

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

Jurij A. Vinogradov

Two centuries of studies on the Kimmerian Bosphoros 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 Bosphoros 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 Bosphoros.

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 mentioned 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 & Skoryj 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.

Bibliography

- Alekseev, A.Ju. 1993. Velikaja Skifija ili dve Skifii, in: B.A. Raev (ed.), *Skifija i Bospor*. Novočerkassk, 28-38.
- Alekseev, A.Ju. 2003. *Chronografija Evropejskoj Skifii*. St Peterburg.
- Alekseeva, E.M. 1997. *Antičnyj gorod Gorgippija*. Moskva.
- Anfimov, N.V. 1951. Raskopki Semibratnego gorodišča, *KSIIMK* 37, 238-244.
- Anfimov, N.V. 1958. *Iz prošlogo Kubani*. Krasnodar.
- Anfimov, N.V. 1967. Meoty i ich vzaimodejstvija s Bosporom v epochu Spartokidov, in: T.V. Blavatskaja (ed.), *Antičnoe obščestvo*. Moskva, 127-131.
- Anochin, V.A. 1986. *Monetnoe delo Bospora*. Kiev.
- Arsen'eva, T.M., B. Böttger & J. Fornasier 2001. Die Grabung in Tanais 2000, *Eurasia Antiqua* 7, 329-336.
- Brujako, I.V. 1999. O sobytijach III v. do n.e. v Severo-Zapadnom Pričernomor'e, *VDI* 3, 76-91.
- Butyagin, A.M., M.Yu. Vakhtina & Yu.A. Vinogradov 2003. Myrmekion – Porthmeus. Two 'small' towns of the Ancient Bosphorus, in: D.V. Grammenos & E.K. Petropoulos (eds.), *Ancient Greek Colonies in the Black Sea 2*. Thessaloniki, 803-840.
- Dem'jančuk, S.G. & E.Ja. Turovskij 1999. Greko-varvarskie vzaimootnošenija v Severnom Pričernomor'e III v. do n.e. i ich vlijanie na monetnoe delo ellinskich gosudarstv regiona, in: P.P. Toločko (ed.), *Problemy skifo-sarmatskoj archeologii Severnogo Pričernomor'ja*. Zaporož'e, 91-94.
- Desjatčikov, Ju.M. 1973. Satarchi, *VDI* 1, 131-144.
- Gajdukevič, V.F. 1959. Bospor i skify, in: A.P. Smirnov (ed.), *Problemy istorii Severnogo Pričernomor'ja v antičnuju epochu*. Moskva, 276-278.
- Gajdukevič, V.F. 1971. *Das Bosporanische Reich*. Berlin.
- Gotier, Ju.V. 1925. *Očerki po istorii material'noj kul'tury Vostočnoj Evropy*. Leningrad.
- Jajlenko, V.P. 1990. Dinastičeskaja istorija Bospora ot Mitridata Evpatora do Kotisa I, in: *Epigrafičeskie pamjatniki i jazyki drevnej Anatolii, Kipra i antičnogo Severnogo Pričernomor'ja*. Moskva, 128-215.
- Jakovenko, E.V. 1986. O diplomatičeskich kontaktach Bospora so Skifiej vremen Ateja, in: V.P. Kopylov (ed.), *Meždunarodnye otnošenija v bassejne Černogo morja v drevnosti i srednie veka*. Rostov-na-Donu, 43-54.
- Kallistov, D.P. 1938. Etjudy iz istorii Bospora v rimskij period. I. Bospor, Mitridat Evpator i Rim, *VDI* 2(3), 276-286.
- Khazanov, A.M. 1984. *Nomads and the Outside World*. Cambridge.
- Kopylov, V.P. 1999. Taganrogscoe poselenie v sisteme rannegrečeskich kolonij Severnogo Pričernomor'ja, *VDI* 4, 170-176.
- Kopylov, V.P. & P.A. Larenok 1994. *Taganrogscoe poselenie*. Rostov-na-Donu.
- Koshelenko, G.A. & V.D. Kuznetsov 1998. Greek Colonisation of the Bosphorus, in: G. Tsetschladze (ed.), *The Greek Colonisation of the Black Sea Area. Historical Interpretation of Archaeology*. Stuttgart, 249-263.

