

A New Chronology for the Ceramic Stamps of Herakleia Pontike

Vladimir I. Kac



Among the ceramic stamps from excavations of various Greek sites on the Pontic littoral, the most numerous are those from Herakleia, Sinope and Chersonesos – the three Black Sea centres in which extensive and systematic stamping of ceramic containers and roof tiles was practised during the late Classical and Hellenistic periods.

At present we have at our disposal fairly well founded chronological sequences for stamps of Sinope¹ and Chersonesos,² which enable us to carry out an effective analysis of their distribution both as regards location and date. But the possibilities for conducting similar studies on imprints from Herakleia are rather limited since the method of chronological classification available at present is flawed by significant imperfections. The objective of the development of the exhaustive scheme of Herakleian stamping is fairly urgent also due to the fact that for the majority of Black Sea sites it is the Herakleian stamps which are the main – and not infrequently the only – evidence of date. Therefore, during S.Ju. Monachov's work on the monograph dedicated to the analysis of assemblages of ceramic containers from the northern Black Sea region,³ it was deemed necessary for a group of archaeologists from the Department of Greek and Roman Archaeology of the Saratov University to thoroughly analyse the chronological schemes for Herakleian stamping, which existed at the beginning of the 1990s.

The amphorae with englyphic stamps, usually found on the necks, were ascribed to Herakleia Pontike by B.N. Grakov as early as 1920s.⁴ The attribution proposed by him, although based only on certain indirect arguments, was consistent with the evidence of the literary tradition and lapidary inscriptions and was therefore accepted by practically all researchers dealing with the history and archaeology of the Black Sea littoral. More surprising were the theses of P. Balabanov who attempted to prove that the place of production of the amphorae with englyphic stamps was Apollonia Pontike.⁵ The main argument in favour of this rather eccentric hypothesis was an analysis of a large collection of stamps amounting to over 1300 specimens, which was found during the excavation of a Thracian sanctuary situated 30 km from Apollonia, near the village of Debelt. About 95% of this collection was composed of englyphic stamps. Balabanov believed that this high con-

centration of stamps suggested direct contacts between the inhabitants of Debelt and the centre where the amphorae were produced. The Greek city of Apollonia, being the closest to the sanctuary, was an obvious candidate.

Thus Balabanov paid tribute to a fairly widespread conception that in the wine-producing centres the majority of the manufactured ceramic containers were used on the site. Were that the case, a high concentration of stamps of a certain type at one site or another may indeed indicate local production. However, we have no grounds to substantiate this argument. Thus, most of the Thasian stamps of the early style, for example, have not been found on the island itself but elsewhere.⁶ The density of their distribution on Thasos is in fact several times lower than that which has been recorded in the centres to which Thasian wine was exported.⁷

Let us present another recent example. During the excavation at the settlement of Novopokrovka 1, situated 20 km from Feodosia (ancient Theodosia), an unusually high concentration of stamps for a rural settlement was recorded.⁸ As at Debelt, over 90% of these stamps were englyphic. Following Balabanov's logic, one would suppose that amphorae with these stamps were produced in Theodosia. However, a more plausible explanation for the concentration of englyphic stamps near Theodosia, and in addition one further argument in favour of their Herakleian provenance, is supplied by written sources telling us about a special relationship between these two *poleis*.

Apparently realising the implausibility of his own hypothesis, P. Balabanov produced additional arguments to confirm it. The weightiest of these is the assertion that there are "exact parallels as regards both the names and the manufacturing technique between the stamps on amphorae and roof tiles of the local production ... the stamps on the tiles from Apollonia are englyphic".⁹ In fact, these parallels are not surprising, since here we are most probably dealing with imported Herakleian tiles and not with ones produced locally.

