

Die umstehende Abbildung zum Aufsatz von Vera Sauer zeigt ein Relief aus der Galleria Estense, Modena, Inv.-nr. 2627.



RBIS

TERRARUM

INTERNATIONALE ZEITSCHRIFT FÜR HISTORISCHE GEOGRAPHIE DER ALTEN WELT

REVUE D'HISTOIRE GÉOGRAPHIQUE DU MONDE ANCIEN

JOURNAL OF HISTORICAL GEOGRAPHY OF THE ANCIENT WORLD

RIVISTA DI STORIA GEOGRAFICA DEL MONDO ANTICO

1/1995



VERI AG ADOLF M. HAKKERT - AMSTERDAM

Sergei Saprykin, Moskau

Megarice-Heracleia-Chersonesus: Three names of a Greek city-state in South-Western Taurica

Practically all our sources, including inscriptions and coins, refer to the colony of Heracleia Pontica in the Crimea-Chersonesus Taurica, and it was under this name, with the exception of a little modification in the Middle Ages (Chherson, Korsun), that this city was known in the course of its history. There is a unique testimony of Pliny the Elder that the city had also another name. In his "Natural History" the Roman geographer and traveller of the first century AD gives the following description of Western Taurica:

"At the river Carcinitis begins the Crimea, itself also formerly surrounded by the sea where there are now low-lying stretches of land, though afterwards it rises in huge mountain ridges. The population includes 30 tribes; of these 23 live in the interior, 6 towns are occupied by the Orgocyni, Characeni, Assyрани, Stactari, Acisalitae and Caliori; the Scytho-Tauri occupy the actual ridge. On the west side they are adjoined by the 'New' Peninsula (Cherroneso Nea) and on the east by the Satauci Scythians. The towns on the coast after Carcine are Taphrae at the actual neck of the peninsula, and then Heraclea Cherronesus (the Heracleian Peninsula - H. R.), a place on which Rome has recently bestowed freedom; it was formerly called Megarice, and is the most highly cultured community in all this region owing to its having preserved the manners of Greece. It is encircled by a wall measuring five miles" (Plin. N. H. IV. 85), Translation by H. RACKHAM.

This evidence deserves full consideration. As M. I. ROSTOVTZEFF had shown, for this part of his masterpiece Pliny used not only a preceding ancient tradition, based on one of the earliest periploi where ancient Ionian geographical ideas had been expressed, but also a periplus or a periegesis chronologically close to it and composed by the Romans probably in the time of Augustus or during the reign of Claudius and Nero¹. The geographer could also use the oral Roman tradition which was passed on to him by one of the Roman officers who had participated in the military campaign under the command of Tiberius Plautius Silvanus Aelianus, the Roman governor of Moesia, who had helped Chersonesus against the barbarians. Pliny was probably able to use official lists of cities on territories adjoining Roman possessions com-

¹ M. I. ROSTOVTZEFF, *Scythia and the Bosphorus*, Leningrad 1925, 51-55 (in Russian).

posed by legates of Moesia. He was at last able to work with the information given to him by Mithridates VIII., a former king of Bosphorus who was taken as prisoner by the Romans and was then brought to the capital of the Empire where he lived in the time of Pliny. Of course, Mithridates was well acquainted with the geographical and historical traditions of Taurica². That is why one cannot imagine that by mentioning the ancient name of Chersonesus Taurica the author had ignored the real state of affairs or made an error as a man who had never been on the Northern coast of the Black Sea. From the information of Pliny we learn that Chersonesus was formerly called Megarice, after that — Heracleia-Chersonesus and later on — simply Chersonesus. Regarding this place the geographer uses one name more — the 'New' Chersonesus — a place-name closely connected with the Greek polis in the South-Western Crimea. Unfortunately, evidence about ancient names of the city has only been superficially interpreted by the modern classical scholars. Some scholars simply confine themselves to stating what Pliny was writing about³, others attempt to give an explanation which is in their point of view the most logical and simple, i. e. first groups of colonists from Heracleia Pontica named the newly founded city Heracleia in honour of their mother-land — in order to remember it on the wide and distant shores of Taurica. The Heracleots supposedly derived their origin from Megara, so their descendants, who came to found Chersonesus in Taurica, called the new mother-land Megarice testifying their respect for their ancestors, the Megarians. Such cases were known in the course of the Greek colonisation of the Northern Black Sea Littoral; Pliny says that first settlers from Miletus in Olbia had called their new city Miletopolis in honour of their former mother-land (Plin. N. H. 82)⁴. To this we can add that in the North-Western part of the Black Sea there was also a small site, maybe of Ionian origin, called a "harbour of the Istrians", which, as its name confirms, could have been led out of Istria, a famous Milesian colony in the Scythia Minor (Arr. PPE 31; Anonym. PPE 87).

Notwithstanding the logical harmony of such an explanation, it does not remove the question why a colony of Heracleia Pontica had changed its names within a short period of time while from the IVth century BC there remained only one which became official, Chersonesus Taurica. In so far as we have at our disposal a number of coins of this city with a legend XEP = Χερ (σόνησος),

2 M. V. SKRŽINSKAJA, The Northern Black Sea Littoral in description of Pliny the Elder, Kiev 1977, 64 (in Russian). See also: M. I. ROSTOVITZEFF, *op. cit.*, 51-55.