- Kruglikova, I.T. 1975. *Sel'skoe chozjajstvo Bospora*. Moskva.
- Kryzhitsky, S.D. 2005. Olbia and the Scythians in the Fifth Century BC. The Scythian 'Protectorate', in: D. Braund (ed.), *Scythians and Greeks. Cultural Interactions in Scythia, Athens and the Early Roman Empire*. Exeter, 122-130.
- Kryžickij, S.D., S.B. Bujskich, A.V. Burakov & V.M. Otreško 1989. *Sel'skaja okruga Ol'vii*. Kiev.
- Kuznecov, V.D. 1992. Raskopki v Kepach 1984-1989 gg., in: G.A. Košelenko (ed.), *Očerki archeologii i istorii Bospora*. Moskva, 28-45.
- Mačinskij, D.A. 1971. O vremeni pervogo aktivnogo vystuplenija sarmatov v Podneprov'e po svidetel'stvam antičnych pis'mennych istočnikov, *ASbor* 13, 30-54.
- Marčenko, I.I. 1996. *Siraki Kubani*. Krasnodar.
- Marčenko, K.K. 1980. Model' grečeskoj kolonizacii Nižnego Pobuž'ja, *VDI* 1, 131-143.
- Marčenko, K.K. 1982. K voprosu o tak nazываемom predmest'e Ol'vii, *VDI* 3, 126-136.
- Marčenko, K.K. 1996. Tretij period stabilizacii v Severnom Pričernomor'e antičnoj epochi, *VDI* 2, 70-80.
- Marčenko, K.K. & Ju.A. Vinogradov 1989. The Scythian Period in the Northern Black Sea Region (750-250 BC), *Antiquity* 63, 803-813.
- Marčenko, K.K., V.G. Žitnikov & V.P. Kopylov 2000. *Die Siedlung Elizavetovka am Don*. Moskau.
- Markov, G.E. 1976. *Kočevniki Azii*. Moskva.
- Maslennikov, A.A. 1997. Issledovanie sel'skoj territorii evropejskogo Bospora, *RosA* 3, 60-70.
- Maslennikov, A.A. 1998. *Ellinskaja chora na kraju Ojkumeny*. Moskva.
- Maslennikov, A.A. 2005. The Development of Graeco-Barbarian Contacts in the Chora of the European Bosphorus (sixth–first centuries), in: D. Braund (ed.), *Scythians and Greeks. Cultural Interactions in Scythia, Athens and the Early Roman Empire*. Exeter, 153-166.
- Molev, E.A. 1976. *Mitridat Evpator*. Saratov.
- Molev, E.A. 1994. *Bospor v period ellinizma*. Nižnij Novgorod.
- Molev, E.A. 1995. *Vlastitel' Ponta*. Nižnij Novgorod.
- Molev, E.A. 1997. *Političeskaja istorija Bospora VI–IV vv. do n.e.* Nižnij Novgorod.
- Murzin, V.Yu. & S.A. Skory 1994. An Essay of Scythian History, *Il Mar Nero* 1, 55-98.
- Ochotnikov 2001
- Onajko, N.A. 1967. Ellinističeskoe zdanie Raevskogo gorodišča i ego mesto v arhitekture Bospora, *SovA* 2, 155-168.
- Paromov, Ja.M. 1990. Principy izučenija evoljucii sistemy rasselenija na Tamanskom poluostrove v antičnoe i srednevekovoe vremja, in: A.M. Ždanovskij & I.I. Marčenko (eds.), *Drevnie pamjatniki Kubani*. Krasnodar, 56-69.

