



Summary :

The campaign of Diophantus, general of Mithridates VI Eupator, took place between 110 and 106 BC against the Scythians of Taurica, with the aim of protecting the Tauric Chersonese. Diophantus' victory, as well as his diplomatic and military activities in Panticapaeum and Theodosia led to the destruction of the Scythian kingdom and Mithridates' dominance in Taurica and the Cimmerian Bosphorus.

Date

110-106 BC

Geographical Location

Crimea

1. Sources - Events

The events of the campaign are described in a votive inscription set up by the Deme of Chersonesus, in honour of Diophantus of Sinope, son of Asclepiodorus and general of [Mithridates VI Eupator](#), placed on the marble pedestal of statue.¹

The background to Diophantus' campaign begins in 179 BC, when the citizens of [Chersonesus Taurica](#) entered into a pact with the king of Pontus [Pharnaces I](#).² The people of Chersonesus, facing the threat of a Scythian invasion, entered into this agreement, on the grounds that Pharnaces would offer them assistance should the neighbouring tribes become aggressive against the city or its hinterland.

The fears of the citizens of Chersonesus soon came true. The [Scythians](#) under the leadership of king Palacus, attacked an area belonging to the city, and soon Chersonesus lost all of its possessions in west Taurica. Under these circumstances, the people of Chersonesus sent for help to the Kingdom of Pontus, where since 111 BC Mithridates VI Eupator was ruling. In 110 BC Mithridates dispatched in Taurica a force of 6,000 hoplites, under the command of Diophantus, to defend Chersonesus.³ Mithridates' intervention was aimed at establishing in the long run his rule over the northern coast of the Black Sea, which would afford him significant strategic advantages in his contest with Rome over ascendancy in Asia Minor. The following events are outlined in the text of the votive inscription.

Diophantus attacked the Scythians in the area of the north bay of what is modern [Sevastopol](#). The Scythians were defeated and Palacus retreated into the steppe. To secure his rear, Diophantus subjugated the [Taurians](#) and founded a city in their lands, Eupatoria, close to the old Dorian colony of [Cercinitis](#).⁴ Thence he moved towards the [Bosphorus](#), where "in a short period of time he achieved many things", and then returned to Chersonesus. This passage of the votive inscription probably pertains to the settlement of the problems with the Scythians. According to a rather well-founded view, the first trip of Diophantus to Panticapaeum was aimed at thwarting joint military action between the Scythians and the Cimmerians of Bosphorus in his rear. The fact that the state of Bosphorus paid the Scythians a regular tribute could mean that there was an alliance between them.⁵ It is also thought that during his first visit to Bosphorus, Diophantus managed to secure King [Paerisades V](#)'s promise that he will cede his throne to Mithridates,⁶ for Paerisades was in no position to face the barbarians without support. Having completed his mission in Taurica, Diophantus



Approximately a year later,⁷ the Scythians became once more aggressive against Chersonesus and recaptured the Scythian fortresses, which the people of Chersonesus and Diophantus had left ungarrisoned. Very soon, the Scythians also recaptured the whole of western Taurica, and Palacus laid siege to the city of Chersonesus. The garrison, left behind by Diophantus in Chersonesus, was surrounded by the Scythians in Cape Ctenous, close to the city, which was fortified with a fortress and moat. To eliminate the garrison, the Scythians attempted to fill the moat with reeds, to which the Greeks set fire at night. During the siege, the people of Chersonesus managed to construct a parapet which connected the city with the cape. Because the situation remained precarious, they were forced to call in Diophantus again. He returned to Taurica and Palacus was forced to lift the siege of Chersonesus. However, as winter was close, Diophantus decided to continue his operations in northwest Taurica, where he was mainly concerned with expelling the Scythians from Cercinitis and [Kalos Limen](#),⁸ which belonged to Chersonesus. Diophantus recaptured Cercinitis, leaving the people of Chersonesus to lay siege to Kalos Limenas, which probably fell during the same winter.

