



MEETINGS OF CULTURES
BETWEEN CONFLICTS
AND COEXISTENCE

*Edited by
Pia Guldager Bilde and Jane Hjarl Petersen*

MEETINGS OF CULTURES
IN THE BLACK SEA REGION

BLACK SEA STUDIES

8

THE DANISH NATIONAL RESEARCH FOUNDATION'S
CENTRE FOR BLACK SEA STUDIES

MEETINGS OF
CULTURES IN THE
BLACK SEA REGION

BETWEEN CONFLICT AND COEXISTENCE

Edited by

Pia Guldager Bilde and Jane Hjarl Petersen

AARHUS UNIVERSITY PRESS 

MEETINGS OF CULTURES
IN THE BLACK SEA REGION

© Aarhus University Press and the authors 2008

Cover design by Pia Guldager Bilde & Jacob Munk Højte. Limestone relief showing reclining Herakles (Černomorskoe Museum); in the background the steppe south of Panskoe

ISBN 978 87 7934 654 3

AARHUS UNIVERSITY PRESS
Langelandsgade 177
DK-8200 Aarhus N

White Cross Mills
Lancaster LA1 4XS
England

Box 511
Oakville, CT 06779
USA

www.unipress.dk

The publication of this volume has been made possible by a generous grant from The Danish National Research Foundation and Aarhus University's Research Foundation.



Danish National Research Foundation's
Centre for Black Sea Studies
Building 1451
University of Aarhus
DK-8000 Aarhus C
www.pontos.dk

Contents

Preface	9
---------	---

SETTING THE SCENE

Jurij A. Vinogradov

Rhythms of Eurasia and the Main Historical Stages of the Kimmerian Bosphoros in Pre-Roman Times	13
--	----

Pia Guldager Bilde

Some Reflections on Eschatological Currents, Diasporic Experience, and Group Identity in the Northwestern Black Sea Region	29
---	----

Valentina Mordvintseva

Phalerae of Horse Harnesses in Votive Depositions of the 2nd-1st century BC in the North Pontic Region and the Sarmatian Paradigm	47
--	----

SPACES OF IDENTITY

Peter Attema

Conflict or Coexistence? Remarks on Indigenous Settlement and Greek Colonization in the Foothills and Hinterland of the Sibaritide (Northern Calabria, Italy)	67
---	----

Alexandre Baralis

The Chora Formation of the Greek Cities of Aegean Thrace. Towards a Chronological Approach to the Colonization Process	101
---	-----

Michael Vickers and Amiran Kakhidze

A Kolchian and Greek Settlement: Excavations at Pičvnari 1967 to 2005	131
---	-----

CLAIMING THE LAND

Jakob Munk Højte

The Cities that Never Were. Failed Attempts at Colonization in the Black Sea 149

Alexander V. Karjaka

The Defense Wall in the Northern Part of the Lower City of Olbia Pontike 163

Alexander V. Karjaka

The Demarcation System of the Agricultural Environment of Olbia Pontike 181

Alexander V. Gavrilov

The First Results of the Archaeological Surveys Near Cape Čauda and Lake Kačik on the Kerch Peninsula 193

Tatiana N. Smekalova

Archaeological Sites of the Southwestern Part of Bosporos and their Connection to the Landscape 207

THE DYNAMICS OF CULTURAL EXCHANGE

Jane Hjarl Petersen

Kurgan Burials from Nymphaion – A New Approach 215

Nadežda A. Gavriljuk

Social and Economic Stratification of the Scythians from the Steppe Region Based on Black-glazed Pottery from Burials 237

Latife Summerer

Indigenous Responses to Encounters with the Greeks in Northern Anatolia: The Reception of Architectural Terracottas in the Iron Age Settlements of the Halys Basin 263

Natalia G. Novičenkova

Mountainous Crimea: A Frontier Zone of Ancient Civilization 287

<i>Emzar Kakhidze</i> Apsaros: A Roman Fort in Southwestern Georgia	303
--	-----

MIND THE GAP

<i>Robin Osborne</i> Reciprocal Strategies: Imperialism, Barbarism and Trade in Archaic and Classical Olbia	333
--	-----

<i>David Braund</i> Scythian Laughter: Conversations in the Northern Black Sea Region in the 5th Century BC	347
--	-----

<i>George Hinge</i> Dionysos and Herakles in Scythia – The Eschatological String of Herodotos' Book 4	369
--	-----

<i>Indices</i>	399
----------------	-----

<i>Contributors</i>	421
---------------------	-----

Preface

Meetings of cultures in the Black Sea region, ranging from conflicts to coexistence, was the topic of the Danish National Research Foundation's Centre for Black Sea Studies' seventh international conference. Meetings of cultures is an overarching theme which forms an umbrella over most of the Centre's activities. It is also a theme which arouses strong feelings, because modern identity formation – not just in the Black Sea region – is to a significant extent still tied to this more distant part of the region's past, as we learnt especially from the contribution by *V. Mordvintseva*. Thus, it was with great expectation – and also some trepidation – that we in January 2006 embarked upon this venture together with a group of Eastern and Western European colleagues.

Because of the different backgrounds of the participants, and because it was needed to bridge the gap between those scholars for whom Black Sea studies are local history and for those whom it is “just” another part of Antiquity, it is unavoidable not to operate with much elasticity in the very concept of culture. Therefore, in the present context we use it as a pragmatic, analytic category.