- Pletneva, S.A. 1982. *Kočevniki srednevekov'ja. Poiski istoričeskich zakonomernostej*. Moskva.
- Polin, S.V. 1992. *Ot Skifii k Sarmatii*. Kiev.
- Polin, S.V. & A.V. Simonenko 1997. Skifija i sarmaty, *Donskie drevnosti* 5, 87-98.
- Rogov, E.Ja. 2005. Greki i varvary v Zapadnom Krymu, in: K.K. Marčenko (ed.), *Greki i varvary Severnogo Pričernomor'ja v skifskuju epochu*. St Peterburg, 137-210.
- Rostovcev, M.I. 1914. Naučnoe značenie istorii Bosporskogo carstva, in: *Sbornik k 40-letiju professorskoj dejatel'nosti N.I. Kareeva*. St Peterburg, 195-210.
- Rostovtzeff, M. 1922. *Iranians and Greeks in South Russia*. Oxford.
- Rostovtzeff, M. 1930. The Bosporan Kingdom, *CAH* 8, 561-589.
- Rostowzew, M. 1931. *Skythien und der Bosporus*. Berlin.
- Rostovtzeff, M. 1932. Pontus and its Neighbours: the First Mithridatic War, *CAH* 9, 211-260.
- Saprykin, S.Ju. 1996. *Pontijskoe carstvo*. Moskva.
- Šelov, D.B. 1970. *Tanais i Nižnij Don v III-I vv. do n.e.* Moskva.
- Šelov, D.B. 1978. Machar, pravitel' Bospora, *VDI* 1, 55-72.
- Šelov, D.B. 1983. Goroda Severnogo Pričernomor'ja i Mitridat Evpator, *VDI* 2, 40-58.
- Šelov-Kovedjaev, F.V. 1985. Istorija Bospora v VI-V vv. do n.e., in: A.P. Novosel'cev (ed.), *Drevnejšie gosudarstva na territorii SSSR, 1984*. Moskva, 5-187.
- Shelov, D.B. 1978. *Coinage of the Bosporus, 6-2 Centuries BC* (BAR International Series 46). Oxford.
- Simonenko, A.V. 1994. The Problem of the Sarmatian Penetration in the North Pontic Area According to Archaeological Data, *Il Mar Nero* 1, 99-136.
- Simonenko, A.V. & B.I. Lobaj 1991. *Sarmaty Severo-Zapadnogo Pričernomor'ja v I v. n.e.* Kiev.
- Skoryj, S.A. 1997. *Steblev: skifskij mogil'nik v Poros'e*. Kiev.
- Sokol'skij, N.I. 1976. *Tamanskij tolos i rezidencija Chrisaliska*. Moskva.
- Sorokina, N.P. 1985. Novye dannye po istorii arhitekturnogo ansamblja epochi ellinizma na Tamanskom poluostrove, in: O.D. Lordkipanidze (ed.), *Pričernomor'e v epochu ellinizma*. Tbilisi, 374-382.
- Tolstikov, V.P. 1984. K probleme obrazovanija Bosporskogo gosudarstva, *VDI* 3, 24-59.
- Tolstikov, V.P. 1986. L'apport de la fortification l'histoire du Bosphore antique, in: P. Leriche & H. Tréziny (eds.), *La fortification dans l'histoire du mond Grec*. Paris, 167-178.
- Tolstikov, V.P. 1997. Descriptions of Fortifications of the Classical Cities in the Region to the North of the Black Sea, *Ancient Civilizations from Scythia to Siberia* 4, 187-231.

- Tsetschladze, G.R. 1997. A Survey of the Major Urban Settlements in the Kimmerian Bosporus, in: M.H. Hansen (ed.), *Yet More Studies in the Ancient Greek Polis*. Stuttgart, 39-81.
- Vachtina, M.Ju. 1995. O drevnejšich oboronitel'nyh sooruzenijach drevnego Porfmija, in: V.M. Masson (ed.), *Fortifikacija v drevnosti i srednevekov'e*. St Peterburg, 31-33.
- Vachtina, M.Ju., Ju.A. Vinogradov & E.Ja. Rogov 1980. Ob odnom iz maršrutov voennyh pochodov i sezonnyh migracij kočevykh skifov, *VDI* 4, 155-161.
- Vachtina, M.Ju. & Ju.A. Vinogradov 2001. Ešče raz o rannej fortifikaciji Bospora Kimmerijskogo, in: V.Ju. Zuev (ed.), *Bosporskij fenomen*. Part 1. St Peterburg, 41-45.
- Vasil'ev, A.N. 1992. K voprosu o vremeni obrazovanija Bosporskogo gosudarstva, in: A.K. Gavrilov (ed.), *Etjudy po antičnoj istorii i kul'ture Severnogo Pričernomor'ja*. St Peterburg, 111-128.
- Vinogradov, Ju.A. 1992. Mirmekij, in: G.A. Košelenko (ed.), *Očerki archeologii i istorii Bospora*. Moskva, 99-120.
- Vinogradov, Ju.A. 1993a. K probleme polisov v rajone Bospora Kimmerijskogo, *Antičnyj mir i archeologija* 9, 79-96.
- Vinogradov, Ju.A. 1993b. Kurgan Ak-Burun (1875), in: B.A. Raev (ed.), *Skifija i Bospor*. Novočerkassk, 38-51.
- Vinogradov, Ju.A. 1999a. Grečeskaja kolonizacija i grečeskaja urbanizacija Severnogo Pričernomor'ja, *Stratum plus* 3, 101-115.
- Vinogradov, Yu.A. 1999b. Selected Findings from Myrmekion Acropolis, *Études et Travaux* 18, 280-293.
- Vinogradov, Ju.A. 1999c. Severnoe Pričernomor'e posle padenija Velikoj Skifii, *Hyperboreus* 5, 56-82.
- Vinogradov, Ju.A. 2000a. K probleme stanovlenija drevnegrečeskich gorodov v rajone Bospora Kimmerijskogo, in: V.Ju. Zuev (ed.), *SUSSITIA. Pamjati Jurija Viktoroviča Andreeva*. St Peterburg, 227-232.
- Vinogradov, Ju.A. 2000b. Narody Severnogo Pričernomor'ja i Mitridatovy vojny, *Tamanskaja starina* 3, 90-93.
- Vinogradov, Ju.A. 2001a. Kurgany varvarskoj znati V v. do n.e. v rajone Bospora Kimmerijskogo, *VDI* 4, 77-87.
- Vinogradov, Ju.A. 2001b. O dvuch pobedach Neoptolema na Bospore Kimmerijskom, in: M.I. Zolotarev (ed.), *ANAXAPΣIE* (Chersonesskij sbornik, 11). Sevastopol', 65-69.
- Vinogradov, Ju.A. 2001c. Dve Skifii i skify carskie, in: V.Ju. Zuev (ed.), *Bosporskij fenomen*. Part 2, 124-127.
- Vinogradov, Ju.A. 2002. Osobennosti i istoričeskoe značenie ob'edinenija Arceanaktidov na Bospore Kimmerijskom, in: E.D. Frolov (ed.), *Antičnoe gosudarstvo*. St Peterburg 2002, 183-196.
- Vinogradov, Ju.A. 2003a. Usobica synovej bosporskogo carja Perisada I, *Materialy i issledovanija po archeologii Kubani* 3, 77-92.

