

EULIMENE

Vol 22 (2021)

EULIMENE 22 (2021)



Rhodes and the Bosphorus. A contribution to the discussion

Mariusz Mielczarek

doi: [10.12681/eul.34057](https://doi.org/10.12681/eul.34057)

Copyright © 2023, Mariusz Mielczarek



This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/).

ΕΥΛΙΜΕΝΗ

ΜΕΛΕΤΕΣ ΣΤΗΝ ΚΛΑΣΙΚΗ ΑΡΧΑΙΟΛΟΓΙΑ,
ΤΗΝ ΕΠΙΓΡΑΦΙΚΗ, ΤΗ ΝΟΜΙΣΜΑΤΙΚΗ ΚΑΙ ΤΗΝ ΠΑΠΥΡΟΛΟΓΙΑ

Τόμος 22
Μεσογειακή Αρχαιολογική Εταιρεία
Ρέθυμνο 2021

ΕΚΔΟΣΕΙΣ

ΜΕΣΟΓΕΙΑΚΗ
ΑΡΧΑΙΟΛΟΓΙΚΗ ΕΤΑΙΡΕΙΑ

Π. Μανουσάκη 5–Β. Χάλη 8
GR 741 00–Ρέθυμνο

Χατζηχρήστου 14
GR 117 42–Αθήνα

ΔΙΕΥΘΥΝΣΗ–ΕΠΙΜΕΛΕΙΑ ΕΚΔΟΣΗΣ

Δρ. Νίκος Λίτινας (Ρέθυμνο)
Καθ. Μανόλης Ι. Στεφανάκης (Ρόδος)

ΒΟΗΘΟΙ ΕΚΔΟΣΗΣ

Δρ. Δήμητρα Τσαγκάρη (Αθήνα)
Δρ. Nicholas Salmon (London)
Μαρία Αχιολά (Ρόδος)

PUBLISHER

MEDITERRANEAN
ARCHAEOLOGICAL SOCIETY

P. Manousaki 5–V. Chali 8
GR 741 00–Rethymnon

Chatzichristou 14
GR 117 42–Athens

PUBLISHING DIRECTORS, EDITORS-IN-CHIEF

Dr. Nikos Litinas (Rethymnon)
Prof. Manolis I. Stefanakis (Rhodes)

ASSISTANTS TO THE EDITORS

Dr. Dimitra Tsangari (Athens)
Dr. Nicholas Salmon (London)
Maria Achiola (Rhodes)

ΕΥΛΙΜΕΝΗ
EULIMENE

2021

Online ISSN: 2945-0357

ΕΠΙΣΤΗΜΟΝΙΚΗ ΕΠΙΤΡΟΠΗ

Ομ. Καθ. Πέτρος Θέμελης (Ρέθυμνο)
Ομ. Καθ. Νίκος Σταμπολίδης (Ρέθυμνο)
Ομ. Καθ. Alan W. Johnston (Λονδίνο)
Καθ. Mariusz Mielczarek (Łódź)
Καθ. Άγγελος Χανιώτης (Princeton)
Καθ. Μανόλης Ι. Στεφανάκης (Ρόδος)
Δρ. Νίκος Λιτinas (Ρέθυμνο)
Καθ. Αναγνώστης Αγγελaráκης (Adelphi)
Καθ. Σταύρος Περεντιδης (Αθήνα)
Καθ. François de Callataÿ (Paris)
Καθ. Maria Chiara Monaco (Potenza)
Δρ. Paolo Daniele Scirpo (Αθήνα)
Δρ. Marco Fressura (Rome)
Δρ. Marco Vespa (Fribourg)

ADVISORY EDITORIAL BOARD

Em. Prof. Petros Themelis (Rethymnon)
Em. Prof. Nikos Stampolidis (Rethymnon)
Em. Prof. Alan W. Johnston (London)
Prof. Mariusz Mielczarek (Łódź)
Prof. Angelos Chaniotis (Princeton)
Prof. Manolis I. Stefanakis (Rhodes)
Dr. Nikos Litinas (Rethymnon)
Prof. Anagnostis Agelarakis (Adelphi)
Prof. Stavros Perentidis (Athens)
Prof. François de Callataÿ (Paris)
Prof. Maria Chiara Monaco (Potenza)
Dr. Paolo Daniele Scirpo (Athens)
Dr. Marco Fressura (Rome)
Dr. Marco Vespa (Fribourg)

Η ΕΥΛΙΜΕΝΗ είναι ένα διεθνές επιστημονικό περιοδικό με κριτές που περιλαμβάνει μελέτες στην Κλασική Αρχαιολογία, την Επιγραφική, τη Νομισματική και την Παπυρολογία εστιάζοντας στον Ελληνικό και Ρωμαϊκό κόσμο της Μεσογείου από την Υστερομινωϊκή / Υπομινωϊκή / Μυκηναϊκή εποχή (12^{ος} / 11^{ος} αι. π.Χ.) έως και την Ύστερη Αρχαιότητα (5^{ος} / 6^{ος} αι. μ.Χ.).

Η ΕΥΛΙΜΕΝΗ περιλαμβάνει επίσης μελέτες στην Ανθρωπολογία, Παλαιοδημογραφία, Παλαιοπεριβάλλον, Παλαιοβοτανολογία, Ζωοαρχαιολογία, Αρχαία Οικονομία και Ιστορία των Επιστημών, εφόσον αυτές εμπίπτουν στα προαναφερθέντα γεωγραφικά και χρονικά όρια. Ευρύτερες μελέτες στην Κλασική Φιλολογία και Αρχαία Ιστορία θα γίνονται δεκτές, εφόσον συνδέονται άμεσα με μία από τις παραπάνω επιστήμες.

Παρακαλούνται οι συγγραφείς να λαμβάνουν υπόψη τους τις παρακάτω οδηγίες:

1. Οι εργασίες υποβάλλονται στην Ελληνική, Αγγλική, Γερμανική, Γαλλική ή Ιταλική γλώσσα. Κάθε εργασία συνοδεύεται από μια περίληψη περίπου 250 λέξεων στην αγγλική ή σε γλώσσα άλλη από εκείνη της εργασίας.

