

VRG-Folder_0227

Dedicated to the bright memory of
my teacher Boris Nikolaevich GRAKOV
the author

Introduction

1)
~~The study of amphoras is important for 3 reasons; increase of knowledge about
stamps, workshops and control of production of the pottery~~

The study of stamps found at one or another ancient centre of stamps found on pottery particularly on amphoras is important for several reasons. In the first place, this study increases our knowledge about the stamps themselves, about the character of the activities of the producing workshops which issued the stamped pottery, and about the type of control over this production etc. In the second place the recording of the finds of pottery stamps as relatively precisely dated material provides us with the possibility of establishing a precise chronology for archaeological complexes, strata, burials and so on. In the third place, a consideration of stamped pottery wares found during the excavation of ancient settlements is interesting in that it helps us reconstruct the economic ties of these settlements at the period when the stamped pottery was issued and used.

The present study is devoted to an analysis and publication of the pottery stamps from the excavations of ancient Tanais. Our collection is comparatively small in scope -- 740 stamps in all, but it is of significant interest from the point of view of all three aspects mentioned above. An enormous number of stamps from Tanais were obtained in the process of work which was carried on in the town site of Nedvigovskoi of the lower Don expedition of 1955 but a certain number of them were acquired during the excavations of Tanais in the 19th cent. and are preserved now in the Hermitage and the National Historical Museum (G.I.M.) There are 85 of these stamps in all, the majority of them were published in their time by P.M. Leontiev,¹ L. Stephani and E.M. Pridik. References to these publications are given with the presentation of each stamp.

p. 5

All of the stamps investigated in the present study were printed on amphoras and tiles. We do not take into account here several stamps found at Tanais which were placed on red-glazed vessels. Only one of these stamps contained an inscription.² It would be more advisable to examine these stamps when studying all of the red-glazed ware from Tanais; such a study has already been begun by T.M. Arsenieva.

p.6

Among the stamps on pottery containers it is necessary first of all to distinguish a not very large but very interesting group printed on amphoras of the 2nd and 3rd cent. AD. Usually in this period amphoras no longer were stamped. The stamps referred to are found comparatively rarely, they have been studied very little and up to the present have not been arranged in any orderly system. We shall return to an examination of them in a special study, here however we shall dwell on the more numerous stamps of the Hellenistic period which comprise the basic group among all of this material from Tanais.

Pottery stamps of the 3rd to the 1st cent. BC come to 609 in our collection. Of these, four stamps occur on tiles, the remainder on handles or the necks of sharp-bottomed amphoras. This insignificant number of finds of tile stamps which comprises a negligible percentage with regard to the whole group of pottery stamps differs sharply from the percentage of these finds in other centres of the north Black Sea regions,³ and can be explained obviously by the fact that the roofs of buildings in Tanais were for the most part not covered by tiles. We have already had occasion to remark on the comparatively small no. of finds of tile sherds in the Nedvigovskoi town site, which had to do with the fact that the majority of Tanais homes⁴ were roofed with straw or rushes.

The amphora stamps of the Hellenistic period from T. can be divided acc. to the centres where they were produced in the following way: [table]

p.6

This distribution of the stamps acc. to the centres where they were produced is very indicative. In comparing our figures with the data of the finds of amphora stamps in the cities of the Bosphorus we are struck above all by the complete absence of the stamps of two significant centres, whose stamps are present in every collection of items of pottery epigraphy, Thasos and Herakleia. The absence in T. of Herakleian englyphic stamps (as well as of Herakleian amphoras in general) -- fragments of amphoras which might possibly be ascribed to this centre can be numbered literally fewer than ten) can be to a certain degree explained by the circumstance that the importing of Herakleian stamped amphora containers to the north B. Sea region occurs mainly in the 4th cent. BC, when T. did not yet exist. It is true that in the special literature of today the opinion prevails that stamping Herakleian amphoras was continued if not until the end at least until the 3rd quarter or to the middle of the 3rd cent. BC. This date for the final phase of stamping in Herakleia which was proposed more than 40 years ago by B.N. Grakov⁶

p.7

was accepted by all investigators and not subjected to any revision.⁷ [...A.A. Neichardt Items of pottery epigraphy from Mermeki and Tiritaka as the source for the study of the trade relations of the kingdom of the Bosphorus with the centres of the B. Sea region during the Hellenistic period. PhD Diss. Leningrad 1951 pp. 8-9] It has also been accepted by the authors of both of the classifications of Herakleian stamps which⁸ exist at the present time, I.B. Brashinsky and B.A. Vasilenko. However one must by no means consider this date as firmly established. On the contrary some data require us to assume that Herakleian stamping ended significantly earlier perhaps even at the beg.⁹ of the 3rd cent. BC. This helps us to explain the absence of Herakleian stamps at T. which came into existence in the 1st quarter of the 3rd cent. BC.¹⁰ On the other hand the absence or at least the very negligible importance of Herakleion imports into T. might be indicated as well by the orientation of that city in the 3rd cent. BC chiefly toward trade relations with the centres of the Asiatic Bosphorus where the positions of Herakleion exporting were somewhat weaker than in Pantikapeia and the surrounding settlements.¹¹

(p.7) More complicated, however, is the situation with Thasian exports into the Don region. The chronological classification of Thasian stamps of the 2nd half of the 4th and of the 3rd centuries B.C. has thus far been insufficiently worked out, however, according to the chronological calculations of B.N. Grakov and VG, it is customary to consider that the stamping of amphoras on Thasos was continued throughout all of the 3rd century B.C.¹² This point of view is also held by the author of the latest and most substantive classification of Thasian stamps, Y. G. Vinogradov.¹³ Consequently Thasian stamped amphoras must have in some measure come to Tanais, all the more so since in the neighboring Elizabetov townsite Thasian stamps are encountered frequently and among them stamps which can be referred to the very latest chronological groups, i.e. to the 3rd century B.C.¹⁴

p.8 To find a satisfactory explanation for their absence from Tanais, we are at present unable. On the whole, in the amphora materials of the Elizabetov townsite and of Tanais of the 3rd century B.C., there are very definite differences which so far do not submit easily to explanation.

Even in her time, T. N. Knipovitch pointed to the preponderance among the pottery stamps from Tanais of Rhodian stamps.¹⁵ As a matter of fact Rh. st. comprise almost 90 per cent of all the finds of Hellenistic amph. st. in that city. In this regard Tanais is quite distinct among all the other N. Black Sea centers, in no one of which do we see such a striking preponderance of Rh. pottery containers. In the small cities of the Bosphorus the pottery stamps of Sinope are by far the most prevalent.¹⁶ In Pantic., the no. of Rh. handles is only slightly more than twice the no. of Sinope st.,¹⁷ while in Tanais the ratio of the stamps of these 2 grps is almost 17 to 1. As far as the Hell. amph. st.s of the other centers (Kos, Cherson., Knidos) are concerned, everywhere in the Bosphorus they are represented by a small amount, and Tanais in this regard does not represent anything particularly unusual.

Of course it is impossible to identify directly the correspondence of the st.s of the early grps. in the finds at any given pt. with the actual corresp. of the importation from corresponding centers as is often done. The quantity of st.s. is a very relative indicator for establishing the absolute scale of commercial dealings.¹⁸ In the first

(p.8) place, in the various centers amphs. were st. in different ways: on Rhodes, they st. both handles of the amphora, while in the majority of centers the st. was placed only on one handle or on the neck. Thus the no. of Rh. sts. is twice as great as the no. of amphoras to which they belong. This circumstance is usually taken into account by scholars, but by no means to the full extent that it should be. Hence for ex. they do not take into account the very widespread practice of this double stamping at Knidos and the sporadic use of this method in Sinope and on Thasos. In the 2nd place one must keep in mind the difference in the volume of st. amph.s from the various centers. It makes no sense to make direct conclusions about the predominance of imports from Sinope over those from Rhodes solely on the basis of the preponderance of the no. of Sinope sts. if the average capacity of a Rh. amphora was 25 to 28 liters,¹⁹ and that of the Sinopean only 14 to 16 liters.²⁰ In the 3rd place a certain corrective coefficient must be applied as to the durability of the handles on which the stamps are found. Thus from our observations Sinope st.s turn out to be broken more often than Rhodian, which fact must somewhat increase their number (since all fragments are counted) in comparison with the former. The most important thing is that we must keep in mind the circumstance that many centers stamped their containers not all but selectively. In particular, this refers to such large-scale productive ~~productive~~ centers as Herakleia and Sinope. And this means therefore that the finds of stamps reflect only a certain part of the import-²¹ ing of merchandise in ceramic containers from those centers. [Acc. to the calculations of Brashinsky, in the 2 centers referred to, only every 5th or every 6th amphora as a general rule is stamped. (I.B.Brash., The use of statistical methods in studying the mass importation of ancient Gk. pottery containers, which appears in Theses of the reports given at the session devoted to the results of field arch. research. . . 1972, Tashkent, 1973, p.74)] All these reservations and considerations make it exceedingly difficult when we attempt to compare the intensity of importing from the various centers on the basis of a count of amphora stamps.

Nonetheless the comparison of these relative data for the various points where the finds are made is completely justified since all the circs. which we have mentioned must have influenced ~~in the same way~~ equally the no. of st.s in all the importer cities.

p.9

(p.9) And the sharp difference in the percentile relation between Rh. and other stamps wh. distinguishes Tanais from the other Black Sea cities reflects very actual specific features of Tanais commerce of the 3rd and 2nd centuries B.C. We have already had occas²² to remark, that these specific characteristics reveal similarities bet. Tanais and Phanagoria where there was also to be noted a significant increase in the vol. of commerce with Rhodes in comparison with the positions it occupied in the cities of the European part of the Bosporos.²³ In general Rhodes, it wd. seem, played a more significant role in the economic and perhaps also in the political life of the cities of the Asiatic Bosporos as is also attested by some data of Bosporos numismatics of the 2nd century B.C.²⁴ The preponderant relations of Tanais in the Hell. period precisely with Phanagoria and not with Pantic. which is being explored from various materials is reflected not only in the enormous numerical predominance of Rh. sts. above all the others but also in certain other phenomena in the area of ceramic epigraphy about wh. we shall speak later on.

p. 5

Dedicated to the bright memory of
my teacher Boris Nikolaevich GRAKOV
the author

Introduction

1)

~~The study of amphoras is important for 3 reasons: increase of knowledge about
stamps, workshops and control of production of the pottery~~

The study of stamps found at one or another ancient centre of stamps found on pottery particularly on amphoras is important for several reasons. In the first place, this study increases our knowledge about the stamps themselves, about the character of the activities of the producing workshops which issued the stamped pottery, and about the type of control over this production etc. In the second place the recording of the finds of pottery stamps as relatively precisely dated material provides us with the possibility of establishing a precise chronology for archaeological complexes, strata, burials and so on. In the third place, a consideration of stamped pottery wares found during the excavation of ancient settlements is interesting in that it helps us reconstruct the economic ties of these settlements at the period when the stamped pottery was issued and used.

The present study is devoted to an analysis and publication of the pottery stamps from the excavations of ancient Tanais. Our collection is comparatively small in scope -- 740 stamps in all, but it is of significant interest from the point of view of all three aspects mentioned above. Any enormous number of stamps from Tanais were obtained in the process of work which was carried on in the town site of Nedvigovskoi of the lower Don expedition of 1955 but a certain number of them were acquired during the excavations of Tanais in the 19th cent. and are preserved now in the Hermitage and the National Historical Museum (G.I.M.) There are 85 of these stamps in all, the majority of them were published in their time by P.M. Leontiev, L. Stephani and E.M. Pridik. ¹ References to these publications are given with the presentation of each stamp.

A 2nd copy
will be sent
to Karygin
12.III.79

p. 5

All of the stamps investigated in the present study were printed on amphoras and tiles. We do not take into account here several stamps found at Tanais which were placed on red-glazed vessels. Only one of these stamps contained an inscription.² It would be more advisable to examine these stamps when studying all of the red-glazed ware from Tanais; such a study has already been begun by T.M. Arsenieva.

p.6

Among the stamps on pottery containers it is necessary first of all to distinguish a not very large but very interesting group printed on amphoras of the 2nd and 3rd cent. AD. Usually in this period amphoras no longer were stamped. The stamps referred to are found comparatively rarely, they have been studied very little and up to the present have not been arranged in any orderly system. We shall return to an examination of them in a special study, here however we shall dwell on the more numerous stamps of the Hellenistic period which comprise the basic group among all of this material from Tanais.

Pottery stamps of the 3rd to the 1st cent. BC come to 609 in our collection. Of these four stamps occur on tiles, the remainder on handles or the necks of sharp-bottomed amphoras. This insignificant number of finds of tile stamps which comprises a negligible percentage with regard to the whole group of pottery stamps differs sharply from the percentage of these finds in other centres of the north Black Sea regions,³ and can be explained obviously by the fact that the roofs of buildings in Tanais were for the most part not covered by tiles. We have already had occasion to remark on the comparatively small no. of finds of tile sherds in the Nedvigovskoi town site, which had to do with the fact that the majority of Tanais homes were roofed with straw or rushes.⁴

The amphora stamps of the Hellenistic period from T. can be divided acc. to the centres where they were produced in the following way: [table]

p.6

This distribution of the stamps acc. to the centres where they were produced is very indicative. In comparing our figures with the data of the finds of amphora stamps in the cities of the Bosphorus we are struck above all by the complete absence of the stamps of two significant centres, whose stamps are present in every collection of items of pottery epigraphy, Thasos and Herakleia. The absence in T. of Herakleian englyphic stamps (as well as of Herakleian amphoras in general) -- fragments of amphoras which might possibly be ascribed to this centre can be numbered literally fewer than ten) can be to a certain degree explained by the circumstance that the importing of Herakleian stamped amphora containers to the north B. Sea region occurs mainly in the 4th cent. BC, when T. did not yet exist. It is true that in the special literature of today the opinion prevails that stamping Herakleian amphoras was continued if not until the end at least until the 3rd quarter or to the middle of the 3rd cent. BC. This date for the final phase of stamping in Herakleia which was proposed more than 40 years ago by B.N. Grakov

p.7

was accepted by all investigators and not subjected to any revision. [...A.A. Neichardt Items of pottery epigraphy from Mermeki and Tiritaka as the source for the study of the trade relations of the kingdom of the Bosphorus with the centres of the B. Sea region during the Hellenistic period. PhD Diss. Leningrad 1951 pp. 8-9] It has also been accepted by the authors of both of the classifications of Herakleian stamps which exist at the present time, I.B. Brashinsky and B.A. Vasilenko. However one must by no means consider this date as firmly established. On the contrary some data require us to assume that Herakleian stamping ended significantly earlier perhaps even at the beg. of the 3rd cent. BC. This helps us to explain the absence of Herakleian stamps at T. which came into existence in the 1st quarter of the 3rd cent. BC. On the other hand the absence or at least the very negligible importance of Herakleian imports into T. might be indicated as well by the orientation of that city in the 3rd cent. BC chiefly toward trade relations with the centres of the Asiatic Bosphorus where the positions of Herakleian exporting were somewhat weaker than in Pantikapeia and the surrounding settlements.

(p.7) More complicated, however, is the situation with Thasian exports into the Don region. The chronological classification of Thasian stamps of the 2nd half of the 4th and of the 3rd centuries B.C. has thus far been insufficiently worked out, however, according to the chronological calculations of B.N.Grakov and VG, it is customary to consider that the stamping of amphoras on Thasos was continued throughout all of the 3rd century B.C.¹² This point of view is also held by the author of the latest and most substantive classification of Thasian stamps, Y. G. Vinogradov.¹³ Consequently Thasian stamped amphoras must have in some measure come to Tanais, all the more so since in the neighboring Elizabetov townsite Thasian stamps are encountered frequently and among them stamps which can be referred to the very latest chronological groups, i.e. to the 3rd century B.C.¹⁴

p.8 To find a satisfactory explanation for their absence from Tanais, we are at present unable. On the whole, in the amphora materials of the Elizabetov townsite and of Tanais of the 3rd century B.C., there are very definite differences which so far do not submit easily to explanation.

Even in her time, T. N. Knipovitch pointed to the preponderance among the pottery stamps from Tanais of Rhodian stamps.¹⁵ As a matter of fact Rh. st. comprise almost 90 per cent of all the finds of Hellenistic amph. st. in that city. In this regard Tanais is quite distinct among all the other N. Black Sea centers, in no one of which do we see such a striking preponderance of Rh. pottery containers. In the small cities of the Bosphorus the pottery stamps of Sinope are by far the most prevalent.¹⁶ In Pantic., the no. of Rh. handles is only slightly more than twice the no. of Sinope st.,¹⁷ while in Tanais the ratio of the stamps of these 2 grps is almost 17 to 1. As far as the Hell. amph. st.s of the other centers (Kos, Cherson., Knidos) are concerned, everywhere in the Bosphorus they are represented by a small amount, and Tanais in this regard does not represent anything particular unusual.

Of course it is impossible to identify directly the correspondence of the st.s of the early grps. in the finds at any given pt. with the actual corresp. of the importation from corresponding centers as is often done. The quantity of st.s. is a very relative indicator for establishing the absolute scale of commercial dealings.¹⁸ In the first

(p.8) place, in the various centers amphs. were st. in different ways: on Rhodes, they st. both handles of the amphora, while in the majority of centers the st. was placed only on one handle or on the neck. Thus the no. of Rh. sts. is twice as great as the no. of amphoras to which they belong. This circumstance is usually taken into account by scholars, but by no means to the full extent that it should be. Hence for ex. they do not take into account the very widespread practice of this double stamping at Knidos and the sporadic use of this method in Sinope and on Thasos. In the 2nd place one must keep in mind the difference in the volume of st. amph.s from the various centers. It makes no sense to make direct conclusions about the predominance of imports from Sinope over those from Rhodes solely on the basis of the preponderance of the no. of Sinope sts. if the average capacity of a Rh. amphora was 25 to 28 liters, ¹⁹ and that of the Sinopean only 14 to 16 liters. ²⁰ In the 3rd place a certain corrective coefficient must be applied as to the durability of the handles on which the stamps are found. Thus from our observations Sinope st.s turn out to be broken more often than Rhodian, which fact must somewhat increase their number (since all fragments are counted) in comparison with the former. The most important thing is that we must keep in mind the circumstance that many centers stamped their containers not all but selectively. In particular, this refers to such large-scale productive ~~productive~~ centers as Herakleia and Sinope. And in this means therefore that the finds of stamps reflect only a certain part of the importing of merchandise in ceramic containers from those centers. ²¹ [Acc. to the calculations of Brashinsky, in the 2 centers referred to, only every 5th or every 6th amphora as a general rule is stamped. (I.B.Brash., The use of statistical methods in studying the mass importation of ancient Gk. pottery containers, which appears in Theses of the reports given at the session devoted to the results of field arch. research. . . 1972, Tashkent, 1973, p.74)] All these reservations and considerations make it exceedingly difficult when we attempt to compare the intensity of importing from the various centers on the basis of a count of amphora stamps.

Nonetheless the comparison of these relative data for the various points where the finds are made is completely justified since all the circs. which we have mentioned must have influenced ~~in the same way~~ equally the no. of st.s in all the importer cited.

(p.9) And the sharp difference in the percentile relation between Rh. and other stamps wh. distinguishes Tanais from the other Black Sea cities reflects very actual specific features of Tanais commerce of the 3rd and 2nd centuries B.C. We have already had occas²² to remark, that these specific characteristics reveal similarities bet. Tanais and Phanagoria where there was also to be noted a significant increase in the vol. of commerce with Rhodes in comparison with the positions it occupied in the cities of the European part of the Bosphoros.²³ In general Rhodes, it wd. seem, played a more significant role in the economic and perhaps also in the political life of the cities of the Asiatic Bosphoros as is also attested by some data of Bosphoros numismatics of the 2nd century B.C.²⁴ The preponderant relations of Tanais in the Hell. period precisely with Phanagoria and not with Pantic. which is being explored from various materials is reflected not only in the enormous numerical predominance of Rh. sts. above all the others but also in certain other phenomena in the area of ceramic epigraphy about wh. we shall speak later on.

R. B. Wright Vg Typ
(pp. 3-12)

SPEROV - TANAIIS - 1975
- 3 -
(2nd edition)
is filed with
Rhodian

(18.IV.77)

3.01

(i.e. Vg+RB)

(We take up now the introductory text on the Rhodian class.)

Chapter 1 - Rhodian Stamps.

p.10
a photo copy
is going to be
sent to Carolyn
Koehler 14.III.77

It has been stated above that the Rhodian stamps constitute the basic and by far the group of most interesting Hellenistic period amphora stamps from Tanais. The overall number of them in our collection is 530. We do not include in this number several other stamps the Rhodian provenience of which can be presumed but cannot as yet be positively establ. [pp.150-1] These last stamps we have referred to the group of st. from unknown centers (see below).

As is well known, three informative elements are contained in Rh. st.: 1) the name of the ep. priest, which occurs in the genitive case and is usually preceded by the prep. ENI and st. by ref. to the priestly function of the IEPEYE although rarely, and particularly in early st., the name of the ep. can be placed on the st. without the prep.; 2) the name of the month of the Rh. calendar; 3) the name of the ergasteriarch, the name of the pottery owner, [usually now referred to as the fabricant] and we use it in this arbitrary way] usually in the gen. and less frequently in the namin. case. These 3 elements which we have mentioned are distributed on 2 stamps which are found on the two handle of the amph.

More frequently in ^{one} ~~xxxxxx~~ st. we find the name of the ep. and the month, and in the other the name of the fab., however not infrequently the name of the month is placed not on the ep.'s but on the fab.'s stamp. In very rare instances both name are pl. in one st. then the name of the month occurs isolated on the other handle. In our collection there are 3 st. which contain only the names of the month (nos. 528-530), and one st. on which can be read 2 names, those of the ep. KPATIAAZ and the fab. ANTIFONOS (nos. 251). ² [Still another st. in which it wd. seem that 2 names are mentioned, no. 72, but the reading of this st. is v. difficult, see below for details] [In fact, it is a Knidian.]

All the remaining Rh. st. are distributed in the following way: eponyms, 250, fabs., 246, uncertain, (rubbed out or completely rubbed out), 30.

In shape, the Rh. stamps from Tanais can be subdivided into circular, rect., and rhomboid. The number of st. of the different forms is as follows [see table].

(p.11)

In round ep. and fab st. on the side surface of the upper part of the handle there sts. can be found small supplementary st.s which we will discuss later. 11 such suppl. sts. were found in Tanais.

The name of months can be read on 204 stamps: [table] The intercalary month II. ΔΕΥΤ. has been excluded in making up our percentages.

The distrib. of Tanais st. according to months corresponds more or less with the usual distrib. of months on Rh. st., and reflects the vol. of the annual output of stamped amphoras on Rhodes. One is easily convinced of this fact when he compares the data cited above with the figures of the finds of Rh. st.s from any other excavations. For example, we will introduce here analogous statistical materials for 3 points (Table 1: from the excav.s of the cistern at Olbia,³ from . . . Mirmeki,⁴ and from . . . Phanagoria⁵ 1936-50.

If we are to indicate the materials that we will present in graphic form by placing along the axis of the (^{abscissas} "absisses") the names of the months in the order in which they occur in the Rh. calendar adopting the order est. by Nilsson, and along the axis of the ordinates, the percentage of seals that have been found with a ref. to each month, we will obtain 4 curves for the finds from Tanais, Olbia, Mirmeki, and Phanagoria.

p.12

The graph shows clearly that the volume of annual production of amphoras in Rhodes as it is reflected in the Tanais finds can be followed as well in the st. which have been found in other centers, and that the correspondence of the number of amphoras produced in the given months is a constant quantity in all the centers. The somewhat partial non"correspondence of the curves particularly in the right section of the graph, which corresponds to the months ΑΡΤΑΜΙΤΙΟΞ, ΑΡΡΙΑΝΙΟΞ, and ΥΑΚΙΝΘΙΟΞ probably can be explained by the comparatively small no. of seals which we have in these 4 places which gives the definite possibilities for accidental oscillations. Research with ~~a~~ considerably larger groups of finds would necessarily smooth out these accidental oscillations. We can find confirmation of this when we analyze the distr. of stamps acc. to months in such large series as all the Rh. sta. found on the Bosphoros, all the st. from the north Bl. Sea coast and all the st. from Lindos. The distr. of Rh. st. of Bosphoran origin acc. to months was made by Y. S. Badalyans in his dissertation;⁶

(p.12) the count of references to the months on Rh. handles from all of the north B¹. Sea region was made by B.N.Grakov in his introductory study to the corresponding division of the ms. 1.O.S.P.E. III; ⁷ and finally M. Nilsson has assembled more than 3000 ⁸ references to Rh. months on stamps with which he was familiar. The graph which has ^{these} been compiled from ~~this~~ data is similar to the preceding one (fig.2), it contains 3 almost identical curves very close to the curves of the preceding graph but free from accidental oscillations, inasmuch as the large no. of references to Rh. months (more than 2000 in each instance) guarantees in this case the reliability of percentile relations.

(p.14)

The non-accidental character of these seasonal oscillations in the production of amphoras was already ^{noted} mentioned ⁹ by M. Nilsson. However the reasons for the oscillations have not been as yet conclusively established. M. Nilsson following several other researchers found them to be the result of the seasonal nature manufacture of pottery containers which depended on weather conditions more or less favorable for the drying of the amphoras. ¹⁰ At the same time all the researchers rely on the suggestions of ¹¹ ancient authors as regards the drying of tiles or bricks. This point of view prevails among scholars even at the present time. ~~Why~~ Y. S. Krushkol expressed another opinion in relating the seasonal nature of the production of amphoras with the times of the high tide of wine and by drawing a conclusion from a count of the various months mentioned on Rhodian stamps as to the predominance of the production of dry wines on Rhodes. ¹² attractive.

The hypothesis of Y. S. Krushkol is very appealing. It would seem to explain the very need for stamping amphoras with the name of the month so that the purchaser might know about the type of wine he was acquiring. The adherents of the traditional point of view who connect the seasonal oscillations in the manufacture with the conditions of the drying of the amphoras are compelled to explain this demand (i.e. need for putting the name of the month on) by some fiscal considerations, by the need of facilitating supervision of the manufacture. This explanation is not very convincing and does not solve many difficult questions which arise. Take this characteristic instance for ex. If the indication of the month on the stamp was due to the demands of ~~the~~ fiscal control policies and was required by the governmental powers, then it would have to have been

(p.14) compulsory for all pottery workshops. And at the same time it is well known that originally on Rhodian stamps the months the month was not indicated. When they began to include the name of the month in the composition of the Rhodian stamp, which took place according to V. Grace around 275 B.C., for a rather long time some fabricants indicated the month while others did not.¹³ Such a selective and not overall procedure is characteristic for the pottery manufacture during the years of the eponyms ΘΙΑΩΝΙΑΑΣ, ΑΙΞΥΑΙΝΟΣ, ΞΣΧΑΡΗΣ, ΠΟΛΥΠΑΤΟΣ, ΕΥΚΑΗΣ and ΘΙΑΟΚΡΑΤΗΣ and would indicate rather the private enterprise and not governmental involvement in this custom, and cannot be explained by proceeding from the traditional concepts as to the seasonal nature of producing the amphora containers. Unexplained also are the omissions of references to the names of the months on later stamps,¹⁴ and the fact that the intercalary month II. deuterios sts. through inadvertence could be indicated simply as ΙΙΑΝΑΜΟΣ.¹⁵ The hypothesis of Y. S. Krushkol removes such questions.

p.15 But this hypothesis itself cannot be considered as proven. To substantiate it, it wd. be necessary to prove that the increased production of amphoras in Rhodes occurs precisely in those months when the essential high tide of wine takes place. Y.S. Krushkol does indeed attempt to contrast the productive wine-making cycle with the rise and fall in the m'f'r of amphora-containers by rejecting the dependence of this rise and fall on the seasonal nature of pottery m'f're. However at the same time it fails to take into consideration that the very order of the months in the Rh. Calendar which it adopts was established by M. Nilsson chiefly on the basis of this dependence which it rejects.¹⁶ It is precisely the conviction that the number of stamps with an indication of one or another month depends on the seasonal nature of pottery m'f'r which lay at the basis of the calendar compiled by Nilsson. If we do not admit this connection, then it will be necessary to conclude that we are unable to establish the sequence of Rh. months.¹⁷ This is very well shown in a special work on calendars by V.V. Latyshev, which elaborated its own variant wh. coincides with the one that was created independently by E. Bischoff.¹⁸ But when M. Nilsson who made wide use of the data about the number of stamps with the names of stamps elaborated his scheme, it was accepted by all scholars and E. Bischoff

(p.15) among them, who proceeding from epigraphical data only proposed that they ~~xxxxxxx~~ transfer the month Sminthios in M. Nilsson's scheme from the 6th to the 2nd position. Hence it is for the time being impossible to reject the point of view which holds that the number of stamps with the names of months depends on conditions of pottery m'f'r, without at the same time upsetting our concept of the Rhodian calendar. Only the massing of new data about the Rhodian calendar which would be independent from the indications of the month on Rh. stamps would permit us to approach the solution of this problem.