3 K. NEUMANN, *Die Hellenen in Skythenlande*. B., 1855, 379f.; P. BECKER, *Die Herakleotische Halbinsel*, Leipzig 1856, 50; E. MINNS, *Scythians and Greeks*, Cambridge 1913, 496f.; M. I. ROSTOVITZEFF, *op. cit.*, 51; K. HANELL, *Megarische Studien*, Lund 1934, 130.

4 M. V. SKRŽINSKAJA, *op. cit.*, 65.

dated to 390–380 BC⁵, and the evidence of Pseudo-Scylax (6)8 where the city is clearly called Chersonesus (according to a great number of commentators it is characterized there by the term “emporion”) is proof, which is usually dated from 361–357 BC.⁶ Then a period of time when the city could bear a name “Megarice” and “Heracleia” would probably belong to the Vth century BC or at least to the early IVth century BC. We must take into account that in ancient times the city was called “Megarice” and then, according to Pliny, “Heracleia-Chersonesus”. That is why the first name could be given to the city only in the Vth century BC immediately after it had been colonized by Heracleia Pontica and the second one — at the end of the century or in the first or second decades of the IVth century BC. It would mean that the Heracleian *apoikia* in the Crimea could have been renamed twice in one century. But the official date of the foundation of Chersonesus is still taken by many scholars as 422 BC⁷. The period when this could have taken place is limited to the last quarter of the Vth century BC; it is possible that it took only 25 years or little more. In connection to this we see our task as making clear why Chersonesus Taurica had changed its names so rapidly during a short period of time. Recent archaeological excavations in Chersonesus could help to answer this question. In the North-Eastern part of the ancient city some interesting finds were made suggesting a more ancient date for the Chersonesus' foundation — the later VIth/early Vth century BC. This material includes Ionian, Corinthian and Attic pottery, graffiti with personal names and fragments of Chian amphoras. Some individual finds of pottery, dated to the time before the official year of Chersonesus' foundation, had been made during the earlier years of investigation and they allow scholars to posit a Tauric site or an Ionian anchor-station there before the Dorian colonists from Heracleia Pontica arrived. But more abundant finds over previous years give grounds to suppose that a Greek colony on the shores of the Carantin Bay was already founded in the late VIth/early Vth century BC, namely Heracleia which, together with a group of Ionian settlers from one of Milesian sites of the Southern coast of the Euxine, had founded this *apoikia*. Moreover, that

5 V. A. ANOCHIN, *The Coinage of Chersonesus*, Kiev 1977, 20.

6 See, for example, P. COUNILLON, *Skylax de Caryanda*, *Periple* 68–104: *Cahier Radet*, 49f.: gives date 361–357 BC; TH. V. SHELOV-KOVEDYAYEV, *Ancient Greek Periples. Scylaxis Caryandensis, Periplus Maris ad litora Habitata*: VDI 1988 N I, 255: gives a date 340–330 BC (in Russian); see in general, P. FABRE, *La date de la rédaction du périple de Scylax: Les Etudes Classiques* 1965, V. 33 (4).

7 A. I. TJUMENEV, *Chersonesian Etudes*: VDI 1938 N 2 (3), 251f.; G. D. BELOV, *Chersonesus Taurica*, Leningrad 1948, 31–34; J. V. DOMANSKIJ, *To the prehistory of Chersonesus Taurica*: *Antičnij mir i archeologia* 1974 V. II, 37–44; A. A. ZEDGENIDZE, *On the Time of Chersonesus Taurica's Foundation*: KSIA 1979 N. 159, 27–30, (all in Russian). See also: J. SCHNEIDERWIRTH, *Das Pontische Herakleia*. Heiligenstadt 1882, 15.

in the last quarter of the Vth century BC when, according to the majority of scholars, Chersonesus Taurica had only just appeared, the supporters of the idea of the earlier foundation of the city suppose that it was turned into a real polis-state with its own political and administrative institutions⁸. This point of view is still disputable as there are some serious arguments against it⁹. In spite of that we have no reason to deny the ancient site on the place of Chersonesus Taurica, because its traces are obvious. We should talk probably about two different settlements in Chersonesus Taurica.

A careful study of early layers of the site showed that the beginning of regular polis planning and building associated with creating urban structures coincide with a first stage of land division in the vicinity of Chersonesus on the Heracleian peninsula, and is dated to the time of colonization from Heracleia in the later Vth century BC, or to a time soon after that, but by no means before it. That is why we had put forward the idea that the early settlement we are dealing with could hardly belong to a Dorian wave of colonization, always based on conquering the neighbouring territories; it looks more probable that it was connected with a Milesian colonizing impulse which came from Olbia spreading its influence to Western Taurica in the course of the Vth century BC under a Scythian protectorate¹⁰.