Taking advantage of the fact that Diophantus' forces were busy in western Taurica, Palacus managed to gather a great army and allied himself to the tribe of the [Rhozolani](#), who were ruled by king Tasius, an alliance which reinforced him with 50,000 more horsemen. In the battle that ensued, the Scythians were defeated by Diophantus.

After this victory, Diophantus returned to Chersonesus, and together with its army launched a campaign in central Taurica, forcing the Scythians to surrender their strongholds of Chabaei and Neapolis, and recognize Mithridates' rule. Palacus again retreated into the steppe. What happened to him afterwards is unknown.

Following the end of the war against the Scythians, Diophantus returned to the Bosphorus, where, according to the votive inscription, he "arranged matters in a manner advantageous to Mithridates". This is obviously a reference to Paerisades' cessation of his kingdom to Mithridates, which infuriated the Scythians in the court of the last Spartocid ruler, who were probably supported by Palacus. Thus, as Diophantus was busy conducting negotiations (i.e. after the spring of 107 BC),⁹ certain people in the entourage of the Scythian Saumacus rebelled, murdered King Paerisades and organized a conspiracy against Diophantus.¹⁰ He managed to escape to Chersonesus, where he began assembling troops and warships, but was ultimately forced to await for reinforcements from Pontus. In the next year Diophantus managed to sail off for Bosphorus and finally captured [Theodosia](#) followed by Panticapaeum;¹¹ "having punished the inciters of the revolt he restored the rule of Mithridates Eupator". The information supplied in the votive inscription can be supplemented by Strabo: when discussing the Cimmerian Bosphorus he mentions an area, ruled by dynasts, "up to the time of Paerisades who ceded his rule to Mithridates".¹² It is believed that the Cimmerian Bosphorus was under the rule of Saumacus for approximately a year.¹³ The details of this policy remain unknown.

2. Assessment

Diophantus' campaign was in fact a twofold operation; it had a military and a diplomatic aspect. The military part of the campaign pertains to his operations against the Scythians, where he acted as a general. His diplomatic activity focused on the Cimmerian Bosphorus with the aim at achieving the peaceful annexation of the Kingdom of Bosphorus into that of Pontus. Both objectives were achieved. The Scythians were defeated and the Kingdom of Bosphorus was ceded to Mithridates, notwithstanding some complications. As a general, Diophantus was forced to launch two campaigns instead of one. As a diplomat he failed to correctly assess the power of the dissenters in Bosphorus and its internal political problems, being thus forced to resort to the force of arms instead of using purely diplomatic means.



If the military part of Diophantus' mission is rather clear in its broad outlines, the same cannot be said for its diplomatic part. The vagueness of the votive inscription with respect to Saumacus allows room for speculation with respect to his role and the true nature of the revolt. The inscription is also silent on the identity of Saumacus, as it does not explain how the Scythians were found in Panticapaeum and why Paerisades abdicated. A formerly prevalent view was that Saumacus was a slave, and the events are interpreted as a slave rebellion. In this view, the word "εκθρέψαντος"¹⁴ on the inscription was usually interpreted as an indication that Saumacus was a slave.¹⁵ A more cautious view has also been put forth; it challenges the relegation of Saumacus to the class of the slaves and considers this to be a Scythian revolt led by Saumacus and aimed at deposing the king of Bosphorus.¹⁶ Few modern scholars doubt that Saumacus' revolt was a coup, intended at thwarting the intended power transfer from Paerisades to Mithridates.¹⁷ Furthermore, no one doubts that this coup was motivated by the desire of the Scythians, and possibly sympathizers of Palacus, who had found their way into Panticapaeum to protect their interests.

Two suggestions have been made with respect to the presence of Scythians in Panticapaeum. The first¹⁸ is grounded on the fact that central Taurica was the main theatre of operations in this campaign, as it was there that the most important Scythian strongholds were located. The Scythians, as soon as they received news of the intended surrender of Bosphorus to Mithridates, invaded Panticapaeum, under the leadership of Saumacus, who was probably of royal Scythian stock, to avert a shift in the balance of power. The second hypothesis¹⁹ argues for a permanent Scythian presence in Panticapaeum in the late 2nd cent. BC. It is much more convincing, for according to the votive inscription of Chersonesus, they appear to be in Panticapaeum at the same time as Diophantus. Furthermore, the inscription does not mention any Scythian invasion there. The word 'εκθρέψαντος' on the inscription really intimates that Saumacus belong to the court of the [king of Bosphorus](#).

