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Introduction

Under the Republic, the integration of conquered lands into the Imperium Romanum generally followed one of two approaches. In the West, existing towns were integrated as self-governing units and new colonies of Roman citizens were founded in strategic positions, while in the Hellenised East, new cities were not founded on any significant scale; instead, existing poleis continued to administer their territories on behalf of their new masters. The inland districts of the conquered Mithradatic kingdom, however, were unlike any that Rome had previously annexed, and unsuitable for either method of integration. The victorious general Pompey the Great made a radical new departure in terms of Roman imperialism by creating an urban network from scratch: seven poleis, spaced so as to control the maximum area of territory with the minimal use of resources, were established. Some of Pompey’s work was undone by Mark Antony (39–31 BC), but the Pompeian structures were reinstated by Augustus.

The importance of urbanisation as an instrument of Roman domination is universally acknowledged among modern scholars, and in November 2012 the research project Where East meets West hosted a workshop in Kolding on Space, Place and Identity in Northern Anatolia. The aim of the workshop was to explore the genesis and function of the city and its sanctuaries, and their role in the process of provincialisation. On 24–26 April 2014 thirty people met in Amasya at the beautiful Historical Saraydüzü Barracks, National Struggle Museum and Conference Center under a banner welcoming us to the seminar on Landscape Dynamics and Settlement Patterns in Northern Anatolia during the Roman and Early Byzantine Period (Fig. 1). The aim of this seminar was to view the Roman settlements and sanctuaries, and their trajectories specifically in the context of their territory. Over the course of three days researchers from all over the world, all working in northern Anatolia met to exchange ideas and compare results. The 26 papers explored the current state of knowledge on settlement patterns in central northern Anatolia from both archaeological and historical points of view. While some papers presented the results of recent field research, others surveyed little known material ripe for new interpretations.

The main principle behind the choice of venue in Amasya was to bring together researchers from both universities and museums: an approach not undertaken previously in Turkey. The aim was to prompt new dynamics in the archaeological exploration of northern Anatolia by encouraging and launching new communications and collaborations between scholars involved in on-going research projects and museum staff concerned with emergency excavations; the event offered the means to share knowledge, data and results that were otherwise difficult to access. With the breaching of the language barrier, the conference was fruitful for all the participants.
Reflecting the nature of the seminar, this volume consists of a combination of articles; some focus on specific locations, others explore a specific region and some consider particular classes of material culture. Alongside these analytical studies, there are preliminary reports of rescue excavations. The articles are arranged in four thematic sections, as detailed below.

1. The dynamics of landscapes: cities and territories

The first three papers of the section on the dynamics of landscapes are closely related to one another and present new results of surveys in neighbouring regions. They are concerned with the identification of settlement patterns and the tracing of the dynamics of spatial organisation. Philip Bes presents the Roman finds from the Cide region revealed by the Cide Archaeological Project. Although the ancient landscapes have today been greatly transformed by natural and cultural processes, the carefully mapped find clusters allow the
identification of sites which are tentatively associated with ancient place names known from the written sources. Owen Doonan demonstrates the divergent histories of contrasting landscapes in the hinterland of Sinop. Some areas remained isolated for millennia while others became deeply integrated in the olive oil trade networks of the Black Sea region and beyond, especially during the Roman period. Meanwhile, Peri Johnson presents some of the results of survey in the district of Taşköprü. She argues that the prosperity and density of the settlements evidenced in the region correlate with the introduction of Roman urban institutions to Pompeiopolis and that the diffusion of monuments in the landscape reveals a need to establish a connection with the past.

The article by Kristina Winther-Jacobsen is the first of four articles which focus on the territory of Neoklaudiopolis. Based on fieldwork conducted in 2013, she presents the current evidence for the settlement dynamics of the city’s territory during the Roman and early Byzantine periods, although one nucleus of shifting settlements appears to date back to the Bronze Age. As the author notes, a more detailed analysis of the territories of the modern-day villages of the region would surely reveal more evidence for this nucleated, shifting settlement pattern. The contribution by Peter Bikoulis, Hugh Elton, John Haldon and Jim Newhard addresses an important methodological issue: the correlation between surface and subsurface finds based on the super-intensive survey of a church site at Avkat in 2009. In contrast to the evidence from Papaz Tarlası presented by Winther-Jacobsen, this study shows only a weak positive correlation between the surface distribution of artefacts and subsurface structures. Max Ritter examines the history of the Paphlagonian cities in late antiquity and argues that the alterations to the urban design reflect economic activities and that this should be understood as correlated with the general prosperity of the hinterland. Another example of late antique alterations to the city’s layout is examined in the article by Baran Aydin, Laura Buccino and Lâtife Summerer.

