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Chora and Polis in the Kingdom of Bosporus in the Classical and Hellenistic Periods

In recent years, regular archaeological excavations in Bosporus have offered an opportunity to examine the spatial development of the agrarian landscape, as well as the chronology and functioning of rural settlements and country estates. Fieldwork has also provided a deeper insight into the nature of the economic activity of the inhabitants in this region. Before the mid-1960s, the boundaries of the agrarian territory of Bosporan cities could only be approximated. In light of intensive archaeological research and surveys on both the Kerch and the Taman peninsulas, scholars have now been able to distinguish levels of settlement and building activity in the agrarian landscape over time and to separate those regions of chora belonging to the cities from those the kings of Bosporus. Research results have facilitated the establishment of a continuous chronology for those rural districts linked to well-known historical events within the Kingdom of Bosporus. The data have also served as a basis for generating a detailed classification for country estates, farms, and fortified sites during the Archaic, Classical, Hellenistic, and Roman periods. Moreover, a typology of rural settlements has brought us closer to the thorny subject of polis and royal landowning. Scholars have long maintained, that the division of agrarian possessions into polis and royal land extends back to the 5th century BC when the Greek cities of Bosporus were organized in a political union - symmachia - with the royal dynasty at its head; at first, there were the
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Archaeactids and from 438 BC onward, the Spartocids³. This article intends to examine the extent to which this widely held interpretation is valid, given the latest archaeological developments in the region.

During the course of Greek colonization in the 6th century BC, a number of Hellenic cities were founded on the shores of the Strait of Kerch: Panticapaeum, Nymphaeum, Phanagoria, Theodosia, Hermonassa, Cepoe, and most likely Patraeus as well as some smaller sites. These cities developed independently and separately over the course of a century or more. One common feature of this Greek polis development, however, most certainly included the possession of certain rural areas. Although a clear reconstruction of the rural landscape of Bosporus has still proved elusive, certain critical observations can be presented. The entire northeastern part of the Kerch peninsula, for example, was characterized by so-called “small” cities: Myrmekion, Tyritake, Parthenion, Porthmion, Hermision, and Chersonesus of Zeno, which belonged to Panticapaeum; sites in the southwestern part of the peninsula behind Lake Tchurubash belonged to the city of Nymphaeum⁴ (Fig. 1-2). It cannot be determined to which large polis other “small” cities belonged. Undoubtedly, Korokondama, Achilleion, Tyramba, Patraeus and probably the Asian Kimmerikos were placed on the chora of the largest cities of the region – either Phanagoria or Hermonassa – and founded as real Greek colonies directly from the Aegean. To a lesser extent one can also think of Cepoe, since this city bordered Phanagoria and the expansion of its chora to the west was impeded by Phanagoria’s chora. While Cepoe could have expanded to the region of the modern Phantalovskij peninsula (the ancient Kimmerian Island), its spatial growth could equally have been controlled by Patraeus, which appeared in the third quarter of the 6th century BC along the northern coast of the Taman Gulf⁵, or by Kimmerikos, founded supposedly in the 6th century BC⁶. Greek authors even mention another site, Tyramba, for which archaeological excavations have established that it was settled not later than the late 6th-early 5th century BC and experienced its heyday between the 4th–3rd centuries BC⁷. Therefore, the site

³ For the creation of the Bosporan kingdom see: Viktor F. Gajdukevich, Das Bosporanische Reich (Berlin, Amsterdam 1971) 32ff.; on polis and royal lands in the early period of Bosporan history see: Irina T. Krouglikova, Sel’skoe khoziaistvo Bospora (Moscow 1975) 160; Maslennikov, Ellinskaja khora 46.
Fig. 1. Rural Territory of the European Bosporus in the 6th-3rd centuries BC: 1 - chorai of Panticapaeum, Nymphaeum and Theodosia; 2 - probable chora of Panticapaeum; 3 - excavated settlements of the 6th-5th centuries BC (according to I. T. Krouglikova and A. A. Maslennikov).
near the modern town of Peresyp, traditionally identified with ancient Tyramba, could hardly have exploited the surrounding lands.

Upon closer inspection of the archaeological map of the Taman peninsula (Fig.3,1–3), it becomes apparent that from the 6th–5th centuries BC and even throughout antiquity, the site of Akhtanizovskaja 4, dating from the mid 6th century BC to the 3rd century AD, occupied the furthest geographical point within the developed territory east-northeast of Cepoe. The site was linked to Phanagoria by a road, which can only serve to highlight the influence the city exerted in organizing the settlement and arranging the whole surrounding district.

Fig. 3. Territory of the Asian Bosporus in Different Periods of Development (according to J. M. Paromov and V. D. Kuznecov): 1 - agrarian sites of the Taman peninsula before the Roman period; 2 - chorai of the Greek cities at Taman in the 6th century BC; 3 - chorai of the Greek cities at Taman in the late 6th till the early 5th century BC.
an area situated not far from Cepoe. It is significant that Pseudo-Scylax lists the Hellenic cities Phanagoria, Cepoe, the Sindian Harbour, Patus (Patraeus or Batae) in the country of the Sindians – Sindica (Ps.-Scylax 70). Although the information provided by Pseudo-Scylax is dated to the 4th century BC, some of his evidence has been dated even as early as the 6th century BC. A reference to Patus (= Patraeus?) along with Phanagoria and Cepoe (perhaps even Hermonassa, if one does not regard the latter as a textual intrusion) presupposes the independent functioning of Patraeus until at least the second or third quarter of the 4th c. BC, when the Sindian Harbour, referred to by Pseudo-Scylax, was re-named Gorgippia. In the last decade of the 5th century BC, Cepoe belonged to the Spartocids (Aischin. Ap.Ctes. 3; Schol. ad Demosth. VIII, p.18 Dind.), while Phanagoria, which retained its own polis coin mint until 389 BC, had not yet fallen under their control.

Thus, the evidence supplied by Pseudo-Scylax should reflect the period prior to the submission of Phanagoria, Patraeus, and the Sindian Harbour to the Spartocids and shows that the *periplous* deals with the time before the early 4th century BC. In this passage, Cepoe is dealt with separately, which would signal a time when Cepoe was independent of Bosporus, i.e. between the 6th – late 5th century BC, or had already been incorporated into this kingdom, i.e. between the end of the 5th – beginning of the 4th century BC. If this was the case, Phanagoria, Cepoe, Patraeus and presumably Hermonassa must have had their own rural territories at least as early as the Archaic and Early Classical periods (6th–5th centuries BC).

