

# THRACIA

JT / 11 17-20

# XX



IN HONOREM ANNORUM XL  
INSTITUTI STUDIORUM THRACICORUM

## Съдържание

<i>Диляна Ботева</i> ХЕРОДОТ (8, 115, 3-4) ЗА КСЕРКС, ПЕОНИТЕ (ПРИ СИРИС?) И „СВЕЩЕНАТА КОЛЕСНИЦА НА ЗЕВС” .....	5
<i>Galya D. Vacheva</i> DETECTING A SATRAPY: THE SKUDRA CASE .....	11
<i>Дамян Дамянов</i> ТРАКИЙСКАТА КРЕПОСТ „ГРАДИЩЕ” ПРИ СЕЛО ГЕЛА, СМОЛЯНСКА ОБЛАСТ .....	27
<i>Диана Димитрова</i> АРХЕОЛОГИЧЕСКИЯТ КОМПЛЕКС КРАСТАВА МОГИЛА ПРИ СЕЛО ДРАГОДАНОВО, СЛИВЕНСКО .....	49
<i>Мирослав Издимирски</i> АРИСТОФАН ЗА СMIKИТА – „ЦАРЯ НА ТРАКИТЕ” (Aristoph. Equit. 967-969 et scholia) .....	73
<i>Румен Иванов</i> ПОСВЕТИТЕЛЕН АЛТАР НА ХЕРКУЛЕС ОТ АБРИТУС .....	83
<i>Кирил Йорданов</i> ПОЛИТИКЪТ И ДЪРЖАВНИКЪТ ФИЛИП II В ПЪРВИТЕ ГОДИНИ НА СВОЕТО УПРАВЛЕНИЕ (359 - 357 Г. ПР. ХР.) .....	87
<i>Ваня Лозанова-Станчева</i> ПРОРОЧЕСТВАТА НА МНОГО(НА)ДАРЕНИЯ .....	103
<i>Цвете Лазова</i> ОМИР И ТРОЯ В КУЛТУРНОТО ПРОСТРАНСТВО НА СРЕДИЗЕМНОМОРИЕТО: ПОЛИТИКИ НА НАСЛЕДСТВОТО .....	135
<i>Gregorio Luri</i> QUID SIT DEUS? .....	155
<i>Ivan Marinov</i> LA CLASSIFICATION EN ARCHÉOLOGIE BULGARE: UNE QUESTION DE MÉTHODOLOGIE OU DE THÉORIE? .....	171
<i>Васил Марков</i> КЪМ ВЪПРОСА ЗА ДРЕВНОТРАКИЙСКОТО НАСЛЕДСТВО В ПРАЗНИКА ГЕРГЪВДЕН ОТ БЪЛГАРСКАТА НАРОДНА КУЛТУРА .....	181

---

<i>Кабалан Мукарзел</i> АМУЛИЕТ С КЪСНО-ВАВИЛОНСКА СЦЕНА ОТ КРАСТАВА МОГИЛА, СЕЛО ДРАГОДАНОВО .....	197
<i>Georgi Nekhrizov, Lynn E. Roller, Maya Vassileva, Julia Tzvetkova, Nadezhda Kecheva</i> GLUHITE KAMANI: OLD QUESTIONS AND NEW APPROACHES .....	215
<i>Plamen Petkov</i> DIE BASTARNEN IN DER PERIODE vom Ende des 1. Jhs.v.Chr. bis Ende des 4. Jhs.n.Chr. ....	235
<i>Ружа Попова</i> ЛЕВКА: КОНСТРУИРАНЕ НА СВЕЩЕНИЯ ТОПОС (1) .....	247
<i>Ratschko Popov</i> DER MYTHOS VON PHINEUSUND DER VOLKSGLAUBEN VON DEM MAULWURF .....	259
<i>Kalin Porozhanov</i> THRACIA PONTICA OF THE EMPIRES, THE RESIDENCES, THE MARKETPLACES AND THE <i>POLEIS</i> IN THE EUROPEAN SOUTHEAST .....	269
<i>Мирена Славова</i> <i>ARTIUM MINUTISSIMUS SCISCITOR DE REBUS THRACORUM SCRIBENS</i> .....	287
<i>Тошо Спиридонов</i> ТРАКИЙСКОТО ИМЕ НА СЕЛИЩЕТО КРАЙ ПЪТНАТА СТАНЦИЯ CASTRA RUBRA – SUB ZUPARA .....	305
<i>Julia Tzvetkova</i> “QUANTIFYING THE CULT”. A GIS APPROACH TOWARDS THE CULT PLACES OF THE THRACIANS FROM THE IRON AGE .....	317
<i>Ирина Шопова</i> ЗА ЕПИТАФИЯТА ОТ МАЛКО ТЪРНОВО .....	327
<i>Светлана Янакиева</i> ТРАКИЙСКИТЕ ЕКСПЛОЗИВНИ СЪГЛАСНИ 1. Ономастичният материал .....	331

**Picard, O. 2000:** Monnayages en Thrace à l'époque Achéménide. – In: O. Casabonne (ed.), Mécanismes et innovations monétaires dans l'Anatolie achéménide. Numismatique et histoire (Varia Anatolica, XII). Istanbul, 239-254.

**Sprawski, Sl. 2010:** The Early Temenid Kings to Alexander I. – In: J. Roisman and I. Worthington (eds), A Companion to Ancient Macedonia. Wiley – Blackwell, 127-144.

**Tuplin, Chr. 2003:** Xerxes' March from Doriscus to Therme. – Historia, LII/4, 385-409.

*Софийски университет  
boteva@clio.uni-sofia.bg*

## **HERODOTUS (8, 115, 3-4) ON XERXES, THE PAEONES (AT SIRIS?) AND “THE SACRED CHARIOT OF ZEUS”**

*Dilyana Boteva*  
(summary)

This study is dealing with some unclear details in Hdt. VIII, 3-4 concerning the place where Xerxes had left behind the sacred chariot of Zeus during his march against Greece in 480 BC. Traditionally it is accepted that it was left with the Paeones at Siris, which however does not fit grammatically in the text. Accordingly, other possibilities or acceptable explanations should be searched for.

Bulgarica XI, 1, 97-99.

**Tonkova, M. 2003:** Late Iron Age pit-sanctuaries in Thrace: the contribution of the studies at Gledachevo. – Thracia XV, 479-504.

**Toteva, G. 2007:** Local cultures of late Achaemenid Anatolia. A University of Minnesota Ph.D. thesis, Minneapolis.

**Tuna-Nörling, Y. 1995:** Die Ausgrabungen von Alt-Smyrna und Pitane: Die Attisch - Schwarzfigurige Keramik und der Attische Keramikexport nach Kleinasien. Tübingen.

**Tuna-Nörling, Y. 1999:** Die Attische Keramik. Arkeoloji Dergisi VI (Daskyleion I. Edited by H. Malay). Izmir.

**Tuna-Nörling, Y. 2001:** Attic Pottery from Dascylium. – In: Achaemenid Anatolia. (Proceedings of the First International Symposium on Anatolia in the Achaemenid Period. Bandırma 15-18 August 1997). Leiden, 109-122.

**Türker, A. 2009:** Early Christian and Byzantine archaeology on the valleys around Madytos. – In: Anadolu ve çevresinde ortaçağ 3. Ankara, 51-74.

**Van De Mieroop, M. 2005:** A history of the ancient Near East ca. 3000-323 BC. Blackwell.

**Vassileva, M. 2010:** Achaemenid interfaces: Thracian and Anatolian representations of elite status. – In: Bollettino di Archeologia On Line, Reg. Tribunale Roma, n. 330, 37-46.

**Voigt, M., C. Young. 1999:** From Phrygian Capital to Achaemenid Entrepot: Middle and Late Phrygian Gordion. - Iranica Antiqua 34, 191-241.

**Young, R. 1956:** The Campaign of 1955 at Gordion: Preliminary Report. - American Journal of Archaeology 60, 249-266.

**Young, R. 1962:** The 1961 Campaign at Gordion. - American Journal of Archaeology 66, 153-168.

**Zahrnt, M. 1997:** Die Perser in Thrakien. – In: Actes du 2e Symposium International des Etudes Thraciennes. Thrace Ancienne. Vol. I. Komotini, 91-98.

*tote0004@umn.edu*  
*Galya D. Bacheva*  
*Independent scholar*

## DETECTING A SATRAPY: THE SKUDRA CASE

*Galya D. Bacheva*  
Резюме

Съществуването на Ахеменидска сатрапия „Скудра“ в Европейска Тракия дълго се е основавало на данни от антични епиграфски и литературни паметници. Същевременно много учени оспорват статуса на Скудра като сатрапия. Настоящата статия допринася към дискусиата с анализ на данните от пет селища в Тракия свързвани с персите (Сестос, Дорискос, Ейон, Миркинос и Бориза), сравнени с находките от три града в Мала Азия които със сигурност били под управлението на Ахеменидите (Горди-

он, Сарди и Даскилеон). За разлика от последните, в тракийските селища не са открити цилиндрични печати, промени в култовете и погребалните обреди, епиграфски, нумизматични и ономастични данни, доказващи наличието на персийска администрация в Тракия. Откритите в региона множество предмети с източен характер (фиали, ритони, изображения на митични животни в торевтиката) е по-скоро резултат от културните връзки между Тракия и съседните ѝ райони, засвидетелствани дълго преди появата на Ахеменидите. Анализът на археологическите, лингвистичните и историческите данни за разглежданите селища показва, че те са били бази на персийски гарнизони, използвани по време на военните кампании на Дарий и Ксеркс. Няма данни за съществуването на централизирана персийска власт в Европейска Тракия и скоро след провала на Ксеркс в конфликта с гръцките градове-държави, селищата, обитавани от персийски гарнизони преминали в ръцете на гърци или траки.