Taking all this into account, and understanding the above mentioned fragment of Pliny the Elder, let us compare it with a passage of Strabo about Chersonesus — evidence which comes from a man who was born in Pontus, knew the real situation and, very important for us, lived in the late Ist century BC early first century AD. He writes:

8 J. VINOGRADOV/M. ZOLOTAREV, *La Chéronèse de la fin de l'archaïsme, Le Pont-Euxin. Vu par les grecs*. P., 1990, 85–119 (Russian edition see: *The Black Sea Littoral in the 7th–5th century BC Literary Sources and Archaeology*, Tbilisi 1990. 48ff.); see also: M. ZOLOTAREV, *The North-Eastern District of Chersonesus in ancient times. Materials of Excavations 1976–1986: Problemy issledovanija Antichnogo i Srednevekovogo Chersonesa*, Sevastopol 1988, 50–52 (in Russian).

9 Arguments against this supposition see: A. A. ZEDGENIDZE, *Chersonesus Taurica in Classical Period: Problemy issledovanija ...*, 47f.; EADEM, *To a question about the Ancient Date of Chersonesus Taurica's Foundation: RusArch*. 1993 N 3, 50–56 (in Russian).

10 A question about the Ionian trading or anchor station in Chersonesus was at first put by M. I. ROSTOVTZEFF (see M. I. ROSTOVTZEFF, *Iranians and Greeks in South Russia*. Oxford 1922, 63), after some time revived by V. V. LAPIN (see V. V. LAPIN, *The Greek Colonization of the Northern Black Sea Coast*, Kiev 1966, 83 (in Russian)). For an Olbian station or site on the shores of the Carantine Bay see detailly: S. SAPRYKIN, *Khersonesos Taurike. New Evidence on a Greek City-state in the Western Crimea: The Hellenic Diaspora from Antiquity to modern time* Vol. I, Amsterdam 1991, 233.

"As one sails out of the gulf, one comes on the left to a small city and another harbour belonging to the Chersonesites. For next in order as one sails along the coast is a great cape which projects towards the south and is a part of the Chersonesus as a whole; and on this cape is situated a city of the Heracleotae, a colony of the Heracleotae who live on the Pontus, and this place itself is called Chersonesus, being distant as one sails along the coast four thousand four hundred stadia from the Tyras. In this city is the temple of the Parthenos, a certain deity; and the cape which is in front of the city, at a distance of the one hundred stadia is also named after this deity, for it is called the Parthenium, and it has a shrine and xoanon of her. Between the city and the cape are three harbours. Then comes the 'Old' Chersonesus (ἡ παλαιὰ Χερρόνησος), which had been razed to the ground; and after it comes a narrow-mouth harbour, where, generally speaking, the Tauri, a Scythian tribe, used to assemble their bands of pirates in order to attack all who fled thither for refuge. It is called Symbolon Limen. This harbour forms with another harbour called Ctenus Limen an isthmus forty stadia in width; and this is the isthmus that encloses the 'Little' Chersonesus, which, as I was saying, is a part of the Great Chersonesus and has on it the city of Chersonesus, which bears the same name as the peninsula" (Strabo 7,4,2 Loeb: translation by H. L. JONES).

In this passage from the 'Geography' of Strabo we must pay attention to the following words: "[...] a city of the Heracleotae, a colony of the Heracleotae who live on the Pontus, and this place itself is called Chersonesus". The geographer had explained that Chersonesus was a polis of the Heracleots and a colony of the Heracleots but he did not say that it was a polis of the Chersonesites, a colony of Heracleia Pontica, for in his time the city had been called Chersonesus for a long time and was really a city with its own administrative and political institutions. It is very significant that G. A. STRATANOVSIJ in a Russian translation of Strabo's 'Geography' had translated this phrase as "[...] which is also called Chersonesus", (see Strabo. The Geography in the 17 books. Moscow, 1964). We consider that here one can see an echo of the time when, according to Pliny, Chersonesus was called Heracleia, and Strabo, or his source, had noted this fact in the passage we are dealing with.

Another very important section of the passage is in the words "the 'Old' Chersonesus which has been razed to the ground" — a place-name which is evidently contrasted with the 'New' Chersonesus of Pliny. For a long time many scholars tried to find an acceptable explanation for this. Some time ago there was a supposition that the Heracleots had founded a city not on the banks of the Carantine Bay but on the isthmus between the Kazačja Bay and the sea — a piece of land which separated the Majačnij peninsula from the remaining territory of the Heracleian peninsula. Only in the late Hellenistic period had the city been brought to the new place in the vicinity of the

Carantine Bay, where it was functioning up to the XIVth century¹¹. Some scholars had also put forward an idea about two cities — one near the Kazačja Bay the other on the shore of the Carantine Bay, both existing simultaneously¹². In spite of the fact that this artificial hypothesis, based on an attempt to reconcile the statements of Strabo and Pliny which mutually exclude each other, had already been argued in the last century¹³, only regular excavations in Chersonesus and the site near the Kazačja Bay proved that all these ideas were scientifically unconvincing: *apoikia* and then a city of the Heracleots, i. e. Chersonesus Taurica, from the very beginning appeared by the Carantine Bay, while the territory of the Majačnij peninsula at the turn of the first and second quarters of the IVth century BC was divided up into allotments with farms which belonged to the first citizens of Chersonesus as their land possessions on “distant” *chora*¹⁴. The isthmus which stretched from the Kazačja Bay to the sea (the Blew Bay) and divided the Majačnij peninsula from the whole Heracleian peninsula was, for a long time, taken as a first military economic settlement (τείχος) like a *katoikia* of Chersonesus which was created on its *chora* between the first and second quarters of the IVth century BC. Plots of land on the Majačnij peninsula were also attributed to this fort¹⁵. But only after the excavations on the Majačnij peninsula and on the isthmus, tentatively identified with the Chersonesus of Strabo, conducted in 1985–1991, it became possible to conclude that plots of land on the Majačnij peninsula did not belong to the fort — τεῖχος of the Chersonesites but to the citizens of Chersonesus itself. The isthmus, the so called ‘Old’ Chersonesus of Strabo,

