

VRG\_Folder\_0232



Pottery stamps

Yu. G. Vinogradov, "Ceramic seals of the island of Thasos," Numismatics and Epigraphy, X, The Institute of Archeology of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR, Moscow 1972, pp. 3-63. (Dedicated to his teacher, B.N.Grakov.)

The study of pottery stamps can follow 2 courses: 1) the study of stamps as an archeological source to ascertain dates with the purpose of establishing a chronology of the stratigraphic layers and other archeological objects; 2) the study of stamps as a source for the history of production and commerce, in other words for the economic history of the Greek world.

The study of the typology and chronology of the Thasos stamps acquires a special significance since it is closely linked with questions of the development of the economic ties of the ancient world. Inasmuch as on the one hand Thasos was the first center which began regular stamping and on the other Thasian wine with its special character won for itself a well-deserved fame among the ancients, one can therefore understand the influence which Thasian amphoras had in the morphologic-al and Thasian stamps in the typological aspects on the many stamped pottery vessels that were contemporary with them.

In treating the various well-studied details of Thasian chronology, we might be able to establish certain moments in dating, for ex. of the Sinope or Herakleian stamps. ~~inasmuch as~~ If we have a reliable chronology of Thasian stamps, we can date various archeological complexes in which the stamped amphoras of other centers are contained, and thereby facilitate the development and perfecting of ~~pottery~~ ceramic epigraphy. Thus for example it is a well-known fact that in the northern Bl. Sea region Thasian amphoras are found in burials as a rule with Herakleian ones with the latter predominating. Inasmuch as the Herak. stamped amphoras up to now have not yielded so easily to dating, the Thasian chronol. wd. therefore play a very definite and positive role. The same may be said about ascertaining datings and other categories of archeological material contained in these complexes.

In the years before the revolution both here and abroad there was almost no

7.10.81  
Old version:  
pp. 12-13  
This needs  
an article  
on Thasos  
Jan -  
X



(p.3) work devoted specifically to Thasian stamps. The picture in this area was the same as it had been in ceramic epigraphy as a whole: alongside of a rather voluminous collection of publications, theoretical research could be numbered on fingers, and concerned itself for the most part with Rhodian stamps (I have in mind the well-known works of F. Bleckmann and M. Nilsson)<sup>1</sup>. Without dwelling at length<sup>2</sup> on the work of A. Dumont, who as one of the first prefaced his publications with an introductory sketch with a characterisation of the basic groups of amphoras and stamps,<sup>3</sup> I wish to call attention only to the work of I. Machov [I. Machov, "Amphora handles from the island of Thasos imprinted with the names of the astynomes and with emblems which were found in the Chersonese," ITUAK, 48, 1912, pp.150, ff.] which was specially devoted to the publication of Thasian stamps from the Chersonese. This article suffers from many defects. Without mentioning the numerous errors in the reading of the inscriptions, in the explanation of the devices, and in the very reproduction of the stamps, one must point out the very strange opinion of the author who refers<sup>4</sup> to the names on the Thasian stamps as astynomes whom he considered obviously magistrates in all of the centers.

p.4

A new step forward in the study of stamps was made by E.M.Pridik and V.V. Schkorpil<sup>4</sup>. E.M.Pridik in the cat. of seals at the Hermitage, which is exemplary for its time, prefaced his publication of the Thasian stamps with a brief essay containing a descr. of the Thasian amphora, the composition of the clay, and of the stamps. A series of inaccuracies which appear here he rectified in a subsequent article which appeared<sup>5</sup> posthumously. ["Ceramic inscriptions from the excavations at Tiritaki and Mirmeki ? Moscow Inst. Arch. ?? in 1932-34," MIA 4, 1941, pp.173-193.] V.V.SCHKORPIL in addition to numerous publications of stamps, Thasian among others, in his research on the names of the potters<sup>6</sup> ["The names of master-potters in ceramic inscriptions," IAK 51, 1914, pp. 129-139.] took up among other things the interpretation of the term "keramarch" in some Thasian stamps.

A qualitatively new stage in the study of ceramic epigraphy both here and abroad



(p.4) is to be found in the works of B.N.Grakov who created in this area the national school of epigraphists. The activity of B.N.Grakov is in a significant way connected with the creation of a most important collection of ceramic inscriptions - Vol.III, ~~XXXXXX~~ I.O.S.P.E. B.N.Grakov took on himself the noble task of completing this enormous corpus of stamps of its founder, E. M. Pridik. B.N.Grakov's main contribution is the fact that he placed ceramic epigraphy on a solid scientific foundation, i.e. he formulated this discipline as a science by elaborating a perfected methodology. It achieved its final completion in the 7 methods to be found in his doctoral dissertation [B.N.G., The stamped ceramic container of the Hell. period as a source for the history of production and commerce. A ms. in the archives of the I.A., D. 538, 1939.] The attributions of Herakl. and Sinope stamps made by B.N.Grakov, if at first they encountered a certain scepticism, have now won absolute general acceptance by all scholars, foreign ones among them, and have been confirmed by a whole series of new proofs.

B.N.G. devoted his attention directly to Thasian stamps in his dissertation<sup>8</sup> and also devoted a special work to them [B.N.G. "The Thasian group of amph. st. and the export of wine from the island of Thasos," ms. in the archive of the I.A., D. 1040, 1938.] as well as his main work which has still not seen the light of day. In print he expressed only an opinion about the beginning dates of stamping amphoras<sup>10</sup> on Thasos. [(Packing and Storage)] In the completed corpus I.O.S.P.E. III which was completed after the war, B.N.G. after he had compiled exhaustive introductory articles for the stamps at each center, in great measure clarified his old datings and gave (a) new classifications. Although this work unfortunately is also unpublished, it remains the finest of the theoretical works which we now have on Thasos.

p.5 Our compatriot scholars have accepted, developed and clarified B.N.G.'s basic positions on the various questions. Thus D.B.Shelov in publishing the stamps from the excavations of Panticapaion<sup>11</sup> and Phanagoria<sup>12</sup> distinguished several new groups of Thasian stamps. I.B.Brashinsky<sup>13</sup> and E.M. Staerman<sup>14</sup> directed attention to the wheel-shaped stamps. One should note particularly the work done on the morphology



15

(p.5) of Thasian amphoras in connection with the groups of stamps in the book of I.B.Zeest which appeared as the result of many years study of the ceramic material of our Black Sea region.

In contemporary western scholarship the most eminent ceramic epigraphist is undoubtedly V.Grace who began her scholarly activities in the mid-thirties. This scholar has elaborated the datings of the basic groups of stamps. She has devoted several studies to Thasian ceramic inscriptions as well. <sup>After her</sup> In expressing briefly ~~the~~ general <sup>16</sup> ideas of their dating in the publication of the stamps from the Ath. Agora <sup>17</sup> she wrote a special article about the early stamps of Thasos. Subsequently she elaborated in detail the chronology of Thasian stamps in the publication of the Pnyx <sup>18</sup> material.

The works of V.G. have exercised a great influence on many contemporary scholars of the west. Some of these (M.Th. Lenger, F. Salviat, A.M.Bon) have written their articles and monographs under the influence of V.G.'s conceptions, at times even in collaboration with her. An undisputed event in the history of ceramic epigraphy is undoubtedly the appearance of the corpus of Thasian stamps published by the French scholars A.-M. Bon and A.Bon with the <sup>participation</sup> <sup>19</sup> collaboration of V.G. The corpus ~~is~~ distinguished by great accuracy, scrupulousness of selection, painstakingness and care in transcription and in the description of the inscriptions, the policy ~~of illustration~~ of illustrating each stamp and by <sup>a</sup> completely compiled indices. This ~~volume~~ book together with the afore-mentioned Vol. III of I.O.S.P.E., is now the basic source for the study of Thasian stamps. The corpus is prefaced by <sup>20</sup> an introduction written by A.M.Bon in which the author examines the sites of the findings, the composition of the clay, and the shape of the Thasian amphoras, questions of the classification of the stamps, of the analysis of the devices and the names, and also the meanings of the stamping. It is a great pity, however, that the scholar reacted so sceptically to the possibility of dating the stamps.

At almost the same time as the corpus there appeared two publications of stamps which contain among others Thasian stamps as well. I have in mind the books of V.



(p.5) Canarache<sup>21</sup> and M. Mircev<sup>22</sup>. An exemplary analysis and evaluation of the first work was made by I.B.Brashinsky.<sup>23</sup> I can only add that in using V. Canarache's book even for supplementing the known types one must use the greatest caution. Besides the incorrect reading of many names on the Thasian stamps, one can note instances of incorrect attributions. Thus under no. 118 a Sinope stamp of the astynome ΔΙΟΦΑΝΤΗΣ with the legend around the sides of the rectangle, around a cluster of grapes is called Thasian. In the chronological classification the author follows B.N.Grakov, accepting his datings (at times incorrectly) from the hands of E.M.Staerman.

p.6

The publication of M. Mircev also contains a number of inaccuracies in reading and interpretation. In the introductory essay for Thasos, the author in great part follows V.G., and criticizes the theory of Grakov on firms of potters which the latter had long since renounced. His datings will be discussed below.

Among the most recent works devoted specifically to Thasian stamps one must<sup>24</sup> mention two publications of materials from the excavations on Thasos itself. F. Salviat has devoted 2 articles to research on stamp devices in connection with Greek mythology. Together with VG he published the only heretofore known implement for<sup>25</sup> stamping Thasian amphoras. Finally one must mention the article of A. Balkanska<sup>26</sup> which is devoted to wheel-shaped stamps. She also published ceramic inscriptions from the excavations of the Thracian city of Seuthopolis among which Thasian stamps predominate.<sup>27</sup> ~~Sztetillo~~ S. Sztetillo has undertaken the study of the devices on stamps<sup>28</sup> from the point of view of statuary subjects and coin symbols.<sup>29</sup>

R.B. is very lucky and July. But  
but not too much

(24) One of these is Lange-Graen.  
The other is Gailme. So it is it all in the article.  
Looking through all portfolios, I now find 2 again.



(p.6)

#### Methods

As already ~~mentioned~~ remarked, the credit for the final shaping of the various methods of dating stamps, for creating new methods and for the multiple application of all of these to the dating of stamps from different centers by Groups belongs to B.N.Grakov. <sup>30</sup> [Doctoral dissertation, unpublished.] <sup>1939</sup> In 1939 he developed 7 methods of dating, which have remained valid up to now, and which as yet cannot be supplemented by new methods. The elaboration of each method separately, however, and their improvement, should be continued by present-day researchers in taking into account the constant progress of the discipline. B.N.Grakov evaluated each method relative to the others, and gave ~~it~~ <sup>31</sup> an estimate of its specific weight. [again] <sup>32</sup> This method has been presented in print by I. B. Brashinsky with a reference to B.N.Grakov's dissertation.

#### 1. The stratigraphic (archeological) method

The strat. method consists in dating the stamps from their occurrence in the strata of ancient settlements and in complexes of different kinds. This method was apparently used for the first time by C. Schuchhardt in his publication of the stamps from the basement of the house in Pergamon. <sup>33</sup> This method is now used to one degree or another by all modern investigators. VG regards it <sup>34</sup> as ~~the~~ fundamental.

In citing examples of the practical application of this method, B.N.Gr., <sup>35</sup> in addition to the well-kn. complexes of Pergamon and the Zeliarsky kurgan, was able to mention for the most part only VG's "deposits" (complexes) and some finds in the strata and floors at Tiritaki and Mirmeki. It is of interest that he considered VG's "complexes" to be "the result of an extremely fortunate combination of finds". <sup>36</sup> I.B. Brashinsky also regards this method as the "fundamental and most reliable" method, although he remarks that it cannot always be used "because as is well kn., archeologists often are forced to deal with mixed layers." <sup>37</sup>



(p.7)

These judgments compel us to dwell on this method in more detail. Let us begin with the dating of a stamp from its stratum. Everyone who has excavated an ancient city knows how mixed its strata are as a result of every kind of re-digging, shearing and faulting, ~~xxxxxxxxxxxx~~ of the fill. Even in ideal cases the material must be approached with extreme caution. In my opinion, if from any clearly identifiable (for example, ash) stratum the entire mass of pottery and other finds belongs to one epoch, let us say 50 years long, there is still no 100 per cent guarantee that a stamp found in this stratum dates from this very period. It seems to me that ~~in dating by strata~~ in a careful analysis of the stratigraphic data and of all the finds, we must have recourse to stratigraphic dating only in extreme cases in the identification of stamps from unknown or only slightly studied centers. Otherwise one can easily fall into error that may lead to a fallacious chronology of a whole group of stamps.

VG's work has recently shown a marked tendency to date separate stamps by strata. Moreover for the Rhodian class she presents a list of eponyms that is valid only for Delos but inapplicable to Athens.<sup>38</sup> Field archeologists ~~xxxxxxxxxxxx~~ in cases where only a few coins are found ~~xxxxxx~~ date a stratum by the use of masses of pottery and especially of stamps. But if one is dating stamps by the strata of the corresponding site in each separate ancient city, for example Delos or Olbia, it is clear that the stamps drop out from the dating category of archeological material and that their chronological determination becomes an end in itself. In fact according to VG the dating which she worked out for the stamps of Delos cannot be applied to Rhodian stamps, for example, of the Olbian reservoir.

I.B.Brashinsky notes that VG "had a fortunate opportunity to use this method, since the stamps . . . in large measure come from well-dated closed archeological contexts."<sup>39</sup> Upon verification, however, it turns out that most of these "complexes" (depots in VG's terminology) are simply stratigraphic layers (or fillings as she calls them) datable by their material (archeological context).<sup>40</sup> The cisterns (wells) from the Athenian Agora are a different matter. These are more reliable complexes,



p.8

whose chronological framework are similar in reliability to those of the house at Pergamon. This we ~~have~~ approach the concept of an archeological complex itself and its estimate on the basis of the narrowness and reliability of its chronological boundaries.

The concept of the archaeological complex, which was introduced into the discipline at the time of O. Montelius, includes a combination of things, that under some circumstances occur together at the same time and have survived until the moment of their discovery in such an undisturbed state. This is combined with the idea that the given complex is guaranteed to be free of things entering it from later times. Classic examples of such complexes are burials and hoards, and also settlements that perished as a result of catastrophes. But any complex must be approached with caution from the standpoint of its guaranteed dating from a single time. Burials, for ex., as a rule are complexes of one time, but there are also known to be family tombs (even tribal tombs) in which burials were made over the course of a century or more. A burial may also be destroyed or disrupted by grave-robbers who have mixed its material with things from later times. Another ex.: the Olbian reservoir of 1949 and the cisterns of the Athenian Agora are undoubtedly complexes, but their filling may have taken place over the course of a fairly prolonged time.

~~if~~ For any complex, even one formed instantaneously, there is the question of the time when the things that have fallen into it were actually used - that is the time that separates the moment when each object was made and the moment that it entered the ground. Certain categories of objects, especially those made of costly or long-lasting materials (ornaments, weapons, etc.) may exist for a long interval of time, up to several centuries. As for masses of pottery, esp. pottery containers, the time of their existence is incomparably shorter. The experience of excavating ancient cemeteries shows that the idea of "family dinner sets" used for a long time is not confirmed - ~~instead of the usual practice~~ the corpse was buried usually with new vessels and amphoras with wine, although there are exceptions.



(p.8)

In particular, in the vast majority of cases it can be relied on that the amphoras entered into the burial shortly after coming from the places where they were made and with wine from the same areas. In my opinion, I.B. Brashinsky is <sup>(1965)</sup> 41 right in considering amphora containers to be the youngest material in burials.

These considerations must be taken into account in evaluating archeological complexes containing stamped amphoras as to the reliability and closeness of their termini. This evaluation it seems to me is as follows:

In the first place is material from burials made at only one time in mounds or in graves. These contain amphoras scarcely more than 20 years old. <sup>42</sup> [The evidence for old and lasting Thasian wine cannot be cited or taken into account here since it was far more economical to retain the wine in the country where it was made in pithoi and to pour it out into amphoras just before exporting it.] To these must be added complexes of stamps from funeral feasts in the fill of burial <sup>deposits</sup> mounds. This category also includes household complexes - stores of amphoras in pits or burials. Typical examples are the Olbia complex of 1947 and the deposit <sup>43</sup> of amphoras at Villanova on Rhodes.

In the second place are all kinds of accumulations of broken pottery: the fills in cisterns and wells, floors, rubbish dumps and the like. Cisterns, for example, may be filled with trash accumulated over the course of long years, <sup>44</sup> as in the Olbia complex of 1949, where the body of water whose deposits accumulated in the second half of the 2nd century B.C., contained material of the first half of the 3rd century B.C., that is, the chronological range of the finds covers <sup>45</sup> about 150 years. Another ex. is the substructure excavated at Hermonassa, consisting of a large no. of amph. fragments. It may have been built up of trash or composed of rubbish or of broken floors. The famous Pergamene complex should be assigned to the same type. Which also apparently includes the complex <sup>46</sup> of the so-called Mirmeki eschara. [ref. to Pruglo, Sinopean amphora stamps from Mirmeki, KSIA 108 109, 1967, pp.42 ff.; same author, The group of Thasian stamps from Mirmeki, KSIA 116, 1969, pp.29-35. In the latter article the author

p.9



(p.9) declares that the inscriptions being published come from a very reliable complex, which makes clear the dating of many stamping instruments of later groupd (our sub-group VB). But V.I.Pruglo remarks herself: "Of course not all amphora stamps are contemporaneous with the corresponding horizons; in the Mirmeki complex/ of Thasian stamps, in fact, there is a small group of early material for which the dates cited must be considered only as a terminus ante quem the material entered into the ash deposit. But in the case of the latest of the Thasian stamps that were found, the chronology of the ash altars stratification may serve as an objective criterion in determining their dates" (ibid. p. 31). By these remarks V.I.Pr. fully confirms our evaluation of the Mirmeki eschara, belonging to the series of archeological complexes whose chronological limits are so broad that they cannot serve as a basis for constructing a precise chrolmology. For the/ rest, the author completely follows the dating of the early groups that was proposed by VG and is criticized in these pages. V.I.Pr. is indisputably correct in believing that the chronology of the late group of Thasian stamps needs further work, but in my opinion this cannot be approached with the methods used by V.I.Pr. Only on the basis of very reliable complexes and extensive use of the paleographic method can one achieve objective reliable results. In the light of all the above remarks, V.I.Pr.'s main conclusion must in my opinion be regarded quite sceptically.] <sup>and 9</sup> <sub>not 46</sub>

A

23-8-72  
B. G. G. G.  
has no cut-off  
is state

A special place is occupied by highly distinctive complexes - stamps from settlements whose period of existence was limited to a very short interval of time, for ex. one century. In essence they are close to the complexes of the Carthaginian type, which falls within the sphere of application of the historical method, and differ from the latter in that they have no precise historical frames for the time of their existence. They are therefore dated by the entire combination of material from the stratum of the particular site. Examples are the ancient settlements of the type of the Roxolan site and some others on the lagoon of the Dniester river.

From everything that has been said it may be included that the stratigraphic



method, with the condition that its criterion is not the stratum but a reliable complex, is a very universal means of dating, the most effective of the methods by which absolute dates can be determined. I have used it as one of the fundamental methods in the present work. Of the accompanying material the most important is mass pottery as the shortest-lived category whose chronology has been worked out in fairly great detail.<sup>47</sup> [includes ack to Blavatsky on dating of bf.] In a few cases of simultaneous finds of Thasian and Sinopean amphoras in complexes, I have used B.N.Grakov's chronology.

As already mentioned, simultaneous finds of Herakleian and Thasian amphoras predominate in our Black Sea region. The most recent chronological classification of the Herakleian ~~amp~~ stamps is I. B. Brashinsky's chronology.<sup>48</sup> Adopting B.N. Grakov's general chronological framework, he divided all the Herakleian stamps into 5 groups as follows:

<u>group</u>	<u>date B.C.</u>	
1	ca.400-370	one-name
2	ca.370-330	2 names without <u>epi</u>
3	ca. 330-300	2 names one w. <u>epi</u>
4	ca. 300-250	1 name, id. by paleography and orthography
5	ca.mid 3rd B.C?	abbreviations of names

Herakleian stamps of the first 3 groups are constantly found with Thasian stamps. But I believe that I.B.Brashinsky's dating cannot be used for the following reasons:

28.05.74  
But of.  
plausibility  
than 5th  
year

1) Throughout the Gk. world the name of the eponym indicated only the year regardless of whether he was a magistrate of the entire city or an official with less extensive authority. According to Vol. III of IOSPE, 72 eponyms are now known on ~~Kar~~ Herakleian stamps. ~~There are unevenly distributed within~~ There is no justification for assigning these to the interval of 30 years.

2) The stamps of Groups 1 and 5 sts. occur in the form of supplementary stamps to the stamps of Group 3.



3) Not one complex is known that contains amphoras belonging only to one group, although the duration of the stamps within each group was quite long - 30 to 40 years. Moreover there are several complexes (among them some very reliable ones) in which amphoras of Groups 1, 2 and 3 have been found. <sup>49</sup> Along, containing ref.s to several unpublished groups of finds. Such a complex must have been accumulated over at least 40 years, which seems unlikely. Therefore, to avoid incorrect dating, I do not use Herakleian amphoras from multiple complexes as a chronological criterion.

## 2. The morphological method

The morph. method may be called the method of dating stamps by the changes <sup>50</sup> in the shape of the amphora itself and its parts. ~~This~~ VG in her publications places this method along with the archeological in the first rank. It was greatly <sup>51</sup> developed after the publication of the investigations of I.B.Zeest, who however does the reverse - she makes extensive use of the dating of the stamps to determine the chronology of the amphora ~~stamps~~ <sup>shapes</sup>. It must be noted that this method has very limited application to Thasos, inasmuch as the most common amphora shape - biconical - existed for a long time - throughout the 4th and 3rd centuries B.C. I.B.Zeest considers the amphoras with the broader trunk (Type I acc. to <sup>52</sup> Bon) as belonging to the earlier time - to the 4th c. B.C., and the amphoras with elongated proportions and a full foot (Type Ia acc to Bon) to the 4th to 3rd <sup>53</sup> centuries B.C. Nevertheless on amphoras of the 2nd type mentioned by her stamps have often been found that are contemporaneous with the stamps on vessels of the 1st type, which proves their synchronous existence.

p.11

VG believes that the angular rim of the Thasos amphora was replaced sometime <sup>54</sup> before 300 B.C. with a thick roll, which later became thinner. The amphora type <sup>55</sup> with such a rim undoubtedly belongs to the 3rd c. B.C., but the biconical amphoras with angular rim also continue to exist, so that the idea that one type

???  
check?  
w. Paul

dec.??  
(No)



was replaced by another is incorrect. The amphoras of Bon's Type II with a  
 56  
 very wide trunk, a sharp break at the shoulder, and an angular rim also  
 57 58  
 bear stamps from the earliest to the latest groups.

At the present time the ~~following~~ morphological evolution of the Thasian amphoras may be summarized as follows:

1) Amphoras of the biconical type (Ia and b acc. to Bon; Type 20 acc to Zeest) existed from the very beginning of the stamping to the 3rd cent. B.C. inclusive; <sup>however</sup> the division of this type into 2 sub-types has only a typological (and not a chronological, as VG believes <sup>59</sup>) significance.

2) The same can be said about the amphoras of Bon's Type II, which existed together with the biconical amphoras.