- Vinogradov, Ju.A. 2003b. Two Waves of Sarmatian Migrations in the Black Sea Steppes during the Pre-Roman Period, in: P. Guldager Bilde, J.M. Højte & V.F. Stolba (eds.), *The Cauldron of Ariantas. Studies presented to A.N. Ščeglov on the occasion of his 70th birthday*. Aarhus, 217-226.
- Vinogradov, Ju.A. 2004. Kurgan Malaja Bliznica (istorija izučenija i datirovka), *Bosporskie issledovanija* 7, 89-111.
- Vinogradov, Ju.A. 2005. Bospor Kimmerijskij, in: K.K. Marčenko (ed.), *Greki i varvary Severnogo Pričernomor'ja v skifskuju epochu*. St Peterburg, 211-296.
- Vinogradov, J.A. & K.K. Marčenko 1989. Das nördliche Schwarzmeergebiet in der skythischen Epoche. Periodisierung der Geschichte, *Klio* 71, 539-549.
- Vinogradov, Ju.A., K.K. Marčenko & E.Ja. Rogov 1997. Sarmaty i gibel' Velikoj Skifii, *VDI* 3, 93-103.
- Vinogradov, Ju.A. & K.K. Marčenko 1995. Greki i skify Severo-Zapadnogo Pričernomor'ja v V v. do n.e., *VDI* 1, 80-84.
- Vinogradov, Ju.A. & K.K. Marčenko 2005. Periodizacija istorii Severnogo Pričernomor'ja v skifskuju epochu, in: K.K. Marčenko (ed.), *Greki i varvary Severnogo Pričernomor'ja v skifskuju epochu*. St Peterburg, 27-41.
- Vinogradov, Ju.A. & S.R. Tochtas'ev 1994. Rannjaja oboronitel'naja stena Mirmekija, *VDI* 1, 54-63.
- Vinogradov, Ju.G. 1980. Die historische Entwicklung der Poleis der nördlichen Schwarzmeergebietes im 5. Jahrhundert v. Chr., *Chiron* 10, 53-100.
- Vinogradov, Ju.G. 1987. Votivnaja nadpis' dočeri carja Skilura iz Pantikapeja i problemy istorii Skifii i Bospora vo II v. do n.e., *VDI* 1, 55-86.
- Vinogradov, Ju.G. 1997a. Chersonesskij dekret 'O nesenii Dionisa' IOSPE I² 343 i vtorženie sarmatov v Skifiju, *VDI* 3, 104-124.
- Vinogradov, Ju.G. 1997b. *Pontische Studien*. Mainz.
- Vinogradov, Ju.G. 1999. Razgrom sarmatami Velikoj Skifii: sledy ordy vedut v Tavridu, in: P.P. Toločko (ed.), *Problemy skifo-sarmatskoj archeologii Severnogo Pričernomor'ja*. Zaporož'e, 59-62.
- Vinogradov, Ju.G. & A.N. Ščeglov 1990. Obrazovanie territorial'nogo Chersonesskogo gosudarstva, in: E.S. Golubcova (ed.), *Ellinizm: ekonomika, politika, kul'tura*. Moskva, 310-371.
- Zin'ko, V.N. 1996. Nekotorye itogi izučenija sel'skoj okrugy antičnogo Nimfeja, *Materialy po archeologii, istorii i etnografii Tavriki* 5, 12-20.

