

VRG_Folder_0593

Marek Palaczyk

Die Zusatzstempel („Secondary Stamps“) der rhodischen Amphoren

Sonderdruck

aus den Jahresheften des Österreichischen Archäologischen Institutes, Band 68, 1999 Hauptblatt
Rudolf M. Rohrer Verlag, Baden bei Wien

Secondary Stamps in the Rhodian Amphora Production

The publication of this English summary was suggested by several scholars attending the Congress. It will focus only on the results of my study of Rhodian secondary stamps. The complete paper (in German), together with the catalogue and the whole bibliographical section, is to be published in the *Österreichische Jahreshefte* 68, 1999, 59 - 103. The denominations of the single stamps used in the appendix and the figures of this summary correspond to those in the complete paper.

Because of the wide distribution of Rhodian wine during the Hellenistic time, usually sold around the whole Mediterranean in stamped amphoras, and because the time frame of the production of these containers can be – at least theoretically – traced to a precise year, amphoras were bound to become the common thread running through the chronology of this period. The names of the eponyms, state officials who changed annually, are the basis of the chronology. Unfortunately no list of these officials has survived to our days, so that their sequence has to be reconstructed. In doing this we are helped not only by the shapes of the amphoras, but also by the connections existing between the names of particular eponyms and the names of the amphora fabricants. On Rhodian wine amphoras these indications appear on two complementary stamps that were each applied on one of the handles. Since the vases are usually found only in fragments, it is rather a question of luck finding a case in which it can be stated with certainty that two of these stamps belonged to the same amphora. Since scholars believed they could recognize fabricant marks in the small additional stamps and since some of them were applied near a dating official stamp, they became an indication for the matching of eponym and fabricant names and were used as a substitute for the fabricant stamp. It is almost exclusively in this context that the secondary stamps have been considered and published until now – very often even without illustrations.

As with most amphora research going back some years, the known and recognized views with regard to secondary stamps stem from Virginia Grace. Her remarks (especially in: *Hesperia* 54, 1985, 1-54, and *Delos XXVII*, 1970, 277-382) can be summarized as follows:

1. The secondary stamps are connected to specific fabricants and are therefore indications for the cooperation of officials and fabricants.
2. The use of secondary stamps has already been attested for the fabricants Sotas I and Diskos. Since however they were applied near the main stamp and not on the side of the handle, near the neck of the jar, they are not considered by Grace to be true secondary stamps.
3. The introduction of secondary stamps is supposed to have taken place in 188 B.C. or immediately thereafter.
4. The oldest „normally“ placed secondary stamps are the rose stamps of Damokrates I.
5. During Periods III and IV the secondary stamps were used only in the workshop of Damokrates I and his successors Hippokrates and Aristokles II.
6. Starting in Period V the small secondary stamps were used increasingly often by various fabricants.

Grace's remarks are known to every amphora scholar – in contrast to the statements made by Russian scholars on the subject. Only D.B. Schelov's first paper, published in 1956 (*MatIsslA* 57, 128-153) – up to now the only compilation of 81 secondary stamps – has found any acknowledgment in the Western world. Interestingly enough, only the list of the names and the table of contents of this paper have been used, while the remarks of the author have scarcely been commented on. It seems to me therefore appropriate to look at this research more thoroughly.

According to Schelov, secondary stamps

1. are almost always square.
2. They are found on handles together with names of fabricants as well as of officials.

3. They almost always only show abbreviations and were applied on a peripheral zone of the handle. Therefore they don't seem to have been meant for the buyer of the jar. At the same time, secondary stamps are very different from one another and the different types are not repeated often. That is why Schelov connects them with
4. the work of a fabricant. Two fabricant names can be found especially often: Hippokrates and Aristokles.
5. Since the name of the workshop owner appears on the main stamp Schelov explains the secondary stamps as the first letter(s) of the name of the actual potter. Schelov himself sees weaknesses in this interpretation. He is not able to explain all stamps as such abbreviations – for instance, the examples with KK or all the anepigraphical stamps. Likewise he can't explain why secondary stamps are so rare. He considers it possible that only every tenth or hundredth amphora received a secondary stamp.
6. He establishes that secondary stamps only appear together with the round main stamps. All square examples that don't fit Schelov's theory are stigmatized as mistakenly identified in their shape.
7. Schelov connects each particular stamp type with the work of one fabricant, and uses them – as did Grace – to match eponym officials with fabricants. Later he warns against this conclusion, since new finds contradict such exclusiveness; and
8. he dates all secondary stamps in Period III and IV.

