:15–32; 3:33–42 + 43–47; 4:49–59; 5:60–69; 19:254–255

TW Pl. 1:6; 3:35, 37

The group of dishes consists of several main forms frequently repeated in the Yurta-Stroyno assemblage and their derivatives. The most frequent forms are the wide-open dishes with an arched rim of different profiles – **1–8, 10–13, 14–24/25** and **254–255**²²; dishes with flaring walls and variously formed rims – **31–32, 33–42**; and hemispherical dishes with rounded rims – **49–64**. Several fragments were found only in single pieces such as **27, 28, 65–70** with **28** and **70** of a mould-made decoration suggesting these could also be trays, however their fragmentary state and lack of similar finds in the assemblage complicates their proper identification.

The lids (**43–47**), all of the Common red-slipped ware, are placed among the dishes, as they have a similar shape and some of them could be, presumably, also used as lids, e.g. **38** (see below).

1–8 (TW Pl. 1:6) and **254–255** are dishes of similar morphology but of different sizes and rim diameters ranging from 160 to 350 mm. The common feature is an out-turned arched rim with a concave depression from outside the lip. The upper part of the lip might be grooved with one or more lines running all around the vessel's perimeter. Based on a form of complete vessels, these dishes commonly have two reflex handles with three loops placed directly on the rim opposite to each other (c.f. **2** and **5**), and a ring base foot. Decoration is not very common; in our assemblage, we may find only one sherd with fine rouletting outside the body below the arched rim (**3**). The most common inner rim diameter is 160–260 mm, with rarer examples of a thicker sherd and bigger rim d. up to 350 mm (**254–255**). A smaller and thinner version of the vessels also appears (**8**), as well as the same shape produced in the Grey ware (see **GW Fig. 2:17**), Marbled ware (**TW Fig. 18:237–240**) and Colour coated ware (**TW Fig. 19:253**).

These dishes relate to Kabakchieva's Type X, which are vessels commonly found in Thrace during the 2nd and 3rd c. AD (КАБАКЧИЕВА 1983, 6; Тип X). This

²² The two bigger size vessels were placed further in the tables to be presented together with a similar dish (in shape and size) of the Colour coated ware to provide a direct comparison for the shape executed in the two fabrics.

kind of dish was produced at two kiln sites not far from Stroyno – at Nova Nadhezda, a production centre active from the mid-2nd till the mid-3rd c. AD (HARIZANOV 2016, 591; pl. 13, lower right second up) and Stara Zagora, active during the 3rd c. AD (KALCHEV 1991, 257; abb. 7:14–16). Production centres of such vessels are also known from Moesia Inferior, e.g. from Durostrorum (MUȘEȚEANU 2003, 62; pl. 28:285, Tipul 5), dated from the 2nd half of the 2nd c. until the beginning of the 3rd c. AD, or from Butovo, where the mass production of bigger size vessels of such a form (rim d. up to 335 mm) started at the end of the 2nd c.–beginning of the 3rd c. AD (SULTOV 1985, 64; tab. XXVII:4 Dishes Type 6).

The smaller-size vessels with rim d. up to 180 mm known from burial sites in Moesia Inferior, e.g., from the necropolis Kalvaka near Butovo, Sultov classes as different dishes of Type 5. Besides the dimension(s), the main reason for the separation is the colour of the fabric and the slip which are not characteristic for the pottery centres of Hotnica, Pavlikeni and Butovo. Sultov describes the fabric as a yellowish-coral to light brown ware, similar to Asia Minor production, which might be fired to a smoky grey / black shiny colour (SULTOV 1985, 64). In fact, we have this shape of dishes also in the “yellowish” fabric of the Marbled ware (**237–240**), as well as in the Grey ware (**GW Fig. 2:17**), which could both relate to the products described by Sultov. Under **254–255** are the same shape vessels but of bigger dimensions, whose production might have started slightly later, at the end of the 2nd–beginning of the 3rd c. AD, as suggested by Sultov (1985, 64).

9 represents a single find in a shape similar to the following group of dishes (both **10–13** and **14–24**), however, it has an upraised concave lip of inner rim d. 290 mm and a relief rib running around its inner edge. We may find parallels in the production centre of Durostrorum (MUȘEȚEANU 2003, 62; Tipul 6, pl. 28:287) among dishes of a similar shape with a ring foot and no handles. Mușețeanu mentions that vessels of this shape are common for the Danubian provinces and northern Black Sea area during the 2nd and 3rd c AD, in Durostrorum, it is dated to the 2nd half of the 2nd c. AD (MUȘEȚEANU 2003, 63).

10–13 are four dishes which share out-turned flat rims with three grooved lines running all around the perimeter. The inner rim d. varies between 170 to 260 mm. The individual vessels differ in their body thickness and presumably also in their

depth (especially **13** – the smallest one – seems to be quite shallow). These dishes do not seem to be common for Thrace as the only comparable find comes from the burial necropolis near Vratitza, Bourgas District, dated from the end of the 1st / beginning of the 2nd century AD to the mid-3rd c. AD (STOYANOV – NIKOV – STOYANOVA 2015, таб. XVIII:I-60). Dishes of a similar form might, however, be found in Sadovets (Moesia Inferior) with a note that this vessel type is also known in Pannonia Inferior from the 4th c. AD (KUZMANOV 1992, 206: Teller Typ 4; Taf. 57:5), a statement, which might be confirmed by finds from Sirmium (BRUKNER 1981, T93:150, Tip 85).

14–24 belong to a bigger group of dishes with out-turned arched and rounded rims, which is grooved with one or two lines running all around the upper side of the lip. The inner d. commonly ranges from 200 to 300 mm, with one smaller exception of 140 mm (**24**). There could be thicker (**14–15**) and thinner (**22–24**) variants; in both cases, the base is in the shape of a ring foot. Rarely, the vessel might be decorated with rouletting from the outside (**14**) or inside (**22**). Rims **17–20** and **25** are more arched than the other dishes in the group, which is a less common feature as the rims are mostly straight (such as **21–24**). These dishes relate to another vessel form which was also produced in the Marbled ware (**242–243**).

These dishes relate to Kabakchieva's Type 8 and 9, covering both the thicker (Type 8) and thinner (Type 9) variants, both dated from the 1st till the 3rd c. AD (КАБАКЧИЕВА 1983, 6 Тип 8, 9). Finds of such dishes are known from Yambol District – e.g. the tumulus necropolis near Straldzha (ALEXANDROVA 2016, таб. 17:V/119–120 and 127), dated to the 2nd–3rd c. AD; from Villa Armira in Ivaylovgrad (КАБАКЧИЕВА 1986, таб. 8–9) and from the area of Kabile²³. Other finds from a wider area are known, e.g., from the tumulus necropolis near the village Pet Mogili (south of Nova Zagora) which was in use from the end of the 1st till the beginning of the 4th c. AD (IGNATOV 1996a, 78; 104:3, 106:2), from the settlement at Kasnakovo, dated from the end of the 3rd to the beginning of the 4th c. AD (KACAROVA – PETKOVA 2015, fig. 3:7) or from the production centre of Nova Nadhezhdha (HARIZANOV 2016, fig. 13: three pots bottom left), active from the mid-2nd till the mid-3rd c. AD.

²³ Several complete dishes are placed in the depository of the Kabile archaeological base.

25, with a distinctly arched rim and only one grooved line, represents a specific shape of a dish, frequently found in Thrace. We may see it among the above-mentioned assemblages of the necropolis near Pet Mogili; the depository of the Kabile base; as a product of the Nova Nadezhda kiln centre or, in the material from Villa Chataalka (*Chataalka* 2015, 75: fig. 80; 2nd–3rd c. AD). We could go even further to Pannonia, to find a vessel of such a form in Sirmium, marked as an imitation of *terra sigillata*, namely a variant of the form Dragendorff 35, dated from the end of the 1st till the 2nd c. AD (BRUKNER 1981, T72:39–40).

26 is a dish with flaring walls thickened on the lip with a small concave depression from the top of the rim, whose d. is 210 mm. Similar dishes come from Sostra (HRISTOV 2015a, 78; fig. 1:3) dated to the 2nd–3rd c. AD, from the fill of a kiln near Khan Krum, Veliki Preslav, dated to the 3rd–beginning of the 4th c. AD (HRISTOV – STOEVA 2013, обр. 3, Паница Тип 3) and from Villa Krlev Dol, dated to the end of the 4th c. AD (NAJĐENOVA 1985, таб. 1:2).

27 has an inclined rim grooved with three lines and an inner rim d. 150 mm. The best parallel for the form might be found directly in the region – as such a dish was uncovered from a burial mound located between Boyanovo and Stroyno, and dated to the end of the 1st–beginning of the 2nd c. AD (AGRE 2013, 354, обр. 15:B).

28 has a flat horizontal rim with a mould made floral decoration, which is otherwise uncommon among the material from Yurta-Stroyno. Only a small part of the rim was preserved (EVE 6 %). According to the shape and the decoration, it resembles Dragendorff 36, of which it could be an imitation, as it was common to copy forms of *terra sigillata* in Pannonia and Moesia starting at the beginning of the 2nd c. AD (BRUKNER 1981, 174; c.f. T12:11). In fact, imitations of a similar form were made in Pavlikeni in the second half of the 2nd c. AD (SULTOV 1986, 66, 69; c.f. XXIX:2–3, XXXI:5–6). Another possibility is that this is a long side of a tray, similar to finds, e.g., from a road station of Sostra, dated from the mid-2nd till the mid-3rd c. AD (c.f. HRISTOV 2015a, fig. 1:1–5) or from the production centre in Butovo, dated to the 3rd c. AD (КАБАКЧИЕВА – SULTOVA – VLADKOVA 1988, 15–17).

29 and **30** are dishes with flanged rims, flaring concave walls and a differently profiled rim. Sherd **29**, of inner rim d. 220 mm, has a small groove from the upper part of the lip, while **30** is lacking the groove, and the lip is more outstretched. Dishes of a similar form might be found in the material from the Gorsko Ablanovo necropolis, dated to the second half of the 2nd c. AD (TORBATOV 2012, обр. 13:1–2), further finds come from Nicopolis ad Istrum, dated to AD 130–250 (FALKNER 1999, 6.3:358), Villa Armira near Ivaylovgrad, dated to the 2nd–4th c. AD (КАБАКЧИЕВА 1986, 13: Тип VI; таб. 9:145) or from Singidunum (Moesia Superior), to the 2nd and 3rd c. AD (BOJOVICH 1971, 35; T. LIV:488–489).

31 and **32** are dishes with flaring walls, a concave body and triangular rim. The first sherd (**31**) has a slightly overhanging rim with one incised line outside the lip, and an inner rim d. 210 mm. Exactly the same form of a dish was recently found in Kabile in a context dated to the end of the 4th c. AD with the base in the shape of a ring foot.²⁴ The second rim, **32**, also has a very fitting parallel, this time directly within the assemblage of the production centre at Nova Nadhezda (HARIZANOV 2016, fig. 13: bottom right corner), and from the *vicus* near Gorsko Ablanovo (RUSEV – RUSEV – VRBANOV 2015, 681; таб. I:2), both examples are dated from the mid-2nd to the mid-3rd c. AD.

33–37 (TW Pl. 3:35, 37), dishes with straight flaring walls and an out-turned rim, seem to be modelled on the Çandarli Ware Form 1 (**33**) and Form 2 (**34–37**) (HAYES 1972, 320, fig. 64; MALAMIDOU 2005, figs. 40–49). The inner rim diameter of these dishes varies from 200 to 270 mm. The base is not preserved; however, these forms are traditionally associated with low wide hollowed feet.

Imitations of the Form 1 – dishes with a heavy angular rim such as our **33** – were produced locally in Stara Zagora (KALCHEV 1991, Abb. 7:4 and 19) during the 3rd c. AD, and in Karanovo, from the mid-3rd c. AD, possibly until the beginning of the 4th c. AD (BORISOV 2013, таб. VII:8).

At the Stara Zagora production centre we may also have found vessels of a shape resembling / imitating the Çandarli Form 2 (KALCHEV 1991, Abb. 7:18) – as such, similar in form to our **34–36**. These sherds together with **37**, might be related

²⁴ Unpublished material from the excavation of Stefan Bakardzhiev of the presumed presidium in Kabile, dated based on coin finds.

to Kabakchieva's Type 3 (1983, 3: o6p. 3), dated from the 2nd c. to the mid-3rd c. AD. Dishes of shapes such as **33–37** are commonly found in Thrace, also in the area of Yambol and Stara Zagora Districts – as in the Villa Chataalka, Villa Armira (a direct parallel to **38**), the necropolis near Svilengrad (KABAKCHIEVA 1983, 3; KABAKCHIEVA 1986, таб. 4:72) and the necropolis near Straldzha (ALEXANDROVA 2016, 248; таб. 16:IV/108). Additionally, sherds **35–37** might be also considered as lids (see below).

38 and **39** both have specific shapes. Regarding **38**, with an unclear rim d. within a possible range of 240 to 300 mm, we may even think this could be a lid. There are parallels among dishes (e.g. RUSEV – RUSEV – VRBANOV 2015, 681; таб. I:3), although one source provides a note saying this form could also serve as a lid (c.f. WICENCIAK 2014, fig. 9:1 – a dish from the Late Hellenistic, early Roman period). The sherd **39** is missing any specific rim shaping. Deep dishes with such simple straight flaring walls are known from the Straldzha tumulus necropolis (ALEXANDROVA 2016, 248; таб. 14:II/95) dated to the 2nd–3rd c. AD, although these examples have a smaller rim d. of 140 mm.

40–42 are dishes with flaring walls and a triangular slightly offset rim grooved with one incised line from the inside. Based on parallels, they have a low ring foot. The inner rim d. varies between 200–230 mm. This shape is known from the Straldzha necropolis (ALEXANDROVA 2016, 249; таб. 15:IV/106 and таб. 16:IV/109–110); close parallels might also be found at the production centre of Stara Zagora (KALCHEV 1991, Abb. 7:5) and in other Roman provinces, e.g. in southern Pannonia, where they are known from the same period, i.e. from the 2nd to 3rd c. AD (BRUKNER 1981, 39; T 72:37–38).

43–47 + 48 (LIDS)

Before approaching the lids, I would like to point out that some of the above-mentioned sherds of the **TW Fig. 3 – the dishes with flaring walls** –, could actually serve as lids. Sherds **33**, **35** and **37** have a slightly burned rim. This would however mean, they have been covering cooking ware, which seems rather unlikely as there are quite a few coarse ware lids (see **CW Figs. 7–8**). Maybe they served as lids in an emergency, or after they were no longer suitable as dishes. The burning could

be, of course, caused secondarily, but it is peculiar to note, very few red-slipped dishes are burned in general, three of them being of this specific shape. Consequently, I have put the lids together with the dishes with flaring walls on one figure, to present them altogether.

The lids were found in quite a small amount – eight pieces in total – seven rims and one handle. The inner diameter of the lids' rims ranges from 130 to 200 mm – they could be used for rather small size dishes and bowls. The fabric of the rims (44–47) has the Common red-slipped ware characteristics, the handle (48) is however different. Its paste is very dense, of a red colour (2.5YR 5/6), with a rare amount of white inclusions. The surface is burned to a light brownish grey (2.5Y 6/2) without any slip.

Lids in general are difficult to date based on their form, which changes very little thorough the periods. Since 44–47 do feature the Common red-slipped ware characteristics, we may, at least, class them into the widest range of that ware popularity, ranging from the turn of the 1st / 2nd c. until the mid-5th c. AD.

49–54 and 60–64 are nine rim sherds of hemispherical-shaped dishes with a rim either straight or slightly bending inwards, and two corresponding bases. The inner rim diameter of seven sherds ranges from 250 to 320 mm, while the other two are smaller, with 190 mm inside (although 64 is not well preserved, and the diameter could in fact be bigger). The two bases of these dishes (60 and 61) feature a low ring foot with d. 100 and 120 mm inside. These forms of dishes quite often preserve trimming marks on the outer surface circling the vessel in wider bands (e.g. see 53). Fragment 52 has similar parameters to the rest of these dishes, although the sherd is thinner than the other ones.

The dishes with straight or slightly inwardly inclining walls are modelled on the forms of *Eastern sigillata* (ESA see HAYES 2008, figs. 1–2 and/or ESC – Çandarli Ware – see HAYES 1972, fig. 64: Forms 4 and 5). These imitations are as well-known from Thrace as they are from the other eastern provinces. Kabakchieva classed them under the Type 2 (1983, 2–3). We can find them all over Thrace, from Serdika (Sofia) and the Upper Struma Valley (KABAKCHIEVA 1983, 2; Тип 2) through Plovdiv (BOTUSHAROVA 1959, tab. 7:1) to Stara Zagora and Yambol Districts, with finds in the Straldzha necropolis (ALEXANDROVA 2016, таб. 8:I/34–35) and Villa Armira (KABAKCHIEVA 1986, таб. 3).

These dishes were also produced at the kiln site of Stara Zagora during the 3rd c. AD (KALCHEV 1991, Abb. 7:1–3), and in Karanovo from the 2nd half of the 3rd c., possibly until the beginning of the 4th c. AD (BORISOV 2013, таб. VII:1–3). Kabakchieva supposes, there were other centres located in eastern Thrace – in or nearby Kabile and Villa Chatalka – active during the 2nd–3rd c. AD (КАБАКЧИЕВА 1983, 3). Finds of similar dishes in Thrace continue until the late 4th c. AD as attested in Villa Kralev Dol located in the Upper Struma Valley (NAJDENOVA 1985, таб. 2:5). In Moesia Inferior, these dishes are known from Nicopolis ad Istrum (FALKNER 1999, 9.27, 9:28/544) where they are a long-lived form starting in the 2nd c. going up to the 5th c. AD; from Novae, where they are similarly dated from the mid-3rd to the mid-5th c. AD (KLENINA 2006, 90: Тарелки Тип 1) and from Iatrus (BÖTTGER 1982, Taf. 39:200–201, 432–433), dated from the 2nd half of the 4th to the mid-5th c. AD.

56–58 are three fragments featuring flaring convex walls with a tip of the lip slightly bending inwards, creating a pronounced rib on the outer part (in the case of **58** marked with one incised line). The base is a hollowed ring foot. Two different sizes of these dishes might be noticed in our material – a bigger one (**58**) with an inner rim d. 270 mm and a base inner d. 120 mm; and a smaller one, of inner rim d. 200 mm (although **57** is not well preserved, and its d. is based on the size of **56**). As in the previous case, these dishes are modelled on the forms of ESA (HAYES 2008, fig. 2) – in fact, the bigger size dish **58** might be considered to be an imitation of ESA shape II, and the smaller ones (**56–57**) to be of ESA shape III (both HAYES 2008, 24). Close in form and size to the smaller series is a dish from the Straldzha necropolis (ALEXANDROVA 2016, таб. 12:I-2/73); to the bigger series, a dish from the tumulus mound at Suchija Saz in Pazardzhik District (GIZDOVA 2005, 179; обр. 15). The chronology for both sizes of the dishes seems to be the same, from the 2nd to 4th c. AD.

55 and **59** share some similarities with the above-described ones (**56–58**) as their walls are quite opened and rather straight, however the body is not convex, and the inwards bending lip is missing. The smaller dish **55** has an inner rim d. 190 mm, base d. 80 mm and rounded rim. This form could again be related to the ESA prototype (shape IV in HAYES 2008, 24). The closest parallels from south-eastern

Bulgaria come from the Stara Zagora production centre (KALCHEV 1991, Abb. 7:3), from the necropolises in Straldzha (ALEXANDROVA 2016, таб. 9:III 38 and 40) and Suchija Saz in Pazardzhik District (GIZDOVA 2005, таб. 4: bottom left). In Moesia Inferior, a very similar piece is published from Nicopolis ad Istrum, dated by the context to AD 150–175 (FALKNER 1999, 185; 9.27:510 – it also has the same rim d. of 190 mm inside). The sherd **59** is of a bigger size with a rim of quadrangular section, undercut from both sides; the rim inner d. reaches 250 mm. Similar dishes of a bigger size (rim d. up to 280 mm) were produced in Butovo from the 2nd half of the 2nd c. AD (SULTOV 1985, 65, Type 7; pl. XXVIII:4). They are, however, missing any undercut. Sultov notes that this type of dish is widespread in Northern Bulgaria (with footnote 41 – referring to unpublished material). In Dobrudzha, similar dishes, again without any undercut, appear during the 2nd half of the 3rd c. AD and continue until the mid-4th c. AD (ОРАИТ 2004a, 74, Dish Type 1). One example with thicker walls and an undercut inside the lip was found at the tumulus of Suchija Saz necropolis in Pazardzhik District (GIZDOVA 2005, 179; таб. 1: in the middle), which is dated from the 2nd to 4th c. AD. And finally, Kabakchieva classes a similar vessel with straight flaring walls, however tapering towards the tip of the rim, as a Type 11 (КАБАКЧИЕВА 1983, 6: Тип 11), dated within the 1st–3rd c. AD. She gives a range of rim diameter from 180 to 300 mm which covers both sizes of our vessels.

Putting all this information together, the biggest concentration of dishes with a such form dates to the 2nd and 3rd c. AD, although they might be found within the contexts of the 1st and the 4th c. AD as well.

65 is a small fragment of inner rim d. 180 mm. The rim is curved and divided by one groove into two parts. It resembles two other forms – according to the curving it resembles the hemispherical bowls (**71–87**) and according to the division of the rim it resembles the deep hemispherical bowls with a split rim (**132–138**). No direct parallels were found in the published literature. The two mentioned morphological groups could be dated, in a wider range, from the 2nd till the 4th c. AD, which seems to also be a feasible chronology for this fragment.

66 is a sherd with inwards inclined walls and a pronounced depression inside of the rim with inner d. 210 mm. Exactly the same form might be found in the Grey ware

(GW Fig. 1:11). Both wares, however, remain without direct parallels at other settlements / necropolises in the area.

67 has a fully preserved profile, with inner rim d. 190 mm, and base d. 100 mm. The dish has one small reflex handle placed just below the rim, a second handle might be expected on the opposite side of the dish as in the cases of sherds **2** and **5**. The dish is in a form similar to a single find of a small bowl **88** (see below) with inner rim d. 110 mm and base d. 45 mm. Both vessels might find parallels in the material from the production centre near Karavelovo (IVANOV 2019a, 271; fig. 5:1–4), classed under the Bowls Type II A, including the same form of bowls of various sizes with the rim d. ranging from 135–225 mm. The forms correspond, although the body of our vessel is lower and wider, and as such classed into the dishes. The finds from Karavelovo are dated from the end of the 2nd till the mid-3rd c. AD. Another parallel might be found in Diana, a Roman fort on the Danube River in Serbia (CVJETIĆANIN 2003, # 16), dated to the 2nd c. AD. This specific vessel is, however, executed in Marbled ware, although Cvjetićanin notes that most forms of the Marbled ware, including this one, also appear at the site in the red-slipped fabric (CVJETIĆANIN 2003, 64).

68 is in a form similar to the bigger group of dishes under **49–64**, only the outer wall of the dish is thickened and slightly undercut just below the lip. The inner rim d. is 200 mm. A dish like this was found in the mound embankment of the Straldzha necropolis and dated based on the parallels to the 2nd–4th c. AD (ALEXandrova 2016, таб. 12:I-2/76).

69 is a dish with curved walls and a thickened rolled rim with two shallow facets on the outer rim of inner d. 190 mm. Similar dishes with facets on the rim might be found in the pottery centre near Karavelovo, under the Dishes Type I dated to the end of the 2nd till the mid-3rd c. AD (IVANOV 2019a, 269; fig. 4), despite the rim profile being more triangular, the size corresponds (rim d. 210–220 mm). More of these vessels, this time with a rounded rim, however without the facets, might be found on the Lower Danube, such as in Nicopolis ad Istrum (FALKNER 1999, 9.32:630 and 9.48:988), the first example dated to the context of AD 350–450, the second one to AD 250–350; and in Novae (KLENINA 2016, 430–431; fig. 12:2) as

Plates Type 1 (of rim d. 180–250 mm), dated from the second half of the 3rd to the end of the 4th c. AD, and produced in a local pottery workshop. Klenina sees a prototype of the vessels in African red-slipped ware – Hayes Form 27 –, produced in AD 160–220.

2.2.5.2. DISHES / TRAYS

Sherd **70** has a peculiar form, which might be a decorated handle of a tray (c.f. HRISTOV 2015a, fig.1:1–5), a common vessel form, which was produced, for example, in Pavlikeni and Butovo during the 2nd and 3rd c. AD (KABAKCHIEVA – SULTOVA – VLADKOVA 1988, 15–17). The decoration is a mould made with an unidentifiable (likely floral) motif on the upper side; the back side is smoothed. The fragment is slipped from both sides. Another fragment which could be considered to be a piece of a tray is **28** also of a mould made decoration placed on the top of the lip.

2.2.5.3. BOWLS

TW Fig. 6:71–88; 7:89–105; 8:106–116; 9:117–121

TW Pl. 1:86, 120; 2:71

The group of bowls might be divided into several basic shapes – hemispherical bowls with a rounded rim (**71–85**); bowls with a flanged rim of smaller – **89–105** and of bigger – **106–116** dimensions; and hemispherical bowls with a short out-turned rim decorated on the body – **117–121**. While these groups are quite coherent in shape (with one “derivative” form of **88**), the bigger size bowls with a flanged rim feature a wide diversity with many individual shapes.

71–87 (TW Pl. 1:86; 2:71) is a series of hemispherical bowls with curved walls and rims either inclined outwards, inwards or straight. The inner rim d. ranges from 140 to 200 mm; the base diameter normally ranges between 35 to 50 mm inside. The base could be low, hollowed from the inside, as it is on **80**; or in the shape of a low ring foot (c.f. KABAKCHIEVA 1986, таб. 1.1; KABAKCHIEVA 1983; Тип 1).

These bowls are a very common find in the Yurta-Stroyno assemblage, both in the excavation material and the field survey. Some of the bowls might be decorated from the outside with one incised line, placed from 4 up to 15 mm below

the rim. Sometimes the incised line changes the appearance of the upper rim / lip, making it oval in section (c.f. **81**). There is no other decoration.

Bowls of this shape are very common in Thrace, where they experienced a production boom during the 2nd and mid-3rd c. AD, although some examples are also known from the very end of the 1st c. AD and the beginning of the 4th c. AD (KABAKCHIEVA 1983, 1–2; BORISOV 2013, 322). Both versions – with and without the incised line – were produced in the pottery workshops of Stara Zagora (KALCHEV 1991, Abb. 9:1–3) and Nova Nadezhda (HARIZANOV 2016, fig. 13); bowls with the incised line are also known from kilns at Karanovo (BORISOV 2013, таб. VII:4). These vessels are common in settlements and necropolises in south-eastern Thrace as well as in Moesia Inferior and Superior, Dacia, Pannonia and in the Black Sea area (KABAKCHIEVA 1983, 2–3).

88 is also a hemispherical bowl, however with a more profiled rim, bevelled inwards, and with an outer lip projecting upwards. The inner rim diameter is smaller – 110 mm, the base is flat, with an outer d. 45 mm. In the basic form, it resembles the dish **67**, which, however, has a distinctly bigger rim diameter (190 mm) and a more open form. A good morphological parallel might be found in the bowl from the Vizitsa necropolis in the Straldzha Mountains found in the Mound 5 dated to the beginning of the 4th c. AD (AGRE – DICHEV 2005, 50–55, обр. 15). Also, this bowl has, however, a much bigger rim diameter (280 mm). If we put the size differences aside and use the two forms for comparison, the approximate chronology for the bowl **88** seems to stretch from the 2nd till the 4th c. AD.

89–101 belong to the bowls with a flanged rim, which is another major series of vessels found at the site of Yurta-Stroyno. They are characteristic due to a pronounced rib dividing the upper and lower part of the vessel. The wall above the lower rib is mostly straight, although it might slightly incline outwards and inwards. There is no decoration and the bases are in the shape of a low ring foot (e.g. **94**). There might be some differences observed in the shape of individual bowls from the Yurta-Stroyno assemblage, creating several independent series:

The first series is of bowls with two pronounced ribs (**89–96**). These can be further divided into – **a**) bowls with straight walls and the two ribs about three centimetres apart with a rim diameter of 160 mm (**89–94**). The base **94** of inner d.

50 mm would also belong to this series; and to – **b**) bowls with concave walls between the two ribs, placed closer to each other (**95–96**). The rim diameter could be either as of the previous series, i.e. d. 160 mm inside (**95**), or smaller, of d. 120 mm, as in the case of the sherd **96**.

Sherds **97–99** represent another series, which keeps only the lower pronounced rib on the body and combines it with straight thin walls stretching above the rib. The rim is undercut by one incised line placed below the lip. The rim inner diameters are more variable, ranging from 90 to 140 mm.

Finally, **100** and **101** represent the last specific series which is a combination of characteristic features from the previously discussed bowls – the one pronounced rib on the body and the thin concave walls stretching above the rib.

These kinds of bowls with a flanged rim are very common in Thrace during the 2nd–4th c. AD. Kabakchieva has sorted them under the Type VII б and в (KABAKCHIEVA 1983, 4–5) and noted that they were, together with her Type I (our hemispherical bowls **71–87**) the most common red-slipped ware shapes in Thrace during the Roman period, produced especially from the 2nd half of the 2nd c. to the beginning of the 3rd c. AD, although their production continued to the 4th c. AD, when the quality of their execution visibly declined (KABAKCHIEVA 1983, 5; KABAKCHIEVA 1986, 12). The quality of the majority of the bowls from our site is high (except **102–105**, see below), suggesting their production during the peak period. Nevertheless, the lower parts of some of the bowls might be unevenly fired creating a sandwich like fraction. It is a result of their being stacked in the kiln, where they were placed directly one on top of another.

All these above-mentioned variants were in use during the same period of time, as we may find them altogether in closed contexts dated mostly to the 2nd and 3rd c. AD, e.g. from Villa Armira in Ivaylovgrad (KABAKCHIEVA 1986, таб. 5–7), Nicopolis ad Istrum (FALKNER 1999, 76; 9.25 and 9.26:479–481, 486–487, 489), or in the necropolis near Straldzha (ALEXANDROVA 2016, VI-1/132–157). The vessels from the first series (**89–94**) are the most common version of the bowls with a flanged rim, known from several production centres in Thrace – Stara Zagora (KALCHEV 1991, Abb 8: 4, 5 and 7), Nova Nadhezda (HARIZANOV 2016, fig. 13), Karanovo (BORISOV 2013, таб. VII:10 – with a small offset); and in Moesia Inferior – near Karavelovo (IVANOV 2019a, fig. 4: 5–6; Bowls Type 1), and Hotnica, Pavlikeni, Butovo (SULTOV 1985, 62; XXVI:1–3, Dishes Type 1). Products from

the latter kilns are often decorated with a stamp of *planta pedis* or with rouletting around the central part of the bottom. From our material, we have only one *planta pedis* stamp found on the bottom (**288**), but we cannot confidently attribute it to any particular vessel form.

102–105 create a very specific group of bowls with a flanged rim of a worse quality than the above-described ones. These bowls are produced from a coarser fabric (similar to the fine-coarse lids) with 10 % of fairly sorted sandy inclusions, bigger particles of lime and quartz, with an amount of silver mica which varies from predominant to rare. These sherds are thicker, unevenly fired with a grey core, have a soft surface and they are commonly heavily worn. The slip – if there was one – is rarely preserved, thin and matt. Altogether nine sherds were found in the excavation and field survey material. The rim inner diameter of this group ranges from d. 120 to 170 mm, the inclination of the walls might differ, but there is always one plastic rib below the rim (about 20 mm apart). These bowls could be the 4th c. AD products of lower quality mentioned by Kabakchieva (1983, 5 and above), or, perhaps, they were made in some parallel workshop by less skilled craftsmen.

106–116 are vessels of bigger proportions, otherwise – especially taking into account the distinctive rib below the rim –, similar to the previously described bowls (**89–105**). The vessels are bigger in size and ‘heavier’ in the body construction, the sherds are thicker (ca. 10 mm), the rim inner diameter varies from 180 to 280 mm. The fabric characteristic is that of the Common red-slipped ware, although some sherds might be slightly coarser – with bigger pellets of white inclusions. Several sherds are softer and worn on the surface, hardly containing any slip, which is, if preserved, of a dull appearance.

The first three sherds, **106–108**, create its own group, characteristic for a raised, inwards inclined rim, uniformly 37 mm high. The inner rim diameter ranges from d. 230 to 280 mm (measured on five samples from the excavations and the field survey). The sherds are soft and worn, in some places with the remains of a tiny layer of a red slip, well absorbed into the sherd. One of the fragments is scratched after firing (**107**), but perhaps accidentally. These vessels are well-known from Thrace, marked by Kabakchieva as Type VI (1983, 5) – bowls whose appearance did not significantly change from the 1st until the 4th c. AD.

109 is of smaller proportions (inner rim d. 180 mm), otherwise, it resembles the previous three fragments. A thin dull slip is well preserved from the outside and quite worn inside. Bowls like this were produced in the Stara Zagora workshop during the 3rd c. AD (KALCHEV 1991, Abb. 8:8), and are also known from the nearby area – e.g. the necropolis near the villa Chatalka (BUYUKLIEV 1980, tab. 1:1), dated from the mid-1st till the beginning of the 3rd c. AD.

110, of rim inner d. 200 mm, features a spiky ending of the lower rib. Otherwise, the fabric and the slip are in hand specimen identical to **109**. Similar bowls with a more profound lower rib are known from the ceramics centre near Karavelovo under Bowls Type 1, dated from the end of the 2nd till the mid-3rd c. AD (IVANOV 2019a, 272; fig. 4:6).

111, from the vessels of bigger proportion, most resembles the ‘classical’ version of the bowls with a flanged rim (**89–94**), although with the upper rib rolled inwards, not outwards. The inner rim d. is 250 mm. Similar fragments are known from the area of Yurta-Stroyno – such as from the field survey of the Nabucco gas pipeline (Sector 1, Revision E), near the village of Bolyarovo (BOYADZHIEV 2013, 580: object 1031; оёр. 3: bottom right), and from the necropolis near Straldzha (ALEXANDROVA 2016, таё. 15:III-1/102). The first find has no context; the necropolis is dated to the 2nd–3rd c. AD.

112 is an upper body with an inner rim d. 190 mm. A complete bowl of this form was found in the necropolis near Straldzha with a flat splaying base (ALEXANDROVA 2016, таё. 20:VI-2/159). A similar vessel comes from the production centre of Durostrorum, classed within the widely defined group of bowls – Castroane Tipul 1 (MUȘEȘEANU 2003, 51–52; pl. 14:4). Both parallels are dated to the 2nd–3rd c. AD.

113 is a shallow bowl with concave walls between the two ribs. In the middle of the concavity runs a small plastic rib. The inner rim d. is 230 mm. No published parallel has been found, although the same vessel form was collected during the field survey of the Tundzha Regional Archaeological Project at the site 6021, located about 5 km north-west of Yurta-Stroyno, near the village of Karevelovo.²⁵ Since the overall appearance of the vessel is similar to the other finds of the bowls with a flanged rim of bigger proportions, we may also expect a similar chronology, ca. from the 1st till 4th c. AD.

²⁵ Unpublished pottery find.

114 is so fragmentarily preserved, that its rim diameter is only estimated at 230 mm inside. A pot of the same shape was found at the embankment at the necropolis near Straldzha (ALEXANDROVA 2016; таб. 15:III-2/103), dated based on the parallels to the 2nd–4th c. AD. A similar fragment also comes from the field survey near Bolyarovo (BOYADZHIEV 2013, 580: object 1031; оѡп. 3: lower right, second up).

115 is a bigger size bowl with a flanged rim and inner d. 270 mm, ribbed with two incised lines; and sherd **116** is a partly preserved rim with inner d. 180 mm, also ribbed with two incised lines. From the rim inclination, the latter sherd seems to have a similar shape to **106–108**, i.e. an inwards inclined rim, rib on the body and walls sharply sloping to the base. No direct parallel was found for either of them. Based on the fabric / slip characteristics, **115** and **116** can fit quite well among the other bowls of this group, which suggests a similar chronology of ca. the 1st–4th c. AD.

117–121 (TW Pl. 1:120) are five hemispherical bowls with short outturn rims which might be divided, based on their size, into two groups – bigger, with inner rim d. between 170 and 180 mm (**117–118**), and smaller, with inner rim d. 110–130 mm (**119–121**). All of the vessels are decorated – mostly with motifs executed in *barbotine* (**118**, **120–121**), less frequently with incised horizontal lines (**117**), or other incised decoration (**119**).

Such bowls are known from Novae – the smaller size one (DYCZEK 1991, tab. XIV:2), decorated with *barbotino* and dated to the 2nd–3rd c. AD, as well as the bigger size one (KLENINA 2016, 430; fig. 12:7), classed by Klenina under the Bowl Type 5 and by Sultov as a Type 1c – ‘c’ for the rich decoration on the body (SULTOV 1985, 66). Sultov marks as its production period, in the pottery centres of Pavlikeni and Butovo, the second half of the 2nd c. AD–beginning of the 4th c. AD.

Similar bowls might also be found in Nicopolis ad Istrum (FALKNER 1999, 82:771–786; 9:38, 9:39), dated into the context of the mid-3rd to mid-5th c. AD; in Sostra, from the 2nd and 3rd c. AD (HRISTOV 2015a, fig. 3:13) and in the production centre in Durostrorum (MUŞEŢEANU 2003, 55; pl. 20:133, Castroane Tipul 11), where these bowls are considered an imitation of metal vessels, and, based on other finds from Histria, dated to the first half of the 2nd c. AD.

2.2.5.4. CUPS

TW Fig. 9:122–131

TW Pl. 1:/SY15_175/; 2:122

The following group of vessels includes smaller size cups of both open and closed form with a rounded body, narrow base and one or two handles. The majority of the cups from Yurta-Stroyno are represented by one type, here under **122–127**. Only a small number of examples are depicted here as these vessels are of a common form, already well described and defined, however we should bear in mind they are one of the most represented morphological forms of the Common red-slipped ware (and of ware in general) found at the site.

The remaining cups (**128–131**) are also of quite a popular form, however in our assemblage represented by a much smaller amount – these four fragments are all that was found in the six reference contexts. They are all of a closed body form with flaring rims and one handle, although they differ in small details.

122–127 (TW Pl. 1:/SY15_175/; 2:122), cups with an off-set rim and two band handles, they are very common at the site of Yurta-Stroyno, where they represent one of the most frequent vessel forms. They have a rounded upper part of the body with the lower part sharply sloping to the base. The rim is offset and ribbed with two incised lines, the base has the shape of a hollowed ring foot. None of the cups is decorated. Based on the size, there might be several versions. The most common size is of inner rim d. 90–110 mm, with outer base d. ca. 30–35 mm. The two band handles attached to the body are oval with dimensions of 10–12×5–7 mm (**122–125**). Rarely, smaller and bigger versions of the same cup might appear. We have a single sherd from each. The smaller series is represented by sherd **126**, which does not have a preserved rim, only the base with an outer d. 25 mm and handle 9×7 mm in section. Based on the body size, the rim d. would be about 60 mm. From the bigger series, on the other hand, we have only the thicker off-set rim with an inner d. 130 mm (**127**). Different sizes do not seem to be chronologically sensitive, as they might be found together within one grave / necropolis (see ALEXANDORVA 2016, таб. 23:I-1/95 and таб. 24; KALCHEV 1994, таб. 3:рпоб 8).

These cups might be found widely spread over the territory of Thrace and Moesia Inferior. In our area (the Yambol and Stara Zagora Districts), they were produced at the kiln site of Stara Zagora (KALCHEV 1991, Abb. 9:10–13) and Nova

Nadhezda, here even in different sizes (HARIZANOV 2016, fig. 13: top right). They are known from nearby settlements such as from Villa Armira (KABAKCHIEVA 1986, 17–18; таб. 17:238), and the necropolises near Nova Zagora (IGNATOV 1996a, e.g. таб. 3:2), Straldzha (ALEXANDROVA 2016, таб. 24), Villa Chataalka (BUYUKLIEV 1980, e.g. таб. 31:444) and Kabile (BAKARDZHIEV – MIKOV – DZHANFEZOVA 2014, обр. 3:В). In the area of Kabile, this cup is very common as it is attested by many complete vessels from burial contexts exhibited at the local museum. The peak of its popularity seems to be in the 2nd–3rd c. AD, with the continuation of production until the 4th c. AD.

These cups are also known from other areas of Thrace, e.g. from the Plovdiv (BOTHUSHAROVA 1956, таб. 5:7, 6:19) and Pazardzhik Districts (GIZDOVA 2005, 185: обр. 5; таб. 2) and from Moesia Inferior, e.g. Nicopolis ad Istrum (FALKNER 1999, 81; 9.38:756–759), or Novae (KLENINA 2006, 100; Кубки Тип 6). Many of these cups were produced in Hotnica and Pavlikeni pottery workshops from the mid-2nd till the beginning of the 4th c. AD (SULTOV 1985, 77; таб. XXXVII:2, Type 7) – products of these kiln sites are often decorated with *barbotine* on the upper part of the body.

128–131 are four cups with a rounded body and closed rim of inner d. 50–60 mm. Only **130** has one preserved handle of 12×7 mm in section. Compared with other published cups, this form has one handle only. Fragments **130–131** have a ribbed upper part of the body, no other decoration is attested.

Similar cups are known in high amounts from Singidunum (BOJOVICH 1971, 39; LXVIII–LXX), dated to the 2nd–3rd c. AD, from Villa Armira (KABAKCHIEVA 1986), where we can find parallels for all of these vessels: **128** (таб. 17:236–237), **129** (таб. 14:225–226), **130** (таб. 18:251) and **131** (таб. 16:231). Sherd **129** has further close parallels at the Stara Zagora pottery workshop (KALCHEV 1991, Abb. 9:18) or at the necropolises near Nova Zagora (IGNATOV 1996a, таб. 4:6) and Stara Zagora (KALCHEV 1994, таб. 4:рроб 6); similarly, more parallels might be found for **130** and **131**, such as products from the pottery centre near Karavelovo (IVANOV 2019a, fig. 7:2 Cups Type V = **130**; and fig. 7:3 Cups Type VI = **131**), and one more for **130** from Sostra (HRISTOV 2015a, fig. 2:11).

The chronology of these cups seems to be very similar to the previous group (122–127), i.e. the peak production from the 2nd to 3rd c. AD, with a continuity of finds until the 4th c. AD.

2.2.5.5. CUPS / DEEP HEMISPHERICAL BOWLS

TW Fig. 10:132–152; 11:153–171; 12:172–174

TW Pl. 1:143, 169; 2:134

The following class is a compound of smaller and bigger size hemispherical vessels, with straight or slightly rounded walls and differently profiled rims. The shape relates to cups / deep bowls without handles, although one series (165–172) seems to have handles attached to the upper body. Most of the shapes could be classed into smaller morphological groups such as 132–138, 139–141, 145–152, 153–164 + 173–174 and 165–172. A special series of cups / deep bowls with flaring rims represents three individual forms of different vessels – 142, 143 and 144.

132–138 (TW Pl. 2:134) are cups / deep hemispherical bowls with a rim split into two parts, with the outer one protruding over the inner one. Based on their size, two groups could be defined. The first one, of smaller dimensions, with an inner rim d. 90–100 mm (132–135), and the second one, of bigger dimensions, featuring an inner rim d. 140–180 mm (136–138). One of the sherds – 138 – has body walls inclining inwards, closing the rim. This shape might relate to a slightly different vessel, although in our material its shape is closest to this group.

For the smaller forms we may find exact parallels in the assemblages from the necropolis near Straldzha (ALEXandrova 2016, таб. 12:I-3/79), although uncovered in the embankment and dated based on parallels from the 2nd till the 4th c. AD; and from the production centre at Stara Zagora (KALCHEV 1991, Abb. 25:6), dated from the beginning of the 3rd until the end of the 4th c. AD. We can also find them in Singidunum (NIKOLIĆ-ĐORĐEVIĆ 2000, 44; Tip 1/65), dated to the 2nd c. AD.

Parallels for the bigger size vessels come from a pottery kiln found in Leshnica near Lovech (IVANOVA 2003, обр. 38:6), dated to the 3rd c. AD and from the Roman *vicus* near Gorsko Ablanovo, dated from the second half of the 2nd c. AD to the first half of the 3rd c. AD (RUSEV – RUSEV – VRBANOV 2015, таб. VIII:63). Both sizes of these vessels were also found together in Durostrorum, dated

to the 2nd and 3rd c. AD (MUȘETEANU 2003, 54, Castron Tipul 7 and 8; pl. 19:103–117).

139–141 are three fragments of cups / deep hemispherical bowls with a triangular rim and inner d. from 110 to 130 mm. They slightly differ from each other in the shape of the rim, with **141** having a more pronounced rib on the outer lip. This sherd has a good parallel in the finds from the Straldzha necropolis (ALEXANDROVA 2016, таб. 12:I-3/80), dated to the 2nd–mid-3rd c. AD. A similar chronology might be expected for the other two sherds.

142 has a flaring, slightly concave body and flanged rim. The inner rim d. is 85 mm. This form is modelled on Arretine ware *Conspectus* forms 17 and 22 (HAYES 2008, 29; fig. 20:591) and ESA Atlante form 47 (XVIIIC), produced from the Augustan period to the late 1st c. AD (HAYES 2008, fig. 6: 154–161). Imitations of these bowls started in Pavlikeni around the mid-2nd c. AD (SULTOV 1985, 68; таб. XXXI:2, Cups Type 3). They are known from the area of Moesia Inferior – e.g. from Novae (KLENINA 2006, 97; Чашки Тип 5), but they do not seem to be common in Thrace. Their occurrence is so far limited to the 2nd c. AD only.

143 (TW Pl. 1) is a cup with straight flaring walls, a thickened flat rim of inner d. 120 mm, decorated with two grooved lines. Parallels might be found at the necropolis east of Stara Zagora, dated to the 3rd–4th c. AD (KALCHEV 1994, 178; таб. 5:39) and in a rich grave at the necropolis near Villa Chatalka dated to the beginning of the 3rd c. AD (BUYUKLIEV 1980, 127:326).

144 is a deep bowl with flaring walls and a bended rim, grooved from the upper part by two lines; the inner rim d. is 100 mm. This form seems to be inspired by ESB2 Atlante 72 / Robinson shape IV (HAYES 1985, tav. XV:4; HAYES 2008, 31–32; fig. 12:326), dated from the mid-1st till the end of the 2nd c. AD. We may find a similar shape – without the grooves on the rim – also in the *Pontic sigillata B* dated from the mid-2nd till the 3rd c. AD (ZHURAVLEV 2002, 260; fig. 16:5).

Similar size bowls with flaring walls and an arched rim, but only with one incised line, are known from Pavlikeni, dated by the context to the 2nd c. AD (IVANOV 2019b, 12–13; fig. 7:5 Bowls Type XII) and with one or two lines, from

the production centre in Stara Zagora, dated from the beginning of the 3rd c. to the end of the 4th c. AD (KALCHEV 1991, Abb. 24: 4–6). In Thrace, such bowls were also found in later contexts, such as in the Sliven District, where they have the rim grooved by two lines (BORISOV 1988, 103; рис. 6:3, Тип 3). Borisov, relying on other finds from Madara and Karanovo, dates these bowls from the 4th to the mid-5th c. AD. He notes that these late vessels have a low-quality red slip. Since our vessel has a well-preserved slip of good quality, we may incline to class it rather with the earlier production of the 2nd–4th c. AD.

145–152 are eight bowls featuring a small raised rim, separated from the rounded body by an engraved line. The rim inner d. ranges from 90–120 mm. The upper part of the body is commonly decorated, mostly with another engraved line and/or with different motifs, either incised (**145**) or executed in *barbotine* (**147**).

These vessels are of the same form as the following group (**153–164**), only of smaller size. The first five fragments (**145–149**) are very unified in their shape and size, while the three remaining sherds (**150–152**) each have a slightly different shape reflecting more the following group.

The parallels for the small size vessels are poor. Interestingly, the only found fragment of a similar shape and size is executed in the Grey ware. It comes from the villa Krlev Dol, dated to the end of the 4th c. AD; the sherd has an inner rim d. 80 mm and it is decorated with stamped motifs (NAJDENOVA 1985, 73; таб. 15:176). In the chapter dealing with the Grey ware, I use the red-slipped ware to approximate the date for some of the finds, perhaps this approach could also work in this case, only vice versa. Further, if we consider these vessels as a smaller version of the following group (**153–164**), we may also gain inspiration as to its chronology, ranging from the 3rd to the mid-5th c. AD.

153–164 and **173–174** create a big group of bowls with a rounded body and out-turned rim with a small depression inside the lip. Some of these bowls are decorated below the rim with an incised line or two, some are either further incised on the upper body with various motifs (**153–154**, **159**, **173–174**) or decorated with *barbotine* (**160**). The most common dimensions of the inner rim d. are 160–200 mm. One specific sub-group features smaller size vessels with a horizontally

grooved body and inner rim d. 100–130 mm (**162–164**). On the other hand, **173–174** represent bigger size vessels with an inner rim d. 240–250 mm.

The best parallels might be found in Moesia Inferior – at Nicopolis ad Istrum, however the local bowls are of bigger dimensions than most of ours, with the rim diameter of 200–320 mm. Falkner approximates their date range to AD 250–450 (FALKNER 1999, 82; 9.39:794–796). Similar forms are also known from Novae – Bowls Type 2 – found in the context of the 4th c. AD (KLENINA 2006, 94; Миски Тип 2), also featuring a bigger rim d. of 200–300 mm, and from the fill of a pottery kiln near the village of Khan Krum (HRISTOV – STOEVA 2013, 389; обр. 12, Купи Тип III), dated to the 3rd–beginning of the 4th c. AD, with the rim d. 205 mm.

In Thrace, all of the hemispherical bowls which could be considered for comparison, have a more rounded body and/or an out-turned flat rim. These come from the Stara Zagora production centre, dated to the 3rd c. AD (KALCHEV 1991, Abb. 8:10); from the Karanovo kiln site, active in the second half of the 3rd c.–beginning of the 4th c. AD (BORISOV 2013, таб. V: 7–10), and from the villa Kravev Dol, dated to the end of the 4th c. AD (NAJDENOVA 1985, 86; таб. 6:21).

The dimensions of the majority of our vessels (**153–164**), with the biggest rim d. 200 mm, are on the lower border of the given examples. Despite this, the similarity in the form, especially with the material from Moesia Inferior, is sufficient enough to use it as a comparative sample for dating. The two bigger size vessels with the rim d. 240–250 mm (**173–174**), on the other hand, perfectly fit into the dimensions of the given comparative samples.

The chronology of these vessels seems to span from the 3rd to the 4th c. AD, with possible continuity to the first half of the 5th c. AD (such as in Nicopolis ad Istrum). For **155**, with a rather massive lip and a more subtle body, we could also consider Bowls Type 6 from Novae, dated from the end of the 2nd till the mid-5th c. AD (KLENINA 2006, 95; Миски Тип 6).

165–172 (TW Pl. 1:169) represent deep bowls or cups with a triangular rim of inner d. 100–140 mm with one bigger exception of rim d. 190 mm (**172**). The body walls are straight, slightly inclining inwards in the direction of the foot. The body is decorated with engraved lines, either placed horizontally or arranged in different directions. One of the smaller vessels bears the sign of a handle attachment (**166**),

the bigger one has it preserved (**172**, in section 31×5 mm), suggesting this shape had one, but more likely two, handles. Vessels of such a form with two handles were produced in the Stara Zagora pottery centre (KALCHEV 1991, Abb. 24:10 and 12); they might also be seen in the exhibition of the Stara Zagora Archaeological Museum; both examples are dated to the 2nd–3rd c. AD; their rim d. is around 130–140 mm.²⁶

Vessels of a similar form might be found at the pottery centre in Karavelovo under the Cup Type 1 A – with two handles, and B – with four handles, both dated to the end of the 2nd c. AD–mid-3rd c. AD (IVANOV 2019a, 271–272; fig. 6). Despite having a rim diameter closer to our smaller size vessels (110–120 mm), the body form – with very straight walls – resembles rather our bigger vessel **172**. Vessels of a similar size (rim d. 130 mm) also come from Nicopolis ad Istrum, dated by the context to the 2nd c. AD (FALKNER 1999, 82; 9.38:760).

These vessels are also a common inventory of burial mounds. We may find them, for example, in the tumulus necropolis near Pet Mogili in Nova Zagora region, which was in use from the end of the 1st till the beginning of the 4th c. AD (IGNATOV 1996a, 89; таб. IV:1, X:1, XII:1, XIV:1). The four vessels from the necropolis have a rim diameter ranging from 140–170 mm, as such, they represent a better comparison for our small size vessels. Another parallel, this time rather for the bigger size vessel **172**, comes from the tumulus necropolis near Stara Zagora, dated to the 3rd–4th c. AD (KALCHEV 1994, таб. 3:гроб 6:1 with rim d. 220 mm). The majority of the parallels date to the 2nd–3rd c. AD, where the production peak might be expected, with an extension into the 4th c. AD.

2.2.5.6. KRATERS

TW Fig. 12:175–180; 13:181–187; 14:188–191

The form of the following vessels is regarded as a *kratēr* in the literature to reflect its Hellenistic origin. It has a horizontal rim, which might protrude inside, and sometimes a raised outer tip of the lip. The neck is either cylindrical or slightly sloping towards the rim. The vessels seem to have at least two handles placed on the upper body; for the shapes of **181–187** up to four handles are attested. The

²⁶ They are both missing a scale or any information about the rim diameter, but in both cases, they are either depicted or placed next to the cups (here under **122–125**) which mostly have a rim d. 100 to 110 mm. Consequently, the rim diameter could be approximated based on the comparison of these two vessels.

dimensions of the rim d. vary from 140 to 240 mm and the only secure base of this shape in our material has a ring foot of outer d. 80 mm (**185**). Since we are dealing here with bigger size vessels, they might be of a thicker body sherd, which might be unevenly fired with grey core in the section. Slip is always present, although in some cases of lower quality, in a colour close to the tint of the fabric, being very thin and almost soaked to the sherd. The majority of the vessels are simply decorated with horizontal incised lines (**177, 178, 180–183, 186–186**), others bear more complicated incised motifs such as tendrils with leaves (**180**) and oblique engraved grooves – floral leaves (?) (**175, 176, 191**).

Regarding the shapes, **175** is of a unique form with a funnel shaped neck, otherwise several smaller (**176–178, 179–180**) and bigger (**181–186/187, 188–191**) groups can be recognized.

175 has, as the only sherd from the kraters, a funnel-neck and folded rim of inner d. 200 mm, featuring a small raised plastic rib inside. The sherd is decorated below the rim with oblique engraved grooves. The closest parallel is represented by the so-called Krateroid vessel Type III from the pottery kiln of Varbovski Livadi, near Pavlikeni, dated to the 2nd c. AD (IVANOV 2019b, 19; fig. 10:4). It has a hemispherical shape with a ring foot and two handles attached to the body, which is decorated with vegetal motifs executed in *barbotine*, the d. of the rim is 265 mm. The general vessel shape corresponds, only the inner raised rib is missing in the published form. Ivanov notes that this type of vessel is not widespread.

176–178 is another series of kraters with straight or slightly closing walls and a flat rim, either fully horizontal (**176**) or with a tip pointing upwards (**177–178**). The inner rim diameter covers 140, 180 and 210 mm. Each vessel is decorated, **176** with short and wide incised lines; **177** with one incised horizontal line, and **178** with short oblique scratches.

A common type for these three vessels seems to be the Two-handled earthenware Type 1b (SULTOV 1985, 76, таб. XXXV:4), produced in Pavlikeni during the 2nd c. AD, perhaps until the beginning of the 3rd c. AD. For its flat horizontal rim, it best fits our **176**. The only difference is the style of decoration, as the Sultov type was commonly decorated with *barbotine*. The same shape was recently re-classified by Ivanov (2019b, 18–19; fig. 10:3) under Krateroid vessels type

II, produced during the 2nd c. AD in Varbovski Livadi near Pavlikeni. Sherd **178** also has a good parallel in the material from Novae, both in the shape and the decoration, although the scratched lines are arranged in a checkerboard pattern. The vessel is dated by the context to the 3rd–4th c. AD (DYCZEK 1991, tab. XIII:4).

179 and **180** are two vessels with a cylindrical body and inwards leaning rim, flattened from above. The rim inner d. ranges from 230 to 240 mm. The upper body might be plain (**179**) or decorated with incised lines and tendrils with leaves (**180**). Klenina classes such vessels (with two handles) from Novae into the Kraters Type 1, a type, where we can also find the shapes of vessel **187**. The rim inner d. given by Klenina is smaller, ranging from 90 to 150 mm (KLENINA 2016, 428; fig. 13:17), the finds are dated to the 3rd c. – second half of the 5th c. AD (BIERNACKI – KLENINA 2015, 377). Similar smaller shapes might also be found in the Stara Zagora production centre (3rd c. AD), with the rim d. 140–150 mm and with the upper body decorated with an engraved rhombi (KALCHEV 1991, Abb. 25:13); and in Villa Armira of inner rim d. 150 mm and with the body decorated with short incised sloping lines, dated by the villa horizon to the 2nd–4th c. AD (KABAKCHIEVA 1986; таб. 35:405). The only example with a similar size of rim diameter (220 mm) might be found in the Straldzha necropolis, unfortunately, in the mound embankment, dated only by the parallels to the 2nd–4th c. AD (ALEXANDROVA 2016, таб. 28:II-I/248).

181–187 are vessels with a horizontal flattened rim and a straight or slightly inwards inclined neck, which is raised over the bulky body. The inner rim diameter varies mostly between 135 and 170 mm, with two sherds of bigger dimensions, both of inner rim d. 210 mm (**184** and **187**). They can have two, but also three or four handles (BORISOV 2013, 295). The handles are either oval, or with a double ribbed upper part, in our case of various dimensions, measuring in section: 39×17, 26×12, 16×7 mm. They commonly joined the bulky body with the neck, rarely also with the rim (one of the bigger vessels **187**). The base has a ring foot, the one example presented here (**185** – likely part of the body depicted above), has an inner base d. 80 mm. Decoration is limited to incised horizontal lines.

The fragment **187**, with handles attached to the rim, finds parallels in the Krater Type 1 from Novae, dated from the 2nd c. to the second half of the 5th c. AD

(KLENINA 2006, 101; KLENINA 2016, 428; fig. 13:15); and in the production centre near Karavelovo, dated to the end of the 2nd c. AD–mid-3rd c. AD (IVANOV 2019, fig. 8:7, Pots Type I A).

The other fragments (**181–186**) have a shorter, rather straight neck, with handles attached on the body / neck, not touching the rim. These find parallels in the production centres at Stara Zagora (KALCHEV 1991, Abb. 10: 1–2; 25:8), Karanovo (BORISOV 2013, таб. VI:1–6) and in the kiln at Leshnica near Lovech (IVANOVA 2003, 58; оѡр. 38:3–7), all dated within the 2nd–3rd c. AD. These examples are richly decorated with engraved motifs / rouletting on the upper part of the body as well as from above the flat rim. In Villa Armira, they might be decorated with incised or relief decoration, rarely with stamped motifs (KABAKCHIEVA 1986, 24; таб. 24:395–409). The rim diameter also covers a wide spectrum of sizes, as given by Borisov (2013, 295), ranging from 170 to 350 mm. Sherd **184**, of a slightly different form and bigger dimensions, has a direct parallel in the pottery material from the tumulus mound VI near Gorsko Ablanovo dated, as were the previous finds, from the end of the 2nd till the beginning of the 3rd c. AD (TORBATOV 2012, 283; оѡр. 14:8).

Borisov notes that these kraters are no longer known from the 5th c. AD onwards (BORISOV 2013, 295). This specification does not seem to apply for sherd **187**, with handles placed on the rim, a form which might be found until the 5th c. AD in Moesia Inferior, although in Thrace, they were existent at least until the very end of the 4th c. AD, as attested by the finds from the villa Krlev Dol (NAJDENOVA 1985, таб. 31).

188–191 are kraters or jars (as marked by Klenina) with a horizontal rim of inner diameter ranging from 150 to 230 mm, and with an upwards tapering neck protruding inwards. When complete, two handles are attached on the neck below the rim; the one preserved here is 38×14 mm in section. Klenina sorted such vessels under the Jars Type 2, dated from the 4th to the beginning of the 5th c. AD, known (also) from the pottery workshop in Novae (KLENINA 2006, 103; KLENINA 2016, 377; fig. 3:15). Such vessels were also found in the Straldzha necropolis – both in the mound's embankment and in the graves, all dated to the 2nd–4th c. AD (ALEXANDROVA 2016, II-1/243–245, 256).

2.2.5.7. POTS

TW Fig. 14:192–193 these two pots share the form of a raised rounded rim separated from the bulging body by a shallow groove. The inner rim d. is uniformly 230 mm inside. Both sherds are decorated on the upper body, **188** with imprinted / incised drops, **189** with one incised horizontal line. The fabric quality of **182** is not that high and the slip is worn and flaking, pointing to a later production of the 4th–5th c. AD. No direct parallels have been found for either of these two sherds.

2.2.5.8. BASINS / KRATERISKOI

TW Fig. 14:194–196

194–196 are three fragments with a very straight rim and bigger size inner d. ranging from 320 to 400 mm. All the sherds have an engraved line below the rim, one is decorated with a sharp tool of several parallel lines (**196**). The fabric is as of Common red-slipped ware; the slip is applied on both sides.

The closest parallels come from Dyrrhachium (SHEHI 2008, 14; fig. 4:46–47) of Krateriskoi Gruppo III:2 of local production, imitating – according to Shehi – African red-slipped ware of the forms Hayes 8A, Hayes 9 and 9A (see HAYES 1972, 32–37). There is indeed a similarity between these three sherds and the form Hayes 9, which might be decorated with rouletting (A) or with two incised lines (B) – the second way of decoration would be analogous to our **195–196**, however, our examples are much larger (Hayes' fragments have a rim d. up to 210 mm). The appearance of the above-mentioned types is dated between the last decades of the 1st c. till AD 160+. The majority of the finds of the local production in Dyrrhachium were found in the context of the same time range as the original African production (SHEHI 2008, 14), i.e. the end of the 1st to the mid-2nd c. AD, the rim d. is also about the same size.

Our fragments are of the Common red-slipped ware and their rim d. is almost twice as much as the above given examples. They could be, still, modelled on the African red-slipped ware forms and produced locally, as the fabric tell us they are not an imported ware. We may certainly date them into a wide chronological span from the mid-1st c. AD until the mid-5th c. AD, with the possibility of similar data as in Dyrrhachium, i.e. the turn of the 1st/2nd–2nd c. AD.

2.2.5.9. VESSELS FOR WATER AND OTHER LIQUIDS

TW Fig. 15:197–207; 16:208–216 (table amphorae); 17:217–236 (jugs)

TW Pl. 2:201, 203

The majority of vessels for liquids are represented in the assemblage by table amphorae of one type (197–210), and by a smaller number of single pieces of different amphorae shapes (211–216). From the latter ones, 216 has a slightly different fabric than the Common red-slipped ware. A smaller series of jugs (217–236) might be divided into more groups, which can be classed under the two main distinctive shapes: 217–227 with a narrow neck and differently profiled rims, and 230–236, with a small spout and a disk placed below the rim or instead of it. The latter ones were probably used for olive oil or another thicker liquid. Fragment 236 is, again, of a different fabric than the rest of the group (for both see below).

197–210 (TW Pl. 2:201, 203) is a big series of table amphorae numbering – including the material from the excavation as well as from the field survey – 29 individual pieces. The rim is out turned, rounded to triangular, incised with one (18 pcs.), two (10 pcs.) or three (1 pc.) line(s). The inner rim diameter varies from 90 to 110 mm with one bigger exception of 130 mm (197). The neck is cylindrical, mostly plain, occasionally supplemented by one relief ring placed 30–45 mm below the top of the rim, creating a small offset of the upper part (203–206, 209). Only one vessel is decorated on the neck with several horizontal incised lines (202). The jars have two handles attached on the neck below the rim; they are oval in section and ribbed from the upper part; the section varies in range 39–48×15–18 mm (measured on eight different handles).

All the preserved fragments are fully slipped from the outside; inside only the upper part of the neck is covered by slip (in both of the following cases). Two different kinds of surface treatment were applied approximately with the same frequency. From the sample of 29 jars, on 15 of them the slip was applied by brush (here 203, 204, 206, 207, 208 and 210), leaving brush marks scattered all over the surface in different directions (TW Pl. 2:203). Where the individual brush strokes were overlapping, the tint of the slip turned into a darker red colour (10YR 4/8) after firing (the same effect as in the case of double dipping). The remaining 14 fragments were dipped into a diluted clay substance (like the rest of the Common

red-slipped ware; **TW Pl. 2:201**). The fabric characteristics are the same, no matter how the surface was treated (slipped by dipping × by brush).

The overall appearance of these vessels reflects the Amphorae Type 1 of Sultov (1985, 74; XXXIV:3) produced in Hotnica, Pavlikeni and Butovo from the second half of the 2nd c. AD. These, however, do not have the incised rim, although more recent studies class under this Type 1 also amphorae with one incised line on the rim (KLENINA 2016, 413–414, fig. 5:8). Klenina describes these vessels as Lower Moesian Amphorae with reference to Dyczek (2001, 225–228), who classed them among transport amphorae Type 30, and marked them as containers for local wine²⁷, being produced until the end of the 4th c. AD.

If we focus more on the ribbed rim, characteristic for our material, we may find some parallels in the pottery centre of Karavelovo (in Thrace), producing an amphorae with three incised lines on the rim (IVANOV 2019a, fig. 7:6–7, fig. 8:2). Its overall shape looks like ours, the size of the rim corresponds (d. 90 mm and more), but the rim of the vessel is more triangular, and the neck tapers towards the shoulders. It is dated to the end of the 2nd–mid-3rd c. AD. Other finds of such amphorae featuring one, two or four incised lines on the rim were discovered in the Roman *vicus* Gorsko Ablanovo (Moesia Inferior) (RUSEV – RUSEV – VRBANOV 2015, 717–718, таб. IX:69–71). The rim of the amphorae is slightly out turned, the neck also tapers towards the shoulders. The whole finding context is dated to the 2nd half of the 2nd c.–first half of the 3rd c. AD. A similar amphora, with one incised line on the rim, might also be found in the Villa Armira in Ivaylovgrad (KABAKCHIEVA 1986, 341–345; таб. 27:341), dated by the whole context of the villa to the 2nd–4th c. AD.

Even with the small differences in the shape (straight rim × tapering towards the body; plain rim × incised), we are very likely dealing here with the same amphorae, with a peak production from the second half of the 2nd c. till the 3rd c. AD, although they seem to be produced until the 4th c. AD. The variant with the incised rim might be found both in Moesia Inferior (Gorsko Ablanovo, Novae) and

²⁷ Dyczek (2001, 228) did not properly explain on what basis he assumes that these are transport amphorae, as he also notes there were no inscriptions, graffiti or stamps ever found – evidence, which could help to support this idea. Classification among the transport amphorae seems to be followed only in Novae (KLENINA 2016), as the other sources reference them as being table amphorae. The containers are quite high (Sultov: up to 58 cm, Dyczek: up to 70 cm), which could suggest their use for transportation, but since they are otherwise executed in the same fabric and slipped like any other red-slipped table ware, I do not have a strong argument to class them elsewhere.

in Thrace (Villa Armira, Karavelovo), where it also seems to be manufactured – both with incised and plain triangular rims (c.f. IVANOV 2019a, fig. 7:6–9, fig. 8:2).

211 has a rounded rim of inner d. 70 mm undercut by two incised lines, and a cylindrical neck. A peculiarity of this vessel is an extra band of clay ‘crawling’ vertically on the neck. It is quadrangular in section, creating a flat area on the top of the rib, having been secured in its place by a pressed finger, which has left an imprint on the rim part. Perhaps this could be a representation of a snake, which is a common motif on bigger vessels in the area of Moesia Inferior and Thrace. We can find this depiction, for example, on the vessels produced in Pavlikeni and Hotnica during the 3rd–4th c. AD (SULTOV 1976, 63); on finds from Novae dated to the 2nd c. AD (CVJETIĆANIN 2010, fig. 64); or on several fragments from Kabile, interpreted as parts of cult vessels (4th c. AD? DIMITROVA 1982, 125; таб. VIII:2). One krater-like vessel with a crawling snake is also exhibited in the Kabile Museum (2nd–3rd c. AD). Regarding the form, an exact parallel has not been found, but close in shape is the table amphora from Pavlikeni (IVANOV 2019b, fig. 9:3) dated to the 2nd c. AD, and a jar from the Shrine of the Nymphs and Aphrodite near Kasnakovo, dated to the end of the 3rd–beginning of the 4th c. AD (KACAROVA – PETKOVA 2015, оѡр. 3:10). Summarising all of the above, I would suggest dating this vessel to the 2nd–4th c. AD.

212 and **213** are table amphorae with a straight neck and quadrangular (**212**) to triangular (**213**) rim of inner d. 85 and 100 mm. They were supplemented with two handles, the remains of one can still be seen below the rim of **212**. Both vessels have a parallel in the Sliven District near Yambol. Fragment **212** can be compared with table amphorae Type VI from Sliven (KOVACHEV 1998, 63; таб. 3:35), dated from the second half of the 2nd c. to the 4th c. AD and **213** with Type VI, dated from the 3rd to the 4th c. AD (KOVACHEV 1998, 62; таб. 2:27) – although this one has a smaller rim d. (63 mm). For the latter sherd, another comparison – this time with a similar rim d. – might be found in the production centre of Stara Zagora active during the 3rd c. AD (KALCHEV 1991, Abb. 23:12), and among the finds from a burial necropolis near Vratitza, Bourgas District, dated from the end of the 1st / beginning of the 2nd century AD to the mid-3rd c. AD (STOYANOV – NIKOV – STOYANOVA 2015, таб. XXII:1). Fragment **212** might also find a parallel among

the products of the kiln of Leshnica, near Lovech in Moesia Inferior, dated to the 3rd c. AD (IVANOVA 2003, обр. 38. Т.III:14). In summary, the final chronological data for both sherds seem to be from the 2nd to 4th c. AD.

214 and **215** are table amphorae with flaring rims of a similar inner rim d. 120 and 130 mm; **214** is decorated with several incised lines on the rim and with one plastic rib on the neck, while **215** has only one plastic rib placed on the lower part of the rim.

Vessels with flaring walls similar to **215** are known from burial complexes, such as from the necropolis Pet Mogili in Nova Zagora region dated from the end of the 1st till the beginning of the 4th c. AD (IGNATOV 1996a, таб. XIX:3), and from burial finds deposited in the Nova Zagora Museum dated to the 2nd–3rd c. AD (VELKOV 1996 таб. I:1, III:2, IV:3). These amphorae are, however, smaller, with a rim d. ca. 60–70 cm, they are also missing the plastic rib. For the second vessel (**214**) no parallels have been found at all.

216 is a rim of a table amphora without a turned hooked rim and cylindrical ribbed neck. The fabric is light red (2.5YR 6/8), very porous, evenly fired with a higher amount of inclusions similar to the coarser fabric of **102–105**. The red (2.5YR 5/6) slip on the surface is very worn. In shape, the vessel resembles ‘Small clay amphorae from north-eastern Thrace’ of Type 5 from Sliven (KOVACHEV 1998, 62; таб. 3:33), dated from the 2nd half of the 2nd c. to the 4th c. AD, although our fragment has a slightly bigger rim diameter (100 mm instead of the 70 mm from Sliven).