19.IV.77

Y.S.Krushkol's hypothesis elicits one further difficulty: it assumes inevitably that both the eponym's year has been indicated in order to show a year when wine was particularly abundant, and that the second name on the Rh. st. belongs not to the owner of the pottery workshop but to some person who had to do with wine production or with the wine trade. Y.S. Krushkol also sees in these persons wine exporters and in this point he disagrees with all the existing scholarly tradition. The question is too complicated and it deserves special study based on the materials not only of the Rh., but also of other pottery stamps, all the more so because the functions of the persons indicated in other groups of amphora st. cannot up to the present be regarded as having been sufficiently explained.

p.16 In addition to the legend, Rh. st. contain occasionally depicted emblems. On round st. it is usually a pomegranate blossom, the Rh. "coat of arms" around wh. the legend is placed; less frequently in the center of the st. is the radiant head of Helios, and very rarely we encounter other emblems. For rectangular stamps, the emblems are not characteristic, infrequently we find only the head of Helios, while on the other hand on fabricant stamps they are very frequent, and at the same time many ergast.s constantly employ the same fixed symbol: Amyntas - a crown, Sokrates, a torch, Imas, Eukleitos and others - a caduceus, etc. Here is a list of the emblems on the stamps from Tanais (table 2) [table]

The majority of the emblems we have listed are quite common for Rh. st. A very rare emblem is the one of the eagle seated on a thunderbolt (no.354), which was encountered

(p.16) in the N Bl. Sea region a second time, at the first find the eagle was taken to be an owl.²² Comparatively rare also is the depiction of the double axe - labris, which occurs on the st. of Panchares (no.442).²³

p.17 The most important and at the same time the most difficult aspects in the study of Rh. amph. st. is their proper chronol. classification. Up to now there is still no complete chronol. classification of Rh. st., and by no means all Rh. amph. st. be^{can} definitely dated. None the less 80 percent of the Rh. st. found at Tanais can with more or less certainty be ~~fx~~ referred to one or another chronol. group. Without dwelling here in detail on the means and methods of dating, we shall indicate only the basic principles ~~fixing~~ for the chronol. classification of Rh. st.

The publication ~~of~~ by (C.) Schuchhardt of the complex of amph. st. from Pergamon,²⁴ which are welldated from general historical considerations in a period about 220-180 B.C., permitted F. Bleckmann to estab. a group of Rh. eponyms and potters (erg.s), whose activities fall approx. in those years.²⁵ The finds of amph. st. in the ruins of Carthage wh. was destr. by the Romans in 146 B.C. made it possible for (him) to estab. a group of stamps belonging to a period between 180 and 146 B.C.²⁶ This grouping of st. by Bl. has remained basically unaltered even today despite certain errors and inaccuracies.²⁷ Attempts to reconsider the dating of the Perg. complex have been on the whole unconvincing.²⁸ After the works of F. Bleckmann there were discovered a few other welldated complexes of the same period as the Perg. complex, among them the most important are the remarkable collection of amphoras from Villanova on Rhodes,²⁹ the collection of Rh. st. from the cistern in the Olbia agora,³⁰ pottery st. from the constr. layer of the Central Stoa in the Agora in Athens.³¹ A detailed study of the st.s of this period in their various combinations and in the various finds enabled V. Grace to date more precisely many of them, and to propose a precise dating of the Perg. complex within the limits of 210-175 B.C.³² This last proposal can still not be regarded as completely established, but independently of whether or not it will be accepted, the general chronol. frame of both of F. Bleckmann's groups remain valid, slight oscillations of 5 to 10 years can have no essential significance.

By employing the stratigraphic data from the finds of Rh. amph. st. in Athens,

(p.17) Tarsus, Delos and other places, VG was able to distinguish groups of Rh. st.s that were
 33
 both later and earlier than the st.s of the Perg. and Carthage complexes. In order
 to define the earliest Rh. sts. of the 4th and the beg. of the 3rd cent. B.C., a place
 of special importance is occupied by the complex of Rh. amphs. from the Koroni peninsula.
 although disputes are still carried on with regard to the dating of the complex, there
 p.18 can be no doubt about the fact that the monuments of ceramic epigraphy from this find
 34
~~xxxxxx~~ are to be placed at the very beginning of Rhodian stamping. Of extreme
 importance also was the discovery in Rhodes of a store of Rhodian amphoras of the time
 of the ep. MAYZANIAE I, approx. 275 B.C., which were found during the estr. of the
 35
 Hotel Soleil, and which are as yet unpublished. In order to date the stamps of the
 "post-Perg. period", in addition to the Carthage finds one may also use the finds from
 36
 Corinth which was destroyed in the same year as Carthage. As far as the amph. st.s
 of the second half of the 2nd cent. B.C. are concerned, they can usually be distinguished
 by the fact that they are not to be found in the earlier complexes.

Definitive chronological indication might be found in the finds in Samaria which
 37
 ceased to exist in 108 B.C., however the sta. from the excavations of this city were
 38
 published very unqualifiedly and can be identified only with difficulty.

Rh. sts. from the end of the 2nd and of the beginning of the 1st cent. B.C. can be
 easily distinguished owing to the finds in the layer of the Sulla-destruction of Athens,
 which have been widely used by VG for dating, and thanks also to the recently discovered
 39
 complexes in Cosa and Alba Fucens in Italy. Finally, in order to determine later
 Rhodian st.s of the first half of the 1st cent. B.C., of great interest are the observa-
 tions made in the investigation of the remains of an ancient shipwreck of this period
 40
 along the shores of Antikythera.

even
 Basing herself chiefly on stratigraphic data, VG still in 1952 made a classifi-
 cation of almost all Rh. eponyms, distributing them into 6 chronol. groups. It is true
 that in making this classification she qualifies her remarks by saying that her data
 were applicable only to the stamps found in Delos, and that several of the names which
 she presents can appear as well in other chronological groups, inasmuch as in a series
 of instances several eponyms who lived at various times bore the same name.
 41

(p.18) Actually we now know that among the names of the Rh. eps. there are many which are repeated two and even three times. Nonetheless, ^(for) the distribution of Rh. eps. into chronological groups VG provides firm basis for approximate dating (within the limits of several decades) of a tremendous number of eponym stamps. Subsequently VG on the basis of an analysis of new finds more than once has revised the whole list of eponyms and the dating of the individual names. ⁴²

Originally the chronol. classification of the Rh. eponyms acc. to VG looked like this: ⁴³ (Delos) [table]

Later VG somewhat changed the limits of the first 2 groups by increasing the limits of Group I to last until the middle of the 3rd cent. B.C., and by limiting Group II to approxim. the 3/4 of that century. ⁴⁴ (Pnyx) This distrib. of stamps in the first 2 groups has been accepted by us in our present study. In her study written jointly with M. Sav.-Petr., VG once again has practically returned to her original into groups, limiting Group I only to those eponyms whose names are unknown on stamps where months are named, and establishing its end thus at some time around 275 B.C. ⁴⁵ In the same work she proposes to divide the final, that is the 6th chronol. group into two, actually a Group VI which corresponds approx. to 108-80 B.C., and a seventh group wh. is to be dated from 80 - 30 (?) B.C. ⁴⁶ This division based entirely on observations of Knidian amphoras, ~~in relation to the~~ ^{as} as far as Rh. sts. are concerned does not seem to us to be sufficiently justified and we prefer to adhere to the former 6-part subdivision of the list of Rh. eponyms, all the more so since the stamps of the last group, Group VI, are on the whole extremely scarce in our finds.

In distributing the names of Rhodian eponyms into chronological groups, VG started out not only from the stratigraphic data of the finds of the sts. She also employed methods of relative dating, and among them the determining of the period of a stamp by the shape of the amphora on which it was found. The evolution of the shapes of Rh. amphoras and their parts particularly their handles, which has been studied by VG ⁴⁷ and other scholars, ⁴⁸ sts. permits us to determine an approx. ^{no} chronological place for a vessel and the stamps found on it. In particular, Rh. amphs. of the 1st chronol. group can be easily distinguished by these characteristics. The use of this method of

(p.19) dating which B.N.Grakov called morphological has enabled us to determine chronologically a whole series of stamps found at Tanais, even in those instances when the name on the stamp cannot be read (for ex., no.237, 502, 529).

p.20 Some it is true very limited data for the dating of Rh. stamps is given by materials of an iconographic and paleographic character. This wide use in round Rh. sta. of the radiant head of ⁴⁹Helios as an emblem can be observed in the second half of the 2nd cent. B.C., and the depiction of the same head on rect. ep. stamps to the left of the inscr. is characteristic acc. to our observations for sts. of the last third of the 3rd cent. B.C. (no. 3, 70, 101, 120, 194, 209). In some instances, supplementary ~~xxxx~~ chronol. criteria can be found in the shape and proportions of the letters in the legend of the stamp, in the way the legend is divided into lines, and in the corresp. bet. the inscr. and the emblem on the st., etc. ⁵⁰ We shall employ these criteria chiefly when it is necessary to distinguish the homonyms among the Rh. eponyms and fabricants.

The paleographic method of dating can be employed only in combination with other data; attempts to use it independently ⁵¹ have led only to errors. Thus A. Dumont on the basis of paleographic observations, attempted to date some Rh. stamps of the beginning of the 2nd century B.C. as of the 4th cent. B.C.

The stamps of the Rh. ergasts. can be dated with even greater difficulty than the ep. sts. So far there exists no general compilation of fabricants' names with a breakdown into chronol. groups similar to the one made by VG with regards to the names of the ep.s. In order to establish a chronology of fab.s' names, of extreme importance is the determining of the pairs of names of ep.s and fabricants which appear in a single stamp or in the stamps of a single amphora. Instances of such synchronism were already noted and utilized for dating by F. Bleckmann. ⁵² F. Hiller von Gaertringen, ⁵³ J. Paris, ⁵⁴ and E.M.Pridik ⁵⁵ devoted their special attention to these problems. As a result of much work, VG in 1934 in publishing the stamps from the Athenian Agora, was able to provide a table of correspondences of Rh. fab.s and ep.s. ⁵⁶ 53 such correspondences which include 32 names of Rh. ep.s and 24 names of ergast.s appear in it. Even at this time it was already known that there existed a somewhat larger number of correspondences, but in the individual cases the correspondence of the names had not been established completely

(p.20) convincingly. In some old editions which refer to intact amphoras with two stamps the reading of the stamps is subject to doubt, which fact obviously caused VG not to include many of the pairs which are referred to in the literature in her table. This has to do ~~with~~ in particular with a very imp. publication of intact Rh. amphoras⁵⁷ from the Metrop. Museum which was made with insufficient qualification by Hall.

p. 21 VG was able to check a part of the stamps publ. by Hall and to ~~index~~ make the necessary corrections in reading them,⁵⁸ however part of the amphoras in this collection remained inaccessible to her. Doubts are elicited as well by several readings⁵⁹ which appear in the old publications of Hiller v.G., J. Paris, E.M.Pridik. And still in a series of instances by employing the whole inventory of data which is now available to us for the dating of Rh. St.s, it is poss. quite definitely to accept or reject one or another of these old correspondences. Thus even the use of data which ~~has~~ ^{have} long since been familiar with regard to the synchronism of several names can be applied now with significantly more assurance than VG was able to do in her time.

The supplementing and revision of the table of correspondences of ep. and fab. names appears to be an impending task, even more so because of the fact that in VG's table which was compiled in 1934, a large group of names was given an erroneous relative dating. At that time it was assumed that the eponyms who had to do with the ~~argast.s~~⁵⁹ Agathoboulos, Drakontidas and Midas, precede the time of the Perg. complex. As a matter of fact, as VG establ. later, they refer⁶⁰ already to the second half of the 2nd century B.C. The early stamps of the first and second chronological groups do not seem to have been reflected at all at that time in the table. Moreover we now know of ~~the~~ the existence of many homonyms among the Rh, ep.s and fab.s, which now enables us to clarify the data on the correspondence of the names. The imp. fact is that during the last decades the material accessible to us had grown with enormous proportions, above all as a result of the reworking by VG herself of the new finds from various regions of the ancient world. An approximate count indicates that now we know of no less than 150 combinations of names of fabricants and eponyms, i.e. three times greater than had been assumed by scholars in 1934. Consequently the dating of many stamps, particularly fabricant stamps, ^{as far as the group of names is concerned,} ~~with regard to the names,~~ is one of the basic methods of establishing

(p.21) a chronology and is employed by us in connection with many stamps from the Tanais collection.

The corresp. of the names of the ergasts. and the eponyms can now ^{be} ^{sed} establish through a series of characteristics such as unique paleographic and breaking-down data [i.e. apparently the way the legends are arranged] (within the limits of narrow group^a) the presence of supplementary stamps or cases of erroneous impositions of stamps one upon another. However of course the main source of our information in this problem remains the finding of intact or broken amphoras which preserve both handles with both stamps. Such finds can now be numbered in the hundreds and they provide us with a basic concept of the interrelation of the names of the eponyms and the ergasts.

20.IV.77

The finds from Tanais also are quite interesting in this regard. They provide us with 8 combinations of the names of eps. and ergs., 2 of which repeat combinations which were known earlier. while 6 of them are new.

p.22

First of all ~~it~~ should be noted ~~that~~ st. no.251, to which we have already referred, and wh. contains the names of the ep. of chronol. grp III, KPATIAAZ and the fab. ANTIFONOS. A st. with this comb. of names was already known to F. Bleckmann, ⁶¹ but VG in her table of name-combs. for some reason does not indicate this pair. Nor is there anything new about the comb. of the names of the ergast. APISTOKANZ (no.288) and of the ep. APXIAAIAAZ (no.77), which we find on the amphora excavated by P.M.Leontieff in the Tanais necropolis. ⁶² This combination is known also on the stamps of 2 other intact jars. ⁶³ However the comb. of the names of the same APXIAAIAAZ (no.78) and the ergast. AMYNTAZ (no.264) is encountered for the first time and confirms the dating of the fab. sts. of AMYNTAZ at the beginning of the 2nd cent. B.C. We also encounter for the first time the comb. of the names of the ep. APISTON (no. 68) with the name of the ergast. AIOZ (no. 326) and of the ep. name APISTOAAAMOZ (no.54) with the female name of the proprietress of a pottery KAAAIQ (no.378). The dating of the amphoras of AIOZ and KAAAIQ at the time of the Petg. complex could have been estab. even without these correspondences, our pairs of names only serve to

(p.22) confirm and estab. a more precise chronol. for these amphoras, in particular they enable us to refer the stamp of KAAAIS to the 2/2 of the "Perg. period", to 200 to 180 B.C. Much more important are 3 other combinations of names: of the ep. AETYMHAHE II (no.87) and the fab. EYKAEITOE (no.351), of the ep. MENOKANTOE (no.168) and the fab. ZIMIAE (no.451), of the ep. APIZTEIAAE (no.40) and the fab. MENEKPATHE (no.405). In the first 2 instances these combinations enable us to determine the time of the activities of the workshops of EYKAEITOE and ZIMIAE, for the dating of whose output we had had no data. As far as MENEKPATHE is concerned, the Tonaïs amph. with his stamp dated by the name of the ep. APIZTEIAAE, attests the fact that he worked at the beginning of the 2nd cent. B.C., and is to be distinguished from the fab. of the same name whose activities took place in the middle or the 3/4 of the 3rd cent. B.C. 64 (Pnyx)

p.23 A supplementary method for synchronizing ep. and fab. names and a relative dating of st.s can also be found in a study of the so-called secondary st.s wh. are st.s found together with the primary stamps on the handles of Rh. amphorae. These sec. st., wh. have been noted occasionally by scholars, 65 ~~but~~ and have never constituted an object of special study, can in our opinion serve as an approx. chronol. indicator. It is true that our orig. dating of these stamps in the period of the Perg. complex 66 turned out to be too restricted. At the present time it must be admitted that these stamps began to be used at the very end of the 3rd century B.C. and existed throughout the course of almost all of the 2nd cent. B.C., however their more or less regular use is to be referred to the first quarter of that century. 67 [D.B.Shelov, "Sec. st.s. on Rh. amphs.", Melanges offerts à K. Michalofsky, Warsaw 1966, pp.666-667.]

→ In a series of instances on the basis of comparing sec. st.s, it is possible to form a synchronization of fab. and ep. names which have been indicated on primary st.s that are accompanied by secondary ones. 68 The methodology wh. we have suggested for such a synchronization was greeted by positive response, 69 ~~and~~ however practice shows that such comparisons must be made with extreme caution. It is hardly possible, for ex., to consider as conclusive the comb. of the names of the ep. NIKAZAPOPAAE and the fab. APIZTOKAHE merely on the basis of the fact that on their st.s there also happens to be the same sec. st. [B in rect.] 70 Such a simple sec. st. can be found with various

71

(p.23) names. In our collection in particular the sec. st.s ~~EL~~ occurs on the handle with the primary st. of the fab. ~~IIIOKPATHZ~~ (no.372). In this connection it is imp. to know as well the sec. st. no. 369 from Tanais. This st. consists of the letter P and ~~xxxxxx~~ of a small star at the right of it. All these st.s we have considered as belonging to the workshop of ~~APIZTOKAHZ~~,⁷² but the Tanais suppl. st. accompanied the primary st. of the ergast. ~~IIIOKPATHZ~~. This does not change the datings of several ep.s wh. have been estab. by us, of ep.s connected with similar sec. st.s, since the activities of the ergast.s ~~APIZTOKAHZ~~ and ~~IIIOKPATHZ~~ coincide in time, however it requires us to approach with greater caution the linking of the names of ergast.s and ep.s on the basis of an identity of sec. st.s. Of course the recurrence of more complicated st.s (like the monograms of the fab. ~~EYEPANSP~~, (no. 355) is far less probable. Acc. to information furnished by VG, Lucas Benaki, who was the possessor of the largest collection in the world of Rh. st.s, which he has now given to the Alexandria museum, provided her with a great amount of material for work on the synchronization of Rh. ep.s and fab.s on the basis of comparing sec. st.s.⁷³ Unfortunately the results of the research on this material have not as yet been published.

p.24

In the study of VG and M. Sav.-Petr., the suggestion is made that sec. st.s in their usual form were introduced for the 1st time in 188 B.C.⁷⁴ This date has even been adopted as the starting point for establishing the end of the "Perg. period". However this dating has no basis except for general considerations about "the great Rhodian expansion on the continent." Thus the earliest sec. sts. which appeared on the amphoras of the ergast. ~~ΔΙΕΚΟΖ~~ at the turn of the 3rd and 2nd cent.s B.C. ~~q~~ which are abundantly represented in the Villanova complex,⁷⁵ turn out to be isolated from the other sec. st.s which appeared as it were only 12 to 15 years afterward. We find this proposal not to be very convincing, and we continue to believe that the sec. st.s of ~~ΔΙΕΚΟΖ~~, which were placed alongside the primary st.s, were indeed ~~xxxxxx~~ ^{the earliest} attempt to introduce this sec. indication-factor ~~and~~ ^{but} that a significant chronol. break between the stamps of ~~ΔΙΕΚΟΖ~~ and the other suppl. st.s ought not to be hypothesized.⁷⁶

to agree

Correspondingly, it is scarcely possible with the assertion that sec. st.s were rarely used at the beginning of the 3rd cent. B.C. on the amphoras of the fab. ~~ΣΤΑΖ~~.⁷⁷ It is

(p.24) true that VG has reconsidered her original dating of these stamps, and now refers them ⁷⁸ to a later ergast. of this name who worked in the 2/2 of the 2nd cent. B.C., however she continues to consider as possible the existence of such st.s on the amphoras contemporary with $\Sigma\epsilon\tau\alpha\epsilon$ I. Obviously this is also an error. *[Biller name!]*

In our Tanais collection there are 11 sec. st.s on Rh. handles. 9 of them are found on handles on which the primary st. has been lost or cannot be read (nos. 524-527), one of them accompanies the ep. st. of $\Lambda\Upsilon\tau\omicron\kappa\pi\alpha\theta\eta\varsigma$ (no.91) and 6 of them appear with the stamps of the ergast.s $\epsilon\Upsilon\epsilon\pi\alpha\lambda\epsilon\pi$ (no.355), $\mu\mu\mu\kappa\pi\alpha\theta\eta\varsigma$ (no.369-372) and $\tau\iota\mu\omicron\epsilon\epsilon\eta\omicron\varsigma$ (no.466).

In discussing the dating of Rh. st.s, we will refer also to the so-called cursive st.s. There are 6 such st.s in our collection: with the names of the ep.s $\alpha\Nu\tau\iota\lambda\alpha\tau\omicron\varsigma$ (no.27), $\Delta\alpha\mu\omicron\kappa\pi\alpha\theta\eta\varsigma$ (no.99), $\tau\iota\mu\omicron\epsilon\epsilon\eta\omicron\varsigma$ (no.216), $\tau\iota\mu\omicron\kappa\alpha\eta\varsigma$ (no.222), and two wh. cannot be read (no.232, 236). The names of all these ep.s, except for $\tau\iota\mu\omicron\epsilon\epsilon\eta\omicron\varsigma$, have already been encountered on cursive st.s. ⁷⁹ The st. of $\tau\iota\mu\omicron\epsilon\epsilon\eta\omicron\varsigma$ is interesting in that it contains ^{does not} the indication of the priestly function of the ep., which is usually present in cursive st.s although the other characteristics of this grp of st.s are present on it. Thus we have confirmation of Y.S.Badalyans' observation about the existence of cursive st.s ⁸⁰ on which there is absent an indication of the priestly dignity.

When in 1956 we distinguished for the 1st time a group of cursive eponymous stamps, we proposed that all of these stamps had come from one workshop or even from the ~~hands~~ hands of a single master whose activities we referred to the 2/4 of the 2nd century ⁸¹ B.C. I. B. Brashinsky proposed a later dating for this group, referring it to the ⁸² 2/2 of the same century. Probably this dating is more correct. In proposing our dating for this group of stamps, we proceeded from the fact that the ep.s $\Delta\alpha\mu\omicron\kappa\pi\alpha\theta\eta\varsigma$ II and $\alpha\Nu\tau\iota\lambda\alpha\tau\omicron\varsigma$, whose names are found on cursive stamps, belong to the time of the Carthaginian complex. ⁸³ However recently VG has estab. that the activities of these ⁸⁴ ep.s refer already to the end of the 2nd cent. B.C. (no.27, 99). One shd also date in the 2/2 or the end of the same cent. the activities of the ep.s $\alpha\lambda\epsilon\chi\iota\mu\alpha\varsigma$, $\alpha\pi\iota\varsigma\tau\pi\alpha\tau\omicron\varsigma$, $\nu\alpha\Upsilon\epsilon\mu\iota\mu\omicron\varsigma$, $\tau\iota\mu\omicron\kappa\alpha\eta\varsigma$ II, $\alpha\Gamma\omicron\pi\alpha\lambda\epsilon$, $\alpha\pi\iota\epsilon\tau\omicron\mu\omicron\varsigma$, $\alpha\pi\iota\varsigma\tau\alpha\kappa\omicron\varsigma$ (np.10, 36, 63, 222). To determine the time of the other ep.s whose names are present on cursive stamps, - $\alpha\Nu\tau\iota\mu\alpha\kappa\omicron\varsigma$, $\Delta\alpha\mu\omicron\varsigma\eta$, $\alpha\Nu\tau\iota\alpha\kappa\omicron\varsigma$, "XONTIOZ" - there are no firm bases, although several of

p.25

(p.25) them were inddeed referred by VG to her chron. grp. IV. There are still left the ep.s APIZTEIAAZ and APATQANHE, whose names are attested to on the handles of amphoras of the Perg. complex. However as far as APATQANHE is concerned, it has now been estab. that ⁸⁵ there were 2 ep.s of this name (no.28), the second of whom exercised the functions of ep. at the end of the 2nd cent. B.C.; it is he obviously who is referred to on the cursive stamps. As far as APIZTEIAAZ is concerned, in all probability one must return to the hypothesis of F. Hiller v.G., who distinguished in the 2nd cent. B.C. 2 ep.s of this name: 1) of the period of the Perg. complex, and the other a later one, who is ⁸⁶ referred to in the cursive stamps. (no.40). Our objections against such a classification ⁸⁷ must now be withdrawn. Thus nothing contradicts referring the whole group of cursive ep. stamps to the end of the 2nd cent. B.C., that is to the end of chronol. grp V or even to the beginning of VG's grp VI. This group of stamps retains its significance as a ^{the} dating factor, however naturally it establishes time ~~in a different way~~ of the materials connected with it differently from what we have assumed earlier.

The redating of the group of cursive ep. st.s enables us to pay careful attention to ⁸⁸ the attempts to compare these stamps with the fab. st.s of ΔΡΟΞ (no.334). In acknowledging that all cursive st.s came from a single workshop, it is more probable to assume that they belong to the workshop of ΔΡΟΞ, although of course complete conviction of this fact can be obtained only after the finding of the handles of an amphora that are indisputably connected with each other, and which contained an ep. cursive stamp and a cursive st. of the ergast. ΔΡΟΞ.

p.26 In applying all the methods of dating Rhodian st.s which we have listed above to the objects found in Tanais, we can chronologically determine within the limits of certain periods all of the ep. st.s which can be read and the overwhelming majority of fab. st.s, in all, 432 st.s out of the total of 530. These st.s can be divided into chronol. grps as follows: [table]

Inasmuch as the time sectors corresponding to chronol. grps. are unequal, to determine the intensity of the importing of Rhodian amphoras into Tanais at various periods ~~it is necessary to divide~~ the number of stamps of each chronol. grp into the approx. ~~of years covered~~

(p.26) no. of years covered by the corresponding period. The annual coefficient obtained will give us an idea of the increase or decline of the importing: [table]

Of course these figures are to, a certain extent arbitrary inasmuch as in the first place the very limits of the chronol. periods and the no. of years in each period are approximate, and in the second place one or another stamp can by no means always be referred precisely to one or another period. Nevertheless the annual coefficient (volume) obtained thereby permits us to form a more accurate idea of the dynamics of the trade.

R. Burgi, PMWM typing

(25.IV.77)

The figures we have just presented indicate that the importing of merchandise in Rhodian amphoras to Tanais took place continuously throughout the course of two centuries -- the 3rd and 2nd BC. We have already had occasion to remark about the presence of Rhod. stamps in Tanais, stamps dating from the very beginning of the

⁸⁹
3rd century BC. Rhodian amphoras were delivered to Tanais quite regularly, although not in very large quantities, throughout all of the 3rd century BC.