2. Συνομογραφίες δεκτές σύμφωνα με το *American Journal of Archaeology, Numismatic Literature, J.F. Oates et al., Checklist of Editions of Greek and Latin Papyri, Ostraca and Tablets, ASP.*

3. Οι εικόνες πρέπει να υποβάλλονται σε μορφή αρχείου .jpg ή .tiff και σε ανάλυση τουλάχιστον 1,200 dpi (dots per inch) προκειμένου για γραμμικά σχέδια και 400 dpi για ασπρόμαυρες εικόνες (στην κλίμακα του γκρι). Όλα τα εικονογραφικά στοιχεία πρέπει να είναι αριθμημένα σε απλή σειρά.

4. Οι εργασίες υποβάλλονται ηλεκτρονικά στις ακόλουθες διευθύνσεις: litinasn@uoc.gr και stefanakis@rhodes.aegean.gr.

Βλ. <https://ejournals.epublishing.ekt.gr/index.php/eulimene/about/submissions>

<https://ejournals.epublishing.ekt.gr/index.php/eulimene/about/submissions>

Είναι υποχρέωση του κάθε συγγραφέα να εξασφαλίζει γραπτή άδεια για την αναπαραγωγή υλικού που έχει δημοσιευτεί αλλού ή είναι αδημοσίευτο.

Οι συγγραφείς θα λαμβάνουν ανάτυπο της εργασίας τους ηλεκτρονικά σε μορφή αρχείου .pdf.

Συνδρομές – Συνεργασίες – Πληροφορίες:

Μεσογειακή Αρχαιολογική Εταιρεία

Δρ. Νίκος Λίτινας, Πανεπιστήμιο Κρήτης, Τμήμα Φιλολογίας, Ρέθυμνο – GR 74100 (litinasn@uoc.gr)

Καθ. Μανώλης Ι. Στεφανάκης, Πανεπιστήμιο Αιγαίου, Τμήμα Μεσογειακών Σπουδών, Ρόδος – GR 85132

(stefanakis@rhodes.aegean.gr)

<https://ejournals.epublishing.ekt.gr/index.php/eulimene/index>

EULIMENE is an international refereed academic journal which hosts studies in Classical Archaeology, Epigraphy, Numismatics, and Papyrology, with particular interest in the Greek and Roman Mediterranean world. The time span covered by EULIMENE runs from the Late Minoan / Sub Minoan / Mycenaean period (12th / 11th cent. BC) through to the Late Antiquity (5th / 6th cent. AD).

EULIMENE will also welcome studies on Anthropology, Palaeodemography, Palaeo-environmental, Botanical and Faunal Archaeology, the Ancient Economy and the History of Science, so long as they conform to the geographical and chronological boundaries noted. Broader studies on Classics or Ancient History will be welcome, though they should be strictly linked with one or more of the areas mentioned above.

It will be very much appreciated if contributors consider the following guidelines:

1. Contributions should be in either of the following languages: Greek, English, German, French or Italian. Each paper should be accompanied by a summary of about 250 words in one of the above languages, either in English or in other than that of the paper.

2. Accepted abbreviations are those of *American Journal of Archaeology, Numismatic Literature, J.F. Oates et al., Checklist of Editions of Greek and Latin Papyri, Ostraca and Tablets, ASP.*

3. Illustrations should be submitted in .jpg or .tiff format of at least 1,200 dpi (dots per inch) for line art and 400 dpi for halftones (grayscale mode) resolution. All illustrations should be numbered in a single sequence.

4. Please submit your paper to: litinasn@uoc.gr and stefanakis@rhodes.aegean.gr.

See <https://ejournals.epublishing.ekt.gr/index.php/eulimene/about/submissions>

<https://ejournals.epublishing.ekt.gr/index.php/eulimene/about>

It is the author's responsibility to obtain written permission to quote or reproduce material which has appeared in another publication or is still unpublished.

Offprint of each paper in .pdf format will be provided to the contributors.

Subscriptions – Contributions – Information:

Mediterranean Archaeological Society

Dr. Nikos Litinas, University of Crete, Department of Philology, Rethymnon – GR 74100 (litinasn@uoc.gr)

Prof. Manolis I. Stefanakis, University of the Aegean, Department of Mediterranean Studies, Rhodes – GR

85132 (stefanakis@rhodes.aegean.gr)

<https://ejournals.epublishing.ekt.gr/index.php/eulimene/index>

Περιεχόμενα
ΕΥΛΙΜΕΝΗ 22 (2021)

List of Contents
EULIMENE 22 (2021)

Περίληψεις / Summaries / Zusammenfassungen / Sommaires / Riassunti	vi
Angeliki Lebessi, “The Erotic Goddess of the Syme sanctuary, Crete”: Additions and corrections to the 2009 article.....	1
Alexandros Mazarakis Ainian – Alexandra Alexandridou – Kornilia Daifa – Eleni Chatzinikolaou, Sacred, Communal or Private “Oikoi”? Ambivalent edifices of the Archaic period on the island of Despotiko in the Cyclades.....	9
Μαρία Γκιώνη, Η κατοικία στην επικράτεια της Κορίνθου από την Αρχαϊκή έως και την Ελληνιστική περίοδο. Μια πρώτη κριτική προσέγγιση.....	41
Mariusz Mielczarek, Rhodes and the Bosphorus. A contribution to the discussion.....	113
 Βιβλιοκρισία – Book Review	
Jasna Jeličić Radonić, Hermine Göricke-Lukić and Ivan Mirnik, <i>Faros. Greek, Graeco-Illyrian and Roman Coins III</i> (Biblioteka Knjiga Mediterana 99), Split 2017, 305 pages [ISBN 978-953-163-454-0 (KKS). ISBN 978-953-352-017-9 (FFST)]. (Katerini Liampi)	121

Περίληψεις / Summaries / Zusammenfassungen /

Sommaires / Riassunti

Angeliki Lebessi, “The Erotic Goddess of the Syme sanctuary, Crete”: Additions and corrections to the 2009 article, *EYAIMENH* 22 (2021), 1-8.