217–218 are jugs which share a rounded rim with slightly flaring walls, an inner d. from 60 to 65 mm and a distinctive plastic rib placed a little over 20 mm below the rim. Based on the parallels, these vessels have a short neck, a rounded or pear-shaped body and one handle. Because of the distinctive rib below the rim, Kuzmanov regards these vessels as clay imitations of glass and/or metal jugs of the imperial period, known in the area of Thrace from the 3rd c. AD onwards (KUZMANOV 1985, 28; Кани тип 1). The peak of their production / use is, however, in the 4th and mid-5th c. AD, when they become common jugs for the area of the former Moesia Inferior and Thrace (KLENINA 2006, 107; Кувшины Тип 2).

219 is a rim of a jug with an inner d. 70 mm. The rim is hooked, and its upper part is offset at ca. 30 mm from the top. The shape relates to Sultov's Pitchers Type 1 (SULTOV 1985, tab. XXXIII:1) produced in Hotnica, Pavlikeni and Butovo during the 2nd–4th c. AD. Sultov, however notes, that this form is also known from the western and eastern Roman provinces, where it is dated to the Late Antiquity (SULTOV 1985, 71). Our sherd has all the fabric and slip parameters of the Roman period finds, and its chronology might then be expected to be from the 2nd till the 4th c. AD.

220 is a jug with a rim d. 50 mm inside with parallels in the material from the grave offerings at the Straldzha necropolis dated to the 2nd–mid-3rd c. AD (ALEXANDROVA 2016, таб. 7:V-2/30). A similar jug can also be found at the Nova Nadhezda production centre (HARIZANOV 2016, fig. 12: upper right third from the top). These vessels have a long neck, ovoid body, ring base and one handle (oval and ribbed). The approximate chronology is the 2nd–3rd c. AD.

221–223 create a group of vessels with a double ribbed rim of inner d. 65 to 75 mm. They do not have any preserved handles, but examples with one or two (oval and ribbed) strip handles attached under the rim are published. All the fragments are red slipped with the common fine ware characteristics.

Several parallels with the same rim (the most common appearance like **222**), but with a differently shaped body, might be found. In the exhibition catalogue of finds from Moesia Superior we may see such a jug of local production with a spherical body slightly flattened from the upper part and dated to the 2nd–3rd c. AD (CVJETIĆANIN 2010, fig. 46). Another example is a vessel from the tumulus mound of Staro Selo near Svilengrad, dated to the 1st half of the 4th c. AD (KOVACHEV 1998, 64 Type IX; таб. 3:47). The vessel is of a hemispherical lower part of the body on which are placed cone shaped shoulders, the base is flat, slightly raised in the middle. Yet another different body shape comes from the Straldzha necropolis (ALEXANDROVA 2016, таб. 3:III/10), where the body is cylindrical, otherwise it is similar to the previous form (i.e. shoulders in a cone shape, a flat base raised slightly in the middle). In this case, the shoulders and the body are richly decorated with a continuous wavy line and incised drops.

Vessels of such a rim shape are also known from later periods – in the Lower Danube area specifically – from the beginning of the 4th c. AD until the beginning of the 7th c. AD. These are, however, often green glazed (see e.g. ОРАИЋ 1996, 240; pl. 48:11 under Тип II-B; BÖTTGER 1982, 54; Taf. 29:366, Typ I Form 1; KUZMANOV 2005, 145; Тип II; таб. XXIII:162–163; KLENINA 2006, 107; Кувшины Тип 3).

Obviously, there might be many different body shapes ending in the same ribbed rim, as well as different surface treatments. For our sherds from the area of Thrace, covered by the red slip, a chronology from the 2nd c. till the 1st half of the 4th c. AD seems appropriate.

224 is a jug with a short neck and two handles attached just below the rim. The rim inner d. is 50 mm, the handles are oval, measuring in section 19×8 mm. This sherd might be classed under Sultov's Amphorae and amphora-like earthenware Type 2, Variant a (SULTOV 1985, 74; tab. XXXIV:5), although his example vessel has a slightly longer neck due to which the handles are not touching the rim. Sultov has it as a later variant of his Type 2 (our **225**), whose production started at the beginning of the 3rd c. AD and continued until the 4th c. AD; it was produced in Butovo.

This vessel shape is also known in the green glaze variant dated from the 5th to 6th c. AD – from Iatrus and many other sites in the Lower Danube (for a list of finding places see BÖTTGER 1982, 56; Taf. 31:388, Typ II, Form 2 – period C; and ОРАИЋ 1996, 319; pl. 49:8 under Тип IV-C). Regarding our sherd, as in the previous case, it is of the Common red-slipped ware covered by a good quality slip, consequently the 3rd–4th c. AD data suggested by Sultov seems appropriate.

225 is a jug with a long slender neck and two handles attached below the rim (the remains of the attachment might still be noticed), with the rim inner d. 60 mm. It reflects the form of Sultov's Amphorae and Amphora-like earthenware Type 2 (SULTOV 1985, 74; tab. XXXIV:4), produced in Pavlikeni and Butovo from the beginning of the 2nd c. AD until the beginning of the 3rd c. AD and considered to be an earlier variant of his Type 1, our **224**.

226 is a jug with a tall straight neck and out-turned flaring rim decorated with horizontal incised lines and plastic rings. The rim inner d. is 60 mm, with no signs of handles. Jugs of the same shape, although missing the decorative relief rings, might be found in Novae, where they are classed under the Jugs Type 2, single handled vessels with rim d. 66 mm, produced during the 2nd and 3rd c. AD in the pottery workshops in the area of Nicopolis ad Istrum, and in general, well-known in Moesia Inferior (KLENINA 2016, 425; fig. 11:1).

227–228 are two fragments of frequently found jugs with a rounded rim, a long slim neck and biconical body. No handle is preserved, but they are commonly depicted with one, oval in section. The rim inner d. varies from 50 to 55 mm. In Thrace, these jugs are known from necropolises, such as from the one near Straldzha (ALEXANDROVA 2016, таб. 4:V-1/17 or таб. 5:V-1/20), Karanovo in the Nova Zagora District (KANCHEV – KANCHEVA-ROUSSEVA 1996, таб. XV:3 and XVIII:6), near the villa Chatalka (BUJUKLIEV 1980, таб. 21:283), or the Nova Zagora tumulus mound (KOVACHEV 1998, 64; таб. 3:45 Type VIII). They might also be found in settlements, such as the Villa Armira near Ivaylovgrad (KABAKCHIEVA 1986, 25; таб. 36: 416–420). The chronological span for this type goes from the mid-1st to the 4th c. AD, although, based on the given parallels, they seem to be most popular within the end of the 1st and mid-3rd c. AD.

229 features a cylindrical neck with an out-turned flattened rim of inner d. 65 mm. One handle attached to the neck is preserved. It is oval in section (29×8 mm) and concave and grooved from the upper part. The neck is decorated with one incised line. The closest parallel is the Type 5 from the ‘Small clay amphorae from north-eastern Thrace’, found in a grave context in Sliven, dated from the 2nd half of the 2nd c. to the 4th c. AD (KOVACHEV 1998, таб. II.32). The published vessel has two handles.

230–235 are six jugs which share a small size mouth (16–27 mm) with a wide ring below the lip (**230–235**). Only one fragment has a preserved neck with a handle attachment (**230**). The handle (19×9 mm) is rounded, slightly flattened from one side (but perhaps because it is very close to the neck). All the sherds are slipped from both sides and feature the Common fine ware characteristics. Based on

parallels (see below), all of these vessels have one handle, the body might be oval, pear-shaped or biconical; it ends in a ring base.

These jugs are very common in Moesia Inferior as well as in Thrace. They were produced during the 2nd and 3rd c. AD in Pavlikeni and Butovo in Moesia Inferior (SULTOV 1985, 73; tab. XIV:2). For the same area, their complex typology was done in 2005 by Avramova, based on the finds from Ulpia Oescus and its hinterland. It includes complete vessels from necropolises as well as from settlements, dated from the 2nd to 3rd c. AD. In the publication we may find parallels for each of our sherds: **230** (Тип 2–3), **231** (Тип 2–3), **232** (Тип 2–3), **233** (Тип 2), **234** (Тип 2–3) and **235** (Тип 2) (AVRAMOVA 2005).

In Thrace, they are also known from the contexts of the 2nd–3rd c. AD such as from settlements: Villa Armira (КАБАКЧИЕВА 1986, таб. 275–28)1; and necropolises: Straldzha (ALEXANDROVA 2016, таб. 6:V-2/28). It is, however, interesting that they were not produced at any of the known pottery centres in the nearby area – including Stara Zagora, Nova Nadhezda or Karanovo. The jugs are existent until the end of the 4th c. AD, as confirmed by the finds from the villa Kralev Dol, near Pernik (NAJĐENOVA 1985, таб. 23:65–69).

236 relates to the previous series of small jugs with a wide ring on the rim, which is however placed directly on the lip of the vessel in the form of a disk. Its rim diameter is only slightly bigger reaching up to 29 mm inside. The biggest difference is however the fabric, which is very dense with no pores, but with a predominant amount of tiny white particles and common dark pellets. The colour is uniformly brown (7.5YR 5/4). The surface is not slipped, but it seems smoothed. Parallels might be found in the same publication of Avramova, where it is classed together with the above-mentioned series only under the Type 1 and dated as well to the 2nd–3rd c. AD (AVRAMOVA 2005 Тип 1).

2.2.5.10. STRAINERS

TW Fig. 19:261–264 are several diagnostic pieces of strainers executed in the Common red-slipped ware, which were found both during the excavations and the field survey. There is one rim with a rolled lip (**261**) and inner d. 165 mm; two bases – one flat splaying of outer d. 80 mm (**262**), one with a ring foot of inner d. 120 mm (**263**); and a body fragment from a bigger-size vessel (**264**). The sizes of the holes

range from 6 to 9 mm, the fragments are red slipped from both sides, except the rim **261**, which is only light-brown coated. Similar strainers (with a rounded rim) were found in the Villa Armira in Ivaylovgrad dated to the 2nd–4th c. AD (KABAKCHIEVA 1986, 16; оѡр. 13, таѡ. 18:206–207). A longer time span might, however, be expected for this kind of forms in red-slipped ware, ranging from the 1st/2nd c. AD till the mid-5th c. AD.

2.2.5.11. BASES

TW Fig. 20:266–273; 21:282–288, 290–292 – for the description of the individual Common red-slipped ware bases see below BASES – MIXTURE OF WARES.

2.2.5.12. DECORATION

Complicated decoration on vessels of the Common red-slipped ware is not frequent. The most common for all shapes are simple horizontal engraved lines running all around the vessel. Rouletting is preserved only on dishes, which might be occasionally decorated from the outside or inside – in both cases just below the rim (**3, 14** and **22**). On bowls and deep bowls one might find shorter or longer engraved lines of different width, representing twigs and leaves (**119, 145, 153, 154, 166, 167, 169, 171, 173–176, 180**), and floral motifs executed in *barbotine* (**118, 120, 121, 147, 160**). Two small fragments, possibly of trays (**28** and **70**), have decoration made in mould. Imprinted decoration relates to the bases, such as the *planta pedis* (**288**), palmettes (**291–292**) and other, unidentifiable motifs (**290**). Several fragments were scratched with letters (?) before (**284–285**), and some after (**282–283**) firing.

2.2.6. MARBLED / MOTTLED WARE

TW Fig. 18:237–247 (rims); 21:289 (base)

TW Pl. 4:241, 291

The following pottery class includes fragments of eight dishes and three deep bowls, collected within the whole excavated area, while no such sherd was identified during the field survey.

This group has a specific fabric and slip characteristic, including very well levigated clay with very few inclusions visible in hand specimen. Only after a

thorough study of individual pieces, tiny inclusions (up to 0.3 mm) of different colours might be identified, seldom with bigger pieces of lime and rarely with pieces of shells (both up to 1 mm). All the sherds have at least some small amount of silver mica. The fabric is characteristic for a light-coloured sherd – most frequently of a pink (7.5YR 8/3 and 7/4) or very pale brown colour (10YR 8/3) with a red slip (2.5YR 5/8) of many different tints, ranging from dark red to orange. A flame-like pattern is characteristic on the surface applied on both sides of the sherd by a sponge or cloth, based on which the ware was named Marbled or Mottled (**TW Pl. 4:241**). This pattern is however not always that pronounced, and we may need to base the identification of this ware on a combination of the light fabric and spots of different colours on the surface (**TW Pl. 4:291**).

The Marbled ware first appeared during the early Flavian times among the products of the South-Gallic *terra sigillata*, later on also on other red-slipped pottery assemblages (CVJETIĆANIN 2003, 59; CVJETIĆANIN 2004, 121). The origin of the ware in the Balkan provinces is so far inconclusive; it was suggested it is related to a military presence, either as a direct product of a Roman army or the private property of the (migrating) soldiers. ‘Civilian’ production of this ware also cannot be ruled out (CVJETIĆANIN 2003, 66–67). So far attested production of Marbled ware in Moesia Inferior comes from the Pavlikeni and Butovo kilns sites, where marbled trays dated to the 2nd c. AD were found (KABAKCHIEVA – SULTOVA – VLADKOVA 1988, 14:62–63).

In Thrace, fragments of the Marbled ware were identified only in Augusta Trajana (Stara Zagora), Kabile and Pernik; many more finds come from the military installation along the Danube River in Moesia Inferior, including also the South-Gallic imports of marbled ware from Almus, Oescus and Novae (KABAKCHIEVA 1996, 119–121; Abb. 1; KABAKCHIEVA 2005, 84). Kabakchieva (1996) divided the occurrence of the ware in Moesia Inferior and Thrace into two periods – the first one of high quality vessels imitating forms of *terra sigillata* dated to the 2nd c. AD, and the second one, with much fewer finds, dated from the end of the 3rd until the mid-4th c. AD. She also suggested that the marbled ware was produced in workshops under the military camp in Kabile from the mid- till the end of the 2nd c. AD, and that the finds from Stara Zagora were actually produced there, as she expects the workshops to be connected with the military installations, although no such evidence has been found so far (KABAKCHIEVA 1996, 121). Finds belonging

to the latter series of the marbled pottery were also found in Kabile and Stara Zagora (KABAKCHIEVA 1996; Abb. 1, 5 and 6).

Regarding the material from Yurta-Stroyno, it is dominated by four types of dishes (**237–240**, **241**, **242–243** and **244**) which are accompanied by three different types of cups / deep bowls. The material is very fragmented, and, compared to other pottery classes, made up of a small number of finds. The style of the mottled surface varies, but often, it is difficult to appreciate / evaluate it due to the small preserved area of the fragment; the best execution of the surface decoration seems to be on a rim **241**, base **289**, and several undiagnostic body fragments.

237–240 are dishes with an out-turned arched rim with a concave depression from outside the lip, which is otherwise grooved from above by one or more lines running all around the vessel's perimeter. These dishes commonly have two reflex handles with three loops placed directly on the rim opposite each other (see **237**) and a ring base foot. The same form is known in the Common red-slipped ware (**1–7**) where it is dated to the 2nd–3rd c. AD. The Marbled ware examples feature a rim d. from 190 to 210 mm with one bigger exception of 280 mm inside (**237**), with the latter also decorated with rouletting on the inner tip of the rim. A direct parallel to the form in the marbled ware comes from Stara Zagora, dated to the 2nd c. AD (KABAKCHIEVA 1996, Abb. 3:2).

241 (TW Pl. 4) is a dish in a similar form to the previously mentioned fragments, although the rim is only slightly concave from the outside and its inner lip is straight, resembling the form of *Conspectus* 45 (dated from the Flavian period to the mid-2nd c. AD). The rim diameter is difficult to measure due to the fragmentary state of preservation and the measurement of 190 mm inside is only an estimation. The surface of this fragmented specimen is of high-quality marbling applied on both sides. Its similarity to the form of *terra sigillata* suggests its classification into the 2nd c. AD or slightly later.

242–243 are vessels which also reflect the forms of previously described dishes executed in Common red-slipped ware, with an arched, out-turned ribbed rim dated from the 1st till the 3rd c. AD (**14–24**). The rim d. of **242** is bigger than 210 mm, of **243** it is 260 mm inside. A similar form (with a more arched rim) in Marbled ware

is published from Diana, dated from Domitian to Trajan (CVJETIĆANIN 2003, 65, fig. 10), and exactly the same form might be found in Oescus, dated to the 2nd c. AD (KABAKCHIEVA 1996, Abb. 3:4).

The last dish, **244**, is also fragmentarily preserved, complicating the measurement of the rim diameter, about which we can only say it is more than 110 mm inside. This form does not have a parallel among the Common red-slipped ware, nor in the published Marbled ware.

245–247 represent a series of various cups / deep bowls with an inner rim d. 120–140 mm, with **247** so fragmentarily preserved, that the diameter 120 mm inside is only an estimation. Fragments similar to **245** and **247** might be found in Trajanic contexts in Moesia Superior (CVJETIĆANIN 2004, tab. III:1).

289 is the only preserved base in Marbled ware, with an inner d. 70 mm, fully slipped inside, only partly outside (where the slip ends just above the ring foot). The stamp placed in the middle of the base is unidentifiable.

2.2.7. COLOUR COATED WARE

TW Fig. 18:248–252; 19:253

TW Pl. 5:250, 253

The following ware consists of five bowls of two types (**248–250** and **251–252**) and one big size dish (**253**). The fabric is of orange clay which is covered by a thick dark red slip of high quality, creating a smooth surface feel. The fabric colour is reddish yellow (5YR 7/6), the slip is red (10R 4/6). No complete vessel is preserved, but from the fragments we may conclude that at least in the case of bowls and dishes, the inner surface was fully slipped, while the outer surface was covered by slip just below the flange. On this outer part especially, the dark slip applied on relatively light clay creates a pronounced contrast, which is a characteristic feature for this pottery class. The slip is thicker and cracks on breaks (such as below the flange). The fabric is otherwise hard; all the sherds are evenly fired. In hand specimen, the fabric looks like the Common red-slipped ware – it is very well sorted (4), with up to 10 % of incisions sized between 0.3 mm and 0.5 mm; rarely with occasional bigger pellets (1–2 mm). The predominant inclusion is lime, few are soft

red-brown inclusions (grog?) and flakes of silver mica, quartz is rare. In the fabric of **250** we may also find small flakes of golden mica (**TW Pl. 5**).

All three forms represented in this ware might be linked to the finds from Moesia Superior, denominated as Colour coated ware, of possibly Italian, Pannonian, but also of local provenance, dated to the Trajanic period (CVJETIĆANIN 2004, 123–126; tab. IV). These products could be the imported ware before the local (middle – lower Danubian) mass production of the red-slipped pottery fully started, or, the first products of the local (not yet identified) pottery workshops. Comparing it to the Common red-slipped ware products (ca. mid-1st/2nd c.–mid-5th c. AD) from Yurta-Stroyno, these vessels differ in the high-quality red slip gloss and in the shape of the two types of bowls (**248–252**), which are unique in the assemblage and do not repeat among the Common red-slipped ware or elsewhere. These shapes could be linked to / modelled on the form of *Conspectus 37*, “Hemispherical cups with variously articulated rims”, produced in Etruria and the Po valley from the time of Tiberius until the end of the 1st c. AD. Based on the in hand specimen observation it is impossible to say if they were imported or produced in local (Balkan) workshops, but due to their scarcity and the high quality red slip, an earlier date and external origin might be preferred (ca. production by the 1st c. AD or at the beginning of the 2nd c. AD).

248–250 (TW Pl. 5:250) are flanged bowls with a rim decorated from the upper part with incised lines (rouletting). The rim inner d. ranges from 190 to 230 mm. In the area of Moesia Inferior and Thrace, this shape is not well represented. We may encounter single finds from the early Roman period – such as the bowl from the tumulus Dulgata Mogila near Karanovo, Nova Zagora region, dated to the end of the 1st–beginning of the 2nd c. AD (KANCHEV – KANCHEVA-ROUSSEVA 1996, таб. 18:5, grave 3:83). More of these forms might be found in Moesia Superior, in addition to the above-mentioned ones, also at Burgenae (BRUKNER 1981, 88; T.72:30 and 32) or Singidunum (NIKOLIĆ-ĐORĐEVIĆ 2000, 34; Tip I/38). According to both authors, these vessels are considered to be an imitation of *terra sigillata* (Dragendorff 35 or Curle 11),²⁸ dated from the 1st to the mid-3rd c. AD.

²⁸ <http://potsherd.net/atlas/types/sigillata/gallery>.

251–252 are flanged bowls with a concave rim, one of them (**252**) decorated with incised lines. The rim d. of both vessels is very different – with the first fragment being 150 mm inside, the second 250 mm. The quality of the slip is also different, as the first undecorated fragment (**251**) has matt, orange rather than red, slip, resembling more the Common red-slipped ware. We may consider this sherd to be a local imitation of lower quality without the characteristic decoration placed on the lip, perhaps even later in date. The shape again resembles the form of *terra sigillata* (Ritterling 12), dated from 40–80 AD.²⁹ From the area of Bulgaria – Thrace and Moesia Inferior –, I found no parallels.

253 (TW Pl. 5) represents a dish of inner rim d. 350 mm, which, unlike the other sherds, has good parallels among the different wares of the Yurta-Stroyno assemblage such as in the Common red-slipped ware (c.f. **254–255**), and the Marbled ware (c.f. **237**). All these dishes are bigger versions of vessels popular during the 2nd–3rd c. AD executed in the Common red-slipped ware (**1–8**). The Marbled – bigger size – version is presumably dated to the 2nd c. AD (see above). Consequently, a similar chronology of the 2nd and 3rd c. AD might also be expected for this dish.

2.2.8. ÇANDARLI WARE

TW Fig. 19:256–260 (rims); 21:277–280 (bases)

TW Pl. 5:256, 280

The following five rims (**256–260**) represent TW imports from the eastern Mediterranean – the so-called Çandarli ware (also known as *Eastern sigillata C*), produced in the Pergamon region. Two shapes relating to concrete forms might be identified at the site of Yurta-Stroyno, Hayes Form 4 (**256–258**) and Form 3 (**259** and **260**); they are often found together (HAYES 1972, 321–322; fig. 64). The red colour of the fabric and high-quality slip of this ware make it distinctive among the Common red-slipped ware. All of the sherds are hard, evenly fired with red fabric (2.5YR 5/8 or 10R 5/6) and red slip (2.5YR 4/8 or 10R 4/6), which is just a tint darker than the fabric. The slip is compact, shiny, creating a solid layer on the surface resulting in a smooth feel. In hand specimen only a few (5 %) inclusions

²⁹ <http://potsherd.net/atlas/types/sigillata/gallery>.

might be identified – lime is common, black and brown-red inclusions and tiny flakes of silver and golden mica are rare.

All the fragments found in the excavations and the field survey are represented here, including also very fragmented rims with barely measurable diameters (**257** and **258**). None of the rim fragments is decorated.

From Thrace, finds of Çandarli ware are well-known, e.g., from the Villa Armira near Ivaylovgrad (KABAKCHIEVA 1986, таб. 16:217), the Nova Nadhezda kiln site (HARIZANOV 2016, fig. 14) or from Plovdiv³⁰ (e.g. BOTUSHAROVA 1959, таб. VII:1:1, 3).

256–258 (TW Pl. 5:256) (Hayes Form 4: *Dish with shallow curving floor, incurved wall and triangular tapering foot*). The rim d. can be measured only on one dish – **256** – being 200 mm inside. The two other rims are too fragmentary to be measured; we can only say, the inner d. of **258** is over 120 mm. Hayes gives a range of 170–380 mm for this form, covering medium and large size vessels. These dishes are common especially for the 3rd c. AD (HAYES 1972, 322).

259–260 (Hayes Form 3: *Hemispherical flanged bowl with low heavy foot*). Bigger and smaller versions are present at the site – with the rim inner d. either 80 or 170 mm. Hayes gives a wide range of possible rim diameters, from 65 to 220 mm, and as a peak period for export determines the mid-2nd to the mid-3rd c. AD (HAYES 1972, 321).

Four base fragments (**277–280, TW Pl. 5:280**) presumably from one dish / bowl of inner base d. 110 mm resemble in fabric the above-mentioned rims. They are all decorated with a motif of fishes engraved on the inner surface before firing. If we consider them as Çandarli ware, we may directly link them to Hayes Form 4 (c.f. MALAMIDOU 2005, fig. 60:729) (for more information see bases below).

2.2.9. BASES – MIXTURE OF THE WARES

TW Fig. 20:265–276; 21:277–291

TW Pl. 3:287, 289, 290; TW Pl. 4:291, Pl. 5:280

³⁰ Several fragments of Çandarli ware dishes were also found during the excavation of the 27 Metropolit Panaret street in 2010; unpublished finds.

In total, 171 bases of the red-slipped table ware³¹ were found in the Rooms A, B and C, with the most frequent shape of a ring foot (83 pcs.; here: **265–269**, **277**, **281**, **286**, **290–291**) and false ring foot (63 pcs; **282**), followed by a much smaller number of flat bases (19 pcs; **272**), flat splaying bases with flaring walls (4 pcs.; **271**), bases of unguentarium / amphora stoppers (3 pcs.; **274–276**), and other various shapes (4 pcs.; e.g. **273**, **283–285**). Several other tens of bases are fragmentary, of unidentifiable form (here e.g. **287** and **289**). Regarding all the shapes, the inner base diameter ranges from 40 to 150 mm, with the most common dimensions: ring foot 40–110 mm, false ring foot 40–80 mm and flat base 50–70 mm. These results perhaps explain the domination of the ring foot bases in the assemblage, as with the wider diameter range they could be used for more types of vessels with different sizes and shapes.

The majority of the bases are slipped inside, outside only sparsely – above the feet. Very few of them are decorated inside – for a selection of motifs see **TW Fig. 21:285–291** (**TW Pl. 3:287**, **289**, **290**). Stamped motifs include palm leaves (**289**), *planta pedis* (**287**), and other unidentifiable stamps (**290–291**). There is not a single stamped name or letter(s). Otherwise, we may find engraved lines in circles (**285–286**) or, rarely, engraved motifs (**277–280**).

Regarding the wares, **265–272** and **281–290** are of the Common red-slipped ware, **273** and **274–276** of the ‘other’ ware, **277–280** presumably of Çandarli ware and **291** of Marbled ware.

265–272 are examples of the Common red-slipped ware bases found at the site. Their closer dating is impossible to approximate, but we can at least give them the wider chronology of the Common red-slipped ware, ranging from the mid-1st till the mid-5th c. AD. Sherd **270** is decorated on the body with long smoothed inclined bands, which are regularly interrupted by horizontal lines erasing the bands.

273 is a base with a convex bottom and the upper body decorated with grooved horizontal lines. The fabric is coarser than the Common red-slipped ware and it is not covered by any slip. This fragment relates to the Late Roman production, with direct parallels to the material from Dodoparon, dated to the end of the 6th c. AD

³¹ Here are counted and considered all bases together including Common red-slipped ware, Marbled ware, Colour coated ware, Çandarli ware and individual fragments featuring their own fabric characteristics such as **273** or **274–276**, which are not always red-slipped.

(Dodoparon Fig. 1:1–3). In Thrace, we can find similar pots in the Sliven District (BORISOV 1988, 100; рис. 5:3; Тип 11), dated to the 6th c. AD as well. It is the only later TW base securely identified at the Yurta-Stroyno assemblage.

274–276 are three bases of the same characteristics – evenly fired, with a very fine soft chalky fabric, a small amount (5 %) of inclusions up to 1 mm – tiny lime, red-brown pellets and silver mica. The fabric has a unique reddish yellow colour (5YR 6/6, 7/6 or 7.5YR 6/6), none of them were slipped. The string-cut base has an outer d. between 32 and 33 mm.

A possible explanation of these vessels' function is varied and for now inconclusive. A common interpretation is that these are amphora stoppers (e.g. HAYES 1977a, 35; fig. 12 here dated from the 1st–2nd c. AD). Falkner notes that these vessels are too small (max body d. 65 mm) to accomplish this function (FALKNER 1999, 85 9.47:980–981). Sultov, regarding the pieces produced in Pavlikeni and Butovo, besides giving the possibility of being stoppers, also suggests a religious function, as some vessels of this shape were found in graves (SULTOV 1985, 82; XLI:varia). Băjenaru (2013, 69), regarding the material from Tomis (the end of the 2nd–3rd c. AD), points out the similarity of the presumed amphorae stoppers (pl. 12:99 and 100) and unguentaria (pl. 12:97–98), with the latter ones indeed being found in graves. Perhaps we are dealing here with two different vessels of similar form – one of unguentaria and a second one of amphorae stoppers. The presumed dating range for both are from the 1st till the 3rd/4th c. AD.

277–280 (TW Pl. 5:280) were all found in Rooms A, B and C. They are likely from one open vessel (large bowl / dish). All four fragments bear decoration representing fish engraved on the sherd before firing. The fabric and slip differ from the Common red-slipped ware – the slip is of high quality; completely covering the inner part of the vessel, the outside slip is missing above the base. The fabric colour is a reddish yellow (5YR 6/8), the slip is red (2.5YR 5/8). The inclusions are very small, barely visible in hand specimen as the observation surface is also quite limited. Lime and silver mica are common, black pellets are rare. We may notice a similarity with the Çandarli ware – not only in the fabric, but also in the form, as this shape could be related to the base of Hayes Form 4 (c.f. MALAMIDOU 2005, fig. 60:729 – even with the same base d. of 110 mm), dated to the 3rd c. AD.

281–282 are two different bases with letter(s) (?) engraved after firing. Both sherds are slipped inside and un-slipped from the outside. Sherd **281** – the inscription is unreadable; Sherd **282** – there is one preserved motif, resembling the Greek letter ‘H’ (eta).

283–284 are two pieces of one base with an inner d. 100 mm, not slipped, unevenly fired. The two pieces preserve a depiction resembling the lower parts of three Greek letters: ‘X’ (chi) running around the lower part of the base. The motif was engraved by a thicker stick before firing.

285–286 are two bases grooved either by one or two lines. The first one, **285**, has the unusual shape of a flat base with attached very low feet of inner d. 140 mm. The sherd is worn, but it was originally fully covered by slip (which is unusual for the Common red-slipped ware bases and it might relate to yet another type of ware). Even though there are no other bases of such a shape, the fabric, in hand specimen, looks the same as the Common red-slipped ware, only both the fabric and the slip colour are lighter (slip light red 2.5YR 6/8 and pink fabric 7.5YR 7/4). Fragment **286** has a double grooved base – which is again not that common a feature. The base is fully slipped inside, un-slipped outside, with an inner base d. 80 mm.

287 (TW Pl. 3) is an unusually thin fragment of a base with a stamp of *planta pedis* (the only one found at the site), which belongs to an open form, likely to a dish or plate. From the bottom, the base is un-slipped and heavily scratched, the slip on the upper part is quite worn.

The stamp of *planta pedis* is common for the Arezzo production of *terra sigillata* where it appears in ca. 30 AD. In Arezzo, the stamp however contains the name of the workshop owner or of the craftsman (ZHURAVLEV 2009, 56). In the northern Black Sea area, the *planta pedis* appears on the so-called *Pontic sigillata* in the mid-1st c. AD, and might be found on the vessels until the 2nd quarter of the 2nd c. AD. The difference in the stamp use for the Arezzo and the *Pontic sigillata* production is, that the second one does not bear any name (ZHURAVLEV 2009, 56). The same situation is in the Balkan provinces, where the function of the *planta pedis* is rather decorative – as attested by the four clay stampers found in the

Pavlikeni production centre, from which three are double-sided with a rosette as the second motif (VLADKOVA 2011, каталог на печатите). The stamp often appears on one vessel in higher numbers covering, e.g. lamp stands or encircling (e.g. together with rosettes) the inner base of an open vessel. The most common form, where the *planta pedis* appears, is a bowl with a flanged rim (here **89–99**) (c.f. SULTOV 1985; ZHURAVLEV 2009; VLADKOVA 2011).

In Moesia Inferior and Thrace it does not seem to be a very common motif, as even in big pottery assemblages, stamps of *planta pedis* appear in a small quantity – e.g. four such stamps were found in Nicopolis ad Istrum (FALKNER 1999, 109; 7.1), one is published from Villa Armira (KABAKCHIEVA 1986, обр. 6), one from the Straldzha necropolis (ALEXANDROVA 2016, таб. 8:32) and also only one was found in Yurta-Stroyno. Their chronology, however, goes further than the one of the *Pontic sigillata*, judging from the above-mentioned examples, it covers a period from ca the 1st/2nd c. until the 3rd/4th c. AD.

288 is a ring base foot with an inner d. 90 mm, slipped from both sides, the stamp represents three leaves / palmettes without inner details.

289 (TW Pl. 3) is the middle part of a base, slipped only from the inside with two imprinted palmettes from the same stamp. Similar ones are published from Villa Armira, dated from the 2nd to 4th c. AD (KABAKCHIEVA 1986, обр. 7). The base is not complete, but its inner ring d. is about 100 mm. There are two more sherds in the assemblage bearing a palmette stamp, both very fragmented.

290 (TW Pl. 3) is a ring foot with an inner base d. 80 mm, slipped from the inside, un-slipped from the outside. The stamp (a motif) imprinted in the middle is unidentifiable.

291 (TW Pl. 4) is a base with an inner d. 70 mm. It belongs to the Marbled ware (see above for the fabric description), with the slip fully covering the inner part, the outside ending just above the ring foot. The stamp placed in the middle of the base is unidentifiable.

2.2.10. THIN-WALLED WARE

TW Fig. 22:292–306 + specific – and separate – case of 307

TW Pl. 3:296, 300; 4:307

A smaller number of vessels, in total 31 sherds from all the Yurta-Stroyno assemblage, is of the Common red-slipped ware fabric, although with thinner walls, of up to 3 mm (with one exception being **304**, which has the wall thickness closer to 4 mm). The vessels are also slipped in the manner characteristic for the Common red-slipped ware. The main forms are cups and bowls; none of the sherds are decorated. Most of the fragments are evenly fired, only **304** and **306** are both overfired resulting in more brittle sherds of a darker colour. Consequently, **304** has a dusky red (10R 3/4) colour fabric and slip, and **306** – both the rim and base – have the surface covered by two distinct shades of a reddish brown (see below).

The Thin-walled vessels started to be produced in Italy at the beginning of the 2nd c. BC. About two hundred year later, at the beginning of the 1st c. AD, their production also started in some of the western provinces (e.g. Gallia, and in the area of the Iberian Peninsula) which at first imitated the Italian forms, but shortly after started to produce their own original shapes (GERVASINI 2005, 290–291). The western products (especially the Italian ones) were exported in great numbers to the eastern Mediterranean during the Late Republic and Early Imperial period, where, by the 1st century AD, their local production also started, which continued until the 3rd c. AD (HEATH – TEKKÖK 2006-2009, early Roman Thin-wall – Roman-period cups/jugs).³² Among the known production centres located in the eastern Mediterranean belong, e.g., Knidos (KÖGLER 2005, 56) and Phocaea (HAYES 1997, 68).

In our assemblage, we do not have discoloured upper parts of the vessels or significant variability in the fabric colour as Hayes describes the material from the Athenian Agora, for which he expects a north Italian origin (HAYES 2008, 95–96). Since the fabric, slip, and firing technics used for the Thin-walled vessels and the Common red-slipped ware found in Yurta-Stroyno seem to correspond, we may suppose, they were produced simultaneously in the same centres, or, at least, in centres using the same clay sources and technology, within the 1st–3rd c. AD. We

³² The so-called Italian jugs, or Thracian Thin-walled ware, produced in Ainos (here under **CW Fig. 9:101–106**) also belong to the group of imitations of Italian products (e.g. HAYES 1997, 67–71).

should, however, also note that none of the published production centres in Moesia Inferior and Thrace has attested production of the Thin-walled ware.

The morphological forms of all the Thin-walled ware sherds found in Yurta-Stroyno are modelled on the western Mediterranean products which might be linked to known typological forms – either of Marabini Moevs (1973; regarding material from Cosa) or Mayet (1975; vessels from the Iberian Peninsula); or to Italian-type *terra sigillata* forms published in *Conspectus* (1990).

Since we do not have fully preserved shapes, we cannot always confidently link our sherds to one specific typological form on the basis of which it was modelled, consequently, more forms for one sherd might be considered:

292–295 are carinated cups with two handles (in section 9×7 mm), inwards inclined walls, and inner rim d. 70–85 mm. The base is not preserved, which leaves us with two possible forms: Marabini Moevs LXIII or XLIII (the latter one has a higher base).

Fragment **296 (TW Pl. 3)**, of inner rim d. 110 mm, could still belong among the previously mentioned vessels, only of bigger proportions, or we can also consider the type Marabini Moevs XI – simple cups with convex walls and inward inclined rim.

Under **297** is a cup with flaring walls of inner rim d. 90 mm, only one type for comparison seems to be possible: Marabini Moevs XII.

298–299 are cups with a rounded body and rim, with no preserved handles. The inner rim d. is uniformly 75 mm. They are similar to three forms of Mayet: XXX, XXXVII and XLIV, all of them are plain, with no handles.

300–301 (TW Pl. 3:300) are, in their basic form, similar to the above-mentioned vessels, although the rounded rim is engraved with one deep line and its inner d. is slightly bigger – 90 mm. One of the sherds has a – not fully – preserved handle (14×9< mm).

The flat splaying base under **302**, with outer d. 50 mm, might belong to many different shapes of cups, thus its closer classification is impossible.

303–304 are shallow hemispherical bowls with an inner rim d. of 160–170 mm reflecting the type Marabini Moevs LIII.

305 is a shallow bowl with an inwards inclined rim of inner d. 150 mm, which is modelled on the form of *terra sigillata* – *Conspetus* 4.

And finally, **306** is a shallow carinated bowl with inner rim d. 130 mm. This vessel is overfired resulting in a red fabric colour and a surface of two tints of a reddish brown (5YR 5/4 and 4/3). Thanks to its distinctive colour, we can link these two sherds – the base and rim – together; the part in between is missing. This form is modelled on the Type *Conspetus* 22; regarding the Marabini Moevs typology, closest to its shape is the form XIX, which is a bowl of similar shape, but with more rounded edges and rather raised body walls decorated with one incised line.

Chalice of a pale brown colour

307 (TW Pl. 4) represents eight fragments of one chalice which were scattered over the excavated area. They were easy to collect and put together due to their specific shape and fabric characteristics. The upper part of the vessel – the chalice – is of a rounded form with walls slightly inclined inwards, the rim inner d. is 80 mm. The body is decorated with two horizontal shallow engraved lines. On the upper body, below the rim, are the marks of handle attachments, with the upper one preserving the original dimensions of the handle – 16×10 mm. There was likely a second handle placed in the opposite position. The chalice is sharply separated from the base by a high foot, created by a rounded stem (d. 16 mm) divided into two equal parts by a deep engraved line, and by an arched foot whose lower part is missing.

The fabric is soft, evenly fired, very well levigated and sorted. Regarding the inclusions, only tiny flakes of silver mica might be rarely identified. The fabric is of a unique very pale brown (10YR 8/4) colour. The slip has a colour ranging from yellowish red (5YR 4/6) to reddish brown (2.5YR 4/4); it is very worn, especially on the inner part of the vessel – on the outer surface, it ends just above the narrow part of the high foot.

The shape and execution of this vessel (e.g. the sharp ending of the chalice above the foot) reminds one of two-handled metal cups (*kantharoi* or *skyphoi*). In clay, the closest is the form Mayet IX (1975, 42; planchet LXXVIII) of Thin-walled ware, representing a very similar cup on a high foot with two handles, however, with the upper handle attachment placed directly on the rim. These chalices of Hellenistic tradition were produced in Italy during the 1st c. BC, and they did not survive over the Augustan Age (MAYET 1975, 42; GERVASINI 2005, 297; tav. 5A).

The average thickness of the chalice body is 5 mm, and in general, the vessel feels robust compared to the rest of the Thin-walled ware. Since the fabric is very specific (and as such unique in the assemblage), it was produced at a different centre or during a different period of time (or both) than the rest of the wares found at the site of Yurta-Stroyno.

Comparative material from Thrace executed in clay is scarce, limited to a chalice of a similar form,³³ found in the top layer of an embankment of a burial mound located near the village Staro Selo in Sliven District (KOVACHEV 2009b, 52; таб. XXXXII:2). The mound was originally covering three graves dated by the coins of Caracalla to the first half of the 3rd c. AD, however, it contained 39 secondary graves dug into the embankment in the course of the 4th c. AD as well. The chalice was uncovered as a single find, without any grave or other accompanying items (KOVACHEV 2009b, 50–54). Based on the given information, we must date it to after the mid-3rd c. AD, although most likely into the course of the 4th c. AD, together with the secondary graves. Kovachev also refers to further parallels – an unpublished chalice from Nova Zagora Museum (footnote 30), although he does not provide any data about its finding context or chronology.

2.2.11. TABLE WARE – CONCLUSION

The majority of the table ware found in the Yurta-Stroyno assemblage consists of the Common red-slipped ware (253 pcs.), which might find many parallels in local – Thracian and Moesia Inferior – production centres. If we exclude undiagnostic fragments such as bases, lids and strainers from this type of ware, we are left here with 226 fragments, from which 155 pcs. have a direct parallel among the products

³³ The overall form relates to the same type of vessel, also of the same height (130–140 mm). The chalice from Staro Selo has, however, the two handles attached directly to the rim, the cup part is open (d. 124 mm), and the stem has a plastic ring in the middle instead of the incised line. Regarding the fabric, its colour is brick-red, covered by the red slip (KOVACHEV 2009b, 63).

of the known kiln sites, 25 pcs. are in shape similar to these products and 46 pcs. do not resemble any of the published material from the local production centres. This gives us approximately an 80 % resemblance to our Common red-slipped ware with pottery produced in the area of Thrace and Moesia Inferior. We may assume that the other 20 % will also find parallels, once assemblages from more production centres are published, as the fabric and slip of the sherds throughout the Common red-slipped ware does not really differ.

The production centres providing the main parallels in Thrace include Stara Zagora (KALCHEV 1992), Karanovo near Nova Zagora (BORISOV 2013) and Nova Nadhezda near Haskovo (HARIZANOV 2016); In Moesia Inferior it is Pavlikeni, Butovo and Hotnica (SULTOV 1976, 1985; KABAKCHIEVA – SULTOVA – VLADKOVA 1988; VLADKOVA 2011; IVANOV 2019b), Durostrorum (MUŞEŢEANU 2003), Karavelovo near Shumen (IVANOV 2019a) and Leschnica, near Lovech (IVANOVA 2003). All these production centres were active during the 2nd–3rd c. AD, some of them until the 4th c. AD. Besides the production centres, parallels were searched for elsewhere, including settlements and burial grounds, which revealed the continuation of some of the Common red-slipped ware until the end of the 4th c. AD and, in Moesia Inferior, until the mid-5th c. AD. The shapes produced in the Common red-slipped ware are quite diverse, including dishes, bowls, cups, cups / deep bowls, kraters, trays, vats (?), table amphorae, jugs and lids. The most common shapes at our site are the hemispherical bowls (71–87) and the two handled cups (122–127).

Other table wares are much less represented, these include the Marbled ware (12 pcs. 237–247), Colour coated ware (6 pcs. 248–252), Çandarli ware (5 to 9 pcs. 256–260) and Thin-walled ware (15 pcs. 292–306/307), which were all collected from the excavation and the field survey. All these wares represent a very marginal amount of the overall material, but their presence at the site at all is an important marker. The Colour coated ware and the Thin-walled ware have their roots in the Italian *terra sigillata*. Their appearance at the site might either relate to the early Italian import (1st c. or very beginning of the 2nd c. AD), or to local imitations. The fabric of the Thin-walled ware (292–306) corresponds in hand specimen to the Common red-slipped ware, which suggests its local production, likely during the 2nd–3rd c. AD, although none of the mentioned pottery workshops active during this period has attested to its production. Regarding the forms of the Thin-walled ware,

all the shapes found in Yurta-Stroyno have Italian prototypes. A peculiarity is the chalice **307** whose shape seems to be based on metal drinking ware of Hellenistic tradition, produced in Italy from the 1st c. BC until the age of Augustus, but in Thin-walled ware. Its fabric is different from the rest of the ware and the sherd is also thicker. The scarce parallels from Thrace suggests its dating from the second half of the 3rd till the 4th c. AD.

The Colour coated ware has a unique fabric, based on the contrast of a lighter sherd and dark red slip which is of very high quality. From the three attested forms of this ware at the site, two are of the Italian *terra sigillata*, not repeated in the local production (**248–252**). Only one of these sherds (**251**) is lacking the characteristic lustre as well as the rim decoration – this one could be a local imitation, for the other ones we may suppose a non-local origin and chronology spanning from the end of the 1st c. AD till the first half of the 2nd c. AD.

The Marbled ware, produced from the Flavian times (2nd half of the 1st c. AD) in the South-Gallic pottery centres and heavily imitated in Pannonia from the period of Trajan, might also be locally produced in Moesia Inferior and Thrace. So far, its limited production during the 2nd c. AD was identified in Pavlikeni and Butovo; Kabakchieva also suggested its production centre in Kabile, although this assumption has not yet been confirmed. The majority of the Marbled ware shapes (**237–240, 242–243**) resemble dishes of the Common red-slipped ware produced during the 2nd–3rd c. AD. Consequently, their local production during this period might be expected.

The Çandarli ware, or, the Eastern sigillata C, is the only securely attested import at the site from the eastern Aegean. The fabric contains golden mica, the slip is lustrous red. Two types of bowls are present – Hayes Form 3 and Hayes Form 4 (**256–260**). The four fragments of bases (of one vessel) under **277–280** also resemble the Çandarli fabric and bottoms of the Hayes Form 4. What is interesting, and not a common feature of this ware, is however the decoration representing swimming fishes which were incised by free hand onto the surface before firing.

A special group of finds is created by the Coarser red-slipped table ware, including four rim fragments of bowls with a flanged rim (**102–105**). Although, of the Common red-slipped ware, they are thicker and more robust than the other bowls of this type, with a worn soft surface preserving almost no slip. They could be products of some specific workshop, or, they might be of a later date (ca. 4th–

mid-5th c. AD). One more sherd of the Common red-slipped ware modification is the table amphora **216**, similar in fabric to the above-mentioned bowls. Several other fragments have their own specific fabric, such as the un-slipped lid handle **48** (Late Antiquity?); also the un-slipped rim of the jug **236**; the lower parts of **274–276**, of a presumably specific function; and **273**, which is the only securely identified table ware fragment dating to the Late Antiquity (the 6th c. AD) of local – Thracian and/or Moesia Inferior – provenance. No fragments of later imports, such as of African or Phocaeian red slip ware, were identified.

2.3. Grey ware

2.3.1. HISTORY OF RESEARCH – INTRODUCTION TO THE MATERIAL

The Grey ware in the Balkan Peninsula during the Roman and Late Antique period is not yet well researched (KABAKCHIEVA 2005, 91; ALEXANDROVA 2015, 146). So far, we know most about the so-called Macedonian grey ware (*Macedonian terra sigillata grise*), which was first described by Hayes in 1972, who assumed it was produced in Macedonia at the end of the 4th–beginning of the 5th c. AD (HAYES 1972, 405–406). The typology of this ware, based on the Late Antique finds from Stobi and compared with other grey wares from Greece, Macedonia and Bulgaria, was conducted by Anderson–Stojanović, who identified 11 different forms, from which the Forms 1, 2 (the most popular ones) and 8, were also produced in oxidized versions (= in the red slip). In Stobi, this ware was present in the contexts of the last quarter of the 4th c. till the mid-6th c. AD, and as such extending the chronology given previously by Hayes deeper into the Late Antiquity (ANDERSON-STOJANOVIĆ 1984; 1992, 62–65).

As noted by Anderson-Stojanović, the Grey ware has a long tradition in Macedonia, as well as in Thrace, spanning from the Bronze Age, throughout the Iron Age. In Macedonia – or at least in Stobi – the Grey ware seems to vanish in the 1st c. AD and to appear again at the end of the 4th c. AD (ANDERSON-STOJANOVIĆ 1984, 99).³⁴ This phenomenon, however, does not seem to apply to Moesia Inferior and Thrace, where the Grey ware persists during the first centuries of the Roman period, but also appears in the contexts of the Late Antiquity.

This evolution is very well reflected in the pottery material from Nicopolis ad Istrum, where the Grey ware appears in the contexts of the 2nd and 3rd c. AD, and then again by the mid-5th c. AD, to continue until the end of the 6th c. AD (FALKNER 1999, 85–86). Falkner suggests, these are two similar wares, used in different periods, from which the early one could be a local product and the later one might be an import. This seems to be a key idea, i.e., to understand that we may be dealing here with two different products / productions.

The majority of the Grey ware finds from Bulgaria might be dated from the 2nd till the turn of the 4th/5th c. AD, as are the finds from Pautalia and the Upper

³⁴ The decline of the Grey ware during the 2nd–3rd c. AD is also noted in the assemblages from Greece (c.f. HAYES 1972; MALAMIDOU 2005, 52), regarding finds from Athens, Corinth, Amphipolis, Philippi, Kepia, Abdera and Thasos.

Struma Valley (STAJKOVA 1989), villa Kralev Dol near Pernik (NAJDENOVA 1985, e.g. таб. 15:176), Castra Martis (KABAKCHIEVA 2005, 91–91), Kocherinovo near Blagoevgrad (KACAROVA 2005, таб. 8), or from Heraclea Sintica (ALEXANDROVA 2015; NANKOV – TSONEVA 2017). Since the Grey ware finds are accumulated in western Bulgaria, Kabakchieva suggested that the production centre, active during this period, is located somewhere in the area of Serdika, Pautalia and/or Nicopolis ad Nestum (KABAKCHIEVA 2005, 91–92).

Since quite a small number of Grey ware finds have been published, and established chronologies and form typologies for Moesia Inferior and Thrace are missing, we do not have much of a basis for comparing our finds with other material. However, what I found interesting, is the parallel production of the same forms of the red-slipped ware (our Common red-slipped ware) and the Grey ware, mentioned – besides by Anderson-Stojanović – by Stajkova 1989 (139–141), Falkner (1999, 85), Kabakchieva (2005, 92) and Kacarova (2005, 227–228). Kabakchieva gives a specific example of a plate found at the production centre of Butovo, made from the same mould (i.e. of the same shape and decoration) – which was produced simultaneously, and on purpose, in red-slip and grey ware during the 3rd and at the beginning of the 4th c. AD (KABAKCHIEVA – SULTOVA – VLADKOVA 1988, 14; no. 69 and 75). A similar case of simultaneous production was noted in Kocherinovo near Blagoevgrad, where the same forms of the red-slipped ware and grey ware were found together in the contexts of the 2nd–4th c. AD (KACAROVA 2005, 227–228).

I would use this information as a hint and compare the Yurta-Stroyno material not only with the (small amount of) published Grey ware and the Macedonian grey ware, but also with the shapes of the Common red-slipped ware from our site, as it is dated based on quite abundant comparative material.

2.3.2. MATERIAL CHARACTERISTIC

The Grey (table) ware is the least represented group in the pottery assemblage of Yurta-Stroyno, with only 146 fragments of 1.5 kgs found in the excavated area, and 402 fragments of 2.6 kgs from the field survey (**Introduction Tabs. 1 and 2**). From the six core contexts, the biggest number of the finds belongs to undiagnostic body fragments (76 pcs.), a lower number to rims (33 pcs.), bases (15 pcs.), handles (4 pcs.), and to decorated body fragments (20 pcs.) see **GW Tab. 1**.

The six core contexts were, however, enriched by the remaining – at least a little diagnostic – Grey ware finds from the excavations and the field survey. Consequently, all variability of shapes detected at the site is presented here, amounting to 49 pcs. (35 from the excavation and 14 from the survey).

Stroyno Pottery 2014–2016			EXCAVATION - GREY WARE							
Context			Body	Rims	Bases	Handles	Lids	Decor	Total (pcs.)	Weight (g.)
SU	Trench	Sector								
SU001	ROOMS	A, B, C	18	10	7	0	0	9	44	406
Levelling I	100E-105N	NE	39	12	5	3	0	6	65	555
Levelling II	100E-110N	SE	14	5	2	1	0	4	26	361
SU008	100E-100N	SW	5	2	0	0	0	1	8	89
SU021	095E-100N	SE	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
SU057	100E-105N	SE	0	2	1	0	0	0	3	37
Total amount:			76	31	15	4	0	20	146	1448

GW Tab. 1: Amount overview of the Grey ware pottery fragments retrieved from the six main contexts.

The material is quite fragmented, and in some cases, it is difficult to approximate the original form (especially to distinguish between dishes and bowls). For this reason, some fragments might be attributed to more shapes. In the most likely scenario, the proportions are as follows: dishes (20 pcs.), pots (7 pcs.), deep bowls (5 pcs.), bowls (5 pcs.), jars (6 pcs.), jugs (5 pcs.) and a frying pan (1 pc.). Being as it is, the dishes and bowls are the most represented forms.

Besides the vessels, fragments of three Grey ware terracotta lamps were found altogether in one context [SU021] (GW Pl. 2:SY14_031, SY14_132 and SY14_140). There are about 130 fragments of lamp finds from the site in total (both from the excavation and the survey), but only these three are in the Grey ware. Despite the lamps not being part of this study, I found it interesting to present these three lamps here, although they do not have any parallels (or perhaps because of that) in the published material.

The decoration of the vessels is not very common and if it is decorated, it is quite simple. Most often we may find engraved horizontal lines (22, 24, 26–27, 31–32); much less common is *barbotine*, here applied on the body of a deep bowl and

of a jug (**31** and **42**), engraved decoration in wide inclined lines (**30**), and stroked ornament (**34**) – several millimetres deep, but not completely through the sherd.

2.3.3. FABRIC CHARACTERISTIC

The fabric is common to all sherds, with some variations in the colour of the sherd or slip, sometimes also in the amount of inclusions. Most frequently, the fabric is very well levigated with up to 10 % of inclusions sized between 0.3 mm and 0.5 mm. In the otherwise well purified fabric, there randomly appear bigger pieces of white stones (lime?) up to 1 mm. Common in the paste are tiny flakes of silver mica, and rare are red soft pellets, probably grog. In very rare cases, organic inclusions such as shells or even straw, might be noted. The amount of inclusions slightly varies from sherd to sherd, with the white soft pellets being the biggest type of inclusion reaching up to 1 mm in smaller vessel forms, and up to 2 mm in bigger ones. The red pellets are the rarest ones, reaching up to the size of 1 mm. The sherds are hard, the majority are evenly fired, the fraction is smooth / fine, and some fragments seem to have a smoothed surface. On some vessels, especially on the dishes, we may note trimming marks – quite wide cut facets (e.g. **1–4**, **9–10** and **14**).

The slip is, as in the case of the Common red-slipped ware, sparse, covering only part of the body. Regarding the open forms, it fully covers the inner part of the vessel, but from the outside, it ends above the base. In the case of the closed forms, such as jars and jugs, the outer surface is covered in the same manner as of the open form vessels, while inside, it is applied only on the rim or on the upper part of the inner neck.

The fabric colour is grey, while the slip might have several different colours (see **GW Pls. 1–2**), most frequently black (43 pcs.), much less common are tints of grey (3 pcs. – **1**, **9**, **19**) and red-brown (2 pcs. – **8** and **34**). There are also cases where the slip seems to be completely missing (3 pcs. – **6**, **21** and **39**).

The black slip is applied in a thicker layer, it flakes in bigger fields and cracks on breakages (e.g. below the rim or on the decoration, e.g. **18**). Rarely, the outer slip seems to be of a lighter colour and thinner. The common fabric colour is light grey (2.5YR 7/1), grey (2.5YR 6/1, 10YR 5/1 and 6/1), greyish brown (10YR 5/2) or light brownish grey (10YR 6/2). The slip is black (Gley 1 2.5/N) or very dark grey (Gley 1 3/N – **18**, **32** and **45**).

The grey slip is lighter, up to the colour of the fabric, and it is well absorbed into the sherd. The most common fabric sherd colour is light olive brown (2.5Y 5/3), while the slip colour varies between grey (5Y 6/1), yellowish brown (10YR 5/4), or dark greyish brown (10YR 4/2).

In both cases, the slip can be either matt (**45**) or glossy (**40**), with the latter reaching, in some cases, a metallic shine (**8**, **29** and **40**).

2.3.4. DISHES

GW Fig. 1:1–11; 2:12–20/21

GW Pl. 1:1, 10, 18; 2:19

Dishes create the biggest group of the Grey ware, consisting of many different shapes. From these, the only repetitive shape are dishes with a rounded body and a simple raised rim, which might be straight or slightly inclined inwards / outwards (**1–8**). The other sherds in the group are of unique shapes, some of which, however, resemble each other, such as **9** and **10**; **12** to **14**; or **17** and **18**.

1–8 (GW Pl. 1:1) are hemispherical-shaped dishes with a curved rim and of a very different inner rim diameter ranging from 120 to 440 mm. The thickness of the body sherd also significantly differs, reaching from 4 to 9 mm. Such a basic shape has a direct parallel in the Common red-slipped ware (**TW Fig. 4:49–54** and **TW Fig. 5:60–64**), where also a different range of sizes appears, as well as the facets on the surface which are highly noticeable. In the red-slipped ware, such dishes were most popular during the 2nd–3rd c. AD, however, in Thrace, they are known until the end of the 4th c. AD, in Moesia Inferior even longer, until the mid-5th c. AD; they were also produced locally, in Stara Zagora and Karanovo near Nova Zagora (KALCHEV 1991, Abb. 7:1–3; BORISOV 2013, таб. VII:1–3).

In Moesia Inferior, we may find parallels also in the Grey ware, such as in Nicopolis ad Istrum, where these dishes were also found in many different sizes (rim d. 160–320 mm) and thicknesses. Falkner, with hesitation, dates them to the 4th and 5th c. AD (FALKNER 1999, 85; 9.48:983–986). His dating seems to be based on the Macedonian grey ware, where this shape of dishes might be found under the Form 5 (ANDERSON-STOJANOVIĆ 1984, 105; ANDERSON-STOJANOVIĆ 1992, 69–70).

9 and **10** (**GW Pl. 1:10**) share a similar shape of the rim, although both differ in its rotation, with **9** being more open with the inner rim d. of 170 mm, while **10** represents a wide dish with inner rim d. 250 mm. These do not have direct parallels in the Common red-slipped ware, but we may notice at least some resemblance with **TW Fig. 2:26** and, by the divided rim into two parts, to **TW Fig. 10:136** and **137**; both dated to the 2nd–4th c. AD.

11 is a fragment with a highly raised rim slightly inclined inwards, and with a pronounced depression inside of the rim. It has an exact shape parallel in the Common red-slipped ware (**TW Fig. 5:66**), even the rim inner d. is similar – 195 mm of the grey ware to 210 mm of the red-slipped ware. These two fragments indeed look like the same vessel produced in two different colours. Unfortunately, none of the variants has a direct parallel. The fragment of the Common-red slipped ware is only dated based on the overall time span of the ware – from the 1st/2nd c. AD to the mid-5th c. AD.

12–14 share an out-turned rim, double ribbed from above. The inner rim d. of **12** is 270 mm, for the two other sherds, **13** and **14**, it is 190 mm. Sherd **14** preserves part of a handle in the shape of extra clay applied directly on the rim and rounded. It looks more like a thickening of the rim for better manipulation, than a proper handle. The body of the same vessel bears the visible remains of faceting. Sherd **12**, with its vertical walls and up-raised tip of the rim, does not have parallels among the Common red-slipped ware. On the other hand, **13–14** with a more rounded body, share similarities with **TW Fig. 1:10–13**, dated from the end of the 1st / beginning of the 2nd century AD to the mid-3rd c. AD, in Moesia Inferior and Pannonia until the 4th c. AD.

15, is a dish with a roller rim of inner d. 205 mm. In shape it is close to **TW Fig. 5:69**, dated from the turn of the 2nd/3rd c. till the mid-5th c. AD, although it is missing the facets on the rim. A similar Grey ware shape is known from Nicopolis ad Istrum (FALKNER 1999, 9.48:988), dated from the mid-3rd c. AD to ca. AD 400.

16 has a massive triangular rim in a shape close to **15** and **17**, its section is however slightly reconstructed as the sherd is quite worn on the lip. The inner rim d. is

unmeasurable, approximated at 160 mm. If we were to use an extended chronology for these two-surrounding sherds, we would arrive at the 2nd–the mid-5th c. AD, which might serve as an orientation date.

17, with inner rim d. 300 mm, finds a perfect parallel in the Common red-slipped ware, under the dishes with flaring walls and triangular rim (**TW Fig. 3:40–42**), especially with **TW Fig. 40**. All this group is dated to the 2nd–3rd c. AD.

18 (GW Pl. 1:18), of inner rim d. 235 mm is of a similar shape to the sherd above – **14** – only with a less pronounced triangular rim. In the Common red-slipped ware assemblage, it would be closest to **TW Fig. 3:36**, dated from the mid-2nd to the mid-3rd c. AD, and, by the incised line inside the rim, to the above-mentioned fragments **TW Fig. 3:40–42** dated to the 2nd–3rd c. AD.

19 (GW Pl. 2:19) is a wide dish of inner rim d. 240 mm, with a flaring rim sharply divided from the body. The fabric colour is slightly lighter than the other sherds, with a yellowish brown core (10YR 5/6) and grey (mottled) surface. In our assemblage it is unique, however, exactly the same shape might be found in the Straldzha necropolis in the Grey ware (ALEXANDROVA 2016, таб. 9:III/41), dated to the 2nd–3rd c. AD.

20 is extremely fragmentary, with a small rim EVE, and as such a diameter ranging from 260 to 300 mm. Despite this, it represents a shape very well-known from the Common red-slipped ware of dishes with an arched, out-turned rim (**TW Fig. 1:1–7**), dated to the 2nd–3rd c. AD. A similar dish in the Grey ware is also published from Castra Martis, dated to the 3rd c. AD (KABAKCHIEVA 2005, таб. VI:32) and from Nicopolis ad Istrum, from the 2nd–3rd c. AD (FALKNER 1999, 85–86; 9.48:993).

21 is a fragment of a wide horizontal rim engraved with one line running all around the vessel. It is a very small fragment with an unmeasurable rim diameter, which (if known) would however determine if this is a bowl or a dish. The inner d. of 70 mm, used in the drawing, is only approximated. The sherd is quite rough, not slipped. This shape could be linked to the Macedonian grey ware – vessels with a decorated rim – either of Form 1 or 2 – depending on its original size (ANDERSON-

STOJANOVIĆ 1984, 103–105). However, a Grey ware dish with a flat rim engraved with two lines was also found in Nicopolis ad Istrum in the context dated to AD 175–250 (FALKNER 1999, 242; 9.48:991) and in Pautalia, with one engraved line on the lip, dated to the 2nd–4th c. AD (STAJKOVA 1989, обр. 3:a).

2.3.5. BOWLS

GW Fig. 2:22–26

A small group of bowls with a hemispherical body and differently profiled rims contains five sherds, each of a different shape.

22–24 are hemispherical bowls with straight / inwards inclined walls with a rim d. ranging from 120 to 160 mm, with differently profiled rims. Sherds **22** and **24** are decorated with one incised/shallow grooved line below the rim. All three shapes might find parallels among the Common red-slipped ware bowls **TW Fig. 6:71–87**, which were most popular during the 2nd–3rd c. AD, although they were produced until the 4th c. AD.

25, with a split rim of inner d. 110 mm, might find a similarity in the two shapes of the Common red-slipped ware – **TW Fig. 5:65** and **TW Fig. 10:132–137** – which were divided, based on their size, between dishes and bowls, however, in both cases they might be dated to the 2nd–4th c. AD.

26 is a hemispherical bowl with a divided rim of inner d. 190 mm, and a body decorated with two engraved lines. It might find a similarity in the Common red-slipped ware **TW Fig. 10:136–137** dated to the 2nd–3rd c. AD.

2.3.6. CUPS / DEEP HEMISPHERICAL BOWLS

GW Fig. 3:27–31

Fragments of the following group of five cups / deep hemispherical bowls have parallels in the Common red-slipped ware (c.f. **TW Fig. 11:153–164**). They all feature a similar shape, however with a different rim diameter.

The first three sherds, **27–29**, are of different inner rim diameters, ranging from 150 to 260 mm, otherwise they are of a very similar shape. Sherd **27**, of inner rim d. 150

mm, is decorated with one engraved line just below the rim under the groove dividing the body and the rim. Sherd **28**, with inner rim d. 190 mm, is of a very similar shape, only without the engraved line below the rim, and **29** is of the biggest rim d. 260 mm, without any decoration, the lip is slightly out turned. The chronology of these vessels executed in the Common red-slipped ware seems to span from the 3rd to 4th c. AD, in Moesia Inferior possibly into the first half of the 5th c. AD.

30 has a slightly out-turned rim, flattened from above, of inner d. 130 mm. It bears the remains of deep engraved lines decorating the upper body. Its shape looks like a combination of the above mentioned Common red-slip ware (TW Fig. 11:153–164) and a similar, but still different shape to TW Fig. 11:165–170, with the latter one dated to the 2nd–4th c. AD.

31 has a barely measurable rim diameter, but it seems to be equal to or bigger than 150 mm inside. The body is decorated with *barbotine*, perhaps with a plant / floral motif, the exact image is unidentifiable. Its shape is closest to the Grey ware sherd with inner rim d. 80 mm decorated with a stamped motif found in the villa Kralevo Dol, dated to the end of the 4th c. AD (NAJDENOVA 1985, 73; таб. 15:176). In the Common red-slipped ware, the closest in shape are sherds under TW Fig. 10:145–152, which do not have, however, many parallels in the red-slipped ware.

2.3.7. KRATERS / POTS

GW Fig. 3:32–35

GW Pl. 1:32, 34

Four vessels of different sizes and shapes, only one of them with possible parallels in the Common red-slipped ware.

32 has a wide flat horizontal rim of inner d. 210 mm and high neck engraved with a series of horizontal lines. Below the neck starts a bulky body as in the case of the Common red-slipped ware kraters (see TW Fig. 13:181–186). Consequently, we may expect a similar form, just of bigger dimensions. The red-slipped vessels are dated from the 2nd till the 4th c. AD.

33–35 are all of a unique shape. Sherd **33** has a flattened, slightly raised rim, with inner d. 140 mm. Sherd **34** also has a raised flattened rim, engraved from the outside with one deep line, the inner d. is 120 mm. It is decorated with a stroked ornament, several mm deep (but not penetrating through the sherd). Sherd **35** is a pot with straight walls and an oblong rim with a pronounced rib inside of the vessel. Just below the rim is placed a reflex handle (19×8 mm). To be functional, we may expect one more handle on the other side of the pot. This vessel is overfired, resulting in a very sharp brittle sherd.

2.3.8. TABLE AMPHORA

GW Fig. 4:36 has a bigger rim d. of 110 mm inside; the upper part of the lip is engraved with one line. A similar appearance might be found among the table amphorae of the Common red-slipped ware (especially **TW Fig. 15:202**), with peak production from the second half of the 2nd c. till the 3rd c. AD, although they seem to be produced until the 4th c. AD.

2.3.9. JUGS

GW Fig. 4:37–43

GW Pl. 1:40; Pl. 2:42

Seven fragments of the Grey ware jugs, none of them with a direct parallel in the Common red-slipped ware, only **37–38** might find a bigger variant of similar shape.

37–38 have similarly prolonged necks with a rounded rim of inner d. 60 and 70 mm, none of them bears the mark of a handle. They likely belong to a similar shape of jug. Such a small shape cannot be found in the Common red-slipped ware, although a bigger variant of a presumably similar shape, with rim d. 130 mm, might be seen under **TW Fig. 16:215**, which, however, does not have a clear parallel. In the red-slipped ware, we may find jugs of a similar rim diameter, but with a more flaring rim. These are vessels from the necropolis Pet Mogili in Nova Zagora region (IGNATOV 1996a, таб. XIX:3), dated from the end of the 1st till the beginning of the 4th c. AD, and from burial mounds inventory deposited in the Nova Zagora Museum (VELKOV 1996 таб. I:1, III:2, IV:3), dated to the 2nd–3rd c. AD, which represent the closest parallels.

39 is a jug of inner rim d. 30 mm, with the marks of two handle attachments placed below the rim, both badly preserved, with unclear section / thickness. For more see **42**.

40 has only half of the neck preserved, with one handle (7×17 mm). The existence of the second handle is unclear. The inner rim d. is 43 mm.

41 is the only Grey ware jug with a trefoil rim. The rounded part of the lip has an outer d. of 45 mm. In this case it is very clear there is only one handle, which was attached below the rim, measuring in section 11×6 mm. For more see **42**.

42 is a fragment of a rounded upper body decorated with motifs of pinecones executed in *barbotine*. The rim is not preserved, but the maximal body diameter could be measured, being ca. 120 mm outside. Two jugs of a similar size with exactly the same body decoration are exhibited at the Regional Museum of History in Stara Zagora and dated to the 2nd–3rd c. AD. The first of them has a trefoil rim (like **41**) and the above described body; the second one has a rounded rim (like **39**) but is flattened from the top, with one preserved handle attached just below the neck, and a spout placed on the maximal body diameter. Consequently, we may consider the chronology of the 2nd and 3rd c. AD for the rims **39** and **41** as well as for the body **42**.

43 is a single handle, with a protrusion for a thumb. In section it is 17×10 mm. There were some handles with a similar protrusion among the Common red-slipped ware, although since they were missing any other diagnostic features for their chronological classification, they were excluded from the published material, however, we may consider the extended chronology of the 1st / 2nd c. AD till the mid-5th c. AD for them.

2.3.10. FRYING PAN (?)

GW Fig. 4:44

44 is indeed of a unique shape among the whole assemblage. It has straight walls of approximate inner rim d. 270 mm. Directly on the rim is attached a rounded handle (26×27 mm), with a hole in the middle (d. 8 mm). It looks like a frying pan,

although the fragment does not bear any signs of burning (however, only the rim with a part of the handle is preserved).

2.3.11. BASES

GW Fig. 4:45–49

GW Pl. 2:44

From the 15 bases of the Grey ware, ten are ring foot bases (**47**) and five have the shape of a false ring foot (**45–46**, and **48**). Fragment **49** has the unusual shape of a flat base with an attached strip of clay, similar to **TW Fig. 21:285**; Sherds **45** and **47** belong to table amphorae / jars, **48** to a small jug, **46** and **49** to an open vessel – plate or dish. The bases are fully slipped inside, outside only partly, above the feet (except for **46** which is fully slipped outside). The base diameters range from 25 to 150 mm, covering all possible sizes of vessel.

2.3.12. LAMPS

GW Pl. 2:SY14_031, **SY14_132** and **SY14_140** are the only three lamps made in the Grey ware fabric found at the site, all of them in one of the core contexts (SU021).³⁵ They are of the same shape and parameters, seemingly produced from one mould. The nozzle is placed slightly higher than the body. After the nozzle / body division we may find a rounded button of d. 9 mm. From both sides of the nozzle along the perimeter of the body are engraved stylized volutes, ending in a small hole. The discus is undecorated, lined with a relief ring of d. 84 mm. The base is flat with d. 49 mm outside; no handle was found. Their approximate length would be 130 mm. The fabric is of a light brownish grey (2.5Y 6/2), the slip is dark grey (5Y 4/1), completely covering the outer surface, but it is missing inside.

These lamps do not have any parallels in the Common red-slipped ware; they seem to be rare pieces in general. So far, such a shape, executed in red or grey ware, has not been found in the published material.

³⁵ The lamps from the site of Yurta-Stroyno are being processed separately by Robert Frecer, who is responsible for their final publication. The lamps description in the texts is based on his notes which he kindly provided to me.