A sharp increase in Rhodian imports occurs in the first decades of the 2nd cent. BC. Chronological group III of Rhodian stamps, which can be dated approximately 220-180 BC, is represented by the largest number of finds and the annual co-efficient of this group exceeds the co-efficient of the preceding groups by five times. In fact the increase in intensity of importation at the beginning of the 2nd cent. BC was much more significant, inasmuch as the overwhelming majority of stamps of group III belongs to the 2nd half of the "Perg. period", i.e. to the first two decades of the 2nd cent. BC. If we take this fact into consideration then the annual co-efficient of these two decades increases significantly since the co-eff. of the earlier "Perg." group declines.

p. 27 (importing)
The idea that further imports into Tanais of Rhod. amphora containers in the (was)
2nd century BC were maintained at the same high level as in the first decades of that century was deduced by us from a preliminary inspection of the materials and

(total)
from a summary tabulation of the stamps, ⁹⁰ but however turned out to be inaccurate.

As a matter of fact, as the annual co-efficients indicate, the flow of Rhod. amphoras into Tanais although indeed it did continue throughout all of the 2nd century BC on quite a considerable scale does not attain subsequently the full developement that it had in 200-180 BC. By the end of the century this importing is sharply curtailed -- the final group of stamps which corresponds with the last years of the 2nd century BC and the first half of the first cent. BC, is represented by a relatively small number of finds and a comparatively low co-efficient. At the same time we must keep in mind that all the stamps which can be referred to this group belong to the beginning of the period -- to the end of the 2nd and the turn of the 2nd/1st cent. BC.

It would be very interesting to compare these results which have to do with the dynamics of importing Rhod. amphora containers into Tanais with the corresponding data for all other north Black Sea centres particularly for the cities of the Bosphorus. Unfortunately such a comparison would involve considerable difficulties. In the first place the number of Rh. stamps which have been found in many centres (Nympheion, Gorgitsia, Tiritakos, Kepai, et al.), are far too few to use these sta.s for a comparative statistical tabulation. In the 2nd place the chronological classification of the Rh. sta.s acc. to the individual centres where they were found has been begun only recently by Y. S. Badaliants and refers almost exclusively to eponym stamps. At this point we can contrast the data of the finds of Rh. stamps of various periods for four Bosphorus cities -- Pantikapeios, Phanagoria, Mirmeki, Theodosia. The counts of stamps from the last two centres ^{were} ⁹¹ published by Y.S. Badalyants, the counts of Pantikapeion and Phanagoria finds were presented in his unpublished doctoral dissertation. ⁹² The utilisation for numerical comparison of our own publications of stamps from Pantikapeios and Phanagoria ⁹³ is impossible since they do not contain complete numerical data according to groups and furthermore deal with only part of the material covered in the research of Y.S. Badalyants. The use of the annual co-eff. in comparing the finds of the various cities is not very wise since the magnitude of the co-eff. will be influenced by the

differences in the overall no. of stamps found at one or another point. For this reason we will limit ourselves to presenting on our graph the no. of finds and the percentile indicators (table 3). At the same time we must bear in mind that the graph shows not the general no. of finds of Rh. stamps at a given centre but only the no. of stamps which are mainly eponym stamps [table 3] and which were established chronologically by Y.S. Badalyants.

The comparison of these figures internally and contrasting them with the figures for the finds of Rh. stamps at Tanais indicate that the overall dynamics of trade relations with Rhodes in all of these cities was approx. the same: slight, but continuous, relations, during the 3rd cent. BC, a sharp increase toward the end of the cent. and at the beginning of the 2nd cent. BC, a noticeable decline in the last decades and complete decline toward the end of the 2nd cent. BC. Approx. the same picture will be seen when we count the Rh. stamps which were found on the territory of the whole Bosphorus ⁹⁴ and even throughout all of the north Black Sea region, although the relations of Rhodes and the western centres of the north B. Sea region underwent somewhat different changes ⁹⁵ from its relations with the Bosphorus and Tanais. We must note only that the finds at Tanais attest to a certain stability in importing from Rhodes throughout the course of the greater part of the 2nd cent. BC and even a certain increase in the 2nd half of that cent. in comparison with the 2nd quarter of the cent. This indicates a similarity btwn the Tanais materials and the finds from the centres of the Asiatic Bosphorus, where we also observe a comparatively high activity in Rh. trade during the 2nd half of the 2nd cent. BC, as distinguished from the European side of the Bosphorus, where a more intensive curtailing of Bosphoro-Rhodian relations takes place after 220 BC. ⁹⁶ This also can serve to confirm our contention ~~about~~ about the chief relations of Tanais during the Hellenistic period with the centres of the Asiatic Bosphorus specifically.

We take up now the introductory text on the Rhodian class.

p.10

Chapter 1 - Rhodian Stamps.

It has been stated above that the Rhodian stamps constitute the basic and by far the most interesting group of Hellenistic period amphora stamps from Tanais. The overall number of them in our collection is 530. We do not include in this number several other stamps the Rhodian provenience of which can be presumed but cannot as yet be positively establish. [pp.150-1] These last stamps we have referred to the group of st. from unknown centers (see below).

As is well known, three informative elements are contained in Rh. st.: 1) the name of the ep. priest, which occurs in the genitive case and is usually preceded by the prep. ENI and sts. by ref. to the priestly function of the IEPEYZ although rarely, and particularly in early st., the name of the ep. can be placed on the st. without the prep.; 2) the name of the month of the Rh. calendar; 3) the name of the ergasteriarch, the name of the pottery owner, ¹ [usually now referred to as the fabricant] and we use it in this arbitrary way] usually in the gen. and less frequently in the nomin. case. These 3 elements which we have mentioned are distributed on 2 stamps which are found on the two handle of the amph.

More frequently in ^{one} ~~xxxxxx~~ st. we find the name of the ep. and the month, and in the other the name of the fab., however not infrequently the name of the month is placed not on the ep.'s but on the fab.'s stamp. In very rare instances both name are pl. in one st. then the name of the month occurs isolated on the other handle. In our collection there are 3 st. which contain only the names of the month (nos. 528-530), and one st. on which can be read 2 names, those of the ep. KPATIAAZ and the fab. ANTIFONOS (nos. 251). ² [Still another st. in which it wd. seem that 2 names are mentioned, no. 72, but the reading of this st. is v. difficult, see below for details] [In fact, it is a Knidian.]

All the remaining Rh. st. are distributed in the following way: eponyms, 250, fabs., 246, uncertain, (rubbed out or completely rubbed out), 30.

p.11

In shape, the Rh. stamps from Tanais can be subdivided into circular, rect., and rhomboid. The number of st. of the different forms is as follows [see table].

(p.11) In round ep. and fab st. on the side surface of the upper part of the handle there sts. can be found small supplementary st.s which we will discuss later. 11 such suppl. sts. were found in Tanais.

The name of months can be read on 204 stamps: [table] The intercalary month II. ΔΕΥΤ. has been excluded in making up our percentages.

The distrib. of Tanais st. according to months corresponds more or less with the usual distrib. of months on Rh. st., and reflects the vol. of the annual output of stamped amphoras on Rhodes. One is easily convinced of this fact when he compares the data cited above with the figures of the finds of Rh. st.s from any other excavations. For example, we will introduce here analogous statistical materials for 3 points (Table 1: from the excav.s of the cistern at Olbia,³ from . . . Mirmeki,⁴ and from . . . Phanagoria⁵ 1936-50.

If we are to indicate the materials that we will present in graphic form by placing along the axis of the ("abscisses") the names of the months in the order in which they occur in the Rh. calendar adopting the order est. by Nilsson, and along the axis of the ordinates, the percentage of seals that have been found with a ref. to each month, we will obtain 4 curves for the finds from Tanais, Olbia, Mirmeki, and Phanagoria.

p.12 The graph shows clearly that the volume of annual production of amphoras in Rhodes as it is reflected in the Tanais finds can be followed as well in the st. which have been found in other centers, and that the correspondence of the number of amphoras produced in the given months is a constant quantity in all the centers. The somewhat partial non-correspondence of the curves particularly in the right section of the graph, which corresponds to the months ΑΡΤΑΜΙΤΙΟΞ, ΑΡΡΙΑΝΙΟΞ, and ΥΑΚΙΝΘΙΟΞ probably can be explained by the comparatively small no. of seals which we have in these 4 places which gives the definite possibilities for accidental oscillations. Research with a considerably larger groups of finds would necessarily smooth out these accidental oscillations. We can find confirmation of this when we analyze the distr. of stamps acc. to months in such large serées as all the Rh. sta. found on the Bosphoros, all the st. from the north Bl. Sea coast and all the st. from Lindos. The distr. of Rh. st. of Bosphoran origin acc. to months was made by Y. S. Badalyans in his dissertation;

- (p.12) the count of references to the months on Rh. handles from all of the north B₁. Sea region was made by B.N.Grakov in his introductory study to the corresponding division of the ms. I.O.S.P.E. III;⁷ and finally M. Nilsson has assembled more than 3000⁸ references to Rh. months on stamps with which he was familiar. The graph which has^{these} been compiled from ~~this~~ data is similar to the preceding one (fig.2), it contains 3 almost identical curves very close to the curves of the preceding graph but free from accidental oscillations, inasmuch as the large no. of references to Rh. months (more than 2000 in each instance) guarantees in this case the reliability of percentile relations.
- (p.14)

The non-accidental character of these seasonal oscillations in the production of^{noted} amphoras was already mentioned by M. Nilsson.⁹ However the reasons for the oscillations have not been as yet conclusively established. M. Nilsson following several other researchers found them to be the result of the seasonal nature manufacture of pottery containers which depended on weather conditions more or less favorable for the drying¹⁰ of the amphoras. At the same time all the researchers rely on the suggestions of¹¹ ancient authors as regards the drying of tiles or bricks. This point of view prevails among scholars even at the present time. ~~May~~ Y. S. Krushkol expressed another opinion in relating the seasonal nature of the production of amphoras with the times of the high tide of wine and by drawing a conclusion from a count of the various months mentioned¹² on Rhodian stamps as to the predominance of the production of dry wines on Rhodes.^{attractive.}

The hypothesis of Y. S. Krushkol is very appealing. It would seem to explain the very need for stamping amphoras with the name of the month so that the purchaser might know about the type of wine he was acquiring. The adherents of the traditional point of view who connect the seasonal oscillations in the manufacture with the conditions of the drying of the amphoras are compelled to explain this demand (i.e. need for putting the name of the month on) by some fiscal considerations, by the need of facilitating supervision of the manufacture. This explanation is not very convincing and does not solve many difficult questions which arise. Take this characteristic instance for ex. If the indication of the month on the stamp was due to the demands of ~~the~~ fiscal control policies and was required by the governmental powers, then it would have to have been

(p.14) compulsory for all pottery workshops. And at the same time it is well known that originally¹⁷ on Rhodian stamps ~~the months~~ the month was not indicated. When they began to include the name of the month in the composition of the Rhodian stamp, which took place according to V. Grace around 275 B.C., for a rather long time some fabricants indicated the month while others did not.¹³ Such a selective and not overall procedure is characteristic for the pottery manufacture during the years of the eponyms ΔΙΑΩΝΙΑΑΣ, ΑΙΣΧΥΑΙΝΟΣ, ΕΞΧΑΡΗΣ, ΠΟΛΥΠΑΤΟΣ, ΕΥΚΑΗΣ and ΔΙΑΟΚΡΑΤΗΣ and would indicate rather the private enterprise and not governmental involvement in this custom, and cannot be explained by proceeding from the traditional concepts as to the seasonal nature of producing the amphora containers. Unexplained also are the omissions of references to the names of the months on later stamps,¹⁴ and the fact that the intercalary month II. deuterios sts. through inadvertence could be indicated simply as ΙΙΑΝΑΜΟΣ.¹⁵ The hypothesis of Y. S. Krushkol removes such questions.

p.15 But this hypothesis itself cannot be considered as proven. To substantiate it, it wd. be necessary to prove that the increased production of amphoras in Rhodes occurs precisely in those months when the essential high tide of wine takes place. Y.S. Krushkol does indeed attempt to contrast the productive wine-making cycle with the rise and fall in the m'f'r of amphora-containers by rejecting the dependence of this rise and fall on the seasonal nature of pottery m'f're. However at the same time it fails to take into consideration that the very order of the months in the Rh. calendar which it adopts was established by M. Nilsson chiefly on the basis of this dependence which it rejects.¹⁶ It is precisely the conviction that the number of stamps with an indication of one or another month depends on the seasonal nature of pottery m'f'r which lay at the basis of the calendar compiled by Nilsson. If we do not admit this connection, then it will be necessary to conclude that we are unable to establish the sequence of Rh. months.¹⁷ This is very well shown in a special work on calendars by V.V. Latyshev, which elaborates its own variant wh. coincides with the one that was created independently by E. Bischoff.¹ But when M. Nilsson who made wide use of the data about the number of stamps with the names of stamps elaborated his scheme, it was accepted by all scholars and E. Bischoff

(p.15) among them, who proceeding from epigraphical data only proposed that they ~~xxxxxxx~~ transfer the month Sminthios in M. Nilsson's scheme from the 6th to the 2nd position. Hence it is for the time being impossible to reject the point of view which holds that the number of stamps with the names of months depends on conditions of pottery m'f'r, ~~at~~ without at the same time upsetting our concept of the Rhodian calendar. Only the massing of new data about the Rhodian calendar which would be independent from the indications of the month on Rh. stamps would permit us to approach the solution of this problem.

19.IV.77

Y.S.Krushkol's hypothesis elicits one further difficulty: it assumes inevitably that both the eponym's year has been indicated in order to show a year when wine was particularly abundant, and that the second name on the Rh. st. belongs not to the owner of the pottery workshop but to some person who had to do with wine production or with the wine trade. Y.S. Krushkol also sees in these persons wine exporters and in this point he disagrees with all the existing scholarly tradition. The question is too complicated and it deserves special study based on the materials not only of the Rh. but also of other pottery stamps, all the more so because the functions of the persons indicated in other groups of amphora st. cannot up to the present be regarded as having been sufficiently explained.

21

p.16 In addition to the legend, Rh. st. contain occasionally depicted emblems. On round st. it is usually a pomegranate blossom, the Rh. "coat of arms" around wh. the legend is placed; less frequently in the center of the st. is the radiant head of Helios, and very rarely we encounter other emblems. For rectangular stamps, the emblems are not characteristic, infrequently we find only the head of Helios, while on the other hand on fabricant stamps they are very frequent, and at the same time many ergast.s constantly employ the same fixed symbol: Amyntas - a crown, Sokrates, a torch, Imas, Eukleitos and others - a caduceus, etc. Here is a list of the emblems on the stamps from Tanais (table 2) [table]

The majority of the emblems we have listed are quite common for Rh. st. A very rare emblem is the one of the eagle seated on a thunderbolt (no.354), which was encountered

(p.16) in the N Bl. Sea region a second time, at the first find the eagle was taken to be an owl.²² Comparatively rare also is the depiction of the double axe - labris, which occurs on the st. of Panchares (no.442).²³

p.17 The most important and at the same time the most difficult aspects in the study of Rh. amph. st. is their proper chronol. classification. Up to now there is still no complete chronol. classification of Rh. st., and by no means all Rh. amph. st. be^{can} definitely dated. None the less 80 percent of the Rh. st. found at Tanais can with more or less certainty be ~~fxs~~ referred to one or another chronol. group. Without dwelling here in detail on the means and methods of dating, we shall indicate only the basic principles ~~xxxxx~~ for the chronol. classification of Rh. st.

The publication ~~of~~ by (C.) Schuchhardt of the complex of amph. st. from Pergamon,²⁴ which are welldated from general historical considerations in a period about 220-180 B.C., permitted F. Bleckmann to estab. a group of Rh. eponyms and potters (erg.s), whose activities fall approx. in those years.²⁵ The finds of amph. st. in the ruins of Carthage wh. was destr. by the Romans in 146 B.C. made it possible for (him) to estab. a group of stamps belonging to a period between 180 and 146 B.C.²⁶ This grouping of st. by Bl. has remained basically unaltered even today despite certain errors and inaccuracies²⁷ Attempts to reconsider the dating of the Perg. complex have been on the whole unconvincing²⁸ After the works of F. Bleckmann there were discovered a few other welldated complexes of the same period as the Perg. complex, among them the most important are the remarkable collection of amphoras from Villanova on Rhodes,²⁹ the collection of Rh. st. from the cistern in the Olbia agora,³⁰ pottery st. from the constr. layer of the Central Stoa in the Agora in Athens.³¹ A detailed study of the st.s of this period in their various combinations and in the various finds enabled V. Grace to date more precisely many of them, and to propose a precise dating of the Perg. complex within the limits of 210-175 B.C.³² This last proposal can still not be regarded as completely established, but independently of whether or not it will be accepted, the general chronol. frame of both of F. Bleckmann's groups remain valid, slight oscillations of 5 to 10 years can have no essential significance.

By employing the stratigraphic data from the finds of Rh. amph. st. in Athens,

(p.17) Tarsus, Delos and other places, VG was able to distinguish groups of Rh. st.s that were both later and earlier than the st.s of the Perg. and Carthage complexes. In order to define the earliest Rh. sts. of the 4th and the beg. of the 3rd cent. B.C., a place of special importance is occupied by the complex of Rh. amphs. from the Koroni peninsula. although disputes are still carried on with regard to the dating of the complex, there can be no doubt about the fact that the monuments of ceramic epigraphy from this find ³³ ~~xxxxix~~ are to be placed at the very beginning of Rhodian stamping. Of extreme importance also was the discovery in Rhodes of a store of Rhodian amphoras of the time of the ep. NAYZANIAS I, approx. 275 B.C., which were found during the estr, of the Hotel Soleil, and which are as yet unpublished. In order to date the stamps of the "post-Perg. period", in addition to the Carthage finds one may also use the finds from Corinth which was destroyed in the same year as Carthage. As far as the amph. st.s of the second half of the 2nd cent. B.C. are concerned, they can usually be distinguished by the fact that they are not to be found in the earlier complexes. ³⁴

p.18

Definitive chronological indication might be found in the finds in Samaria which ceased to exist in 108 B.C., however the sta. from the excavations of this city were published very unqualifiedly and can be identified only with difficulty. ³⁵ ³⁸

Rh. sts. from the end of the 2nd and of the beginning of the 1st cent. B.C. can be easily distinguished owing to the finds in the layer of the Sulla-destruction of Athens, which have been widely used by VG for dating, and thanks also to the recently discovered complexes in Cosa and Alba Fucens in Italy. Finally, in order to determine later Rhodian st.s of the first half of the 1st cent. B.C., of great interest are the observations made in the investigation of the remains of an ancient shipwreck of this period along the shores of Antikythera. ³⁹ ⁴⁰

Basing herself chiefly on stratigraphic data, VG still in 1952 made a classification of almost all Rh. eponyms, distributing them into 6 chronol. groups. It is true that in making this classification she qualifies her remarks by saying that her data were applicable only to the stamps found in Delos, and that several of the names which she presents can appear as well in other chronological groups, inasmuch as in a series of instances several eponyms who lived at various times bore the same name. ⁴¹

(p.18) Actually we now know that among the names of the Rh. eps. there are many which are r
(for)
repeated two and even three times. Nonetheless, the distribution of Rh. eps. into
chronological groups VG provides firm basis for approximate dating (within the limits
p.19 of several decades) of a tremendous number of eponym stamps. Subsequently VG on the
basis of an analysis of new finds more than once has revised the whole list of eponyms
and the dating of the individual names.⁴²

Originally the chronol. classification of the Rh. eponyms acc. to VG looked like
this: ⁴³ [table] (Delos)

Later VG somewhat changed the limits of the first 2 groups by increasing the limits
of Group I to last until the middle of the 3rd cent. B.C., and by limiting Group II
to approx. the 3/4 of that century.⁴⁴ (Phyx) This distrib. of stamps in the first 2
groups has been accepted by us in our present study. In her study written jointly with
M. Sav.-Petr., VG once again has practically returned to her original into groups,
limiting Group I only to those eponyms whose names are unknown on stamps where months
are named, and establishing its end thus at some time around 275 B.C.⁴⁵ In the same
work she proposes to divide the final, that is the 6th chronol. group into two, actually
a Group VI which corresponds approx. to 108-80 B.C., and a seventh group wh. is to be
dated from 80 - 30 (?) B.C.⁴⁶ This division based entirely on observations of Knidian
amphoras, ~~xxxxxxxxxxxx~~ as far as Rh. sts. are concerned does not seem to us to be
sufficiently justified and we prefer to adhere to the former 6-part subdivision of the
list of Rh. eponyms, all the more so since the stamps of the last group, Group VI, are
on the whole extremely scarce in our finds.

In distributing the names of Rhodian eponyms into chronological groups, VG started
out not only from the stratigraphic data of the finds of the sts. She also employed
methods of relative dating, and among them the determining of the period of a stamp by
the shape of the amphora on which it was found. The evolution of the shapes of Rh.
amphoras and their parts particularly their handles, which has been studied by VG⁴⁷
and other scholars,⁴⁸ sts. permits us to determine an approx. chronological place for
a vessel and the stamps found on it. In particular, Rh. amphs. of the 1st chronol.
group can be easily distinguished by these characteristics. The use of this method of

(p.19) dating which B.N.Grakov called morphological has enabled us to determine chronologically a whole series of stamps found at Tanais, even in those instances when the name on the stamp cannot be read (for ex., no.237, 502, 529).

p.20 Some it is true very limited data for the dating of Rh. stamps is given by materials of an iconographic and paleographic character. This wide use in round Rh. sta. of the radiant head of ⁴⁹Helios as an emblem can be observed in the second half of the 2nd cent. B.C., and the depiction of the same head on rect. ep. stamps to the left of the inscr. is characteristic acc. to our observations for sts. of the last third of the 3rd cent. B.C. (no. 3, 70, 101, 120, 194, 209). In some instances, supplementary ~~from~~ chronol. criteria can be found in the shape and proportions of the letters in the legend of the stamp, in the way the legend is divided into lines, and in the corresp. bet. the inscr. and the emblem on the st., etc. ⁵⁰ We shall employ these criteria chiefly when it is necessary to distinguish the homonyms among the Rh. eponyms and fabricants.

The paleographic method of dating can be employed only in combination with other data; attempts to use it independently have led only to errors. Thus A. Dumont on the basis of paleographic observations, attempted to date some Rh. stamps of the beginning of the 2nd century B.C. as of the 4th cent. B.C. ⁵¹

The stamps of the Rh. ergasts. can be dated with even greater difficulty than the ep. sts. So far there exists no general compilation of fabricants' names with a break-down into chronol. groups similar to the one made by VG with regards to the names of the ep.s. In order to establish a chronology of fab.s' names, of extreme importance is the determining of the pairs of names of ep.s and fabricants which appear in a single stamp or in the stamps of a single amphora. Instances of such synchronism were already noted and utilized for dating by F. Bleckmann. ⁵² F. Hiller von Gaertringen, J. Paris, ⁵³ and E.M.Pridik ⁵⁴ devoted their special attention to these problems. As a result of much work, VG in 1934 in publishing the stamps from the Athenian Agora, was able to provide a table of correspondences of Rh. fab.s and ep.s. ⁵⁵ 53 such correspondences which include 32 names of Rh. ep.s and 24 names of ergast.s appear in it. ⁵⁶ Even at this time it was already known that there existed a somewhat larger number of correspondences, but in the individual cases the correspondence of the names had not been established completely

(p.20) convincingly. In some old editions which refer to intact amphoras with two stamps the reading of the stamps is subject to doubt, which fact obviously caused VG not to include many of the pairs which are referred to in the literature in her table. This has to do ~~with~~ in particular with a very imp. publication of intact Rh. amphoras⁵⁷ from the Metrop. Museum which was made with insufficient qualification by Hall.

p. 21 VG was able to check a part of the stamps publ. by Hall and to ~~imminex~~ make the necessary corrections in reading them,⁵⁸ however part of the amphoras in this collection remained inaccessible to her. Doubts are elicited as well by several readings⁵⁹ which appear in the old publications of Hiller v.G., J. Paris, E.M.Pridik. And still in a series of instances by employing the whole inventory of data which is now available to us for the dating of Rh. St.s, it is poss. quite definitely to accept or reject one or another of these old correspondences. Thus even the use of data which ~~has~~ ^{have} long since been familiar with regard to the synchronism of several names can be applied now with significantly more assurance than VG was able to do in her time.

The supplementing and revision of the table of correspondences of ep. and fab. names appears to be an impending task, even more so because of the fact that in VG's table which was compiled in 1934, a large group of names was given an erroneous relative dating. At that time it was assumed that the eponyms who had to do with the ~~ergast.s~~⁵⁹ Agathoboulos, Drakontidas and Nidas, precede the time of the Perg. complex. As a matter of fact, as VG establ. later, they refer⁶⁰ already to the second half of the 2nd century B.C. The early stamps of the first and second chronological groups do not seem to have been reflected at all at that time in the table. Moreover we now know of ~~the~~ the existence of many homonyms among the Rh. ep.s and fab.s, which now enables us to clarify the data on the correspondence of the names. The imp. fact is that during the last decades the material accessible to us had grown with enormous proportions, above all as a result of the reworking by VG herself of the new finds from various regions of the ancient world. An approximate count indicates that now we know of no less than 150 combinations of names of fabricants and eponyms, i.e. three times greater than had been assumed by scholars in 1934. Consequently the dating of many stamps, particularly fabricant stamps, with regard to the names is one of the basic methods of establishing

(p.21) a chronology and is employed by us in connection with many stamps from the Tanais collection.

The corresp. of the names of the ergasts. and the eponyms can now ^{be} ^{ed} establish through a series of characteristics such as unique paleographic and breaking-down data [i.e. apparently the way the legends are arranged] (within the limits of narrow groups) the presence of supplementary stamps or cases of erroneous impositions of stamps one upon another. However of course the main source of our information in this problem remains the finding of intact or broken amphoras which preserve both handles with both stamps. Such finds can now be numbered in the hundreds and they provide us with a basic concept of the interrelation of the names of the eponyms and the ergasts.

20.IV.77

The finds from Tanais also are quite interesting in this regard. They provide us with 8 combinations of the names of eps. and ergs., 2 of which repeat combinations which were known earlier, while 6 of them are new.

p.22

First of all it should be noted ~~that~~ st. no.251, to which we have already referred, and wh. contains the names of the ep. of chronol. grp III, KPATIAAZ and the fab. ANTIFONOS. A st. with this comb. of names was already known to F. Bleckmann, ⁶¹ but VG in her table of name-combs. for some reason does not indicate this pair. Nor is there anything new about the comb. of the names of the ergast. APIETOKANZ (no.288) and of the ep. APXIAAIAAZ ⁶² (no.77), which we find on the amphora excavated by P.M.Leontieff in the Tanais necropolis. This combination is known also on the stamps of 2 other intact jars. ⁶³ However the comb. of the names of the same APXIAAIAAZ (no.78) and the ergast. AMYNTAZ (no.264) is encountered for the first time and confirms the dating of the fab. sts. of AMYNTAZ at the beginning of the 2nd cent. B.C. We also encounter for the first time the comb. of the names of the ep. APIETON (no. 68) with the name of the ergast. AIOZ (no. 326) and of the ep. name APIETOAMMOZ (no.54) with the female name of the proprietress of a pottery KAAAIK (no.378). The dating of the amphoras of AIOZ and KAAAIK at the time of the Petg. complex could have been estab. even without these correspondences, our pairs of names only serve to

(p.22) confirm and estab. a more precise chronol. for these amphoras, in particular they enable us to refer the stamp of KAAAIΩ to the 2/2 of the "Perg. period", to 200 to 180 B.C. Much more important are 3 other combinations of names: of the ep. ΑΣΤΥΜΗΔΗΣ II (no.87) and the fab. ΕΥΚΑΕΙΤΟΣ (no.351), of the ep. ΜΕΝΟΦΑΝΤΟΣ (no.168) and the fab. ΣΙΜΙΑΣ (no.451), of the ep. ΑΡΙΣΤΕΙΔΑΣ (no.40) and the fab. ΜΕΝΕΚΡΑΤΗΣ (no.405). In the first 2 instances these combinations enable us to determine the time of the activities of the workshops of ΕΥΚΑΕΙΤΟΣ and ΣΙΜΙΑΣ, for the dating of whose output we had had no data. As far as ΜΕΝΕΚΡΑΤΗΣ is concerned, the T. n. amph. with his stamp dated by the name of the ep. ΑΡΙΣΤΕΙΔΑΣ, attests the fact that he worked at the beginning of the 1st cent. B.C., and is to be distinguished from the fab. of the same name whose activities took place in the middle or the 3/4 of the 3rd cent. B.C. 64 (Phyx)

A supplementary method for synchronizing ep. and fab. names and a relative dating of st.s can also be found in a study of the so-called secondary st.s wh. are st.s found together with the primary stamps on the handles of Rh. amphoras. These sec. st., wh. have been noted occasionally by scholars, 65 but have never constituted an object of special study, can in our opinion serve as an approx. chronol. indicator. It is true that our orig. dating of these stamps in the period of the Perg. complex 66 turned out to be too restricted. At the present time it must be admitted that these stamps began to be used at the very end of the 3rd century B.C. and existed throughout the course of almost all of the 2nd cent. B.C., however their more or less regular use is to be referred to the first quarter of that century. 67 [D.B.Shelov, "Sec. st.s. on Rh. amphs.", Melanges offerts a K. Michalofsky, Warsaw 1966, pp.666-667.]

