



D. BRAUND

**NOTES ON THE HISTORY OF CHERSONESUS
BEFORE 422 B.C. AND AFTER***

Of course, before work M. Zolotaryov it had become usual to locate the foundation of the city of Chersonesus around 422 BC. And that notion will take some time yet to vanish from our scholarly literature¹. The main reason² for that date was a passage in Pseudo-Scymnus, who wrote a geographical poem for a Bithynian King Nicomedes, perhaps around 100 B.C. A king of Bithynia could not fail to be concerned with Chersonesus and the Taurians, close to the north across the sea from his realm and with a potential for help and harm. Pseudo-Scymnus' passage is so well-known that another discussion of it may seem superfluous. However, one important detail demands comment. The text does not give any reason to connect the foundation of Chersonesus with the Athenian expulsion of Delians from Delos in the late 420s.

There is no mention of Athens or of any expulsion. On the contrary, the text suggests a very different scenario. It reads as follows:

The so-called Tauric peninsula (Kherronesos) connects with these (the Taurians), having a Greek city, which the Heracleotes and Delians founded when the Heracleotes had received an oracle – those dwelling in Asia inside the Blue Rocks – to settle Peninsula (Kherronesos) with the Delians.

(Ps.-Scymnus, fr.12, Marcotte)

This key text strongly suggests that the inspiration for the foundation was not the expulsion of Delians, which is not mentioned, but an oracle received in Heraclea Pontica. Of course, it remains possible that all this was thought to have happened at the time of the expulsion, but there is no evidence

of that at all. In consequence, even without the vital discovery of a late archaic level at Chersonesus, there was never any evidence that the city was founded around 422 and some indication (the oracle as the cause) that it was not. Meanwhile, we may note also how careful our author has been with his use of names. He is very careful to be clear that this Heraclea is Heraclea Pontica, which he poetically describes as «in Asia inside the Blue Rocks», i.e. in the Black Sea. And he needed to be careful for, as we shall see, there were other cities called Heraclea. Moreover, there is a play-on-words in the oracle, because the oracle exploits the double meaning of *kherronesos* here: it means both peninsula and the city. Oracles often contain a riddle. This one is quite simple: they are to settle a peninsula by settling the city (which is also located on a peninsula of course).

Meanwhile, the role of Delos requires some consideration, though this is not the place for a full discussion of so large an issue. It is enough to make the obvious point that Delos is the island of Apollo and Artemis, with their mother Leto, while Apollo (whether at Delphi, Didyma or elsewhere) is a major source of oracles. The similarity between Artemis and Parthenos is obvious enough. Nor should we overlook the oracle controlled by Heraclea itself. It is no surprise in principle to find a connection between Heraclea, Delos, an oracle and the foundation of Chersonesus, particularly as oracles are regularly included in the stories of civic foundation (as elsewhere in Pseudo-Scymnus). There is much to be said about all this, but it will suffice here to draw attention to a single issue which

*When I last heard Misha Zolotaryov address an audience in a formal context, he was my guest at the University of Exeter in England, some months before his sad loss. His subject in that lecture was the theme of a great deal of his work, the city of Chersonesus. He captivated the Exeter audience with his enthusiasm and commitment to a topic about which his profound knowledge and understanding were completely obvious even in that rather unfamiliar context, far from the Crimea. We met first in Georgia in 1987, where he had shown great kindness to this young scholar, listening patiently to my questions and offering constructive answers. In the two decades or so which followed we continued to discuss his beloved Chersonesus, whether driving up the western Crimea or sitting over a long lunch in Exeter or Bordeaux. To be sure, there was much about which I was stubborn, for example about the Taurians' role in the foundation of Chersonesus (См.: Зубарь В.М. Херсонес и тавры: противостояние или взаимодействие // Археология. – 2005, № 1, с. 16-28). However, such disagreements only served to invigorate our exchanges. Here I wish to consider further one of his major contributions to the study of Chersonesus. Specifically, I shall suggest some consequences of the discovery he made (and published with the much-lamented Yuri G.Vinogradov) of the late archaic level in the heart of the settlement, delving beneath the Byzantine surface which covers much of the site today.



does not seem to have attracted much notice in this context. By the Hellenistic period and possibly earlier, the island of Delos had a festival known as the *Khersonesia*, apparently connected with a territory called *Khersonesos* which brought in a revenue known as the *khersonesion*: we may be sure enough that the territory was in some sense a peninsula³. It is interesting to find that the Delians had their own Khersonesos: we may wonder whether that played some part in the evolution of the story of their involvement, by oracular command to the Heracleotes, in the foundation of Crimean Chersonesus.