3) Amphoras of the conical type (21 acc. to I.B. Zeest) with a roll-shaped rim appeared at the threshold of the 4th and 3rd c. B.C. and existed together with amphoras of the 2 above types in the 3rd c. B.C.

4) Amphoras with an egg-shaped body and with a foot very similar to the Sinopean (Type III acc. to Bon; 22 acc to Zeest) are evidently the latest; this type appeared some time in the 3rd c. B.C. and lasted until the 2nd c. B.C.,  
 60  
 as indicated by the amphora found at Villanova.

(56) refers to Bon, p. 19

(57) refers to Bon fig. 7, 2, which is certainly early, but has nothing to do with

(58) refers to Bon's Table (Bon, p. 47)  
 does not document anything of what he says

P. 11  
 Do this  
 document  
 later?

bravo!

Ry. 58 "Pays"  
 p. 123. No def.  
 to 2 subtypes



p.11

### 3. The paleographic method

By paleographic method we mean the dating of stamps acc. to the devel. of the shape of the letters and the script.<sup>61</sup> The method was applied as early as the v. beginning of ceramic epigr. in the middle of the 19th c. but it received its development in the work of M. Nilsson<sup>62</sup> and B.N.Grakov.<sup>63</sup> (1929 vol.) B.N.Gr. attributed a very special significance to it in his work of the pre-war period and he indicated the necessity of comparing the paleography of the stamps with numismatic paleogr.<sup>64</sup> In recent times the application of this method has been less frequent and some scholars are completely sceptical about it.<sup>65</sup> [Bon-Bon. . The authors point out the high frequency of coincidences of the script with numismatic script, p.40.]

33  
This method has most important significance for those stamps which are difficult to handle with the other methods: stamps without device which are with diff. broken down into typological groups and particularly stamps which have been found outside of complexes, for ex. the stamps of the "Parmeniskos Group". One must avoid over-evaluation of this method and must subject it wherever possible to the other methods. B.N.Gr. in relying exclusively on the data of paleogr. and orthogr. dated in his time the beginning of stamping in Herakleia in the 3/4 of the 4th c. B.C.<sup>66</sup> ["Englyphic stamps on the necks of some Hell." etc. 1926] consequently after studying a great no. of Herakl. stamps and applying reliable archeol. complexes, he considered it possible to refer the origin of Herakleian stamping to the very beginning of the 4th c. B.C. and he created typological groups of stamps.<sup>67</sup> [IOSPE III] Actually the study of the paleography of the cer. inscr. of Herakleia forces one to conclude that there was a strong conservatism in the script so that in my opinion it suggests that it was borrowed from the paleogr. of monument inscriptions wh. show the same charact. features.

p.12

scope  
As far as Thasos is concerned, with its vast field for applying the other methods, the pal. method recedes to a less important position and gives only a rel. confirmation of the synchronism of the various groups.<sup>68</sup> [The table of the alphab.



(p.12) in groups, see Table III.] However, for the chronol. breaking down of Group 5<sup>7</sup> and for the attribution of stamps of various epochs to Group E, it has most decisive significance. The paleogr. of the stamps of Thasos for the most part follows a lapidary rather than a numismatic<sup>course</sup>, and on the whole develops acc. to its own internal laws. Thus the lunate sigma and the cursive omega are met in stamps as early as the beginning of the 3rd c. B.C. and on coins they appear only at the turn of the 2nd and 1st B.C.<sup>69</sup> [Guide de Thasos, 1968] On the whole in judging the similarity of the script of stamps and coins we encounter much difficulty<sup>in?</sup> so that on the latter in the majority of cases the legend is limited to an ethnic which was regularly written between 404 and 340 B.C. and it is in precisely this period that the majority of the group of stamps occur.

#### 4. The grammatical method

70

The gramm. method is closely involved with the paleogr. and has a still narrower application so that even on lapidary monuments it is diff. to est. with great accuracy the time of transition from one orthography to another. Very often elements of old phonetics are reflected in new grammatical writing. This is clearly observable on Thasos where in stamps of one group the same name is written in various ways: HPAKAEIAHΣ and HPAKAIΔHΣ (the second form, demotic) EYΦANΩP and EYΦHNΩP, etc. This method is particularly valuable for clarifying alien non-Ionian names in the pottery business of Thasos.

One must proceed v. carefully in handling the orthography of Thasian stamps because of the frequent use on them of abbreviations of names and of the ethnic.<sup>71</sup> [We don't know for ex. whether the form MYAAO is an archaic gen. or just a abbrev. of the nominative form.]<sup>72</sup> ~~New~~ VG and after her Bon assume that in the form of the ethnic @AZION we observe a survival of the Parian alphabet in which omicron equals omega, that is @AZION equals @AZION. This form which had disappeared by this time from official Thasian inscr.s is explained by VG who follows the hypothesis of A. West as the anti-Athenian attitude after the uprising of 411 B.C. and she calls



(p.12) it the application of a "nationalistic archaism". However A. West himself observes in connection with this hypothesis that the form @AZION on coins could indicate a neuter adjective referring to the understood word NOMIZMA. This proposal is confirmed by the similar forms of the ethnic on stamps from other centers - ΠΑΠION, ΙΚION, ΚΝΙΑION and ΚΟΛΟ~~Σ~~ΝION of the time of the KOINH and also <sup>80 Ref.</sup> 74 <sup>is my</sup> by the same form of the ethnic on the coins of the Gk cities of various epochs. <sup>to Thuc.</sup> [p.13] On specifically Thasian coins the ethnic was <sup>[p.13]</sup> written as late as the 2nd c. B.C. when there can be no question of archaisms in the language. Compare Guide de Thasos, <sup>pl. 4</sup> pp. 54-55.] Moreover it wd. be strange if with this substitution of an omicron for and omega only the ~~th~~ ethnic had been engraved when at the same time names were already being written in the general Ionian orthography. Consequently the hypothesis falls and we see that ~~XXXXXX~~ the dating of a whole group of VG is based upon it.

Hence we see that the grammatical method yields very little for dating. B.N. Grakov considers that for late groups the application of the grammatical device is "diff. as a result of the astoundingly rapid levelling action of the KOINH." <sup>75</sup> ~~XXXXXX~~ Below I will only observe some few deviations from the general orthography when I illustrate in this way the merely relative antiquity of the group.

##### 5. The numismatic method

76

The num. method is based on ~~the~~ <sup>comparing</sup> contrasting the devices on stamps with those on coins. B.N. Grakov made wide use of it in his research on the Sinope stamps. <sup>77</sup> Even then he understood it as a <sup>method</sup> ~~matter~~ of studying the devices as such, that is, <sup>studying</sup> of all the realia depicted on them. <sup>78</sup> ~~XXXXXX~~ It is on this plan that he <sup>as do</sup> ~~developes it~~ <sup>79</sup> ~~XXXXXX~~ ~~follows~~ ~~XXXXXX~~ several other scholars. The signif. of this method is v. great since it permits one to est. absolute dates, in certain instances even more accurately than w. the help of the stratigraphic method. This can be explained by the fact that coins submit much more easily to chronol. classification. It suffices to say that the dating of several important groups of Thasian stamps is based on the numismatic method.

However B.N. Gr. 80



(p.13) However B. N. Gr. indicates the need for painstaking and detailed and not superficial comparison of the devices inasmuch as one and the same numismatic symbol as it develops changes its form on the same coin and on the stamp. Moreover a precise localization of the stamps is required since one and the same device can appear in various centers at various times. At this point B.N.Gr. studies the question of the borrowings of devices of other centers as phenomena connected with historical events. It seems necessary to me to add several observations.

In the first place it is impossible to approach formally the borrowing of num. devices from the coins of the same center which stamped the containers. In the early period (4th c. B.C.) from numismatics are taken as a rule official coats of arms, the ΠΑΡΑΣΗΜΑ of cities - for ex. the Sinopian eagle on the dolphin, the Thasian Herakles Archer and so on. The governmental char. of these devices on coins is completely obvious. On the stamps the state emblem in the major. of cases was borrowed by the city magistrates - astynomes - whose eponymous signif. is confirmed by the prep. ΕΠΙ. The so-called Early Sinopean pottery type with the ΠΑΡΑΣΗΜΟΝ do not contrast <sup>with</sup> this since the device on them, eagle on dolphin, is to be explained not by the personal taste of each potter but rather by an imposed rule: this symbol is found among all the early potters which confirms the semi-official semi-private character of stamping. Precisely the same phenomenon can be observed on Rhodes as well where the pomegranate blossom for the very same reason is often found on the stamps of the ergasteriarchs.

p.14 Consequently for Thasians as well we can assume that the appearance of the crest on the stamps can be partially explained by the official character of the stamp and that it is connected with the name rather of the magistrate than of the potter. Further investigation will convince us of this fact.

In the second place we are dealing with Thasian stamps which are unusually rich in the most various devices. Despite this variety, the parallels with numis. symbols are unique. This caused some investigators to see in Thasian stamping implements borrowings from numismatics from other centers and to connect



(p.14) these borrowing with one or another event in the life of the city. For ex. the appearance of devices in the form of a crab, a lion, a hare, etc., VG<sup>81</sup> explains as a borrowing from the monetary typology of the members of the Athenian APXH in the west (Akragas, Leontini and Messana, etc.) and connects with their triumph<sup>82</sup> after the overthrow of Athens. Proceeding from similar considerations she refers Thasian stamps without device to the period of the sojourn on the island of the Athenian garrison, 408-404 B.C.

<sup>84</sup>  
The subjectivity of such an hypothesis is obvious. Need one explain everything by as monetary borrowings? How then explain those stamps for which we have not succeeded in finding analogies in monetary devices? As far as I am concerned, these coincidences appear to be accidental for the simple reason of the abundance of devices on Thasian stamps. Below I shall dwell on this in detail and in addition we shall see later that the group of Thasian stamps without devices cannot be placed within the framework of the 5-year period.



(p.14)

## 6. The synchronistic method

85

Credit for the discovery of the method of synchronism belongs to F. Bleckmann. At the present time this method has been successfully used by many scholars. It is based on the fact that during the tenure of a single magistrate several potters were active, and by comparing the lists of potters one can determine the sequence ~~of~~ according to which one magistrate replaced another. The method which was utilized <sup>where</sup> for the 1st time ~~by~~ for Rh. amphoras ~~with~~ the names of the eponyms and the manufacturers are located on the 2 handles and consequently in order to be studied whole amphoras are required ~~and~~ can be used for those amphoras in which the two components are combined in one stamp: for Thasos, Sinope, Herakleia, Knidos, and individual stamps of other centers. Its specific character lies in the fact that it itself does not give even a relative chronology which can be obtained only as the result of the application of other methods. One may also speak here of absolute dates. 86

*9.0.7*  
The possibility of the presence of homonyms even during a very small interval of time significantly complicates the application of this method, particularly if seals which have existed for a long time (as for ex. those of Rhodes) are difficult to <sup>87</sup> separate into groups. However as B.N. Grakov observes in groups which existed for a short time an error of this type wd. have little meaning since the dating of the group remains unchanged. ~~However~~ it can play a role in estimating the no. of potters - for it is possible to count 2 people as a single person and vice versa. The same applies to the magistrates as well. On Thasos in the majority of groups they are clearly distinguished one from the other, and as far as the potters are concerned success has been achieved in my opinion in finding a method more or less suitable for distinguishing persons of the same name.

p.15

This method which was strengthened by others (the archeological, numismatic, above all historical) is most adaptable for creating a relative chronology of stamps from the centers that have been mentioned. Thus for the stamps of Rhodes, Herakleia, and individual groups of stamps from Sinope and Knidos the eponymity of the magi-



(p.15) ~~starts~~ is very clearly expressed. I attempt to prove the same for several groups of Thasian stamps. We can by comparing the lists of ~~others~~ of various chronological groups with a greater or lesser portion of probability refer individual eponyms to the beginning, middle or end of given group which indeed was done by B.N.Grakov in his corpus. With a general chronological extent of a group, for ex. almost 30 years, this narrows the dating of the activity of an individual magistrate down to 10 years, that is it gives an element of preciseness which one cannot always achieve even for coins. In relation to the Thasian stamps this is possible only for several groups.

#### 7. The historical method

89

The historical method is based on referring to well-known historical facts. Its chief characteristic consists of the fact that it does not exist in isolation but is dissolved in the other methods and is closely interconnected with them. Thus for ex. F. Bleckmann in utilizing the data of stratigraphy dated the Carthaginian collections of Rhodian stamps which were discovered under a Roman wall of the time of the destruction of Carthage - 146 B.C.

are

Here ~~is~~ included also onomatological studies wh. had formerly been subdivided into a special method<sup>91</sup>, that is, the explanation of the appearance of various foreign names (for ex. Roman) at the given center as an historical conjuncture. The historical method is connected with the numismatic as well. For ex. the appearance in Sinopean stamps of devices borrowed from Roman coins was explained by B.N.Grakov as the participation of Sinope in the 3rd Punic War. This method<sup>92</sup> on the one hand is the most active inasmuch as it gives the most precise absolute date. On the other hand it is precisely this which obliges one to exercise extreme caution in its application. Above indication has already been given of erroneous in our opinion explanations of the borrowing of coin devices in the stamps of Thasos. It is essential that this method be applied only after a dating by the other methods has been achieved and checked, inasmuch as in any incident the historical explanation of one or another element of stamping can bear the character of a hypothesis.



(p.15)

For the stamps of Thasos the area for utilizing historical facts is comparatively vast since the history of the city has a solid narrative base in the testimony of the ancient authors. Moreover there has survived a unique document - the legislation about wine trade. In this work the historical method is also applied for the dating of the large "one-sided" complexes which have only a ~~ps~~ terminus post quem: for the stamps from Alexandria, Seuthopolis and Kabile.

methodology

p.16

Finishing our survey of the ~~methodology~~ which is applied in studying amph. st we must also mention one principle wh. does not enter in and must not enter in the group of 7 methods but which permeates the entire work of B.N.Grakov. I have in mind the typological study of the stamp itself. Actually inasmuch as the stamps somehow change in form with the course of time there arises the necessity for dividing them into typological groups. This is less important for Rhodes and Sinope in view of the uniformity on the whole of their stamps but it acquires a very special significance for Herakleia and esp. for Thasos whose stamps are distinguished by a very special wealth of types. Typological groups do not always corresp. to Chronological groups. And the ex. from the chronol. of Herakleia wh. has been presented above puts one on guard. However it is not possible in any way whatsoever to avoid typological classification, otherwise we wd have to limit ourselves nearly to the dating of the various stamps or of the individual magistrates. In my opinion it is this that was the basic error of the early work of VG, in which she approached the dating of the individual stamps before she had achieved their typological classification. In her subsequent work VG overcame this defect dividing the early stamps into groups. However by being unwilling to ~~reject~~ the conclusions of her previous article she ~~now~~ again defines only the time of the eponyms, by dating the individual stamps according to the stratigraphy of the layers of the Pnyx. Incidentally she at this point makes an attempt to define the date "the ~~involved~~ group of eponyms APIETOMENHE and TEAEZ( " around 400 B.C. independently of the conditions of the finds of their stamps on the Pnyx.

There was no earlier date of this class, since before 1934 Noll (Gibson HAY) had observed that they were 4th c. B.C. dated.

7  
94 is  
Pnyx  
First  
Stamp  
with  
oil

(He refers to referring to the early work of B.N.G. (p. 22))



(p.16)

On no case in research must one be attracted by typological classification as an end in ~~itself~~ itself - the conclusions of this work show that many groups of stamps of Thasos are typologically close to one another but behind such a formal similarity there stands a completely different sense. Other methods help to determine such groups chronologically, and particularly the stratigraphic and the synchronistic. Appendix case are applying one and two in this is obviously convincing.

From what has been said it follows that the main condition for dating is the complex application where possible of the greatest number of methods <sup>96</sup> at least of twp. Only then can the conclusions be considered solid and credible. Otherwise they risk great subjectivity or objective accidentalism. It seems to me that the most modern and methodologically correct scheme for elaborating chronology is the following (in the given instance for Thasos stamps): first the creation of a developed typological classification but without exaggerating the importance of formal similarity, and then the dating of the various groups of stamps by the archaeolog. and numism. methods, and after that the establishing of their mutual position in time with the help of the synchronistic method, and finally the ultimate check and narrowing of the chronology by paleogr. and morphological devices and a careful attempt at an historical handling of the substitution of one historical group by another.

#### THE CHRONOLOGICAL CLASSIFICATION OF THASIAN STAMPS

As has already been said the most perfect typology and chronology as well of the stamps was elaborated by B.N. Grakov whose conclusions many researchers follow.

It is hardly worth dwelling on the early works of B.N. Grakov inasmuch as his chronology received its ultimate achievement in the introduction to Vol. III of IOSPE.

B.N. Grakov broke down all the stamps acc. to the formulae of the legends into 6 groups which since they were typological, ~~and~~ at the same time as he observes they reflect chronology as well.

1. The inscription is placed in 2 or 3 lines and consists of an ethnic and

7.10.81  
What is counted  
as the date?  
This introd?  
What could be  
learned?



(p.16) two or more rarely one name. Sometimes a device is placed between the lines.

p.17 2. The legend goes <sup>along</sup> around the frame of the stamp circling a required depiction and consists with rare exceptions of 2 names with the ethnic.

3. The stamp consists of 1 name and the ethnic. Between them the device.  
Rarely <sup>such</sup> a legend goes around the frame.

4. The stamp has a round form. It contains an inscription and a depiction.

5. The stamp contains one name without the ethnic with a device or without one.

6. Anepigraphic stamps.

2.I.74

1a is usual of 1

1b is typical of Te (usual abbrev.)

1v is 2-line (Αἴγρος, Δαφνός, Ἀγρός, Εἰόςος - no ethnic) or 20 sec. ago

1s just like 1a but + sec. st.

2a is Shulov's group, q. to p. 32 below (mainly Mss)

2b is basically the O types dated by S. 1900s  
but also " " w. name Τεῖς αὐτὸς + emblem

3 Inscriptions arranged along the frame, emblem in middle.  
2 names + ethnic. Usually 1, etc. 2, emblems.

Date: to p. 39, end of Group I, ca 370 B.C.

(to q. with coins of Thracians)

p.50

4a type naming Ἀγροῦτας

p.51

4b type "without ethnic", but w. 2 names + device  
He then mentions the foll. epigrams

Ἀγροῦτας (TSS) (no ethnic)

Νικίας " "

Τηδὲ φάγας " " (the emblem)

"Ἀγροῦτας" (S. 1900s) no ethnic

Παυφάγας has ethnic (q. B. 1301)

Φιδόφας " "

Βίαν

[very dated with ep. (confirmation also w. B. 1301)]

4c Swift name, legend surrounds device



(p.17)

In addition, B.N.Gr. places the wheel-shaped stamps, which he considers Thasian, 97  
in a special group. In his doctoral dissertation 98 and in a special work on the  
Thasian stamps [a ms. described in note 9 as in the archive of the Arch. Inst.] and dated 1938  
B.N.Gr. regarded as the earliest a stamp of ΑΠΙΣΤΟΜΕΝΗΕ with a depiction of Herakles  
Archer which he dated to the time around 380 B.C. After becoming acquainted with  
the publications of VG he began to follow her identification of stamps without device 99 (105PE)  
and with letters arranged in lines as the earliest. The chronological distribution  
of the Thasian typological groups appeared to BNGr. to be as follows: Group 1, the  
earliest, is dated to the very end of the 5th or beginning of the 4th c. B.C. The  
stamps with depictions belonging to it already come from the time of Group 2, which is  
contemporaneous w. the first within the interval of 390-370 B.C. and encompasses a  
somewhat later period. The ~~xxx~~ group comes to an end at approximately 320 B.C. or  
perhaps somewhat earlier or later. The stamps with inscriptions along the frame and  
the stamps with the (phiale) of Group 3 must be placed within the same interval of  
time as the stamps of Group 2, wh. corresponds to the ~~fx~~ entire second half of the  
4th c. B.C. On the whole, Grp.3 in the Mediterranean region goes down to 220 B.C.  
~~Thaxxer~~ Grp.4 is contemporaneous with the end of the 1st or the beginning of the  
2nd group and apparently lasted only one or two years. Grp. 5 acc. to the list of  
names belongs partly to the time before 350 B.C., but for the most part coincides  
in time with Grp.3. Grp.6 consists of additional stamps that are found on the other  
handles of amphoras with stamps belonging to Group 1.

100  
D.B.Shelov developing B.N.Grakov's investigations from his Grp. 1 identified  
stamps with abbreviations of names (MEΣ(, MEΓ(] and an emblem below or between the  
lines. He assigned to it the well-known stamps of the Keramarchs and dated them  
in the middle of the 4th c. B.C. He also discussed the problem of the anepigraphic  
stamps in detail. 101  
On the whole, the author followed B.N.Gr.'s pre-war dating, 102  
which was also preferred by I.B.Zeest 103 and E.M. Staerman, [Pottery stamps from Tyras]

A different chronol. classification was worked out in articles by VG. She  
finally formulated her typology in an article on the stamps from the Phyx. 104

(No identification of these groups mostly  
w/last ones  
22.X.72  
- in Grp. 1-23



(p.17) Here is this classification and its dates:

Group 1, end of 5th and 1/2 of 4th c.s (to 340 B.C.)

- a) without emblems
- b) stamps with the sign (phiale)
- c) " " " star
- d) " " 2 names along the edge (sts without ethnic)
- e) " of the keramarchs

p.18

Group 2, end of 4th to 3rd c.s B.C.. Stamps contain 1 name, ethnic and emblem.

- a) legends/ surrounds emblem
- b) " placed on opposite short sides of rectangle
- c) " " " " long " " "

*This is not a classification of Thasos as a whole, but a sorting of a given collection into date periods.*

This classification, which is based on material of the Athenian Agora and the Pnyx, is far narrower than the preceding one since it does not include, for ex., groups of stamps with the name ΣΑΤΥΡΟΣ, wheel-shaped stamps, stamps with one name without ethnic, etc. As already mentioned, this investigator follows the method of dating individual stamps, and not entire groups. This she does mainly by the archaeological method, that is from the "context". She does not however always maintain this principle. Thus, for example, she places "the related group of eponyms of ΑΠΙΣΤΟΜΕΝΗΣ and ΤΕΛΕΣ" independently of the Pnyx context in a period around 400 B.C., on the basis of the synchronousness of the names. <sup>105 (Pnyx, p.126)</sup> The author definitely deserves credit for identifying stamps without emblems as earlier than stamps of ΑΠΙΣΤΟΜΕΝΗΣ. <sup>106 (Early Thasos, p.55)</sup> In so doing VG proceeds from the following consideration:

1) Inasmuch as the majority of emblems reflect anti-Athenian attitudes, stamps with emblem belong to years after the Peloponnesian war; the stamps without emblems reflect the depressed situation of Thasos and can be dated to the time when an Athenian garrison was on the island (407-404 B.C.) or to the period before the uprising of 411 B.C.

2) In considering the series of stamps with the names ΜΕΙΣΩΝ, ΣΑΤΥΡΟΣ and the stamps without device, VG notes that the same names are repeated in them. The



(p.18) author identifies 8 names and on the basis of the fact that they do not, occur in combination with each other, and are not present in the stamps of other groups, except the group without emblems, considers them to be the earliest magistrates.