As is well known, from the remotest Antiquity the indigenous and nomadic non-Greek populations of the Pontic region were persistently viewed as one of the major “Others” (e.g. Hartog 1980). And because the region geographically was located as a bridge between Europe and Asia it was, and still is, also part of a Europe/Asia discourse of dichotomy (cf. Neumann 1998). The region and its non-Greek inhabitants were thus doubly “othered” foremost by the Mediterranean Greeks.

As far back in time as Antiquity, Western self-understanding and identity formation has been shaped not least through its colonial experiences (Stein 2005, 16, 22). With colonies in India, the Caribbean, and Africa, as well as rule over the Faroe Islands, Iceland and Greenland, even a small country like Denmark has been a colonial “power” for more than 600 years. Until recently, such colonial experience has led to a very static picture in our analysis of colonial encounters. However, as a result of post-colonialism, post-modernism and now globalization our conception of colonization has undergone a rapid and far-reaching conceptual change. Gone are the days when the Black Sea region was seen as a sea of barbarian wilds enlightened by small flicks of Greek civilization along the coast. Accordingly, we prefer using the terms ‘meeting’ or ‘encounter’ whereby we want to emphasize the dynamic nature of the cultural interaction, and by using the term settler rather than colonist, we avoid much heavy semantic baggage of former times. A similar approach has recently been proposed by E.K. Petropoulos in his book from 2005, *Hel-*

lenic Colonization in Euxeinos Pontos: Penetration, Early Establishment, and the Problem of "emporion" Revisited, in which he suggests that the ancient Greek word *apoikismos* is used instead of colonization.

At the conference there was a general tendency to draw the lines between the "Them" and "Us" dichotomy less sharply than had been the case in previous research, as well as a more obvious focus on the successful meetings of cultures and coexistence instead of on conflicts and on what did not succeed. This follows a general trend in the study of colonial encounters, i.e. emphasis is on how the practices of colonialism had a pervasive and transformative impact on the cultures of *all* groups involved neither discriminating the colonized nor the colonizer. Accordingly, this results in a less hierarchical approach to the understanding of cultural interactions.

The self/other perspective upon the region is more readily visible in the literary sources created in the Mediterranean than it is in the local, material sources, be they epigraphy or archaeology. This becomes evident in the four different contributions that discuss the same narrative source, namely the Scythian *logos* in Herodotos' Fourth Book (*D. Braund, P. Guldager Bilde, G. Hinge, and R. Osborne*). All four target the question of the culture and identity of Greeks and Scythians and their interplay (or lack of same), and as foreseeable, the result of the individual analyses is quite different. Thus, as formulated by R. Osborne, the material sources in the quest for an understanding of the identity formation on the local level are to be privileged.

Life in the world of ideas and lived or real life are two very different things. Surely, settling the Black Sea region was a challenge for the Greeks. Compared with the Mediterranean, this happened relatively late, and as explicated in the paper by *J.M. Højte*, the attempts at settling the land were not always equally successful. So when viewed with Mediterranean eyes, the Black Sea region was a marginal one, and even though vain attempts were made to prove the contrary no Mycenaean or even Greek Iron Age material has been found, and the region is also completely devoid of Phoenician colonies.

A number of papers presented at the conference discussed the physical arena of the colonial encounters, namely the production zones surrounding the newly founded cities and settlements. Because of the various claims laid upon the territory, space had to be negotiated all the time, and it is obvious that there were many ways of managing the landscape. Three contributions in this volume, not presented at the conference, provide new insights into the physical management with systematic land divisions (*A.V. Gavrilov, A.V. Karjaka, and T.N. Smekalova*), and such projects surely could only function in periods of collaboration if not outright co-habitation.

It was in the countryside that the meeting of settlers and indigenous tribes mostly took place. Two of the papers (*P. Attema and A. Baralis & A. Riapov*) showed how the various ethnic groups settled in different but neighbouring ecological zones. This was particularly clear in the case of Aegean Thrace as shown by *Baralis & Riapov*, but also in the territory of Sybaris something

similar took place according to *Attema*. The same pattern can clearly be seen around the Džarylgač Lake in western Crimea, where Greeks and barbarians settled at each margin of the demarcated agricultural zone, as established in the Danish Black Sea Centre's ongoing fieldwork (Bilde et al. 2007). The management of widely extended *chorai*, the Metapontion model, seems to be characteristic of the Black Sea region. This must be considered revealing for the Greek-barbarian relationship in the region. Settling side by side – and even burying their dead side by side but in separate plots is visible in the necropolis of Pičvnari as shown by *M. Vickers & A. Kakhidze*.

Although we are obliged to accept that the power balance in many instances was in favour of the indigenous population, the cultivation of the land and the establishment of exchange systems must nevertheless, as stressed by *D. Braund* and *J.M. Højte*, have been beneficial for all participants in the exchange network.

Several papers investigate the dynamics of the cultural exchange of various types of goods. *N. Gavriljuk* discusses the function of Attic black-glazed pottery in the tombs of the Forrest Steppe Scythians. The paper by *L. Summerer* gives an interesting insight into the creative reception, emulation, and transformation of architectural terracottas and their ornamentation between the South Coast of the Black Sea (Sinope, Amisos) and the hinterland, in the double-cultural influence from the Greek, one the hand, and from Anatolia, on the other. In the paper by *N. Novicenkova*, on a hilltop sanctuary near Gurzuf in the Mountain Crimea a portrait is painted of a central place in the Taurian culture, where votives of Mediterranean and Bosphoran types show a close connection with the surrounding cultures.