If, as we must now suppose, the city of Chersonesus was founded before 500 BC, we are left to wonder about its history in the century or so that followed. Clearly, the evidence is slight, but there is perhaps more than might be obvious at first glance. The expedition of Pericles into the Black Sea in about 437 cannot seriously be doubted, though we remain unclear about much of its detail. Plutarch offers our only narrative (*Per.* 20). He stresses in particular that the expedition sailed *extensively* around the Black Sea. The tyranny at Sinope resisted him, no doubt hoping for active Persian support, since Pericles' invasion had broken the terms of the Peace of Callias of 450, under which Athenian warships were not to enter the Black Sea. However, there is no information about any resistance elsewhere to Pericles' expedition. Plutarch stresses that the expedition strengthened the general position of Greek cities in the region against local barbarians. There may be some truth in that. As is well-known, archaeology indicates that the north coast in particular experienced severe difficulties through the earlier part of the fifth century, when the region had been under Persian control. More important for the present discussion is the relevance of the expedition to Chersonesus⁴.

Of course, we cannot trace in detail the route (or routes) which Pericles and his fleet took around the region. But we can be sure about a few places visited, quite apart from Sinope. Heraclea is recorded in the so-called Athenian «tribute-lists» as required to pay tribute to the Athenians in 425. And, thanks to Thucydides, in particular, we happen to know that Lamachus (who had finally dealt with Sinope in the 430s) tried to enforce payment in 424, when a sudden surge in the River Cales destroyed his small fleet. We know also that the aftermath of this minor disaster was quite positive for Athens and for Heraclea: the cities seem to have worked out their differences. We happen to have the honours

inscribed by the Athenians for their *proxenos* at Heraclea, a man called Sotimus. No doubt he had played a part in negotiating the return of Lamachus' roces and the establishment of better relations between the two cities. Meanwhile, a fragment of the comic poet Eupolis mentions an Athenian (as it seems) called Simon, who seems to have taken much of the blame for the temporary break in these relations.

If Heraclea had already, perhaps about a century earlier, established its colony at Chersonesus, it seems hard to believe that Chersonesus would not have been involved in all this. For, while it is true that relations between colonies and mother-cities could be rather distant, in this case the two communities seem to have maintained an unusually strong bond⁵. Certainly, that bond is very obvious in their fulsome civic relations in the Roman period. In fact, there may be even more at stake. For Pericles' expedition came close upon the Athenians' suppression of the revolt of Byzantium around 440: Byzantium, Heraclea and Chersonesus, as well as cities of the west coast (Callatis and Apollonia?) were all Megarian colonies. In the aftermath of the suppression of Byzantium, Pericles is likely to have paid particular attention to the Megarian settlements of the region.

Moreover, since Pericles' expedition (at least on Plutarch's account) was designed as a show of force against the troublesome barbarians of the region, it would have been strange if he had not shown something of his strength to the Taurians. All the more so, if, as seems most likely, he was aware of the religious and historical Athenian tradition which connected the Taurians with the cult of Artemis Tauropolos at Halae Araphenides in Loutsas on the Aegean coast of Attica. Although there has been an influential argument that Pericles' expedition never visited the north coast, there is nothing to support that view and much against it, as P.O. Karyshkovskiy and Yu.G. Vinogradov have demonstrated⁶. The most striking piece of evidence is the fragment of the so-called Coinage Decree (now usually called the «Standards Decree») from Olbia. Since this imperial Athenian decree was erected at Olbia it seems strange to insist that the city was not brought within the Athenian empire: the obvious moment was the expedition of Pericles. It is a pity that the «tribute-list» for the Black Sea in 425 has not survived well: it remains true that we cannot identify for sure any north Black Sea city among the more than 40 cities listed there. But it is surely clear enough that cities whose names begin



Kim- and Pat(rasys?) are from the north. By the end of the fifth century, and perhaps already in 425, Nymphaeum was paying 1 talent per year, as Craterus informs us. It is only by the most strained of argumentation that the northern coast of the Black Sea (including Chersonesus) can be supposed to have been outside Pericles' travels. Especially so, since, as we have seen, Plutarch stresses that the expedition ranged widely. In fact it would be an enormous puzzle if Pericles had indeed not visited the north coast. For what possible reason would we imagine that he had failed to do so?