3) The author notes that Aristomenes, judging from the names found in his stamps, shd. not be far from the eponyms that use stamps without emblems.

The evident weakness of the argumentation for this hypothesis, which in my opinion is nevertheless correct, has produced a sceptical attitude toward it on the part of the above-named Soviet epigraphers, who used B.N.Gr.'s earlier chronology in their investigations. B. N. Gr. later adopted VG's hypothesis and supported it by an analysis of the reliable complexes from our territory.

Inasmuch as VG as a rule declines to create ~~an~~ a chronology of entire groups and confines herself to dating individual stamps, it is worth ~~presenting~~ citing her particular dates here.

Regular stamping on Thasos began no earlier than 425 B.C. We have already mentioned the "anti-Athenian" emblems and stamps without emblems above. The activity of the eponym ΜΕΙΣΩΝ occupied the time around 410 B.C. The stamps with "phiale" date from the end of the 5th c. B.C. VG includes them ~~in the~~ among the first Thasian stamps. All the stamps on the necks belong to the period up to 400 B.C. The stamp of ΟΡΑΣΩΝΙΑΗΣ and ΜΕΙΣΩΝ is dated by the lamp type to the time no later than the 1/4 of the 4th c. BC. The eponym ΑΡΙΣΤΕΙΑΗΣ shd be assigned, judging from the finds of his stamps in the Agora, to the beginning of the 4th c. B.C. The interconnected group of ΑΡΙΣΤΟΜ. and ΤΕΛΕΣ (" (that is, without emblem) is located by the similarity of the names around 400 B.C. independently of the Pnyx "context". The author presents her remaining particular dates in her commentaries on the individual stamps. Summing up all the facts it may be said that VG is inclined to date the absolute majority of stamps of her group 1 to a small interval of time of 10 to 20 years.

One cannot agree with I.B.Zeest that "VG's dating was adopted by A.-M. and A.Bon in their new work on the Thasian stamps." The authors although they make use



(p.19) of the conclusions in the articles by their American colleague (as A.M. Bon ack.)<sup>115</sup>  
 in general follow their own lines of reasoning. A.-M. Bon, to be sure, was too  
 sceptical of the possibility of creating a chronology, pointing out the very slight  
 role of paleography, the very rare cases when the emblems coincide with the devices  
 on coins, the lack of reliable archeological contexts, and the actual co-existence of  
 different types of amphoras.<sup>116</sup> Also pointing out other difficulties of dating, she  
 confines herself to studying the general time-limits of stamping. Her conclusions  
 as to the time when the stamps originated seem more reasonable than those of VG.  
 Thus she considers the stamp with no emblem marked TEAEZ ΘΑΣ EYPMA (np.72), which  
 appeared no later than the 4th c. B.C., to be the earliest. Contrary to VG's con-  
 clusions, the author believes that stamps with emblems, even those having parallels  
 in the earlier coins, cannot be assigned to the 5th c. B.C.<sup>117</sup> She suggests that  
 there may have been interruptions in stamping and supposes that stamps were made  
 even in the first few centuries A.D.<sup>118</sup> To the later category she assigns certain  
 stamps without ethnic, wheel-shaped stamps and stamps with monograms.<sup>119</sup>

A.-M. Bon divides all the Thasian stamps into 3 categories:<sup>120</sup>

- 1! Stamps with lines of letters without device.
2. Stamps with device, ethnic/(or no ethnic) and two or one names. The special stamps of this category make up groups: a) stamps with 2 emblems, including "phiale" and star; b) stamps with coin devices.

3. Stamps with monograms, separate letters, and wheel-shaped stamps.

It can be seen from this division of types that the investigator was guided by only one criterion - the presence or absence of a device and its composition. Some categories therefore appear to be quite broad (category 2 includes the majority of stamps and the greatest variety of variations of the formula), whereas other categories are quite artificial. For ex., Group b of category 2 includes the same stamps as the entire category but only those whose emblems repeat coin types. All this means that Bon's classification is of limited applicability.

It is not worth dwelling on the chronology of M. Mircev,<sup>121</sup> who, like the



19)  
(p.19

p.20

Bons (but independently of them) divided stamps into 2 groups - those with emblems and those without - and, exclusively on the basis of Paleography, assigned the first group to the end of the 4th to middle of the 3rd c. B.C., and the second to the mid-3rd to end of 2nd B.C. Such formalism of classification and error in dating is evidently due to the limited material which the author had at his disposal.

V. Canarache's chronology has already been discussed.

After these introductory remarks, we may now turn directly to the chronological classification of Thasian stamps. <sup>122</sup> [In studying the material I have used mainly to IOSPE III corpus, the Bons' catalogue, the well-known writings of Mircev and Canarache, and also some collections from archeological excavations now in museums in Moscow, Leningrad and Kiev, to whose curators I am profoundly grateful.]

Because of

The abundance of devices on Thasian stamps, and the variety of their types, the first task is to create a single typological classification. Three main elements must be taken into account in developing such a classification: 1) the shape of the stamp, 2) its inscription, and 3) its device.

The combinations of these three components give rise to the different types. All these factors must be taken into account in equal measure in making up a typology. Ex.s of the disregard for some and overemphasis of others have been cited above. If however we were to attempt to take account of the smallest differences in inscriptions, devices, etc., such a great abundance of types would have to be created as to be of little practical use. This calls for some generalization of the different types according to the most rational criteria. The most reliable of such criteria, in my opinion, is the principle of chronological contemporaneity. On this basis, it seems best to me to distinguish two categories: groups (periods) and subgroups (types). Noting all the main distinctions between types, they can be combined into several groups, each of which may be assigned to one chronological interval. In only three cases is the principle not maintained, for the reasons stated above. The creation of such groups leads to the conclusion that the entire history of stamping on



(P.B.)

(p.20) Thasos can be broken down into 5 periods: three stable and two transitional periods (see Table II), which are explained by the economic and political history of the city state.

### Group 1

Group 1 combines the stamps of 4 sub-groups [Cyrillic] a, b, v, g, whose distinctive feature are the absence of device and the arr. of the inscr. in lines. This group is distinguished by almost all investigators. Subgrp 1 a includes the greater part of the stamps of this group. The stamps are rectangular or almost square in shape. The inscr. is arr. in 3 lines, but v. rarely the end of the last line is carried over into a 4th line. The legend consists of 2 names and an ethnic arr. variously, the ethnic most often in the 2nd place, more rarely the 1st place, and in extremely rare cases the 3rd. The names are almost always abbreviated, as is the ethnic, but the abbreviation consists of no less than 4 letters of the word. The inscr. is occasionally retrograde.

Subgrp 1b differs from the preceding only in the greater abbrev. of the legend: 2 letters in each line. This whole subgrp is combined around the abbrev. of the name TI, which stands in the first place. In the second line is the ethnic in the form of @A and in the 3rd place is one more abbrev. of 2 letters of a name. Only 4 such third names are known (Appendix 2). This formula is constantly maintained.

Subgrp 1 v is characterized by the presence not of 3 lines as in subgrps 1a and 1b, but only of two. Their contents are of 2 types. One part of the stamps of this subgrp. bears the name AABPOZ which always occupies the first place. In the second line are other names, which as a rule are abbreviated. The other part of this sub-group is made up of stamps with one name and an ethnic. The names which occupy the first place, are the following: ΔΑΜΑΣ(, ΔΗΜΗΣ( ΕΥΑΓΟΡ(.

Subgrp 1g is identical to subgrp 1 a except for the difference that an additional stamp is used along with the main stamp. This is evidenced in the first names: ΔΙΑΦΗΣ, ΑΕΩΝΙ and ΧΑΡΕ.



(P.B.)

(p.21)

The additional stamps are of 2 shapes - square and trapezoidal. The depictions on them are various: the head of a man or a torch. <sup>123</sup> *Bon no 80* ΔΙΑΡΗΣ is characterized by a series of letters in a trapezoidal stamp: H, Θ, and E. <sup>124</sup> *q. Prig. no. 229 (slut and ref. 5 Bon 86, 87)*

For the rest, the difference between Subgrp 1 g and 1 a is only formal, inas-  
much as even in the stamps of 1 a there ~~are~~ is the habit of placing an additional stamp on the second handle of the amphora. This is shown by several whole amphoras. <sup>125</sup>  
A number of anepigraphic stamps of group 8 shd probably be regarded as additional stamps on amphoras of subgrp ~~of~~ 1 a, placed on the second handle. Such additional stamps were evidently placed indiscriminately either on the second handle or together with the main stamp. This is excellently confirmed by the additional stamps of subgrp 1 g. On the stamp of XAPΣ (n stands an additional stamp with a picture of a man's head (Pl.IV, 7), but such stamps also occur separately (Pl.IV, 10).

The whole of Grp. 1 is undoubtedly a single unit. This follows above all from the unity of the names occurring in subgrps 1a and 1g. Moreover the single list of second names indicates the closeness of the stamps of all the subgroups to each other (appendix 2). Group 1 can be readily dated by the clear archeological complexes, which provide excellent confirmation of the synchronousness of its subgrps. The most prominent place among them is occupied by the ~~X~~ Zmeinyy Kurgan and the Olbia store of 1947. <sup>*Depos. 2 (p. 45)*</sup> In the first complex were found 3 stamps of subgrp 1a, one st. of 1 v, and 3 st. of ΑΡΙΣΤΟΜΕΝΗΣ with Herakles Archer. All this material is clearly dated by a lekythos of Xenophontes of the 1/4 of the 4th c. B.C. The even more <sup>126</sup> interesting complex from Olbia has this far unfortunately not been published.

As the author of the report writes, in the bottom of the burial pit lay "59 empty carefully deposited amphoras". This remarkable complex contains the stamps of only the two subgrps 1 b and 1 v, confirming that they are synchronous. From the correspondence between the second names in the stamps of the two subgrps, it can be concluded that KI equals KIPΣN and ΔΑ equals ΔΑΜΑΣ(ΤΗΣ).

Consideration of the paleography (Pl.III) shows that the stamps of Grp 1 are distinguished by a quiet beautiful script, whose letters are characterized by



(P.B.)

(p. 21) strictness and monumentality. Especially characteristic are the forms nu, ~~fixxx~~ xi, sigma and omega, which occur exclusively in this early grp. N has a slightly inclined first and a diminished second hasta, the xi has ~~a~~ broad ~~outlines~~ of the same size, the omega is characterized by a regular roundness and several slanting lines, running in the same direction; these have their nearest closest parallels in monumental and numismatic epigraphy of the end of the 5th and beg. of the 4th c. B.C. It can be suggested that the shape of the legend itself in the stamps of grp 1 was taken from lapidary inscriptions. This hypothesis is also supported by the fact that some of the stamps <sup>127</sup> almost regularly maintain the manner of a stoichedon, and most of them depart from this only at the end of the whole inscr. or in the 3rd line. This appears to be not a random thing or a matter of chance and corresponds fully to the lapidary epigraphics of the same time with its transition from stoich-<sup>128</sup> *roundness* edon to the usual arr.

p.22

The grammatical deviations from the koine are generally quite few in the Thasian stamps of all groups. Grp 1 is characterized by comparatively rare Ionisms (evid. because of the abundance of abbreviations). Remarkable features are the typically Ionic replacement of the long alpha with eta in ΔΙΑΡΗΞ, the characteristic writing of the diphthong EY as EO in ΕΟΑΓΟΡΗΞ <sup>129</sup> [ . . . This phenomenon can be traced from the end of the 5th c. B.C.] and, on the other hand, the coupling of the group of vowels EO into a diphthong - ΘΕΥΑ(ΣΡΟΞ), ΚΑΕΥ., which is characteristic of the Ionian dialect from the beg. of the 4th c. B.C. <sup>130</sup> In the case of the flexion (?) one may note the gen. sing. omicron in ΑΑΒΡΟ( (cf. ΕΗΙ ΣΑΤΥΡΟ, 2b), assuming that we do not have an abbreviation here. The form of the gen. ΑΑΜΕΑ (cf. ΤΕΑΕΑ - 2 b) indicates a Doric <sup>131</sup> element which in general was present on Thasos. Such grammatical anomalies on the whole are quite char. of Thasos, and they ultimately give only the ~~lower~~ lower terminus for the ~~rise~~ origin of stamping, namely the threshold between the 5th and 4th c. B.C.

The ethnics in the stamps of all 4 subgrps are used in the most varied abbrev.s. The usual form is ΘΑΣΙΩΝ; apparently, only in the presence of ΤΕΑΕΞ stands ΘΑΣΙΟ.,



(p.22) which stands for the form @AZIO(N). It was stated as an opinion above that this is not genitive plural but a neuter adjective, and there can be no question of a "nationalist archaism". Actually, although VG has related this form of the ethnic with the years immediately following the conquest as we shall see below it also is found in Grps 3, 5a, and even 5b, which VG herself assigns to the time after the Macedonian conquest. Thus no chronological conclusions can be based on this. It is remarkable that VG in her second article <sup>132</sup> everywhere writes @AZION with the accent on the alpha. <sup>(X)</sup> Only in exceptional cases does @AZIOZ appear in the stamps of Grp.1; on the basis of the fact<sup>m</sup> that this ethnic is always associated with the second name @IAS@N, it can be concluded that its appearance is due to the preference of a single person. But @IAS@N did not regularly maintain this habit and sts. placed the ethnic in the usual form.

The most important problem that arises in the study of the group 1 and is ~~in~~ of great importance in dating the stamps is that of the significance of the names in the stamps. But this problem cannot be solved in isolation for this group alone; one must also simultaneously consider the problem of the meaning of the devices and their relation to the names. We will therefore analyze this ~~especially~~ after studying the first three groups.

(X) See Pappas,  
pp. 118-119  
for explanation



(p.22)

Group ~~1~~ 22a: MEZ typ  
2b: O 2d typ

This grp is divided into 2 subgroups: 2a and 2b. The first of these was disting.  
 133 by D. B. Shelov. He considered that the charact. feature of these stamps was the fact  
 that "the inscription on them is placed in 2 or 3 lines <sup>parallel to (cf. Shelov et al.)</sup> ~~along~~ one of the short sides of  
 the rectangular stamp, over the device which occupies the main space" and he was inclined  
 134 to include in this group various stamps with similar characteristics, among them stamps  
 135 of the Keramarchoi and the stamp APIETO - MEPA with the <sup>same</sup> ~~basin~~ which acc. to my  
 p.23 classification fits into Subgrp 4b. Because of the presence in the stamps of the keram-  
 archs of the device of Herakles Archer, D. B. Shelov dated the whole grp. in the mid  
 4th B.C.

At the present time in view of the accretion of material collected in vol. III of  
 IOSPE and in the corpus of Bon and also which has come from new excavations, it is  
 nec. to introduce some corrections into these categories. D.B.Shelov observed char. abbr.  
 for the group, MEZ, MEI, MEPA. Now without any doubt one may state that the stamps which  
 he publ. refer to one group which can be united around the name MEZ which is always  
 present in them. I know of only one stamp without this name and without the device  
 (IOSPE III, no. 435) which can be read MEI - APIZ but here the fact can be explained by  
 the faulty reading and transcription of V.V. Schkorpil. The inscr.s on the stamps  
 MEZ do not go only along the short sides of the frame but are sts. located along the  
 long ones as well (table, V, 3). However, the group of stamps MEZ possesses a series  
 of characteristic features:

- 1) Constant abbreviations up to 3 or 4 letters
2. The presence in many cases of several devices in one stamp (Appendix 3)
3. The required retrograde writing of the legends.
4. " " presence of the ethnic.

We encounter the various ways of placing the legend as is shown here:

1)  $\begin{array}{c} \textcircled{\theta} - 2 \\ 1 \end{array}$  2)  $\begin{array}{c} \textcircled{\theta} - 2 \\ 1 \end{array}$  3)  $\begin{array}{c} \textcircled{\theta} - 1 \\ 2 \end{array}$  4)  $\begin{array}{c} \textcircled{\theta} \\ 1 \\ 2 \end{array}$  5)  $\begin{array}{c} \textcircled{\theta} \\ 1 \\ 2 \end{array}$  6)  $\begin{array}{c} \textcircled{\theta} \\ 1 \\ 2 \end{array}$  7)  $\begin{array}{c} \textcircled{\theta} \\ 2 \\ 1 \end{array}$

where  $\textcircled{\theta}$  is the ethnic, 1 is MEZ, 2 the second name - the placing of the device.

The emblems are completely varied but upon inspecting the list of them one is struck  
 by the fact that they fall into several subject cycles (Appendix 3), that is, the

⊗ Hic  
 Sub 4  
 is not  
 around,  
 but one  
 does not  
 know  
 anything  
 about it  
 until  
 this list  
 p. 34.











(p. 25) Ainsi la datation des timbres de ΣΑΤΥΡΟΣ <sup>du milieu</sup> ~~de la fin de la 4<sup>ème</sup> siècle de notre~~ <sup>notre</sup> ère doit être abandonnée; B. N. Grakov lui-même <sup>(qui s'est corrigé)</sup> a abandonné cette hypothèse et penchait <sup>141</sup> à placer ce groupe entre la fin de la première classe et le début de la seconde. Plus bas <sup>du sous-gr.</sup> on fera l'hypothèse que le ΣΑΤΥΡΟΣ de ~~ΣΑΤΥΡΟΣ~~ 2b et le ΣΑΤΥΡΟΣ du sous-gr. la sont un seul et même personnage. Parmi les emblèmes de ΤΕΛΕΑΣ il y a un Herakles Archer mais sa représentation est très grossière et du point de vue stylistique elle supporte difficilement la comparaison avec la typologie du monnaie. Cependant il faut remarquer qu'elle est <sup>plus</sup> proche de l'Herakles des timbres de plusieurs ΚΕΦ<sup>Α</sup>ΜΑΡΧΟΙ que de celui des timbres de ΑΡΙΣΤΟΜΕΝΗΣ. Les caractères de ce gr. sont petits mais assez précis, et dans les formes principales (particulièrement nu) semblable à l'alphabet des gr. 1 et 2a. Malheureusement, pas un seul timbre rond ne provient de bon complex <sup>t</sup> qui pourrait donner confirmation à la datation proposée.

## Groupe 3

2 <sup>+ ethnique</sup> ~~noms~~ <sup>arabes</sup> ~~à l'époque~~

Dans le gr. 3, entre les timbres avec un emblème au centre du champ et une inscription disposée autour du cadre, l'emblème est habituellement seul; ~~on ne~~ <sup>HPOΦΩΝ</sup> rencontre que rarement, comme avec le nom ~~ΥΠΕΡΘΥΜΗΤΗΣ~~, des symboles complémentaires. L'inscription est placée sur 3 ou 4 côtés du timbre. La légende consiste en ~~2~~ <sup>2</sup> noms et un ethnikon. Les premiers et la seconde ~~sont~~ <sup>sont</sup> très souvent abrégés; on rencontre l'ethnikon sans abréviation avec les terminaisons en ~~ΩΝ~~ <sup>ΩΝ</sup> et ~~ΩΝ~~ <sup>ΩΝ</sup>. Très rarement le graveur manquait de place et terminait l'inscription de la légende pour ainsi dire sur <sup>142</sup> un second cercle. Un fait exceptionnel: à côté du timbre de ΑΙΚΗΚΡΑΤΗΣ on trouve <sup>143</sup> la lettre Α sur un poinçon complémentaire.

Parfois dans la littérature on rencontre l'expression "la groupe d'Aristomène" ~~EDME~~ <sup>sous-entend</sup> par lequel on ~~renvoit~~ <sup>renvoit</sup> les timbres avec les noms d'Aristomène et la représentation d'Herakles Archer. On ne peut pas être d'accord avec un tel emploi du mot. Effectivement, les timbres d'Aristomène sont sans doute les représentants les plus "claires" de ce groupe et dans l'ensemble de tous les timbres Thasiens; les chercheurs leur ont consacré une large place et dans notre travail ils jouent un rôle important dans la



(p. 25) ils n'existent  
 chronologie Thasienne. Cependant ~~il n'existe pas~~ pas du façon isolé/ mais ils entrent  
 dans le gr. 3 qu'ils datent essentiellement. Il ne convient pas non plus de ranger dans  
 un gr. à part les timbres dans lesquels la légende est disposée sur les trois côtés  
 d'un cadre quadrangulaire. De tels poinçons comportent assez souvent des noms communs  
 aux timbres du groupe restant, ce qui détermine son monolithisme. L'inscription<sup>est parfois</sup> retro-  
 grade. Les timbres de cette période étaient placés tant sur les anses que parfois  
 (mais très rarement) sur le cou de l'amphore. Les timbres des ~~derniers~~ gr.s<sup>postérieures</sup> ne sont  
 pas connus sur les cous des amphores.

Typologiquement les timbres du gr. 3 provenaient des timbres du sous-gr. 2a  
 précédant dans les 3 premières variantes de la formule. Selon toute vraisemblance  
 on parvint à ce résultat par un développement graduelle des 3 éléments de la légende  
 autour de l'emblème. Une telle hypothèse fait du gr. 3 l'héritier immédiat du sous-  
 gr. 2a.

No  
 (ou autre)



(p.25)

p. 26 <sup>x</sup>  
Hefpate  
has  
as 370,  
one  
with p. 26

(X)  
(Cannot be  
precisely  
synchronised  
since they  
have  
different  
epochs.)

A series of reliable complexes date quite well the group we are studying (Appendix 1). Most frequently in these complexes we encounter the stamps of Aristomenes. We cannot agree with VTrace who dates the Dubois de Montpereux mound at 410-400 BC. <sup>x 144</sup> <sup>145</sup> Certainly I. B. Zeest is correct in distinguishing in this complex two burials of different periods. The amphora with the stamp from there should be placed in the 1/2 of the 4th cent. B.C. Materials from the burial of the Zmeinii mound show that the Aristomenes stamps ~~refer~~ relate directly to stamps of Group I and perhaps in some sections (?) are even synchronous with it. This makes out conceptions of the various groups as consecutive one upon the other somewhat arbitrary. It is altogether possible that a succeeding group sprang up during the existence of the preceding one. However this does not change the conclusions about Group 3 as being on the whole a later one. There is no doubt that the stamps of Aristomenes are the earliest ones in it. This is attested to by the list of their second names which coincides greatly with similar lists in the two preceding groups. However in the Aristomenes stamps there are already new names as well that are characteristic for the whole of Group 3. Here is the relationship in percent of coincidences of second names in the stamps of Aristomenes and in the various early groups: Group I - 77 percent; Aristomenes - 100 percent; Group III - 94 percent; Group IV - 29 percent.

Much attention has been devoted to Aristomenes in the special literature esp. because he puts in his stamps the Greek parasemon of the city of Thasos <sup>146</sup> which has direct analogies in the sculpture and numismatics of the island.

B.N. Grakov who compares the emblems of Aristomenes with coins, at first dated <sup>147</sup> these stamps at a period around 400 B.C. Later on he proposed that they be dated <sup>148</sup> <sup>149</sup> at 390-380 or 390-370 BC. In complete agreement with this chronology I shall only permit myself to make it more precise merely because of stylistic considerations. <sup>150</sup> The stamps of Arist. bear an emblem of a kneeling Herakles preparing to draw his bow. His pose is distinguished by the sureness of his movements: one foot is slightly extended forward so that the center of gravity is transferred to



151

3.02

(p.26)

the bent knee of the other leg which rests firmly on the ground, the torso of the hero is either erect or protrudes sl. backward reflecting the moment when he had barely begun to draw his bow; in such instances even the line of the bow-string bends somewhat (Table V, 8). Herakles' head is covered with the lion skin, on his chest one sees the animal's paw, its tail is caught in at the waist in a belt. Her. is dressed in a chiton which falls in flowing calm folds from the knee on both sides. The folds are worked very simply, in a specially clear ~~example~~ example one can observe the detailed musculature of his legs.