In general, the perception of how it was to be Greek in the Pontic realm was heavily debated at the conference. Was there a thick or a thin coherence (cf. Sewell 1999)? How much influence – if any – was exerted by the indigenous tribes upon the Greek settlers? And vice versa? And how do we weigh the individual building blocks of identity, such as ethnic affiliation, gender, age, status etc., against each other? Several papers agree that status and power were perhaps more important markers than ethnicity (*D. Braund*, *P. Guldager Bilde*, *J. Hjarl Petersen*), and *P. Guldager Bilde* even attempted to turn the discussion upside-down in her attempt to introduce the term *diaspora* as a means of obtaining a glimpse of the psychological side effects of settling abroad within a comparative sociological framework.

Five contributions included in this publication were not presented at the conference. However, since they fit well with the theme and/or present important new relevant data are they included here (*A.V. Gavrilov*, *G. Hinge*, *A.V. Karjaka*, and *T.N. Smekalova*). The papers in the publication are for the most part grouped thematically. The book opens with the broader historical context as presented by *J.A. Vinogradov* and *V. Mordvintseva*, in addition to reflections on the psychology in the process of settling by *P. Guldager Bilde*. A section follows with three papers discussing the spaces of identity as found

in the *chorai* of Sybaris by P. Attema, and Aegean Thrace by A. Baralis. Five contributions bring us close to the theme of conflict and coexistence. J.M. Højte discusses the occasions where Greek settling failed, and A.V. Karjaka brings us the new data on the excavation of the city wall in Olbia. This manifest marker of latent conflicts teach us (as did D. Braund's contribution) that conflicts are found not alone between the Greeks and the barbarians, but equally among Greeks themselves, because what may have left the most significant traces of destruction in Olbia around the city wall, may have been caused by Alexander's general, Zopyrion, rather than groups of barbarians. In this section, also the second contribution by A.V. Karjaka and the papers by A.V. Gavrillov and T.N. Smekalova give further details as to the actual territory management. Then follows a section on the dynamics of cultural exchange seen from a perspective, on the one hand, of power rather than ethnicity (J. Hjarl Petersen) and, on the other hand from various indigenous tribes – be they steppe Scythians (N. Gavriljuk), Anatolian (L. Summerer), or Taurian (N. Novičenkova). Included also is a paper on Roman Apsaros at the border of the Roman limes (E. Kakhidze). Finally, three papers consider the reciprocal strategies exerted by the Greeks and Scythians in Olbia as described in Herodotos' Fourth Book of his Histories (R. Osborne, D. Braund, and G. Hinge). Together the three papers fully explicate how we also describe ourselves when we describe the "others". Self and other are two sides of the same coin – yesterday, today and, tomorrow.

Before finishing this preface, it is a great pleasure for us to extend our heartfelt gratitude to colleagues at the Centre, who have helped to make this book: Kristina W. Jacobsen, who did a lot of editing, Jakob M. Højte who undertook the hard job of editing the illustrations, and finally Elena Stolba for checking transliterations. The articles were linguistically revised by Robin Wildfang and Stacy Cozart.

Pia Guldager Bilde and Jane Hjarl Petersen

Bibliography

- Guldager Bilde, P., P. Attema, S.B. Lancov, T.N. Smekalova, V.F. Stolba, T. de Haas & K. Winther Jakobsen 2007. Džarylgačskij issledovatel'skij proekt. Resultaty sezona 2007g, *Bosporskij Fenomen*, 107-118.
- Hartog, F. 1980. *Le miroir d'Herodote. Essai sur la représentation de l'autre*. Paris.
- Neumann, I.B. 1998. *Uses of the Other. "The East" in European Identity Formation* (Borderlines 9). Minneapolis.
- Petropoulos, E.K. 2005. *Hellenic Colonization in Euxeinos Pontos: Penetration, Early Establishment, and the Problem of "emporion" Revisited* (British Archaeological Reports International Series 1394). Oxford.
- Sewell, Jr., W.H. 1999. The Concept(s) of Culture, in: V.E. Bonnell & L. Hunt (eds.), *Beyond The Cultural Turn: New Direction in the Study of Society and Culture*. Berkeley.
- Stein, G.J. (ed.) 2005. *The Archaeology of Colonial Encounters*. Santa Fe.

Rhythms of Eurasia and the Main Historical Stages of the Kimmerian Bosporos in Pre-Roman Times

Jurij A. Vinogradov

Two centuries of studies on the Kimmerian Bosporos have played an enormous role in our understanding of this region of the ancient world. Only in recent years, however, thanks to large-scale archaeological research carried out on the sites of Bosporos and other ancient centers of the northern Black Sea littoral and on the adjacent territories inhabited by local tribes, has it become possible to offer a pattern of historical development for the region which differs from the customary division of ancient history into Archaic, Classical, Hellenistic and Roman periods, or, more precisely, which concretizes it, considers its regional peculiarities, and provides it with local nuances.¹ Among the regional peculiarities, the development of Greek-native (or Greek-barbarian) interrelations in the northern Black Sea area, and especially the determination of the stages connected with the advance of new nomadic tribes (Scythians, Sarmatians) from the East, must be considered the most important.