3, 115-123.

**Петрова, Н. 1975:** За проучването на тракийските крепости в Смолянски окръг. – Известия на музеите от Южна България, 1975, 1, 89-98.

**Саватинов, С. 1995:** Сондажни археологически проучвания в местността „Старото селище” край град Раднево. – „Марица-изток” – археологически проучвания, 3, 147-169.

**Тахчийски, А., Г. Господинов 2007:** Геоложка характеристика на Смолянска община. – *Rhodopica*, 1, 7-18.

**Тачева, М. 2000:** Власт и социум в римска Тракия и Мизия. София.

**Шейлева 1994:** Балзена ли е крепостта край Главан. – „Марица-изток” – археологически проучвания, 2, 227-234.

**Šićikova, M. 1972:** Nouvelles données sur la culture thrace de l'époque du Hallstatt en Bulgarie du Sud. – In: *Thracia*, 1, 79-100.

**Damyanov, D. 2009:** Thracian Sanctuary-fortress at the Village of Strashimir – the Middle Rhodopes. – In: *Thracia*, 18, 451-467.

**Detev, P. 1981:** Le tell Razkopanica. – In: *Cultures préhistoriques en Bulgarie*. Sofia, 141-189.

**Hänsel, B. 1976:** Beiträge zur regionalen und chronologischen Gliederung der älteren Hallstattzeit an der Unteren Donau. Bonn

**Vulcheva, D. 2002:** Hand-made Pottery of the Early Iron Age. – In: *Koprivlen*, 1. Sofia, 125-132.

**Wardle, K. 1980:** Excavations at Assiros, 1975-9. – In: *The Annual of the British School at Athens*, 75, 229-265.

Смолян

e-mail: dam\_sm@mai.bg

damyan\_sm@abv.bg

## **The Thracian Fortress „Gradishte” in Gela, Smolyan Region**

*Damyan Damyanov*

(summary)

The fortress is located about 3.5 km southwest of the present village of Gela. Two major periods in its construction were registered during the investigations in 2010. The first period covers the so-called “Dark Ages” in Southeast Europe (12th-9th C BC), the time of large migration movements in the region of the seaside and the hinterland of the Black Sea, the Aegean and the eastern Mediterranean Basin, which led to the change of ages. The settling down of newcomers from a new “Iron Culture” in the area of the Middle Rhodopes started during the 11th-9th C BC. Evidence of military conflicts is provided by the existence of Thracian fortresses in this part of the mountain range.

The first fortress construction occupied the upper, relatively flat part of the ridge in the area of Gradishte. A rock precipice is supposed to have been the eastern wall. The building technique yielded a one-sided dry-stone masonry

of partially processed stones. The wall is 2.60-3 m wide. The outer face is smooth and vertical. Considering the amount of pottery found during the excavation works the construction and the culmination in the functioning of this first fortress could be dated to the 11th-9th C BC. Evidence of the existence of a sanctuary and a residential area within the fortification is provided by the pottery fragments found on the site of the fortress.

The beginning of the sanctuary's existence is marked by a relatively numerous pottery with a decoration characteristic of the Early Iron Age. It is represented by fragments of bowls decorated with grooves and buckles, as well as relief straps and embossed buckles, typical of large vessels for food and liquids. The fragments of bowls decorated with grooves have their analogues in the Rhodopes, in the Sakar Mountain, in the Thracian Plain, and in the Lower Danubian Plain. In the west analogues occur as far as the Vardar Valley. The pottery decorated with buckles, part of it combined with grooves, is widely spread within the same bounds, extending east-northeast to the Black-Sea coast at the mouth of the Dniester, west-southwest up to the Valley of Vardar, south and southeast – up to the Aegean coast of the Balkan Peninsula and the northeastern coast of Asia Minor.

The second stage of the fortress's life is related to the construction of an outside wall – lower, on the western and northern slopes of the Gradishte area. The route of the base here is dug up horizontally too, yet 10 m lower in the terrain. The total length of the outer fortification wall during the second period must have been about 120 m. The building technique is the same as that of the earlier wall. The masonry was made in sectors with joint.

The wall is based without indentation into the rocky terrain and features a substructure of poorly shaped plinth, on spots pushed out as a result of the gravity of the superstructure. The stone wall must have been 2.5 to 3 m high, and a palisade was probably built over it. The width of the base is 3.20-3.50 m. It has a well designed vertical and smooth outer face, an inner filling of irregularly shaped stones, the inner masonry having not a vertical, but rather an oblique face. This type of wall – stone base and palisade – was registered during the research works on the Thracian fortress in the area of Gradishte in the village of Strashimir (Middle Rhodopes). This type of structure of a defense facility appears quite logical, as the one-sided dry masonry of partially processed stones built on a sloping terrain cannot stand the height; besides, much more construction material would be necessary. The lack of sufficient stone was compensated by abundant amounts of timber, of which the palisades and buildings in the fortress were made.

The stratigraphic drilling No. 1 into the inner face of the outer wall of the fortress revealed the structure of stone masonry and provided pottery fragments for the dating of the wall. The period, in which the Thracian fortress was extended, covers the second phase of the Early Iron Age (8th-6th C BC). It



worked during the Late Iron Age and ceased its functioning in the 2nd-3rd century.

Analogues of the pottery complex from drilling No. 1 of the Thracian fortress in the village of Gela, dated back to the second phase of the Early Iron Age, are already known in the country. Similar is the situation with the pottery with incised and imprinted decoration from certain archaeological sites in the Valley of Nestos, in the basins of the rivers Maritsa and Tundzha, in the Sakar Mountain, and in Dobrudzha.

The latest pottery from drilling No.1 in the fortress is represented by three identical vessels of the amphora-type dated back to the 2nd-3rd century. The inclusion of the Rhodopes into the boundaries of the Roman Empire in the 1st century could obviously not break the resistance of the local Thracians, who fought for a long time defending their lands.

**Панайотов, Ив., Ст. Александров, Хр. Буюклиев, А. Георгиева 2006:** Могилен некропол от римската епоха в м. Керакова могила до с. Винаца, Пловдивско. – В: Спасителни археологически разкопки по трасето на железопътната линия Пловдив – Свиленград през 2004 г. Велико Търново, 27-60.

**Тачева-Хитова, М. 1971:** Тракийско могилно погребение край с. Староселка, Щуменски окръг. II. Инвентар, ритуал и датировка на погребението от могилната гробница. – Археология 3, 42-51.

**Танкова, Ж. 2010:** Археологически разкопки на обект “Музеят”, гр. Пловдив. – Археологически открития и разкопки през 2009 г. София, 388-390.

**Теодосиев, Н. 1990:** Свещената игра на орфиците. – Култура 2, 64-78.

**Филев, Б. 1934:** Надгробните могили при Дуванлий в Пловдивско. София.

**Фол, Ал. 1986:** Тракийският орфизъм. София.

**Фол, Ал. 1991:** Тракийският Дионис. Книга първа Загрей. София.

**Чернева-Гилкиян, С. 1997:** Типология и хронология на стъклените балсамарии от Филипопол. – Годишник на Археологически музей Пловдив VIII, 42-57.

**Georgieva, R., D. Momčilo 2000:** Le tumulus près du village de Žitosvjat, région de Karnobat. – Thracia 13, *Studia in memoriam Velizari Velkov*, 2000, 111-132.

**Hayes, W. 1980:** Ancient Lamps in the Royal Ontario Museum. Toronto.

**Kern, O. 1963:** Orphicorum fragmenta. Berolini.

**Milne, M. 1944:** A Greek Footbath in the Metropolitan Museum of Art. – *American Journal of Archaeology* XLVIII, 1, 26-65.

**Perlzweig, J. 1961:** Lamps of the Roman Period. The Athenian Agora VII. Princeton.

**Preshlenov, H. 2008:** The Bulgarian Black Sea Region in the Economy of the Roman Empire. – In: *Studia in Honorem Aleksandrae Dimitrova-Milcheva. Югоизточна Европа през античността. VI в. пр. Хр. – началото на VII в. сл. Хр.* София, 300-323.

**Raev, B. 1977:** Die Bronzgefäße der römischen Kaiserzeit in Thracien und Mösien. – In: *Bericht der Römischen-Germanischen Kommission. Bd. 58 II*, 168-201.