In a series of instances on the basis of comparing sec. st.s, it is possible to form a synchronization of fab. and ep. names which have been indicated on primary st.s that are accompanied by secondary ones. 68 The methodology wh. we have suggested for such a synchronization was greeted by positive response, 69 but however practice shows that such comparisons must be made with extreme caution. It is hardly possible, for ex., to consider as conclusive the comb. of the names of the ep. ΝΙΚΑΓΑΓΟΡΑΣ and the fab. ΑΡΙΣΤΟΚΛΗΣ merely on the basis of the fact that on their st.s there also happens to be the same sec. st. (B in rect.). 70 Such a simple sec. st. can be found with various

71

(p.23) names. In our collection in particular the sec. st.s ⁷² occurs on the handle with the primary st. of the fab. ΜΗΠΟΚΡΑΤΗΣ (no.372). In this connection it is imp. to know as well the sec. st. no. 369 from Tanais. This st. consists of the letter P and ~~infixes~~ of a small star at the right of it. All these st.s we have considered as belonging to the workshop of ΑΠΙΣΤΟΚΡΑΤΗΣ, but the Tanais suppl. st. accompanied the primary st. of the ergast. ΜΗΠΟΚΡΑΤΗΣ. This does not change the datings of several ep.s wh. have been estab. by us, of ep.s connected with similar sec. st.s, since the activities of the ergast.s ΑΠΙΣΤΟΚΡΑΤΗΣ and ΜΗΠΟΚΡΑΤΗΣ coincide in time, however it requires us to approach with greater caution the linking of the names of ergast.s and ep.s on the basis of an identity of sec. st.s. Of course the recurrence of more complicated st.s (like the monograms of the fab. ΕΥΣΠΑΝΣΡ, (no. 355) is far less probable. Acc. to information furnished by VG, Lucas Benaki, who was the possessor of the largest collection in the world of Rh. st.s, which he has now given to the Alexandria museum, provided her with a great amount of material for work on the synchronization of Rh. ep.s and fab.s on the basis of comparing sec. st.s. ⁷³ Unfortunately the results of the research on this material have not as yet been published.

p.24 In the study of VG and M. Sav.-Petr., the suggestion is made that sec. st.s in their usual form were introduced for the 1st time in 188 B.C. ⁷⁴ This date has even been adopted as the starting point for establishing the end of the "Perg. period". However this dating has no basis except for general considerations about "the great Rhodian expansion on the continent." Thus the earliest sec. sts. which appeared on the amphoras of the ergast. ΑΙΣΚΟΞ at the turn of the 3rd and 2nd cent.s B.C. ⁷⁵ which are abundantly represented in the Villanova complex, turn out to be isolated from the other sec. st.s which appeared as it were only 12 to 15 years afterward. We find this proposal not to be very convincing, and we continue to believe that the sec. st.s of ΑΙΣΚΟΞ, which were placed alongside the primary sts, were indeed ^{the earliest} ~~xxxxxxxearlier~~ attempt to introduce this sec. indication-factor and that a significant chronol. break between the stamps of ΑΙΣΚΟΞ and the other suppl. st.s ought not to be hypothesized. ⁷⁶

Correspondingly, it is scarcely possible with the assertion that sec. st.s were rarely ^{to agree} ⁷⁷ used at the beginning of the 3rd cent. B.C. on the amphoras of the fab. ΣΤΑΞ. It is

(p.24) true that VG has reconsidered her original dating of these stamps, and now refers them \times to a later ergast. of this name who worked in the 2/2 of the 2nd cent. B.C., however she continues to consider as possible the existence of such st.s on the amphoras con-
temp. with ESTAZ I. ⁷⁸ Obviously this is also an error.

In our Tanais collection there are 11 sec. st.s on Rh. handles. 9 of them are found on handles on which the primary st. has been lost or cannot be read (nos. 524-527), one of them accompanies the ep. st. of AYTOKPATHZ (no.91) and 6 of them appear with the stamps of the ergast.s EYOPANZP (no.355), HHIOKPATHZ (no.369-372) and TIMOEENOZ (no.466).

In discussing the dating of Rh. st.s, we will refer also to the so-called cursive st.s. There are 6 such st.s in our collection: with the names of the ep.s ANTHIATPOZ (no.27), AAMOKPATHZ (no.99), TIMOEEOZ (no.216), TIMOKAHZ (no.222), and two wh. cannot be read (no.232, 236). The names of all these ep.s, except for TIMOEEOZ, have already been
⁷⁹ encountered on cursive st.s. The st. of TIMOEEOZ is interesting in that it contains ^{does not} the indication of the priestly function of the ep., which is usually present in cursive st.s although the other characteristics of this grp of st.s are present on it. Thus we have confirmation of Y.S.Badalyans' observation about the existence of cursive st.s
⁸⁰ on which there is absent an indication of the priestly dignity.

When in 1956 we distinguished for the 1st time a group of cursive eponymous stamps, we proposed that all of these stamps had come from one workshop or even from the ~~hands~~
hands of a single master whose activities we referred to the 2/4 of the 2nd century
⁸¹ B.C. I. B. Brashinsky proposed a later dating for this group, referring it to the
⁸² 2/2 of the same century. Probably this dating is more correct. In proposing our dating for this group of stamps, we proceeded from the fact that the ep.s AAMOKPATHZ II and ANTHIATPOZ, whose names are found on cursive stamps, belong to the time of the
⁸³ Carthaginian complex. However recently VG has estab. that the activities of these
⁸⁴ ep.s refer already to the end of the 2nd cent. B.C. (no.27, 99). One shd also date in the 2/2 or the end of the same cent. the activities of the ep.s AIXINAZ, APIETPATOZ, NAYENHIOZ, TIMOKAHZ II, APOPANAE, APIETONOMOZ, APIETAKOZ (np.10, 36, 63, 222). To determine the time of the other ep.s whose names are present on cursive stamps, - ANTIMAKOZ, AAMEN, ANTIAOKOZ, "XONTIOZ" - there are no firm bases, although several of

(p.25) them were indeed referred by VG to her chron. grp. IV. There are still left the ep.s APIETEIAAZ and APATONANHZ, whose names are attested to on the handles of amphoras of the Perg. complex. However as far as APATONANHZ is concerned, it has now been estab. that ⁸⁵ there were 2 ep.s of this name (no.28), the second of whom exercised the functions of ep. at the end of the 2nd cent. B.C.; it is he obviously who is referred to on the cursive stamps. As far as APIETEIAAZ is concerned, in all probability one must return to the hypothesis of F. Hiller v.G., who distinguished in the 2nd cent. B.C. 2 ep.s of ⁸⁶ this name: 1) of the period of the Perg. complex, and the other a later one, who is ⁸⁷ referred to in the cursive stamps. (no.40). Our objections against such a classification must now be withdrawn. Thus nothing contradicts referring the whole group of cursive ep. stamps to the end of the 2nd cent. B.C., that is to the end of chronol. grp V or even to the beginning of VG's grp VI. This group of stamps retains its significance as a ^{the} dating factor, however naturally it establishes ~~time in a different way~~ of the materials connected with it differently from what we have assumed earlier.

The redating of the group of cursive ep. st.s enables us to pay careful attention to ⁸⁸ the attempts to compare these stamps with the fab. st.s of ΔΡΡΟΖ (no.334). In acknowledging that all cursive st.s came from a single workshop, it is more probable to assume that they belong to the workshop of ΔΡΡΟΖ, although of course complete conviction of this fact can be obtained only after the finding of the handles of an amphora that are indisputably connected with each other, and which contained an ep. cursive stamp and a cursive st. of the ergast. ΔΡΡΟΖ.

p.26 In applying all the methods of dating Rhodian st.s which we have listed above to the objects found in Tanais, we can chronologically determine within the limits of certain periods all of the ep. st.s which can be read and the overwhelming majority of fab. st.s, in all, 432 st.s out of the total of 530. These st.s can be divided into chronol. grps as follows: [table]

Inasmuch as the time sectors corresponding to chronol. grps. are unequal, to determine the intensity of the importing of Rhodian amphoras into Tanais at various periods it is necessary to divide the number of stamps of each chronol. grp into the approx. ~~no. of years covers~~

(p.26) no. of years covered by the corresponding period. The annual coefficient obtained will give us an idea of the increase or decline of the import^{ing}: [table]

Of course these figures are to, a certain extent arbitrary inasmuch as in the first place the very limits of the chronol. periods and the no. of years in each period are approximate, and in the second place one or another stamp can by no means always be referred precisely to one or another period. Nevertheless the annual coefficient (volume) obtained thereby permits us to form a more accurate idea of the dynamics of the trade.

R. Burgi, PMWM typing

(25.IV.77)

The figures we have just presented indicate that the importing of merchandise in Rhodian amphoras to Tanais took place continuously throughout the course of two centuries -- the 3rd and 2nd BC. We have already had occasion to remark about the presence of Rhod. stamps in Tanais, stamps dating from the very beginning of the

89
3rd century BC. Rhodian amphoras were delivered to Tanais quite regularly, although not in very large quantities, throughout all of the 3rd century BC.

A sharp increase in Rhodian imports occurs in the first decades of the 2nd cent. BC. Chronological group III of Rhodian stamps, which can be dated approximately 220-180 BC, is represented by the largest number of finds and the annual co-efficient of this group exceeds the co-efficient of the preceding groups by five times. In fact the increase in intensity of importation at the beginning of the 2nd cent. BC was much more significant, inasmuch as the overwhelming majority of stamps of group III belongs to the 2nd half of the "Perg. period", i.e. to the first two decades of the 2nd cent. BC. If we take this fact into consideration then the annual co-efficient of these two decades increases significantly since the co-eff. of the earlier "Perg." group declines.

p. 27 (importing)
The idea that further imports into Tanais of Rhod. amphora containers in the (was) 2nd century BC were maintained at the same high level as in the first decades of that century was deduced by us from a preliminary inspection of the materials and (total) 90 from a summary tabulation of the stamps, but however turned out to be inaccurate.

As a matter of fact, as the annual co-efficients indicate, the flow of Rhod. amphoras into Tanais although indeed it did continue throughout all of the 2nd century BC on quite a considerable scale does not attain subsequently the full developement that it had in 200-180 BC. By the end of the century this importing is sharply curtailed -- the final group of stamps which corresponds with the last years of the 2nd century BC and the first half of the first cent. BC, is represented by a relatively small number of finds and a comparatively low co-efficient. At the same time we must keep in mind that all the stamps which can be referred to this group belong to the beginning of the period -- to the end of the 2nd and the turn of the 2nd/1st cent. BC.

It would be very interesting to compare these results which have to do with the dynamics of importing Rhod. amphora containers into Tanais with the corresponding data for all other north Black Sea centres particularly for the cities of the Bosphorus. Unfortunately such a comparison would involve considerable difficulties. In the first place the number of Rh. stamps which have been found in many centres (Nympheion, Gorgitsia, Tiritakos, Kepai, et al.), are far too few to use these sta.s for a comparative statistical tabulation. In the 2nd place the chronological classification of the Rh. sta.s acc. to the individual centres where they were found has been begun only recently by Y. S. Badalyants and refers almost exclusively to eponym stamps. At this point we can contrast the data of the finds of Rh. stamps of various periods for four Bosphorus cities -- Pantikapeios, Phanagoria, Mirmeki, Theodosia. The counts of stamps from the last two centres ^{were} published by Y.S. Badalyants, ⁹¹ the counts of Pantikapeion and Phanagoria finds were presented in his unpublished doctoral dissertation. ⁹² The utilisation for numerical comparison of our own publications of stamps from Pantikapeios and Phanagoria ⁹³ is impossible since they do not contain complete numerical data according to groups and furthermore deal with only part of the material covered in the research of Y.S. Badalyants. The use of the annual co-eff. in comparing the finds of the various cities is not very wise since the magnitude of the co-eff. will be influenced by the ^{from}

differences in the overall no. of stamps found at one or another point. For this reason we will limit ourselves to presenting on our graph the no. of finds and the percentile indicators (table 3). At the same time we must bear in mind that the graph shows not the general no. of finds of Rh. stamps at a given centre but only the no. of stamps which are mainly eponym stamps [table 3] and which were established chronologically by Y.S. Badalyants.

The comparison of these figures internally and contrasting them with the figures for the finds of Rh. stamps at Tanais indicate that the overall dynamics of trade relations with Rhodes in all of these cities was approx. the same: slight, but continuous relations during the 3rd cent. BC, a sharp increase toward the end of the cent. and at the beginning of the 2nd cent. BC, a noticeable decline in the last decades and complete decline toward the end of the 2nd cent. BC. Approx. the same picture will be seen when we count the Rh. stamps which were found on the territory of the whole Bosphorus ⁹⁴ and even throughout all of the north Black Sea region, although the relations of Rhodes and the western centres of the north B. Sea region underwent somewhat different changes from its relations with the Bosphorus and Tanais. ⁹⁵ We must note only that the finds at Tanais attest to a certain stability in importing from Rhodes throughout the course of the greater part of the 2nd cent. BC and even a certain increase in the 2nd half of that cent. in comparison with the 2nd quarter of the cent. This indicates a similarity btwn the Tanais materials and the finds from the centres of the Asiatic Bosphorus, where we also observe a comparatively high activity in Rh. trade during the 2nd half of the 2nd cent. BC, as distinguished from the European side of the Bosphorus, where a more intensive curtailing of Bosphoro-Rhodian relations takes place after 220 BC. ⁹⁶ This also can serve to confirm our contention ~~about~~ about the chief relations of Tanais during the Hellenistic period with the centres of the Asiatic Bosphorus specifically.

D.B.Shelov, Pottery Stamps from Tanais, 3rd - 1st centuries B.C., Moscow, 1975.

We translate the passages cited by Riley, for the stamps found at Benghazi.

(Riley's catalog, selected)

p.34

On no.23. Andronaikos is one of the eponyms of the 2nd cent. B.C. He is dated
either as 180-150 B.C.,⁴⁴ or rather as the second half of the century.⁴⁵ His name has
been established rather probably on the stamp of ΑΓΑΘΟΒΥΑΟΞ.⁴⁶

On no.25. The die of this stamp is cut from one that has already been used: the
remains of the earlier inscr. are visible.

p.47

On no.86. The stamp on the handle of a very small amphoriskos. The handle ^{sub-} ~~was~~
sequently served as a polisher. (?) There were no less than 3 eponyms of this name.
Astymedes 1st belonged to a period which preceded the Pergamon complex, the activities
of A. 2nd occurred in the period of 180-150 B.C.¹³⁰ This The last eponym is known not only
from stamps but also from the testimony of Polybios.¹³¹ This has enabled us to clarify
the time when he exercised the functions of eponymous priest to 170-150 B.C.¹³² It is
true that V.Grace¹³³ is now inclined to consider that the term of office as eponym for
A. 2nd falls in the period which does not precede but follows immediately after 150 B.C.,
but she produces no justification for such a redating. The name of this eponym occurs
on both Tanais stamps, in the one which is now being described and on the following
one. Of course there was still another eponym, A. 3, who can be dated in the 1st cent.
B.C.,¹³⁴ and is probably identical with A. son of Dorotheos, priest of Lindian Athena
in 46 B.C.¹³⁵

50
p.100#1

On no. 100. The stamp with the name of the eponym ΔΟΡΚΥΑΙΔΑΞ is found in the
Pergamon complex,¹⁵⁴ and the eponym can be dated 220-180.¹⁵⁵ Judging by the presence
in many rectangular stamps of D. of the representation of the full-face head of Helios
(no.101), D. exercised the functions of priest-eponym rather at the end of the 3rd
than at the beginning of the 2nd century B.C.

p.51

The stamp was published by P.M.Leontieff¹⁵⁶ and E.M.Pridik¹⁵⁷ who however did not
read the name of the month.

p.85

On no.271. The stamp was published by P.M.Leontieff⁴¹⁴ and E.M.Pridik⁴¹⁵. The name of the ergasteriarch Antimachos is one of the most frequently encountered. It is always placed in rectangular stamps accompanied by the emblem of a caduceus. Such stamps are found in a significant number in the Pergamon complex⁴¹⁶ and in the cistern of the agora of Olbia,⁴¹⁷ which makes us refer⁴¹⁸ the activities of this m'f'r to 230-180 B.C. We are further led to this dating by encountering A. stamps on the same amphs. with the stamps of the eps. Athanodotos and Pratophanes (no.6, 186).⁴¹⁹ E.M.Pridik has indicated the existence of an amphora of A. with a stamp which contains the name of the ep. AAEIMAXOZ.⁴²⁰ If this is the case, then we must recognize the fact that the activities of A.'s workshop outlived the chronological frame of the Pergamon complex and continued on in the second quarter of the 2nd cent, B.C., to which period the ep. Aleximachos is referred. But inasmuch as the reading of the name of A. on the amph. cited by E.M.Pridik is conjectural, for the time being it wd. be more prudent to date the activities of this m'f'r in the period of the Pergamon complex.

p.97

On nos.329-30. The ergasteriarch (Drakontidas) can be dated securely in the second half of the 2nd cent, B.C. on the basis of the contemporaneity of these stamps with the stamps of the eponyms of Group V, APXEMBOTOZ 1, AAEELIAS, and APIZTAKOZ.⁵¹³

p.112

On no. 413. MOXKOZ with branch. For the time being it is difficult to date the stamps of the m'f'r Moschos. E.I.Levi thinks that the st. of M. found in the Olbia cistern must precede the period of the Pergamon complex, in which such stamps were not found. She proceeds from the shape of the handle and the script of the seal.⁶¹⁴ However, there are ~~xxxx~~ stamps with this name which have been executed with a very careless script, retrograde, with a lunate sigma, etc.⁶¹⁵ Moreover the absence of Moschos stamps in Pergamon in itself cannot serve as a basis ~~for~~ against referring them to the period of the Perg. complex.

Selection for Rhodi catalog

to translate the passages cited by Riley, for the stamps found at Benghazi.

p. 34

On no.23. Andronaikos is one of the eponyms of the 2nd cent. B.C. He is dated
 44 45
 either as 180-150 B.C., or rather as the second half of the century. His name has
 46
 been established rather probably on the stamp of ΑΓΑΘΟΒΟΥΛΟΣ.

On no. 25. The die of this stamp is cut from one that has already been used: the remains of the earlier inscr. are visible.

p. 47

On no.86. The stamp on the handle of a very small amphoriskos. The handle ~~now~~ subsequently served as a polisher. (?) There were no less than 3 eponyms of this name. Astymedes 1st belonged to a period which preceded the Pergamon complex, the activities of A. 2nd occurred in the period of 180-150 B.C. The last eponym is known not only from stamps but also from the testimony of Polybios. This has enabled us to clarify the time when he exercised the functions of eponymous priest to 170-150 B.C. It is true that V.Gracey is now inclined to consider that the term of office as eponym for A. 2nd falls in the period which does not precede but follows immediately after 150 B.C., but she produces no justification for such a redating. The name of this eponym occurs on both Tanais stamps, in the one which is now being described and on the following one. Of course there was still another eponym, A. 3, who can be dated in the 1st cent. B.C., and is probably identical with A. son of Dorotheos, priest of Lindian Athena in 46 B.C.

50
pp. 1000-1

On no. 100. The stamp with the name of the eponym ΔΟΡΚΥΑΙΑΔΕΣ is found in the Pergamon complex, and the eponym can be dated 220-180. Judging by the presence in many rectangular stamps of D. of the representation of the full-face head of Helios (no. 101), D. exercised the functions of priest-eponym rather at the end of the 3rd than at the beginning of the 2nd century B.C.

p. 51

The stamp¹⁵⁵ was published by P.M.Leontieff¹⁵⁷ and E.M.Pridik who however did not read the name of the month.

p.85

Antimachos

On no.271. The stamp was published by P.M.Leontieff⁴¹⁴ and E.M.Pridik.⁴¹⁵ The name of the ergasteriarch Antimachos is one of the most frequently encountered. It is always placed in rectangular stamps accompanied by the emblem of a caduceus. Such stamps are found in a significant number in the Pergamon complex⁴¹⁶ and in the cistern of the agora of Olbia,⁴¹⁷ which makes us refer the activities of this m'f'r to 220-180 B.C. We are further led to this dating by encountering A. stamps on the same amphis.⁴¹⁸ with the stamps of the eps. Athanodotos and Pratophanes (no.6, 186). E.M.Pridik has indicated the existence of an amphora of A. with a stamp which contains the name of the ep. AAEEMAXOZ.⁴¹⁹ If this is the case, then we must recognize the fact that the activities of A.'s workshop outlived the chronological frame of the Pergamon complex and continued on in the second quarter of the 2nd cent, B.C., to which period the ep. Aleximachos is referred.⁴²⁰ But inasmuch as the reading of the name of. A. on the amph. cited by E.M.Pridik is conjectural, for the time being it wd. be more prudent to date the activities of this m'f'r in the period of the Pergamon complex.

p.97

On nos.329-30. The ergasteriarch (Drakontidas) can be dated securely in the second half of the 2nd cent, B.C. on the basis of the contemporaneity of these stamps with the stamps of the eponyms of Group V, APXEMBOTOZ 1, AAEZIAZ, and APIZTAKOZ.⁵¹³

p.112

On no. 413. MOEXOZ with branch. For the time being it is difficult to date the stamps of the m'f'r Moschos. E.I.Levi thinks that the st. of M. found in the Olbia cistern must precede the period of the Pergamon complex, in which such stamps were not found.⁶¹⁴ She proceeds from the shape of the handle and the script of the seal. However, there are ~~xxxi~~ stamps with this name which have been executed with a very careless script, retrograde, with a lunate sigma, etc.⁶¹⁵ Moreover the absence of Moschos stamps in Pergamon in itself cannot serve as a basis ~~for~~ against referring them to the period of the Perg. complex.

sup. *Apri 2010* *2010*
p.45 On no. 77 [reading] around a blossom

118

The stamp on one of the handles of an intact Rh. amphora from Mound 7 of the excavations of P.M. Leontiev was published by L. Stefani and E.M. Pridik.

119

On the other handle is the stamp of the fabricant Aristokle^s (no. 288). The same combination of names of eponym and fabricant are known on two other amphoras, one of which is in the Cyprus museum and the other from the grave of Khan-El-Azal near Aleppo ~~in the~~ ^{in the} Damascus museum.

120

On the Cyprus amphora there is a secondary stamp. This requires us to date the eponym Arch^{id}idas not during the whole period of the Pergamon complex as one might be led to think if one started out from the fact that stamps of Archi. were found in Pergamon, but in a narrower sector of time -- 200-180 BC.

121

122

No mention that

On file for Pridik

is in fragment

sup. *Apri 2010*
On no. 78 T-66 R. III Burial 237 No. 25

p.46 A stamp on one of the handles of an intact amphora. On the other handle is the stamp of the fabricant Amyntas (no. 264). The amphora has been published.

123

o. file for Brashinsky, but could not find it!

p.47 On no. 87 A stamp of Astymedes II.

p.48 On the other handle of the same fragmented amphora was the stamp of the ergasteriarch^{os} EYKAEITOIY (no. 351) A.I. Boltunova perfectly correctly dated this amphora at 180-150 BC.

136

NEW

p.64 On no. 168 A stamp on the handles of an intact amphora; on the other handle is the stamp with the name of the fabricant Simmias (no. 451). There were no less than two

Eponyms (see comment w. Brashinsky)

eponymous Rh. priests with the name Xenophantos. The first of these has been referred by VG to Group II of eponyms, his priesthood has been dated approx the middle of the 3rd cent. BC.

270

271

p.65 To him belong the stamps which have been found in great numbers during the excavations of the Ath. Agora. Xenophantos II was dated by Bleckmann during the period of the Pergamon complex, but VG puts him in the following period, 180-150 BC. In Pergamon itself

271

272

was found one stamp with this name which was wrongly identified by K. Schuchardt as a stamp of Xenophanes. Xenophantos II is referred to in stamps found on Delos, and it is

273

274

his name which appears on the stamp on an amphora which has on its other handle the name

X

275

p. 65 of the fabricant Hippokrates. Finally we know of a stamp of Xenophantos II which is accompanied by a secondary stamp. Obviously this eponym to whom our stamp also belongs was active at the very end of the "Pergamon period", in the '80s of the 2nd cent. BC. However we do not exclude the possibility that among the stamps of X. II there will subsequently be distinguished stamps of two magistrates, one of whom can still be referred to the period of the Pergamon complex, and the other to a period after 180 BC.

for file for Brashinsky

p.83 No. 264 ^{*Amyntas*} [reading] wreath

A stamp on the handle of an intact amphora, on its other handle is found the eponym stamp ΕΠΙ ΑΡΧΙΑΙΔΑ ΕΜΙΝΟΙΟΥ (no. 78). The synchronisation of the names of this eponym and the fabricant Amyntas which was 1st established by our amphora confirms the referring of the activity of the latter to the first two decades of the 2nd cent. BC (no. 263). ⁴⁰³ [In 1961 during the excavations of the mounds on the right bank of the Manych River M. G. Moshkova found a shattered amphora with two stamps on the handles: ΑΜΥΝΤΑ and ΑΡΙΣΤΟΚΛΕΟΥ ΕΜΙΝ ΥΑΚΙΝΘΙΟΥ. This combination of names confirms our dating (see no. 66)] [See p. 32 of present typescript]

p.88 No. 288 ^{*Αριστοκλ. 288*} [reading] around a blossom

A stamp on one of the handles of an intact Rh. amphora, from Mound 7 of the excavations of P.M. Leontiev and published by Pridik. ⁴⁴⁴ On the other handle is the eponym stamp ΕΠΙ ΑΡΧΙΑΙΔΑ ΑΔΑΙΟΥ (no. 77). This combination of stamps on amphoras has been encountered before. ⁴⁴⁵ The ergasteriarch Aristokles is one of those whose stamps are found particularly often. Seven of his stamps were found in Pergamon. ⁴⁴⁶ The presence on amphoras from the workshop of Aristokles of stamps of the eponyms ⁴⁴⁷ Aristonos, ⁴⁴⁸ Archilaidas, and ⁴⁴⁹ Aratophanes I also point to the period of the Pergamon complex. The stamps of this fabricant are very frequently accompanied by ⁴⁵⁰ secondary stamps which usually contain a single letter. This enables us to refer the time of the activities of the erg. Aristokles as well as the eponyms referred to

p.89

p. 89 to the first two decades of the 2nd cent. BC. ⁴⁵¹ Obviously there was also an
earlier fabricant with the same name. ⁴⁵²

p.96 No. 326 ^{Δίος} A stamp on the handle of an intact amphora, on the other handle is the eponym
stamp ΕΗΙ ΑΡΙΣΤΟΝΟΣ ΥΑΚΙΝΘΙΟΥ (no. 68). The ergasteriarch Dios is one
of the most active fabricants of the period of the Pergamon complex. In Pergamon there
were found 19 stamps with his name, ⁵⁰² in the Olbia cistern 12 were found. ⁵⁰³ The
finding of his stamp in Villanova enables us to date his activities in the beg. of the
2nd cent. BC. ⁵⁰⁴ The chronological correspondence of the fabricant Dios and the ep.
Aristonos which was established by our amphora confirms this dating. At the same time
the combinations of stamps of Dios with stamps of the eponyms Sodamos, Nestoros and
Kallikrtes II ^a ⁵⁰⁵ require us to refer the beg. of the work of this fabricant to the
last quarter of the 3rd cent. BC.

p.101 No. 351 ^{Ε3 καδευτο} [reading] caduceus to the right
A stamp on the handle of a shattered amphora, on its other handle is the stamp
ΕΗΙ ΑΣΤΥΜΗΔΟΥΣ ΔΑΛΙΟΥ (no. 87). ⁵³² *NEW*

p.107 No. 378 ^{Καδδευτο} A stamp on the handle of an intact small amphora on the other handle of
which is the ep. stamp of Aristodamos (no. 54). This find establishes precisely the time
of the activities of the workshop Kallio which enables us to refer her to the 2nd half
of the "Pergamon period".

p.101 No. 405 ^{Μενεκράτης} cluster of grapes [reading] ^{ΚΡ} ^{α' τ' υ' ο' ς}
The stamp has been published. ⁶⁰¹ It was found on one of the handles of an
intact Rh. amphora which had on its other handle the eponym stamp [ΕΗ' ΙΕΡΕΣΣ]
ΑΡΙΣΤΕΙΑΑ ~~ΑΡΤΙΤΑ~~ ΑΡ[ΤΑ]ΜΙΤΙΟΥ (no. 40). The combination of these two stamps on one
amphora enables us to refer the activities of the fabricant Menekrates to the period
of the Pergamon complex. Obviously there also existed an earlier ergast. with the
same name who stamped containers in the 3rd quarter of the 3rd cent. BC. This is also

p.110 indicated by the findings of stamps of Menekrates in early complexes and the combination
602
of one ~~and~~ such stamp with the stamp of the ep. Mition.