In truth, the most important feature of the Greek colonies of the Northern Pontic area was the fact that they interacted with the very mobile world of the Eurasian nomads.² Periodical movements of nomads from east to west (approximately one every 200 years) resulted in serious alterations in the military-political situation of the region,³ impacting the development of all the people and states adjacent to the steppe zone. Nomadic tribes determined the local military-political situation because of their military strength and significant mobility, thereby also heavily influencing the economic situation, not only within the territories inhabited by local tribes but also in the ancient *poleis* of the northern coast of the Black Sea, including Bosporos.

Nomadic invasions of new territories led, as a rule, to military crises, lengthy wars, etc. The period of invasion itself as a rule lasted approximately 30-50 years. After this period, a second stage occurred, characterized by the nomads' establishment of their leadership over the "new motherland", and a systematic extra-economic exploitation of the settled and semi-settled populations of the region. This stage was a time of stable and relatively peaceful relations in the steppes and adjacent territories (it lasted 100 years or more). The third stage is characterized by a crisis in the nomadic economy, the end of which was connected with a new wave of eastern nomads and a new period of instability.

Among the Greek states of the Black Sea coast, the Kimmerian Bosporos was situated as the very first advanced post on the route of barbarian movements from the East. The rhythms of Eurasia determined the main historical stages of its development. The history of the Kimmerian Bosporos in pre-Roman times may be subdivided into the following seven main stages:

Stage 1. Settling the region (600-480 BC)

During this phase, Greek appropriation of the littoral of the Strait of Kerch took place, and of a series of *apoikiai* in this territory were established as well as contacts with neighboring local tribes. Sound reasons exist for assuming that Greek penetration into the northeastern Black Sea area and the Sea of Azov began at an early date. Material from the ancient settlement located at present-day Taganrog suggests that it was founded as early as the third quarter of the 7th century BC.⁴ The bulk of the settlements around the Strait of Kerch, however, were founded later, between the first and second quarters of the 6th century BC.⁵ Why did the colonists not cross the Strait earlier? Why did they not found any colonies in the Bosporos itself? Perhaps this was due to the demographic situation there? At any rate, in the relatively small territory of Bosporos numerous Greek settlements first arose at a later date,⁶ unlike other areas of Greek colonization in the northern Black Sea region. Some were *apoikiai* or *city-states* (Pantikapaion, Nymphaion, Phanagoria, Hermonassa, Kepoi, Sindian Harbour = Gorgippia), while other settlements – several dozen known from written sources and archaeological evidence – were most probably founded as a result of internal colonization of the region (Myrmekion, Tyritake, Porthmion, etc.).⁷ It is interesting that the earliest settlements of the European Bosporos were rather large units, later transformed into towns. I believe this development was caused by demographic factors: the proximity of pre-Caucasian Scythia and the periodic movements of groups of Scythians through Bosporos (Hdt. 4.28).⁸ To my mind, these periodic movements were the most important factor for the demographic situation here. This is probably why the Bosporans could not create a system of agricultural settlements around the towns similar to that of the Olbia region.⁹

There exist sound reasons for assuming that the Greek colonial settlements appear to have proceeded unhindered without threat from external enemies. Sometime around the middle of the 6th century BC, however, the Greek settlements met with substantial reverses. These reverses are apparent first of all in the traces of large-scale fires in Kepoi, Myrmekion and Porthmion.¹⁰ Development of the Taganrog settlement stopped at approximately the same time as well.¹¹ It is interesting that in Myrmekion and Porthmion the remnants of early fortifications (from the second half of the 6th century BC) were found.¹² These are the earliest fortification systems currently known in the northern Black Sea area.

The results of contemporary archaeological studies enable us to assume

that almost all Greek settlements originally had a rather primitive “semi-barbarian” architectural appearance with semi-dugout dwellings and household buildings. The period of construction of dugouts apparently ended some 70-80 years after the foundation of the settlement. At that time all semi-dugouts were covered with earth, and in their place buildings constructed above-ground, paved yards and streets etc. were erected. The creation of these urban structures may be seen as the completion of the colonists’ period of adaptation to the difficult climatic, ecological and demographic conditions of the region.¹³ From this time until approximately the end of the first quarter of the 5th century BC they were at the peak of their powers in all aspects of life.

Stage 2. The rule of the Archaianaktids (480/79-438/7 BC)

The rule of the Archaianaktids is only described by one ancient source (Diod. 12.31.1). Archaeological material, however, demonstrates that this was a time of noticeable instability on the steppes of the northern Black Sea area, related to an increased Scythian aggressiveness. This may be explained by a number of factors,¹⁴ but the most important of them is probably the westward advance of a new Scythian tribe from the eastern Eurasian steppe.¹⁵ These new nomads had, from an archaeological point of view, a rather different material culture, but the differences seem not to have appeared significant to the Greeks, who extended the same ethnic-name, “Scythians”, to them too.