Balabanov's statement that "the chronology and dynamics of the manufacture of amphorae with englyphic stamps agrees well with the information about the general economic development of Apollonia" is also without validity. In this context we may recall an article written by Balabanov some twenty years ago¹⁰ when he still shared the "orthodox" conception of a Herakleian provenance for the englyphic stamps. He also believed at that time that the chronology of the amphora stamps corresponded well with known historical events not of Apollonia, but of Herakleia. Thus this attempt to revise Grakov's attribution of the englyphic stamps cannot be considered successful. Furthermore, there are no grounds to regard Apollonia as the centre of production of ceramic containers. It is indicative that during the fairly comprehensive excavations at Apollonia itself and in the territories adjoining it, no traces of any extensive ceramic manufacture

have been recorded. Meanwhile, judging by the number of fabricants' names recorded on the englyphic stamps of the magistrates, there must have been, in some years, at least 20-30 workshops functioning simultaneously.

It is true that none of the Herakleian *ergasteria*, neither of the late Classical nor of the early Hellenistic period, have yet been discovered. However, the city has been very poorly investigated archaeologically, and the remains of a workshop manufacturing light-clay amphorae of the Roman period were found not long ago in the vicinity of the city.¹¹ This raises hopes of future discoveries of earlier ceramic workshops.

Besides the attribution of these stamps, B.N. Grakov was also responsible for developing their first chronological classification. However, this has subsequently been refined first by Grakov himself¹² and later by two generations of experts in ceramic epigraphy.¹³ Notwithstanding the advances achieved by the efforts of many researchers, no complete and exhaustive sequence of Herakleian stamping had been created by the beginning of the 1990s.¹⁴ The scholar who came closest to the solution of the problem was I.B. Brašinskij who in his two last papers presented the most elaborate classification of Herakleian stamps.

Following tradition, the chronological classification was preceded by a typological analysis of the imprints. All the stamps were divided into seven typological groups:¹⁵

Group 1: stamps containing a single name, either that of the magistrate or the workshop-owner.

Group 2 (early): stamps with two names, of which one is presented in highly abbreviated form.

Group 2 (late): stamps with two names written in full.

Group 3 (early): stamps with a single name preceded by the preposition EIII.

Group 3 (late): stamps with two names of which one is preceded by an eponymous preposition (EIII).

Group 4: stamps with a single name (probably that of the fabricant) differing from the 1st group by a number of palaeographic, grammatical and orthographic peculiarities.

Group 5 (early): imprints containing the abbreviation of a single name.

Group 5 (late): stamps with NI or a similar abbreviation.

Group 6: figured stamps.

Group 7: anepigraphic imprints.

This typological classification, though at present the most advanced one, suffers from a number of drawbacks. Firstly, any clear definition of typological signs is absent. The majority of the typological groups listed above are distinguished according to the substance of their legend, but for *Group 6* (figured stamps) the typological sign is the form of the imprint; meanwhile, various figured stamps have been employed practically throughout the entire period of stamping, and by the composition of their legend they differ in no way from the imprints which Brašinskij himself assigned to other typological groups. The figured stamps thus represent no special type being rather variants of other types. Also we must consider the stamps of groups 1 and 4 as two variants of one and the same type containing only the names of the fabricants.

Having considered the correlation between the types of Herakleian amphorae, their capacity and the types of their stamps, Brašinskij divided the Herakleian stamps into three major chronological periods:

Period A: the first and the beginning of the second quarter of the 4th century BC comprising the stamps of typological groups 1, 2 early, 5 early, and 6.

Period B: the second and the beginning of the last quarter of the 4th century BC comprising the stamps of groups 2 late, 3 late, and possibly some of the stamps of group 7 (the other imprints of group 7 probably belonging to period A).

Period C: the end of the 4th to the first quarter of the 3rd century BC comprising the stamps of groups 4 late and 5 late.

