

# The *Chora* in the Bosporan Kingdom

Sergej Ju. Saprykin

The Bosporan Kingdom had vast agrarian possessions on the European and Asian sides of the Kerch Straits; these possessions played an important role throughout the kingdom's history. Regular archaeological excavations and surveys, carried out in the last half of the 20th century, have brought to light many interesting sites of different types and helped scholars to follow the evolution of the rural settlements during the whole of this period. They have also allowed a study of the changes in the structure of these settlements over time, which has enabled us to develop a typology of the archaeological landscape and to map the agrarian environs of the greatest cities of Bosporos.<sup>1</sup> Yet there is much left to discuss, as, for example, the historical periodization of the *chora*, the links between *polis* and *chora*, the relationship between *polis* land and royal land possessions, and the dependence of the *chora* development on historical events in the Kingdom of Bosporos. Scholars still have various opinions on these topics: some believe that we can speak about a royal *chora* already in the time of the Spartokids, others connect its development with the so-called "Proto-hellenism" of the 4th century BC or with the "Sarmatization" of Bosporos, and, accordingly, ascribe it to the period of Roman domination. We shall not, however, delve into these difficult questions which have become grounds for lengthy disputes. The main aim of the present paper is to outline the historical development of the rural territory in the Bosporan Kingdom, concentrating on what we can know of the royal *chora* and of the *chora* of the *polis*, as well as the questions of when royal land possessions may have appeared at Bosporos and how the two types of land-possession could coexist. Our main conclusions are based on the archaeological typology of sites, as suggested earlier by A.A. Maslennikov, as well as on his tentative archaeological periodization of monuments, concerning the Crimean Bosporos, and on J.M. Paromov's surveys on the Taman' Peninsula and investigations around Gorgippia. The notes below are at the same time an expanded vision of the historical development of the *chora*, an attempt to explain some archaeological complexes and phenomena which has also been made in our own earlier works about Bosporos and its rural territory in Archaic, Classical and Hellenistic periods.

*The First Period, the 6th to the beginning of the 5th century BC*

The greatest cities of the kingdom were Pantikapaion and Theodosia on the Crimean side, founded by Milesians in the early 6th century BC, as well as Nymphaion, colonized by the Samians. On the Asian side we find Phanagoria, settled by colonists from Teos, Hermonassa, probably a joint foundation of the Ionians and the Aeolians, and Kepoi, also a Milesian foundation. Besides these large *apoikia*i, there were many smaller towns or townlike settlements such as Myrmekion, Tyritake, Parthenion, Porthmion, Zenon's Chersonesos, Hermision, Herakleion, Patrasys, Achilleion, Tyrambe, Stratokleia, Sindian Harbour, Kytaia, Akra, Zephyrion, Kimmerikos and others. In the early 4th century BC the city of Gorgippia appeared, probably on the site of the earlier Sindian Harbour or close to it. Myrmekion, founded in the second quarter of the 6th century BC, and presumably Tyritake, could have been colonized from Pantikapaion. Other sites, like Kytaia, could have been founded by either Nymphaion or Pantikapaion, as was Zenon's Chersonesos. Some think that Miletos could have organized such cities as Pantikapaion, Myrmekion, Theodosia, Kepoi, Patrasys, Korokondame, and Hermonassa. As for Tyrambe, it could have been either directly founded by Ionians or, more likely, a result of a secondary colonization from one of the centers of the Asiatic Bosporos. In any case, all the centers of Bosporos appeared in this period and at an early stage in their history functioned as *poleis* which in turn enabled the initiation of a process of secondary colonization, establishing smaller outposts around the whole area of the kingdom. This took place during the 6th to the 4th centuries BC.<sup>2</sup>

Ancient written sources allow us to assume that while settling Pantikapaion the Greeks fought the Scythians and made a treaty with their king in order to get the land they then settled. The treaty gave them a narrow strip of land, situated in the coastal zone (Steph. Byz. *s.v.* Pantikapaion; cf. Strab. 7.4.4-5). This is confirmed by archaeology as we are aware of only a few Archaic sites, mainly located in the coastal area close to the Strait of Kerch. Those rural sites in the European Bosporos which have layers dating from the middle to the late 6th to early 5th centuries BC were evidently subordinated to Nymphaion, Pantikapaion or Theodosia. To Nymphaion belonged such sites as Geroevka, South Čurubaš, Vasil'evka, probably Kimmerikos Hill A (Opuk) and others, to Pantikapaion belonged Myrmekion, where material from as early as the beginning of the 6th century BC has been found, Zenon's Chersonesos (Cape Zyk), Cape Čokrak, Andreevka South, early Porthmion, probably Parthenion, Herakleion, etc. Theodosia may have possessed the sites Gogolevka, Staryj Krim, Batal'noe, etc.<sup>3</sup> Although Maslennikov denies that these early settlements belonged to the *chora* of any of the cities, they in every way testify to the Greeks' interest in the distant territories and their desire to annex them to their cities. There was doubtlessly a particular kind of secondary colonization, demonstrating methods and patterns for the future expansion of the

*poleis*. It is important that Pantikapaion was enlarging its possessions to the north and to the west, Nymphaion – to the south-west and south. According to modern research, Nymphaion by the late 6th century BC was already a true city-state with its own agrarian territory.<sup>4</sup> Yet it is true that in the late Archaic and early Classical periods, the land on the Kerch Peninsula was divided among the three great *poleis* of Pantikapaion, Theodosia and Nymphaion, all of which started to enlarge their *chorai* only 50 to 60 years after their own founding. Probably, in the case of the Bosporos we should speak about a traditional Ionian way of colonizing with the foundation of separate *apoikiai* which later on started to subdue the neighbouring towns and thus developed into genuine *polis* communities. This resembles somehow the situation in the Lower Bug region with the extension of the rural territories of Berezan' and then of Olbia.