To this day Schelov's theories have not provoked any substantial critical response among Russian scholars. The only new impulse has come from the papers of Jurij Badalianz (especially in: *VestDrevIst* 4, 1973, 48-64) where the discussion of secondary stamps is extended to single letters appearing on the main stamps of some fabricants. Badalianz supposes these letters to be forerunners of the secondary stamps and to have the same function. In my view such a thesis is untenable alone for chronological reasons: the secondary stamps appear before these additional letters.

How do the theories proposed by Grace and Schelov stand in relation to my research, resting upon a catalogue of 323 examples belonging to 80 different types?

First we must keep in mind that secondary stamps are always small in format and in general were affixed to a place of little prominence on the handle. Exceptions to this rule are the early examples by Sotas I and Diskos, and Hieroteles' complementary stamps mentioning the month, which were applied on the upper side of the handle next to the main stamp.

The shapes vary considerably more than it had been supposed. Next to the numerous rectangular ones – among these are many square ones – there also are oval, round and rhomboid ones. The stamp designs are even more varied. They range from a single or more letters that sometimes can be combined with a star, to more complicated monograms, or anepigraphic signs. Only one type, two examples of which are known to me, provides a fully written name: Ephesos.

The catalogue of types shows that secondary stamps containing identical marks can be found in connection with different fabricant names. For this reason it is not accurate to use secondary stamps to match eponym officials and fabricants without reservations. Most of the repetitions can be found in connection with three names: Damokrates I, Hippokrates and Aristokles II. In these cases the secondary stamps are closely related to one another in their form: they are identical or very similar. It appears that secondary stamps provide further support to Grace's theory on the possibility of a family connection among the above-mentioned fabricants.

Not only Aristokles II and Hippokrates "produced" secondary stamps showing identical contents. Also Euphranor I and Timoxenos used the same letters. Thereby are the E-stamps of Euphranor II and Hippokrates almost identical, whereas the design of the ones of Timoxenos is different in type. This should serve as a warning against using identical contents as sole basis for the identification of the fabricant, without a comparison of the stamps. Although difficult, illustrations often unfortunately not being available, this is an indispensable task.

Secondary stamps were added next to round as well as rectangular main stamps. Their presence is not as nearly as uncommon as has been supposed. On average it seems that every twenty-fourth jar received a secondary stamp. Since only a small group of fabricants seems to have made use of them, secondary stamps must have been used more frequently within the production of these fabricants. The attempt to quantify this for Hippokrates' workshop produces a surprising result: it seems that two out of three jars produced by him received a secondary stamp. In the workshop of Aristokles II a secondary stamp appears on every third amphora.

Secondary stamps certainly enjoy a connection to the activity of the workshops - as Grace and Schelov postulated - although they can be found next to the stamp of an official as well as next to a fabricant stamp. This idea is supported not only by the reiteration of particular stamps (whose contents are incomprehensible for outsiders) with particular fabricants, but also by the technical process used in the production of the amphoras. Since they were impressed during the manufacture of the jars, stamps can not really reflect the end-user of the amphoras. It would be possible to imagine that a fabricant marked in this way a specific production, like the order of a specific trader. But this proposition would have to be supported by the geographical distribution of particularly marked vessels, which is not the case. So, if secondary stamps truly do have something to do with the production of the amphoras, which meaning do they have in this context?

Not at all fitting as decoration, secondary stamps have to have a meaning nevertheless. Ch. Börker's newest supposition (PF 11, 1998, 17), made in the context of his interpretation of round main stamps as marks of the *ergasteriarches*, in which he sees state officials, that secondary stamps could define the production of single *Leiturgies*, is not acceptable since secondary stamps are also found next to rectangular stamps. Also unsatisfactory is Schelov's theory since it cannot give an explanation for every type of stamp. The only plausible explanation for secondary stamps is to interpret them as marks of some special section of the potter workshop, as suggested by Grace. Most of these marks could, as proposed by Schelov, be composed by the first letters of the name of

the superintendant or of the potter, or by a whole name as in the case of Ephesos. Others were able to choose a rose or an animal figure as their mark. The pure fact of marking bore more importance than the contents of the stamp. Secondary stamping was used especially in big workshops.

