

CONCLUSION

Lise Hannestad, Vladimir F. Stolba, Alexander N. Ščeglov

We have not yet explained our choice of the term ‘the monumental building’ to designate U6. Initially, in the annual communications on the excavations, and in the first preliminary publications, the building was described as a ‘farmhouse’. This term reflected our opinion that the building was similar to the large farmhouses which had been investigated at that time, first and foremost by S.F. Strželeckij, on the Herakleian Peninsula in the immediate vicinity of Chersonesos. However, when the special character of the building, compared with the other buildings on the site, later became clear, we were forced to find a term that took into consideration the position of the building in the settlement, its size, layout, building technique, and the variety of artefacts found in it. For that reason the Russian term ‘*usad’ba*’ was chosen, meaning an estate, rural or urban, with a courtyard attached to it (including structures such as a well and various outbuildings), and already well established in the archaeological vocabulary. In the end, this was translated into English as ‘the monumental building’.

Such a term may evoke ideas of an aristocratic palace or a costly public building. However, no costly materials and no traits such as columns or walls built completely of well-dressed ashlar were used in the erection of U6. The building was thoroughly utilitarian. While the term clearly underlines the role of the building in the settlement, it also conveys a certain vagueness. The fortress U7, built in the very beginning of the 4th century B.C., (*i.e.* the stratigraphical horizon B, see Part I, p. 24) was certainly larger, and more effort was probably expended on its erection. However, the four rounded corner-towers of U7 clearly define the building as a fortress. U6 may have served a similar purpose in the last period of the settlement (horizon A), but if this was the case, it is mainly indicated by the fact that it was built in strict correspondence with U7, that its walls are more monumental than those of the contemporary buildings on the site, and that it had only one entrance from the outside, the gate leading into the courtyard.

The short life-span, a fairly firm chronology, and the fact that the building was destroyed after an attack and a fire, leaving the larger part of the movables still inside, though often in a very broken state, and seldom *in situ*, combined with the lack of any later building activity on the site provide us with a unique opportunity of studying in detail a rural complex of the *chora* of a Greek city-state (and a very large one) from the early Hellenistic period. We are able to examine aspects such as the divinities worshipped by the inhabitants, or the food supplies they had stored in the building (since the destruction took place in late spring or early summer, these supplies were most probably for use by the inhabitants of U6 themselves, not for export to the city proper, or elsewhere).

The chronology of the building is primarily based on the chronologies established for amphorae stamps of the Black Sea cities (Chersonesos, Herakleia, Amastris, and Sinope) and of Thasos, together with the Chersonesean coin series. These chronologies are supported by an independent chronology, that of Attic black-glaze pottery of the Hellenistic period (for this we have depended on the chronology established by S. Rotroff, see most recently Rotroff 1997). Whereas the time of destruction is well established to *c.* 270 B.C. on the basis of the latest amphorae stamps from Chersonesos, Sinope, and Thasos – a date not disputed by the Attic black-glaze pottery (for an explanation for the fragment of a mould-made bowl (B 144) see Part II, pp. 129-130) – it has been far more difficult to establish the exact date of the con-

struction of the building. This date depends on, firstly, the date of the first major group of amphora stamps from the building, which is a group of 34 Chersonesean stamps of the chronological group 1A (according to V.I. Kac), dated to the period 325-315 B.C. (see part II A). Also most important is the find of three coins (I 5, I 7, and I 8) under the floors of rooms 22 and 24, which may have ended up there during the construction of the building. Of these Chersonesean copper coins, I 5 belongs at the end of the series showing a kneeling Parthenos, while I 7 and I 8 belong at the beginning of the next series with a butting bull (for the date of the last type, see Stolba 1989, 67). This means that the construction date of U6 can be fixed to some time during the decade 320-10 B.C.

U6 was not the first building to be erected on the site after the destruction of U7 and the conquest of the region by Tauric Chersonesos. The earliest building of the Chersonesean phase seems to be the so-called extramural house, on the extreme north-western edge of the fortress (see Stolba 1991). This house was destroyed after a fairly short period of time. The fortress was partly rebuilt, probably in the 340s or 330's, and other buildings, such as U2 (partly excavated), were erected in the last third of the 4th century B.C. At some point during the period 320-10 B.C., U6 was constructed on the eastern fringe of the then existing settlement, at a site where there had apparently never been any building activity, and where finds in the layer beneath the floors of the building suggest that neither was this a cultivated area, since trees or shrubs grew here before U6 was constructed (see Part I, p. 79). U6 differs from the other building complexes in several respects: primarily, as already stated, through its layout and size; it contained especially large rooms for storage (*cf.* Part I), two connected sanctuaries, one for Herakles, and one for a number of agrarian divinities, and last but not least, apart from apartments of one or two rooms (on the ground floor) in the original layout, it also contained what must have been a common dining room (the room above room 5; see Part I, p. 75).