For all those reasons, therefore, we may suppose that Pericles or one of his key associates (Lamachus perhaps) visited Chersonesus. He may have been on his way between Olbia and Heraclea, for example, presumably stopping at Kerkinitis too. Subsequently, it remains entirely possible that some of the Delians who were expelled by the Athenians in the late 420s, went to join the city of Chersonesus, though there is no evidence at all to suggest that they did.

Less clear are the decades before Pericles' expedition. The fact that the Peace of Callias specifically excluded Athenian warships from the Black Sea could mean that they had already been active there. That logic certainly works for the eastern Mediterranean: Athens' exclusion from there followed her adventurous expeditions to Egypt and Cyprus in particular. Since Byzantium had been a key point in the Greek pursuit of the Persians from as early as 479/8 and since the Hellespont had been a focus of Athenian operations by the 470s, there seems every reason to suppose that Athens had at least done something to explore the Black Sea, if only in its south-western corner. The case of Miltiades is very suggestive. For his occupation of Lemnos late in the sixth century was staged from his base in the Thracian Chersonese, showing how conquest and military activity could spread around an area. Moreover, not only had Miltiades taken part in Darius' Scythian campaign, but he had been driven from his tyranny by the Scythians themselves. His experience in and around the Black Sea region, together with that of his associates, may well have contributed to Athenian and other Greek thinking about the further exploration and conquest of the Pontus⁷. It is a pity that we do not know more about the circumstances of the death of Aristides, who took a leading role for Athens in these early years: according to at least one tradition, he died in the Black Sea (*Arist.*). If there is any substance to the tradition, it is reasonable to ask what he was doing

there. Conceivably, he too went to Chersonesus!

But what of those who came from Chersonesus? Here we return to the problem that Pseudo-Scymnus was eager to avoid, that is the imprecision of the city's name, as indeed of the neighbouring Taurians, in Greek «the bulls». These problems are unfortunately beyond solution, but it is important to be clear about them, because they raise several possibilities. First, Taurians. There is only one Taurian whose ethnic identity can be thought to be recorded explicitly in a Greek inscription. He is Tykhon, who was buried at Panticapaeum in the fifth century B.C. However, as I have argued in detail elsewhere, his case is in fact rather less than certain, since there has been no entirely convincing reading of the stone⁸. Otherwise, we know no Taurian, whether free or slave. But it remains possible that at least some slaves whose names begin *Taur-* came from among the Taurians, while it is likely enough that Taurian slaves (like those from all other regions) had names which were not connected at all with their ethnic or geographical origins. Secondly, the city's usual name, *Khersonesos* (literally, in Greek, «Peninsula»), is also problematic because there are simply too many possible peninsulas to consider. The Crimean city's name does not stand out, unless particular care is taken, as with Pseudo-Scymnus and the occasional inscription: exceptionally, we happen to find the Crimean city referring to itself as «The Chersonitans in the Pontos» in a dedication which its citizens made – appropriately enough – on Hellenistic Delos⁹.

Otherwise, the name could be attached to the Crimea as a whole, for that too was a peninsula (cf. Hdt. 4. 99-102). Especially confusing for modern scholars is the so-called Thracian Chersonese, which was not a city but the region to the north of the opening of the Aegean towards the Black Sea. The region, a substantial peninsula, was of some importance to Athens from the sixth century when Miltiades left Athens to establish a regime there¹⁰.

What, then, are we to make of *Khersonesitans* in Athenian inscriptions? An interesting example illustrates the problem well enough: *IG* i³ 1301. This is a simple tombstone recorded at Athens (now lost), which has only three words. The first two are personal names: *Herakleitos* and *Naukles*, his father. The third word identifies Herakleitos as *Kherronesites* (clearly a variant spelling for *Khersonites*), a Chersonite. Usually, the inscription is dated around the middle of the fifth century, linked with developing Athenian relations in the Thracian Chersonese. In particular, we know that Pericles



was given the credit for the establishment of a substantial Athenian settlement there.

