This study aims to present Pontic Red Slip Ware samples obtained during excavations conducted in Cıngırt Kayası Fatsa/Ordu. Examples of Pontic Red Slip Ware dating from the Late Roman Empire – Early Byzantine Period have been recovered from Cıngırt Kayası, mainly open forms consisting of Arsenieva – Domzalski Form 4 bowls and Form 1, Form 3 plates, dating to the late 4th century – mid-5th century AD. The samples recovered from the Cıngırt Kayası in the Southern Black Sea Region, other than Pompeiopolis, have proven that this group is more widespread in the Southern Black Sea trade than is known and that they have a much larger share in the north-south Black Sea trade. These forms were widely used, particularly in the 5th century AD, and spread all over the Black Sea Basin. Therefore, the fact that these vessels were found in Cıngırt Kayası, albeit in small numbers, together with the other ceramic forms recovered from the site, have indicated that the settlement is part of the Black Sea trade network in Late Antiquity and that regional trade was important in the late 4th and 5th centuries AD.
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Introduction

Cıngırt Kayası was within the geographical boundaries of the Pontos Region in ancient times and is located in the Eastern Black Sea Region today, 5 km from the center Ordu/Fatsa District, in the village of Yapraklı. It is located on a natural hill, 200 meters above sea level, strategically overlooking the valley and the sea\(^1\) (Fig. 1, 2). The excavations at Cıngırt Kayası, which started in 2012, were carried out mainly on the summit of the settlement (Fig. 3) and also on the northern slope during the 2012-2014 excavation seasons\(^2\). For these sections, starting from the early Hellenistic Period\(^3\), archaeological data have shed light on the continuity of settlement in the Roman and Early Byzantine Periods\(^4\).

The settlement at Cıngırt Kayası became smaller during the Byzantine Period, and it is understood from the ceramic finds that the settlement was mainly integrated with the Black Sea Region in terms of trade, except for the amphora finds of Aegean and Mediterranean origin\(^5\).

While evaluating the Pontic red slip wares\(^6\), which constitute the fine ceramics of the settlement from the Late Roman – Early Byzantine Period, a general information about these vessels will be given first, and under the title of bowl and plate form of each sample, the typology and the chronology created by scientists who have studied on the subject will be used\(^7\). In the catalog section, an analogy will be created over similar samples in the Black Sea Basin (Fig. 4, 5).

---

\(^1\) Erol 2013, 183-196.
\(^2\) The excavations at Cıngırt Kayası were carried out by a team under the direction of the Ordu Museum Directorate and under the scientific supervision of Prof. Dr. Ayşe Fatma Erol. I would like to thank Prof. Dr. Ayşe Fatma Erol for allowing me to work on Cıngırt Kayası ceramics, including the subject of this article, all of this material were studied as the subject of my Ph.D dissertation.
\(^3\) During the 2014 excavations in Trench J 15, a depth of 3.19 metres was reached and the ceramics recovered from stratigraphy of the trench provided evidence for the Early Hellenistic Period occupation phase of the settlement. For detailed information, see Tamer 2022, 45-49, Şekil 2.1, Res. 2.4.
\(^5\) For detailed information, see Tamer 2022, 440- 457, Çizelge 9.4.
\(^6\) Pontic red slip wares are defined with the abbreviation PRS by scholars working in the Black Sea Region. The examples of the group in this article will henceforth be written using the abbreviation PRS in accordance with the international literature.
\(^7\) I would like to thank Prof. Dr. Billur Tekkők Karaöz and Prof. Dr. Denis Zhuravlev for their contributions to this article.
Pontic red slip wares

Pontic red slip wares were first published by Knipovitch among the finds from Tanais and Opait have emphasized that vessels belonging to this group were produced in the Black Sea. The term PRS was first suggested by Domzalski, and also typology, basic chronology was created by determining 7 forms of open vessels and 4 forms of jugs on the basis of the typological features of the ware. Smokotina added to Domzalski's typology the earliest example of this group, the Form 0/4 bowls, and published eight types of plates and bowls (Forms 0/4-7), sherds of different forms and jug fragments from the excavations in the Kerch Strait. A very important publication showing a different approach to the subject belongs to Ivanova, who examined the red slip wares found in the Almaluk-Dere (Mangup) necropolis. All of the ceramics are grave finds from the Almaluk-Dere (Mangup) necropolis and are important for establishing analogies with examples from closed contexts of the Northern Black Sea region. A typo-chronological classification of open and closed forms of PRS was also created by Ivanova. Ceramics of the necropolis were evaluated by dividing into 14 open and 6 closed vessel forms.