2.3.13. GREY WARE – CONCLUSION

The Grey ware finds of the Roman and Late Antique periods from eastern Bulgaria are basically not known, and all the comparative samples, given here, come from western Bulgaria and even more distant areas of the Balkan peninsula. The best described, so far, is the so-called Macedonian grey ware (MGW), dated from the end of the 4th to the 6th c. AD. This ware, classed by Anderson-Stojanović, based on the finds from Stobi and other sites in Macedonia, Greece and Bulgaria, is mostly made up of open dishes and bowls with out-turned horizontal flattened rims, which are richly decorated with imprinted stamps (like Forms 1 and 2).

In Moesia Inferior and Thrace, vessels of the morphological forms traditionally attributed to MGW might, however, already be found in the contexts dated from the 2nd to 4th c. AD, with the most popular ones being the bowls with an out-turned horizontal flattened rim of Forms 1 and 2 (e.g. KACAROVA 2005, таб. 8), and simple hemispherical bowls of Forms 4 and 5 (e.g. FALKNER 1999, 9.48:983–988). Additionally, still during the 2nd–4th c. AD it seems that some forms of table ware vessels were produced simultaneously in grey and red-slipped wares.

Looking at the material from Yurta-Stroyno, from 44 diagnostic fragments (not counting the bases), 32 pcs. (73 %) might find a direct parallel in the Common red-slipped ware dated to the 1st/2nd–3rd/4th c. AD, and 16 pcs. (36 %) in Grey ware from elsewhere. From the latter, all 16 fragments find parallels in the Grey ware material published from Moesia Inferior and Thrace dated, based on the context, to the 2nd–4th c. AD, with the odd exception extending up to the 5th c. AD; while only 9 pcs. of the same 16 fragments, have a form which might also be attributed to the MGW, and as such, dated from the late 4th c. until the 6th c. AD.³⁶ These 9 pcs. might be attributed to two forms, **1–8** being of the MGW Form 5, and **21** being of the MGW Form 1 or 2. The shapes of the first form were also produced locally in the Common red-slipped ware during the 2nd–4th c. AD. The latter sherd, **21**, does not seem to have a parallel in the Common red-slipped ware, on the other hand, such a sherd in Grey ware was published from Nicopolis ad Istrum, dated to AD 175–250, and from Kocherinovo near Blagoevgrad, dated to the 2nd–4th c. AD (**GW Tab. 2 and 3**).

³⁶ The number overlaps as some forms might be found in all three fabrics.

Seven fragments from the assemblage (**12, 16, 33–35, 40** and **44**) do not have a parallel in the Grey ware (both Roman and Late Antique), nor in the Common red-slipped ware.

Despite knowing several Grey ware sherds only from one production centre in Butovo and not from the nearby kilns in Thrace, it seems more than probable that some pottery forms were intentionally produced in two different colours during the 2nd–4th c. AD in Thrace and Moesia Inferior. We may also expect more production centres spread over a wider area than one (or some) located in western Bulgaria as previously suggested.

2.4. Coarse ware

2.4.1. HISTORY OF RESEARCH

The coarse ware represents an abundant amount of material from each archaeological site, including cooking vessels, but also containers of different functions, always with a sandy fabric and a higher amount of inclusions. Due to its utilitarian function, the coarse ware is not, traditionally, a favourite pottery material for processing and publishing. In Bulgaria and Romania it attracted the wider interest of several researchers in the course of the 1970s, when the first studies were published by Dremsizova-Nelchinova (1971) from a villa near Madara; Rădulescu (1975) from Dobrudzha; Scorpan (1975) from Sacidava; Kuzmanov (1978) from Kaliakra; and Böttger (1978) from Iatrus. From these works, only that of Rădulescu focuses on the Roman period of the 1st–4th c. AD, Dremsizova-Nelchinova covers a wider time span of the 2nd till the 6th c. AD, while the other studies regard pottery material from the Late Antiquity.

At the end of the 70s and during the 80s, more comprehensive studies appear, such as Popilian's book on Roman pottery from Oltenia (Roman Dacia) published in 1979 and Kuzmanov's book from 1985 on the Late Antique pottery from the diocese of Thrace and Dacia (modern Bulgaria), on which he follows up with a series of studies and becomes the leading Bulgarian researcher on Late Antique coarse ware pottery (e.g. KUZMANOV 1992, 1993, 2005, 2009, 2013). Back in the 80s, more important studies appear, including Böttger's (1982) pottery assemblages from well dated contexts of the Late Antique Castel Iatrus; Sultov's (1985) typology of the pottery production centres in Pavlikeni, Butovo and Hotnica (active during the 1st–4th c. AD), Najdenova's (1985) study of a closed context from the Roman Villa in Krlev Dol, dated to the end of the 4th c. AD; and Kabakchieva's (1986) material from Villa Armira in Ivaylovgrad, dated from the 2nd to 4th c. AD. All these studies cover various pottery assemblages, including coarse ware as well. For our area, it is also important to mention a paper of Borisov (1988), focusing on Late Antique pottery finds from the Sliven District.

In the 90s, several more studies on the Late Antique coarse ware were published by Kuzmanov; one of his papers focused on the material from Nicopolis ad Nestum (1993), a second one is an extensive study of the pottery from Sadovets, near Pleven (1992). In 1999, a complex study of the pottery material from Nicopolis ad Istrum by Falkner came out, which covered both the Roman and Late Antique

periods. In the same year, one of the first studies by Klenina regarding the (table) and cooking ware material of the Late Antique period from Novae was published (KLENINA 1999).

At the beginning of our millennium, we may encounter more papers by Kabakchieva, including one on the early Roman material from Oescus (2000) and by Kuzmanov, namely on the Late Antique material from Castra Martis (2005) and Gradishteto near Dichin (2009). Pottery studies, including coarse ware, are also published from the early Roman – Late Antique contexts from Novae (e.g. GENCHEVA 2002; KLENINA 2006; BIERNACKI – KLENINA 2014). Several books focusing solely on the Late Antique material in Romanian Dobrudzha were also published, namely by Topoleanu (2000) from Halmyris and by Opaiț (2004) from Scythia. In 2005, a book on the Roman (1st–4th c. AD) pottery finds from several sites in Northern Greece – the Aegean Thrace –, written by Malamidou is also published.

Most recently, several studies on the Late Antique coarse ware pottery from Bulgaria might be found in the collective publication *In Honorem Professoris Георгу Кузманов* from 2013 (KUZMANOV – GRUDEV; BORISOV) and in an article by Rusev, Rusev and Vrbanov (2015), concerning the pottery material from the 2nd–3rd c. AD *vicus* near Gorsko Ablanovo (Targovishte District). More papers relevant to the area might be found in conference proceedings such as in *LRCW*, *RCRF* or in local journals (*Известия*), excavation reports (*AOPs*), and elsewhere.

Additionally, important comprehensive publications, which also need to be mentioned here as possible sources of comparative data, are the pottery finds from Lower Pannonia (BRUKNER 1981); Stobi in Macedonia (ANDERSON-STOJANOVIĆ 1992); and Singidunum in Moesia Superior (BOJOVIĆ 1977; NIKOLIĆ-ĐORĐEVIĆ 2000). Last but not least, no study of the Eastern Roman pottery would be complete without going *ad fontes*, to the publication of Robinson (1959) from the Athenian Agora; to the series of books and articles by Hayes (e.g. 1977a, 1977b, 1983, 1991) and to important papers by Riley (1979) and Kenrick (1985) regarding the material from Benghazi, Libya.

2.4.2. INTRODUCTION TO THE MATERIAL

The forms of coarse ware vessels used for cooking / food preparation of the Roman period have a long tradition going all the way back to the Classical / Hellenistic

times. Regarding our material, the forms of casseroles (1–9), frying pans (10–13) and stewing pots (56–63) keep their traditional appearance, which was established already at the end of the Hellenistic period, for at least the first three centuries AD, perhaps even longer.

In general, the forms of coarse ware are rather more functional, than variable, and we may encounter the same form during a long-time span, which makes it an unpopular ware for dating without having material from well stratified contexts.

In Bulgaria, the Late Antique contexts are better elaborated. Several major publications of material from sites along the Danube area have been published (see above), with an overview of the material from Moesia Inferior and Thrace by Kuzmanov (1985). The early Roman period material is published only occasionally, without any comprehensive study being issued. The most missing type of study, however, is one covering the transition and development of vessel forms from the Roman period till the Late Antiquity. Consequently, the end in the popularity of particular Roman forms and the appearance of new ones, common for the Late Antiquity, is unclear.

Another limiting aspect of the coarse ware study in Bulgaria is the flexibility of some typologies, clustering quite different shapes together under one type. What happens is that quite often not the original sherds are referred to, but the ones already referring to the prime forms. In consequence, the range of shapes regarding one type is growing, covering quite a range of forms. Having run into some dead ends, tracing sherds referring to a type which, in its original form, had very little to do with the traced one, I prefer, in specific cases, to refer directly to individual sherds (if from a well stratified context), than to a specific type.

Besides the cooking pots and their lids, which create the biggest body of the assemblage (1–99) one fragment of the so-called fenestrated stand (100) might be found, as well as several fragments of the (Thracian) Thin-walled ware (101–106).

2.4.3. MATERIAL CHARACTERISTIC

At the site of Yurta-Stroyno, the coarse ware is, after the TW, the second most abundant pottery class. In the excavated material it is made up of 2,184 pieces amounting to 20.5 kgs of material (**Introduction Tab. 1**), in the field survey of 4,806 pieces amounting to 31.5 kgs (**Introduction Tab. 2**).

The main body of finds is represented by the wheel-made cooking ware, vessels used for food preparation, which were produced to withstand a high temperature and heat changes, either directly placed over the fire, or standing by it. Consequently, the fabric is coarse, sandy and its colour might have many different shades of dark (-red, -brown, -grey). The sherds are commonly burned on the outside, especially around the base. Open vessels also feature burning marks on the upper part of the body and below the rim. In terms of proportions, the most common are pots of a closed form with 224 pcs. / 85 % (52 pcs. represented here; **14–64, 67–68**), with a much lower number of open forms, 39 pcs. / 15 % (19 pcs. here). A series of lids (**69, 71–94**) accompanies the pots, either made of the same fabric as the vessels, or slightly finer.

A different set of vessels is represented by the (Thracian) Thin-walled ware (**CW Fig. 9**), reflected here in several cups (**101–105**) and one jug (**106**). Additionally, the fragment under **100** completely differs from the rest of the assemblage, representing a wheel-made fenestrated stand (*pyraunos*), the only one found at the site.

Regarding the statistical proportion of the coarse ware material, body fragments amount to 1,665 pcs, rims 263, bases 127, single handles 59, lids 44 and only 26 body fragments are decorated (**CW Tab. 1**). The decoration is rare, simple, limited to one or more horizontal grooves (**35–37, 50**), or plastic rib(s) (**2, 6, 10, 24, 54–55**) on the upper part of the body / flaring neck.

Stroyno Pottery 2014–2016			EXCAVATION - COARSE WARE							
Context										
SU	Trench	Sector	Body	Rims	Bases	Handles	Lids	Decor	Total (pcs.)	Weight (g.)
SU001	ROOMS	A, B, C	584	90	46	34	17	17	788	9511
Levelling I	100E-105N	NE	562	110	33	17	9	1	732	5233
Levelling II	100E-110N	SE	265	31	20	3	17	2	338	2673
SU008	100E-100N	SW	183	26	24	1	0	6	240	2427
SU021	095E-100N	SE	8	3	2	1	0	0	14	102
SU057	100E-105N	SE	63	3	2	3	1	0	72	689
Total amount:			1665	263	127	59	44	26	2184	20635

CW Tab. 1: Amount overview of the Coarse ware pottery fragments retrieved from the six main contexts.

2.4.4. FABRIC CHARACTERISTIC

I. Common coarse ware (CW Pl. 1:1, 38) is hard and sandy, with predominant sub-angular to rounded quartz (and perhaps other, by the naked eye undistinguishable, white opaque and semi-transparent inclusion[s]), which is accompanied by a much lower number of red and black pellets (both dull), and rare flakes of tiny silver mica (the more the sherd is burned, the more visible is the mica). The sorting of the inclusions is fair to good, with an average amount of 20 % in the size of 0.5–1.0/2.0 mm. The outer surface has a tiny self-slip of the fabric colour. It is well soaked into the sherd, but sometimes, it is visible below the rim where it may break into tiny long cracks. The paste is quite porous; the fracture is hackly. Firing might be both even and uneven, with the latter one most represented by a sandwich fracture with a grey to black core. The margins commonly have the colour of the fabric, which ranges from red (5YR 5/6), light red (2.5YR 7/8) to reddish yellow (5YR 6/6 or 6/8). The majority of the pots are secondarily burned on the base and on the outer rim, the shoulders/bodies of the vessels normally keep the colour of the fabric.

Two variations to the Common coarse ware might be identified in the hand specimen, while they keep the above-mentioned description, their fabric characteristics are enriched by the following:

1) **Coarser fabric (CW Pl. 1:10)** = higher amount of the Common coarse ware inclusions (i.e. 30 % and above), which are fairly sorted. These features result not only in the coarser fabric, but also in harder sherds with a rough surface.

The sherds with a “coarser” fabric might originate from vessels with a specific function (as they are better adapted for cooking over a fire), but the effect could also be caused by the state of their preservation, as if the sherds are very worn or have an eroded surface, the clay mass disappears, and the inclusions stand out (and look more dense and bigger). I have witnessed this phenomenon regarding the material from Dodoparon (**Chapter 4**), where it was possible to put together fragments of a different colour and, seemingly, different fabric (one coarser than the other), but they were parts of the same vessel facing a different way of destruction and deposition (some sherds were burned, some probably spread over a bigger distance).

Regarding our material, there is not a major morphological difference between the sherds executed in the Common coarse ware and its Coarser fabric, except fragments **50–51** and **54–55**, shapes, we may only find in the Coarser fabric. These might have, indeed, a different function or use which required them to possess better thermic properties.

2) **Finer fabric (CW Pl. 1:74)** = lower amount of the Common coarse ware inclusions (i.e. 10–20 %), which are better sorted; the surface consequently has a rather smooth feel. This fabric might be related only to some of the coarse ware lids (**71–94**). The finer fabric of the lids, than of the pots, was also noted by Opaït̃ (2004, 57) on the coarse ware material from the Late Roman Scythia (Dobrudzha). Perhaps less coarse clay was intentionally used for (some) lids of cooking pots, as the advantage of coarseness was not necessary for covering purposes. In our material, from 44 lids, 43 % are of Common, 37 % of Fine, 17 % of Coarser and 3 % of the Golden mica fabric (see below).

II) **Golden mica ware (CW Pl. 1:65)** = fabric characteristic of the Common coarse ware enriched with frequent bigger flakes of a golden mica, up to 4 mm in size. This fabric regards only a limited amount of the diagnostic coarse ware – five rims presented here (**CW 6**). Three of the rims / upper bodies have a “heavy” sherd of a unique shape (**64–66**), while the other two are of similar form to the non-micaceous

coarse ware (67–68). The golden mica might also be found in a limited number of bases and lids (e.g. 69–70).

Division of the material

The two main coarse wares, I) Common coarse ware (CW Fig. 1–5, 7–8; CW Pl. 1:1, 38, 10, 74) and II) Golden mica ware (CW Fig. 6; CW Pl. 1:65), are separated in the text and tables from each other. The I) Common coarse ware is, however, presented together with its Coarser and Finer variants, as none of these variants create significant cluster(s). If the sherd differs from the Common coarse ware, it is marked in the figures with a note *coarser fabric*; or, regarding the more variable lids, they are accompanied by the letter **C** for **Coarser fabric** and **F** for **Finer fabric**. The sparsity of the Golden mica fabric does not allow any meaningful division, as each sherd is basically its own type. They are consequently presented on one figure altogether with lids and bases of the same properties (CW Fig. 6). The main division of both fabrics is between open / closed forms, with similar morphological forms further grouped together.

2.4.5. COMMON COARSE WARE

2.4.5.1. CASSEROLES

CW Fig. 1:1–9

CW Pl. 1:1

Includes six pots of the Common (1–6) and three of Coarser fabric (7–9), with a carinated, relatively low, body, a flat base (which might be slightly raised in the centre), a wide projecting rim, either flat (1, 3, 5 and 7) or concave on the top (2, 4, 6, 8, and 9), in some cases with a small plastic rib running along the inner edge to secure the lid (2, 4, 8 and 9). More rarely, the rim is folded inwards (6, 7). The upper body walls incline either inwards (1), they are straight (5–6) or, most frequently, they incline outwards (all the other cases).³⁷ The flat / concave rim likely accommodated a lid. The outer diameter of the bases ranges from 60 to 80 mm; the rim inner diameter from 140 to 190 mm. These vessels could have none, one, or

³⁷ The casseroles from other sites, which are used here as comparative material, mostly have the walls sloping inwards – so they are rather closed, not open (e.g. Sadovec, Castra Martis, Nicopolis ad Istrum). Consequently, the fragment 1 – with the inward sloping walls – is the most repeated form from this group found elsewhere. This feature could reflect different traditions / cooking habits at Yurta-Stroyno.

two handles; the two of them preserved here are oval in section, of ca. 14–16×7–9 mm.

In the Eastern Mediterranean, the form of a casserole has a long tradition. It was very popular already in the Classical Greek / Hellenistic period, during which it was used for boiling, braising and/or stewing meat, fish and big pieces of vegetables. The inwards / outwards inclination or the upper body might reflect a different style of food preparation, chronologically it does not seem to play any role, as these versions coexisted (c.f. BERLIN 1997, 94; ROTROFF 2006³⁸, 85).

Already in the Late Hellenistic period there appears a casserole of a form, which persists into the Roman period. As an example, might serve ‘the angled rim casseroles’ with rounded or flat base, dated to the beginning of the Late Hellenistic phase at Tel Anafa (125–75 BC) (BERLIN 1997, 95; pl. 28: PW234–240). The form further developed during the Roman period and was popular until the Late Antiquity, as might be demonstrated by the following examples of variable chronology from the south-eastern Balkan Peninsula. If possible, individual sherds from Yurta-Stroyno are linked to the published examples:

The Athenian Agora (ROBINSON 1959, G 195), from the 1st to the early 2nd c. AD (c.f. **1**); Nicopolis ad Istrum (FALKNER 1999, 70; 9.11:188/182 and 9.10:162), from AD 140 to 300 (c.f. **1**) and AD 130–450 (c.f. **6**); Plovdiv (TUŠLOVÁ – WEISSOVÁ 2014, figs. 4–5) mid-3rd c. AD (c.f. **1** and, especially, **3** – which is exactly of the same shape); Castra Martis (KABAKCHIEVA 2005, 94; табл. VII–VIII), 3rd–4th c. AD (c.f. **1**); Villa Armira in Ivaylovgrad (KABAKCHIEVA 1986, Type 2, figs. 469–471) mid-4th c. AD (c.f. **3**); Sadovets (KUZMANOV 1992, Schalen Typ 3), 4th c. AD (**1** and **7**); and Novae (KLENINA 2006, 116; Кастрюли Тип 3), from 2nd to mid-7th AD (**7**).

Despite the long history of this type during the Roman period (1st till mid-7th c. AD), the form of a casserole seems to be the most common in Thrace and Moesia Inferior during the 3rd and 4th c. AD, although its popularity starts already in the 2nd c. AD (KABAKCHIEVA 2005, 94). The shapes of some of our sherds (especially **1** and **6**) might also be related to the finds from the kiln site at Nova Nadhezda in Haskovo District, active from the mid-2nd to the mid-3rd c. AD (HARIZANOV 2016, 12: fourth and fifth rim from the bottom on the right).

³⁸ In the Classical / Hellenistic period they are called *lopades*, vessels with a tradition starting in the third quarter of the 5th c. BC (ROTROFF 2006, 178–179).

2.4.5.2. FRYING PANS

CW Fig. 1:10–11; 2:12–13

CW Pl. 1:10

The group of frying pans includes three vessels of the Common (**11–13**), and one of the Coarser fabric (**10**). They have different sizes and rim shapes. What is however common for this group, is the relatively short sloping walls inclined outwards, the wide projecting rim with a depression for a lid, mostly with a small plastic rib running along the inner edge to secure the lid, and the flat base (preserved only in one instance). As the name of the group suggests, these pans were used for frying.

This type of kitchen ware appears in the East already in the 2nd c. BC, with the presumed local exporter during the early times being Phocaea (in Western Anatolia), whose production seems to start in the 1st c. BC (HAYES 1977a, 78; cf. HEATH – TEKKÖK eds. 2006–2009).

The inner rim diameter of our four fragments ranges from 160 to 190 mm, with one exceptionally big vessel of inner d. 270 mm (**12**). The base is preserved only in one case (**10**), with outer d. 130 mm, 20–30 mm smaller than the inner rim diameter of the pan. No handle is preserved; however, based on published finds, there might be none, or one horizontal handle (HAYES 1983, c.f. 9). Some frying pans are known to have a reddish wash inside (HAYES 1983, 108), our fragments, however, do not have a significantly thicker layer of slip / coating inside.

10 (CW Pl. 1) has a coarser fabric, thinner body walls (ca. 6 mm) – as well as the rim – and the smallest dimensions of all the frying pans. There are not many comparative examples, but quite a good one comes from Kepia (northern Greece) featuring the same slim body with a flat base, projecting rim narrowed near the body and a small plastic band running along the outer body perimeter; the published example (also) has no handles. This piece might be dated to a time range from the 1st to 4th c. AD (MALAMIDOU 2005, 96:1440).

11 is fragmentarily preserved, which complicates its comparison with other materials. It is, however, similar to **10**, as it shares its thinner body, rim inclination and it also has a similar rim diameter (175 mm). The best published parallels are from Ephesos – ‘pans with ribbed body’ (TURNOVSKY 2005, 640–641, 1:3), from

the end of the 4th / beginning of the 5th c. AD, although the main characteristic of the type – the decorated body – cannot be compared.

The shapes of sherds **12–13** are much better represented in the published materials, dated to the contexts of the 2nd–3rd c. AD. The fragment under **12** is similar to the ‘utility vessels’ from the Athenian Agora. In shape it is closest to pl. 72:K89 and 72:J22 (ROBINSON 1959), from which the first is dated to the mid-3rd c. AD, the second one to the early 3rd c. AD; similar finds are also known from Knossos dating from the early 2nd to the early 3rd c. AD (COLDSTREAM – EIRING – FORSTER 2001, 410:g, h), and from Callatis in Dobrudzha, also from the 2nd–3rd c. AD (OΠΑΙΤ – IONESCU 2016, XXVI:154).

13 represents a common Eastern Aegean type of cooking ware, widely spread along the Mediterranean, modelled on the Phocaean ware (REYNOLDS 2010, 92). Both imported and local imitations might be found at archaeological sites (c.f. in Argos, ABADIE-REYNALD 2005, 23). A good example is also known from the Villa Dionysus at Knossos, with sherds of this type dated to the 2nd–3rd c. AD (HAYES 1983, 9:104–109, Type 2), where their local production – with red-brown coating inside – was recently confirmed (BONETTO *et al.* 2017, 729, 5:8). Similar finds are also known from the Athenian Agora, from the mid-3rd c. AD – described as a flat bottom dish with no handles (ROBINSON 1959, 67; pl. 72:K89); from Stobi of the mid-2nd–3rd c. AD (ANDERSON-STOJANOVIĆ 1992, Middle Roman Cooking Ware Form 1, 135; pl. 135:1164); Berenice also of the 2nd–3rd c. AD (RILEY 1979, fig.128:947), and from Amphipolis of a context dated within the range of the 1st to 4th c. AD (MALAMIDOU 2005 Type 2, 81, 209 94: 1428, 95:1433 and 1435). Our fragment does not have the red-brown slip inside, and the fabric looks very much like the other Common coarse ware – it might have been made locally, as a copy of an Aegean production. A kiln producing frying pans (and other coarse ware) is in fact known from Karanovo, near Nova Zagora, active from the mid-3rd to the beginning of the 4th c. AD (BORISOV 2005, 137, o6p. 12).

2.4.5.3. POTS

CW Fig. 2:14–27; 3:28–43; 4:44–55; 5:56–63

CW Pl. 1:38

Closed form pots with a rounded body and differently profiled necks and rims are the most abundant shape of the Common coarse ware. Bigger and smaller (morphological) groups, as well as single sherds, might be encountered in the following texts.

14–19 are six rims with an out-turned rounded rim of inner d. ranging from 90 to 130 mm. Two (**14–15**) fragments are of the Coarser and four (**16–19**) of the Common fabric. None of them have preserved handles. Based on parallels, these rims might belong to vessels with a higher ovoid body (c.f. SULTOV 1976, 105 – black burned pots from Hotnica without handles). Similar sherds might also be found in Nicopolis ad Istrum dated from AD 130–150 to AD 250 (FALKNER 1999; figs. 9.2:21–23; 9.6:76–81 and 92; 9.7:106), with the note, that despite being quite common in Nicopolis until the mid-3rd c. AD, they are not known from Novae or Iatrus (FALKNER 1999, 67). In 2006, similar vessels were, however, published also from Novae of a context dated from the second half of the 2nd c. AD to the 4th c. AD (KLENINA 2006, 38; рис. 9:16/17). They are also known from Gorsko Ablanovo, dated to the beginning of the 3rd c. AD (RUSEV – RUSEV – VRBANOV 2015, таб. XVII/162). Hence, the chronological classification of this kind of pot by Falkner, dating them from the mid-2nd to mid-3rd c. AD, seems to be quite possible.

20–37 is a group, which includes the most common coarse ware finds from the site, consequently, it is represented by a bigger amount of sherds, which might be further sorted into smaller sub-variants, however, they are, at least in the Late Antiquity (4th–6th c. AD), coexistent, as it is well demonstrated with the finds from Sadovets, where they were all sorted by Kuzmanov under the Töpfe Typ 4 (KUZMANOV 1992, 214–215; Taf. 92–97). In this Type 4, we can basically find a direct comparison for each of our sherds. What is, however, different between the Yurta-Stroyno material and the Sadovets finds, is that Kuzmanov's Type 4 is listed as pots without handles, which however seem to be a common feature for our finds.

Single sherds in this wider group are also known from earlier contexts, starting as early as in the 2nd c. AD (c.f. BRUKNER 1981; NIKOLIĆ-ĐORĐEVIĆ 2000).

Consequently, a wider time range for some of the sherds might be expected. In this point, we cannot say if this wider chronology is applicable to the whole of Kuzmanov's Type 4, or only to the selected shapes within this type. The extended time span might also be caused by the widely dated contexts of some of the comparative material, although, the most frequently repeated cross-period within the given contexts is the 4th c. AD, where the earlier and later chronologies meet.

Since we may find some morphological differences within the group, similar rim shapes from Yurta-Stroyno were clustered together and their specific characteristics are further described; if additional parallels are available, they are given in the following text.

20–21 are two fragments with a raised projecting rim of a quadrangular tip, a small concavity for a lid inside and handles attached below the rim. Each sherd has a different inner rim diameter: **20** = 185 mm, **21** = 130 mm, with the first one being one of the biggest closed form pots in the assemblage. The handles are striped, with double ribbing on the upper part, 30×13 mm and 27×12 mm.

Direct parallels might be found in Novae (KLENINA 2006, 38–39; рис. 9:16–17 and 23:147), the best one being the second example (рис. 23:147), which is very similar in shape, but also in its rim diameter (d. 160 mm) to the sherd **20**. It was found in a context of a wider chronology, dated from the 2nd to mid-7th c. AD. Another parallel comes from Nicopolis ad Istrum (FALKNER 1999, 9.9.158), from two contexts, the first dated from AD 250 to 350, the second from AD 350 to 450; for Sadovets finds see KUZMANOV 1992, 214–215; Töpfe Typ 4, Var. 3, Taf. 97:1–6).

22–25, the morphology of the following rims is based on the previously mentioned ones (**20–21**), only the rims' tips are thinner, longer and triangular, while the inner concavity for the lids remains. Some fragments have preserved handles attached below the rim. Sherd **22** is a bigger vessel than the others, with an inner diameter of 165 mm and handle section of 39×12 mm. The other three sherds (**23–25**) in this group, have the same rim diameter of 120 mm; the one preserved handle has a section 28×9 mm. In all cases, the handles are striped and double ribbed from the top. We can find parallels in Novae, dated from the end of the 4th to the 7th c. AD (KLENINA 1999, 92; 8:10; KLENINA 2006, 79; рис. 43:342–346); for a similar find from Sadovets see KUZMANOV 1992, Taf. 97). Since the shape resembles the

following series of clear Late Antique chronology, we may assume the same dates for these pots.

26–31, the shape of these pots is again similar to the above-mentioned ones (**22–25**), but with the rim placed horizontally and flat on the top. The inner d. ranges from 120 to 150 mm, the handle section is 36–34×12 mm (on two preserved handles: **27**, **30**), only one sherd is smaller than the others, with inner d. 90 mm and the handle section 26×11 mm (**31**). We may find a number of parallels dated into the range of the 4th–6th c. AD in Novae (KLENINA 1999, 4.1–4); Sadovets (KUZMANOV 1992; Taf. 96–97); Gradishteto near Dichin (KUZMANOV 2009, таб. XIX:188); and Iatrus (BÖTTGER 1978, Taf. 46:472, Period C). None of the comparative examples, however, have handles. Of interest is a similar set of pots from Lower Pannonia, where they are dated already into the range of the 2nd–4th c. AD (BRUKNER 1981, 106–107; T.121:124, T.122:136–139), but again, with no handles.

32–34 are three fragments with an out-turned triangular rim, from which the first one (**32**) has a smaller rim diameter (80 mm) and overall dimensions than the other two, whose rim diameters range from 110 to 120 mm. No handles are preserved.

Very similar pots are known from two different contexts in Novae. The first one is dated from the 2nd to the mid-7th c. AD (KLENINA 2006, 54–55; рис. 23:148–149); the other one from the 4th to 6th c. AD (KLENINA 2006, 76; рис. 40:314). Such a type might also be found in the Middle Danube area, in Serbia – Singidunum, already in the 2nd c. AD context (NIKOLIĆ-ĐORĐEVIĆ 2000, 65; Tip 1/129); and from the 2nd to 4th c. AD Sirmium (BRUKNER 1981, 107; tab. 122, Tip 28). For Sadovets finds see KUZMANOV 1992, Taf. 92–93.

35–37, these three fragments are put together on the bases of a small inner rim d. 90–95 mm and the body decorated with horizontal ribbing on the upper part, which is not common for the other fragments. The handle is banded, ribbed twice from the upper part, with sections of 27×12 mm and 23×9 mm.

Pots with two or three ribbed horizontal lines and no handles have a long tradition in Dacia during the first three centuries AD, and a kiln site producing (besides other forms) these pots with a ribbed body is known from Valea Morilor (near Tulcea in Dobrudzha); active in the 4th c. AD (BAUMANN 1996, 46; 4:4, Type II). For the Sadovets finds see KUZMANOV 1992, Taf. 96:11. Sherd **36** has a rim

shape comparable to a find from Novae dated from the 2nd to 6th c. AD, although, this example is missing the ribbed body (KLENINA 2006, 69; рис 36:271). A similar shape, with one handle and a ribbed body, might be found at villa Krlev Dol, dated to the end of the 4th c. AD (NAJDENOVA 1985, таб. 41:149).

38–41 (CW Pl. 1:38) are four pot fragments with a short out-turned hooked rim directly connected to the rounded body, without a neck. The missing neck is a distinctive division from other kinds of pots with the same rim profile, but, with a straight neck (c.f. KLENINA 2006, 113–114; Горшки Тип 22 – known e.g. from Novae, Iatrus, Nicopolis ad Istrum or Sadovets). Both types, however, seem to be dated solely to the Late Antiquity.

From our assemblage, only one pot has a handle, with a section 24×9 mm (**38**). Based on the parallels from Novae and Iatrus, the pots should have two handles, directly connected to the rim. According to the further description, the body is round, sometimes grooved in the upper part, with a flat, slightly concave base (BIERNACKI – KLENINA 2014, 152; BÖTTGER 1978, 30).

38 and **39**, with sharper edges, relate to the shapes known e.g. from Hierapolis (Anatolia), where they represent the most popular Late Antique cooking ware, which was produced locally (although in a wide area),³⁹ from ca. the 5th to 7th AD (COTTICA 2005, 657; 4:1–4). Opaıt (2004, 46) has a similar chronological classification for a pot from Ibida (Scythia), dated from the second half of the 5th to the 6th c. AD ('local pots type IV'). He also suggests this is a local imitation of pots produced in the Aegean (and found e.g. at Chios or the Yassi Ada shipwreck). The same shape is also known from Novae – dated to the 5th–6th c. AD (BIERNACKI – KLENINA 2014, 152; 3:2). The Late Antique dating of these pots might also be confirmed by Hayes (1992, 158), who notes, these pots are known in Thrace and Constantinople from layers of the 6th–early 7th c. AD. Sherds **40** and **41**, with more rounded edges, seem to be dated the same as the previous ones, with a good example being published from Iatrus (BÖTTGER 1982, Taf. 48:595, Töpfe Typ VII, Period D), known already by the 5th c. AD (Period C), while being a characteristic shape for the 6th c. AD, when these dimensions are supposed to diminish (BÖTTGER 1978, 29–30).

³⁹ In the article not further specified.

Under **42–47** are groups of twos. The first fragments have an s-shaped rim with either rounded (**42–43**) or sharp (**44–45**) edges, the latter one with a small depression on the outer lip. The sherds are very fragmented, and the diameters of three out of four are not possible to measure precisely, only within a range. The only measurable sherd (**45**) gives us a possible standard for the rim diameter – 160 mm inside; no handles were preserved.

The earliest parallels come from *Novae* (GENCHEVA 2002, 32; таб. VI:7–8, таб. VII:1 – Type I.2.3. Гърнета с изгънени устия). Gencheva sees an Italian origin of these pots, as they were found there in the contexts of the end of the 1st c. BC until the mid-1st c. AD (GENCHEVA 2002, 32; SANTROT 1995, 194; 63:524). These pots might, however, also be found later, e.g. at the *Villa Armira* in *Ivaylovgrad*, where they are dated from the 3rd to 4th c. AD (КАБАКЧИЕВА 1986 Гърнета Тип 2, 28–29; таб. 42:486);⁴⁰ or from a wider area, e.g. from *Zagreb*, in the context of the 2nd to 4th c. AD (BRUKNER 1981, 107; tab. 120:109) and *Singidunum*, from the end of the 3rd to the beginning of 5th c. AD (NIKOLIĆ-DORDEVIĆ 2000, 66; Tip II/1 and Tip II/2).

For our area, we could best associate the fragments with the pots known and published from the *Sliven District* (BORISOV 1988, 92–93; рис 1, Горшки Тип 1–2). There are only upper body parts, mostly without decoration, rarely horizontally grooved, with no handles. Borisov's Type 1 perfectly fits our **42–43**, and his Type 2 our **44–45**. He notes, these two types are frequently being found together in *Thrace*, in the contexts of the mid to 2nd half of the 4th c. AD; in *Moesia Inferior* only within the first half of the 4th c. AD.

Another two pots (**46–47**) with an out-turned s-shaped rim, rounded lip from the outside and more pronounced inner depression, are often grouped together with the above-mentioned ones (**42–45**) (see FALKNER 1999, 67; 9.7:103–106; BÖTTGER 1982, Taf. 45:84–85 Typ I – Period A). We may consider **46** of inner rim d. 130 mm to be a part of this group, but the classification of the bigger and thicker **47**, with inner rim d. 200 mm, is questionable. Falkner proposes a start of this type around AD 250, with a note that these pots might have gone out of use during the 4th c. AD. Böttger places them to the 1st half of the 4th c. AD. Consequently, all these five (six?) sherds might be similarly dated into the course of the 4th c. AD, the last two possibly also half a century earlier.

⁴⁰ Kabakchieva notes that some of the pots are supposed to have handles attached to the rim.

48–53 is a set of finds which does not represent a group, but a series of single fragments, with some shared similarities, such as the globular body, thicker sherds, straight neck and out-turned rim (**48–52**) and no (at least preserved) handles. The outer rim/lip profiles are always slightly different, as are the rim diameters. Fragment **55** has a unique appearance with an s-shaped rim and a small raised rib inside the lip. Due to the inconsistency of the shapes, each fragment is treated separately, with parallels relating solely to its specific shape.

48 is a pot with a straight neck, triangular rim of inner d. 90 mm, and wide upper body. No exact parallels were found, the closest in appearance is the following sherd **49**.

49 is a pot with a raised neck, out-turned rim with an outer hooked lip of inner d. 100 mm. This kind of shape has a direct parallel in the material from the Roman *vicus* near Gorsko Ablanovo, where it is dated, with a reference to the Dacian finds, to the beginning of the 3rd c. AD (RUSEV – RUSEV – VRBANOV 2015, 690; Гърнета Тип II; таб. XVII:165; POPILIAN 1979, 89). The shape also resembles Tip II/5 from Singidunum dated from the 3rd to mid-4th c. AD (NIKOLIĆ-ĐORĐEVIĆ 2000, 67–68) and Brukner Tip 17, dated to the 4th c. AD (BRUKNER 1981, 106; T.117:90).

50 is a rim with inner d. 155 mm and one incised line below the neck. This fragment has two main parallels. The first one is from Nicopolis ad Istrum, dated into the range of the mid-3rd–mid-5th c. AD (FALKNER 1999, 83; 9.41:846–847). According to Falkner, this pot is of local fabric, but was not produced in Hotnica, Butovo or Pavlikeni. Other such pots were found in Aegyssus in the contexts of the 2nd–middle of the 3rd c. AD (NUȚU – STANC 2017, 616; 2:1–2 pots of type 1). They have a globular body, either a flat or concave base.

51 is a sherd similar in shape and rim d. (140 mm) to the previous one, however the outer lip is not that rounded, and the incised decoration is missing (at least on the preserved part). This shape has a direct parallel in the material from the Roman *vicus* near Gorsko Ablanovo, with a reference to the Dacian finds, dated into the range of the 2nd to mid-4th c. AD, with a peak at the beginning of the 3rd c. AD (RUSEV – RUSEV – VRBANOV 2015, 690; Гърнета Тип I; табл. XVI:157; POPILIAN 1979, 67). In this case, we may also consider the above-mentioned parallel from Aegyssus, dated to the 2nd–middle of the 3rd c. AD.

52 is a sherd with a folded outer rim of inner d. 130 mm. These characteristics find parallels in the material from Novae, where they were sorted by Klenina under the Горшки Тип 25, pots with a rim d. 120 mm (KLENINA 2006, 114). These pots are common in Novae (as well as in the rest of Moesia Prima and Secunda) from the end of the 3rd to the first half of the 5th c. AD (KLENINA 2006, 114).

53 is a rim of specific shape – a pronounced rib encircling the inner part of the lip, perhaps a convenient feature for accommodating the lid. The rim's inner d. is 160 mm, the body sherd is thicker (9 mm) than the majority of the other fragments. A similar sherd might be found in Sadovets (KUZMANOV 1992, 214–215, Taf. 97:13), dated from the 4th to 6th c. AD.

54–55 are two rims with the same inner diameter of 140 mm. They belong to the most common cooking pots of the Late Antiquity, dated from the 4th to the 6th c. AD – see finds from Sadovets (KUZMANOV 1992, 213; Taf. 73–79; Töpfe Typ 1), Gradishteto near Dichin (KUZMANOV 2009, 169; таб. 18:162–178; таб. 19:177, Тип V), Novae (KLENINA 2006, 113–114, Тип 22), or the Sliven area (BORISOV 1988, 99–100; рис. 5, Тип 10). A direct comparison can also be found in Dodoparon – c.f. **Dodoparon Fig. 2:17** with **CW Fig. 4:52**; and **Dodoparon Fig. 3:19–23** with **CW Fig. 4:53**.

56–63 are eight pots with a cylindrical neck, either slightly inclined inwards (**56** and **57**), outwards (**61–63**), or straight (**58–60**). The rim shape varies between triangular and rounded. The inner diameter ranges from 100 to 150 mm, with one wider rimmed sherd of 170 mm (**59**). The preserved fragments are not grooved or in any other way decorated; no handles, or handle attachments, were found.

These forms seem to be uncommon in the pottery deposits known from Bulgaria, where very little comparable material might be found. Close in shape (especially to **61–63**), are finds published from Oescus, dated to the early Roman contexts of the 1st c. AD (КАВАКЧИЕВА 2000, таб. XVIII:74–75). The two fragments from Oescus are however painted (Рисувана керамика).

Vessel forms of such a shape, indeed, seem to have early roots, reaching back to the Late Hellenistic period, where more comparable material might be found. Good examples are the late 1st c. BC pots from the Athenian Agora

(ROBINSON 1959, pl. 3:F83–85), with a cylindrical rim and rounded body, likely modelled on the Late Hellenistic stew pots (c.f. EDWARDS 1975, 122; pl. 27; HAYES 1991, 78; 28:W11.61; 29; SANTROT 1995, 224; figs. 58–59). The rare examples from the Roman period contexts in the Balkans come from Stobi (ANDERSON-STOJANOVIĆ 1992, 134–135 + plates below), dated to the early Roman period (the 1st c.–mid-2nd c. AD) c.f. ANDERSON-STOJANOVIĆ 1992, pl. 134:1156–1157 with **CW Fig. 5:61–63**; and to the middle Roman period (mid-2nd–3rd c. AD), c.f. ANDERSON-STOJANOVIĆ 1992, pl. 137:1183 and pl. 138:1192 with **CW Fig. 5:56–57 and 61**). Having only scarce data, we may still assume, the shapes of pots with a cylindrical neck and rounded body were modelled on the Hellenistic stew pots, likely meant for the same use. Based on the few comparisons, their chronology might span from the 1st till the 3rd c. AD. The original forms have one handle attached directly on the rim, one more can be fully attached on the upper body (see ROBINSON 1959, pl. 3:F83–85).

2.4.5.4. LIDS

CW Fig. 7:71–86; 8:87–94

CW Pl. 1:74

A variety of 44 wheel-made coarse ware lids was found at the site, with 24 fragments presented here (21 rims and 3 handles). The rim inner diameter varies from 160 to 350 mm, with the highest number of lids in the range of 200–250 mm (16 rims out of 21). Ten lid fragments are of the Common, five of the Coarser and nine of the Finer fabric. As was discussed above, the Finer coarse ware fabric is connected solely with the lids, likely made on purpose, as they were not directly exposed to fire, and they did not need to have the same thermal resistance ability as the pots – which were therefore coarser.

The rims are simple, either straight, rounded, or thickened at the end – both from above and below; some might have a slightly hooked rim (e.g. **88**). Despite a high fragmentation we may notice that some were more arched (e.g. **89**) than the others. Such a feature might be connected to the different types of vessels these lids were covering, and/or to different ways of food preparation (OPIIT 2004a, 57). The majority of the lids are burned on the rim from the inside and/or from the outside, while the rest of the body keeps its original colour (commonly a reddish yellow or yellowish red).

The upper handles might have a variety of diameters, on the four examples we have preserved (three shown here, **92–94**), it is ranging from 36 to 66 mm. One of them (**94**) has a secondarily drilled hole in the middle of the handle (d. 16 mm). This is not an isolated case in the Roman world, and it has been suggested, the holes were made intentionally to release steam during cooking (NUȚU – STANC 2017, 618). Indeed, this lid handle is larger than the rest, with a thicker sherd, made to cover a big size pot or casserole.

The Late Antiquity lids (5th–6th c. AD) are often wider, flattened / forked, at the end (c.f. BÖTTGER 1982, Taf. 49:217–514; BORISOV 1988, рис. 15; KUZMANOV 1992, Taf. 108–109; KUZMANOV 2009, таб. XX:198–200, XXI:201–204; KUZMANOV – GRUDEV 2013, таб. XVII etc.), while earlier (Roman period) lids also include simpler forms like ours, dated to the contexts of the 2nd–4th c. AD (c.f. SULTOV 1985, 86; XLIV:2–3; КАБАКЧИЕВА 1986, таб. 43:500, 503; BORISOV 2013, таб.10; KLENINA 2006, 119; Тип 2, etc.). Consequently, we may incline to date them accordingly. The lid handles seem to keep the same shapes during all the Roman – Late Antique periods, consequently, they are not chronologically sensitive.

2.4.5.5. BASES

CW Fig. 8:95–99

Only two vessels from the Yurta-Stroyno assemblage have preserved bases, one casserole (**1**) and one frying pan (**10**). We may expect the latter one always had a flat base, suitable for its purpose, while casseroles had flat or rounded bases, which could be slightly concave in the middle. Statistically, from the 46 coarse ware bases found in the Rooms A, B and C, the majority (41 pcs.), are flat, with opening walls (c.f. **95** of a pot; **98** of a frying pan); much fewer (3 pcs.) are flat splaying, with opening walls (**96** + **70** of the golden fabric), and 2 pcs. have a ring foot. Occasionally, in the rest of the assemblage, rare shapes might also appear, such as the flat base with straight walls (**97**), or with a moulded base (**99**).

The outer diameter of the 46 bases from the Rooms A, B and C, ranges from 60 to 170 mm, with 70 and 80 mm being the most common size (22 sherds out of 46). None of the bases had a red slip inside (as we might expect e.g. for the frying pans).

Other finds of the Common coarse ware

CW Fig. 8:100 is a wheel-made fenestrated stand (*pyraunos*). It is the only preserved fragment of such a vessel, which had very big dimensions, as the body sherd is only slightly curving. The ‘window’ was cut from the outside inwards, leaving extra clay inside, the opening has the shape of a rectangle, with rounded edges. Similar stand was found in Kabile, dated to the Roman period (DIMITROVA 1982, таб. IX:a).

2.4.6. GOLDEN MICA WARE

CW Fig. 6:64–70 (mix of shapes)

CW Pl. 1:65

CW Fig. 6 offers an assemblage of different forms of pots, a frying pan, bowls, a base and a lid, for which the common feature is, however, the amount of golden mica in the fabric. The first three shapes in **CW Fig. 6** are each unique (**64–66**), consisting of large vessels with a thick body sherd, massive rim and wide diameter (170, 200 and 280 mm). None of them have a parallel, even among the non-micaceous fabrics. From these three pots, **65 (CW Pl. 1:65)** has an abundant amount of the mica in the fabric, while the other two sherds – in comparison – have a lower amount.

64 is a large pot with one preserved handle with a section of 34×17 mm, and inner rim d. 170 mm. Pots with a similarly flaring rim might be found in the Roman *vicus* near Gorsko Ablanovo (RUSEV – RUSEV – VRBANOV 2015, 690; Гърнета Тип III; таб. XVIII:185), dated to the 2nd–4th c. AD and in the pottery workshop near Karanovo, Nova Zagora Region, dated from the mid-3rd to 4th c. AD (BORISOV 2013, таб. IV:10).

65 (CW Pl. 1:65) is an open deep bowl (?) without handles, of inner rim d. 200 mm. No exact parallels have been found.

66 is a wide open ledge rim bowl with inner d. 280 mm. Bowls of such a shape with a flat base and rim d. up to 320 mm were found in Nicopolis ad Istrum (FALKNER 1999, 70; 9.11:167–176), produced from the local clay (*Grey coarse ware 1*), which

includes a little mica. The contexts of these bowls in Nicopolis cover the period from the mid-3rd to the 6th c. AD.

The other shapes in this group (**67–70**) are comparable with ones of the Common coarse ware fabric. Sherd **67** (c.f. **CW Fig. 1:1–9** *Pots with carinated body / Casseroles*) has a thin sherd, inner rim d. 185 mm and a handle section of 19×10 mm. The form is however closed, in contrast to the other casseroles from the site. Regarding this feature, it resembles the Aegean cooking wares recognized by Hayes in Knossos and dated to the 1st/2nd–3rd c. AD (HAYES 1983, 105; 7, Type 2), but executed in a rather squat version. Parallels might be further found at the Athenian Agora dated from the 1st to early 2nd c. AD (ROBINSON 1959, G 195) and Nicopolis ad Istrum, dated from AD 140 to 300 (FALKNER 1999, 70; 9.11:188/182 and 9.10:162). Accordingly, we may assume the chronology to span from 1st/2nd–3rd c. AD.

68 belongs to the series of flat frying pans (c.f. **CW Figs. 1/2:10–13**). It has an inner rim d. 190 mm and outer base d. 170 mm. Morphological parallels might be found in Nicopolis ad Istrum dated to the 2nd–4th c AD (FALKNER 1999, 70; 9.11:177 – of the same diameter), however, there is no (note of) golden mica in the fabric and further, in Amphipolis, dated from the 1st to 4th c. AD (MALAMIDOU 2005, 94:1427) and Villa Armira, dated from the 2nd till the 4th c. AD (KABAKCHIEVA 1986, 28; таб. 41:464); both of these have no information about the inclusions in the fabric. It can also be related to some of the pans found in Villa Dionysus on Crete, dated to the 2nd and 3rd c. AD (HAYES 1983, 127, 9:104–109), however, from these, none have golden mica in the fabric. Similar pans were also produced in Hotnica and Pavlikeni (SULTOV 1985, 84; XLII/4 Dishes Type 3) and Butovo (SULTOV 1976, pl: the cult vessel) during the 2nd and 3rd c. AD. Consequently, we may expect the form to be most popular from the 2nd to 3rd c. AD, but produced over a slightly longer span (possibly as early as the 1st c. AD, until the 4th c. AD).

69–70 besides the rims / upper bodies, a few sherds of lids and bases with a smaller amount of golden mica in the fabric might be found in the overall material from the site. The amount is low (individual pieces) and the fragments are not variable. We have included here the best representatives for both – one lid (**69**) with a badly

preserved rim with d. over 250 mm; and one flat splaying base (70), with outer d. 70 mm. The base might belong to a smaller size pot, perhaps like 67, although for this particular one it seems to be too small. By itself, it is undatable. The lid shape looks like the others of the Common coarse ware (c.f. below) dated, approximately, from the 2nd till the 4th c. AD, its bigger size diameter might be caused by its bad state of preservation. Together with the two rims (67–68), the base and the lid resemble shapes of the Common coarse ware – while the first rims (64–66), have unique shapes in the whole assemblage.

2.4.7. (THRACIAN) THIN-WALLED WARE

CW Fig. 9:101–106

CW Pl. 1:101

The so-called Thracian thin-walled ware, mainly represented by cups, might be found in literature under many different classes of wares: Marabini Moevs (1973) places them as kitchen ware, Malamidou (2005) as coarse ware, Adamsheck (1979) as fine ware, and Băjenaru (2013) as thin-walled ware. These classifications are, more or less, correct, as these cups create a fusion between several different wares being thin-walled, slightly coarse, covered with a fine glazed surface. While dividing the pottery at the site, I have intuitively placed them under the coarse ware, consequently, also here I follow this division, although they could be classed elsewhere.

2.4.7.1. CUPS

101–104 (CW Pl. 1:101)

are small, thin-walled (2–3 mm) cups characteristic for their hard red fabric (2.5YR 5/8, 4/6, 4/8) with 20 % of sandy inclusions up to 0.5 mm and a few flakes of silver mica; the surface is of a grey (2.5YR 5/1), to purplish-brown colour (from weak red 10R 4/2 to shiny black 10YR 2/1), sometimes with a vitreous glaze outer surface, one handle (11×8 mm) and a common, but not always present, horizontal plastic band on the transitional part from the rim to the body (as on 103). The inner rim diameter, regarding our samples, varies from d. 60 to 65 mm, the base is 50 mm on the outside.

The cups might be decorated with a dark band on the lower part of the body and a base. The later pieces (3rd c. AD) are commonly decorated with white spiral / floral motifs, dots, or large written letters / messages (ADAMSHECK 1979; MALAMIDOU 2005, 57; HEATH – TEKKÖK eds. 2006–2009). The grey outer coating might be missing above the base – see, e.g. the cup exhibited at the Histria Archaeological Museum (dated to 2nd–3rd c. AD). Our samples, however, do not feature any painting / marks on the surface.

These cups follow on from the Italian tradition of thin-walled ware, formally known as ‘Italian mugs’, or ‘*boccalini a collarino*’. The production place for the eastern market was found at Ainos, on the Maritza River estuary in the Aegean Thrace, active from the mid-1st c. AD until the 3rd c. AD, with the highest production period until the end of the 2nd c. AD (MARABINI MOEVS 1973, 237–238; MALAMIDOU 2005, 57; HEATH – TEKKÖK eds. 2006–2009). Many finding places are known from the Aegean and eastern Mediterranean, e.g. Ilion (HEATH – TEKKÖK eds. 2006–2009), Paphos on Cyprus (Hayes 1977b, 6/4), Amphipolis, Abdera, Thasos (MALAMIDOU 2005, 57), Corinth (ADAMSHECK 1979, pl. 22/LRB11a) or Benghazi in Libya (KENRICK 1985, 310; B452).

The Yurta-Stroyno finds include three fragments (**101–103**) of the Marabini Moevs LXVIII form (1973, no. 431, pls. 46 and 85), dated from the mid-1st to the late 2nd c AD; and two undiagnostic sherds, one cup base (**105**) (c.f. MALAMIDOU 2005, 80), and one rim (**104**). The surface treatment of all the sherds is slightly different: vitreous (**101**), matt grey (**102**) and purple (**103**).

2.4.7.2. JUG(S)

106 is a one-handled trefoil-mouthed jug, which does not, morphologically speaking, belong to the group of (Thracian) thin-walled cups. However, the fabric is exactly the same – thin, red in section with a vitreous grey surface, although somehow finer, with only 10% of inclusions. Since the fabric is very specific, we may suppose these jars were made in the same production centre using the same technique as the cups (high temperature firing is necessary for the vitrification). The origin of the cups and jugs in one place was already proposed by Băjenaru (2013, 57). Having found both vessels altogether in Tomis (Constanța) he proposes they were used together as a set of drinking vessels.

2.4.8. COARSE WARE – CONCLUSION

The coarse ware material from the site of Yurta-Stroyno is mostly represented by cooking pots of a closed form (**14–64, 67**), much less by open form casseroles (**1–9, 67**), and frying pans (**10–13, 68**). Many forms are of the Late Hellenistic tradition, such as the casseroles, frying pans and pots with a rounded body and cylindrical neck – the stewing pots (**56–63**). Pre-Roman predecessors might also be expected for the pots with an s-shaped rim (**42–45**).

The coarse ware material from Yurta-Stroyno is represented by two types of fabric, the Common coarse ware and the Golden mica ware with the following characteristics: **I) Common coarse ware** is the main fabric of the site (97 % of all the material), which can be present in two variants, finer and coarser. The former one is connected solely with the lids, while the latter relates to vessels, although without creating any pronounced morphological clusters. Differences in the coarseness of the clay could be caused by the provenance in different production centres, but also by a different batch of clay used within one centre, or just by the state of preservation (pots with a more eroded surface appear coarser). **II) Golden mica ware** is much less represented (3 % of all the material) and includes a variable set of finds, featuring two groups of vessels. The first group consists of three unique forms without any parallels among the Common coarse ware (**64–66**); while the second group, of two rims, one lid and a base, has parallels among the Common coarse ware (**67–70**). Fabric with golden mica was noted by Hayes on some frying pans he processed in Knossos, and for which he expected an Aegean provenance (HAYES 1983, 107). However, none of the forms he mentions resembles ours, executed in the Golden mica ware.

Hayes (1983, 1991) identified several forms of frying pans and casseroles (without golden mica) as the production of a few major, yet unidentified, Aegean centres active during the 1st/2nd–3rd c. AD. Regarding our material, according to the shape, we may consider **13** and **68** to be his Frying pans Type 2 and **67** to be his Casserole Type 2 (HAYES 1983, figs. 7, 9). These could also be products of local workshops inspired by the Aegean forms, as **67** and **68** do have golden mica in the fabric, although **13** does not – as it should be for a comparison with the Frying pans Hayes Type 2. The inner surface of the frying pans is missing the non-stick red cover, common for this type of vessels, which could have been badly executed and did not survive until now...or simply it was not present there at all.

It is quite difficult to establish the chronology of the coarse ware material, without well stratified contexts. From the 66 fragments, which could be dated based on their parallels, not counting the lids and the fragments of a long lifespan, 48 pcs. (73 %) could be attributed to the material of the 1st–4th c. AD (42 cooking vessels and 6 Thracian thin-walled wares) and 18 pcs. (27 %) to the Late Antiquity (**CW Tab. 2**). From the latter, I would also leave open the possibility for other sherds, such as for the wide group of shapes under **20–27** and **28–37**, in Bulgaria commonly dated from the 4th to 6th/7th c. AD, to have earlier predecessors, as we may find their parallels along the middle stream of the Danube River, where they are dated to the 2nd–4th c. AD (BRUKNER 1981; NIKOLIĆ-ĐORĐEVIĆ 2000). A hint to their longer existence also in our area is the few closed contexts of the late 4th c. AD found in Dobruzha and Bulgaria containing the same shapes (BAUMANN 1996; NAJDENOVA 1985).

2.5. Handmade pottery

2.5.1. HISTORY OF RESEARCH

The handmade pottery is a very characteristic class of ceramics of pre-Roman, but also Roman, Thrace. The Roman period finds of the handmade pottery in Bulgaria are mostly only briefly mentioned within archaeological reports and studies, some are not even included within the figures/plates (i.e. the drawings × photos are missing). Because of its lower amount and small variety of forms compared to other pottery classes, the main division of the handmade pottery is in general limited to the description of the main vessel forms (mostly pots, but also bowls, cups or jugs), or, simple typologies, based on a limited amount of material from a single site (e.g. КАВАКЧИЕВА 1986).

The first comprehensive study on the handmade pottery from Bulgaria, covering the period from the 1st till the 6th c. AD, was published in 2013 by Alexandrova as her PhD thesis *Типология и хронология на керамиката изработена на ръка от римския и ранновизантийския период (I–VI в.) на територията на България* [Typology and chronology of pottery made in hand from the Roman and early Byzantine period (I–VI c. AD) from the Bulgarian territory], putting together, as she states in the text, all the handmade pottery finds – within the given period – from Bulgaria. This work follows up the dissertation thesis of Handzhijaska (2006a), defended (but not published) in 2006, processing the pre-Roman material from south-eastern Bulgaria *Традиции и тенденции в производството на керамика на ръка в днешната югоизточна България през VI – I в. пр. Хр.* [Traditions and tendencies in the production of handmade pottery in present day south-eastern Bulgaria in the 6th–1st c. BC], which gave morphological bases to the Roman period pottery forms.

Alexandrova's study gives an overview of pottery shapes which were found in Bulgaria from the 1st until the 6th/7th c. AD. However, any division based on fabric characteristics is completely missing, as well as a specification (or at least division from the other finds) of the Late Roman period handmade ceramics (5th–6th / 7th c. AD), which she claims is different. Anyway, the thesis represents a comprehensive study putting together literature regarding the handmade pottery finds from Bulgaria since the beginning of the 20th c. AD, and offers its classification based on the main vessel types and their shapes. Even though the relevant references to our material were used in the following text (c.f.

Introduction to the material), see her chapter *Historiographical review* (p. 10–34) for a more detailed list of publications mentioning handmade ceramics finds from Bulgaria, and for the context of individual sites and studies.

2.5.2. INTRODUCTION TO THE MATERIAL

The handmade pottery of the Roman period in Thrace follows on from a local tradition of pottery making, already starting in the Late Iron Age.⁴¹ During this period, the main shapes of the vessels, together with the decoration, are formed, keeping their simple appearance for almost one millennium (from the 6th c. BC to ca. the 4th c. AD). The favourite form, both for the LIA and Roman period, being a pot with straight or slightly curved walls and an extra applied relief band with imprinted fingers/incised lines, accompanied with horizontal handles applied directly on the upper body.

During the Roman period, the handmade pottery might be found in the settlement contexts as well as in necropolises, typically, represented by a smaller amount of finds than the wheel made pottery, or by single pieces only. A specific group of finds is also represented by wheel made pots in the handmade forms produced in Hotnica during the 2nd–4th c. AD (SULTOV 1985, 88–89; XLV:2–3).

Regarding the settlements, the handmade pottery might be found in Oescus, dated to the 1st AD (KABAKCHIEVA 2000, таб. XXI:93–95, XXII–XXIII); Novae, from the 1st c. AD (GENCHEVA 2002, таб. XXXIX–XLI); Villa Armira in Ivaylovgrad, from the 2nd to 4th c. AD (KABAKCHIEVA 1986, 1986, таб. 45–46); or Poletto near Simitli (Straldzha Vallley), from the 2nd to 3rd c. AD (KULOV 2007, обр. 11), etc. Finds from burial mounds and pits come from Velichkovo near Pazardzhik, dated from the 2nd to 4th c. AD (GIZDOVA 2005, табл. 5:3); Sredina near Dobrich, from the 2nd and 3rd c. AD (TORBATOV 1992, табл. 6); Charda near Straldzha in Yambol District, from the 2nd to 4th c. AD (ALEXANDROVA 2016, 102–105); Pet Mogili near Stara Zagora, dated from the 1st till the 4th c. AD (IGNATOV 1996a, XIX:6), burial pits at Gledachevo, from the 1st till the 4th c. AD (ALEXANDROVA 2013, 57–58), or from Drashan village near Vraca, dated from the 2nd to the mid-4th c. AD (MASHOV 1975, обр. 7), etc.

⁴¹ For the LIA forms see, e.g., finds from Seuthopolis (e.g. CHICHIKOVA 1977; 1984); Kabile (e.g. HANDZHUSKA 2006b); or Pistiros (e.g. BOUZEK – MUSIL 2002).

The point of the above-mentioned list is to show that the handmade pottery is a quite common find in contexts (both settlement and burial) dated from the 1st till the 4th c. AD. On the other hand, very few, if any, finds come from the Late Antique sites / contexts, as the following publications, otherwise heavily referenced elsewhere in this thesis, do not include any handmade sherds, c.f. finds from Iatrus (BÖTTGER 1982, but see below VON CONRAD 2007); Sliven District (BORISOV 1988); Sadovets (KUZMANOV 1992); Castra Martis (KUZMANOV 2005); Raciaria (KUZMANOV – GRUDEV 2013); Dichin (KUZMANOV 2009); or Halmyris (TOPOLEANU 2000).

Several fragments dated to the first half of the 5th c. AD might however be found, such as in Nicopolis ad Nestum (KUZMANOV 1993, oбp. 10:г), Iatrus (VON CONRAD 2007)⁴², Transmarisca (VAGALINSKI 2002, 200:B) and Deultum (ALEXANDROVA 2013, 744, 747–748, 754, 756). In Nicopolis ad Istrum (FALKNER 1999, 65; 9.1), the handmade pottery was found across the contexts dated from the early Roman to Late Antique period (2nd c. AD–AD 600), Falkner himself however wonders, if the younger material could be residual. Otherwise, the handmade pottery finds, from the well dated Late Antique sites / contexts, are extremely rare. Alexandrova made available, for the first time, several finds from Deultum, dated from the 5th to 6th c. AD (ALEXANDROVA 2013, I-2/27–28; III/89; IV:101; 745–746; 749–753, 755, II/1107–1109, II/1147). Similarly dated handmade pottery was also published from Scythia by Opaïț (2004, 52–53; pl. 40), who associates these finds with a new migratory population coming from the north during the 5th–7th c. AD. Similarly, Alexandrova (2013, 75) argues that the Late Antique finds from Deultum could be connected with a different population, as she does not see a similarity between the Late Antique vessels and the ones of a Thracian tradition.⁴³

It seems, there is a breaking point in the handmade pottery production at the end of the 4th c. AD, or at the beginning / first half of the 5th c. AD, when the traditional shapes of the Thracian vessel forms decline. In any case, finds of the

⁴² von Conrad (2007, 1; 1252 and 1253) also published several handmade sherds from contexts marked as D1 and D2 which are dated to the 6th c. AD. However, as he notes, these contexts are heavily disturbed. Consequently, as in the case of Nicopolis ad Istrum, I prefer not to include them into the Late Antiquity finds, as they might have been residual.

⁴³ Alexandrova, however, does not write exactly where she sees the differences between the products of the Thracian tradition and the Late Antique finds, which she considers as products of a different people; she only states, there is a similarity with pottery produced by the German tribes.

handmade pottery of the Late Antique period are very scarce, no matter if they belong to the new people, or, they are still a continuation of the Thracian tradition.

Since all the shapes found in Yurta-Stroyno have parallels in the published material dated from the 1st till the 4th c. AD, we may expect our finds to be dated accordingly. The only exception might be some of the decorative patterns, for which I did not find parallels in the Roman period material, such as the rim with two perforated holes below the lip (6), and the vertically applied strip of clay on the transition of the neck to the body part (26). These might just be lacking published parallels, although, with a higher probability than for the others we may also assume, they could be of either pre-Roman⁴⁴, or, alternatively, of Late Antique origin.

2.5.3. MATERIAL CHARACTERISTICS

In the excavated material, the handmade pottery is represented by 312 pcs. of a little over 5 kg, which make them, after the Grey ware, the second least represented pottery class (**Introduction Tab. 1**). In the field survey material, the handmade pottery was found in higher proportions, being the third most represented pottery class after the Table ware and Coarse ware, with 1,462 pcs. of a little over 15 kgs (**Introduction Tab. 2**), leaving out Grey ware, and transport amphorae.

The most frequent pieces are body fragments (238 pcs.), with much fewer rims (49 pcs.), individual handles or bodies with handles (13 pcs.), bases (4 pcs.), lids (2 pcs.) and several decorated body fragments (6 pcs.) (**HM Tab. 1**).

⁴⁴ A hoard of 195 silver coins with *terminus ante quem* in 81/80 BC was found in 1961 about 1.5 km south-west of Yurta, at the site known as Sveti Ilija (PAUNOV 2013, 727). Additionally, some of the transport amphorae found at the site are of the Late Hellenistic tradition. More such finds point to the possibility the settlement, or another one in its immediate hinterland, had already been established before the foundation of the Roman *vicus*.

Stroyno Pottery 2014–2016			EXCAVATION – HANDMADE							
Context										
SU	Trench	Sector	Body	Rims	Bases	Handles	Lids	Decor	Total (pcs.)	Weight (g.)
SU001	ROOMS	A, B, C	35	33	0	3	1	2	74	1695
Levelling I	100E-105N	NE	53	10	3	5	1	3	75	1327
Levelling II	100E-110N	SE	123	6	1	5	0	0	135	1532
SU008	100E-100N	SW	4	0	0	0	0	0	4	61
SU021	095E-100N	SE	16	0	0	0	0	1	17	398
SU057	100E-105N	SE	7	0	0	0	0	0	7	152
Total amount:			238	49	4	13	2	6	312	5165

HM Tab. 1: Amount overview of the handmade pottery fragments retrieved from the six main contexts.

The most repetitive decoration are the relief bands with finger/sharp tool imprints (7, 10, 13 and 33). Other motifs are mostly represented by single sherds, such as the incised: lines (31), ‘leaves’ (3) and waves (4); extra applied strip of clay (26); or perforated holes (6)⁴⁵. The base fragments (4 pcs.) are with a straight bottom and flaring walls; the handles are either strip – oval in section (8–9, 11–12 and 30, in total 10 pcs.); or horizontally applied directly on the body in a shape of a simple knob (1 pc.) or hearth-shaped knob (14; 2 pcs. in total). In the excavated material, from a different area (SU 059), a small piece of a handmade strainer was also found.

The six core contexts were enriched by finds from the field survey and selective finds from other layers to add less fragmented pieces and more of the decorated fragments for a better illustration of the overall material and its variability. All of the vessels found in Yurta-Stroyno are pots of two main forms of different sizes, although other forms are known from the Roman period – Alexandrova notes bowls, cups and jugs, however, she also confirms three quarters of all of the material she processed from Bulgaria were pots (ALEXANDROVA 2013, 62–71), which are conclusively the most represented forms of handmade vessels of the Roman period.

2.5.4. FABRIC CHARACTERISTICS

The handmade pottery regards coarse ware of thicker walls (0.6–0.12 mm). Commonly, the fabric is fairly to poorly sorted, the fractions hackly-laminated and

⁴⁵ As already noted above, this decoration is not consistent with finds of the Roman period and it might relate to pre-Roman or to Late Antique data.

the sherds are hard, but brittle. The pots were fired at a lower temperature, probably in a pit or in simple kilns with little air regulation causing uneven firing. Consequently, the fabric colour ranges from red – brown – grey to black tints, which mutually intertwine. A common feature is the sandwich like fracture with a lighter-coloured core and darker margins and surface.

The fabric of the handmade pottery can be sorted, based on the predominant inclusions, into two main groups – one with a high amount of dark shiny particles and one with quartz-based particles. These fabrics might be further divided by amount and size of overall inclusions into coarser and finer sub-groups. In proportions, from 49 rims, the fabric of 28 sherds (57 %) are quartz based; 20 sherds (41 %) have a higher amount of the dark shiny particles, and one fragment (**26**; 2 %) seems to have the same proportions of both the main inclusions. In **HM Tab. 2** the mentioned fragments of each fabric are to be found, with a marked percentage estimation of the two main inclusions represented in the fabric (based on in hand specimen observation).

2.5.4.1. QUARTZ BASED FABRIC

HM Pl. 1:5

This fabric is dominated by quartz inclusions. The sorting ranges from very poor to fair, with the common size of quartz 1–2 mm, occasionally reaching up to 5 mm. The fabric further includes a few shiny-silver particles (silver mica?) and a rare amount of round red-brown pellets. The overall impression of the fabric is ‘sandy’. We may also find single pieces of the dark shiny particles, characteristic for the second fabric, either noticeable after a short observation of the sherd (expressed by 20 % in the **HM Tab. 2**), really searched for (by 10 %), or not found at all (in the cases of **3** and **8**); in any case, they are not easily visible at first sight.

The majority of the sherds are poorly sorted with over 30 % of inclusions, however, several of them have a finer fabric with a lower amount of fairly sorted admixtures (**3**, **13**), also including two lids (**15** and **16**). The assemblage is too small for any meaningful conclusions, but we should mention here, that the same phenomenon of lids made of a finer fabric was previously noted regarding the coarse ware lids (**CW Figs. 7–8**). The surface seems to be smoothed, but no marks of instruments are visible. The fabric and the surface colour vary depending on the

firing; one vessel might have different colour combinations and tints. The repetitive fabric colours are light red (2.5YR 6/8), red (2.5YR 5/6) and brown (7.5YR 5/3).

As an exception, or variation, to this fabric, is **13** and **14**, with quartz-based inclusions and a rare amount of shiny dark particles, which are, however, enringed by a smaller amount of golden mica flakes, visible especially on the surface. Some amount of silver mica is common for the other sherds as well, but the golden colour of the admixtures is unique for these sherds only.

2.5.4.2. FABRIC WITH DARK SHINY PARTICLES

HM Pl. 1:23, 29

This fabric is commonly poorly sorted, with a predominant amount of shiny dark/black green inclusions of various sizes, generally 1–4 mm big, with exceptional ones reaching up to 7 mm. The inclusions have the shape of angular crystals with sharp sides, which could suggest they were added intentionally to the paste as a temper. The dark shiny particles are accompanied by a small number of white pellets, mostly quartz. The proportions of the inclusions for each sherd are expressed by percentage in **HM Tab. 2** – in the same manner as for the previous fabric. The amount and size of the inclusions varies, and as in the case of the quartz-based fabric, a finer version with better sorted fabric also appears (**18, 26, 27** and **33**).

Some of the fragments bear the traces of a flat tool, leaving marks on the surface (applied either on one side or on both sides of the sherd). These marks run in all possible ways over the surface, although an attempt at their horizontal placement might be noticed (e.g. **31**).

The colour of the fabric and surface – as in the previous case – is the result of the firing method. Some of the repetitive colours are as follows: red (2.5YR 4/6 and 4/8), dark red (2.5YR 3/6) and yellowish red (5YR 4/6).