When Spartocus I came to power in 438 BC or at the latest under his successor Satyros I, Cepoe took the side of the new dynasty; Phanagoria, Hermonassa, and Patraeus possibly still supported the adherents of the former ruling family – the Archaeanactids. They did not immediately hurry to join the *symmachia* of the Bosporan cities of the European side (except Theodosia), which had become the basis for a new regime. After having brought Theodosia to submission and having achieved a victory over Heraclea Pontica at the beginning of the 4th century BC, Leucon I initiated what would become a period of broad territorial expansion on the Asian side of Bosporus. Although Satyros I had laid the basis for this expansion, it was his son and successor, Leucon I, who succeeded in subjugating Sindica. Phanagoria, Hermonassa, and Patraeus also would align themselves with the new dynasty. These actions could have followed events associated with the aggressive opposition of the Maeotae and the Sindians against the Greeks. This conflict is

10 *Michail I. Rostovtzev*, Skifija i Bospor (Leningrad 1925) 23–25: although M. I. Rostovtzev denied the early date of Pontic *periplous*' witnesses, and dated them not earlier than the 4th century BC, they are now confidently dated to 508–500 BC (Alexander A. Baschmakoff, *La synthèse des periples pontiques* [Paris 1948] 14, 22).
perhaps echoed in a popular Bosporan legend about the Maeotian queen Tyrgatao and the Sindian king Hecataeus (Polyaen. VIII 55). The queen together with the Maeotian tribe, the Jazamati, devastated Sindica and the Asian part of the Bosporan kingdom. As a result, the Greek cities, probably in the time of Leucon I, united around the Spartocids, who according into a votive inscription from Semi-bratnee Gorodische – ancient Labrita – expanded into the hinterland of Sindica. From this time onward, Phanagoria could have emerged as a focal point of Spartan policy in Sindica and included into her chora the small domain of Cepoe and Patraeus. These small cities, in turn, were interested in the supervision by Phanagoria and by the Spartocids due to the increasingly aggressive actions of local barbarian tribes.

According to the above-mentioned inscription from Labryta, there were some problems between the Sindians and the local Scythian ruler. After the first half of the 4th century BC, the newly founded polis of Gorgippia started to arrange its own chora and included into its possessions already existing cities as well as nearby Sind, Sinda or Sindian Harbour. In any case, during the course of the 6th–early 4th centuries BC, Phanagoria, Hermonassa, Cepoe, and presumably Patraeus had their own agricultural land on the islands of Sindica, Phanagora, and Kimmeris (the modern Phantalovskij peninsula). At some time, Cepoe could also have obtained its own agricultural territory; only later it became incorporated into the Phanagorian state. In addition, it should be taken into account that after submitting to the Spartocids, Phanagoria increased its settlement activity along the Phantalovskij peninsula, while Hermonassa enlarged its chora east and southeast of the Taman peninsula. If this was the case, then the “small” cities on the Asian side, listed above, fulfilled the same function as their counterparts on the European side, namely to help the largest cities develop the surrounding countryside and keep it in the hands of their polis communities. It was not by chance, that Asian Kimmerikos had been founded by the tyrants of Bosporus not earlier than in the 4th century BC, i.e. it had been colonized anew (Ps-Scymn. 896–899). The same scenario probably applied to other “small” Bosporan towns or townlike cities, since the purpose was to strengthen Bosporan influence in the chora and the positions of the large Greek cities in that area. The resulting power base of the rulers, then, was as much of polis character as tyrannic in origin. The primary goal of this policy was to expand the agrarian possessions to enable a more suitable use of resources. Thus, it seems quite correct to consider that the “small” towns had to be established in the countryside in order to further develop the agricultural land retained by the large Bosporan poleis.

---

13 Zavoikin, Kimmerida 133 ff.; idem, Periodozatsija 120; cf. Viktor G. Zubarev, Aziatskij Bospor (Tamanskij poluostrrov) po dannym anticnoj pismennoj traditsii, in: Drevnosti Bospora 2 (1999) 124–126: he places Kimmerikos at the site of Peresyp’ where Tyramba is traditionally localized, but this seems to be dubious (see: Juri M. Desiatchikov, Aziatskij Kimmerik [Dostizhenija Sovetskoj arkheologii ν XI pjatiletke, Baku 1985] 131–132: identifies the town with the site of Kuchugury).
In the Late Archaic and Early Classical periods (mid-late 6th – beginning of the 5th century BC), most of the rural settlements were situated on the Asian side of the Bosporus – 63 alone on the Taman peninsula. Unfortunately, these sites have never been excavated and their dating is established solely on survey evidence. At that time, sites were built on the banks of the Kuban River, on the coastline, and in the interior. They were all linked with Phanagoria and Hermonassa, which suggests inclusion into their chorai. The first settlements appeared there already in the mid-third quarter of the 6th century BC, which speaks for initial peaceful relations between the Greeks and the Sindians, who allowed the Greeks to interfere even in the hinterland of their territory. Already at this time, these early sites were linked to Phanagoria by roads, which confirms a certain role of this city in colonizing the peninsula and organizing the chora. By the end of the 6th – early 5th century BC, the number of interior sites on the Taman peninsula increased significantly, a development which should be associated with the process of settlement formation and polis development. In order to keep the neighbouring lands in the hands of these poleis, several large sites were established on the chora in the late 6th century BC, such as Tyramba and imposing sites of agrarian type like Golubitzkaja 2 and Akhtanizovskaja. These sites should be regarded as administrative centers of certain regions within the chora and subject to polis officials.

Quite another pattern can be observed on the opposite side of the Strait of Kerch, where only few sites of the period come into existence (Fig.1, 3). In the second quarter of the 6th century BC, the town of Myrmekion was founded, apparently not so much as a result of the so-called “secondary” colonization, but as a reinforcement for the neighbouring lands belonging to Panticapaeum. Included among rural settlements of that time are: Geroevka 1, Juzhno-Tchurubashskoe, which belonged to the chora of Nymphaeum (Fig. 2), Tchokrakskij Spring in the Crimean Azov region, early Porthmion, Andreevka the Southern, in the vicinity of Panticapaeum, Aivazovskoe, Frontovoe, Zhuravka, and Novopokrovka –

14 Jakov M. Paromov, Materialy k arkheologii Tamanskogo poluostrova (Prichernomorje v VI-V vv. do n.e., Tbilisi 1990) 122, 123; idem, Ocherk istorii arkheologo-topograficheskogo issledovaniya Tamanskogo poluostrova, in: Bosporskij Sbornik 1 (1992) 133; idem, Osnovnije 6–8; Andrej P. Abramov, Jakov M. Paromov, Ranneantichnije poselenija Tamanskogo poluostrova, in: Bosporskij Sbornik 2 (1993) 71 ff.
15 Abramov, Paromov, Ranneantichnije 71.
17 Abramov, Paromov, Ranneantichnije 71–73; Paromov, Osnovnije 7–9.
18 Vinogradov, Nekotorije problemy 152–160.
20 Maslennikov, Nekotorije problemy 61–71; idem, Ellinskaja khora 37–44; idem, Drevnije
in the region of Theodosia. Some of these sites appear to be purely Hellenic, such as Geroevka 1, Juzhno-Tchurubashskoe, Porthmion, Andreevka, whereas others were of mixed Helleno-Scythian character (e.g. Tchokraksj Spring). Some of these sites clearly belonged to the chorai of Panticapaeum, Theodosia, and Nymphaeum. The majority of Classical agrarian settlements is concentrated to the north, northeast, and to the west of Panticapaeum, spreading over the whole northeastern part of the Kerch peninsula in the area of the modern villages Bagerovo, Glazovka, Vojkovo. The territory encompassed by these sites forms a roughly rectangular area, bordered by a line between Lake of Tchokrak—Bagerovo-Kerch (Panticapaeum) (Fig. 1, 2). Both population and site density strongly suggest that this territory was actually the chora of Panticapaeum by the early 5th century BC. This observation is strengthened by the fact that most of the above-mentioned sites were in ruins by the beginning of the 5th century BC and only few were in use again in the second quarter of the 5th century BC. Sites located on the Kimmerikos-Hill A, Cape Zyk, and the Cape of Tchokrak, for example, came into existence during this period and probably belonged to Panticapaeum, which had enlarged its chora by the 5th century BC.