Unlike the European side of the Bosporos, the spread of Archaic rural sites in the Asian side, mainly on the Taman' Peninsula, seems to have been much more active. Three main *poleis*, Phanagoria, Hermonassa, Kepoi, and presumably some others, such as Patrasys, Achilleion, and Tyrambe, managed to create a dense network of settlements throughout the whole peninsula and near the mouth of the Kuban' River. The earliest material, from the middle and the second half of the 6th century BC, comes from Patrasys and Tyrambe. Judging by Paramov's surveys we are now able to attribute more than 30 sites to the period from the middle to the third quarter of the 6th century BC, and 63 sites to the late 6th to early 5th centuries BC. Most of them are situated on the banks of the Kuban' River, along the sea coast and inland. This was possible due to good and peaceful trade relations with the local Sindian and Maiotian tribes, relations which are confirmed by the appearance of a town, named Sindian Harbour, on the site of later Gorgippia. The rural settlements in the Taman' could have been the result of two main processes, both of which were going on in the region: either the direct creation of a smaller town by large *poleis* in the course of secondary colonization, or the settling of colonists from Ionia not only in the cities but in the countryside as well. Yet after the foundation of Phanagoria around 542 BC the city could include the greatest part of these sites within its *chora*. The same could also be the case in Kepoi and Hermonassa, thus creating a situation similar to that on the Crimean coast. Although most of these rural sites have not been studied archaeologically, we can be certain that on the Taman' Peninsula the development of the rural landscape begins a bit earlier than in the Crimean part of the Bosporos.

### *The Second Period, the 5th century BC*

According to archaeological investigations, in the beginning of the 5th century BC the sites of the European Bosporos suffered a disaster, in which some of them were devastated, others were ruined, and still others completely burnt down. Traces of destruction are discovered in such towns as Myrmekion,

Porthmion, Tyritake, Zenon's Chersonesos, and others; the same disaster also effected the rural settlements, for example, the site of Geroevka.<sup>5</sup> There are different theories on the events which lead to the ruin of these places: some think it was due to the Scythian attacks which stimulated the creation of the Bosporan Kingdom under the rule of the dynasty of Archaianaktids (480 BC), others that it might have been the result of an attempt on the part of the same tyrants of Pantikapaion to enlarge the *chora* of their city at the expense of neighbouring territories.<sup>6</sup> As we learn from a number of other cases, tyrants, mostly on the periphery of the Greek world, like those in Sicily and Herakleia Pontike, always tried to conquer the territories around them, an act which usually carried losses, casualties and destruction with it. The tyrants' policy of power expansion would correspond with the growth of Pantikapaion where new public and state buildings appeared and the akropolis was enlarged, and to the erection of a defensive wall in Myrmekion which was by that time a part of the Pantikapaion *polis*.<sup>7</sup>

The *chora* of Asiatic Bosporos was greatly enlarged in the course of the 5th century BC, and we know of more than 100 sites that existed contemporaneously. Some of them are large in size, as Achantanizovskaja 4 and Golubickaja 2, both linked to Phanagoria by roads.<sup>8</sup> This could confirm that Phanagoria, like Pantikapaion, was trying to develop its *chora* quickly, but the process was hardly military, unlike that which took place in the Eastern Crimea. It also testifies to the probability that the *chorai* of European and Asiatic Bosporos functioned independently at this time, so we can hardly speak of any kind of union between the Greek *poleis* of the Bosporos under the Archaianaktids. The latter must have been ruling only in Pantikapaion and Myrmekion and presumably some other small sites nearby, and were in charge of the political and economic growth of Pantikapaion's community at the expense of its neighbours in the Kerch Peninsula, but not of the whole territory of the later Kingdom (cf. Strab. 7.4.4-5).<sup>9</sup> Around the late 6th or early 5th century BC, the city of Phanagoria enlarged its urban territory, and at approximately the same time a shrine of Aphrodite Apatoura appeared in the vicinity of this city. Kepoi and Hermonassa were also prosperous at this time capable of developing the rural territories on the Taman' Peninsula.

From the second quarter of the 5th century BC, agricultural sites in the Eastern Crimea were mostly situated to the north, north-west and west of Pantikapaion as a part of its *chora* which stretched to the Uzunlar Rampart, the extreme western border of the city's possessions.<sup>10</sup> The *chora* of Theodosia included about 30 sites,<sup>11</sup> while Nymphaion also enlarged the number of its rural settlements and farms.<sup>12</sup> At that particular time, a process of establishing mixed Hellenic-Scythian conglomerate communities may have begun: to that type of community we can attribute Kimmerikos Hill A on the Opuk and the site of Čokrak Spring on the Crimean Azov Sea coast. This was a result of stable relations between Pantikapaion and the Scythians in the period 480-438 BC. The same is true for the *chora* of Nymphaion and in the case of the city

itself, its being on good terms with the Scythians is proved by the constructions of Scythian barrows from the 5th century BC in its necropolis.<sup>13</sup> All this shows that the rural territory on the Kerch Peninsula was still developing at that time into a complete *polis* and was divided, as earlier, between Pantikapaion, Nymphaion and Theodosia. But Pantikapaion's *chora* was becoming larger and larger as a result of the Archaianaktids' expansion policy.

In the second quarter of the 5th century BC, rural settlements in the Asian Bosporos began to appear in the interior of the Taman' Peninsula and in Sindike, all still within the framework of the city's *chorai* of Phanagoria, Hermonassa and Kepoi. A city of Sindos or Sindian Harbour also began to expand into its environs where in the late 6th-early 5th century BC a site of Alekseevskoe appeared.<sup>14</sup> All this, however, was going on without any participation of the Archaianaktids, particularly since in 438 BC a new dynasty, the Spartokids, came to power in Pantikapaion.