2.5.4.3. MIXED FABRIC

HM Pl. 1:26

Fragment **26** is the only sherd where we can see a similar amount of quartz and shiny dark inclusions, as in the other cases, one type of these inclusions always prevails. The sherd is however, heavily worn – especially on the inner surface –, allowing us the possibility to see the body mass stripped of the upper layer of clay.

Thanks to this possibility, we may evaluate – in hand specimen – the percentage and character of inclusions over a wider area. It only leaves us to wonder what the other sherds would look like having the same opportunity of fabric observation over a larger area and not in a small section of a sherd's fraction.

2.5.5. VESSELS OF THE QUARTZ BASED FABRIC

HM Fig. 1:1–10; 2:11–16

HM Pl. 1:5, 14

This fabric includes 14 pots and two lids. Regarding the pots, two main forms might be distinguished:

A) (1–12) Pots of a closed form and rounded body (c.f. **8**), with an offset rim either inclined inwards (**1–4, 6–7**), straight (**5**), or slightly bent outwards in an s-shape (**8–10**). From the measurable rims, the inner diameter ranges from 130 to 180 mm. Several other rims, however, have a barely measurable diameter, which could only be estimated (**1** and **3**); **7** is too small even for an estimation and it is presented here only for the decoration. For the two bodies with a handle (**11–12**), the inner body diameter could only be approximated (120 and 140 mm); the handle section regarding the four samples (**8, 9, 11–12**) ranges from 12–15×30–33 mm. Fragment **6** has a unique perforated decoration with no parallels among the Roman period material. Otherwise, some rims have a small plastic ridge on the outer surface (**1, 4** and **5**), others have a lip shallowly grooved from the upper part (**2–3**). The decoration includes different patterns, such as engraved 'leaves' (**3**), lines (**4**) and a plastic band (**7** and **10**).

B) The other shape of the pots is represented by only two fragments (**13–14**) of a rounded lower part of the body, straight, pulled up, walls, a gentle inward inclination of the upper body and a simple rim with inner diameters of 170 and 200 mm. One horizontal handle (of **14**) with an impressed finger in the middle, 50×16 mm in section, was preserved.

The two lids are of a finer fabric: **15** has an uneven rim, not permitting a proper measurement of its diameter, however it seems to be smaller, ca. of 90 mm or

slightly bigger than that; **16** is, on the other hand, of bigger dimensions with a rim d. 290 mm.

2.5.6. VESSELS OF THE FABRIC WITH DARK SHINY PARTICLES

HM Fig. 3:17–25; 4:27–33

HM Pl. 1:23, 29

The fabric with predominant dark/black shiny particles is represented here by 14 pots and three decorated pieces. All the pots reflect the shapes of the Quartz fabric **A**), i.e. closed pots with an offset rim inclined either inwards (**17–21**), straight (**22–24**), or bent outwards – slightly (**25–26**), or more profoundly (**27–29**). The rim diameters cover quite a wide scale, ranging from 90 to 200 mm, with two pots of even bigger dimensions – **20**, whose d. starts at 280 mm, and **21** with 310 mm or more. Fragment **19** has an uneven rim, with a possible range of diameter from 160 to 250 mm inside, it is drawn with the smallest possible measurement.

The pots are not significantly different than the ones of the Quartz based fabric shape **A**), as the vessels' shape, and the decorative features, correspond. Thus, the small plastic rim on the outer surface (**18, 19** and **21**), the shallow groove from the upper part of a lip (**23**), the pot with an ovoid handle 32×10 mm (**30**), as well as the wavy decoration (**32**) and applied band of clay with incised lines (**33**) might be found here as well.

On the other hand, the decoration of **26** (vertically applied strip of clay) and **31** (short vertical scratches made by a sharp tool) are unique for this fabric.

2.5.7. HANDMADE POTTERY – CONCLUSION

The handmade pottery in Thrace has a long tradition, with vessels of similar (if not the same) shapes and decoration produced for nearly one thousand years, starting in the 6th c. BC, going through the Roman period at least until the end of the 4th c. / first half of the 5th c. AD. The Late Antique (second half of the 5th–6th/7th c. AD) handmade pottery exists in a much lower amount, and, it has been suggested, it seems to be connected with a different people rather than with the handmade pottery of the Thracian tradition (OPIȚ 2004a, 52–53; ALEXANDROVA 2013, 75).

Since all the vessel shapes (i.e. pots **A** and **B**) found in Yurta-Stroyno, have parallels elsewhere in the published material dated within the 1st and 4th c. AD, we

may assume it dates accordingly. Actually, rather than a connection with the Late Antiquity, we may point out the possibility of the existence of a Late Hellenistic Thracian settlement nearby in the area, as the hoard of 195 silver coins with *terminus ante quem* in 81/80 BC, found about 1.5 km from the site, suggests (PAUNOV 2013, 727). The transport amphorae of the Hellenistic tradition found at the site of Yurta-Stroyno (see **Amphorae**) also support the idea of the existence of a pre-Roman installation, which had already established trade with the Aegean area on which the Roman foundation built on.

Without a closed context, based only on the shape and decoration, it is impossible to distinguish between the Late Iron Age and Roman handmade pottery. Since the similarity is that profound, we may assume, the pottery was produced in the same way and by the same (Thracian) population of the Roman province (at least until the turn of the 4th/5th c. AD). Not having much to add to the chronology, I have focused on the fabric division and descriptions, as there are differences, which have not yet been described, and which might be important for further studies.

Two main fabrics might be noticed, here described as I) Quartz based fabric and II) Fabric with dark shiny particles. The core of the inclusions seems to be the same for both the fabrics, however, each is dominated by one main particle, as suggested by the name, either quartz or dark shiny inclusions. The latter has an angular crystal-like shape, presumably freshly crushed and added as a temper to the quartz-based clay, which could be taken from several sources with a different amount of natural (quartz – sandy based) inclusions. Traces of a flat tool, leaving marks on the surface, were noticed only in the case of the Fabric with dark shiny particles, which might relate to an attempt to smooth the surface from the sharp edges of the tempering rock.

The two dominant types of inclusions in the fabric may also be found at other sites nearby (or, better said, at pottery scatters) detected by a field survey during the Tundzha Regional Archaeological Project taking place in the Yurta-Stroyno hinterland (up to 5 km from the site) and Dodoparon (about 30 km from the site as the crow flies) (ILIEV *et al.* eds. 2012; ROSS *et al.* eds. 2018).⁴⁶ This preliminary observation points to a more widely spread, and somehow unified,

⁴⁶ As a member of this project, taking place in the Yambol District from 2009 to 2011, I had the opportunity to go through all the pottery material found during the field survey.

practice of handmade pottery production – regarding the clay sources and perhaps also the temper.

Evaluating the handmade finds from Yurta-Stroyno, sherds of the Quartz based fabric slightly predominate (58 %). Their shape is also more variable, including two main pot forms, here marked as A) and B); while finds of the Fabric with dark shiny particles are represented only in the shape A). The less represented shape B) (of fragments **13** and **14**) is known both from the LIA⁴⁷ and the Roman period, as such pots, with a vertical band handle, were found in Villa Armira in Ivaylovgrad, dated to the 2nd–4th c. AD (KABAKCHIEVA 1986, таб. 45, 46). Consequently, this shape does not seem to be chronologically (or locally) sensitive, although a curiosity is the small amount of golden mica flakes noticeable in the fabric of these two sherds, otherwise not common among the handmade pottery.

Regarding the differences in the handmade pottery material, three sherds feature specific fabric characteristics, first **13** and **14**, both including golden mica (**HM Pl. 1:14**), and second, **26** (**HM Pl. 1:26**), which combines both the main fabrics in the same percentage. In terms of decoration, two patterns do not seem to have direct parallels in the Roman period material, first **6**, with perforated holes just below the lip, although similar shapes of thicker sherds normally appear (e.g. ALEXANDROVA 2013, figs. 81, 328, 345 etc.) and **26**, with a vertically applied clay band. Perhaps it is also interesting to point out that **13–14** as well as **26** are both different in terms of fabric and shape / decoration.

⁴⁷ c.f. finds from Kabile of the 3rd–2nd c. BC (HANDZHIJSKA 2006b, ‘catalogue’); or from Staro Selichte near Radnevo in Stara Zagora District (SAVATINOV 1997, opp. 3:6; 10:a; 17).

2.6. Transport amphorae

2.6.1. HISTORY OF RESEARCH

The first amphorae study, relevant to the area of Thrace and Moesia Inferior, was carried out in 1960 by I. B. Zeest, who established the fundamental typology of Greek, Hellenistic and Roman amphorae in the Black Sea area. Her classification is still in use today, especially for the Black Sea area, although more studies, focused closely on particular periods of the western Pontus followed up shortly after her publication. Among the most important ones belong the works of C. Scorpan (1976; 1977) and A. Rădulescu (1976), for creating the first typologies focused on the Late Antique – Early Byzantine amphorae (4th–6th/7th c. AD) found in Romanian Dobrudzha. G. Kuzmanov, in 1985, expanded the mapped area by publishing the Late Roman – Early Byzantine amphorae finds from Thrace and Dacia.

These first studies were further developed by – mostly – contemporary researchers, especially active in the area of Romanian Dobrudzha – i.e. the Late Antique *Scythia* (e.g. OPAIȚ 1996; 1997-1998; 2004; 2010; 2016; 2017; OPAIȚ – PARASCHIV 2013; OPRIȘ 2003; OPRIȘ – RAȚIU 2016; PARASCHIV 2006; 2013; TOPOLEANU 2000; etc.); and in the Lower Danube area, with the most important amphorae assemblages published from the excavation of *Iatrus* (BÖTTGER 1982; CONRAD 1999); *Novae* (DYCZEK 1991; 1997; 2001; 2007; GENCHEVA 2002; KLENINA 1998; 2016; KOVALEVSKAJA 1998); *Nicopolis ad Istrum* (FALKNER 1999); *Dichin* (SWAN 2004; 2007; 2010) and *Sadovets* (MACKENSEN 1992). The majority of the above-mentioned studies are focused on the Late Antique – early Byzantine period which is, consequently, better researched than the early years of the Roman presence in the area (1st–4th c. AD). Amphorae of the early period in the Lower Danube area (Moesia Inferior) were nevertheless summed up in 2001 by P. Dyczek; but for Thrace a similar study had to wait until recently. In 2017, D. Dobрева published a book based on her dissertation thesis, which, for the first-time, encompasses into one publication the currently known amphorae finds from the area of modern-day Bulgaria (i.e. including Moesia Inferior and Thrace as well). Her book covers the finds since the early Roman period until the Late Antiquity, giving a synoptic overview of the finding contexts and the amphorae types as well.

Two PhD theses, both defended in 2017, focused on filling in the gap of recent amphorae studies in Thrace, one by N. G. Borislavova with the title *Амфори от римската провинция Тракия (I – III в.)* [Amphorae of the Roman Province of

Thrace (I – III c. AD)], and of N. R. Rusev, *Амфори от диоцеза Тракия: IV – първа половина на VII в.* [Amphorae from the Diocese of Thrace: IV – first half of the VII c. AD]. Both works, so far, were published only as so-called ‘avtoreferat’ (i.e. a short summary in Bulgarian with no [as in the case of these two works], or very few, drawings or pictures).

The amphorae of the Black Sea origin were classed, after I. B. Zeest in 1960, by D. B. Shelov in 1986, and more recently by S. Yu. Vnukov (e.g. 2000; 2003; 2004; 2006; 2010; 2016) and D. Kassab Tezgör (e.g. 2009; 2010), which are currently the lead researchers in the area, carrying out the biggest body of the Black Sea amphorae studies.

2.6.2. INTRODUCTION TO THE MATERIAL

The transport amphorae from Yurta-Stroyno are the third most abundant pottery class regarding the excavations (after TW and CW) with 477 pieces and 14 kgs of material (**Introduction Tab. 1**), and the fourth most abundant in the field survey material with 1,036 pieces of 18 kgs (after TW, CW and HM) (**Introduction Tab. 2**). These proportions relate well to the inland settlements, where the number of amphorae is in general much lower than in the coastal areas, where the amphorae fragments usually create the most numerous finds (VNUKOV 2017, 111).

Within the six core contexts, the biggest amount of the amphorae is represented by body fragments (436 pcs.), and in a much lower amount by diagnostic sherds such as rims (22 pcs.), toes (9 pcs.), handles (9 pcs.), and one body fragment with *titulus pictus*. Some of the contexts, such as [SU021] and [SU057], did not contain any diagnostic amphorae fragments at all (**Amphorae Tab. 1**).

Stroyno Pottery 2014-2016			EXCAVATION - AMPHORAE FRAGMENTS							
Context			Body	Rims	Toes	Handles	Lids	Body with <i>Tituli picti</i>	Total (pcs.)	Weight (g.)
SU	Trench	Sector								
SU001	ROOMS	A, B, C	89	9	5	3	0	1	107	5552
Levelling I	100E-105N	NE	172	9	2	5	0	0	188	4201
Levelling II	100E-110N	SE	130	4	0	1	0	0	135	2371
SU008	100E-100N	SW	27	0	2	0	0	0	29	1200
SU021	95E-100N	SE	14	0	0	0	0	0	14	443
SU057	100E-105N	SE	4	0	0	0	0	0	4	28
Total amount:			436	22	9	9	0	1	477	13795

Amphorae Tab. 1: Amount overview of the transport amphorae fragments retrieved from the six main contexts.

In total, 27 fragments from the six core contexts are included among the published material, the rest of the 64 fragments is mainly selected from the field survey (21 pcs.), fewer from the other excavated material (16 pcs.).

The fragmentation of the material is very high, and not all diagnostic pieces could be confidently classed into the established typologies. Based on the fabric, the main areas of production of most of the sherds could be identified (Aegean / Eastern Mediterranean, Black Sea, Northern Africa), but the suggested classification of some sherds needs to be taken with caution (these ones are marked in the text).

The amphorae from Yurta-Stroyno create a very diverse assemblage, spanning over the period from the 1st till the 7th c. AD. The earliest attested pieces of the Roman period (1st–2nd/3rd c. AD) follow on from the Late Hellenistic tradition of amphorae making in the eastern Aegean, reflecting the form of Rhodian and Coan containers (36–39). The biggest body of the finds is however represented by two sets of amphorae – Dressel 24 Family (1–26; 26 pcs. drawn / 30 identified) and Kapitän II (27–35; 9 pcs. drawn / 13 identified), which together represent more than half of all the diagnostic amphorae fragments found at the site (43/68 from all identified × 35/60 from all drawn). This is nothing surprising, as they are both typical representatives of the high Roman period imports to the settlements in the eastern provinces. Besides these, several other eastern Mediterranean amphorae types are attested at the site during the 2nd–3rd c. AD, together with much fewer amphorae of the Black Sea and African origin. During the Late Antiquity / Early Byzantine period (4th–6th/7th c. AD), the total amount of finds visibly decreases and

the proportions of Aegean / Eastern Mediterranean, Black Sea and African imports almost equals each other. Counting all the diagnostic fragments altogether throughout the periods, the majority of the amphorae is of an Aegean / East Mediterranean origin (56 pcs.), much fewer from the Black Sea area (8 to 9 pcs.), and very few from Northern Africa (3 pcs.) (**Amphorae Tabs. 2–3**).

If possible (in the cases of amphorae Dressel 24 Family and Kapitän II, i.e. the types with more representatives), the amphorae fragments are described in groups and then individually; if it is not possible (i.e. not enough representatives), each sherd gets its own individual description directly, including its fabric characteristics, provenance and chronological classification.

2.6.3. EASTERN MEDITERRANEAN AMPHORAE (AEGEAN SEA / ASIA MINOR)

2.6.3.1. DRESSEL 24 / DRESSEL 24 *SIMILIS* / DRESSEL 24 FAMILY

Amphorae Fig. 1:1–9; 2:10–21; 3:22–26

Amphorae Pls. 1–21

The amphorae Dressel 24 are a vast group of pottery containers, whose types and subtypes might be found under different denominations which relate to their morphological characteristics. Three specific variants are most frequently identified within the type: Knossos 15, Knossos 18 and mid-Roman 18/Zeast 90 (AURIEMMA 2007, 142–144). A. Opaıt (2007) calls the amphorae and their derivatives Dressel 24 *similis*, a broad type with many sub-types which also includes the Late Hellenistic amphorae of similar form; D. Dobрева (2017, 224–237) classed all of the above mentioned types under the superordinate designation “Dressel 24 Family”, which I have adapted for this text.⁴⁸

The main characteristics of the amphorae are a funnel/cup-shaped rim, accompanied by a conical neck, an egg-shaped body, massive handles banded in the upper part and a conical toe (DYCZEK 2001, 176; OPAIT 2007, 628). The morphology and individual characteristics of the amphorae vary, so does the fabric,

⁴⁸ Further studies are needed to understand the typology of the Dressel 24 and related amphorae with a funnel/ cup-shaped mouth. There are many different types and typologies which are heterogenous and the classifications are inconsistent. Since I am aiming here to determine the approximate place of origin of the amphorae and their chronology, I do not dip into the terminology and all funnel/cup-shaped amphorae from Yurta-Stroyno are understood here as ‘Dressel 24 Family’. For the most recent study regarding the problem of the Dressel 24 amphorae classification see DOBREVA 2017.

pointing to several different workshops presumably located in the Eastern Mediterranean (DOBREVA 2017, 224).

Kiln sites of the Late Hellenistic/early Roman predecessor of the Imperial type were discovered in Erythrai, Turkey (with the production of the funnel/cup-shaped rim amphorae ca. from the mid-2nd to the mid-1st c. BC) with several different types of fabric (CARLSON – LAWALL 2005/2006, 37–38). Another kiln site was identified on the island of Chios, operating from the Hellenistic period until the turn of the 2nd/3rd c. AD (OΠΑΙΤ – TSARAVOPOULOS 2011, 317). Many other production centres are however expected, e.g. in Ephesus and the Maeander Valley (BEZECZKY 2013, 72–73). Directly in Ephesus, Bezczky recognized six different fabrics of Dressel 24 and its predecessor, two from Erythrae, two from Ephesus, and another two from an as yet unknown production centre (BEZECZKY 2013, 73).

The amphorae Dressel 24 Family were in use until the 4th c. AD, when they supposedly evolved into the Late Roman Amphorae 2 (LRA2) of a similarly profiled rim, but with a much wider and rounded body. These were in use until the 6th/7th c. AD (e.g. DYCZEK 2001, 173–199; OΠΑΙΤ 2007, 627–643).

The Dressel 24 Family amphorae were primarily distributed over western Asia Minor, to the Aegean Sea, Black Sea and along the Danube River (for the list of finding places see DYCZEK 2001, 183–184 and DOBREVA 2017, 224–237). The most frequent commodity carried in these vessels is expected to be olive oil (OΠΑΙΤ 2010, 157; BERTOLDI 2012, 155; OΠΑΙΤ – TSARAVOPOULOS 2011, etc.), although some *dipinti* on amphorae also relate to *garum* (e.g. at Novae: DYCZEK 2001, 192). Oπαίτ and Paraschiv (2013, 319) estimated the capacity of these amphorae to be 75 litres (of olive oil).

In Moesia Inferior (on the coast and in the area of the Middle/Lower Danube) and Thrace (on the coast but also inland, e.g. in Plovdiv) the Dressel 24 Family amphorae are known from the second half of the 1st c. AD. Their peak seems to be from the 3rd quarter of the 1st c. AD to the middle of the 2nd c. AD, with single finds until AD 250 (DOBREVA 2017, 224–237).

In the assemblage of Yurta-Stroyno, the amphorae of Dressel 24 Family represent the biggest group of finds. However, due to the high fragmentation of the sherds, their classification is based on the fabric characteristics and not primarily on the fragment shape. Nevertheless, in some cases, the fabric groups also reflected specific morphological characteristics (e.g. **10–12**, *amphorae with a light fabric*).

In total, 30 diagnostic fragments were recognized, from them 26 are presented here: four bases, one bigger pc. of a body, one lid, one handle and 19 rims.⁴⁹ They are divided into four groups based on the fabric: *with red clay and a grey surface* (9 pcs.), with a *micaceous fabric* (6 pcs. + 2 uncertain), with a *light fabric* (3 pcs. + 1 uncertain), and with a *normal fabric* (3 pcs.). Two fragments of toes do not share fabric similarities with the others (nor with each other), and they are presented separately at the end. The uncertain pcs., given in brackets (e.g. + 2) within some of the individual groups, relate to sherds with (seemingly) the same fabric as the group (observed in hand specimen), but with doubts about their correct morphological classification into the Dressel 24 Family.

Common characteristics for Dressel 24 Family

Area of production: different workshops in the Aegean area / western Asia

Minor

Chronology: ca. 50–250 AD

Probable content: mainly olive oil

Capacity: ca. 75 l

Dressel 24 Family with 'red clay and grey surface'

Amphorae Fig. 1:1–9

Amphorae Pls. 1–5

A variable group of amphorae fragments for which is characteristic, a red, well levigated, dense fabric with a light grey to pale brown outer surface (in some cases also inner surface) and small white inclusions. The group numbers nine diagnostic fragments in total (five rims, one lid, one base, one handle and one body fragment). Two of the rims are very fragmented and their diameter might only be estimated (1, 3). In the case of the remaining three rims, the inner diameter ranges from 100 to 110 mm. One of the handles is shown here just for illustration purposes (6), while the only amphora lid with an outer d. 100 mm (7) found within the Yurta-Stroyno assemblage, belongs here. The amphora under 9 shows a lower body, one of the biggest pottery fragments preserved at the site. On its inner surface there are linear marks visible, likely caused by a dipper extracting the content.

⁴⁹ The remaining four are two body fragments and two handles.

One rim differs the most from the others. It is fragment **5**, which has the main fabric characteristic to be classed into this group, however it seems to be overfired which results in a very hard sherd of darker colour and very sharp edges. The amount of the white inclusions is higher (or perhaps better visible due to the overfiring). Morphologically, it also differs from the other Dressel 24 Family fragments, in the plastic rib on the top of the rim which circles around its perimeter. Comparing the fabric of this specific sherd with known production centres, we may find similarities to Erythraean fabric A which has many white calcareous inclusions and no mica (BEZECZKY 2013, 73; nos. 105–109, 117, 122–123, 126).

Common fabric characteristics

Fabric: hard, dense, with very little pores, evenly fired

Inclusions: 10 %, very tiny (below 0.3 mm), predominantly sandy, well visible white inclusions

Fabric colour: red (2.5YR 5/6) or (2.5YR 5/8)

Surface colour: light grey (5Y 7/2) or pale brown (2.5Y 8/2)

Note: for clarity each sherd description repeats these characteristics, unless the information differs – in such a case they are written in italics

Individual fragments

ID # SY15_233 / Amphorae Fig. 1:1 / Pl. 1:1

Context: excavation; **layer:** SU001; **trench:** Rooms A, B, C

Part: rim; **inner diameter:** 130 mm (?); **EVE:** 7 %

Fabric: hard, dense, with very little pores, evenly fired

Inclusions: 10 %, very tiny (below 0.3 mm), predominant sandy, well visible white inclusions

Fabric colour: red (2.5YR 5/6) or (2.5YR 5/8)

Surface colour: light grey (5Y 7/2) or pale brown (2.5Y 8/2)

ID # SY16_I12_SW_08 / Amphorae Fig. 1:2 / Pl. 1:2

Context: survey; **trench:** I12; **sector:** SW

Part: rim; **inner diameter:** 100 mm; **EVE:** 19 %

Fabric: hard, dense, with very little pores, evenly fired

Inclusions: 10 %, very tiny (below 0.3 mm), predominant sandy, well visible white inclusions

Fabric colour: red (2.5YR 5/6) or (2.5YR 5/8)

Surface colour: light grey (5Y 7/2) or pale brown (2.5Y 8/2)

ID # SY16_039 / Amphorae Fig. 1:3 / Pl. 2:3

Context: excavation; **layer:** SU001; **trench:** 110E-115N; **sector:** S

Part: rim; **inner diameter:** 130 mm (?); **EVE:** 5 %

Fabric: hard, dense, with very little pores, *unevenly fired*

Inclusions: 10 %, very tiny (below 0.3 mm), predominantly sandy, well visible white inclusions

Fabric colour: *margin red* (2.5YR 5/6) or (2.5YR 5/8), *grey core*

Surface colour: light grey (5Y 7/2) or pale brown (2.5Y 8/2)

ID # SY15_521 / Amphorae Fig. 1:4 / Pl. 2:4

Context: excavation; **layer:** SU041; **trench:** 105E-105N; **sector:** SW

Part: rim; **inner diameter:** 110 mm; **EVE:** 12 %

Fabric: hard, dense, with very little pores, evenly fired

Inclusions: 10 %, very tiny (below 0.3 mm), predominantly sandy, well visible white inclusions **Fabric colour:** red (2.5YR 5/6) or (2.5YR 5/8)

Surface colour: *same as the fabric colour*

ID # SY15_232 / Amphorae Fig. 1:5 / Pl. 3:5

Context: excavation; **layer:** SU001; **trench:** Rooms A, B, C

Part: rim; **inner diameter:** 100 mm; **EVE:** 33 %

Fabric: *very hard*, dense, *overfired*

Inclusions: 20 %, normally up to 0.5 mm, with several bigger pcs. of white inclusion (up to 5 mm), or holes after exploded lime (see the fraction)

Fabric colour: red (2.5YR 4/6) – a tint darker than the normal fabric

Surface colour: light grey (5Y 7/2), or pale brown (2.5Y 8/2)

Note: This fragment features characteristic of the Erythraean Fabric A

ID # SY16_H13_SE_08 / Amphorae Fig. 1:6 / Pl. 3:6

Context: survey; **trench:** H13; **sector:** SE

Part: rim; **inner diameter:** 90 mm (?); **EVE:** 5 %

Fabric: hard, dense, with very little pores, evenly fired

Inclusions: 10 %, very tiny (below 0.3 mm), predominantly sandy, well visible white inclusions

Fabric colour: red (2.5YR 5/6) or (2.5YR 5/8)

Surface colour: light grey (5Y 7/2) or pale brown (2.5Y 8/2)

Note: the inclination of the sherd is unsecure since only small fragment is preserved

ID # SY16_H13_NE_16 / Amphorae Fig. 1:7 / Pl. 4:7

Context: survey; **trench:** H13; **sector:** NE

Part: lid; **outer diameter rim:** 100 mm; **EVE:** 100 %; **outer diameter handle:** 25 mm

Fabric: hard, dense, with very little pores, evenly fired

Inclusions: 10 %, very tiny (below 0.3 mm), predominantly sandy, well visible white inclusions

Fabric colour: red (2.5YR 5/6) or (2.5YR 5/8)

Surface colour: light grey (5Y 7/2) or pale brown (2.5Y 8/2)

ID # SY15_236 / Amphorae Fig. 1:8 / Pl. 4:8

Context: excavation; **layer:** levelling; **trench:** 100E-105N; **sector:** NE

Part: base (toe); **outer diameter:** 20 mm

Fabric: hard, dense, with very little pores, evenly fired

Inclusions: 10 %, very tiny (below 0.3 mm), predominantly sandy, well visible white inclusions

Fabric colour: red (2.5YR 5/6) or (2.5YR 5/8)

Surface colour: light grey (5Y 7/2) or pale brown (2.5Y 8/2)

ID # SY15_348 / Amphorae Fig. 1:9 / Pl. 5

Context: excavation; **layer:** SU061; **trench:** 110E-100N; **sector:** NW

Part: body near base; **outer max. diameter:** 445 mm

Fabric: hard, dense, with very little pores, evenly fired

Inclusions: 10 %, very tiny (below 0.3 mm), predominantly sandy, well visible white inclusions **Fabric colour:** red (2.5YR 5/6) or (2.5YR 5/8)

Surface colour: light grey (5Y 7/2) or pale brown (2.5Y 8/2)

Note: inside the vessel are visible scratched vertical lines, likely from a dipper extracting the content

Dressel 24 Family with 'light' fabric

Amphorae Fig. 2:10–13

Amphorae Pls. 6–9

Three (plus one) rim belong to this group, which is characteristic for a rather soft fabric of either a yellow or very pale brown colour, with few inclusions visible at first sight (many more are, however, visible on closer inspection, as they are mostly light in colour and camouflaged well in the fabric). The morphology of the rims differs.

The first three fragments (**10–12**) have an inner d. in a range from 80 to 110 mm, and a characteristic depression on the top of the outer rim which encircles the whole perimeter. With this specific feature, their shape resembles the subtype Knossos 15 (c.f. AURIEMMA – QUIRI 2004, fig. 10:A). The last fragment (**13**), has a different shape than the others, with a rim inner d. 120 mm and a triangularly shaped rib leaning inwards. This morphological feature resembles rims of amphorae Knossos 18 (c.f. AURIEMMA – QUIRI 2004, fig. 10:B), whose rim opening is however supposed to be bigger, between 190 and 240 mm (DOBREVA 2017, 233).

Common characteristics

Fabric: soft, fairly sorted, chalky surface, evenly fired

Inclusions: 10–20 %, normally up to 1 mm, predominant white inclusions and red pellets, common quartz

Fabric colour: yellow (10YR 8/6) or very pale brown (10YR 8/3)

Surface colour: of the fabric colour

Individual fragments

ID # SY14_110 / Amphorae Fig. 2:10 / Pl. 6

Context: excavation; **layer:** SU018; **trench:** 95E-105N; **sector:** SW

Part: rim; **inner diameter:** 110 mm; **EVE:** 25 %

Fabric: soft-hard, fairly sorted, chalky surface, evenly fired

Inclusions: 10 %, normally up to 1 mm, predominant white inclusions, red pellets; common quartz

Fabric colour: very pale brown (10YR 8/3)

Surface colour: of the fabric colour

ID # SY14_193 / Amphorae Fig. 2:11 / Pl. 7

Context: excavation; **layer:** SU027; **trench:** 90E-105N; **sector:** SE

Part: rim; **inner diameter:** 80 mm; **EVE:** 11 %

Fabric: soft-hard, fairly sorted, chalky surface, evenly fired

Inclusions: 10 %, normally up to 1 mm, predominant white inclusions, red pellets; common quartz

Fabric colour: yellow (10YR 8/6)

Surface colour: of the fabric colour

ID # SY16_I09_SE_01 / Amphorae Fig. 2:12 / Pl. 8

Context: survey; **trench:** I09; **sector:** SE

Part: rim; **inner diameter:** 100 mm; **EVE:** 12 %

Fabric: soft-hard, fairly sorted, chalky surface, evenly fired

Inclusions: 10 %, normally up to 1 mm, predominant white inclusions, red pellets; common quartz

Fabric colour: very pale brown (10YR 8/3)

Surface colour: of the fabric colour

ID # SY14_174 / Amphorae Fig. 2:13 / Pl. 9

Context: excavation; **layer:** SU006; **trench:** 100E-100N; **sector:** S

Part: rim; **inner diameter:** 120 mm; **EVE:** 10 %

Fabric: soft-hard, fairly sorted, chalky surface, evenly fired

Inclusions: 20 %, predominant white inclusions (also holes from exploded ones), red pellets; common quartz

Fabric colour: yellow (10YR 8/6)

Surface colour: of the fabric colour

Dressel 24 Family with 'micaceous' fabric

Amphorae Fig. 2:14–21

Amphorae Pls. 10–17

Five (plus three) fragments belong to this group, which is characteristic for sandy inclusions, red pellets and, especially, a micaceous fabric (the inclusions are in different proportions sherd by sherd). This group shows more variability than the previously presented ones, regarding the fabric colour, proportion of inclusions, but also the shape – consequently, each sherd is described separately. What is, however, common for all the fragments, is the highly micaceous fabric, which is, from the known production centres, connected with Chios (e.g. OPAIȚ – TSARAVOPOULOS 2011, 293). Comparing the fabric appearance in hand specimens of our amphorae with the published Chian samples, they are indeed similar, suggesting the possible area of their origin (e.g. compare pl. XIII/74 of OPAIȚ – IONESCU 2016 and our **18**; for more fabric examples see OPAIȚ – TSARAVOPOULOS 2011 and DOBREVA 2017, tav. XXXV and XXXVII).

Twice two fragments feature a more pronounced shape similarity – **14–15** and **16–17**. The inner diameter of the first three ranges between 100 and 120 mm, while for the last one it cannot be precisely measured. Fragment **18** has a slightly different shape, with an almost straight outer wall and a low plastic rib; while the last two rims, **19–20**, differ the most from the others. The rim **19** has a bigger diameter (140 mm inside) and is rather triangular, although it still has a 'funnel/cup-shaped' rim. The rim **20** has a specific shape deviating from the classical form of the Dressel 24 Family, however, it might still be considered as its derivative form.⁵⁰ Its fabric in hand specimen looks identical to **16** of this group. The last fragment, a toe **21**, has the characteristic shape of the Dressel 24 Family amphorae bases.

ID # SYP16_105 / Amphorae Fig. 2:14 / Pl. 10

Context: excavation; **layer:** levelling II; **trench:** 100E-105N; **sector:** NE

Part: rim; **inner diameter:** 100 mm; **EVE:** 14 %

Fabric: hard, fairly sorted, evenly fired

⁵⁰ Classification of this sherd into the Dressel 24 Family was suggested – independently of each other – by Andrei OpaȚ and Diana Dobreva.

Inclusions: 20 %, normally up to 0.5 mm, sandy, with common red pellets, tiny flakes of silver mica and few bigger pcs. (up to 1 mm) of white inclusions

Fabric colour: light red (2.5YR 6/8)

Surface colour: of the fabric colour, pink self-slip on random places (7.5YR 8/3)

ID # SY16_063 / Amphorae Fig. 2:15 / Pl. 11

Context: excavation; **layer:** FA07; **trench:** 100E-105N; **sector:** NW

Part: rim; **inner diameter:** 100 mm; **EVE:** 35 %

Fabric: hard, good sorting, evenly fired

Inclusions: 10 %, up to 0.5 mm, sandy, predominant white inclusions and tiny flakes of silver mica, few red pellets

Fabric colour: light red (2.5YR 6/8)

Surface colour: very pale brown (10YR 8/3), self-slip on both sides

ID # SY15_235 / Amphorae Fig. 2:16 / Pl. 12

Context: excavation; **layer:** levelling I; **trench:** 100E-105N; **sector:** NE

Part: rim; **inner diameter:** 120 mm; **EVE:** 10 %

Fabric: hard, well sorted, evenly fired

Inclusions: 20 %, sandy, predominant silver mica, common white inclusions, red pellets and few pieces of golden mica and quartz

Fabric colour: core light red (2.5YR 6/8), margins pink (7.5YR 8/4)

Surface colour: pink (7.5YR 8/4)

ID # SY16_H13_NE_17 / Amphorae Fig. 2:17 / Pl. 13

Context: survey; **trench:** H13; **sector:** NE

Part: rim; **inner diameter:** 100 mm (?); **EVE:** 7 %

Fabric: hard, good sorted, evenly fired

Inclusions: 10 %, up to 0.5 mm, sandy, few flakes of silver mica (visible only on the surface)

Fabric colour: reddish yellow (5YR 6/6)

Surface colour: of the fabric colour

Note: less silver mica than in the other sherds of this group; the rim diameter is unmeasurable, for the drawing it was set on the smallest range of the other rim fragments in this group

ID # SYP16_104 / Amphorae Fig. 2:18 / Pl. 14

Context: excavation; **layer:** levelling II; **trench:** 100E-105N; **sector:** NE

Part: rim; **inner diameter:** 120 mm; **EVE:** 19 %

Fabric: hard, chalky surface (heavily eroded), good sorting, unevenly fired

Inclusions: 20 %, sandy, normally up to 0.3 mm, with random bigger pcs. up to 2 mm, predominant tiny flakes of silver mica, few red soft pellets (grog?)

Fabric colour: margins very pale brown (10YR 7/3), core pink (5YR 7/4)

Surface colour: same as the margins colour

ID # SY14_184 / Amphorae Fig. 2:19 / Pl. 15

Context: excavation; **layer:** SU032; **trench:** 100E-100N; **sector:** SW

Part: rim; **inner diameter:** 180 mm; **EVE:** 10 %

Fabric: hard, fairly sorted, evenly fired

Inclusions: 20 %, sandy, normally up to 0.5 mm, predominant lime and red rounded pellets (the later up to 2 mm), common tiny flakes of silver mica

Fabric colour: reddish yellow (6YR 6/6)

Surface colour: outer very pale brown (10YR 8/2), inner of the fabric colour

ID # SY16_I12_SW_07 / Amphorae Fig. 2:20 / Pl. 16

Context: survey; **trench** I12; **sector:** SW

Part: rim, handle attachment; **inner diameter:** 110 mm; **EVE:** 22 %

Fabric: hard, good sorted, evenly fired, micaceous

Inclusions: 20 %, up to 0.5 mm, predominant flakes of silver and gold mica, few red pellets

Fabric colour: light red (2.5YR 6/6)

Surface colour: inner surface of the fabric colour, outer closest to very pale brown (10YR 8/3)

ID # SY15_238 / Amphorae Fig. 2:21 / Pl. 17

Context: excavation; **layer:** levelling I; **trench:** 100E-105N; **sector:** NE

Part: base (a toe); **outer diameter:** 27 mm; **EVE:** 100 %

Fabric: good sorting, evenly fired

Inclusions: 10 %, normally up to 0.5 mm, predominant red pellets (rarely up to 1.5 mm) and silver mica, common white hard inclusions (quartz?)

Fabric colour: core light red 2.5YR (7/8), margins reddish yellow (7.5YR 7/6)

Surface colour: reddish yellow (7.5YR 7/6)

Dressel 24 Family with 'normal fabric'

Amphorae Fig. 3:22–24

Amphorae Pls. 18–21

The last specific fabric reflects the micaceous one, however, it is missing the key ingredient – the silver mica. Characteristic are sandy inclusions, red pellets and no mica. The fabric is pale/light brown and porous. Since there is no main characteristic, we may call it 'normal fabric', not having any specific feature to point out. The group contains three rims (22–24), with inner d. 100–140 mm, which are quite morphologically different.

ID # SY15_231 / Amphorae Fig. 3:22 / Pl. 18

Context: excavation; **layer:** SU001; **trench:** Rooms A, B, C

Part: rim; **inner diameter:** 110 mm; **EVE:** 46 %

Fabric: hard, porous, good sorted, the thicker rim unevenly fired

Inclusions: 10 %, sandy, normally up to 0.3 mm, predominant lime, quartz and red pellets; random bigger white particles (up to 3 mm) well visible on the surface

Fabric colour: pink (7.5YR 7/4)

Surface colour: very pale brown (10YR 8/4)

ID # SY15_428 / Amphorae Fig. 3:23 / Pl. 19

Context: excavation; **layer:** SU033; **trench:** 100E-105N; **sector:** SE

Part: rim; **inner diameter:** 140 mm; **EVE:** 7 %

Fabric: hard, good sorting, porous, unevenly fired

Inclusions: 10 %, sandy, normally up to 0.3 mm, predominant quartz, few red pellets

Fabric colour: light brown (7.5YR 6/4)

Surface colour: pale brown (2.5YR 8/2)

ID # SY16_G12_NE_21 / Amphorae Fig. 3:24 / Pl. 20

Context: survey; **trench:** G12; **sector:** NE

Part: rim; **inner diameter:** 100 mm; **EVE:** 21 %

Fabric: hard, porous, evenly fired, inner surface eroded

Inclusions: 10 %, sandy, normally up to 0.3 mm, predominant quartz, few red soft pellets; random bigger white inclusions

Fabric colour: strong brown (7.5YR 5/6)

Surface colour: very pale brown (10YR 7/3)

Dressel 24 Family – unclassified toes

Amphorae Fig. 3:25–26

Amphorae Pl. 21

The fabric of the two remaining toes is closest to the ‘normal fabric’, however, their colour is reddish, and the clay rather more dense than porous. Each of the sherds has further specifics. The toe **25** is very rich in big sized particles of softer white minerals. Its shape is also similar to the toes of the Late Antique amphorae series – LRA 2 (cf. BĂDESCU 2012, pl. 1:10; KLENINA 2013, 88, рис. 5/27). Consequently, we may also consider this toe to be of a later production (ca. beginning of the 4th–5th c. AD). Base **26**, otherwise also similar to the ‘normal fabric’, is missing the red pellets which (also) make the previous group characteristic.

Both of these toes bear technological marks of production – the toe was attached to the bottom of the amphora separately, now creating a double layer on the bottom with a visible division between the body and the toe.

ID # SY15_225 / Amphorae Fig. 3:25 / Pl. 21:25

Context: excavation; **layer:** SU001; **trench:** Rooms A, B, C

Part: base (a toe); **outer diameter:** 26 mm; **EVE:** 100 %

Fabric: hard, poorly sorted, unevenly fired

Inclusions: 30 %, normally up to 2 mm, predominant softer white pellets, few red inclusions

Fabric colour: core red (5R 5/8), margins reddish yellow (7.5YR 7/6)

Surface colour: reddish yellow (7.5YR 7/6) – as are the margins

ID # SY14_069 / Amphorae Fig. 3:26 / Pl. 21:26

Context: excavation; **layer:** SU008; **trench:** 100E-100N; **sector:** SW

Part: body over the base / toe; **diameter base/attachment:** 64 mm

Fabric: hard, good sorting, evenly fired

Inclusions: 10 %, sandy, up to 0.5 mm, predominant white soft pellets and quartz

Fabric colour: red (2.5YR 5/6)

Surface colour: reddish yellow (5YR 7/6)

Chronology: ca. 2nd–5th c. AD

2.6.3.2. KAPITÄN II AMPHORAE

Amphorae Fig. 3:27–35

Amphorae Pls. 22–26

The Kapitän II amphorae⁵¹ are one of the most represented transport containers in the Roman Empire from the end of the 2nd to the beginning of the 5th c. AD (OΠΑΙΤ – IONESCU 2016, 62), with the peak period of their production/distribution in the 3rd and 4th c. AD (DYCZEK 2001, 143–144; BEZECZKY 2013, 149). In Moesia Inferior, these are the predominant Aegean provenance amphorae of the 3rd c. AD (OΠΑΙΤ – PARASCHIV 2013, 322).

The Kapitän II amphorae might be found all over the Roman Empire – in the Eastern and Western Mediterranean, from Britain to the Black Sea (DYCZEK 2001, 141; OΠΑΙΤ – IONESCU 2016, 62 etc.). In Moesia Inferior, this type is well-known from the Lower Danube and the western Black Sea coast, especially from Romanian Dobrudzha (for a comprehensive list of find places in the Lower Danube and western Black Sea see DYCZEK 2001, 141–143 and DOBREVA 2017, 240–241).

The appearance of the Kapitän II amphorae in south-eastern Thrace seems to be rather scarce, with fragments published only from several centres on the Black Sea coast – Apollonia Pontica and Deultum (DOBREVA 2017, 240). However, in her PhD thesis, Borislavova (2018) mentions other finds from Anchialos, Ainos, Nesebar, Plovdiv, Stara Zagora and Sofia. Regarding the high number of finds from Moesia Inferior as well as in Yurta-Stroyno, I would presume their scarcity in south-eastern Bulgaria / Thrace is rather caused by the state of publications of finds rather than by their absence in the area.

No kiln sites have been found so far, although, at least three different fabrics might be recognized pointing to several different workshops, probably located along the Aegean Sea (likely in the Ephesus region, perhaps also in Samos) and western

⁵¹ This type is known under many different names, among the most frequently used are: Agora/Robinson K 113; Benghazi MRA7; Bjelajac XII; Dyczek 18; Knossos 37; Kuzmanov VII (1973), Kuzmanov XII (1985); Keay XII (on the West); Niederbieber 77; Peacock and Williams 47; Radulescu 6; Scorpan I–E; Zeest 79.

Asia Minor (e.g. PEACOCK – WILLIAMS 1986, 193; BJELAJAC 1996, 41; BEZECZKY 2013, 149; DOBREVA 2017, 238). Dyczek presumes that local workshops also existed in the later period in Moesia Inferior (DYCZEK 2001, 141) while Reynolds (2010, 90) suggests that the place of origin was rather located in the Black Sea area, near the Crimea, and not in the Eastern Aegean.⁵²

As the main content of the amphorae it is widely accepted to be wine (KEAY 1984, 137; PEACOCK – WILLIAMS 1986, 194; BJELAJAC 1996, 41; REYNOLDS 2010, 90; DYCZEK 2001, 143; OPAIȚ 2004a, 13, etc.), and the estimated vessel capacity is ca. 9 litres (OPAIȚ 2004a, 13). Opaïț and Paraschiv (2013, 320) suggest high quality wine of Chian origin to be the content.

The Kapitän II amphorae from Yurta-Stroyno are the second most represented in the assemblage. In total, 13 diagnostic sherds were identified, including three bases, five characteristic pcs. of body fragments⁵³ and five rims. The rim inner d. ranges from 45 to 100 mm, the hollow feet d. is uniformly 60 mm inside.

The morphological variations of this type (highly visible on both – rims and bases), might be attributed to different, by now unlocated, production centres (e.g. NEGRU – BĂDESCU – AVRAM 2003, 209). Some changes in the form might also be attributed to a different chronology – it is commonly accepted that the volume (and so the size) starts decreasing in the 2nd c. AD (e.g. BJELAJAC 1996, 41; DYCZEK 2004, 140, etc.); Opaïț also observed that by the 4th c. AD, the characteristic rim undercut is shallower and the plastic rib below becomes less sharp (OPAIȚ 2004a, 13).

Following Andrei Opaïț's observation mentioned above, rim **31** could belong to a container produced earlier than the others. The remaining – quite variable – assemblage presented here might be produced within the same time frame, but possibly in different workshops. Sherd **35** has a very similar fabric to the other samples (regarding colour and inclusions), but its shape is very specific with a thick inwardly inclined rim. However, even for this rim we may find parallels

⁵² Reynolds based this hypothesis on the fabric observation and its similarity to amphorae Zeest 72 (produced in the northern Pontic area). Since the chemical analyses (conducted after he published the paper) are in favour of the Ephesus region (BEZECZKY 2013, 149), I consider these amphorae to be of Aegean production (although there might still be another centre located in the Black Sea area as well).

⁵³ From these, only one is presented here – for illustration –, as the diagnostic value of the pieces is very low.

among Kapitän II amphorae, e.g. at KUZMANOV 1985 (type XII, таб. 7/A67a): an amphora from Odessos (Varna); or at ROBINSON 1959 (pl. 31/M303, Group M) a container from the Athenian Agora dated to the early 5th c. AD.⁵⁴

Common characteristics for Kapitän II amphorae

Area of production: Aegean Sea, Western Asia Minor – around Ephesus; possibly Black Sea

Chronology: from the 3rd to the 4th c. AD

Probable content: probably wine

Capacity: 9 litres

Individual fragments

ID # SY14_071 / Amphorae Fig. 3:27 / Pl. 22

Context: excavation; **layer:** SU008; **trench:** 100E-100N; **sector:** SW

Part: body

Fabric: very hard, evenly fired

Inclusions: 20 %, normally up to 1 mm, predominant white inclusions, common red-brown pellets (grog? up to 2 mm), few golden mica well visible on the outer surface

Fabric colour: red (2.5YR 5/6)

Surface colour: of the fabric colour

ID # SY14_070 / Amphorae Fig. 3:28 / Pl. 23:28

Context: excavation; **layer:** SU008; **trench:** 100E-100N; **sector:** SW

Part: base / part of the hollow feet; **outer feet d.:** 70 mm (check with the drawing)

Fabric: very hard, fairly sorted, evenly fired, rough surface

Inclusions: 30 %, normally up to 1 mm, sandy, predominant red soft pellets, common white inclusions, few quartz

Fabric colour: light red (2.5YR 6/8)

Surface colour: light self-slip of the fabric colour

⁵⁴ This fragment was consulted about with A. Opaït, who confirmed its classification to the group of Kapitän II amphorae. He suggested this rim to be a late variant of a subtype with a large neck and estimated chronology of the 3rd-4th c. AD.

ID # SY14_122 / Amphorae Fig. 3:29 / Pl. 23:29

Context: excavation; **layer:** SU016; **trench:** 95E-105N; **sector:** NW

Part: base / hollow feet; **inner diameter:** 60 mm; **EVE:** 20 %

Fabric: very hard, rough surface, good sorted, unevenly fired – “sandwich” on the body fragment, grey inner part of the hollow feet

Inclusions: 30 %, normally up to 1 mm, sandy, predominant red soft pellets, common lime, few quartz and red pellets

Fabric colour: light red margins (2.5YR 6/8), core reddish yellow (5YR 6/8)

Surface colour: red (2.5YR 5/6)

ID # SY15_223 / Amphorae Fig. 3:30 / Pl. 23:30

Context: excavation; **layer:** SU001; **trench:** Rooms A, B, C

Part: base / hollow feet; **inner diameter:** 60 mm; **EVE:** 27 %

Fabric: very hard, fairly sorted, evenly fired, rough surface

Inclusions: 20 %, normally up to 1 mm, sandy, predominant white inclusions and quartz, common dark pellets, rare golden mica

Fabric colour: red (2.5YR 5/8)

Surface colour: of the fabric colour

ID # SY15_229 / Amphorae Fig. 3:31 / Pl. 24:31

Context: excavation; **layer:** SU001; **trench:** Rooms A, B, C

Part: rim; **inner diameter:** 100 mm; **EVE:** 6 %

Fabric: very hard, fairly sorted, evenly fired

Inclusions: 30 %, sandy, normally up to 0.5 mm with bigger (1–3 mm) red rounded pellets (ferrous minerals?)

Fabric colour: red (2.5YR 4/8)

Surface colour: self-slip of the fabric colour

ID # SY14_002 / Amphorae Fig. 3:32 / Pl. 24:32

Context: excavation; **layer:** SU023; **trench/sector:** 95E-105N SE – 100E-105N SE/SW

Part: rim; **inner diameter:** 100 mm; **EVE:** 8 %

Fabric: hard, fairly sorted, sandy surface, evenly fired

Inclusions: 20 %, sandy, predominant quartz, white inclusions, few red pellets

Fabric colour: yellowish red fabric (5YR 5/8)

Surface colour: of the fabric colour

ID # SY16_G12_SE / Amphorae Fig. 3:33 / Pl. 25:33

Context: survey; **trench:** G12; **sector:** SE

Part: rim; **inner diameter:** ca. 70 mm; **EVE:** 4 %

Fabric: very hard, fairly sorted, evenly fired

Inclusions: 20 %, sandy, predominant quartz, white inclusions, common red pellets

Fabric colour: yellowish red (5YR 5/8)

Surface colour: a tint darker but still yellowish red (5YR 4/6)

ID # SY15_548 / Amphorae Fig. 3:34 / Pl. 25:34

Context: excavation; **layer:** levelling I; **trench:** 100E-105N; **sector:** NE

Part: rim; **inner diameter:** 55 mm; **EVE:** 16 %

Fabric: very hard, fair sorting, evenly fired

Inclusions: 20 %, normally up to 1 mm, sandy, predominant quartz and red pellets (exceptionally up to 2 mm)

Fabric colour: red (2.5YR 5/8)

Surface colour: red coating/self-slip, a tint darker (2.5YR 5/6) than the fabric

ID # SY16_F13_SW_03 / Amphorae Fig. 3:35 / Pl. 26

Context: survey; **trench:** F13; **sector:** SW

Part: rim; **inner diameter:** 45 mm; **EVE:** 21 %

Fabric: hard, good sorting, evenly fired

Inclusions: 10 %, sandy, predominant quartz, rare silver mica

Fabric colour: light red (2.5YR 6/8)

Surface colour: coating/self-slip a tint darker than the fabric – red (2.5YR 5/8)

Chronology: from the 3rd to early 5th c. AD

2.6.3.3. AMPHORAE OF THE HELLENISTIC TRADITION

Amphorae Fig. 4:36–39

Amphorae Pl. 27–30

Four pottery fragments found in Yurta-Stroyno reflect the continuation of the Late Hellenistic production, mostly represented at the site by the so-called amphorae of

Rhodian and Coan traditions. The amphorae of the Rhodian tradition (also commonly known under the type Camulodunum 184) are attested at the western Black Sea coast / Moesia Inferior from the 2nd half of the 1st c. AD, although their highest circulation in the area relates to the period from the beginning of the 2nd c. AD until ca. AD 275. These amphorae were produced in several different places on the island of Rhodes and its *perea* (e.g. at Carphatos, or Cnidos), consequently, different fabrics might be encountered (DOBREVA 2017, 210–211). They are characteristic for a long neck, slender to ovoid body, full rounded spike and, especially, arched handles, which, during the Roman period, become more pronounced and ‘peaked’ at the top.

The amphorae of the Coan tradition are most frequently referred to as Dressel 2–4 / Dressel 5. This is a vast group of amphorae produced in many different workshops over the Mediterranean and Black Sea area – including the island of Cos itself, the Iberian Peninsula, southern and central France, the Apennine Peninsula, Egypt, perhaps also the British Islands (e.g. PEACOCK – WILLIAMS 1986, 105–106; BERTOLDI 2012). Three different production centres were also described in the Black Sea area (e.g. VNUKOV 2000; VNUKOV 2004; for a summary of the production centres see: DOBREVA 2017, 243–244). The main characteristic feature of these amphorae is a long slim body, double-barrelled handles and a small toe, which develops in the Late Hellenistic period (late 2nd c.–mid-1st c. BC) into a specific shape with a pointed nub at the base surrounded by a cuff of clay (c.f. **39**) (LAWALL 2004, 182). In the course of the Roman imperial period the toe becomes a rounded spike with gentle or no shaping. The Dressel 2–4 / Dressel 5 are common amphorae in the Roman world for the first two centuries AD, with the peak of their distribution in Moesia Inferior and Thrace from the turn of the 1st c. BC/AD to the end of the 1st c. AD (DOBREVA 2017, 219).

The first fragment from Yurta-Stroyno, **36**, is a toe/spike with a cylindrical lower part of 43 mm in diameter, a small knob at the bottom, and a red-brown micaceous fabric. An almost identical spike of a highly micaceous fabric was found in Troesmis, first published by Paraschiv (2006, 81; pl. 17:10), later by Băjenaru (2013, 73–74; pl. 22/117). Paraschiv suggests its Cretan origin and classes it as Dressel 43 = Crétoise 4. Băjenaru doubts this classification, and points to its typological similarity to the Rhodian production of the 1st–2nd c. AD, consequently, he prefers its ‘pseudo-Rhodian’ denomination. The latter classification is also

adopted by Dobрева (2017, 213). We should still be careful with this designation, since the fabric of **36** is in hand specimen basically indistinguishable from the *micaceous fabric* of amphorae Dressel 24 Family, likely produced on Chios. Of course, this (and any other) fabric similarities need to be proven by proper petrographic/chemical pottery analyses. Additionally, a very similar amphora spike was also found in the Villa Armira at Ivaylovgrad (KABAKCHIEVA 1986, 22, таб. 31:364) in a context dated to the 2nd–4th c. AD and marked as an imported amphora of a fine beige fabric.

The handle under **37**, of similar micaceous fabric to **36**, however of a light red colour, might be, without doubt, classed to the amphorae of Rhodian tradition as it represents the most distinctive feature of the type – the peaked handle.

The rim fragment **38**, of inner d. 140 mm and Aegean fabric (although it is much less micaceous compared to the two previously mentioned fragments), has a simple shape which might be attributed both to amphorae of Rhodian (Camulodunum 184) and Coan (Dressel 2–4 / Dressel 5) traditions (c.f. HASNARD 1986; DESBAT – PICON 1986).

The toe **39** belongs to the amphorae of Coan tradition (Dressel 2–4) produced in the Aegean area.⁵⁵ A similar shape, with a protruding inner knob and circulating notch around, can be traced already to the 1st c. BC (c.f. EMPEREUR – HESNARD 1987, pl. 4/20, 21 – year 69 BC; HEIN *et al.* 2008, fig. 5/right; LAWALL 2004, fig. 8⁵⁶). Since the distribution peak of the amphorae of Coan tradition in Moesia Inferior and Thrace is during the 1st c. AD (DOBREVA 2017, 219), these two dates create a possible time frame for the toe chronology.

The main content of the amphorae from the Eastern Aegean islands is commonly expected to be wine with a long production tradition. The capacity of the pseudo-Coan/-Rhodian amphorae was estimated by Opaıt (2017, 588) as 20–26 litres.

ID # SY16_G12_NW_04 / Amphorae Fig. 4:36 / Pl. 27

Context: survey; **trench:** G12; **sector:** NW

⁵⁵ A description of the Aegean fabric of locally produced Dressel 2–4 (DOBREVA 2017, 217): “The fabric colour varies from orange-red to ochre-red with predominant inclusions of golden mica and rare white inclusions (calcite?). Surface is smoothed, sometimes coated in white-yellow colour”.

⁵⁶ The material presented by Lawall was produced in Ephesos, which seems to be one of the production places of the Late Hellenistic Coan amphorae.

Part: base (spike); **outer diameter:** 43 mm; **EVE:** 100 %
Fabric: hard, good sorted, evenly fired, micaceous
Inclusions: 20 %, flakes of tiny silver (and gold?) pcs. of mica, in hand specimen
no other visible inclusions
Fabric colour: strong brown (7.5YR 5/6)
Surface colour: very pale brown (10YR 8/4)
Classification: Late Rhodian / of Rhodian tradition
Area of production: eastern Mediterranean (Rhodes and its *perea*)
Chronology: 1st–2nd c. AD (?)
Content: wine
Capacity: 20–26 l

ID # SY16_J13_SE_06 / Amphorae Fig. 4:37 / Pl. 28

Context: survey; **trench:** J13; **sector:** SE
Part: ‘peaked’ handle; **handle section:** 21×19 mm
Fabric: hard with very good sorting, surface feels smoothed
Inclusions: 30 %, flakes up to 0.5 mm, predominant silver and golden mica, few
red pellets
Fabric colour: light red (2.5YR 6/8)
Surface colour: very pale brown (10YR 8/3)
Classification: Late Rhodian / of Rhodian tradition / Camulodunom 184
Area of production: eastern Mediterranean (Rhodes and its *perea*)
Chronology: ca. 50–275 AD
Content: wine
Capacity: 20–26 l

ID # SY16_059 / Amphorae Fig. 4:38 / Pl. 29

Context: excavation; **layer:** SU077; **trench:** 110E-105N; **sector:** E
Part: rim; **inner diameter:** 140 mm; **EVE:** 10 %
Fabric: hard to soft, good sorted, evenly fired
Inclusions: 10 %, up to 1 mm, predominant lime and quartz, very few flakes of
silver mica
Fabric colour: yellowish red (5YR 5/8)
Surface colour: light self-slip of the fabric colour

Classification: Amphora of Coan tradition (Dressel 2–4 orientale) / amphorae of Rhodian tradition (Camulodunom 184)

Area of production: eastern Aegean / eastern Mediterranean

Chronology: 1st c. AD–275 AD

Content: wine

Capacity: 20–26 l

ID # SY15_226 / Amphorae Fig. 4:39 / Pl. 30

Context: excavation; **layer:** SU001; **trench:** Rooms A, B, C

Part: toe; **outer diameter:** 28 mm; **EVE:** 100 %

Fabric: hard, very good sorting, very fine fabric

Inclusions: 10 %, predominant tiny flakes of silver mica, few red pellets, random white particles

Fabric colour: strong brown (7.5YR 5/6)

Surface colour: pale brown (2.5YR 8/2)

Classification: amphora of Coan tradition

Area of production: eastern Aegean / eastern Mediterranean (Ephesus?)

Chronology: 1st BC/AD–end of the 1st c. AD

Content: wine

Capacity: 20–26 l (?)

2.6.3.4. OTHER AEGEAN / ASIA MINOR AMPHORAE

Amphorae Fig. 4:40–48

Amphorae Pls. 31–38

Agora M273 (?) / **Amphorae Fig. 4:40 / Pl. 31**

The base with a spiky toe (40) belongs, most likely, to an amphora type *Agora M273*, in the eastern Aegean / Black Sea area also known as *Opaiṭ C III-1*. There seems to be at least two centres, likely located in the Eastern Mediterranean, producing these vessels in two different colours – buff and red (*OPAIṬ 2004a*, 18). The visual description of the red fabric by *Bezeczky* (2013, 156; cf. pl. 92): “hard fabric, rich in limestone with many voids and few quartz inclusions” fits our sherd well. These amphorae are commonly found in the Black Sea area and the Aegean, rarely also in Italy and France (*OPAIṬ 1996*, 211; *OPAIṬ 2004a*, 18; *BEZECZKY 2013*,

156). As a content it is expected to be wine; their average capacity is 30–33 litres, with bigger (up to 40 l), and smaller (17–18 l) individuals (KLENINA 2016, 421). They are dated from the mid-4th to 6th c. AD (OΠΑΙΤ 2004a, 18; PARASCHIV 2006, 104).

ID # SY15_222 / Amphorae Fig. 4:40 / Pl. 31

Context: excavation; **layer:** SU001; **trench:** Rooms A, B, C

Part: toe (spike); **outer diameter:** 34 mm in the middle of the rounded spike; **EVE:** 100 %

Fabric: hard, fairly sorted, evenly fired

Inclusions: 20 %, predominant red pellets, common white soft inclusions of bigger size (5 mm; lime?), few quartz

Fabric colour: reddish yellow (5YR 6/8)

Surface colour: light red (2.5YR 6/8), self-slip

Classification: Agora M273 (?)

Area of production: eastern Mediterranean

Chronology: mid-4th–6th c. AD

Probable content: wine

Capacity: 30–40 l

Agora G 199 / Amphorae Fig. 4:41 / Pl. 32

The mushroom shaped toe of amphora **41** might be attributed to the pinched handle amphorae Agora G 199, with attested production centres at Cilicia and Cyprus (BERTOLDI 2012, 41). Its buff non-micaceous slightly sandy soft fabric points to the Cypriot production⁵⁷ of wine amphorae, which was taking place from the mid-1st till the 3rd c. AD. It seems that these Cypriot amphorae were distributed more frequently over the Mediterranean than the Cilician ones (LUND 2010, 569–571). The production continued until the 4th c. AD with a visible decline in export power and with morphological changes of the containers starting from the mid-3rd c. AD, when, besides the capacity reduction and other changes, the mushroom-shaped toe was replaced by a solid spike with no thickening (LUND 2010; BERTOLDI 2012, 141; DOBREVA 2017, 285).

⁵⁷ Amphorae from the area of Cilicia – produced at Anemurium and possibly at other sites of Rough Cilicia – have a micaceous fabric.

In Moesia Inferior and Thrace, the early version – with the mushroom-shaped toe – is rare, and the amphorae are best known from the 2nd–3rd c. AD contexts of Novae, Trimammium and Sozopol (see KUZMANOV 1985, taб. 4/A36a; DYCZEK 2001, 160–161 and DOBREVA 2017, 286). The volume of the known amphorae ranges from 36 l (amphorae from the 1st c. AD), 46 l and 53 l (DYCZEK 2001, 161).

ID #: SY16_062 / Amphorae Fig. 4:41 / Pl. 33

Context: excavation; **layer:** FA09; **trench:** 100E-105N; **sector:** NW

Part: base (a toe); **outer diameter:** 57 mm; **EVE:** 100 %

Fabric: hard with good sorting, soft/chalky surface, evenly fired

Inclusions: 20 %, sandy, up to 0.5 mm, predominant lime, common red pellets, few quartz

Fabric colour: reddish yellow (7.5YR 7/6)

Surface colour: of the fabric colour

Classification: Agora G199 – Buff Cypriot non-micaceous fabric

Area of production: Cyprus

Chronology: ca. 50–200 AD

Content: Wine

Capacity: ca. 36–53 l

San Lorenzo 7 / Amphorae Fig. 4:42–43 / Pls. 33–34

The chronology of the amphorae San Lorenzo 7 is quite broad, starting in the 2nd c. AD continuing to the 6th c. AD, with the peak distribution to the western Pontic coast (Dobrudzha) from the 2nd to 4th c. AD (OPIAȚ 2004a, 42; PARASCHIV 2006, 10; DOBREVA 2017, 318). Two subtypes might be recognized by the shape of the body; four different fabrics are known, and even more are expected to exist (OPIAȚ – IONESCU 2016, 68, 98 pl. XIV/85–86, pl. XV/87–89). The amphorae are distributed over the whole Mediterranean as their representatives are known from Spain, Italy, North Africa, Syro-Palestine, the Aegean, the Lower Danube and the Black Sea area (BERTOLDI 2012, 137; DOBREVA 2017, 319). The place of production is unknown; as well as the relation of the different fabric to possible places of origin. The area of the Aegean Sea and Asia Minor are commonly supposed as places of origin (BERTOLDI 2012; OPIAȚ – IONESCU 2016). OpaȚ and

Paraschiv also mention that some of the amphorae might be produced in Cilicia (2013, 323). The content is unknown, but olive oil was proposed (OPIAȚ – IONESCU 2016, 67). The capacity of the type was estimated by Opaîț and Paraschiv (2013, 322) at 50 litres.

The two rims from Yurta, **42** and **43**, share a similar shape and inner d. of 80 mm, but the fabric is different. The first sherd (**42**) is rather coarse, and roughly resembles the second type of fabric described by Opaîț and Ioanescu (2016, 68). The other sherd (**43**) might correspond to the first fabric (very fine) identified by the same authors. In hand specimen, it also resembles the *light fabric* of the Dressel 24 Family described above.

ID # SY16_D11_01 / Amphorae Fig. 4:42 / Pl. 33

Context: survey; **trench:** D11

Part: rim; **inner diameter:** 80 mm; **EVE:** 25 %

Fabric: hard, good sorted, evenly fired

Inclusions: 30 %, sandy, predominant white soft pellets, quartz, red and dull black inclusions. Many pores from fallen out stones, no mica

Fabric colour: pink (7.5YR 7/4)

Surface colour: of the fabric

Classification: San Lorenzo 7

Area of production: Aegean (?), Asia Minor (?)

Chronology: from the 2nd c. AD to the 6th c. AD

Probable content: olive oil (?)

Capacity: ca. 50 l

ID # SY15_350 / Amphorae Fig. 4:43 / Pl. 33

Context: excavation; **layer:** levelling I; **trench:** 100E-105N; **sector:** NE

Part: rim; **inner diameter:** 80 mm; **EVE:** 16 %

Fabric: soft, fairly sorted, chalky, evenly fired

Inclusions: 10 %, predominant lime, red pellets, few quartz

Fabric colour: very pale brown (10YR 8/3)

Surface colour: of the fabric

Classification: San Lorenzo 7

Area of production: Aegean (?), Asia Minor (?)

Chronology: from the 2nd c. AD to the 6th c. AD

Probable content: olive oil (?)

Capacity: ca. 50 l

Note: the sample in hand specimen resembles the *light fabric* of Dressel 24 Family amphorae

'Micaceous water jars' – LRA 3 / Amphorae Fig. 4:44 / Pl. 35

The 'Micaceous water jars' (also known as Agora F65–66), of a characteristic red-brown fabric, were produced on the western coast of Asia Minor, in the area stretching from Ephesus to Pergamon, from the mid-1st till the mid-7th c. AD. Their later production (from the end of the 4th c. AD) is best known as the Late Roman Amphorae 3 (LRA 3) (OΠΑΙΤ 2017, 585–589). They are supposed to carry wine in the containers whose size diminished from 6–4 litres in the early production to 2–1 litres in the later production. Their presence in the western Pontic area / Lower Danube is not very high, with a visible decrease from the 4th c. AD (OΠΑΙΤ 2017, 597). The body fragment 44 shows all the characteristics of the 'micaceous water jars' (very compact red-brown micaceous fabric and thin sherd), however, from this small piece we are not able to specify its chronology more closely.

ID #: SY16_I12_SE_12 / Amphorae Fig. 4:44 / Pl. 35

Context: survey; **trench:** I12; **sector:** SE

Part: body; **thickness:** 4 mm

Fabric: hard-soft with smoothed surface, very good sorting, evenly fired

Inclusions: 30 %, predominant tiny flakes of silver mica, rare quartz

Fabric colour: red (2.5YR 4/6)

Surface colour: of the fabric colour

Classification: 'micaceous water jars' / LRA 3

Area of production: western Asia Minor – area between Miletus and Pergamon

Chronology: 1st to mid-7th c. AD

Probable content: wine

Capacity: 6–4 l for early ones, 2–1 l for later ones

Ephesus 56 / **Amphorae Fig. 4:45–46 / Pl. 36:45–46**

These two bases, **45** and **46**, both with missing toe tips, have a fabric similar to the previously described ‘Micaceous water jars’ / LRA 3 amphorae – i.e. of a uniform red colour, very well sorted and levigated, with inclusions of silver mica. They are, however, thicker than the LRA 3 and more rounded near the bottom. Thanks to these morphological differences and the amphorae from Ephesus published by Bezczky (2013), it was possible to link the two fragments with the amphorae Ephesus 56 (BEZECZKY 2013, pl. 54:862–871 and pl. 83:393). These amphorae are parallel production of the LRA 3, dated ca. from the end of the 4th c. to the end of the 6th / beginning of the 7th c. AD. They are not known very well outside of Ephesus, but – relevant to our area – fragments were found in Zadar and on the island of Samos. The content is unknown, olive oil was suggested (BEZECZKY 2013, 167–169).

ID # SY14_126 / Amphorae Fig. 4:45 / Pl. 36:45

Context: excavation; **layer:** SU016; **trench:** 95E-105N; **sector:** NW

Part: body; **outer body diameter:** 70 mm

Fabric: hard, evenly fired, very fine-clay with smoothed-bright surface

Inclusions: 10 %, tiny flakes of silver mica

Fabric colour: red (2.5YR 5/6)

Surface colour: self-slip in the fabric colour

Classification: Ephesus 56

Area of production: Ephesus / also some other place (?)

Chronology: end of the 4th–6th/7th c. AD

Probable content: olive oil (?)

ID # SY16_H13_NW_03 / Amphorae Fig. 4:46 / Pl. 36:46

Context: survey; **trench:** H13; **sector:** NW

Part: body with base attachment; **outer diameter:** 21 mm (on the base – body attachment)

Fabric: hard, evenly fired, very fine-clay with smoothed-bright surface

Inclusions: 10 %, tiny flakes of silver mica

Fabric colour: red (2.5YR 5/6)

Surface colour: self-slip in the fabric colour

Classification: Ephesus 56

Area of production: Ephesus / also some other place (?)

Chronology: end of the 4th–6th/7th c. AD

Probable content: olive oil (?)

Unidentified amphorae of eastern origin / Amphorae Fig. 4:47–48 / Pls. 37–38

The following two fragments have a fabric of the Eastern Mediterranean / Aegean area, however, their provenance is unknown. These are the rim **47** with inner d. 110 mm and the toe/spike **48**, with an extra applied band of clay turned around its lower part (d. 46 mm) and a small hole (d. 4 mm) from outside the base.