**Ruseva-Slokoska, L. 1991:** Roman Jewellery. London.

**The Luster 2010:** The Luster of Eternity. The Chariot from Caranovo, Nova Zagora Region I-II Century AD. Sofia.

**Ελευθεράτου, Σ. 2006:** Το Μουσείο και η Ανασκαφή. Αθήνα, 2006.

## **The Archaeological Complex of *Krastava Tumulus* near the Village of Dragodanovo, Sliven District**

*Diana Dimitrova*  
(summary)

In August 2010 *Krastava Tumulus* became subject of full archaeological research. A central grave, four ritual platforms and a fire were discovered therein. A person was probably cremated and buried in a one-step pit dug in the south-east part of the tumulus. The grave goods can be split in three groups. The *first* one covers the personal jewelry of the particular Thracian well-born man/

woman: a gold appliqué with no image, a gold lunula, a massive gold earring and a gold ring with carnelian intaglio with the image of a bee. The *second* group comprises bronze and clay vessels of different sizes and shapes. All vessels refer to the libation and/or washing practices before, during and/or after the performed ritual. Among these vessels there are at least three clay pitchers and three bronze wash basins of different sizes. One of the basins is a tripod and might have been used either as a podanipter (vessel for washing the feet) or a cauldron. The vessel's legs are shaped as winged sphinxes with four lion's paws each, staying firmly on a pedestal formed as a large lion's paw. The main sphinx elements are emphasized by means of silver coating on the bronze. The *third* group of grave goods consists of different beads, amulets, small-size cult objects, and a silver mirror. These are the so-called 'Zagreus' toys'. According to the myth the child Zagreus was playing with those toys, and when he looked into the mirror, he got torn in seven pieces by the Titans. These objects were presumably used in that person's lifetime for ritual practices such as fortune-telling. Thus they suggest the priest function the deceased used to have in the Thracian society of the Roman Age. One of the beads is scarab-shaped and has a hole to be worn on a string; a scene is engraved on its flat side, representing a right-profiled man's figure standing before a sacrificial altar and predicting the fortune by stargazing. The priest's function is once more emphasized by such attributes as scepter and rhomb. The object might have been an amulet, worn either in a leather pouch or on a string. The iconography of the scene is of eastern origin and represents a pattern rooted back in the centuries and millennia like the seal of the Sumerian priest Hashhamer from the late 3<sup>rd</sup> millennium B.C. or the plate of King Meli-Shih from the Babylonian Kassite Dynasty in 12<sup>th</sup> C BC. A two-wick clay lamp, fragments from the casing and decoration of a toilet-ware wooden box, as well as a silver coin of Emperor Trajan dated to 103 or 104 remain outside the above-mentioned three groups. The early 2<sup>nd</sup> c. is the final date of the burial in Krastava Tumulus.

Immediately after the cremation in the center of a flat platform south of it must have taken place certain post-ritual practices as for ex. ritual banquets around a fire enclosed by slab-stones.

As a whole, the grave in Krastava Tumulus is dated to the very early 2<sup>nd</sup> c. and comprises grave goods utilized over a long period of time and handed down from generation to generation. On one hand, the lack of weapons suggests that the buried person may have been a woman and this is supported by the small size of the gold finger ring. On the other hand, a man is depicted on one side of the scarab-shaped amulet. Hence the buried person, having the status of a priest, fortune-teller or magician, might have been of male or female sex. And since there is not enough bone material for anthropological research, it is impossible to specify the sex of the individual, who used to hold the secret knowledge of the ancient Thracians transmitted orally amongst the initiated.

**Roberts, E. S. 1887:** An Introduction to Greek Epigraphy. The Archaic Inscriptions and the Greek Alphabet. Part I. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

**Robson, J. 2006:** Humor, Obscenity and Aristophanes, Gunter Narr Verlag, Tübingen.

**Sommerstein, A.H. 1981:** Knights (The Comedies of Aristophanes, Vol. II). Warminster.

**Sommerstein, A. H. 2002:** Greek Drama and Dramatists. Routledge, London & New York.

**Storey, I. C., A. Allan 2005:** A Guide to Ancient Greek Drama. Blackwell, Oxford.

**Stronk, J. P. 1995:** The Ten Thousand in Thrace: An Archaeological and Historical Commentary on Xenophon's Anabasis, Books VI, 3-6 – VII (Amsterdam Classical Monographs, Vol. II). Brill.

**Thompson, W.E. 1965:** Prosopographical Notes on Athenian Treasurers – Hesperia, Vol. 34, No. 2, 148–156.

*miroslav.izdimirski@gmail.com*

## **ARISTOPHANES ON SMICYTHES, “KING OF THE THRACIANS” (ARISTOPH. EQUIT., 967-969 ET SCHOLIA)**

*Miroslav Izdimirski*  
(summary)

This essay deals with three verses from Aristophanes' comedy “The Knights” and the later scholia to them. The verses report the sausage seller's (Agoracritus) prophecy about the future superiority of Paphlagonian Cleon over the Athenian demos. In the text there is a mention of Smicythes, a higher Athenian financial officer, and his master. Smicythes is feminized; “she” is expected to be asked to the Athenian court along with “her” master, just the way a woman is being appealed with her husband/guardian.

According to the scholia, Smicythes is “the king of the Thracians.” The view reasoned here suggests the idea that this person cannot be a Thracian king, because the name Smicythes is Greek and was attested in many inscriptions from Attica. However, in the scholia are mentioned the relations of political dependence between the “Thracian king” and Cyrus the Younger, which fit well into the period 407-401 BC. In the opinion of the author the political relations between the Odrysians and the satrap Cyrus the Younger from Asia Minor were settled during this period. In such a way Seuthes II was aiming at re-establishing his rule over the lost paradynastic territory of his father (Maidas) in South-Eastern Thrace.

ara(m) sub s[(ua) c(ura posuit)]

Изпуснатият ред, който трябва да е бил между втори и трети ред на надписа, трябва да е гласял: Severo et. В него името на консула е в Ablativus, докато името на императора е в Dativus, но тъй като окончанията им съвпадат, каменоделецът, който сигурно слабо знаел латински и не е разбирал съдържанието на надписа, вероятно е помислил, че вече е завършил изписването на името и е продължил нататък.

### Цитирана литература

**Иванов, Т. 1980:** Абритус. Римски кастел и ранновизантийски град в Долна Мизия. Топография и укрепителна система на Абритус. Том I. София.

**Радославова, Г., Г. Дзанев 2003:** Абритус (Abritus). – В: (Р. Иванов, ред.) Римски и ранновизантийски селища в България (Roman and Early Byzantine Settlements in Bulgaria). София, 110–148.

**Стоев, К. 2012:** Романизация на Горна и Долна Мизия по данни на антропонимията (I–III в.) София (Автореферат на дисертация за присъждане на образователната и научна степен „доктор“).

**Degrassi, A. 1952:** I fasti consolari dell' Impero Romano. Roma.

**Kienast, D. 1996:** Römische Kaisertabelle. Grundzüge einer römischen Kaiserchronologie. Darmstadt.

**Schillinger-Häfele, U. 1986:** Consules – Augusti – Caesares. Datierung von römischen Inschriften und Münzen. Stuttgart 1986.

*Национален археологически институт с музей  
rumenvily@abv.bg*

### Votive altar of Hercules from Abritus

*Rumen Ivanov*  
(summary)

A reused limestone sacrificial altar with a votive inscription (Fig. 1) was discovered during the survey of the late-antique city of Abritus, at the eastern part of the modern town of Razgrad. It was situated between the south-eastern tower with number 16 and the next one with number 17 of the fortified wall.

The inscription was dated by prof. Teofil Ivanov to AD 200. It was written in Latin, divided into six lines. The dedicator was a priest bearing a Greek cognomen and the nomen Aelius. This nomen was quite typical for the period between the middle and the end of the 2<sup>nd</sup> century.

The inscription causes confusion, prompted by the name Severus, due to

an error committed either by the stone-cutter or by the priest, who ordered the limestone altar. The inscription was dedicated both to the deity Hercules and Emperor Septimius Severus in AD 200, when consuls at Rome were Severus and Victorinus. The name of the Princeps was L. Septimius Severus and the full names of the consuls in AD 200 were Ti. Claudius Severus Proculus and C. Aufidius Victorinus. Most probably, since the text reads

Invicto Herculi (et)  
 imp(eratori L. S.) Severo  
 Victorino co(n)s(ulibus)  
 P(ublius) Ael(ius) Epityn-  
 5 chanus sacerdos  
 ara(m) sub s[(ua) c(ura) posuit],

a line situated between the second and the third lines of the inscription and containing the words *SEVERO ET* has been omitted.