Although it has been suggested that the PRS ware was produced in the South-West Crimea, no workshop has been found so far, and a specific region where the production is carried out has not been determined. However, in the following study, the idea that production was carried out in the Northern Black Sea was given up and it was suggested that production might have been carried out in the north of Anatolia. From the end of the 4th century AD, PRS wares began to be seen in large quantities in the Eastern and Northern Black Sea markets, extended market share and dominance, and continued throughout the 6th century. Although

9 Three forms of PRS group from Topraichioi have been published Opait 1985, 154, 155, 158-161, 163.
11 Domzalski 2000, 163-166, Fig. 2; Arsenieva-Domzalski 2002, 425-428, 437-445, Fig. 5-13; Domzalski 2007, 76, 77, 162, Pl. 61. 1-7; 163, Pl. 62. a-d.
12 Smokotina 2014a, 44.
13 Ivanova 2009, 28.
14 Tanais or Crimean region cannot be clearly suggested as a production centre, although Pontic Red Slip wares are much more abundant than Phocaean Red Slip Wares (PhRS – LRC) and African Red Slip Wares (ARS). For a graph showing the density of finds, see Arseneva-Domzalski 2002, 422, 424, Fig. 3; it is suggested that it may have been produced in several places in the Black Sea Basin Ushakov 2015, 61.
15 Domzalski-Zhuravlev 2013, 109, 110; Domzalski 2011, 165.
16 Smokotina 2015, 312; Pontic vessels appear during the stabilization of the economic situation of the Roman Empire under Constantinus. The earliest finds can be dated to the 2nd quarter of the 4th century. The heyday of PRS wares falls on the end of the 4th – the first half of the 5th century. From the 2nd half of this century a gradual decline in production begins and ends after the second half of the 6th century Krapivina-Domzalski 2008, 78.
17 Ushakov 2015, 61, Form 1-6 dated mainly in the second half of the 4th century AD and the first half of the 5th century AD, Form 7 dated between the second half of the 5th century AD and the third quarter of the 6th century AD. For the chronology of the forms, see. Ushakov 2015, 66, Табл. 1.
the chronology of the forms has been established, studies are continuing to determine the exact dates for this group.\(^{18}\)

The distribution pattern shows clearly that PRS wares were traded by the sea in the Late Antiquity.\(^{19}\) These wares, which could not exceed the Black Sea basin, spread to the coastal regions on all four sides of the Basin.\(^{20}\) It was widely traded in the Danube River Delta in the West, the Sea of Azov, the Crimean Peninsula, and the Don Delta in the North, Southern Colchis in the East\(^{21}\), Constantinopolis\(^{22}\), and Pompeiopolis\(^{23}\) in the South.

Khersonesos\(^{24}\), Pantikapaeum\(^{25}\), Tanais\(^{26}\), Olbia,\(^{27}\) and the necropolises of Khersonesos\(^{28}\) in the Northern Black Sea region are the centers where PRS were found in large numbers, allowing detailed studies to be carried out and accordingly typology was established, the chronology was determined and the results were published.

The strongly standardized PRS forms are very limited in number. Among these forms, the most widely used and produced large plates with diameters ranging from approximately 28 to 40 cm\(^{29}\), as also found at Cingırt Kayası. Form 1 and Form 3 continued beginning from the early phase of production until the end of the 5th century AD and became the dominant form.\(^{30}\) Form 4 bowls, another PRS form recovered from Cingırt Kayası, were produced simultaneously with Form 1 plates\(^{31}\).

The situation has changed with the increasing of mass production and exportation of African Red Slip Wares (ARS) and Phocaean Red Slip Wares (PhRS – LRC), shortly before the 5th century AD. Black Sea productions began to decline slowly in the mid-5th and early 6th centuries\(^{32}\).

---

\(^{18}\) Arsenieva-Domzalski 2002, 422, 423.
\(^{19}\) For the settlements that PRS wares recovered in the Cimmerian Region, see Domzalski 2000, 161, Fig. 1; For the spread of PRS wares in the Black Sea Region, see Domzalski 2000, 165, Fig. 3.
\(^{20}\) No evidence has been found that PRS wares exceed the Black Sea basin and took part in the Mediterranean and Aegean trade Domzalski 2011, 165; Krapivina – Domzalski 2008, 78.
\(^{21}\) Kazanski-Mastykova 2009, 153, Pic. 1. 15.
\(^{22}\) Harrison-Fıratlı 1968, 212.
\(^{23}\) Domzalski 2011, 165.
\(^{27}\) Krapivina – Domzalski 2008, 73–81.
\(^{29}\) PRS plates are classified Form 1 and Form 3 by Arsenieva-Domzalski. Arsenieva-Domzalski 2002, 425-427, 437-443, Fig. 5-11. 1-38, 270-299.
\(^{30}\) Arsenieva-Domzalski 2002, 424.
\(^{31}\) Arsenieva-Domzalski 2002, 427.
\(^{32}\) Along with increasing of ARS and PhRS - LRC wares market share in the Mediterranean and Black Sea, it seems that PRS producers tried to adjust their ware to the trends imposed by two main centers (African/ARS and...
In comparison to other Late Roman red slip wares, PRS is the most similar to Cypriot Red Slip (LRD). The clay is fine-grained, almost always containing small lime grains. Sometimes also contains very small white mica. The slip, applied with a brush and completely covers the inside of the vessel, is darker, matte and thicker on the inside surface of the vessels than outside. On the exterior the slip is lighter in colour and glossy. Upper parts of the walls are covered completely with a thin layer of slip. The ring foot and the bottom are usually not covered with slip.