Η πρόσφατη δημοσίευση των 238 αναθημάτων από πηλό, τα οποία εικονίζουν μορφές διαφορετικού φύλου και οντότητας (υπερβατικής ή θνητής) κατά περιόδους της λειτουργίας του ιερού της Σύμης, όπως και η ολοκληρωμένη μελέτη της κεραμικής της 2ης χιλ. έως και του 4ου αι. μ.Χ. καθιστούν αναγκαίες ορισμένες προσθήκες στο τιτλοφορούμενο άρθρο. Παράλληλα επιβάλλουν και την αναθεώρηση μερικών υποθετικών εκτιμήσεων μου, οι οποίες σχετίζονται με την Ερωτική Θεά του ιερού της Σύμης.

Following the recent publication of the clay anthropomorphic votives from the Syme sanctuary (Crete) and their comparable thematic relation to the anthropomorphic bronze offerings from the same sanctuary published back in 1985, I realized that certain hypotheses, which I had formulated in my 2009 article concerning the Erotic Goddess at Syme, were wrong. The isolation of two transcendental female figures out of a total number of 238 anthropomorphic votives, which depict both male and female figures either mortal or immortal, necessitates additions to and, even more so, the revision of my erroneous assessments in the 2009 article.

Alexandros Mazarakis Ainian – Alexandra Alexandridou – Kornilia Daifa – Eleni Chatzinikolaou, Sacred, Communal or Private “Oikoi”? Ambivalent edifices of the Archaic period on the island of Despotiko in the Cyclades, *EYAIMENH* 22 (2021), 9-40.

Το πλούσιο αρχαϊκό ιερό του Απόλλωνα, που βρίσκεται στη θέση Μάνδρα στο Δεσποτικό, δυτικά της Αντιπάρου, αποτελεί τον κύριο πόλο ερευνητικού ενδιαφέροντος για την ακατοίκητη νησίδα. Ωστόσο, η εν εξελίξει ανασκαφή έχει φέρει στο φως μια εκτεταμένη εγκατάσταση, που περιλαμβάνει 22 κτίρια, που εκτείνονται χρονολογικά από την Πρώιμη Εποχή του Σιδήρου έως την ελληνιστική περίοδο.

Η κατανόηση του χαρακτήρα και της χρήσης αυτών των κτηρίων είναι ουσιαστική για την ερμηνεία της θέσης. Η αποσαφήνιση των ορίων μεταξύ «λατρευτικού» και «κοσμικού» σε χωροταξικό επίπεδο μπορεί να επιτευχθεί με την εφαρμογή αυστηρής μεθοδολογίας.

Στο πλαίσιο Ερευνητικού Ευρωπαϊκού Προγράμματος προορισμένου για υποψήφιους διδάκτορες, επιχειρήθηκε η συστηματική μελέτη της αρχιτεκτονικής και της υλικής σκευής συγκεκριμένων οικοδομημάτων που χρονολογούνται πριν την διαμόρφωση του αρχαϊκού ιερού με στόχο τη διασαφήνιση της λειτουργίας του.

Στο παρόν άρθρο συζητείται η μεθοδολογία που υιοθετήθηκε για την επίτευξη των παραπάνω, καθώς και τα διαφορετικά τεχνολογικά μέσα (φωτογραμμετρία, Γεωγραφικά Συστήματα Πληροφοριών [GIS] και τα Εφαρμοσμένα μαθηματικά). Έμφαση δίνεται στα πρώτα αποτελέσματα της συνδυαστικής μελέτης των αρχιτεκτονικών καταλοίπων και των κινητών ευρημάτων.

The recent discoveries at the site of Mandra on the island of Despotiko in the Cyclades is here used as a case study for showing the blur and rather unnecessary divisions between these notions and the need to adopt a more inclusive view of life and activity in the early Aegean.

In the frame of the Research Project Sacred, Public or Private Buildings? Ambiguous sites and structures in the Early Cyclades, a strict methodology has been adopted, aiming at deciphering the “character” of a number of buildings. The adopted methodology has been based on the detailed documentation of the architectural remains and the related finds. In the former case, the photogrammetry of the buildings, including ground plans and wall sections, has been combined with a structural analysis mainly involving the descriptive representation of the architectural remains and the examination of the techniques and materials used during the construction process. The various types of finds from each building have not been only classified according to their types, but an emphasis has been placed on their spatial distribution revealed through the use of the Geographic Information System (GIS). On this basis, a synthetic study both of the architectural remains and of the artefacts in their original context was possible, elucidating the function of the selected buildings and their components. At the same time, a list of material correlates was created to provide a basis as secure as possible for designating each building’s “character”.

Μαρία Γκιώνη, Η κατοικία στην επικράτεια της Κορίνθου από την Αρχαϊκή έως και την Ελληνιστική περίοδο. Μια πρώτη κριτική προσέγγιση, *EYAIMENH* 22 (2021), 41-111.

The examination of the evolution of the Corinthian houses from the Protocorinthian to the Hellenistic period through published material has shown that their walls were mostly made of stone foundations, on which were placed mud bricks. Initially the walls are sometimes curved and tangled in slightly blunt or acute angles. Gradually this trend tends to be reduced until the 4th c. BC. The openings between the inner rooms probably didn’t bear doors.

During the Protocorinthian period the houses are carefully constructed. They already have courtyards, whose place is not yet at the southern part of the house. The arrangement of each house is very different. The great majority of the archaic houses in Greece had just one or two rooms, so the number of five or six rooms of Houses 2 and 6 (see Appendix 4 with the catalogue of houses) respectively in the city center displays a complex social differentiation in Corinth during the Protocorinthian period, that is relevant with the commercial and industrial bloom of Corinth, as well as the making of the city-state. In the 6th c. BC the houses are equally good constructions, almost rectangular in plan, some of them more irregular. The court appears in the middle and there are series of rooms around it. From the 5th c. BC onward the tile roof appears, the courtyard is located in the southern part or in the center of the house, and a *pastas* appears at its north or west. *Pastas* is absent during the centuries to follow, even though it occurs elsewhere during this period, e.g. at Olynthus. During the 5th c. BC the houses had no regular plan or common size. However, in the houses that were not erected on previous constructions one can better discern the new characteristic elements of the era, such as the direct course of the walls, the right angles, the big cut stones for the walls.