That interpretation makes good sense¹¹. However, it becomes less compelling on closer examination: the fact is that there is no particular link between the Athenian interest in the Thracian Chersonese and the erection of this epitaph in Athens¹². Nor is this the only interpretation available. The Herakleitos and Naukles of the inscription could have been citizens of Crimean Chersonesus. Indeed, while the Thracian Chersonesus could be used as a geographical identification for those who inhabited the various cities of the region (Elaeous, Madytos, Sestos and so on), it is better suited to the outlook of an outsider to the Thracian Chersonese than to the perspective of an inhabitant of a particular city there. Since we know nothing of the circumstances of our epitaph, beyond its discovery at Athens, we have no way of solving the matter. However, the point here is not to re-assign the stone to the Crimean city, but to highlight the recurrent difficulty in finding clear cases of citizens from Crimean Chersonesus. Meanwhile, there is even a certain irony in the fact that the same problem besets the citizens of Heraclea Pontica: for that city too the term «Heracleote» could apply as far afield as Sicily. For that reason, some have insisted that the artist Zeuxis, who probably came from Pontic Heraclea, was in fact from its Sicilian counterpart¹³.

The purpose of these remarks is not to confuse a picture that is clear, but to draw attention to the fact that the picture is not as clear as it may seem to be. The standard prosopography of non-Athenians in Athens, which appeared in 1996, has left the question properly open for Chersonitans. Its authors simply list those recorded as Chersonitans, without attempting to draw distinctions between which type of Chersonitan is meant¹⁴. The wisdom of that approach (even if it may seem to avoid the issue, or is simply an accident) soon becomes apparent when we consider the other Chersonitans listed.

From the end of the fourth century B.C. we have another three-word epitaph, housed in Piraeus Museum: *Apollonides, (son of) Dionysodorus, (a) Chersonitan*¹⁵. This too could be a man from the Thracian Chersonese¹⁶, but (especially in the absence of the Periclean initiative which dominates consideration of the previous and very similar epitaph) there is at least as good a case for the Crimean Chersonesus.

From 183/2 B.C. we have two Chersonitans, possibly related and certainly listed in sequence, in a long list of donors, which was inscribed on Pentelic marble at Athens. Their names are Samos and

Attinas: each is identified simply as *Khersonites* (*IG* ii², 2332, lines 162-163). In principle, it might perhaps be argued that each may come from the Thracian Chersonese, but we should really expect a city, as with other foreigners extant in the list. If there is any significant doubt, the presence of an Attinas seems to settle the matter: here at least we have the Crimean Chersonesus, where the name Attinas is well attested. While it is to be allowed that the inscriptions from the Thracian Chersonese are not numerous and also that the name Attinas is not strikingly rare, its prominence in the inscribed record of Crimean Chersonesus precludes further discussion.

If he is from the Crimea, then so too, we may presume, is Samos, listed immediately before him, also as a Chersonitan. The name Samos is a curiosity. In view of its obvious geographical meaning, it may hint at some family connection with the Samians. If not, then we can only wonder why his parents gave him this name.

There is also a helmsman recorded in the lists of those who formed the crew of eight ships which fought for Athens at sea, probably¹⁷ at the very end of the Peloponnesian War? We do not know for sure that he is a helmsman, but we have the last three letters of what seems to be *kubernetes*. The man's name too is lost, except for the last two letters – *es*. These are accidents of the history of the stone, found in pieces on the Athenian acropolis. However, even when the inscription was first made, perhaps in 405 B.C., the man's homeland was given simply as XEPP. Evidently, the identification was considered sufficient, though it remains insufficient for us. Clearly, he was from a Chersonesus. The abbreviation may well call to mind the coinage of the city of Crimean Chersonesus. As usual, however, we cannot be certain of his origins: we must bear in mind that much of the naval conflict at the end of the war was located near the Thracian Chersonese (cf. *Xen. Hell.* 1. 3. 10; 3. 2. 8). And yet it remains possible that we have here a Chersonitan fighting for Athens as a helmsman towards the end of the fifth century B.C.

In sum, we can say a little about the history of Chersonesus before 422, the period which M. Zolotaryov has done so much to revive for us by his archaeological discoveries. However, the recovery of this history requires care and caution, because we do not have much evidence and because the evidence which we do have is so difficult to handle, especially in view of the problem of names.