In this same period, the rural territory of Nymphaeum also began to take shape. Its territory spread to the south of the so-called “Tyritake Rampart”, constructed in the 18th century along the coastline between Lake Tchurubash and Tobechik; to the west, it bordered the Glubokajia Ravine (35 sq.km and about 6 km in diameter). It is more difficult, however, to attribute ownership of the Archaic site of Kimmerikos-Hill A, where pottery fragments of the 6th-5th centuries BC have been discovered. The same situation applies to the site of Tchokraksj Spring, since, as A. A. Maslennikov notes, the Greeks until the first or second third of the 5th century BC could hardly have established any settlements in the Crimean Azov region west of Cape Zyk. These sites could be Scythian sites or belong to some other tribes which had close ties with the inhabitants of the Crimean foothills, whose graves survive in the form of rough stone boxes within stone circles. Nevertheless, nothing excludes the possibility that these sites could have been the first Greek or Helleno-Scythian creations on the chora of Panticapaeum, whose inhabitants established good, peaceful relations with the Scythians under the Archaeanactids and early Spartocids. Moreover, this enabled them to develop distant
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23 Paper given by A. A. Maslennikov during a conference in memory of Prof. V. D. Blavatskij (May 1999).
24 Maslennikov, Drevnije greki 82.
regions of the peninsula, including the Azov coastline. It is surely no coincidence, that on the eastern and western slopes of Opuk Hill, where the earliest settlement – Kimmerikos – had been created, pottery similar to that produced by the barbarian tribes has been found\(^{26}\). When examined as a whole, these facts confirm the peaceful contacts between the Bosporan Greeks and the resident population after the events of 480 and 438 BC in Panticapaeum. As a result, a fortified defensive wall at Myrmekion, which had been erected against the Scythian threat during the first third of the 5\(^{\text{th}}\) century BC, lost importance already in the second third of the century due to changes in Bosporo-Scythian relations and stability in the kingdom\(^{27}\).

It is equally difficult to gain a clear picture of the chora of Theodosia. As a map of rural sites in the region illustrates (Fig.1, 1), during the 6\(^{\text{th}}\)-3\(^{\text{rd}}\) centuries BC it could have extended northwest and northeast of the city up to a distance of approximately 20 km. The most outlying sites appear to have been Gogolevka and Starij Krim to the north-west and Batal’noe and Batal’noe 2 to the north-east\(^{28}\). In any case, the rural area in the Eastern Crimea during the 6\(^{\text{th}}\)-early 5\(^{\text{th}}\) century BC was divided up exclusively between Panticapaeum, Nymphaeum, and Theodosia with their adjacent territories or chorai. The rural sites were mostly established within a coastal zone which did not expand far into the peninsula’s interior. This seems to be a feature which distinguishes Greek settlements of the Eastern Taurica from sites on the Kuban River delta and Taman peninsula, where even in the earliest periods Greeks became accustomed to spread out deep into the hinterland. Indeed, this difference in settlement patterns also reflected the situation in the Eastern Crimea where colonists had to face political and military pressure of the steppeland population, mainly the Scythians. This was not the case, for example, in the colonies of the Asian Bosporus, with their peaceful relations between the Hellenes and the Sindians from the very beginning of the colonizing process.

Recent archaeological research has permitted some clarification concerning this interpretation. It is now obvious that in the 6\(^{\text{th}}\)-5\(^{\text{th}}\) centuries BC, the number of local inhabitants in that region was actually not large enough to threaten the Greek colonies with their land possessions. Native steppeland tribes of the Kerch peninsula strongly depended on the royal Scythians\(^{29}\). Thus, another explanation must be found for the absence or paucity of Greek farms and sites in the hinterland of the Kerch peninsula and their primary concentration near the coastline or in close proximity to the city walls. Stephanus of Byzantium relates that while founding Panticapaeum the son of Aietus was granted land for the future city from Agaetus, king of the Scythians (Steph.Byz. s.v. Panticapaeum). Based on this


\(^{28}\) Petrova, Greki i “varvary” 146,147; Krouglikova, Sel’skaja territorija. 74; Evgenij A. Katiyushin, Feodosija – Kaffa – Kefe (Feodosija 1998) 23–25.

\(^{29}\) Maslennikov, Nekotorije problemy 61–71; idem, Kamennije jaschiki 62.
legend, which goes back to the great period of Greek colonization and the time when the Milesians founded Panticapaeum in the first quarter of the 6th century BC, it is possible to conclude that the first Greek settlers could obtain land for establishing the colony directly from resident Scythian tribes “by a treaty” with their king. This often occurred, for example, during the creation of apoikiai in the Black Sea region as in the case of Heraclea Pontica. Therefore, the amount of land possessions of the early colony was limited in accordance with a special agreement with the natives, and any new acquisition of territory followed either military action or the conclusion of a new treaty. Both approaches imply the expansion of the Greeks at the expense of neighbouring barbarian lands. This probably can also be seen as the cause of certain devastations and disasters suffered by early Hellenic settlements on the Kerch peninsula in the course of the 6th – beginning of the 5th century BC. Archaeologically, these destructions have been traced in the Archaic layers of all these sites, and indicate a possible backlash against Greek attempts to enlarge their possessions. Thus, in this early period, the Greek poleis of the Eastern Taurica could possess only a small amount of territory in their vicinity, and these lands are best characterized simply as being “adjacent to the cities”.

At the turn of the first to the second quarter of the 5th century BC several new “agrarian” towns appeared: Chersonesus of Zeno, Parthenion (reconstructed), Zephirion, Hermision, Heracleon, and finally – not later than the late 5th century BC – Cytaeum and Acra. All these towns presumably belonged to the chora of Panticapaeum, which had already been enlarged (see above). The polis chora of Nymphaeum also expanded in this time; nine new sites were founded, such as Tobechik 3, Tobechik 8, Tobechik 9, Ogon’ki 1 (Fig.2; 4). Old farms and country estates like Geroevka 1 grew in size and were rebuilt towards the last quarter of the 5th century BC. Moreover, kurgans of the Scythian aristocracy appeared in the chora, attesting to its spread to the west. The new western border of the city’s land possessions followed the Ortelskaja Ravine.