Depending on the temperature of firing, two different fabric colours are observed. The softer fired fabric of vessels are orange-brown (2.5 YR 6/8-5/8) or orange-buff (5 YR 7/8-6/8-6/6). Slip colour is darker than fabric colour (2.5 YR 5/4-4/8). The hard-fired fabric of vessels are pinkish-brown (2.5 YR 5/6-6/6) or pinkish-red (5 YR 6/6-7/6). The slip colour is generally darker brownish pinkish (2.5 YR 5/4-5/6, 10 R 5/6-4/8). The rims of vessels are sometimes discoloured as a result of partial reduction which takes place when vessels are fired in stacks.

Pontic vessels recovered from Cıngırt Kayası have light red, red-brown fine-grained fabric with small lime inclusions and also small amounts of mica particles. All samples are similar in terms of fabric and slip, indicating the production of a single workshop. The slip, ranging from orange-red to brown, is thicker on the inner surface and thinner on the outer surface.

PLATES

Arsenieva – Domzalski Form 1

Plate with plain rounded, sometimes slightly incurved rim, the high straight wall rising at an angle to a plain rim, flat bottom rising slightly towards the center, A well distinguished low ring foot is under the edge of the bottom. The thin groove at the transition from the body to the

Aegean/PhRS - LRC) of red slip pottery production in Late Antiquity. This interaction is particularly evident in the late forms that appear after the second half of the 5th century AD Arsenieva-Domzalski 2002, 424.

33 Hayes 1972, 371.
34 Smokotina 2014a, 31; Ivanova 2009, 28.
36 Domzalski’s division of the Tanais specimens into two main clay groups based on the difference in kiln temperature is objected to by Smokotina on the grounds of the visual similarity between the two groups and the presence of intermediate samples, and it is stated that this may be due to production in different workshops or in nearby centers, but this can only be proven by analysis Smokotina 2014a, 31, 32. Ivanova also states that there are two groups with differences in production techniques. The samples, which are thinner-walled, of 1st group, have a very dense beige fabric with limes and unevenly coated with a light orange slip. The vessels of the other group have red-brown fabric without visible impurities. Dark red slip with a thin layer covers all surfaces of products, including the bottom. This differentiation can be explained either by their production in different centers of the Northern Black Sea region or by the earlier chronology of the latter Ivanova 2009, 28.
flat bottom, which is a characteristic feature of all PRS plates, is also seen in this form. The slip, ranging between orange to brown, is applied to the entire inner surface and the upper part of the outer surface. Slip thicker and evenly applied to the inner surface. Thin application on the outer surface creates a stained appearance. There is no slip on the bottom.\footnote{Ivanova 2009, 29.}

In Tanais, this form is divided into two sizes according to the rim diameter: Small, with rim diameter 20-22 cm, and large with rim diameter of 28-32 cm. Large-size plates are more common. None of the samples of the form has decoration on the inner side, and on the outside, bands of rouletting are sporadically applied. The form generally is dated from the mid-4th (earlier ?) to mid-5th century (later ?).\footnote{Arsenieva-Domzalski 2002, 425, 426.}

Typological and chronological study of PRS (Domżalski) has made it possible to distinguish two main versions: Form 1A is typical of the 4th century, more massive, with thick walls, pointed rim, on a ring foot relatively high; Form 1B corresponds to the late 4th - 5th century AD, with thinner walls, rounded rim, and low ring foot.\footnote{Arsenieva-Domzalski 2002, 437-439, Fig. 5. 2, 8-10; Fig. 6. 12; Fig. 7. 38.} The evolution of form 1A to form 1B has been progressive, which has given rise to intermediate versions 1A/B, dated from the end of the 4th – the beginning (first half?) of the 5th century AD.\footnote{Domzalski 2007, 77.} Smokotina, on the other hand, divided the Form 1 group into early and late versions through the finds from Bosporus (Kerch), where PRS wares are very common. Form 1A, early type, is dated to the second half and end of the 4th century AD; Form 1B, later type, is dated to the beginning and first half of the 5th century AD. Form 1A/B1 and 1A/B2 are transitional forms.\footnote{Smokotina 2015, 316, 324, Рис. 3. 3-8.}

This form is probably inspired by Hayes Form 50 of ARS. In the PRS group, Form 1 plates are the most common.\footnote{Smokotina 2014a, 46; Domzalski 2007, 77.}
Examples of Form 1A have been found in Kilen-Balka Necropolis, Nymphaeum, Chersonesos, Karshi Bair II, Olbia, Tanais, Phanagoria, Tsebelda/Tsibilia, Toprachi, Pompeiopolis, Lugove in the Chernyakhov Cultural District, Sukhumi, Pitsunda/Pityus, Tsikhisdziri, Almaluk-Dere (Mangup), Djurg-Oba, Krasny Mak, Neyzats, Panticapaeum.