It seems to have been these new groups who were responsible for the increasing aggressiveness recorded by all sources: for example, the political and military expansion into the Balkans (Hdt. 4.40) and the growth of internecine warfare, which, by the second quarter of the 5th century BC, had become endemic.¹⁶ As a result of these changes, the Greek colonies of the region found themselves in a very complicated situation. Numerous rural settlements in the lower Bug area and the Dniester area ceased to exist.¹⁷ Traces of fire were revealed in many Bosphoran sites, and in some of them defense installations were erected (Pantikapaion, Myrmekion, Tyritake, Porthmion, Phanagoria).¹⁸

Under these conditions, the Bosphoran *poleis* seem to have united into a defensive union headed by the Archaianaktid dynasty (Diod. 12.31.1). In joining forces they were able to withstand the Scythian onslaught. The union of Archaianaktids should hardly be treated as one indivisible state or one power, however. I would like to point out some facts: the minting of Phanagoria and Nymphaion in later times¹⁹ and the burial mounds of the nomadic nobility near Nymphaion, Pantikapaion, Phanagoria, Kepoi and probably Hermonassa, with their traditional constructions appeared precisely at the time of the Archaianaktids.²⁰ So we should consider the possibility that within this union, the Bosphoran *apoikiai* preserved a certain degree of independence.²¹

Stage 3. The early rule of the Spartokids and the Golden Age of Bosporos and Scythia (438/7-c. 300 BC)

In 438/7 BC the power of Bosporos passed to Spartokos (Diod. 12.31.1). It was approximately at this time that a period of stability commenced in the northern Black Sea area, leading to the Golden Age of Great Scythia.²² The gradual reduction of conflict in the steppes down to the third quarter of the 5th century BC appears to have been the precondition for a general stabilization and development of economic and cultural life throughout the region. From 430 BC onwards, the Greeks began to re-colonize the agricultural territories of the northwestern Black Sea coast.²³

All categories of sources state that this Golden Age in the Kimmerian Bosporos ran from the last third of the 5th to the beginning of the 3rd century BC. One of the very obvious signs of the favorable military-political situation in the region was the development of the Bosporan *chora*, the historical peak of which fell within this period.²⁴ During the second half of the 4th century BC, a small Bosporan colony seems to have operated as a separate Greek quarter within the barbarian settlement of Elizavetovskoe in the Don delta.²⁵

The first Spartokids are known to have carried out an active policy aimed at strengthening their state and expanding its borders.²⁶ Satyros I occupied Nymphaion and tried to take Theodosia; Leukon I seized Theodosia, Phanagoria and the territories of a number of local tribes on the Asian side of Bosporos: Sindoi, Toretoi, Kerketai, etc. It was under Leukon that the Greek-barbarian Bosporan Kingdom took shape with its mixed culture very vividly manifested in the burials of the Bosporan elite – the famous burial mounds of the Kimmerian Bosporos. The new structure of the state corresponded with the new topography of the local nobility's burials. These mounds were grouped around the two capitals of Bosporos, Pantikapaion and Phanagoria, with the former group more numerous and important (the Kul'-Oba, the Patinioti Barrow, the Kekuvatskij Barrow, etc.).²⁷ These *tumuli* show the direction of the main political and cultural links with the steppes of the northern Black Sea area, indicating the presence of an alliance with close relations between Scythia and Bosporos.²⁸ This alliance could only exist as long as the situation in the region remained relatively stable, however.

Greater Scythia gradually reached a period of crisis, as well as a weakening in the political and military sphere. In this sense, the period when the most Scythian "royal" kurgans full of gold and silver were constructed – the second half of the 4th century BC – can be thought of as Scythia's "Golden Autumn".²⁹ An important point is that in Bosporos things began to change, too. From Demosthenes' speech we know of the war of the Bosporan King Pairisades I against the Scythians, which resulted in difficulties in trade (Dem. 34.8). Yet that war was just a symptom of future difficulties.

The conflict between Pairisades' sons in 310/09 BC (Diod. 20.22-24) should most probably not be considered a simple internecine dissension or a small-

scale civil war.³⁰ The brothers' quarrel over the Bosporan throne happened during a struggle in the region between two ethnic and political groupings – the Scythians and Sarmatians. It seems quite natural that Satyros II and Prytanis were supported by the Scythians, the traditional allies of Bosporos, while the offended Eumelos was backed, most probably, by the Sarmatians (Syrakoi).³¹ And it was Eumelos who was the winner in this war!

It is significant that these two local wars do not have any signs of crisis or large-scale disorders connected with them. All the disorders related to them were of short duration. Of course, a war is always bloody and tragic, but archaeological data demonstrates that the second half of the 4th century BC was a flourishing period in Bosporan history. It was a proper "Golden Age"! To my mind, a local war could not have been a reason for the large-scale crisis in Bosporos. Instead, the reason for the crisis was connected with global changes in the world of the nomads of the Northern Pontic area.

Stage 4. A time of crisis (first half of the 3rd century BC)

The first half of the 3rd century BC may be defined in the history of the northern Black Sea area as a period of instability connected with the downfall of Greater Scythia. It seems that the fatal blow which internally weakened Scythia was dealt at around 300 BC by a new wave of nomads – the Sarmatians.³² The first wave of the Sarmatian migration from the East was apparently connected with the Syrakoi and Aorsoi. Probably it also involved the "Royal" Sarmatians.³³ This migration precipitated a crisis, deeper than that of the 5th century BC, throughout the entire system. The Sarmatians seem to have delivered a number of fierce blows against the Scythians, though failing to secure themselves a place in the area of Scythia. For a relatively long time the territory where their tribes roamed was found to the east – in the trans-Don and Kuban' areas – while the steppes of the northern coast were practically empty until the 2nd century BC.³⁴ The cause of such an unusual phenomenon may have been Celtic expansion here from the West. Possibly, it was in the trans-Dnieper area that the two expansions – western (Celtic) and eastern (Sarmatian) – clashed with each other. Neither was able to gain a final victory, and so the steppes of the northern Black Sea area remained for a long time a "no man's land".³⁵