### *The Third Period, late 5th to the middle of the 3rd century BC*

The regime of Spartokos I, founder of the dynasty which ruled the Bosporos until the end of the 2nd century BC, was also a kind of *polis* tyranny, though he and his successors on the throne called themselves "archonts", and from the second half of the 3rd century BC "kings". Their rule opened a new page in the history of the Bosporan *chora*. It was not until Satyros I, son of Spartokos I, who ruled in the last quarter of the 5th to the beginning of the 4th century BC, that the tyrants of Pantikapaion began to expand their power to the other Greek cities in the Kerch Peninsula. Only after this, and not before the rule of the Archaianaktids, as was believed previously, are we able to speak about the Bosporos as a confederacy of Greek *poleis* and their *chorai*. In 405 BC the Spartokids captured Nymphaion, and around the last decade of the 5th or the early 4th century BC, Kepoi on the Asian side became the first town in that region to experience Satyros' rule. Satyros besieged Theodosia and because of this became involved in a war with Herakleia Pontike, which had its own commercial interests in that city and in the agrarian territory around the Strait of Kerch as well. The tyrant also began diplomatic activity in Sindike, aiming at the final subduing of this vast agricultural and grain-producing area. His successor, Leukon I, expanded the kingdom's possession of land to its maximum area by the third quarter of the 4th century BC: he conquered Theodosia and achieved a difficult victory in the conflict with Herakleia, took Sindike into his domain and ended a war with the Maiotians, led by Tyrgatao, a local princess, with the subjugation of Phanagoria and its vicinity.<sup>15</sup> The local barbarians, who had enjoyed regular and peaceful relations with the Greeks since their arrival in Sindike, had no desire to be subjugated by the Pantikapaion tyrants. As the Spartokid regime was tyrannic or *polis* based in character, however, the cities, foremost among them Pantikapaion, Theodosia, Nymphaion and Phanagoria, which became a part of the Bospo-



ran state, were allowed to keep the land which they had obtained earlier, in or after the 6th century BC. We know of more than 35 sites of the early 4th or beginning of the 3rd century BC in the Nymphaion's *chora*. This was also divided into plots and, moreover, a part of the Kerch Peninsula, west of the city, was incorporated into its agrarian possessions too.<sup>16</sup> Pantikapaion also enlarged its territory along the peninsula, thus reaching to the hinterland and to the coastal zones of the Strait of Kerch and the Sea of Azov.<sup>17</sup>

There was eventually a time when the Spartokids began to found new "small" towns in the *chora* – Akra, Zephyrion, Herakleion, Hermision on the European side, and Stratokleia, Kimmerikos, and others on the Asian side of the Bosporos. It is remarkable that along with Pantikapaion, the citizens of Nymphaion and Phanagoria also took part in this campaign. Leukon's brother Gorgippos helped to "Bosporonize", i.e. hellenize on a much larger scale than before, a large part of Sindike. He founded a new city, called Gorgippia after himself on the site of former Sindos, which had its own *chora*.<sup>18</sup> All this was done to cultivate as much grain as possible in order to bring in as much income as possible from commerce with the Aegean.

Grain and other agricultural products were mainly obtained from the resident population in the interior of the Kerch Peninsula and Sindike. This area was inhabited by the so-called *komai* or villages which became known after regular excavations in the European Bosporos. Such sites as Košara, Zolotoe Plateau, Ak-Taš etc., which belonged mostly to the Scythian agricultural communities, were situated around Theodosia and Nymphaion, but with high probability most of them belonged to the *chora* of Pantikapaion which can be characterized as "subjected" to the city (like *paroikoi* of Greek *poleis* in Asia Minor and Greece, *Mariandynoi* in Herakleia Pontike, etc.). Although there is actually much debate in modern literature about the status of land and its inhabitants in the Kingdom of Bosporos (some advocate some form of royal land-tenure in the hinterland of the Kerch Peninsula and on the Azov Sea coast), there are enough convincing arguments in favour of these peoples' dependence on the *polis* of Pantikapaion as a part of its distant *chora*.<sup>19</sup> We agree that the tyrants and their relatives, including the Bosporan elite, could possess land in different parts of the country, but believe that these possessions cannot be considered "royal". The Spartokids were archonts of Bosporos, i.e. Pantikapaion, Nymphaion, Phanagoria, Hermonassa, Kepoi, Gorgippia along with smaller places, and Theodosia, while being kings only over the resident tribes of Sindike and Maiotis. So we can hardly view their possessions of land in the Kerch Peninsula and in the Taman' as royal land, i.e. *ge basilike*, as it was ruled by archonts and was divided between the largest cities of the state. The situation is reminiscent of that in the *chorai* of Tauric Chersonesos, Thasos, Rhodos, and to a certain extent of Olbia and the cities of the western Black Sea coast etc., which we know as *polis* centers. This is also confirmed by the types of rural sites in the region.

We can distinguish country estates of Hellenic origin, which actually be-

longed to Pantikapaion's *chora* (Andreevka Južnaja, Oktjabr'skoe, Baklan'ja Skala). They appeared in the beginning of the 4th century BC after a devastation of the *chora*, caused by either a Scythian raid or by a military conflict with Herakleia Pontike. In the late 4th and early 3rd century BC the settlements were enlarged, presumably after Pairisades I's war against the Scythians in 328 BC. We also can distinguish some sites of the Greek type as well beyond the urban *chora* and situated in the coastal zone (Pustynnyj Bereg, General'skoe), sites which functioned as farms or country-estates of inhabitants from larger sites in distant *chora*. Besides these, there were large fortified sites which were centers of administrative districts (Cape Čokrak) and served as residences for the *epistatai*, the Spartokid officials in the *chora*. Along with these fortifications the Spartokids built large fortified sites with a number of towers, rooms and dwellings behind huge defensive walls which looked like forts or fortresses, and were probably a kind of trading settlement (like Čajka in the distant *chora* of Tauric Chersonesos) for trade with the hinterland, inhabited by Scythian land-tillers. They were used as granaries for tribute from the natives in the inland villages in order to supply Pantikapaion and other Greek cities with grain. A classic example of this kind of settlement is General'skoe West on the Azov Sea coast which blossomed sometime within the 4th to the first half of the 3rd century BC.<sup>20</sup>