Unfortunately, this chronological classification cannot be said to be optimal. Having quite justifiably rejected the previous concept of a rigid sequence in the change of different types of stamps, Brašinskij did not succeed in achieving a detailed chronology either. The first period (*period A*) proved to be fairly varied in its composition, and it would be quite reasonable to subdivide it into a series of successive stages. Undoubtedly, the stamps of the long second period (*period B*) must also be subdivided into separate chronological stages. Moreover, no lists of names of fabricants and magistrates related to each of the periods were presented.¹⁶ Such was the point of departure from which the Saratov research team commenced its work on developing a new chronological classification.

A successful solution to the problems pertaining to classification depends directly on the volume of the initial material and on those principles, which are incorporated into the basis of its systematisation and analysis. Therefore, first of all we built and maintained a database of stamps. In the course of these studies we have adjusted the information included in Volume III of *IOSPE* and this has enabled us to correct readings of many damaged stamps

reconstructed by the compilers. In addition, most of the Herakleian stamps found after Volume III had been compiled were studied, and in the course of these studies the following particulars have been observed: between 10 and 15% of the stamps from each collection were represented by unknown dies. In the legends of these, a considerable number of previously unrecorded combinations of names and new names of fabricants and magistrates were encountered. This laborious work resulted in the compilation of the first version of a catalogue of Herakleian stamps containing information on more than 1200 dies. This information made possible a much more extensive application of the data in a synchronous analysis of the stamps. Moreover, practically all of the presently known ceramic assemblages containing series of Herakleian stamps have been considered.

About two hundred different stamps have been identified and grouped according to the content of the legends into three typological groups:

Group 1: stamps containing a single name

Group 2: stamps with two or three names

Group 3: anepigraphic stamps

Analysis of the stamps of group 1 enabled a subdivision into five variants:

Variant A: monograms

Variant B: isolated letters

Variant C: names abbreviated to two or three letters

Variant D: names written in full or in a slightly abbreviated form

Variant E: stamps containing a single name preceded by the preposition EIII

Although the stamps of this group were in use throughout the entire period of stamping, the stratigraphical, morphological, synchronistic and palaeographic analyses showed that most of them belong either to the initial or to the final phases of stamping. Apart from some dies of variant D and all of the dies of variant E, which undoubtedly contain the names of early eponyms, all the other stamps of typological *Group 1* are the stamps of the fabricants.

Analysis of the stamps of *Group 2* enabled a subdivision into three variants:

Variant A: stamps composed of two names in complete or abbreviated form

Variant B: stamps containing two names one of which is preceded by an eponymous preposition (EIII)

Variant C: stamps containing three names frequently in an abbreviated or, less frequently, complete form.¹⁷

A preliminary study of the correlation of stamps of particular types with securely dated ceramic material from complexes confirmed, as already observed, that contemporary stamps prove to be typologically heterogeneous. Thus, some stamps of *Group 1* belonging to the same type, and not infrequently even to the same variant, were encountered among the ceramic complexes from both the beginning of the 4th century BC and the beginning of the third century. Asynchronous are also a few anepigraphic stamps of the typological *Group 3*. The assumption about the long period of coexistence of different variants of stamps of the typological *Group 2* was also confirmed. At the same time it proved possible to establish a certain logic in the development of the legends of Herakleian stamps, that in turn enabled us to identify three successive periods of stamping of varying length (Fig. 1).

The majority of the stamps of the first period are represented by one-, two- or three-line stamps of typological *Group 1* containing single names executed by means of rectangular, less frequently of figured (leaf-like) dies. Representations rarely accompany the names. Very few of the stamps of this period contain names in highly abbreviated form. I.B. Brašinskij and B.A. Vasilenko suggested that these contain the names of both fabricants and magistrates. However, a collation of these names and the presence of a number of complexes comprising only stamps of typological *Group 118* testify that during that early period stamping had a non-public character but was conducted exclusively by the fabricants. The list of workshop-owners of the Early Fabricants' *Group (EFG)* contains at present about 50 names. Moreover, the workshops of 19 of these "fabricants" were active only within the EFG, while the others were active also under the magistrates of MG I (cf. appendix).