ID # SY16_D13_NW_02 / Amphorae Fig. 4:47 / Pl. 37

Context: survey; **trench:** D13; **sector:** NW

Part: rim; **inner diameter:** 110 mm; **EVE:** 16 %

Fabric: hard, good sorted, evenly fired

Inclusions: 20 %, sandy, up to 0.5 mm, predominant quartz, white inclusions (lime?) and red-brown pellets, common dark inclusions and pores

Fabric colour: reddish yellow (7.5YR 6/6)

Surface colour: outer surface of the fabric colour, inner covered by grey (calcareous) sediments

Classification: x

Area of production: Aegean / Eastern Mediterranean

ID # SY15_217 / Amphorae Fig. 4:48 / Pl. 38

Context: excavation; **layer:** SU001; **trench:** Rooms A, B, C

Part: base (spike); **outer diameter:** 46 mm; **EVE:** 100 %

Fabric: hard, evenly fired

Inclusions: 30 %, sandy, up to 0.5 mm, predominant white inclusions (lime?), common dark and red pellets, few quartz

Fabric colour: light red (2.5YR 7/6)

Surface colour: reddish yellow (7.5YR 8/6)

Classification: x

Area of production: Aegean / Eastern Mediterranean

2.6.4. BLACK SEA – SOUTH PONTIC AMPHORAE

Amphorae Fig. 5:49–57

Amphorae Pls. 39–46

The assemblage of the Black Sea amphorae⁵⁸ from Yurta-Stroyno includes the south Pontic production, mainly the Sinopean amphorae of orange fabric with a high amount of shiny black particles (pyroxenes), which are represented by four rims (49–50, 53–54), one body fragment with *titulus pictus* (51) and a toe (52). Only one handle of a light-coloured amphora from Heraclea Pontica was identified (55). Several body fragments and undiagnostic pieces of south Pontic fabric were additionally found in the excavation area, however, only in a small number counted in the tens. All of the diagnostic Black Sea amphorae were found within the excavation.

The south Pontic region exported amphorae already during the Classical and, especially, Hellenistic period, and continued with this tradition until the Late Antiquity (e.g. OPAIT 2010 – the “carrot” amphorae). The main product of the area was wine, some olive oil and fish products (DYCZEK 2001, 220; OPAIT – PARASCHIV 2013, 330; VNUKOV 2017, 100).

On the Lower Danube and the western Black Sea coast (especially in Dobrudzha) these amphorae are quite common, both in rural and urban sites (OPAIT 2004a, 26–32). In Thrace, they are rather attested on the coast, although they might be found, in lower numbers, also inland (for a summary of the finding places in Bulgaria and a comprehensive map of individual type’s distribution see DOBREVA 2017, 246–272). The main market area of the southern Black Sea coast centres seems to be the northern Black Sea coast, with the western one – especially Thrace – being of marginal interest (see the distribution map in VNUKOV 2017, fig. 5.3).

Amphorae of Sinope / **Amphorae Fig. 4:49–54 / Pls. 39–43**

The first two rims (49 and 50), are fragmentarily preserved, which complicates their classification. The sherd under 49 has a small rolled rim with inner d. 35 mm. The closest shape seems to be the type D Snp I,⁵⁹ dated to the 6th c. AD, with a possible continuation to the 7th c. AD. The capacity of the container is approximated to 6–7

⁵⁸ I would like to greatly thank Sergey Vnukov for his help with the amphorae classification.

⁵⁹ S. Vnukov suggests that this fragment could also belong to a jug produced in Sinope.

litres with olive oil as its possible content (KASSAB TEZGÖR 2009, 134–137; cf. pl. 20:1, 5 and 6). This type was also classed by D. Pieri as a subtype of the LR 1A amphorae produced in the Demirci workshop at Sinope (PIERI 2005, 76–77; KASSAB TEZGÖR 2009, 135).

The fragment **50** has an opening neck with a higher rim, rounded from the outside and flattened from the inside, with inner d. 70 mm. This is quite a rare shape which does not give us many possibilities for pairing. The closest in form is the recently identified ‘transitional variety’ (in the sense of transition from the early to later production, namely from Sin II to Sin VI) by Vnukov (2010, 366; fig. 2:3–4). These amphorae are few and not yet well studied, and their chronology is not developed, however, the transitioning period should take place during the 2nd c. AD. Another possibility of classification would be the later type, Sin VI, which, however, has a higher and flattened rim. It dates to the late 2nd and early 3rd c. AD, and it was used for carrying wine (VNUKOV 2010, 366; fig. 2:5–8).

The body fragment under **51** belongs to an unspecified Sinopean amphora with marks of the *tituli picti* in red colour on the neck. Two letters are still visible [...Γω...]; more of them might be expected, as random, unreadable spots of red colour continue further on the right; on the left they are interrupted by a fraction. The toe **52** with a broken tip is also of the Sinopean fabric. It is only a small piece, but since the early Sinopean amphorae do not end in such a plain, hollow and spiky toe, we may consider its later production, especially resembling the wine “carrot amphorae” of the 4th and 5th c. AD, when the lower body starts to narrow and ends in a sharp conical base. These amphorae are known in small numbers from the western Black Sea coast – Mesambria and Topraichioi (OPAIT 2010, 378; c.f. with the fig. 1.7 of the Subtype 3, dated to the 5th c. AD).

The last two rims originate at the Sinopean production centre at Demirci, active from the 2nd/3rd to 6th c. AD. Most relevant to our assemblage is the local group B Snp I-III,⁶⁰ especially the last type B Snp III, with its peak distribution from the 2nd c. till the 1st half / end of the 3rd century AD. While amphorae of the first two types have a cylindrical neck, the last one has a conical shape – as do our

⁶⁰ This group of amphorae might also be called Knossos 26/27, based on the material from Crete (HAYES 1983, 153).

53⁶¹ and 54 (c.f. KASSAB TEZGÖR 2010, 126; VNUKOV 2010, 367, fig. 2; DOBREVA 2017, 261–263). The amphorae with a conical shaped neck of this group may also be considered to be type Zeest 84a (ZEEST 1960, 171). Opaït and Ionescu (2016, 60 and pl. II/10) described a very similar rim/neck fragment as a transitional amphora type from Vnukov Sin II to Terzgör B Sin I. As a content it is considered to be wine (e.g. OPAÏT – IONESCU 2016, 58), both wine and olive oil (VNUKOV 2010, 368), or fish products/garum (this interpretation is repeatedly stressed by Reynolds [2010, 90; 2013, 102], pointing out the continuity of the Hellenistic tradition of fish processing in the area). The capacity of the container B Snp III is expected to be more than 30 litres (VNUKOV 2010, 366–368).

ID # SY15_547 / Amphorae Fig. 5:49 / Pl. 39:49

Context: excavation; **layer:** levelling I; **trench:** 100E-105N; **sector:** NE

Part: rim; **inner diameter:** 35 mm; **EVE:** 64 %

Fabric: good sorting, rough surface (the ‘sandy’ feel), evenly fired

Inclusions: 30 %, sandy, normally up to 0.5 mm, predominant black shiny particles, few white lime and rare red particles

Fabric colour: reddish yellow (5YR 7/6)

Surface colour: of the fabric colour

Classification: D Snp I / jug and not an amphora?

Area of production: South Pontic – Sinope

Chronology: 6th c. AD, possibly also 7th c. AD

Probable content: presumably olive oil

ID # SY15_228 / Amphorae Fig. 5:50 / Pl. 39:50

Context: excavation; **layer:** SU001; **trench:** Rooms A, B, C

Part: rim; **inner diameter:** 70 mm; **EVE:** 11 %

Fabric: South Pontic, coarse, hard, outer self-slip worn, evenly fired

Inclusions: 30 %, predominant black shiny particles, normally up to 1 mm big with few bigger (one 4 mm long); common red pellets with few white particles

Fabric colour: core and inner margin pinkish grey (5YR 6/2)

⁶¹ S. Vnukov agrees with the similarity in shape with B SNP III, although, the fabric – from a photo – looks to him more like it is from Abkhazia (north-western Colchis); however, in this area is not yet attested such a form (personal communication, summer 2019).

Surface colour: outer surface and outer margin are light reddish brown (2.5YR 7/4); very pale brown (10YR 7/4) self-slip preserved inside

Classification: possibly the *transitional period* from Sin II x Sin VI (?)

Area of production: South Pontic – Sinope

Chronology: 2nd c.–early 3rd c. AD

Probable content: wine (?)

ID # SY15_423 / Amphorae Fig. 5:51 / Pl. 40

Context: excavation; **layer:** SU001; **trench:** Rooms A, B, C

Part: neck with *tituli picti* in red slip; **max. outer diameter:** 150 mm; **inscription:** [...Γω...]

Fabric: hard, rough surface, fairly sorted, unevenly fired

Inclusions: 30 %, sandy, normally up to 1 mm, South Pontic fabric – with predominant black shiny inclusions (pyroxenes?) and random bigger pcs. of red pellets (up to 4 mm)

Fabric colour: inner margin – red (2.5YR 5/8), outer margin – yellow (10YR 8/6)

Surface colour: self-slip in colours of inner and outer margins

Area of production: South Pontic – Sinope

ID # SY15_427 / Amphorae Fig. 5:52 / Pl. 41

Context: excavation; **layer:** SU033; **trench:** 100E-105N; **sector:** SE

Part: toe/spike; **diameter:** 20 mm above the tip

Fabric: hard with rough surface, evenly fired

Inclusions: 20 %, sandy fabric, predominant black shiny inclusions, common quartz, silver mica, few red pellets

Fabric colour: reddish yellow (7.5YR 7/6)

Surface colour: of the fabric colour

Classification: “Carrot Amphorae” (?)

Area of production: South Pontic – Sinope

Chronology: 5th c. AD

Probable content: wine

Capacity: 5.6–5.9 l

ID # SY15_219 / Amphorae Fig. 5:53 / Pl. 42

Context: excavation; **layer:** SU001; **trench:** Rooms A, B, C

Part: rim; **inner diameter:** 140 mm; **EVE:** 14 %

Fabric: hard, porous, evenly fired, coarse, good sorting with rough surface

Inclusions: 30 %, sandy, normal size of 0.5 mm, random bigger pellets up to 2 mm, common black shiny and white (quartz and lime) inclusions, few red pellets of bigger dimensions

Fabric colour: red (2.5YR 5/8)

Surface colour: red (2.5YR 4/8) self-slip – by a tint darker than the fabric

Classification: B Snp III

Area of production: South Pontic – Sinope

Chronology: 2nd–3rd c. AD

Probable content: wine / olive oil / fish products

Capacity: more than 30 l

ID # SY16_051 / Amphorae Fig. 5:54 / Pl. 43

Context: excavation; **layer:** SU079; **trench** 105E-105N; **sector:** NE

Part: rim, handle attachment; **inner diameter:** 100 mm; **EVE:** 35 %; **handle att.:** 76x38 mm

Fabric: hard with rough, quite eroded, surface, good sorting, evenly fired

Inclusions: 30 %, sandy, normal size 0.5 mm, predominant shiny black pellets, common red and white particles, few silver mica flakes

Fabric colour: yellowish red (5YR 5/6)

Surface colour: self-slip in the colour of the fabric

Classification: B Snp III

Area of production: South Pontic – Sinope

Chronology: 2nd–3rd c. AD

Probable content: wine / olive oil / fish products

Capacity: over 30 l

Amphorae of Heraclea Pontica / **Amphorae Fig. 5:55 / Pl. 44**

The only diagnostic fragment of an amphora originating from Heraclea Pontica is a handle **55**, which preserves the characteristic fabric of this production centre. It can be classed into the light-clay amphorae of the type Vnukov S IV

(KOVALEVSKAJA 1998, tab. 2; VNUKOV 2003, 126; рис. 49; VNUKOV 2016, 40; рис. 3). These amphorae are the most common containers of the Black Sea region from the 1st till the 3rd c. AD, during which they are exported in high numbers to the main consumption area – the northern Black Sea. Their exclusive content was wine (VNUKOV 2017, 113–115, 121; VNUKOV 2016, 36). The type has many variants, from which our handle might belong to several of them, especially to Vnukov types S IVA2, S IVB and S IVC,⁶² dated from the late 1st c. till the late 2nd c. AD (VNUKOV 2016, 43).

In Moesia Inferior and Thrace these amphorae are well attested, concentrated mostly along the Lower Danube and the Black Sea coast. The most widely spread type is Vnukov S IVC / Shelov C, which might be found in higher numbers also inland, as far as in the Struma Valley (DOBREVA 2017, 246–259).

ID # SY15_351 / Amphorae Fig. 5:55 / Pl. 44

Context: excavation; **layer:** levelling I; **trench:** 100E-105N; **sector:** NE

Part: grooved-handle; **dimensions:** >40×30 mm

Fabric: hard with rough surface, good sorted, evenly fired

Inclusions: 30 %, sandy, normally up to 1 mm, predominant red inclusions – either bigger pellets or long veins up to 1.5 cm –, common black shiny inclusions, quartz and lime

Fabric colour: very pale brown (10YR 8/2)

Surface colour: colour of the fabric

Area of production: South Pontic – Heraclea Pontica

Classification: Vnukov type S IV ('light-clay amphorae')

Chronology: from late 1st to late 2nd c. AD

Probable content: wine

Unidentified South Pontic amphorae / Amphorae Fig. 5:56–57 / Pls. 45–46

Fragments **56** and **57** are likely from the same amphora. The fabric structure in hand specimen, as well as the colour, look the same, as is the size of the inner rim diameter (70 mm). The neck is cup-shaped with handles attached almost at the rim, which inclines inwards. Drawings of the two pieces are slightly different, both sections are, however, made on the handle attachment to the neck/rim which

⁶² This classification refers to Shelov types A, B and C (SHELOV 1986, 395–400).

naturally causes a different shaping of the sherd. The fabric resembles Heraclea Pontica for which there are not, however, the characteristic white soft inclusions (calcite?).

ID # SY14_004 / Amphorae Fig. 5:56 / Pl. 45

Context: excavation; **layer:** SU023; **trench/sector:** 95E-105N SE – 100E-105N SE/SW

Part: rim with handle; **inner diameter:** 70 mm; **EVE:** 16 %; **handle section:** 31×22 mm

Fabric: hard, evenly fired, rough/sandy surface

Inclusions: 30 %, sandy, predominant white (quartz and lime), red particles and pores, rare black inclusions

Fabric colour: reddish yellow (5YR 6/8)

Surface colour: worn self-slip of the fabric colour

Note: same characteristics as **57**, those two pcs. are probably from one vessel

Area of production: southern – eastern Pontic area (?)

ID #: SY15_255 / Amphorae Fig. 5:57 / Pl. 46

Context: excavation; **layer:** levelling I; **trench:** 100E-105N; **sector:** NE

Part: rim with handle; **inner diameter:** 70 mm; **EVE:** 12 %; **handle section:** 27×24 mm

Fabric: hard, evenly fired, rough/sandy surface

Inclusions: 30 %, sandy, predominant white (quartz and lime), red particles and pores, rare black inclusions

Fabric colour: reddish yellow (5YR 6/8)

Surface colour: worn self-slip of the fabric colour

Note: same characteristics as **56**, those two pcs. are probably from one vessel

Area of production: southern – eastern Pontic area (?)

2.6.5. AFRICAN AMPHORAE

Amphorae Fig. 6:58–60

Amphorae Pls. 47–49

The export of the African amphorae started in higher numbers by the end of the 2nd c. AD and continued until the 7th c. AD (CARAVALE – TOFFOLETTI 1997, 140–141). The main exporting centres were located in the Roman provinces of Zeugitana, Byzacena and Tripolitana (BONIFAY 2015, 7), in modern-day terms in the area of central-north Tunisia and north-western Libya.

The African amphorae are found on the western Black Sea coast and in the Lower Danube in small numbers, mostly represented by several pieces (see DOBREVA 2017). Higher numbers – especially from necropolises – are reported from *Scythia* (OΠΑΙΤ 1997-1998, 47; OΠΑΙΤ 2004a, 33–40).

As a main content of the amphorae it is expected to be olive oil, but also fish products and wine are attested (see tab. IV in BONIFAY 2004). Some of the containers seem to be designed for one specific content, while others could carry many different products (DOBREVA 2017, 313–314).

The African amphorae at the site of Yurta-Stroyno are represented by three rims only (58–60); two are from the excavation, one from the survey. The first sherd, rim 58, is characteristic for its specific shape (and outer grey surface), which classes it into the wide group of the type Keay LXII (KEAY 1984, 309–350), amphorae, spread along the (mainly western) Mediterranean, best known from Spain and Italy. Some individuals are, however, also known from the western Black Sea coast (e.g. Tomis – Constanța: OΠΑΙΤ 1997-1998, figs.11 and 12). The type has about 22 different subtypes produced at several places mostly in central Tunisia. From these, the closest to our example is the type Q, also known under Albenga 11-12, dated from the last quarter of the 5th to the mid/third quarter of the 6th c. AD (BONIFAY 2004, 137; FANTUZZI – CAU ONTIVEROS 2018). The content of the amphorae is unknown, the capacity given here (70–78 l) is estimated from two different vessels of the Keay LXII group found in Tomis (OΠΑΙΤ 1997-1998, 53).

Rim 59 might find parallels among the Late African Cylindrical Amphorae of the 5th–7th c. AD. It is very fragmentary, but the fabric description in hand specimen – as well as, roughly, the shape – correspond to the production of the workshop in Nabeul-Sidi Zahruni in Tunisia (“orange to red fabric with outer

surface covered by light colour, the inclusions are white to yellow and red–purple – ferric”). Bonifay refers to this rim shape, which is not that common for the workshop, as a variant of Keay LXI (BONIFAY 2004, 37–39, 125–141; fig. 18:24; planchet I 20/21).

The last rim, **60**, likely⁶³ belongs to amphora type Africana IIA with an almond shaped rim marked by a small undercut (BONIFAY 2004, 111). The sherd is brown-red with a whitish self-slip on both sides. Several amphorae of the wider group of Africana II (with the subtypes A, B, C and D), produced from the mid-2nd till the beginning of the 4th c. AD, were found on the Lower Danube and western Pontus (OPIȚ 1997-1998, 50; DOBREVA 2017, 313).

ID # SY15_237 / Amphorae Fig. 6:58 / Pl. 47

Context: excavation; **layer:** levelling I; **trench:** 100E-105N; **sector:** NE

Part: rim; **inner diameter:** 90 mm; **EVE:** 25 %

Fabric: hard, fairly sorted, evenly fired

Inclusions: 10 %, predominant lime (up to 1 mm), common quartz, few silver mica

Fabric colour: yellowish red (5YR 5/6)

Surface colour: outside grey (10YR 6/1), inside of the fabric colour

Classification: Keay LXIIQ, Albenga 11-12

Area of production: (central-eastern) Tunisia (Africa Proconsularis)

Chronology: last third of the 5th c. to the mid/third quarter of the 6th c. AD

Probable content: (?)

Capacity: 70 l (for LXIIJ), 78 l (for LXIIA)

ID # SY15_216 / Amphorae Fig. 6:59 / Pl. 48

Context: excavation; **layer:** SU001; **trench:** Rooms A, B, C

Part: rim; **inner diameter:** 90 mm; **EVE:** 12 %

⁶³ A. Opiț (personal communication, summer 2019) has suggested that this is a rim of an amphora type Ostia LIX – of the late phase (dated from the 2nd till the mid-3rd c. AD) of Leptimian production (eastern coast of Tunisia). I am not familiar with this material, however, based on a drawing, the Ostia LIX type seems to have a bigger and more rounded rim, otherwise, the fabric – at least the surface – looks alike. If we were to prefer this possibility, not much would change anyway, as the chronology of these two amphorae is very similar (mid-2nd–3rd c. AD), as well as the area of production – Tunisia. What would differ is the content, which is in the case of type Ostia LIX unknown – possibly olive oil; in the case of Africana IIA it is *salsamenta*, perhaps also wine (BONIFAY 2004, tab. IV).

Fabric: hard, good sorted, surface is worn (best preserved on the top of the rim), evenly fired

Inclusions: 20 %, up to 1 mm, sandy, predominant lime (heavily eroded creating small holes/pores on the surface), common sand – mixture of rounded red, dark and white stones

Fabric colour: yellowish red (5YR 5/8)

Surface colour: very pale brown (10YR 8/3)

Classification: variant of Keay LXI, Bonifay 49 (?)

Area of production: Tunisia (Africa Proconsularis), Ateliers de Nabeul-Sidi Zahrani

Chronology: from 5th to 7th c. AD

Probable content: (?)

ID # SY16_H13_SE_07 / Amphorae Fig. 6:60 / Pl. 49

Context: survey; **trench:** H13; **sector:** SE

Part: rim; **inner diameter:** 80 mm; **EVE:** 20 %

Fabric: hard, good sorting, unevenly fired

Inclusions: 20 %, sandy, of normal size 0.5 mm. Predominant quartz and lime, common red soft pellets, few black matte inclusions; common pores

Fabric colour: margins yellowish brown (10YR 5/4), core red (2.5YR 5/8)

Surface colour: pale brown (2.5Y 8/2) self-slip on both sides

Classification: Africana IIA / Ostia LIX (?)

Area of production: Tunisia (Africa Proconsularis)

Chronology:

Africana IIA: mid 2nd c. to the end of the 3rd c. AD

Ostia LIX: mid 2nd c. to beg. of the 4th c. AD (?)

Probable content: Africana IIA: *salsamenta*; wine? Ostia LIX: olive oil?

Capacity: 60–65 l⁶⁴

⁶⁴ Based on:

http://archaeologydataservice.ac.uk/archives/view/amphora_ahrb_2005/character.cfm?id=3.

2.6.6. MISCELLANEOUS AMPHORAE

Amphorae Fig. 6:61–64

Amphorae Pls. 50–53

This last group contains amphorae whose origin and type were not possible to identify. Rim **61** has a common amphora shape with few characteristic features. The handle was attached below the rim, leaving a mark on the neck. The fabric is brownish with few inclusions, the surface has a slightly darker tint. Another rim, **62**, belongs to amphora of a whitish surface and orange core, with a big quartz inclusion in the fabric. The sherd seems to be overfired, the rim is rather ovoid than rounded. Rim **63** refers to small scale amphora. The fabric looks like an African one, however the smoothed surface is not characteristic for this production area. The last fragment, **64**, has a very dense red fabric with a light-coloured surface and noticeable flakes of golden mica. The fabric is very specific and unique in the assemblage. In this case, we may hesitate if we are dealing here rather with a table amphora or a pitcher, but since the handle is arched (not like in the case of pitchers, where the handle is straight – horizontal – near the neck part), we may suppose it is indeed a transport amphora.

ID # SY16_D13_NW_01 / Amphorae Fig. 6:61 / Pl. 50

Context: survey; **trench:** D13; **sector:** NW

Part: rim with handle attachment; **inner diameter:** 140 mm; **EVE:** 17 %

Fabric: hard, very well sorted, evenly fired

Inclusions: 10 %, up to 0.5 mm, predominant tiny flakes of silver and gold mica, few red, dark brown/black inclusions

Fabric colour: brown (7.5YR 5/4)

Surface colour: brown (7.5YR 4/4), tint darker than the fabric

ID # SY16_E10_01 / Amphorae Fig. 6:62 / Pl. 51

Context: survey; **trench:** E10

Part: rim with handle; **inner diameter:** 90 mm; **EVE:** 53 %; **handle section:** 35×16 mm

Fabric: coarse, poorly sorted, very hard (over fired?), rough surface, unevenly fired

Inclusions: 20 %, up to 2 mm, predominant quartz, common lime and red soft pellets, few golden flakes up to 1 mm

Fabric colour: core yellowish red (5YR 5/6), margins very pale brown (10YR 8/4 and 7/4)

Surface: very pale brown (10YR 8/4 and 7/4) = same as the margins

ID # SY15_549 / Amphorae Fig. 6:63 / Pl. 52

Context: excavation; **layer:** SU078+84; **trench** 100E-105N; **sector:** NE

Part: rim; **inner diameter:** 45 mm; **EVE:** 41 %

Fabric: hard, good sorted, evenly fired

Inclusions: 10 %, predominant tiny flakes of silver and golden mica, rare quartz (exceptionally pcs. up to 1 mm)

Fabric colour: reddish yellow (5YR 6/8)

Surface colour: of the fabric

ID # SY16_J13_NE_09 / Amphorae Fig. 6:64 / Pl. 53

Context: survey; **trench:** J13; **sector:** NE

Part: rim with handle; **inner diameter:** 70 mm; **EVE:** 25 %; **handle section:** 46×17 mm

Fabric: very hard, very good sorted, unevenly fired, smoothed surface

Inclusions: 10 %, sandy, predominant white, red and dark inclusions and pores, common golden flakes up to 1 mm, which shine on the surface

Fabric colour: red (2.5YR 5/6)

Surface colour: the closest colour is light yellowish brown (2.5YR 6/3), a tint lighter inside the vessel and below the handle

2.6.7. TRANSPORT AMPHORAE – CONCLUSION

The presented 64 fragments of transport amphorae include 48 pcs. from the eastern Mediterranean / Aegean area; 8–9 pcs. from the Black Sea area and 3 pcs. from Africa Proconsularis. Based on their evaluation, two peaks of amphorae import to the site of Yurta-Stroyno might be noticed (**Amphorae Tab. 3**). The first (and major) peak is during the Imperial period up to, approximately, the mid-3rd c. AD, which seems to reflect the flourishing time of the settlement. On the other hand, it is still difficult to determine when import of the amphorae to the site actually

started. The earliest dated fragments might be attributed to the amphorae of the Late Hellenistic tradition, whose production, however, lasted until the 2nd or even 3rd c. AD. One exception would be **39**, a toe of an amphora of Coan tradition, produced from the 1st c. BC until the end of the 1st c. AD. Consequently, this amphora fragment might be considered to be the earliest attested one at the site. Other amphorae of a possible early date are the ones of the Dressel 24 Family produced on Chios, also evolving from the Hellenistic prototypes, with a continuation until the turn of the 2nd/3rd c. AD. The micaceous fabric, commonly associated with the Chian production, is attested at the site (**14–21**), as well as the calcareous fabric linked with an Erythrean origin (**5** and possibly the whole group of the *red clay and grey surface* amphorae of Dressel 24 Family), a production centre which should have, however, ceased production already around the mid-1st c. BC. Petrographic / chemical analyses are necessary to determine these connections precisely, as without them, we can only speculate about the representation of specific production centres at the site and of the early chronology of some of the fragments.

During the peak period (up to the mid-3rd c. AD) of the amphorae import to the site, the highest amount come from the Aegean area (ca. 42 pcs.; **1–39, 41–43**), much fewer from the Black Sea (4 pcs.; **50** and **53–55**) and very few from Africa (1 pc.; **60**). The second, however much smaller, peak period, seems to be during the 5th–6th c. AD with about 3 pcs. imported from the Aegean area (**40, 45–46**), 2 pcs. from the Black Sea (**49, 52**), and 2 pcs. from northern Africa (**58, 59**); making the representation of these areas in the final assemblage almost equal.

From the amphorae with a known or anticipated place of origin in the eastern Mediterranean / Aegean, the suppliers of Yurta-Stroyno, during the first peak period, seem to be located in a stretch from Chios to Rhodes (including also Erythrea, Ephesus, Kos and Knidos) and on Cyprus. This area was providing a volume of olive oil, brought to the site likely in the containers of Dressel 24 Family and San Lorenzo 7; and wine, brought by the traditional Hellenistic suppliers from the Aegean islands (Rhodes, Kos and their *pereae*); from Cyprus in container Agora G199 and from Ephesus in Kapitän II amphorae.

From the Black Sea area, all of the nine identified amphorae (**49–57**) originate at the southern Pontus, a region which features a specific fabric on the basis of which the sherds might be identified (sandy with dark shiny particles – pyroxene – and a light orange and whitish fabric). However, the fragmented

character of the finds complicates their precise classification into the many already known south Pontic amphorae types. The majority, during both the peak periods, seem to be imported from Sinope (orange colour). Three pieces (**50, 53–54**) feature characteristics of the early period (especially of the 2nd c. AD), while two pieces (**49, 52**) seem to be later, although both should be marked with a question mark, as their classification is not that conclusive.

Heraclea Pontica is represented by one diagnostic sherd only (handle **55** from the first peak period) with the characteristic whitish fabric and ribbing. Fragments **51** and **56–57**, might be, based on the fabric, attributed to the south Pontic area, but their closer classification is impossible. The first mentioned piece bears the only *tituli picti* found at the site, while the last two fragments are possibly from one container. The content of the Black Sea amphorae brought to the site of Yurta-Stroyno was mixed, possibly including wine, olive oil as well as fish products.

The African amphorae (**58–60**) are very scarce in the whole assemblage, the three identified fragments came from modern-day Tunisia, Roman Africa Proconsularis. The rim **60** might be attributed to the first peak period, while **58** is later, dated to the 5th–6th c. AD. The classification of the last fragment, **59**, to the later period is questionable, but if correct, it would strengthen the representation of the Late Roman amphorae at the site. The content of these three amphorae is either unknown or uncertain (including the possibility of olive oil, wine as well as of fish products).

2.7. Pottery from Yurta-Stroyno – conclusion

Despite being decontextualized, the pottery finds from Yurta-Stroyno proved to be an interesting set of pottery classes including Red-slipped ware, Grey ware, Coarse ware, Handmade pottery and Transport amphorae. Each of these class includes well-known, but also less well-known wares and fabrics, either of local production or imported.

The majority of the pottery, represented mainly by the **Common red-slipped table ware** (TW Figs. 1–17:1–235, Fig. 19:254–255 and 261–272, Fig. 21: 282–290), coined as such in this thesis, are of Thracian to Moesia Inferior origin, manufactured from the 1st/2nd c. till the 4th/first half of the 5th c. AD, with peak production during the 2nd–3rd c. AD. Several kiln sites producing this type of

ware are known from places near Yurta-Stroyno (up to 150 km), such as Stara Zagora, Karanovo near Nova Zagora and from Nova Nadhezda near Haskovo, as well as from more remote places in Moesia Inferior such as from Pavlikeni, Butovo and Hotnica, Durostrorum, Karavelovo near Shumen and from Leschnica, near Lovech. The Common red-slipped ware seems to cover the need for the full repertoire of table ware shapes, as the assemblage is quite variable including different sizes of dishes, bowls, deep bowls, cups, table amphorae, jugs, kraters, pots, trays, basins / krateriskoi, but also lids and strainers. Despite the variability, and perhaps also wide availability of this ware, other classes of table ware are also to be found within the assemblage.

The small amount of the **Grey ware (GW Figs. 1–4)** found in Yurta-Stroyno reflects morphological forms of the Common red-slipped table ware produced ca. during the 2nd–4th c. AD, rather than of the so-called Macedonian grey ware of the Late Antiquity (ca. end of the 4th to the 6th c. AD). It seems very likely that both wares – the Common red-slipped ware and the Grey ware – were produced in the same centre(s) and even fired in one kiln, either in an oxidised or a reduced atmosphere. We may assume some finds of the Grey ware fragments could have been made at local kiln sites, but probably no importance was given to them by the excavators as they might have been considered red slip ware burned during the kiln destruction. The only production place where one type of dish produced in two colours was so far published from is Butovo in Moesia Inferior.

Finds of the Grey ware pottery in eastern Bulgaria have so far been unpublished and as such considered non-existent. Consequently, the production centre was assumed to be located in western Bulgaria where the finds were concentrated. However, the Grey ware finds from Yurta-Stroyno, as well as from nearby Roman period sites show, it was also a common find at the Roman settlements along the Tundzha River.⁶⁵

Besides the Common red-slipped ware and the Grey ware, several other table wares were identified at the site, namely the Thin-walled ware, Marbled ware,

⁶⁵ During the year 2019 several total pick ups were conducted at two other Roman-period settlements located about 4 km north of Yurta-Stroyno; both featured the Grey ware finds, although in a much lower amount than the Common red-slipped ware (in similar proportions as to here). Nevertheless, the resulting information confirms the Grey ware is a common find at the Roman period sites along the Tundzha River.

Colour coated ware and the Çandarlı ware. All of these are represented by several fragments only (tens), creating a very small fraction of the pottery finds in general.

The **Thin-walled ware** (TW Fig. 22:292–306), with a wall thickness of 3 mm, is morphologically based on the shapes of the western Mediterranean products, however, the fabric characteristic looks very local, and we may assume, these vessels were produced locally during the 1st–3rd c. AD as imitations of Italian prototypes. One sherd of this class (TW Fig. 22:307) is however very peculiar. It is a chalice, with a thicker sherd and pale brown fabric and a yellowish red to reddish brown slip, which in terms of the form reminds one of two-handled metal cups. Similar chalices were manufactured in Thin-walled ware in Italy from the 1st c. BC until the Augustan Age. Its parallel from Thrace shows, however, a later chronology, spanning from the mid-3rd c. AD until the end of the 4th c. AD.

The **Marbled ware** (TW Fig. 18:237–247) represents another smaller class of table ware. It first appeared during the early Flavian times among the products of the South-Gallic *terra sigillata* and later-on (by the Trajanic period) spread into the Balkan provinces and to Pannonia. This ware is often connected with the military presence, either as a direct product of the Roman army or as a property of soldiers. In Thrace, the Marbled ware was so-far identified only in Augusta Trajana (Stara Zagora), Kabile and Pernik with many more finds detected in Moesia Inferior along the lower stream of the Danube River (the Limes area). The chronology of the ware in Moesia Inferior and Thrace is divided into two periods, the first including the whole 2nd c. AD, and the second dated from the end of the 3rd until the mid-4th c. AD. Based on the parallels, our sherds (the ones for which parallels were found) belong to the 2nd c. AD.

The amount of this ware found in Thrace seems to be so far underestimated. During the mentioned field survey of the two Roman period scatters north of Yurta-Stroyno, several Marbled ware fragments were found at each site. In all three cases (including Yurta-Stroyno), they are the most fragmented ware in the pottery assemblages, likely pointing to its earlier dating and as such longer time spent in the ground (could the chronology even reach back as early as to the Trajanic horizon as it does in Pannonia?). The majority of the forms executed in the Marbled ware (TW Fig. 18:237–240 and 242–243) resemble dishes of the Common red-slipped ware produced locally, mainly during the 2nd–3rd c. AD. Perhaps the local

production of the Common red-slipped ware could have been inspired by the Marbled ware brought to the place by the Roman army.

The **Colour coated ware** is also represented by several fragments only (**TW Fig. 18:248–250** and **251–253**), including two unique morphological forms known only from the *terra sigillata* of the 1st c. AD (**TW Fig. 18:248–250** and **251–252**), which do not appear in any other table ware assemblage. In Thrace, we may find only one parallel to this unique form, specifically to the sherds **248–250**, dated to the end of the 1st–beginning of the 2nd c. AD; in Moesia Superior, vessels of the same form were considered an imitation of Italian products made locally from the 1st to the mid-3rd c. AD. An exception is the last sherd of this ware (**TW Fig. 19:253**), which reflects a frequent form of the Common red-slipped ware (c.f. **TW Fig. 19:254–255**) produced during the 2nd–3rd c. AD and the Marbled ware (c.f. **TW Fig. 18:237**) of the 2nd c. AD. In Moesia Superior, we may find all these three forms made in the Colour coated ware together, dated to the Trajanic period (beginning of the 2nd c. AD), with an unknown provenance (both Italian import and local production was suggested).

We may assume, this ware – if executed in a higher quality – could be imported, likely from northern Italy, during the 1st and also at the beginning of the 2nd c. AD; however, by the same time it also started to be produced locally until the mid-3rd c. AD. Considering our material, five of the fragments have smooth high-quality red slip placed on a light-coloured sherd (very distinctive in the material), and a rim decorated with rouletting. Only one fragment, **TW Fig. 18:251**, is missing the characteristic rim decoration and instead of the glossy red cover, it has a dull orange slip applied on an orange sherd, rather resembling the Common red-slipped ware. Following the above suggested pattern, **251** seems to be a local product (ca. 1st c. AD–mid-3rd c. AD) modelled on shapes of the imported ware of higher quality, which could be represented by the rest of the fragments (**TW Fig. 18:248–250** and **252–253**) produced during the 1st c. till the beginning of the 2nd c. AD, presumably in northern Italy.

If we turn our attention to the eastern part of the Roman world, several fragments of the **Çandarli ware** – Eastern sigillata C – were also identified in the table ware assemblage. We may relate them to the Hayes Form 4 (**TW Fig. 19:256–258**) and Form 3 (**TW Fig. 19:259** and **260**), dated to the mid-2nd–3rd c. AD. Five fragments of one base with fishes engraved before firing (**TW Fig. 21:277–280**)

might also be considered to be part of this ware, although the decoration is not a typical one. Despite not having published parallels from the Yambol District, the Çandarli ware seems to be quite a common find along the Tundzha River, especially the simple hemispherical bowls of Hayes Form 4.⁶⁶

Despite classing the **Thracian thin-walled ware** ('Italian mugs') among the coarse ware, it seems more appropriate to continue with these. The class of the Thracian thin-walled ware was traditionally created by cups (**CW Fig. 9:101–105**), quite recently extended to trefoil-mouthed jugs (**CW Fig. 9:106**) which share the fabric characteristics – hard red with sandy inclusions and a grey to purplish-brown surface, often vitreous. This ware was inspired by Italian prototypes, for the eastern market produced at Ainos, at the Maritza River estuary in Aegean Thrace. The 'Thracian' production is dated from the mid-1st c. AD until the 3rd c. AD, with the peak period until the end of the 2nd c. AD, during which some of our cups seem to be produced (**CW Fig. 9:101–103**).

The shape of the Thracian thin-walled ware cups is similar to those of the Common red-slipped ware (c.f. **TW Fig. 9:129–130**), and we may assume, cups of these two wares might be occasionally confused in literature as we may come across the shape in the published materials, but not over an identification of the ware. However, the cup exhibited in the Museum of Histria, or another one in Kabile museum attest that the Thracian thin-walled ware is present in Thrace and Moesia Inferior and it might even play a role in the adaptation of this specific cup shape into the locally produced Common red-slipped ware.

The second most represented pottery class at the site is the **Coarse ware**, often featuring the shapes of its Hellenistic predecessors. The early influence might be noticed especially in the open forms such as the casseroles (**CW Fig. 1:1–9**) and frying pans (**CW Fig. 1/2:10–13**), but also in closed forms such as the stewing pots (**CW Fig. 5:56–63**). The determination of the chronology regarding the coarse ware is in general difficult, as many shapes do not change much also during the Roman – Late Antique periods, and without the finding context are impossible to be dated

⁶⁶ At each of the two Roman period scatters located north of Yurta-Stroyno there was found at least one fragment of the Hayes Form 4 in the total pick ups. A bowl of the same shape was also identified at the site of Sv. Ilija, located 1.5 km south-west of Yurta-Stroyno – an unpublished surface find. Consequently, we may note, all major Roman period scatters spread over an area of about 4.5 sq km feature at least some (although small) amount of the Çandarli ware.

more precisely. The problem with chronology is also obscured by the much lower amount of coarse ware published from Roman period contexts in Bulgaria than from the Late Antiquity. If we look at Moesia Superior, we will find the material in Bulgaria dated to the Late Antiquity classed (also) into the 2nd–4th c. AD. Consequently, we need to be especially careful while evaluating the coarse ware from unstratified contexts. The majority (over 70 %) of the coarse ware from Yurta-Stroyno was classed to the Roman period, although the production of some of the forms dated to the Late Antiquity based on the Bulgarian parallels, might in fact start already in the Roman period (**CW Fig. 2:20–27** and **CW Fig. 3:28–37**). On the other hand, we cannot say this long-term chronology might apply to all the sherds, as some of them are very clearly of a Late Antique date only (**CW Fig. 3:38–41**, **CW Fig. 4:54–55**).

The coarse ware material was possible to divide, based on the fabric characteristics, into two groups: the predominant one, sand-based **Common coarse ware** and a **Golden mica ware** which do not seem to be chronologically or morphologically sensitive, although the latter also contains big-size vessels not known from the Common coarse ware (**CW Fig. 6:64–66**).

A third pottery class, which is very characteristic for Bulgaria, is the **Handmade pottery** (**HM Figs. 1–4**), produced in unchanged forms from the Late Iron Age (ca. from the 6th c. BC) to the Roman period, perhaps also, in a smaller amount, until the Late Antiquity. The main forms of the ware are closed shape pots with a straight or slightly profiled body which might have vertically or horizontally placed handles on the upper body part. The most common decoration is, as in the LIA period, an applied plastic band either cut by a sharp object or impressed by fingers in more or less regular intervals. The typological variability of the handmade pottery is not very diverse, we may distinguish two main forms – pots with a rounded body and out-turned rim, representing the majority of the finds, and in the assemblage the much less represented pots of a hemispherical form with straight walls and rim (such as **HM Fig. 2:13–14**). The chronological classification of both forms stretches from the 1st till the 4th c. AD, but we cannot exclude their earlier dating, as the area of Yurta-Stroyno seems to have been settled already before the Romans,

as suggested by various finds of the Greek-Hellenistic period amphorae⁶⁷ in its hinterland, dated from the 6th till the 3rd c. BC (TUŠLOVÁ – WEISSOVÁ 2017), and by a hoard of 195 silver coins of *terminus ante quem* 81/80 BC, found about 1.5 km south-west of the site.

The fabric of the handmade pottery might be divided into two major groups, one quartz-based, another one with dark shiny inclusions. Such a division into two main fabrics might be noted also in a wider area, to my (field) knowledge up to the site of Dodoparon, on the fields of which, during the surface survey, the same (two) fabrics of the handmade pottery were noted. The fabric does not seem to be chronologically sensitive, but we may assume, the dark shiny particles might have been added to the paste as a temper, since they are very angular in shape (crushed before addition?), while the quartz-based fabric contains a lot of sand, and, obviously, quartz, all of a sub-rounded to rounded form (likely from natural deposits).

The class of **Transport amphorae** feature 64 diagnostic fragments, which, altogether with the undiagnostic pieces, class them among the lesser represented pottery class. Two main amphorae types, altogether representing over 50 % of all the finds, might be identified, one of the so-called Dressel 24 family with the funnel-shaped rim (**Amphorae Figs. 1:1–9, 2:10–21, 3:22–26**), in the area characteristic for the mid-1st–mid-3rd c. AD, and the second one, of the Kapitän II (**Amphorae Fig. 3:27–35**), dated to the 2nd–4th c. AD. The rest of the finds are quite fragmented, and some of the sherds might even be questioned, as to whether they may count as diagnostic or not. Since very few transport amphorae finds from the Yambol District have so far been published, preference was given to show as much of the material as possible, although in some cases, several types had to be proposed for a single sherd. To avoid mistakes in such cases, amphorae specialists were consulted to get the best possible results.⁶⁸

Besides the two bigger groups, fragments of amphorae of the Late Hellenistic tradition, attributed to a Coan and Rhodian origin, were found at the site

⁶⁷ About 20 other diagnostic fragments of Greek to Hellenistic period transport amphorae were found during the TRAP continuation in 2019 – covering an area north of the site of Yurta-Stroyno (up to 8 km as the crow flies). In a preliminary observation, fragments of – Chian, Thasian, Knidian and Heracleian (Pontica) amphorae were found within six different pottery scatters.

⁶⁸ Diana Dobрева, Andrei Opař and Sergey Vnukov.

(**Amphorae 4:36–39**). These, together with some of the Dressel 24 family amphorae, might represent the earliest imports to the settlement, dated to the 1st c. BC–1st c. AD. Most of the amphorae finds are, however, dated to the 2nd–3rd c. AD, including mainly types from the eastern Aegean (42 pcs.), much fewer of a southern Black Sea provenance (4 pcs.), and only one fragment from northern Africa. During the Late Antiquity there seems to be a small renaissance of the amphorae import during the 5th–6th c. AD with almost equal proportions from the Aegean area (3 pcs.), Black Sea (2 pcs.), and northern Africa (2 pcs.).

The transport amphorae assemblage seems to reflect well the settlement dynamics of Yurta-Stroyno. The Late Hellenistic influence attested by the amphorae of the Rhodian and Coan traditions is also highly visible in the Thracian handmade pottery and its continuation through the Roman period and in some morphological forms of the coarse ware, which might have continued from the Hellenistic up to the Roman times or even to the Late Antiquity. We may expect to find Thracian settlement(s) in the area/hinterland of Yurta-Stroyno with already established connections in the Aegean area, followed by the Roman period installation(s). A small number of transport amphorae (**Amphorae Fig. 1:5 and 4:39**) might have a traceable chronology into the 1st c. BC–1st c. AD. Nevertheless, a growing number of pottery finds might especially be noticed from the end of the 1st and the beginning of the 2nd c. AD, such as of the Colour coated ware and Marbled ware – both likely imported and perhaps in small quantities imitated locally – which might have also been predecessors of the locally produced Common red-slipped ware; or of the Thracian thin-walled ware cups/jugs and the Thin-walled ware in general. The 2nd and 3rd c. AD is a peak of the transport amphorae import, mainly from the eastern Aegean, but also of other wares from the same area, which came, however, in a small amount, such as the Çandarli ware. At the same time, the amount of the locally produced Common red-slipped ware is reaching its peak, with several known production centres located near Yurta-Stroyno; the Grey ware of similar shapes to the Common red-slipped ware is also being produced. In the 4th c. and at the beginning–middle of the 5th c. AD the variability of the pottery classes decreases with the table ware represented by the Common red-slipped ware and the Grey ware; the coarse ware pottery continues through this period in almost unchanged forms.

The exact breaking point in the local (Roman period) pottery production in Thrace is not very certain. The red slip ware is traditionally considered to be in use until the end of the 4th c. AD, unlike in Moesia Inferior, where some of the red-slipped ware forms are known until the mid-5th c. AD. Since we were able to find parallels to our Common red-slipped ware in the products of Moesia Inferior dating up to the mid-5th c. AD, we may also expect such an extended chronology for Thrace. The same trends are reflected in the Grey ware production which should be replaced by the so-called Macedonian grey ware at the end of the 4th–beginning of the 5th c. AD and in the handmade production, which was supposed to decrease by the same time. The end of the 4th c. AD / mid-5th c. AD marks technological changes in pottery making, likely connected with the turbulent political situation and presence of foreign tribes in the Bulgarian lands (see **Chapter 5**).

In the 5th–6th/7th c. AD a limited-size settlement seems to exist in Yurta-Stroyno, as a small number of transport amphorae (**Amphorae Fig. 4:45–46, Fig. 5:49 and 52, Fig. 6:58–59**), dated to the given period, were found, as well as several coarse ware cooking pots (**CW Fig. 3:38–41, 4:54–55**) and table ware pots (e.g. **TW Fig. 20:273**). Based on the amount of the material, the settled area had to be a fraction of what it had been during the Roman period, but just the existence of a flat settlement located in lowlands during the Late Antiquity is an interesting fact, as in general it is expected that settlements of that time were located on high hills and defended by massive fortifications – as in the case of Dodoparon.

3 Palauzovo

3.1. Introduction

The third set of pottery finds comes from two burial mounds located about 2.5 km north-east of the village Palauzovo, about 21 km east of the ancient city of Kabile, in an area known as “Kojadzhika” – a small elevated ridge dotted by nine burial mounds of different sizes and dimensions. Two burial mounds (8 and 9) were excavated by the Regional Historical Museum in Yambol (by Ilija Ilijev and Stefan Bakardzhiev) in 2007 and published in two short excavation reports, specifically, in the *Археологически разкопки и проучвания* (2008, 239–242) and *Вести на Ямболския музей* (2008, 3–4). The following description of the mounds and the finding context represents a synthesis of the two texts⁶⁹:

3.1.1. CONTEXT OF THE POTTERY FINDS

Mound 8

Fig. 1:1–5 / Pl. 1:1–5; 4:1–3

The Mound 8 is of smaller dimensions, built of quarry stones covered by a soil embankment. Its total height is 1.24 m, the dimensions of the stone core are ca. 6.7×6.85 m and of the soil embankment 9–9.5×9–9.5 m. The stone core was mixed with diverse Roman period pottery fragments either handmade or made on a wheel, including one transport amphora, whose fragments were found all the way down to the ancient ground level, where its rim and a base were located (about 85–90 cm from the top). The amphora was not further documented, but we may identify it from the excavation photos (**Palauzovo Pl. 4:1**). Its upper neck and the rim are preserved enough to be able to class it as Vnukov’s Narrow-necked light clay amphorae C IV – either a late variant of the C IVA2 or C IVB type, produced in Heraclea Pontica from the last quarter of the 1st till the first third of the 2nd c. AD (VNUKOV 2016, 41; рис. 1:8,9; рис. 3:7–12), it is a container used for wine.⁷⁰

⁶⁹ Which are also enriched by the excavation diary kindly provided by the Regional Historical Museum in Yambol.

⁷⁰ The amphora was consulted about with S. Vnukov, who inclines to date it into the 1st third of the 2nd c. AD.

Only one grave was found under the stone embankment, almost in the centre of the mound. It was represented by one big bowl (1), fixed standing on the place by four flat stones creating a rectangle around the bowl (**Palauzovo Pl. 4:3**). The vessel was filled with soil mixed with the remains of bones and almost at its bottom a fragment of an iron knife was placed. Next to the burial place was found a burned spot of 1.0×1.2 m, probably the area of the body cremation, with a 10 cm deep layer of ashes. Several other burned spots were located around, always containing some broken pottery fragments, sometimes also fragmented bones, and in one case, also a complete cup (2). One of the burned places was especially interesting, preserving a charred wooden beam, around which two fragments of bronzes, one spindle and three complete vessels, a small bowl (3), a lekythos (5) and a jug (4), were located.

In summary, the mound seemed to be built for one person, who was cremated near the burial place. The remains were collected into an urn (1). The small objects and several complete vessels represent burial offerings and/or the remains of the funeral ceremony (2–5) and are consequently contemporary to the burial. The mound was dated to the 2nd–beginning of the 3rd c. AD by the excavators, although the transport amphora, found at the same level as the burial, suggests its construction shortly after the beginning of the 2nd c. AD.

Mound 9

Fig. 2:6–11; 3:12–19 / Pl. 2:6–11; 3:12–19; 4:4

The burial Mound 9 was located about 50 m north-west of the Mound 8. It was of a bigger size, with maximal height 2.9 m and the outer embankment dimensions ca. 20.6×23.4 m. The core of the mound measured 16 m in diameter, it was created by quern stones mixed with soil and the base of the mound was delimited by a quern stone *crepis*. The bigger diameter of the outer embankment was caused by its erosion.

The embankment was built in two phases. During the first phase, a mound of quern stones was piled up to cover three graves (Graves 2, 3 and 4), all located next to each other, at the same elevation, very likely placed simultaneously. They were all rectangular in form, placed in an east-west orientation only with a small deviation, dug 15–24 cm into the virgin soil. The bodies were cremated in the rectangular area, as the walls of the pits were fired, and their inner space covered by a layer of burned ashes.

One more grave (Grave 1) was found, placed north-west of the others (not covered by the stone pile); as were the other three graves, it was of a rectangular shape, dug into the virgin soil with a body cremated on the spot.

All the four graves were equipped with (at least some) burial goods, mostly with pottery vessels, which seem to be placed on the spot as offerings after the cremation, broken *in situ* by the weight of the stones/soil embankment piled up on top of them. Other pottery fragments had been scattered around the cremation area. The Grave 3 contained only one glass *lacrimarium*, placed approximately in the middle of the rectangular area of the grave. The excavators dated the whole set of the three graves by the chronology of the *lacrimarium*, spanning from the 2nd till the mid-3rd c. AD, and extended the same chronology also to the Grave 1 as it featured the same burial rite.

Besides the graves, three sets of pottery vessels were found in the embankment of the Mound 9, presumably dug there secondarily, as they were placed in different areas and at various depths.

Mound 9 / Grave 1

A rectangular pit of dimensions 1.72×1 m, 15 to 28 cm deep. In its western and south-western part several vessels were found *in situ* – one krater (6), one jar (7), one cup (8) and one dish (9). The krater was found in the south-western corner of the pit, broken into pieces with many bone fragments placed around it; it seems to have been used as a funerary urn. One astragal was also placed in the grave.

Mound 9 / Grave 2

A rectangular pit of dimensions 1.34×0.7 m, dug 20 cm into the terrain. In the north-western part of the pit a jar (10) was found *in situ*, broken on the spot by the weight of the embankment, just next to it (but not inside), were scattered human bones. More pottery fragments were concentrated along the southern wall of the pit (along the border with the Grave 4).

Mound 9 / Grave 3

A rectangular pit of dimensions 1.55×0.78 m, 25 cm deep. In the central part of the pit partly burned bones and several pottery fragments were found, however, there

was no complete vessel. Approximately in the central part of the pit, about 10 cm north of its southern edge, an intact glass *lacrimarium* was found.

Mound 9 / Grave 4

A rectangular pit of dimensions 1.6×0.92 m, about 17–20 cm deep. In its northern part (in the direction towards the Grave 2), one broken jug (**11**) was found. Directly south of the vessel, almost at the centre of the pit, a concentration of bones and charcoal was uncovered. More pottery fragments could be noticed in the western part of the pit, where a badly preserved bronze earring and iron wedge were also located.

Burial 9 / Vessels from the embankment

Within the embankment of the Mound 9 two sets of vessels and one single cup were found. They were all placed in different areas and at different depths. The single vessel find is that of cup **12**. The smaller set is represented by krater **13** and a cup with a drilled hole **14**, which was found placed inside of the krater (**Palauzovo Pl. 4:4**). The last set is the biggest, consisting of a small bowl (**15**), a bowl with rounded and smoothed edges (**16**), a dish (**17**), a small jug (**18**) and a jug (**19**).

3.1.2. REGIONAL (AND TRANS-REGIONAL) PARALLELS TO THE POTTERY

Necropolises

The nearest parallels to the two burial mounds' inventory (both from the graves and the embankments) might be found either directly in the Yambol District or in its closest surroundings including Sliven, Stara Zagora, Bourgas and Plovdiv Districts (**Palauzovo Map 1**).⁷¹

Regarding the **Yambol District**, five burial mounds from a bigger necropolis dated to the 2nd–3rd c. AD were excavated in 2008 (CHOLAKOV *et al.* 2016). The necropolis is located between the villages of Charda and **Straldzha**, about 8.5 km west of the Palauzovo mounds. The pottery finds, which create the

⁷¹ There are many more burial mounds excavated in the area of south-eastern Thrace, however, many of them are published only in the form of short excavation reports (*AOP*). The selection here includes publications which depict, although sometimes in variable quality, drawings or photos of at least some of the finds, which could serve as comparative material. The mound Kral Mezar is noted here despite not having any pottery material published, as it is located 4 km from the *vicus* in Yurta-Stroyno, which is a subject of another chapter of this thesis, and it might relate to the settlement.

closest-located comparative material, were published together with a catalogue first in Bulgarian language (ALEXANDROVA 2013) then in English (ALEXANDROVA 2016). More finds come from the **Kabile** area such as the settlement's southern necropolis dated to the 2nd–4th c. AD (GETOV 1982), the eastern necropolis dated to the 2nd–3rd c. AD (CHANDZHIJSKA – RABADZHIEV 2009, oбp. 2; CHANDZHIJSKA – YANKULOV 2010) and the north-western necropolis dated to the 1st–3rd c. AD (BAKARDZHIEV 2012). Furthermore, individual burial mounds were excavated in the area due to the Thracian highway project and the building activities connected with its construction. One such mound was located south of the ancient city of Kabile and revealed two rich graves dated to the 2nd–3rd c. AD (LOZANOV – CHRISTOV 2010). Another 25 graves dated from the mid-2nd till mid-3rd c. AD were found in a disrupted burial mound near the modern town of Kabile (BAKARDZHIEV – MIKOV – DZHANFEZOVA 2014).

In the area of **Koz Bunar**, located between the villages of Stroyno and Boyanovo, one burial mound containing two graves was excavated. The original grave is dated to the turn of the 1st/2nd c. AD, the second one seems to be deposited into the embankment about 50 years later (AGRE 2013). About 3.5 km north of the mound, another one was excavated, known as **Kral Mezar**, containing three (different style) burials dated from ca. the mid-2nd till the mid-3rd c. AD (AGRE – HRISTO 2016; AGRE – DICHEV – AGRE 2019). No pottery finds were, however, published from this mound.

A good amount of comparative material could also be found in the burial mound of the **Lyulin** village, dated from the 1st c. BC to the 4th c. AD (VELKOV 1996). The finds are currently deposited in the Nova Zagora Museum.

The last finds from the Yambol District are represented by the seven vessels from the Mound 5, located 3 km north-west of the village of **Mogila**, dated from the mid-2nd c. till the beginning of the 3rd c. AD (ALEXANDROV *et al.* 2019, 182; oбp. 3).

Other parallels are from the **Stara Zagora District**, directly from the eastern part of **Stara Zagora** city – ancient Augusta Trajana – itself, where two mounds from a necropolis of 13 mounds, were investigated, and dated to the 3rd–4th c. AD (KALCHEV 1994). Furthermore, a vast assemblage of finds is represented by the two burial mound necropolises of villa **Chatalka**, with the rich one (Mounds 1–9) dated from the mid-1st till the beginning of the 3rd c. AD, and the poor one (Mounds 9–

20), dated from the end of the 1st till the beginning of the 4th c. AD (NIKOLOV – BUYUKLIEV 1967a; 1967b; 1970; BUYUKLIEV 1980). Another amount of comparative material comes from the area of **Maritza Iztok** power plants.⁷² There we would find a necropolis of seven burial mounds located north of the village **Obruchishte**, in the area of Maritza Iztok 1, dated from the beginning of the 2nd till the end of the 4th c. AD (BUYUKLIEV 1962); a burial Mound III, located near the village of **Golyama Detelina**, containing one burial grave with offerings and a pottery item deposited in its embankment, both dated to the end of the 1st–mid-2nd c. AD (GEORGIEVA 2007) and **Osmanova mound**, located 3 km south of the village Radetski, right next to the power plant Maritza Iztok 2, where 11 graves with offerings dated from the 2nd–3rd c. AD were found (GEORGIEVA 2010). About 3 km south of the district border we could also find the village of **Merichleri**⁷³ with several necropolises located in its vicinity and dated from the beginning of the 2nd till the mid-4th c. AD (ALADZHOV 1965).

Large burial mound necropolises were also found in the **Sliven District**, such as directly in the city of **Sliven** – ancient Thuidas –, dated from the mid-2nd till 4th c. AD (BATSOVA-KOSTOVA 1970; KOVACHEV 2009a), as well as in its vicinity, up to 25 km from the city, in the hinterlands in the villages **Staro Selo** (KOVACHEV 2009b); **Binkos** (BATSOVA – KOVACHEV 2009), **Trapoklovo** (KOVACHEV *et al.* 2009) and **Skobelovo** (KOVACHEV 2009c). All are dated within the time span of the 2nd–4th c. AD. In the eastern part of the same district, in the Nova Zagora region, we may find **Dulgata mogila**, which contained three graves dated to the turn of the 1st and the 2nd c. AD (KANCHEV – KANCHEVA-ROUSSEVA 1996). Further south, north-east of the village **Liubimets**, a burial mound with 31 graves, dated from the end of the 1st till the mid-4th c. AD was found, located next to the Roman settlement dated to the same period (IGNATOV – VELKOV 2009). Even further south, north-west of the village **Pet Mogili**, a group of burial mounds, known as Bodakovi mogili, is located. One of them was excavated and the material published, dated from the mid-1st till the beginning of the 4th c. AD (IGNATOV 1996a).

⁷² The three power plants Maritza Iztok 1–3 cover an area of about 20×25 km. Many archaeological sites (settlements and burials) were surveyed and excavated before their construction resulting in a series of archaeological publications *Марица Изток. Археологически проучвания* vol. 1–7. The majority of the joint Maritza Iztok 1–3 complex is located in the Stara Zagora District, however, the area of Maritza Iztok 2 already reaches to the southern edge of the Sliven District (together with the Osmanova mound, located about 700 m north of the district border).

⁷³ Haskovo District.

Besides these three districts, located one next to the other in the central to eastern part of the Upper Thracian lowlands and consequently providing the closest comparison for the Palauzovo finds, we may extend our search for parallels also into other areas of Thrace, specifically to the modern-day Bourgas, Haskovo and Plovdiv Districts.

Further east, in the Bourgas District, which stretches along the Black Sea coast, we may find a flat necropolis together with six burial mounds of about 50 graves located near the village of **Vratitsa**, dated from the turn of the 1st/2nd c. to the 3rd c. AD (STOYANOV – NIKOV – STOYANOVA 2015). On the western edge of the **Karnobat** town a mound containing five child graves was excavated, all dated from the end of the 2nd till the mid-3rd c. AD (GEORGIEVA – MOMCHILOV – GOSPODINOV 2007). Another burial mound (located within a bigger necropolis) was investigated south of the village of **Prosenik**, dated to the 2nd c. AD (LAZAROV 1962). If we leave the Upper Thracian lowland aside, we may also extend, in the same district, into the Strandzha Mountains, where eight burial mounds from three necropolises located near **Vizica** town in the Malko Trnovo region were excavated. They might all be dated into the range of the 2nd–4th c. AD (AGRE – DICHEV 2005).

Further west, in Plovdiv District, we may find two burial mounds in an area called Kerakova mogila, near **Vinitsa** village, dated from the mid-2nd till 3rd c. AD (PANAYOTOV *et al.* 2006) and a necropolis with one excavated burial mound located east of **Asenovgrad**, dated from the 2nd till 4th c. AD (MOREVA – ANGELOVA 1968).

Settlements and production centres

Other parallels (although less numerous) might be found in settlement contexts. The most important for the Yambol District are the finds from **Villa Armira** near Ivaylovgrad, dated from the 2nd till 4th c. AD (KABAKCHIEVA 1986) and from the rural *vicus* at **Yurta-Stroyno**, which has, however, a disrupted stratigraphy (see **Chapter 2**). It is important to note that there are also pottery production centres with published finds from **Stara Zagora** (Stara Zagora District), active during the 3rd c. AD (KALCHEV 1991); **Karanovo** (Sliven District), active from the mid-3rd c. AD possibly until the beginning of the 4th c. AD (BORISOV 2013); and **Nova Nadhezda** (Haskovo District), active from the mid-2nd till mid-3rd c. AD (HARIZANOV 2016).

Suitable parallels could also be found in other places in Thrace, such as in the Roman villa near **Kralev Dol**, Pernik District, dated to the end of the 4th c. AD (NAJDENOVA 1985) and at the main production centres of Moesia Inferior – **Pavlikeni**, Hotnica and Butovo (SULTOV 1985; IVANOV 2019b). Furthermore, focused studies on specific morphological forms of fine-ware vessels should also be mentioned here, such as the typology of the red-slipped bowls from Thrace made by Kabakchieva (1983) and of small-size table amphorae from the north-east Thrace made by Kovachev (1998).

3.2. Pottery finds from Palauzovo

The following 19 vessels were found almost completely preserved in the two burial mounds, placed either directly in the graves, or in the embankment. In the Mound 8 one urn (1) and four vessels / grave offerings (2–5) were found, while in the Mound 9 a total of six vessels were located directly in the graves (6–11) and eight (12–19) in the mound embankment, deposited in three different places.

The vessels were all reconstructed by Georgi Iliev (RIM) and now they are exhibited in the Historical Museum in Straldzha. Several additional pottery fragments, which were not possible to reconstruct into whole vessels, were also found in the burial mounds. These sherds were not available for further processing. Only the transport amphora from Heraclea Pontica found in the Mound 8 was possible to be identified from the excavation photos (**Palauzovo Pl. 4:1**).

The majority of the vessels from Straldzha are missing several fragments, which were replaced during the reconstruction by plaster. The weight given here is for the fully reconstructed vessels and as such it might give slight weight deviations; to give a possible balance between the two components, the approximate percentage of preservation of the original clay vessel is marked in the description; it generally ranges between 70 % and 100 %.

The vessels presented here⁷⁴ are all wheel made, but quite often irregular in shape (each side has a different height, body / handle shape, the rim or base might be wavy or askew), which is in some cases evident from the drawings / photos, in others it is not. For this reason, there is a note in the description of each vessel regarding its shape; some tolerance is applied, and a slightly irregular shape of the

⁷⁴ In the excavation report we may find a note about handmade pottery fragments found within the embankments.

body/rim/base still counts as regular, so as to point out the vessels which are especially badly executed.

3.2.1. MOUND 8

Palauzovo Fig. 1:1–5 / Pl. 1:1–5; 4:2–3

Vessel 1 was found complete, placed standing between the four stones immediately surrounding the vessel (**Palauzovo Pl. 4:3**). It was filled with soil and the remains of bones, containing also one fragment of an iron knife. The vessel is a big bowl of uneven shape, with an irregular body and wavy rim; the fabric is red, the outer slip is very worn and barely visible.

In terms of the shape and dimensions, the closest morphological form from the described typologies is the Bowl Type VI of Kabakchieva (1983, 4) widely dated from the 1st till 4th c. AD. Similar vessels were also found at the settlement of Yurta-Stroyno (**TW Fig. 8:106–112**), dated based on the parallels into the same time span as Kabakchieva's Type VI. Similar vessels are also known from necropolises, such as from nearby Straldzha, where a bowl of similar shape and the same size was found (ALEXANDROVA 2013, III-1/100); and from the so-called Osmanova mound in the area of Maritza Iztok (GEORGIEVA 2010, обр. 4:6). Both parallels from the necropolises are dated to the 2nd–3rd c. AD.

ID # ИК 19 / Palauzovo Fig. 1:1 / Pl. 1:1

Vessel: Big bowl; **shape:** irregular

Preservation: 95 %; **fragments:** 17 pcs.; **weight:** 1630 g; **max. body th.:** 10 mm

Inner rim d.: 300 mm; **inner base d.:** 88 mm; **max. height×width:** 178×317 mm

Fabric: hard and sandy, very well sorted; smooth to chalky feel; evenly fired

Inclusions: 5 %, normally up to 0.5 mm; predominant white and dark particles, few vughs

Fabric colour: reddish yellow (5YR 6/8)

Surface: red (10R 5/6) colour; thin matt slip, quite worn

Vessel 2 was found next to a burned spot nearby the cremation place of a single grave of the Mound 8. It is a small cup of beige to red fabric colour covered by brown slip worn in places. Originally, two handles were placed on the body

opposite to each other just below the raised rim decorated with five incised horizontal lines. Both handles are now missing, and additionally, the remains of one of them were smoothed and almost lost. Parts of the other one are still preserved, allowing the measurement of the handle section (14×4 mm). In the middle of the body, between the handles, a hole 5 mm in diameter was drilled after firing.

Cups / small *kantharoi* of corresponding size with one or two engraved line(s) on a slightly raised rim might be found in the ceramic centre near Pavlikeni, dated to the 2nd c. AD (IVANOV 2019b fig. 7:9–10, 8:6–7). Cups Type I (fig. 7:9–10) might especially be considered as a close parallel to vessel 2, however, comparing it to our cup, the Pavlikeni pieces have one handle only, the body is commonly decorated (rouletting, barbotine) and the bottom ends in a ring base. In Thrace, several similar forms of smaller size cups might be found in graves, however none of them has exactly the same form as the main feature of our cup – the raised ribbed rim – is always missing. As examples of similar cup forms we may point to finds from Vratitsa necropolis, dated from the 1st/2nd c. till the mid-3rd c. AD (c.f. STOYANOV – NIKOV – STOYANOVA 2015, таб. XIII:2); from burial mounds in Merichleri, dated from the beginning of the 2nd c. till the mid-4th c. AD (ALADZHOV 1965, таб. Б:VI4.1); or from Straldzha necropolis, dated to the 2nd–3rd c. AD (ALEXANDROVA 2013, cups II/208). The cups of the two latter examples do not seem to have handles at all.

ID # ПК 8 / Palauzovo Fig. 1:2 / Pl. 1:2

Vessel: cup; **shape:** irregular (whole)

Preservation: 80 %; **fragments:** 9 pcs.; **weight:** 104 g; **max. body th.:** 7 mm

Inner rim d.: 66 mm; **inner base d.:** 30 mm; **max. height×width:** 66×77 mm

Handles: 2; **section on the attachment:** 14×4 mm

Fabric: hard, very well sorted; evenly fired

Inclusions: 10 %, normally up to 0.5 mm; predominant lime and dark particles

Fabric colour: red (2.5YR 5/6)

Surface: brown (7.5YR 5/3) slip covering the whole vessel, worn on places (as on the maximal body dimensions); smooth surface feel

Decoration: the raised rim is horizontally incised by five parallel lines

Vessel 3 – a grey bowl with a flanged rim and a rib – was found directly at the eastern edge of the cremation area of the Mound 8, right next to the charred piece of wood (**Palauzovo Pl. 4:3**). The upper part of the vessel which was facing the fire was burned black.

In its general form, the vessel relates to the bowls with a flanged rim with one or two ribs, which were common for Thrace during the 2nd–3rd c. AD, although being produced, in a lower quality, until the 4th c. AD (see **Yurta-Stroyno TW Fig. 7:89–101** for parallels). In comparison to these, the bowl from Palauzovo is of smaller proportions, with one rib and of a grey fabric (although this colour seems to be caused by secondary firing). We may find vessels of such a shape and of a grey colour, although of bigger proportions (rim d. 130 mm), in Straldzha necropolis, dated to the 2nd–3rd c. AD (ALEXANDROVA 2013, VII/166); at the necropolis near Vratitsa, dated from the turn of the 1st/2nd to the mid-3rd c. AD, where the vessel is closer in size with a rim d. 100 mm although its fabric description is missing (STOYANOV – NIKOV – STOYANOVA 2015, таб. XVIII:IX-15); and, if we go to extremes, an almost twice as big bowl (rim d. 145 mm) of similar form is also known from the burial mound near Liubimets village in the Nova Zagora region, dated from the end of the 1st till the mid-4th c. AD, this vessel is of an ochre colour (IGNATOV – VELKOV 2009, таб. LVI:17/2).

ID # ПК 5 / Palauzovo Fig. 1:3 / Pl. 1:3

Vessel: bowl; **shape:** regular (but the body inclined to the one side)

Preservation: 100 %; **fragments:** 3 pcs.; **weight:** 112 g; **max. body th.:** 6 mm

Inner rim d.: 85 mm; **inner base d.:** 35 mm; **max. height×width:** 47×87 mm

Fabric: hard, well sorted; unevenly fired (secondarily?)

Inclusions: 10 %, normally up to 0.5 mm; predominant lime and dark pellets

Fabric colour: grey (2.5Y 6/1)

Surface: different tints of grey–very dark grey (Gley 1 6/N – Gley 1 3/N), no slip; smooth surface feel

Vessel 4 is a jug of a reddish fabric and no surface slip, the form is biconical and the upper shoulders are decorated with two horizontal engraved lines. The rim shape is quite specific, quadrangular, not having parallels in burial nor settlement contexts in Thrace / Moesia Inferior, despite jugs with one handle being common grave goods

in south-eastern Bulgaria during the 2nd–3rd/4th c. AD.⁷⁵ Closest in form – with a biconical body with a sharp transition – is the jug from Lyulin, Yambol District (VELKOV 1996, таб. I:11). Its rim is, however, triangular and the fabric colour ochre brown.

The quality of the vessel, for table ware, is not very high – the body and the rim are slightly irregular, the fabric is sandy, and the slip is completely missing. Consequently, we may consider the vessel to be a regional product only, with a specific rim shape, otherwise it is not different from other jugs known from the area during the 2nd–3rd/4th c. AD.

ID # ИК 15 / Palauzovo Fig. 1:4 / Pl. 1:4

Vessel: jug; **shape:** more or less regular (crooked rim)

Preservation: 85 %; **fragments:** 45 pcs.; **weight:** 1292 g; **max. body th.:** 7 mm

Inner rim d.: 55 mm; **inner base d.:** 76 mm; **max. height×width:** 255×200 mm

Handles: 1; **section:** 33×12 mm

Fabric: hard, sandy, good sorting; evenly fired

Inclusions: 20 %, normally up to 1.0 mm (rarely bigger pcs. up to 2 mm), predominant sandy admixture, common vesicles/vughs (fallen out particles)

Fabric colour: reddish yellow (5 YR 6/6)

Surface: same as the fabric; no slip; rough surface feel

Vessel 5 features a distinctive form in the context of the Roman period material. It has a globular body, narrow neck and broad curved rim without a spout. The surface is of a black glossy slip with tints of red to grey colours. The one handle, originally placed below the rim and on the body, is completely missing, and it seems to have been deliberately removed and the body attachment areas smoothed. Perhaps the handle got broken, but since the vessel was still functional, it was removed and further used. In the middle of the body, just below the engraved double-lines below the neck, a small hole, 2–3 mm in diameter, was drilled after firing.