How many amphoras were needed could vary considerably from year to year, depending on the production of wine. It follows that potter workshops had to be flexible enough to produce different quantities of amphoras, since it is scarcely thinkable that they stored enormous stocks of ready-made jars. To satisfy a large increase in the demand of containers, big workshops could have recruited from the surroundings small independent potters whose usual production consisted of everyday pottery. As independent potters, these were not allowed to accept commissions to produce amphoras since state controlled capacity authorized only some workshops to do so. Small workshops were also probably technically not able to produce amphoras, as the firing of a large number of jars required the presence of a big kiln. In order to simplify the settling of accounts with the fabricant, potters might have used their small stamps to mark the vessels they had produced. They impressed them on the side of the handle, leaving enough room for the main stamps which would be applied later. When the market demanded fewer amphoras, there was no need for the recruited potters and they went back to their usual production. Year after year they could have been periodically employed by the same amphora workshop. This theory is supported by the fact that secondary stamps appear only during the months characterized by an increased production. They disappear altogether during the winter months, whereas the intercalary month *panamos deuterios* shows them. The decreased production of this period could be managed by the potters belonging to the workshop. They didn't need to mark their products since they were employed on a yearly basis. This would also explain why most amphoras don't carry any secondary stamps. The recruiting of additional potters according to the needs of the amphora workshop made it more flexible and saved costs, which in the end led to success. There are enough indications that all workshops using secondary stamps on a big scale were successful.

The origin of the use of secondary stamps as carriers of complementary information lies outside the realm of the model proposed above. It probably goes back to the time when the mention of the month was added to the legend of the main stamps, shortly after the middle of the third century B.C. This is suggested by Hieroteles' complementary stamps with the indication of the month as well as by the monograms by Sotas I which come just a short time later.

Secondary stamps were used sparsely at the beginning, but later, with production increasing, they saw greater and greater use by an increasing number of workshops. At the latest during the eponym year of Hieron, but possibly already at the time of Xenophanes I and Mytion, they can be seen in their typical usage. 188 B.C., as proposed by Grace to date the beginning of the use of secondary stamps, can therefore not be maintained. The workshops of Damokrates I, Hippokrates and Aristokles II made large use of secondary stamps, which also appear in the contemporary production of Agasikles II, Marsyas and Aisopos. In the second half of the century the number of fabricants using them increases to at least eight. The latest examples date from Period VI.

This folder photocopied
by Kathy Davis 22. III. 94
for Amphora Project.

CONTENTS OF VG FILE :

KNIDIAN : SEC. STAMPS

Metu list

Eponyms must be fixed [3.01]
who want see. ~~it~~.

Agadoury (pub. Kúpis)
?Andreas (pub. Tynobswos)

KTs with secondary stamps

4.xii.93—

KT 0233 4 A

Κνίδιον Ἀρι
στοκλεῦς
(O solid, small)

Ἀριστοκλῆς

Sec stp: @, P (retr).
Publ: Dumont 1871 p233 nrs 12--14; Pridik 1897 p150 nr 5; Pridik 1917 p59 nr 34; Pnyx 1956 p151 nr 116, Pl 65; Sztetyllo 1975 p222 nr 249, p223 Pl XXVIII
Date: Dated to @p period because of stylistic similarities (solid O) to KT 0234 (variant type, same content) Exs in Agora Deposit F 5:1 (before 150 BC; see VG deposit summary)

KT 0235

Ἀριστοκλεῦς
Κνίδιον
(Σ lunate, A broken-barred)

Ἀριστοκλῆς

Sec stp: Δ, @. Δ looks most like that of ABC 2 (broader based than A1's in ABC 4b?). The dot under ID clear in ABC 2, 3 is faintly visible in EM 1. VGF: A1's = Die A EM 1??

KT 0236

Ἀριστοκλεῦς vac
boukranion with neck
(in O framed)

Ἀριστοκλῆς

Publ: Dumont 1871 p343 nr 35 (sigma lunate); Grace 1934 p302 nr 6, p300 fig 5 nr 6; Grace 1985 p17 nt40, p49 nr 19, Pl 3 nr 19
Sec stp @

KT 0253 4 B

Ἐπὶ Εὐκράτεος
Κνίδι(scepter
Ἀριστοκλεῦς
(Σ lunate, A broken-barred)

Ἀριστοκλῆς

Publ: Dumont 1871 p247 nr 12 a (? , restored); Pridik 1896 p155 nr 125
Sec stp: Δ, star P (retr)

KT 0254 4 B

Ἐπὶ Εὐκράτε(ε)
Ἀριστοκλεῦς(ς)
Κνίδιον
scepter
(O solid, small)

Ἀριστοκλῆς

Publ: Tenos 1 1986 p241 nrs 57--58
Sec stp @. EM 1 fractional?