Fragments of Hellenic pottery dated to the 5th century BC and discovered along the coast of Maeotis west of Cape Zyk show that the Greek penetration in that area could represent an enlargement of the chora of Panticapaeum resulting from the addition of new lands, appropriated from the Scythians. The agricultural territory of both Panticapaeum and Nymphaeum underwent a parallel phase of expansion, though Nymphaeum did not acknowledge the rule of the Spartocids. It is probably not by accident that Pseudo-Scylax, when giving a list of Hellenic
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32 Zinke, Khora 87–89; idem, Nekotorije itogi 13–14; idem, Sakral’naja skulptura s sel’skoj okrugi Nimfeja (Bosporskiy fenomen: grecheskaja kul’tura na priferii antichnogo mira, Saint-Petersburg 1999) 188–191; Nonna L. Grach, Nekropol Nimfeja (Saint-Petersburg  1999) 25.
Fig. 4. Plan of the Site of Ogon'ki on the Chora of Nymphaeum (according to V. N. Zinko).
cities of the European Bosporus, states that Theodosia, Cytaeum, Nymphaeum, Panticapaeum, and Myrmekion were situated on the lands of the Scythians (Ps. Scylax, 68). In the chora of Panticapaeum, the subdued town of Myrmekion suffered a series of devastations caused by Scythian acts of aggression toward the end of the first quarter of the 5th century BC. Many other rural settlements were likewise ruined and stopped functioning. In the second quarter of the 5th century BC, a destruction layer appears to be separating two stratigraphic layers at Chersonesus of Zeno, which confirms a change in settlement life. Earlier scholars postulated that Geroevka 1 in the chora of Nymphaeum was destroyed in the early 5th century BC. Recent research, however, has indicated that no traces of fire and ruins at that time prove an abandonment phase between the second quarter and the end of the 5th century. In addition, the discovery of Scythian kurgans in its necropolis attests to the stability of mutual relations between the Scythians and Nymphaeum. In contrast, Panticapaeum had to enlarge its chora by force, which explains the appearance of weapons among the burial goods of the early necropolis on the site.

The development of agrarian territory within the Asian part of the state continued with greater intensity than at any previous time. During the course of the 5th century BC, the possessions of Phanagoria and Hermonassa expanded to the interior. Most of the earlier sites continued in use; the number of settlements reached a total of 81 (Fig. 3, 1), which indicates a steady relationship between the inhabitants and the barbarian tribes of that region. Despite the political changes caused by the rise to power of the Archaeoactids, the cities of the Asian Bosporus persisted in extending their rural possessions and dealing on good terms with the resident population. Ultimately, these developments mean that during the 5th century BC the rural territory of the kingdom functioned exclusively as polis land. The tense situation on the chora of Panticapaeum, unlike the relatively peaceful chorai of Nymphaeum, Phanagoria, Hermonassa and probably Theodosia, can probably be attributed to the new regime of the Archaeoactids, since their political base could draw upon the resources of Greek poleis on the Asian side of Bosporus, Nymphaeum and Theodosia. This is confirmed by V. D. Blavatskij's supposition that the dynasty might originate from one of the cities of the Asian Bosporus. In addition, there is evidence that some refugees from Panticapaeum, supposedly supporters of the Archaeoactids or opponents of Bosporan centralization, lived in Theodosia since 438 BC, at a time when the Spartocids had estab-

33 Vinogradov, Myrmekij 106,107; idem, Issledovaniya na zapadnoi okraine Myrmekija, in: KSIA 204 (1991) 76; Maslennikov, Ellinskaja khora 184.
35 Elena G. Kastanajan, Gruntovije nekropolii bosporskikh gorodov VI–IV vv. do n.e. i mestnije ikh osobennosti, in: MIA 69 (1959) 260–263.
lished power in the capital of Bosporus (Anon. Per. 77; Isokr. Trap. XVII.5)\(^{37}\). The new regime probably was either unable or unwilling to prolong the terms of treaty with the Scythians regarding land borders. This treaty had been concluded in the 6\(^{th}\) century BC while founding Panticapaeum.

The succeeding stage in developing the chora of Bosporus occurred in conjunction with the first Spartocids. In approximately 405 BC, Nymphaeum fell into the hands of this dynasty. At the end of the first quarter of the 4\(^{th}\) century BC or shortly thereafter, the fight to capture Theodosia began, when Satyros I and then Leucon I put pressure on Sindica, after having seized many areas in the Asian Bosporus. All these events had an impact on the chora. Despite the inclusion of the city of Nymphaeum into the kingdom, the chora of Nymphaeum flourished in the early 4\(^{th}\) century BC. There were 35 sites in the early 4\(^{th}\)/beginning of the 3\(^{rd}\) century BC; some of them were enlarged and reconstructed. In the last quarter of the 5\(^{th}\) century BC, Geroevka 1 was transformed into a large building more than 20 m in length, while in the first half of the 4\(^{th}\) century BC, a fortified country estate was established consisting of a rectangular tower and what were most likely outer fortification walls 1,4–1,7 m in width, a courtyard, household and habitation structures. The site of Ogon’ki 1 can also be seen as a country estate with a courtyard. A system of sites along the boundaries of the city’s chora was also created, with the sites situated at a distance of 1–1,5 km from each other. Moreover, not only was there a visual connection, but a system of land division into land-plots between 1 ha and 29,4–35,4 ha in size was created. It shows that every citizen could possess an allotment on the chora. Large farms or complexes of farms were centers of small administrative units on the chora, while minor country estates or small farms, like the households of Geroevka 2 with dugouts, could have been subordinate to them (Fig. 2; 4). Earlier erected sites, such as Juzhno-Tchurubashskoe, Tchurubash 9, Geroevka 6 and others were still active and continued in use. This distribution of sites underscores the fact that the chora of Nymphaeum was a developed administrative and economic unit with an assembled infrastructure including lands perceived as adjacent to the city. To a certain extent, the organization of the polis land of Nymphaeum is reminiscent of the polis chorai of Tauric Chersonesus and Olbia\(^{38}\).

By the 370's BC, a traditional agrarian structure of a Hellenic polis, based on country estates and individual farms with their surrounding parcels of land, subject administratively and militarily to the community of citizens, had been created in the Bosporan kingdom. At the same time, the largest poleis like Panticapaeum

\(^{37}\) Dmitry P. Kallistov, Ocherki po istorii Severnogo Prichernomor’ja antichnoj epochi (Leningrad 1949) 213; Fedor V. Shelov-Kovedijaev, Istorija Bospora v VI-IV vekakh do n.e. (Drevnejshie gosudarstva na territorii SSSR, Moscow 1985) 115.

enlarged their land domains, and the small sites, unfortified villages, and even small farms were incorporated into large fortified units on the chora. The whole system of control over the poleis and their rural territories came under the authority of polis officials subject to the Spartocids as archons of Bosporus or of governors appointed by them. The elements of this system can be subdivided as follows: a) small farms – oikoi (Pustynnij Bereg), consisting of isolated stone buildings with one to four rooms, with or without a courtyard (Fig. 5, 1); b) country estates – residences of “royal satraps” or governors of certain regions on the chora (Tchokrak); c) emporia or centers of trade with the barbarians of the interior which were at the same time “centers of royal landowning” ( attribution by A. A. Maslennikov), like Generalskoe the Western; d) farms with land-plots (Andreevka the Southern, Baklan’ja Rock, Oktiabr’skoe etc.); e) villages-komai of the native Scythian rural population in the interior of the Kerch peninsula, consisting of mostly unfortified sites such as Ak-Tash, Zolotoe-Plateau, Koshara.