Magistrates

The longest period is the second – the *Magistrates' Period*. At present, the list of Herakleian officials who controlled the manufacture of amphorae already includes 90 names. For 40 of the eponyms, parallel employment of dies of differing variants of typological *Group 2* has been recorded. The practice of using an eponymous preposition with the name of a magistrate was finally established during the last three decades of this period. Therefore, the grouping of the magistrates within this lengthy period was carried out by means of the synchronistic method taking into account the set of the combinations of the names of magistrates and manufacturers. In order to verify the results obtained, an analysis of numerous complexes containing magisterial stamps was carried out.

As a result, all of the Herakleian magistrates known up till now have been preliminarily subdivided into five successive chronological groups.

In the first *Magistrates' Group (MG I)* 13 officials were included (cf. the appendix). The stamps of the earliest of them (Aristokles and Orthesilas)

| Period | Group | Chronological limits (BC) | Number of fabricants or magistrates | Total number of dies | % of figured dies | % of dies with EIII | % of dies with emblem |
|--------|--------|--------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|----------------------|-------------------|---------------------|-----------------------|
| I | EFG | 415-400 | 49 | 130 | 5 | 0 | 15 |
| II | MG I | 390s | 13 | 114 | 0 | 7 | 0 |
| | MG II | end of 390s- middle of 370s | 19 | 347 | 7 | 55 | 8 |
| | MG III | end of 370s- middle of 350s | 17 | 268 | 17 | 66 | 42 |
| | MG IV | middle of 350s- beginning of 330s | 21 | 213 | 18 | 17 | 54 |
| | MG V | 330s-310s | 22 | 52 | 0 | 98 | 0 |
| III | LFG | end of the 4th to c. 275 | 32 | 82 | 7 | 0 | 3 |

Fig. 1. A new typology and chronology of Herakleian stamping.

usually contain the names in the complete or slightly abbreviated form. An eponymous preposition before the name is fairly uncommon. In the stamps of the subsequent officials of this group, these were practically absent. At this stage, two-line stamps containing two names each, of which one was written in a highly abbreviated form were widely employed. Vasilenko was of the opinion that the latter names belonged to the fabricants,¹⁹ but this assumption has not been confirmed: the names abbreviated to two, occasionally three letters, are characteristic of most of the eponyms included in MG I.

The majority of the presently known dies of this group bear a combination of the names of a magistrate and a fabricant. However at the initial stage of the eponymous stamping, the traditions of the preceding *Fabricants' Group* still continued. The practice became fairly widespread of accompanying a magisterial stamp (variants D and E of typological *Group 1*) with a separate fabricant's stamp not infrequently of the same die as the isolated imprints of the EFG. The shape of the stamps varies: while rectangular stamps predominate, there are nevertheless a few figured ones (round and cross-shaped). Emblems were used during this period mostly in some fabricant's stamps, which accompany the stamps of magistrates.

The magistrates of this group are subdivided into two subgroups. *Subgroup A* comprises in addition to Aristokles and Orthesilas, three other magistrates, the names of which are highly abbreviated: "Iα(...), Λυ(...), Πα(...).

A characteristic feature of this subgroup is a relatively large number of dies recorded for each magistrate (from 10 to 23).

Subgroup B now includes eight magistrates, the names of which are highly abbreviated and during whose office only a few (not more than five) workshops were active. It may seem that during this period, a considerable recession in the production of ceramic containers occurred in Herakleia. However, it was apparently not that serious. Since the practice of magisterial stamping had still not been completely established, the possibility cannot be ruled out that the annual control over the ceramic production was exercised not by one official, as was later the case, but rather by a board of magistrates. Indirectly, this is suggested by a stamp found in Kytiaia,²⁰ in the three-line legend of which the magistrate's name Φι(...) is followed by one more name Ἡο(...), known in other stamps also as the name of an eponym. This assumption would explain the numerous cases where the narrowly dated burial complexes contain both the amphorae stamped by early magistrates [Ἰα(...), Λυ(...), Πα(...)] and jars marked by the eponyms of *Subgroup B* of MG II [Μολοσσός, Αἰθέρι(...), Ἀρίστων, Ἀλκέτας, Στύφων].²¹ During the time span between the activities of these two series of magistrates, at least 15 other officials must have been working, but the total length of this period seems to be considerably less than a decade and a half.

