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Neolithic Sites along the Bulgarian Black Sea Coast and its Hinterland

Miroslav KLASNAKOV

INTRODUCTION
After a hundred years of prehistoric research in Bulgaria, the Black Sea coast and its hinterland remain among the relatively scarce investigated areas in the country, considering emergence and development of the communities which carry Neolithic achievements and traditions. While some Chalcolithic and Bronze Age sites are recognized as eponyms of separate phases or even entire prehistoric cultures, Neolithic monuments (with few exceptions, e.g. Usoe and Durankulak) stay beyond the vision of researchers. To a great extent this assumption is valid for the whole Bulgarian Black Sea coast, especially for the southern one, and it leads to the false impression that during the Neolithic period this area is scarcely settled. Monuments and findings from that period are discovered as early as 20s of 20th century, but with time they have remained unrecognized, either incorrectly dated or most often unpublished.

Opposed to the northern Bulgarian Black Sea coast where systematic investigation of Neolithic begins in 70-80s of the 20th century and the accumulated data base allows cultural differentiation or synchronization and establishing of affiliations with already known cultures, the exploration of the southern Bulgarian Black Sea coast begins in the first years of 21st century. Despite lack of large scale excavations (with few exceptions, e.g. Krushaka) and absence of detailed publications of registered and investigated Neolithic sites, I think that presentation of new empirical information and its integration with existing data will contribute to construction of the future general picture of Neolithic Age along the west Black Sea coast.

The hinterland of Bulgarian Black Sea Coast is settled by Palaeolithic groups. Traces of their existence are registered in the northern parts. They are presented by the early, middle and late Palaeolithic sites near Devnia (Джамбазов 1979, 19) (fig. 1/g-h) and in Pobitite kamani – Dikili Tash locality, west of Varna (fig. 1/i-j) (Джамбазов / Маргос 1960, 269-295; Джамбазов 1962, 53-60; 1964, 67-76). Late Palaeolithic findings are known also from the cave in the Kukite locality, situated between Debelets and Asparuhovo villages, Varna region (fig. 1/q) (Тодорова 1978, 1). The only sites in Bulgaria, assigned by many authors to Epi-Palaeolithic and Mesolithic, are concentrated in Pobitite kamani locality (Джамбазов / Маргос 1960, 271-283; Джамбазов 1962, 53-60; 1964, 74-76; 1979, 20). Eleven sites are described – Banovo (fig. 1/b), Slanchevo I-IV (fig. 1/c-f), Strashimirovo (fig. 1/n), Central part of Pobitite kamani (fig. 1/o), Kanarata (fig. 1/p) and Beloslav I-III (fig. 1/k-m) and they are assigned to late Mesolithic (Гацов 1984, 3-16). Another Mesolithic site in the area is documented close to Novakovo village, Varna region (fig. 1/a) (Маргос 1964, 49-50). Presence of microlithic flint artifacts is the reason to date all abovementioned sites to Epi-Palaeolithic / Mesolithic chronological period. In some aspect they could be compared to Epi-Palaeolithic assemblages of Ağacı group which are situated on fossil dunes along seaside terraces of Black Sea and Marmara Sea (Özdoğan 1999, 210). There is also an opinion that in Pobitite kamani case the microlithic nature of the assemblages is not a chronological de-
Fig. 5. Bourgas – Fresh water channel. Ceramics from late Neolithic (1-3), ceramic (clay) figurine from late Neolithic (4) (drawings by T. Stefanova – NAIM-BAS).
One of the most interesting and enigmatic coinages from the West Pontic region (present-day Dobrudja) is that of the Scythian kings. Despite the efforts of several generations of scholars, the basic questions of this coinage (types, denominations, chronology, countermarking, etc.) have not yet found satisfactory answers. This is largely for two reasons: insufficient number of specimens published and the lack of modern monographic studies on coinages of the cities of *Tomis*, *Callatis*, *Dionysopolis*, and *Odessus*.

Because the number of published specimens is limited, it is generally accepted that coins of the Scythian kings in Dobrudja are rare. However, this is contradicted by recent evidence of the number of coins actually found. For instance, the “Bobokov Brothers” collection in Bulgaria alone (now kept in the Numismatic Museum Ruse) includes 489 specimens and a similar number can be added from museums and other private collections. Enough material is therefore now available for a complete study of this coinage.