Farms like Andreevka the Southern, Oktiabr’skoe, Baklan’ja Rock are thought to have been owned by individual property holders and as belonging to the chora of Panticapaeum; while the coastal forts and fortified settlements (Generalskoe the Western, Tchokrak) were associated with the royal chora and were immediately subject to the Spartocids. The boundaries of the chora of Theodosia can still be traced. In the 4th-3rd centuries BC it covered a territory of 10-20 sq. km. In the coastal zone Hellenic country estates constituted the dominant buildings; in the villages of the interior, the native population obviously prevailed (Vinogradnoe, Otvazhnoe, Boevoe, Tambovka, Vladislavovka, Frontovoe etc.). Other sites inhabited by the local population were situated near Starij Krym beyond the River of Tchuruksu. The chora of Theodosia clearly encompassed the territory adjacent to the city, i.e. the real polis–chora, divided up into land-plots, and the region, which was subject to the city, with villages-komai of the resident population presumably semi-dependent on the polis community. Indeed, this structure mirrors what we know about the polis chora of Panticapaeum, confirming the polis character of landownership under the first Spartocids.

The period from the 4th to the end of the first quarter of the 3rd century BC was a flourishing period for the chorai of Phanagoria and Hermonassa. At that time there were 185 sites, twothirds of which were newly organized small sites or separately placed farms (Fig. 1–3). It was a process of consolidation of the chorai

39 Alexander A. Maslennikov, Sel’skaja territorija Evropejskogo Bospora v antichnyuyu epochu, Diss.(Moscow 1993) 12–15; idem, Ellinskaja khora 66; idem, Drevnie greki 82 ff.; on excavations of different types of rural sites in East Taurica see: idem, Issledovanija pamyatnikov Bosporskoy khory v Krimskom Priaizov’je (Arkheologicheskije issledovanija v Krymu, Simferopol 1994) 195. See also: idem, O tipologii 72; Krouglkova, Sel’skaja territorija 72–76.

Fig. 5. Plans of Bosporan Sites of the Hellenistic Epoch: 1 – Pustynnij Bereg (according to A. A. Maslennikov); 2 – Bijuk-Janyshar (according to E. Katiuschin); 3 – the tholos of Taman (according to N. I. Sokol’skij); 4 – Djemete (according to E. M. Alexeeva); 5 – Polianka (according to A. A. Maslennikov).
nearest to Phanagoria and Hermonassa when the islands of Kimmerios, Phanagoria, Golubitzkij, and the Great Kandaur had been saturated with settlements and the number of coastal sites as well as the villages-komai in the interior greatly increased\textsuperscript{41}. After the foundation of Gorgippia in the first half of the 4\textsuperscript{th} century BC, the nearest chora began to play an active role, including such sites as Dzhemete, Utash, Su-Psech, Krasnaja Skala, Krasnij Kurgan. Five unfortified rural sites of the 4\textsuperscript{th} century BC were found, which were composed of several separately standing houses at a distance of 50–100 m from each other. They all belonged to citizens of Gorgippia\textsuperscript{42}. The organization of the Bosporan chora continued for the most part with the polis land possessions of the largest cities serving as a main base as they had done earlier. One difference, however, appeared in the 4\textsuperscript{th} century BC: a large part of rural territory, chiefly in Eastern Taurica, was covered with numerous villages inhabited by the local rural population on the so-called “distant” chora, and was subjected to polis communities, at least to that of Panticapaeum, and through them to the supreme power of the Spartocids as archons of Bosporus and Theodosia.

In this connection, the important question arises, if it is correct to define the “royal” land at Bosporus at that time as being a direct possession of the Spartocid dynasty. Some scholars in support of this connection argue that some agrarian regions in the interior of the Kerch peninsula, in the Crimean Azov region and to the west of Nymphaeum, as well as on the Taman peninsula should be attributed to “royal” lands\textsuperscript{43}. This opinion is based on three contemporary narrative accounts. The first is Isokrates’ “Trapezitikos”, where there is a description of a certain Sopeus, one of Satyros’ I favourites, who “was in charge of a large region and cared for all his (Satyros’ I – S.S.) possessions” (Isokr. Trap. 3). It does not, however, follow from this speech that Sopeus had property on royal lands: the verbs ἀρχεῖν and ἐπιμελεῖσθαι, used in the passage for characterizing Sopeus’ functions in the kingdom, have the nuance “to rule”, “to govern”, “to be in charge of something”, but not the meaning of owning something or obtaining somebody else’s property; they also do not mean “to possess” but simply “to govern” as official administrative magistrate, responsible for the state of affairs on a certain territory which was under the rule of an archon or tyrant – in this particular case an official

\begin{footnotesize}
\item[43] See, for example, Shelov-Kovedijaev, Istorija Bospora 159; Maslennikov, Ellinskaja khora 66–72; \textit{idem}, Drevnie greki 82 ff.; Krouglikova, Sel’skoe khoziaistvo 160; Juri V. Gorlov, Juri A. Lopanov, Drevnejshaja sistema melioratzii na Tamanskom poluostrove, in: VDI 3 (1995) 121 ff.; Rusijaeva, Zubar, Bospor Kimmerijskij 34: the authors consider the lands to have belonged to “the tyrants”.
\end{footnotesize}
of the supreme ruler Satyros I. "Ωστε πολλής μὲν χώρας ἀρχεῖν, ἀπάσης δὲ τῆς δυνάμεως ἐπιμελεῖσθαι τῆς ἐκείνου means that Satyros I possessed a territory not as a proprietor, but as an official ruler – archon of Bosporus –, and Sopeus could have been an ordinary governor of the subjected territory or of part of it, regardless of any polis or royal status of the land. Polis lands also were divided into administrative, economic, military, and strategic units under the charge of polis officials – epimeletoi, and there is no reason to think that Sopeus possessed land granted to him as part of his own property by the Spartocid ruler or that he was governing over land which was a property of the dynasty. It seems more probable that he was in charge of a region in accordance with a rule established in the Bosporan state under the Spartocids and applied when a member of the ruling family or a man closely connected with it received a governorship in the Asian part of the kingdom.