KT 0260 4 B

Ἐπὶ Κλεοβρότου
Ἀριστοκλεῦς
Κνίδιον
scepter
(A broken-barred)

Ἀριστοκλῆς

Sec stps Δ, @

KT 0356 6 B

Ἐπὶ Ἑρμοφάντου
Δαμοκράτεος
Κνίδιον caduceus r.
(retr except for N)

Δαμοκράτης

(cont.)

Publ: Kourouniotis 1899 p140 nr 3; Baumann 1973 p39 nr 24; Pl IX, 2
 (corrected); Sztetyllo 1978 p94 nr 354 (with photo, corrected);
 Tenos 1 1986 p248 nr 150
 Sec stp: w/ sec stps O, E.
 Note: lower l. corner cut off. Date: change from 4 B OK?
 Exs: CSM says 20 (Dobroudja ex added?)

KT 0365

Δαμοκρά(τευς) τοῦ Ἀριστοκλεῦς (sic)
 boukranion
 (Σ lunate, in O)

Δαμοκράτης

w/ sec stp: A broken-barred, O

KT 0366

Δαμοκράτευς τοῦ Ἀριστοκλεῦς
 boukranion
 (in O framed)

Δαμοκράτης

Combined with KT 1353.
 Publ: Pridik 1896 p 145 nrs 31 (restored),
 32 (corrected?), p146 nr 58; Grace 1934 p271 nr 204;
 EAD 27 1970 p327 nrs E 66, 67;
 Wells 1982 p122 nr 9 fig 2, p122 nr 10 fig 2 (=KT 366 A);
 Tenos 1 1986 p244 nr 99;
 Agora 22 p106 (deposit R 21:2)
 w/ sec stps: A, E, Θ, O, OΛ, Π, X

KT 0366A

[---]
 boukranion
 (in O framed)

[Δαμοκράτης]

w/ sec stps: A, Θ, O, OΛ, X

KT 0368 5

forepart of lion
 Δαμοκράτευς τοῦ Ἀριστοκλεῦς
 (in O framed)

Δαμοκράτης

Publ: see EAD 27 1970 p327 nr E 66, p328 nr E 69
 Sec stp: A broken-barred, O, Λ.
 Pair: w/ ΔΙΟΚΛΗΣ ep. (KT 1346)

KT 0592

thyrsos
 Ἐπὶ Ἀναθοκλεῦς Ἑρμογένεως
 (E, Σ lunate, A broken-barred in O)

Ἑρμογένης

Sec stp: * (on top of hdl KT 0592 EM 1)

KT 0923

Κύπρου
 forepart of lion
 (in O framed)

Κύπρος

w/ sec stp A broken-barred, O, Θ, E? 5 w/ companion stp ΤΙΜΑΣΙΚΡΑΤΗΣ

KT 0923A

[---]
 forepart of lion

Type: This nr was given to hdl's w/ this rdg which have sec stps. The
 se are Δ?, Α?, O, E? (rdgs of some unclear). 1 EM ex, w/ sec stp E.

KT 0926 5

Ἐπὶ Διονυσίου Κύπρου Κνέδιον
 forepart of lion
 (Σ squared, in O)

Κύπρος

(cont.)

Publ: Dumont 1871 p346 nr 56; Grace 1934 p274 nrs 218, 218 bis (to be restored, ill.); Lenger 1955 p498 nrs 48--51, Pl XXIV; EAD 27 1970 p329 nr E 72; Agora 22 p103 (deposit I 16:5); Tenos 1 1986 p245 nrs 111--112
 Sec stp: \square (only 1 ex). Eponym ΔΙΩΝΥΣΙΟΣ follows ΙΕΡΟΚΛΗΣ (KT 0928)

KT 0928 5

Ἐπὶ Ἱεροκλεῶς Κύπρου Κνέδιον
 forepart of lion

Κύπρος

(in O)

Publ: see EAD 27 1970 p329 nr E 72

Sec stp: \square . Reworked to make KT 0926

KT 0930 5

Ἐπὶ Χρυσέππου Κύπρου
 forepart of lion

Κύπρος

(E, P, Σ, K reversed, E, Σ lunate, in O)