The following names of Scythian kings from this region who issued coinage are known: Ateas, Kanites, Tanousas, Aelis, Charaspes, Akrosas and Sariakes. Only Ateas, who was contemporary with Philip II of Macedon, occurs in literary sources and only a few coin types of his, all in silver, are known. To be comprehensive, a bronze type (##9-10) is included here, struck at *Dionysopolis*, with a reverse presenting a typical Scythian horseman (in Scythian costume and with a bow case attached to his belt) with right hand raised. It is considered likely to date “after the death of Ateas and before the time of the Scythian kings of Scythia Minor” (Stolyarik 2001, 29).

The names of two other kings, Kanites and Sariakes, occur in inscriptions. Their coins, and those of Tanousas, Charaspe, Akrosas and Aelis, were struck in the Hellenistic period and are found almost exclusively within the hinterland of the West Pontic Greek cities of *Istrus*, *Tomis*, *Callatis*, *Dionysopolis* and *Odessus*.

We present here a catalogue which includes all iconographic types and variants, both published and unpublished, of the coins of the Scythian kings. This will eliminate the unusually high number of inaccuracies in earlier descriptions of these types and provide a broad general overview of the iconography of the Scythian regal coinage in the West Pontic area.

The numismatic material of the “Bobokov Brothers” collection is used as a basis for this study. Coins of the Scythian kings in this collection comprise 489 specimens. They are divided by rulers as follows: Ateas (4), Kanites (131), Tanousas (10), Aelis (100), Charaspe (28), Akrosas (59), Sariakes (157). In order to provide a clearer idea for the viewer, we have used illustrations of specimens from other museum and private collections too. In addition, all the bronze coins are shown by line drawings as well as photographs.

Coin types of Ateas (##1-8) are presented first, followed by the bronze type of Dionysopolis depicting the Scythian horseman, and then all the types of Scythian kings Kanites, Tanousas, Aelis, Charaspe, Akrosas, and Sariakes. As the sequence of reigns of these last kings has not yet been determined, the order of their
CATALOGUE

Illustrations correspond to the text in bold from the catalogue.

ATEAS

1 Obv.: Head of beardless Heracles in lion skin, l. Rev.: ΑΤΑΙΑΣ (r.). Scythian horseman with long hair, shooting a bow, galloping l. Pellet (below). AR; didrachm; 19 mm; 5.78 g; Hermitage (St. Petersburg).

Анохин 1965, 4, 1-2; Stolyarik 2001, Pl. 2/1-2.

2 Obv.: Head of beardless Heracles in lion skin, l. ΤΙ (below). Rev.: ΑΤΑΙΑΣ (r.). Scythian horseman with long hair, shooting a bow, galloping l. AR; didrachm; 20 mm; 6.93 g.


3 Obv.: Head of beardless Heracles in lion skin, l. Rev.: ΑΤΑΙΑΣ (r.). Horse galloping l. AR; drachm; 15 mm; 3.35 g.


4 Obv.: Head of Artemis wearing ear-ring and pendant, with bow and quiver, r. Rev.: ΑΤΑΙΑ (r.), ΚΑΛ (below). Scythian horseman with long hair, shooting a bow, galloping l.

AR; drachm; 16 mm; 5.23 g; Archaeological museum Varna (Bulgaria).

Imhoof-Blumer 1908, Taf. X/22; Hill 1912, Pl. 6/5; SNG BM, 200; Stolyarik 2001, Pl. 2/8.

5 As previous.

AR; drachm; 20/18 mm; 5.98 g; Bobokov Bros. Coll. (Bulgaria).

6 As previous, but with letter Θ (below) on the rev.

AR; drachm; 15/17 mm; 5.80 g; Bobokov Bros. Coll. (Bulgaria).

7 As previous, but with letters Ο and Θ (below) on the rev.

AR; drachm; 16/17 mm; 5.50 g.