The *chora* of Theodosia resembled that of Pantikapaion with Greek farms in the home *chora* and villages of Scythian or mixed Scythian-Hellenic population in the distant *chora*.<sup>21</sup>

As for the Asian Bosporos, we now know of more than 185 sites around Phanagoria, Hermonassa, and Kepoi; practically the whole Taman' Peninsula was divided into landplots, found chiefly in the Fontalovskij Peninsula, the north-western cape of Taman'.<sup>22</sup> Gorgippia actively created its *chora* at that time, as attested by such sites as Džemetete, Natuchaevskaja, Su-Psech (Krasnaja Skala) and others. Archaeological surveys revealed many rural houses standing separately at a distance of 50-100 m from each other.<sup>23</sup> This witnesses to the Spartokids' economical power based on *polis* lands. From this time in the Bosporos their influence spread to the mouth of the Don River where a former Greek *emporion*, Elizavetovskoe, fell under control of the Pantikapaion tyrants. The abovementioned system of land-tenure was in use until the second quarter to the middle of the 3rd century BC.

#### *The Fourth Period, mid 3rd- late 2nd century BC*

In the beginning of the 3rd century BC, the nomads of the steppes between the Don and the Dnieper became active; the Sarmatians forced the Scythians out into the Crimea, where a new Scythian kingdom emerged and strengthened. Sarmatian raids touched Taman', Gorgippia, Elizavetovskoe, and probably the Crimean settlements. The Scythians may also have challenged the European possessions of the Bosporan Kingdom, but the evidence for this is lacking.

Probably, the main threat to the Bosporos came from the Sarmatians as well as from the Crimean Scythia.<sup>24</sup> As a result, the whole agrarian territory suffered a serious reduction, and the villages throughout the Kerch Peninsula and partially those in the hinterland of Sindike disappeared or were reorganized by their rulers. All this caused a great break in trade for the kingdom from the second quarter of the 3rd century BC. For a long time it has been supposed that Bosporos was at this time in a deep economic crisis, but archaeological evidence has caused scholars to change this point of view. It has shown that the *chora* of Bosporos continued to develop but radically changed their shape because of new economic conditions. Instead of farms and country-estates of the Greek type along with villages in the hinterland of the Kerch Peninsula, large fortified sites and forts appeared, most of which were placed on hill tops along the border with the Scythians and the Sarmatians. They were all strongly defended by massive fortifications – walls and towers, and they had regular plan, like the Hellenistic settlements in Asia Minor and Greece, with one-roomed houses united into blocks which were divided by longitudinal streets. In the Kerch Peninsula the most significant sites of this kind were Zolotoe East, Krutoj Bereg, Novotradnoe, Porthmion, Semenovka, Poljanka, etc. Maslennikov's research has shown that a great part of the resident population, formerly peasants who had lived in unfortified villages, moved to the coastal zone and settled around the newly created forts as semi-dependent land-tillers like the Hellenistic *katoikoi*.<sup>25</sup>

Along with these new types of settlements, some of the traditional Greek country estates still functioned. One of these is situated near Myrmekion in the *chora* of Pantikapaion, another was the governor's residence by Lake Čokrak. The above-mentioned sites could be attributed to the distant *chora* of Pantikapaion, unlike the *villa* near Myrmekion, which surely belonged to the adjacent *chora* of this city.<sup>26</sup> This is even more likely in that the Spartokids, now called "kings", still retained all the features of *polis* tyrants they were earlier. We can hardly describe large fortified settlements of Bosporos as simply "royal". They were strengthened not because of their supposed "royal" status, but purely as a consequence of the barbaric threats from the steppe. This is consistent with the synchronous reinforcement of sites in the Crimean foothills, which belonged to the Scythians.<sup>27</sup> The system of land relations in the Bosporos, described above, continued functioning until the late 2nd century BC. At that point in time, the forts and fortified sites in the hinterland and on the coast were destroyed or devastated, while the suburban farms managed to survive until the early 1st century BC, thanks to the Mithridatic protectorate over Bosporos.

Theodosia's *chora* was also seriously reduced at this time because of the Scythian and Sarmatian invasions, but continued to exist.<sup>28</sup> There appeared new large settlements which were meant to defend the city's possessions against the barbaric tribes.<sup>29</sup> The *chora* of Nymphaion also suffered a reduction in the number of sites, although some of them, much larger in size, now



became capable of defending their area from the hinterland.<sup>30</sup> On the Asiatic side, however, the *chora* seemed to be much more prosperous: there were about 203 rural sites on the Taman' Peninsula and many country-estates in the city's *chora* of Gorgippa. There were also large forts, as everywhere in Bosporos at that time, which were built to defend the rural *polis'* possessions – Raevskoe and Semibratnee (the former Sindo-Maiotian town of Labrys).<sup>31</sup> Thus the preservation of *polis* traditions in landowning is visible even in the late Hellenistic period.