The best parallel might be found in Classical and Hellenistic Greece among the *lekythoi*, vessels which might originally serve as oil holders – with use in a

⁷⁵ c.f. STOYANOV – NIKOV – STOYANOVA 2015, таб. XIX:V-25; ALEXandroVA 2013, jugs V-1/20–21; KOVACHEV 2009a, таб. VI/17:4, VII/18:1, 7, VIII/22:2, IX/23/6, XV:3–5 etc.; PANAYOTOV *et al.* 2006, таб. XVI XVII–XX; AGRE – DICHEV 2005, обр. 6, 7, 10, 11; BUYUKLIEV 1980, таб. 13: upper left; ALADZHOV 1965, таб. Д:V14.2; LAZAROV 1962, обр. 10; etc.

kitchen, but as well as for perfumes or even as lamp fillers (ROTROFF 1997, 169) commonly associated with burial customs (SPARKES – TALCOTT 1970, 150). Parallels from the Athenian Agora show exactly the same shape, however of much bigger dimensions (height of 225 mm), dated by Rotroff to the first half of the 3rd c. BC (SPARKES – TALCOTT 1970, fig. 11:1108; ROTROFF 1997, fig. 69:1110).⁷⁶ Rotroff mentions that the form gets smaller towards the early Roman period and we may, indeed, see a similarity with another *lekythos* from the Athenian Agora of smaller dimensions dated to the mid-2nd c. BC, although the rim is not preserved for comparison (ROTROFF 1997 fig. 69:1116). The similarity between our vessel and the latter piece is enhanced by the horizontal engraved lines placed below the narrow neck, a feature common for both vessels.

We may also see parallels in the Campanian ware, Apulian production (MOREL 1981, 346; 5235a 1 and 5236a 1), dated, similarly to the finds from the Athenian Agora, to the end of the 4th c.–early 3rd c. BC. Comparing them to our piece, the Campanian vessels are either more elongated (5235a 1 and 5236a) or with a wider rim and double-barrel handle which is attached to it (5236a 1). Considering the smallest vessel (5236a 1), the overall dimensions correspond to our piece. Despite the small differences, the similarity between both given examples of the Campanian ware and our vessel is quite pronounced.

ID # IIIK 17 / Palauzovo Fig. 1:5 / Pl. 1:5

Vessel: jug; **shape:** regular body with irregular neck and rim

Preservation: 95 %; **fragments:** 9 pcs.; **weight:** 118 g; **max. body th.:** ca. 4 mm

Inner rim d.: 54 mm; **inner base d.:** 32 mm; **max. height×width:** 99×86 mm

Handles: 1, fully removed (only distinguishable places of attachments)

Fabric: hard, very well sorted; evenly fired

Inclusions: individual particles not detectable under the layer of the slip

Fabric colour: grey (10 YR 6/1)

Surface: good quality glossy black slip with dark reddish brown (5YR 3/4) spots, slightly worn; smooth surface feel

Decoration: Two horizontal incised lines on the upper shoulders

⁷⁶ These two publications present the same vessel found at the Athenian Agora and dated by Sparkes and Talcott (1970) to the last third of the 4th c. BC and by Rotroff to the first half of the 3rd c. BC (1997). In the text I use the latter chronology.

3.2.2. MOUND 9

Palauzovo Fig. 2:6–11; 3:12–19 / Pl. 2:6–11; 3:12–19; 4:4

Mound 9 / Grave 1

Palauzovo Fig. 2:6–9 / Pl. 2:6–9

Vessel 6 is a krater, which served as a funeral urn. It was found broken into pieces together with many bone fragments. The vessel is of a red fabric with the upper part covered by a red slip, burned in several places to black.

A similar vessel form, although with a squatter body and with a ring foot, is known from the area of Moesia Inferior and Thrace, dated from the end of the 1st c. AD onwards (SULTOV 1985, 77; tab. XXXVI:4, Type 5). Sultov mentions that this type of vessel is found in necropolises as it was commonly used as a funeral urn; he also refers to such a find from Chatalka necropolis (BUYUKLIEV 1962, оѡп. 11:6 and 12). We may find basically the same vessel form as Sultov describes also at the production centre in Stara Zagora, active during the 3rd c. AD (KALCHEV 1991, Abb. 9:7–8), suggesting a longer production span of the form and its use both in Moesia Inferior and Thrace.

Many rim and upper body fragments of presumably similar kraters are published from the Straldzha necropolis, although all of them were found in the mounds' embankments and as such not properly dated nor do they reveal their whole shape (ALEXANDROVA 2013, Pots II-1/250–256, II-1/242–249). We may also mention a very similar vessel from a burial discovered in the necropolis in Merichleri (ALADZHOV 1965, таѡ. B:II5.1). The vessel, despite having a corresponding form and dimensions, has rounded handles placed horizontally on the upper body in the style of Hellenistic kraters.

Furthermore, similar kraters, although with a more distinctively raised neck over the bulky body, were described in the chapter dealing with the material from Yurta-Stroyno (see description of **TW Fig. 13:181–187**). Based on the comparisons, the overall chronology related to this form seems to span from the end of the 1st till the 4th c. AD.

ID # ИК 20 / Palauzovo Fig. 2:6 / Pl. 2:6

Vessel: krater; **shape:** regular

Preservation: 70 %; **fragments:** 43 pcs.; **weight:** 1435 g; **max. body th.:** 8 mm
Inner rim d.: 185 mm; **inner base d.:** 70 mm; **max. height×width:** 239×290 mm
Handles: 2; **section:** 27×11 mm
Fabric: hard, very well sorted; evenly fired/secondarily burned (?)
Inclusions: 5 %, normally up to 0.5 mm; common white pellets, silver mica, few vughs, rare pieces of shells (up to 5 mm)
Fabric colour: red (2.5YR 6/8), but burned to tints of red – dark brown – black
Surface: red (2.5YR 5/6) slip partly preserved on the upper body part; smooth surface feel

Vessel 7 is a jug with a triangular rim, narrow neck and slightly irregular bulky body accompanied by one handle. It is of a red fabric, slightly burned in several places. As already discussed regarding the vessel 4, jugs with one handle were commonly deposited in graves in Thrace and Moesia Inferior during the 2nd–3rd/4th c. AD, and many such examples might be found in published literature (see footnote of vessel 4). A jug, very close in form to our vessel 7, comes from the Vratitsa necropolis, dated from the 1st/2nd c. till the mid-3rd c. AD (STOYANOV – NIKOV – STOYANOVA 2016, таб. XXII:ΠΓ-17), however, the vessel is depicted with two handles.

ID # ПК 12 / Palauzovo Fig. 2:7 / Pl. 2:7

Vessel: jug; **shape:** irregular (each half of the body part different shape)
Preservation: ca. 80 %; **fragments:** 36 pcs.; **weight:** 551 g; **max. body th.:** 5 mm
Inner rim d.: 50 mm; **inner base d.:** 44 mm; **max. height×width:** 197×173 mm
Handles: 1; **section:** 22×10 mm
Fabric: hard, very good sorting; evenly fired
Inclusions: 10 %, normally up to 1.0 mm, predominant lime and silver mica
Fabric colour: light red (2.5YR 6/8)
Surface: red (2.5YR 5/6 to 5/8) thin matt slip well soaked into the clay covering the whole vessel; smooth feel

Vessel 8 is a simple hemispherical bowl with an inside inclined rim and a base, which might be more or less hollowed. The form, which is based on Hellenistic

prototypes (c.f. STOYANOV – MIKOV – DZHANFEZOVA 2013, фиг. 43–44)⁷⁷, is very common for Roman Thrace.

Such bowls might be frequently found in necropolises, such as in the mound near the village Pet Mogili, dated from the end of the 1st till the beginning of the 4th c. AD (IGNATOV 1996a, таб. VIII:15/3); at several graves from the Straldzha necropolis, dated from the 2nd till the 3rd c. AD (ALEXANDROVA 2013, I-1/52–56); at the rich necropolis near Chataka, dated from the mid-1st till the beginning of the 3rd c. AD (BUYUKLIEV 1980, 80; таб. 17:218); at the Vratitsa necropolis, dated from the 1st/2nd c. till the mid-3rd c. AD (STOYANOV – NIKOV – STOYANOVA 2016, таб. XVIII:I-39, IX-6), or at the burial mound from the Maritza Iztok area, dated from the end of the 1st till the mid-2nd c. AD (GEORGIEVA 2007, обр. 4:2–4). Finds of such bowls are also known from settlements, such as from the Villa Armira in Ivaylovgrad (KABAKCHIEVA 1986, таб. 1, обр. 5).

In 1983, Kabakchieva sorted out the most common bowls found in Thrace during the Roman period. We may find our bowl there under the Type I, with further parallels from burial mounds in Svilengrad and Roman period settlements in Kabile and Nova Zagora (KABAKCHIEVA 1983, 1–2; Тип 1). Kabakchieva puts their chronology from the turn of the 1st/2nd c. AD until the beginning of the 4th c. AD, with the peak production in the 2nd c. AD.

ID # ПК 2 / Palauzovo Fig. 2:8 / Pl. 2:8

Vessel: bowl; **shape:** regular

Preservation: 70 %; **fragments:** 19 pcs.; **weight:** 258 g; **max. body th.:** 10 mm

Inner rim d.: 135 mm; **inner base d.:** 42 mm; **max. height×width:** 70×142 mm

Fabric: hard, very well sorted; evenly fired

Inclusions: 5 %, normally up to 0.5 mm; predominant white pellets, silver mica and vesicles

Fabric colour: reddish yellow (5YR 6/6)

Surface: light red (2.5YR 6/8) to red (10R 5/6) matt slip well soaked to the clay covering the whole vessel; smooth surface feel

Vessel 9 is a dish of an orange fabric and a red slip, of an irregularly shaped body, with a wavy rim and a shallow barely visible rouletting applied in two rows on the

⁷⁷ Finds from a mound near ancient Kabile dated to the second half of the 4th century AD.

external part of the body. In general, dishes are common grave goods, featuring slightly different forms, especially regarding the rim shape. The dish **9** has a simple triangular rim with rounded edges, pulled out and flattened from above, with no grooves, engraved lines, or any other decoration. Similar forms of dishes might be found in the burial mound near Liubimets village, dated from the end of the 1st till the mid-4th c. AD (IGNATOV – VELKOV 2009, таб. LII:4/1, LIV:12/2), and at the Straldzha necropolis, dated to the 2nd–3rd c. AD (ALEXANDROVA 2013, IV/110). Dishes with a slightly deeper body, otherwise of very similar form, were also produced in the Stara Zagora pottery workshop during the 3rd c. AD (KALCHEV 1991, Abb. 7:5).

ID # IIIK 3 / Palauzovo Fig. 2:9 / Pl. 2:9

Vessel: dish; **shape:** irregular (whole body and rim)

Preservation: 90 %; **fragments:** 24 pcs.; **weight:** 261 g; **max. body th.:** 6 mm

Inner rim d.: 190 mm; **inner base d.:** 62 mm; **max. height×width:** 42×194 mm

Fabric: hard to soft, very good sorting; evenly fired

Inclusions: 5 %, normally up to 0.5 mm; predominant white pellets, no other inclusions visible in hand specimen

Fabric colour: reddish yellow (5YR 7/6)

Surface: red (10R 5/8), partly greyish brown (10 YR 5/2) – part of the rim seems to be affected by fire (primary burning?); smooth surface feel

Mound 9 / Grave 2

Palauzovo Fig. 2:10 / Pl. 2:10

Vessel **10** is a jug of a light orange fabric with the upper body part covered by red slip and decorated with rouletting and incised leaves. The body has an irregular form and the handles are placed at different heights.

Exactly the same form was not found elsewhere, however, we may see similarities with a jug published from Vratitsa necropolis, dated from the 1st/2nd c. till the mid-3rd c. AD (STOYANOV – NIKOV – STOYANOVA 2016, таб. XIX:II-13, II-9). The body form is almost the same, also the vessel proportions, handles, the area covered by the slip and the upper body decoration made with rouletting. The main difference is the neck shape, the rim profile and the extra decoration of incised

leaves placed on the upper body shoulders. However, comparing both drawings and photos (on the cover of the journal) the overall impression of the two vessels is the same.

ID # IIIK 11 / Palauzovo Fig. 2:10 / Pl. 2:10

Vessel: jug; **shape:** irregular (body, handles)

Preservation: ca. 95 %; **fragments:** 45 pcs.; **weight:** 549 g; **max. body th.:** 5 mm

Inner rim d.: 50 mm; **inner base d.:** 50 mm; **max. height×width:** 200×160 mm

Handles: 2; **section:** 20×8 mm

Fabric: hard, very well sorted; evenly fired

Inclusions: 5 %, normally up to 0.5 mm, predominant silver mica, common vesicles/vughs

Fabric colour: very pale brown (10YR 7/4)

Surface: red (2.5YR 4/8 to 5/8) slip – located on the upper body part from above the maximal vessel dimensions up to the rim; smooth feel

Decoration: horizontally grooved neck, shoulders covered by two lines of incised leaves separated by two incised lines, the maximal body dimension decorated with two lines of wide rouletting

Mound 9 / Grave 4

Palauzovo Fig. 2:11 / Pl. 2:11

Vessel 11 is a pale brown table amphora with a brownish slip applied on the upper body. A vessel of the same form, as well as of the same rim and base diameter, was found at the mound dated to the 2nd–3rd c. AD at the village of Lyulin; even the colour of the fabric and the slip correspond (VELKOV 1996, таб. I:3; KOVACHEV 1998, таб. 3:43). Further parallels of such jugs executed with a pale brown fabric might be found in the burial mound near Liubimets village, dated from the end of the 1st till the mid-4th c. AD (IGNATOV – VELKOV 2009, таб. LV:14/1), and in the area of Maritza Iztok power plant, dated from the beginning of the 2nd till the end of the 4th c. AD (BUYUKLIEV 1962, оѡр. 14:a). Additionally, similar vessels in different fabric colours might also be found, such as an amphora of a red fabric and bigger proportions (rim d. 80 mm, height 290 mm) from the Osmanova mound in the Maritza Iztok area dated to the 2nd–3rd c. AD (GEORGIEVA 2010, 304, оѡр. 6a);

an amphora of a brownish colour and less squat body from the burial mound near Kabile dated from the mid-2nd till the mid-3rd c. AD (BAKARDZHIEV – MIKOV – DZHANFEZOVA 2014) and an amphora from the burial mound near Mogila village, dated from the mid-2nd c. to the beginning of the 3rd c. AD (ALEXANDROV 2019, oбп. 3:6).

ID # ИК 14 / Palauzovo Fig. 2:11 / Pl. 2:11

Vessel: table amphora; **shape:** regular

Preservation: ca. 80 %; **fragments:** 63 pcs.; **weight:** 808 g; **max. body th.:** 5 mm

Inner rim d.: 56 mm; **inner base d.:** 63 mm; **max. height×width:** 220×182 mm

Handles: 2; **section:** 27×10 mm

Fabric: hard, fairly sorted; evenly fired

Inclusions: 10 %, normally up to 0.5 mm, predominant lime and grog (the latter in bigger particles up to 4 mm), common vesicles (after burned out lime and fallen particles)

Fabric colour: pale brown (5Y 8/3)

Surface: red (2.5YR 5/6) to brown (if overfired) slip – located on the upper body part from the maximal vessel dimensions up to the rim; smooth surface feel

Grave goods from the embankment – Set 1

Palauzovo Fig. 3:12 / Pl. 3:12

Vessel 12 has the very typical form of cups produced in Moesia Inferior and Thrace during the 2nd–4th c. AD. This vessel, however, has no surface slip, which is otherwise characteristic for these cups, and its lower part is burned to black from stacking in the kiln, where it was directly sitting on another such vessel.

We may find these cups among the products of the local kiln sites in Stara Zagora (KALCHEV 1991, Abb. 9:10–13) and Nova Nadhezda (HARIZANOV 2016, fig. 13: upper right), and from nearby settlements, such as, from Villa Armira (KABAKCHIEVA 1986, 17–18; таб. 17:238) or Yurta-Stroyno (TW Fig. 9:122–127). These cups are also very popular as grave goods as many have been found in necropolises. To name some finds from the Yambol and Stara Zagora Districts, we may give examples from the mound near Pet Mogili (IGNATOV 1996a, e.g. таб. 3:2); Straldzha necropolis (ALEXANDROVA 2016, таб. 24); the poor necropolis of Villa

Chatalka (BUYUKLIEV 1980, e.g. таб. 31:444); from the area of Maritza Iztok power plant (BUYUKLIEV 1962, обр. 2, 6a; GEORGIEVA 2010, обр. 5: 6–3); the burial mound near Liubimets village (IGNATOV – VELKOV 2009, таб. LII/6:1,2; LIV/12:4,5; LV/13:1; LVII/18:2), or from Kabile (BAKARDZHIEV – MIKOV – DZHANFEZOVA 2014, obr. 3:B). Many other such vessels from the Yambol District are exhibited in the Museum of Archaeological park of Thracian and Ancient city of Kabile. Based on the finds, the peak of the vessel popularity seems to be in the 2nd–3rd c. AD, with the production continuation until the 4th c. AD.

This cup form might be found in graves quite frequently with a perforated hole on one of the long sides drilled after the firing. This feature was probably made for libation / ceremonial purposes of the funerary feast. Many such examples come from the region, such as from several graves of the mound near the village Pet Mogili (IGNATOV 1996a, таб. III: Грoб 5:2; IX: Грoб 17:1; X: Грoб 19:2; XIII: Грoб 24:2; XVII:2) which was in use from the end of the 1st till the beginning of the 4th c. AD, or from a burial mound near Lyulin village, dated from the 2nd till the 4th c. AD (VELKOV 1996, обр. 2 and таб. I:7).

ID # ИК 4 / Palauzovo Fig. 3:12 / Pl. 3:12

Vessel: cup; **shape:** regular

Preservation: 80 %; **fragments:** 14 pcs.; **weight:** 146 g; **max. body th.:** 7 mm

Inner rim d.: 102 mm; **inner base d.:** 27 mm; **max. height×width:** 64×107 mm

Handles: 2; **section:** 11×6 mm

Fabric: soft and sandy, fairly sorted; the bottom is unevenly fired from stacking in the kiln

Inclusions: 20 %, normally up to 1.0 mm; predominant sandy admixture, common grog

Fabric colour: light red (2.5 YR 6/8), bottom burned to dark – black

Surface: same as the fabric colour, no slip; sandy feel

Decoration: the rim is decorated with one horizontal incised line below the lip

Grave goods from the embankment – Set 2

Palauzovo Fig. 3:13–14 / Pl. 3:13–14

The krater **13** is of the Grey ware, with the upper body slipped to black. The surface is highly smoothed / polished. The upper body and the handles are decorated with deep engraved grooves; part of the right handle was cut in antiquity. The form might find its parallels in Moesia Inferior among kraters being produced in small quantities during the 2nd c. AD in Pavlikeni (SULTOV 1985, 76–77; tab. XXXVI:2; IVANOV 2019b, fig. 9:1). The height of our vessel and the ones from Pavlikeni is the same (180 cm for Pavlikeni), but the width is different (max d. up to 170 mm for Pavlikeni), which makes the comparative vessel slenderer than ours. The rim profile, placement of the handles and the ring base are, however, the same for both exemplars.

The vessel shape seems to be influenced by the black glazed West Slope amphorae of a form created during the Hellenistic period, dated ca. from the 2nd half of the 3rd c. BC till the beginning of the 1st c. BC (ROTROFF 1997, 120; 407–459, figs. 32–34). Rotroff distinguished three variants, from which the Asia Minor and the Black Sea area products are characteristic for their ribbed body (c.f. JACQUEMIN – MAFFRE 1986, fig. 30–31) – a feature which might be an inspiration for the deep engraved grooves on our vessel. The amphora closest in form to our vessel **13** (ROTROFF 1997, fig. 32:440)⁷⁸ belongs among the latest Hellenistic products dated to the 1st quarter of the 1st c. BC.

ID # ИК 18 / Palauzovo Fig. 3:13 / Pl. 3:13

Vessel: krater; **shape:** irregular

Preservation: 80 %; **fragments:** 43 pcs.; **weight:** 891 g; **max. body th.:** ca. 6 mm

Inner rim d.: 145 mm; **inner base d.:** 75 mm; **max. height×width:** 185×228 mm

Handles: 2; **section:** 21×15 mm

Fabric: hard, well sorted; evenly fired

Inclusions: 5 %, normally up to 0.5 mm; predominant dark stones, common white pellets and grog inclusions

⁷⁸ An even more striking similarity might be noticed between IVANOV 2019b, fig. 9:1 and Rotroff 1997, fig. 32:440 as these two amphorae, besides the other features, also share the slender body. Compared to them, our vessel **13** is squatter and looks ‘heavier’. Due to this appearance, it is referred to as a krater or krater-like vessel, which seems to be more appropriate.

Fabric colour: grey (Gley 1 6/N)

Surface: highly smoothed; dark grey (5YR 4/1) glossy slip applied on the upper body part from the maximal dimension up to the rim

Decoration: Raised neck and the upper shoulders decorated with incised grooves; the neck and the shoulders divided by one plastic rib

The cup **14** was found placed inside of the krater **13**. Its form is based on the most typical cup for the area (here **12**), but its body is more rounded, the base is slightly wider, while the rim is a bit narrower. The handles are placed at various heights and have a different shape.⁷⁹ The base of the vessel is very uneven, and it seems, it was never meant to stand, as it easily topples over. On the lower body part, on one of the long sides, a funnel-shaped hole (d. 7 to 3 mm) was drilled after firing, giving the impression that the vessel might have served as a *rhyton*. The perforated holes are frequently connected with *kantharos*-like vessel forms, as are the ones under **12**, and, also **14**.

In the Yambol District, cups of the same form were found in other mound necropolises such as in the one in the Lyulin village, dated from the 2nd till 4th c. AD (VELKOV 1996, таб. I:10) and in Straldzha, dated from the 2nd till 3rd c. AD (ALEXANDROVA 2013, I-1/197). None of these finds has, however, a drilled hole. Such cups are also attested at the settlements, such as in villa Armira in Ivaylovgrad, also dated to the 2nd–4th c. AD (KABAKCHIEVA 1986, 17–18; таб. 17:238).

ID # ИК 10 / Palauzovo Fig. 3:14 / Pl. 3:14

Vessel: cup; **shape:** irregular (body, base)

Preservation: 90 %; **fragments:** 15 pcs.; **weight:** 127 g; **max. body th.:** 3 mm

Inner rim d.: 86 mm; **inner base d.:** 37 mm; **max. height×width:** 77–81×130 mm

Handles: 2 (each of different shape, one fully reconstructed); **section:** 7×7 mm

Fabric: soft, very well sorted; evenly fired

Inclusions: 5 %, normally up to 0.5 mm; predominant white pellets and silver mica, common grog

Fabric colour: red (2.5 YR 6/8)

Surface: of fabric colour with no slip; chalky surface feel

⁷⁹ The right handle of the vessel is reconstructed in plaster on the bases of the preserved parts – handle/body attachments.

Grave goods from the embankment – Set 3

Palauzovo Fig. 3:15–19 / Pl. 3:15–19

Vessel **15** is a small irregular bowl of a red colour and a double engraved rim from above. Its closest parallel might be found in the Osmanova mound, in the area of Maritza Iztok power plant, dated to the 2nd–3rd c. AD (GEORGIEVA 2010, o6p. 3:6 and B). Similar bowls might be further found in the poor necropolis of Villa Chataalka, dated from the end of the 1st till the beginning of the 4th c. AD (BUYUKLIEV 1980, o6p. 482, 486); in the mound near the village of Pet Mogili, dated from the mid-1st till the turn of the 3rd/4th c. AD (IGNATOV 1996a, Ta6. 15/27:1); in the burial mound near Karnovat, dated to the end of the 2nd–mid-3rd c. AD (GEORGIEVA – MOMCHILOV – GOSPODINOV 2007, 112; o6p. 3:2); or in the mound in Liubimets village, dated from the end of the 1st till the mid-4th c. AD (IGNATOV – VELKOV 2009, Ta6. LII:4/2).

Besides the funerary context, very similar vessels are known from the production centre in Stara Zagora (KALCHEV 1991, Abb. 7:13 and/or Abb. 9:4,5). Further, the bowls of Kabakchieva Type 4 are also very close in a morphological form, these are dated to the 2nd–3rd c. AD. Kabakchieva also gives further examples from Kabile, Villa Armira and Stara Zagora (1983, 3–4).⁸⁰

Georgieva (2010, 300) relates such bowls to a similar form of vessels which have, however, a thickened everted rim grooved from above. These vessels were found in necropolises, such as in Stara Zagora (KALCHEV 1994, Ta6. 5:39), or at the rich necropolis of Villa Chataalka (BUYUKLIEV 1980, o6p. 326). They are also known in a settlement context, such as in Yurta-Stroyno (**TW Fig. 10:143**). They do keep a similar concept (small bowls with flaring walls and a bended rim), but the rim profile is quite different and much thicker. Consequently, we may hesitate to relate these two forms together. Either way, all the mentioned examples might be dated similarly, into a wider chronological range stretching from the mid-1st till the turn of the 3rd/4th c. AD.

ID # ИК 6 / Palauzovo Fig. 3:15 / Pl. 3:15

Vessel: small bowl; **shape:** irregular

Preservation: 80 %; **fragments:** 16 pcs.; **weight:** 92 g; **max. body th.:** 5 mm

⁸⁰ Kabakchieva refers to unpublished material.

Inner rim d.: 78 mm; **inner base d.:** 28 mm; **max. height×width:** 45×100 mm

Fabric: hard, very well sorted; unevenly fired

Inclusions: 5 %, normally up to 0.5 mm (rare bigger particles up to 2 mm), predominant white pellets

Fabric colour: yellowish brown (10 YR 5/4)

Surface: red (2.5YR 5/8) to reddish brown (2.5YR 4/4) slip covering the upper part of the body, burned to black on the rim, and quite worn on the body part; smooth surface feel

Vessel **16** is a hemispherical bowl of a red colour with a dark red slip. The rim, which was originally pulled out, was broken off in antiquity. Its remains are well smoothed on one part, while the other part is hackly, suggesting the direction of its original continuation.

We may imagine several forms of the rim. It could be either in the form of a small rounded ending such as on a bowl from the Straldzha necropolis (ALEXANDROVA 2013, bowls I-3/85); an overhanging ribbed rim similar to a bowl found at the same necropolis (ALEXANDROVA 2013, bowls V/113) and at the mound near Pet Mogili (IGNATOV 1996a, таб. XVI:30/4); or featuring a small beak-like rim as on the bowl from the area of Maritza Iztok (GEORGIEVA 2007, обр. 5:3). All these parallels cover a wide chronological span, stretching from the mid/end of the 1st till the 3rd-4th c. AD.

ID # IIIK 7 / Palauzovo Fig. 3:16 / Pl. 3:16

Vessel: bowl; **shape:** regular

Preservation: 90 %; **fragments:** 7 pcs.; **weight:** 149 g; **max. body th.:** 6 mm

Inner rim d.: 125 mm; **inner base d.:** 45 mm; **max. height×width:** 52×127 mm

Fabric: hard to soft, very well sorted; evenly fired

Inclusions: 10 %, normally up to 0.5 mm; predominant white pellets, few silver mica and grog, rare straw and vughs

Fabric colour: reddish yellow (5YR 6/8) / yellowish red (5YR 5/6)

Surface: matt red (2.5YR 4/6) and dark reddish grey (2.5YR 4/1) slip which is covering the whole vessel, it is worn on places; smooth feel

Vessel **17** is a dish of an orange fabric and a red slip with two lines of rouletting running all around the body, with the lower line disappearing on one side. The form is very common, being found both in the settlements and necropolises during the 1st till the 3rd c. AD (see **Yurta-Stroyno TW Fig. 2:14–24** for parallels).

As an example from necropolises we may give here finds from the burial mound near Liubimets village, dated from the end of the 1st till the mid-4th c. AD (IGNATOV – VELKOV 2009, таб. LVII:18/3–6; LX:27/4–6; LXI/29:1); from the Straldzha necropolis, dated to the 2nd–3rd c. AD (ALEXANDROVA 2013, Bowls V/119–129); finds from burial mounds near the village Pet Mogili in Nova Zagora region, dated from the mid-1st till the 3rd/4th c. AD (IGNATOV 1996a, таб. III:9/3; XIV/25:3; XVII:31/3) or from the burial mound near Karnobat, dated to the end of the 2nd–mid 3rd c. AD (GEORGIEVA – MOMCHILOV – GOSPODINOV 2007, обр. 4:6).

ID # ИК 1 / Palauzovo Fig. 3:17 / Pl. 3:17

Vessel: dish; **shape:** (very) irregular

Preservation: 70 %; **fragments:** 25 pcs.; **weight:** 244 g; **max. body th.:** 5 mm

Inner rim d.: 170 mm; **inner base d.:** 60 mm; **max. height×width:** 29–37×200 mm

Fabric: hard to soft, very well sorted; evenly fired

Inclusions: 5 %, normally up to 0.5 mm; predominant white pellets, common vesicles

Fabric colour: reddish yellow (7.5 YR 7/6)

Surface: red (2.5 YR 5/6) to dark grey (7.5 YR 4/1) matt slip covering the whole vessel; smooth surface feel

Decoration: two lines of rouletting on the body; two incised lines on the top of the rim

Vessel **18** is a small jug of a pale brown – beige fabric, covered by brown slip, worn in places. The base is not trimmed, the string marks are visible on the bottom, as well as irregular clay leftovers around the base. Each handle is placed at a different height. No exact parallel to this vessel was found. The *amforiskos* dated to the end of the 1st c.–beginning of the 2nd c. AD from the burial mound located between Stroyno and Boyanovo is closest in form (AGRE 2013, 353–354; обр. 14), it

represents an elongated and narrower form of our vessel. The beige fabric colour and careless execution of the base is common to both pieces.

ID # ПК 9 / Palauzovo Fig. 3:18 / Pl. 3:18

Vessel: small jug; **shape:** irregular (base, rim)

Preservation: 100 %; **fragments:** 10 pcs.; **weight:** 84 g; **max. body th.:** 5 mm

Inner rim d.: 40 mm; **inner base d.:** 45 mm; **max. height×width:** 69×65 mm

Handles: 2; **section:** 10×5 mm

Fabric: hard, very well sorted; evenly fired

Inclusions: 5 %, normally up to 0.5 mm; individual inclusions not identifiable

Fabric colour: very pale brown (10 YR 7/4)

Surface: brown (10YR 4/3) slip covering the whole vessel, worn on places, especially on the maximal dimensions; smooth feel

Vessel **19** represents a common type of jug, which might be found in high numbers both in Moesia Inferior and Thrace (for extended parallels see **Yurta-Stroyno TW Fig. 235–235**). Our example here has a pale brown fabric with a slip of a brown-grey colour and random spots of red colour located on its upper body part. The pale tint of the vessel seems to be caused by different firing temperatures, leaving the remains of the originally intended slip colour – the red spots.

The vessel form is most popular during the 2nd–3rd c. AD, with the red-slipped surface existing until the 4th–mid-5th c. AD, and with the form continuity until the 6th c. AD (see **Dodoparon Fig. 4:35**). It was found in settlements, such as in Villa Armira (KABAKCHIEVA 1986, таб. 275–281); or in Villa Krlev Dol (NAJDENOVA 1985, таб. 23:65–69); and necropolises, such as in Straldzha (ALEXANDROVA 2016, таб. 6:V-2/28); Vinitsa (PANAYOTOV *et al.* 2006, таб. XXII:3); Vratitsa (STOYANOV – NIKOV – STOYANOVA 2016, таб. XIX:II-8); or Vizica (AGRE – DICHEV 2005, обр. 35). All of the mentioned necropolises are dated to the peak period of the production, to the 2nd–3rd c. AD.

ID # ПК 16 / Palauzovo Fig. 3:19 / Pl. 3:19

Vessel: jug; **shape:** regular (body slightly irregular)

Preservation: 90 %; **fragments:** 30 pcs.; **weight:** 314 g; **max. body th.:** ca. 5 mm

Inner rim d.: 22 mm; **outer base d.:** 53 mm; **max. height×width:** 151×115 mm

Handles: 1; **section:** 20×8 mm

Fabric: hard, well sorted; evenly fired

Inclusions: 5 %, normally up to 1.0 mm; predominant lime, red particles and grog, few vughs

Fabric colour: very pale brown (10 YR 7/4)

Surface: dark grey (10 YR 4/1) slip on the upper body part up to the rim with random spots of red tints (2.5 YR 5/8); smooth feel

3.3. The characteristics of the pottery finds

All 19 vessels might be classed among the fine table ware, mostly used for food serving and drinking, apart from the two bigger-size vessels which were directly used as funerary urns (**1, 6**). The majority of the vessels – twelve of them – are of a red fabric (**1, 2, 4, 6–9, 12, 14–17**), four are of a pale brown fabric (**10, 11, 18, 19**), one is black glazed (**5**), one of Grey ware (**13**), and the last bowl is burned to grey, although its original fabric might have been red (**3**). The fabric of the red-coloured vessels features characteristics of the Common red-slipped ware described in the Yurta-Stroyno chapter, very likely produced locally. The quality of the vessel execution is, however, quite poor. Many of them are of an irregular form (**1, 2, 7, 9, 10, 13, 14, 15, 17, 18**), which would probably make some of them unsuitable for everyday use (**Palauzovo Tab. 1**). The best example is the cup **14**, with a highly uneven base, due to which it could not even stand upright. Furthermore, many vessels have a slip of low quality (**1, 6, 7, 8, 16**), or they have no surface cover at all (**3, 4, 12, 14**), exposing the quite sandy fabric they are made of. The cup **12** has a burned base and lower body from stacking in the kiln; the cup **18** does not have a trimmed base, therefore it still preserves the excess clay; and several other vessels have their appearance modified. Vessels **2** and **5** seem to have deliberately removed handles and smoothed areas where the handle was attached to the body. Similarly, the rim of the bowl **16** was removed in antiquity and its edges smoothed.

All these features point to lower quality vessels deposited both in the graves and in the mound embankment. Considering the overall low number of finds from the five graves / two mounds limited to a *lacrimarium*, one spindle, a piece of an iron knife, iron wedge, one bronze earring and two bronze pieces, we would not be wrong in considering these graves to be poor. Interestingly, at the nearby Straldzha necropolis, which is of the same chronology, but conversely equipped with much

richer – both in its quantity and value – grave goods, we may find vessels of an irregular form and of low quality slip as well (c.f. CHOLAKOV *et al.* 2016, o6p. 56; ALEXANDROVA 2016, see the tables with photos). Alexandrova suggests (2013, 28) some of the irregular vessels found in Straldzha were pottery production wasters (there the forms are limited to bowls and plates). A similar irregular cup with two handles (a form of our vessel **12**) was also found in the eastern necropolis of Kabile interpreted as a vessel secondarily burned – and consequently deformed – on the burial pyre (CHANDZHIJSKA – RABADZHIEV 2009, 534; o6p. 2:1). I suppose these vessels were lower quality products which could be acquired for a better price and used deliberately for funerary purposes – similar to the modified vessels without handles or rim found in Palauzovo, which were still good for their symbolic / ritual function and for deposition in graves / mound embankment(s).

On the other hand, the vessel **5** (*lekythos*) might represent a more valuable item, possibly an heirloom, as its form, and likely also origin, is Late Hellenistic. The thoroughly removed handle, leaving almost no marks, indicates that it was well taken care of,⁸¹ perhaps for several generations. The vessel has a hole drilled in its body (see below) which corrupted its original function as an oil / perfume holder and as such was modified for a local burial custom.

Several other vessel forms, although Roman period products, found inspiration in the Hellenistic period. Besides the hemispherical bowl **8**, an example can especially be found in the krater **13**, executed in the Grey ware and equipped with a smoothed glossy surface, decorated with grooves in the style of West Slope amphorae with a ribbed body.

Regarding the burial practices, two phenomena might be noticed – the drilled hole in the middle of a vessel (**2**, **5**, **14**); and the placing of a cup with two handles (kantharos?) into a bigger vessel, often into a krater (**14** to **13**). Both these features were already described by Ignatov (1996b), who related them to the geographically limited area of eastern Thrace, specifically to the Stara Zagora District, and connected them to the period of the 1st–3rd c. AD. With more excavations and published reports, we may now extend the area of the practice of placing cups into bigger vessels from Sofia (AGRE 2000, 54) to Vratitsa in Bourgas District (STOYANOV – NIKOV – STOYANOVA 2015). Due to the frequency of such

⁸¹ Compare with vessel **2**, which has more or less a well smoothed side where the handle was originally placed, while the other side still keeps parts of the attachments.

finds, we may also presume they were used together as one set of vessels, probably for some specific funerary custom.

A perfect comparison for the combination of the two above-mentioned phenomena of the burial practices comes directly from the Vratitsa necropolis, dated from the turn of the 1st/2nd c. to the 3rd c. AD (STOYANOV – NIKOV – STOYANOVA 2015, 352; таб. 20), where a cup with a drilled hole in the body similar in form to our vessel **14**, was placed into a krater similar in form to our vessel **13**. Unlike our set of two vessels found in the mound embankment, these were placed directly into the grave.

The most commonly found vessel with a drilled hole in the body is the cup with two handles (forms of vessels **12** and **14**), which, especially in combination with the krater-like vessel, gives the impression of taking the role of a *rhyton*, a popular wine-drinking container of the Thracians in pre-Roman Thrace. However, the real function of the pottery set and the drilled hole in the body of some of the vessels is for now only a matter of speculation (IGNATOV 1996b, 60; AGRE 2000, 55–56; AGRE – DICHEV 2000, 40).

3.4. Pottery from Palauzovo – conclusion

The two burial mounds – 8 and 9 – from a bigger necropolis located in the area of “Kojadzika”, located about 2.5 km north-east of the village Palauzovo, yield in total 19 complete vessels. Five of them were located in the single grave of the Mound 8 (**1–5**), another six came from the grave 1, 2, and 4 of the Mound 9 (**6–11**), and the last eight vessels were distributed in the embankment of the latter mound, placed in three different areas of various depths (**12–19**).

The chronology of the Mound 8 might be best determined by the transport amphora of Heraclea Pontica found at the grave level, produced from the end of the 1st–beginning of the 2nd c. AD, thus dating the grave towards the mid-2nd c. AD (**Palauzovo Pl. 4:1**). The Mound 9 was dated by the excavators to the 2nd–mid-3rd c. AD on the basis of the glass *lacrimarium* found in the Grave 3, approximating a similar dating for the separated Grave 1, and for the finds in the embankment. None of the pottery vessels from the Mound 9 is that chronologically sensitive so as to narrow the dating and if we were to work with the whole pottery complex, we may consider a wider chronology stretching from the 2nd till the 3rd c. AD.

The majority of the vessels represent characteristic pottery of Thrace produced locally during the mid-1st till the 3rd c. AD. The vessels are, however, of lower quality, reflecting the poor character of the burials. The only exception is the black glazed *lekythos* (5), presumably of a Hellenistic date, found in the Mound 8.

The closest parallels to the pottery vessels might be found directly in the area of eastern Thrace, especially in the modern-day Districts of Stara Zagora, Sliven, Haskovo, Yambol and Bourgas (**Palauzovo Map 1**). In the same area, we may find the habit of drilling holes into some of the vessels (especially cups with two handles) deposited either in graves or in mound embankments. Furthermore, in an extended area reaching up to Sofia, we may also note the habit of placing a smaller cup into a bigger container, again, in various contexts either relating directly to a grave or to a later deposition into the embankments. Both these acts refer to an as yet undisclosed funeral custom common to the inhabitants of the Roman province of Thrace during the 1st–3rd c. AD.

4 Dodoparon

4.1. Introduction

The archaeological site known best as Dodoparon was excavated in cooperation between the Regional Historical Museum in Yambol (RIM) and the Tundzha Regional Historical Project (TRAP) within a five-week season in 2010 (BAKARDZHIEV 2011; SOBOTKOVA – LONGFORD – BAKARDZHIEV 2018). The site is located in the Yambol District, about 21 km to the west of the Tundzha River, north of the village of Golyam Manastri, at the highest peak (600 m.a.s.l.) of the so-called Manastirski Vazvishenie (**Dodoparon Map 1**). The site might also be referred to as Gradishteto or Kaleto, but most frequently it is associated with the name of Dodoparon (or Dodopara) mentioned in one of the three inscriptions found near the site, all dated between the 2nd and 3rd c. AD (*IG Bulg* 3.2, nos. 1794, 1795 and 1796; VELKOV 1991, 26; MIHAILOV 1964, 254).

4.1.1. CONTEXT OF THE POTTERY FINDS

The site of Dodoparon

The settlement itself stretches over the hilltop in a north-south (585 m) and an east-west (80–40 m) direction, covering an area of 4.2 hectares. Within the excavation, two test trenches were placed along the massive fortification walls (T1 and T2), still highly visible in the terrain, one trench was placed in the central part of the settlement (T3) (**Dodoparon Map 2**). Based on the material from these three trenches, occupation of the settlement was determined to be from the 3rd c. AD to the end of the 6th c. AD (SOBOTKOVA – LONGFORD – BAKARDZHIEV 2018, 209). Pottery of mixed chronology (Roman and Late Antique) came from the two areas along the walls (T1 and T2), while the central trench (T3) revealed a closed context – a one-room house with a deposit of about 49 vessels and 8 lids. This pottery assemblage from the well dated context is the topic of the following study which presents the reconstructed vessel forms, if possible, with their approximate capacity, weight and function. Each vessel is supplemented with a thorough morphological and fabric description to provide a functional comparison for the following Late Roman pottery studies, especially the ones focused on south-eastern Thrace, which,

compared to the Lower Danube / Lower Limes area, has not been that well researched yet. The article does not aim to provide a new morphological typology, as we are dealing here only with a small number of vessels from one house, an assemblage which either reflects the shapes of already established pottery types known from northern Bulgaria and Dobrudzha, or, features new shapes with no repetition (within the assemblage) and as such is unsuitable for a new typological study. It is also necessary to bear in mind that only a small part of the Dodoparon settlement was excavated and a more varied set of pottery might be expected to be found within the following excavation campaigns.

The one-room house of Dodoparon

The central trench (T3) revealed the foundation walls of a one-room house with a porch in front of the entrance to the south-east. The house is oriented by its longer walls parallel to the fortification, in a north-west to south-east direction. The dimensions of the whole house are 6×8 m. The inner room space, where the pottery was found, is irregular, on average measuring 5.4×4.6 m, i.e. 25 sq m (**Dodoparon Map 3**) (BAKARDZHIEV 2011, 370). Beaten clay was identified as the house floor, covered, approximately, by 3700 pottery sherds weighing 80 kilos mixed with fired mudbricks and broken roof tiles. Metal objects, such as nails, brackets, furniture attachments, jewellery (belt buckles and pendants), various fragments of domestic implements, arrowheads, projectiles and fragments of weaponry were also found there. Together with the pottery, architectural ceramics and metals, a hoard of nine coins of Justinian I and Justin II dated by the coinage to between AD 536–572 was retrieved (SOBOTKOVA – LONGFORD – BAKARDZHIEV 2018, 204).⁸² The date of the deposit, with the *terminus post quem* of AD 572, roughly corresponds to the Avar invasion of the southern part of the Balkan Peninsula in the 580s AD (CURTA 2001, 98), especially to the year AD 587, when many cities of inner Thrace were besieged (VELKOV 1983, 234). We may assume, that Dodoparon was also affected during this period, when the central house in T3 was destroyed and never reinhabited again.

⁸² The hoard, as well as the other finds, has not yet been published.

4.2. Pottery finds from Dodoparon

The pottery found in the destruction layer was fragmentary with many pieces secondarily burned; in some cases, two fragments of a completely different colour can be joined together (**Dodoparon Pl. 2:18**). This state of preservation suggests the final destruction of the house was caused by a fire. Whether the pots were already broken and scattered on the floor when the fire started or if they broke just at the moment of the fire/the final destruction of the house and fell into different parts of the room variously affected by the heat, it is impossible to say. Unfortunately, no data of the pottery distribution within the room were preserved, as the excavation diaries and other important entries were stolen together with the computers of the excavators almost at the end of the project (SOBOTKOVA – LONGFORD – BAKARDZHIEV 2018, 207). Consequently, we cannot answer even the basic questions such as: Was the pottery concentrated in one place? Were the fragments of one vessel scattered all around the house or concentrated together? Were the same pottery classes/shapes clustered? Despite this lack of data, it was possible to reconstruct, partly, or fully, 49 vessels and 8 lids, which were in the house at the moment of the destruction.⁸³ These are made up of 19 pots – both table and cooking ware –, with seven lids; one strainer and one vessel with a spout; six jugs; five table amphorae; two *carafes*; two cups / mugs; seven transport amphorae (one with a lid); six dolia and one red-slipped dish imported from the Eastern Aegean.⁸⁴

If we exclude the specific fabrics of the dolia, amphorae, the red-slipped imported dish (**Dodoparon Fig. 6:57**) and two of the jugs (**Dodoparon Fig. 4:33** and **34**), which are unusually fine, the other pottery material of the assemblage features some similarities – sandy fabric, yellowish red / reddish yellow colour and no surface slip.

The similarity among the fabrics of individual vessels is sometimes so pronounced, that it was not possible to attribute many body sherds more specifically than to a group of several individuals (always marked in the text). Still, about 260

⁸³ I would like to thank several of my colleagues for their help in putting together this puzzle, which took three years to put into the state presented here, namely to Brabora Weissová and Věra Doležálková.

⁸⁴ The transport amphorae and the red-slipped dish from Dodoparon were presented at the *LRCW* conference and have already been published (TUŠLOVÁ 2017). They are, however, included here, to present the whole context altogether, as the aim of this article has a different focus than a simple typological presentation.

fragments of 2330 grams were left without any further contribution, including handles and parts of bases.

Several other sherds (ca. 20 pcs.) of an earlier period were also secondarily deposited in the destruction, these were typical forms for the local Roman pottery production of the 2nd–4th c. AD, coated with a red slip (c.f. KABAKCHIEVA 1983, 1986). They were taken out of the assemblage and not processed any further.

We may take an advantage of having the counts and weights of some of the vessels to present here some additional data – if possible, the final dimensions, the weights and capacities of individual vessels were approximated. Since none of the vessels could be fully reconstructed from the original pieces and some sherds ‘lost weight’ due to the effects of the fire, which caused heavy wear to some of the sherds and their surfaces, it is necessary to take these data as an estimation. Still, they can give us an extended view of the description and evaluation of the pottery material, which can help us to better understand the use of the inner spaces of houses, individual rooms within, as well as the alimentation of its occupants.

Pottery description

The fabric description of the pots follows the Cambridge manual for pottery studies (ORTON – TYERS – VINCE 1993); the colours are given based on the Munsell soil-colour chart (2009); the ‘max. height×width’ of each vessel represents its maximal preserved body dimensions, handles are not included in the measurement. If ‘+’ is placed in front of a number (e.g. +86×151 mm) it marks the real size of the sherd, which is the minimum dimension as it is not fully preserved; if ‘ca.’ is given in the same place, it is a size approximation of the whole preserved vessel (mostly in cases when the vessels is reconstructed from pieces which are not directly joined together). The vessel preservation is approximated from all the fragments associated with the container; and if the final weight is given, it is simply calculated by cross-multiplication from the percentage of the preservation and the number of associated fragments.

Vessel capacity estimation

The advantage of having complete vessels is the possibility of calculating their capacity. I used free ware online software called *Calcul de capacité d'un récipient*

à partir de son profil,⁸⁵ which was developed by *Centre de Recherches en Archéologie et Patrimoine*.⁸⁶ The efficiency of this software was verified by a refined version of the quadrature rule used by Rigoir (1981). An application in the open source programming language Python was developed for this purpose, using the software library Scipy (JONES – OLIPHANT – PETERSON 2001). Given the centre, top and bottom of the object, the volume is estimated as the sum of the volumes of thin cylinders, where the radius of each cylinder changes according to the height value (small radius on the top and bottom, reaching a maximum around the middle of the pot).⁸⁷ The results of both measurements compared on several vessels were quite similar, with a possible deviation of up to 70 ml per container. Consequently, only the free ware online software was used for the whole assemblage to collect uniform data (see the results in **Dodoparon Figs. 7–9**).

The form and height of some of the vessels had to be reconstructed to be uploaded to the software and, of course, the results might differ from the reality. To get at least close to it, vessel forms and heights are based on similar shapes published elsewhere. If a comparison was not found, the upper and lower body parts are connected as naturally as possible resulting in a final height, if only part of the vessel is preserved, no reconstruction (and no capacity measuring) is done at all.

Another challenge faced while approximating the original capacity, is, where to measure the content level. It does not seem reasonable to have the same approach for each vessel as the jugs, for example, were probably not filled up to the lip, while the pots could have been almost full. Consequently, in many cases, different measurements were taken – of pots, generally 10 mm below the rim, or on the neck offset, or on some pronounced change in the body profile; of jugs, at the level of a neck-body attachment. To keep a track of the reconstructed shapes and the content level, screen shot(s) of every measured vessel were taken (**Dodoparon**

⁸⁵ <http://capacity.ulb.ac.be/index.php>.

⁸⁶ The input picture is best as a .jpg with a high DPI, but of small size. I have exported a drawing of 300 DPI from CorelDraw and made the final picture 30–50 % smaller with normal compression using the online image resizer: <https://resizeimage.net/>. The resulting image size was about 25–70 KB with a good resolution, easily readable for the online software. There are several ways to fit the uploaded picture into the final capacity chart (as in **Dodoparon Figs. 7–9**), the combination of changing the DPI and the water level (of the real height of the vessel minus the thickness of the bottom) worked the best for me. The profile side of the vessel, which is measured, is better to be clean of any extra lines, handles, and of any deeper cuts, which might confuse the measurement.

⁸⁷ The application for the measurement verification was run by Juan Pablo Maldonado López from the Faculty of Information Technology, Czech Technical University in Prague.

Figs. 7–9). Out of curiosity, the capacity of the lids was also measured (**Dodoparon Fig. 1:8–14**) – see further in the text.

4.2.1. SMALL SIZE POTS WITH A ROUNDED BODY

Dodoparon Fig. 1:1–3

Dodoparon Pl. 1:1

The following three pots have very similar shapes and dimensions (rim d. from 85 to 105 mm, base d. from 65–70 mm), with two handles attached to the rim with sections 20–21×8 mm and 30–11 mm in the case of the bigger pot (1). The body is rounded, with either a flat (1) or rounded (2) base. The upper body is decorated with two or three engraved parallel lines (1–3). The fabric is in general sandy with predominant inclusions of quartz and lime, common to rare brown to red inclusions and all the pots have some small amount of mica. Many pores appear on the surface as a result of the fallen sand. There is no surface treatment and the fabric colour (red to yellowish red/brown) is commonly unique for the whole vessel.

Their height is ca. 120–125 mm, width 140–155 mm, capacity about 1.2 litres and the whole vessel would have weighed no more than 500 grams. They are all slightly secondarily burned (handles and upper part), but none of them seems to have been originally used for cooking (at least not directly placed over the fire), rather they seem to have been used for the storage of solid / liquid products (c.f. OPAIT – GRIGORAŞ 2018, fig. 19–20).

ID # V2 / Dodoparon Fig. 1:1; Pl. 1:1

Part: whole vessel; **preservation:** 90 %; **fragments:** 20 pcs.; **weight:** 425 g; **capacity:** 1.23 l

Inner rim d.: 100 mm; **outer base d.:** 70 mm; **max. height×width:** 121×147 mm

Handles: 2; **section:** 21×8 mm

Fabric: sandy, fairly sorted (3), worn surface

Inclusions: 20 %, up to 1 mm (rarely bigger pcs.), predominant quartz and lime, common pores, few brown to red pellets, rare silver mica

Fabric and surface colour: red (2.5YR 5/8)

ID # V28 / Dodoparon Fig. 1:2

Part: whole vessel; **preservation:** 40 %; **fragments:** 10 pcs.; **weight:** 220 g;
capacity: 1.19 l

Inner rim d.: 85 mm; **outer base d.:** 65 mm; **max. height×width:** 123×142 mm

Handles: 1 preserved; **section:** 20×8 mm

Fabric: sandy, good sorted (4), smoothed outer surface, worn inside

Inclusions: 20 %, up to 1 mm (rarely bigger pcs.), predominant quartz and lime, common pores and brown to red pellets, rare silver mica

Fabric and surface colour: yellowish red (5YR 4/6)

ID # V27 / Dodoparon Fig. 1:3

Part: upper part, two handles; **preservation:** 40–50 %; **fragments:** 16 pcs.;
weight: 235 g

Inner rim d: 105 mm; **max. height×width:** +86×151 mm; **capacity:** >1.23 l

Handles: 2; **section:** 30×11 mm

Fabric: sandy, micaceous, good sorted (4)

Inclusions: 20 %, up to 2 mm (rarely bigger pcs.), predominant quartz and lime, common pores, few black inclusions, silver and gold mica (flakes up to 3 mm)

Fabric colour: red (2.5YR 4/8) outer surface and margin, yellowish brown (10YR 5/4) inner surface and margin

4.2.2. SMALL SIZE POTS WITH A BROAD BODY / CASSEROLES

Dodoparon Fig. 1:4–5

Dodoparon Pl. 1:4

The following two pots, vessel **4** and **5**, have a rather squat body, twice as wide as is the vessel height (100×200–205 mm), which suggests their use as casseroles. The upper body turns slightly inwards, and the rim section is triangular. The rim inner diameter ranges between 180–190 mm, the base is flat with an outer diameter of 80 to 90 mm. The vessels have two handles with a section 23–25×9–10 mm.

Vessel **4** (**Dodoparon Pl. 1**) is decorated with one engraved line on the upper body, the rim is undercut by a knife (or another sharp object), leaving a rusty appearance below its lip. Vessel **5** bears no decoration.

The fabric is similar to the *Small size pots with a rounded body*, i.e., sandy with predominant inclusions of quartz and lime, few to rare brown to red pellets and silver mica. The pores are highly visible on the vessel 4 which has a worn surface, more prone to fallouts. Again, there is no surface treatment or slip, and the fabric always has a unique light red to yellowish colour. Even the body shape is slightly different, they have exactly the same capacity of 1.98 l.

Their weight might be approximated to 600 grams. The vessels are not burned from the outside, they might have not been used, or, they were not directly put over a fire.

ID # V3 / Dodoparon Fig. 1:4; Pl. 1:4

Part: whole vessel; **preservation:** 80 %; **fragments:** 29 pcs.; **weight:** 501 g; **capacity:** 1.98 l

Inner rim d: 180 mm; **outer base d:** 80 mm; **max. height×width:** 100×200 mm

Handles: 2; **section:** 25×10 mm

Fabric: sandy, poorly sorted (2)

Inclusions: 20 %, up to 1 mm (rarely bigger pcs.), predominant quartz and lime, common pores, few brown to red inclusions, rare silver

Fabric and surface colour: yellowish red (5YR 5/8)

ID # V7 / Dodoparon Fig. 1:5

Part: whole vessel; **preservation:** 90 %; **fragments:** 39 pcs.; **weight:** 556 g; **capacity:** 1.98 l

Inner rim d: 190 mm; **outer base d:** 90 mm; **max. height×width:** 100×205 mm

Handles: 2; **section:** 23×9 mm

Fabric: sandy, poorly sorted (2)

Inclusions: 20 %, up to 0.5 mm (rarely bigger pcs. up to 5 mm), predominant quartz and lime, rare brown to red inclusions and silver mica

Fabric and surface colour: light red (2.5YR 6/8)

4.2.3. POTS FOR SUPPLEMENTARY KITCHEN WORK

Dodoparon Fig. 1:6–7

Dodoparon Pl. 1:6

Two different pots, both used in the kitchen for supplementary work. Vessel 6 (**Dodoparon Pl. 1**) is a strainer, with a preserved rim, one attached handle, and several body parts, including one big piece near the base. The reconstruction given here is tentative as are the maximal dimensions of the vessel. The rim inner d. might, however, be confidently measured at 190 mm; the base d. is approximated at 75 mm on the outside, as the bottom is rounded, without any visible mark delimiting the base. The whole vessel has a unique dark colour and very micaceous fabric. The body sherd over the base is 12 mm thick, likely it is an intentional thickening on the lower part(s) where the greatest pressure was exerted on the strainer. Vessel 7 is a vessel with a rounded body and a spout, placed on the upper part below the rim. We may expect at least one, or, better, two handles (c.f. a similar pot from Capidava, see OPRIŞ 2003, pl. XXXIII:217), however, none of the handles found in the house could be attributed to the pot. The rim is preserved only above the spout and its shape might be affected by its attachment; it is only a small part (EVE 1–2 %), making the diameter measurement, 130 mm, an approximation. The base was attributed to the upper part based on the colour and overall fabric similarity, its outer diameter is 90 mm. As in the case of the strainer, the maximal vessel dimensions given here are only approximated. The vessel was badly secondarily burned.

The reconstruction of these two pots is rather illustrative, giving a capacity of a little below 5 l for vessel 6 and around 2 l for vessel 7.

ID # V41 / Dodoparon Fig. 1:6; Pl. 1:6

Part: strainer; rim and part of a base; **preservation:** 10 %; **fragments:** 7 pcs.; **weight:** 230 g

Inner rim d: 190 mm; **outer base d:** ca. 75 mm; **max. height×width:** ca. 180×ca.240 mm; **Individual holes d.:** 0.4 mm; **capacity:** ca. 4.88 l (very rough estimate)

Handles: 1 preserved, likely 2; **section:** 34×18 mm

Fabric: micaceous, good sorted (4), thick walls near the bottom (up to 14 mm)

Inclusions: 20 %, up to 0.5 mm (rarely bigger pcs. up to 1 mm), predominant quartz, lime and sliver mica, common brown to red inclusions

Fabric and surface colour: dark reddish brown (5YR 3/4)

ID # V42 / Dodoparon Fig. 1:7

Part: rim, spout, parts of body/base; **preservation:** 10 %; **fragments:** 6 pcs.; **weight:** 188 g

Inner rim d: ca. 130 mm; **outer base d:** 90 mm; **max. height×width:** ca. 142×+170 mm; **Diameter of the spout:** 40 mm; **capacity:** ca. 1.84–2.28 l (very rough estimate)

Handles: none is preserved

Fabric: good sorting (2)

Inclusions: 20 %, up to 0.5 mm (rarely bigger pcs. up to 3 mm), predominant quartz and lime, few brown to red inclusions

Fabric and surface colour: yellowish red (5YR 4/6), all preserved pcs severely burned from both sides

4.2.4. LIDS

Dodoparon Fig. 1:8–14

Dodoparon Pl. 1:8–9

Based on the dimensions, the lids are represented by two different sets. The first four are smaller, with a rounded body and inner rim d. 100–105 mm; the other three are bigger, wide open, with inner rim d. 160–190 mm. The reconstructed weight would be about 140–150 g for the smaller size ones, and 250–300 g for the bigger ones.

They are all made of the same sandy fabric, which is good to fairly sorted (3, 4), with 10–20 % of inclusions up to 1 mm, with rare bigger pellets. Predominant are quartz and lime, common to few are brown to red pellets and pores (more if worn), silver mica is rare. The colour of the fabric is reddish brown (5YR 6/6) to reddish yellow (5YR 5/4), if not secondarily burned to grey or black. Only one lid bears marks of burning on the rim, another one is completely burned to grey. There is no decoration or surface cover and the fabric is alike to the *Small size pots (1–5)*.

We can find similar lids in Dichin with rim d. 160 mm (KUZMANOV 2009, tab. XXI/201), Sadovec with rim d. 110–210 mm (KUZMANOV 1992, some on Taf. 108) and Nicopolis ad Istrum with rim d. 190 mm (FALKNER 1999, fig. 9.14.253). Kuzmanov (1992, 216–217), working with the material from Sadovec, wrote regarding these forms: ‘pots, or lids of cups.’ Indeed, the use of this form of vessel might be questioned, as besides cups/bowls, parallels with the late version of the

so-called Cooking bells, known from the late contexts in the East, e.g. from Ephesus, have recently appeared.⁸⁸

Based on the diameter range given above, we are dealing here with two different sets. The small series, **8–11 (Dodoparon Pl. 1:8–9)**, of inner rim d. 100 to 110 mm and approximated capacity of 0.16 litres⁸⁹ (measured on the vessel **10**) very unlikely used for cooking/baking as it is simply too small for such an approach, but it could, in theory, be used for the consumption of a food stuff as a bowl for one, although its interpretation as a classical lid is still the preferable one. The second series (**12–14**) with rim d. from 160 to 240 mm and approximated capacity from 0.42 l (**12**) to ca. 1.5 l (**14**). This series could, however, have some potential for cooking/baking. The biggest versions, regarding our material and the above-mentioned parallels, are based on a rim d. of around 200 mm, which would be sufficiently enough for baking bread. On the other hand, the rim with an inner ledge would be very impractical for any kind of cooking/baking and the fabric similarity with the *Small size pots* rather links them together as a set.

ID # V11 / Dodoparon Fig. 5:8; Pl. 1:8

Part: rim, body; **preservation:** 15 %; **fragments:** 4 pcs.; **weight:** 37 g

Inner rim d: ca. 100 mm; **max. height×width:** +28×120 mm

Fabric: fairly sorted (3)

Inclusions: 20 %, up to 1 mm (rarely bigger pcs. up to 3 mm), predominant quartz and lime, common brown to red inclusions and pores, rare silver mica

Fabric and surface colour: reddish yellow (5YR 6/6)

ID # V4 / Dodoparon Fig. 1:9; Pl. 1:9

Part: rim, body; **preservation:** 85 %; **fragments:** 5 pcs.; **weight:** 118 g

Inner rim d: ca. 100 mm; **max. height×width:** +44×130 mm

Fabric: good sorted (4)

Inclusions: 10 %, up to 0.5 mm (rarely bigger pcs. up to 4 mm), predominant quartz and lime, common brown to red inclusions, rare silver mica

Fabric and surface colour: brown (7.5YR 5/4) – secondarily burned

⁸⁸ Personal communication with Alice Waldner and Robin P. Symonds, who opened the discussion on these Roman ‘lid’- like shapes as possible late form of the Roman *clibanus*, or Cooking bell, used for baking bread.

⁸⁹ All of the ‘lid’ shapes are measured 5 mm below the lip (as a shape of a bowl).

ID # V12 / Dodoparon Fig. 1:10

Part: rim, body; **preservation:** 30–40 %; **fragments:** 4 pcs.; **weight:** 47 g

Inner rim d: ca. 105 mm; **max. height×width:** +41×130 mm; **capacity:** 0.16 l

Fabric: fairly sorted (3)

Inclusions: 20 %, up to 0.1 mm (rarely bigger pcs. up to 2 mm), predominant quartz, lime and pores, rare silver mica

Fabric and surface colour: reddish brown (5YR 5/4)

ID # V10 / Dodoparon Fig. 1:11

Part: rim, body; **preservation:** 10–20 %; **fragments:** 2 pcs.; **weight:** 27 g

Inner rim d: ca. 105 mm; **max. height×width:** +38×130 mm

Fabric: good sorted (4)

Inclusions: 10 %, up to 0.5 mm (rarely bigger pcs. up to 1 mm), predominant quartz and lime, rare brown to red inclusions and silver mica

Fabric and surface colour: brown 7.5YR 5/4 – burned

ID # V13 / Dodoparon Fig. 1:12

Part: rim, body; **preservation:** 40 %; **fragments:** 6 pcs.; **weight:** 118 g

Inner rim d: ca. 160 mm; **max. height×width:** +46×190 mm; **capacity:** ca. 0.42 l

Fabric: good sorted (4)

Inclusions: 20 %, up to 1 mm (rarely bigger pcs. up to 2 mm), predominant quartz and lime, common pores, rare brown pellets and silver mica

Fabric and surface colour: reddish brown (5YR 5/4)

ID # V15 / Dodoparon Fig. 1:13

Part: rim, body; **preservation:** 60 %; **fragments:** 10 pcs.; **weight:** 155 g

Inner rim d: ca. 180 mm; **max. height×width:** +41×210 mm

Fabric: good sorted (4)

Inclusions: 10 %, up to 0.5 mm (rarely bigger pcs. up to 4 mm), predominant quartz and lime, few brown to red inclusions, rare silver mica

Fabric colour: outer margin yellowish red (5YR 4/6), inner margin brown (7.5YR 4/4)

Surface colour: reddish brown on outer surface (5YR 5/4)

ID # V14 / Dodoparon Fig. 1:14

Part: rim, body; **preservation:** 5–10 %; **fragments:** 5 pcs.; **weight:** 52 g

Inner rim d: ca. 190 mm; **max. height×width:** +68×220 mm; **capacity:** ca. 1.5 l

Fabric: good sorted (4)

Inclusions: 20 %, up to 0.5 mm (rarely bigger pcs. up to 1 mm), predominant quartz, lime, brown to red inclusions, rare pores and silver mica

Fabric and surface colour: each sherd is of slightly different colour, mixing tints of previously given colours to the other lids

4.2.5. BIGGER-SIZE POTS OF DIFFERENT SHAPES

Dodoparon Fig. 2:15–18

Dodoparon Pl. 2:15–18

The state and quality of preservation of the four following vessels is varied. On what can be reconstructed, all of them are bigger-size containers of closed form (height ca. 220–270 mm, width ca. 250–330 mm), with two handles (section 32–40×12–13 mm). Their shapes, however, differ from each other. Vessel **15** is the best-preserved container, with fabric not affected by fire (**Dodoparon Pl. 2:15**). It keeps its original strong brown colour, and sandy character. It is decorated on the upper body by one thick wavy line and one shallow horizontal line which is placed just below. The body sherd of the vessel is quite thick, and the bottom is concavely formed. Both of these signs suggest the vessel was not used for food preparation over the fire (VAN DER VEEN 2018) and could rather serve for storage, food serving or consuming. Its reconstructed weight is slightly below two kilograms and its capacity ca. 10 litres.

Despite of many fragments associated with the vessel **16**, its full reconstruction was not successful. The sherds have very characteristic wheel marks, combining classical finger marks with a tool, which creates shallow parallel lines all around its interior (**Dodoparon Pl. 2:16**). Based on these marks, pieces could be easily identified and sorted together. The sherds are also very thin for such a big container (thickness up to 4.5 mm). The surface seems to be smoothed; the fabric is sandy and micaceous. The vessel is partly burned, combining black with the original colour – yellowish red. The original weight of the container could be approximated to around 1800 g and its capacity 13 to 14 litres. According to the form, vessel **16** is alike to **1–3** and could be considered as a larger version of these pots.

The vessel **17** is completely (secondarily) burned, leaving its fabric grey to black with many pores on the eroded surface (**Dodoparon Pl. 2:17**). The pot is grooved under the neck with shallow lines, and on the upper body decorated with one engraved horizontal line. The lower part/base is missing. The capacity of the upper – preserved – body is 8.5 to 9 litres. If we try to reconstruct the vessel with the lower part by elongating the body walls to the base of, let's say, an outer d. 90 mm, we end up with the vessel height at ca. 280 mm with a capacity of about 1 litre higher than before, so 9 to 9.5 litres.

The last of the big pots, **18**, is of a particularly interesting shape, with a carinated upper body part and abrupt closing of the rim. This pot is also heavily burned, resulting in a crumbling structure of the sherds, thinner walls and eroded coarse surface. The original reddish yellow colour of the fabric might be visible in places (**Dodoparon Pl. 2:18**). It is decorated with shallow engraved lines and waves running all around the vessel, with short cut marks near the body's maximal diameter. The vessel's weight could be estimated at around 750 g. Its height, into which it is reconstructed here (320 mm), is based on a complete vessel found in Iatrus (BÖTTGER 1982, Taf. 48:508), resulting in a capacity of a little below 13 litres.

ID # V5 / Dodoparon Fig. 2:15; Pl. 2:15

Part: whole vessel; **preservation:** 70 %; **fragments:** 69 pcs.; **weight:** 1373 g

Inner rim d: ca. 240 mm; **outer base d.:** 100 mm; **max. height×width:** 220×310 mm; **capacity:** 10.16 l

Handles: 2; **section:** 34×13 mm

Fabric: sandy, good sorting (4), worn on surface

Inclusions: 20 %, up to 0.5 mm (rarely bigger pcs. up to 1 mm), predominant quartz, lime, black, brown to red inclusions, common pores, few silver and golden mica

Fabric colour: strong brown (7.5YR 4/6)

ID # V22 / Dodoparon Fig. 2:16; Pl. 2:16

Part: rim, handles, body frgs., base; **preservation:** 70 %; **fragments:** 96 pcs.; **weight:** 1231 g

Inner rim d: ca. 180 mm; **outer base d.:** 90 mm; **max. height×width:** ca. 270×332 mm

Handles: 2; **section:** 40×12 mm; **capacity:** 14–13 l

Fabric: sandy, micaceous, good sorting (4), smoothed surface

Inclusions: 20 %, up to 1.0 mm (rarely bigger pcs. up to 4 mm), predominant silver mica, common quartz, lime, black and brown inclusions

Fabric and surface colour: yellowish red (5YR 4/6)

ID # V25 / Dodoparon Fig. 2:17; Pl. 2:17

Part: upper body, base missing; **preservation:** 20–30 %; **fragments:** 18 pcs.; **weight:** 492 g

Inner rim d: ca. 180 mm; **max. height×width:** +216×290 mm

Handles: 2; **section:** 36×13 mm

Fabric: sandy, good sorting (4), smoothed surface

Inclusions: 20 %, up to 0.5 mm (rarely bigger pcs. up to 4 mm), predominant quartz and lime, common brown to red inclusions and pores, few silver mica

Fabric and surface colour: completely burned – dark greyish brown (10YR 4/2)

ID # V6 / Dodoparon Fig. 2:18; Pl. 2:18

Part: upper body, base, handle; **preservation:** 50 %; **fragments:** 25 pcs.; **weight:** 364 g

Inner rim d: ca. 120 mm; **outer base d.:** 100 mm; **max. height×width:** ca. 320×+250 mm

Handles: 1 preserved, likely 2; **section:** 32×12 mm; **capacity:** 12.73 l

Fabric: sandy, poor sorting (2)

Inclusions: 30 %, up to 0.2 mm, predominant quartz and lime, common brown to red inclusions, rare silver mica

Fabric colour: burned – few marks of original colour (?): reddish yellow (7.5YR 7/8)

4.2.6. COOKING POTS

Dodoparon Fig. 3:19–23

Dodoparon Pl. 2:20

The following five pots share a similar form. They have a rounded bulky body, slightly raised neck, up-turned rim with an inner space to accommodate a lid and a

decoration of two to four shallow engraved lines on the upper body part. We may expect two handles with a section ranging from 27–43×11–13 mm. The base is seldom preserved, rounded or slightly concave around the centre. Two different size categories of the pots might be noticed – with a rim inner d. from 120 to 130 mm, and from 170 to 200 mm. The size of the vessel echoes the size of the handle section which grows with the size of the pot. All of the containers are more or less burned (likely primarily, from their usage over a fire), which changed their fabric colour. The original tints range from yellowish red to reddish yellow, the fabric is sandy. The majority of the body sherds are impossible to link to individual vessels. Consequently, many pieces ended up on one pile altogether dedicated to this group (a count of 430 pcs. of almost 3 kg). The only exception is a pot **23**, with grey micaceous fabric, which allowed us to link it with the base of the same characteristic. The connection of the vessel **22** – the rim and base – is the most likely one. Several fragments of other bases exist, but it was not possible to join them together, or to connect them with the upper body parts.