The fragment recovered from Cıngırt Kayası (Fig. 6.1 - Cat. No. 1) has almost a complete profile. Only the base is missing. It has a slightly tapered rim and conical body. The lower part of the body makes a smooth transition merging with the ring foot. The sherd, which is in the 1A subgroup with its form features, belongs to the group of small-sized plates with a rim diameter of 22.4 cm.

Arsenieva – Domzalski Form 3

Form 3 is wide and shallow plates with a rising broad flaring outward rim, a curved body, flat bottom rising slightly towards the center, and a well-distinguished low ring foot. The rim

---

45 Domzalski states that this form was misinterpreted by Sazanov, who studied on wares from Bosporus, as Hayes Form 62B of African red slip wares (ARS) Domzalski 2000, 163, 164; Arsenieva – Domzalski, 2002, 423. For samples of African red slip Hayes Form 62B, which should be PRS Form 1, see Sazanov 2000a, 250, Рис. 11. 1-5; Romanchuk – Sazanov 1991, Рис. 12-17. 154-190; Sazanov 1994, 424, Рис. 1. 5.

46 Nessel 2001, 176, Fig. 2. 1; Nessel 2003, 109, Рис. 2. 1-8, 10.

47 Domzalski 1996, 106, 107, Fig. 4. 85.

48 Ushakov 2011, 230, Рис. 9. 1; Ushakov 2017, 185, Рис. 4. 19; 190, Рис. 6. 14; 191, Рис. 7. 32; 192, Рис. 8. 13, 14; 194, Рис. 10. 8; Ushakov 2018, 259, Рис. 3. 1; Yashaeva et al. 2018, 2017, 185, Рис. 4. 19; 190, Рис. 6. 17; 195, Рис. 2. 18; Ushakov et al. 2006, 195, 213, Рис. 8. 5, 6, 9.

49 Ushakov 2010b, 117, Рис. 75. 35.

50 Krapivina 2010, 266, Pl. 164, E-55.

51 Arsenieva-Domzalski 2002, 437, Fig. 5. 2, 8-10; 438, Fig. 6. 12; 439, Fig. 7. 38; Arsenieva 1981, 43, 44, Рис. 1. 3; Arsenieva-Naumenko 2001, 123, Рис. 47. 1.


53 Voronov 2003, 136, Рис. 27. 2; 148, Рис. 39. 3.

54 Opaït 2004, 75, 173, Pl. 54. 4.

55 Khrapunov-Khrapunov 1999, 252, 249, Рис. 8. 1; Khrapunov 2002, 169, Рис. 69. 8; 186, Рис. 86. 5; 220, Рис. 120. 1; 240, Рис. 140. 17; 247, Рис. 147. 3; 251, Рис. 151. 1, 2; 258, Рис. 158. 1; 279, Рис. 179. 1; 311, Рис. 211. 1.

56 Domzalski 2011, 171, Pl. 2. 3.

57 Magomedov-Didenko 2009, 323, Рис. 2. 13-17.


60 Inaishvili 1993, 59, 480. 26. 1, 2.

61 Ivanova 2009, 74, Рис. 2. 1, 4-10; 75, Рис. 3. 11, 12, 15-18; 76, Рис. 4. 19-24.


63 Loboda 2005, 194, 198, 229, Рис. 3. 7; 234, Рис. 8. 3.

64 Vlasov et al. 2011, 195, 205, 239, Рис. 28. 1-16; Khrapunov 2019, 37, 36, Рис. 3. 12; Vlasov et al. 2013, 209, 259, Fig. 28. 1-16.

65 Smokotina 2014a, 200, Рис. 4. 1.9-1.16; 201, Рис. 5. 1.17-1.23; 202, Рис. 6. 1.24-1.26.
diameters of the plates, which are divided into several groups from small to large, varies between 22 and 42 cm. The width of the rims are between 2.1 - 4.1 cm.

The medallion on the tondo, bordered by incised or slightly relief circles, is decorated with ornamental elements in the form of concentric circles or wavy bands radiating from the center using a comb-like tool. The combed decoration with grooves on the outer or both edge of the rims can be seen also on the large-sized vessels. The form dates from the late 4th century AD / early 5th century AD to the middle of the 5th century AD and stands out among the PRS with its ornaments. Slip is applied evenly on the inner surface, thin and irregular application on the outer surface creates a stained appearance. There is no slip on the bottom.