4, 9-20

**Йорданов, К. 2000:** Политическите отношения между Македония и тракийските държави (359-281 г. пр. Хр.). (= Studia Thracica 7), София

**Йорданов, К. 2003:** Thraco-Paeonica: историческа панорама според писмената традиция. – В: Пирајхме, 2. Куманово, 63-118

**Кацаров, Г. 1922:** Царь Филип II Македонски. История на Македония до 336 г. пр. Христа. София

**Попов, Д. 2009:** Древна Тракия. История и култура. София

**Тонев, Мл. 1942:** Приноси към историята на траките. – Беломорски преглед 1, 179-226

**Хаммонд, Н. 2008:** История древней Греции. Москва

**Цветкова, Ю. 2008:** История на тракийския Херсонес (от Троянската война до времето на римското завоевание). София

**Шахермайер, Ф. 1984:** Александр Македонский. Москва

## THE POLITICIAN AND STATESMAN PHILIP II DURING HIS FIRST YEARS OF GOVERNMENT (359 - 357 BC)

*Kiril Jordanov*

Summary

During his first three years of government Philip II proved his exceptional talents as statesman, politician, diplomat and administrator. He met no challenge to get the supreme power after the decision voted by the general assembly made of warriors and the aristocratic elite – he even left his underage nephew, Amyntas IV, close to the government of the state. Gradually, by smart diplomatic maneuvers he got rid of all real and imaginary pretenders to the Argeades' throne. He entertained delicate diplomatic relations with Athens and even more so with Amphipolis and the Odrysian king Cotys I, and played astute political games with the neighboring Paeonian and Illyrian tribes. The latter suffered a heavy defeat on the battlefield where their old king Bardylis was also killed. At that time Philip II contracted his first dynastic and political marriages in order to legitimize incontestably his position as well at home as in the eyes of his foreign counterparts. His military and administrative reforms were particularly important and made him a political factor in the European Southeast and the Hellenic world, especially after the fall of the strategically important Amphipolis.

## THE PROPHECIES OF THE “MANY-GIFT[ED]”

*Vanya Lozanova-Stantcheva*  
(summary)

The submitted essay deals with the origin and development of the mythological figure of Polydorus (the translation of the name from Ancient Greek means as much as „many-gift[ed]”) and its eventual rooting in well-known ritual practices in Ancient Thrace. Although the name comes up already in Homer’s *Iliad*, in ancient-Greek literary tradition it is generally associated with Euripides’ tragedy *Hecuba* (dated to ca. 425 BC, mostly because of the occurrence in its text of allusions to the revival of the Delos Festivities in 426 BC). The whole conception of the tragedy *Hecuba* seems to be organized namely with a view to the localization of the tragic action in Thrace, in an explicit Thracian context; this fact has presumably led a number of researchers preoccupied with its study to the assumption that the mythological figures of Polydorus and of the Thracian king Polymestor are not to be regarded as a result just of Euripides’ purely poetical fantasy – they have rather been loaned from some local “gloomy” myth from the Thracian Chersonese. Does it seem possible to reconstruct an eventual cult situation pre-conditioned by the Thracian localization of the action of the tragedy feeding up the tragic characters in Euripides’ tragedy?

The exposition is organized in 3 main groups of source problems:

1. In **the first place** is considered the mythic-literary complex related to the epiphany and prophecies of Polydorus in the context of Euripides’ tragedy *Hecuba* and its literary tradition. The appearance of the ghost of Polydorus deliberately removes the pathos of the tragedy from the figure of Achilles and his traditional ritual space in Troas (eventually near Sigeon, where the ancient authors localized Achilleion and the burial tumulus of the hero) in Thrace, and, respectively, on the Thracian Chersonese. Through the incorporation of the ritual space of the Thracian Chersonese into the range of events in his tragedy Euripides created a new model of the dramaturgic space, also adding a new functionality to it by means of the metaphoric image of Ancient Thrace as identification of the specific border area and borderline situation of the tragedy crisis. One may suppose however that the author suggested this particular approach in the literary interpretation of the mythological material not so much as a response to his dramaturgical prototypes – whoever they might be – as rather as following the logics of the Thracian localization of the events of the tragedy action.

2. All this also very clearly indicates the **post-Euripidean** tradition about Polydorus considered in **the second place** in the submitted essay. After the staging of Euripides’ tragedy *Hecuba* in the last quarter of the 5<sup>th</sup>



century BC the mythological figure of Polydorus “was revived” only during the 2<sup>nd</sup> century BC through the imitations of Roman tragedians like Ennius (*Hecuba*), Pacuvius (*Iliona*), and Accius (*Hecuba*). The mythological narrative about Polydorus in Latin literature – especially the version of Pacuvius (*Iliona*) and the Chronical of the Trojan War, referred to Dictys of Crete and dated to AD 4<sup>th</sup> century – is an original evolvement-interpretation of the Euripidean tradition merging anonymous sources of mythology with Homeric elements.

3. The most significant tendency of development of the mythological narrative on Polydorus offers the tradition connecting Polydorus’ prophecies with **the founding of the city of Aineia** (Αἰνεΐα; Aene(i)a; alternatively – Aineiadae as designation of its inhabitants, as well as of the city of Aenus situated on the shore of the river Hebros), assigned to Aeneus. This tendency reveals an earlier circle of sources, alternative to the tradition of the foundation of Alba Longa, where Aeneus founds an eponymous city in Thrace and dies (or – his father Anchises) being buried there as a *heros oikistes*. An integral moment of a great part of the mythic-literary versions is the specific cult situation surrounding an underground mystery sanctuary (*tumulus* or *cave*) with a prophesying (anthropodaemonized) “Bacchus’ prophet” identified with the epic hero Polydorus. Certainly, the Roman authors oriented their efforts towards the developing of the conception on the foundation of Alba Longa by Aeneus, omitting the earlier mythographic details about the stay of the hero in Thrace.

4. Finally, last but not least, the literary material is analyzed in the Dionysian context of the tragedy conceptualization of Euripides’ *Hecuba*, where oracular dreams, prophecies and Bacchic associations frame up the mythic-dramaturgical events as a whole. The outlines of the Dionysian ritual space, in which the action of the tragedy *Hecuba* is embedded, appear dramaturgically sealed by some additional artistic strokes deliberately loading the women of Troy with Dionysian characteristics.

The **conclusion** yields the hypothesis that we may possibly be facing a literary, respectively dramaturgic re-interpretation of a cult situation surrounding an underground mystery sanctuary (*tumulus* or *cave*) with an anthropodaemonized “Bacchus’ oracle” prophesying there, in this case identified with the (pseudo-) Homeric hero Polydorus. It seems very probable that Euripides merged the image of the epic hero Polydorus, generally associated with Dionysos, with the figure of the local Thracian anthropodaemonic prophet, towards which a sanctuary with an oracle site of Dionysian type leans, thus laying the beginnings of a new literary tradition. The pattern of the mythical creation might appear identical with that of the tragedy *Rhesus* ascribed to Euripides. Reconstructible seems also the steady mythological core and the ritual complex related to the founding of a

new city, along with the required underground mystery sanctuary (*tumulus* or *cave*) with a prophesying (anthropodaemonized) oracle (“Bacchus’ prophet”) there, as an alternative to the Delphic oracle site.

- Lord, A. 1960:** *The Singer of Tales*. New York.
- Lorimer, H. L. 1950:** *Homer and the Monuments*. London.
- Meskel, L. et al. 1998:** *Archaeology under Fire. Nationalism, Politics and Heritage in the Eastern Mediterranean and Middle East*. London, New York.
- Morris, I. 1997:** *Periodization and the Heroes: Inventing a Dark Age*. – In: Golden, M., Toohey (eds.). *Inventing Ancient Culture: Historicism, Periodization and the Ancient World*. New York, Routledge.
- Morris, I. 2000:** *Archaeology as Cultural History. Words and Things in Iron Age Greece*. Oxford.
- Page, D. 1959:** *History and the Homeric Iliad*. Oxford.
- Redfield, R. 1956:** *Peasant Society and Culture*. Chicago.
- Snodgrass, A. 1971:** *The Dark Age of Greece*. Edinburgh.
- Starr, Ch. 1961:** *The Origins of Greek Civilization*. New York.
- Trigger, B. 1984:** *Alternative Archaeologies: Nationalist, Colonialist, Imperialist*. – *Man*, New Series, Vol.19, №3, 355–370.
- Trigger, B. 1989:** *A History of Archaeological Thought*. Cambridge.
- Trigger, B. 2005:** *Romanticism, nationalism, and archaeology*. – In: Philip L. Kohl, C. Fawcett (eds.). *Nationalism, Politics, and the Practice of Archaeology*. Cambridge, 263–279.
- Urry, J. 1990:** *The Tourist Gaze*. London: Sage.
- Whitley, J. 2007:** *The Archaeology of Ancient Greece*. Oxford.

## **HOMER AND HIS TROY IN THE CULTURAL SPACE OF THE MEDITERRANEAN: POLITICS OF THE HERITAGE**

*Tsvete Lazova*  
(summary)

As a doctoral student on Homer and his evidence concerning Thrace and the Thracians in the Institute of Thracology established in 1972 I have all good reasons to offer a text on my understandings of Homer developed through the years. They took paths in an anthropological perspective understanding the past and its uses as a cultural capital in the context of various cultural politics: as procedures regulating the production of cultural products and practices from one side and as reflections of power in the representation of cultural meanings from the other side. Another important perspective in the study of Antiquity is its touristification and the “tourist gaze”. This aspect in the study of Antiquity is recognized as important anthropological perspective in the context of the “great and little traditions” in the Mediterranean space as it studies the processes of the commoditization of the ancient images. The “touristic gaze” which is always socially organized seeks authenticity and therefore it has to be produced. Usually the discourse forms the idea expected by the tourists to be seen.