"Zepia" / *from 59 & Egeia: see inscriptions 1972-7 and*
p.117 No. 451 The stamp is on the handle of an intact Rh. amphora. On the other handle of
t the same vessel is the ep. stamp ΕΠΙ ΞΕΝΟΦΑΝΤΟΥ ΠΑΝΑΜΟΥ (no. 168). The
stamps of the fabricant Simmias are exceedingly rare. We know of only one other stamp of
his which was found in Bulgaria. 650 The finding of our amphora enables us to date the
activities of this fabricant in the time of the ep. xenophantos II, i.e. at the end of
the period of the Pergamon complex.

[The following is referred to in footnote 403 on p. 83. See p.30 of present typescript]

p. 42 No. 66 *But: "ΑΡΙΣΤΟΝΟΣ" (Kapp) [103] (in 1972) should be, say, "ΑΡΙΣΤΟΝΟΣ" (no. 103)*
[reading] around the head of Helios

p.43 Twenty stamps of the ep. Ariston were found at Pergamon. Among them was one
round stamp which was accompanied by a secondary stamp [K] 103. Judging from this find
the time of the activities of the eponymous priest Ariston must be placed not at
220-180 BC as is done by F. Bleckmann and VG, 104 but in the second half of that period --
200-180. F. Hiller von G. dates this ep. to 220-150 BC, 105 but there is no basis for
expanding the chronological frame.

*(Some types follow that do not
"ΑΡΙΣΤΟΝΟΣ")*

(p.37) The following items form Rh. Pairs.

p.38 On no. 40. The stamp has been published. It is found on the handle of an intact amphora which has on the other handle the stamp of the fabricant Menekrates (no. 495)

Stamps with the name of the eponym Aristeidias have been found in the

Pergamon complex and are dated thereby at 220-180 BC F.H. von G. proceeding from the

difference in scripts on the various stamps with the name Ari. considered the possibility

of distinguishing in the 2nd cent BC two eponyms of this man. We objected to this

proposal on the assumption that already in the 1st quarter of the 2nd cent. BC forms of

letters which F.Hiller considered late could have been used. Inasmuch as

a group of cursive stamps on which the name of Ari. is found were dated by us to 180-

150 BC it seemed only natural to consider that the 1st examples of these stamps

could have appeared even at the end of the "Pergamon period" and hence be referred to the

period of the priesthood of Ari. in the eighties, of the 2nd cent. BC. However at present when

the entire group of cursive stamps has been referred by us to the end of the 2nd cent.

BC (see above) it has become impossible to hold that all stamps with this name are

contemporary. In the stamps of the Pergamon complex and on cursive stamps there

are inscribed the names of two different persons who correspondingly exercised

priestly functions in the period 220-180 BC and at the end of the 2nd cent. BC.

Obviously there was yet another eponym Aristeidias I much earlier among the eponyms of

chronological group I. Our amphora belongs to the time of Aristeidias II, to the time

of the Pergamon complex. The shape of the Tanais amphora with the bulging proportions

of the body and the sloping shoulders corresponds to this date. It is more likely that the

stamps of this Aristeidias than those of Ari. III are combined on the handles with

secondary stamps.

p.40- On no. 54 On the other handle of a small intact amphora is the fabricant's name
41 KAAAIONΣ (no. 378)

p. 43 On no. 68 On the other handle of the same amphora was found the stamp of the
ergasteriarch AION (no. 326)

p.45 On no. 77 [reading] around a blossom

The stamp on one of the handles of an intact Rh. amphora ¹¹⁸ from Mound 7 of the excavations of P.M. Leontiev was published by L. Stefani and E.M. Pridik. ¹¹⁹
On the other handle is the stamp of the fabricant Aristokle~~ps~~ (no. 288). The same combination of names of eponym and fabricant are known on two other amphoras, one of which is in the Cyprus museum and the other from the grave of Khan-El-Azal near Aleppo ^{in the} ~~the~~ ¹²⁰ ~~the~~ ¹²¹ ~~the~~ ¹²² ~~the~~ ¹²³ ~~the~~ ¹²⁴ ~~the~~ ¹²⁵ ~~the~~ ¹²⁶ ~~the~~ ¹²⁷ ~~the~~ ¹²⁸ ~~the~~ ¹²⁹ ~~the~~ ¹³⁰ ~~the~~ ¹³¹ ~~the~~ ¹³² ~~the~~ ¹³³ ~~the~~ ¹³⁴ ~~the~~ ¹³⁵ ~~the~~ ¹³⁶ ~~the~~ ¹³⁷ ~~the~~ ¹³⁸ ~~the~~ ¹³⁹ ~~the~~ ¹⁴⁰ ~~the~~ ¹⁴¹ ~~the~~ ¹⁴² ~~the~~ ¹⁴³ ~~the~~ ¹⁴⁴ ~~the~~ ¹⁴⁵ ~~the~~ ¹⁴⁶ ~~the~~ ¹⁴⁷ ~~the~~ ¹⁴⁸ ~~the~~ ¹⁴⁹ ~~the~~ ¹⁵⁰ ~~the~~ ¹⁵¹ ~~the~~ ¹⁵² ~~the~~ ¹⁵³ ~~the~~ ¹⁵⁴ ~~the~~ ¹⁵⁵ ~~the~~ ¹⁵⁶ ~~the~~ ¹⁵⁷ ~~the~~ ¹⁵⁸ ~~the~~ ¹⁵⁹ ~~the~~ ¹⁶⁰ ~~the~~ ¹⁶¹ ~~the~~ ¹⁶² ~~the~~ ¹⁶³ ~~the~~ ¹⁶⁴ ~~the~~ ¹⁶⁵ ~~the~~ ¹⁶⁶ ~~the~~ ¹⁶⁷ ~~the~~ ¹⁶⁸ ~~the~~ ¹⁶⁹ ~~the~~ ¹⁷⁰ ~~the~~ ¹⁷¹ ~~the~~ ¹⁷² ~~the~~ ¹⁷³ ~~the~~ ¹⁷⁴ ~~the~~ ¹⁷⁵ ~~the~~ ¹⁷⁶ ~~the~~ ¹⁷⁷ ~~the~~ ¹⁷⁸ ~~the~~ ¹⁷⁹ ~~the~~ ¹⁸⁰ ~~the~~ ¹⁸¹ ~~the~~ ¹⁸² ~~the~~ ¹⁸³ ~~the~~ ¹⁸⁴ ~~the~~ ¹⁸⁵ ~~the~~ ¹⁸⁶ ~~the~~ ¹⁸⁷ ~~the~~ ¹⁸⁸ ~~the~~ ¹⁸⁹ ~~the~~ ¹⁹⁰ ~~the~~ ¹⁹¹ ~~the~~ ¹⁹² ~~the~~ ¹⁹³ ~~the~~ ¹⁹⁴ ~~the~~ ¹⁹⁵ ~~the~~ ¹⁹⁶ ~~the~~ ¹⁹⁷ ~~the~~ ¹⁹⁸ ~~the~~ ¹⁹⁹ ~~the~~ ²⁰⁰ ~~the~~ ²⁰¹ ~~the~~ ²⁰² ~~the~~ ²⁰³ ~~the~~ ²⁰⁴ ~~the~~ ²⁰⁵ ~~the~~ ²⁰⁶ ~~the~~ ²⁰⁷ ~~the~~ ²⁰⁸ ~~the~~ ²⁰⁹ ~~the~~ ²¹⁰ ~~the~~ ²¹¹ ~~the~~ ²¹² ~~the~~ ²¹³ ~~the~~ ²¹⁴ ~~the~~ ²¹⁵ ~~the~~ ²¹⁶ ~~the~~ ²¹⁷ ~~the~~ ²¹⁸ ~~the~~ ²¹⁹ ~~the~~ ²²⁰ ~~the~~ ²²¹ ~~the~~ ²²² ~~the~~ ²²³ ~~the~~ ²²⁴ ~~the~~ ²²⁵ ~~the~~ ²²⁶ ~~the~~ ²²⁷ ~~the~~ ²²⁸ ~~the~~ ²²⁹ ~~the~~ ²³⁰ ~~the~~ ²³¹ ~~the~~ ²³² ~~the~~ ²³³ ~~the~~ ²³⁴ ~~the~~ ²³⁵ ~~the~~ ²³⁶ ~~the~~ ²³⁷ ~~the~~ ²³⁸ ~~the~~ ²³⁹ ~~the~~ ²⁴⁰ ~~the~~ ²⁴¹ ~~the~~ ²⁴² ~~the~~ ²⁴³ ~~the~~ ²⁴⁴ ~~the~~ ²⁴⁵ ~~the~~ ²⁴⁶ ~~the~~ ²⁴⁷ ~~the~~ ²⁴⁸ ~~the~~ ²⁴⁹ ~~the~~ ²⁵⁰ ~~the~~ ²⁵¹ ~~the~~ ²⁵² ~~the~~ ²⁵³ ~~the~~ ²⁵⁴ ~~the~~ ²⁵⁵ ~~the~~ ²⁵⁶ ~~the~~ ²⁵⁷ ~~the~~ ²⁵⁸ ~~the~~ ²⁵⁹ ~~the~~ ²⁶⁰ ~~the~~ ²⁶¹ ~~the~~ ²⁶² ~~the~~ ²⁶³ ~~the~~ ²⁶⁴ ~~the~~ ²⁶⁵ ~~the~~ ²⁶⁶ ~~the~~ ²⁶⁷ ~~the~~ ²⁶⁸ ~~the~~ ²⁶⁹ ~~the~~ ²⁷⁰ ~~the~~ ²⁷¹ ~~the~~ ²⁷² ~~the~~ ²⁷³ ~~the~~ ²⁷⁴ ~~the~~ ²⁷⁵ ~~the~~ ²⁷⁶ ~~the~~ ²⁷⁷ ~~the~~ ²⁷⁸ ~~the~~ ²⁷⁹ ~~the~~ ²⁸⁰ ~~the~~ ²⁸¹ ~~the~~ ²⁸² ~~the~~ ²⁸³ ~~the~~ ²⁸⁴ ~~the~~ ²⁸⁵ ~~the~~ ²⁸⁶ ~~the~~ ²⁸⁷ ~~the~~ ²⁸⁸ ~~the~~ ²⁸⁹ ~~the~~ ²⁹⁰ ~~the~~ ²⁹¹ ~~the~~ ²⁹² ~~the~~ ²⁹³ ~~the~~ ²⁹⁴ ~~the~~ ²⁹⁵ ~~the~~ ²⁹⁶ ~~the~~ ²⁹⁷ ~~the~~ ²⁹⁸ ~~the~~ ²⁹⁹ ~~the~~ ³⁰⁰ ~~the~~ ³⁰¹ ~~the~~ ³⁰² ~~the~~ ³⁰³ ~~the~~ ³⁰⁴ ~~the~~ ³⁰⁵ ~~the~~ ³⁰⁶ ~~the~~ ³⁰⁷ ~~the~~ ³⁰⁸ ~~the~~ ³⁰⁹ ~~the~~ ³¹⁰ ~~the~~ ³¹¹ ~~the~~ ³¹² ~~the~~ ³¹³ ~~the~~ ³¹⁴ ~~the~~ ³¹⁵ ~~the~~ ³¹⁶ ~~the~~ ³¹⁷ ~~the~~ ³¹⁸ ~~the~~ ³¹⁹ ~~the~~ ³²⁰ ~~the~~ ³²¹ ~~the~~ ³²² ~~the~~ ³²³ ~~the~~ ³²⁴ ~~the~~ ³²⁵ ~~the~~ ³²⁶ ~~the~~ ³²⁷ ~~the~~ ³²⁸ ~~the~~ ³²⁹ ~~the~~ ³³⁰ ~~the~~ ³³¹ ~~the~~ ³³² ~~the~~ ³³³ ~~the~~ ³³⁴ ~~the~~ ³³⁵ ~~the~~ ³³⁶ ~~the~~ ³³⁷ ~~the~~ ³³⁸ ~~the~~ ³³⁹ ~~the~~ ³⁴⁰ ~~the~~ ³⁴¹ ~~the~~ ³⁴² ~~the~~ ³⁴³ ~~the~~ ³⁴⁴ ~~the~~ ³⁴⁵ ~~the~~ ³⁴⁶ ~~the~~ ³⁴⁷ ~~the~~ ³⁴⁸ ~~the~~ ³⁴⁹ ~~the~~ ³⁵⁰ ~~the~~ ³⁵¹ ~~the~~ ³⁵² ~~the~~ ³⁵³ ~~the~~ ³⁵⁴ ~~the~~ ³⁵⁵ ~~the~~ ³⁵⁶ ~~the~~ ³⁵⁷ ~~the~~ ³⁵⁸ ~~the~~ ³⁵⁹ ~~the~~ ³⁶⁰ ~~the~~ ³⁶¹ ~~the~~ ³⁶² ~~the~~ ³⁶³ ~~the~~ ³⁶⁴ ~~the~~ ³⁶⁵ ~~the~~ ³⁶⁶ ~~the~~ ³⁶⁷ ~~the~~ ³⁶⁸ ~~the~~ ³⁶⁹ ~~the~~ ³⁷⁰ ~~the~~ ³⁷¹ ~~the~~ ³⁷² ~~the~~ ³⁷³ ~~the~~ ³⁷⁴ ~~the~~ ³⁷⁵ ~~the~~ ³⁷⁶ ~~the~~ ³⁷⁷ ~~the~~ ³⁷⁸ ~~the~~ ³⁷⁹ ~~the~~ ³⁸⁰ ~~the~~ ³⁸¹ ~~the~~ ³⁸² ~~the~~ ³⁸³ ~~the~~ ³⁸⁴ ~~the~~ ³⁸⁵ ~~the~~ ³⁸⁶ ~~the~~ ³⁸⁷ ~~the~~ ³⁸⁸ ~~the~~ ³⁸⁹ ~~the~~ ³⁹⁰ ~~the~~ ³⁹¹ ~~the~~ ³⁹² ~~the~~ ³⁹³ ~~the~~ ³⁹⁴ ~~the~~ ³⁹⁵ ~~the~~ ³⁹⁶ ~~the~~ ³⁹⁷ ~~the~~ ³⁹⁸ ~~the~~ ³⁹⁹ ~~the~~ ⁴⁰⁰ ~~the~~ ⁴⁰¹ ~~the~~ ⁴⁰² ~~the~~ ⁴⁰³ ~~the~~ ⁴⁰⁴ ~~the~~ ⁴⁰⁵ ~~the~~ ⁴⁰⁶ ~~the~~ ⁴⁰⁷ ~~the~~ ⁴⁰⁸ ~~the~~ ⁴⁰⁹ ~~the~~ ⁴¹⁰ ~~the~~ ⁴¹¹ ~~the~~ ⁴¹² ~~the~~ ⁴¹³ ~~the~~ ⁴¹⁴ ~~the~~ ⁴¹⁵ ~~the~~ ⁴¹⁶ ~~the~~ ⁴¹⁷ ~~the~~ ⁴¹⁸ ~~the~~ ⁴¹⁹ ~~the~~ ⁴²⁰ ~~the~~ ⁴²¹ ~~the~~ ⁴²² ~~the~~ ⁴²³ ~~the~~ ⁴²⁴ ~~the~~ ⁴²⁵ ~~the~~ ⁴²⁶ ~~the~~ ⁴²⁷ ~~the~~ ⁴²⁸ ~~the~~ ⁴²⁹ ~~the~~ ⁴³⁰ ~~the~~ ⁴³¹ ~~the~~ ⁴³² ~~the~~ ⁴³³ ~~the~~ ⁴³⁴ ~~the~~ ⁴³⁵ ~~the~~ ⁴³⁶ ~~the~~ ⁴³⁷ ~~the~~ ⁴³⁸ ~~the~~ ⁴³⁹ ~~the~~ ⁴⁴⁰ ~~the~~ ⁴⁴¹ ~~the~~ ⁴⁴² ~~the~~ ⁴⁴³ ~~the~~ ⁴⁴⁴ ~~the~~ ⁴⁴⁵ ~~the~~ ⁴⁴⁶ ~~the~~ ⁴⁴⁷ ~~the~~ ⁴⁴⁸ ~~the~~ ⁴⁴⁹ ~~the~~ ⁴⁵⁰ ~~the~~ ⁴⁵¹ ~~the~~ ⁴⁵² ~~the~~ ⁴⁵³ ~~the~~ ⁴⁵⁴ ~~the~~ ⁴⁵⁵ ~~the~~ ⁴⁵⁶ ~~the~~ ⁴⁵⁷ ~~the~~ ⁴⁵⁸ ~~the~~ ⁴⁵⁹ ~~the~~ ⁴⁶⁰ ~~the~~ ⁴⁶¹ ~~the~~ ⁴⁶² ~~the~~ ⁴⁶³ ~~the~~ ⁴⁶⁴ ~~the~~ ⁴⁶⁵ ~~the~~ ⁴⁶⁶ ~~the~~ ⁴⁶⁷ ~~the~~ ⁴⁶⁸ ~~the~~ ⁴⁶⁹ ~~the~~ ⁴⁷⁰ ~~the~~ ⁴⁷¹ ~~the~~ ⁴⁷² ~~the~~ ⁴⁷³ ~~the~~ ⁴⁷⁴ ~~the~~ ⁴⁷⁵ ~~the~~ ⁴⁷⁶ ~~the~~ ⁴⁷⁷ ~~the~~ ⁴⁷⁸ ~~the~~ ⁴⁷⁹ ~~the~~ ⁴⁸⁰ ~~the~~ ⁴⁸¹ ~~the~~ ⁴⁸² ~~the~~ ⁴⁸³ ~~the~~ ⁴⁸⁴ ~~the~~ ⁴⁸⁵ ~~the~~ ⁴⁸⁶ ~~the~~ ⁴⁸⁷ ~~the~~ ⁴⁸⁸ ~~the~~ ⁴⁸⁹ ~~the~~ ⁴⁹⁰ ~~the~~ ⁴⁹¹ ~~the~~ ⁴⁹² ~~the~~ ⁴⁹³ ~~the~~ ⁴⁹⁴ ~~the~~ ⁴⁹⁵ ~~the~~ ⁴⁹⁶ ~~the~~ ⁴⁹⁷ ~~the~~ ⁴⁹⁸ ~~the~~ ⁴⁹⁹ ~~the~~ ⁵⁰⁰ ~~the~~ ⁵⁰¹ ~~the~~ ⁵⁰² ~~the~~ ⁵⁰³ ~~the~~ ⁵⁰⁴ ~~the~~ ⁵⁰⁵ ~~the~~ ⁵⁰⁶ ~~the~~ ⁵⁰⁷ ~~the~~ ⁵⁰⁸ ~~the~~ ⁵⁰⁹ ~~the~~ ⁵¹⁰ ~~the~~ ⁵¹¹ ~~the~~ ⁵¹² ~~the~~ ⁵¹³ ~~the~~ ⁵¹⁴ ~~the~~ ⁵¹⁵ ~~the~~ ⁵¹⁶ ~~the~~ ⁵¹⁷ ~~the~~ ⁵¹⁸ ~~the~~ ⁵¹⁹ ~~the~~ ⁵²⁰ ~~the~~ ⁵²¹ ~~the~~ ⁵²² ~~the~~ ⁵²³ ~~the~~ ⁵²⁴ ~~the~~ ⁵²⁵ ~~the~~ ⁵²⁶ ~~the~~ ⁵²⁷ ~~the~~ ⁵²⁸ ~~the~~ ⁵²⁹ ~~the~~ ⁵³⁰ ~~the~~ ⁵³¹ ~~the~~ ⁵³² ~~the~~ ⁵³³ ~~the~~ ⁵³⁴ ~~the~~ ⁵³⁵ ~~the~~ ⁵³⁶ ~~the~~ ⁵³⁷ ~~the~~ ⁵³⁸ ~~the~~ ⁵³⁹ ~~the~~ ⁵⁴⁰ ~~the~~ ⁵⁴¹ ~~the~~ ⁵⁴² ~~the~~ ⁵⁴³ ~~the~~ ⁵⁴⁴ ~~the~~ ⁵⁴⁵ ~~the~~ ⁵⁴⁶ ~~the~~ ⁵⁴⁷ ~~the~~ ⁵⁴⁸ ~~the~~ ⁵⁴⁹ ~~the~~ ⁵⁵⁰ ~~the~~ ⁵⁵¹ ~~the~~ ⁵⁵² ~~the~~ ⁵⁵³ ~~the~~ ⁵⁵⁴ ~~the~~ ⁵⁵⁵ ~~the~~ ⁵⁵⁶ ~~the~~ ⁵⁵⁷ ~~the~~ ⁵⁵⁸ ~~the~~ ⁵⁵⁹ ~~the~~ ⁵⁶⁰ ~~the~~ ⁵⁶¹ ~~the~~ ⁵⁶² ~~the~~ ⁵⁶³ ~~the~~ ⁵⁶⁴ ~~the~~ ⁵⁶⁵ ~~the~~ ⁵⁶⁶ ~~the~~ ⁵⁶⁷ ~~the~~ ⁵⁶⁸ ~~the~~ ⁵⁶⁹ ~~the~~ ⁵⁷⁰ ~~the~~ ⁵⁷¹ ~~the~~ ⁵⁷² ~~the~~ ⁵⁷³ ~~the~~ ⁵⁷⁴ ~~the~~ ⁵⁷⁵ ~~the~~ ⁵⁷⁶ ~~the~~ ⁵⁷⁷ ~~the~~ ⁵⁷⁸ ~~the~~ ⁵⁷⁹ ~~the~~ ⁵⁸⁰ ~~the~~ ⁵⁸¹ ~~the~~ ⁵⁸² ~~the~~ ⁵⁸³ ~~the~~ ⁵⁸⁴ ~~the~~ ⁵⁸⁵ ~~the~~ ⁵⁸⁶ ~~the~~ ⁵⁸⁷ ~~the~~ ⁵⁸⁸ ~~the~~ ⁵⁸⁹ ~~the~~ ⁵⁹⁰ ~~the~~ ⁵⁹¹ ~~the~~ ⁵⁹² ~~the~~ ⁵⁹³ ~~the~~ ⁵⁹⁴ ~~the~~ ⁵⁹⁵ ~~the~~ ⁵⁹⁶ ~~the~~ ⁵⁹⁷ ~~the~~ ⁵⁹⁸ ~~the~~ ⁵⁹⁹ ~~the~~ ⁶⁰⁰ ~~the~~ ⁶⁰¹ ~~the~~ ⁶⁰² ~~the~~ ⁶⁰³ ~~the~~ ⁶⁰⁴ ~~the~~ ⁶⁰⁵ ~~the~~ ⁶⁰⁶ ~~the~~ ⁶⁰⁷ ~~the~~ ⁶⁰⁸ ~~the~~ ⁶⁰⁹ ~~the~~ ⁶¹⁰ ~~the~~ ⁶¹¹ ~~the~~ ⁶¹² ~~the~~ ⁶¹³ ~~the~~ ⁶¹⁴ ~~the~~ ⁶¹⁵ ~~the~~ ⁶¹⁶ ~~the~~ ⁶¹⁷ ~~the~~ ⁶¹⁸ ~~the~~ ⁶¹⁹ ~~the~~ ⁶²⁰ ~~the~~ ⁶²¹ ~~the~~ ⁶²² ~~the~~ ⁶²³ ~~the~~ ⁶²⁴ ~~the~~ ⁶²⁵ ~~the~~ ⁶²⁶ ~~the~~ ⁶²⁷ ~~the~~ ⁶²⁸ ~~the~~ ⁶²⁹ ~~the~~ ⁶³⁰ ~~the~~ ⁶³¹ ~~the~~ ⁶³² ~~the~~ ⁶³³ ~~the~~ ⁶³⁴ ~~the~~ ⁶³⁵ ~~the~~ ⁶³⁶ ~~the~~ ⁶³⁷ ~~the~~ ⁶³⁸ ~~the~~ ⁶³⁹ ~~the~~ ⁶⁴⁰ ~~the~~ ⁶⁴¹ ~~the~~ ⁶⁴² ~~the~~ ⁶⁴³ ~~the~~ ⁶⁴⁴ ~~the~~ ⁶⁴⁵ ~~the~~ ⁶⁴⁶ ~~the~~ ⁶⁴⁷ ~~the~~ ⁶⁴⁸ ~~the~~ ⁶⁴⁹ ~~the~~ ⁶⁵⁰ ~~the~~ ⁶⁵¹ ~~the~~ ⁶⁵² ~~the~~ ⁶⁵³ ~~the~~ ⁶⁵⁴ ~~the~~ ⁶⁵⁵ ~~the~~ ⁶⁵⁶ ~~the~~ ⁶⁵⁷ ~~the~~ ⁶⁵⁸ ~~the~~ ⁶⁵⁹ ~~the~~ ⁶⁶⁰ ~~the~~ ⁶⁶¹ ~~the~~ ⁶⁶² ~~the~~ ⁶⁶³ ~~the~~ ⁶⁶⁴ ~~the~~ ⁶⁶⁵ ~~the~~ ⁶⁶⁶ ~~the~~ ⁶⁶⁷ ~~the~~ ⁶⁶⁸ ~~the~~ ⁶⁶⁹ ~~the~~ ⁶⁷⁰ ~~the~~ ⁶⁷¹ ~~the~~ ⁶⁷² ~~the~~ ⁶⁷³ ~~the~~ ⁶⁷⁴ ~~the~~ ⁶⁷⁵ ~~the~~ ⁶⁷⁶ ~~the~~ ⁶⁷⁷ ~~the~~ ⁶⁷⁸ ~~the~~ ⁶⁷⁹ ~~the~~ ⁶⁸⁰ ~~the~~ ⁶⁸¹ ~~the~~ ⁶⁸² ~~the~~ ⁶⁸³ ~~the~~ ⁶⁸⁴ ~~the~~ ⁶⁸⁵ ~~the~~ ⁶⁸⁶ ~~the~~ ⁶⁸⁷ ~~the~~ ⁶⁸⁸ ~~the~~ ⁶⁸⁹ ~~the~~ ⁶⁹⁰ ~~the~~ ⁶⁹¹ ~~the~~ ⁶⁹² ~~the~~ ⁶⁹³ ~~the~~ ⁶⁹⁴ ~~the~~ ⁶⁹⁵ ~~the~~ ⁶⁹⁶ ~~the~~ ⁶⁹⁷ ~~the~~ ⁶⁹⁸ ~~the~~ ⁶⁹⁹ ~~the~~ ⁷⁰⁰ ~~the~~ ⁷⁰¹ ~~the~~ ⁷⁰² ~~the~~ ⁷⁰³ ~~the~~ ⁷⁰⁴ ~~the~~ ⁷⁰⁵ ~~the~~ ⁷⁰⁶ ~~the~~ ⁷⁰⁷ ~~the~~ ⁷⁰⁸ ~~the~~ ⁷⁰⁹ ~~the~~ ⁷¹⁰ ~~the~~ ⁷¹¹ ~~the~~ ⁷¹² ~~the~~ ⁷¹³ ~~the~~ ⁷¹⁴ ~~the~~ ⁷¹⁵ ~~the~~ ⁷¹⁶ ~~the~~ ⁷¹⁷ ~~the~~ ⁷¹⁸ ~~the~~ ⁷¹⁹ ~~the~~ ⁷²⁰ ~~the~~ ⁷²¹ ~~the~~ ⁷²² ~~the~~ ⁷²³ ~~the~~ ⁷²⁴ ~~the~~ ⁷²⁵ ~~the~~ ⁷²⁶ ~~the~~ ⁷²⁷ ~~the~~ ⁷²⁸ ~~the~~ ⁷²⁹ ~~the~~ ⁷³⁰ ~~the~~ ⁷³¹ ~~the~~ ⁷³² ~~the~~ ⁷³³ ~~the~~ ⁷³⁴ ~~the~~ ⁷³⁵ ~~the~~ ⁷³⁶ ~~the~~ ⁷³⁷ ~~the~~ ⁷³⁸ ~~the~~ ⁷³⁹ ~~the~~ ⁷⁴⁰ ~~the~~ ⁷⁴¹ ~~the~~ ⁷⁴² ~~the~~ ⁷⁴³ ~~the~~ ⁷⁴⁴ ~~the~~ ⁷⁴⁵ ~~the~~ ⁷⁴⁶ ~~the~~ ⁷⁴⁷ ~~the~~ ⁷⁴⁸ ~~the~~ ⁷⁴⁹ ~~the~~ ⁷⁵⁰ ~~the~~ ⁷⁵¹ ~~the~~ ⁷⁵² ~~the~~ ⁷⁵³ ~~the~~ ⁷⁵⁴ ~~the~~ ⁷⁵⁵ ~~the~~ ⁷⁵⁶ ~~the~~ ⁷⁵⁷ ~~the~~ ⁷⁵⁸ ~~the~~ ⁷⁵⁹ ~~the~~ ⁷⁶⁰ ~~the~~ ⁷⁶¹ ~~the~~ ⁷⁶² ~~the~~ ⁷⁶³ ~~the~~ ⁷⁶⁴ ~~the~~ ⁷⁶⁵ ~~the~~ ⁷⁶⁶ ~~the~~ ⁷⁶⁷ ~~the~~ ⁷⁶⁸ ~~the~~ ⁷⁶⁹ ~~the~~ ⁷⁷⁰ ~~the~~ ⁷⁷¹ ~~the~~ ⁷⁷² ~~the~~ ⁷⁷³ ~~the~~ ⁷⁷⁴ ~~the~~ ⁷⁷⁵ ~~the~~ ⁷⁷⁶ ~~the~~ ⁷⁷⁷ ~~the~~ ⁷⁷⁸ ~~the~~ ⁷⁷⁹ ~~the~~ ⁷⁸⁰ ~~the~~ ⁷⁸¹ ~~the~~ ⁷⁸² ~~the~~ ⁷⁸³ ~~the~~ ⁷⁸⁴ ~~the~~ ⁷⁸⁵ ~~the~~ ⁷⁸⁶ ~~the~~ ⁷⁸⁷ ~~the~~ ⁷⁸⁸ ~~the~~ ⁷⁸⁹ ~~the~~ ⁷⁹⁰ ~~the~~ ⁷⁹¹ ~~the~~ ⁷⁹² ~~the~~ ⁷⁹³ ~~the~~ ⁷⁹⁴ ~~the~~ ⁷⁹⁵ ~~the~~ ⁷⁹⁶ ~~the~~ ⁷⁹⁷ ~~the~~ ⁷⁹⁸ ~~the~~ ⁷⁹⁹ ~~the~~ ⁸⁰⁰ ~~the~~ ⁸⁰¹ ~~the~~ ⁸⁰² ~~the~~ ⁸⁰³ ~~the~~ ⁸⁰⁴ ~~the~~ ⁸⁰⁵ ~~the~~ ⁸⁰⁶ ~~the~~ ⁸⁰⁷ ~~the~~ ⁸⁰⁸ ~~the~~ ⁸⁰⁹ ~~the~~ ⁸¹⁰ ~~the~~ ⁸¹¹ ~~the~~ ⁸¹² ~~the~~ ⁸¹³ ~~the~~ ⁸¹⁴ ~~the~~ ⁸¹⁵ ~~the~~ ⁸¹⁶ ~~the~~ ⁸¹⁷ ~~the~~ ⁸¹⁸ ~~the~~ ⁸¹⁹ ~~the~~ ⁸²⁰ ~~the~~ ⁸²¹ ~~the~~ ⁸²² ~~the~~ ⁸²³ ~~the~~ ⁸²⁴ ~~the~~ ⁸²⁵ ~~the~~ ⁸²⁶ ~~the~~ ⁸²⁷ ~~the~~ ⁸²⁸ ~~the~~ ⁸²⁹ ~~the~~ ⁸³⁰ ~~the~~ ⁸³¹ ~~the~~ ⁸³² ~~the~~ ⁸³³ ~~the~~ ⁸³⁴ ~~the~~ ⁸³⁵ ~~the~~ ⁸³⁶ ~~the~~ ⁸³⁷ ~~the~~ ⁸³⁸ ~~the~~ ⁸³⁹ ~~the~~ ⁸⁴⁰ ~~the~~ ⁸⁴¹ ~~the~~ ⁸⁴² ~~the~~ ⁸⁴³ ~~the~~ ⁸⁴⁴ ~~the~~ ⁸⁴⁵ ~~the~~ ⁸⁴⁶ ~~the~~ ⁸⁴⁷ ~~the~~ ⁸⁴⁸ ~~the~~ ⁸⁴⁹ ~~the~~ ⁸⁵⁰ ~~the~~ ⁸⁵¹ ~~the~~ ⁸⁵² ~~the~~ ⁸⁵³ ~~the~~ ⁸⁵⁴ ~~the~~ ⁸⁵⁵ ~~the~~ ⁸⁵⁶ ~~the~~ ⁸⁵⁷ ~~the~~ ⁸⁵⁸ ~~the~~ ⁸⁵⁹ ~~the~~ ⁸⁶⁰ ~~the~~ ⁸⁶¹ ~~the~~ ⁸⁶² ~~the~~ ⁸⁶³ ~~the~~ ⁸⁶⁴ ~~the~~ ⁸⁶⁵ ~~the~~ ⁸⁶⁶ ~~the~~ ⁸⁶⁷ ~~the~~ ⁸⁶⁸ ~~the~~ ⁸⁶⁹ ~~the~~ ⁸⁷⁰ ~~the~~ ⁸⁷¹ ~~the~~