11 A. L. BERTIJE-DELAGARD, About Chersonesus: *Izvestija Archeologičeskoj Komissii* 1907, Vol. 21, 168–172; IDEM, Ancient Chersonesus according to Strabo and Excavations: *ibid.*, 177–207, (all in Russian).

12 S. F. STRZELETSKIJ, The Altar of Heracles from the so called Chersonesus of Strabo: *Chersonesskij Sbornik* 1948 N 4,37; IDEM, Main Lines of Economic Development and Periodization of History of Chersonesus Taurica in ancient Epoch: *Problemy istorii Severnogo Prichernomorja v antichnuju epochu*, Moscow 1959, 72f.; V. I. KATS, Foreign Trade in the Economy of Ancient Chersonesus, *Diss. Moscow*, 1967, 80–83, (all in Russian).

13 E. R. STERN, About the location of Ancient Chersonesus: *Zapisky Odesskogo Obschestva Istorii i Drevnostej*, 1896 N 19, 103f.

14 S. SAPRYKIN, *Heraclea Pontica and Chersonesus Taurica. Relations of mother-city and colony in the VI–I centuries BC*, Moscow, 1986, 59; IDEM, *Khersonesos Taurike*, 241; IDEM, *Héracée du Pont et Chéronésos Taurique. Institutions publiques et rapports fonciers*: *DHA* 1991 Vol. 17 N 1, P. III.

15 A. N. SČEGLOV, the „Old“ Chersonesus of Strabo: 50 let Odesskomu Archeologičeskomu Museju, Kiev 1975, 135; IDEM, Tauri and the Greek colonies in Taurica: *Demografičescaja Situacija v Prichernomorje, Tibilisi* 1981, 213f.; IDEM, Process and Character of Territorial Expansion of Chersonesus in the IVth century BC: *Antičnaya Graždanskaja Obsčina*, Leningrad 1986, 156–159; J. VI-NOGRADOV/A. N. SČEGLOV, *Formation of the Territorial Chersonesian State: Hellenism. Economy, Politics, Culture*, Moscow 1990, 316, (all in Russian).

fortified with parallel walls was probably at first a territory divided up into plots of land, and only when the remaining territory had been divided up into *kleroi* of other groups of citizens was the area of the isthmus turned into a fort which defended the inhabitants of the farms on the Majačnij peninsula from the barbarians who had occupied the whole Heracleian peninsula¹⁶.

In spite of that, inadequate explanations of Pliny's and Strabo's information about the 'Old' and the 'New' Chersonesus are still continuing. In a commentary on the text of Strabo R. BALADIE confirms that the 'Old' Chersonesus of Strabo was a city of Ionian origin and it had preceded a colony of Heracleia Pontica. Moreover, he considers that it was situated on the isthmus of the Majačnij peninsula between the mouth of the Kazačja Bay and the coast on the southern point of the peninsula¹⁷. A. N. SČEGLOV, on the basis of the new finds of the late VIth/early Vth century BC in the North-Eastern part of Chersonesus, supposes that the city by the Carantine Bay was primarily called "Megarice" or the 'Old' Chersonesus of Strabo. Later on, in the early IVth century BC, when a new large group of colonists-*epoikoi* had arrived from Heracleia Pontica and the city began to grow rapidly, it was renamed as the 'New' Chersonesus and continued to exist under its traditional name up to the Middle Ages. At the same time the author of this hypothesis does not reject his earlier suggested view that the 'Old' Chersonesus should be identified with the fortification on the isthmus of the Majačnij peninsula and a confusion in names was a result of the incomplete knowledge of the ancient authors¹⁸.

Despite the above mentioned facts this point of view does not finally solve the problems of renaming the city, because it does not take into account the new results of investigations on the Majačnij peninsula. Also, the suggested theory of renaming the city and a fort on the isthmus does not appear to be logical. A reference to the inadequate knowledge of ancient geographers about the situation around Chersonesus is also hardly correct. There can be no doubt that Pliny's information is correct. Strabo's evidence is also based

16 Recent excavations on the Majačnij peninsula: A. A. ZEDGENIDZE, Excavations of the 'Old' Chersonesus of Strabo: ArchOtk 1985, Moscow 1987, 330; J. BOUZÉK/A. WAŚOWICZ, Le Pont dans l'épopée et dans l'archéologie. VIe Colloque sur l'histoire ancienne de la Mer Noire: DHA 1991 V. 17 N 1, 441; S. SAPRYKIN, Héraclée du Pont et Chersonésos Taurique. P. III; IDEM, Population of the Majačnij peninsula in the IVth-III century BC: Problemy istorii Crima Vol. I, Simpheropol 1991, 108-110 (in Russian).