In the final article in this section, Celal Özdemir presents a preliminary report on the results of rescue excavations at the important Sanctuary of Zeus Stratios in the territory of Amaseia. This eagerly awaited report offers new impetus to the dynamic of the discussion on the character of this monumental hilltop sanctuary in northern Anatolia as well as that on the role of ritual space as common ground amongst the political territories of the region.

2. The dynamics of mortuary space: *necropoleis*, graves and grave monuments

In the second section, on the dynamics of mortuary space, Pavol Hnila presents his thoughts on the Roman and Byzantine graves at Oymağaç Höyük and places this rural necropolis and its population within the settlement dynamics of the territory of
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1 See also Tonnes Bekker-Nielsen and Rainer Czichon, Pavol Hnila (and Vera Sauer) and Vera Sauer below.
2 See below.
Neoklaudiopolis. This careful study of the necropolis provides evidence of long-term continuity – possibly over a millennium – of a rather small community. In an appendix, Vera Sauer offers the numismatic basis for the dating of two of the graves. Rather than necropoleis, Julia Koch focuses on individual funerary monuments and presents new evidence from Pompeiopolis on Phrygian doorstones and other monument types from Paphlagonia. Koch argues that identity was the dynamic behind the design and decoration of certain forms of funerary monuments in Paphlagonia. Meanwhile, based on the results of rescue excavations undertaken by the Amasya Museum between 1977 and 2014, the report of Muzaffer Doğanbaş considers the distribution of the necropoleis of Amaseia during the Roman and Byzantine periods and provides a glimpse of the burial customs of the ancient city by presenting evidence of the grave types and offerings. The final contribution to this section, by İlayı İvgin, reports on the results of the 2013 rescue excavation of a rock-cut tomb with tube-shaped clay sarcophagi in the village of Zafer in the territory of Amisos. The interpretation of this tomb is viewed against the occurrence of similar tombs and Hellenistic sites recorded in the territory of Amisos, mainly during the course of rescue excavations. İvgin notes that a large-scale research project is required in order to contextualise the results of the rescue excavations.

3. The dynamics of decoration: sculptures and mosaics

The first article in the third section, on the dynamics of decoration, is by Laura Buccino and Latife Summerer in cooperation with the director of the Amasra Museum, Baran Aydin, and considers changes in the use of urban space in Amastris in light of the discovery of a cache of buried statues. The material, excavated in 1993, illustrates an interesting example of changing intra-city dynamics during the Roman and early Byzantine periods, when the city contracted. In the following article, Luisa Musso examines five Roman and early Byzantine mosaic designs from northern Anatolia. She concludes that, in general terms, most of the mosaic compositions studied differ markedly from the repertoire of western Asia Minor and that the northern Anatolian mosaic pavements tend to be more closely connected with the eastern territories of the Empire. In the final article of this section Esra Keskın documents the presence of a rural Roman villa decorated with mosaic floors in the territory of Amaseia. This is a preliminary report on the results of rescue excavations conducted in the village of Yavru.

4. The dynamics of circulation: roads, inscriptions and coins

The first contribution to the section on the dynamics of circulation, by Tønnes Bekker-Nielsen and Rainer Czichon, updates our current understanding of the ancient road network in the Phazemonitis linking the pre-Roman and Roman road networks. It also presents evidence for two roads linking Neoklaudiopolis to the commercial road identified by John Arthur Ruskin Munro. Christian Marek then revisits the question of
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4 See also Ritter above.
provincial *koina* and argues, in opposition to the *communis opinio*, that Paphlagonia did not belong to the *koinon* of Pontus. He concludes, on the basis of epigraphic evidence including the well-known imperial oath inscription from Vezirköprü and recently discovered inscriptions from Pompeiopolis, that there existed an independent *koinon* of the province of Paphlagonia. Finally, Vera Sauer discusses the coinage of Neoklaudiopolis and Pompeiopolis against the background of the minting practices of other Pontic and Paphlagonian cities. She argues that the minting strategies of these cities was simultaneously both individual and conventional.
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Roman-period finds from the Cide region