As a result of this theoretical background the paper discusses the space, the

place and their meanings constructed through various networks of social power relations. It discusses Homer and his Troy in the context of various foundation myths produced in different times for different reasons. It studies also the process of producing the idea or better the ideal, represented as *Hellenism* in the sense of apology of Greece and the Greek culture and embedded in the academic space before Heinrich Schliemann. The paper presents the heroic age “imagined” by Schliemann and thus “inventing” the Dark Ages. After the Second World War a new “Dark Ages” were established in the context of the development of the archaeological discipline in the social sciences perspective. This was the theoretical perspective that diverted it from the cultural-historical approaches typical for the nationalistic cultural archaeology. This change of paradigms opened the way for redefining the Mycenaean heritage and the ideas about the social life of the Greek poleis.

This paper discusses in short the position of Homer and his Troy in the Bulgarian *Altertumswissenschaft*. It retains the feeling produced by the old cultural-historical perspectives that the links between the “Mycenaean” Greece and the “Mycenaean” Thrace are so transparently visible that they enter all academic and touristic discourses as something natural and non-debatable.

Homer and his Troy is amongst the most successful touristic destinations. It is valued today with the “authenticity” of the Trojan horse in the Turkish town of Canakkale gifted by the Hollywood production of the film “Troy” with the famous Brad Pitt playing the role of Achilles. Fascinated by the “Trojan horses” in this space, monumentalizing the cunning Greeks, the tourists would hardly notice the concluding suggestion in a chapter from the Guidebook by Manfred Korfmann – the late archaeologist from the Tubingen University – who says: “*what remains unconfirmed is a struggle over Troia as historic and heroic as that depicted in the Iliad*”.

What “proofs” do we seek in the discourse practices that have produced a reality worth to be known, worth to be seen and memorized by pictures and souvenirs?

HBV  
tlazova@nbu.bg

**Strauss, L. 1989:** Introduction to History of Political Philosophy. – In: An Introduction to Political Philosophy. Wayne State University Press, Detroit, 159-166.

## QUID SIT DEUS?

*Gregorio Luri*

In this paper I will show how rarely the question “What is God?” has been formulated by modern scholars of mythology. It seems as if they think it is far less important question than “Who is that God?” or as if the answer is an obvious one. But neither “what” is the same as “who”, nor the answer to the “what question” is obvious in any way. Following a Nietzsche’s hermeneutic proposal, according to which the presence of a God always creates a world around him, I prove to find a response to what’s the meaning of a world for us. I follow this way to the conclusion that we call “world” to that a God gives us in exchange for the gift of unconditional faith we put on his altars. Analyzing the relationship among God, faith and the world, are emerging to me different profiles of what is a God and that finally lead me to the question "What is law?". However, in the Socratic texts the pious man appears as that one that knows the laws but never formulated this question.

*gregorioluri@gmail.com*

## **КЛАСИФИКАЦИЯТА В БЪЛГАРСКАТА АРХЕОЛОГИЯ: ВЪПРОС НА МЕТОДИКА ИЛИ НА ТЕОРИЯ?**

*Иван Маринов*

Позовавайки се на примери от сферата на българската археология, авторът си поставя за цел да уточни основните проблеми, които предизвиква в нея липсата на методологичен подход към класификацията на материалната култура. Особено внимание е обърнато на отсъствието на информация относно целите, които си поставят авторите на типологии и относно факторите, които определят избора на критерии на категоризиране в предлаганите класификации. Авторът описва метод на класификация, който е разработен и прилаган в световната археология от средата на 20-ти век насетне, и който подчертава зависимостта на категоризирането на материалната култура от предварително подготвена теоретична основа, формулирана на базата на археологическия материал.

от древноезическите свети места в българската народна култура. Благоевград: УИ „Неофит Рилски”, 2007

**Марков 2009:** Марков, В. Културно-историческо наследство от култа към змията-змей в земите на тракийските сатри. Благоевград: УИ „Неофит Рилски”, 2009

**Пенкова 1994:** Пенкова, Е. Тракийският Дионис и вратата в безсмъртието. – Проблеми на изкуството, 1994, кн.3, с. 43 – 54

**Попко 1983:** Попко, М. Митология на Хетска Анатолия. София: Български художник, 1983

**Попов 1989:** Попов, Д. Залмоксис. Религия и общество на траките. София: УИ „Климент Охридски”, 1989

**Попов 1995:** Попов, Д. Богът с много имена. София: Свят.Наука, 1995

**Теодоров, 1981:** Теодоров, Е. Български народен героичен епос. София: Народна просвета, 1981

**Теодоров 1999:** Теодоров, Е. Древнотракийско наследство в българския фолклор. София: АИ „Марин Дринов”, 1999

**Теодоров, Гергова 2006:** Теодоров, Е., Гергова, Д. Прабългарски и тракийски следи. София: Изток-Запад, 2006

**Филипович 1937:** Филипович, М. Говедаров камен на Овчем полу. – Гласник етнографског музеја Београду. Београд, 1937, 21-29

**Филипович 1986:** Филипович, М. Матџијско разбијанье судова. – Трачки коњаник. Студије из духовне културе. Београд, 1986

**Фол 1982:** Фол, Ал. Мегалитите в Тракия. Т.III. София: Наука и изкуство, 1982

**Фол 1991:** Фол, Ал. Тракийският Дионис. Книга първа. Загрей. София: УИ „Климент Охридски”, 1991

**Фол 1988:** Фол, В. Свещеното пространство. – В: МИФ. Т.III, София, 1988

**Hemberg 1950:** Hemberg, B. Die Kabiren. Munchen, 1950

**Yankov, Markov 2004:** Yankov, A., Markov, V. The Holy Spirit Holiday in the village of Novo Lyasky, Gotze Delchev Region. In: Art and Culture with no Limits. Blagoevgrad: Neofit Rilski, 2004, 45 – 60

## КЪМ ВЪПРОСА ЗА ДРЕВНОТРАКИЙСКОТО НАСЛЕДСТВО В ПРАЗНИКА ГЕРГЪОВДЕН ОТ БЪЛГАРСКАТА НАРОДНА КУЛТУРА

*Васил Марков*

Резюме

В статията са предложени нови свидетелства, подкрепящи тезата за присъствието на древнотракийско наследство в българския народен празник Гергъовден. Изследвани са български народни легенди и обредни практики свързани с древнотракийските мегалитни светилища край Ляски връх, Гоцеделчевско, Св. Гергъова скала край с. Бачево, Разложко и Го-

ведар камен на Овче поле в Р Македония. Привлечени са редица паралели. В резултат на сравнително-историческия и семантичния анализ са открити основни мотиви и обредни практики, свидетелстващи за древнотракийско наследство в народния празник Гергьовден, при това – свързани с конкретни древнотракийски свети места.



*Гл. ас. д-р Кабалан Мукарзел,  
катедра по Стара история, тракология  
и средновековна история,  
Софийски университет „Св. Климент Охридски”  
e-mail: nuskuh@yahoo.com*

## **AN AMULET WITH A LATE-BABYLONIAN SCENE FROM KRATAVA TUMULI, DRAGODANOVO VILLAGE.**

*Kabalan Moukarzel*  
(Summary)

The present article analyzes an artifact found during the archaeological excavations conducted by TEMP in 2010 near the village of Dragodanovo. The artifact is an amulet of jasper, which image and form has analogies with monuments of the Mesopotamian glyptics. The amulets' scene depicts six figures: bearded human figure, with crown (or tiara), whose right hand is lifted in supplicant gesture, altar, lozenge, dagger (or sword), crescent, and a star with eight beams. The amulet in its main scene and its particular elements is compared and analyzed with images on cylinder-seals, amulet-seals, and their impressions, known from the Mesopotamian glyptics during the Neo-Babylonian and Late-Babylonian periods, and preserved today in the collections of the British Museum and Le Louvre.

The amulet itself is dated to the end of First and the beginning of Second century AD. on the base of its archaeological environment. But the scene, as motif, is dated early - in the Late-Achaemenidian and Seleucid period. The main motif in the amulet's image is a "Babylonian cultic scene" – with human figure in profile before altar and divine emblems, with many parallels in similar monuments from Mesopotamia, dated during the Neo-Babylonian and Late-Babylonian periods. The amulet is not a part of well-attested tradition in the lands of the Ancient Trace. It is proposed, that the "cultic scene" of the amulet can be connected with the influences of the Eastern astral cults, during the Early Roman Empire.

glyph

Fig. 5. Miniature Vessels and Anthropomorphic Figurines

Fig. 6. Fireplace in the SE Sector of the Trench: Different Investigation Stages

Fig. 7. The Medieval Church with the Rock-cut Chamber and New Uncovered Rock-cuttings; Detailed Picture of the Instrument Traces

## ГЛУХИТЕ КАМЪНИ: СТАРИ ВЪПРОСИ И НОВИ ПОДХОДИ

*Георги Нехризов, Лин Ролър, Майя Василева,  
Юлия Цветкова и Надежда Кечева*  
(Резюме)

Големият интерес към Глухите камъни се дължи основно на многобройните ниши, изсечени по увенчаващите билото скални зъбери. Най-впечатляващи обаче са изсичанията в доминиращия над околните скален масив. Върху заравнения му връх е вкопана дълбока правоъгълна шерпа за събиране и съхраняване на вода. До нея води добре оформена двураменна стълба. Южното лице на скалата, от където започва стълбата, е оформено отвесно. На това място е издълбано пещерообразно помещение, с правоъгълен план и куполообразно покритие.