Examples of Form 3 have been found in Tanais, Ilurat, Droozhnoye, Almaluk-Dere (Mangup), Luchyste Necropolis, Chernaya Necropolis, Sovkhoz 10 Necropolis, Karshi Bair, Sukhumi, Krasny Mak, Djurg-Oba, Abkhazia/Shapka-Tserkovny Kholm-4, Tsikhisdziri, Phanagoria, Alonia Necropolis, Neyzats, Topraichioi and Murighiol, Chersonesos, and Panticapaeum.

It has been pointed out by Domzalski that Sazanov, who studied on wares from Bosphorus, incorrectly assessed these plates as Form 2 of Phocaean red slip wares (PhRS - LRC) Domzalski 2000, 163, 164; Arsenieva-Domzalski 2002, 422. For examples of Phocaean red slip (PhRS - LRC) Form 2, which should be PRS Form 3, see Fig. Sazanov 2000, 251, Рис. 12, 1-12; Romanchuk-Sazanov 1991, Рис. 2-4, 6-26; Sazanov 1994, 426, Рис. 4. 11.

Arsenieva-Domzalski 2002, 426, 427, 440-443, Fig. 8-11; Arsenieva-Naumenko 2001, 121, Рис. 45. 7; 122, Рис. 46. 6.

Silantyeva 1958, 301, 302, Рис. 15. 4.

Atiani 1977, 197, Рис. 50-52.

Khrapunov 2002, 60, 186, Рис. 86. 6.

Ivanova 2009, 77-81, Рис. 5-9, 27-36.

Aibabin-Khairedinova 2001, 75, 79, 85, Рис. 5. 1; Aibabin-Khairedinova 2017, 122, Рис. 65. 4; 131, Рис. 74. 12-14.

Aibabin 1996, 293, 557, Рис. 9. 2.


Ushakov 2010b, 121, Рис. 79. 8; 124, Рис. 82. 20.

Gabeliya 2014, 441, 494, Табл. XXIX. 11-14, 16-20.

Loboda 2005, 195, 199, 210, 211, 229, Рис. 3. 9, 10; 235, Рис. 9. 5, 6; Табл. II. 16, 17, 20, 21.

Yermolin 2004, 15, 28, Рис. 3. 7-9; Yermolin 2005, 130, 143, Рис. 9. 8; 146, Рис. 13. 3-5, 9.

Kazanski – Mastykova 2009, 153, Рис. 1. 15.

Inaiushvili 1993, 59, 60, 60, 26. 4, 5.

Voroshilova 2013, 3, Рис. 2. 5; 6, Рис. 5, 2, 3; Golofast – Ol’khovskiy 2016, 67, 66, Рис. 14. 1, 2.

Aibabin – Khairedinova 2017, 121, Рис. 64. 5.

Vlasov et al. 2011, 195, 239, Рис. 28. 18-21; Vlasov et al. 2013, 209, 259, Fig. 28. 18-21.

Opaït 2004, 75, 173, Pl. 54. 1, 2.

Golofast 2007, 81, 80, Рис. 8. 7; Ushakov 2010a, 292, 293, 306, 296, Рис. 7. 31; 299, Рис. 10. 11, 12; 303, Рис. 16. 1; Ushakov 2011, 227, Рис. 6; Ushakov 2017, 185, Рис. 4. 17; 192, Рис. 8. 20; 193, Рис. 9 18, 19, 30, 31, 194, Рис. 10. 9, 10; Ushakov 2018, 259, Рис. 3. 2, 3; Yashaeva et al. 2018, 362, Рис. 28. 7; Sedikova 1996, 179, 176, Рис. 2. 19; Ushakov et al. 2006, 195, 213, Рис. 8. 23-29.

Smokotina 2014a, 207, Рис. 11. 1.61-1.71; 208, Рис. 12. 1.72, 1.73.
The fragment recovered from Cıngırt Kayası (Fig. 6.2 - Cat. No. 2) is a plate with preserved ring foot and lower part of the body. The sherd has a low ring foot and the transition from the body to the foot has a thin groove, typical for these vessels. Wall thickness decreases from the base to the body. The ornamental motifs, which are very common on the surface of the form, are not seen in the example of Cıngırt Kayası. From the diameter of the ring foot, it becomes clear that it is an example of a small-size form.

The fragment recovered from Cıngırt Kayası (Fig. 6.3 - Cat. No. 3) is a sherd of a plate with preserved rim and edge-to-body transition. With a width of 3.3 cm, the edge of the rim is a long-kept example. Ornamental motifs on the edge of some dishes are not seen on the examples of Cıngırt Kayası. From the diameter of the rim it becomes clear that it is an large sized example of the form.

**BOWLS**

**Arsenieva – Domzalski Form 4**

Bowl with plain rim, curved walls, slightly concave bottom, and well-distinguished ring foot. Not decorated. They were produced between the late 4th century AD and mid-5th century AD\(^90\). Fabric with small lime particles has rare mica. Slip, from orange to brown, is applied evenly on the inner surface, and the outer part of the bowls is covered with stains. There is no slip on the lower part of the body\(^91\). The body thickness of bowls with rounded or slightly thickened rims varies between approximately 0.4-0.5 cm\(^92\).