17 Strabon: Géographie, Tome IV (livre VII), Texte établi et traduit par R. BALADIE, P., 1989, 105, 201

18 A. ČHTČEGLOV, Polis et chora, P. 1992, 222; IDEM, Main structural Elements of the ancient Boundary System on the Majačnij peninsula (South-Western Crimea): Isterija i Archeologija Jugo-Zapadnogo Krima, Simpheropol 1993, P. II (in Russian).

on a very reliable source — a periplus of Artemidorus of Ephesus, which was composed in 104–100 BC¹⁹. That is why chronological proximity of sources, used by both authors, can reflect a real situation in Chersonesus Taurica in the 2nd century BC–1st century AD. We can not consider it accidental that the place-names 'Old' Chersonesus and 'New' Chersonesus were used only by these authors.

Strabo and Pliny in general clearly differentiate geographical notions and objects to which they refer. The Greek geographer is obviously distinguishing between the 'Old' Chersonesus and the city of Chersonesus, a colony of Heracleia Pontica, because he says that the first was situated at a certain distance from the second one. As far as the text of Pliny is concerned, the Roman author is also making a difference between the 'New' Chersonesus and the city of Heracleia-Chersonesus, formerly called Megarice. That seems well-founded because the first one comes out as the Western border of a territory, inhabited by the Scytho-Tauri, and the second one as a city which had obtained freedom from the Romans. In connection with this, we can not agree with H. RACKHAM, whose translation identifies Pliny's Heracleia-Chersonesus with the Heracleian peninsula. It seems impossible as Pliny further says that it was "a place on which Rome has recently bestowed freedom". Of course it could refer only to the city of Chersonesus and not to the Heracleian peninsula, as the Roman government preferred to deal with cities and not with their agrarian territories.

A supposition that all these place-names could belong to one city — the Tauric Chersonesus — is well founded. There is no doubt that the terms 'Old' and 'New' Chersonesus appeared in the late Hellenistic and early Roman periods and were used to characterise the place, connected with the peninsula (in Greek *χερσόνησος*), closely connected with the city of Chersonesus Taurica, which had two names — Megarice and Heracleia. And it is not surprising that H. RACKHAM translated the *Cherroneso Nea* of Pliny as the "New Peninsula" and *Heracleia-Chersonesus* as the "Heracleian Peninsula" just as it is called today²⁰. To our mind the first translation is principally correct, but the second is radically wrong. We think so, because Pliny evidently supposes a city under these names. That is surely why the Roman geographer had distinguished between the 'New' Chersonesus and the city itself.

What should we then understand from the distinguishing terms the 'Old' Chersonesus of Strabo and the 'New' Chersonesus of Pliny the Elder? For a

19 M. I. ROSTOVTZEFF, *Strabo as a Source for the History of Bosphorus: Studies in honour of V. P. Buzeskul*, Charkov 1914, 374; L. I. GRAZIANSKAJA, 'The Geography' of Strabo. Problems of Source-Study: *Drevnejschie Gosudarstwa na Territorii SSSR*. 1986. Moscow, 1988, 63–65, (both in Russian)

20 Pliny, *Natural History* Vol. II, transl. by H. RACKHAM, The Loeb Classical Library, Cambridge/London 1961, 185.

long time it has been considered that the 'Old' Chersonesus of Strabo means the agrarian territory of the city Chersonesus Taurica on the Heracleian peninsula, including particularly the farms and land-plots on the Majačnij peninsula which fell into desolation when the barbarian raids on the chora of the city became more frequent. It happened in the late 2nd century BC²¹. Land-plots and country estates on the Majačnij peninsula were left by the inhabitants even earlier — in the first/second quarters of the 3rd century BC, — and only single farms were later revived²². In the time of Artemidorus, who served as Strabo's source when he was writing his 'Geography', practically all buildings and land-plots on the nearest chora of the Chersonesian state on the Heracleian peninsula, which were actively functioning in the course of about 200 years, were either in ruins or devastated, the land-plots were deserted and desolated. The city itself was beset by a great crisis caused by, in addition to other circumstances, regular Scythian invasions of its chora both in the North Western Crimea and on the Heracleian peninsula. That is why a name the 'Old' Chersonesus, which reflected the division of the Heracleian peninsula into plots of land (*kleroi*) already in ancient times, (i. e. "old" times about the middle of the IVth century BC, and the Majačnij peninsula even earlier), could be used by Strabo or by one of his sources as referring to both the Heracleian peninsula and to one of its parts — the Majačnij peninsula. It is true that the Heracleian peninsula was called the 'Little' Chersonesus by the Greeks (Strabo 7,4,1f.), and using the words "ancient" or "old" the Greek authors of the late Hellenistic period, like Artemidorus and Strabo, tried to show that the Heracleian peninsula had once been densely inhabited but in their time was lying in ruins.