All Greek centers along the Black Sea coast faced a difficult period of adaptation to contemporary realities. In the area of the Bosporos and in other Greek city-states of the region the *chora* settlements, the most vulnerable to hostile attack, disappeared, due to the unsettled conditions of the end of the first third of the 3rd century BC.³⁶ The most eloquent picture of the downfall resulting from these military attacks has been uncovered in some of the sites in the eastern Crimea,³⁷ where in many town centers active construction of fortifications began.³⁸ I am not aware of the identity of the perpetrators of this catastrophe, but one may assume that it was the leftover groups of Scythians,

who had been driven to the Crimea from the northern Black Sea area and who were in the process of securing new living space for themselves.³⁹ A monetary crisis connected with the crisis of the grain trade, which befell the Bosporan Kingdom as well as other Greek states of the region, was an important consequence of the changes that took place during this period of time.⁴⁰

On the Asian side of the coast, closer to the territories inhabited by the Sarmatians, the situation seems to have been worse than on the European side, although, there is little concrete evidence of this.⁴¹ Still, on the Semibratnee site a destruction level related to that time has been noted,⁴² but it is likely that relations with the new neighbors soon normalized. One should hardly consider it accidental that in the civil war of Pairisades' sons, Eumelos, backed by the Syrakoi, was the victor. He must also have adhered to this political alignment later on. Unsurprisingly, at the end of the 4th century BC, the Elizavetinskoe site at the Kuban' River became an important point of Bosporan influence over the Kuban' area.⁴³ It is important to note that from this point onwards burials of the local nobility began to take place only in the Asiatic part of the Bosporos. In the territory of the eastern Crimea the latest burial of this type – the Ak-Burun Barrow excavated in 1875 – manifests explicit Maiotian-Sarmatian features. It dates to about the end of the 4th century BC.⁴⁴

At that time, a similar situation has been identified in the Don estuary, which was close to the route of the Sarmatian campaigns. As shown by the archaeological excavations at the Elizavetovskoe site, a Bosporan colony moved there at the very beginning of the 3rd century BC. It did not last long, however, and was burnt down in the 280-270s BC, probably as a result of the Sarmatian attack.⁴⁵ Yet, almost simultaneously, Tanais appeared,⁴⁶ and became a major point for Bosporan influence in the trans-Don area (Strab. 7.4.5).

Stage 5. A Bosporan renaissance (c. 250-c. 150 BC)

Following M. Rostovcev, the second half of the 3rd to the first half of the 2nd century BC may be called a period of cultural *renaissance* in the history of the Bosporan Kingdom.⁴⁷ This was again connected with a period of relative stability in the steppes of the northern Black Sea area, more evident in the eastern part of the region than elsewhere.⁴⁸

It is in Bosporos that the most prominent signs of the revival of rural settlements may be seen, many of which though (and this is quite telling) had fortifications.⁴⁹ The state's financial system gradually recovered from the collapse. The important financial changes were connected with the reform of Leukon II.⁵⁰

On the Asian side, rich burial mounds of the local nobility were erected (the complexes of Mount Vasjurinskaja, Buerova Mogila, Merdžany, etc.).⁵¹ The impression is given that at this stage close, allied relations were preserved and developed with the local tribes of the trans-Don and Kuban' areas.

Stage 6. A new period of instability (mid- to late 2nd century BC)

Sometime around the middle of the 2nd century BC this situation broke down, and the relatively trouble-free epoch ended. From beyond the Don new nomadic tribes began to advance westwards. The depth of this crisis was a direct result of the high frequency with which successive waves of nomads arrived, creating no reliable basis for the prolonged consolidation of geographically and politically stable structures or federations in the region.⁵² According to Strabon's text (Strab. 7.3.17), this second wave of Sarmatian migration can be linked with the Roxolanoi, Iazyges, and, possibly the Ourgoi. Probably it also involved the "Royal" Sarmatians, who, as mention above, may have been living in the steppes of the Don region and who Strabon recorded as occupying the right bank of the Dnieper River.⁵³ Another group which must have been related to this wave was the Satarchoi. Pliny records that these people crossed the Don River (Plin. *NH* 6.22), and one inscription mentions their presence in the Crimea in the second half of the 2nd century BC (*IOSPE* I², 672).⁵⁴ The Aspourgianoï appeared in the Asian part of Bosporos (Strab. 11.2.11) and their advance here is usually dated to the last quarter of the 2nd century BC.⁵⁵ Later, the Aspourgianoï assumed a very important role in the events of Bosporan history.⁵⁶

The downfall of several rural settlements on the Asian side of the Bosporos (so-called Taman' Tholos, and others) was a result of these changes in the Kimmerian Bosporos.⁵⁷ It was a time when grain had to be imported into Pontos from the Mediterranean (Polyb. 4.4-5).