#### *The Fifth Period, the 1st century BC*

The upkeep of the *polis* – *chora* system until the early 1st century BC required Mithridates Eupator at first to use the facilities of *polis* lands on the Bosporos for the economic needs of his kingdom, in particular for supplying his army with food and natural resources. The Bosporos paid Mithridates 180 thousand *medimnoi* of grain and 200 talents of silver (Strab. 7.4.6; Memn. FGrHist 434F37.6). These deliveries were most intensive in the late 2nd and first quarter of the 1st century BC, at a time when the king was trying to support the Greek *poleis* of Bosporos and their *chorai*. Before the Third Mithridatic War in 74 BC the king collected more than 2 million *medimnoi* of grain around the Black Sea region (App. *Mithr.* 69). During the war, grain came mostly from the Bosporos, presumably from the East Crimea and Sindike (Memn. FGrHist 434F37.2, 6). We know that the European Bosporos suffered greatly during the troubles with the barbarians in the 2nd century BC and particularly during the wars which Diophantos and other of Mithridates' generals waged against the Scythians there (*IOSPE I*, 352). According to archaeological studies, political, military, and economic problems in the Bosporos in the late 2nd and beginning of the 1st century BC resulted in the destruction of many agricultural sites there, a destruction which soon exhausted the potential of the *chora* (Strab. 7.1.5). *Poleis*, chiefly on the Crimean side of the strait, were incapable of contributing more to Mithridates for the waging of wars in Asia Minor. Yet, as the *chora* on the Asian side of the Kimmerian Bosporos did not suffer such large scale destruction, we would probably be correct in supposing that the king received the major quantity of grain from Taman' and Sindike in particular. These regions might have been the king's main economic base in the late 2nd and beginning of the 1st century BC. The latter is confirmed by Appianus' testimony: when Mithridates Eupator escaped from Pompeius and came to Eastern Maiotis, all the local rulers, unlike those of other cities and other dynasts, received him with friendship and recognized his royal power over them. This finally enabled him to capture Pantikapaion and exile Machares, his son, who had betrayed him (App. *Mithr.* 102). This he could accomplish only because he had a firm base in Taman', Sindike and Maiotis.

All this happened in the beginning of the 60s BC. Earlier, around 85-80 BC, the king stopped supporting the economies of the subjected Bosporan cities

and started to create a real royal *chora* as in the Kingdom of Pontos with all the trimmings, traditionally part of the Hellenistic methods of land-tenure and organization of settlements. This process began when Mithridates proclaimed Bosporos to be his ancestral domain like Pontic Kappadokia, Paphlagonia and Lesser Armenia, and appointed his sons as governors over all the lands there and over Kolchis as well. A new system of relationships in the agricultural periphery was now based on strong forts established in different places of the country as the main points of royal power.

Mithridates VI did not manage to complete this huge and difficult programme, nor did his son Pharnakes I, who was busy with constant wars against the Romans. The treason of Pharnakes I's own sons, Mithridates the Younger and Machares, as well as that of Pharnakes II, the cities' revolt in 85-80 BC and the preparations for a military expedition (App. *Mithr.* 64, 67), also had a negative impact on this policy. The system was finally established by Asander in the middle or second half of the 1st century BC as a consequence of his pro-Mithridatic policy. As a result, the new *chora* and its inhabitants, mainly *katoikoi* who lived at sites of the *katoikia*-type as in Hellenistic kingdoms, including the Kingdom of Pontos, could effectively oppose Polemon I and the Romans in the last quarter of the same century, and actively supported Dynamis in her claims to the throne of Bosporos as well as eventually assisting Aspourgos to gain power over the kingdom. After accepting the throne, Aspourgos completed what his predecessors had begun, making royal landowning the mainstay of economic policy for his state. At the same time, following Mithridates Eupator and Asander, he secured a certain amount of *polis* land for Pantikapaion, Theodosia, Gorgippia and some other cities, but always under strict royal supervision. In general, everything in the Bosporos now followed a proper Hellenistic political, military and economic structure.<sup>32</sup>

#### *The Sixth Period, late 1st century BC-mid 3rd century AD*

This era is characterized chiefly by royal and partly by *polis* land-tenure systems. The rural sites were mostly *katoikia* of different types and size – from smaller to larger ones which seem to have been small towns or townlike settlements, although they were situated on the royal land. Hellenization mainly affected the Sarmatian natives who were living at these sites as military-economic settlers. They defended the *polis'* land possessions from aggressive neighbours, mainly the Alans. Until the 3rd century AD and even later, the rural sites were rather large in size, many of them having citadels and strong fortifications; some of them were also centers of administrative districts on royal land (Belinskoe, Artezian, Ilouraton, Semenovka, Temir Gora and some others throughout the whole Bosporan territory). They dominated over smaller forts and over villages of peasants who had to pay tribute to the kings for tilling the land, which was under royal control. Though the *polis* territo-

ries were still functioning, they were seriously reduced and did not play any important role in economic life, being mainly political and religious centers. They were all defended by royal forts.<sup>33</sup> Their resources were used against the Crimean Scythians in waging wars that helped the Bosporan kings to expand their power to include the whole of Taurica within the 1st-3rd centuries AD. These forts were also the kings' military strongholds in wars with the Sarmatians – Sirakoi, Aorsoi and Alanoi on the Northern Caucasus, which ended with the enlarging of the Bosporan territories around the Kuban' River and the Eastern Maiotis to the country of the Heniochoi and the Achaians. This was the reason why during the wars with the Alanoi in the late 1st century AD some of the forts on the Taman' and around Gorgippia were destroyed, being temporarily out of use. No *polis* lands, as during the Spartokid times, but only royal domains, created after traditional Hellenistic models, could withstand the barbarian raids and supply the Bosporan economy with the necessary resources. The other factor for this organization seems to have been a policy on the part of the kings who were trying to retain good relations with the barbarian nobles and tribal warriors in order to use them as soldiers and mercenaries, seeing them also as potential *katoikoi* on their land. This system helped to keep these nobles and warriors from aggressive actions against the Greeks, Romans and other subjects of the kings. Bosphoros managed to continue this system until the late antiquity and it suffered only a few changes during three hundred or even more years. It helped the Romans and their vassals – the Bosporan rulers – to maintain their interests in the north-eastern Black Sea littoral. Some of these settlements survived or were restored to their former status even after the Gothic and Hunnic invasions in the 3rd and 4th centuries AD along with a brief Roman-Chersonesean control over the eastern Crimea in the 4th century AD.