Publ: Pridik 1897 p151 nr 14 (corrected), p152 nr 15

Sec stp: A, Θ , Π?, \square

KT 0931 5

Ἐπὶ Χρυσέππου Κύπρου
 forepart of lion

Κύπρος

(E, K, P, Σ reversed, E, Σ lunate, in O framed)

Sec stp: A, Θ , Θ

KT 0933

(Ἐπὶ) Ἀγαθοκλέους Κύπρου Κνέδιον
 forepart of lion
 (letters retr in O)

Publ: Tenos 1 1986 p245 nr 110

Sec stp: A, \square

KT 0973 5

Ἐπὶ Δράκοντος
 Κνέδιον rose
 Μενεστράτου

Μενεστράτος

Publ: Dumont 1871 p254 nr 51 (corrected), p265 nrs 118--120, (restored), p362 nr 182 (restored); Grace 1934 p275 (unread)

Sec stp: *P (retr), Δ

KT 1236 4 B or 5 A?

Ἐπὶ Ἀμόντα ca-
 Κνέδιον rose du-
 Τιμοξένου ceus
 up

Τιμόξενος

(retr)

Sec stp: Δ

KT 1238

Ἐπὶ Δράκοντος
 Κνέδιον rose tri-
 Τιμοξένου pod

Τιμόξενος

Publ: Grace 1934 p218 nr 121a (restored, ill.)

Sec stp: star, P (retr), and star Θ

KT 1241 5

Ἐπὶ Φιλομβροτίδα
 Κνέδιον rose tri-
 Τιμοξένου pod

Τιμόξενος

Sec stp: Δ , star, P (retr)

KT 1287

[Δαμοκράτης]

Ἐπὶ Ἀναθοκλεῦς Κνέδιον
boukranion
(in O framed)

Publ: Dumont 1871 p343--344 (no statement it is framed chk);
Preisigke 1926 p27 nr 6526; Tenos 1 1986 p246 nr 125
Sec stp: @? Type of ΔΑΜΟΚΡΑΤΗΣ Ο ΑΡΙΣΤΟΚΛΕΥΣ fab

KT 1346 5

[Δαμοκράτης]

forepart of lion
Ἐπὶ Διοκλεῦς Κνέδιον
(in O framed)

Publ: EAD 27 1970 p328 nr E 69
Sec stps A, E, @, O, N illeg. Combined w/ KT 0368

KT 1351 5

[Δαμοκράτης]

Ἐπὶ [---]ου Κνέδιον (Διονουσι in rasura)
boukranion
(Σ lunate, in O framed)

Publ: Tenos 1 1986 p251 nr 218
Sec stp: X, Π, * (star?).

chk → Pair: w/ ΔΑΜΟΚΡΑΤΗΣ Ο ΑΡΙΣΤΟΚΛΕΥΣ fab (by sim stp types?)
Date: Corinth ex C 1937-2450 listed Hesp 1978 p21 n29 as betw 146
and 108 BC, VG note on Corinth dups: "hdl from jar of Dam son
of Arist."

KT 1434 5

[Δαμοκράτης]

Ἐπὶ Μενεκράτεος Κνέδιον
boukranion
(in O framed)

Publ: Dumont 1871 p242 nr 80 (no device mentioned), p362 nrs 176
(corrected), 178--180; Pridik 1896 p166 nrs 201--202; Grace 1956
chk which? p162 nr 178, Pl 70; Agora 22 p102 (dated deposit);
Criscuolo 1986 p112 nr 140, fig p158; Tenos 1 1986 p246 nr 127
Sec stps OΛ?, A, O. Combined w/ Δαμοκράτης ὁ Ἀριστοκλεῦς

KT 1456 6 A

?

Ἐπὶ Σωσέφρονος Κνέδιον vac.
head and forepart of lion
(in O)

Publ: Milne 1928 p123 nr 26087; Tenos 1 1986 p250 nr 195
Sec stp: @

KT 1468

?

Ἐπὶ Φιλίππου Κνέδιον vac.
boukranion
(in O framed)

Sec stp: A, O

KT 1568 6 A

? ~~chk~~

Ἀνδρῶν Δημητρίου Κυδοσθένους (sic)
head and forepaw of lion
(in O)

Publ: Agora 22 p98 (dated deposit); Tenos 1 1986 p250 nr 196
Year of Σωσέφρων.
Sec stp: @ (TD 6545).