The likelihood of Scythian presence in Panticapaeum and possible dynastic links between members of the Scythian royal family and the Bosphorus royal house is reinforced by a dedicatory inscription of the late 2nd cent. BC, which refers to the daughter of the Scythian king [Scillouros](#).²⁰ That Saumacus belonged to the elite can also be seen in the fact that Diophantus did not punish him, like he did with the rest of the citizens that joined in the revolt, but simply expelled him to [Sinope](#). It is very probable that Saumacus was related to the two royal houses. At any rate the events at Panticapaeum are strongly suggestive of a courtly coup, aimed at preventing the change of the status quo and the establishment of a 'protectorate' by Diophantus' troops in the region.

As to the causes behind Paerisades' cessation of power to Mithridates, one hypothesis correlates this to the fact that the king of Bosphorus was heirless. However, this cannot be ascertained, and even if this were true, it would not suffice to explain it. Equally unfounded is the hypothesis that there were family ties between the dynasties of Bosphorus and Mithridates, on the basis of which Mithridates could claim the throne of Bosphorus. A more likely explanation was that Mithridates became master of Bosphorus by right of force. The events that ensued proved that the Greek cities of the Black Sea, irrespective of their polities, one after the other recognized the rule of the king of Pontus. At any rate, the votive inscription in honour of Diophantus testifies that even the Scythians were forced to do the same, albeit temporarily. In fact, the only other option available to the Greek cities was to place themselves under the power of the Scythians. As a result of Diophantus' campaign the Cimmerian Bosphorus, Chersonesus, Taurica and later [Olbia](#), that is, the entire area of the Black Sea, came under the rule of the king of Pontus.

Diophantus' campaign was instrumental in the destruction of the Scythian kingdom, the downfall of the Spartocid



dynasty in the Cimmerian Bosphorus and the submission of the northern Black Sea to Mithridates VI Eupator. In this sense, it is a first rank event in the history of Antiquity.

1. *IOSPE* P 352.
2. *IOSPE* P 402.
3. Гайдукевич, В.Ф., *Боспорское царство* (Москва – Ленинград 1949), p. 301; Жебелев, С.А., *Северное Причерноморье* (Москва —Ленинград 1953), pp. 93-94. On the date of Diophantus' first campaign there is disagreement. Молев dates it to the summer-spring of 111 BC. See Молев, Е.А., *Властитель Понта* (Нижний Новгород 1995), p. 37.
4. Strabo, 7.312. The exact location of the city is unknown. Гайдукевич situates it in the region of modern Balaclava. See Гайдукевич, В.Ф., *Боспорское царство* (Москва – Ленинград 1949), p. 302. According to another view, Eupatoria was located south of Cercinitis. See Молев, Е.А., *Властитель Понта* (Нижний Новгород 1995), p. 36.
5. Виноградов, Ю.Г., «Вотивная надпись дочери царя Скилура из Пантикапея и проблемы истории Скифии и Боспора во II в. до н.э.», *ВДИ* 1 (1987), p. 73; Молев, Е.А., *Боспор в период эллинизма* (Нижний Новгород 1994), pp. 118-119.
6. Жебелев, С.А., *Северное Причерноморье* (Москва – Ленинград 1953), pp. 96-98; Гайдукевич, В.Ф., *Боспорское царство* (Москва – Ленинград 1949), p. 302.
7. According to Молев, Е. *Властитель Понта* (Нижний Новгород 1995) this took place in the fall of 110 BC.
8. *IOSPE* P 353.
9. According to Gajdukevič, В., *Боспорское царство* (Москва – Ленинград 1949) or in 109 BC according to Молев, Е., *Властитель Понта* (Нижний Новгород 1995), p. 43.
10. ...τῶν περὶ Σαύ μακρον Σκυθῶν ἐ νεωτερίζοντων καὶ τὸν μὲν ἐ κθρέψαντα αὐτὸν ἐν {²ΑΥΤΟ[—]}² [βα]σιλέα Βοσπόρου Παρισά δαν ἄνελεόντων, αὐτῶν δ' ἐπιβουλεύσάντων...
11. The latter probably in the winter of 108/107 BC.
12. Strabo 7.4.4.
13. Молев, Е.А., *Властитель Понта* (Нижний Новгород 1995), p. 43.
14. ...τὸν μὲν ἐ κθρέψαντα αὐτὸν ἐν {²ΑΥΤΟ[—]}² [βα]σιλέα Βοσπόρου Παρισά δαν...
15. Жебелев, С.А., *Северное Причерноморье* (Москва – Ленинград 1953), pp. 105-106.
16. *RE* III:I (1897), column 774, see under entry 'Bosporos' (C.G. Brandis); Гайдукевич, В.Ф., «О скифском восстании на Боспоре в конце 2 в. до н.э.», in *Античное общество: Труды конференции по изучению античности* (Москва 1967), pp. 17-22.
17. For a fuller re-evaluation of the various views see Rubinson, Z.W., «Saumakos, Ancient History, Modern Politics», *Historia* 29 (1986), pp. 50-70.
18. Гаврилов, А.К., «Скифы Савмака – восстание или вторжение? (IPE I2 352–Syll.3 709)», in *Этюды по античной истории и культуры Северного Причерноморья* (Санкт-Петербург 1992), p. 61-62.
19. Виноградов, Ю.Г., «Вотивная надпись дочери царя Скилура из Пантикапея и проблемы истории Скифии и Боспора во II в. до н.э.», *ВДИ* 1