*V.I. 2  
data*

This composition places these emblems in close ties with the numismatic symbols of those three groups of gold and silver coins which according to metrological, stylistic, or other indications have been referred by A. West to Periods 2 and 3. <sup>152</sup> All specific stylistic features and particularly the characteristic details - the permanent absence of the second paw of the beast which peers out in several examples of coins from under the hem of the garment which is under the hero's foot ~~refer~~ relate the emblems of Arist. <sup>153</sup> precisely to these coins, which are dated in Period 3 (380-370 BC) and to the very beginning of Period 4 (370-350 BC). This permits us to locate the stamps of Arist. chronologically around 370 B.C., although they could have appeared even earlier in the decade of the '70s. This arbitrary boundary (370 B.C.) denotes the end of Group I of Thasian stamps and the beginning of Group III, Group II is located in close proximity to this date.

p.27

*(Not a borrowing  
just a reference)*

Despite the obvious dependence of the Arist. stamps on coinage typology, it is unlikely that one should see in Thasian stamps such a great number of borrowings <sup>154</sup> from the coins of other centers which some investigators find, and even more unlikely to explain these borrowings through historical considerations. Orienting herself from the latter, VGrace has referred a great number of stamps of Group III to the very end of the <sup>5th</sup> ~~5th~~ cent. B.C., to the moment after the completion of the Peloponnesian war, <sup>155</sup> although according to the data of the complexes and in view of the considerations we have offered they refer to a period after 370 BC.



(p. 27)

It is possible that the emblems of the stamps of Herophon are also connected with numismatics: <sup>156</sup> the head of the bearded Herakles in a lion skin, the club under it, and a series of additional symbols, although it is difficult to find coin analogies to the basic emblem, if not to consider it as having its source in the type of the Archer. The supplementary symbols might be used to confirm such an hypothesis. The script of the Herophon stamps (~~7~~ Plate III, 3) is distinguished by embellishments in the form of little circles at the ends of the letters - which is a very characteristic phenomenon in the coinage technique of the whole Gk. world. It is possible that the amphora dies ~~xxx~~ of Herophon were prepared by a diecutter for coins. An amphora with a similar stamp was found in a grave (Appendix I, no.9), which is dated by the materials as 370-350 B.C., which confirms the chronological proximity of the stamps of Herophon and Aristomenes. Another stamp of Group III in view of the material of a reliable complex (Appendix I, no.11) is also dated ideally at the middle of the 4th century B.C. The end of the whole group in view of considerations which will be offered below can be placed around 340 BC.

On neck  
(one on each  
side of neck)  
Hyp. -  
Herophon

The script of Group III represents a further development of an earlier one. Despite the general retention of the forms of the letters of Groups I and II, one can observe a gradual widening of the letters, the script in some instances becomes uneven and hasty. Indicative is the shape of Φ - sometimes large in size with slightly protruding lines and stems quite to the contrary with a little ~~circle~~ circle and a vertical slash which emerges only from below. The letter N, although still in its slanting form, nevertheless gradually acquires vertical strokes parallel one to the other which are so char. of the succeeding group. The same can also be said of the forms of sigma which are rare here with its horizontal strokes.

Group III more than the others gives examples of anomalies of dialect which can be explained by the very rich anthroponomic materials it contains. On the one hand they would seem to indicate a very marked influence of the <sup>but</sup> Ionic dialect, and on the other, a gradual ~~but~~ quite persistent penetration of the koine in its developed forms.



## I. Ionisms

157

Eta after rho, iota, epsilon: ΑΡΙΣΤΑΓΟΡΗΣ, ΕΥΑΓΟΡΗΣ, ΙΣΑΓΟΡΗΣ, ΗΡΑΓΟΡΗΣ,

ΗΡΩΣΤΑΓΟΡΗΣ, ΠΑΥΣΑΝΙΗΣ, but ΠΑΥΣΑΝΙΑΣ, ΚΑΛΛΙΑΣ, ΝΙΚΙΑΣ, ΕΥΦΡΑΝΩΡ [seems out of place].

158

Eo instead of EY: ΕΟΑΓΟΡΗΣ, cf. ΓΛΑΟΚΙΑΣ.

159

EY instead of EO: ΘΕΥΔΟΤΟΣ, ΘΕΥΔΩΡΟΣ, ΘΕΥΦΙΛΟΣ, ΚΑΕΥΚΡΑΤΗΣ, but ΘΕΟΔΟΤΟΣ, ΘΕΟΔΩΡΟΣ, ΘΕΟΦΙΛΟΣ.

160

p.28

Eta iota instead of eps. iota: [Possibly under the influence of Attic.

K. Brugmann, A. Thumb. Griechische Grammatik, München 1913, pp. 62, ff. (This phenomenon is studied from the beginning of the 4th c. B.C.).] ΠΟΞΙΑΗΙΟΣ instead of ΠΟΞΙΑΕΙΟΣ.

161

Epsilon instead of eps. iota: ΧΕΡΙΑΟΣ but ΧΕΙΡΙΑΟΣ (Group I)

162

Contraction of vowels: ΔΗΜΗΣ (from ΔΗΜΕΗΣ), ΗΡΑΣ (for ΗΡΑΗΣ).

163

Inflections (genitive): ΕΠΙ ΤΗΛΕΦΑΝΕΟΣ. Cf. ΠΥΛΑΔΕΩ (keramarchos)

164

165

Loss of iota from the diphthong in intervocalic position: ΔΕΙΑΛΚΟΣ →

ΔΕΑΛΚΟΣ.

## II. Instances of developed koine

166

Iota instead of eps. iota: ΔΕΙΑΛΚΟΣ - ΔΙΑΛΚΟΣ (occasional form) → ΔΙΑΛΚΗΣ;

ΕΥΑΛΚΙΑΗΣ. ΗΡΑΚΛΙΤΟΣ, but ΗΡΑΚΛΕΙΤΟΣ.

167

Epsilon iota instead of iota: ΤΕΙΜΗΖΙΘΕΟΣ but ΤΙΜΗΖΙΚΑΗΣ.

168

Epsilon instead of eta: ΑΡΧΕΚΡΑΤΗΣ but ΑΡΧΗΚΡΑΤΗΣ.

Dissimilation: ΠΑΜΦΑΗΣ - ΠΑΝΦΑΗΣ - ΠΑΝΦΑΟΣ(!)

## III. Doricisms and similar

ΑΘΑΝΟΚΡΙΤΟΣ, ΔΑΜΑΤΡΙΟΣ, ΔΑΓΕΤΑΣ, ΝΟΞΙΚΑΣ, ΑΡΤΩΝΔΑΟ equals gen. of ΑΡΤΩΝΔΑΣ, 169

[it is understood that this is not an epic form but a dialectical phenomenon which resembles most closely the Aeolic dialect (the Boeotian or Thessalian variants).

170

Cf. etc.] ΔΑΔΑΣ. [This is a barbarian name (perhaps Thracian?), char. of the Hell. period etc. . ]



(p.28)

Particularly noticeable is the abundance of developed forms of koine (many of them appear in texts on papyri from the 3rd century B.C.), which were absent in the preceding groups. Char. also is the presence of Doricisms. [Cf. Grakov . . . . The names ΝΟΞΕΟΞ and ΝΟΞΕΙΚΑΞ which he presents are not Asia Minor names but Greek: Zgusta . . . ]

The materials presented for the first 3 groups of Thasian stamping permits us now to raise the question of the significance of the names and emblems on the stamps of Thasos. This problem is of the utmost importance, once it is solved it will help us to explain the overall datings of the groups and to point out smaller gradations within them.

More than half a century ago E.M.Pridik advanced the hypothesis of the so-called double firm, according to which both of the names which appear on Thasian stamps were those of fabricants, i.e. potters. B.N.Grakov who accepted this at first, soon rejected it. Basing his views on stamps of the Keramarchis

p. 29

and on a few names accompanied by the preposition ΕΗΙ, he considered one name as that of the magistrate referring to the keramarch, and the other the potter's name. V.V.Schkorpil distinguished the functions of the eponym (with the preposition ΕΗΙ) and the keramarch. V.Grace conclusively defined one name as the name of the magistrate-eponym, accompanied by a constant emblem, and the other as the name of the person who ~~affirmed~~ attested (endorsement) the quality of the amphora. Subsequently she compiled a whole table of correspondences of eponyms and potters.

Relying on her article, M. Mircev subjected to critical analysis the long-since-abandoned theory of "double firms". Apart from general considerations he, following in the footsteps of Yu. S. Krushkol, presents the observation that the names of the magistrates refer to aristocrats (ΑΡΙΣΤΟΛΙΚΟΞ etc. ) while the second names belong to craftsmen or tradesmen (ΜΥΤΙΩΝ, ΘΡΑΣΩΝ, ΚΙΡΩΝ and ΔΕΜΕΑΣ). If a name of the second type occurs in the first position, this can be explained by the fact that a wealthy tradesman could have been elected to the post of a magistrate. In dealing with the group of stamps with one name, M. Mircev



(p. 29) observes that the name on them refers to the potter, while the emblem represents the eponym. Thus in stamps with letters functioning as emblems, these letters must be the initials of the eponyms.

A. M. Bon while not entirely rejecting the "magistrates" interpretation of the names <sup>181</sup> points out the possibility of another hypothesis for which she indicates her preference. Considering the stamp in its entirety to be a partial marking, the certificate of important wine-merchants, she revives the old theory of the "double firms" on a somewhat different basis. She considers that one name belongs to the head of a "trade-firm", and the other to some responsible person, the appearance of whose names on the stamps was required by the state: an inspector, a degustator, etc. It is possible that it belongs also to a second partner. Abbreviations and monograms have the same sense. The emblem depends on the personal taste of the merchant. The whole idea of this French researcher presupposing "a director of a firm", and "investment of capital" in a hazardous enterprise, "competing firms" etc. is a very strong modernization of the economic relations of ancient Greece.

In Thasian stamps actually one very rarely encounters names with ENI. Thus far <sup>182</sup> three instances are known: ENI ΣΑΤΥΡΟ(Y), ENI ΜΕΓΩΝΟΣ, ENI ΘΑΛΕΦΑΝΕΟΣ. [others are doubtful (references)] However scholars are undoubtedly correct when they ascribe the first name to a magistrate and the second to a potter. How is one to make out the name of the magistrate, where is the criterion for "first" and "second"? In placing the legend on the 4 sides of the frame, the idea of "first" place is completely relative. Observations indicate that the names of undisputed magistrates occur as a rule immediately after the ethnic. It is completely correct to regard names <sup>with</sup> which one and the same emblem constantly appears as those of magistrates, these emblems being borrowed from the coins of the city. However with these names for ex. with the name ~~ΗΑΡΡΟ~~ Herophon one finds as well other and most varied symbols. V. Grace considered these names homonyms and referred them to various eponyms (for ex. ΜΕΓΩΝ I with ENI and ΜΕΓΩΝ II without the prep.). <sup>183</sup> However even after such a distinction the majority of the names on the stamps of Group III is left undefined with regard to their belonging to magistrates.

It should  
anytime  
stand at  
corners,  
not in the  
middle of  
a side.

how  
does the  
text look  
and?



(p.29) For this reason, the same scholar has gone further and numbered among the eponyms  
 p.30 names of stamps with a special positioning of the inscription, for ex. along 3 sides,  
 as in the KAEOΦΩN stamps.<sup>184</sup> However such a positioning of the inscription can be  
 found with many other names beside those of KAEOΦΩN, and with stamps of this same KA.  
 we meet inscriptions along 4 sides.

In view of the difficulties which we have enumerated, we must begin our study with  
 the very first group. V.V.Schkorpil<sup>185 (1914)</sup> had already observed that second (as regards the  
 ethnic) names in the stamps of AΠΙΣΤΟΜΕΝΗΣ with Her. Archer are repeated in the second  
 or third lines of stamps without emblems. B.N. Grakov<sup>186</sup> subsequently defined the first  
 names of Group I as the names of Keramarch-eponyms. However the matter is not as simple  
 as it seems. V.G.<sup>187</sup> thinks that the magistrate names never occur together. Meanwhile  
 However we know of 9 names of Group I that occupy sometimes the first (i.e. they are  
 magistrate names) and stc. the second place where they must belong to potters (Appendix  
 II). The only explanation can be found in the fact that the functions post of an  
 eponym-magistrate on Thasos was an elective one and that the eponym could be selected  
 from the group of the producers of the containers.<sup>188</sup> This is remarkably demonstrated  
 by stamps of subgroup Ib with one name and the ethnic. All three names which enter in  
 here - ΔΑΜΑΣΤΗΣ, ΘΗΜΗΣ, ΕΥΑΓΟΡΗΣ - belonged to potters who exercised the functions of  
 magistrate, consequently these are stamps which were issued during the time that they  
 were exercising these functions and they were issued from their pwn shops.<sup>189</sup>

illustration of this  
 The most brilliant hypothesis as to be found in the stamps of ΣΑΤΥΡΟΣ. The very  
 fact that in the basic stamp are located arme parlante and a supplementary die with the  
 inscription ΕΠΙ ΣΑΤΥΡΟ(Y) occurs also with the name ΕΥΑΓΟΡΑΣ compels us to refer all  
 these round stamps to the eponym ΣΑΤΥΡΟΣ who maintained his own shop and for that reason  
 affixed his own eponymous die to the basic one most frequently including his own name  
 - 20 times. The infrequency of combinations of the name ΣΑΤΥΡΟΣ in the preceding group  
 (only with 2 potters) and the chronological proximity of both groups allows us to  
 assume that the ΣΑΤΥΡΟΣ of Groups I and II ~~is~~ one and the same person. Hence it

What  
are there?  
not nec.  
not nec.  
could easily  
be different  
people  
1/4. W.P.W.  
in context  
differ 9  
more



(p.30) follows that the transition to the new type of stamp occurred during the incumbency of one magistrate - ΣΑΤΥΡΟΣ. This fact in all probability confirms the hypothesis that ΣΑΤΥΡΟΣ exercised the rights of an eponym (i.e. he was elected for a year),<sup>190</sup> although the preposition ΕΠΙ was inserted rather infrequently. The functions of eponyms were also in all probability exercised by ΤΕΑΕΑΣ who has like ΣΑΤΥΡΟΣ a permanent supplementary symbol in the round stamps - a caduceus, although combined with various central emblems (Appendix III).

Despite the fact that ΜΕΞ. has various emblems, I am also inclined to regard him as an eponym. This would seem to be confirmed by the original type of the stamp and by the fact that all of the emblems fall into a series of subject cycles (Appendix III), and at the same time one and the same name of a potter is accompanied by emblems from the various cycles i.e. ΜΕΞ. affixed emblems according to his own choosing which is in principle equivalent to having a single emblem. The fact the the list of accompanying names coincides with the list of the potters of Groups I, III, and IV once again confirms this hypothesis. All the data which we have examined bespeaks the ~~bravix~~ ephemeral nature and consequently the transitional character of Group II which occupied in all about <sup>2</sup>3 years.

APIΣΤΟΜΕΝΗΣ stands as it were at the boundary of the 2 periods. He is undoubtedly the first eponym in Group III. The abundance of potters' names on his stamps induces one to think of comparing their list with the lists of potters under the eponyms of Group I who bear on their stamps references to a substantial number of potters:

(list or table, with these headings: eponym of Group I  
no. of potters  
percentage of coincidences)

From the data which have been presented it is clear that this group of ep. stamps shows <sup>1</sup>coincidences of from 40 to 63 percent, i.e. on the average of about 50 percent independently of the number of potters. Only the stamps of the eponyms ΑΕΩΝΙΑΑΣ (33 percent), ΔΗΜΗΣ and ΤΙ (33 and 75 percent) prove to be exceptions. In the two last instances the figures obviously are of an accidental character as a result of the infrequency of the accompanying names. It thus becomes clear the compactness of the



(p.31) whole group and its chronological proximity to ΑΡΙΣΤΟΜΕΝΗΣ. Consequently I consider it possible to divide Group I into 2 stages: early and late, of approximately 15 years each. The 12 eponyms listed above enter into the late group, together with the eponyms ΜΕΣ and ΤΕΑΕΑΣ of Group II, they occupy precisely such an interval of time. Into the early stage will go eponyms whose names on the stamps are accompanied by the names of one or two potters who are in some instances not even found on the stamps of the rest of the group. There are 10 names which belong here: ΑΣΤ., ΚΙΡΩΝΙ(ΔΗΣ), ΝΟΞΕΟ(Σ), ΑΡΙ., ΔΑΜΩ(Ν), ΑΘΗ., [ΚΙΡ]ΩΝ(?), ΤΕΙ., ΘΕΟΦΙΛΟΣ, ΕΥΑΓΟΡ(ΗΣ). The possibility of finding new names increases this stage to the time-span which we have allotted to it. Of course such a division is more or less arbitrary and it does not exclude the possibility that some of the eponyms of the early stage can also be entered in the late one. The results of the present study serve to confirm the final conclusions of B.N. Grakov <sup>191</sup> on the development of regular stamping for the first time precisely on Thasos in the last years of the 5th or the very beginning of the 4th cent. B.C. Bearing in mind a certain conservatism on the part of Greek society of the time one may understand that as was the case with every innovation, stamping although indeed it had been officially introduced was not at the beginning accepted by all of the potters, i.e. that it was not universally recognized. This would help also to explain ~~the rarity of stamps of the early stage of Group I.~~ the rarity of stamps of the early stage of Group I. and the small number of potters (1 or 2), who stamped their wares during the incumbency of a single eponym. Regular stamping nevertheless bore for the time being a sporadic character. And it is only at the beginning of the second stage of Group I, that is approximately from 385 B.C., that stamping became popular and was used regularly by all potters.

All that has been said indicates the arbitrariness of our typological classification, inasmuch as the stamps of subgroups Ib, Ic, Id are referred on the whole to the late stage of the whole group. Under a single eponym (ΔΙΑΦΗΣ for ex.) there existed dies of subgroups Ia and Id. Therefore subgrp Ia already belongs partially to the second stage. As far as subgrps Ib and Ic are concerned (we have in mind only the eponym ΔΑΒΡΟΣ)



(p.31) as the complexes of the Zmeimii Mound and the Olbia complex of 1947, they probably can be referred to the very end of the second stage, and are chronologically close to the stamps of ΣΑΤΥΡΟΣ (subgrps Ia plus Iib) and to those of ΑΡΙΣΤΟΜΕΝΗΣ (Group III).

Many more difficulties arise in determining the eponyms in Group III. According to the only true criterion, a constantly recurring emblem, one can single out <sup>192</sup> 9 names:  
 p. 32 ΑΡΙΣΤΟΜ(ΝΗΣ), ΤΙΜΗΕΙΚ(ΛΗΣ), ΔΗΜΗΤΡΙΟΣ, ΔΙΚΗΚΡΑΤΗΣ [Editors sometimes read this as ΑΡΧΗΚΡΑΤΗΣ but this obviously can be explained by the carelessness with which the scribe executed his inscription - breaks in the drawing of the delta transformed it into an alpha (cf. Bon, no. 468).], ΑΜΦΙ(ΚΑΗΣ?), ΓΑΛΥΚ(ΟΣ?), ΗΡΟΦ(ΑΝΗΣ?), ΜΕΓΩΝ (plus ΕΠΙ), ΗΡΟΦΩΝ. One more eponym ΘΑΛΕΦΑΝΗΣ is distinguished by the preposition ΕΠΙ; on his stamps there are no names of potters (with the exception of the very doubtful ΔΗΜΗΣ). Therefore he already belongs to the end of Group III or basically to Gr. IV. All 9 of the eponyms which we have listed have permanent emblems on their stamps (Appendix IV) some of them (Her. Archer for ΑΡΙΣΤΟΜ., the head of Her. for ΗΡΟΦΩΝ, and amphora for ΑΜΦΙ) are borrowed from contemporary coins which once again confirms the magistrate rank of the bearers of these names. However some names from this list are found with the most various emblems, for ex. ΗΡΟΦΩΝ, ΓΑΛΥΚΟΣ and particularly ΜΕΓΩΝ. Following VTrace, we were obliged here to single out still one more eponym, for ex. ΜΕΓΩΝ I and ΜΕΓΩΝ II. But then why one and not several, after all the stamps of ΜΕΓΩΝ II are not united by any common features, and the name ΗΡΟΦΩΝ is found even with the name ΑΜΦΙ (an eponym). One could think that ΗΡΟΦΩΝ in this instance was a potter. This fully confirms the custom of selecting eponyms from among the potters and extends this custom to Group III, however it does not give any proofs of the magistrate rank, for ex., of ΜΕΓΩΝ II.

Interesting observations can be made on the basis of the materials <sup>de</sup> to the stamps of the eponym ΗΡΟΦΩΝ. He has as permanent emblems the head of Herakles in a lion skin and a club beneath it. In front of the face of the hero at the bottom there are additional symbols which vary with the various names of the potters. They never are repeated with various ceramists, which gives one the right to conclude that they are the special emblems of the fabricants. This conclusion finds remarkable confirmation in the fact



(p. 32)

that additional symbols - a Corinthian helmet with the name of ΠΟΣΙΔΕΙΟΣ, and a herm with the names of ΣΚΥΜΝΟΣ - become the chief symbols in the stamps with the names of those persons but without ΗΡΟΦΑΝ. If previously the emblem (or group of emblems) was affixed only at the choice of the person in authority - the eponym -, now into the field of the die comes also the symbol of the potter. There arises the custom which is followed by the stamps of the greater part of Group III and of all those that follow after it. If under the eponym ΗΡΟΦΑΝ this symbol occupied a subordinate position, subsequently it is advanced to a central one.