Tkalec (29.02.2008), #403.
The hygiene was an integral part of the everyday life in antiquity. Many medical and non-medical authors gave proof of this. It comprises not only the baths, latrines, water supply (aqueducts and pipes) and water drainage system, i.e. the social appearance, but also the personal hygiene. This means also the care of the mouth, the hair, the body, the fingernails and the toe-nails. Self-hygiene is not confined to washing, but includes cleaning, trimming, etc. Thus, it stays close not only to the cosmetics, which uses many utensils for make-up, beautification, perfuming, de-hairing, but also to the plastic surgery and dentistry, known in antiquity. The good self-hygiene at that time was adopted as a key factor for a good health. Shaving was also regarded as a very important hygienic procedure – against hair loss and other troubles (Celsus VI.4.3). By different hygienic procedures special utensils and sets, which are also known nowadays, have been used. These sets represent bronze utensils, attached to a single base. They were worn attached to the belt, which made them very comfortable to use in times of travel. This concerns the most indispensable set of instruments – a nail-trimmer, tweezers, an ear-cleaner, a razor, a tooth-piker, etc., varied in combinations.

From this point of view the hygiene and the medicine were closely related in the Roman world. Often purely cosmetic utensils have been interpreted like medical ones. Many of those with auxiliary function like tweezers, probes, spatulas, strigilae could also be used in medicine, as well as in cosmetics and for hygienic procedures. The presence of medical instruments in a closed complex, a grave for example, guarantees that other utensils are not cosmetic, but pharmaceutical or medical ones. In many case, these are female graves or of painters, comprising cosmetic or make-up utensils, and not a doctor’s or a pharmacist’s. Cosmetic utensils happened to be single ones, but of special interest are those in a set.

We are going to direct our attention to a set, which for a long time has been interpreted as a medical one. This is “the combined medical instrument”, found in a grave by the village of Lyublen, in the region of Turgovishte (Овчаров 1974, 345-352; Овчаров 1979, 33-46) (fig. 1). D. Ovcharov, who excavated the site, has identified the set as a chirurgic one, which consisted of six instruments, but only four of them have been preserved. They are attached to a silver open-work base and have been interpreted as follows: 1. an awl for tissues; 2. an ear-probe; 3. two lancets (one of them is missing at present) in the shape of a wound-extensor and 4. a drop-shaped hook, sharp-pointed at the end. There is a big spoon also attached to the base (5), most probably used for measuring drugs. According to the researcher the scalpel has been missing. This interpretation has been adopted by all Bulgarian archaeologists (Вълчева 1992, 140). The association of the set with a medical function is doubtful, because too many instruments have been attached to a single base. Thus, the utensils are unusable. Usually two medical instruments have been combined to a common handle and this is the optimal number for effective usage. The silver open-work base is also inconvenient. Silver is not a typical metal for producing medical instruments, whereas the open-work decoration would cause quick contamination of the tools. This makes a medical set extremely unhygienic and out-of-function. The fact that all instruments are
Fig. 1. The cosmetic set from a grave from Ljublen, district of Turgovishte (after Овчаров 1974).

Fig. 2. A cosmetic set with an unknown provenance from the Roman period (after Miron 1989).

Fig. 3. A travelling cosmetic set from a grave from Ventimiglia, Italy (after Miron 1989).
In 2007, during the archaeological excavations of the ancient city of *Heraclea Sintica* in Kozhuh area, Rupite village, Petrich municipality (Вагалински / Чопаков 2008) along with terracotta figurines (Cholakov 2008) and other artefacts were discovered two votive plates, made of marble, without inscription\(^1\). The first one is with an image of Heracles, the other represents Artemis.

Using epigraphically obtained data from a marble stele with inscription in Latin dated from the beginning of the IV c. AD, it is possible to determine the name of the urban area as *Heraclea* (Митрев / Тарakov 2002; Mitrev 2003). The geographical position of the city on the border of cultural influence between Thrace and Hellenistic Macedonia and its belonging to the Hellenistic world define it as an important centre for the development and propagation of the cults of Heracles and Artemis.

1. The votive plate with the figure of Heracles has a rectangular shape with rounded apex. It was broken in two parts in antiquity (fig. 1). It is made of white marble. Its dimensions are 20 x 24 x 3.5 cm. The relief is carefully carved. The figure is surrounded by a frame which is divided for better visual effect into three parts – two are vertical and one is arc-shaped at the top. The frame is 3 cm wide and has a decorative floral ornament. This style of framing is more characteristic for grave reliefs than votive plates. In stelae from *Moesia Inferior* (Conrad 2004) we have no examples of such a style. It is more typical of the region of Thrace. This style is of Greek and Asia Minor origin and is observed in Hellenistic funeral stelae. Its use continues during the Roman period mostly in the areas with long Greek art traditions (Иванов 2004). Similar in ornamentation and having equally rounded top part are some sepulchral tombstones from *Phrygia* dated to III-IV c. AD (Димитров 1939, обр. 96, 98).