(1987), pp. 55-87; Vinogradov, Ju.G., «Die Votivinschrift der Tochter des Königs Skiluros aus Pantikapaion und Probleme der Geschichte Skythiens und des Bosporos im 2. Jh. v.Chr.», in Vinogradov, Ju.G. (επιμ.), *Pontische Studien: Kleine Schriften zur Geschichte und Epigraphik des Schwarzmeerraumes* (Mainz 1997), pp.526-562.

20. Виноградов, Ю.Г., «Вотивная надпись дочери царя Скилура из Пантикапея и проблемы истории Скифии и Боспора во II в. до н.э.», *ВДИ* 1 (1987), pp. 55-87.

Bibliography :

	Гайдукевич В.Ф. , <i>Боспорское царство</i> , Москва – Ленинград 1949
	Gajdukevič V.F. , <i>Das Bosporanische Reich</i> , Berlin – Amsterdam 1971
	Сапрыкин С.Ю. , <i>Понтийское царство. Государство греков и варваров в Причерноморье</i> , Москва 1996
	Виноградов Ю.А. , "Вотивная надпись дочери царя Скилура из Пантикапея и проблемы истории Скифии и Боспора во II в. до н.э.", <i>ВДИ</i> , 1, 1987, 55-87
	Vinogradov A. , "Die Votivinschrift der Tochter des Königs Skiluros aus Pantikapaion und Probleme der Geschichte Skythiens und des Bosporos im 2. Jh. v.Chr.", Ju.G. Vinogradov (ed.), <i>Pontische Studien. Kleine Schriften zur Geschichte und Epigraphik des Schwarzmeerraumes</i> , Mainz 1997, 526-562
	Гайдукевич В.Ф. , "О скифском восстании на Боспоре в конце 2 в. до н.э.", <i>Античное общество: Труды конференции по изучению античности</i> , Москва 1967, 17-22
	Rubinsohn Z.W. , "Saumakos, Ancient History, Modern Politics", <i>Historia</i> , 29 , 1986, 50-70
	Жебелев С.А. , "Последний Перисад и скифское восстание на Боспоре", С.А. Жебелев (ed.) , <i>Северное Причерноморье</i> , Москва – Ленинград 1953, 82-115
	Молев Е.А. , <i>Властитель Понта</i> , Нижний Новгород 1995
	Молев Е.Ф. , <i>Боспор в период эллинизма</i> , Нижний Новгород 1994
	Блаватская Т.В. , <i>Очерки политической истории Боспора в V-IV вв. до н. э.</i> , Москва 1959
	Brandis C.G. , "Bosporos", <i>RE</i> 3, 1897, 757-789
	Гаврилов А.К. , "Скифы Савмака – восстание или вторжение? (ΙΡΕ Ι2 352–Syll.3 709)", <i>Этюды по античной истории и культуры Северного Причерноморья</i> , Санкт-Петербург 1992, 53-73