275

p. 65 of the fabricant Hippokrates. Finally we know of a stamp of Xenophantos II which is accompanied by a secondary stamp. Obviously this eponym to whom our stamp also belongs was active at the very end of the "Pergamon period", in the '80s of the 2nd cent. BC. However we do not exclude the possibility that among the stamps of X. II there will subsequently be distinguished stamps of two magistrates, one of whom can still be referred to the period of the Pergamon complex, and the other to a period after 180 BC.

276

p. 83 No. 264 [reading] wreath

A stamp on the handle of an intact amphora, on its other handle is found the eponym stamp ΕΠΙ ΑΡΧΙΑΙΙΑΑ ΖΜΙΝΙΟΙΥ (no. 78). The synchronisation of the names of this eponym and the fabricant Amyntas which was 1st established by our amphora confirms the referring of the activity of the latter to the first two decades of the 2nd cent. BC (no. 263). [In 1961 during the excavations of the mounds on the right bank of the Manych River M. G. Moshkova found a shattered amphora with two stamps on the handles: ΑΜΥΝΤΑ and ΑΡΙΣΤΟΝΟΖ ΣΜΕΝ ΥΑΚΙΝΘΙΟΥ. This combination of names confirms our dating (see no. 66)] [See p. 32 of present typescript]

403

p. 88 No. 288 [reading] around a blossom

A stamp on one of the handles of an intact Rh. amphora, from Mound 7 of the excavations of P.M. Leontiev and published by Pridik. On the other handle is the eponym stamp ΕΠΙ ΑΡΧΙΑΙΙΑΑ ΔΑΔΙΟΥ (no. 77). This combination of stamps on amphoras has been encountered before. The ergasteriarch Aristokles is one of those whose stamps are found particularly often. Seven of his stamps were found in Pergamon. The presence on amphoras from the workshop of Aristokles of stamps of the eponyms Aristonos, Archilaidas, and Aratophanes I also point to the period of the Pergamon complex. The stamps of this fabricant are very frequently accompanied by secondary stamps which usually contain a single letter. This enables us to refer the time of the activities of the erg. Aristokles as well as the eponyms referred to

444

445

446

447

448

449

450

- p. 89 to the first two decades of the 2nd cent. BC. ⁴⁵¹ Obviously there was also an ⁴⁵² earlier fabricant with the same name.
- p.96 No. 326 ^{ΔΙΟΥ} A stamp on the handle of an intact amphora, on the other handle is the eponym stamp ΕΠΙ ΑΡΙΣΤΕΡΝΟΣ ΥΑΚΙΝΘΙΟΥ (no. 68). The ergasteriarch Dios is one of the most active fabricants of the period of the Pergamon complex. In Pergamon there ⁵⁰² were found 19 stamps with his name, ⁵⁰³ in the Olbia cistern 12 were found. The finding of his stamp in Villanova enables us to date his activities in the beg. of the ⁵⁰⁴ 2nd cent. BC. The chronological correspondence of the fabricant Dios and the ep. Aristonos which was established by our amphora confirms this dating. At the same time the combinations of stamps of Dios with stamps of the eponyms Sodamos, Tastoros and ^a ⁵⁰⁵ Kallikrtes II require us to refer the beg. of the work of this fabricant to the last quarter of the 3rd cent. BC.
- p.101 No. 351 ^{B3 12 x 2170} [reading] caduceus to the right
A stamp on the handle of a shattered amphora, on its other handle is the stamp ⁵³² ΕΠΙ ΑΣΤΥΜΗΑΘΥΣ ΑΔΑΙΟΥ (no. 87).
- p.107 No. 378 ^{Καλλιόου} A stamp on the handle of an intact small amphora on the other handle of which is the ep. stamp of Aristodamos (no. 54). This find establishes precisely the time of the activities of the workshop Kallio which enables us to refer her to the 2nd half of the "Pergamon period".
- p.101 No. 405 ^{cluster M2v2} cluster of grapes [reading] ^{Kp[ε]τερος} ⁶⁰¹
The stamp has been published. It was found on one of the handles of an intact Rh. amphora which had on its other handle the eponym stamp [ΕΠΙ ΙΕΡΕΣΣ] ΑΡΙΣΤΕΙΔΑ ΑΠ[Ε]ΤΑ ΑΠ[Ι]ΤΑ ΜΙΤΙΟΥ (no. 40). The combination of these two stamps on one amphora enables us to refer the activities of the fabricant Menekrates to the period of the Pergamon complex. Obviously there also existed an earlier ergast. with the same name who stamped containers in the 3rd quarter of the 3rd cent. BC. This is also

p.120 indicated by the findings of stamps of Menekrates in early complexes and the combination
602
of one and such stamp with the stamp of the ep. Mition.

Σιμμία

p.117 No. 451 The stamp is on the handle of an intact Rh. amphora. On the other handle of
t the same vessel is the ep. stamp ΕΠΙ ΞΕΝΟΦΑΝΤΟΥ ΠΑΝΑΜΟΥ (no. 168). The
stamps of the fabricant Simmias are exceedingly rare. We know of only one other stamp of
his which was found in Bulgaria. 650 The finding of our amphora enables us to date the
activities of this fabricant in the time of the ep. xenophantos II, i.e. at the end of
the period of the Pergamon complex.

[The following is referred to in footnote 403 on p. 83. See p.30 of present typescript]

p. 42 No. 66 [reading] around the head of Helios

p.43 Twenty stamps of the ep. Ariston were found at Pergamon. Among them was one
round stamp which was accompanied by a secondary stamp E. Judging from this find
the time of the activities of the eponymous priest Ariston must be placed not at
220-180 BC as is done by F. Bleckmann and VC, 104 but in the second half of that period --
200-180. F. Hiller von G. dates this ep. to 220-150 BC, 105 but there is no basis for
expanding the chronological frame.

(2nd carbon on
 filed with
 KNIDIAN, KOAN)

2nd photocopy
 is going to be
 sent to Karoly
 Koehler
 12.IV.92

Knidian wine was very popular in the ancient world, it is referred to by
 1
 various Greek and Roman authors. Knidian wine amphoras of the Hellenistic period
 are very well known owing to the stamps found on them which contain the ethnikon
 KNIAION or KNIAISON (sometimes abbreviated). Both the evolution of the shape of
 2
 Kn. amphoras and the chronological changes in the manner of stamping have been
 quite well investigated. Usually Kn. stamps contain three items of information:
 1) the name of the eponym magistrate preceded by the prep. EHI, occasionally with
 and indication of his function -- ΔΑΜΙΟΠΤΟΣ or ΕΠΟΥΡΑΡΧΟΣ; 2) the name of the
 ergasteriarch; 3) the ethnikon.

In one group of stamps which can be dated at the end of the 2nd and the beg.
 of the 1st cent. BC, in addition to this data we find the names of two other
 3
 officials, sometimes accompanied by the titles ΑΡΧΟΝΤΩΝ or ΑΝΑΡΧΩΝ.
 All this data can be placed on two stamps on the two handles of the amphora or
 can be found on one stamp. In the second instance on both handles of the amphora
 one and the same stamp may appear or the second handle can remain unstamped.

Inasmuch as the ethnikon is by no means found on all Kn. stamps and the
 shapes of the stamps and the formulae of the inscriptions are quite various, it
 is not always possible to distinguish Kn. stamps with sufficient accuracy. Indicators
 for such a distinction can be found in the clay and the general shape of the amphora
 handle. This data however does not always enable us with complete certainty to refer
 a stamp to the Kn. category particularly if the stamp is poorly preserved. In our small
 collection of Kn. stamps two stamps (no. 535, 539) occasion certain doubt as to
 whether or not they belong to this centre (see also commentary on stamp 601).

Although we already know very many Kn. stamps in the north B. Sea region
 they are encountered comparatively rarely. The export of Kn. wine was made basically

(p.128) to other regions, particularly to Athens where Kn. stamps comprise significantly more than half of all finds of amphora stamps in general⁴. Just as significant was the importing of Kn. wine to Delos⁵. During the excavations of the cities of the north Black Sea region it was found that Kn. stamps comprise on the whole only a small percentage of the overall no. of the amphora stamps⁶. The twelve Kn. stamps in our collection completely correspond to this usual norm.

The general chronological frame and the individual periods of Kn. stamping have been quite firmly established. This stamping was employed from the third to the beg. of the 1st cent. BC⁷, i.e. at precisely the same time that (it was employed) in Rhodes⁸. The majority of Tanais finds of this type which admit of a more precise dating belong to the end of the 2nd or the beg. of the 1st cent. BC.

On no. 531 The name of the eponym Apollonidas is frequently found on Kn. stamps⁸. Sometimes it is mentioned with the title $\Theta\text{POUPARKOZ}$. This circumstance and also the conditions of the find of one of the stamps with the name Apollonidas in the complex of the cistern B 20:2 at the Ath. Agora enabled⁹ the dating of the eponym Ap. in the period 188-166 BC. Incidentally it is possible that there also was a second eponym of this name who came considerably later in the beg. of the 1st cent. BC.¹⁰

p.129 On no. 532 The inscription reads from right to left. In her publication of a similar stamp [see reading] VG remarks that stamps of this type are known even earlier and must be dated in the 3rd quarter of the 2nd cent. BC¹¹. A stamp of this type was found in the Pergamon complex.¹²

On no. 533 The stamps of the eponym Politas are referred by VG to the end of the 2nd and the beg. of the 1st cent. BC¹³. Obviously the fabricant Nikasiboulos should be dated at the same time.

(25.IV.77)

p.129) On no. 534 [reading] Prow of ship
on the left

The eponym Sosiphron¹⁴ is well-known on Kn. stamps. An amphora
with a similar stamp was found in Ath. in a complex from the end of the 2nd cent. BC.¹⁵
VG refers his activities to the beg. of his duoviri-period. The fabricant Diodotos¹⁶
mentioned on our stamp must also be dated to the end of the 2nd cent. BC. However¹⁷
VG admits the possibility of the existence of two fabricants of this name.

On no. 535 Both names are known on Kn. stamps of the end of the 2nd and beg. of the
1st cent. BC.¹⁸ Probably similar stamps, not completely preserved, were read by¹⁹
V. Canarache as ΕΠΙ ΔΙΟΝΥΣΙΟΥ.

(p.130) On no. 536 The stamp was published by A. I. Boltunova [Chatterbox].²⁰

A similar stamp from Tyre was published by E.M. Shterman who for
some reason considered it to be Rhodian.²¹ V. Canarache properly designated a similar
stamp from Istria as belonging to the group of Kn. stamps but he erroneously read the
name of the fabricant which has been incompletely preserved as ΕΥΦΡΟΛΝΟΖ.²² The find
of a similar stamp in the construction layer of the south stoa of the Ath Agora made²³
possible the dating of it to a period around the middle of the 2nd cent. BC.
However there was also another Kn. fabricant who had the same name and whose activities²⁴
can be referred to the end of the 2nd and the beg. of the 1st cent. BC. In his
stamps there is mentioned the name of a later eponym Sosiphron (no. 534).²⁵ When²⁶
we first mentioned our stamp we erroneously referred it to the stamps of this
Euphrosynos II.

On no. 537 The names read from right to left. A very similar stamp from the
Bosphorus, except with the addition of the ethnicon ΚΝΙΑΙΟΝ was published by
E.M. Pridik.²⁷ On Kn. stamps we encounter the name of the eponym Lachartos who²⁸
belonged to the first half of the 2nd cent. BC. However, the L. on our stamp as
well as the Aristogenes, obviously was ^athe member of the committee of officials whose

(p.130) names are occasionally preceded by the title ANAPON. This requires us to date the stamp in the duoviri-period, i.e. at the end of the 2nd and the beg. of the 1st cent. BC.

On no. 538 A completely unreadable rectangular stamp.

On no. 539 This stamp is referred to the Kn. group provisionally.

On no. 540 An unreadable rectangular stamp with the depiction of a trident at the right.

p. 131 On no. 541 A rectangular stamp.

On no. 542 An undecipherable rectangular stamp with the depiction of a palmette.

Chapter 3 -- Koan Stamps

Koan stamps on double-barrelled amphora handles were first distinguished by A. Maiuri among those found on the island of Kos on the basis of the coincidence of a large no. of names of these stamps with names found on Koan coins and in Koan lapidary inscriptions.¹ In 1951, E.M. Shtaerman as a means of comparing stamps on double- and single-barrelled handles which recall Rh. handles in shape except that they are more slender, proved the existence of Koan stamps on ordinary everyday amphora handles.² This discovery of E.M. Shtaerman is now accepted by all specialists in ceramic epigraphy, although many specific stamps on single-barrelled amphora handles which she had classified as Koan turned out to belong as a matter of fact to other centres.³ Despite the fact that the percentage of Koan amphora stamps among other remains of ceramic epigraphy has increased somewhat after this identification by E.M. Shtaerman nevertheless their number in finds remains comparatively small, which fact can be explained obviously by the sporadic nature of the stamping of Koan amphora containers. Numerous Koan amphora

(p.131) handles which were not stamped are very well known.⁴

+ it is Sinop^{ean}

In Tanais no more than 14 Koan stamps were found. They all occur on double-barrelled amphora handles but that two⁵ of these stamps (no. 549, 561) belong to Kos is still doubtful inasmuch as the clay of the handles on which they have been stamped differs somewhat from the ordinary Koan clay and moreover ~~they are without~~ [angob] the handles lack the bright which is characteristic of Koan amphoras.⁵ Imitations of Koan amphoras are well-known.

{132}

(p.132) As far as the dating of Koan stamps is concerned the development of Koan amphoras⁶ in the course of the 4th to the 1st cent. BC has been investigated, but these amphs apparently were more or less regularly stamped only in the 2nd and 1st cent. BC. The chronology of Koan stamps has not as yet been elaborated, however, individual stamps can be dated from palaeographic and other data. It is impossible with certainty to decide who the persons were whose names figure on Koan stamps. Extremely rarely do we find magistrates names with the prep. EHI,⁷ in the majority of instances single names on Koan stamps occur without a prep. in the genitive or nominative case and occasionally extremely abbreviated. Most prob. they are the names of the fabricants and not of the magistrates. Such an assumption would seem to be supported by the fact, ~~that~~ among other things, that the most frequent names of Koan stamps are Adaïos, Orobion, and Polites and others which are not to be found on Koan lapidary inscriptions and coins.⁸ [Lists of names found on Kos, see PH]

The dependence of Koan amphora containers on Rhodian necessarily calls attention to itself. It can be seen in the angular curve of Koan amphora handles and in several other technical specific characteristics of Koan amphoras which have not infrequently caused investigators to confuse Koan stamps with Rhodian, and also in the use as emblems on Koan stamps (which in general are rather rare) of typically Rh. motifs --

(p.132) the pomegranate blossom, the caduceus et al. (no. 544, 564).

Anastagion stamp

On no. 543 The name of Adaios is encountered very frequently on Koan double-barrelled handles, it occurs also on single-barrelled ones. It is usually accompanied by the depiction of a pomegranate blossom which was borrowed from the typology of Rh. stps (no.544). Whether there was such a depiction on our stamp it is impossible to tell, since the right part of the stamp is broken off. VG dates Koan handles with the stamp of Adaios which were found on Delos at the beg. of the 1st cent. BC.

On no. 544 [AAAI plus pomegranate blossom]

(p.133 On no. 545 The stamp reads from right to left. The name is new for Koan stamps.

On no. 546 A similar stamp was published by A. Dumont who considered it to be Knidian. Such stamps have already been found in the north E. Sea region.

On no. 547 T-62. Mound 1. Without no.

On no. 548 Inscription reads from right to left.

On no. 549 The inscription reads from right to left.

On no. 550 This inscription reads from right to left. The stamps of Lochos are encountered not infrequently on Koan handles.

On no. 551 The name Orobion is one of the most frequently encountered on Koan stamps.

Stamps with this name have been found in the north E. Sea region, in Athens, in Alexandria, on Delos, in Palestine. The find of a stamp of this type in Pergamon proposes that it be dated at the end of the 3rd or the beg. of the 2nd cent. BC.

(133) However VG points out the fact that stamps of Orobian ~~are~~ discovered on Delos and at the Ath. Agora according to the conditions of the find and the shape of the handles cannot be that early, and proposes that we see in them the stamps of a later homonym p.134 presumably of the end of the 2nd cent. BC. If this is the case then our stamp which was printed it seems with the same die as the stamp from Delos belongs to the same Orobian II, for whom a shape of the Ω open toward the top () and the use of the name in the nominative case would seem to be characteristic, while on stamps from Pergamon and from Tyre the Ω is open toward the bottom (Ω) and the name appears in the genitive case.

On no. 552 A stamp of Orobian II.

553

554 Pomegranate blossom $\Pi\Omega\Lambda\Gamma\Theta\Xi$

The extremely stylised and simplified depiction of the blossom to the left of the inscription which recalls several depictions on late Rh. stamps, ¹⁷ establishes the date of this stamp as not earlier than the end of the 2nd cent. BC.

On no. 555 To the left of the inscription there is some sort of unclear depiction or letters.

On no. 556 On both barrels of the red-clay double-barrelled handle -- on a rectangular anepigraphic stamp in the shape of a two-pronged fork which falls along the stamp.

(25.IV.77)

- 21 -

R. Burgi &
P. M. W. M. Lippman

p. 127 Chapter 2 -- Knidian Stamps

[also KOAN, on p. 24 of text.]

Knidian wine was very popular in the ancient world, it is referred to by various Greek and Roman authors. Knidian wine amphoras of the Hellenistic period are very well known owing to the stamps found on them which contain the ethnicon KNIDION or KNIDAIEN (sometimes abbreviated). Both the evolution of the shape of Kn. amphoras and the chronological changes in the manner of stamping have been quite well investigated. Usually Kn. stamps contain three items of information:

- 1) the name of the eponym magistrate preceded by the prep. EHI, occasionally with and indication of his function -- ΔΑΜΙΟΠΡΟΣ or ΦΡΟΥΠΑΡΧΟΣ; 2) the name of the ergasteriarch; 3) the ethnicon.

In one group of stamps which can be dated at the end of the 2nd and the beg. of the 1st cent. BC, in addition to this data we find the names of two other officials, sometimes accompanied by the titles APXONTEN or ANAPEN. All this data can be placed on two stamps on the two handles of the amphora or can be found on one stamp. In the second instance on both handles of the amphora one and the same stamp may appear or the second handle can remain unstamped.

Inasmuch as the ethnicon is by no means found on all Kn. stamps and the shapes of the stamps and the formulae of the inscriptions are quite various, it is not always possible to distinguish Kn. stamps with sufficient accuracy. Indicators for such a distinction can be found in the clay and the general shape of the amphora handle. This data however does not always enable us with complete certainty to refer a stamp to the Kn. category particularly if the stamp is poorly preserved. In our small collection of Kn. stamps two stamps (no. 535, 539) occasion certain doubt as to whether or not they belong to this centre (see also commentary on stamp 601).

Although we already know very many Kn. stamps in the north B. Sea region they are encountered comparatively rarely. The export of Kn. wine was made basically

Take
TX. 8.1
Garden & P. M. W. M. Lippman
copy

A 2nd copy
is going to be
sent to C.
Kochler
12.11.77

(p.128) to other regions, particularly to Athens where Kn. stamps comprise significantly⁴ more than half of all finds of amphora stamps in general. Just as significant was⁵ the importing of Kn. wine to Delos. During the excavations of the cities of the north Be-Black Sea region it was found that Kn. stamps comprise on the whole only a small percentage⁶ of the overall no. of the amphora stamps. The twelve Kn. stamps in our collection completely correspond to this usual norm.

The general chronological frame and the individual periods of Kn. stamping have^{3rd} been quite firmly established. This stamping was employed from the third to the beg.⁷ of the 1st cent. BC, i.e. at precisely the same time that^{as} (it was employed) in Rhodes. The majority of Tanais finds of this type which admit of a more precise dating belong to the end of the 2nd or the beg. of the 1st cent. BC.