Even in the 5th c. BC, the spaces cannot be identified with a certain use, except for the court. In the beginning of the 4th c. BC the cellar for the storage of food appears. Cellars are also used in the Hellenistic times. In a fourth c. BC house the possible traces of the evolution of the *pastas*, the *peristyle* was also found. In the 3rd c. BC the Long Building no. 28 in the Panagia Field and the long 5-room Building in the north side of the Rachi settlement at Isthmia probably were used as storage buildings that served houses with industrial character. The houses themselves on Rachi have a simpler plan than those of the previous period, less rooms with more linear arrangement, but they usually include a court at the south. Pits for storage amphoras with a formed floor occasionally occur through all the periods examined.

During the whole period examined there are a lot of examples of house industry, however due to lack of further evidence we do not know the percentage of them in relation to the non-industrial houses. A new type of house industry emerges on the Rachi settlement in the 3rd c. BC, with alike pressing rooms for making oil or wine. The character of the settlement on Rachi suggests that there was a central organization of its enterprise, probably forced by the Macedonians who held Corinth at the time.

The Protocorinthian wells were a distance of a few meters away from the houses they served. From the 6th c. BC onward the wells appear in the courtyards, in the course of change of the house plans towards a more introverted character. In the Hellenistic settlement of Rachi at Isthmia, one single well and one pear-shaped cistern served the whole of the settlement, showing that the settlement was under central management. During the Hellenistic period pear-shaped cisterns are dominant. The first example lies beside House no. 41 at Perachora.

The great cisterns that were used as part of a house industry appear in the 4th c. BC. The hard plaster with which they are covered inside shows their probable use as rainwater collectors.

The floors of the Protocorinthian houses are quite elaborate. Pebble floors are mostly preferred at the time. In the 5th c. BC the most common floors were made from clay or from plaster. The plaster floor appears then for the first time and is mostly used in the *andrones*. From the end of the 5th c. BC appear the pebble floors with a presentation of animals or plants that are used in the *andrones* as well. The floor from chipped limestone is used in the courtyards because of its great endurance. The pebble and the hard plaster floors are more elaborate to construct, whereas the clay floor is more careless.

The first *andron* appears in the 6th c. BC at Perachora. This innovation maybe has to do with the nearby Heraeum which at that time was an important centre of circulation of ideas from all over the known world, especially from the East. In the 4th c. BC *andrones* occur at the Houses nos 12 and 40, but then they disappear.

In the Archaic Era no traces of decoration have been saved. From the end of the 5th c. BC there is a tendency to decorate the interior, for example with painted walls, pebble mosaics in *andrones* and a peristyle. In the circumference, Perachora doesn't follow the trend for decoration. In the 3rd c. BC there is a turn towards industrial or rural houses, probably due to the Macedonians holding Corinth at the time.

Three Protocorinthian houses in the city centre were built in linear alignment, which is a characteristic element of the making of the *asty* throughout the Archaic era.

The same alignment appears at the same spot in the 4th c. BC during the erection of three new houses, however, we're left with no other traces for a similar system of city blocks in the city. In the 5th c. BC the houses (especially those with older phases) have a lack of symmetrical elements in plan, and the public streets follow the course of the irregular house walls. The houses at Perachora are mostly solitary structures and not parts of an organized settlement plan. In the Hellenistic period the Rachi settlement grows in between streets that cross each other at right angles, however the houses are irregular in plan and different in size.

Aqueducts are used for the first time along with wells in the 5th c. BC and continue in the 4th c. BC. In the 3rd c. BC only one example of a house aqueduct is known.

In the 6th and 5th c. BC local sanctuaries were occasionally established over abandoned houses within the *asty*, a practice not found elsewhere.

Mariusz Mielczarek, Rhodes and the Bosphorus. A contribution to the discussion, *EYAIMENH* 22 (2021), 113-120.

An inscription dated to the reign of King Pairisades II (284/3-ca 245 BC), the son of King Spartocus III (304/3-284/3 BC) and carved on the base of a monument aroused great interest, becoming the main argument in the discussion about the relationship between Rhodes and the Bosporan state in the 3rd c. BC.

RHODES AND THE BOSPORUS. A CONTRIBUTION TO THE DISCUSSION *

Among the evidence relevant to the relations of the inhabitants of Rhodes with the Greek settlements of the northern Black Sea coast¹, especially from the point of view of the Euxine Pontus, is an inscription found in the area of Kerch (ancient Panticapaeum) around 1837². The inscription was carved on the base of a monument:

Βασιλέα Παιρισάδην βασιλέως Σπαρτόκου
Ἴππ[ο]κλῆς καὶ Δωριεύς καὶ Ἴππ[ο]κράτης
Ἀγησιάρχ[ο]υ Ῥόδιοι *vacat* θεοῖς πᾶσι
(after *CIRB* 20 = *IOSPE* II 35)

The inscription is dated to the reign of King Pairisades II (284/3-ca 245 BC)³, the son of King Spartocus III (304/3-284/3 BC). It has been noted that the titles of both rulers did not take into account the fact that each of them was officially archon of the Bosphorus and Theodosia⁴. Shortly after its discovery, this monument, aroused great interest, becoming the main argument in the discussion about the relationship between Rhodes and the Bosporan state in the 3rd c. BC⁵.

On the one hand, the inscription confirms the presence of newcomers from Rhodes in Panticapaeum. The first commentary on the inscription explored the idea that the Rhodians in Panticapaeum had honoured the Bosporan ruler for his “involvement” (there is no indication of what kind of commitment is involved) in the development of trade

* The present article is the fruit of the research project *Sacred, Public or Private Buildings? Ambiguous sites and structures in the Early Cyclades*, which lasted for 15 months (2020-2021), and was funded by the European Social Fund (EΔBM103). It was directed by A. Mazarakis Ainian with A. Alexandridou being an academic consultant [see the relevant website at <http://extras.ha.uth.gr/oikoi/index.php?page=home>, last accessed 22-02-2023]. The contributors would like to thank sincerely Yannis Kourayos, the director of the Despotiko Project, for granting access to unpublished material from the excavation at Mandra on Despotiko.