On the plate Heracles is represented calm in a pose of a mighty deity. Here he is an adult male with a short beard, naked, standing, and facing forward. His head is slightly bigger than the body. The muscles are well expressed. The weight of his body rests on the right leg; the left is represented in front of the body. In his left hand, Heracles holds a club pointed up. The skin of the Nemean lion is draped over the same hand. In his right hand he holds a phiale. Beneath it is an altar. The apples from the garden of Hesperides or some other kind of fruit are represented on its top and probably a basket stands above them. This part of the representation is unusual. The altar was perhaps connected with an existing sanctuary in Antiquity. The votive plate is damaged at the image of the fruit and, in its present condition cannot be determined with certainty, if three apples are depicted. If we interpret the composition in this way, then there may be a connection with the myth of Heracles and the Hesperides. Fruit placed on an altar, on the other hand, suggests the information recounted by Pausanias about *Mycalessus*, whereby the first spring fruits were offered in the temple of Demeter and Heracles and they remained fresh until the end of the year (Pausanias, 9.19.5). Perhaps what we are seeing in this case is a similar bloodless sacrifice\(^2\). There is no other parallel of

---

\(^1\) Thanks are due to the head of the archaeological survey of *Heraclea Sintica* Dr. L. Vagalinski (National Archaeological Institute with Museum, Sofia) for presenting these plates for publication.
Fig. 1. Votive plate of Heracles (Ivo D. Cholakov).
Les παραφύλακες dans les inscriptions non anatoliennes de l’Antiquité (Ier-VIe siècle apr. J.-C.). État de la question, hypothèses et pistes de recherche*

Dominic MOREAU


“L’article Παραφύλακες de O. Schulthess a été imprimé, après la mort de l’auteur, sans la révision qui eût été indispensable et alors que l’auteur avait livré un manuscrit qui, dès lors, était une antiquité; il n’est à peu près pas de référence épigraphique qui ne renvoie à des éditions périmées et ne soit empruntée sans critique à une étude antérieure; on est découragé de signaler les erreurs et les lacunes d’un tel article, car il donne à peu près l’état de la documentation en 1908-1909 et ignore les études parues depuis lors; on ne peut que signaler aux directeurs de la

* Cette petite étude a initialement été composée pour un recueil de mélanges en l’honneur de Pierre Senay, professeur émérite de l’Université du Québec à Trois-Rivières (UQTR, Canada), chef de la mission archéologique canadienne à Carthage de 1974 à 2005, qui devrait paraître au cours des premiers mois de 2011, en tant que supplément des *Cahiers des études anciennes*. Je remercie vivement Lyudmil Vagalinski, qui m’a gentiment proposé de soumettre mon article à *Archaeologia Bulgarica*, pour une publication quasi simultanée, dans le but de favoriser davantage sa diffusion. J’exprime également ma très sincère reconnaissance à André Daviault, professeur émérite et ancien doyen de la Faculté des Lettres de l’Université Laval (Canada), qui m’a chaleureusement invité à participer à l’hommage rendu à Monsieur Senay. Même après mon “exil” en France en 2001, il a toujours insisté pour que nous demeurions en contacts réguliers. Je le considère comme l’un de mes principaux mentors, car c’est à lui que je dois ma passion pour l’Antiquité romaine, cela même si mes recherches actuelles portent sur une période beaucoup moins noble que celle à laquelle ont vécu les grands auteurs latins dont il est spécialiste. C’est avec enthousiasme qu’il a donné son accord à la double publication du présent travail, qui est, pour sa part, inspiré du mémoire de maîtrise (M.A.) en études anciennes que j’ai effectué sous la direction du professeur d’Histoire grecque Patrick Baker et déposé à la Faculté des études supérieures de l’Université Laval en août 2003: Ο παραφύλακης, ο παραφύλακας και ο ἀρχιπαραφύλακας. Les policiers montés des campagnes de l’Anatolie attalide et romaine (cf. infra, appendice). J’en profite pour renouveler mes remerciements à toutes les personnes qui m’ont lu et relu au cours de l’élaboration de mon travail de 2e cycle, en premier lieu mon directeur ainsi que les professeurs Jean-Yves Marc de l’Université de Strasbourg (de la section qui s’appelait naguère Université Marc Bloch – Strasbourg II, France) et Gaétan Thériault de l’Université du Québec à Montréal (UQAM, Canada). Je témoigne à nouveau ma gratitude à ce dernier qui a aimablement accepté de jeter un coup d’œil aux traductions qui sont proposées dans les lignes qui suivent. Cependant, je précise que je demeure le seul responsable de tout problème éventuel que l’on pourrait trouver, je suis également redevable à ma compagne, Iva, qui m’a permis d’utiliser pleinement la bibliographie bulgare en la traduisant en français, et à sa cousine, Evgenia, qui s’est rendue pour moi à la Nationalna bibiloteka “Sv. Sv. Kiril i Metodiy” de Sofia. Je m’en voudrais enfin d’oublier Laetitia Pascolini, bibliothécaire chargée des fonds bulgares et russes à la Bibliothèque interuniversitaire des langues orientales de Paris, qui m’a gracieusement fourni la photocopie d’extraits d’ouvrages difficilement trouvables ailleurs en France, ainsi que mon ami Nicolas Laubry, maître de conférences à l’Université Paris-Est Créteil Val de Marne (UPEC, France), qui m’a, lui aussi, aidé dans la collecte de certaines données. En ce qui concerne les abréviations des intitulés des publications de sources épigraphiques et papyrologiques ici utilisées, elles se conforment à celles du *Supplementum epigraphicum Graecum* (à l’instant où ces lignes sont écrites, la liste n’est plus disponible sur le site institutionnel: http://www.hum.leiden.edu/history/)
Statistical Data on the Archaeological Fieldwork in Bulgaria, Season 2009