The original weight of the smaller pots seems to be around 600–700 g; the bigger ones are very fragmentarily preserved, and their weight estimation is difficult. We may only expect this to be over 1000 g. Two of the pots (**22–23**) allow us some capacity for estimation for the smaller size vessels, which ranges from 2.5 to 4.7 l.

ID # V26 / Dodoparon Fig. 3:19

Part: rim and a handle; **preservation:** 10 %; **fragments:** 10 pcs.; **weight:** 116 g

Inner rim d: ca. 200 mm; **max. height×width:** +37×+230 mm

Handles: 1 preserved, likely 2; **section:** 37×13 mm

Fabric: sandy, fair sorting (3)

Inclusions: 20 %, up to 0.1 mm (rarely bigger pcs. up to 4 mm), predominant quartz and lime, common brown to red inclusions, rare silver mica

Fabric colour: burned – fabric brown (7.5YR 4/3), surface black (Gley 1 2.5/N)

ID # V24 / Dodoparon Fig. 3:20; Pl. 2:20

Part: upper body and a handle; **preservation:** 10–20 %; **fragments:** 13 pcs.; **weight:** 292 g

Inner rim d: ca. 170 mm; **max. height×width:** +98×255 mm

Handles: 1 preserved, likely 2; **section:** 43×11 mm

Fabric: sandy, good sorting (4)

Inclusions: 20 %, up to 0.5 mm (rarely bigger pcs. up to 2 mm), predominant quartz and lime, common brown to red inclusions, rare silver mica

Fabric and surface colour: burned – black (7.5YR 2.5/1)

ID # V17 / Dodoparon Fig. 3:21

Part: rim and handles; **preservation:** 5 %; **fragments:** 5 pcs.; **weight:** 65 g

Inner rim d: ca. 130 mm; **max. height×width:** +30×+146 mm

Handles: 2; **section:** 27×11 mm

Fabric: sandy, good sorting (4)

Inclusions: 20 %, up to 0.5 mm (rarely bigger pcs. up to 3 mm), predominant quartz and lime, common brown to red inclusions and pores, rare silver mica

Fabric and surface colour: yellowish red (5YR 5/8)

ID # V38 / Dodoparon Fig. 3:22

Part: upper body, handles, base; **preservation:** 90 %; **fragments:** 37 pcs.; **weight:** 544 g

Inner rim d: ca. 130 mm; **outer base d.:** ca 80 mm; **max. height×width:** ca. 180×225 mm

Handles: 2; **section:** 31×12 mm; **capacity:** ca. 4 to 4.7 l

Fabric: sandy, fair sorting (3)

Inclusions: 20 %, up to 0.5 mm (rarely bigger pcs. up to 7 mm), predominant quartz and lime, common brown to red inclusions, rare silver mica

Fabric colour: partly burned; several different tints, most frequent – red (10R 5/8)

ID # V19 / Dodoparon Fig. 3:23

Part: upper body, handles, base; **preservation:** 80 %; **fragments:** 27 pcs.; **weight:** 468 g

Inner rim d: ca. 120 mm; **outer base d.:** 70 mm; **max. height×width:** ca. 173×180 mm

Handles: 2; **section:** 30×11 mm; **capacity:** ca. 2.5 to 3 l

Fabric: sandy, micaceous, fair sorting (3)

Inclusions: 30 %, up to 1.0 mm (rarely bigger pcs. up to 3 mm), predominant silver mica, common quartz, lime, brown to red inclusions and pores

Fabric colour: upper part – reddish yellow (7.5YR 6/8); the base (slightly burned) – pale brown (10YR 6/3)

4.2.7. POTS WITH ROUNDED BODY AND HIGHLY RAISED OFFSET RIM

Dodoparon Fig. 3:24–25

Dodoparon Pl. 2:24–25

These two pots have a similar shape, which shares a straight off set neck with a rounded rim, grooved by one line of different width. One handle was identified for each vessel, but two could be expected, one on each side. A pronounced finger impression on the upper part of the handle is common for both the pots, on the other hand, they have a different rim d., with **24** about 130 mm inside (the rim is irregular) and **25** of 90 mm. The latter vessel has a preserved upper body part, which is extremely globular and grooved by two shallow horizontal lines. The first pot (**24**) is completely burned, only the cores of some fragments feature the original vessel colour – yellowish red (**Dodoparon Pl. 2:24**). The upper body of the second one (**25**) does not bear any marks of burning and shows a characteristic colouring of red fabric covered by a contrasting greyish surface on which a high amount of whitish inclusions might be noticed (**Dodoparon Pl. 2:25**). Both pots feature only a small amount of silver mica. Due to the fragmentary state, the original weight and capacity cannot be approximated. Their bases are not preserved, so we cannot see if they were burned from a fire. It is interesting that their rims do not seem to have a space to accommodate a lid, and we may assume, they could have been used for a different type of food preparation (if used directly for cooking at all).

ID # V36 / Dodoparon Fig. 3:24; Pl. 2:24

Part: rim, a handle; **preservation:** 5 %; **fragments:** 4 pcs.; **weight:** 87 g

Inner rim d: ca. 130 mm; **max. height×width:** +40×+148 mm

Handles: 1 preserved, likely 2; **section:** 33×13 mm

Fabric: sandy, fair sorting (3)

Inclusions: 10–20 %, up to 1.0 mm (rarely bigger pcs. up to 5 mm), predominant quartz and lime, common brown to red inclusions, rare silver mica

Fabric colour: core of the sherd is yellowish red (5YR 4/6)

Surface colour: burned to black

ID # V37 / Dodoparon Fig. 3:25; Pl. 2:25

Part: rim, upper body, a handle; **preservation:** 10 %; **fragments:** 18 pcs.; **weight:** 187 g

Inner rim d: 90 mm; **max. height×width:** +84×187 mm

Handles: 1 preserved, likely 2; **section:** 30×11 mm

Fabric: sandy, poor sorting (2)

Inclusions: 20 %, up to 2.0 mm (rarely bigger pcs. up to 4 mm), predominant quartz and lime, few brown to red inclusions, very rare silver mica

Fabric colour: red (2.5YR 5/8)

Surface colour: dark greyish brown (10YR 4/2)

4.2.8. POTS WITH TRIANGULAR RIM SECTION

Dodoparon Fig. 3:26–28

Dodoparon Pl. 2:26

The last three pots are very fragmentary, with only a small percentage of preservation. Their common morphological feature is the triangular rim, otherwise each sherd has its individual shape. None of the vessels was burned, and they keep their original fabric colour in tints of reddish yellow. Pot **26** is very rich in silver mica making its surface shine; it is also coarser than the other two, which contain silver mica in a very low amount (**Dodoparon Pl. 2:26**). The same vessel (**26**) is preserved in a small number of fragments which do not contain a handle or handle attachment, but there would still be a space on the rim for one, or even for two handles. Pot **27**, rim with one preserved handle, is decorated with a plastic rib running around the neck. Vessel **28** has two preserved handles, but if the base really belongs to this pot, is questionable, as it seems a bit disparate. On the other hand, based on the fabric similarities, the colour, as well as the exclusion method, it should be a part of one of these pots and **27** seems to be too small and **28** is, unlike the base, micaceous.

ID # V18 / Dodoparon Fig. 3:26; Pl. 2:26

Part: rim; **preservation:** 3 %; **fragments:** 5 pcs.; **weight:** 66 g

Inner rim d: 130 mm; **max. height×width:** +38×+174 mm

Handles: none preserved

Fabric: sandy, fair sorting (3)

Inclusions: 30 %, up to 1.0 mm (rarely bigger pcs. up to 5 mm), predominant silver mica, common quartz, lime, brown and red inclusions, few pores

Fabric colour: reddish yellow (5YR 6/8)

ID # V21 / Dodoparon Fig. 3:27

Part: rim, a handle; **preservation:** 10 %; **fragments:** 14 pcs.; **weight:** 109 g

Inner rim d: 75 mm; **max. height×width:** +44×+108 mm

Handles: 1 preserved, likely 2; **section:** 20×8 mm

Fabric: sandy, good sorting (4)

Inclusions: 20 %, up to 0.5mm (rarely bigger pcs. up to 2 mm), predominant quartz and lime, common brown to red inclusions, few pores, rare silver mica

Fabric colour: strong brown (7.5YR 5/6)

Surface colour: reddish yellow (7.5YR 6/6)

ID # V39 / Dodoparon Fig. 3:28

Part: rim, handles, base; **preservation:** 5 %; **fragments:** 5 pcs.; **weight:** 61 g

Inner rim d: 110 mm; **base outer d.:** 80 mm **max. height×width:** ca. 150×+40 mm

Handles: 2; **section:** 30×11 mm

Fabric: sandy, fair sorting (3)

Inclusions: 20 %, up to 0.5 mm (rarely bigger pcs. up to 2 mm), predominant quartz and lime, common brown to red inclusions, rare silver mica

Fabric colour: reddish yellow (5YR 4/4); core – grey

Surface colour: reddish yellow (7.5YR 6/6)

4.2.9. MIX OF SMALL SIZE VESSELS IN A FRAGMENTED STATE

Dodoparon Fig. 3:29–32

Dodoparon Pl. 3:29, 32

Four vessels of different forms and state of preservation are represented in the following group. The first one (29), a cup or mug, keeps the full section of the vessel, however, the rim EVE is only 30 % and there is still the possibility of the existence of one or more handles. It has a severely burned rim; the body and neck

are engraved with shallow horizontal lines all around. The fabric colour of the vessel is yellowish red (**Dodoparon Pl. 3:29**). The original weight might be approximated at up to 400 g, and the capacity at ca. 0.6 litres. The following vessel, **30**, has a well-preserved lower body with two handles, however the upper body part (the neck with a rim) is completely missing. It has a flat base and a body decorated with one shallow horizontal line. It seems, that the neck was broken off at the point of the attachment (a long straight breakage line on one level). We may assume it was a small table amphora with a globular body or a jug. The colour of the fabric is strong brown, burned slightly in several places to dark brown. The original vessel weight seems to be up to 500 g, and the capacity of the preserved lower body is only 0.6 l. If we presume the neck continued straight all the way to the upper handle attachment, the capacity increases to 0.8/0.9 l.

The last two vessels, **31** and **32**, are both burned to black tints, and they share a similar fabric, which is quite fine, well levigated, with a smooth surface treatment. The few body fragments associated to them were divided just based on their size (if not joined directly together), as they were otherwise impossible to distinguish based on the fabric itself. Vessel **31**, a small jug, is decorated under the neck with one plastic bend, while **32**, twice with three shallow incised lines on the upper body. The original shape of the latter vessel is difficult to approximate, it was perhaps a cup or mug (**Dodoparon Pl. 3:30**).

Since no rims or bases of these two fragments were preserved, the diameter was measured on the body – the place of which is marked on the drawing. In these two cases, any weight or capacity cannot be even estimated.

ID # V1/ Dodoparon Fig. 3:29; Pl. 3:29

Part: whole vessel; **preservation:** 30 %; **fragments:** 15 pcs.; **weight:** 113 g

Inner rim d: 90 mm; **base outer d.:** 55 mm; **max. height×width:** 103×114 mm

Handles: none preserved; **capacity:** 0.63 l

Fabric: sandy, fair sorting (3)

Inclusions: 20 %, up to 1.0 mm (rarely bigger pcs. up to 3 mm), predominant quartz and lime, common pores, few brown to red inclusions, rare silver mica

Fabric colour: upper part burned; base and lower body – yellowish red (5YR 4/6)

ID # V20 / Dodoparon Fig. 3:30

Part: lower body with base, handles; **preservation:** 40 %; **fragments:** 8 pcs.;
weight: 187 g
Base outer d.: 50 mm; **max. height×width:** +142×116 mm; **capacity:** 0.63–0.86 l
Handles: 2; **section:** 7×4 mm
Fabric: sandy, fair sorting (3)
Inclusions: 20 %, up to 2.0 mm, predominant quartz and lime, common brown to red inclusions, few pores, rare silver mica
Fabric colour: strong brown (7.5YR 5/6)

ID # V31 / Dodoparon Fig. 3:31

Part: upper body; **preservation:** 20 %; **fragments:** 8 pcs.; **weight:** 117 g
Max. height×width: +80×141 mm
Handle: 1; **section of attachment:** 25×6 mm
Fabric: sandy, good sorting (4), smoothed surface
Inclusions: 20 %, up to 0.5 mm (rarely bigger pcs. up to 3 mm), predominant quartz and lime, few brown to red inclusions and silver mica
Fabric colour: burned – black (gley 1 2.5/N)

ID # V30 / Dodoparon Fig. 3:32; Pl. 3:32

Part: upper body, neck; **preservation:** 5 %; **fragments:** 3 pcs.; **weight:** 49 g
Max. height×width: +60×120 mm
Handle: 1; **section of attachment:** 22×7 mm
Fabric: sandy, good sorting (4), smoothed surface
Inclusions: 20 %, up to 0.5 mm (rarely bigger pcs. up to 7 mm), predominant quartz and lime, few brown to red inclusions and silver mica
Fabric colour: burned – reddish black (2.5YR 2.5/1)
Surface colour: burned – greyish brown (2.5Y 5/2)

4.2.10. JUGS WITH ONE HANDLE

Dodoparon Fig. 4:33–36

Dodoparon Pl. 3:33–34, 36

The first two jugs **33–34** have a rounded body, high neck with small spout (d. 20–26 mm), which is encircled below the lip by a wide plastic rib. Vessel **33** has bigger

dimensions, with an approximated height of 330 mm and a flat base; while **34** is smaller, of 234 mm, with a ring foot. These two vessels have more in common than the shape – they are both from fine, very pale brown fabric, with a small number of tiny inclusions). As the fabric is very soft, it is also heavily eroded, flaking in layers – especially the fragments connected with vessel **33 (Dodoparon Pl. 3:33–34)**.

The fine fabric relates to a serving function (table ware), the specific shape of the spout suggests using for liquid, whose dropping was undesirable. We might directly think of olive oil. The original weight of the jug **33** seems to be around 1400 g, while its capacity might be only approximated, as the base and the upper part do not join together. In this case, I would also omit the neck in the capacity calculation, as we may suppose it was not practical to have this type of vessel filled up fully (i.e. to 260 mm of the 320 mm of the vessel height). For the result, we get a very approximate number of 7.8 l of content. The smaller jug **34** might have originally weighed around 1000 g and its capacity, calculating it as well without the neck (i.e. to 176 mm of the 234 mm of the vessel height), is 2 litres.

ID # V8 / Dodoparon Fig. 4:33; Pl. 3:33

Part: upper part, a handle, base; **preservation:** 60 %; **fragments:** 104 pcs.; **weight:** 828 g

Inner rim d: 26 mm; **base outer d.:** 90 mm; **max. height×width:** ca. 330×+224 mm

Handle: 1; **section:** 26×14 mm; **capacity:** 7.8 l (very rough estimate)

Fabric: good sorting (4), very worn

Inclusions: 10 %, up to 0.3 mm (rarely bigger pcs. up to 2 mm), predominant quartz and lime, common brown to red inclusions and silver mica

Fabric colour: very pale brown (10YR 7/4)

ID # V9 / Dodoparon Fig. 4:34; Pl. 3:34

Part: whole vessel; **preservation:** 80 %; **fragments:** 67 pcs.; **weight:** 799 g

Inner rim d: 20 mm; **base outer d.:** 70 mm; **max. height×width:** 234×167 mm

Handle: 1; **section:** 23×14 mm; **capacity:** 2 l

Fabric: very good sorting (5), very worn

Inclusions: 10 %, up to 0.3 mm (rarely bigger pcs. up to 1 mm), predominant quartz, lime, brown to red inclusions, rare silver mica and pores

Fabric colour: very pale brown (10YR 7/4)

Vessels **35–36** do not share the main characteristic with the above described jugs, nor with each other. Jug **35** has a long narrow neck with a small spout with an outer d. 28 mm and sandy fabric of reddish yellow colour which is quite fine, soft, and eroded on the surface resulting in many pores. Its original weight would have also been around 1000 g and its capacity, without the neck (i.e. to 150 of the 220 mm) is 1.72 l. The last jug, **36**, has a hard fabric with a smooth surface (not as eroded and soft as **33–34**), a red colour, and a wider rim of inner d. 50 mm. It has characteristic wheel marks inside of the base and on the neck, just below the rim, it is decorated with several engraved horizontal lines (**Dodoparon Pl. 3:36**). Part of the base is missing, otherwise it can be reconstructed into the whole vessel of original weight 1000–1300 g. Its capacity below the neck (i.e. to 170 mm of the 210 mm of the vessel height) is 1.97 l.

ID # V35 / Dodoparon Fig. 4:35

Part: whole vessel; **preservation:** 20–30 %; **fragments:** 24 pcs.; **weight:** 215 g

Inner rim d: 28 mm; **base outer d.:** 65 mm; **max. height×width:** 220×152 mm

Handle: 1; **section:** 19×14 mm; **capacity:** 1.72 l

Fabric: good sorting (4), sandy

Inclusions: 10 %, up to 0.5 mm (rarely bigger pcs. up to 1 mm), predominant quartz and lime, common pores, elongated vugs, few brown red inclusions, rare silver mica

Fabric colour: reddish yellow (7.5YR 7/6)

ID # V16 / Dodoparon Fig. 4:36; Pl. 3:36

Part: whole vessel; **preservation:** 30–40 %; **fragments:** 33 pcs.; **weight:** 396 g

Inner rim d.: 50 mm; **base outer d.:** 60 mm; **max. height×width:** 210×160 mm

Handle: 1; **section:** 27×8 mm; **capacity:** 1.97 l

Fabric: fair sorting (3), sandy, smoothed surface

Inclusions: 20 %, up to 0.5 mm (rarely bigger pcs. up to 9 mm), predominant quartz and lime, few pores, brown to red inclusions and elongated vugs, rare silver mica

Fabric colour: red (2.5YR 4/8)

These four (**33–36**) vessels feature a smaller capacity which probably correlates with a (technical) need of one handle only. Vessels **34–36** seem to weigh around 1000 grams or slightly more, with the capacity of each container ranging from 1.7 to 2 litres. The vessel **33** is not that well preserved, but clearly it is the biggest and heaviest one-handled jug in the assemblage, whose approximate weight together with the content is 3 to 4 times higher than of the other vessels in this category.

4.2.11. TABLE AMPHORAE

Dodoparon Fig. 4:37–40

Dodoparon Fig. 3:37, 39

The following group is of table amphorae, bigger containers with two handles, a wider neck, a rim of 70–85/100 mm, an ovoid to rounded body and a flat base. Each amphora is characteristic on its own. The vessel **37** differs significantly from the rest of the assemblage. It has a red colour with a yellowish surface and very shiny fabric, which might find similarities only with some of the dolia fabric. It is quite coarse, with a high number of inclusions, from which golden mica (or a similar shiny mineral) completely dominates, which is accompanied to a lesser degree by quartz and lime (**Dodoparon Fig. 3:37**). Thanks to this specific fabric, the fragments of this vessel were easily collected and put together almost completely. It also has thicker walls, producing quite a heavy container, which weighed on its own about 3000 g. Its capacity is ca. 14.36 l, measured below the neck (i.e. to 270 mm of the 352 mm of the vessel height).

The other three amphorae (**38–40**) share a strong brown colour and similar appearance of the fabric and inclusions. They all have a sandy and quite porous fabric, coarser when worn (**Dodoparon Fig. 3:39**). It was impossible to attribute all the available sherds of similar characteristic to each amphora, consequently they were put together in a pile of 110 sherds of 1130 grams. The weight of the individual vessel thus cannot be reconstructed; only the capacity of **38** can be estimated at 10.5 l below the neck (i.e. to 250 mm of the 325 mm of the vessel height). The combination of the upper and lower part of **39** resulted from the fabric match, however, the base seems to me to be too small for the vessel (outer base d. 45 mm).

The table amphorae feature a higher capacity and overall weight than the one-handled jugs. Based on the approximation of the vessels **37** and **38**, their

capacity reaches over 10 litres, and the expected weight of a full container might be as much as 18 kilograms (vessel 37). Their coarser fabric likely relates to the bigger dimensions, but it may also suggest, together with the wider opening, that these vessels could have been used over the fire for boiling water (VAN DER VEEN 2018).

ID # V43 / Dodoparon Fig. 4:37; Pl. 3:37

Part: whole vessel; **preservation:** 90 %; **fragments:** 116 pcs.; **weight:** 2742 g

Inner rim d.: 85 mm; **base outer d.:** 130 mm; **max. height×width:** 352×324 mm

Handle: 2; **section:** 47×18 mm; **capacity:** 14.36 l

Fabric: fair sorting (3)

Inclusions: 30 %, up to 1.0 mm (rarely bigger pcs. up to 4 mm), predominant golden mica, common quartz and lime, few brown to red inclusions

Fabric colour: red (2.5YR 5/8)

Surface colour: reddish yellow (5YR 6/6)

ID # V32 / Dodoparon Fig. 4:38

Part: upper body, handles, base; **preservation:** 40–50 %; **fragments:** 37 pcs.; **weight:** 948 g

Inner rim d.: 80 mm; **base outer d.:** 70 mm; **max. height×width:** ca. 325×294 mm

Handle: 2; **section:** 40×15 mm; **capacity:** ca. 10.47 l

Fabric: good sorting (4), sandy

Inclusions: 20 %, up to 0.5 mm (rarely bigger pcs. up to 5 mm), predominant quartz and lime, common brown to red inclusions, few pores and rare silver mica

Fabric colour: strong brown (7.5YR 5/6)

ID # V33 / Dodoparon Fig. 4:39; Pl. 3:39

Part: neck with handles, base; **preservation:** 10 %; **fragments:** 10 pcs.; **weight:** 234 g

Inner rim d.: 70 mm; **base outer d.:** 45 mm; **max. height×width:** upper part +83×+143 mm; base +35×+212 mm

Handle: 2; **section:** 32×13 mm

Fabric: fair sorting (3), sandy

Inclusions: 20 %, up to 1.0 mm (rarely bigger pcs. up to 4 mm), predominant quartz and lime, few brown to red inclusions, rare silver and golden mica

Fabric colour: strong brown (7.5YR 5/6)

ID # V34 / Dodoparon Fig. 4:40

Part: neck with a handle; **preservation:** 3 %; **fragments:** 4 pcs.; **weight:** 46 g

Inner rim d.: 100 mm; **max. height×width:** +59×+103 mm

Handle: 1 preserved, likely 2; **section:** 32×10 mm

Fabric: good sorting (4), sandy, micaceous

Inclusions: 30 %, up to 0.5 mm (rarely bigger pcs. up to 2 mm), predominant quartz and lime, common silver mica, rare brown to red inclusions

Fabric colour: strong brown (7.5YR 5/6)

4.2.12. CARAFES

Dodoparon Fig. 4:41–42

Dodoparon Pl. 3:41

Two *carafes*, vessels of an ovoid body, wide neck and trefoil rim, similar to *oinochoai*, were found in the assemblage. They share decoration which combines wavy motifs with horizontal lines, below which follows a series of small cuts. Both vessels have one handle of very similar section: 37–38×14–15 mm, while only one of them, **42**, has it decorated from above with a series of deep cuts. The wide opening of the vessels could be measured well on **41**, where it ranges in d. 200–230 mm; in the second case, the vessel is not that well preserved, however, the width from spout to handle can be approximated at 290 mm. The original colour of both vessels was similar – brownish, although **42** is now mostly burned. The fabric of both *carafes* is sandy, containing similar inclusions, only **42** has a rather micaceous fabric, with flakes of silver mica highly visible thanks to the burned (black) sherds (**Dodoparon Pl. 3:41**). The original weight of **41** seems to be around 1500 g, while its capacity is difficult to measure – even with the whole profile. The upper part of trefoil vessels, by its definition, is irregular, therefore our measurement of 10.5 l (measured 20 mm below the rim), relates to a capacity of a fully rounded shape – body and the neck – with the maximal rim d. 230 mm. Consequently, we need to take this measurement as the maximal capacity, as the real one, with the neck concavity, had to be smaller.

On the other hand, the capacity of the regular-shaped body part (measured to 170 mm of the 248 mm of the vessel height) is ca. 8.2 litres. Consequently, I suppose we will not be wrong in assuming the real (maximal) capacity of this *carafe* at 9 to 10 litres.

The fabric coarsening of both vessels relates to the appearance of the table amphorae, for which possible use over a fire for boiling water has been suggested (see above). In fact, the wide-neck *carafes* seem to be more fitting for this action, as the boiling water would not create such a pressure on the rim/upper body part, and manipulation with the hot water (pouring it in and out) would also be easier thanks to the rim shaping. The capacity seems similar as for the table amphorae, around 10 litres.

ID # V23 / Dodoparon Fig. 4:41; Pl. 3:39

Part: whole vessel; **preservation:** 60–70 %; **fragments:** 38 pcs.; **weight:** 849 g

Inner rim d.: 200–300 mm (trefoil rim); **max. height×width:** 248×296 mm

Handle: 1; **section:** 37×14 mm; **capacity:** max. 10.5 l

Fabric: good sorting (4), sandy

Inclusions: 20 %, up to 0.5 mm (rarely bigger pcs. up to 2 mm), predominant quartz and lime, few brown to red inclusions and pores, rare silver mica

Fabric colour: strong brown (7.5YR 4/6)

ID # V45 / Dodoparon Fig. 4:42

Part: upper body, handle; **preservation:** 20–30 %; **fragments:** 19 pcs.; **weight:** 369 g

Inner rim d.: 290×? mm (trefoil rim); **max. height×width:** +102×292 mm

Handle: 1; **section:** 38×15 mm

Fabric: fair sorting (3), sandy

Inclusions: 20 %, up to 1 mm (rarely bigger pcs. up to 2 mm), predominant quartz, lime and silver mica, common brown to red inclusions, few golden mica

Fabric colour: burned core – black (Gley 1 2.5/N)

Surface colour: yellowish brown (10YR 5/4)

4.2.13. STORAGE VESSELS

Dodoparon Fig. 5:43–49

Dodoparon Pl. 4: 43, 46–49

Six upper parts/rims of storage vessels (43–48) and one base (49) were partly reconstructed. The shape of the dolia is quite unified – closed forms with a rounded body, projecting rim quadrangular or triangular in section, flat from the top. By form, only one container is different, 48, with the rim rather straight, decorated with one engraved line. By fabric, we may divide them into two main groups: the first with a very micaceous fabric, in a hand specimen similar to jug 37 (43–44, 46, 48–49; Pl. 4:43, 46, 48, 49), where also the base 49 belongs, which seems to be part of the container 43 or 46; and the second one, with a quartz-based fabric without any mica (45, 47; Pl. 4:47). The container 47 has the best levigated, sandy-based fabric, with fewer inclusions compared to the others; it is also decorated on the upper body with two engraved lines, similar decoration also appears on the top of the lip. Its peculiarity is also its lower part, which is cut off before firing. The cutting is done by a string (?) in horizontal lines, removing a big piece of clay from the outside and sharpening the rest of the body also from the inside, creating a tapered tip (Dodoparon Pl. 4:47).

A pile of further unsorted sherds might be attributed to these two main groups – of micaceous fabric: 248 pcs. of 9000 g; and of quartz-based fabric: 98 pcs. of 3400 g. If we count the weight of each fabric together with the fragments associated with the individual containers, we get 17000 g of the micaceous fabric (4200 g average weight of one container) and 16000 g of the quartz-based fabric (8000 g average weight of one container). This second number correlates better with the best preserved dolium under 47, to which we could attribute, thanks to its specific fabric described above, 154 fragments of weight of almost 7000 g. If we add the weight of the bottom 49 (just for illustrative purposes, as these two parts do not belong to one vessel) which weighs 850 g, we indeed approach a minimum weight of about 8000 grams per dolium.⁹⁰

⁹⁰ As only parts of 47 were possible to reconstruct into some mass, an approximation of the percentage of preservation is not possible. For this I would work here with rough numbers which offer ca. 7000 grams of the upper body and 850 g for the bottom (of a different vessel). There are certainly missing pieces so rounding the number up to 8000 g and expecting it to be even higher is well justifiable.

The lack of lower body fragments and only one better preserved base give rise to a question, whether these containers, likely sunken in the house floor, were fully excavated. This would explain the low number of fragments related to the vessels of micaceous fabric, whose dimensions (based on the rim diameter) are comparable to the ones of quartz-based fabric, and also the good preservation of **47**, which presumably had no base. From the one reconstructed example (**43+49**) it is obvious that the container could not stand alone and had to be either sunken in the ground or laid against a wall.

None of the dolia are complete, but we can hint at the capacity of two of them – containers **43** and **47**. If we measure them as they are, so in their real state of preservation, **43** has 25.5 l and **47** 36.7 l. The lower part / base of **49**, as we have discussed above, seems to relate, based on the fabric and colour similarity, to the upper body with a rim under **43**. The capacity of the base is 1.3 l, which would result in 27 litres if counted together. We may go even further to reconstruct the whole container from these two parts, by extending the body walls of **43** and the base **49** until they meet at a height of 475 mm (446 mm excluding the base thickness). The resulting shape resembles dolium from the Yassi Ada shipwreck, of only slighter bigger dimensions, which was interpreted as the ship water jar covered by a wooden lid (BASS 1982, 187–188, fig. 8:21). The final capacity of the two joined parts would result in ca 34 l which seems to be close to the highest possible number for such a shape of dolium from the one-room house.

ID # K5 / Dodoparon Fig. 5:43; Pl. 4:43

Part: upper body; **fragments:** 7 pcs.; **weight:** 661 g; **capacity:** 25.5–34 l

Inner rim d.: 180 mm; **max. height×width:** +245×430 mm

Fabric: micaceous, fair sorting (3)

Inclusions: 20 %, up to 1 mm (rarely bigger pcs. up to 5 mm), predominant quartz and silver mica, common lime, few brown to red inclusions

Fabric colour: core burned – grey, margin outside: red (5YR 5/8); inside: brown (7.5YR 4/3)

ID # K1 / Dodoparon Fig. 5:44

Part: rim; **fragments:** 20 pcs.; **weight:** 2383 g

Inner rim d.: 250 mm; **max. height×width:** +51×+342 mm

Fabric: micaceous, fair sorting (3)

Inclusions: 30 %, up to 2 mm (rarely bigger pcs. up to 8 mm), predominant silver mica, common quartz, few brown to red inclusions and pores

Fabric colour: red (2.5YR 4/6)

Surface colour: red of different tints, outside 10R 5/8, inside 2.5YR 4/6

ID # K6 / Dodoparon Fig. 5:45

Part: rim, body frags.; **fragments:** 115 pcs.; **weight:** 5554 g

Inner rim d.: 210 mm; **max. height×width:** +52×+312 mm

Fabric: micaceous, poor sorting (2)

Inclusions: 20 %, up to 1 mm (rarely bigger pcs. up to 9 mm), predominant quartz, few lime, brown to red inclusions and pores

Fabric colour: yellowish red (5YR 4/6)

Surface colour: outside red (5YR 5/8), inside reddish brown (5YR 4/4)

ID # K4 / Dodoparon Fig. 5:46; Pl. 4:46

Part: rim; **fragments:** 3 pcs.; **weight:** 300 g

Inner rim d.: 160 mm; **max. height×width:** +39×+236 mm

Fabric: micaceous, good sorting (4)

Inclusions: 20 %, up to 1 mm (rarely bigger pcs. up to 3 mm), predominant quartz, lime and sliver mica

Fabric colour: burned – outside grey (x), inside red (2.5YR 4/8)

Surface colour: strong brown (7.5YR 4/6)

ID # K3 / Dodoparon Fig. 5:47; Pl. 4:47

Part: upper body, body frgs.; **fragments:** 154 pcs.; **weight:** 6903 g; **capacity:** min. 36.73 l

Inner rim d.: 190 mm; **max. height×width:** +353×451 mm

Fabric: sandy, good sorting (4)

Inclusions: 10–20 %, up to 0.5 mm (rarely bigger pcs. up to 7 mm), predominant quartz, lime and pores, few brown to red inclusions and sliver mica

Fabric colour: combination of red (2.5YR 4/8) and dark reddish brown (5YR 3/4)

ID # K2 / Dodoparon Fig. 5:48; Pl. 4:48

Part: rim, body frgs.; **fragments:** 25 pcs.; **weight:** 3878 g

Inner rim d.: 210 mm; **max. height×width:** +121×+357 mm; **capacity:** >1.3 l

Fabric: micaceous, poor sorting (2)

Inclusions: 30 %, up to 2 mm (rarely bigger pcs. up to 8mm), predominant golden mica, common quartz, shiny black particles and brown to red inclusions

Fabric colour: red (2.5YR 4/6)

Surface colour: red (2.5YR 2/6)

ID # K7 / Dodoparon fig. 5:49; Pl. 4:49

Part: base; **fragments:** 7 pcs.; **weight:** 857 g

Outer base d.: 80 mm; **max. height×width:** +114×+253 mm

Fabric: micaceous, fair sorting (3)

Inclusions: 20 %, up to 1 mm (rarely bigger pcs. up to 5 mm), predominant quartz and silver/golden mica, common lime

Fabric colour: yellowish red (5YR 4/6)

4.2.14. TRANSPORT AMPHORAE

Two types of transport amphorae were found in the house – two of a small size Kuzmanov XIV, sub-variant I / Opaït B V and five of bigger size containers of Late Roman 2 Amphorae (LRA 2). Since these containers are the direct witnesses of a trade, or, to say it better, of an import to the site, I will focus more on their possible provenance and content.

Kuzmanov XIV, sub-variant I / Opaït B V

Dodoparon Fig. 6:50–51

Dodoparon Pl. 5:50–51

The first two amphorae (50–51) might be attributed to the type Kuzmanov XIV, sub-variant I (in Bulgaria) as well as to type Opaït B V (in Romania). Both of these types are treated, in scientific literature, as two different amphorae, although they have the same fabric appearance, as well as dimensions: containers of small proportions

(rim d. 40–50 mm⁹¹/40–70 mm⁹², body d. 100–120 mm and height 300–350 mm), fabric of brown-red colour with dark red (iron oxide) particles, white (lime) inclusions and surface covered by whitish coating (engobe) (KUZMANOV 1985, 18–20; OPAIȚ 2004a, 27; PARASCHIV 2014, 426). The confusion might be caused by their classification as sub-variant I of Kuzmanov type XIV (KUZMANOV 1985, 18), which otherwise relates to LR1 amphorae, quite a different container.⁹³ However, if we compare closely the fabric description, dimensions, and after all, appearance, Kuzmanov XIV, sub-variant I and Opaïț B V can be, without doubts, attributed to the same amphora type (compare e.g. KUZMANOV 1985, таб. 9: A90–A93 with finds from Capidava – OPRIȘ 2003, cat. nos 159–167; or OPAIȚ 2004a, 29 and PARASCHIV 2014, fig. 2:4). Both Opaïț and Paraschiv present one (and the same) complete amphorae (once in photo once in drawing) found in Halmyris, very much similar to ours. Opaïț also gives its capacity of 1.793 liters, which corresponds to the approximated capacity of the better preserved Dodoparon sample (50), which is 1.7 litres, counted to the preserved top, as the upper rim is missing.

Both in Scythia Minor (i.e. roughly Romanian Dobrudzha) and in Bulgaria, these amphorae are known from the second half of the 6th century AD to the beginning of the 7th century AD. Paraschiv (2014, 426) suggests, they were produced locally in Scythia Minor for short-distance transport of low quality wine, as he bases his interpretation on presumption, these amphorae were found only in Scythia. The wine, as a content, is also supported by a find of a pitch inside of one the containers (OPAIȚ 2004a, 29).

We may, however, enlarge their area of appearance, adding Kuzmanov's finds from Varna, Kastel Akra (Chernomorec⁹⁴), Balchik, Early Byzantine fortress at Vojvoda in Shumen District (KUZMANOV 1985, 20), and our finds from Dodoparon, which represent, for now, the furthers place of their discovery – or recognition – from Dobrudzha. The distance is still not that significant (ca. 380 km from Capidava, 440 km from Ibida, 500 km from Halmyris – which are some of the places these amphorae were found), but it quite enlarges the area of their distribution – if indeed produced in Scythia Minor, as suggested by Paraschiv. We

⁹¹ KUZMANOV 1985, 18 and 20.

⁹² PARASCHIV 2014, 426.

⁹³ For further discussion regarding the typology see TUŠLOVÁ 2017.

⁹⁴ More of these were recently found at the peninsula of Hrisosotira at Chernomorets (HRISTOV 2015b, fig. VI-2:11 and 12, Fig. VI-15 and VI-17).

may also speculate about the content, as the organic residue analysis of the two Dodoparon vessels (see POLLA *et al.* in print) showed oil as their prime content, although the sample of amphora **50** could also contain wine or milk product(s).

None of our containers is complete. The better-preserved amphora **50** is missing part of the rim with a lip, but based on the comparison (OPAIT 2004a, 29; PARASCHIV 2014, fig. 2:4) we may expect that it ended shortly above the handle. Amphora **51**, on the other hand, has a preserved rim with a lip (inner d. 40 mm), but the upper part with shoulders is missing. Its reconstructed height is then based on the first amphora (**50**), reaching up to 310 mm. Since both amphorae are better preserved, we may also approximate their weight when complete. Container **50** would have around 1300–1400 grams, while for **51** we may expect a little less, as it has a slender body.

The approximate capacity of the better preserved Dodoparon sample (**50**) is 1.7 litres, counted to the preserved top, as the upper rim is missing. The total weight of the container and the content would then be around a little over 3000 grams.

ID # F37 / Dodoparon Fig. 6:50; Pl. 5:50

Part: vessel without a lip; **preservation:** 60 %; **fragments:** 34 pcs.; **weight:** 805 g

Inner d.: ca. 26 mm; **max. height×width:** +286×120 mm; **capacity:** ca. 1.7 l

Handle: 1 preserved, likely 2; **section:** 25×17 mm

Fabric: sandy, poor sorting (2)

Inclusions: 20 %, up to 2 mm (rarely bigger pcs. up to 4 mm), predominant quartz and lime, few brown to red inclusions, rare silver mica

Fabric colour: brown (10YR 4/3)

Surface colour: outer – whitish engobe

ID # F38 / Dodoparon Fig. 6:51; Pl. 5:51

Part: rim, body, base; **preservation:** 40 %; **fragments:** 15 pcs.; **weight:** 458 g

Inner rim d.: 40 mm; **max. height×width:** ca. 310×+104 mm; **capacity:** ca. 1.6 l

Handle: not preserved, likely 2

Fabric: sandy, fair sorting (3)

Inclusions: 20 %, up to 0.5 mm (rarely bigger pcs. up to 7 mm), predominant quartz and lime, common brown to red inclusions, few elongated vugs (a straw?), rare silver mica

Fabric colour: reddish brown (5YR 5/4)

Surface colour: outer – whitish engobe

Late Roman 2 Amphorae (LRA 2)

Dodoparon Fig. 6:52–56 + a,b,c,d

Dodoparn Pl. 5:52, 53–56, 54, 55

The following containers (52–56) share a similar morphology, which classes them among the LRA 2, very common at the Aegean Sea and the Balkan Peninsula, where they might be found in the highest quantities along the Danube River and in Dobrudzha (KARAGIORGOU 2001, 129). In northern Bulgaria, they are well-known from Iatrus (BÖTTGER 1982, Taf. 17–18), Nicopolis ad Istrum (FALKNER 1999, fig. 9.52:1056–1062), Novae (e.g. DYCZEK 2007), Trimamium (DOBREVA 2017, 67; tab. 27) or Dichin (SWAN 2004, 373; fig. 5; SWAN 2007, 841, fig. 3); in the southern part of Bulgaria, closer to Dodoparon, we may mention finds from Kabile.⁹⁵

The LRA 2 are common trade containers of the Late Antiquity, dated from the 4th until the turn of the 6th/7th century AD, with multiple production places, presumably located in the Aegean area and the eastern Mediterranean (PEACOCK – WILLIAMS 1986, 184), possibly also at the Black Sea (BĂDESCU – CLIANTE 2014, 178).

Olive oil is commonly expected to be the main content of these amphorae (e.g. SWAN 2007, 836; OPAIT 2004b, 297; KARAGIORGOU 2001, 149; DYCZEK 2001, 191), although wine (BASS 1982, 164–165; SCORPAN 1977, 276) and resin (RĂDULESCU 1973, 193–207) have also been identified. In some cases, we may also speculate about their use (or rather re-use) as grain containers (BÖTTGER 1982; STECKNER 1989, 63–64).

The five LRA 2 from Dodoparon share a funnel shaped rim with inner d. 80–90 mm, a rounded body, the bottom in the form of a small knob with outer d. 20–23 mm, and decoration on the upper body – a series of engraved horizontal lines, either straight (52; **Dodoparon Pl. 5:52**), or wavy (53–56; **Dodoparon Pl. 5:53–56**). They have two handles with a section of 35–40×24–27 mm. Five upper bodies and five bases could be reconstructed, however, only in one case was it possible to attribute

⁹⁵ Unpublished finds of LRA 2 from the excavations of Kabile are to be found in the archives of the local archaeological base.

these two parts to a single vessel (**52**). This amphora has very fine soft fabric, thinner sherds and two distinctive fabric colours, light red and very pale brown, which mutually intersect on the body (**Dodoparon Pl. 5:52**). Based on these characteristics, it was possible to sort out about 200 body sherds of 3000 g, which belong to the amphora, together with one rim of inner d. 80 mm and a base of d. 20 mm. Both of these parts represent pieces of the smallest diameters of all, which together with the lighter body fragments show a rather slender container of smaller proportions (compared with the other four). This specific fabric description goes hand in hand with the unique upper body treatment of shallow engraved parallel lines, while the other amphorae share a deep wavy motif. Its reconstructed height is 545 mm which results in a capacity of about 32 litres, a common amount for the LRA 2 amphorae of the Late Antiquity (OΠΑΙΤ 2004a, 11).

The other four amphorae share a coarser fabric of a darker brownish to greyish colour. Their upper body is decorated with wavy striation and the rim diameter is slightly bigger (inner d. 90 mm). The bases share a similar width (21–23 mm), but they could not be correctly attributed to the upper body parts and they are represented separately under the letters **a**, **b**, **c**, and **d**. The same situation is with the body fragments, which were put on a pile of 833 fragments of 17500 grams. This would result in an approximated weight of 4.5 kg for one amphora, if we presume that all of the sherds were collected during the excavation. Only one amphora lid was found (approximately 50 % preservation, outer d. 80 mm), which by colour, fabric and dimensions perfectly fits container **54**.

Comparing the vessel forms among each other, **52**, **55** and **56** share similar profiles and proportions, suggesting also a similar capacity (i.e. around 32 litres); while the rim of **53** has, besides a pronounced protrusion from inside and a missing neck, also about 50 mm wider shoulders than **52**, which would likely result in a bigger capacity (32 < litres). The last container, **54**, has the most different shape from the others, with a shorter rim and a robust neck, which is, however, of similar width to the others. It seems reasonable to presume, these characteristics will not result in a smaller container, but rather in a bigger one (32 < litres).

From the organic residue analysis of four of the bases, one did not give any results, one shows markers of both fat/oil and wine, and the last two of fat/oil and wine and/or a dairy product (POLLA *et al.* in print). This information is inconclusive

and relates well to what is generally thought, i.e. that the LRA 2 were often reused for different contents.

The capacity of the two Kuzmanov XIV, sub-variant I / Opaït B V amphorae altogether would be around 3.5 litres in contrast to ca. 160 litres or more (ca. 32 litres × 5 containers) of the LRA 2. Based on the organic residue analyses, only one Kuzmanov XIV, sub-variant I / Opaït B V amphora (**51**) shows a clear content of oil, while all of the others seem to be used and reused for oil and wine and/or dairy products, perhaps also for bulky foodstuffs which are undetectable using this analysis.

There is a possibility that at least one of the LRA 2 was used for a bulky foodstuff. I base this idea on the different style of the container **52**, whose upper body treatment of shallow horizontal grooving morphologically relates to earlier types of LRA 2, dated to the 4th–5th century AD (SCORPAN 1976, 159–162; SCORPAN 1975, 263–313). A good example / comparison is the description of the LRA 2 grooving from Dichin, dated to the late 5th c. AD: *straight, proportionately wide-spaced with narrow flat ridges between each groove* (SWAN 2007, 836), which is a perfect description of our container suggesting it might predate the other LRA 2 for almost 100 years. The amphora thus seems to be used for longer period, perhaps for bulky foodstuff, as liquids would be difficult to maintain fresh in the re-used container. If the other amphorae were used for olive oil, they seem to have been empty by the time the house collapsed and burned, as if full, they would have been highly flammable and explosive as e.g. attested from Dichin (SWAN 2007, 836).

ID # F39 / Dodoparon Fig. 6:52; Pl. 5:52

Part: upper body and rim, lower body, base; **fragments:** 198 pcs.; **weight:** 2999 g

Inner rim d.: 80 mm; **max. height×width:** ca. 545×344+ mm; **capacity:** ca. 32 l

Handle: 2; **section:** 40×25 mm

Fabric: very good sorting (5), fine

Inclusions: 10 %, up to 0.5 mm, predominant white opaque stones and soft brown pellets (grog?), rare silver mica

Fabric colour: two distinctive colours – light red (2.5YR 6/8), very pale brown (10YR 8/2)

ID # F40a / Dodoparon Fig. 6:53

Part: upper body with rim and handles; **fragments:** 15 pcs.

Inner rim d.: 90 mm; **outer base d.:** 21–23 mm; **max. height×width:** +235×+400 mm

Handle: 2; **section:** 35×25 mm

Fabric: fair sorting (3)

Inclusions: 10 %, up to 1 mm (rarely bigger pcs. up to 7 mm), predominant white opaque stones and soft brown pellets (grog?), few silver mica

Fabric colour: reddish yellow (5YR 5/6) with light red (5YR 7/1) margins

ID # F40b / Dodoparon Fig. 6:54; Pl. 5:54

Part: upper body with rim, handles, lid; **fragments:** 26 pcs.

Inner rim d.: 90 mm; **outer base d.:** 21–23 mm; **max. height×width:** +150×+185 mm

Handle: 2; **section:** 40×27 mm

Fabric: fair sorting (3)

Inclusions: 10 %, up to 1 mm (rarely bigger pcs. up to 4 mm), predominant white opaque stones and soft brown pellets (grog?), few silver mica

Fabric colour: pink (2.5YR 8/4) with light reddish grey (2.5YR 7/1) margins

ID # F40c / Dodoparon Fig. 6:55

Part: upper body with rim and handles; **fragments:** 9 pcs.

Inner rim d.: 90 mm; **outer base d.:** 21–23 mm; **max. height×width:** +208×+334 mm

Handle: 2; **section:** 39×24 mm

Fabric: fair sorting (3)

Inclusions: 20 %, up to 2 mm (rarely bigger pcs. up to 4 mm), predominant white opaque stones and silver mica, common soft brown pellets (grog?)

Fabric colour: inner margin – red (2.5YR 6/8), outer – light brown (7.5YR 6/4)

ID # F40d / Dodoparon Fig. 6:56; Pl. 5:56

Part: upper body with rim and handles; **fragments:** 14 pcs.

Inner rim d.: 90 mm; **outer base d.:** 21–23 mm; **max. height×width:** +173×+300 mm

Handle: 2; **section:** 35×24 mm

Fabric: fair sorting (3)

Inclusions: 10 %, up to 1 mm (rarely bigger pcs. up to 4 mm), predominant white opaque stones and silver mica, common soft brown pellets (grog?)

Fabric colour: yellow to brown (5YR 7/6 to 7.5YR 5/4), light grey margins (5YR 7/1)

4.2.15. PHOCAEAN RED-SLIPPED WARE

Dodoparon Fig. 6:57

Dodoparon Pl. 5:57

One table ware vessel differs significantly from the rest of the material. It is a dish of Phocaean red-slipped ware, also known as Late Roman C ware, and its late type Hayes 10 (HAYES 2008, 88; HAYES 1972, fig. 71:6A). This ware was distributed especially over the Eastern – Byzantine – Empire, where it is known best from coastal settlements, although it also appears inland. It is characteristic for the 5th and 6th c. AD, although some finds might date until the end of the 7th c. AD (HAYES 2008, 85–86). The dish from Dodoparon is decorated on the inner floor with four poorly embossed, half-imprinted cross-monograms, each with two circle motifs between the lower arms (similar to HAYES 1972, fig. 78:68), which are one of the most common decorations of larger dishes. It has a red fabric with only a tint of darker slip, covering the surface fully on both sides. The slip is thin and dull, well soaked into the fabric. On the outer surface, we may find about 10 mm wide facets from a trimming tool, the inner surface is smoothed. Over 60 % of the vessel is preserved, allowing us to estimate its original weight at 900–950 grams. Its capacity is 3.5 l if completely full and 2.85 l if measured 10 cm below the lip.

ID # V40 / Dodoparon Fig. 6:57; Pl. 5:57

Part: whole bowl; **preservation:** 60 %; **fragments:** 25 pcs.; **weight:** 547 g

Inner rim d.: 270 mm; **outer base d.:** 150 mm; **max. height×width:** 64×298 mm

Fabric: very good sorting (5); **capacity:** 3.5 l (if full); 2.85 l (10 mm below)

Inclusions: 10 %, up to 0.5 mm (rarely bigger pcs. up to 1 mm), predominant lime, common pores, few red stones

Fabric colour: red (2.5YR 5/8)

Surface colour: red slip (2.5YR 4/8)

4.3. Parallels to the pottery assemblage

For the majority of the pottery material from Dodoparon, we may find parallels in other Late Antique settlements elsewhere in Bulgaria. Over half of the forms match the material from Sadovec, near Pleven (KUZMANOV 1992), such as the small size pots with a rounded body **1–3** (Taf. 80, Töpfe Typ 2 Var. 1, esp. 11 and 14); the small size pots with a broad body / casseroles **4–5** (Taf. 61, Shalen Typ 2 and 3); lids **8–14** (Taf. 108, Deckel Typ 1 and 2); bigger-size pots of different shapes **16–17** and cooking pots **19–23** (Taf. 73–79, Töpfe Typ 1). One of the table amphorae, **39** (Taf. 69:6, Krüge Typ 3), and the *carafe* **41–42** with engraved wavy and horizontal lines, also shares a similarity with the Sadovec material (Taf. 72:5⁹⁶ and 10); regarding the dolia, all but one (**43–47**) can be matched with the Kuzmanov Type 2 (Taf. 106–107). In Sadovec were also discovered LRA 2 (Taf. 51) even with the same lid (Taf. 109:26), and some fragments of Phocaeen red-slipped ware as well (MACKENSEN 1992, Abb.1).

The pottery assemblage from Gradishteto near Dichin (KUZMANOV 2009), also shares many similar forms with Dodoparon finds, specifically the small size pots **4–5** (more or less таб. 5:4 and таб. 7:18–21); the lids **8–14** (таб. 21:201); bigger-size pots **17** and the cooking pots **19–23** (таб. 18:162–178; таб. 19:177 see also SWAN 2007, fig. 6:57–58); In 2007, Swan published some additional finds from the same site with parts of vessels resembling the specific shape of the pot **18** (SWAN 2007, fig. 5:46) and the two pots **24–25** (SWAN 2007, fig. 48). In Kuzmanov (2009) we can further find parallels to jugs **37** (таб. 9:38; although in the description there is no information about a micaceous fabric) and **39** (таб. 9:46). The dolium with a rim decorated with engraved lines from above (**47**) may also find parallels there (таб. 20:192–193). It is classed by Kuzmanov among dolium-like pots (Питосовидни гърнета, Тип 8, p. 172), although the rim d. (190–200 mm) of the published example is exactly the same as ours (190 mm).

Besides the two above-mentioned settlements which share the highest number of forms with Dodoparon, parallels for single vessels may also be found in

⁹⁶ In Sadovec, the upper part of the vessel is presented among mugs. Despite this, I would like to point out the similarities to our *carafes* – the massive neck, dark grey colour and the decoration. The other example given here from Sadovec (Taf. 72:10) is, indeed, like our *carafe* of trefoil wide neck.

other sites in Bulgaria dated to the Late Antiquity (4th–6th c. AD), but mostly to the 6th c. AD. Namely from Novae: the cooking pots **16–17** and **19–23** (КОТЕЦКИ 1977, tab. II; KLENINA 2006, 113–114, Тип 22; ТОМАС 2015, tab. I), and **24–25** (КОТЕЦКИ 1977, tab. I/2 and III/4), jugs **39** (КОТЕЦКИ 1977, tab. III/1; KLENINA 2006, 108 Тип 9), **40** (КОТЕЦКИ 1977, tabl. III/2) and possibly also the jug **37** (KLENINA 2006, 108 Тип 7) as it has the same overall body shape, although the rim is slightly different; Nicopolis ad Istrum: the smaller (**1–3**) and bigger (**16–17** and **19–23**) pots and the one table amphora under **39** (FALKNER 1999, 6.7); another good comparative assemblage is from Iatrus: for pots **1–3** (BÖTTGER 1982, Taf. 34:411, Periode D⁹⁷); the carinated pot **18** (BÖTTGER 1982, Taf. 48:508, also Periode D) and the dolia **43–46** (BÖTTGER 1982, Taf. 51:526, Periode C⁹⁸).

The most commonly repeated vessel shapes seem to be the cooking pots **19–23**, which also have a parallel in southern Bulgaria – in the Sliven area. Borisov (1988, 99–100; рис. 5) classes them as Горшки Тип X, of two main variants, of smaller (A) and bigger (B) dimensions (as we have also noticed) and gives two examples from Hisarlik in Sliven and from the Late Antiquity fort near Dyadovo. Their morphology also perfectly relates to the chronological development shown by Swan of the material from Dichin (SWAN 2007, fig. 6:58), dated to the mid-late 6th c. AD. Quite common are also the shapes of the pots **1–3**, **4–5**, **17–18**; lids **8–14** and the table amphora **39**.

Several of the remaining vessels appear once or twice elsewhere, while for some of the others, I did not find any parallels. Among these is the kitchen ware **6** and **7**, as there are vessels of the same function, but none of them with the same shape (c.f. **7** with KUZMANOV 2005, таб. XXI:140–144); then **15**, which might resemble some of the big pots found elsewhere, but its out-turned rim combined with the decoration is too specific; the mixture of fragmented forms **30–32** and not even the complete form of a cup / mug **29**; one dolium **48**; the series of jugs with one handle **33–36** and the table amphora **38**. One of the jugs with a handle, **35**, is, however a common shape for the 2nd–4th c. AD (e.g. КАБАКЧИЕВА 1986, 275–279; АВРАМОВА 2005), back then, commonly covered by red slip. The form, now without any surface coating, seems to, at least locally, continue into the 6th c. AD.

⁹⁷ i.e. 6th c. AD.

⁹⁸ i.e. the first half of the 5th c. AD.

4.4. Inner space of the house – the pottery evidence

Since there is no documentation of the vessel distribution within the house, we cannot reconstruct their original positions. The only premise we may use, is, that the heavy vessels (dolia and LRA 2) were located on/in the ground, and the other – table, kitchen, cooking and small storage ware – could be either placed on the shelves along the walls, not taking much from the inner space of the room, or locally clustered depending on their function (for a good example of how the vessels can be clustered indoor, see the Late Roman closed context from Capidava [OPRIŞ – RAȚIU 2016, fig. 16; OPRIŞ – RAȚIU 2017, pl. 34]). The excavators incline to interpret the house as a storeroom, or, with less probability, a residential house with significant storeroom capacity (SOBOTKOVA – LONGFORD – BAKARDZHIEV 2018, 208–209). We took advantage of having the majority of the vessels complete, and, based on their maximal diameter, arranged them artificially into the house of average inner dimensions of 5400×4600 mm (15). The dolia are all reconstructed with a width of 450 mm, approximated from the vessel 43 (430 mm) and 47 (451 mm); LRA 2 of 400 mm (based on the widest vessel 53, confirmed by the possible full dimensions of 52).

If we consider the dolia and amphorae (together 11 containers) aligned directly along one wall, they will cover a length of 4700 mm, if they lie directly next to each other; more, if there is some space between individual vessels. In both setups, they would easily occupy just one long side of the room, protruding into the open space no more than half a metre. The other 36 vessels⁹⁹ (not counting the ‘lids’, as we may suppose they were covering the vessels) might fit, e.g., into six compartments of one shelf 1700–1800 mm wide, and about 330 mm (dimension of the widest pot 16) deep; or, they can be divided into three and three compartments placed above the dolia and amphorae not occupying any other part of the room. In the illustrative **Dodoparon Fig. 10** we can see all of the vessels placed within the inner space of the house arranged into one layer. This is, however, quite an unlikely scenario, and we may rather think of their arrangement onto the shelf placed along the wall(s) – as illustrated at the same figure. From this reconstruction we cannot

⁹⁹ The ones with fully preserved width serve as a base for the ones, whose width could not be fully reconstructed. These are in **Dodoparon Fig. 10** marked by a grey stripe, to make it clear at first sight, which ones are based on real dimensions (white), and which ones are estimated (with the grey stripe).

figure out the original placement of the vessels within the house, but it does give us a good idea about how much of the inner space was taken up.

In summation, the inner space is far from being filled up with pottery containers¹⁰⁰, as we would expect for a storeroom, and there is plenty of space for another activity to take place. Regarding the character of the vessels, including mostly pots, jugs and table amphorae, cooking and/or food preparation seems likely. If we consider the none-pottery finds discovered inside the house, as architectural elements, jewellery and domestic implements (SOBOTKOVA – LONGFORD – BAKARDZHIEV 2018, 204), we may also consider its residential function.

4.5. Pottery from Dodoparon – conclusion

The pottery assemblage from Dodoparon is not very diverse, containing altogether 57 pieces of cooking / storage pots (19), lids (7), jugs, table amphorae and *carafes* for water/other liquids (12), several cups / mugs (2), specialized kitchenware (2), dolia (6), transport amphorae (7 + 1 lid), and only one dish of Phocaean Red slip ware, imported from the eastern Aegean. By the low variability of the vessel forms (basically pots and jugs/table amphorae, with dolia and transport amphorae), the low amount of fine ware import from the eastern Aegean (one) and northern Africa (none), and the majority of amphorae of most likely eastern Aegean or Asia Minor (LRA 2) origin, the assemblage from Dodoparon does not significantly differ from deposits of any other inland Late Antique settlements (or settlement phases) from northern Bulgaria such as Castra Martis, Sadovec, Gradishteto near Dichin and Nicopolis ad Istrum (c.f. KUZMANOV 2009, 204).

If we compare pottery assemblages from individual sites, the table, cooking and storage ware from Dodoparon shares over 50 % of the morphological forms with Sadovec and only a little less with Gradishteto near Dichin. Single vessels might then be compared with the ones known from Novae, Nicopolis ad Istrum, Iatrus and several locations in the Sliven District. On the other hand, especially the shapes of jugs and cups / mugs have very few parallels in the northern Bulgarian sites, and they might rather relate to the long-lasting local tradition of pottery

¹⁰⁰ We cannot exclude the use of wooden barrels or canvas bags which could occupy the space as well, but up to date left no remains; my conclusion here is based only on the preserved and to us available data, which might be, of course, incomplete.

making as in the case of vessel **35**, still featuring a common shape of the 2nd–4th c. AD jugs (e.g. KABAKCHIEVA 1986, 275–279; AVRAMOVA 2005).

The LRA 2 are very common for all the Late Antique settlements in Bulgaria and Dobrudzha, while the presence of Kuzmanov XIV, sub-variant 1 / Opaït B V, is rare for inland settlements. We may expect the LRA 2 were shipped on a boat and brought up from the Aegean area via the Tundzha River and passed about 21 km east to the settlement on land. The Kuzmanov XIV, sub-variant 1 / Opaït B V, if indeed produced in Scythia, travelled either on land (the total weight of 3000 grams per vessel with contents seems to facilitate this approach), or first by the Black Sea (e.g. to Chernomorets, where these amphorae were found on the coast, see HRISTOV 2015b, fig. VI-2:11 and 12, fig. VI-15 and VI-17) and then further west on land. The capacity of the two small vessels could be approximated at 3.5 litres altogether, while the LRA 2 seem to contain, again altogether, a minimum of 160 litres.

Organic residue analyses of the amphorae show results only for one container of Kuzmanov XIV, sub-variant 1 / Opaït B V (**51**), identifying oil as its prime content. The remaining amphorae seem to have been used and reused for a different foodstuff, presumably liquids. We may wonder if one of the LRA 2 (**52**) could be residual, or used over the long term, as the surface treatment of its upper body (straight shallow horizontal grooves) reflects the LRA 2 production of the late 5th century AD.

Six upper body parts of dolia were preserved inside of the house (**43–49**). Only one base could be at least partly reconstructed, which, combined with a fitting upper body part (**43+49**) gives a shape of a quite unstable container if standing alone. Based on this reconstruction, we rather incline to the idea that some, if not all, of the dolia were partly sunken in the clay floor of the house or laid against the wall. Of a peculiar shape is the vessel **47**, which is completely missing its lower part, cut off when the clay was still leather-hard. The capacity of the two best preserved upper dolia bodies starts at ca. 26 litres (**43**) and goes up to ca. 37 litres (**47**). The possible reconstructed capacity of the combined upper body and base **43+49** starts at 27 litres and reaches up to 34 litres at the point the two-body parts joined together. If we take the approximate capacity of 34 litres as an estimation for each dolium, and combine it with the (also approximate) capacity of 32 litres for each of the five LRA 2, not even taking into consideration the other storage vessels

(such as the small amphorae and possibly, the big size pots), the house does prove to have a good storage capacity of over 360 litres of liquids and/or bulky food stuff(s).

The majority of the remaining pottery shapes includes different types / shapes of pots, which are the most represented vessel types (19 individuals). The average capacity of the smaller pots is ca. 1.2 l (1–3) and ca. 2 l (4–5), they were likely used for food preparation; the bigger size pots (15–18), hold about 9–14 l and could be, besides for food preparation, also used for storage. The most typical Late Antique cooking pots in Bulgaria are preserved fragmentarily (19–23) and their capacity could be only roughly estimated in the range of 2.5 to 5 litres. Pots of different form, 24–25, which do not seem to be covered by a lid, could reflect either a different way of food preparation or they could have been used for some specific kind of food. The high number of jugs and table amphorae (10 individuals) + 2 *carafes*, probably served for keeping water for cooking and drinking, as the site is placed on a high hill and the water source might not be located nearby. The shapes of some of the jugs (especially 33–34) suggests a content of thicker liquids such as of olive oil, some might have been also used for wine (36?). Otherwise, there are no serving dishes, besides the one East Aegean import, the Phocaean red-slipped ware plate (57), which seems to be too fine (too special?) for serving daily meals. This leaves us without any daily use serving dishes found in the house, unless we consider such a function for the lids (8–14). Their capacity, however, seems to be either too small (0.16 l), or too big (0.42–1.5 l), to be used as a serving dish, and their form, with a lip protruding inside the rim, is impractical both for consuming and cleaning. Quite recently, similar lids attracted attention for their possible connection with the late version of the so-called Cooking bells used for bread baking. Since we have two sets of these lids with different sizes, one of them very small for such use (rim d. 100–110 mm) so directly excluded from such a possibility, but both sets of the same fabric as the pots 1–5, the traditional opinion – that these are indeed just lids of pots – is preferable.

The *mix of small size vessels in a fragmented state* includes four vessels (29–32), which do not have any traceable parallels at the above-mentioned sites. The fully preserved cup / mug 29 could be used for drinking, but if wine was really present in the house, it could not be confirmed, as the organic residue analyses of the small amphorae Kuzmanov XIV, sub-variant I / Opaït B V – previously

considered as wine containers – did not clearly confirm this assumption. Of course, it may have served for water or other liquids. The other three vessels include incomplete shapes of a small table amphora (30), a jug (31), and a cup / mug (32); all without parallels.

Summarising what has just been mentioned above and adding the two, in conclusion yet not mentioned, vessels for auxiliary work in the kitchen – the strainer (6) and the container with a spout (7), the whole pottery assemblage has a pronounced storing, but also cooking potential, which might relate to the house function within the settlement. However, no more structures have so far been excavated at Dodoparon, and the house in the trench T3, and its pottery assemblage, cannot be interpreted in the wider context of the settlement itself. Similarly, the small finds discovered inside the house are awaiting their publication. Progress in both of these fields – the further excavation of the site and/or processing or making available the other finds from the house – would facilitate a further contextual and functional interpretation of the assemblage.

5 Conclusion

The pottery assemblages from Yurta-Stroyno, Palauzovo and Dodoparon are all specific and variable enough to be evaluated independently within their own context and period of deposition. Consequently, each of them has its own conclusion and interpretation within the text (2.7; 3.4; 4.3). The most abundant material from Yurta-Stroyno was treated with an additional conclusion for each class represented (Red-slipped ware, Grey ware, Coarse ware, Handmade pottery and Amphorae – 2.2.10; 2.3.11; 2.4.8; 2.5.7; 2.6.7), as well as for the complete pottery material altogether. The smaller sets of finds from Palauzovo and Dodoparon have one conclusion each (3.4.; 4.3.).

Nevertheless, we may now put the results of the three newly processed assemblages together, add information from other pottery finds from Ancient Thrace, and extract the main information to create one final conclusion summarising the characteristics of the Roman – Late Antique pottery material in the Roman province of Thrace based on the finds from the Yambol District and its immediate hinterland.

5.1. Roman and Late Antique pottery in the Yambol District

The Roman pottery in Ancient Thrace, as well as in the Yambol District, has a strong link to the territory of the pre-Roman period. This phenomenon is especially reflected in the persistence of the handmade pottery, characteristic for the Thracian tribes/*ethne*, which was produced in unchanged forms until the end of the 4th / mid-5th c. AD. It might be found both in the settlement contexts (Yurta-Stroyno HM Figs. 1–4) as well as being deposited in the burial mounds. In spite of not uncovering any such vessel from the burial mounds of Palauzovo, we may find handmade pots in the graves of the nearby Straldzha necropolis dated to the same period of the 2nd–3rd c. AD (ALEXANDROVA 2013, 103–105).

Another dominant aspect of the pottery making during the Roman period is the strong Hellenistic influence, which is reflected in several pottery classes. We may notice it most in the Coarse ware pottery from Yurta-Stroyno, especially in its open forms such as the casseroles (CW Fig. 1:1–9) and frying pans (CW Fig. 1/2:10–13), but also in some of the closed forms, such as the stewing pots (CW Fig. 5:56–63). These forms of coarse ware changed very little since the Late

Hellenistic period and their production persisted to the Late Antique period, making it a difficult pottery class for processing without having well dated contexts. Some of the other pottery classes might include individual vessels reflecting forms of Hellenistic products, such as the Grey ware krater from Palauzovo (**Fig. 3:13**), which seems to be imitating the black glazed West Slope table amphorae of the Black Sea – Asia Minor provenance.

The connection between inner Thrace (the middle stream of the Tundzha River) and the Aegean area is well confirmed by many finds of Greek transport amphorae in Kabile, attesting to vivid trade by means of the river already during the 4th–2nd c. BC (GETOV 1995). The economic ties were not only limited to the major settlement, which was Kabile, but we may also find fragments of Greek transport amphorae in every bigger Greek-Hellenistic pottery scatter along the Tundzha River Valley (TUŠLOVÁ – WEISSOVÁ 2018¹⁰¹). Consequently, it is not surprising to discover that the earliest transport amphorae documented at Yurta-Stroyno are Late Hellenistic, produced in the Rhodian and Coan traditions (**Amphorae Fig. 4:36–39**). The black glazed *lekythos* (**Fig. 1:5**), found in one of the graves from Palauzovo and dated approximately to the 2nd c. BC, might also well confirm the strong persistence of the Hellenistic culture into the Roman period.

The first Roman period table and coarse ware seems to come to the area during the mid-1st c. AD. As to whether the pottery was already produced locally during this period remains an open question, as the production of known kiln sites in south-eastern Thrace is attested only for the 2nd–3rd c. AD, also possibly for the beginning of the 4th c. AD (KALCHEV 1991; BORISOV 2013; HARIZANOV 2016).

The local production of the red-slipped table ware might have found inspiration in the pottery brought to the area by the Roman army and/or by the military veterans as suggested by Cvjetićanin. She assumes this to be the case especially for the Marbled ware, produced at the beginning of the 2nd c. AD (CVJETIĆANIN 2003, 59; CVJETIĆANIN 2004, 121). Indeed, the Marbled ware found in Yurta-Stroyno (**TW Fig. 18:237–247, Fig. 21:291**) reflects the forms of the locally produced Common red-slipped ware of the 2nd–4th / mid-5th c. AD. Similarly, this might have been the case for Colour coated ware, presumably imported from Italy / Pannonia (at least for the area of Moesia Superior) during the 1st c. and at the beginning of the 2nd c. AD (CVJETIĆANIN 2004, 123–126). This ware

¹⁰¹ And the field survey of 2019.

is highly recognizable in the Yurta-Stroyno assemblage thanks to its unique forms (TW 18:248–252) and high-quality slip which support the assumption of its foreign origin.

The locally produced fine ware experienced its peak during the 2nd–3rd c. AD, although most of the forms continued to be produced until the 4th or mid-5th c. AD. Within the thesis, it is called the Common red-slipped ware and represents the biggest amount of all the pottery finds (TW Figs. 1–17, 19–21). It is also the dominant table ware which seems to cover all the necessary forms of crockery, including different sizes of dishes, bowls, deep bowls, cups, table amphorae, jugs, kraters, pots, trays, basins / krateriskoi, but also lids and strainers. Perhaps the variability and availability of the ware is the reason for its popularity and for the low demand for other types of table ware, since a very small amount of other red-slipped ware and the grey ware was uncovered.

Among the lesser represented table ware from Yurta-Stroyno we may find the Thin-walled ware (TW Fig. 22), Thracian thin-walled ware (CW Fig. 9), Çandarli ware (TW Figs. 19:256–260, 21:277–280) and the Grey ware (GW Figs. 1–4). The first two thin-walled wares are inspired by the Italian (western Mediterranean) products, which started to be exported to the eastern provinces by the 1st c. AD, where they initiated local production. The forms of Thin-walled ware from Yurta-Stroyno include only cups and bowls. The fabric is similar to the Common red-slipped ware, which might suggest their local production, although they were not discovered in any of the known production centres. On the other hand, the production centre of the Thracian thin-walled ware, of a dark red fabric and specific (vitrified) surface, was identified at Ainos, at the Marica River estuary in southern Thrace. This ware is traditionally represented by cups, but recently, also jugs of the same fabric might be attributed to it. Both thin-walled wares might be dated to the mid-1st–3rd c. AD.

The Çandarli ware, produced in the Pergamon region, represents the only definite table ware import from the eastern Mediterranean. The pottery is characteristic for its fabric including golden mica and smooth high-quality slip. Only two forms were recognized in the assemblage, Hayes Form 3 (Fig. 19:259 and 260) and Form 4 (Fig. 19:256–258, 277–280, Fig. 21:277–280); both types together might be dated from the mid-2nd till the 3rd c. AD.

It might be interesting to point out at this juncture, that the import of the fine ware (the Thracian thin-walled ware and the Çandarli ware) ceases at the end of the 3rd c. AD. Later imports, which, for the area of the eastern Mediterranean, are mostly represented by the African red-slipped ware and the Phocaeian red-slip ware, is attested only by one plate of the latter ware found at Dodoparon (**Fig. 9:57**).