All that has been said permits us to propose the division of Grp. III into early and late stages. The early stage begins with ΑΡΙΣΤΟΜΕΝΗΣ and lasts about 10 years, from 370 to 360 B.C. To this stage can be referred all 9 of the listed eponyms who have stable emblems. The late stage occupies about 20 years (360-340 B.C. and takes in stamps of eponyms without a stable emblem. To this stage can be referred, and obviously to its end, the eponym ΘΑΛΕΦΑΝΗΣ. The variety of his emblems in the stamps of Group IV where he appears without potters, demonstrates quite clearly the adoption of a new principle on a much wider scale. And it is precisely in this stamp that there are put not only emblems both of the eponyms and the potters but also the eponyms themselves (and perhaps the potters too) choose from for themselves not one stable emblem but a whole selection of them. Therefore compiling the lists of the magistrates and fabricants in the late stage of Grp. III becomes wellnigh impossible. Perhaps one shd follow the path proposed by VG: <sup>193</sup> to single out eponyms (for ex. ΚΑΕΟΦΑΝ, ΑΡΙΣΤΕΙΔΗΣ, ΔΑΜΑΣΤΗΣ and others) according to the manner of placing the inscr., for ex. along the 3 sides of the stamp. However there is no guarantee that such a type of die was not dictated by the tastes of the potters of ΚΑΕΟΦΑΝ, ΑΡΙΣΤΕΙΔΗΣ, and the others. All the more so since the potter ΔΑΜΑΣΤΗΣ exercised the function of eponym in Group I (before 370 BC), could hardly have been again elected as magistrate several years later for the meaning of the function of the eponym <sup>would then be</sup> ~~were then being~~ lost. The meaning of the names and emblems in the following groups will be examined below.

p.33

Most complicated of all is the matter of clarifying the title of the magistracy



(p.33) which gave the right of affixing the name of the magistrate on the stamps. V.V.Schkorpil was the first to state the idea ~~at~~ that this function was exercised by the keramarch <sup>194</sup> who was chose from among the potters, <sup>195</sup> who comprised a special guild on Thasos. And ~~at~~ the same time he ~~was~~ distinguished between eponyms and keramarchs. B.N.Grakov accepted this hypothesis of "guild unification," but recognized the keramarch to be an eponymous official. <sup>196</sup> In his late works he defended this point of view and regarded the keramarch who was elected for a year as the "eponym of his productive-religious union". <sup>197</sup>

The question is highly debatable because we know of very few stamps of keramarchs. <sup>198</sup>  
In precise reproductions only two stamps are known:

(he gives readings)

<sup>198</sup>  
Beside these two, V.V.SCHKORPIL published 2 more stamps:

(he gives 2 more readings which he calls doubtful)

*not seen*  
The accuracy of the publ. of the stamps by V.V.S. is very doubtful, inasmuch as it is clear that these 2 stamps are variants of stamp no. 1 and obviously the emblem was placed in them not on the side but also at the bottom. After V.V.S. no one has seen <sup>199</sup> or published these stamps. [In IOSPE III they are given with a ref. to their publ.]

One can draw the following conclusions:

- (with conclusion)*  
*may be* //
1. In stamps there are names of only 2 ker.s - ΠΥΘΙΩΝ and ΠΥΛΑΑΗΣ.
  2. In stamp no. 1 in all probability the first line had not been preserved and it is an analogy of stamps nos. 3 and 4.
  3. In all stamps functioning as an emblem we find the arms of Thasos - Her. Archer, which proves the official character of the dies.
  4. The name of ΠΥΛΑΑΗΣ stands alone only if the first line had not been lost (while the name of ΠΥΘΙΩΝ is accompanied by the names of 2 potters - ΑΜΘΙΚΡΑΤΗΣ and ΜΕΓΑΚΑΕΙΔΗΣ (or ΗΡΑΚΑΕΙΔΗΣ)).



(2.5.7)

(p. 33) One is struck by the unusual nature of this type of stamp, which makes one think of their very extraordinary features, for we know of many more stamps with EIII and they refer to the most various types. The name of IYΘIQN is found only in subgrp Vb and there it had nothing in common with the name of the keramarch. As for IYAAΔHΞ, a rather widespread name, which however is not met among the names of obvious magistrates, is known only among potters. All that has been said makes the identification of the post of ep. with that of keramarch hypothetical in the highest degree. Moreover, it was not always, judging from the stamps of Group I and III. (Appendix II) that the eponym had his own potters' stamps, i.e. not all magistrates were selected from among the potters, and to speak of some "productive-religious union" is premature. The keramarch was rather some sort of special magistrate the exercise of whose functions lasted for a period of relatively small extent as for instance the "esimnāt" in Sinope. [He says this is definitely not the word astynomos.] Its official character cannot be doubted. It will be more prudent for the time being to leave the question open.

p. 34

indeed yes

IVa: types having 2 names 22.XII.73  
 Group IV IVb: 2 names without ethnic (but some have ethnic)  
 IVc: 1 name plus ethnic, sign goes round 4 or 3 sides

Grp IV is repres. by 3 subgrps (IVa, IVb, IVc). Typologically they seem too heterogeneous to make it possible to unite them into a single whole. However in the general list of potters, some complexes and other factors confirm their chronological similarity.

Subgrp IVa contains seals with 2 names and an emblem. Their char. feature is the position of the ethnic: it is located on both sides of the emblem, sts in lines, that is as though it had been broken by it (emblem) (Pl. VII, 4), and sts it forms what wd seem to be 2 cols. along the short sides of the frame, with the letters going retr. As a rule the ethnic is abbrev. to 4 letters: ΘΑ ΣΙ. The emblems are of the most varied types (Appendix V). The whole subgrp is unified around a single name, AAFETAE. 200



(R.B.)

3.14

(p.34) The originality of the type, and the accompanying lists of the names of the potters permit us to regard AAETAZ as an eponym. It is possible that he had his own shop even during the times of the late stage of Grp III, but there is no complete certainty of this. <sup>201</sup> [His stamp with AM... (IOSPE III, no. 936) is poorly preserved and can be completely referred to Grp IV.]

Subgrp IVb is dist. from IVa by the absence of an ethnic, but it resembles it by having 2 names one of which is a magistrate's. Only in the case of a few eponyms are the names abbreviated, usually they are written out in full. The stamps of APIETOKPATHE are distinguished by the permanent retrogradeness of the inscr.s. The legend is placed usually on both sides of the emblem, Sts. (as in the stamps of NIKIAZ) the 2nd name is upside down. In some stamps the legend is placed along 4 sides as in the stamps of Grp III, only with the difference that the ethnic is missing. On the dies of APIETOKPATHE both names are placed occasionally together above the emblem (Pl.VII, 5). These stamps contain a unique ex. of an additional symbol: an "englyphically" executed club is placed in the field of the stamp at the bottom, to the left of the basic emblem - a jug. [No ref. unless it is supposed to be the one just referred to, but we cannot see any club.]

The depictions in this subgrp are highly varied (Appendix V), they are not united around subject cycles. The potters do not have stable emblems. The repetition of the names of the potters and the originality of the emblems of the eponyms permit the compiling of a list of the ep. magistrates. They are APIETOKPA(THZ), NIKIAZ, THAEΦANHZ, <sup>202</sup> AMIOZ, [read GAMIOZ by the Bon], ΠΑΝΦΑΗΖ, ΦΙΑΟΚ[ΠΑΘΗΖ], ΒΙΩΝ. The recent discovery <sup>203</sup> of a stamp with the name of the last eponym shows the possibility of broadening this list, in time.

Subgrp IVc unites the most different stamps with one char. common to them all - the presence of a single name accompanied by the ethnic. The legend is placed on 4, less frequently 3 sides of the frame. In exceptional cases with the names AAKAM[ENHZ], IHTIAHZ, KPINIZ, MEΓA(KAHZ), the inscription is placed in 2 lines above or below the emblem. The ethnic has the form ΦAZIΩN, less frequently ΦAZION, only in one instance with the name



(p.34) with the name ΓΑΛΥΚΩΝ - ΘΑΣΙΟΣ. The emblems are varied (Appendix V), with ΘΡΑΣΣΝΙΑΗΣ, ΗΡΟΦΩΝ, and ΤΙΜΑΡΧΙΑΔΑΣ instead of emblems there are letters. It is difficult to determine where the majority of the names of this grp belong. ΘΑΕΦΑΝΗΣ undoubtedly is an ep. judging from the preposition ΕΠΙ. His emblems are of the most varied subjects. Probably these stamps belong to the same year as his stamps of subgrp IVb in which the name of the potter is present. Most likely these are dies from his own shop. Some names of stamps of this subgrp coincide with the names of the eponyms or potters of subgrp ~~IX~~ IVb (Appendix II), however when <sup>I</sup> consider the custom of selecting eponyms from among the potters, I refrain from identifying them. Probably ΗΡΑΚΛΕΙΤΟΣ wd have been a magistrate with his emblems in the form of a bow with an arrow or with a quiver, and with a supplementary letter of the alphabet at the side.. This can be attested to by his ~~σ~~ emblems which are attributes of Herakles, and which emerge (as was the case with the ~~σ~~ stamps of ΣΑΤΥΡΟΣ from subgrp IIb) as "arms parlants". In that case the additional letter could signify the potters who worked under ΗΡΑΚΛΕΙΤΟΣ. However all of this does not go beyond the scope of hypotheses. In all probability the majority of the names of this subgrp shd be ascribed to potters.

p.35

Thus as we see the whole of grp IV is of various types. Nevertheless we can unite it into a single period in view of many considerations. The chronological completeness of subgrp IVb is remarkably attested to by several unpublished complexes (Appendix I, nos. 13-15). Thus far there have not been found in reliable complexes any stamps of ΑΛΕΞΑΝΔΡΑΣ, however because of the coincidence of typical potters' names (ΗΡΑΚΛΕΙΤΟΣ, ΜΕΓΩΝ, ΠΥΡΡΑΝΗΣ) and of the script, he must be placed in the same category as the other stamps of this grp. Probably he like ΘΑΕΦΑΝΗΣ was one of the early eponyms of this period. Typologically his dies originate from the stamps of Grp III, but in them we see applied the original positioning of the ethnic on both sides of the emblem. As a next step possibly, there occurred a complete rejection of the ethnic with ΑΡΙΣΤΟΚΡΑΤΗΣ, ΝΙΚΙΑΣ, and the others. The stamps of ΘΑΕΦΑΝΗΣ, ΗΡΑΚΛΕΙΤΟΣ and the other persons of subgrp IVc are direct analogies of the stamps of Grp III in view of the position of the legend and probably relate to a time when the latter still existed.



(p.35)

*This is "Good date for NIKIAZ etc."*

The complexes referred to above reliably date Grp IV at a time around 350-330 B.C., that is, at the period at the end of Grp III and the beginning of Grp V. This position of Grp IV wd seem to be indicated ~~xx~~ also by the coincidences of the names of the potters

(table, with these headings:	Grps and subgrps
(in 2 cols.)	General no. of potters in the grp
	No. of coincidences with Grp IV
	Percentage of coincidences )

The highest percentage of coincidences occurs in the late stage of Group 3. The great no. of coincidences with subgrp 5a can be explained obviously by the small no. of its potters (34).

The script of the stamps of Grp 4 fully corresponds to the script of the end of Grp 3 and the beg. of Grp 5 (~~xxxx~~ Pl. III) ~~xxxxxx~~. One can observe a gradual lengthening of the letters (sigma) and their widening (gamma). Especially notable is the form nu with parallel strokes which appear completely vertical. A small no. of names permits us to make only slightly meaningful observations about the orthography. Alongside old Ionic forms (APICTAΓOPHΞ) forms of Attic koine (NIKIAZ) predominate. As far as developed koine is concerned it is possible that we see it in the dissimilation of ΠΑΝΦΑΗΞ (to make unsimilar). It is interesting to note the very perceptible Doric influence (ΑΑΡΕΤΑΞ, ΤΙΜΑΡΧΙΑΑ (sic)) - 2 names in 30 and at the same time one of them is that of a magistrate, while in Grp 3 the Doric forms are found in  $\frac{1}{5}$  names out of 200. Several clarifications of the general dating of Grp 4 in view of historical background are given below.

#### Group 5

Grp 5 unites stamps of one type which contain one name and the ethnic placed on 2 opposite sides of the frame above and below the emblem.

p.36

Subgrp 5a which was distinguished for the first time by VG<sup>204</sup> is distinguished from all of the rest of Grp 5 by a characteristic feature - in the stamp to the side of the emblem there is a sign which resembles the letter @ or a "phiale". F. Salviat<sup>205</sup> convincingly demonstrated recently the fact that the last symbol belongs to the astral cults. This is well confirmed by the fact that in Subgrp 5 a star sts appears, either alone or accompanied by signs in the form of little balls. VG<sup>206</sup> assumes that in this





(p.36) occurs  
grp the ethnic ~~stands~~ solely in the form ΘΑΣΙΩΝ and considers it a manifestation of numbers as of "nationalistic archaism". On this basis she ~~attributes~~ similar dies to the most ancient (a period before the acceptance on Thasos of the Ionic alphabet). One cannot help but be struck by the unfoundedness of such a dating. In the first place, in stamps of this type the ethnic very often occurs in the form ΘΑΣΙΩΝ; in the second place, as we have already said, the form ΘΑΣΙΩΝ occurs as a neuter adjective, and there is no reason to speak of any substitution of an omicron for an omega.

[1966] In the symbol shaped like a "phiale" VG found a tie with Delphi and explained it by the fact that the supreme magistrates of Thasos were Theorai whose dependence on the shrine of Pythian Apollo was deeply felt. However after the work of F. Salviat the possibility of such an explanation no longer existed consequently rejected her ascription of these stamps to the ~~theorai~~ theoroi. Nevertheless one must agree with her idea that the additional symbols had a magisterial significance. Arbitrarily one may subdivide the additional emblems into 3 types: 1) the astral sign, 2) the star, 3) the star and the pellets. As an hypothesis one can connect these three types with three different eponyms. The coincidences in the lists of names of potters of subgrp 5a and the other groups look as follows:

(table, with same headings as on p.35)

The highest percentage of coincidences occurs in the late period of Grp 3 and in subgrp 5b; the small no. of coine. with Grp 4 can be explained in all probability by the insignificant no. of potters. The script confirms placing subgrp 5a together with Grp 4 (Pl.III). One can observe a further change in the forms of the letters in cf. with Grp 3: the whiskers of kappa get longer, nu is always vertical, the final lines of the sigma become almost parallel, the form of xi is char. and found only within the limits of the 4th century B.C.

In the orthography we can observe the same features we saw in Grp 4. Alongside of Ionic forms (ΠΑΥΣΑΝΙΗΣ) occur oscillations toward Attic koine: ΕΥΦΗ(ΝΩΡ) - ΕΥΦΑΝ(ΩΡ)



(p.36) and features of developed koine: ΝΙΚΟΣ(ΤΡΑΤΟΣ) - ΝΙΚΩΣ(ΤΡΑΤΟΣ). The form ΚΑΑΑΙΑ [No ref.] represents an abbreviation rather than a Doric genitive. The comparatively early dating of Grp 5 is dictated also by the Pavlosk Mound (Appendix I, no. 10) with its rather broad frame which still do not permit us to refer to stamps of subgroup 5a which ~~were~~ found there ~~within~~ outside the limits of the 4th century BC. [But note that the only types from "Grp 5" are the phiale and star types; all others are 2-name types.]

p.37 One must definitely object to the typological breaking of subgroup 5a from the whole of Grp 5. Judging from the material which has been presented, it unites only a few of the early stamps of the whole period, <sup>perhaps the very earliest.</sup> Chronologically it coincides with Grp 4, and only arbitrarily (Appendix II) is it placed after the latter. Typologically it developed most likely out of subgroups 4a and b by means of removing one name ~~xxxx~~ and substituting the ethnic in its place.

The stamps of subgroup 5b are of the same type as the stamps of subgroup 5a but without the astral additional symbols.

The form of the stamps of Grp 5 is for the most part rectangular, only rarely almost square. <sup>209</sup> VG ~~distinguish~~ <sup>seven</sup> locates the square stamps in a special class. Sts. an overly long name does not fit along the side of a die, and goes on to the other side at rt angles. In ~~such~~ <sup>individual</sup> cases, such a placing of the inscription is deliberate and concerns not only the name but also the ethnic, although there is enough space. <sup>210</sup> Very often the name is inverted in relation to the ethnic, rarely one or both inscriptions are executed retr. <sup>211</sup> In the majority of cases the names are given in full, only rarely are abbreviations admitted (Appendix). Not infrequently ~~xxx~~ beside the emblem are found monograms, and at the same time in the case of some names they are repeated unchanged with various symbols. The meaning of these permits us to determine those stamps where instead of ~~individual~~ individual letters and monograms there occur whole syllables - ΚΑΕΟ, ΗΓΗ, so that the impression is created that these stamps relate not to the 5th but to the 3rd grp. However the sharply different forms of the letters dispel any such doubts. It is interesting to note the <sup>212</sup> similarity of the stamp where along the short



(p. 37) side of the frame we find ΓΟΡΤΟΥ accompanying the name ΣΑΤΥΡΟΣ. The lunate sigma requires us to refer this stamp to Group 5. This case and also the repetition of monograms with one and the same names makes the only possible interpretation of similar additional letters and combinations of letters <sup>as</sup> ~~and thus~~ indicating the patronymics of those persons whose names occupy the basic position on the stamps. In Such a solution is confirmed also by the stamps of ΑΡΙΣΤΟΚΛΗΣ <sup>213</sup> with the patron. ΘΕΑΜΑΧΟΥ, placed in a line directly under the name. In the case when similar names appear with varying monograms, one must see in the bearers of these names different persons.

Emblems with one name as a rule ~~are~~ can ~~be~~ vary greatly. The unusual abundance of emblems has made many scholars regard them as borrowings from coins. Although one may regard many similar attributions sceptically, nevertheless one must note the amazing similarity of some emblems with numismatic symbols. Thus for ex. the vine <sup>214</sup> hung with clusters of grapes in the stamp of ΑΡΙΣΤΟΑΙΚΟΣ in the smallest details <sup>215</sup> repeats a figure found in the coins of neighboring Maroneia; the dancer with <sup>216</sup> kalathos in the stamp of ΚΡΙΝΙΣ <sup>217</sup> is borrowed from a coin of Abdera. It seems to me that one shd look for analogies in numismatics only of cities located nearby, and <sup>218</sup> not turn to examples from centers located over thousands of versts from Thasos. Sts. emblems of stamps borrow statuary subjects: this for ex. the sphinx in the stamp <sup>219</sup> of the same ΚΡΙΝΙΣ in all probability are copies from the famed Delphic column of <sup>220</sup> the Naxians, in which one is also convinced by the way the base is depicted; perhaps however one shd see here the influence of Chios.

Highly important is the question of the meaning of the names and the emblems in this group. Most scholars rightly consider the names on the stamps of Grp 5 as the name of the potter. This is undoubtedly proven by the lists of names and the general trend of development of the type of the Thasian stamps and its components. More complicated is the problem ~~and~~ of the emblem. B.N.Grakov in his time expressed the idea that it represents in these stamps the eponym-keramarch <sup>221</sup> and that like emblems correspond to a single magistrate. Independently from him, M. Mircev <sup>222</sup> hit upon the same idea. It is interesting that he, like the first scholar, sees a confirmation of this in the



(p.38) abbreviations, letters, and monograms after the name of the potter, the meaning of which has just been discussed. As still another argument, the Bulgarian scholar presented those stamps where instead of emblems we have letters which he considers to be the initials of the eponyms. B.N.Grakov assumed that they could indicate the year of the potter's work. However neither of these proposals finds confirmation in the facts.

If the letter<sup>222</sup>-emblem indicated the year, how are we to explain those cases when in the stamp there occurs not a separate letter but a monogram? On the other hand against the identification of the letter with an initial can be attested to in one stamp<sup>225</sup> in which it is perfectly obvious that a koppa occurs. Inasmuch as it is obvious that not even the most daring ~~exprs~~ adherent of "nationalistic archaism" wd begin his name with a letter which had gone out of use already in the 1st half of the 5th c. B.C., the hypothesis of the initials cannot stand. Moreover one's attention is drawn to the fact that letter-emblems were placed by only 2 potters - KAEITON and HOAYNEIKH<sup>226</sup>, but on the other hand they were maintained by them constantly, and they did not use other emblems. This wd make one think that the letters were chosen according to the taste of the potter himself and had no other significance except that of an emblem as such. This wd also seem to be indicated by the double symbols which M. Mircev defines as follows: a large emblem, an eponym, a small one ~~was~~ a potter. But to whom shd we refer the large emblem of the potter HOAYEN<sup>227</sup> - a male bust with outstretched arm which we find exclusively in his stamps (he used no other) accompanied by various additional symbols (a star, a wing, a bird, a vase, etc.)? Following the principle of the composition of the stamps of Grp 3, we must see that HOAYEN was a magistrate, but inasmuch as this contradicts the system of stamping of Grp 5, there remains only one solution: during this period the potter used emblems at his own discretion. In those cases when in this group a coinage emblem occurs, even if it be the crest of the city itself, [Herakles Archer also with various additional symbols - ear of corn, a kantharos.] for the time being we can see no indications of the presence of a magistrate and supplementary symbols can have some other meaning which may be hypothetically defined as for ex. the trademarks of individual masters or something else of the sort. It is possible that future



(p.38) discoveries will change much of what we now know, and will permit us to speak of some  
p.39 very special type of magistrates that were introduced for some short period. But this  
will hardly disturb our ideas of the main principle of composition of the stamps of  
Grp 5 which proceeds from the general development of the potter's trade on Thasos.  
These ideas might find a contradiction in the discovery of several stamps with a thyrsos  
and various names of potters in the Pergamon complex, [B.N.Grakov explains this <sup>230</sup> by  
as the borrowing of the emblem by various potters from one another.] however the thyrsos  
is so widespread an emblem in all the groups, and especially in Grp 5 that here it may be  
simply an accidental coincidence. In any case to ~~fix~~ draw typological conclusions  
based on the date of a complex which has as the scope of its chronological framework  
about 40 years is altogether hazardous.

No less difficult is the question of the chronology of Group 5. The transition to  
dies with one name and the ethnic VG connected with the Macedonian conquest of Thasos  
in 340 BC which brought about acc. to her suppositions some changes in the administra-  
tive structure. <sup>231</sup> This hypothesis was adopted by I.B. Brashinsky. <sup>232</sup> Despite the  
highly problematical char. of the question of the Macedonian conquest, one may accept  
340 BC as a certain arbitrary boundary in the change of the system in stamping. Acc.  
to the proposed scheme of the development of the types, into this period falls the  
second transitional period to which can be referred the stamps of the whole of Group 4  
and of subgrp 5a. Probable administrative changes which in my opinion took place  
gradually were reflected in the inconstant nature of the types of stamps of these groups  
and led ultimately to the third stable period (Subgrp 5b). While I espouse the thesis  
of the eponymous char. of Grps 4 and 5a, and bear in mind the possibility of finding new  
eponyms in Grp 4b, I allot to both a period of approx. 20 years: 340-320 BC. <sup>233</sup> At the  
same time I am aware of the arbitrariness of such a designation inasmuch as some eponyms  
especially those of Grp 4 ed have coexisted with the eponyms of Grp 3. Assuming at the  
same time the presence in subgrp 4c of potter's stamps, one must note that a certain num-  
ber of the stamps of subgrp 5b (i.e. those without astral symbols) in all probability  
as well coincide with the aforementioned 20-year period, i.e. the "potters'" principle



(p. 39) coexisted for some time alongside the "eponyms" ~~period~~.

24.XII.73

Some confirmation of the proposed dating of Grps 4 and 5a is given by a list of stamps from Alexandria, where up to now not a single similar die has been found. Stamps from Seuthopolis<sup>234</sup> and Kabile<sup>235</sup>, founded ~~successively~~ <sup>respectively</sup> after 359 and ~~24~~ 342/1, confirm the chronological determination for the lowest limit of subgrp 5b, inasmuch as stamps predating this group at any rate in Kabile (stamps of Seuthopolis are completely unpublished) have not been found. Well-dated complexes from the Ziminskii and Plovdivskii mounds, from the Elizavetovskii and Nikolaevskii cemeteries (Appendix I, no. 20, 21, 24, 25) show the existence of this type during the whole of the first half of the 3rd c. B.C. The date of the end of the groups as well as of all of the stamping of Thasos, is difficult to determine. The presence of Thasian stamps in the Pergamon complex and in the coll. of amphoras of Villanova and the relatively small number of them there in cf. with Rhodian indicate a time around 200 B.C. as the most probable upper limit of Thasian stamping in general and of Grp 5 in particular.

period

p. 40 But such an enormous <sup>in cf. with all the preceding grps. - approx. 140 years -</sup> can hardly satisfy the archaeologists and therefore the next task for scholars must be the further breakdown of Grp 5 into a series of smaller <sup>stages</sup> and more limited in time. However here we are at once confronted with a series of difficulties. The chief one of these consists in the fact that in such a large segment of time - almost a cent. and 1/2 - homonyms can have appeared. One must bear in mind that the potter (as dist. from the ep.) ed have worked for a significant no. of years. Nevertheless if one is to take such a frequently occurring name as ΠΥΘΙΩΝ, <sup>237</sup> [In the cat. of Bon one can count 60 stamps with this name. . . .], one can observe that it is ~~is~~ encountered on stamps from the mound of Nikolaevka and in the famed Pergamon cellar - complexes separated one from the other by half a cent. and hardly belonging to one and the same person.

\* In Rhodes, <sup>foreign</sup> all classes are in small number compared with <sup>a</sup> ~~Rhodian~~. (See report of 1957, Phil-Soc.)



(p.40)

For the time being the only real means of establishing chronol. precision is to break down the various stages acc. to specific characteristics of the script. In this way probably to separate the homonyms and to determine whether the various emblems belong to one or to several potters. At the same time one must guide oneself not only on the external features of the various letters but one must study all of the alphabet as a whole. Thus 2 forms of sigma - angular and lunate - are <sup>238</sup>sts found in a single die. I do not take it on myself here to solve such a task inasmuch as it requires research in the originals of a great no. of inscriptions. As a first attempt one can only separate a series of names which undoubtedly must relate still to the 4th c. B.C. Here is a far from complete list of them: ΑΡΙΣΤΟΤΕΛΗΣ, ΚΑΛΜΟΣ, ΚΑΕΙΤΟΣ, ΚΡΙΝΙΣ, ΝΑΥΣΩΝ, ΠΟΛΥΝΕΙΚΗΣ, ΤΙΜΟΚΛΗΣ.

The paleography of the early stage (Pl.III) is very close to the script of Grps 4 and 5a. This is especially noticeable in the forms of the letters kappa, nu, xi, sigma. At the same time mu with parallel absolutely vert. strokes, a certain restlessness in inscribing the omega, set the stamps of this stage in close connection w. subgrp 5b. Charact. of it are completely varying forms of letters which are altogether typical in developed Hellenism, both in ceramic and in monumental epigraphy and not only on Thasos but <sup>239</sup>everywhere else as well. Pi acquires the features of a cursive letter which is common on papyri, the cross stroke of the alpha at first bends and then breaks, epsilon, sigma, and omega not infrequently appear in lunate cursive forms, the point of theta yields to a cross bar, xi on the other hand loses its vertical stroke.

The dialect of the inscriptions of <sup>is</sup> Grp 5 - a fixed Attic koine with the characteristic substitution of A for Eta in certain positions: ΑΙΝΕΑΣ, ΚΡΙΤΩΑΣ, ΧΑΙΡΕΑΣ, and names ending in ΑΓΟΡΑΣ (ΔΙΑΓΟΡΑΣ, ΗΡΑΓΟΡΑΣ, etc.) exclusively. It is also observed in the inflections of names ending in ΚΛΗΣ (ΤΙΜΟΚΛΕΟΥΣ). Ionicisms are <sup>lyok</sup> rather rare but they do occur: ΠΑΥΞΑΝΙΗΣ (but also ΠΑΥΞΑΝΙΑΣ), ΠΡΗΕΙΗΘΑΙΣ, ΠΡΗΕΙΗΝΑΕ, ΑΡΙΣΤΟΚΛΕΥΣ (this can also be the personal ending of the nominative), ΔΕΙΑΛΚΟΣ - ΔΕΑΛΚΟΣ (cf. Grp 3). Together with this one can see the influence of developed koine of the Hellenistic period: in a large no. of names which end in ΚΑΕΙΑΗΣ, there is also ΗΡΑΚΑΙΑΗΣ; the appearance of iota in



(p. 40) <sup>er</sup> intravocal non-constant position (ΠΑΜΦΑΗΣ - ΠΑΜΦΑΙΗΣ); dissimilation (ΠΑΝΦΑΗΣ); haplo-  
graphy [?] of sonants - a phenomenon which is frequently encountered in the Hell. period  
in ceramic inscriptions and papyri (ΜΑΛΙΩΝ); a reducing of the sound "O" under the infl.  
of the ~~distinct~~ double-assimilative action of ypsilon (ΠΟΛΥΑΔΗΣ - ΠΟΥΛΥΑΔΗΣ). The number  
of Doricisms is greater than in Grp ~~3~~ 3: ΑΘΑΝ(ΔΗΣ) (but also ΑΘΗΝΑΔΗΣ), ΑΚΑΡΝΑΝ, ΑΛΚΕΤΑΣ,  
ΑΡΚΕΣΙΑΑΣ, ΙΕΡΟΙΤΑΣ (subjected to the infl. of the koine), ΑΕΩΔΑΜΑΣ, ΜΑΤΡΟΒΙΟΥ. The  
ethnic in the majority in the majority of cases ends in ΩΝ, endings of the neuter are  
known in doubtful instances. It is obvious that this form of the ethnic ceases to exist  
in subgrp 5a.

p.41

#### Group 6 (wheel-shaped stamps)

The question of wheel-shaped stamps is highly disputed. At the present time most  
scholars are inclined to refer them to Thasian stamps. <sup>240</sup> Actually the clay of the amphoras  
with these stamps has much in common with the wellkn. Thasian clay and differs from it  
only by a reddish brown tint and a coarser<sup>r</sup> manufacture. The handles of the amphoras are  
more massive and flatter. Unfortunately I am not acquainted with a single whole amphora  
with such a stamp: B.N.Grakov reveals in IOSPE III that he had seen the only complete  
example in the Yalta museum.

The majority of stamps represent letters included between the spokes of the wheel.  
Most frequently such a wheel has 4 spokes and a rim which is differentiated from the frame  
of the die/ For the most part the letters are placed in lines, however we do encounter  
radial orientat<sup>ation</sup> - - with the tops toward the axis. Much more infrequent is a stamp that  
has 3 spokes, in which case the positioning of the letters is exclusively radial. It is  
only extremely rarely that one encounters a wheel with 5 strokes, in it most frequently  
is encountered the name ΧΑΡΙΞ. <sup>241</sup> Sts. in a round stamp there are no spokes at all and the  
position of the letters is more or less free. <sup>242</sup> A. Balkanska thought that the very form  
of the stamp imitates the ancient form of theta which points to the name of the city of  
Thasos. I.B.Brashinsky justly subjected this hypothesis to criticism by noting ~~that~~ the  
wheels with 3 and 5 strokes. <sup>243</sup> In my opinion the form of these stamps is most likely



(p. 41) borrowed from numismatics where a reverse with a wheel and letters on it is met rather frequently.

In the sections between the spokes stand the most varied letters, sts. joining ~~in~~<sup>244</sup> to make sense - XAPIΣ, MEΔ. B.N.Grakov directed out attention to the ligature wh. is frequently met and the parallel grp of letters formed from Π and X which stand in ~~various~~ different sections; he correctly interpreted these signs as number designations acc. to the acrophonic system (equals five thousand) and advanced the hypothesis acc. to which such stamps were intended for special purposes, for ex. for the exporting on a single occasion of a large shipment of wine. On the basis of the unity of the type, B.N.Grakov referred them to a small interval of time, possibly to a single year. I.B.Brashinsky is <sup>245</sup> also inclined to relate them to a single or several years. He thinks that wheel-shaped stamps are a turning point in Thasian stamping after which they returned to an old but altered type of stamps; this event he connects with the Macedonian conquest of the city in 340.

Accepting the hypotheses of the special purpose of these stamps I feel it necessary to make several observations. In the first place, as has been shown above, these stamps are not all that similar to each other and it is perhaps possible to single out a series of types among them. It is most likely that they are not the output of a single year but a series of impulse emissions separated perhaps by several years. In the second place in advancing the hypothesis of a turning point in the stamping on the basis of the introduction of wheel-shaped stamps, I. B. Brashinsky thereby rejects the possibility of the coexistence of these stamps ~~of~~ with the stamps of other groups. Putting the question this way seems slightly disputable. Wheel-shaped stamps differ sharply in type from all the rest which proves their special function and at the same time <sup>their</sup> the parallel existence with stamps of the basic types.

p.42

One can accept the dating of this group at a time around 330 B.C. and somewhat later. This dating is also borne out by the script of the wheel shaped seals which finds a correspondence of Grps 4, 5a, and 5b of the early stage (Pl.III). At the same time



(p. 42) the appearance of apices and the embellishment of the letters with a "swallowtail" brings the script of the wheelshaped stamps into close contact with the paleography of the second stage of Grp 5b, i.e. at the boundary of the 4th and 3rd centuries B.C. Probably wheel-shaped stamps are located in the 2/2 of the 4th century B.C. around 340 B.C. This is ~~also~~ also confirmed by the fact that they were found in Seuthopolis and Kabile which sprang up at precisely this time. The meaning of most of the letters is unclear, they are probably the initials of potters or magistrates. It is possible that subsequent finds will require us to change our ideas about these stamps as being Thasian and will permit us to ascribe them to another locality.

#### Group 7

The dies of Grp 7 contain an emblem and one name variously placed (Appendix 7). The inscription is abbreviated only rarely. The emblem is almost always a single one, in rare instances there are 2. <sup>The</sup> A selection of symbols is rather large, sts (as in the case of the lion of ΠΑΝΤΕΜΙΑΕΣ) they reproduce statuary monuments.

One must admit that most of these stamps are referred to Thasos only hypothetically and exclusively on the basis of studying the make-up of the clay of the amphoras. The names except for 2 or 3 are generally widespread and do not correspond to Thasian names. On the contrary the name ΠΑΝΤΕΜΙΑΕΣ which occurs in several stamps is attested to in a die of Oisyme. This makes one wonder whether or not many such stamps belong to the "orbit" of Thasos. In this connection the stamps of ΕΥΑΝΘΗΣ are interesting (Pl. <sup>IX</sup> ~~Y~~ 4). They all have a club in the middle, the inscription is entered acc. to the boustrophedon method, but in no case can one speak of any great antiquity; such a manner of positioning functions here rather as ornamentation. After inspecting an amphora with such a stamp from the wellknown Nymphaion, I came to the conclusion that owing to similarity in slightest details of the clay, of the shape of the amphora and the stamp, and even the fashioning of the surface, it had to be recognized as Thasian. However a stamp which originates from Hermoussa (so far unpublished) <sup>is</sup> ~~are~~ of the same type with the name ΕΥΑΝΘΗΣ



(p. 42) and a club but more coarsely executed, the clay of the amphora has nothing in common with Thasian clay. On the break, the clay is coarse-grained, raspberry-colored and does not contain the slightest trace of mica, and at the same time with a great nb. of lime formations and quartz inclusions. Such a clay mass cannot originate in any clay deposit of the island, inasmuch as it does not have even the remotest analogies in the clay of Thasian vessels. We can only assume one thing: the stamp of EYANΘHZ was so widespread on Thasid that they <sup>it</sup> adopted it without changing in the slightest in other regions, most likely in direct proximity with the island.

The general chronology of the group cannot be elaborated since all the stamps in it are of the same date. There are only 2 ways to approach the dating: stratigraphically and paleographically. At the same time an individual approach to each stamp is essential. Stratigraphic data is the surest of all. For ex. the amphora with the EYANΘHZ stamp was found in a complex of the 1/4 of the 4th c. B.C. ~~at~~ most likely ca. 370 B.C. Several ~~xxx~~ stamps of EKATAIOZ were found in the Pergamon complex, they are dated at the end of the 3rd century B.C.

As far as the meaning of the names and emblems is concerned, the most probable hypothesis is that these are potters' stamps.

p.43

#### Group 8 (anepigraphic)

The last group is made up of stamps without any inscription. Here we come up against the same difficulties of attribution as in Grp. 7. The clay of several groups of amphoras ("goblet-shaped Type Solokh-I" / , Mendeian) brings to mind at once Thasian clay, hence errors are possible. Nevertheless <sup>we must not doubt</sup> in the existence of this group of Thasian stamps, especially when we bear in mind the find of an amphora from Kerch, on one handle of which was a stamp of Grp I and on the other an anepigraphic stamp, a turtle. <sup>246</sup>  
D.B.Shelov who was the first to distinguish this group associates only a few ex.s with it, almost all are square dies with varying depictions: ~~xxxx~~ bearded head in pilos, turtle, etc. <sup>247</sup>  
B.N.Grakov who came to the idea of classifying such stamps at the same time <sup>248</sup> regards them as a supplement to Grp I. Later discoveries enabled us to introduce



(p. 43) corrections and additions to his thesis. In 1965 in the necropolis of Nikolaevka, was found a whole Thasian amphora with a stamp of Subgrp 4b (Appendix I, no. 14). On the other handle was an unscripted stamp: in the round die a rosette or star. Thus one may assert that the custom of affixing unscripted stamps on the other handle survived until the time of the existence of Grp 4, i.e. until 340-320 B.C. However this find is not unique, hence the majority of such stamps must actually be referred to the time of Group I.

Unscripted Thasian stamps usually have a square shape, sts. trapezoidal (Pl.IV,8). One can include in this group <sup>analogous</sup> stamps but with emblems as letters. Such stamps in the strict sense of the word are not unscripted but undoubtedly they fulfil the same functions. In those cases where only one stamp appears on the handle of an amphora, one can assume by analogy with the Kerch amphora mentioned above that there was a stamp of Grp I on the other handle. The custom of such stamping coexisted with the custom of placing both stamps on one handle (Subgrp 1d). Such combinations permit us to refer to many unscripted stamps which have been met separately to Thasian stamps. They are depictions of the head of a bearded Dionysos (?) in an ivy crown (Pl.4, 10) which are found in the stamps of XAPQN; a turtle (Pl.4, 9), which is also known on the amphora of the eponym <sup>250</sup> AEQNIAAZ; a theta, which coincides even in form with the letters of the suppl. stamps with the stamp of ΔΙΑΦΗ (Pl.4, 8), etc. One can only guess about the function of such stamps. Judging from the fact that, for ex. the suppl. theta on the stamps of ΔΙΑΦΗ combines with the names of various potters, these stamps cannot be connected with potters and are some sort of very special symbols.

In all probability they originated from the same ancient unscripted stamps which were used as early as the 6th and 5th c. B.C. before the appearance of regular <sup>251</sup> stamping. [See for ex. the rosette-shaped stamp from the archaic layers of Olbia (Olbia <sup>251</sup> Temenos and Agora . . .)] Connected with them possibly are both Thasian stamps (judging from the clay) which were imprinted by special stamps (Pl.IX, 6, 9) and gems. Some gems have an archaic appearance, however one must not forget that intaglios made from precious stones or metal could have survived many centuries.



(p.43) All that has been said makes the attribution of the majority of uninscribed stamps hypothetical, and dating them acc. to style unreliable.

p.44 In conclusion, I wd like to note that the present article is only the first stage of research on Thasian stamps. The next step must be the historical analysis of the classified material, and the creation on the basis of the data above all of ceramic epigraphy, as well as of the numerous references by ancient authors and of the legislation unique in the Hellenic world on the wine trade, of a work on the history of the production of wine, ceramic containers and the wine trade of the island of Thasos in the late classical and Hellenistic periods. Such a work the wuthor hopes to put out in the future.



p.44

When this work had already been sent to press, a new article by VG and MZH appeared that dealt with the stamps from the Maison des Comediens quarter of the Fr. excav. on Delos.<sup>252</sup> The work was preceded by a theoretical outline touching on general problems of amphoras as a whole, on the methods of chronology, and the attribution of stamps, their contents, on the stamping instruments used for the stamps, on the amphora stamps at Delos, etc. In addition, the content and chronology of the stamps of this center are considered in the introductions to the descriptions of each group. This publication is distinguished by its great thoroughness and scrupulousness. <sup>Two</sup> ~~The~~ Thasos stamps have been published ~~twice~~ in all. In the foreword to this part, the authors repeat a number of the views advanced in earlier works by VG, on which there is no need to dwell here. There are however also some new remarks. For example, this investigator has arrived at the conclusion, which we have also come to (see above, p. 37), that ~~th~~ in the stamps with one name and ethnic (our Group V) the abbreviations stand for patronymics. Unlike the previously suggested transcription of the ethnic @AZION as a genitive plural, the authors now believe that even in the very late stamps they have published, the ethnic @AZION should be read as nominative singular neuter. Our criticism of such a hypothesis was presented above. Following the previous method of dating separate stamps, the authors also propose their dates for these two stamps from Delos: ~~their~~ method remains as before. For ex., considering the stamp of the potter APISTO~~PN~~ with an emblem in the form of an amphora, which has no direct ~~xxx~~ parallels, even with a soft-clay stamp, they, on the basis of a comparison of the type of the amphora in the emblem with a similar type on a stamp from the Athenian Agora (on which only ~~the~~ emblem was preserved!), date it in the 1st cent. B.C., since the stamp from Athens was found in a complex (evidently in a well), belonging to the time after Sulla. The other stamp, which also has no parallels, in their opinion, should be dated to the 2nd cent. B.C., inasmuch as a stamp by the same potter MEPISTEYZ was

and see Brn  
p. 28, d. 8  
with 4 - 6  
no document

Not in  
in this work  
see Hesp. 1963,  
p. 327, with 18

Not in  
see Brn  
(1958)

p. 119  
q. al. Brn  
p. 28, d. 8  
with 4 - 6

How would  
in date?

own stamps?

Q. and?



(p.44) found in a well in the Corinthian Agora, dating from the time before 146 B.C.  
 (that is, before the destr. of Corinth by the Romans), whereas the emblem of  
 this stamp (not from Delos, but from Corinth!) - the cornucopia - was found among  
 the symbols of the stamps of the Pergamene complex from the end of the 3rd to  
 beginning of the 2nd centuries B.C. It need not be said that such remote and  
 precarious comparisons make this chronology unreliable. I have already pointed  
 out that we have no information on the stamps of Thasos amphoras dating not only  
 from the 1st but also from the 2nd century B.C.

So this is  
 only 146  
 B.C.

7.10.81

(his p. 39)

See also

this table which at the bottom

says END OF STAMPING

What I say there is true



*Photostat made for Knopfer (on substitute)  
Bisler*

Vinogradov's article, table pp. 45 ff.,

*text  
(p. 45)  
ff.)*  
Column 4, conditions of finding

Context group 1: 3 Semibratni mound. From a grave with amphora sherds

- " " 2: From the funeral banquet in the filling of the Zmeyeviny Mound. A row of amphoras comprised the lining of the mound, but it is impossible to distinguish these amphoras.
- " " 2a: Fill of the mound in the Yuz-Oba chain. The complex is obviously mixed, funeral banquets were performed over various burials. The central grave was plundered.
- " " 3: An amphora from Burial 51 in the Olbia necrop.
- " " 4: A supply of amphoras in the cellar of an Olbia house. 59 amphoras in all.
- " " 5: In Stone Grave 1 on Karantinny Highway near Kerch, the so-called mound of Ashik, 1838.  
or r.r. line
- " " 6: Olynthos.
- " " 7: Panticapaea mound, Dubois de Montpereux. In a stone grave with 3 skeletons.
- " " 8: Baksinski Mound. Circumstances of the find are not clear. Funeral banquet? In the mound undoubtedly at least 2 burials were made.  
From a
- " " 9: Apollonia Pontica, cemetery, Grave 38.
- " " 10: Pavlov mound. 10 amphoras comprised the lining of the mound, the remaining handles - in the funeral banquet (?). There were 2 more burials in the mound. The burial and the fun. Banquet were not of the same date.
- " " 11: The small mound ~~at~~ near Dolokha, 1962. Both amphoras are from the outer (ditch or trench). The central grave was robbed. One burial was inserted under the top of the smaller mound, directly into the inner (ditch or trench).
- " " 12: In a Thracian mound-stone grave near the village of Kaloyanovo.
- " " 13: Kapulovka 1, mound 13, burial 1. On the handle of a complete amphora.
- " " 14: Nikolaevka, 1965, necrop., excavation 5, burial 1. On the handle of an intact amphora.
- " " 15: Nikolaevka, 1966, excavation VIII, burial 18.
- " " 16: Alexandria, excavations.
- " " 17: Store of amphoras at Villanova on Rhodes.
- " " 18: Fragments of amphoras in the basement of a house in Pergamon.

*→  
under  
analysis*



- Context group 19: An intact amphora in a cistern in the Agora of Athens.
- " " 20: From the funeral banquet of the fill of the Zelenski mound.
- " " 21: Elizabetinski cemetery, mound no. 4.
- " " 22: Mound Kut. in a partially plundered burial.
- " " 23: Trekhbratny mounds at Lake Tobeckik. In a stepped storeroom with a great quantity of objects.
- " " 24: A cupola grave at Plovdiv, in the fill of the mound.
- " " 25: Nikolaevka, small grave, 1968. In the funeral banquet of the mound with a plundered catacomb.
- " " 26: The Thracian settlement Kabile.
- " " 27: Sevtopol. Stamps not published. The preponderance of Group 5b is to be noted.
- " " 28: Olbia, 1886, cemetery, storage 41.
- " " 29: Probably at the beginning a household but later a refuse pit, in Nymphaea.

Column 5, accompanying material

- Cont. grp. 1: ~~gold~~ 1) gold ornaments; 2) a chalcedony gem; 3) an iron sword with a hilt framed with gold, and other things
- " " 2: 1) shattered amphoras; 2) a redfigured lekythos of Xenophon
- " " 2a: 1) fr. of rf vessels of the "quick" style; 2) a fr. of a blackgl. oinochoe w. decorations of applied clay; 3) fr. of a bl.gl. vessel; 4) fr. of alabaster; 5) 2 necks of amphoras; 6) Herakleia stamps ΔΙΟΝΥΣΙΟΥ and ΣΤΑΣΙΧΩΡΟ; 7) the neck of a redgl. vessel w. applied white; 8) an iron nail
- " " 3): 1) a grey clay lekythos; 2) a basin with designs on it; 3) Herakl. amphoras with stamps: (etc., etc.)
- " " 4: Herakl. amphoras with stamps: (etc., etc.)
- " " 5: 1) a helmet; 2) greaves; 3) scales of a coat of armor; 4) arrow heads; 5) a bz. plaque ornament; 6) a bz. ladle
- " " 6: nothing
- " " 7: 1) a bl.gl. kylix; 2) a bl.gl. saltcellar; 3-4) two aryballic lek-  
ythoi one with palmettes on its neck; 5) a r.f. aryballic lekythos  
with a figure of a doe.



Cont. grp. 8: in one of the funeral banquets, fr. of an rf krater of Free Style.  
A vase of the same style in the storage.