A characteristic trait of the stamps of the officials who controlled the ceramic production in Herakleia throughout the subsequent half a century (MG II-MG IV) is the use of the same magistrates' names both with and without an eponymous preposition.

In the *Magistrates' Group II* (MG II) 19 officials are enumerated. While in the legends of the earliest of these, the newly reappeared eponymous preposition is rather uncommon, by the end of this group it is already present on half of the stamps. Practically all of the magistrates from this group have stamps on which their names like those of the officials of *Subgroup B* of MG I are written in a strongly abbreviated form. However, the slightly abbreviated names are predominant, and gradually the complete form of the names becomes prevalent. Half of the magistrates are represented both by rectangular and figured stamps (round, triangular, or rhomboid). Stamp devices are relatively uncommon.

As a working hypothesis, we may divide the magistrates of this group into two subgroups of unequal number. *Subgroup A* is constituted by the first six magistrates during whose office the recession in the ceramic manufacture observed in the precedent decade was being gradually overcome: while at the beginning of the period, there were one or two workshops active, down to the end of the subgroup the number of such workshops increased to six or seven. An eponymous preposition appears only on solitary stamps.

The following stage, which is linked to the 13 magistrates of *Subgroup B*, constitutes the period of the highest amphora production in Herakleia. Each

series of a particular magistrate is represented by 15 to 50 dies. This facilitates the application of synchronous analysis to determine the sequence of the magistrates. An exception is the eponym *Λαίσας* known from one die only. However, the finds of the amphorae stamped with his name in burial contexts containing jars marked by eponyms of the end of MG II²² compels us to include also this magistrate in the group under consideration. In the majority of the stamps of *Subgroup B*, the name of the official is introduced with a preposition EIII. Emblems are found in single examples.

Attributed to the *Magistrates' Group III* (MG III) were 17 eponyms (cf. appendix). In two thirds of the dies of this group the name of the official is preceded by EIII. The use of figured stamps becomes more widespread. For some officials they amount to 20-40%, and in the case of Karakydes even to 100%. In the majority of the series, emblems are fairly uncommon, although on the stamps of five official emblems, (apparently eponymous) devices occur repeatedly (a grape for Karakydes, Skythas and Philinos; a crescent for Dionysios II; a club for Andronikos). The volume of the production decreased slightly under these magistrates, but it still remained fairly high, although there was considerable fluctuation throughout the entire period. The number of known dies for individual magistrates varies from four to 40.

Preliminarily, seven officials have been grouped in *Subgroup A*. The first six of these were placed fairly reliably within this subgroup on the basis of the accompanying fabricants' names and their amphorae having been found together in the same narrowly dated burial complexes. The last magistrate ΚΟΥΠΤ(...) is known only from one die where he appears together with the fabricant Euarchos, whose activities came to the end under the magistrates of the beginning of *Group III*.

The sequence of the magistrates of *Subgroup B* has also been reliably identified because the majority of them are represented by a considerable number of dies. Exceptions are two eponyms: Ἐχέμιος and Κέραυνος. The first is known on three dies and the second on only one. However, due to the fact that the first of them is linked through one of the dies with the fabricant Eukleion and the second with Sosibios, whose workshops were active only during MG III, these two magistrates can also be included quite reliably into the group under consideration.