The last identified type of the table ware is the Grey ware (**GW Figs. 1–4**), which is an especially peculiar pottery class, as the majority of its forms reflect the shapes of the Common red-slipped ware. It seems probable that several vessel forms, produced presumably at one (or more) production centre(s), were fired in different atmospheres, either oxidised or reduced. The red colour of the final products was preferred, as the Grey ware is much less represented. We may also see a similarity with the Macedonian grey ware, produced during the Late Antiquity. However, the amount of comparative material dated to the 2nd–4th c. AD from western Thrace confirms that these are two different products. It was previously suggested that the Roman period Grey ware was produced along the Struma River Valley, as there were no finds from eastern Bulgaria. However, we may add some now, and in addition, we may propose its production also in our area. Of note are also the three Grey ware lamps of a single form, which are for now without direct parallels (**GW Pl. 2**).

Leaving aside the locally produced and, especially, the imported fine wares, we may focus on the transport amphorae, which help us to reconstruct the main economic ties (**Yurta-Stroyno Amphorae Figs. 1–6; Palauzovo Pl. 4:1; Dodoparon Fig. 6**). For the 2nd–3rd c. AD there is an obvious connection with the eastern Aegean, which is the major supplier of goods shipped in the transport amphorae. The area of the amphorae provenance seems to be located mainly on a strip running from Chios to Rhodes (including Erythraea, Ephesus, Kos and Knidos) and on Cyprus. This location ties in nicely with the Çandarli ware production area, and the ware might have been imported together with the amphorae. A much lower quantity of imports during this time are from the southern Black Sea coast with only a symbolic one from northern Africa. The transport amphorae might also be found in necropolises (**Palauzovo Pl. 4:1**), although in such a small number that no distribution / deposition patterns might be studied.

For the Late Antiquity (5th–6th c. AD), we have much less data. On the flat unfortified settlement of Yurta-Stroyno an equally small number of amphorae from

the Aegean area, Black Sea and northern Africa might be found, originating in the same areas as the earlier ones. Together with the amphorae, several table ware and cooking ware pots dated to the same period were found there. The hillfort of Dodoparon preserved several of the most typical Late Antique amphorae – LRA 2 – presumably of an eastern Aegean provenance, traditionally connected with the military *annona*. Furthermore, two small size amphorae likely of local – the province of Scythia – provenance were also found there (**Dodoparon Fig. 6**).

The pottery of the Late Antiquity, substituted mainly by the finds from Dodoparon dated to the end of the 6th c. AD, becomes coarser and sandier (with only a few ‘finer’ exceptions), the variability of the forms becomes limited, and the table ware loses its red slip (**Figs. 1–4**). From the forms, dishes and bowls are completely missing; cups and smaller vessels are rare. The majority of the vessels are represented by pots of different sizes either for storage or cooking, and by jars and carafes, for water and/or other liquids. The excavated house in Dodoparon also has quite a potential for the storing of bulk food and liquids in dolia and transport amphorae (**Figs. 5–6**), reflecting the turbulent and unstable time at the end of the 6th c. AD.

Regarding the pottery vessels used as burial goods in the Yambol District and its hinterland, we may evaluate the data only for the Roman period, based on the finds from Palauzovo (**Figs. 1–3**) and from other necropolises in the area (**Palauzovo Map 1**). The most frequently deposited ware in graves and mound embankments is the Common red-slipped ware, with a lower percentage of the Grey ware and the Handmade pottery. Occasionally, earlier dated vessels, such as the Late Hellenistic *lekythos* (a family heirloom?) might be found in grave contexts as well (**Fig. 1:5**). Many of the vessels from Palauzovo have irregular forms and the quality of their execution is quite low. Some vessels are missing the slip (even though slipped versions of the same vessels are to be found in settlement contexts), or, they are somehow modified. Two vessels from Palauzovo are missing handles which seem to be deliberately removed (**Fig. 1:2, 5**), another one has a broken and smoothed rim (**Fig. 3:16**). Some of these features, especially the (very) irregular form of some of the vessels, are also known from other necropolises in the Yambol District, such as from Straldzha, or from the eastern necropolis of Kabile. The frequency of their deposition does not seem to be accidental, and we may suppose lower quality

products might have been intentionally used as grave goods, since they played a rather symbolic role which would not be affected by small imperfections. Another explanation could be, of course, the poor character of the graves equipped with low budget items, although the Straldzha necropolis seems to be much richer than the one in Palauzovo, and even so, we may find these vessels there as well.

Another characteristic modification of the vessels for burial purposes is the drilled hole in the middle of some of the forms, most frequently of kantharos-like cups (**Fig. 3:14**). The hole is commonly placed in the middle of the lower part, between the handles, made secondarily (after the firing of the vessel). Yet another characteristic feature is the placing of this kantharos-like cup (with and without the hole as well) into a larger krater-like vessel. The combination of these two features (**Fig. 3:14** placed in **3:13**), especially resembles the Thracian custom of wine drinking including *rhyton* (= a cup with two handles) and the krater. The real purpose or function of these two phenomena is however not yet explained.

5.2. Roman period vs. Late Antiquity – the pottery evidence

The local red-slipped pottery production in Bulgaria is well attested by the kiln sites operating from the 2nd c. AD onwards.¹⁰² In Thrace (south of the Stara Planina Mountains), the centres are believed to have continued their production until the end of the 4th c. AD, while in Moesia Inferior (north of the Stara Planina Mountains), some of the red-slipped ware forms, which might also be found in Thrace, are attested until the mid-5th c. AD. Since there is no excavated and well published material from this period in Thrace (compared to more abundant finds from Moesia Inferior/Secunda, such as from Nicopolis ad Istrum – FALKNER 1999), there is no real basis for this discrepancy. Moreover, these two areas were part of one bigger unit – the Diocese of Thrace – by the 5th c. AD, and, in addition, all the major raids of the barbaric tribes always struck them both with the same force. Consequently, the cultural and historical development during this period was basically identical.

It seems the chronology of the pottery making in Thrace is rather traditionally connected to one of the major historical events, the Battle in

¹⁰² The majority of the kilns also produced, although in smaller amounts, the coarse ware, but settling its chronology is much more difficult since the ware did not change much from the Hellenistic till the Late Antique period. Consequently, I focused here on the table ware only as it is much easier to trace its existence.

Hadrianopolis, which took place in AD 378. Despite this battle being distractive, the (pottery) data suggests, the main breaking point in pottery making and usage should be rather connected with the period after the raids of the Huns in the 440s.¹⁰³ During this period, the locally produced red-slipped ware, grey ware and the handmade pottery of the Thracian tradition gradually vanishes, and it is replaced by less variable pottery of a sandy fabric and no slip.

The transformation of the pottery after the mid-5th c. AD reflects the changes in the whole society, connected with the decline of rural villas and of the agricultural economy as a whole. Presumably also the availability of foodstuffs and the overall eating habits start changing, as only a limited amount of vessel forms, which seem rather multifunctional, are attested at the settlements. Since this is the period which marks the major changes in the pottery making and usage, we may consider it to be the real beginning of the Late Antiquity as confirmed by major changes in the material culture.

¹⁰³ In Nicopolis ad Istrum (FALKNER 1999 114) is well attested the breaking point just before the city was destroyed by the Huns and a few years after (we are still in the mid-5th c. AD) where no immediate pottery replacement was noticed and the changes in the pottery production / usage might have still taken some time during the 5th c. AD.

6 Abbreviations

- *AB* = *Archaeologia Bulgarica*
- *AOP* = *Археологически открития и разкопки*
- *BAR* = British Archaeological Reports
- *BAR IS* = British Archaeological Reports International Series
- *BCH* = Bulletin de Correspondance Hellénique
- *BCH Suppl.* = Bulletin de Correspondance Hellénique Supplément
- *LRCW* = Late Roman Coarse Wares, Cooking Wares and Amphorae in the Mediterranean. Archaeology and Archaeometry
- *PATABS* = Production and Trade of Amphorae in the Black Sea
- *RCRF* = *Rei Cretariae Romanae Fautores*
- *The Athenian Agora* = *The Athenian Agora. Results of Excavations Conducted by the American School of Classical Studies*
- *TIR* = *Tabula Imperii Romani* (IVANOV, R. ed. 2012)

7 Bibliography

- ABADIE-REYNALD, C. 2005: Trade Relations in the Aegean Sea. The Ceramic Evidence from Argos between the 1st century BC and the 2nd century AD. In: M.B. Briese – L.E. Vaag (eds.): *Trade Relations in the Eastern Mediterranean from the Late Hellenistic Period to Late Antiquity. The Ceramic Evidence*. Halicarnassian Studies III. Odense, 37–49.
- ADAMSHECK, B. 1979: *Kenchreai. Eastern Port of Corinth. Results of Investigations by The University of Chicago and Indiana University for The American School of Classical Studies at Athens. IV. The Pottery*. Leiden.
- AGRE 2000 = АГРЕ, Д. 2000: Тракийска могила от римската епоха в кв. Дружба, София. *Археология* 1-2, 51–59.
- AGRE – DICHEV 2000 = АГРЕ, Д. – ДИЧЕВ, Д. 2010: Гроб на тракийски воин от римската епоха в долината на река Вит. *Археология* 3-4, 35–47.
- AGRE – DICHEV 2005 = АГРЕ, Д. – ДИЧЕВ, Д. 2005: Могили от римската епоха в централна Странджа. *Известия на Националния исторически музей* XV, 43–74.
- AGRE 2013 = АГРЕ, Д. 2013: Тракийска могила от римската епоха в землището на с. Бояново, Елховска община. In: *Сборник в памет на акад. Д.П. Димитров*. София, 346–358.
- AGRE – DICHEV – HRISTOV 2015 = АГРЕ, Д. – ДИЧЕВ, Д. – ХРИСТОВ, Х. 2015: Археологически разкопки на селищен обект в м. Манастирчето – Св. Илия, край с. Стройно, община Елхово. *АОР през 2014*, 208–211.
- AGRE – HRISTO 2016 = АГРЕ, Д. – ХРИСТО, Х. 2016: Спасителни археологически проучвания на могила Крал Мезар в землището на с. Бояново, общ. Елхово. *АОР през 2015*, 300–303.
- AGRE, D. – DICHEV, D. – AGRE, G. 2019: Roman Balsamarium Shaped as a Male Head in Feline-Skin Cap from the Territory of Southeast Bulgaria. *American Journal of Archaeology* 123:4, 687–698.
- ALEXANDROV *et al.* 2019 = АЛЕКСАНДРОВ, С. – ВЛОДАРЧАК, П. – БАКЪРДЖИЕВ, С. – ВЪЛЧЕВ, Т. 2019: Археологически разкопки на надгробна могила № 4, могилен некропол в м. Големя Кайряк, с. Могила, област Ямбол. *АОР през 2018*, 180–182.

- ALEXANDROVA, S. 2013: Ceramic Vessels from the Roman Tumulus Necropolis near the Village of Charda, Yambol Municipality, SE Bulgaria. *AB XVII/3*, 17–108.
- ALEXANDROVA, S. 2015: *The Black-Slipped Pottery from Heraclea Sintica (1st–4th c. AD)*. In: L. Vagalinski – Nankov, E. (eds.): *Heraclea Sintica: From Hellenistic Polis to Roman Civitas (4th c. BC–6th c. AD)*. Proceedings of a Conference at Petrich, Bulgaria, September 18–21, 2013. Sofia, 144–166.
- ALEXANDROVA 2016 = АЛЕКСАНДРОВА, С. 2016: Керамични съдове от римски могилен некропол край гр. Стралджа, Ямболско. In: И. Д. Чолаков – С. Александрова – В. Русева – Н. Пеева: *Могилен некропол от римската епоха край град Стралджа, Ямболско*. Българско е-Списание за Археология Suppl. 5, 33–107.
- ANDERSON-STOJANOVIĆ, V.R. 1984: Macedonian Terra Sigillata Grise from Stobi: A New Typology for the Ware. *RCRF XXIII/XXIV*, 99–109.
- ANDERSON-STOJANOVIĆ, V.R. 1992: *Stobi. The Hellenistic and Roman Pottery*. Princeton – New Jersey.
- ARCHIBALD, Z. 1998: *The Odrysian Kingdom of Thrace: Orpheus Unmasked*. Oxford.
- AURIEMMA, R. – QUIRI, E. 2004: Importazioni di anfore orientali nell'Adriatico tra primo e medio imperio. In: EIRING – LUND (eds.) 2004, 171–188, 43–55.
- AURIEMMA, R. 2007: I materiali di età Romana. Produzioni orientali. In: C. Mortelli (ed.): *Trieste Antica. Lo scavo di Crosada. I materiali II*. Trieste, 136–154.
- AVRAMOVA 2005 = АВРАМОВА, Д. 2005: Типология на един вид стомнички от Улпия Ескус. *Известии на Национален Исторически Музей София XVI*, 95–117.
- BĂDESCU, A. 2012: Oriental Amphorae Type LRA 1 and LRA 2 Discovered at Histria (The Basilica Extra Muros Sector). *Pontica XXXXV*, 311–328.
- BĂDESCU, A. – CLIANTE, L. 2014: Oriental amphorae discovered at Histria in the central-north sector (campaign 2012). *Materiale și cercetări arheologice X*, 173–193.
- BĂJENARU, C. 2013: Contextes ceramiques de Tomis. (I). Un ensemble de la fin du IIe –debut du IIIe s. ap. J.-C. *Pontica XLVI*, 41–110.

- BAKARDZHIEV, S. 2007 = БАКЪРДЖИЕВ, С. 2007: Сондажни археологически проучвания в м. Юрта при с. Стройно, община Елхово, област Ямбол. *АОР през 2006 г.*, 238–241.
- BAKARDZHIEV, S. 2008 = БАКЪРДЖИЕВ, С. 2008: Сондажни археологически проучвания в м. Юрта при с. Стройно, община Елхово, *АОР през 2007 г.*, 471–473.
- BAKARDZHIEV 2011 = БАКЪРДЖИЕВ, С.О. 2011: Археологически проучвания на късноантичната крепост в м. „Градището“, с. Голям Манастир, област Ямбол, In: *АОР през 2010 г.*, 368–270.
- BAKARDZHIEV 2012 = БАКЪРДЖИЕВ, С. 2012: Археологически проучвания на плосък античен некропол северозападно от северната крепостна стена на Кабиле. *АОР през 2011*, 365–366.
- BAKARDZHIEV – MIKOV – DZHANFEZOVA 2014 = БАКЪРДЖИЕВ, С. – МИКОВ, Р. – ДЖАНФЕЗОВА, Т. 2014: Спасително археологическо проучване в границите на пи № 000159 от землището на с. Кабиле, общ. Тунджа, Ямболска област. *АОР през 2013*, 426–429.
- BAUMANN, V.H. 1996: La céramique utilitaire du IV^e siècle fabriquée par l’officina romana de Valea Morilor (Telița, dep. De Tulcea). *RCRF* 33, 45–58.
- BASS, G.F. 1982: The Pottery. In: G.F. BASS – F.H. FREDERICK – JR. VAN DOORNINCK (eds.): *Yassi Ada: A Seventh-Century Byzantine Shipwreck I*. Texas, 155–188.
- BATSOVA-KOSTOVA 1970 = БАЦОВА-КОСТОВА, Е. 1970: Нови дани за римския некропол в Сливен. *Археология* XII:3, 22–33.
- BATSOVA – KOVACHEV 2009 = БАЦОВА, Е. – КОВАЧЕВ, Г. 2009: Надгробна могила край село Бинкос, Сливенско. In: KOVACHEV – IGNATOV – VELKOV 2009, 96–100.
- BERLIN, A. 1997: The Plain Wares. In: Ch.C. Herbert (ed.): *Tel Anafa, The Hellenistic and Roman Pottery*. Ann Arbor, 1–244.
- BERTOLDI, T. 2012: *Guida alle anfore romane di età imperiale. Forme, impasti e distribuzione*. Roma.
- BEZECZKY, T. 2013: *The Amphorae of Roman Ephesus*. Forschungen in Ephesos 15/1. Wien.

- BIERNACKI, A.B. – KLENINA, E.YU. 2014: Early Byzantine Coarse Ware from Novae. Production and Chronology. In: N. Poulou-Papadimitriou – E. Nodarou – V. Kilikoglou (eds.): *LRCW 4*, BAR IS 2616. Oxford, 151–157.
- BIERNACKI, A.B. – KLENINA, E.YU. 2015: Early-Byzantine Pottery Workshops in Novae (Moesia II, Bulgaria): Technological, Economic and Historical Aspects. In: F. Thuillier – E. Louis (eds.): *Tourner autour du pot... Les ateliers de potiers médiévaux du Ve au XIIe siècle dans l'espace européen*. Turnhout, 373–381.
- BJELAJAC, L. 1996: *Amfore gornjo mezijskog podunavlja*. Beograd.
- BOJOVICH, D. 1971: *Rimska keramika Singidunuma*. Beograd.
- BONETTO *et al.* 2017 = BONETTO, J. – BRESSAN, M. – FRANCISCI, D. – MAZZOCCHIN, S. – SHINDLER-KAUDELKA, E. 2017: Spoglio e riuso del teatro del Pythion de Gortyna tra 300 e 365 d.C. I contesti ceramici. In: D. DIXNEUF (ed.) 2017, 723–732.
- BONIFAY, M. 2004: *Etudes sur la céramique romaine tardive d'Afrique*. BAR IS 1301. Oxford.
- BORISLAVOVA, N.G. 2018 = БОРИСЛОВОВА, Н.Г. 2018: *Амфори от римската провинция Тракия (I–III в.)*. Автореферат на дисертация за присъждане на образователна и научна степен „доктор”. Sofia.
- BORISOV 1988 = БОРИСОВ, Б. 1988: Исследование ранневизантийской керамики из сливенского округа. *Thracia* 8, 90–118.
- BORISOV 2005 = БОРИСОВ, Б. 2005: Пещи за изпичане на битова керамика от античното селище край село Караново, Новозагорско. *Известия на Регионален исторически музей Велико Търново XX*, 129–139.
- BORISOV 2013 = БОРИСОВ, Б. 2013: Късноантичната грънчарска работилница край с. Караново, Новозагорско, и намерената в нея керамика. In: В. Динчев (ed.): *Honorem professoris Georgi Kuzmanov*. София, 281–336.
- BOTUSHAROVA 1959 = БОТУШАРОВА, Л. 1959: Нови данни за Филипопол през Римската епоха. *Годишник на музеите в Пловдивски окръг II*, 1954–1955, 111–140.
- BOUZEK, J – MUSIL, J. 2002: Adžijska Vodenica II, 1994–1998: Excavations report by the Czech Mission. In: J. Bouzek – L. Domaradzka – Z. Archibald (eds.): *Pistiros II. Excavations and Studies*. Praha, 37–109.

- BOUZEK, J. – GRANINGER, D. 2015: Geography. In: VALEVA – NANKOV – GRANINGER (eds.) 2015, 12–21.
- BOYADZHIEV 2013 = БОЯДЖИЕВ, К. 2013: Издирвания на археологически обекти по трасето на газопровод „на буко“, сектор 1, ревизия е. *АОР през 2012 г.*, 579–581.
- BOYANOV 2006 = БОЯНОВ, И. 2006: Римските ветерани от района на Кабиле. *Поселищен живот в Тракия* 4, 235–242.
- BOYANOV, I. 2007: Two fragments from military diploma in Yambol Museum. *AB* XI/3, 69–74.
- BOYANOV 2008 = БОЯНОВ, И. 2008: *Римските ветерани в Долна Мизия и Тракия (I–III в.)*. София.
- BÖTTGER 1978 = БЪОТГЕР, Б. 1978: Домашна керамика от IV–VI в. от Ятрус (Долна Мизия). *Археология* XX:2, 26–32.
- BÖTTGER, B. 1982: Die Gefäßkeramik aus dem Kastell Iatrus. In: *Iatrus-Krivina. Spätantike Befestigung und frümittelalterliche Siedlung an der unteren Donau*. Band II. Berlin.
- BRUKNER, O. 1981: *Rimska keramika u Jugoslovenskom delu provincije Donje Panonije*. Beograd.
- BUYUKLIEV 1962 = БУЮКЛИЕВ, Х. 1962: Трако-римски могилен некропол в района на промишления комплекс „Марица-Изток“. *Археология* IV:2, 50–55.
- BUYUKLIEV 1980 = БУЮКЛИЕВ, Х. 1980: *Тракийският могилен некропол при Чаталка, Старозагорски окръг*. Разкопки и проучвания XVI. София.
- BUZOIANU, L. – DUPONT, P. – LUNGU, V. (eds.): *Production and Trade of Amphorae in the Black Sea III. Actes de la table ronde internationale de Constanța, 6–10 octobre 2009*. Constanța.
- CARVALE, A. – TOFFOLETTI, I. 1997: *Anfore antiche, conoscerle e identificarle*. Roma.
- CARLSON, D.N. – LAWALL, M. 2005/2006: Towards a Typology of Erythraian Amphoras, *Skyllis* 1-2, 33–40.
- CHANDZHISKA – RABADZHIEV 2009 = ХАНДЖИЙСКА, В. – РАБАДЖИЕВ, К. 2009: Сондажни археологически и проучвания по трасето на АМ „Тракия“, ЛОТ 4, Обект №8, км 283+400 – 283+800. *АОР през 2008*, 532–535.

- CHANDZHISKA – YANKULOV 2010 = ХАНДЖИЙСКА, В. – ЯНКУЛОВ, Д. 2010: Спасителни проучвания по трасето на АМ Тракия, ЛОТ 4, Обект 8. Източен некропол на Кабиле от II-III в. *АОР през 2009 г.*, 422–425.
- Chatalka* 2015 = *Римската вила при чаталка. Богатството на един Тракийски аристократ*. Catalogue of Exhibition, Sofia National Museum of Archaeology. May 22–September 10, 2015. София.
- СНІСНІКОВА, М. 1977: *Ceramique Thrace fabriquee a la main du VI^e au 1^{er} siecles avant notre ere*. *Thracia* IV, 123–140.
- СНІСНІКОВА 1984 = ЧИЧИКОВА, М. 1984: Антична керамика. In: Т. Иванов (ed.): *Севтополис I*. София, 18–114.
- СНОЛАКОВ *et al.* 2016 = Чолаков, И.Д. – Александрова, С. – Русева, В. – Пеева, Н.: *Могилен некропол от римската епоха край град Стралджа, Ямболско*. Българско е-Списание за Археология Suppl. 5. София.
- Conspectus* = Ettliger, E. *et al.* 1990: *Conspectus formarum terrae sigillatae italico modo confectae*. Bonn.
- COLDSTREAM, J.N. – EIRING, I.J. – FORSTER, G. 2001: *Knossos Pottery Handbook. Greek and Roman*. British School at Athens Studies 7. London.
- CONRAD, S. 1999: Zu Typologie und Funktionsbestimmung der Amphoren aus dem Kastell Iatrus. In: G. von Bülow – A. Milcheva (eds.): *Der Limes an der unteren Donau von Diokletian bis Heraklios*. Sofia, 175–188.
- COTTICA, D. 2005: Perspectives on Pottery Production and Exchange in Late Roman and Byzantine Anatolia. The Common Wares from Hierapolis, Phrygia. In: Gurt i Esparraguera – J. Buxeda i Garrigós – M.A. Cau Ontiveros (eds.): *LRCW I*. BAR IS 1340. Oxford, 655–666.
- CVJETIĆANIN, T. 2003: Early Roman Marbled Vessels from Diana (Serbia): *AB* VII/1, 59–70.
- CVJETIĆANIN, T. 2004: Trajanic *LIMES* in Upper Moesia, a ceramic viewpoint. *Novensia* 15, 117–132.
- CVJETIĆANIN, T. 2010: *Roman Pottery in Moesia Superior*. Belgrade.
- DELEV, P. 2015a: Thrace from the Assassination of Kotys I to Koroupedion (360–281 BCE). In: VALEVA – NANKOV – GRANINGER (eds.) 2015, 48–58.
- DELEV, P. 2015b: From Koroupedion to the Beginning of the Third Mithridatic Ware (281–73 BCE). In: VALEVA – NANKOV – GRANINGER (eds.) 2015, 60–74.

- DESBAT, A. – PICON, M. 1986: Les Importations d'amphores de Méditerranée orientale a Lyon. In: J.-Y. Empereur – Y. Garlan (eds.): *Recherches sur les Amphores Grecques*. BCH Suppl. XIII, 637–468.
- DIFNEUAX, D. (ed.) 2017: *LRCW 5. Études Alexandrines 42*. Alexandrie – Paris.
- DIMITROVA – РОДОВ 1978 = ДИМИТРОВА, Д. – ПОПОВ, З. 1978: *Археологически паметници в Ямболски окръг*. София.
- DIMITROVA 1982 = ДИМИТРОВА, А. 1982: Разкопки на базилика No 1 в Кабиле. In: Т. Иванов (ed.): *Кабиле 1*. София, 115–157.
- DIMITROV 2004 = ДИМИТРОВ, З. 2004: Типология на архитектурните детайли в Долна Мизия и Тракия през римската епоха (I-II в. сл. Хр.). *Археология на Българските земи I*. София, 203–256.
- DOBREVA, D. 2017: *Tra Oriente e Occidente. Dinamiche commerciali in Moesia Inferior e Thracia in epoca romana i dati delle anfore*. Padova.
- DOMARADSKI 1991 = ДОМАРАДСКИ, М. 1991: Западна крепостна стена на град Кабиле. In: В. Велков (ed.): *Кабиле 2*, 54–82. София.
- DREMSIZOVA-NELCHINOVA = ДРЕМСИЗОВА-НЕЛЧИНОВА, ЦВ. 1971: Сивочерна керамика от римската вила край с. Мадара, Шуменски окръг. *Археология II:2*, 21–30.
- DUMANOV, B. 2015: Thrace in Late Antiquity. In: VALEVA – NANKOV – GRANINGER (eds.) 2015, 91–105.
- DYCZEK, P. 1991: Ceramika z odcinka IV (1981, 1983). *Novaensia 2*, 101–127.
- DYCZEK, P. 1997: Remarks on the Roman amphorae at Novae from the first to the third century AD. *Novaensia 9*, 81–96.
- DYCZEK, P. 2001: *Roman Amphorae of the 1st–3rd Centuries AD Found on the Lower Danube. Typology*. Warsaw, Warsaw University Press.
- DYCZEK, P. 2007: Late Roman amphorae from the site of valetudinarium at Novae. In: M. Bonifay – J.-Ch. Tréglia (eds.): *LRCW 2*. BAR IS 1661. Oxford, 827–834.
- EDWARDS, G.R. 1975: *Corinthian Hellenistic Pottery. Corinth, Results of Excavations conducted by the American School of Classical Studies at Athens VII/III*. Princeton – New Jersey.
- EMPEREUR, J.-Y. – HESNARD, A. 1987: Les amphores hellénistiques. In: P. Lévêque – J.-P. Morel (eds.): *Céramiques hellénistiques et romaines II*. Besançon, 9–72.

- EIRING, J. – LUND, J. (eds.) 2004: *Transport Amphorae and Trade in the Eastern Mediterranean. Acts of the International Colloquium at the Danish Institute at Athens, September 26–29, 2002*. Aarhus.
- FALKNER, R.K. 1999: The pottery. In: A.G. Poulter (ed.): *Nicopolis ad Istrum: A Roman to Early Byzantine City. The pottery and Glass*. London.
- FANTUZZI, L. – CAU ONTIVEROS, M.A. 2018: Archaeometric Analysis of Late Roman amphorae from Africa in the ancient city of Iluro (Mataró, Catalonia, Spain). *Archaeological and Anthropological Science* 10/4, 759–780.
- GENCHEVA 2002 = ГЕНЧЕВА, Е. 2002: *Првият военен лагер в Novaе, провинция Мизия (Северна България)*. Sofia – Warszawa.
- GEORGIEVA – МОМЧИЛОВ – GOSPODINOV 2007 = ГЕОРГИЕВА, Р. – МОМЧИЛОВ, Д. – ГОСПОДИНОВ, К. 2007: Надгробна могила край Карнобат от римската епоха. *Годишник на националния археологически музей* 11, 104–122.
- GEORGIEVA 2010 = ГЕОРГИЕВА, В. 2010: Спасителни археологически разкопки на надгробната “Османова” могила в землището на село Радецки, в енергийния комплекс “Марица–изток”. In: Б. Борисов (ed.): *ВТУ „Св. св. Кирил и Методий” и българската археология*. Велико Търново, 299–314.
- GERVASINI, L. 2005: La ceramica a pareti sottili. In: D. Gandolfi (ed.): *La ceramica e i materiali di età Romana. Classi, produzioni, commerci e consumi*. Bordighera, 279–310.
- ГЕТОВ 1982 = ГЕТОВ, Л. 1982: Тракийски могилен некропол от римската епоха при Кабиле. In: Т. Иванов (ed.) 1982: *Кабиле 1*. София, 40–78.
- ГЕТОВ 1995 = ГЕТОВ, Л. 1995: *Амфори и амфорни печати от Кабиле*. София.
- GIZDOVA 2005 = Гиздова, Н. 2005: Тракийски могилен некропол и селище в местността Сухия Саз при с. Величково, Пазарджишко. *Studia Archaeologica Universitatis Serdicensis*, Suppl. IV. София, 173–192.
- GRANINGER, D. 2015: Ethnicity and *Ethne*. In: VALEVA – NANKOV – GRANINGER (eds.) 2015, 22–32.
- HANDZHIJSKA 2006a = ХАНДЖИЙСКА, В. 2006: *Традиции и тенденции в производството на керамика на ръка в днешната югоизточна България през VI – I в. пр. Хр.* Дисертация за присъждане на образователна и научна степен доктор.

- HANDZHIJSKA 2006b = ХАНДЖИЙСКА, В. 2006: Керамика на ръка от Кабиле от III и II в. пр. Хр. In: И. Илиев (eds.): *Поселищен живот в Тракия*. Ямбол, 109–122.
- HARIZANOV, A. 2016: A New Centre for Ceramic Production from the Roman Province of Thrace (2nd–3rd Century). Preliminary Results. *RCRF* 44, 581–594.
- HASNARD, A. 1986: Imitations et raisonnement archéologique : A propos des amphores de Rhodes et de Cos. In: Empereur, J.-Y. – Garlan, Y. (eds.): *Recherches sur les Amphores Grecques*. BCH Suppl. XIII, 69–79.
- HAYES, J.W. 1972: *Late Roman Pottery. A Catalogue of Roman Fine Wares*. London.
- HAYES, J.W. 1977a: *Handbook of Mediterranean Roman Pottery*. London.
- HAYES, J.W. 1977b: Early Roman Wares from the House of Dionysos, Paphos. *RCRF* XVII/XVIII, 96–101.
- HAYES, J.W. 1983: The Villa Dionysos Excavations, Knossos: The Pottery. *The Annual of British School of Athens* 78, 98–169.
- HAYES, J.W. 1985: Sigillate Orientali. In: *Enciclopedia dell'Arte Antica, Classica e Orientale* II. Roma, 1–96.
- HAYES, J.W. 1991: *Paphos. The Hellenistic and Roman Pottery* III. Nicosia.
- HAYES, J.W. 1992: *Excavations at Saraçhane in Istanbul 2, The pottery*. Princeton.
- HAYES, J.W. 2008: *Roman Pottery. Fine-ware Imports*. The Athenian Agora XXXII. Princeton – New Jersey.
- HAYNES, I.P. 2011: Early Roman Thrace. In: I.P. Haynes 2011 (ed.): *Early Roman Thrace. New Evidence from Bulgaria*. Journal of Roman Archaeology Suppl. 82. Portsmouth, 7–14.
- HEATH, S. – ТЕККÖК, В. eds. 2006–2009. Greek, Roman and Byzantine Pottery at Ilion (Troia). <http://classics.uc.edu/troy/grbpottery/>. Visited 06/06/2018.
- HEIN *et al.* 2008 = HEIN, A. – GEORGOPOULOU, V. – NODAROU, E. – KILIKOGLU, V. 2008: Koan amphorae from Halasarna – investigations in a Hellenistic amphora production centre. *Journal of Archaeological Science* 35, 1049–1061.
- HEŘMÁNKOVÁ, P.: The epigraphic finds from Yurta-Stroyno in regional context. In: Tušlová, P. – Weissová, B. – Bakardzhiev, S. (eds.): *Yurta-Stroyno. The final excavation report for seasons 2014–2016*. Prague. in preparation.

- HRISTOV – STOEVA 2013 = ХРИСТОВ, М. – СТОЕВА К. 2013: Съдове от антична пещ за битова керамика до раннохристиянска църква № 1 в аула до с. Хан Крум, община Преслав. In: *Преслав* 7, 370–401.
- HRISTOV, I. 2015a: *THE PRAETORIUM OF SOSTRA. A study of the Roman roadside station of Sostra on Oescus – Philippopolis road (II–III century)*. Sofia.
- HRISTOV, I. 2015b: *ΧΡΥΣΟΣΩΤΗΡΑ. An early Byzantine fortress on the Peninsula of Hrisosotira at the town of Chernomorets 5th–7th century* I. Sofia.
- IGNATOV 1996a = ИГНАТОВ, В. 1996: Тракийска надгробна могила от римската епоха край ц. Пет могили, Новозагорско. In: IGNATOV – KANCHEVA-RUSEVA – VELKOV 1996, 71–124.
- IGNATOV 1996b = ИГНАТОВ, В. 1996: За няколко аспекта на погребалния обред в Тракия през I–IV в. *Археология* 2-3, 59–63.
- IGNATOV – KANCHEVA-RUSEVA – VELKOV 1996 = ИГНАТОВ, В. – КЪНЧЕВА-РУСЕВА, Т. – ВЕЛКОВ, К. (eds.): *Проучвания на надгробни могили в новозагорско*. Русе.
- IGNATOV – VELKOV 2009 = ИГНАТОВ, В. – ВЕЛКОВ, Кв. 2009: Гробни съоръжения, инвентар и обред от надгробна могила край ц. Любимец, Новозагорско. In: KOVACHEV – IGNATOV – VELKOV 2009, 106–129.
- ILIEV – BAKARDZHIEV 2008a = ИЛИЕВ, И. – БАКЪРДЖИЕВ, С. 2008: Спасителни археологически проучвания на две надгробни могили в м. Кояджика 1, с. Палаузово, община Стралджа, област Ямбол. *АОР през* 2007, 239–242.
- ILIEV – BAKARDZHIEV 2008b = ИЛИЕВ, И. – БАКЪРДЖИЕВ, С. 2008: Спасителни археологически проучвания на две надгробни могили край с. Палаузово, община Стралджа. *Вести на Ямболския музей* 2:5, 3–4.
- ILIEV *et al.* (eds.) 2012 = ИЛИЕВ, И. – ROSS, S. – SOBOTKOVÁ, A. – BAKARDZHIEV, S. – CONNOR, S. (eds.) 2012: *The Tundzha Regional Archaeological Project. Elhovo Survey* [Регионален археологически проект Тунджа. Проучване в Елхово]. Yambol.
- IVANOVA 2003 = ИВАНОВА, М. 2003: Пещ за битова керамика край с. Лешница, община Ловеч. In: И. Христов – Г. Китов – М. Иванова – М. Бунев (eds.): *СОСТРА. Пръцкане на Римската крайпътна станция и кастел на пътя Ескус – Филипополис* I. Велико Търново, 57–64.

- IVANOV (ed.) 1982 = ИВАНОВ, Т. (ed.) 1982: *Кабиле 1*. София.
- IVANOV, R. (ed.) 2012: *Tabula Imperii Romani: K 35/2, Philippopolis*. Sofia.
- IVANOV, S. 2019a: Typology and chronology of red-slip ware from the Roman ceramics centre near Karavelovo village, Shumen region, North Bulgaria. *Bulgarian e-Journal of Archaeology Suppl.* 7, 267–284.
- IVANOV, S. 2019b: Typology and Chronology of the Red Slip Ware from the Roman Manufacturing Complex in the Varbovski Livadi Site near Pavlikeni (North Bulgaria). *AB XXIII/1*, 1–31.
- JACQUEMIN, A. – MAFFRE, J.J. 1986: Nouveaux vases grecs de la collection Zénon Piéridès à Larnaca (Chypre). *BCH* 110, 177–204.
- JONES, E. – OLIPHANT, E. – PETERSON P. *et al.* 2001: SciPy: Open Source Scientific Tools for Python. <http://www.scipy.org/>. Visited 11/04/2019.
- КАВАКСИЕВА 1983 = КАБАКЧИЕВА, Г. 1983: Типология и хронология на глинените червенолакови паници от Тракия (I–IV в.). *Археология* XXV/4, 2–12.
- КАВАКСИЕВА 1986 = КАБАКЧИЕВА, Г. 1986: *Керамика от вилата при Ивайловград, II–IV в.* Разкопки и проучвания XV. София.
- КАВАКСИЕВА, G. 1996 = Die marmorierte Keramik in Moesien und Thrakien in Römischer Zeit. *RCRF* 33, 119–125.
- КАВАКСИЕВА – SULTOVA – VLADKOVA 1988 = КАБАКЧИЕВА, Г. – СУЛТОВА, С. – ВЛАДКОВА, П. 1988: *Керамични центрове на територията на Никополis ad Istrum II – IV век.* Плевен – Велико Търново.
- КАВАКСИЕВА 2000 = КАБАКЧИЕВА, Г. 2000: *Oescus. Панноримски военен лагер при устието на Искър.* София.
- КАВАКСИЕВА, G. 2005 = КАБАКЧИЕВА, Г. 2005: Римска и сива излъскана керамика. In: *Кастра Мартис. Квадрибургий и кастел.* Разкопки и проучвания XXXIII. София, 81–127.
- КАСАРОВА 2005 = КАЦАРОВА, В. 2005: *Пауталия и нейната територия през I–VI век.* Велико Търново.
- КАСАРОВА – РЕТКОВА 2015 = КАЦАРОВА, В. – ПЕТКОВА, К. 2015: Археологически проучвания на обект „Светилище на Нимфите и Афродита“ при с. Каснаково, община Димитровград. *АОР през 2015*, 562–566.

- KALCHEV 1991 = КАЛЧЕВ, К. 1991: Zur Herstellung der antiken Keramik in Augusta Trajana / Stara Zagora. *RCRF* 29/30, 245–273.
- KALCHEV 1994 = КАЛЧЕВ, К. 1994: Надгробни могили източно от Стара Загора. In: *Марица Изток. Археологически проучвания* 2, 171–188.
- KANCHEV – KANCHEVA-ROUSSEVA 1996 = КЪНЧЕВ, М. – КЪНЧЕВА-РУСЕВА, Т. 1996: Спасителни разкопки на Дългата могила до с. Караново, Новозагорско. In: *IGNATOV – KANCHEVA-RUSEVA – VELKOV* 1996, 17–66.
- KARAGIORGOU, O. 2001: LRA 2, a Container from the Military Annona on the Danubian Border? In: S. Kingsley – M. Decker (eds.): *Economy and Exchange in the East Mediterranean during Late Antiquity*. Oxford, 129–166.
- KASSAB TEZGÖR, D. 2009: *Typologie des Amphores Sinopéennes entre le IIe-IIIe s. et le VIe s. ap. J.-C.* *Varia Anatolica* XX, 121–212.
- KASSAB TEZGÖR, D. 2010: Typologie des amphores sinopéennes entre les IIe-IIIe s. et le VIe s. ap. J.-C. In: D. Kassab Tezgör (ed.): *Les fouilles et le matériel de l'atelier amphorique de Demirci près de Sinope*. *Varia Anatolica* XXII. Paris, 121–140.
- KEAY, S.J. 1984: *The Late Roman Amphorae in the Western Mediterranean. A Typology and Economic Study: the Catalan Evidence*. BAR IS 196 (i), Oxford.
- KENRICK, P.M. 1985: *Excavations at Sidi Khrebish Benghazi (Berenice). The Fine Pottery* III:1. Tripoli.
- KLENINA 1998 = КЛЕНИНА, Е.Ю. 1998: Тарная керамка I в. из принципия в Нове. *Novaensia* 11, 176–183.
- KLENINA, E.Yu. 1999: Table and Cooking Pottery of the IV–VI c. AD from the Excavation of the Episcopal Residence in Novae. In: G. Bülow – A. Milcheva (eds.): *Der Limes an der unteren Donau von Diokletian bis Heraklios*. Sofia, 87–93.
- KLENINA 2006 = КЛЕНИНА, Е.Ю. 2006: *Столовая и кухонная керамика II–IV. Веков из Нов (северная Болгария)*. Poznań – Sevastopol.
- KLENINA, E.Yu. 2013: Некоторые аспекты экономической жизни в Новах (Мезия II) (V–VI век). In: A.B. Biernacki – E. Klenina – E. Genceva (eds.): *Biskupstwo w Novae (Moesia Secunda) IV-VI w. Historia - Architektura - Życie Codzienne*, II. Poznań, 75–116.

- KLENINA, E.YU. 2016: Local and imported pottery of the 2nd–4th centuries A.D. in the excavations of the large legionary thermae. In: A.B. Biernacki – E.Yu. Klenina (eds.): *The large legionary thermae in Novae (Moesia Inferior) (2nd–4th century A.D.)*. Poznan, 413–453.
- КОТЕЦКИ, J. 1977: Piec garncarski w sondażu wodociągowym. In: Novae – Sektor zachodni 1975. Sprawozdania tymczasowe z wykopalisk Ekspedycji Archeologicznej Uniwersytetu Warszawskiego. *Archeologia* 28, 193–200.
- KOVACHEV, G. 1998 = КОВАЧЕВ, Г. 1998: Малки глинени амфорки от североизточна Тракия от римската епоха. *Археология* XXXIX/1-2, 58–64.
- KOVACHEV 2009a = КОВАЧЕВ, Г. 2009a: Могилен некропол при Сливен. In: KOVACHEV – IGNATOV – VELKOV 2009, 7–43.
- KOVACHEV 2009b = КОВАЧЕВ, Г. 2009: Могилен некропол край село Старо Село, Сливенско. In: KOVACHEV – IGNATOV – VELKOV 2009, 45–95.
- KOVACHEV 2009c = КОВАЧЕВ, Г. 2009: Късноантичен гроб от "Червената могила" до с. Скобелево, Сливенско. In: KOVACHEV – IGNATOV – VELKOV 2009, 102–105.
- KOVACHEV – IGNATOV – VELKOV 2009 = КОВАЧЕВ, Г. – ИГНАТОВ, В. – ВЕЛКОВ, К. 2009: *Проучвания на надгробни могили в Сливенско и Новозгроско*. Варна.
- KOVACHEV *et al.* 2009 = КОВАЧЕВ, Г. – ТАНЧЕВА, Н. – БЪНОВ, П. – РАДЕВА, М. 2009: Проучвания на надгробна могила при село Трапоклово, Сливенско. In: KOVACHEV – IGNATOV – VELKOV 2009, 97–101.
- KÖGLER, P. 2005: Import, export, imitation. Trade and the economic power of late Hellenistic and early Imperial Knidos according to the fine pottery. In: M.B. Briese – L.E. Vaag (eds.): *Trade Relations in the Eastern Mediterranean from the Late Hellenistic Period to Late Antiquity. The Ceramic Evidence*. Odense, 50–62.
- KULOV 2007 = КУЛОВ, И. 2007: Античен производствен център край Полето, община Симитли. *Археология* XLVIII/1-4, 132–142.
- KUZMANOV 1978 = КУЗМАНОВ, Г. 1978: Ранновизантийска керамика от кастела на нос Калиакра. *Археология* 1978/2, 20–26.

- KUZMANOV 1985 = КУЗМАНОВ, Г. 1985: *Ранновизантийска керамика от Тракия и Дакия (IV–началото на VII в.)*. Разкопки и проучвания XIII, София.
- KUZMANOV, G. 1992: Die Lokale Gefäßkeramik. In: S. Uenze (ed.): *Die Spätantiken befestigungen von Sadovets (Bulgarien)*. München, 201–221.
- KUZMANOV 1993 = КУЗМАНОВ, Г. 1993: Ранновизантийска керамика от Никополис ад Нестум. *Археология XXXV/4*, 35–45.
- KUZMANOV 2005 = КУЗМАНОВ, Г. 2005: Късноантична керамика. In: *Кастра Мартис. Квадрибургий и кастел*. Разкопки и проучвания XXXIII. София, 128–180.
- KUZMANOV 2009 = КУЗМАНОВ, Г. 2009: Ранновизантийска битова керамика от *Гледницето* (северозападен сектор). In: *Българско-британски разкопки на гледницето при с. Дичин, Великотърновска област 1996–2003*. Разкопки и проучвания XXXIX. София, 153–205.
- KUZMANOV – GRUDEV 2013 = КУЗМАНОВ, Г. – ГРУДЕВ, И. 2013: Късноантична керамика от Рациария (крайбрежна Дакия). In: В. Динчев (eds.): *Известия на Националния Археологически Институт XLI, In Honorem Professoris Георги Кузманов*. София, 337–388.
- KOVACHEV 2009b = КОВАЧЕВ, Г. 2009: Могилен некропол край село Старо Село, Сливенско. In: KOVACHEV – IGNATOV – VELKOV 2009, 45–95.
- KOVALEVSKAJA 1998 = КОВАЛЕВСКАЯ, Л. 1998: Светлоглиняные амфоры и в. из принципия в Нове. *Novaensia* 11, 163–174.
- LAWALL, M.L 2004: Archaeological Context and Aegean Amphora Chronologies a Case Study of Hellenistic Ephesos. In: EIRING – LUND (eds.) 2004, 171–188.
- LAZAROV 1962 = ЛАЗАРОВ, М. 1962: Тракийско могилено погребение при с. Просеник, Бургаско. *Археология IV:1*, 44–49.
- LOZANOV – CHRISTOV 2010 = ЛОЗАНОВ, И. – ХРИСТОВ, К. 2010: Спасително проучване по трасето на ам „Тракия”, ЛОТ 4, КМ. 281+500–281+600, обект №6, в землището на с. Кабиле, община Тунджа. *AOR през 2009*, 419–422.
- LOZANOV – BAKARDZHIEV 2008 = ЛОЗАНОВ, И. – БАКЪРДЖИЕВ, С. 2008: Проучвания в НАР „Кабиле“ (Сектор II, Квартали 34, 35–Късноримски Кастел). *AOR през 2007*, 420–422.

- LOZANOV – RAYCHEVA 2012 = ЛОЗАНОВ, И. – РАЙЧЕВА, М. 2012: Кабиле, Сектор VIII, квартали 2 и 3, южно от северната крепостна стена. *AOR през 2011*, 360–362.
- LOZANOV, I. 2015: Roman Thrace. In: VALEVA – NANKOV – GRANINGER (eds.) 2015, 75–90.
- LUND, J. 2010: The “Pinched-handle” Transport Amphorae as Evidence of the Wine Trade of Roman Cyprus. In: Γ.Κ. Ιωαννίδης – Σ. Χατζηστόλλης (eds.): *Πρακτικά του τρίτου διεθνούς κυπριολόγικου συνέδριου (Λευκωσία, 15-20 απρίλιου 1996)*. Λευκωσία, 565–578.
- MADZHAROV, M. 2009: *Roman Roads in Bulgaria. Contribution to the Development of Roman Road System in the Provinces of Moesia and Thrace*. Veliko Turnovo.
- MACKENSEN, M. 1992: Amphoren und Spatheia von Golemanovo Kale. In: S. Uenze (ed.): *Die Spätantiken befestigungen von Sadovets (Bulgarien)*. Munchen, 239–254.
- MALAMIDOU, V. 2005: *Roman Pottery in Context. Fine and Coarse Wares from Five Sites in North-eastern Greece*. BAR IS 1386. Oxford.
- MARABINI MOEVS, M.T. 1973: *The Roman Thin Walled Pottery. From Cosa (1948–1954)*. Memoirs of the American Academy in Rome 32. Michigan.
- MASHOV 1992 = МАШОВ, С. 1991: Тракийски некропол от римската епоха при с. Драшан, Врачански окръг. *Археология* XVII/1, 41–50.
- MAYET, F. 1975: *Les céramiques à parois fines dans la Péninsule Ibérique*, Parigi.
- МИХАЙЛОВ, G. 1964: *Inscriptiones Graecae in Bulgaria Repertae*, vol. 3.2. Academia Litterarum Bulgarica. Serdicae.
- MOREL, J.-P. 1981: *Céramique campanienne : les formes*. Rome.
- MOREVA – ANGELOVA 1968 = МОРЕВА, Р. – АНГЕЛОВА, П. 1968: Могилни гробни находки от Асеновградско. *Известия на музеите от югоизточна България* X:3, 29–38.
- MUNSELL SOIL-COLOR CHARTS 2009. Michigan.
- MUȘEȚEANU, C. 2003: *Ateliere ceramice Romane de la Durostrorum*. Monografie IV. București.
- NAJDENOVA 1985 = НАЙДЕНОВА, В. 1985: *Римската вила в с. Кралев Дол, Пернишки окръг*. Разкопки о проучвания XIV. София.

- NANKOV, E. – TSONEVA, A. 2017: Addenda and Corrigenda to the ‘Black-Slipped’ Pottery from Heraclea Sintica. In: E. Nankov (ed.): *Papers of the American Research Center in Sofia 3. Sandanski and its Territory during Prehistory, Antiquity and Middle Ages. Proceedings of an International Conference at Sandanski, September 17–20, 2015. Sofia*, 419–434.
- NEGRU, M. – BĂDESCU, A. – AVRAM, R. 2003: Kăpitan II amphorae in Roman Dacia. *RCRF* 38, 209–214.
- NIKOLIĆ-ĐORĐEVIĆ, S. 2000: Antička keramika Singidunuma. Oblici posuda, In: *Singidunum 2*. Beograd, 11–244.
- NIKOLOV – BUYUKLIEV 1967a = НИКОЛОВ, Д. – БУЮКЛИЕВ, Х. 1967: Тракийски могилини гробове от Чаталка, Старозагорско. *Археология* IX:1, 19–31.
- NIKOLOV – BUYUKLIEV 1967b = НИКОЛОВ, Д. – БУЮКЛИЕВ, Х. 1967: Нови Тракийски могилини погребения от Чаталка, Старозагорско. *Археология* IX:3, 10–25.
- NIKOLOV – BUYUKLIEV 1970 = НИКОЛОВ, Д. – БУЮКЛИЕВ, Х. 1970: Разкопки на могилен некропол Чаталка през 1967 г. *Археология* XII:2, 52–63.
- NUŢU, G. – STANC, S. 2017: *Cooking Ware and Dietary Reconstruction from Two North Scythian Sites. Aegyssus and Enisala Peștera*. In: DIFNEUAX, D. (ed.) 2017, 613–627.
- ОРАИЃ, А. 1996: *Aspecte ale vieții economice din provincia Scythia (secole IV–VI p. Ch.). Producția ceramicii locale și de import*. București.
- ОРАИЃ, А. 1997-1998: North African and Spanish amphorae in Scythia Minor. *Il Mar Nero, Annali di archeologia e storia* 3, 47–95.
- ОРАИЃ, А. 2004a: *Local and Imported Ceramics in the Roman Province of Scythia (4th–6th centuries AD)*. BAR IS 1274. Oxford.
- ОРАИЃ, А. 2004b: The Eastern Mediterranean Amphorae in the Province of Scythia. In: J. Eiring – J. Lund (eds.): *Transport Amphorae and Trade in the Eastern Mediterranean. Acts of the International Colloquium at the Danish Institute at Athens, Monographs of the Danish Institute at Athens 5*. Aarhus, 293–308.
- ОРАИЃ, А. 2007: From Dr 24 to LR 2? In: M. Bonifay – J.-Ch. Tréglia (eds.): *LRCW 2*. BAR IS 1661. Oxford, 627–631.
- ОРАИЃ, А. 2010: Sinopean, Heraklean and Chersonesan “Carrot” Amphorae. *Ancient Civilizations from Scythia to Siberia* 16/1-2, 371–556.

- OPAIȚ, A. 2017: On the Local Production and Imports of Wine in the Pontic and Lower Danube Regions (1st Century BC to 7th Century AD). In: DIFNEUAX, D. (ed.) 2017, 579–612.
- OPAIȚ, A. – TSARAVOPOULOS, A. 2011: Amphorae of Dressel 24 *Similis* Type in the Central Aegean Area (Chios–Erythrai–Kyme). *The Annual of the British School at Athens* 106 (I), 275–323.
- OPAIȚ, A. – PARASCHIV, D. 2013: On the Wine, Olive Oil and Fish Supply of the Countryside in Roman Dobrudja (1st–3rd Centuries AD). In: L. Buzoianu – P. Dupont – V. Lungu (eds.): *PATABS III. Actes de la table ronde internationale de Constanța, 6–10 octobre 2009*. Constanța, 317–333.
- OPAIȚ, A. – IONESCU, M. 2016: Contributions to the Economic Life of the City of Callatis in Light of New Ceramic Finds (2nd–6th Centuries AD). *Arheologia Moldovei XXXIX*, 57–112.
- OPAIȚ, A. – GRIGORAȘ, B. 2018: Storage Vessels from Pompeiopolis. *RCRF* 45, 715–720.
- OPRIȘ, I.C. 2003: *Ceramica romană târzie și paleobizantină de la Capidava în contextul descoperirilor de la Dunărea de Jos (sec. IV-VI p. Chr.)*. București.
- OPRIȘ, I.C. – RAȚIU, A. 2016: An Early Byzantine Amphorae Deposit from Capidava. *Journal of Ancient History and Archaeology* 3/1, 24–42.
- OPRIȘ, I.C. – RAȚIU, A. 2017: *CAPIDAVA II Building C1 – Contributions to the history of annona militaris in the 6th century*. Cluj – Napoca.
- ORTON, C. – TYERS, P. – VINCE, A. 1993. *Pottery in Archaeology. Cambridge manuals in archaeology*. Cambridge.
- PANAYOTOV *et al.* 2006 = ПАНАЙОТОВ, И. – АЛЕКСАНДРОВ, С. – БУЮКЛИЕВ, Х. – ГЕОРГИЕВА, А. 2006: Могилен некропол от римската епоха в м. Керакова могила до с. Винаца, Пловдивско. In: В. Николов – Г. Нехризов – Ю. Цветкова (eds.): *Спасителни археологически разкопки по трасето на железопътната линия Пловдив-Свиленград през 2004 г. Велико Търново, 27–97*.
- PARASCHIV, D. 2006: *Amfore romane și romano-bizantine în zona Dunării de Jos (Sec. I–VII p. Chr.)*. Iași.
- PARASCHIV, D. 2013: Les amphores romaines d'héraclée du pont en Dobroudja. In: G.R. Tsetskhladze – S. Atasoy – A. Avram – Ş. Dönmez – J. Hargrave

- (eds.): *The Bosphorus. Gateway between the Ancient West and East (1st Millennium BC–5th Century AD). Proceedings of the Fourth International Congress on Black Sea Antiquities Istanbul, 14th–18th September 2009*. BAR IS 2517. Oxford, 213–217.
- PARASCHIV, D. 2014: Roman-Byzantine Pontic Amphorae Discovered at (L)Ibida, in the Province of Scythia. In: N. Poulou-Papadimitriou – E. Nodarou – V. Kilikoglou (eds.): *LRCW 5*. BAR IS 2616 (I). Oxford, 425–432.
- PAUNOV, E.I. 2013: *From Koine to Romanitas: The Numismatic Evidence for Roman Expansion and Settlement in Bulgaria in Antiquity (Moesia and Thrace, ca. 146 BC–AD 98/117)*. Cardiff University, unpublished PhD thesis.
- PEACOCK, D.P.S. – WILLIAMS, D.F. 1986: *Amphorae and the Roman Economy: an Introductory Guide*. London.
- PIERI, D. 2005: Le commerce du vin oriental à l'époque Byzantine (Ve-VIIe siècles). *Le témoignage des amphores en Gaule, Bibliothèque archéologique et historique* 174, Beyrouth.
- POLLA *et al.* in print = POLLA, S. – SPRINGER, A. – TUŠLOVÁ, P. – WEISSOVÁ, B.: Inland Trade and Consumption in Context. A Case Study on the Organic Residue Analysis of Transport Amphorae from the Balkan Peninsula (Yambol District, South-Eastern Bulgaria). In: *Proceedings of the International Interactive Conference Roman Amphora Contents, Reflection on Maritime Trade of Foodstuffs in Antiquity, 5–7 October 2015, Cadiz, Spain*. Roman and Late Antique Mediterranean Pottery Series, Oxford.
- POPILIAN, G. 1979: *Ceramica Romană din Oltenia*. Craiova.
- RĂDULESCU, A.V. 1973: Amfore cu inscripții de la Edificiul roman cu mozaic din Tomis. *Pontica* VI, 193–207.
- RĂDULESCU, A. 1975: Contribuții la Cunoașterea ceramicii Romane de uz comun, din Dobrogea. *Pontica* VIII, 331–360.
- RĂDULESCU, A. 1976: Amfore Romane și Romano-Bizantine din Scythia Minor. *Pontica* IX, 99–114.
- REYNOLDS, P. 2010: Trade Networks of the East, 3rd to 7th Centuries. The View from Beirut (Lebanon) and Butrint (Albania) (Fine Wares, Amphorae and Kitchen Wares). In: S. Menchelli – S. Santoro – M. Pasquinucci – G. Guiducci (eds.): *LRCW 3*. BAR IS 2185. Oxford, 89–114.

- REYNOLDS, P. 2013. Transport Amphorae of the First to Seventh Centuries: Early Roman to Byzantine Periods. In: W. Aylward (ed.): *Excavations at Zeugma*. California, 93–161.
- RIGOIR, Y. 1981: *Méthode géométrique simple de calcul du volume des contenants céramiques*. Documents d'Archéologie Méridionale 4, 193–194.
- RILEY, J.A. 1979: The Coarse Pottery from Berenice. In: by J.A. Lloyd (ed.): *Excavations at Sidi Khrebish Benghazi (Berenice) II*. Suppl. to Libya Antiqua V. Tripoli, 91–465.
- ROBINSON, H.S. 1959: *Pottery of the Roman Period. Chronology*. The Athenian Agora V. Princeton – New Jersey.
- ROSS *et al.* (eds.) 2018 = ROSS, S. – SOBOTKOVA, A. – NEHRIZOV, G. – TZVETKOVA, J. – CONNOR, S.E. (eds.): *Tundzha Regional Archaeological Project, Surface Survey, Palaeoecology, and related Studies (2009-2011) Final Report*. Oxbow.
- ROTROFF, S.I. 1997: *Hellenistic Pottery: Athenian and Imported Wheelmade Table Ware and Related Material*. The Athenian Agora XXIX. Princeton – New Jersey.
- ROTROFF, S. 2006: *Hellenistic Pottery. The Plain Wares*. The Athenian Agora XXXIII. Princeton – New Jersey.
- RUSEV – RUSEV – VRBANOV 2015 = РУСЕВ, Н. – РУСЕВ, Н. – ВЪРБАНОВ, В. 2015: Керамичният комплекс от римския викус край с. Горско Абланово (2007–2008). In: *Поломието, находки, събития, личности. VII и VIII национални научни конференции*. Veliko Trnovo, 678–740.
- SAVATINOV 1997 = САВАТИНОВ, С. 1997: Комплекс от ями от късната желязна епоха в м. Старото селище край град Раднево. In: Б.Д. Борисов – Р. Георгиева (eds.): *Марица-Изток. Археологически проучвания 4*. Раднево, 9–54.
- SANTROT, M.-H.J. 1995: *La citerne 5 et son mobilier. Production, importations et consommation III^e siècle/début I^{er} siècle av. J.-C. et deuxième tiers du I^{er} siècle ap. J.-C.* Fouilles de l'École française de Rome à Bolsena VII. Rome.
- SCORPAN, C. 1975: Ceramica Romano-Bizantina de la Sacidava. *Pontica* VIII, 263–313.
- SCORPAN, C. 1976: Origini și linii evolutive in ceramica Romano-Bizantina (sec. IV–VII) din spațiul Mediteranean și Pontic. *Pontica* IX, 155–185.

- SCORPAN, C. 1977: Contribution à la connaissance de certains types céramiques Romano-Byzantins (IV^e–VII^e siècles) dans l'espace Istro-Pontique. *Dacia* XXI, 269–297.
- SHEHI, E. 2008: La ceramica a vernice rossa da Dyrrhachium. *RCRF* 40, 9–17.
- SHELOV, D.B. 1986: Les amphores d'argile Claire des premiers siècles de notre ère en Mar Noire, In: Empereur, J.-Y. – Garlan, Y. (eds.): *Recherches sur les Amphores Grecques*, BCH Suppl. 13, 395–400.
- SOBOTKOVA, A. – LONGFORD, C. – BAKARDZHIEV, S. 2018: Excavations at Dodoparon, Yambol province. In: S. Ross – A. Sobotkova – G. Nekhrizov – J. Tzvetkova – S. Connor (eds.): *The Tundzha Regional Archaeology Project: Surface Survey, Palaeoecology, and Associated Studies in Central and Southeast Bulgaria, 2009-2015 Final Report*. Oxford, 200–210.
- SPARKES, B.A. – TALCOTT, L. 1970: *Black and Plain Pottery of the 6th, 5th and 4th Centuries B.C.* The Athenian Agora XII. Princeton – New Jersey.
- СТАЙКОВА 1989 = СТАЙКОВА, Л. 1989: Производство и разпространение на Т.Н. 'Македонска' сива тера сигилата по долината на Горна Струма. *Известия на Исторически музей Кюстендил* 1, 139–156.
- STECKNER, C. 1989: Les Amphores LR1 and LR2 en relation avec les pressoir du complex ecclésiastique des Thermes de Samos. In: V. Déroche – J.M. Spieser (eds.): *Recherches sur la céramique byzantine*, BCH Suppl. XVIII, 57–71.
- СТОЯНОВ – НИКОВ – СТОЯНОВА 2015 = Т. СТОЯНОВ – К. НИКОВ – Д. СТОЯНОВА 2015: Спасителни разкопки на некропол от римската епоха при С. Вратица, Бургаска Област (2003–2004). *Studia Archaeologica Universitatis Serdicensis* 5, 315–360.
- СТОЯНОВ – МИКОВ – ДЖАНФЕЗОВА 2013 = СТОЯНОВ, Т. – МИКОВ, Р. – ДЖАНФЕЗОВА Т. 2013: Надгробна могила от ранната елинистическа епоха край с. Кабиле, Ямболско. *Българско е-Списание за Археология* 3, 245–314.
- SULTOV, B. 1976: *Ancient Pottery Centres in Moesia Inferior*. Sofia.
- SULTOV, B. 1985: *Ceramic Production on the Territory of Nicopolis ad Istrum (2nd–4th century)*. Terra Antiqua Balcanica 1. Sofia.

- SWAN, V.G. 2004: Dichin (Bulgaria) and the Supply of Amphorae to the Lower Danube in the Late Roman-Early Byzantine Period. In: EIRING – LUND (eds.) 2004, 371–382.
- SWAN, V.G. 2007: Dichin (Bulgaria): The fifth- and sixth-century destruction deposits, and their implications for ceramic chronology. In: M. Bonifay – J.-Ch. Trégliá (eds.): *LRCW* 2. BAR IS 1661. Oxford, 835–844.
- SWAN, V.G. 2010: Dichin (Bulgaria): the destruction deposit and the dating of Black Sea amphorae in the fifth and sixth century A.D. In: D. Kassab Tezgör – N. Inaishvili (eds.): *PATABS* I. Actes de la Table Ronde Internationale de Batoumi et Trabzon, 27-29 Avril 2006, Istanbul, 107–118.
- THEODOSSIEV, N. 2011: Ancient Thrace during the First Millenium BC. In: G.R. Tsetskhladze (ed.): *The Black Sea, Greece, Anatolia and Europe in the First Millenium BC*. Leuven, 1–60.
- TOMAS, A. 2015: Sixth-century Pottery Kiln from Novae (Moesia Secunda). A Contribution to the Studies on the Local Pottery Manufacturing. *AB* XIX/3, 63–73.
- ТОПОЛЕАНУ, F. 2000: *Ceramica romană și romano-bizantină de la Halmyris (sec. I–VII d.Ch.)*. Tulcea.
- ТОРБАТОВ 1992 = ТОРБАТОВ, С. 1992: Могилен некропол от римската епоха край село Средина, Генералтошевско. *Добруджа* 9, 91–110.
- ТОРБАТОВ 2012 = ТОРБАТОВ, С. 2012: Археологическо проучване на Могилен некропол № 1 край Горско Абланово през 2008–2009 г. In: *Попово – минало и бъдеще* 1. Доклади от секция „Археология и стара история“. Велико Търново, 251–302.
- TURNOVSKY, P. 2005: The Morphological Repertory of Late Roman / Early Byzantine Coarse Wares in Ephesos. In: J.M. Gurt Esparraguera – J. Buxeda i Garrigós – M.A. Cau Ontiveros (eds.): *LRCW* 1. BAR IS 1340. Oxford, 635–645.
- TUŠLOVÁ, P. – WEISSOVÁ, B. 2014: Late Roman Coarse Ware and Amphorae from 27 Metropolit Panaret Street, Plovdiv, Bulgaria. In: N. Poulou-Papadimitriou – E. Nodarou – V. Kilikoglou (eds.): *LRCW* 4. BAR IS 2616. Oxford, 433–439.

- TUŠLOVÁ, P. – WEISSOVÁ, B. – BAKARDZHIEV, S. 2014. Stroyno Excavation Project, Introduction to the Site of Yurta–Stroyno and Report on the 2014 Season. *Studia Hercynia* XVIII/1-2, 16–24.
- TUŠLOVÁ *et al.* 2015 = TUŠLOVÁ, P. – WEISSOVÁ, B. – BAKARDZHIEV, S. – ČISŤAKOVA, V. – FREČER, R. – JANOUCHOVÁ, P. 2015: The Stroyno Archaeological Project, Report on the Season 2015. *Studia Hercynia* XIX/1-2, 243–261.
- TUŠLOVÁ, P. 2017: Late Roman Amphorae from the 6th Century AD House at the Site of Dodoparon in South-Eastern Bulgaria. In: D. Dixneuf (ed.): *LRCW* 5. *Études Alexandrines* 43. Alexandria, 671–681.
- TUŠLOVÁ, P. – WEISSOVÁ, B. – BAKARDZHIEV, S. 2017: Yurta-Stroyno Archaeological Project. Preliminary Report to the Final Season of 2016. *Studia Hercynia* XXI/2, 99–112.
- TUŠLOVÁ, P. – WEISSOVÁ, B. 2018: Greek and Black Sea Provenience Transport Amphorae Found During the Field Survey in Yambol Region, Bulgaria. In: S. Ross – A. Sobotkova – G. Nehrizov – J. Tzvetkova – S.E. Connor (eds.): *Tundzha Regional Archaeological Project, Surface Survey, Palaeoecology, and related Studies (2009-2011) Final Report*. Oxbow, 212–216.
- TUŠLOVÁ, P. – WEISSOVÁ, B. – BAKARDZHIEV, S. 2018: Excavations at the Roman site of Stroyno-Yurta (2014–2015): An interim report. In: S. Ross – A. Sobotkova – G. Nehrizov – J. Tzvetkova – S.E. Connor (eds.): *Tundzha Regional Archaeological Project, Surface Survey, Palaeoecology, and related Studies (2009-2011) Final Report*. Oxbow, 191–199.
- TUŠLOVÁ, P. 2019: Pottery from a Closed Context at the Late Antique Site of Dodoparon, Yambol Region. *AB* XXIII:3, 71–108.
- VAGALINSKI, L. 2002: *Burnished Pottery from the First Century to the Beginning of the Seventh Century AD from the Region South of the Lower Danube (Bulgaria)*. Sofia.
- VALEVA, J. – NANKOV, E. – GRANINGER, D. 2015 (eds.): *A Companion to Ancient Thrace*. Oxford.
- VAN DER VEEN, V. 2018: Form Follows Function. A new approach to determining vessel function. *Internet Archaeology* 50. <https://doi.org/10.11141/ia.50.2>. Visited: 11/04/2019.

- VELKOV, V. 1977: *Cities in Thrace and Dacia in Late Antiquity (Studies and Materials)*. Amsterdam.
- VELKOV 1982 = ВЕЛКОВ, В. 1982: Предговор. In: Т. Иванов (ed.): *Кабиле 1*. София, 5–6.
- VELKOV, V. 1983: The Thracian City of Kabyle. In: A.G. Poulter (ed.): *Ancient Bulgaria. Papers presented at the International Symposium on the Ancient History and Archaeology of Bulgaria*. Nottingham, 233–238.
- VELKOV 1991 = ВЕЛКОВ, В. 1991: Надписи от Кабиле. In: В. Велков (ed.): *Кабиле 2*. София, 7–53.
- VELKOV (ed.) 1991 = ВЕЛКОВ, В. (ed.) 1991: *Кабиле 2*. София.
- VELKOV 1996 = ВЕЛКОВ, К. 1996: Случайни находки от надгробни могили в музея Нова Загора. In: IGNATOV – KANCHEVA-RUSEVA – VELKOV 1996, 125–138.
- VŁADKOVA 2011 = Владкова В. 2011: *Античен производствен център при Павликени /Долна Мизия/*. Велико Търново.
- VNUKOV 2000 = ВНУКОВ, С.Ю. 2000: Псевдокосские амфоры Причерноморья. *Российская Археология* 4, 54–63.
- VNUKOV 2003 = ВНУКОВ, С.Ю. 2003: *Причерноморские амфоры I В. До Н.Э. – II В. Н.Э.* Морфология. Москва.
- VNUKOV, S.YU. 2004: Pan-Roman Amphora Types Produced in the Black-Sea Region. In: EIRING – LUND (eds.) 2004, 407–415.
- VNUKOV 2006 = ВНУКОВ, С.Ю. 2006: *Причерноморские амфоры I В. До Н.Э. – II В. Н.Э.* Петрография, Хронология, Проблемы Торговли. Москва.
- VNUKOV, S.YU. 2010: Sinopean Amphorae of the Roman Period. *Ancient Civilizations from Scythia to Siberia* 16, 361–370.
- VNUKOV 2016 = ВНУКОВ, С.Ю. 2016: Еще раз о типологии, эволюции и хронологии светлоглиняных (позднегераклейских) узкогорлых амфор. *Российская археология* 2, 36–47.
- VNUKOV, S.YU. 2017: Foreign Trade in the Black Sea Region and the Formation of the Pontic Market from the First Century BCE to the Third Century CE. In: V. Kozlovskaya (ed.): *The Northern Black Sea in Antiquity. Networks, Connectivity, and Cultural Interactions*. Cambridge, 100–138.
- VON CONRAD, S. 2007: Kommentierter Katalog der gefässkeramischen Funde. *Iatrus-Krivina* VI, 1–84.

- WICENCIAK, U. 2014: Pottery Production in the Late Hellenistic and Early Roman Periods at Jiyeh – ancient Porphyreon (Lebanon). In: B. Fischer-Genz – Y. Gerber – A. Hamel (eds.): *Roman Pottery in the Near East. Local Production and Regional Trade*. Proceedings of the Round Table held in Berlin, 19–20 February 2010. Roman and Late Antique Mediterranean Pottery 3. Oxford, 103–124.
- ZAHRNT, M. 2015: Early History of Thrace to the Murder of Kotys I (360 BCE). In: VALEVA – NANKOV – GRANINGER (eds.) 2015, 35–47.
- ZHURAVLEV, D.V. 2002: Terra Sigillata and Red Slip Pottery in the North Pontic Region (a Short Bibliographical Survey). *Ancient Civilizations from Scythia to Siberia* 8(3), 237–309.
- ZHURAVLEV, D.V. 2009: Pontic Sigillata Plates with Vertical Rim from the Belbek IV Necropolis in the South-Western Crimea. *Ancient Civilization from Scythia to Siberia* 15/1-2, 25–94.
- ZEEST 1960 = ЗЕЕСТ, И.Б. 1960: *Керамическая тара Боспора*. Москва.