Webliography :

Decree honoring Diophantos
http://www.chersonesos.org/?p=museum_coll_ep1&l=eng

Glossary :

Rhoxolani



Rhoxolani were Sarmatian tribes. Their original homeland lay between the Don and Dnieper rivers. They migrated in the 1st century BC toward the Danube, to what is now the Baragan steppes in Romania.

Quotations

Decree honouring Diophantus (late 2nd century BC)

[-----]σω[-----][-----]

Ἰπαν· ἐ [ἰδῆ Διοφάντος Ἀσκλη] [πι]οδώρου Σινωπεὺς φίλος [μὲν καὶ][εὐεργέτας ἀμῶν] ὦν, πιστε[υ]όμενος δὲ [ἰ]τιμώμενος οὐ[θ]ενὸς ἤσσον ὑπὸ βασιλέος Μιθραδά α Εὐπά[τορος], ἅ παντὸς ἀγαθοῦ παραίτιος γίνεται [κἀστωι] μῶν, ἐπ[ἰ] τὰ κάλλιστα καὶ ἐνδοξότατα τὸν [βασ]ιλέα προτρεπόμενος· παρακληθεὶς δ' ὑπ' αὐτο [καὶ] ὄν ποτι ὑθας πόλεμον ἀναδεξάμενος [καὶ] ἀραγενόμενος εἰς τὰν πόλιν ἀμῶν, ἐπάνδρωσ παντὶ τῶι στρατοπέδῳ τὰν εἰς τὸ πέραν διάβα[σι]ν ἐποίησαςτο. Παλάκου δὲ τοῦ Σκυθᾶν βασιλείος αἰφνιδίως ἐπιβαλόντος μετὰ ὄχλου πολλοῦ, παρα[τα]ξάμενος ἐν ἰαίαι, τοὺς ἀνυποστάτους δοκοῦντας εἶμην Σκύθας τρεψάμενος πρῶτον ἀπ' αὐ[τῶ]ν ἐποίησε βασιλέα Μιθραδάταν Εὐπάτορα τρόπαιον ἀναστᾶσαι· τοὺς δὲ παροικοῦντας Ταύρους ὑ[φ'] ἐ[α]υτὸν ποησάμενος καὶ πόλιν ἐπὶ τοῦ τόπου συνοικίξας, εἰς τοὺς κατὰ Βόσπορον τόπους ἐχωρὶ [σθη] καὶ πολλὰς καὶ μεγάλας ἐν ὀλίῳ χρόνῳ πράξεις ἐπιτελέσας πάλιν εἰς τοὺς καθ' ἀμὲ τόπους [ἐ]πέ[στ]ρεψε καὶ παραλαβὼν τοὺς ἐν ἀκμαῖ τῶν πολιτᾶν εἰς μέσαν τὰν Σκυθίαν προήλθε. παραδόντων δὲ [αὐτ]ῶι Σκυθᾶν τὰ βασιλεία Χαβαίους καὶ Νέαν πόλιν, σχεδὸν πάντας ὑπακόους συνέβα γενέσθαι [βα] ἰλεῖ Μιθραδάται Εὐπάτορι· ἐφ' οἷς ὁ δᾶμος εὐχαριστῶν ἐτίμασε ταῖς καθηκούσαις αὐτὸν τιμαῖς, [ὦ] ἀπολελυμένος ἤδη τᾶς τῶν βαρβάρων ἐπικρατείας. τῶν δὲ Σκυθᾶν τὰν ἔμφυτον [α] τοῖς ἀθεσίαν ἐκφανῆ καταστασάντων καὶ τοῦ μὲν βασιλείος ἀποστάντων, τὰ δὲ πρά[γμ]ατα εἰς μεταβολὰν ἀγαγόντων, δι' ἃς αἰτίας βασιλείος Μιθραδάτα