Първият опит за системно изследване на обекта е поставено от експедицията на Института по тракология през 1975 г. Затова с удоволствие представяме първоначалните си резултати в издание, посветено на 40-годишнината на Института.

Първите археологически проучвания на Глухите камъни започват през 2008 г. под ръководството на д-р Г. Нехризов. Резултатите веднага показаха, че е необходимо ново теренно изследване и документиране на нишите с модерни технически средства и според съвременните стандарти за теренно проучване.

През 2011 г. с финансиране от Фондация Америка за България чрез конкурс, организиран от Американския научен център в София, започна българо-американски проект с две основни задачи – теренно проучване на района на Глухите камъни и археологически разкопки в централния сектор на обекта. В настоящата работа представяме предварителните резултати от тези изследвания.

Основната цел на теренното проучване беше оглед, точно локализиране с мобилни ГИС и GPS устройства, подробно описание и документиране на всички изкуствени изсичания върху скалите в м. Глухите камъни. В резултат на теренната работа бяха установени 459 ниши, част от които

неизвестни досега. Те са обединени в 81 единични или групи от ниши, разположени върху 28 обособени скали и скални групи. Вероятно броят на нишите е по-голям, регистрирането им обаче е затруднено от гъстата растителност, която ограничава видимостта към скалите.

Още в началото на археологическите разкопки се установи, че на обекта има значителни културни напластявания от ранната желязна епоха. Археологическите проучвания в централния сектор продължиха четири сезона докато културните отложения бяха напълно изчерпани. В резултат на стратиграфските наблюдения се установи, че под пласт от средновековието е отложен седимент от ранната желязна епоха с обща дебелина над 2,40 м. В него се разграничиха три стратиграфски пласта с различен интензитет. При проучванията на различни нива бяха разкрити огнища, замазки и други структури, както и голямо количество фрагментирани керамични съдове и разнообразни находки.

Резултатите от четиригодишните проучвания на пластовете от ранната желязна епоха, както и изследванията на целия комплекс ни дават основания да потвърдим досегашната интерпретация на обекта – сложен комплекс с култов характер. Центърът на култовата дейност изглежда е бил на най-високото място, където сега се намират останките от средновековната църква.

Предварителните резултати ни дават възможност само предпазливо да се обърнем към хипотези за предназначението на скалните ниши. Връзката на нишите с погребалната обредност не може да се изключи напълно. Трапецовидна форма на нишите би могла да е алюзия за погребални ритуали или възпоменателни ритуали за вожд или герой. Групите ниши може да са предназначени или изсечени от членовете на една социална единица, като например семейство или род. Също така може да се предположи, че те са били правени по време на различни ритуално (календарно) важни моменти. Дали става дума за почитане на божество, местен херой или култ към предците все още е рано да се каже.. Бъдещите изследвания на Глухите камъни и съседните обекти вероятно ще помогнат за решаването на тези въпроси.

**Diacoviciu, C.** 1977: Dakien und Rom in der Prinzipatszeit. – In: Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt II, 6, 889-918.

**Graebner, F.** 1905: Eine Zosimosquelle. – Byzantinische Zeitschrift 14, 87-159.

**Kos, M.** 1975: The Military Role of Macedonia from the Civil Wars to the Establishment of the Moesian Limes. – In: Akten des XI. Internationalen Limeskongresses. Szekesfehervar –Budapest.

**Mócsy, A.** 1966: Der vertuschte Dakerkrieg des M. Licinius Crassus. – Historia 15, 1966.

**Niese, B - Hohl, E** 1923: Grundriss der römischen Geschichte. Neubearbeitet von E. Hohl. München.

**Rappaport, B.** 1899: Die Einfälle der Goten in das Römische Reich bis auf Constantin. Leipzig.

**Schmidt, L.** 1934: Geschichte der deutschen Stämme bis zum ausgang der Völkerwanderung. Die Ostgermanen

*Пламен Петков - pidna@abv.bg*

## **DIE BASTARNEN IN DER PERIODE vom Ende des 1. Jhs.v.Chr. bis Ende des 4. Jhs.n.Chr.**

*Plamen Petkov*

Резюме

През 30/29 г. пр. Хр. бастарните преминават Истрос и побеждават мизите, дарданите и трибалите. Акцията продължава и срещу дентелетите, предвождани от слепия владетел Ситас, и поставя под заплаха провинция Македония. Това принуждава проконсула Марк Лициний Крас да отговори на предизвикателството - варварите са победени, а предводителят им Делдо е убит в лична схватка от римския военачалник. През 29/28 г. пр. Хр. Марк Лициний Крас регулира военно-политическата ситуация в земите на бъдещите римски провинции Мизия и Тракия. След операциите на Марк Лициний Крас бастарните са обект на внимание у писмените извори след близо два века, в една коренно променена обстановка - отбелязани са във връзка с маркоманските войни (167-180 г. сл. Хр.) на император Марк Аврелий (171-180 г. сл. Хр.). В средата на III в. сл. Хр. са засвидетелствани около т.нар. Скитски (Готски) войни. През 280 г. сл. Хр. император Проб (276-282 г. сл. Хр.) преселва на територията на Тракия 100 000 бастарни, които са зачислени сред поданиците на Римската империя. Бастарните продължават да са фактор във военно-политическите отношения - информация за тях се среща в изворите до края на IV в. сл. Хр.

Gott Achilles. – In: Sitzungsberichte der Heidelberger Akademie der Wissenschaften. Phil-Hist. Klasse, 7-52)

**Яйленко, В. П. 1980:** Граффити Левки, Березани и Ольвии. – ВДИ 2, 72-99.

**Яйленко, В. П. 1980:** Граффити Левки, Березани и Ольвии. – ВДИ 3, 75-116.

*AJPh* – American Journal of Philology

*AR* – Archaeological Reports

*CA* – Classical Antiquity

*CQ* – Classical Quarterly

*DHA* – Dialogues d'histoire ancienne

*GRBS* – Greek, Roman, and Byzantine Studies

*JHS* – Journal of Hellenic Studies

*ВДИ* – Вестник древней истории

*МАСП* – Материалы по археологии Северного Причерноморья

*ИАК* – Известия императорской археологической комиссии

## **LEUKA: CONSTRUCTING THE SACRED TOPOS (1)**

*Ruja Popova*

The present paper attempts at reconstructing the initial situation when the cult of Achilles was founded on the island of Leuka. To this effect the earliest written evidence related to it is being discussed: Aetiopis' fragment by Arktinos from Miletos, Alkaios' fragment, Pindar's and Euripides' verses. These are considered against the background of the archaeological evidence from the island gathered for a century and a half. Greek concept of the North and identification of the small piece of land with the White Island – The Island of the Blessed – Leuka provides a useful context for the discussion.

Research results show that the earliest written evidence that locate geographically the cult in the Pontos Euxeinos and on this specific island date back to the 5th century BC: those are the texts by Pindar and Euripides. It is generally accepted that in the time when Aetiopis was created and even before that, e.g. in the 8th – early 7th century BC, the name White Island existed in Greek tradition and was associated with other mythological and literary notions as the Island of the Blessed and the White Rock, which had nothing to do with the Black Sea island and Achilles planted there in the beginning of the Greek colonization of the area. So far data confirms that the cult on the island of Leuka, the island opposite the Istros delta, was most probably constructed as worship of Achilles in the first half of the 6th century BC when apoikoi were settled along the northwestern Pontic coast. The name Leuka or White Rock certainly existed long before Greek colonists located, recognized and gave a name to the small piece of rocky land in the Black Sea. Greek interpretation

of the Pontos Euxeinos as the abode of the dead, as the place of crossing over to the netherworld, an idea related to the Greek/Ionian concept of the North, significantly facilitated the process.

The author is skeptical about Skythian contributions to the shaping of Achilles' myth and cult as claimed by some scholars. However, it is demonstrated that Greek seafarers in the region found there rituality that they recognized as a mythological and literary topos known to them as the abode of the hero Beyond. This "meeting" is echoed in Alkaios' metaphor calling the land beyond the Istros, Skythia.

The offered conclusions have highly been stimulated by the research of the Greek colonization during the last few decades when scholars considered it as an unceasing process of interrelations, contacts and interactions.

- СБНУ:** Сборник народни умотворения. София.
- Срејовић, Др. 1987:** Речник грчке и римске митологије. Београд.
- Фрејденберг, О. 1978:** Миф и литература древности. Москва.
- Цибрус, Г. 1885:** Южноунгарските българи. – Периодическо списание, бр.13, Средец.
- Чакајновић, В. 1929:** Српске народне приповетке. Београд.
- Воннергеа, L. 1969:** Dictionary of Superstition and Mythology. London.
- Gubernates, A. 1872:** Zoological Mythology. V. 2, London.
- Jobes, G. 1961:** Dictionary of Mythology, Folklore and Symbols. New York.
- Meyer, C. 1884:** Der Aberglaube des Mittelalters und der nächstfolgenden Jahrhunderte. Berlin.
- Oman, M. 1986:** Mitologie popular romaneasc. Bukuresti.
- Pauly-Wissowa 1930:** Pauly-Wissowa Real-Encyclopedie. Band XIV-2, Stuttgart.