COMMENTS

1. So, for example, Marcotte D. *Les Géographes grecques I: Pseudo-Scymnos*. – Paris, 2002, p. 247, following Burstein (Burstein S. *Outpost of Hellenism: the emergence of Heraclea on the Black Sea*. - Berkeley, 1976), still places the foundation of the city in c. 422.
2. Herodotus' apparent silence may seem peculiar at 4. 100-2, but he is not much concerned with the Greek cities of the region: it is the local peoples and their customs that form his subject, perhaps especially in this section where he sketches the peoples who met to consider a response to Darius' invasion.
3. For the evidence, see *Inscr. Dulos*, 346A, line 13 with commentary.
4. I have discussed the evidence on Pericles' expedition (more than sometimes claimed) at length in: Braund D. *Pericles, Cleon and the Pontus: the Black Sea in Athens c. 440-421*. in: *Scythians and Greeks* /ed. D. Braund. - Exeter, 2005, p. 80-99.
5. Сапрыкин С.Ю. *Гераклея Понтийская - Херсонес Таврический*. - М., 1986.
6. Карышковский П.О. *Ольвия и Афинский союз. Материалы по археологии Северного Причерноморья 3*. – 1960, с. 57-100; Виноградов Ю.Г. *Политическая история ольвийского полиса VII-I вв. до н.э.* - М., 1989, с. 129.
7. Pemberton E.G. *An early red figure Calyx krater from ancient Corinth* // *Hesperia* 57. - 1988, p. 231-235 offers a rich discussion.
8. Braund. D. *Tykhon the Taurian: a cautionary note on CIRB 114* // *Древности Боспора* 7. – 2004, с. 11-14.
9. This was a dedication of three silver *phialae*, deposited in the temple of Apollo: Bruneau P. *Recherches sur les cultes de Délos à l'époque hellénistique*. - Paris, 1970, p. 113.
10. Krauss (Krauss J. *Die Inschriften von Sestos und der thrakischen Chersones* // *IK* 19. - Bonn, 1980) offers a recent general study, including a collection of the inscribed texts.
11. See further Kahrstedt U. *von Beiträge zur Geschichte der thrakischen Chersonesus*. - Baden Baden, 1954, s. 14-16.
12. For we cannot go so far as to assume that Herakleitos had come to Athens (and died and been buried there) specifically in connection with Athens' political concerns there (though that remains of course possible).
13. Ameling W. *Prosopographia Heracleotica*. in: L. Jonnes, *The inscriptions of Heraclea Pontica*. - Bonn, 1994, s. 115-68, offers a good discussion.
14. Osborne M.J., Byrne S.G. *The foreign residents of Athens*. - Leuven, 1996, p. 316.
15. *IG* ii2 10505. On its date, which has been the subject of some discussion, see *IG* i3 p.973.
16. Cf. Kahrstedt, *Beiträge zur Geschichte...*, s. 39.
17. The lines in question are *IG* i3 1032, col. viii, lines 292-293, which the editors provide with a valuable commentary. Although many opinions have been expressed, much about the list remains uncertain.



Д. Браунд

ЗАМЕТКИ ПО ИСТОРИИ ХЕРСОНЕСА ДО И ПОСЛЕ 422 Г. ДО Н.Э.

Резюме

Автор статьи обращается к известному свидетельству Псевдо-Скимна, которое непосредственно относится к основанию Херсонеса Таврического. Он особо подчеркивает, что основание гераклеотами и делосцами колонии на Таврическом полуострове в этом сообщении никоим образом не связывается с изгнанием делосцев со своего острова афинянами. Таким образом, следует, что утвердившаяся в историографии дата основания колонии – около 422 г. до н. э., связанная с изгнанием делосцев, не имела под собою основания еще до открытия М.И. Золотаревым позднеархаического слоя в Херсонесе. На самом деле поводом для выведения колонии был оракул, полученный в Геракле Понтийской. Автор статьи подчеркивает, что для изучения ранней истории Херсонеса необходим вдумчивый анализ не только археологических, но и письменных

источников. Он рассматривает афинские морские экспедиции в Понт Эвксинский под началом Перикла и Ламаха, высказывая предположение, что Перикл или один из его основных сподвижников (вероятно, Ламах) посетил Херсонес. Он мог оказаться там на пути между Ольвией и Гераклеей. Кроме того, Д. Браунд рассматривает случаи упоминания херсонеситов в различных афинских надписях, постоянно подчеркивая сложность однозначной связи упомянутых людей с крымской колонией. Заключают статью соображения, что в целом, пока еще возможно лишь очень немного говорить об истории Херсонеса до 422 г. до н.э. – периоде, возродить который во многом помогли археологические открытия М.И. Золотарева. Но восстановление истории требует бережности и внимания, поскольку у нас ничтожно мало материала, а тот, что есть, очень трудно использовать.