According to the shape and diameter of the mouth, Form 4 bowls were examined in detail by Ivanova and divided into three subgroups. Subgroup I: Bowls with the largest rim diameter (18-19 cm) has a sharp edge at the transition from the vertical edge to truncated-conical walls and are decorated along the rim with one or two incised lines on the outside. Subgroup II: Bowls with a rim diameter (11-17 cm) with a curved and rounded edge, smoothly turning into rounded walls. Subgroup III: Bowls with a rim diameter of 11 to 17 cm, having a vertical or slightly outwardly inclined rounded rim, smoothly turning into rounded walls\(^93\).

The fragment recovered from Cıngırt Kayası (Fig. 6.4 - Cat. No. 4) is a bowl with preserved rim and upper part of the body. It has a slightly incurved rim and conical body form.
with a distinct edge-to-body transition. With its form characteristics, it belongs to the 2nd subgroup by Ivanova. Examples of the form were recovered from Almaluk-Dere (Mangup)\textsuperscript{94}.

The fragments recovered from Cıngırt Kayası (Fig. 6.5 - Cat. No. 5 and Fig. 6.6 - Cat. No. 6) are bowls with preserved rim and the upper part of the body. **Fig. 6.5 - Cat. no 5** has an upright, rounded rim and a curved body. **Fig. 6.6 - Cat. No 6** has a rounded, thickened, upright rim and a curved body. Both pieces of Form 4, which have a straight rim and a curved body, are in the 3rd subgroup of Ivanova with form features. Examples of form have been recovered from Tanais\textsuperscript{95}, Phanagoria\textsuperscript{96}, Panticapaeum\textsuperscript{97}, Chersonesos\textsuperscript{98} and Almaluk-Dere (Mangup)\textsuperscript{99}.

**Conclusion**

Examples of PRS forms obtained from Cıngırt Kayası are open forms consisting of 3 bowl sherds (Form 4) and 3 plate sherds (Form 1 and Form 3), dated to the late 4th - mid-5th century AD. The sherds were recovered from three adjacent trenches of the summit (L16 trench NE sector, L17 trench SW, NE, SE sectors, and L18 trench NE sector) and were not distributed throughout the summit (Fig. 3). When sherds are evaluated in terms of their fabric and slip properties as well as their form characteristics, it is observed that they form a single homogeneous group.

Forms 1, 3 and 4 were widely used, especially in the 5th century AD, and spread throughout the Black Sea Basin. Therefore, the fact that these vessels were found at Cıngırt Kayası, albeit in small numbers, together with the other ceramic forms recovered from the site, indicates that the settlement was part of the Black Sea trade network in Late Antiquity and that regional trade was important in the late 4th and 5th centuries AD.

The data obtained from Bosphorus (Kerch), one of the places where PRS are most common, is instructive for Cıngırt Kayası. In Bosphorus, the proportion of PRS among the red slip wares at the end of the 4th century AD and the beginning of the 5th century AD is around 90\%, and some forms of ARS and PhRS - LRC were recovered. These high proportions indicate that regional trade played a dominant role in the Black Sea region at that time. In the middle of the 5th century AD, the rate of PRS decreased to 70\%. When the region came under the control of the Byzantine Empire in the second quarter of the 6th century AD, there was a sharp increase

---

\textsuperscript{94} Ivanova 2009, 82, Рис. 10. 42-46.
\textsuperscript{95} Arsenieva – Domzalski 2002, 445, Fig. 13. 568, 570-572, 574.
\textsuperscript{96} Medvedev 2013, 384, 385, Рис. 40. 2.
\textsuperscript{97} Smokotina 2014a, 208, Рис. 12. 1.74-1.77.
\textsuperscript{98} Ushakov 2017, 185, Рис. 4. 8-10; 190, Рис. 6. 20-22; 194, Рис. 10. 11; Ushakov 2018, 259, Рис. 3. 5.
\textsuperscript{99} Ivanova 2009, 82, Рис. 10. 47-50; 83, Рис. 11. 51-62.
in the number of goods imported from the Mediterranean centers, and the proportion of PhRS - LRC vessels increased to 70%. In the second quarter of the 6th century AD, amphora production ceased in the Kerch Strait region, and imports from Sinop and Heracleia Pontica declined sharply and disappeared completely. In contrast, amphorae were imported from South Pontic centers (this situation is also observed at Cingırt Kayası) and also from the eastern Mediterranean, especially from Crete, Cilicia, and Cyprus\textsuperscript{100}.