As far as the place-name the "New" Chersonesus of Pliny is concerned, a fair interpretation of its meaning as a "peninsula" has already been mentioned above. Really in the context of Pliny's "Natural History" the term Scytho-Tauri means not a city, which these tribes were bordering on the west, but a territory, "a plain" of the Heracleian peninsula where the spurs of the Crimean Mountains protrude. Mention of another native tribe — the Satauci-Scythians

21 S. F. STRŽELETSKIJ, *The Kleroi of Chersonesus Taurica*, Simpheropol 1961, 99–108; A. N. SČEGLOV, *Polis and Chora*, Simpheropol 1976, 59, (both in Russian) = A. N. ČTČEGLOV, op. cit. 83; I. T. KROUGLIKOVA, *Land-plots of Chersonesus on the Heracleian Peninsula*: KSIA 1981 N 168, 15; S. SAPRYKIN, *Heracleia Pontica and Chersonesus Taurica*, 214.

22 S. F. STRŽELETSKIJ thought that country estates on the Majačnij peninsula were functioning up till the IInd century BC (see S. F. STRŽELETSKIJ, *The Kleroi* ..., 29–43) but recent researches allow us to move a date of their destruction to the first half of the IIIrd century BC (see S. SAPRYKIN, *Population*, 108–110; IDEM, *Heraclea du Pont et Chersonésos Taurique*, P. III). Only single farms were occupied during the Roman period, as excavations by Chersonesian State Museum in 1988–1990 show us (materials unpublished).

(or Satarchians as in some manuscripts) — belong to this context. They were in the East bordering on Taurica, the Tauric mountains and the Scytho-Tauri who lived there. Archaeological investigations around Chersonesus proved that already in the middle of the IVth century BC, when the Greeks began to divide the Heracleian peninsula up into plots of land, the Tauri who had lived there before, had been pushed out of this area and were compelled to live along the borders of the agrarian territory of the city, divided up into *kleroi*, i. e. along the borders of the Heracleian peninsula just before the Crimean Mountain ridge²³.

The Satauci-Scythians lived, as it is well-known, on the plain of the Eastern Taurica, approximately the territory which stretches from the Eastern spurs of the Crimean ridge in the vicinity of what are now the 'Old' Crimea and Theodosia, up to ancient Panticapaeum (modern Kerč). They occupied a flat steppe land region on the Kerč peninsula and were engaged in agriculture²⁴. In the Ist century BC/Ist century AD these regions were a place where the people of Satarchians had settled and were bordering on the Scythians²⁵. For localisation of the Scytho-Tauri and the Crimean Ridge, i. e. Taurica itself, which they inhabited, Pliny had taken two plains — the 'Little' Chersonesus or

23 O. J. SAVELJA, On the Greek-Barbaric Mutual Relations in the South-Western Crimea in the VI–IVth centuries BC: Problemy Grečeskoj Kolonizazii Severnogo i Vostochnogo Pričernomorja, Tbilisi 1979, 166–176; A. N. SČEGLOV, Tauri and the Greek Colonies in Taurica: Demografičeskaja Situazija v Pričernomorje v Period Velikoi Grečeskoj Kolonizazii, Tbilisi 1981, 215; IDEM, Tauri in the VIIth-first half of the IVth centuries BC and the Greco-Tauric mutual Relations: Mestnije Ethno-Politicheskiye Objedinenija Prichernomorja v VII–IV vekach do n. e. Tbilisi 1988, 74, (all in Russian).

24 A. A. MASLENNIKOV, Population of the Bosporan State in the VI–II centuries BC, Moscow 1981, 43 (in Russian).

25 *ibid.* 72; IDEM, Population of the Bosporan Kindom in the first centuries AD, Moscow 1990, 83–93: the author assumes that the Satauci and the Satarcheians can be one and the same tribe (see also J. M. DESIATCHIKOV, The Satarchians: VDI 1973 N 1, 131). Some scholars put them to the shores of Lake Sivaš (see E. MINNS, Scythians and Greeks, 463; M. I. ROSTOVZJEFF, Scythia, 47). V. D. BLAVATSKY had considered that the Satarchians belonged to one of the Tauric tribes (see V. D. BLAVATSKIJ, Slavery in the ancient States of the Northern Black Sea Littoral: SA 20 [1956], 37). The tribe is mentioned in a Greek inscription from Neapolis in the Crimea of the II century BC (IosPE I², 672). That is why some scholars localize them in the North-Western Crimea (V. F. GAJDUKEVIČ, A History of Ancient cities of the Northern Black Sea Littoral: Antičnije Goroda Severnogo Pričernomorja, Moscow/Leningrad 1956, 87; A. N. SČEGLOV, On a Population of the North-Western Crimea in Ancient Epoch: VDI 1966 N 4, 146–157). But as DESIATCHIKOV had shown this tribe occupied a vast area of the Northern Black Sea Coast — from Dobrudja through the North-Western Black Sea Littoral up to Perekop, Central and Eastern Taurica to the Northern Caucasus.

the Heracleian peninsula on the West and the "Rugged" Chersonesus (Herod. 4,99) or the Kerč peninsula on the East²⁶. This was optimal for creating borders. It was done in order to aid orientation among the people who lived in Taurica. Why then was the Heracleian peninsula called the 'Old' by Strabo and a little later the 'New' by Pliny the Elder?