The second narrative is a well known story about Gylon, grandfather of Demosthenes from his mother’s side. For handing over Nymphaeum to the tyrants of Bosporus, he received as a gift from Satyros I a town by the name of Cepoe (Aeschin. Ap Ctes. 171) or – as the Scholia to Demosthenes report – obtained from the dynasts of Pontus “for subsistence the so-called Cepoe, some places …” (Schol. ad Demosth. VIII p.18 Dind.). The evidence shows a close parallel to Plutarch’s description of Themistocles’ political career in the Persian kingdom, where king Artaxerxes bestowed on him as a gift some cities: Magnesia for bread, Lampsacon for wine, and Myus for υφος (Plut. Them. 29.7). Modern scholarship has understood this act as a gift by the king to the Athenian general who was appointed ruler over Magnesia and the neighbouring cities with their territories. As a special incentive, all the revenues and taxes which were going from these cities to the Great King, were now channeled to support Themistocles and his family. Gylon could have also been made Satyros’ governor – epimeletes in Cepoe and those lands in the close vicinity, probably the city’s territory (τόπους τινάς), with the task to levy taxes and the right to take a part of them for his own needs. Unlike Plutarch’s account, there is no reference whatsoever to royal land property; thus, Gylon could rule in Cepoe under the supervision of Satyros I, but not as a proprietor. The tyrant is seen here more as a ruler than as an owner of land. This episode, then, can hardly prove the existence of royal land property in Bosporus in the early 4th century BC. Indeed, it only shows that at the beginning of the century, Cepoe may have had its own rural territory.

A third piece of evidence can be found in Diodorus’ passage on Eumeles’ ruling in Bosporus when he received 1000 hungry refugees from Callatis, which was besieged in 311/310 BC by Lysimachus. He gave them not only security but also a polis for settlement and divided up plots of land for them somewhere on the king-

dom’s territory (Diod.XX 25.1). Although this part of the text is damaged, a special article has been dedicated to this question, where an attempt was made to show that the Callatians were settled on the Kerch peninsula roughly somewhere near the chora of Nymphaeum. The king’s action reflected the standards of polis land tenure and polis juridical norms. Diodorus’ remark that Eumeles perished while returning from Sindica to his own land (έκ γαρ τῆς Σινδικῆς ἑπανών εἰς τὴν οἰκείαν: Diod.XX 25.4) is sometimes taken as evidence for royal land property of the king. This passage, however, by no means can be associated with royal landownership, because it merely relates that the king returned from some place in Sindica outside Bosporus into his own kingdom, i.e. within the borders of the Bosporan kingdom. Oikeia can mean not only “private holding”, but also “household affairs”, “something which belongs to one family” (LSJ. s.v.), so it can point to the Bosporan kingdom ruled by Eumeles.

Ultimately, none of these three accounts proves the existence of royal landowning in the Kingdom of Bosporus under the Spartocids. If their power had been tyrannic as was the case with the Archaeanactids, it consequently did not step outside the framework of polis administration. Therefore the land brought under Spartocid control in the 4th till the early 3rd century BC, should be labelled solely as “polis land”. It is also unnecessary to search for Gylon’s or Sopeus’ possessions either on the Kerch peninsula or on the Taman peninsula, since all the land at that time was divided between the largest poleis of Bosporus – Panticapaeum, Theodosia, Nymphaeum, Phanagoria, Hermonassa, Gorgippia, and Cepoe – at some period in the 4th century BC under Satyros I. These can hardly be considered as royal land possessions. K. M. Kolobova accurately stated that cities incorporated into the Kingdom of Bosporus at first ruled the adjacent territories on their own, and that the Bosporan rulers, including Leucon I, at first had no privately owned land. Even when the power of the Spartocids became stronger, the cities of Bosporus kept their rural possessions (see: VDI 4 (1953) 56ff.). This is certainly true for Panticapaeum, since Strabo says that the Bosporan tyrants had earlier owned only a small region by the mouth of Maeotis and Panticapaeum up to Theodosia, while the largest part of the country up to the isthmus and the Karkinit Bay was in the possession of the Scythian tribe of the Tauri (Strabo VII 4.5). The geographer also mentions Theodosia as a border town between the possessions of the Bosporanians and the Tauri. “Furtheron lies a fruitful country up to Panticapaeum, a capital of Bosporus, built by the mouth of Maeotis” – concludes Strabo (VII 4. 4). The first account indicates that the Spartocids (and probably the Archaeanactids) had control over the land spanning the whole Kerch peninsula from the capital as far as Theodosia, while the second account proves that the chora of Theodosia was bordering the land of the Tauri in the west and the country submitted to Panticapaeum (the Bosporians) in the east. This country was possessed by the “tyrants”.
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Thus, we should consider all land from the Strait of Kerch as far as Theodosia as having been controlled by Panticapaeum and its archons, i.e. the tyrants.

The latter is confirmed by epigraphic and numismatic sources. Until the mid 3rd century BC, or in the time before Paerisades II (284–c.245 BC), all the Spartocid dynasts held the title "archon of Bosporus and Theodosia, king of Sindians, of all the Maeotae", and, in addition, of the tribes of the Doschoi, Toretai, Dandarians, and Psessoi, these being enumerated according to a specific order reflecting the different dates of their submission (CIRB p. 840-843). Their official title is meant to underscore the nature of their power as being of polis type by origin, distinguishing polis land possessions on the Kerch and Taman peninsulas subsumed under the term "Bosporus" (e.g. the lands of Panticapaeum, Nymphaeum, Phanagoria, Hermonassa, Gorgippia) and the term "Theodosia", from lands in the Asian part of the state inhabited by resident tribes who recognized the royal authority of the Spartocids. Thus, any search for royal lands of the Spartocids should target the outermost periphery of Bosporus, ancient Sindica, and the neighbouring country not divided up by poleis. Accordingly, the whole Kerch peninsula and the Taman peninsula should also be regarded as polis lands, while the vast Bosporan possessions in the hinterland of the Crimean Azov region, densely covered with numerous villages, country estates and forts, ought to be seen as the distant chora of Panticapaeum, with Panticapaeum being both the largest city in the kingdom and its capital. This scenario is underscored by the fact that under the Spartocids only Panticapaeum had a right to mint polis coins until the fall of the dynasty at the end of the 2nd century BC.

From the second quarter to the middle of the 3rd century BC (c. 270 BC) all settlements, villages, and country estates in the European Bosporus completely disappeared, having succumbed presumably to attacks by the Sarmatians living in the steppe region between the Tanais and Borysthenes rivers. As a result, the Scythian kingdom in Taurica was created, and a series of offensives against the Crimean Greeks was initiated. The resulting disappearance of villages and unfortified sites on the Kerch peninsula and the abandoning of forts and fortified settlements on the Crimean coast of Maeotis, signalled that the whole structure of the chora had radically changed. New fortified settlements were erected everywhere, mostly within the coastal zone of the Crimean Azov region, reflecting a habitation pattern considerably different from earlier periods. They took the form of small forts, and became administrative centers of their respective subordinate areas. Examples of these newly fortified sites include: the large forts of Porthmion and Zolotoe the Eastern, which undoubtedly dominated the vast surrounding district, and fortified country estates or rather large villas, such as Krutoj Bereg and Novootradnoe. Typical urban villas (villa urbica) also appeared, for example a complex found in the neighbourhood of ancient Myrmekion, which belonged to the chora of Panticapaeum. The chora of Nymphaeum underwent a reduction in size;