¹ The bibliography of the problem of the relationship between the Pontic world and Rhodes in antiquity, discussed from the 19th century, is scarce. The situation is slowly changing as a result of new, very scanty data, obtained during the excavations in the Black Sea region.

² This work constitutes part of the project “Greek Kymissala. Ancient *polis* on the Island of Rhodes”, which has been funded by the National Centre of Science, granted on the basis of decision number DEC-2013/11/B/HS3/02061.

³ See Gajdukevič 1971, 89ff.

⁴ *CIRB*, p. 2; Litvinenko 1991, 19.

⁵ For instance, see Shelov 1958, 333.

relations between the Bosphorus and Rhodes⁶. It was even suggested that the Rhodians mentioned in the inscription were representatives of the Rhodian aristocracy, thus making it easier for the Rhodians to access the Bosphoran ruler⁷. King Pairisades II acted in favor of the Rhodians⁸. The intensification of relations between Rhodes and the Bosphorus took place in the second half of the 3rd c. BC. This was partially due to the change of Athens' position in the North Pontic region⁹. The fact remains, however, that Diodorus (III.34) and Agatharchides (V.7) indicated Rhodes as an intermediate "point" on the way from Meotis to Alexandria.

On the other hand, it has been suggested that the inscription may be testimony to the wider international policies of Pairisades II. During his reign, the relationship of the Bosphorus with the eastern Mediterranean developed¹⁰, including those with Rhodes, through trade and other means.

The foreign policy of Pairisades II has been assessed primarily on the basis of the information contained in the Zenon Archive, specifically in relation to a letter of the *dioiketes* Apollonius addressed to Zenon. The letter proves that in 254 BC, during the reign of Ptolemy II Philadelphos (282-246 BC), the envoys of Pairisades (*Παιρισάδου πρεσβευταῖς*) were present in Egypt¹¹. Together with the envoys from Argos, they were to visit the Arsinoite nome, which seems to have been a routine practice for foreigners on official duties in Egypt¹². Although the royal title of Pairisades is not mentioned in the document from the Zenon Archive, it is believed that he is the Bosphoran ruler, Pairisades II¹³. The letter from the Zenon Archive has been discussed numerous times. Yet a fundamental question remains unanswered. The question is: was the voyage of the Bosphoran envoys to Egypt a result of action of Ptolemy II, or was it precipitated by a decision of the Bosphoran king? It should be stressed that Pairisades II also directed his attention towards Delos, where he donated a phiale to the temple and appears on the list of donors¹⁴. Delos, like Rhodes, benefited from its association with the Ptolemies¹⁵.

A number of opinions expressed about Bosphoran envoys in Egypt have been influenced by the scholarship of M.I. Rostovzeff¹⁶. He emphasized the importance of the visit of the envoys of Pairisades II to Ptolemaic Egypt¹⁷. Others have since argued that the visit of the envoys of the Bosphoran king to Egypt was aimed at agreeing on the division of the trade in grain between the two states¹⁸. The Bosphoran state was one of the largest

⁶ See Badaljants 1986, 88.

⁷ Krushkol 1957, 110-115.

⁸ At this point it is worth drawing attention to Athenian privileges in the Bosphoran state. Demosthenes, *ad Lept.* 29-40. For instance, see Burnstein 1993, 81-83; Burnstein 1978, 428-436.

⁹ From the rich literature on the subject see indicatively Brashinskiy 1963; Burnstein 1978; Kuznetsov 2000; Skrzhinskaya 2002; Braund 2003.

¹⁰ See Gaydukevich 1960, 105-111.

¹¹ SB 7263; *Pap. London* 7. See Olszta-Bloch 2011, 35-71.

¹² Bell 1927, 36-38; Olszta-Bloch 2011, 36-40.

¹³ Bell 1927, 34-35; Olszta-Bloch 2011, 35-36.

¹⁴ Olszta-Bloch 2011, 64.

¹⁵ Fraser 1972, 163, 169-171.

¹⁶ See Litvinenko 1999.

¹⁷ Rostovtzeff 1928, 13-15; Olszta-Bloch 2011, 35-71.

¹⁸ Gajdukevič 1971, 89; Shurgaya 1973. See also Fraser 1972, 172.

producers of grain (in the wider Greek world?), as demonstrated by its trade relations with Athens¹⁹.

Some scholars have suggested that the Bosporan envoys sent to Egypt may have been connected with the development of relations between the Bosporus and Rhodes²⁰, including trading links²¹. Trade connections between Rhodes and Alexandria are indicated by the finds of Rhodian amphorae, alongside other artefacts, in the city²².

The development of relations of the Bosporus with Rhodes falls within the scope of the activities of Pairisades II in Egypt and is confirmed not only by the envoys of the Bosporan king in Egypt. Contacts between the Bosporan kingdom and Egypt are conclusively confirmed by finds of Egyptian objects relatively numerous on the Bosporus²³. Among them are Ptolemaic rings, including some bearing the image of the ruler of Egypt. Ptolemaic rings have been also found at Olbia and Chersonesos²⁴, while finds of bronze Ptolemaic coins have been recorded in the area occupied by the Bosporan state²⁵.

All the more so, since until the Second Syrian War, Rhodes tied its activities with the Ptolemies²⁶. At this point it is important to mention that the relations between the Bosporan Kingdom and Ptolemaic Egypt are supposedly attested to by the graffito on the walls of the temple in Nymphaion²⁷, showing an Egyptian ship with the word ΙΣΙΣ scratched on the bow²⁸. The graffito is likely to depict an Egyptian ship which at some point arrived at the Bosporan port²⁹. However, this suggestion has been disproved, as has the whole interpretation of the drawing from Nymphaion³⁰.