The answer to our mind is as follows; if, in the time of Artemidorus and Strabo, farmhouses on the Heracleian peninsula were for the most part destroyed and their allotments devastated, then, by the time of Pliny, and the Romans who were his sources, intensive life and farming on the nearest chora of Chersonesus had begun to revive. More than 60 farms from a total of 84 which had been functioning on the Heracleian peninsula in the late Hellenistic period still continued under habitation in the Roman time. The archaeological layers, dated to the 1st century BC/1st century AD are fixed on many of these farms²⁷. They confirm that economic life in the county-estates of the Heracleian peninsula had been revived. This gave contemporaries an opportunity to characterize the 'Little' Chersonesus of Strabo, i. e. the Heracleian peninsula, as the 'New' Chersonesus. Thus, we consider that by this name the Greeks and the Romans called the agrarian area of Chersonesus Taurica which was restored from devastation and began to function again, unlike the 'Old' Chersonesus, which was in decline for a long time. An impulse for economic development of chora and the city was given by the expedition of Tiberius Plautius Silvanus, which helped to drive the Scytho-Tauri away from the walls of Chersonesus in 63–66 AD just before Pliny had finished his masterpiece.

Therefore, in spite of Ščeglov's argument, a name "Megarice" could by no means correlate to the place-names like the 'New' Chersonesus of Pliny the Elder or the 'Old' Chersonesus of Strabo, because it must refer only to the city of Chersonesus Taurica, a colony of Heracleots in the South-Western Taurica. Toponyms the 'Old' Chersonesus and the 'New' Chersonesus must refer to the Heracleian peninsula or the 'Little' Chersonesus of Strabo, where a city of the same name had been founded.

26 "The Rugged" Chersonesus is usually connected with the Kerč peninsula in the Eastern Taurica (see A. I. DOVATUR/D. P. KALLISTOV/I. A. SCHISCHOVA, *The Peoples of our Country in the "History" of Herodotus*, Moscow 1982, 338; A. A. MASLENNIKOV, *Historic-Geographic Zoning of the Eastern Crimea in the Ancient Epoch*: *Archeologia* 1989 N 4, 36 (in Ukrainian), but J. HIND supposed that this toponym refers to the Mountaneous Crimea, i. e. Taurikē, with a final point stretching to the South-East at Ai-Todor (J. G. F. HIND, *Herodotus' Geography of Scythia. The Rivers and the "Rugged" Chersonesus: Pričernomorje v VII–V vv. do n. e.* Tbilisi 1990, 133f.).

27 G. M. NIKOLAENKO, *The Vicinity of Chersonesus in the 1st century BC – IVth century AD (according to the materials from the Heracleian Peninsula)*: *Antičnye Drevnosti Severnogo Pričernomorja*. Kiev 1988, 203–211 (in Russian).

There can be no doubt that "Megarice" is the ancient name of Heracleia's *apoikia* in Taurica. The question is, to what period does it belong? This name does not appear original if we turn to the colonizing practice of the Dorian Greeks from Megara. In the course of the foundation of Astacus by the Chalcedonians, a small town of Μεγαρίχον or Megarice, also appeared there which, according to K. HANELL, confirms the participation of Megara in its foundation²⁸. A name of a Megarian *apoikia* in Sicily-Megara Hyblaea is also well-known: it was founded by the emigrants from Megara when they had been pushed out from the other parts of the island by their former companions in the colonizing process — the Colchidians, the Ionians and the Corinthians²⁹. In all these cases the creation of a settlement with such a name was a result of the establishment of a colony by people of only Dorian, i. e. Megarian origin, without any participants from the non-Doric Greek cities. That is why a name "Megarice" referring to Chersonesus could not belong to the most ancient site there because, according to Vinogradov and Zolotarev, it was founded together by the Dorians from Heracleia Pontica and the Ionians from Miletus (see above). From our point of view we think that it was done by the Ionian settlers from Olbia, but in any case the name "Megarice" should be connected only with a colony of Heracleia Pontica. It is possible that this name was brought by the colonists who arrived in Taurica in the last quarter of the Vth century BC. The site which had existed there before their arrival would have had another name, closely connected with the Ionian world.

This conclusion does not conflict with the fact that some people from Delos took part in the foundation of Chersonesus together with the Heracleots (Ps.-Scymn. 822–830). All institutions of the colony, later on turned into a polis-state, were completely Doric and of precise Megarian origin. It confirms the opinion of TJUMENEV that the participation of Delos in the foundation of Chersonesus was reduced to a minimum and the Delians could hardly have settled on the Northern coast of the Euxine. Therefore, the reasons why the Heracleian colony had adopted this name but soon changed it to another one should be sought in the internal political situation in Heracleia Pontica.