---

48 Vladilen A. Anochin, Monetnoe delo Bospora (Kiev 1986) 136–144.
the number of farms and sites seriously diminished, and only estates such as Ge-
roevo-1, Ogon'ki, Tchurubashskoe continued to function, but not beyond the
late 2nd century BC\(^49\). A similar development occurred in the chora of Theodosia.
On the one hand, barbarian and semi-barbarian villages practically disappeared,
and only Greek farms located close to the walls of the city continued in use. On
the other hand, a system of newly fortified sites (e.g. Bijuk-Janyshar [Fig. 5.2],
Kokljuk, and Tepe-Oba) established to defend the city’s chora, was created along
the boundaries of the Theodosian chora. Such sites were also to defend the south-
western frontier of the Bosporan kingdom\(^50\). For example, the forts on the coast of
Maeotis and in the hinterland of East Crimea could serve to defend the chorai
of Panticapaeum and Nymphaeum in the east; one might strongly argue that the
so-called Uzunlar rampart, erected around the middle of the 3rd century BC,
 served to protect against the barbarians – the Scythians and the Sarmatians –
threatening from the west\(^51\).

In this period, fortified settlements were constructed on rocky promontories
along the coast of the Strait of Kerch; they were surrounded with strong defensive
walls and ramparts. The interior living space, which encompassed an area of 0.5–2
ha in size, was densely occupied with buildings consisting of one or two rooms
which were oblong in shape, often adapted to topographical considerations. The
most studied site of this type is Zolotoe the Eastern. A. A. Maslennikov maintains
that sites of this type could have belonged to royal lands, while smaller sites, like
farms or rural estates, existed on lands far from polis centers, similar in type to
those termed suburban (e.g. Novootradnnoe, Artesian, Michailovka). But large
fords, such as Zolotoe the Eastern, are also known in Mainland Greece (Boiotia,
Thessaly, Lokris etc.) and were usually situated along the borders of the chorai of
large poleis for defensive purposes\(^52\). Just as these Greek establishments did not
belong to royal lands, the latter being absent from Classical Hellas, one could
argue that their Bosporan analogies of the 3rd–2nd centuries BC could also refer
to polis and not royal lands. As is evident for sites such as Generalskoe the Western,
we can hardly speak of royal landowning in Hellenistic Bosporus. The desig-

\(^{49}\) Goroncharovskij, Novije dannije 23–24; Zinko, Nekotoriye itogi 16–18; on the changes of
the chora on the Kerch peninsula since the second half of the 3rd century BC see: Krougli-
kov, Selskoe khozjajstvo 99, 203; Maslennikov, Ellinskaja khora 89–100.

\(^{50}\) Krouglikov, Selskoe khozjaijstvo 72; Petrova, Greki i “varvary” 151. The most studied
settlement of the Theodosian chora is Bijuk-Janyshar, a small fortress, which was to defend
the city towards the west, presumably against the Scythian threat. It is dated from the mid 3rd
to the late 2nd century BC: Katijuschin, Feodosija 40–43.

\(^{51}\) This idea I owe to a private communication by A. A. Maslennikov resulting from surveys
on the rampart; on the Sarmatian threat in Taurica in the 3rd century BC see: Jurij G. Vino-
gradov, Khersonesskij dekret o “nesenii Dionisa” IosPE I (ed.2) 343 i vtorzhenije sarmatov v
Skifiju, in: VDI 3 (1997) 119–124; on the Sarmatian monuments in the region close to the
Crimea see: Aleksandr V. Simonenko, Sarmaty Tavrii (Kiev 1993) 104–108.

\(^{52}\) John M. Fossey, The Ancient Topography of Eastern Phokis (Amsterdam 1986) 19–82;
_idem, The Ancient Topography of Opountian Lokris (Amsterdam 1990) 107–113; Hans
Lohmann, Agriculture and Country Life in Classical Attica, in: Agriculture in Ancient
nation of the Spartocids from the time of Paerisades III as "kings" is not decisive, since it simply reflects a Hellenistic tradition where tyrants frequently referred to themselves as "kings", in keeping with the diadochoi of Alexander the Great who were proclaimed "kings" in 308 BC. This is attested for the tyrants of Heraclea Pontica, who were declared "kings" in 306 BC during the last years of Dionysius' rule.

The distribution of rural sites on the Asian side of Bosporus indicates a quite different situation. From the beginning of the second quarter of the 3rd to the end of the first quarter of the 1st century BC, the largest number of sites ever was documented for the whole area of the Taman peninsula; according to J. M. Paramonov, there were 203 sites (3 large, 7 middle, and the remainder small in size) (Fig.3, 1). Practically the entire Taman peninsula was divided into land plots. The process of consolidating the chora along the already existing boundaries, suggests that it was precisely the polis chora of the largest cities of the region which flourished at this time - Phanagoria and Hermonassa. In addition, there were sanctuaries with their associated sacred lands and temples dedicated to Aphrodite Apatura. Some of these temples were constructed in tholos form (Fig.5, 3)\(^{53}\). The stability felt by the rural population in the region itself was due to the lack of any external military threat, a situation which is in strong contrast to the reduction of the polis chora on the European Bosporus in the face of the imminent Scythian threat. All the survey and literary evidence strongly suggests that in the course of the 3rd-1st centuries BC, land possessions on the European and Asian Bosporus could still belong to the large cities and take the form of polis lands. Moreover, the activity of the polis mint at Panticapaeum substantiates the idea that most of the lands on the Kerch peninsula continued as possessions of the capital of Bosporus. As a consequence of the economic crisis in the mid 3rd century BC, however, some changes in the structure of the chora had actually taken place. This development involved a more rigid control over land possessions by the ruling Spartocid dynasty, but no significant alterations in the nature of land-owning and the character of lands as polis territory can be seen. A number of large fortified sites, such as Zołotoe the Eastern and Semenovka, emerged as types of military-economic settlements similar in type to the katoikiai, which depended directly on the authority of the ruling dynasty. Since, as archons of Bosporus and Theodosia, the rulers did not form a Hellenistic royal house, but were only nominally called kings\(^{54}\), those

---

53 On temple communities in the Asiatic Bosporus with dependent population see: CIRB 976 (γέας ... και τούς πελάτας ... ἀπεκατέστησε τῇ θεω ... , 151 AD - the time of king Rhoimetalces); Sergej A. Zhebelev, Severnoe Prichernomor'ye (Moscow, Leningrad 1953) 26; Viktor F. Gajdukevich, Bosporskoe tsarstvo (Moscow, Leningrad 1949) 363; on the Taman tolos as a temple of Apatura see: Nikolaj I. Sokol'skij, Tamanskij tolos i rezidetsija Khrisaliska (Moscow 1976).

54 Polis character of the late Spartocids' power is confirmed by CIRB 75 (c.150-125 BC), where Paerisades IV is called ἄρχων καὶ βασιλεύς Παιρισάδης τοῦ βασιλέως Παιρισάδου. Spartokos III, son of Eumeles, was also titled both as archon and king (CIRB 974; 1043), but sometimes he was simply characterised as king without addition of archon (CIRB 19). The same is valid for Paerisades II and Paerisades IV (CIRB 20; 21; 23; 25; 1036 - Paerisades II;
fortified sites night belong to the polis community of Panticapaeum, their inhabitants defending the borderland.