In order to better oppose the onslaught from the East, the Bosporan rulers sought support from the kings of Crimean Scythia: epigraphic evidence found in Pantikapaion supports this assumption.⁵⁸ At this stage, however, close relations with the Scythians failed to bear positive results. No doubt, Crimean Scythia could not provide the Bosporan rulers with any support similar to that offered by Greater Scythia in the 4th century BC. Bosporos was expected to pay ever greater tribute to the barbarians (Strab. 7.4.4) – in fact, it had to collaborate with the piratical tribes of north-western Caucasus: Achaioi, Zygoi and Heniochoi (Strab. 11.2.12). The Russian epigrapher V.P. Jajlenko suggests that the state was on the verge of a true catastrophe because of its de-Hellenisation.⁵⁹ Under such conditions the last Pairisades had to hand over power to Mithradates VI Eupator, king of Pontos (Strab. 7.24.3-4; *IOSPE* I², 352).

Stage 7. Bosporos under Pontic influence (late 2nd century-63 BC)

The time of the Pontic sovereign's rule over Bosporos is full of intriguing events important for the understanding of the Roman period that followed. There are sound reasons for assuming that the locals, first of all the Scythians, Achaioi, etc., did not submit tamely to the loss of their influence in Bosporos. This is

how the uprising of the Scythians of Saumakos (107 BC), famous in Russian historiography,⁶⁰ has to be treated. The uprising was suppressed by Diophantos (*IOSPE* I², 352), while Neoptolemos, another Mithradatic military leader, inflicted two defeats on the barbarians in the Kimmerian Bosporos – one in a sea battle, the other in a winter cavalry battle which took place on the ice of the Strait of Kerch (Strab. 2.1.16; 7.3.18). These barbarians were very likely the Achaioi and other piratical tribes of the northwestern Caucasus.⁶¹

In the Pontic Kingdom of Mithradates VI Eupator, Bosporos occupied a very important place as the point of delivery for local military detachments to his army, as well as for the supply of munitions, food, etc.⁶² But Mithradates' wars against Rome adversely affected Bosporos. After the First Mithradatic War, Bosporos withdrew its support from the king (App. *Mithr.* 64), most probably because of local preferences rather than those of the Greeks.⁶³ In any case, the sources at our disposal let us assume that these were the same natives (Scythians and Achaioi) who had fought besides Mithradates to retain their influence over the Bosporans.⁶⁴ The idea that it was the Scythians who were the most important element in Mithradates' policy in the region, and that they were his main supporters, seems to be much exaggerated. His most loyal allies were the Maiotian-Sarmatian tribes of Kuban' area, Sarmatians, etc.⁶⁵

The defeat of Mithradates in his last war again Rome led to his flight to Bosporos, which became the training center for his intended Italian campaign (App. *Mithr.* 101). The burdens of his previous, unsuccessful wars and of his preparations for a new one, as well as the carefully considered actions of the Romans, led eventually to a situation in which the Greek towns and even his own army rose in rebellion against the king (App. *Mithr.* 110-111). It is interesting that the local detachments from the northern Black Sea area did not participate in the rebellion.⁶⁶ Mithradates' death in 63 BC under these conditions was an important indicator of the end of one major period in the historical development of the Bosporos and the onset of another.

Conclusion

It seems feasible to divide the six centuries from the 7th to the 1st century BC of the development of the Kimmerian Bosporos in pre-Roman time into the above-mentioned seven periods or stages. All peaks and declines of its history, all stages of periodical oscillation illustrate the close connection of the history of the Bosporan Kingdom with the military-political situation (or more correctly – situations) in the steppes of the northern Black Sea area. This dynamic process has been described in Ju. Gotier's words, written almost 80 years ago: the domains of the Bosporan rulers sometimes stretched very far, but "during the recurring periods of decline the steppe would free itself from the domination of the Bosporan cities and, assuming the offensive, it would bring its barbarian influence nearly to the very city gate of Pantikapaion".⁶⁷ To

my mind, Gotier could not have formulated an insight of greater importance for our understanding of this area, than he, thus, did.