The interest of the Rhodians in the Euxine Pontus region is confirmed by epigraphic material from the Black Sea settlements³¹, including that from Olbia³². Rhodes also supported Sinope (Polyb. IV, 56)³³, which defended itself against Mithridates II (ca 250-220 BC) king of Pontus³⁴. Also noteworthy is the war between Rhodes and Byzantium in 220 BC, fought over free access to Euxine Pontus³⁵.

As far as the relations between Rhodes with the Bosporan settlements are concerned, the archeological evidence from the Cimmerian Bosporus is not as rich as that from Ptolemaic Egypt. The presence of Rhodian amphorae at Black Sea settlements does, however, provide clear evidence of trade connections with Rhodes, namely through the

¹⁹ From a long list of publications, Kuznetsov 2000.

²⁰ Olszta-Bloch 2011.

²¹ Rostovtzeff 1941, 676, 1250.

²² See Fraser 1972, I, 162; Lund 1999; Rauh 1999; last two papers in relation to 2nd c. BC.

²³ Touraieff 1911; Trophimova 1961; Alekseeva 1972; Shurgaya 1979; Treister 1985.

²⁴ Karyshkovskiy 1961; Olszta-Bloch 2011, 139-154; Litvinenko 1991, 15ff.

²⁵ Mielczarek 1990; Mielczarek 1997.

²⁶ See Ephremov 2005, 129.

²⁷ Olszaniec 1995; Scholl and Zin'ko 1998; Zin'ko 2001.

²⁸ Grach 1984; Grač 1987.

²⁹ Vinogradov 1999, 289-300.

³⁰ Nowicka 1999.

³¹ Litvinenko 1991.

³² For instance: Karyshkovskiy 1961.

³³ On trade relations between Sinope and Rhodes, Badaliants 1976; Gabrielsen 1997, 46.

³⁴ In the collection of the Archaeological Museum at Rhodes are two stelai of Sinopean citizens who died on Rhodes. See *IG XII.1* 465, 466.

³⁵ Ephremov 2005.

importation of wine³⁶. This fact probably influenced the statement that the inscription mentioned at the beginning of this presentation is, at last, evidence for the cooperation of Rhodes in the field of trade with Panticapaeum.

Finds of Rhodian amphorae are attested in every Greek settlement of the northern Black Sea coast. In terms of the total number of finds of Rhodian amphorae³⁷, the northern coast of the Black Sea appears to have been the area with the most intensive contact. The number of finds within the Bosporan state, however, shows the same trends that are visible in other settlements (apart from Chersonesos, which is probably due to their own wine production). The Bosporus is nothing special in this respect³⁸. The peak of the influx of Rhodian amphorae on the Bosporus came after the reign of Pairisades II³⁹. This is clearly shown by the propositions of Badalians⁴⁰.

If one considers that the level of finds of Rhodian amphorae on the Bosporus reflects the level of “contacts” between Rhodes and the Bosporan state, the inscription quoted at the beginning of this paper would refer to an early stage in the period of cooperation. Cooperation at this stage is not as well documented as is the case with the relationship of Rhodes with Ptolemaic Egypt.

The relationship of the Bosporus with Ptolemaic Egypt is indicated by the presence of Ptolemaic coins in the northern Black Sea coastal settlements. There are no Rhodian coins found within the territory of the Bosporan state⁴¹. However, there are examples of local issues imitating Rhodian coins⁴², but mainly on the Taman Peninsula, in the eastern part of the Bosporan state. It has already been noted that, in the case of the Asian part of the Bosporan state, we are dealing with particularly intense cooperation with the Rhodians⁴³. This statement, however, applies only to the times after the reign of Pairisades II. Such agricultural activity supports the opinion that Rhodians were interested in the grain trade, including that of the Bosporus⁴⁴.

Regarding the times of Pairisades II, it is worth returning to a discussion of the mercenaries who found themselves in the service of the Bosporan rulers. The earliest known piece of literary evidence refers to an incident around the middle of the 4th c. BC, which likely refers to Arcadians serving in the times of Leukon I⁴⁵. Another source refers to an inhabitant of Paphlagonia fighting in the land of the Meotians at the end of the 4th c. BC⁴⁶. According to Diodorus, mercenaries took part in the war between the sons of Pairisades I (344/3-311/10 BC)⁴⁷. It is likely that they were employed in the army of Pairisades II (284/3-ca 245 BC) –since there is evidence for the presence of Bosporan mercenaries in the Arsinoite nome⁴⁸. An inscription carved on a marble stele from Egypt

³⁶ Shelov 1958, 33.

³⁷ Badajants 1976; Monachov 2005.

³⁸ Gabrielsen 1997, 46.

³⁹ Badalians 1986, 91ff.

⁴⁰ Badalians 1986, 93 ris. 1 and 94 ris. 2.

⁴¹ See Bresson 1993.

⁴² Shelov 1958, 336; Brabich 1960; Abramzon and Kuznetsov 2017; Vinogradov 2019.

⁴³ Shelov 1958, 336.

⁴⁴ Shurgaya 1973.

⁴⁵ *IOSPE* II.4. Sokol'skiy 1958, 302-304.

⁴⁶ Sokol'skiy 1958, 301-302.

⁴⁷ Diod. XX.22.

⁴⁸ Sokol'skiy 1958.

(the exact findspot is unknown)⁴⁹, mentions Rhodians and Bosporans alongside people from other parts of the Greek world⁵⁰. The inscription may be from the time of Ptolemy II Philadelphos⁵¹. We are therefore dealing with Bosporan mercenaries serving in the Ptolemaic army, in which they served alongside Rhodians. It is possible that in the time of Ptolemy II Rhodian mercenaries could also have been found serving in the Bosporus⁵².

Otherwise, nothing is known of Agesiarchos and his three sons, Hippokles, Dorieus and Hippokrates. None of them are listed as being mercenaries in the prosopographical section of M. Launey⁵³, and of the Rhodians bearing these names listed in the *Lexicon of Greek Personal Names* there are no obvious connections with prominent individuals of the same name.

Nevertheless, based on epigraphic material from Pontus and Egypt as well as archaeological evidence from the Black Sea region, it is possible to propose that the Panticapaeum inscription erected to honor King Ptolemy II, found in Kerch around 1837, may have been built by three Rhodians, who were mercenaries⁵⁴.