The development of the land on the chora had its roots in the Classical and Hellenistic periods. The chronology of the discovered sites indicates that in terms of the agrarian territory, a polis structure existed from the 6th century BC until the end of the 2nd century BC, due to the fact that the Archaeanactid and the Spartocid regimes were initially tyrannic. This would explain why the settlement processes in the rural regions during this period reflected the traditional framework associated with developing polis lands. Since the late 2nd century BC, when Bosporus became part of the Hellenistic kingdom of Pontus under Mithridates VI, cardinal changes in land structure took place. Recent surveys in this region were, in fact, able to distinguish polis lands from actual royal land domains subject to the king in accordance with Hellenistic modes of land tenure.

Immediately upon establishing his power over Bosporus, Mithridates Eupator began to utilize the benefits derived from the agrarian possessions of the largest cities, including Panticapaeum, Phanagoria, Hermonassa, Gorgippia. At this time, a traditional polis land structure happened to exist in the Kingdom of Bosporus, with no royal lands. Mithridates, however, needed to acquire natural resources and had no time to create a new system of land possessions in light of the upcoming war with Rome. This situation is reflected in a country estate in the vicinity of Myrmekion, which was in use from the 3rd until the first quarter of the 1st century BC, and was part of the chora of Panticapaeum. Other similar farms have been discovered nearby, none of which has ever been excavated. The site of Zolotoe the Eastern thrived until the first quarter of the 1st century BC; several urban farms existed on the chora of Nymphaeum, but most of them declined in the late 2nd century BC, and experienced a revival only close to the end of the 1st century BC. Rural farms are also documented on the chora of Gorgippia, such as Djemete I and II, altogether more than structures, mostly rectangular in form, with two rooms, a courtyard, and fence. These sites have been dated to the late 3rd till the early 1st century BC (Fig. 5, 4).

1044 – Paerisades IV). This points to the formal royal power of the dynasty, still based on polis traditions of their tyrannic regime. Cf. the thesis of Jurij G. Vinogradov that Hellenism in Bosporus should be dated from the time of Mithridates Eupator on (Jurij G. Vinogradov, Bospor i ellinizm [Tretij Vsesojuznij simposium po problemam ellinisticheskoj kul'tury na Vostoke, Erevan 1988] 16–17).
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58 Zinko, Nekotorije itogi 17.
59 Alekseeva, Izucheniju 27–41; eadem, Sel'skaia territorija 90; Kuznecov, L'organisation 344.
It is not until the period of Mithridatic rule that one can actually speak of royal land possessions in the Kingdom of Bosporus. Between the second quarter and the middle of the 1st century BC, the structure of the Bosporan chora radically changed. The amount of polis land was seriously reduced by that time, given that the main part of it was incorporated into the royal land domain. The number of rural sites, farms, and country estates of the preceding period declined. Although a small amount of polis lands continued to exist in some places, they did not provide Mithridates VI with the necessary gains needed for waging longtime wars with Rome, particularly in the 70s-60s BC, when he began to lose his domains in Asia Minor. A new system of land tenure was needed and new settlements of quite another type appeared. These settlements consisted mostly of forts and fortresses of fully Hellenistic character, inhabited by katoikoi; they spread over the entire agrarian territory, now mainly in royal possession, of Eastern Taurica, Sindica, and even the South Crimea (Kutlak). They were subject directly to the royal administration. These forts helped the new rulers of Bosporus to keep land, local population, and the Greek cities under control.

The fortified sites were erected mostly on hilltops and possessed strong defensive walls about 2–2.5 m wide, deep ditches, and high ramparts. The forts differed in size between 2000–2400 sqm and 110–200 sqm and usually had one, two or even four and more towers, as well as a variable number of rooms (even double or single room houses had rather strong defensive walls). Some of them had hidden passages beneath the walls descending to wells or water reservoirs (e.g. Ilourat, Turkmen, Kazantyp, Adjimushkai) – a characteristic feature of Hellenistic forts in Eastern Anatolia, dated securely to the period of the Mithridatids or even earlier.

Practically all fortresses had a citadel forming the main part of the site, another feature characteristic of Mithridatic forts in Pontic Cappadocia and Paphlagonia. Scholars have long since rightly interpreted such fortified settlements as having a military-economic character, i.e. of the katoikia-type. Their construction echoed a change of policy set in motion by King Mithridates VI since 80 BC, when he shifted from philhellenism to enforcing the position of the gé basiliké. His forts were designed to resist the autonomy of the Greek cities. These cities had experienced growing constraints on their independence, after having shown disloyalty to the king during the last years of the first war with Rome. Two categories of land existed now – polis and royal – with a considerable enlargement of the latter at the expense of the former. Since this time, all forts on rural territory of the Bosporan kingdom and some citadels in the cities were built under the strong

Fig. 6. The Kingdom of Bosporus and Settlements of its Chora during the Time of Mithridates Eupator and his Immediate Successors: 1 - military-economic settlements on royal lands; 2 - the site of Novootradnoe from the 1st century BC till the 4th century AD (according to I. T. Krouglikova).
influence of Hellenistic architecture, borrowed from Asia Minor, particularly from the royal domains of the Pontic kings in Eastern Anatolia.

Another type of military-economic settlement, found mostly in the Eastern Crimea, consisted of large sites with an orthogonal layout, bearing some structural affinity with the earlier Bosporan forts of the 3rd-1st centuries BC. They occupied a position usually at the foot of hills, defended by the natural landscape and fortifications (towers and walls) on top of the mountain ridges. Some of these sites, in addition, had their own fortifications and should be divided into 2 or 3 groups according to the plan of their central section. The largest of these fortified settlements included an area of 1.5–2 ha and usually had a shrine in close proximity (General'skoe the Eastern, Polyanka etc. – Fig. 5, 5).

After the death of Mithridates Eupator, his successors continued the same policy of creating royal strongholds on the gé basiliké. Pharnaces II, Asander, and Aspourgos completed the creation of royal forts – katoikiai – under direct supervision of the kings. They regarded this as an instrument against the separatist moods of the Greek cities. Kings Asander, Dynamis, and Aspourgos maintained a balance of power by supporting the autonomy of Greek poleis up to a certain degree, while at the same time strengthening the katoikiai on royal lands and making them the basis of their rule. Such policy helped to bolster the Bosporan economy; it enabled the kings to oppose local tribes along the borders of their lands and led to a stronger dependence of the cities on royal administration. Just as royal forts and fortresses on royal lands around the cities (Fig. 6, 1–2) served to protect against the barbarian threat, an increasing number of resident tribes fell under the direct control of the kings. The system of land relations with royal landowning at its base functioned successfully with only slight modifications until Late Antiquity, thus preserving Hellenistic traditions in Bosporus for a long period of time.