## Notes

- 1 On the agrarian economy of Bosphoros, see Kruglikova 1975, 10. The typology of the agrarian sites in the European (Crimean) part of the Bosphoros is studied by Maslennikov (1989, 70-77; 1992, 69-84; 1998, 112-181). On the organization of the *chora* on the Asian side of the Bosphoros, see Kuznecov 1999, 342-344; Paromov 1990, 56-69; Paromov & Voronov 1990, 3-11. A periodization of the *chora* of European Bosphoros based on archaeological data was made by Maslennikov (2001, 84-98).
- 2 Košelenko & Kuznecov 1992, 18-20; Kuznecov 1991, 32-34; Sudarev 1999, 227.
- 3 On the foundation of the so-called "minor" cities of Bosphoros, see Šelov-Kovedjaev 1985, 50 ff.; Vinogradov 1995, 154; Maslennikov 1996, 64 ff. On the early sites in the Kerch Peninsula, see Kruglikova 1975, 27-29; Maslennikov 1998, 37; Scholl & Zinko 1999, 30, 43. On early materials from the Theodosian *chora*, down to the late 6th-early 5th century BC, see Petrova 2000, 59-60.
- 4 Zin'ko 2001b, 102-104.
- 5 Kruglikova 1975, 31; Tolstikov 1984, 32-39; Maslennikov 1992, 120-173; 1998, 37-39.

- 6 Saprykin 2003, 18. On the creation of the Pantikapaion *chora* (not a territorial state!), see now Zavojkin 2000, 34-36; 2001, 22-28.
- 7 Vinogradov & Tochtas'ev 1994, 61; Tolstikov 2001b, 402-404.
- 8 Paromov 1990, 122-124; 1998, 216-222; Abramov & Paromov 1993, 25; Kuznecov 1999, 342 ff.
- 9 Vasil'ev 1992, 122-125; Saprykin 2003, 16-17.
- 10 Maslennikov 1998, 42; Saprykin 2001, 645.
- 11 On the *chora* of Theodosia, see Gavrilov 1998, 105-110; 1999, 4-6; Katjušin 2003, 662-665: it is worth mentioning that the earliest archaeological material from such sites of the Theodosian *chora* as Žuravki, Novopokrovka, Subaši dates to as early as the middle of the 5th century BC. See also Petrova 2000, 59-62. In the light of this evidence it seems strange to hear from A.A. Maslennikov about the absence of sites near Theodosia in the late 6th-early 5th century BC (Maslennikov 2001, 85). See also Smekalova & Smekalov in this volume.
- 12 Kruglikova 1975, 93; Zin'ko 1996, 12-14; 1998, 87-89.
- 13 Maslennikov 1978, 33; Zin'ko 1998, 88; 2001a, 210: relations between Nymphaion and the Scythians became very solid within the second and third quarters of the 5th century BC, they were even more stable than those with Pantikapaion (Tolstikov 2001a, 45-57).
- 14 Abramov & Paromov 1993, 71; Alekseeva 1991, 18-19.
- 15 On the history of Bosporos in that period, see Gajdukevič 1971, 30-65.
- 16 Kruglikova 1975, 93 ff.; Zin'ko 1996, 15, 16; 1998, 89-94; Zin'ko & Solov'ev 1994, 159-162.
- 17 Maslennikov 1995, 82 ff.; 1996, 61-71; 1998, 76 ff.; 2001, 86-90.
- 18 Alekseeva 1997, 38 ff.
- 19 Maslennikov has repeatedly stated the opinion, put forward earlier by V.D. Blavatskij and I.T. Kruglikova, that lands which were far from Pantikapaion's nearer *chora* should be viewed as private possessions of the ruling dynasty of the Spartokids (1998, 66 ff.). But recently, he has considered large fortified sites on these lands, which have some similarities to Greek farmhouses, as a type of collective settlements, usual for the Greek city-states with the vast agricultural periphery as indicative of royal lands, which to my mind is closer to the truth (Maslennikov 2001, 90). In his view, this development seems to prove it possible to consider these lands as "subjected" to the city-state, at some point denying the characteristic of them as royal. On *polis* lands in Bosporos, see Saprykin 2001, 654 ff.; 2003, 26-30.
- 20 Maslennikov 1998, 50-59; 2001, 89.
- 21 Petrova 1996, 148-150; 2000, 82-85; Gavrilov 1998, 110-117; 1999, 6-9; Maslennikov 2001, 91; Katjušin 2003, 662-665.
- 22 Paromov 1990, 56-69; 1994, 3-5; Kuznecov 1999, 344 ff.
- 23 Alekseeva 1980, 13-51; 1997, 41-43; Novičichin 1994, 172-173.
- 24 Puzdrovskij 2001, 86-90.
- 25 Kruglikova 1975, 99, 100; 1998, 144-146; Maslennikov 1989, 72-74; 1998, 89-102.
- 26 Gajdukevič 1981, 55-75; Zin'ko 1999, 133-141; Maslennikov 1998, 88-89; 2001, 92.
- 27 Koltuchov 1991, 91-104; Puzdrovskij 2001, 87.
- 28 See A.V. Gacrilov's contribution in this volume. Eds.
- 29 Gavrilov 1999, 8-9; Petrova 1996, 151; 2000, 85; Maslennikov 2001, 92; Katjušin 2003, 673.

- 30 Kruglikova 1975, 130; Zin'ko 1996, 17; Maslennikov 2001, 92.
- 31 Paromov 1994, 6-9; Kuznecov 1999, 344-347; Alekseeva 1980, 27-41.
- 32 On the organization of the *chora* in the Kingdom of Bosporos in Mithridatic and post-Mithridatic period, see now in detail: Saprykin & Maslennikov 1995, 279-281; Saprykin 1994, 43-57; 1996, 283 ff.; 2002, 207-224. See also Maslennikov 1998, 112-181.
- 33 Kruglikova 1970, 76-81; 1975, 105-121; Maslennikov 1998, 136-178; 2001, 97-98. On the Taman' Peninsula and its importance for the history of Bosporos during the Roman period, see Sokol'skij 1963, 23 ff.; Tolstikov 1989, 52-65; 1992, 41-57.