Bibliography-Abbreviations

- Abramzon, M.G. and V.D. Kuznetsov. 2017. “Phanagoriyskie dioboly s rozoy – podrazhaniya rodoskomu tipu”, *Kratkie Soobshcheniya Instituta Arkheologii* 249, 275-280.
- Alekseeva, M.V. 1972. “Predmety iz egipetskogo phayansa VI v. do n.e.-IV v. n.e. v Severnom Prichernomor’e”, *Kratkiye Soobshcheniya Instituta Akheologii* 130, 3-11.
- Badaljants, Yu.S. 1976. “Khronologicheskie sootvestvie eponimov i phabrikantov na amphorakh Rodosa”, *Sovetskaya Arkheologiya* 4, 32-41.
- Badalyants, Yu.S. 1986. “Torgovo-ekonomicheskie sv’yazi Rodosa s Severnym Prichernomor’em v epokhu ellinizma (Po materialam keramicheskoy epigraphiki)”, *Vestnik Drevney Istorii* 1, 87-99.
- Bell, H.I. 1927. “Greek Sightseers in the Fayum in the third century BC”, *Symbolae Osloenses*, 5, 33-37.
- Brabich, V.M. 1960. “Egipetskiye motivy v monetnoy chekanke Bosporskogo tsarstva kontsa I v. do n.e. nachala I v. n.e.”, *Numizmatika i Epigraphika* 2, 41-45.
- Brashinskiy, I.B. 1963. *Aphiny i Severnoe Prichernomor’e v VI-II vv. do n.e.* Moskva.
- Braund, D. 2003. “The Bosporan Kings and Classical Athens: Imagined Breaches in a Cordial Relationship (Aisch. 3.171-172; [Dem.] 34.36)”, in P.G. Bilde, J.M. Højte and V.F. Stolba (eds), *The Cauldron of Ariantas. Studies presented to A.N. Ščeglov on*

⁴⁹ Sherwood Fox 1917, 304-311.

⁵⁰ Sherwood Fox 1917, 310 –the identification *Βοσπορίτης* with Bosporan (from the Cimmerian Bosporus) is certain.

⁵¹ Sherwood Fox 1917, 305-306.

⁵² See Mielczarek 1999, 37-38.

⁵³ Launey 1950, 1149-50.

⁵⁴ This article was written at a time when access to libraries was not possible. I would like to thank prof. N. Sekunda sincerely for placing his personal book collection at my disposal. I am especially grateful for his efforts on my behalf as it was only possible to resolve my enquiries through indirect communication through the internet.

- the occasion of his 70th birthday* (Black Sea Studies 1). Aarhus: University Press, 197-208.
- Bresson, A. 1993. "La circulation monétaire rhodienne jusqu'en 166", *Dialogues d'histoire ancienne* 19.1, 119-169.
- Burnstein, S.M. 1978. "IG II² 653. Demosthenes and Athenian relations with Bosphorus in the fourth century BC", *Historia* 27, 428-436.
- Burnstein, S.M. 1993. "The origin of Athenian privileges at Bosphorus: A reconsideration", *Ancient History Bulletin* 7, 81-83.
- CIRB = Corpus Inscriptionum Regni Bosporani – Korpus bosporskikh nadpisey*, V.V. Struve (ed.). Moskva-Leningrad, 1965.
- Ephremov, N.V. 2005. "Rodosko-vizantiyskaya voyna 220 g do.n.e.", *Vestnik Drevney Istorii* 1, 128-153.
- Fraser, P.M. 1972. *Ptolemaic Alexandria*, I-III. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Gabrielsen, V. 1997. *The naval aristocracy of Hellenistic Rhodes*. Aarhus: Aarhus University Press.
- Gajdukevič, V.F. 1971. *Das Bosporanische Reich*. Berlin-Amsterdam: Akademie-Verlag.
- Gaydukevich, V.F. 1960. "Bospor i Arkadiya (Po povodu IPE, II,4)", *Zapiski Odesskogo Arkheologicheskogo Obshchestva* 34, 105-111.
- Grač, N. 1987. "Ein neu entdecktes Fresko aus hellenistischer Zeit in Nymphaion bei Kertsch", in L.K. Galanina and H. Franke (eds), *Skythika. Vorträge zur Entstehung des skytho-iranischen Tierstils und zu Denkmälern des Bosporanischen Reichs anlässlich einer Ausstellung der Leningrader Ermitage in München 1984*. Abhandlungen der Philosophisch-historischen Klasse, Neue Folge 98. Berlin: Beck, 87-95.
- Grach, N.L. 1984. "Otkrytie novogo istoricheskogo istochnika v Nimphee", *Vestnik Drevney Istorii* 1, 81-88.
- IOSPE = B. Latyshev, Inscriptiones orae septentrionalis Ponti Euxini*, vols I, II, IV, I.2, Petropoli, 1885, 1890, 1901, 1916.
- Karyshkovskiy, P.O. 1961. "Ol'viya i Rodos po numizmaticheskim dannym". *Kratkiye Soobshcheniya Instituta Arkheologii* 83, 9-14.
- Krushkol, Yu.S. 1957. "Osnovnye punkty i napravleniya trgovli Severnogo Prichernomor'ya s Rodosom v ellenisticheskuyu epokhu", *Vestnik Drevney Istorii* 4, 110-115.
- Kuznetsov, V.D. 2000. "Aphiny i Bospor: khlebnaya trgovla", *Rossiyskaya Arkheologiya* 1, 107-119.
- Launey, M. 1950. *Recherches sur les armées hellénistiques*, Tome II. Paris: De Boccard.
- LGPN = A Lexicon of Greek Personal Names*, vol. I. *The Aegean Islands, Cyprus, Cyrenaica*, P.M. Fraser and E. Matthews (eds), Oxford, 1987.
- Litvinenko, Yu.N. 1991. "Ptolemeevskiy Egipet i Severnoe Prichernomor'e v III v. do n.e. (K voprosu o kontaktakh)", *Vestnik Drevney Istorii* 1, 12-26.
- Litvinenko, Yu.N. 1999. "Ptolemeevskiy Egipet Rostovtseva (K publikatsii russkogo originala glavy M.I. Rostovtseva dlya 'Kembridzhskoy drevney istorii')", *Vestnik Drevney Istorii* 4, 180-196.
- Lund, J. 1999. "Rhodian amphorae in Rhodes and Alexandria as evidence of trade", in V. Gabrielsen, P. Bilde, T. Engberg-Pedersen, L. Hannestad and J. Zahle (eds),