- " " 9: 1) - 7), amphoras with and without stamps, but of what type precisely is unclear; 8) an rf oxybaph; 9) a bl.gl. kylix
- " " 10: 1) an rf krater; 2) a Sinopean stamp on the handle: (etc.) In storage 3) a rf pelike; 4) a Panticapaeum coin
- " " 11: 1) a Herakl. amphora w. the stamp ΕΗΙ ΚΑΡΧΥΑΕΤΟΖ around a bunch of grapes; in Burial 1: 2) a bl.gl. kylix
- " " 12: 1, 2. gold ornaments; 3-8 iron implements and armor; 9, a bz helmet; 10-15, bz vessels and a lamp; 16, an iron candelabra; 17, 18, a silver vessel and "applications"; 19, a bz ring; 20, an iron (implement); 21-26, simple clay vessels; 27, a clay amphora; 28, a rf lekane; 29, a bl.gl. aryballos-lekythos; 30, rf skyphoi (2); 31, rf pelike
- " " 13: 1) bl.gl. kylix w. graffito (that's all)
- " " 14: 1) bl.gl. kylix; 2) bl.gl. kantharos; an alabastron
- " " 15: 1) bz mirror; 2) bz ladle; 3) paste bead; 4) iron knife w. hilt; 5) bl. gl. bowl; 6) bl.gl. kantharos
- " " 16 (nothing)
- " " 17: Rh. amphoras of the time of the Perg. complex
- " " 18: great quantity of Rh. handles w. stamps
- " " 19: various ceramics
- " " 20: 1) great no. of amphora frags. of bl.gl. ceramics; 2) Sinopean stamps of Grps. II and the beg. of III acc. to B.N.Grakov; 3) pieces of Pan-athenaic amphora of the archon Neaishmos; in the graves: 4-5, staters of Alexander (terminus post quem, acc. to B.N.Grakov)
- " " 21: 1) bz bracelet; 2) Bosphoros flagon
- " " 22: 1) bl.gl. kylix w. stamped dec.; 2) bl. gl. bowl
- " " 23: 1) gold ornaments<sup>2)</sup>/ wooden objects; 3) bl.gl. saltcellars; 4) a coin. The whole of the material is unpublished.
- " " 24: 1) pottery askos
- " " 25: handles w. stamps. Sinopean: etc. Chersonesan: etc.
- " " 26: nothing
- " " 27 "
- " " 28: gr. qu. fr. pottery, among them 1) top of a thymiaterion; 2) pottery and alabaster alabastra; 3) fr. bl. gl. pelike
- " " 29: Herakl. amphis. w. stamps (etc.) misc. pottery fr.



Vinogradov, p. 58, patch of text.

Appendix 2. The overall concordance table (App.2) shows with ~~xxx~~ Xes the combinations of the names of the eponyms and the potters in the various dies of Groups 1-5. In Group 3 (a late stage) and subgrps 4c and 5b are indicated only those names which appear in the stamps of the other groups indicated in the table. The following means for distinguishing homonyms among the potters is proposed. Proceeding from the fact that the span of activity of the individual producers did not exceed as a rule 30 to 40 years, ceramicists [i.e. potters] who fall within the limits of this sector of time under various eponyms, are taken to be the same person. On the table this is expressed by a vertical cartouche which embraces groups of the X-combinations. If opposite to one name there appear several cartouches - this corresponds to several potters with the same names. Of course within a single cartouche there remains the possibility of homonyms occurring, however the percentage of such a possibility is considerably reduced and in the case of rare names it approached zero.

Appendix 3. The list of devices of ep. MEΣ(  
animals and insects

eagle on serpent	API
spider	Θ.
cuttlefish, centipede	ΘPA
<del>goat</del>	KAEY
dolphin, fish	ΔYΣI
crab, cuttlefish	ΠAYΣ(ANIHZ)
frog, serpent	ΠYAA(ΔHZ)
lizard, bee	...MO

vegetable world

wreath, flower	Γ...
----------------	------

Bon

843??

1119

1171? we have no fab. and

1509

1174



(Vinogradov, p.58)

Bm

palmette MEI 1173

\*  
amphora, branch, API 251  
kantharos

torch, 2 wreaths KAA

prow, wreath MEAI 1150 ?

flower ...

## vessels

pitcher MEI

amphora, branch, kanth. API 251

amphora API

vessel, unclear sign Θ[PAΣ(ΩN)? 844 ?

vessel NIK

## cult appurtenances etc.

torch, 2 wreaths KAA

lyre KAE 924

lyre MYKI

prow, wreath MEAI 1150 ?

censer, shovel ΘPA 845

censer, trident ...

V mill (double axe? call "mill" in Hurm.) HPA

musee des V. d. Ind. V. 3

\* Italics indicate devices which do not enter into the indicated thematic grps.

p. 61

## List of emblems with the ep. TEAEA(E)

Herakles Archer, caduceus

sea turtle, cad.

mentula, cad.

ivy wreath, cad.

rhyton, cad.

astragalus, cad.

krater, cad.

male bust, cad.

ushabti on a base, cad.



(p. 61)

## APPENDIX 5

## List of names and devices of Grp. 4

Subgrp 4a

ΛΑΓΕΤΑΖ	ΜΕΓΩΝ	sickle, leaf
	ΠΑΥΣΑΝΙ(ΗΣ)	wheel
	ΠΕΡΙΘΥΜΟΣ	boukranion
	ΠΥΛΑΔΗΣ	caduceus
	ΝΥΜΦΩΝ ?	goose
	ΜΕΛΙΝΟΣ	palmette
	ΗΡΑΚΛΕΙΤΟΣ	thyrsos
	ΔΕΥΚΩΝ	dolphin

Bon

1082

1344

1083

1084, 1085

(Th. 2996 ?)

(Th. 3469)

How much  
is there? → Did not  
or = f. b.Subgrp. 4b

ΑΡΙΣΤΟ(ΚΡΑ(ΤΗΣ)	Δ[ΗΜΑ]ΛΑΚ(ΗΣ)	dolphin	324
	? ΗΡΑΚΛΕΙΤΟΣ	kantharos	(339)
	ΗΡΑΚΛΕΙΤΟΣ	horn	431
	? ΜΕΓΑΚΑ(ΗΣ)	lekkythos, club (anglyphic)	(307?)
	ΝΟΣΣΟΣ	wheel	340
	ΠΥΛΑΔΗΣ	club	341
	ΣΙΜΑΛΙΩΝ	amphora	308
	ΑΡΙΣΤΑΓΟΡΗΣ	herm	
	Γ[ΑΛ]ΥΚΩΝ	herm	
	ΣΙΜΑΛΙΩΝ	dolphin	
ΝΙΚΙΑΣ	ΘΑΣ[ΩΝ] ?	ant	1235 1234
	ΗΡΑΚΛΕΙΔΗΣ	female head	716
	ΘΕΟΦΙΛΟΣ	crab	1238
	ΘΡΑ[ΣΩΝΙΑ]Σ	bird?	1239
	ΜΕΓΩΝ	hand	1141
	ΣΙΜΑΛΙΩΝ	kantharos	1240 (p. N.)
	ΠΡΟΤΙΩΝ	fish	1236, 1237
	ΔΗΜΑΛΚΗΣ	flower	
	ΠΥΛΑΔΗΣ	locust?	1241

Bon

? not  
characteristic  
ant.Of basis of θ at  
is Herma, it is  
wrong way up in  
molding.



(p. 61)

(Subgrp 4b)

THAEΦANHE	HPAKAEITOZ	owl
	ΔHMAAKHE	sphinx
	MEIΩN	censer
ΛAMIOZ	ΣATYPOZ	2 torches
IIANΦAHE	ΛAB PO(Σ)?	kantharos
	MEΓΩN	dolphin
ΦIAOK PATHE	ΣKYM NOZ	caduceus
BION	MEΓΩN	(rubbed out)

Subgrp. 4c

AAKAM ENHE	amphora, caduceus
APICTAΓO(PHE	sword
APICTHΠIOZ	kantharos
APICTOKAHE	fish
APICTOKPATHE	scarab helmet
APICTOMENHE	wheel, 4 spokes
ΓAAVKΩN	mouse
HPAKAEIA(HZ)	kantharos
HPAKAEITO(Σ	hook bow and arrow, suppl. letters bow and quiver, suppl. letters scarab

p.62

HPOΦΩN	the letters Z or N
IQ<Σ>	vessel
ΘPAΣΩN(I(ΔHE	letter Γ mirror bunch of grapes
IIIIAHE	kantharos



(p.62)

ΚΑΛΛΙΚΡΑΤΗΣ	butting bull
ΚΑΛ(Α)ΙΦΩΝ	labrys
ΚΡΙΝΙΣ	rooster gorgoneion
ΛΕΩ[ΦΑ]ΝΗΣ	pilos, boukranion
ΛΕΩΦΑΝΤΟ(Σ)	club
ΜΕΓΑ(ΚΛΕΙΔΗΣ) ?	pitcher
ΜΕΓΩΝΟΣ	leaf
ΜΕΓΩΝ	vessel
ΜΝΗ]ΣΙΜ(ΑΧΟΣ ?	labrys
ΠΥΛΑΔΗΣ	wing
ΤΗΛΕΜΑΧΟΣ	triskeles unclear bucket
ΤΙΜΑΡΧΙΑΔΑ	letters Α, Γ, Κ, Μ, Ν, Ξ, Ο, Π, Τ, ϑ Φ
ΕΠΙ ΤΗΛΕΦΑΝΕΟΣ	amphora boukranion bunch of grapes caduceus cad., halfmoon lightning (thunderbolt) goat palmette dog unclear dolphin helmet



Παγκόσμιος & Ελ  
Ταχ

Αριθ

8456  
ΑΠΟΔΕΙΞΙΣ ΚΑΤΑΘΕΣΕΩΣ ΣΥΣΤΗΜΕΝΟΥ

Αποστολεις

Παραλήπτης

Εις

Ταχ. αντικείμενον \*

Ημερ/νία

Ταχυδρομικόν τέλος

Απόδειξις παραλαβής

Κατεπεΐγον

Σύνολον

Υπογραφή υπαλλήλου

\* Σημειωθήτω γράμμα, δείγμα έντυπου κλπ:

[3.40]



Ted's - p. 45 and Appendix 3.  
missing 9 names in "recent" stamps: p. 56

4. VI. 74

4

Index to the Travel -

also Francis's

Vi's Group 1

pp. 28-31

Group 2

pp. 32-36

2a

Mast series

2b

0 Σαυρος type

Group 3

pp. 36-50

2 names

plus ethnic around a device

Group 4

pp. 50-53

4a

types using Λαγρος

4b

2 names without ethnic (but some have ethnic)

4c

1 name plus ethnic, legend goes round 4 or 3 sides

Group 5

pp. 53-61

1 name and the ethnic placed on 2 opposite sides of the frame above - below the emblem

5a

types with "phrases"

as star

as star, stars with letter balls

(5b

all the rest!)

Group 6

pp. 61-63

"wheel-shaped stamps"

Group 7

pp. 63-64

a device + one name (no ethnic)

Group 8

pp. 64-66

anepigraphic



See also notes  
bushel  
New types

7. I. 74

5

Vinogradov

What we should do  
with material in Vinogradov

File all the stamps in the photos, leaving  
- the only ref. is plate ref., unfortunately.

Analyses of the good groups.

File the type of M50/ in Appendix 3

" " " " Tadeas (p. 61)  
" " " " Kaydas " "

→ Add Satupos to no-divin. eponyms?  
See type w. Dague (Satupos 124)  
(Bon 71)

9. I. 74

? Put in file those 2 Keramaretha types  
cited of Vinogradov from Schlögl -  
V. p. 33, nos. 3, 4. Try to get  
orig. publ., maybe reading is a little diff.

(cont) File

type of Nikias

← (to Bauer)

Appadovs (inv.)

It is a whirligig  
Vinogradov p. 51,  
under Defect 14



On Vengades article

ask Brahmish  
for opinions;

Printed 1941, of <sup>V.</sup> note 5

1959  
Brahmish review of Concordance, of V. note 23

Thas. on KSI 116  
Punglo, of V. note 46 and other



On Vorogradov transl.  
— ask R. Burg.

- 1.) ask him to read about the his version of pp. 32  
pp. — mm. Garlan's of pp. 34 pp. and  
look at the German version of this part.

4. I. 74

He has been here today, and we have gone  
over this section, first part as indicated  
above, but as we went on, and he was well-  
impressed by mm. Garlan's translation, we  
abandoned the German, and I read the French  
while he looked at the Russian original. He  
only made 1 or 2 additions to the French text, & b  
seen in my pencil on the typescript.

(still 4. I.)

check further —

to p. 1/6

to p. 24, near bottom  
p. 22, at 24<sup>th</sup> line (1.)

to pp. 22-23 check definition of groups

7. I.

The words leading to fold-out.

Text on p. 58  
Headings p. 61



(ask Burej)

(2)

(7.I.74)

7.02

In p. 34. ~~fix~~ <sup>we</sup> <sup>not</sup> <sup>sure</sup> <sup>if</sup> <sup>must</sup> <sup>own</sup> understand all this  
about percentages

Table, p. 49, <sup>9</sup> hubb <sup>9</sup> group 9

Fix sentence end p. 46, <sup>9.I.74</sup> ~~stop~~ p. 47

Devices on p. 61 (last)

" on p. 51 <sup>✓</sup> in sentence Nikita  
- Dymov



Imaginos

7. Jan. - 73

8

I need to lay out his  
groups with  
identified  
members of p. refs.  
A mention  
dates be assign

Cannot keep mind  
or arguments are lost -



99

Prof. V.R. Grace  
54 οδὸς Συμβρίας  
Ἀθῆναι  
ΕΛΛΑΣ

ГРЕЦИЯ

RECOMMANDÉ



USSR, Москва А-57 СССР  
Чапаяевский пер. 8, кв. 23  
Виноградов Ю.Г.

5/3





96



10a

Prof. Miss V. R. Grace  
American School of Classical  
Studies, 54, οδὸς Σουφλίας,  
Ἀθῆναι

ΕΛΛΑΣ

ГРЕЦИЯ

PAR AVION    ПРОСТЫЕ БАНДЕРОЛИ



USSR  
MOSCOW A-57  
Чапаявский  
lane 8  
APR 23

USSR  
MOSKVA A-57  
CHAPAEVSKY PER. 8  
Kv. 23  
VINOGRADOV R. B.

USSR  
Москва A-57  
Чапаявский пер. 8, кв. 23  
Виноградов Ю. Г.

СССР



106







evski per. 8, kv. 23

75

11.03

11.01a

Prof. V. R. Grace

54, 65ος Σουφιάς

Αθήνα

ΕΛΛΑΣ ΓΡΕЦΙΑ

Индекс предприятия связи и адрес  
отправителя

USSR, Moscow A-57

Čapajevskij per. 8, kv. 23

Vinogradov Yu. G.

schreiben,

zu, erstens

Two Books

ersten sind

bildet, und

Scott ist

gewesen ausgezeichnet. Ich glaube, daß das Buch  
für viele Jahrzehnte zur festen Basis aller kera-  
mischen Datierungen wird. Zweitens war ich sehr froh,  
Ihre beiden Arbeiten über Stempelkunde zu bekommen.

Der Artikel in Ath. Mitt. ist sehr wichtig für eine genaue-  
ren chronologischen Präzisierung sowohl der rhodischen  
Amphorenstempel; als auch der Bleiplatten selbst. Was  
den Délos betrifft, ist die Edition m. E. ein Standardwerk.

Leider beschäftige ich mich selbst mit Stempeln nicht  
so intensiv, wie vor kurzem, weil meine Interessen  
in ein anderes Bereich übersiedelt sind, nämlich zu  
Lapidar- und Metallinschriften sowie Graffiti.

Auf dem letzten Gebiet sammle ich mit meinen  
Kollegen Graffiticorpus von Olbia. Ich habe gehört,  
daß ein solches Corpus von Agoragraffiti Mrs. Mabel  
Lang schon in Druck gegeben hat. Aber mit Stempeln





11.019

Prof. V. R. Grace

54, οδὸς Σουγδίας

Ἀθῆναι

ΕΛΛΑΣ ГРЕЦИЯ

Индекс предприятия связи и адрес  
отправителя

USSR, Moscow A-57

Čarajevskij per. 8, kv. 23

Vinogradov Yu. G.





Изготовлено в Ленинской Ф-ке Госнака



Издание Министрства связи СССР

Лист с 12 копеек, 20 коп.



11.01.76







Rumynskoje-Siedlung  
1972

7-g

C-3 zone  
N12

11.026

pyel. 1972

pyel. 1972

15 1/8

N205



Moskau, Čapajevski per. 8, kv. 23

den 20. 2. 75

11.03

Sehr geehrte Miss Grace,  
Ich habe schon lange vor, einen Brief zu schreiben,  
um Ihnen mein innigsten Dank zu äußern, erstens  
für die Sendung durch Emily von Picture Books  
komplett und Athenian Agora XII. Die ersten sind  
wirklich sehr hübsch und interessant gebildet, und  
die Monographie von B.A. Sparkes und L. Talcott ist  
geradezu ausgezeichnet. Ich glaube, daß das Buch  
für viele Jahrzehnte zur festen Basis aller kera-  
mischen Datierungen wird. Zweitens war ich sehr froh,  
Ihre beiden Arbeiten über Stempelnkunde zu bekommen.  
Der Artikel in Ath. Mitt. ist sehr wichtig für eine genau-  
eren chronologischen Präzisierung sowohl der rhodischen  
Amphorenstempel, als auch der Bleiplatten selbst. Was  
den Délos betrifft, ist die Edition m.E. ein Standardwerk.  
Leider beschäftige ich mich selbst mit Stempeln nicht  
so intensiv, wie vor kurzem, weil meine Interessen  
in ein anderes Bereich übersiedelt sind, nämlich zu  
Lapidar- und Metallinschriften sowie Graffiti.  
Auf dem letzten Gebiet sammle ich mit meinen  
Kollegen Graffiticorpus von Olbia. Ich habe gehört,  
daß ein solches Corpus von Agoragraffiti Mrs. Mabel  
Lang schon in Druck gegeben hat. Aber mit Stempeln



möchte ich nicht völlig brechen. So, vor kurzem  
habe ich als Beilage zur einer höchst interessanten  
Siedlung auf der Tamarahalbinsel gewidmeten  
Monographie von N. I. Sokolskij + eine Edition  
der dortigen Amphoren- und Ziegelstempel vor-  
bereitet. Ein von ihnen ist ~~von~~ besonderem Inte-  
resse, weil er ein für Rhodos sehr seltsames  
Emblem trägt: nicht Helios-, sondern den Diony-  
suskopf (?) in Efeublattkranz. Vielleicht erweckt  
er auch bei Ihnen ein Interesse, darum schicke ich  
das Foto. Die Legende ist unleserlich, man sieht  
mit Sicherheit nur die Eponymenpräposition. Ich denn  
habe an Sie eine Bitte, mir - wenn es möglich - die  
Adresse von John H. Kroll zu benachrichtigen. Sein  
Buch über Allotment Plates ist bei uns unzugänglich,  
ich aber muß mit ihm ein neues Pinakion besprechen,  
das ich in Ermitage entdeckt hatte.

Mit besten Wünschen

Ihr H. Brunsford



VINOGRADOV

1973

V9

12

АКАДЕМИЯ НАУК СССР

ОРДЕНА ТРУДОВОГО КРАСНОГО ЗНАМЕНИ

ИНСТИТУТ АРХЕОЛОГИИ

# КРАТКИЕ СООБЩЕНИЯ

133

ЖЕЛЕЗНЫЙ ВЕК  
ВОСТОЧНОЙ ЕВРОПЫ

ОТДЕЛЬНЫЙ ОТТИСК

ИЗДАТЕЛЬСТВО «НАУКА»

МОСКВА 1973



*Miss V. Grace with best compliments*

*12.7.74.*

*Ю.В.Виноградов*

И. Т. КРУГЛИКОВА, Ю. Г. ВИНОГРАДОВ

# КЛЕЙМА СИНОПЫ НА АМФОРАХ ИЗ ПОСЕЛЕНИЯ АНДРЕЕВКА ЮЖНАЯ

Античное поселение Андреевка Южная находится в 11 км к западу от г. Керчи. Раскопки там проводились с 1964 по 1970 г.<sup>1</sup> Небольшой холм, на котором располагалось поселение, сохранил остатки сельского поселения, существовавшего с VI по III в. до н. э. Хорошо прослеживаются три строительных периода в жизни поселка. Наиболее раннее из открытых там жилищ относилось к VI—V вв. до н. э., оно было слегка углублено в землю и имело стены из сырцовых кирпичей. После пожара, в котором погибло жилище, в V в. до н. э. рядом с ним был построен каменный дом. В V—IV вв. до н. э. на холме было не менее четырех каменных изолированных домов, очень небольших по размерам. По-видимому, в это время поселение представляло собой деревню с отдельными небольшими хозяйствами. Довольно бедный инвентарь жилищ свидетельствует о небольшом достатке их хозяев. Вместе с тем уже начиная с VI в. до н. э. в деревню попадают не только изделия городских ремесленников, но и импортные вещи. Главное место среди них занимают амфоры с хиосским, фазосским, гераклейским вином, встречаются единичные экземпляры лесбосских амфор и аттических чернолаковых и расписных сосудов.

В IV в. до н. э. в жизни поселения происходят серьезные перемены. На месте, где ранее стояло несколько небольших изолированных домов, строится большая сельскохозяйственная усадьба. Она существует до III в. К началу III в. до н. э. относится самая поздняя из медных пантикапейских монет, найденных в помещениях усадьбы. К периоду существования усадьбы относится большое количество найденных при раскопках амфор. Среди них преобладают гераклейские и синопские, имеются фазосские, амфоры с «колпачковой ножкой», рюмкообразные, боспорские, типа Солоха I и одна косская. Обращает на себя внимание тот факт, что среди найденных при раскопках керамических клейм все, кроме синопских, не выходят за рамки IV в. до н. э. Особенно показательно, что на поселении полностью отсутствуют родосские амфоры и почти не встречаются косские. Вместе с тем на поселениях, существовавших в III в. до н. э. даже на таких отдаленных, как поселения у дер. Семеновки, родосские

клейма встречаются довольно часто с начала III в. до н. э. Вместе с родосскими клеймами в Семеновке имелись синопские клейма V и VI групп Б. Н. Гракова<sup>2</sup>. Всего в Андреевке Южной найдено 57 синопских клейм, которые удается прочесть. Все они на ручках амфор. Имеются клейма первых пяти групп, выделенных Б. Н. Граковым<sup>3</sup>. При этом 24 клейма принадлежат к 3, 4 и 5 группам, т. е. датируются III и II вв. до н. э. Если учесть, что подавляющее большинство материала, найденного на поселении, относится к IV в., значительно меньше — к III в. и нет ничего такого, что бесспорно принадлежит II в., следует детальнее остановиться на синопских клеймах. В литературе уже поднимался вопрос о необходимости передатировки последних хронологических групп Б. Н. Гракова и удревнения его первых групп<sup>4</sup>. Б. А. Василенко, изучая материалы Никоний и других поселений Днестровского лимана, приходит к выводу, что датировка IV группы Б. Н. Гракова, даже если принять новую дату, предложенную им во вступительной главе к разделу Синопа в IOSPE III<sup>5</sup>, или датировку Б. И. Брашинского<sup>6</sup>, противоречит исторической действительности. Никоний в конце III в. до н. э. переживал упадок, пришли в запустение и малые поселения Днестровского лимана.