## Bibliography

- Abramov, A.P. & J.M. Paromov 1993. Ranne-antičnye poselenija Taman-skogo poluoostrova, in: Ja.M. Paromov (ed.), *Bosporskij sbornik*, 2. Moskva, 25-99.
- Alekseeva, E.M. 1980. K izučeniju sel'skich poselenij vokrug Gorgippii, in: I.T. Kruglikova (ed.), *Gorgippija*. Vol. 1. Krasnodar, 13-51.
- Alekseeva, E.M. 1991. *Grečeskaja kolonizacija Severo-Zapadnogo Kavkaza*. Moskva.
- Alekseeva, E.M. 1997. *Antičnyj gorod Gorgippija*. Moskva.
- Gajdukevič, V.F. 1971. *Das Bosporanische Reich*. Berlin-Amsterdam.
- Gajdukevič, V.F. 1981. Zagorodnaja sel'skaja usad'ba ellinističeskoj epochi v rajone Mirmekija, in: A.N. Ščeglov & A. Jakobson (eds.), *Bosporskij gorod*. Leningrad, 55-75.
- Gavrilov, A.V., 1998. Novye dannye o sel'skoj okruge antičnoj Feodosii, *ArcheologijaKiiv* 1, 105-118.
- Gavrilov, A.V. 1999. *Sel'skaja okrugja Feodosii v V-II vv. do n.e.* PhD Thesis. Kiev.
- Katjušin, E.A. 2003. Theodosia, in: D.V.Grammenos & E.K. Petropoulos (eds.), *Ancient Greek Colonies on the Black Sea*. Vol. 1. Thessaloniki, 645-695.
- Koltuchov, S.G. 1991. Sistemy oborony Krymskoj Skifii v IV-II vv. do n.e., *VDI* 4, 91-104.
- Košelenko, G.A. & V.D. Kuznecov 1992. Grečeskaja kolonizacija Bospora (v svjazi s nekotorymi obščimi problemami kolonizacii), in: G.A. Košelenko (ed.), *Očerki archeologii i istorii Bospora*. Moskva, 6-27.
- Kruglikova, I.T. 1970. Raskopki poselenija u d. Semenovka, in: I.T. Kruglikova (ed.), *Poselenija i mogil'niki Kerčenskogo poluoostrova pervykh vekov n.e.* (MatšslA, 155). Moskva, 4-81.
- Kruglikova, I.T. 1975. *Sel'skoe chozjajstvo Bospora*. Moskva.
- Kruglikova, I.T. 1998. Poselenie u d. Novo-Otradnoe, *Drevnosti Bospora* 1, Moskva, 143-185.
- Kuznecov, V.D. 1991. Rannie apojkii Severnogo Pričernomor'ja, *KSIA* 204, 32-34.
- Kuznecov, V.D. 1999. L'organisation du territoire du Bosphore asiatique, in: M. Brunet (ed.), *Territoires des cités grecques. Actes de la table ronde interna-*



- tionale organisée par l'École française d'Athènes, 31 octobre-3 novembre 1991* (BCH Suppl., 34). Paris, 341-354.
- Maslennikov, A.A. 1978. Etničeskij sostav naselenija bosporskich gorodov v VI-V vv. do n.e., *SovA* 1, 24-38.
- Maslennikov, A.A. 1989. O tipologii sel'skich poselenij Bospora, *SovA* 2, 70-77.
- Maslennikov, A.A. 1992. Evoljucija organizacii sel'skoj territorii evropejskogo Bospora, *ArcheologijaKiiv* 2, 69-84.
- Maslennikov, A.A. 1995. Drevnie greki v Krymskom Priazov'e, *VDI* 2, 78-93.
- Maslennikov, A.A. 1996. Nekotorye problemy rannej istorii Bosporskogo gosudarstva v svete novejšich archeologičeskich issledovanij v Vostočnom Krymu, *PIFK* 3, 61-71.
- Maslennikov, A.A. 1998. *Ellinskaja chora na kraju Ojkumeny. Sel'skaja territorija Evropejskogo Bospora v antičnuju epochu*. Moskva.
- Maslennikov, A.A. 2001. Sel'skie poselenija evropejskogo Bospora (Nekotorye problemy i itogi issledovanij), *Bosporskie issledovanija* 1, Simferopol', 75-100.
- Novičichin, A.M. 1994. Raskopki antičnogo poselenija v Andreevskoj Ščeli bliz Anapy, in: Ja.M. Paromov (ed.), *Bosporskij sbornik* 4, Moskva, 171-174.
- Paromov, Ja.M. 1990. Principy izučenija evoljucii sistemy rasselenija na Tamanskom poluostrove v antičnoe i srednevekovoe vremja, in: *Drevnie pamjatniki Kubani*. Krasnodar, 56-69.
- Paromov, Ja.M. 1994. *Osnovnye etapy osvoenija Tamanskogo poluostrova v antičnuju epochu*. PhD Thesis. St Peterburg.
- Paromov, Ja.M. 1998. Glavnye dorogi Tamanskogo poluostrova v antičnoe vremja, *Drevnosti Bospora* 1, Moskva, 216-222.
- Paromov, J.M. & A. Voronov 1990. Planirovočnye principy rasselenija na Tamanskom poluostrove v antičnuju epochu, in: *Architekturnoe nasledstvo*. Moskva, 3-11.
- Petrova, E.B. 1996. Greki i "varvary" antičnoj Feodosii i ee okruzi v VI-II vv. do n.e., *MAIET* 5, 146-154.
- Petrova, E.B. 2000. *Antičnaja Feodosija*. Simferopol'.
- Puzdrovskij, A.E. 2001. Političeskaja istorija Krymskoj Skifii vo II v. do n.e.-III v. n.e., *VDI* 3, 86-118.
- Saprykin, S.Ju. 1994. Greek Cities and Rural Settlements of Bosporos under the Successors of Mithridates VI, in: G.R. Tsetschladze (ed.), *Colloquenda Pontica: Greek and Roman Settlements on the Black Sea Coast*. Bradford, 43-57.
- Saprykin, S.Ju. & A.A. Maslennikov 1995. Bosporan Chora in the Reign of Mithridates VI Eupator and His Immediate Successors (Part I), *Ancient Civilizations from Scythia to Siberia* 2.3, 279-281.
- Saprykin, S.Ju. 1996. *Pontijskoe carstvo*. Moskva.
- Saprykin, S.Ju. 2001. Polis Chora in the Kingdom of Bosporus, in: *Problemi della chora coloniale dall' occidente al Mar Nero* (Atti del quarantesimo con-