On no. 531⁸ The name of the eponym Apollonidas is frequently found on Kn. stamps. Sometimes it is mentioned with the title $\Theta\text{POY}\text{P}\text{A}\text{R}\text{K}\text{O}\text{Z}$. This circumstance and also the conditions of the find of one of the stamps with the name Apollonidas in the^{made possible} complex of the cistern B 20;2 at the Ath. Agora enabled⁹ the dating of the eponym Ap. in the period 188-166 BC. Incidentally it is possible that there also was¹⁰ a second eponym of this name who came considerably later in the beg. of the 1st cent. BC.

p.129 On no. 532 The inscription reads from right to left. In her publication of a similar stamp [see reading] VG remarks that stamps of this type are known even¹¹ earlier and must be dated in the 3rd quarter of the 2nd cent. BC. A stamp of¹² this type was found in the Pergamon complex.

On no. 533 The stamps of the eponym Politas are referred by VG to the end of¹³ the 2nd and the beg. of the 1st cent. BC. Obviously the fabricant Nikasiboulos should be dated at the same time.

p 129) On no. 534 [reading] Prow of ship
on the left

The eponym Sosiphron¹⁴ is well-known on Kn. stamps. An amphora
with a similar stamp was found in Ath. in a complex from the end of the 2nd cent. BC.¹⁵
VG refers his activities to the beg. of his duoviri-period. The fabricant Diodotos¹⁶
mentioned on our stamp must also be dated to the end of the 2nd cent. BC. However¹⁷
VG admits the possibility of the existence of two fabricants of this name.

On no. 535 Both names are known on Kn. stamps of the end of the 2nd and beg. of the
1st cent. BC.¹⁸ Probably similar stamps, not completely preserved, were read by¹⁹
V. Canarache as ENI DIONYSIOU.

(p.130) On no. 536 The stamp was published by A. I. Boltunova [Chatterbox].²⁰
A similar stamp from Tyre was published by E.M. Shtaerman who for²¹
some reason considered it to be Rhodian. V. Canarache properly designated a similar
stamp from Istria as belonging to the group of Kn. stamps but he erroneously read the²²
name of the fabricant which has been incompletely preserved as EYPOINOZ. The find²³
of a similar stamp in the construction layer of the south stoa of the Ath Agora made
possible the dating of it to a period around the middle of the 2nd cent. BC.²⁴
However there was also another Kn. fabricant who had the same name and whose activities²⁵
can be referred to the end of the 2nd and the beg. of the 1st cent. BC. In his
stamps there is mentioned the name of a later eponym Sosiphron (no. 534).²⁶ When
we first mentioned our stamp we erroneously referred it to the stamps of this
Euphrosynos II.

On no. 537 The names read from right to left. A very similar stamp from the
Bosphorus, except with the addition of the ethnicon KNIAION was published by²⁷
E.M. Pridik. On Kn. stamps we encounter the name of the eponym Lachartos who²⁸
belonged to the first half of the 2nd cent. BC. However, the L. on our stamp as
well as the Aristogenes, obviously was the member of the committee of officials whose

(p.130) names are occasionally preceded by the title ANAPQN. This requires us to date the stamp in the duoviri-period, i.e. at the end of the 2nd and the beg. of the 1st cent. BC.

On no. 538 A completely unreadable rectangular stamp.

On no. 539 This stamp is referred to the Kn. group provisionally.

On no. 540 An unreadable rectangular stamp with the depiction of a trident at the right.

p. 131 On no. 541 A rectangular stamp.

On no. 542 An undecipherable rectangular stamp with the depiction of a palmette.

Chapter 3 -- Koan Stamps

Koan stamps on double-barrelled amphora handles were first distinguished by A. Maiuri among those found on the island of Kos on the basis of the coincidence of a large no. of names of these stamps with names found on Koan coins and in Koan lapidary inscriptions.¹ In 1951, E.M. Shtaerman as a means of comparing stamps on double- and single-barrelled handles which recall Rh. handles in shape except that they are more slender, proved the existence of Koan stamps on ordinary everyday amphora handles.² This discovery of E.M. Shtaerman is now accepted by all specialists in ceramic epigraphy, although many specific stamps on single-barrelled amphora handles which she had classified as Koan turned out to belong as a matter of fact to other centres.³ Despite the fact that the percentage of Koan amphora stamps among other remains of ceramic epigraphy has increased somewhat after this identification by E.M. Shtaerman nevertheless their number in finds remains comparatively small, which fact can be explained obviously by the sporadic nature of the stamping of Koan amphora containers. Numerous Koan amphora

(p.131) handles which were not stamped are very well known.⁴

In Tanais no more than 14 Koan stamps were found. They all occur on double-barrelled amphora handles but that two of these stamps (no. 549, 561) belong to Kos is still doubtful inasmuch as the clay of the handles on which they have been stamped differs somewhat from the ordinary Koan clay and moreover ~~they are without~~ [angob] the handles lack the bright ⁵ which is characteristic of Koan amphoras. Imitations of Koan amphoras are well-known.

~~(132)~~

(p.132) As far as the dating of Koan stamps is concerned the development of Koan amphoras⁶ in the course of the 4th to the 1st cent. BC has been investigated, but these amphs apparently were more or less regularly stamped only in the 2nd and 1st cent. BC. The chronology of Koan stamps has not as yet been elaborated, however, individual stamps can be dated from palaeographic and other data. It is impossible with certainty to decide who the persons were whose names figure on Koan stamps. Extremely rarely do we find magistrates names with the prep. EHI,⁷ in the majority of instances single names on Koan stamps occur without a prep. in the genitive or nominative case and occasionally extremely abbreviated. Most prob. they are the names of the fabricants and not of the magistrates. Such an assumption would seem to be supported by the fact, ~~that~~ among other things, that the most frequent names of Koan stamps are Adaïos, Orobion, ~~and~~ Polites and others which are not to be found on Koan lapidary inscriptions and coins.⁸ [Lists of names found on Kos, see PH]

The dependence of Koan amphora containers on Rhodian necessarily calls attention to itself. It can be seen in the angular curve of Koan amphora handles and in several other technical specific characteristics of Koan amphoras which have not infrequently caused investigators to confuse Koan stamps with Rhodian, and also in the use as emblems on Koan stamps (which in general are rather rare) of typically Rh. motifs --

(p.132) the pomegranate blossom, the caduceus et al. (no. 544, 564).

On no. 543 The name of Adaios is encountered very frequently on Koan double-barrelled handles, it occurs also on single-barrelled ones. It is usually accompanied by the depiction of a pomegranate blossom which was borrowed from the typology of Rh. stps (no. 544). Whether there was such a depiction on our stamp it is impossible to tell, since the right part of the stamp is broken off. VG dates Koan handles with the stamp of Adaios which were found on Delos at the beg. of the 1st cent. BC.

On no. 544 [AAAAI plus pomegranate blossom]

(p.133 On no. 545 The stamp reads from right to left. The name is new for Koan stamps.

On no. 546 A similar stamp was published by A. Dumont who considered it to be Knidian. Such stamps have already been found in the north E. Sea region.

On no. 547 T-62. Mound 1. Without no.

On no. 548 Inscription reads from right to left.

On no. 549 The inscription reads from rgt to lft.

On no. 550 This inscription reads from rgt to lft. The stamps of Lechos are encountered not infrequently on Koan handles.

On no. 551 The name Orobion is one of the most frequently encountered on Koan stamps. Stamps with this name have been found in the north E. Sea region, in Athens, in Alexandria, on Delos, in Palestine. The find of a stamp of this type in Pergamon proposes that it be dated at the end of the 3rd or the beg. of the 2nd cent. BC.

(133) However VG points out the fact that stamps of Oroblion ~~are~~ discovered on Delos and at the Ath. Agora according to the conditions of the find and the shape of the handles cannot be that early, and proposes that we see in them the stamps of a later homonym p.134 presumably of the end of the 2nd cent. BC. If this is the case then our stamp which was printed it seems with the same die as the stamp from Delos belongs to the same Oroblion II, for whom a shape of the S open toward the top () and the use of the name in the nominative case would seem to be characteristic, while on stamps from Pergamon and from Tyre the S is open toward the bottom (S) and the name appears in the genitive case.

On no. 552 A stamp of Oroblion II.

553

554 Pomegranate blossom HOATHE

The extremely stylised and simplified depiction of the blossom to the left of the inscription which recalls several depictions on late Rh. stamps, ¹⁷ establishes the date of this stamp as not earlier than the end of the 2nd cent. BC.

On no. 555 To the left of the inscription there is some sort of unclear depiction or letters.

On no. 556 On both barrels of the red-clay double-barrelled handle -- on a rectangular anepigraphic stamp in the shape of a two-pronged fork which falls along the stamp.

D.B. Shelov, Pottery Stamps from Tanais, 3rd to 1st centuries BC,
Moscow, 1975

p 134

Chapter 4

Sinopean Stamps

The group of Sinopean astynomic stamps is one of the most interesting divisions of ceramic epigraphy. The individuality of these stamps and their enormous numbers, coming mainly from the Pontic region, and above all from the ~~North~~ North Black Sea area, long ago turned scholars' attention upon them, particularly Russian and Soviet scholars. The Sinopean origin of the principal mass of astynomic stamps, while already suspected by V.N. Yurgevich and D. Robinson,¹ was brilliantly proved by B.N. Grakov in his monograph specially devoted to these stamps.² B.N. Grakov also gave the first classification of Sinopean stamps, dividing them into six chronological groups and distributing all the names known to him of astynomes and ergasteriarchs according to these groups. According to his presentation, the stamping of Sinopean amphoras arose at the end of the 4th c. BC, and continued to the first half of the 1st c. BC. In general, the chronological classification of Sinopean stamps of B.N. Grakov appears as follows:

Group	I	end 4th c. BC - around 270 BC
	II	around 270 - 220
	III	around 220 - 180
	IV	around 180 - 150
	V	around 150 - 120
	VI	around 120 - 70

The attribution of the astynomic stamps ~~proposed~~ ^{established} by B.N. Grakov and the chronological classification of them proposed by him were

1. Yurgevich, Inscrs on handles and frags of amphs and tiles found in Theodosia in 1894, ZOOID XVIII, 1895, p 90-94; Robinson, Gk and Lat Inscrs from Sinope and Env, AJA IX, 1905, p 299-300.
2. Grakov, Anc Gk ceramic sts with names of astynomes, Moscow, 1929, p 11 ff.
3. Ibid., p 107 ff.

A 2nd copy
is going to be
sent to E. Kessler
12.10.99

p 135

accepted by all scholars and remain to this day the basis for dealing with this category of epigraphic ceramic monuments. But the absolute chronology of Sinopean stamps has undergone revision and significant modification. Already in his review of B.N. Grakov's book, A.N. Zograff pointed out that the beginning of Sinopean stamping should be dated not to the end but, for example, to the middle of the 4th c. BC.⁴ The necessity of moving the beginning date to the middle of the 4th c. BC was noted by A.A. Neichardt; she based this on the redating of Sinopean silver coins by T. Reinak and on the facts established by finds of early Sinopean stamps in archeological complexes.⁵

Accordingly, B.N. Grakov, proceeding from these supporting facts, redated the beginning moment of Sinopean stamping, bringing it to the middle of the 4th c. BC.⁶ However the chronology of the remaining groups was not revised by him.⁷ In the meantime, already in 1951 A.A. Neichardt proposed to lower /this seems to mean 'put further into the past' in Russian/ the dates of the last three ^{chronological} groups of B.N. Grakov significantly, proceeding from the archeological context of finds.⁸

p 136

Other researchers also spoke of the necessity of a much earlier dating of the last groups.⁹ In 1960, V.I. Tsekhmistrenko brought the end of astynomic stamping down to the dividing line of the first and second quarters of the 2nd c. BC, while assuming the existence after that in Sinope of stamping only with the names of potters.¹⁰ But he did not give an absolute chronology for the various groups of Sinopean stamps. In 1963, S.A. Semenov, on the basis of study of the complexes of finds on the Bosporos proposed his chronological scale for all six groups of B.N. Grakov,¹¹ and in the same year I.B. Brashinsky published his

4. Zograff, ZfN XL ~~1-2~~ 1-2, 1930 p 175.

5. Neichardt, Monts of cer epig of Mirmeki and Tiritaki as a source for study of trade rels of the Bosporan realm with the Bl Sea centres in the Hell. period, PhD diss., Leningrad, ~~1951~~ 1951, p 11; eadem, On the question of the politics of Eumelos on the Euxine Sea, in The Ancient World, M; 1962, p 598.

6. Grakov, A stone settlement on the Dnieper (MIA, no; 36), Moscow 1954 p 90.

7. Ibid. p 91.

8. A.A. Neichardt, Monuments of ceramic epigraphy ..., p 12.

9. M.I. Maksimova, The Ancient Cities of the S-E Bl Sea area, M-L, 1956, p 218-9; Tsekhmistrenko, Sinopean cer sts with the names of master potters, ~~SA~~ SA 1960, no. 3 p 75; Brashinsky, Advances in cer epig, SA 1961, no. 2 p 301.

10. Tsekhmistrenko, Sinopean cer sts ..., p 75; idem., Sts as a source for the study of ceramic production at Sinope 4th-2nd c. BC, PhD diss. 1966 1963, p 8-9;

11. Report on the 3rd session of the Odessa arch. society in Kerch 23 Sept, 1963

unpub.?

accepted by all scholars and remain to this day the basis for dealing
with this category of epigraphic^{ceramic} monument;

chronological scheme.¹² Both the latter scholars, while completely accepting the classificational grouping of B.N. Grakov, propose a rather profound alteration of his dates. Here are their chronological boundaries:

	S.A. Semenov	I.B. Brashinsky
Group		
I	350-325	360-320
II	325-280	320-270
III	280-245	270-220
IV	245-215	220-183
V	215-170	183-150
VI	170-110	150-100

As we see, the two schemes are fairly close to each other in the definition of the first groups and differ significantly in the dating of the last groups, although the authors of the two schemes were proceeding on the basis of the same material, the testimony of archeological complexes. At the present time ever more often voices are raised in favour of an even greater lowering /putting farther back/ of the dates of Sinopean stamps.¹³ V.I. Tsekhmistrenko, while dating the beginning of astynome stamping at Sinope to the middle of the 4th c. BC, at the same time places already in the second quarter of that century the first group of fabricant stamps without astynomes, thus defining the beginning of Sinopean stamping in the 70s of the 4th c. BC.¹⁴ But he assumes an even earlier introduction of stamping at Sinope -- in the first quarter of the 4th or even in the last quarter of the 5th c. BC. B.A. Vasilenko proposes a similarly early ~~dating~~ date fro the beginning of Sinopean stamping in a more definite way.¹⁵ He puts forward also a new chronological scheme for the whole of astynome stamping;¹⁶

12. Brashinsky, The economic relations of Sinope in the 4th-2nd c. BC, in The Ancient City, Moscow, 1963, p 133. Cp. J.B. Brashinsky, The progress of Greek ceramic epigraphy in the USSR, Eirene XI, ~~ix~~ 1973, p 127.

13. V.I. Pruglo, Sinopean amphora stamps from Mirmeki, KSIA 109, 1967, p 48;

B.A. Vasilenko, On the question of the dating of Sinopean stamps, SA 1971, ~~xxxx~~ no. 3, p 247-250; idem, Ceramic stamps from ancient settlements ... PhD diss., Moscow, 1972, p 16-18.

14. Tsekhmistrenko, Sinopean ceramic stamps ..., p 68.

15. ~~Vasilenko~~ Vasilenko, On the question of the dating of Sinopean stamps, p249-50

16. Vasilenko, Ceramic stamps from anc setmts ..., p 18

Vasilenko

p 137

Group	I	400-360 BC
	II	360-310
	III	310-260
	IV	260-220
	V	220-180
	VI	180-130

From this short survey it is apparent that the absolute chronology of Sinopean ceramic stamps can by no means yet be considered established. In particular, the dates of stamps in the last three chronological groups, which are chiefly represented in the Tanais excavations, are highly insecure. In accord with the chronological schemes of S.A. Semenov and I.B. Brashinsky, these groups occupy the end of the 3rd and the whole of the 2nd c. BC, while according to the chronology of V.I. Tsekhmistrenko they should be dated to the 3rd c. and 1st quarter of the 2nd c. BC, since, by his scheme, astynome stamping at Sinope comes to an end already in the first quarter of the 2nd c. BC. Apparently, the later limits of Sinopean stamps should be chronologically placed at approximately the same date also according to the proposals of V.I. Pruglo. B.A. Vasilenko attributes the three later groups of stamps to the 2nd half of the 3rd and first three quarters of the 2nd c. BC, while I.T. Kruglikova and Yu.G. Vinogradov accept the later dating to the whole 2nd c. BC.¹⁷

The very early end of Sinopean astynome stamping proposed by V.I. Tsekhmistrenko seems to us nevertheless not very likely. In the first place, the date itself of this end in the works of V.I. Tsekhmistrenko is not very clearly defined: it is placed at the end of the first quarter of the 2nd c. BC, but here it is affirmed that the liquidation of the astynome magistracy at Sinope happened ^{a few} years before the taking of the city by Pharnakes I, i.e. at the beginning of the 80s of that century.¹⁸ In the second place, the sense and reasons

17. I.T. Kruglikova, Stamps on amphoras from the excavations of the settlement at the village of Semenovka, KSIA, 116, 1969, p 96-97; I.T. Kruglikova, Yu.G. Vinogradov, The stamps of Sinope on amphoras from the settlement of Andreevka Yuzhnaya (South Andreevka), KSIA 133, 1973, p 45.

18. Tsekhmistrenko, Sinopean ceramic stamps ..., ~~pp 75 and note 106~~; idem, Stamps ..., p 10, 11.

for such changes in the period of the existence of an independent city remain altogether incomprehensible, a point to which attention has already been drawn.¹⁹ In the third place, if we recognize the dates accepted by V.I. Tsekhmistrenko for the beginning and end of astynome stamping -- 350 and 188 BC --, then it is necessary to recognize that it lasted for 162 years or about that: the number of astynomes should not be higher than the number of years of stamping. Whereas according to the calculations of Tsekhmistrenko himself the number by name of known astynomes is greater than 182,²⁰ and if we consider that a certain quantity of names may be yet unknown to us (although that quantity cannot be significant), we must recognize that the duration of the period of astynome stamping was not less than 200 years. Therefore it is impossible to recognize the concluding date of V.I. Tsekhmistrenko without moving the introduction of astynome stamping at least to the beginning of the 4th c. BC. However, we have seen that B.A. Vasilenko is inclined to attribute this event already to the end of the 5th c. BC.

p 138

If the absolute chronological frames of the astynome groups of B.N. Grakov must now be revised, still the groups themselves and their sequence, i.e. the relative dating of Sinopean astynome stamps, established by B.N. Grakov, retains its importance even today. A different classification from that of B.N. Grakov was proposed by V.I. Tsekhmistrenko, using ^{as} ~~for~~ its ^{basis} ~~base~~ the comparison of combinations of names and devices on the same stamp.²¹ All the astynome stamps were distributed by him first into four and later _o into five chronological periods or into nine stages; in addition, he defined certain groups of stamps without astynomes which preserve only the names of fabricants (or, as V.I. Tsekhmistrenko believes, master potters).²² These groups are in part simultaneous with astynome stamping, in part precede or follow it.²³ On the basis of this

19. Brashinsky, *Advances in ceramic epigraphy* ..., p 302.

20. Tsekhmistrenko, *Stamps* ..., p 6-8.

21. Tsekhmistrenko, *On the question of the periodization of Sinopean ceramic stamps*, *SA* ~~1966~~ 1958, no.1, p 56 ff; *idem*, *Stamps* ..., p 6 ff.

22. Tsekhmistrenko, *On the attribution of the second names on Sinopean stamps*, *NE* VII, 1968 p 23 ff.

23. Tsekhmistrenko, *Sinopean ceramic stamps* ..., p 59 ff

classification V.I. Tsekhmistrenko defined eight chronological groups from second quarter of the 4th c. BC to the first quarter of the 2nd c. BC inclusive.

The classificational work of V.I. Tsekhmistrenko has a number of evident merits, giving the author the possibility of revising and giving greater definition to some of the postulates of B.N. Grakov's classification. There is, first and foremost, the use by V.I. Tsekhmistrenko of the method of comparison of dies and his definition of variants or varieties within the astynome group. Of indisputable merit is his working out of the question of the anastynomic stamps, very cursorily considered by B.N. Grakov, in particular of the group of stamps which preceded astynome stamping. But in general the classification of V.I. Tsekhmistrenko cannot replace the classification of B.N. Grakov, since it suffers from essential deficiencies, making the use of it difficult and sometimes impossible:

- 1) it is very complicated and involved, for the periodization of the stamps of astynomes and potters was produced according to different reasons, ~~where~~ the chronological groups do not correspond to the periods and stages etc.;
- 2) it does not contain absolute dates, but only a sequence of stages, one giving way to the next; absolute dates ~~for~~ ^{for} the periods may be determined indirectly from consideration of the potter groups, but these dates ~~are~~ ^{do} not always synchronize with the dates obtained by the method of calculation of the number of astynomes in each stage and period;
- 3) the author has not given a list of eponyms and fabricants for each period and stage, as B.N. Grakov did, but limits himself to a bare indication of their number, and he did not provide precise criteria for assigning individual stamps to one stage or another.

All this forces us in the definition of Sinopean stamps to use the chronological classification of B.N. Grakov, taking into account, of course, also the observations of V.I. Tsekhmistrenko, in particular the interesting list compiled by him of the gradual changes in the readings and devices of Sinopean stamps.²⁴

24. Tsekhmistrenko, On the question of periodization ..., p 68.

p 139

The uncertainty of the datings of Sinopean stamps forces us to pay special attention to the ~~these~~ archeological complexes in which they have been found. Unfortunately the Tanais material ~~gives~~ gives practically no basis for dating Sinopean stamps by archeological context, since these stamps were not found here in closed, narrowly dated complexes. A few Sinopean stamps were found in Hellenistic grain pit 10 in excavation XII, but among them were both the comparatively early (by ~~Tanais excavations~~ ^{lit. 'notions'} Tanais standards) stamps of the astynomes Leon and Hekataios (no. 567, 558) and the clearly later stamps of Hikesios, son of Bakkhios, Posios, son of Daiskos, and Metrodoros, son of Aristagoras (no. 562, 574, 568). And other material from this pit is dated both ~~to~~ ^{to} the ~~the~~ 3rd and to the 2nd-1st c. BC.²⁵ The earliest Sinopean stamps from Tanais belong to the 3rd and 4th chronological groups of B.N. Grakov and should be compared ~~it~~ with the 3rd period or the first two stages of the 4th period of V.I. Tsekhmistrenko. We may suppose that they date generally (lit. 'in summary') to the 3rd c. BC, perhaps even to the first half of the century, but they can certainly not be assigned to the end of the preceding century since material from the 4th c. BC among the Tanais finds is lacking in general. However there are only a few such stamps (no. 558, 564, 567, 569, 570, 575); the latest stamps of ~~the~~ ^{B.N. Grakov's} chronological groups V and VI with mention of the astynome with patronymic (the last stage of period IV and period V of V.I. Tsekhmistrenko) constitute the overwhelming majority of finds. Judging by certain combined finds of Sinopean stamps of the last chronological groups with late Rhodian stamps, it is possible to think that astynome stamping still existed at Sinope in the second half of the 2nd c. BC. We have in view above all the finding of a stamp of the astynome Leomedon, son of Epidemos (no. 565), in (on?) the floor of habitation location G in excavation

25. M.A. Nalivkina, Excavations of the SE section of Tanais (1960-1961), coll. Antiquities of the Lower Don, Moscow, 1965, p 133, 137.

VI together with a Rhodian eponym stamp of Polyaratos II of the second half of the 2nd c. BC (no. 183).²⁶ To the 2nd c. BC are dated also other ceramic fragments in the floor of this habitation, for example fragments of "Megarian" cups.²⁷ The presence in the (Πογμαζκε) full of the floor of fragments of ^{two painted} cups of Pergamene production with medallion reliefs on the bottom, whose manufacture must date still to the second half of the 3rd c. BC,²⁸ should best be explained by the long use of this artistic ware. I shall mention also the finding of a stamp of the Sinopean astynome Polyktor, son of Demetrios, of chronological group V (no. 573) together with a Rhodian stamp of the eponym Euphranor II, dating to the 2nd quarter of the 2nd c. BC (no. 112), and a stamp of the astynome Phemios, son of Theopeitos, of group VI (no. 579) with the Rhodian eponym stamp of ~~Alexi~~ Alexiades of the second half of the 2nd c. BC (no. 14).

p 140

The great predominance among Sinopean epigraphical monuments from Tanais of stamps ^{of} the last two chronological groups distinguishes Tanais from the other centres of the Bosphoros, where the growth of Sinopean export to the end of stamping, although ^{it is} ~~xxxxx~~ also observed, but not is such a sharp form.²⁹ However the generally too insignifi- cant quantity ^{of finds} of Sinopean stamps at the Nedvigovski town still does ^{not} allow us to draw from that fact any definite conclusions.

-
26. A.I. Boltunova, I.S. Kamenetskii, D.V. Deopik, Excavations of the West region of Tanais (1957-1960), coll. Ancient antiquities of Podon'-Priazov', Moscow 1969, p 19. The dating of the Rhodian ~~stamp~~ stamp is wrong.*
27. Shelov, Finds at Tanais of "Megarian" cups, coll. Anc ant Podon'-Priazov', Moscow 1965, p 224 ff; idem Tanais and the Lower Don, 1970 p 166-7.
28. Boltunova, Kamenetskii, Deopik, ~~xxxxxx Tanais~~ Exc W Tanais, p 19, fig. 9; Shelov, Tanais and the Lower Don, p 167, fig on p 171.
29. Pridik, MIA 1941, p 179 ff, 186 ff; Neichardt, MIA Monuments ;:., p 11-13; Staerman MIA 1925, p 389; Shelov, MIA 1957 p 214; idem, Phanagoria, p 149; Brashinsky, Econ rel Sinope ..., p 137-139.

p. 68

- †
- (182) The Polyaratos II named on this stamp belongs in the number of eponyms of VI's group II.³⁰² Judging by an altered amphora die, the eponymic year of Polyaratos II follows immediately after the year of the eponym Klenostratos (no. 135).³⁰⁴ Stamps of the name of Polyaratos II are found in combination with supplementary stamps.³⁰⁵ ...
- (183) Boltunova assigned him to the 1st half of the 2nd c.³⁰⁷ but the stamps of this Polyaratos II, as we see, should be dated to the 2nd half of the century.