- Hellenistic Rhodes: politics, culture and society*. Aarhus: Aarhus University Press, 187-204.
- Mielczarek, M. 1990. “Contribution numismatique a l’histoire des rapports de l’Égypte ptolémaïque avec les villes grecques du littoral Septentrional de la mer Noire au II^e siècle av.n.e.”, *Wiadomości Numizmatyczne* 34.3-4, 113-119.
- Mielczarek, M. [Milčarek, M.] 1997. “O nekotorykh monetakh Ptolemeev naydennykh v Severnom Prichernomor’e”, *Nikoniy i antichnyy mir Severnogo Prichernomor’ya*. Odessa, 260-263.
- Mielczarek, M. 1999. *The Army of the Bosporan Kingdom*. Łódź: Oficyna Naukowa MS.
- Monachov, S.Ju. 2005. “Rhodian amphoras: developments in form and measurements”, in V.F. Stolba and L. Hannestad (eds), *Chronologies of the Black Sea area in the period c. 400-100 BCI* (Black Sea Studies 3). Aarhus: Aarhus University Press, 69-95.
- Nowicka, M. 1999. “Quelques remarques sur l’‘ISIS’ de Nymphaion”, *Archeologia* 50, 67-72.
- Olszaniec, W. 1995. “Źródła pisane do dziejów Nymfajonu”, *Archeologia* 66, 81-88.
- Olszta-Bloch, M. 2011. *Ptolemejski Egipt i greckie centra północnego wybrzeża Morza Czarnego. Związki polityczne i gospodarcze*. Toruń: Wydawn, Naukowe Uniwersytetu Mikotaja Kopernika.
- Pap. London 7 = Greek Papyri in the British Museum, 7. The Zenon Archive*, T.C. Skeat (ed.), London, 1974.
- Rauh, N.K. 1999. “Rhodes, Rome, and the Eastern Mediterranean wine trade, 166-88 BC”, in V. Gabrielsen, P. Bilde, T. Engberg-Pedersen, L. Hannestad and J. Zahle (eds), *Hellenistic Rhodes: politics, culture and society*. Aarhus: Aarhus University Press, 162-186.
- Rostovtzeff, M.I. 1928. “Greek Sightseers in Egypt”, *Journal of Egyptian Archaeology* 14, 13-15.
- Rostovtzeff, M. 1941. *The Social and economic history of the Hellenistic world*, I-III. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- SB = Sammelbuch griechischer Urkunden aus Ägypten*, E. Preisigke and F. Bilabel (eds), vol. 2-3. Berlin-Leipzig, 1922-1926.
- Scholl, T. and V. Zin’ko. 1998. *Archaeological Map of Nimphaion (Crimea)*. Warsaw.
- Shelov, D.B. 1958. “K istorii svyazey ellinisticheskogo Bospora s Rodosom”, *Sovetskaya Arkheologiya* 28, 333-336.
- Sherwood Fox, W. 1917. “Greek inscriptions in the Royal Ontario Museum”, *American Journal of Philology* 37.3, 304-311.
- Shurgaya, I.G. 1965, “Import Aleksandrii v Severnom Prichernomor’e”, *Vestnik Drevney Istorii* 4, 126-140.
- Shurgaya, I.G. 1972. “O torgovykh snosheniyakh Ol’vii s Aleksandrey egipetskoy v ellinisticheskuyu epokhu”, *Vestnik Drevney Istorii* 3, 17-29.
- Shurgaya, I.G. 1973. “Voprosy bosporo-egipetskoy konkurentsii v khlebnoy torgovle Vostochnogo Sredizemnomor’ya ranne-ellinisticheskoy epokhi”, *Kratkie Soobshcheniya Instituta Arkheologii* 138, 51-59.
- Shurgaya, I.G. 1979. “Der griechisch-ägyptische Kult im nördlichen Schwarzmeergebiet”, *Klio* 61, 453-456.

- Skrzhinskaya, M.V. 2002. "Ol'biopolity i bosporiane v Aphinakh", *Vestnik Drevney Istorii* 2, 133-143.
- Sokol'skiy, O.Yu. 1958. "K voprosu o naemnikakh na Bospore v IV-III vv. do n.e.", *Sovetskaya Arkheologiya* 28, 298-307.
- Touriaeff, B.A. 1911. "Objects égyptienne et égyptisants trouvés dans la Russie Meridionale", *Revue Archeologique* 28, 20-35.
- Treister, M.Yu. 1985. "Bospor i Egipet v III v. do n.e.", *Vestnik Drevney Istorii* 1, 126-139.
- Trophimova, M.K. 1961. "K istorii ellenisticheskoy ekonomiki (K voprosu o torgovoy konkurentsii Bospora i Egipta v III veke do n.e.)", *Vestnik Drevney Istorii* 2, 46-48.
- Vinogradov, Yu.G. 1999. "Der Staatsbesuch der 'ISIS' im Bosporus", *Ancient Civilizations from Scythia to Siberia* 5.4, 289-300.
- Vinogradov, Y. 2019. "Bosporan tumuli with imprint of Rhodian coin", *Acta Archaeologica Lodziensia* 65, 149-155.
- Zin'ko, V.N. 2001. "Bosporskiy gorod Nimphey i barbary", *Bosporskie issledovaniya* I, 207-212.
- Zubarev, V.G. 1999. "Aziatskiy Bospor (Tamanskiy poluostrov) po danym antichnoy pis'mennoy traditsii", *Drevnosti Bospora* 2, 123-146.

Professor Mariusz Mielczarek

Institute of Archaeology and Ethnology

Polish Academy of Sciences

Łódź Department

ORCID 0000-0002-2476-270X