Production of PRS decreased at the end of the 6th century AD. However, a limited number of ARS wares have continued with certain forms through existing traditional commercial connections and economic relations\textsuperscript{101}. The fact that only PRS forms were found at Cingırt Kayası is a result of the intimate and inward-looking trade relations between the centers in the Black Sea region. The fact that no PhRS - LRC or ARS wares were recovered from the excavation site leads us to conclude that Cingırt Kayası was not an important commercial station on a secondary route within the main maritime trade route for the merchants/mediators who were active in the Black Sea trade of the Byzantine Empire in the 6th century and that perhaps it does not attract the attention of merchants in terms of population density or purchasing power. This is also seen in Pompeiopolis, a Paphlagonia settlement that remains inland but is a center in the Northern Black Sea Region that has been published by examining the ceramics of antiquity in detail. Of the ceramics recovered, 238 are PRS, 16 are ARS, and 16 are PhRS - LRC\textsuperscript{102}. Numerical majority indicates that the Black Sea production red slip wares dominate the trade in the region. This shows that the situation in question is not only valid for the northern Black Sea but also for the south of the Black Sea. From the middle of the 5th century AD, the proportion of PRS wares decreased in the region, and they were not seen from the middle of the 6th century AD. By the 7th century AD, brown, green and yellow glazed wares and white glazed wares from Constantinopolis enter the market\textsuperscript{103}.

The importance of PRS forms obtained from the Cingırt Kayası in terms of Black Sea ceramic studies is that these containers were also exported to settlements located on the southern shores of the Eastern Black Sea, and the distribution area is wider than known.

\textsuperscript{100} Smokotina 2015, 316-320; Smokotina 2014b, 71, 72.
\textsuperscript{101} Smokotina 2015, 338, 339.
\textsuperscript{102} Domzalski 2011, 164.
\textsuperscript{103} Domzalski 2011, 167.
CATALOG

Fig. 6.1 – Cat. no 1
Inventory No: FCK12.L17.02.70
Trench: L17 Trench/SE Sector/f-h 9-10 Plansquare/Layer/216.00-215.31
Dimensions: Rim Diameter: 22.4 cm Height: 6.3 cm Thickness: 0.4-0.6 cm
Fabric Colour: 2.5 YR 6/6 (Light Red) Slip Colour: 10 R 4/8 - 5/6 (Red)
Fabric Definition: Thin fabric, with little lime and a few mica inclusions.
Form Definition: Sherd of a plate showing in full cross-section, slip preserved in small pieces only in a few places on the outside. Since the slip is thicker towards the bottom, it is partially preserved on the inside and continued as a thin and very worn on rim.
Analogy: Nessel 2001, 176, Fig. 2. 1; Domzalski 1996, 105, Fig. 4. 85; Ushakov 2011, 230, Рис. 9. 1; Ushakov 2017, 185, Рис. 4. 19; 190, Рис. 6. 14; 191, Рис. 7. 32; 192, Рис. 8. 13, 14; 194, Рис. 10. 8; Krapivina 2010, 266, Pl. 164. E-55; Arsenieva – Domzalski 2002, 437, Fig. 5. 9; Golofast – Ol’khovskiy 2016, 67, 64, Рис. 12. 2; Voronov 2003, 136, Рис. 27. 2; Khrapunov 2002, 169, Рис. 69. 8; 251, Рис. 211. 1; Lordkipanidze 1991, 187, ტაბ. XII. 1; Magomedov – Didenko 2009, 323, Рис. 2. 17; Gabeliya 2014, 440, 494, Табл. XXIX. 10; Ivanova 2009, 75, Рис. 3. 12; Yermolin 2005, 146, Рис. 13. 20; Smokotina 2014а, 201, Рис. 5. 1. 17.
Date: Mid-4th century AD – Mid-5th century AD.

Fig. 6.2 – Cat. no 2
Inventory No: FCK12.L17.02.3
Trench: L17 Trench/SW sector/e 10 Plansquare/Fill/216.00-215.46
Dimensions: Foot Diameter: 8.6 cm Height: 1.4 cm Thickness: 0.4-1 cm
Fabric Colour: 2.5 YR 5/6 (Red) - 2.5 YR 6/6 (Light Red) Slip Colour: 2.5 YR 5/8 (Red)
Fabric Definition: Thin fabric with some lime and a few mica inclusions.
Form Definition: Lower body and ring foot fragment of a plate. Tonal differences are seen on the outer surface due to the application of the slip-by brush. The lowest part of the body and ring foot is not slipped. The slip is thin and very worn on the inside.
Analogy: Domzalski 2000, 163, Рис. 2. 5; Arsenieva – Domzalski 2002, 441, Fig. 9. 283; Ivanova 2009, 77, Рис. 5. 34; Aibabin – Khairedinova 2001, 75, 79, 85, Рис. 5. 1.
Date: Late 4th century AD - Mid-5th century AD.

Fig. 6.3 – Cat. no 3
Inventory No: FCK12.L17.02.14
Trench: L17 Trench/NE sector/f-i 3-5 Plansquare/Fill/216.35-215.99
Dimensions: Rim Diameter: 26.4 cm Height: 2.7 cm Thickness: 0.6-0.8 cm
Fabric Colour: 5 YR 6/8 (Reddish Yellow) Slip Colour: -
Fabric Definition: Thin fabric, with little lime and a few mica inclusions.
Form Definition: Rim and upper body fragment of a plate. Slip mostly missing on inside and outside. No decoration.
Date: Late 4th century AD – Mid-5th century AD.