В Никонии отсутствуют клейма Родоса, нет книдских, косских, паросских, нет синопских клейм V и VI групп. Эта картина импорта на поселениях Днестровского лимана удивительно совпадает с тем, что дает нам материал Андреевки Южной. Создание новой хронологической классификации синопских клейм требует проведения огромной работы по изучению всего импорта Синопы. В настоящее время ни одна из новых датировок не может быть принята безоговорочно. Следует отметить, что первая классификация клейм, предложенная Б. Н. Граковым, основывалась на нумизматических параллелях, палеографических данных и исторических событиях. Аргументация новой датировки не соответствует прежней, особенно для III—VI групп. Так, некоторые исторические аргументы Б. Н. Гракова не опровергаются новой датировкой, но и не находят иного объяснения. Несмотря на все вышесказанное, наиболее приемлема на данный момент датировка, предложенная Б. Н. Граковым, с уточнениями И. Б. Брашинского. Согласно ей, клейма из Андреевки распределяются по группам следующим образом: к группе I принадлежат 14 клейм (360—320 гг. до н. э.), к группе II—19 клейм (320—270 гг. до н. э.), к группе III—15 клейм (270—220 гг. до н. э.), к группе IV—8 клейм (220—183 гг. до н. э.) и к группе V (183—ок. 150 гг. н. э.)—1 клейм; два клейма определить по группам не удается. Среди этих клейм имеются новые сочетания имен астиномов и гончаров, новые эмблемы астиномов. Клеймо № 6 выделяется совершенно необычной композицией, не встречавшейся до сих пор среди синопских керамических надписей<sup>7</sup>.

<sup>2</sup> И. Т. Кругликова. Клейма на амфорах из раскопок поселения у деревни Семеновки. КСИА, вып. 116, 1969, стр. 93 сл.

<sup>3</sup> Б. Н. Граков. Древнегреческие керамические клейма с именами астиномов. М., 1929, стр. 102 сл.

<sup>4</sup> А. А. Нейхардт. Клейменная керамическая тара эпохи эллинизма как источник для изучения торговых связей Боспорского царства с центрами Причерноморья в эллинистическую эпоху. Автореф. канд. дисс. Л., 1951, стр. 12; М. И. Максимова. Античные города Юго-Восточного Причерноморья. М.—Л., 1956, стр. 161, 218 сл.; И. Б. Брашинский. Успехи керамической эпиграфики. СА, 1961, № 2, стр. 301; В. И. Пругло. Синопские амфорные клейма из Мирмекия. КСИА, вып. 109, 1967, стр. 42 сл.; Б. А. Василенко. К вопросу о датировке синопских клейм. СА, 1971, № 3, стр. 245 сл.

<sup>5</sup> Рукопись хранится в архиве ИА АН СССР.

<sup>6</sup> И. Б. Брашинский. Экономические связи Синопы в IV—II вв. до н. э. «Античный город». М., 1963, стр. 133.

<sup>7</sup> После сдачи этой статьи в печать авторам стало известно еще одно такое же клеймо. Оно найдено случайно в Пантикапее на горе Митридат М. К. Трофимовой, которой

<sup>1</sup> И. Т. Кругликова. Раскопки на Керченском полуострове. АО 1965 г. М., 1966, стр. 110; она же. Раскопки сельской усадьбы у дер. Андреевка. АО 1966 г. М., 1967, стр. 220; она же. Исследование хоры Боспорского царства. АО 1967 г. М., 1968, стр. 220; она же. Античная сельскохозяйственная усадьба близ Керчи. АИКСП. Л., 1968, стр. 206; она же. Раскопки сельских поселений Боспорского царства. АО 1968 г. М., 1969, стр. 307; И. Т. Кругликова, М. А. Романовская. Античные поселения у деревень Андреевка и Ново-Отрадное. АО 1970 г. М., 1971, стр. 252.





Рис. 16. Синопские клейма из Андреевки Южной

Надпись здесь расположена по трем сторонам клейма (двум длинным и одной короткой), в правом нижнем углу она прерывается эмблемой — киликом. Сосуды этого типа по форме относятся к середине и второй половине IV в. до н. э. Килик, совершенно сходный с этим, имеется в эмблеме

авторы выражают свою самую искреннюю признательность. Оно отличается от нашего только тем, что в штампе в эпонимном предлоге вырезана йота.



Рис. 17. Синопские клейма из Андреевки Южной

клейма, хранящегося в Эрмитаже<sup>8</sup>. Надпись на нашем клейме выполнена довольно небрежно.

В имени Эхина резчик пропустил первую йоту и изобразил обе сигмы

<sup>8</sup> Е. М. Придик. Инвентарный каталог клейм на амфорных ручках и горлышках и на черепицах Эрмитажного собрания. Пгр., 1917, табл. XIII, 10. Клеймо относится ко II группе Б. Н. Грокова.

La





Рис. 18. Синопские клейма из Андреевки Южной

и пи ретроградно. Астиномов с именем Эсхин было несколько. Один, имя которого всегда в родительном падеже, по наличию в числе его эмблем орла на дельфине отнесен Б. Н. Граковым к I группе, остальные четыре, по списку соответствующих им гончаров, к IV группе<sup>9</sup>. Эсхин

<sup>9</sup> IOSPE III, раздел «Синопа», стр. 149 сл. Прежде Б. Н. Граков выделял в I группе двух Эсхинов (См.: он же. Древнегреческие керамические клейма..., стр. 113), но позже он стал их рассматривать как одно лицо.

первой группы сопровождается различными эмблемами, но никогда надпись не располагается по сторонам четырехугольника. Неизвестен при нем и гончар Бант, который в IOSPE III зарегистрирован на пяти клеймах: один раз при астиноме Антимaxe и четыре раза при Филоне<sup>10</sup>. При последнем астиноме надпись почти во всех клеймах располагается по сторонам четырехугольника, клейма на амфорах мастерской Банта не представляют исключения. В трех случаях при Филоне эмблема на клеймах этого гончара — гроздь над канфаром (несомненно, собственная эмблема астинома) и лишь в одном случае, как при Антимaxe, появляется канфар, но уже без грозди. Учитывая и наше клеймо, можно сделать вывод, что гончар Бант встречается при трех астиномах: Эсхине, Филоне и Антимaxe и имеет собственную эмблему-килик<sup>11</sup>. Таким образом, Бант сотрудничал при астиномах I и II групп.

Б. Н. Граков впервые высказал мысль, что кратковременная мода располагать надпись вокруг эмблемы по сторонам четырехугольника заимствована Синопой с Фазоса<sup>12</sup>. Клейма подобного типа встречаются при трех астиномах: Дионисии, Диофанте и Филоне<sup>13</sup>. Все они относятся к подгруппе Б I группы<sup>14</sup>. К этой же подгруппе относятся и Эсхин, который, как показывает наша ручка, клеймил амфоры подобным образом. Причем, поскольку у него еще встречается городская эмблема — орел на дельфине, его клейма располагаются где-то в середине I группы<sup>15</sup>. Наше клеймо лишний раз аргументирует этот вывод, так как оно дает для Эсхина самый ранний вариант формулы —  $\epsilon\pi\iota$  + имя астинома, без названия должности. На основании этого, по-видимому, его следует отнести к концу подгруппы А I группы, т. е. к 350—345 гг. до н. э. Таким образом, поскольку Эсхин является самым ранним из всех астиномов, имевших клейма указанного типа, закономерно предположить, что он впервые внедрил этот тип клейм в Синопе. Об этом же говорит несколько неустойчивая манера письма: надпись полностью подражает соответствующей фазосской группе клейм, где, как правило, должность магистрата не указывалась, но предлог  $\epsilon\pi\iota$  иногда встречается<sup>16</sup>, а эмблема стоит, как обычно, в синопских клеймах сбоку. Отсюда вытекает, что обычай располагать надпись в штемпеле подобным образом был заимствован Синопой с Фазоса в середине IV в. в том виде, в каком он встречается на нашем клейме, а потом был развит дополнением должности астинома. Поскольку клеймо оказывалось очень загруженным легендой, около 320 г. до н. э. вернулись к обычному синопскому типу клейм со строчным расположением надписи. Следует отметить клеймо № 11 астинома Протофана и гончара Филократа с эмблемой — плющевый венок, которая при данном астиноме ранее не встречалась. Быть может, надо считать его эмблемой гончара Филократа, а не астинома. Клеймо № 4 впервые для астинома Гистиея дает формулу по IV варианту, впервые при нем встречен и гончар Батиск, относящийся к подгруппе А I группы.

Клеймо № 57 пополняет список гончаров при астиноме Посидее сыне Теариона с его постоянной эмблемой (статуя полуобнаженной женщины

<sup>10</sup> IOSPE III, раздел «Синопа», № 1058, 7700—7703.

<sup>11</sup> Что касается последнего астинома, то раньше Б. Н. Граков всецело относил его клейма к IV группе («Древнегреческие керамические клейма...», стр. 138, 184). Теперь он выделил двух Антимaxов: одного II группы с эмблемами — голова Гермеса, кадудей, тирс, голова быка и т. д., второго IV группы с бакхическими эмблемами. Если килик — собственная эмблема Банта, то клеймо его надо приписать Антимaxe II группы.

<sup>12</sup> Б. Н. Граков. Указ. соч., стр. 72.

<sup>13</sup> Там же, стр. 114, 116.

<sup>14</sup> Там же, стр. 119.

<sup>15</sup> Там же, стр. 120.

<sup>16</sup> См., например, А. — М. Bon, A. Bon. Les timbres amphoriques de Thasos. *Études Thasiennes*, v. IV. Paris, 1957, N 1509.



№ пп.	Описание клейм	Год и место находок № описи	Дата (до н. э.)	Основные публикации аналогичных клейм
<b>I группа</b>				
1	Ποσειδῶ(ν)ιο). 'ἐπὶ Ἀπολλῶ(ν)οῦ. οὐδῶ(ρο) ἄστ[υ]ν(ό)μο).	Орел на дельфине	1966, р. IV, пл. 55, шт. 2 № 107	360—340 гг. IOSPE III, № 117—130; ЭК, стр. 82, № 410, 411; Шк. ИАК, вып. 11, стр. 69, № 237
2	'ἐπὶ Ἀπολλοδῶ(ρο) ἄστ[υ]ν(ό)μο). Νίμακτος.	Орел на дельфине	1968, р. IV, пл. 108, шт. 2, № 1	370—360 гг. IOSPE III, № 114—116
3	'ἐπὶ Ἐρμῆ(μ)ο). Ποσειδῶ(ν)ιο).	Орел на дельфине	1968, р. IV, пл. 108, шт. 3, № 3	» IOSPE III, № 264—280
4	Βα[τί]σκο. 'ἐπὶ Ἰσ[τ]ι— αίο[ν] ἄστ[υ]ν(ό)μο).	Эмблема отбита	1966, р. IV, пл. 47, шт. 2 № 107в	360—340 гг. IOSPE III, № 375—
5	Ἰσ[τ]ιαίο ἄστ[υ]ν(ό)μο). Νίμακτος(ς).	Орел на дельфине	1966, р. IV, пл. 47, шт. 2 № 107а	» Там же, стр. 377, 380—387
6	'ἐπ' Α(ι)σχίνου. Βάντος.	Килик ↑ π и обе σ — ретроградно	1966, р. IV, пл. 45, шт. 3 № 86	350—345 гг. —
7	Αἰσχί[ν]ου ἄστ[υ]ν(ό)μο). Γόλ[α]τος.	Амфора ↑ ретроградно	1965, р. IV, пл. 35, № 83	345—320 гг. IOSPE III, № 702—705
8	'Ηφ[αι]στίου ἄστ[υ]ν(ό)μο). [Μάνεω].	Лист, раковина ↑	1965, р. IV, пл. 41, шт. 1, № 80	340—320 гг. IOSPE III, № 3841, 3842 (того же штемпеля); Шк. 300, XXVIII, стр. 23, № 87 IOSPE III, № 7070
9	Πρωταγόρο ἄστ[υ]ν(ό)μο). Βαχχίου.	Mentula ↑	1967, из выкида № 83	» См. IOSPE III, № 7179—7214 (но с таким гончаром нет)
10	Πρωτοφάνους ἄστ[υ]ν(ό)μο). Κλαδίν[ε]τος.	Плоский венчик ←	1967, случайная находка № 87	» См. IOSPE III, № 7206, но без эмблемы
11	Π[ρ]ωτοφάν[ο]υς ἄστ[υ]ν(ό)μο). Φιλοκρά[τ]ε[ο]ς.	Плоский венчик ←	1966, раск. IV, пл. 118	» IOSPE III, № 7708—7718; Шк. ИАК, вып. 11, стр. 78, № 354
12	'ἐπὶ Φ[ί]λ[ω]νος ἄστ[υ]ν(ό)μο). Διονυσίου.	Вокруг грозди над канфаром	1967, р. I, пл. 3, шт. 2, № 39	» IOSPE III, № 7972—7976; АК, табл. 4, 6; Шк. ИАК, вып. 11, стр. 86, № 363
13	Χαβρία ἄστ[υ]ν(ό)μο).	Щит или фиала	1965, р. IV, пл. 31, шт. 2, № 86	» IOSPE III, № 7972—7976
14	То же		1970, р. IX, пл. 10, шт. 5, № 19	340—320 гг. IOSPE III, № 7972—7976
<b>II группа</b>				
15	'Αντιμάχου ἄστ[υ]ν(ό)μο). Ποσειδῶ(ν)ιο).	Цветок ↑	1966, р. IV, пл. 33, проход Т, № 43	320—270 гг. IOSPE III, № 1107, 1108

№ пп.	Описание клейм	Год и место находок № описи	Дата (до н. э.)	Основные публикации аналогичных клейм
16	'Απολλοδῶ(ρο) ἄστ[υ]ν(ό)μο). 'Ηφ[αι]στίου.	Гроздь канфар ↑	1964, р. V из выкида, № 38	300—270 гг. IOSPE III, № 1276—1278
17	То же		1967, р. I из выкида № 40	»
18	ἄστ[υ]ν(ό)μο). 'Απολλοδῶ(ρο).		1967, р. IX, пл. 7, шт. 2 № 8	» См. IOSPE III, № 1274—1301
19	'Αριστοκλέους ἄστ[υ]ν(ό)μο). Κα[λ]λίσ[τ]ρου(ς).	Бодающий бык Цветок ↑	1966, р. IV, пл. 49, шт. 3, № 95	» IOSPE III, № 1514—1520; ЭК, стр. 86, № 487, 488 таб. XII, 13; АК, таб. 8, 3
20	'Αρτεμίδωρου ἄστ[υ]ν(ό)μο). Λά[κ]ωνος.	Гроздь или лист ↓	1965, р. IV, пом. Г, № 17	320—270 гг. См. IOSPE III, № 1653 (но этникон сокращен)
21	'Ασ[τ]υνομῶ(ν)τος 'Επιδήμου. Μαντιθέο.	Канфар ↑	1965, р. IV, пом. Ж, № 126	320—270 гг. См. IOSPE III, № 2957—3051 (но с другими гончарами)
22	'Επιδήμου ἄστ[υ]ν(ό)μο). Πύθεω.	Канфар ↑ Гроздь →	1970, р. IX, пл. 14, шт. 3 № 25	» См. IOSPE III, № 3004—3010 (но без грозди)
23	Εὐχ[α]ρίστου ἄστ[υ]ν(ό)μο).	Голова ←	1965, р. IV, пл. 19, шт. 2 № 65	» См. IOSPE III, № 3315—3402
24	'Ηρ[α]κλείδου или [ωνό]μο[υ] τοῦ... Σι[ν]ωπίων.		1967, р. I № 54	» —
25	Θεοφάνους ἄστ[υ]ν(ό)μο). Ποσειδῶ(ν)ιο).		1967, р. IV, пл. 107, шт. 1 № 59	» См. IOSPE III, № 3938, 3938А, Пруг. № 19
26	Κ[α]λλιστράτου ἄστ[υ]ν(ό)μο). Ποσειδῶ(ν)ιο).	Цветок ↑	1965, р. IV, пл. 18, пом. Е, № 70	» IOSPE, № 4802
27	Ποσειδῶ(ν)ιο ἄστ[υ]ν(ό)μο). Μαντιθέο.		1966, р. IV, пл. 47, № 97	» IOSPE III, № 5097, 5098
28	Μνήσιας ἄστ[υ]ν(ό)μο(υ). Μάνεω.	Голова бородатого Сатира	1966, пом. II, р. IV, № 123	320—300 гг. IOSPE III, № 5827
29	Πατ[ρ]ικίου ἄστ[υ]ν(ό)μο). Διονυσίου.	Бодающий бык ←	1968, р. X, шт. 2, № 193	320—270 гг. IOSPE III, № 6307
30	Πολυχάρμου ἄστ[υ]ν(ό)μο). Πρυτάν[ι]ος.		1965, р. IV, пл. 2, шт. 3 № 2	300—270 гг. IOSPE III, № 6487; Пруг., № 28
31	Ποσειδῶ(ν)ιο ἄστ[υ]ν(ό)μο). Μαντιθέο(υ).	Сосуд? Треножник ↑	1965, р. IV, пл. 36, № 95	320—270 гг. IOSPE III, № 6609—6612
32	... ο]ν ἄστ[υ]ν(ό)μο).	Гроздь канфар ↓	1967, р. IV, пл. 107, шт. 1, № 73	» —
33	... νο ἄστ[υ]ν(ό)μο). 'Ηφ[αι]στίου.		1965, р. IV, пл. 25, шт. 2, № 87	320—220 гг.



## Продолжение

№ пп.	Описание клейм	Год и место находок № описи	Дата (до н. э.)	Основные публикации аналогичных клейм
<b>III группа</b>				
34	Δίου ἀστυ- νομοῦντος. Πρυτάνιος.	1966, р. IV пл. 101, шт. 3, № 31	270— 250 гг.	IOSPE III, № 2693
35	Δίου ἀστυ- νομοῦντος— ς. Πρυτάνιος.	1966, р. IV пл. 102 № 29	270— 250 гг.	IOSPE III, № 2693
36	ἀστυνόμου Ἑστιάου. Μιθραδ[άτου.	1967, р. IX пл. 8, шт. 2 № 9	270— 220 гг.	IOSPE III, № 3208— 3214; Шк. ИАК вып. 3, стр. 126, № 22; Шк. 300 XXVIII, стр. 114, № 35
37	Θεωδωρίδου ἀστυνόμου. Ἑκαταίου.	1967, р. IX пл. 15, шт. 2 № 56	»	IOSPE III, № 3980— 3985
38	Μικρίου ἀστυνο- μοῦντος. Γλαυκία.	1965, р. IV пл. 19, шт. 2 № 66	»	См. IOSPE III, № 5354
39	Μικρίου ἀστυνο- μοῦντος. ....μάδης.	1966, случ. наход. № 77	»	См. IOSPE III, № 5328—5474 (но не ясен гончар)
40	Μικρίου ἀστυνο- μοῦντος. Φιλοκράτους].	1970, случ. наход. № 134	»	IOSPE III, № 5450— 5462
41	ἀστυνόμου Μνη[σικλέους. Ἀπολλωνίου.	1970, тран- шея IX шт. 2 № 122	270— 220 гг.	IOSPE III, № 5584— 5588
42	Μνη[σικλέους ἀστυνομοῦντος. Δημητρίου.	1966, р. IV пл. 48, шт. 3 № 111	»	IOSPE III, № 5622— 5626; Шк. ИАК, вып. 11, стр. 77 № 315
43	Μ[ν]η[σικλέους ἀστυνομοῦν — τος].	1965, р. I пл. 3, шт. 1 № 47	»	IOSPE III, № 5580; ЭК, стр. 94, № 670
44	Π[ο]σ[ε]ιδω[νίου ἀστυνόμου. Ἑκαταίου.	1966, р. IV пл. 49, шт. 1 № 90	»	IOSPE III, № 6564— 6567; ЭК, стр. 96, № 712
45	καρμέως Νουμηνίου τ[οῦ] Διονυσίου.	1965, р. IV пл. 19, шт. 2 № 67	»	IOSPE III, № 883— 8892; Шк. ИАК, вып. 3, стр. 148, № 1; ЭК, стр. 94, № 683
46	ἀστυνόμου .....τος.	1966, р. IV пл. 28—29, № 8	»	—
47	ἀστυνόμου Πο[σειδαίου] τοῦ Ἡφ[αιστοδώρο] (υ).	1970, р. IX, пл. 12, шт. 5 № 15	»	IOSPE III, № 6855, 6858
48	ἀστυνομοῦντος Ἑστιάου. Φιλοκράτης.	1968, р. IX пл. 4, шт. 5 № 128	270— 220 гг.	

## Окончание

№ пп.	Описание клейм	Год и место находок № описи	Дата (до н. э.)	Основные публикации аналогичных клейм
<b>IV группа</b>				
49	ἀστυνόμου Αἰσχίνου. Ἀρχιάλου.	1966, р. IV пл. 101, шт. 3, № 39	220— 183 гг.	IOSPE III, № 647— 651; Шк. ИАК II, стр. 19, № 2а, 2в
50	ἀστυνόμου Αἰσχίνου. Γλαυκία	1966, р. IV пом. С, № 28	»	IOSPE III, № 699
51	[ἀστυνόμος] Ἀρ[ιστίων]. Νουμ[ένιος].	1964, р. IV пл. 2, шт. 2 № 135	»	IOSPE III, № 1448, 1449; ЭК, стр. 64, № 53
52	Αἰσχίνου ἀστυνόμου. Τεωδώρα.	1970, р. IX пл. 14, шт. 3 № 26	»	IOSPE III, № 871
53	ἀστυνομοῦν- τος Ἀττάλου. Γέρβους.	1968, р. IV пл. 114, шт. 2, № 1	»	См. IOSPE III, № 1713, 1714 (с по- хожей эмблемой, но влево)
54	[ἀστυνόμου] Καλλισθένου.	1966, случ. нах. № 44	»	См. IOSPE III, № 4921, 4955, 4957 (но без грозди)
55	ἀστυνόμου Κρατιστ[ά]ρχου.	1965, р. IV пл. 9, шт. 1 № 3	220— 183 гг.	IOSPE III, № 4921, 4955, 4957 (но без грозди)
56	Ἡφίστιος. ἀστυνόμου Μιλτιάδου.	1964, р. IV пл. 4, шт. 1 № 59	»	IOSPE III, № 5551, 5552; Юр. ЗОО XVIII, стр. 140, № 35; Пр. МИА 4, стр. 187, № 116
<b>V группа</b>				
57	ἀστυνόμου Ποσειδείου τοῦ Θεαρίωνος. Διονύσιος.	1967, р. IX пл. 6, шт. 2 № 6	ок. 150 г.	См. IOSPE III, № 6880—6946 (но с другими гончарами)
<b>Неизвестных групп</b>				
58	ἀστυνόμου .....τος.			Эмблема не ясна
59	ἀστυνόμου Τε[.....].	1968, р. IV, пл. III, шт. 2, № 7		

с рогом изобилия, опирающейся на колонну) гончаром Дионисием, обыч-  
ным для V—VI групп. Этот астином по списку гончаров датируется ру-  
бежом V и VI групп. Клеймо № 21 дает новое сочетание астинома Эпи-  
дема с гончаром Мантитеем, а клеймо № 55 пополняет список эмблем  
астинома Кратистарха новой добавочной эмблемой-гроздью.

Таким образом, небольшая коллекция синопских клейм из Андреевки  
Южной пополняет наши сведения о клеймении амфор, дает новые соче-  
тания имен гончаров и астиномов, новые сочетания имен с эмблемами.



BLACK SEA AREA - USSR: VINOGRADOV

232