Ivo D. CHOLAKOV / Krastyu CHUKALEV

The article presents the statistical data and analysis concerning the archaeological field research in Bulgaria during 2009. The bulk of the facts has been collected via electronic inquiry organized by the authors, while the rest comes from the annual National Archaeological Conference on the field research held in the National Institute of Archaeology and Museum at the Bulgarian Academy of Sciences (NIAM – BAS) during February 22nd – March 11th 2010. We perform a similar statistical study for the fourth successive year. All the comparisons here discussed have been grounded upon data released within analyses of the previous archaeological seasons (Cholakov / Chukalev 2008a; Cholakov / Chukalev 2008b; Vagalinski et al. 2008; Cholakov / Chukalev 2009; Чолаков / Чукалев 2010; Cholakov / Chukalev 2010).

The criteria applied to process statistically the data collected are as follows: chronology and type of the site, type of the excavations and complementary interdisciplinary studies, institution the researcher works for, international participation, duration and financial support of the research, location of the site. Their full description was presented with the statistical data for season 2007 (Cholakov / Chukalev 2008b, 89).

The total number of the archaeological excavations in Bulgaria in 2009 is 263. Figure 1 shows their distribution according to the chronology. Some of the sites contain structures and artefacts dating from different periods and thus they are presented in their own right. Three of the sites do not reveal clear archaeological structures or the structures exposed do not allow their precise dating. Once again the number of sites dating from Antiquity is the greatest one as they prevail in general on the territory of Bulgaria. In 2009 there were two particular sites relating to the post-medieval age. As a matter of fact, structures and artefacts from the same period are present and explored at many multi-layered archaeological sites. Figure 2 shows the types of archaeological sites explored in 2009. Archaeological material was missing in eight of them and thus it is not possible to interpret them precisely. The 2009 data do not differ essentially from the results of the previous years. Traditionally, the settlements investigated are greatest in number in any of the periods (fig. 3). It is important to note that elements of the rest of the site types have been explored within a great deal of settlements. For instance, cult areas, grave structures, production centres, etc. have been revealed within the boundaries of some settlements. In 2009, the necropoleis dating from the Antiquity were the most numerous. The analysis proves that the tumular necropoleis prevail in number. They are 24, as the antique ground necropoleis are only five. During the last two archaeological seasons we observe a certain decrease of the number of cult areas under excavation. This circumstance pertains mainly to the Middle Ages and as the greatest number of similar sites belongs to these periods. The Palaeolithic deposits and production centres are smallest in number. It is quite natural concerning the Palaeolithic deposits, as they are not frequently registered on the territory of the country, and it takes a long time for them to be thoroughly studied. Production centres are discovered within the limits of larger sites such as town centres, as well as of smaller settlements, and more seldom as...
STATISTICAL DATA ON THE ARCHAEOLOGICAL FIELDWORK IN BULGARIA, SEASON 2009