Notes

- 1 Marčenko & Vinogradov 1989, 803-805; Vinogradov & Marčenko 1989, 539; 2005, 27-29.
- 2 On nomads, see Markov 1976; Pletneva 1982; Khazanov 1984.
- 3 Mačinskij 1971, 50.
- 4 Kopylov & Larenok 1994, 5; Kopylov 1999, 174-175.
- 5 Koshelenko & Kuznetsov 1998, 255.
- 6 Gajdukevič 1971, 32-38, 170-255.
- 7 Vinogradov 1993a, 86; 1999a, 104-105; 2005, 222; but see Tsetskhladze 1997, 44; Molev 1997, 9.
- 8 Vachtina, Vinogradov & Rogov 1980, 155-161; Vinogradov 2005, 214-220.
- 9 Vinogradov 1993a, 88-89; 2005, 223; on Olbia see: Kryžickij, Bujskich, Burakov & Otreško 1989, 12-95.
- 10 Kuznecov 1992, 32, 42; Vinogradov 1999b, 288-290; 2005, 224-225; Vachtina & Vinogradov 2001, 41-45; Butyagin, Vakhtina & Vinogradov 2003, 803-804.
- 11 Kopylov 1999, 174-175.
- 12 Vinogradov 1999b, 290-293; Vachtina & Vinogradov 2001, 41-45. The traditional conception of the absence of Greek fortifications in the 6th century BC in the northern Black Sea area is incorrect; see Šelov-Kovedjaev 1985, 62; Tolstikov 1986, 167-168; 1997, 209.
- 13 Vinogradov 1999a, 108; 2000a, 230-231.
- 14 Vinogradov 1980, 70-110; Tolstikov 1984, 24-59; Šelov-Kovedjaev 1985, 66-67; Vasil'ev 1992, 111-128.
- 15 Marčenko & Vinogradov 1989, 807; Alekseev 1993, 28-38; 2003, 168-193; Vinogradov 2001c, 124-127; 2002, 184-185.
- 16 Murzin & Skory 1994, 70-71; Skoryj 1997, 70.
- 17 Vinogradov 1980, 71; Marčenko 1980, 142-143; 1982, 126-136; Kryzhitsky 2005, 127; Ochotnikov 2001, 103.
- 18 Tolstikov 1984, 26-31; 1986, 168-170; Šelov-Kovedjaev 1985, 67; Vinogradov 1992, 107; 2005, 238-245; Vinogradov & Tochtas'ev 1994, 58; Vachtina 1995, 33; Alekseeva 1997, 18.
- 19 Shelov 1978, 11-32; Anochin 1986, 14-16; Vasil'ev 1992, 128.
- 20 Vinogradov 2001a, 77-87; 2005, 245-248.
- 21 Vinogradov 2002, 191-192; 2005, 259-260.
- 22 Marčenko & Vinogradov 1989, 809.
- 23 Vinogradov & Marčenko 1995, 81.
- 24 Kruglikova 1975, 53-101, 254, fig. 101; Maslennikov 1998, 43; Paromov 1990, 64.
- 25 Marčenko, Žitnikov & Kopylov 2000, 248-252.
- 26 Gajdukevič 1971, 65-84; Šelov-Kovedjaev 1985, 82-143.
- 27 Vinogradov 2005, 268-274.
- 28 Šelov-Kovedjaev 1985, 156; Jakovenko 1985, 28; Vinogradov 2005, 275.
- 29 Marčenko & Vinogradov 1989, 811.
- 30 Rostovtzeff 1930, 577.
- 31 See Vinogradov 2003a, 77-92.

- 32 Vinogradov 1997a, 122; 1999, 59-62; Vinogradov, Marčenko & Rogov 1997, 93; Brujako 1999, 84-88; Alekseev 2003, 277.
- 33 Vinogradov 2003b, 217-222.
- 34 Simonenko & Lobaj 1991, 78; Polin 1992, 111-112, 120-121; Simonenko 1994, 116, 119; Polin & Simonenko 1997, 92; Marčenko 1996, 72; Vinogradov 1997a, 123, n. 96; Vinogradov 1999c, 57-58, 76.
- 35 Vinogradov, Marčenko & Rogov 1997, 19; Vinogradov 1999c, 80.
- 36 Kryžickij, Bujskich, Burakov & Otreško 1989, 100; Ochotnikov 2001, 115; Vinogradov & Ščeglov 1990, 362; Rogov 2005, 196.
- 37 Zin'ko 1996, 16; Maslennikov 1997, 63, 65; 1998, 88; 2005, 164; Vinogradov 2005, 283-284.
- 38 Tolstikov 1986, 171; Vinogradov 2005, 283-284.
- 39 Rostovtzeff 1930, 574; Gajdukevič 1959, 277; Dem'jančuk & Turovskij 1999, 92; Vinogradov 2005, 289-290.
- 40 Šelov 1978, 89-94; Vinogradov 2005, 289-290.
- 41 Vinogradov 2005, 285-287.
- 42 Anfimov 1951, 242; 1958, 52.
- 43 Anfimov 1967, 130.
- 44 Vinogradov 1993b, 38-51; 2005, 290-294.
- 45 Marčenko, Žitnikov & Kopylov 2000, 70-71, 252-261.
- 46 Šelov 1970, 23; 1989, 47; Arsen'eva, Böttger & Fornasier 2001, 330-336.
- 47 Rostovtzeff 1930, 581; 1932, 227.
- 48 Marčenko 1996, 70-80; Vinogradov 1999c, 56-82.
- 49 Vinogradov 1999c, 59-61; Maslennikov 2005, 165.
- 50 Shelov 1978, 133-138; Anochin 1986, 56-58.
- 51 Vinogradov 1999c, 61-63. The Malaja Bliznica Barrow must be excluded from this list. M.I. Rostovcev dated it to the late 3rd century BC (Rostowzew 1931, 333), but the mound does not belong to this period. It is an important monument of Bosporan culture of the 4th century BC; see Vinogradov 2004, 89-111.
- 52 Rostovcev 1914, 199; Rostovtzeff 1922, 115.
- 53 Vinogradov 2003b, 222-223.
- 54 Desjatčikov 1973, 131-144.
- 55 Molev 1994, 55.
- 56 Gajdukevič 1971, 328ff, 337ff, 362, 471.
- 57 Onajko 1967, 377; Sokol'skij 1976, 46; Sorokina 1985, 377.
- 58 Vinogradov 1987, 55-86; 1997b, 100-132.
- 59 Jajlenko 1990, 129.
- 60 See Gajdukevič 1971, 303-318; Vinogradov 1997b, 549-556.
- 61 Vinogradov 2001b, 65-69.
- 62 See Rostovtzeff 1932, 232; Gajdukevič 1971, 318; Molev 1976, 56-69; 1995, 45-46; Saprykin 1996, 151.
- 63 Šelov 1978, 56-58; 1983, 53.
- 64 Vinogradov 2000b, 91.
- 65 Jajlenko 1990, 130; Vinogradov 2000b, 92-93.
- 66 Kallistov 1938, 283.
- 67 Gotier 1925, 187.