Εὐπάτορος Διοφάντων [π]άλιν ἐκπέ ψαντος μετὰ στρατοπέδου, καίπερ τοῦ καιροῦ συγκλείοντος εἰς χειμῶνα, Διο[φ]αντος ἀναλαβὼν τοὺς ἰδίους καὶ τῶν πολιτᾶν τοὺς δυνατωτάτους ὥρμασε μὲν ἐπ' αὐτὰ [τὰ] βασιλεία τῶν Σκυθᾶν, κωλυθεὶς δὲ διὰ χειμῶνας, ἐπιστρέψας ἐπὶ τὰ παραθαλάσσια Κερκινίτιν [μὲν] ἐλάβετο καὶ τὰ Τεῖχη, τοὺς δὲ τὸν Καλὸν Λιμένα κατοικοῦντας πολιορκεῖν ἐπεβάλετο. Παλά[κο] δὲ ῥογείν τὸν καιρὸν ἑαυτῶι νομίζοντος καὶ συναγαγόντος τοὺς ἰδίους πάντας, ἔτι δὲ [καὶ] ὁ τῶν Ρευξιναλῶν ἔθνος συνεπισπασαμένου, ἅ διὰ παντὸς Χερσονασιτᾶν προστατοῦσα [Πα] θένος, καὶ τότε συμπαροῦσα Διοφάντῳ, προεσάμανε μὲν τὰν μέλλουσαν γίνεσθαι πράξιν [διὰ τ]ῶν ἐν τῶι ἱερῶι γενομένων σαμειῶν, θάρσος δὲ καὶ τόλμαν ἐνεποίησε παντὶ τῶι τοπέ[δωι] Διοφάντου δὲ διαταξαμένου σωφρόνως, συνέβα τὸ νίκαια γενέσθαι βασιλεῖ Μιθ[ρ]αδά[ται] Εὐ[π]άτορι καλὸν καὶ μνάμας ἄξιον εἰς πάντα τὸν χρόνον· τῶν μὲν γὰρ πεζῶν ἦτοι τις οὐ[θ]εὶς ἐσῶ] η, τῶν δὲ ἰπέων οὐ πολλοὶ διέφυγον· οὐδένα δὲ χρόνον ἀργὸν παρείς, παραλαβὼν [τὸ στρατοπέδον], ῥου τοῦ ἕαρος ἐπὶ Χαβαίους ἰ Νέ[αν] πόλιν ἐλθὼν παντὶ [-----] σ[.]ω[. .] [-----] ὥστε τοὺς μὲν -----] . [-----] φυγεῖν, οὐς δὲ λοιποὺς Σκύθας περὶ τῶν καθ' ἑαυτο [-----] τῶι βουλευσασθαι. εἰς τε τοὺς κατὰ Βόσπορον τόπους [ἰ]ς καὶ [καταστα]σάμενος καὶ τὰ ἐν<θ>ίνα καλῶς καὶ συμφερόντως βασιλεῖ Μιθραδάται Εὐπ [τορι], τῶν περὶ Σαύμακον Σκυθᾶν νεωτεριζάντων καὶ τὸν μὲν ἐκθρέψαντα αὐτὸν [?ΑΥΤΟ[-----] (facs.)]? [β]ασιλέα Βοσπόρου Παιρισάδαν ἀνελόντων, αὐτῶι δ' ἐπιβουλεύσαντων, διαφ[υγῶν] τὸν κίνδυνον ἐπέβα μὲν ἐπὶ τὸ ἀποσταλὲν ἐπ' αὐτὸν ὑπὸ τῶν πολιτᾶν πλοῖον, [ἐνὸ]μενος [ἐ] καὶ παρακαλέσας τοὺς πολίτας, συνεργὸν πρόθυμον ἔχων τὸν ἐξ[απο]στέλλοντα ασιλέα Μ[ι]θραδάταν Εὐπάτορα, παρῆν ἔχων ἄκρου τοῦ ἕαρος [τρα]τόπεδον [ὄ]ν τε καὶ ναυτικόν, παραλαβὼν δὲ καὶ τῶν πολιτᾶν ἐπιλέ-κτους ἐμ πληρώμασι τρισί, ὄρμαθεις ἐκ τᾶς πόλεος ἀμῶν παρέλαβ[ε]μὲν Θεοδοσίαν καὶ Παντικᾶπαιον, τοὺς δὲ αἰτίους τᾶς ἐπαναστάσε[ος] τιμωρησάμενος καὶ Σαύμακον τὸν αὐτόχειρα γεγονότα βασιλέος Παιρι-σάδα λαβὼν ὑποχείριον εἰς τὰν βασιλείαν ἐξάπεστείλε, τὰ δὲ πράγματα νεκ[ά]σατο βασιλεῖ Μιθραδάται Εὐπάτορι. ταῖς τε προεσβείαις ταῖς ἀποστελλομέναις ὑπὸ τοῦ δάμου συνεργῶν εἰς πᾶν τὸ συμφέ[ρ]ον Χερσονασίταις εὐνουν ἑαυτὸν καὶ φιλότιμον παρέχεται. ὅπως οὖν καὶ ὁ δᾶμος τοῖς εὐεργέταις ἑαυτοῦ τὰς καθηκούσας φαίνεται χάριτας ἀποδιδούς, δεδόχθαι τῶι βου-λαῖ καὶ τῶι δάμῳ στεφανῶσαι Διοφάντων Ἀσκλαπιοδώρου χρυσέῳ στεφάνῳ Παρθενείοις ἐν τῶι πομπᾶι, τὸ ἀνάγγελμα ποιουμένων τῶν συμμαχόνων· "ὁ δᾶμος στεφανοῖ Διοφάντων Ἀσκλαπιοδώρου Σινωπέα ἀρετᾶς ἕνεκα καὶ εὐνο[ί]ας τᾶς εἰς αὐτόν". σταθῆμεν δὲ αὐτοῦ καὶ εἰκόνα χαλκῆαν ἔνοπλον ἐν τῶι ἀκροπόλε[ι] παρὰ τὸν τᾶς Παρθένου βωμὸν καὶ τὸν τᾶς Χερσονάσου, περὶ δὲ τούτων ἐπιμελ [ς] γενέσθαι τοῖς ἐπιγεγραμμένοις ἀρχουσι, ὅπως ὅτι τάχιστα καὶ κάλλιστα γ νηται· ἀναγράψαι δὲ καὶ τὸ ψάφισμα εἰς τὰν βᾶσιν τοῦ ἀνδριάντος, τὸ δὲ εἰς ταῦτα γενόμενον ἀνάλωμα δόμεν τοὺς ταμίας τῶν ἱερῶν. ταῦτ' ἔδοξε βουλ [ι] καὶ ἄμῳ μὲν Ἰδιουσιόου ἐννεακαίδεκάται, βασιλεύοντος Ἀγέλα τοῦ Λ[α]γορίνου, προαισυνμῶντος Μήνιος τοῦ Ἡρακλείου, γραμματεῦντος [ασικλ] εἰος τοῦ Ἀθαναίου. vacat

IOSPE P 352



Chronological Table

179 BC: Chersonesus of Taurica enters into an alliance with Pharnacus I of Pontus

121 (111) - 63 BC: Regnal dates of Mithridates VI Eupator in Pontus

110 BC: Diophantus' first campaign against the Scythians of Taurica. First diplomatic mission of Diophantus in the Cimmerian Bosphorus

109-108 BC: Second campaign of Diophantus against the Scythians

107-106 BC: Saumacus' revolt

106 BC: Diophantus' campaign against Saumacus; Diophantus is victorious and the Kingdom of Bosphorus is finally annexed by the Kingdom of Pontus