KT 1934 4 B

Ἀριστοκλῆς

Ἐπὶ Εὐφραγόρα
Κνίδι (scepter)
Ἀριστοκλεῦς
(A broken-barred, Σ lunate)

Sec stp: @

KT 2143 4 B

Ἀριστοκλῆς

Ἐπὶ Εὐφ(ρ)αγόρα
 Κνιδι(scepter
 Ἀριστοκλεῦς
 (Σ lunate, Α broken-barred)

Sec stps: Δ, F (P retr)

KT 2156 4 B

Θεῶδκμος

Ἐπὶ Ἀριστο
 κλεῦς Κνι(
 Θεωδάμου

Sec stp: caduceus

KNIDIAN - Secondary stamps

The file of these has accumulated without much attention. I found (see attached) that the order was not thorough, and that there were no eponym cards (just fabi. and sec. stamps). Also it was very tight.

AB has now made x ref. cards for the eponyms, and put all in order, separating those accompanying a main stamp from those accompanying ☐ ones, as in Pludien file. He has put in lots of guide cards, about for every name.

This file is now accommodated in one of the gift filing drawers sent by Helmut Diehl (?).

28.11.72

With rest

Look at Knick sec. & find
 the main section. This is
 not in order of red marking.
 Is there some more

See Oadypot, 5m.
 When is the card?

Apparently they don't have
 ep. cards systematically.

But this not be interesting.

(The drawer is ~~the~~ TIGHT.)

KUIDIAN STUDIES

[6]

Kuidian sec. st. which are also
on Rhodian

	Kuid. f.	Kuid. ep.	Pli. f.	Pli. ep.
P*	Ἀριστοκλῆς	Δράκων ¹⁶⁶⁻¹⁴⁶	Ἀριστοκλῆς	^{not 150?} Εὐκράτης
(w. Pli. →)	Μανέστρατος	Εὐκράτης ¹⁶⁶⁻¹⁴⁶	Ἰπποκράτης	^{not 150?} Ἰπποκράτης
(w. Ku. ←)	Τυμόθεος	Φιδουβρόδης ^{3/4 2nd}		¹⁸⁰⁻¹⁵⁰ Εὐφάντης
				^{ca. 165?} Πανσάριος
				^{ca. 150?} Περικλέης
				^{from 150?} Τυμοίπποδης

Note how P* appears on squat jars in Rhodia.

The fabrenant names all exist as fab. names
on Rhodian. Ἀριστοκλῆς of course has v.
similar stamps on both Kuidian and Rhodian, O
with rose. Τυμόθεος on Kuid. stamps is
usually accomp. by a rose as design (in red. stamp)
Μανέστρατος also ^{small} uses a rose ^{in red. stamp} on Kuidian jars.
Other Ku. fab. who use rose: Σίμυδος, Μόσχος
Μόσχος is a name of a Pli. fab. also; but not Σίμυδος.

Observing the dates suggests that Kuidian -
Rhodian connections were largely if not entirely
after 166 B.C.

Ought to make an

Analysis of Kinds For RT tally in M. Mus.

types is sec. of Ku. Ep. Types which sometimes have
Dec. of

[7]

(beginning after KT 912)

sec. of

KT

Θ

(ΔΑΜΟΚ.)

and
Korinth
of line

ΣΩΣΕΦΡΑΝ, φ.

1456

✓5
6

Θ

(ΔΑΜ. ΤΟΥ ΑΡ.)

brake

ΑΓΑΘΟΚΛΗΣ

1287

1

U, M, Θ, X

" " "

"

ΔΙΟΝΥΣΙΟΣ

1351

✓3

Θ

" " "

"

ΘΑΛΙΜΒΡΟΤΙΑΣ

A, O

" " "

"

ΜΕΝΕΚΡΑΤΗΣ

1434

✓4
5

Θ

" " "

"

ΦΙΛΙΠΠΟΣ

1408

✓7
4

E, Θ, N, O,

" " "

for
line

ΔΙΟΚΛΗΣ

1346

✓2

Θ

and
Korinth
of line
AND
ΔΗΜ.
ΚΥΔΕΑ.

1568

8

A, O

(ΚΥΠΡΟΣ)

for
line

ΤΙΜΑΣΙΚΡΑΤΗΣ

1462

✓6
6

Θ

"

ΧΡΥΣΙΠΠΟΣ

also

ΤΙΜΑΣΕΝΟΣ

"

"

φ. ΑΜΥΝΤΑΣ

1236

ΔΡΑΚΩΝ

1238

ΦΙΛΟΜΒΡΟΤ.

1241