Shelov 1975
2nd carbon

4. III 92. Runt - re-run?

12.01

TANAIS : SINOPEAN

PMRM xxxix 111.83

D.B. Shelov, Pottery Stamps from Tanais, 3rd to 1st centuries BC,
Moscow, 1975

p 154 Chapter 4 Sinopean Stamps

p 135

The group of Sinopean astynomic stamps is one of the most interesting divisions of ceramic epigraphy. The individuality of these stamps and their enormous numbers, coming mainly from the Pontic region, and above all from the Mazhi North Black Sea area, long ago turned scholars' attention upon them; particularly Russian and Soviet scholars. The Sinopean origin of the principal mass of astynomic stamps, while already suspected by V.N. Yurgevich and D. Robinson,¹ was brilliantly proved by B.N. Grakov in his monograph specially devoted to these stamps.² B.N. Grakov also gave the first classification of Sinopean stamps, dividing them into six chronological groups and distributing all the names known to him of astynomes and ergastriarchs according to these groups. According to his presentation, the stamping of Sinopean amphoras arose at the end of the 4th c. BC, and continued to the first half of the 1st c. BC. In general, the chronological classification of Sinopean stamps of B.N. Grakov appears as follows:

Group	I	end 4th c. BC - around 270 BC
	II	around 270 - 220
	III	around 220 - 180
	IV	around 180 - 150
	V	around 150 - 120
	VI	around 120 - 70

The attribution of the astynomic stamps ^{established} ~~proposed~~ by B.N. Grakov and the chronological classification of them proposed by him were

1. Yurgevich, Inscrs on handles and frags of amphs and tiles found in Theodosia in 1894, MOOID XVIII, 1895, p 90-94; Robinson, Gk and Lat Inscrs from Sinope and Env, AJA IX, 1905, p 299-300.
2. Grakov, Anc Gk ceramic sts with names of astynomes, Moscow, 1929, p 11 ff.
3. Ibid., p 107 ff.

accepted by all scholars and remain to this day the basis for dealing with this category of epigraphic ceramic monuments. But the absolute chronology of Sinopean stamps has undergone revision and significant modification. Already in his review of B.N. Grakov's book, A.N. Zograff pointed out that the beginning of Sinopean stamping should be dated not to the end but, for example, to the middle of the 4th c. BC.⁴ The necessity of moving the beginning date to the middle of the 4th c. BC was noted by A.A. Neichardt; she based this on the redating of Sinopean silver coins by T. Reinak and on the facts established by finds of early Sinopean stamps in archeological complexes.⁵

Accordingly, B.N. Grakov, proceeding from these supporting facts, redated the beginning moment of Sinopean stamping, bringing it to the middle of the 4th c. BC.⁶ However the chronology of the remaining groups was not revised by him.⁷ In the meantime, already in 1951 A.A. Neichardt proposed to lower /it seems to mean 'put further into the past' in Russian/ the dates of the last three groups of B.N. Grakov significantly, proceeding from the archeological context of finds.⁸

p 136

Other researchers also spoke of the necessity of a much earlier dating of the last groups.⁹ In 1960, V.I. Tsakhmistrenko brought the end of astynomic stamping down to the dividing line of the first and second quarters of the 2nd c. BC, while assuming the existence after that in Sinope of stamping only with the names of potters.¹⁰ But he did not give an absolute chronology for the various groups of Sinopean stamps. In 1963, S.A. Semenov, on the basis of study of the complexes of finds on the Bosphorus proposed his chronological scale for all six groups of B.N. Grakov,¹¹ and in the same year I.B. Brashinsky published his

4. Zograff, *ZfN XL* 1-2, 1930 p 175.

5. Neichardt, *Monets of cer epig of Mirmaki and Tiritaki as a source for study of trade rels of the Bosphoran realm with the Bl Sea centres in the Hell. period*, PhD diss., Leningrad, 1951, p 11; eadem, *On the question of the politics of Samelos on the Euxine Sea*, in *The Ancient World*, M: 1962, p 598.

6. Grakov, *A stone settlement on the Dnieper* (MIA, no: 36), Moscow 1954 p 90.

7. *Ibid.* p 91.

8. A.A. Neichardt, *Monuments of ceramic epigraphy ...*, p 12.

9. M.I. Maksimova, *The Ancient Cities of the S-E Bl Sea area*, M-L, 1956, p 218-9;

Tsakhmistrenko, *Sinopean cer sts with the names of master potters*, *SA* 1960, no. 3 p 75; Brashinsky, *Advances in cer epig*, *SA* 1961, no. 2 p 301.

10. Tsakhmistrenko, *Sinopean cer sts ...*, p 75; *idem.*, *Sts as a source for the study of ceramic production at Sinope 4th-2nd c. BC*, PhD diss. 1960 1963

p 8-9;

11. Report on the 3rd session of the Odessa arch. society in Kerch 23 Sept, 1963

chronological scheme.¹² Both the latter scholars, while completely accepting the classificational grouping of B.N. Grakov, propose a rather profound alteration of his dates. Here are their chronological boundaries:

	S.A. Semenov	I.B. Brashinsky
Group		
I	350-325	360-320
II	325-280	320-270
III	280-245	270-220
IV	245-215	220-183
V	215-170	183-150
VI	170-110	150-100

As we see, the two schemes are fairly close to each other in the definition of the first groups and differ significantly in the dating of the last groups, although the authors of the two schemes were proceeding on the basis of the same material, the testimony of archeological complexes. At the present time ever more often voices are raised in favour of an even greater lowering /putting farther back/ of the dates of Sinopean stamps.¹³ V.I. Tsekhmistrenko, while dating the beginning of astynome stamping at Sinope to the middle of the 4th c. BC, at the same time places already in the second quarter of that century the first group of fabricant stamps without astynomes, thus defining the beginning of Sinopean stamping in the 70s of the 4th c. BC.¹⁴ But he assumes an even earlier introduction of stamping at Sinope -- in the first quarter of the 4th or even in the last quarter of the 5th c. BC. B.A. Vasilenko proposes a similarly early ~~starting~~ date for the beginning of Sinopean stamping in a more definite way.¹⁵ He puts forward also a new chronological scheme for the whole of astynome stamping;¹⁶

12. Brashinsky, The economic relations of Sinope in the 4th-2nd c. BC, in The Ancient City, Moscow, 1963, p 133. Cp. J.B. Brashinsky, The progress of Greek ceramic epigraphy in the USSR, Eirene XI, 1973, p 127.

13. V.I. Pruglo, Sinopean amphora stamps from Mirmeki, KSIA 109, 1967, p 48;

B.A. Vasilenko, On the question of the dating of Sinopean stamps, SA 1971, ~~xxxxx~~ no. 3, p 247-250; idem, Ceramic stamps from ancient settlements ... PhD diss., Moscow, 1972, p 16-18.

14. Tsekhmistrenko, Sinopean ceramic stamps ..., p 68.

15. ~~Vasilianko~~ Vasilenko, On the question of the dating of Sinopean stamps, p249-50

16. Vasilenko, Ceramic stamps from ancient settlements ..., p 18

p 137

Group	I	400-360 BC
	II	360-310
	III	310-260
	IV	260-220
	V	220-180
	VI	180-130

From this short survey it is apparent that the absolute chronology of Sinopean ceramic stamps can by no means yet be considered established. In particular, the dates of stamps in the last three chronological groups, which are chiefly represented in the Tanais excavations, are highly insecure. In accord with the chronological schemes of S.A. Semenov and I.B. Brashinsky, these groups occupy the end of the 3rd and the whole of the 2nd c. BC, while according to the chronology of V.I. Tsakhmistrenko they should be dated to the 3rd c. and 1st quarter of the 2nd c. BC, since, by his scheme, astynome stamping at Sinope comes to an end already in the first quarter of the 2nd c. BC. Apparently, the later limits of Sinopean stamps should be chronologically placed at approximately the same date also according to the proposals of V.I. Pruglo. B.A. Vasilenko attributes the three later groups of stamps to the 2nd half of the 3rd and first three quarters of the 2nd c. BC, while I.T. Kruglikova and Yu.G. Vinogradov accept the later dating to the whole 2nd c. BC.¹⁷

The very early end of Sinopean astynome stamping proposed by V.I. Tsakhmistrenko seems to us nevertheless not very likely. In the first place, the date itself of this end in the works of V.I. Tsakhmistrenko is not very clearly defined: it is placed at the end of the first quarter of the 2nd c. BC, but here it is affirmed that the liquidation of the astynome magistracy at Sinope happened ^{a few} some years before the taking of the city by Pharnakes I, i.e. at the beginning of the 80s of that century.¹⁸ In the second place, the sense and reasons

17. I.T. Kruglikova, Stamps on amphoras from the excavations of the settlement at the village of Semenovka, KSIA, 116, 1969, p 96-97; I.T. Kruglikova, Yu.G. Vinogradov, The stamps of Sinope on amphoras from the settlement of Andreevka Yuzhnaya (South Andreevka), KSIA 133, 1973, p 45.

18. Tsakhmistrenko, Sinopean ceramic stamps ..., ~~xxxix~~ p 75 and note 106; idem, Stamps ..., p 10, 11.

for such changes in the period of the existence of an independent city remain altogether incomprehensible, a point to which attention has already been drawn.¹⁹ In the third place, if we recognize the dates accepted by V.I. Tsekhmistrenko for the beginning and end of astynome stamping -- 350 and 188 BC --, then it is necessary to recognize that it lasted for 162 years or about that: the number of astynomes should not be higher than the number of years of stamping. Whereas according to the calculations of Tsekhmistrenko himself the number by name of known astynomes is greater than 182,²⁰ and if we consider that a certain quantity of names may be yet unknown to us (although that quantity cannot be significant), we must recognize that the duration of the period of astynome stamping was not less than 200 years. Therefore it is impossible to recognize the concluding date of V.I. Tsekhmistrenko without moving the introduction of astynome stamping at least to the beginning of the 4th c. BC. However, we have seen that B.A. Vasilenko is inclined to attribute this event already to the end of the 5th c. BC.

p 138

If the absolute chronological frames of the astynome groups of B.N. Grakov must now be revised, still the groups themselves and their sequence, i.e. the relative dating of Sinopean astynome stamps, established by B.N. Grakov, retains its importance even today. A different classification from that of B.N. Grakov was proposed by V.I. Tsekhmistrenko, using ^{as} ~~for~~ its ^{basis} ~~base~~ the comparison of combinations of names and devices on the same stamp.²¹ All the astynome stamps were distributed by him first into four and later, into five chronological periods or into nine stages; in addition, he defined certain groups of stamps without astynomes which preserve only the names of fabricants (or, as V.I. Tsekhmistrenko believes, master potters).²² These groups are in part simultaneous with astynome stamping, in part precede or follow it.²³ On the basis of this

19. Brashinsky, *Advances in ceramic epigraphy* ..., p 302.

20. Tsekhmistrenko, *Stamps* ..., p 6-8.

21. Tsekhmistrenko, On the question of the periodization of Sinopean ceramic stamps, *SA* 1968, no.1, p 56 ff; *idem*, *Stamps* ..., p 6 ff.

22. Tsekhmistrenko, On the attribution of the second names on Sinopean stamps, *ME* VII, 1968 p 23 ff.

23. Tsekhmistrenko, *Sinopean ceramic stamps* ..., p 59 ff

classification V.I. Tsakhmistrenko defined eight chronological groups from second quarter of the 4th c. BC to the first quarter of the 2nd c. BC inclusive.

The classificational work of V.I. Tsakhmistrenko has a number of evident merits, giving the author the possibility of revising and giving greater definition to some of the postulates of B.N. Grakov's classification. There is, first and foremost, the use by V.I. Tsakhmistrenko of the method of comparison of dies and his definition of variants or varieties within the astynome group. Of indisputable merit is his working out of the question of the anastynomic stamps, very cursorily considered by B.N. Grakov, in particular of the group of stamps which preceded astynome stamping. But in general the classification of V.I. Tsakhmistrenko cannot replace the classification of B.N. Grakov, since it suffers from essential deficiencies, making the use of it difficult and sometimes impossible:

- 1) it is very complicated and involved, for the periodization of the stamps of astynomes and potters was produced according to different reasons, ~~xxxx~~ the chronological groups do not correspond to the periods and stages etc.;
- 2) it does not contain absolute dates, but only a sequence of stages, one giving way to the next; absolute dates ~~for~~ ^{for} the periods may be determined indirectly from consideration of the potter groups, but these dates ~~xxx~~ ^{do} not always synchronize with the dates obtained by the method of calculation of the number of astynomes in each stage and period;
- 3) the author has not given a list of eponyms and fabricants for each period and stage, as B.N. Grakov did, but limits himself to a bare indication of their number, and he did not provide precise criteria for assigning individual stamps to one stage or another.

All this forces us in the definition of Sinopean stamps to use the chronological classification of B.N. Grakov, taking into account, of course, also the observations of V.I. Tsakhmistrenko, in particular the interesting list compiled by him of the gradual changes in the readings and devices of Sinopean stamps.²⁴

24. Tsakhmistrenko, On the question of periodization ..., p 68.

The uncertainty of the datings of Sinopean stamps forces us to pay special attention to those archeological complexes in which they have been found. Unfortunately the Tanais material ~~gives~~ gives practically no basis for dating Sinopean stamps by archeological context, since these stamps were not found here in closed, narrowly dated complexes. A few Sinopean stamps were found in Hellenistic grain pit 10 in excavation XII, but among them were both the comparatively early (by ~~Tanais standards~~ ^{lit 'notions'} Tanais standards) stamps of the astynomes Leon and Hekataios (no. 567, 558) and the clearly later stamps of Hikesios, son of Bakkhios, Posios, son of Daiskos, and Metrodoros, son of Aristagoras (no. 562, 574, 568). And other material from this pit is dated both ~~to~~ ^{to} the ~~3rd~~ 3rd and to the 2nd-1st c. BC.²⁵ The earliest Sinopean stamps from Tanais belongs to the 3rd and 4th chronological groups of B.N. Grakov and should be compared ~~th~~ with the 3rd period or the first two stages of the 4th period of V.I. Tsakhmistrenko. We may suppose that they date generally (lit. 'in summary') to the 3rd c. BC, perhaps even to the first half of the century, but they can certainly not be assigned to the end of the preceding century since material from the 4th c. BC among the Tanais finds is lacking in general. However there are only a few such stamps (no. 558, 564, 567, 569, 570, 575); the latest stamps of ~~the~~ ^{B.N. Grakov's} chronological groups V and VI with mention of the astynome with patronymic (the last stage of period IV and period V of V.I. Tsakhmistrenko) constitute the overwhelming majority of finds. Judging by certain combined finds of Sinopean stamps of the last chronological groups with late Rhodian stamps, it is possible to think that astynome stamping still existed at Sinope in the second half of the 2nd c. BC. We have in view above all the finding of a stamp of the astynome Leomedon, son of Epidemos (no. 565), in (on?) the floor of habitation location G in excavation

25. M.A. Nalivkina, Excavations of the SE section of Tanais (1960-1961), coll. Antiquities of the Lower Don, Moscow, 1965, p 133, 137.

VI together with a Rhodian eponym stamp of Polyaratos II of the second half of the 2nd c. BC (no. 183).²⁶ To the 2nd c. BC are dated also other ceramic fragments in the floor of this habitation, for example fragments of "Megarian" cups.²⁷ The presence in the (погмазке) fill(?) of the floor of fragments of ^{two painted} cups of Pergamene production with medallion reliefs on the bottom, whose manufacture must date still to the second half of the 3rd c. BC,²⁸ should best be explained by the long use of this artistic ware. I shall mention also the finding of a stamp of the Sinopean astynome Polyktor, son of Demetrios, of chronological group V (no. 573) together with a Rhodian stamp of the eponym Euphranor II, dating to the 2nd quarter of the 2nd c. BC (no. 112), and a stamp of the astynome Phemios, son of Theopetitos, of group VI (no. 579) with the Rhodian eponym stamp of ~~xxxx~~ Alexiades of the second half of the 2nd c. BC (no. 14).

p 140

The great predominance among Sinopean epigraphical monuments from Tanais of stamps ^{of} the last two chronological groups distinguishes Tanais from the other centres of the Bospores, where the growth of Sinopean export to the end of stamping, although ^{it is} ~~xxxx~~ also observed, but not ^{of finds} ~~is~~ such a sharp form.²⁹ However the generally too insignificant quantity ^{of finds} of Sinopean stamps at the Nedvigovski town still ^{not} allows us to draw from that fact any definite conclusions.

26. A.I. Boltunova, I.S. Kamenetskii, D.V. Deopik, Excavations of the West region of Tanais (1957-1960), coll. Ancient antiquities of Podon'-Priazov', Moscow 1969, p 19. The dating of the Rhodian stamp is wrong.

27. Shelov, Finds at Tanais of "Megarian" cups, coll. Ancient Podon'-Priazov', Moscow 1965, p 224 ff; idem Tanais and the Lower Don, 1970 p 166-7.

28. Boltunova, Kamenetskii, Deopik, ~~xxxxxx~~ Excavations at Tanais, p 19, fig. 9; Shelov, Tanais and the Lower Don, p 167, fig on p 171.

29. Fridik, MIA 1941, p 179 ff, 186 ff; Neichardt, ~~xxx~~ Monuments etc., p 11-13; Staerman MIA 1925, p 389; Shelov, MIA 1957 p 214; idem, Phanagoria, p 149; Brashinsky, Icon rel Sinope ..., p 137, 139.

D.B.Shelov, The Necropolis of Tanais, Excavations of 1955-58, Moscow, 1961.

p. 55.-56

Inventory of the burials.

(. . . . Here we get down to descriptions and comments on the finds, which in the earlier part of the book are just enumerated.)

Ceramics

Amphoras.

The no. of amphoras found in the burials is not great but their assortment is of a certain interest since in it is rather accurately reflected ^{by} that of the amphora remains which are found in the city. In the burials of the Hell. period sts. were placed Rhodian amph.s. The stamp imprint of the foot of an amph. of this kind was detected when Burial 60 was cleared. In Grave 70 has been preserved the bottom of a Rh. amph. However of course far more interesting is the discovery of a broken but completely reassembled amph. with stamps on both handles. This amph. together with another Sinopean one was found in the contents of a completely destroyed grave which was not ^{given} a specific no. during Excavation III. Both amphoras stood vertically at the western end of the grave, undoubtedly at the feet of the interred. The Rh. amph. ^{by} in the shape of the neck and the handles can be dated between the 3rd and 2nd century B.C. but the long proportions of the body and the comparatively slanting shoulders of the amph. permit one to date it more accurately in the 2nd c. B.C. This date corresponds well with the script of the stamps on its handles. On one of these has been impressed a 3-line rect. stamp (pl. XV, 1) which reads from r. to l.

[ΕΠ'ΙΕΡΕΩΣ]
ΑΡΙΣΤΕΙΑΑ
ΑΡΤΑΜΙΤΙΟΥ

The 1st line was not impressed, but the whole seal can easily be restored from a complete parallel which was probably made by the same stamped, which was published by B.V. Schkorpil. ² The name of the eponym ΑΡΙΣΤΕΙΑΑΣ in Rh. ceramic epigr. Seals with this name were encountered in the so-called Pergamon complex

A copy of this
is going to be sent
to Car. Kahler
12.III.99

(p.55)

which can be dated from 220-180 B.C. At the same time this name occurs in stamps of a special group which we have subdivided as a "cursive group" which are associated with a later period, 180-150 B.C. Hiller von G.

p.56

proceeding from the difference in the scripts of the various stamps with the name APIZTEIAAZ thought it was possible to distinguish on Rhodes two eponyms of this name, however there is no need for this inasmuch as both the script of the cursive stamps and the script of the other stamps of APIZT. (and among them the ~~Tanais~~ Tanais stamp which has been published) does not prevent contradict ~~or~~ our placing them all at the beginning of the 2nd c. B.C. VG places the eponym APIZTEIAAZ with whom we are concerned in Grp III of her chronological classification of Rho. amph. stamps i.e. approx. to the same time as the Perg. complex. Obviously the activity of the eponym AP. took place at the end of the '80s of this century. This dating is confirmed also by the fact that among the stamps of this eponym are some in which along with the legend there occurs a depiction of the head of Helios in the form of a radiant disk. This depiction must, in the opinion of B.N.Grakov in the majority of cases be dated in the period wh. follows directly after the time of the Perg. complex. In this way we receive a very precise dating of the APIZT. stamp and of our amphora. On the second handle of the amphora there is also a rect. stamps with the name of the ergasteriarch. It was stamped only partially, and besides, it is broken off. But in spite of this, one can read it with certainty: in 2 lines, l. to r., is written M[E]NE/KP[ATHE]. To the l. of the inser. is depicted a cluster of grapes (pl.XV, 2). Similar stamps are known among the finds from the N. Black Sea area.

The discovery of a Rh. amph. with both stamps intact in view of the fact that despite the enormous no. of Rh. st. known to scholars, we have only a v. insignificant no. of jars that preserve both st. and thus provide the possibility of comparing the ep. st. with the manufacturer's. This circumstance makes the chronological classification of the potters' stamp v. difficult, and every evidence of the contemporaneity of any given stamp of an erg. with any ep's

(p.56)

stamp is extremely valuable. The presence of the ~~mfex~~ manufacturer's st. of Menekrates on an amphora with a rather accurately dated st. of the Ep. AP-ISTEIAAS makes it possible to determine chronologically the time of the activities of this ergast. [Our amph. is the 2nd complete Rh. amph. from Tanais; the 1st was discovered by P.M. Leontiev in one of the mounds of the Tanais necropolis (T.N. Knipowitch, Tanais, p.34, fig.2).]

As already stated above, the Rh. amph. which has been described as coming from the destroyed grave of the 2nd c. B.C. was found with a completely preserved Sinopean amph. The shape of the latter (pl. XV, 3) coincides precisely with that of the Sinopean amph. found in one of the burials of the Elizavetinsk grave complex in the Kuban published by I. B. Zest; v. charact. are the round body and the comparatively wide neck. The Eliz. amph. is also without a stamp. It can be dated by what was found with it as well as by 2 other similar amphs. from the same site in the 2nd c. B.C. This date corresponds v. well with our dating of the Rh. amph. descr. above. ~~Another Sinopean~~

Another Sin. amph. was found in destroyed burial 20; the top and one of the handles have been lost. In shape this amph. is somewhat diff. from the former. It has a cone-shaped body with a rather sharply delineated outline from the lower body to the shoulders (pl. XIV, 2). The nearest analogy to it is the amph. from the Zelensky mound which bears the stamps of the astynome and the potter on both handles.

Note the text, of which we have been selected parts in translation, is in a (small) book: D. B. Shelov, Pottery Stamps from Taurus III - I B.C., Moscow 1975 (in Russian). See "Pharmacia L.", notes 15 and 54.

The book is kept in the next & bottom shelf of the East shelves, with other Russian publications.

18.III.86

Note there are now 3 copies of (all?) parts translated. Some could be filed in RHODIAN, KNID., SINOP., etc. folders. But watch that later annotations are on all.

15.01

11. VII. 27

Trans. of Shelo ^{Tanais} in order A

pg. 33-38

Text

3-20

(Loss of
transl. in
order)

1-2

28-32

21-27 (Kied)

14, IX, 81

Y.S. with Trans

Shelo
4

Pambispa (w. text)
Phang

and Shordnow (work order by in 2
EAD 27)

[25. VII. 77]

15.02

Dear Miss Grace,

We have returned (in one piece!)
to Athens and are hoping to
accept your dinner invitation
for Tuesday evening. I will
call you either here or at home

Notes on Shelton, pp. 27, 11.
(Grand & PWM)

Not worth paying too much attention to his
table based on chronol. which itself is still not
reliable.

SHELON 1975
TRANSL. OF AD HOC SELECTION

15. IV. 77
Friday

17

Do write Burgi, Monday 18th

of letter of inquiry from Pilg, to be filed under
BENGHAZI

<u>Pilg. nos.</u>	<u>Shelon 1975</u> ("Post. stamps from Tunisia")
1	2) no. 86 (and full spelling "Astumede")
2	1) nos. 23-25
6	4) 271-5
7	6) 413-6
8	3) 100-101
11	5) 329-330

Here there is a bad date ref. to the many times rejected comb. 3 days — of most recently EAD 27, pp. 305-6, under E 15. And, after all, he has just cited that page, also that no, things he does not suggest.

12

67-8

Burgi please to translate cat. list of these:

288✓	No. 40	168
77✓	51	264
78✓	68	288
264✓	77	326
68✓	78	351
326✓	87	378
54✓		405
378✓		451
87✓		
351✓		
168✓		
451✓		
405✓		

(They are handle of pairs)

No photo.

No measurement

TANAIIS

COMB. S

1.)

a.)

Τοι Αφιδωτος

Υακινθιδου

filed

b.)

Διου

filed

Shelton, Patch Stamps for Tanais,

Moscow 1975, p. 43, no. 68

Same, p. 96, no. 326

~~Described as a "white amphora"~~

No measurement

made.

No photo

2.)

a.)

Τοι Αφιδωτος

Υακινθιδου

Αφιδου

filed

b.)

Ευκλιδου

κατασκευαστη.

filed

Shelton 1975, pp. 77-8, no. 87

Same, p. 101, no. 351

"Shattered amphora"

Shelov's Neurospira of Tanaia, 1961,
and other publication on Tanaia,
incl. Shelov 1970 (Tanaia & Loxodonta)
do we have this? A Yes

— not in both cards, nor in Shelov files

The 1961 vol. has a couple of plates showing
whole jars (not very well), where as included ~~the~~ 2
Rhodian stamps, the relict of a whole jar. But not a
series of readings.

But somewhere I certainly leave note on a Tanaia
publication in which are readings of stamps. I
remember that the Rhodians were not very early.
Probably this is out, not filed. Watch for it.

16. VI. 76

This is Pott's Stamps of Tanaia (1975) ^{IN SEPARATE}
^{FOLDER}

Now these are all in place. This ought to be
processed, with some translations. I think some
work may have been done. Watch for more papers.

Knidian from Tanais

published by Shelov 1975, pp 127-131.

Pottery stamps from Tanais, 3rd to 1st C. B.C.

1) p. 128 no. 531 and pl. VI:

] Απολλων space Shelov completes επι] Απολλων[ida
? T...] r200

I do not find parallel in Knidian file 27.VI.92 Perhaps

2) p. 128 no. 532 and pl. VI

ΑΘην KT #4

επι Δα

μογε

retr.

not Knidian?

Singer?

3) p. 129 no. 533 and pl. VI

επι Πολλ'τα

KT 1072

Νικασιβουχος

4) p. 129 no. 534

* επι Σωσιγρονος

not illustrated

Κυ]διον half-ship KT 396

Αιο]δοτου

5) p. 129 no. 535 and pl. VI

KT 2041

Αγαθοφ = Αγαδο(δωρον) by Shelov

Νυσιου

Κυ]διον 3rd line
read by us* Check
reading for
KT publica-
tion (i.e.,
restoration)

6) p. 130 no. 536 not illustrated

Ευπροσυνον

KT 654

Κ]υδιον [ivy leaf] added by us

23.V.2000

It is filed by A.A. if seems one
have corrected it what was the reading
by Shelov because he didn't end of gus-
see p. 23 of translation 1st B.C.
25.V.77

7) p. 130 no. 537 not illustrated

Λαχάρτου ~~III~~ ~~IV~~

Αριστογέρους
(retr)
called by us
trident because
on our ex.s w. see
prongs

KT 224

8) p. 130 no. 538 not illustrated
no reading

9) p. 130 no. 539 not illustrated

επ[ι] -----

ιζ -----

I would suggested a fabricant
λεροκχus for the 2nd line

10) p. 130 no 540 not-illustrated

not read

11) p. 130 no. 541 not illustrated

----- K_{VI} D

not read

----- v

12) p. 130 no. 542 not illustrated

no reading

27. VII. 92

Not many, and still fewer found legible.
Ditto of those identified, 1/2 2nd and late 2nd

Tanaïs founded 1/4 of 3rd B.C.Tanaïs Rhodina : Early (for there)

false

Ἀγιοτίων 286-7

Κυρίων ms. 389 - 391 (p. 108)

(no months in the types)
MANUS

Μικυθός w. month m. 412 (p. 111)

list
(incomplete)epi

270-240 B.C.

IC Ἀγυόις m. 2

IIa Ἀγυόκετος m. 5

II "222" Ἀγυοσίδης ms. 70, 71 ?

? III "210" Δορικυβίδης ms. 100 - 101

270-240

IC Εὐχάρμος m. 102

IIa Εὐκλή m. 111

II "213" Θευφάνης 120

(Καλλικράτης I? 124-126, om. 5th? (II, "193 B.C.)

(Καλλικράτης I? ?

(Καλλικράτης I (183-175)

II "224?" Μυτίων 150

270-240

IC Νίκων 156

IIa Ξυδάρετος 159, 160

II Ξυδάρετος? 161?, 162?

III "200" Ξυοφάνης 163, 164?, 165-7

II Ὀνδρανδρος 172

II "207" Σώδαμος 191

II "206" Σώστρετος 195, 196

IIa Τυμοκλείδης 197

II Χαρμοκλής 227

(END)

23.II.2000

22

I would like to find the book
and check the readings given by Shilov 1975
There is not the book w. the translation.

I need to put away all the papers we have
concentrated after the new arrangement of the office.

Tanais founded 1/4 of 3rd B.C.

BLACK SEA AREA - USSR: SHELOV
TANAIS 1975 227