Fig. 2. Types of investigated archaeological sites in Bulgaria in 2009.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Site</th>
<th>Palaeolithic sites</th>
<th>Settlements</th>
<th>Necropoleis</th>
<th>Cult sites</th>
<th>Production centres</th>
<th>Unclear type</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prehistory</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prehistory and other period</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antiquity</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antiquity and other period</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Ages</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Ages and other period</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-Medieval</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unclear chronology</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>263</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 3. Distribution of archaeological sites excavated in 2009 in Bulgaria according to type and chronology.

Fig. 4. Distribution of archaeological sites excavated in 2009 in Bulgaria according to duration and chronology.

Fig. 5. Distribution of archaeological sites excavated in 2009 in Bulgaria according to their duration and type.
Metal tools are often found during archaeological excavations, but they are rarely given a proper treatment as regular archaeological finds. Being made of metal alone indicates that they are practically always corroded and without laboratory treatment, many of them are even unrecognizable. That is why many of them end up among forgotten artefacts in different museum collections. Besides, many metal tools are chronologically rather insensible, which could explain why archaeologists often show no or very little interest in dealing with such finds. Still, this book, along with some other publications with similar titles, shows that there are experts who are willing to "struggle" with such topics and succeeding in showing how interesting metal tools can be. Despite their unlikable appearance, finds of metal tools bear information on every-day life, on agriculture, stock-breeding and many crafts, like building and constructing, wood, metal and leather processing, mining, as well as hunting and fishing.

The book "Roman and Early Byzantine Metal Tools on the Territory of Bulgaria (the 1st – the beginning of the 7th century)" has 204 pages of text: the main text (pages 5-176) and a Summary in English translation (pages 177-204). After the text, there is a list of used bibliography, divided into the one written in Cyrillic alphabet (pages 205-215) and the one written in Latin alphabet (pages 215-224). The next part of the book includes illustrations, consisting of diagrams, drawings, photographs and maps. On the back cover of the book there is a CV of the author, both in Bulgarian and in English.

At the very beginning, there is an introduction (pages 5-13) and an overview of archaeological research concerning metal tools – short descriptions of archaeological excavations which yielded larger amounts of metal tools and various publications deriving from them (pages 13-19).

The main text of this book is divided into eight chapters:

Tools connected with agriculture (pages 21-83) include ploughshares (seven types), sheaths (two types), shovels (three types), turf cutters (one type), billhooks (seven types), sickles (two types), scythes (five types), hoes (nineteen types) and plough-staffs (three types). They represent more than a half (54.3%) of all the tools studied in this book, indicating how expressive the agrarian character of the Roman Empire was.

Before naming all these tools, a short overview of cereals, vegetables and fruits grown in antiquity is given. This overview is based not only on finds recovered during archaeological excavations, but also on data supplied by ancient authors, like Homer, Herodotus, Polybius, Columella and most of all, Cato. Cato even gives measures and numbers concerning sizes of farms, fruit-trees grown on them, number of cattle needed and the necessary number of tools to be used. After that, Cholakov discusses the ownership and ways of using of the land during Roman and Byzantine times in Moesia and Thracia.

For all of the agricultural tools, finding places and contexts are given, their description, exact purpose and way of using, as well as dating.

Tools connected with stock breeding (pages 83-95) include currycombs (one type), brands (two types), bells (two types) and shears (two types). As an introduction to this chapter, data about the beginning of stock-breeding in the area concerned are given. Animal breeds are named which were kept for gaining food (meat and milk), clothes (wool and leather) and specific sorts of objects, like tools or jewelry (bone, leather). The distinction is made between animal breeds kept before and after the Roman occupation of Moesia and Thracia, since during the latter phase, some new breeds were introduced.

According to the number of tools connected with stock breeding, Cholakov shows that two thirds of such tools were found in Northern Bulgaria and only one third in Southern Bulgaria. A similar conclusion was already drawn for agricultural tools, thus showing that