Fig. 6.4 – Cat. no 4
Inventory No: FCK13.L16.01.216
Trench: L16 Trench/NE sector/f-g 1-5 Plansquare/Surface/216.73-216.16
Dimensions: Rim Diameter: 16.2 cm Height: 2.6 cm Thickness: 0.5-0.7 cm
Fabric Colour: 5 YR 6/6 (Reddish Yellow) Slip Colour: 10 R 4/8 (Red)
Fabric Definition: Thin fabric, with little lime and a few mica inclusions.
Form Definition: Rim and upper body fragment of a bowl. Slightly incurved rim, conical body, and distinct edge-to-body transition. Slip mostly missing on inside and outside.
Analogy: Ivanova 2009, 82, Рис. 10. 43, 45.
Date: Late 4th century AD – Mid-5th century AD.

Fig. 6.5 – Cat. no 5
Inventory No: FCK12.L17.02.55
Dimensions: Rim Diameter: 12.2 cm Height: 3.4 cm Thickness: 0.4-0.6 cm
Fabric Colour: 2.5 YR 5/8 - 2.5 YR 5/6 (Red) Slip Colour: 10 R 4/8 - 5/6 (Red)
Fabric Definition: Thin fabric, with little lime and a few mica inclusions.
Form Definition: Rim and upper body fragment of a bowl. Rounded upright rim and curved body. Slip preserved only on the lower parts of the outside, mostly missing on the inside.
Analogy: Arsenieva – Domzalski 2002, 445, Fig. 13. 568; Ivanova 2009, 83, Рис. 11. 55.
Date: Late 4th century AD – Mid-5th century AD.

Fig. 6.6 – Cat. no 6
Inventory No: FCK 2012 L18.02. 122
Trench: L18 Trench/NE sector/ f-j 1-5 Plansquare/Fill/215.81-215.33
Dimensions: Rim Diameter: 16.6 cm Height: 3.4 cm Thickness: 0.4-0.7 cm
Fabric Colour: 2.5 YR 5/8 - 2.5 YR 5/6 (Red) Slip Colour: 10 R 4/8 - 5/6 (Red)
Fabric Definition: Thin fabric, with little lime and a few mica inclusions.
Form Definition: Rim and upper body fragment of a bowl. Rounded, thickened upright rim and curved body. Slip well preserved on the outside, mostly missing on the inside.
Date: Late 4th century AD – Mid-5th century AD.
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FIGURES

Fig. 1. Geographical location of Çingirt Kayası

Fig. 2. Location of Phabda-Phadisane in Antiquity (Olshausen – Biller 1984, 275)
Fig. 3. Cingirt Kayası summit plan and distribution of sectors (Cingirt Kayası excavation archive)
Fig 4. Map of Black Sea Basin Settlements analogous with PRS wares from Cıngırt Kayası

```
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BLACK SEA SETTLEMENTS ANALOGOUS WITH PRS WARES FROM CİNGİRT KAYASI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SETTLEMENTS IN NORTHERN BLACK SEA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Settlements of Kerch Peninsula</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Panikapaasum/Kerch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Nymphaeum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Djurg-Oba</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Ilurat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Settlements of Taman Peninsula</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Phanagoria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Settlements of the Don River Delta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Tanais</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Settlements of Kherseynosos Peninsula</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Kherseynosos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Kilen-Balka Nekropolii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Karshi Bair II Yerlesimi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Chernaya Nekropolii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Settlements of Lower Dnieper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Sovkhoz-10 Nekropolii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Almaluk-Dere (Mangup)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Krasny Mak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Neyziyats</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Drozdovoye</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Luchyste Nekropolii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Alonia Nekropolii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Olbia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 Lugove</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| SETTLEMENTS IN EASTERN BLACK SEA                             |
| Settlements of South Colchis (Georgia)                       |
| 20 Tsikhidzir                                                |
| Settlements of Northern Colchis (Abkhazia)                   |
| 21 Pitsunda/Pityns                                          |
| 22 Sukhumi/Dioscuria/Sebastoplis                            |
| 23 Shapka-Tserkovny Kholm-4                                 |

| SETTLEMENTS IN WESTERN BLACK SEA                             |
| Settlements of the Dobrogea Region                           |
| 25 Murighiol                                                 |
| 26 Topraichioi                                               |

| SETTLEMENTS IN SOUTHERN BLACK SEA                            |
| Paphlagonia Region                                           |
| 27 Pompeiopolis                                             |
```

Fig 5. Table of Black Sea Basin Settlements analogous with PRS wares from Cıngırt Kayası
Fig 6. Drawings and Pictures of PRS wares from Çınğırt Kayası