- vegno di studi sulla Magna Grecia, Taranto 29 settembre-3 ottobre 2000). Taranto, 635-665.
- Saprykin, S.Ju. 2002. Aspurg, car' Bospora, *Drevnosti Bospora* 5, Moskva, 207-223.
- Saprykin, S.Ju. 2003. Bosporskoe carstvo: ot tiranii k ellinističeskoj monarchii, *VDI* 1, 11-35.
- Šelov-Kovedjaev, F.V. 1985. Istorija Bospora v VI-IV vv. do n.e., in: A. Novosel'cev (ed.), *Drevnejšie gosudarstva na territorii SSSR. Materialy i issledovanija, 1984 god.* Moskva, 5-187.
- Scholl, T. & V.N. Zinko 1999. *Archaeological Map of Nymphaion (Crimea)*. Warsaw.
- Sokol'skij, N.I. 1963. K istorii severo-zapadnoj časti Tamanskogo poluostrova v antičnuju epochu, in: *VI Conference internationale d'études classiques des pays socialistes*. Sofia, 20-26.
- Sudarev, N.I. 1999. Kult Apollona Vrača na Bospore i nekotorye voprosy grečeskoj kolonizacii, *Drevnosti Bospora* 2, Moskva, 213-231.
- Tolstikov, V.P. 1984. K probleme obrazovanija Bosporskogo gosudarstva, *VDI* 3, 32-47.
- Tolstikov, V.P. 1989. Fantalovskij ukreplennyj rajon v istorii Bosporskogo carstva, *ArcheologijaKiiv* 1, 52-65.
- Tolstikov, V.P. 1992. Neizdannye stranicy istorii Bosporskogo carstva, in: *Archeologija i iskusstvo Bospora*. Moskva, 41-57.
- Tolstikov, V.P. 2001a. Archeologičeskie otkrytija na akropole Pantikapeja i problema bosporo-skifskich otnošenij v VI-V vv. do n.e., in: Vachtina & Zuev (eds.) 2001, 48-55.
- Tolstikov, V.P. 2001. Rannij Pantikapej v svete novych archeologičeskich issledovanij, *Drevnosti Bospora* 4, Moskva, 402 ff.
- Vachtina, M.Ju. & V.Ju. Zuev (eds.) 2001. *Bosporskij fenomen: Kolonizacija regiona, formirovanie polisov, obrazovanie gosudarstva*. St Peterburg.
- Vasil'ev, A.N. 1992. K voprosu o vremeni obrazovanija Bosporskogo gosudarstva, in: A.N. Gavrilov (ed.), *Etjudy po antičnoj istorii i kul'ture Severnogo Pričernomor'ja*. St Peterburg, 111-128.
- Vinogradov, Ju.A. & S.R. Tochtas'ev 1994. Rannjaja oboronitel'naja stena Mirmekija, *VDI* 1, 54-63.
- Vinogradov, Ju.A. 1995. Nekotorye diskussionnye problemy grečeskoj kolonizacii Bospora Kimmerijskogo, *VDI* 3, 152-160.
- Zavojkin, A.A. 2000. Bospor: Pantikapej i territorial'noe gosudarstvo, in: *Tamanskaja starina* 3, St Peterburg, 34-36.
- Zavojkin, A.A. 2001. Bospor: territorial'noe gosudarstvo i polis, in: Vachtina & Zuev (eds.) 2001, 22-28.
- Zin'ko, V.N. & S.L. Solov'ev 1994. Raskopki na poselenii Geroevka-2, in: Ja.M. Paromov (ed.), *Bosporskij sbornik*, 4. Moskva, 159-162.
- Zin'ko, V.N. 1996. Nekotorye itogi izučenija sel'skoj okrugii antičnogo Nimfeja, *MAIET* 5, 12-21.

- Zin'ko, V.N. 1998. Chora Nimfeja v VI-V vv. do n.e., *Drevnosti Bospora* 1, Moskva, 86-105.
- Zin'ko, V.N. 1999. Antičnoe sel'skoe poselenie bliz Mirmekija, in: N.F. Fedoseev (ed.), *Archeologija i istorija Bospora*, 3. Kerč', 133-141.
- Zin'ko, V.N. 2001a. Bosporskij gorod Nimfej i varvary, *Bosporskie issledovanija* 1, Simferopol', 207-213.
- Zin'ko, V.N. 2001b. Stanovlenie Nimfejskogo polisa, in: Vachtina & Zuev (eds.) 2001, 102-104.

### Abbreviations

- MAIET*            Materialy po archeologii, istorii i etnografii Tavrii. Simferopol'.
- PIFK*             Problemy istorii, filologii, kul'tury. Moskva-Magnitogorsk.