During almost the whole Vth century BC, Heracleia, ruled by the extreme oligarchs, conducted an anti-Athenian and anti-democratic policy. As a result, the city refused to join the Athenian Arche and was in friendship with the Persians (Justin 16,3). But in 425 BC Heracleia appeared in the Athenian Assessment, which was a result of the democrats coming to power³⁰. The

28 K. HANELL, op. cit., 122.

29 A. J. GRAHAM, Megara Hyblaea and the Sicels: Mestnija Ethno-Politicheskije Objedinenija ..., 304–317.

30 S. BURSTEIN, Outpost of Hellenism: the Emergence of Heracleia on the Black Sea, Berkeley/Los Angeles 1976, 34; S. SAPRYKIN, Heracleia Pontica and Chersonesus Taurica, 47.

democratic upheaval could have given an impulse for banishing the oligarchs from the city and inspired them to sail to Taurica and establish a colony there. At that time the Delians who had been exiled from the island by the Athenians were searching for a refuge in Asia Minor and could thus support the colonizing activity of this polis-state. In so far as the oligarchs of Heracleia were deprived of power not without the efforts of the Athenians, it looks natural that having arrived at their new homeland they called their *apoikia* "Megarice" — in memory of their far-distant mother-land. It was a demonstration of their dislike of the Athenian democracy and its Heracleian satellites who compelled them to leave Heracleia Pontica. It was a good political step because Megara was a traditional base for oligarchic conservatism in Greece, a city of aristocratic Dorian institutions and a city of strong anti-Athenian inclinations in foreign affairs. If the Delians had really supported the oligarchs of Heracleia in their colonizing activity, then the name of the colony in Taurica would, at that moment, have corresponded to their anti-Athenian mood. The anti-Athenian demonstration in the name of a new colony was all the more frank, because just before the democratic upheaval in Heracleia, and before the foundation of the new *apoikia*, Athens had adopted the so called "Megarian psephisma" in 432 BC — a number of anti-Megarian sanctions which excluded the Megarian traders from the Attic markets and the harbours of Athens and its allies.

But in 424 BC Heracleia Pontica refused to pay phoros to the treasury of the Delian League and it precipitated an attempt to restore Athenian influence in the city by force; Lamachus, the Athenian admiral, was sent with a fleet to Heracleia to punish the rebellious Heracleots and collect tribute (Thuc. 4,75; Diod. 12,72,4; Justin 16,3). The expedition failed, but this fact by itself can testify to a restoration of oligarchy in Heracleia and a resumption of some elements of the former anti-Athenian policy. Another fact of great significance is that the citizens of Heracleia had benevolently let the captive Athenians free. They had even given them food and material help. This change of Heracleia's attitude towards Athens is explained differently: one group of scholars considers that all these events were inspired by a strong democratic party which at the time of Lamachus' mission had been in power for a short period³¹; the other, for example S. BURSTEIN, thinks that the democrats came to power in 424 BC and ruled up till 360 BC³². We propose the argument that the democracy in Heracleia could have come to power only for a short period of time in 425/424 BC and that in 424 BC it fell, thereby having caused the Athenian naval action. After that a moderate oligarchic constitution was established in Heracleia — a social system, based on

31 See, for example, TJUMENEV, op. cit., 256f. and E. I. LEVY, *Heracleia Pontica*, Diss. Leningrad 1946, 43, (both in Russian).

32 BURSTEIN, op. cit. 33f.

a union between the democratic leaders and the trading land-owning nobility, interested in developing sea trade³³. This point of view was to some extent supported by E. D. FROLOV³⁴. In any case a result of all these events was the establishment of a more liberal regime in Heracleia and a change in policy towards closer relations with Athens.

The oligarchic upheaval of 424 BC could have been accelerated by a group of oligarchs who had returned to Heracleia from the Crimean *apoikia*, having repeated a manoeuvre used by the oligarchs already in the late VIth century BC when Heracleia was colonizing Callatis³⁵. A reestablishment of oligarchic rule and a return of oligarchs, the former exiles, to Heracleia could have caused a new resettlement of a section of the Heracleian citizens at that time of democratic orientation, to the newly founded city in Taurica. The arrival of these pro-Athenian democratic elements in 424–422 BC to the Tauric colony had deeply contrasted with its oligarchic name — “Megarice”, the more unsuitable, taking into account that in Heracleia itself the ruling circles decided to change the policy of reapproachment towards Athens. All these reasons immediately inspired them to change the name of the *apoikia* in Taurica in order not to cause anti-Athenian feelings and not to damage contacts with the mother-city. The new city was renamed Heracleia in order not to forget their mother-land, but soon was called Chersonesus by a place-name where it was situated. The last name became more popular, for it was inconvenient to have two cities in one region which bore the same name. From that time the new city took its bearings from Athens, having supported the anti-Megarian actions.

In conclusion we would like to point out that the first “ancient” name of Chersonesus — Megarice was used for a very short time. The city which was founded in 425 BC and not later than 424–422 BC changed its name first to Heracleia and then to Chersonesus. This short period of bearing the name “Megarice” has been confirmed, although there is a lack of evidence for this in the works of ancient authors excepting Pliny the Elder.

33 S. SAPRYKIN, *Heracleia Pontica and Chersonesus Taurica*, 48f.

34 E. D. FROLOV, *A Birth of the Greek Polis*, Leningrad 1988, 220.

35 On the political situation which led to the foundation of Callatis, see Arist. Pol. 5,4,2. See also T. BLAWATSKAJA, *West-Pontic Cities in the VII–I centuries BC*, Moscow 1952, 30–32; Preda C. Callatis. Bucuresti 1968, 3–5; S. SAPRYKIN, *Heracleia Pontica and Chersonesus Taurica*, 27; FROLOV, op. cit. 202.