*Институт по етнология и фолклористика  
с етнографски музеј - БАН*

## **МИТЪТ ЗА ФИНЕЙ И НАРОДНИТЕ ВЯРВАНИЯ ЗА КЪРТИЦАТА**

*Рачко Попов*

В гръцката митология произходът на къртицата е претворен в мита за Финей. Според една от версиите на този мит Финей бил син на морския бог Посейдон. Аполон-Хелиос го дарил с таланта на прорицател, който откривал божествените помисли и ги споделял с хората, за да им помага. След като се оженил за Клеопатра – дъщеря на Бога на северния вятър Борей, се родили двамата ву синове – Плексип и Пандион. Но втората съпруга на Финей мразела силно децата и подтикнала мъжа си да им извади очите (да ги ослепи). Заради това той бил жестоко наказан от боговете, които отнели и неговото зрение.

В българските народни приказки къртицата произхожда от прокълнатите синове на един поп. Тя е митологичен символ на нечистите сили на подземния свят и е в непосредствена връзка с магията и медицината. Данни за подобен извод откриваме в родилната, погребалната и календарната обредност на българите. В християнски план светци покровители на къртицата са св. Трифон и св. Атанас. Особено известна в народната медицина е и “къртичата болест”.

In Memory of Alexander Fol. *Professor Alexander Fol* Centre of Thracology, Eyes Advertising Agency. Sofia, 255-270.

**Tsatsopoulou, P. 1997:** Excavations at Aegean Mesembria in the last decade. – In: *Thrace Ancienne. Actes du 2-e symposium international des etudes Thraciennes*, Vol. 2. Komotinti, 615-630.

**Tsatsopoulou, P. 2009:** Archaeological site of Zone. Informations. Editing and Printing: Epikoinonia Ltd. Komotini, 1-2.

**Velkov, V., L. Domaradska, 1994:** Kotys I (383/382-359) et l'*emporion* de Pistiros en Thrace. – *BCH*, 118, 1-15.

[Pseudo] **Aristot.** *Oeconom.* (ed. Susemihl)

**Demosthen.** *Orationes* (ed. Butcher – Rennie)

**Herodot.** *Hist.* (ed. Hude)

[Pseudo] **Skylax** (ed. Müller)

**Thuc.** *Hist.* (ed. Smith; Hude)

*kalinsp@abv.bg*

*kalinsp@swu.bg*

*Prof. Dr.Hist.Sc. KALIN POROZHANOV:*

*-South-West University "Neofit Rilski" - Blagoevgrad;*

*- Centre of Thracology "Prof. Alexander Fol" in IBSt&CTh at BAS - Sofia*

*BULGARIA*

## ТРАКИЯ ПОНТИКА НА ИМПЕРИИ, РЕЗИДЕНЦИИ, ТЪРЖИЩА И ПОЛИСИ В ЕВРОПЕЙСКИЯ ЮГОИЗТОК

(резюме)

*Калин Порожанов*

1. ИМПЕРИИТЕ. От средата на 5 в.пр.Хр. насетне, Одриското царство в Югоизточна Европа, подобно на Лидия и Персия в Мала Азия, от етносна държава, в която царят властва само над собствения си етнос, се превръща в империя. От средата на 5 в.пр.Хр. Делоската *симахия* от съюз става Атинска *архе*-империя. Голяма част от полисите по крайбрежията на Одриската *базилея*-империя, от средата до края на 5 в.пр.Хр., се включват като данъкоплатци в Атинската *архе*. През първата половина на 4 в.пр.Хр. това продължава и при Втората Атинска империя. Развитието на икономиката на Одриското царство от втората половина на 5 и първата половина 4 в.пр.Хр., от етносна в имперска, налага на царете да облагат с данъци не само поданите етноси, но и елински полиси.

2. РЕЗИДЕНЦИИТЕ. Местоположението на 28 владетелски резиден-



ции потвърждава, че държаните от одриските царе крайбрежия са: западната и средната част на Северното Мраморноморие – най-вече при и около Хиерон орос/Ганиада, източната половина на крайбрежието на Тракийско море и в Югозападното Черноморие. Видно е, че по тези морски крайбрежия на Одриското царство има не само елински полиси, но и достатъчно крайбрежни владетелски резиденции, които се допълват и от други на континента. В тези управленски пунктове на Одриското царство се генерира владетелска мощ, от тях се налагат и се събират данъците, както от подвластните траки, така и от елинските градове.

3. ТЪРЖИЩАТА. Около 20 вътрешни и крайбрежни тракийски тържища със смесено население, но и същинските елински емпориони по морските крайбрежия, а доколкото е възможно и по-големите полиси, намиращи се по тях, се контролират от одриските владетелски резиденции заради техните пазарни функции, свързани с ускореното развитие на стоково-паричните отношения през тези векове.

4. ПОЛИСИТЕ. 16 полиса не плащат на Атинската *архе* минимум около 40-50 таланта, които най-вероятно отиват в хазната на Одриския двор. По-големите и силни полиси като Бизантион, Селимбрия и Перинт от Мраморно море; и Енос, Самотраки, Мароней и Абдера от Тракийско море, макар и членове на *Архета*, са относително свободни полиси, които, до голяма степен са сравнително независими спрямо политиката на властване над тях от Одриската *базилейя*. Изключение в това отношение правят Селимбрия на Мраморно море и Енос на Тракийско. По-малките като Даунион тейхос, Дидюмон тейхос, Бизанте и Серейон тейхос от Северна Пропонтида и Дикая, Дрюс, Зоне, Сале и Дейре от Тракийско море, също имат относителна автономия, но като емпориони по същината си, по-реално са включвани в границите на Одриската империя. При това, те ще функционират, съобразно нейните и техните собствени интереси, а не толкова и само, съобразно интересите на Атинската *архе*.

***ARTIUM MINUTISSIMUS SCISCITOR* DE REBUS  
THRACORUM SCRIBENS**

*Mirena Slavova*  
(résumé)

The paper scrutinizes the testimonies about Ancient Thrace and the ancient Thracians in the text corpus of Herodian the Grammarian. After some preliminary considerations concerning the tangled history of its manuscript tradition and Lenz's reconstruction of the text the author focuses on the specific of Herodian's data dividing them into mythographic, glottographic, geographic, and ethnographic ones.

She points out that the peculiarity of ancient grammatical terminology and the complicated restoration of Herodian's texts often hinder the understanding of his information. Two cases are indicative. The first one is the meaning of the toponym Καβησσός – a small note of Herodian has escaped the scholars' attention so far, informing that this toponym is homonymous to "the excessive desire of Thracians for sexual congress". The second one demonstrates that the thorough analysis of an ancient author's whole text is a prerequisite for a more precise understanding of his data as a source for Thracian history and culture. As a result of such an approach, two discrepancies in Herodian's corpus are identified and should be revised – the name of Rhesus' wife is given twice as Σήτη and Σίντη, and the rule of the accentuation of the compound words is illustrated with the pair Θραξ/σακόθραξ and Θραξ/Σαμόθραξ.

Apart from other particular observations of the philological work of Herodian as a source on Thracian culture the paper constantly renders an account of the part, which other ancient authors play in Herodian's corpus – both his sources of information and authors, thanks to whom his text has been restored (for instance Stephanus of Byzantium). Thus, it gives a more general perspective in analyzing the true value of ancient testimonies by tracing their origin and text archaeology.



Обр. 2. Долменът „Блага черква” край с. Изворово, Харманлийско – 2008 г.

## **THE THRACIAN NAME OF THE SETTLEMENT NEAR THE ROAD STATION CASTRA RUBRA – SUB ZUPARA**

*Tosho Spiridonov*  
(résumé)

This essay interprets data from existing text records, archaeological observations, and archaeological digs from the area. Based on personal observations and analysis of historical and geographical conditions, conclusions about the origins of the name Zupara of the Roman Age Thracian village and its chronology were made.

The settlement display a high living standard from the Neolithic period till the Middle Ages. A golden necklace from the late Bronze Age was discovered in the area in the grave of a noble Thracian, as well as a big necropolis from the Thracian period (1<sup>st</sup> millennium BC) near today's village of Izvorovo, and

a large settlement from the Roman Age. The *mansio* Sub Zupara was built on a lower altitude “beneath” this settlement. The station was later named *Castra Rubra* after the fortress that was built nearby.

*Исторически музей, град Харманли*  
*tosho\_sp@abv.bg*

**Wescott, K., R. Brandon 2000** (eds.): Practical Applications of GIS for Archaeologists: A Predictive Modelling Toolkit (GIS Data Series). (Taylor&Francis). London

**Wheatley, D., M. Gillings 2002**: Spatial Technology and Archaeology. The archaeological applications of GIS. (Taylor&Francis)London.