1. Introduction

The Black Sea basin and northern Asia Minor in particular have long attracted scholarly attention, albeit on a fairly limited scale; in more recent years, however, the scope has been steadily widening.¹ From a Mediterranean perspective, Turkey’s northern coast may be perceived as peripheral, yet culturally it has much in common with the Black Sea basin and inland Asia Minor, and, on a broader scale, also with the Aegean and Mediterranean;² this was also the case during the Roman period.³

This paper focuses on the Roman-period data – ceramic and architectural – that has been gathered by the Cide Archaeological Project (CAP hereafter) and which serves to illuminate both spatial and chronological patterns of occupation as well as economic life.⁴ The scattered and restricted nature of the collected evidence precludes a detailed analysis;⁵ nonetheless, 14 find clusters offer indications that the Cide region was a relatively well-settled area during the (late) Roman period.

The CAP survey area is located about two-thirds along the coast travelling from Constantinople towards Sinope. Ceramic data from these latter two locations together with newly-published evidence from Pompeiopolis, Hadrianopolis and the Paphlagonia survey have served to highlight the late Roman occupational character of the wider region (Fig. 1),⁶ and the small quantity of datable ceramics from the CAP study area (211 fragments) – further complemented by scattered architectural finds and ancient sources – also

¹ Knipowitsch 1929; Asheri and Hoepfner 1972; Marek 1993; Belke 1996; Gabrielsen and Lund 2007; Kassab Tezgör 2010; Tsetskhladze 2012.
² Braund 2005: 115, 117.
³ For a brief historical background, see Bes forthcoming (with bibliography).
⁴ Düring and Glatz forthcoming.
⁵ Düring and Glatz forthcoming: esp. chapter 4.1–3.
⁶ Matthews and Glatz 2009; Domżalski 2011; Zhuravlev 2011; Lafli and Kan Şahîn 2012a; 2012b; Lafli and Christof 2012. Hellenistic and Roman amphorae from Sinope were widely – if at times thinly – distributed throughout the (central and eastern) Mediterranean: Lund 2007; Pieri 2007: 8–9; Kassab Tezgör 2010; Reynolds 2010; De Boer 2013. Constantinople remains relatively poorly known: Hayes 1992; Bardill and Hayes 2002; Jobst 2005. Results from the Yenikapi and Theodosian Harbour excavations will add significantly to our understanding of Roman-period ceramic trends.
signals activity and occupation during the Roman period (Fig. 2; also see Table 2 below).7 This paper aims to combine and discuss these three sources of evidence in order to contextualise the results of the CAP survey.

2. The ceramic finds

Due to the restricted time in the field, only cursory observations could be made. A common methodological approach was followed; this was directed towards determining: (1) fabric (with the naked eye); (2) fragment (rim, handle, etc.); (3) decoration/surface treatment (e.g. slipped); (4) shape/type (e.g. Late Roman Amphora 2); (5) (primary) function;8 and (6) chronological identification. Three (functional) groups were thus distinguished (Table 1).

2.1 Tablewares

Tablewares comprise vessels (open and closed) used for the serving and consumption of food and beverages, and which are also commonly characterised by the presence of slip and/or certain styles of decoration. At the same time, however, we should allow for a fair degree of variability concerning the quantity and variety of vessels in use as tableware – as
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7 Hellenistic: ca 325–25/1 BC; early Roman: ca 1–200; middle Roman: ca 200–400; late Roman: ca 400–650/700. Architectural fragments were studied from drawings and photographs.
8 Peña 2007.
well as the materials these were made of – by a single family or household, as this was likely dependent on, for instance, socio-economic position, where one lived, etc.

Amongst a total of 18 fragments, of most precise chronological significance are 11 sherds of Phocaean Red Slip Ware (PRSW).\(^9\) Originally associated exclusively with ancient Phokaia in western Turkey, we now know that several other locations in the same region produced similar shapes, and this has gradually prompted a return to the use of the former, more neutral term Late Roman C (LRC). Eight fragments are attributed to the Phokaia workshops proper, spanning the period between the early fifth and early seventh centuries.\(^10\) Though obviously too small for a quantitative analysis, the fact that only form 3F occurs more than once is in line with more general (Mediterranean) trends. It is noteworthy that no other class of (late) Roman tableware was recognised. The absence of Pontic Sigillata and Pontic Red Slip Wares, otherwise well attested at Hadrianopolis, Pompeipolis, Neoklaudiopolis and Sinope (see below), is particularly noteworthy.
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\(^10\) Hayes forms 3C (n=1), 3E (n=1), 3E–F (n=1), 3F (n=3), 3F/10A (n=1) and 10A (n=1). Three fragments are classified as Çandarlı Ware/Phocaean LRC: cf. Hayes 1972: 317, 369. Archaeometric analyses now indicate that it is not feasible to distinguish confidently between Çandarlı Ware produced during the first three centuries at Çandarlı (ancient Pitane), near Pergamon, and late Hellenistic to early Roman products from Pergamon proper (Pergamenische Sigillata): Japp 2009; Mommsen and Japp 2009; Schneider and Japp 2009.
2.2 Amphorae