There is no doubt that U6 (and the settlement to which it belonged) was part of the *chora* of Chersonesos. The evidence includes the layout and construction techniques of the building, which are typical of house-building in Chersonesos; the total predominance of both Chersonesean transport amphorae and commonware pottery; the Doric vocalism in the graffiti; and the cult of Herakles, which is especially popular in Chersonesos and its *chora*. That U6 was erected on public initiative by the Chersonesean state is confirmed, not only by its layout and the quality of its construction, compared with other buildings of the period when Panskoye I formed part of the *chora* of Chersonesos, but also by the graffito H 32 on a black glaze plate (B 147) which had been part of the dinner set of the common dining room. It also seems evident that the building was intended to have, and probably did have, a special status in the settlement, though we are unable to say in what way. Possibly it had some control functions, at least in its initial phase. The strong economic ties with Chersonesos suggested by the exclusive finds of Chersonesean coins in the building are confirmed by the pattern of the amphorae (see Part II A), since out of an estimated maximum of 216 amphorae, 168 are Chersonesean, whereas the second most frequent amphorae (from Sinope) amount to only 12. The economic connection of the building (and the site) with the outside world was probably mainly through Chersonesos or cities such as Kerkinitis and Kalos Limen. Panskoye I had its own harbour, and in fact, connections by sea, *e.g.* with Olbia, must also have been very simple.

An analysis of the evidence of social stratification in the building reveals no incontestable corroboration of a clear social ranking. In Part I, Discussion A. Ščeglov has suggested that the apartment originally consisting of rooms 13 and 17 may have been the main apartment of the building, consistent with its size and its placing between the gate and the two sanctuaries in the west corner; and that the head of the family living here was of higher rank than the

other people in the complex. Later, when two more *rooms* (16 and 18) had been added to the apartment, and changes in other parts of the building provided apartments of similar size, details such as differentiation in rank could no longer be distinguished on the basis of the archaeological finds. We shall never be able to reconstruct precisely what happened at the time of the destruction; the comparatively small number of arrowheads (14 specimens) found in U6 suggests that the aggressors did not meet any fierce resistance by the occupants of the building. Probably most of the inmates were away at the time of the attack, or at least they had time to escape in haste – possibly by ship, leaving virtually all their belongings behind.

Who were the people living in U6? From the skeletons found, we know that they included both men, women and children. In fact, from the rebuilding of some of the rooms, it also looks as if there may have been a change towards more family-like units living in the complex, although the common dining room above *room 5* apparently continued in use, even in the final phase. The evidence of the pottery, encompassing at one end of the scale imported Greek black-glaze pottery, of which at least part was produced in Athens, and at the other end, handmade pottery manufactured on the site, may, as stressed by V. Stolba (Part II **D**), provide evidence for a mixed population, some of whom identified themselves as Greeks, whereas others were either Scythians or Taurians, and as such categorised by the Greeks as barbarians. However, nothing suggests that these two groups lived in separate parts of the complex, *i.e.* we cannot identify the barbarian element as exclusively slaves or serfs. The finds instead suggest that the groups were mixed by Greek men taking barbarian women as wives.

In general, the finds from U6 bear witness to the modest living conditions of the inhabitants. Luxury goods are few, mainly consisting of imported Greek pottery. Of course, things like jewellery may have been carried away by those who looted the complex, probably a group of nomads (see Part I, p. 81). Such modest living conditions are also characteristic of other settlements in the *chora* of Chersonesos, including Kerkinitis and Kalos Limen.

The analysis of the black-glazed pottery (Part II **B**) shows that most of it dates to the early years of building, with no continued import on the same level until the destruction. That there was no such continued import also seems confirmed by the fact that a very large part of this pottery shows signs of repair. This may suggest that there was a decline, even in the rather modest prosperity at the time of the foundation of U6, a supposition confirmed by the analysis of the amphora stamps, which show that 64 of the stamped amphorae are to be dated before *c.* 300 B.C., whereas 21 belong to the period 300-285, and only 2 to the period 285-272 B.C. (see Part II **A**, Table 1). However, there is no evidence of a total economic decline, even in the last years of the existence of the building, as indicated by the plentiful food supplies, including imported olive oil, which were kept in the building.



APPENDICES I-V