*Sofia University Sv. Kliment Ohridski  
Faculty of History  
Tsar Osvoboditel Blvd. 15  
BG-1504, Sofia  
Bulgaria  
E-mail: tzvetkova09@gmail.com*

## **„Оцифряване на култа”. ГИС подход към тракийските култови места от желязната епоха**

*Юлия Цветкова*

Резюме: Тракийските култови места са обособени отдавна като самостоятелен изследователски обект в съвременната българска тракология. Многобройни изследвания разглеждат различни аспекти на тази проблематика. Често обаче интересът към тях е тясно, а понякога и емоционално, свързан с изследванията върху тракийската религия. Това води до формулирането на предположения, базирани на погрешна интерпретация или даже несъобразени с археологическите факти. Въпреки че съществуват някои опити за систематизация и типология на култовите места в Тракия, все още липсват обобщаващи изследвания в тази насока.

В последните години броят на археологически проучваните култови места се увеличи значително в рамките на двата основни типа обекти – светилища на връх и ямни светилища. Това поставя отново въпросът за обективната интерпретация на новата информация и преосмислянето на някои вече добили популярност хипотези.

Настоящият текст не претендира да обобщи новите археологически изследвания. Тук е представен един иновативен подход спрямо тракийските култови места чрез приложението на съвременните ГИС технологии за организиране на данните и пространствени анализи. Този подход цели създаването на солидна и систематизирана база, която фактологично да подплати научните дирения относно интерпретацията и характеристиките на обектите, сакралната топография, както и детайлното очертаване на ролята на култовите места в селищната система и значението им в интегриращите процеси на тракийското общество.

от Делфи, където жреците – тълмачи са същинските посредници между вярващите и бога, а тълкуването-пророкуването е мислено като послание на присъстващия бог (Фол, Ал. 1998: 69, 86). Писмената традиция е запазила сведенията за тълкуването – прорицание, което жреците извършвали в кръглото „Дионисово светилище” с отворен покрив по слънчевите лъчи или огнените пламъци върху олтара (Фол, Ал. 1994: 103; Фол, Ал. 1998: 87; Фол, Ал. 2002: 303–304). Такова светилище, наречено от Херодот „прорицалище на Дионис”, ако се разтълкува като Сабазиево, т.е. кръгъл<sup>1</sup> храм на огъня, може да бъде идентифицирано със светилището в местността Мишкова нива (Фол, Ал. 1989: 71–80; Фол, Ал. 1990: 175–178; Фол, Ал. 1991: 160; Фол, В. 2007: 170–171), откъдето произлиза паметникът с епитафията на Хреста.

### Цитирана литература

Делев, П. 1983: Епитафията на Хреста и на Зевс-Дионис в Малко Търново. – *Археология*, 3, 1-11.

Фол, Ал. 1989: Главното светилище на тракийския Дионис. – *Култура*, 2, 71–80.

Фол, Ал. 1990: Политика и култура в древна Тракия. София.

Фол, Ал. 1991: Тракийският Дионис. Книга първа: Загрей. София.

Фол, Ал. 1994: Тракийският Дионис. Книга втора: Сабазий. София.

Фол, Ал. 1998: Древната култура на Югоизточна Европа. София.

Фол, Ал. 2002: Тракийският Дионис. Книга трета: назоваване и вяра. София.

Фол, В. 2007: Скални топоси на вяра в Югоизточна Европа и в Мала Азия през древността. София.

IGBulg. = Mihailov, G. *Inscriptiones graecae in Bulgaria repertae*. Serdicae, I<sup>2</sup> (1970), II (1958), III/1 (1961), III/2 (1964), IV (1966), V (1997).

LSJ = H.G. Liddell. R. Scott. *A Greek-English Lexicon*. Revised and augmented throughout by Sir H. S. Jones. <http://stephanus.tlg.uci.edu/ljsj>

PHI = The Packard Humanities Institute CD-ROM 7: Greek Papyri and Inscriptions (CD-ROM "PHI 7").

Irina Shopova

### SUMMARY

On the basis of the preserved texts in *Anthologia Graeca* 3, 1, 1-3, Plato, *Leges* 7, 815c, and Strabo, *Geographica* 10, 3,10, the author suggests a new reading of the 10<sup>th</sup> and 11<sup>th</sup> lines of a Greek inscription last published by Prof. G. Mihailov in IGBulg. V, n. 5656.

1 За кръглата форма като равнозначна на Сабазиево-мистериална срв. Фол, Ал. 2002: 314.

The suggested reading is as follows:

line 10: Μύρονται Χρήστ[ην Σιληνοί| | τε καὶ Σ]άτυροί τε

*Институт за балканистика с Център по тракология  
E-mail: irinashopova@gmail.com*

## Thracian Plosive Consonants

### 1. Onomastics

(Summary)

*Svetlana Yanakieva*

In connection with the key issue in Thracian phonetics of the graphic variants with alternation of voiceless and voiceless aspirated plosive consonant and variants with alternation of voiced and voiceless consonant different kind of Thracian names have been examined in the paper: hydronyms (Ἰάτρος/ Iatrus/ Ieterus, Ἀθύρας/ Atyras, Θιαγόλα/ Tiagula, Pathissus/ Parthiscus/ Παρτίσκον, Τέαιρος/ Θέαιρος, Utus/ Uthis, Timachus/ Timacum, \*Σαλδοβυσσος/ \*Σαλτοβυσσος, Ρίγγος/ Pincus etc.); personal names (like Αμαδοχος/ Amadochus, Αυλουκενθος/ Aulucentus, Dentis/ Δενθις, Danda/ Δαντω, Επτησυχος/ Επτησυκος, Επτακενθος/ Eftecentus, Zimarcus/ Ζιμαρχος, Ζειπας/ Ζειβας, Κετριπορις/ Κεδριπολις, Σιτάλκης/ Sithalcus, Σπαρτακος/ Sparticus/ Σπαρτυχος); settlement names (Ἀργίδανα/ Arcidava, Διέρνα/ Tierna, Κύψελα/ Chympala, Μηκύβερνα/ Μηκύπερνα, Sparton/ Sparthon, Τάραντος/ Δάρανδος, Τόμοι/ Thomi); tribal names (Βρύγες/ Βρύκες, Δόλογοι/ Dolongi, Κρηστῶνες/ Γραστῶνες, Τραυσοί/ Thrausi); god epitheta (Κενδρεισος, Κενδρεισεια/ Κεντρεισεια) etc.

The usual explanation of this phenomenon is that it was due to the shifting of consonants in the Thracian language. The following view is substantiated in the paper:

The occurrence of names with the variants aspirated/non-aspirated consonants was territorially spread from Dacia, Moesia and Scythia Minor (Pathissus, Ἰάτρος, Thomi, Amadochus) to the Propontis, the Aegean Sea and the islands (Ἀθύρας, Ἀθρυίλατος). Consequently, this variation is not due to the different presence of the Indo-European consonant in two different languages or dialects. A look at the variation of aspirated/non-aspirated consonant shows that some forms with aspirated consonants are earlier than those with non-aspirated ones, as in Ἰάτρος and Timachus, whereas in others they are later (Amadochus, Breierophara, Sithalcus, Σπαρτυχος); in a third category it is not possible to determine a chronological difference (Επτησυχος, Ζιμαρχος). Hence, the phenomenon was not a result of any internal linguistic evolution either.

In the light of these facts a more appropriate explanation of the cited graphic variants can be the following: the voiceless plosive consonants in Thracian, due to their different pronunciation compared to the Greek sounds (probably more tense), were also rendered by means of Greek aspirated consonants, which was possible because such consonants were absent in Thracian.

There is also the possibility of dual use of the Greek aspirated consonants: on the one hand, for voiceless plosives, and on the other – for spirants. The ren-



dering of a dental spirant can possibly be assumed for some rare cases of  $\theta/\sigma$  alternation as in  $\Delta\epsilon\nu\theta\epsilon\lambda\tilde{\eta}\tau\alpha\iota$ / Denseletae,  $Z\beta\epsilon\lambda\theta\omicron\upsilon\rho\delta\omicron\varsigma$ /  $Z\beta\epsilon\lambda\sigma\omicron\upsilon\rho\delta\omicron\varsigma$  and  $\Sigma\epsilon\acute{\upsilon}\theta\alpha\varsigma$  with the form of the genitive variant  $\Sigma\eta\nu\sigma\alpha$ .

In variants of names rendered in some cases by means of a voiced and in other cases – by a voiceless consonant, the explanation should probably be sought again in the imprecise correspondence between the Thracian and Greek or Latin voiced consonants, that is why voiceless consonants were also used in some cases for the graphic rendering of the Thracian ones. The examples of double writing with voiced and voiceless consonant are much fewer than those of alternation of voiceless and voiceless aspirated ones, which might be assumed as an indirect confirmation of the idea of absence of aspirated voiceless consonants in Thracian. I believe that for this reason the Greek aspirated consonants may have also been used to render simple voiceless consonants, whereas the presence of voiceless consonants limited the double transcriptions of the voiced consonants, in spite of their different (softer) pronunciation compared to the respective Greek sounds.

*Институт за балканистика с Център по тракология  
s.yanakieva@mail.bg*