Hellenistic to late Roman amphorae – vessels primarily intended for storing but above all transporting (agricultural) produce – are the best represented category in the CAP assemblage (n=180), yet the assemblage only modestly reflects this period’s wide variety in amphorae morphology and provenance; most types and fabrics are attested in single or a few occurrences only. The exception is a group of 95 fragments with a presumed local (=Cide) provenance (see below).

Among the sample are Aegean classes such as Rhodian and Chian amphorae, the latter known from shipwrecks around Sinope;\textsuperscript{11} Hellenistic to early Roman Knidian amphorae are marginally more common. Their fabric identifies three sherds as having originated in western Turkey: a distinctive profile probably belongs to the so-called Nikandros group from (the region of) Ephesos and resembles closely examples dating to the third century BC.\textsuperscript{12} From the same area comes an amphora toe possibly from a middle to late Roman Agora M273/Samos Cistern Type,\textsuperscript{13} as well as a small rim of possible Roman date. Also from the Aegean come 13 sherds of Late Roman Amphora 2 (LRA 2), a type manufactured at a number of locations yet still poorly understood.\textsuperscript{14} Three fragments originate from the Argolid, and the horizontal combing on two other fragments tentatively suggests a date prior to the mid sixth century. If LRA 2 was indeed used (predominantly) for the transport of olive oil, its presence in the Cide region may reflect the Black Sea basin’s ‘enormous thirst’ for olive oil.\textsuperscript{15}

Seven fragments bear a strong resemblance to both the Kapitân II and Zeest 80/Knossos Type 39 amphorae. The origin (or origins) of these types, which share macroscopic characteristics,\textsuperscript{16} remains poorly understood: a (northern) Black Sea origin has been postulated,\textsuperscript{17} yet a Chian origin has also been proposed for the Kapitân II.\textsuperscript{18} Further, four fragments appear to be of central North African origin. They are presumably middle to late Roman in date and all come from the wider area around Gideros; one fragment is tentatively assigned to the late Roman period.\textsuperscript{19}

Amphorae from Sinope and its environs – tentatively associated with the transport of wine, (olive?) oil and non-liquid contents such as fish products – are represented by 21 fragments.\textsuperscript{20} The identification is based on both colour and the presence of black volcanic inclusions (mostly pyroxene). Caution is, however, required with regard to the presence/absence of pyroxenes, in particular regarding the \textit{pâte rosée}.\textsuperscript{21} Only one fragment could be

\textsuperscript{11} Kassab Tezgör et al. 2003: 172–3, nos 7–9. \\
\textsuperscript{12} Lawall 2004: 180, figs 3, 4 left. \\
\textsuperscript{13} Robinson 1959: 109–10, pl. 29; Reynolds 2010: 97; Pieri 2005: 132–7; on shipwreck finds around Sinope, see Kassab Tezgör et al. 2003: 181–3, nos 26–7. \\
\textsuperscript{14} Karagiorgou 2001; Reynolds 2004: 231–2; Pieri 2005: 85–93; Slane and Sanders 2005: 286–7; Reynolds 2010: 95–7. \\
\textsuperscript{15} Braund 2005: 122. \\
\textsuperscript{16} At Tanagra and Hyettos in Boeotia, central Greece (personal observation). \\
\textsuperscript{17} Reynolds 2010: 90. \\
\textsuperscript{18} Opait and Paraschiv 2013: 319–20. \\
\textsuperscript{19} Bonifay 2004: 9–44, 89–153; Franco 2012. \\
\textsuperscript{20} Demir 2007; Lund 2007; Kassab Tezgör 2010: 121–2, 127, 133–4, 137. \\
\textsuperscript{21} Erten et al. 2004: 105; also Kassab Tezgör 2010: 121, 123, 134–7.