In addition, a new element appeared in the practice of Herakleian stamping at this stage, which continues on the stamps of the subsequent group MG IV: in almost half of the eponyms we encounter solitary stamps containing only the name of the magistrate. Judging by two known intact amphorae, these magistrates' stamps, in contrast to similar imprints of eponyms of MG I, were not always accompanied by separate fabricants' stamps.²³

Magistrates' Group IV (MG IV) includes 21 officials (see appendix). Here, a much more limited use of the preposition EIII is characteristic: it is present only on 17% of the dies. It is indicative that this percentage is considerably higher on stamps of the later magistrates from this group. The employment

of figured stamps also became a rather uncommon phenomenon, while more than half of the stamps had an emblem.

The sequence of the four earliest magistrates from this group (*Subgroup A*) can be reliably identified. During the office of these magistrates, as well as under the six eponyms of the next subgroup (*Subgroup B*), from 10 to 20 workshops were active. Exceptional is Apollonios I on whose stamps the names of only four fabricants have as yet been recorded. These four, though, include Euphraios whose workshop was active only under the magistrates of the end of *Group III* and the beginning of *Group IV*.

Another 11 officials are included in *Subgroup C*. They are known only from single imprints in which their names are recorded in combination with the names of fabricants typical for group MG IV. Probably, only some of them belonged to the final stage of MG IV, while the others may have been synchronous with the eponyms of *Subgroup B*. Of special interest are the two latest magistrates Arkesas and Nikokles, who are known as yet only from tile stamps.

Finally, 22 eponyms are attributed to the last *Magistrates' Group V* (MG V) (see appendix). In practically all the stamps of these magistrates, the names are preceded by the preposition EIII. All of the stamps are rectangular and devoid of any emblems. The majority of the officials from this group are known from a limited number of stamps executed with one or two dies. The sequence of the nine magistrates from *Subgroup A* is relatively reliable. Since the remaining 13 eponyms are known only from single stamps, their names are only listed alphabetically among *Subgroup B*.

The Late Fabricants' Group (LFG)

After magisterial stamping had ceased, ceramic containers still continued to be marked for some time (*Period III*) with stamps containing a single name sometimes in slightly abbreviated form (typological variant 1D). In some instances they are highly abbreviated to one or two letters only (typological variants 1A and 1B). Also from the same period are some of the anepigraphic stamps of the typological *Group 3*. At present, no one questions that in all these cases we are dealing with the stamps of the workshop-owners. These *ergasteriarchoi* constitute therefore the *Late Fabricants' Group* (LFG). This group was first distinguished and isolated by I.B. Brašinskij, who noted peculiar letter patterns characteristic of the later stages of the script development (lunar sigma and some elements of cursive writing). The stamps are mostly of the rectangular shape although a few figured examples have also been recorded. Brašinskij pointed out that the presence of a frame surrounding the inscription is characteristic of this group.²⁴ However, the conclusion is far from indisputable, since some framed stamps undoubtedly dating to an earlier period are known. Also of note are some other traits peculiar to the last stage of Herakleian stamping: the increased number of

relief imprints uncommon during the previous periods as well as the habit of stamping the amphora handles. At present, it is possible to identify about 30 names of fabricants of LFG (see appendix).

Along with the development of a comprehensive relative chronology of Herakleian stamps, we have attempted to determine the absolute dates of the chronological periods and subgroups more precisely. The primary method employed in establishing an absolute chronology was an analysis of complexes where Herakleian amphorae have been found together with stamped jars from other centres, particularly those of Sinope and Thasos, with more developed chronologies.

All scholars now agree that the stamping of ceramic containers in Herakleia started at the turn of the 5th to the 4th century BC. As proof of this date, numerous finds of stamps of the earliest Herakleian magistrates together with the earliest emblem-free stamps of Thasos can be cited.²⁵

Perhaps the most informative complex of this kind is the Olbian storage-cellar of 1947. Here, a fairly representative assemblage consisting of 49 stamped Herakleian and eight Thasian amphorae has been recorded.²⁶ Most of the Herakleian amphorae bear manufacturers' stamps of the EFG. However, almost twenty of the latest jars prepared by the first magistrates of the MG I Aristokles and Orthesilas. The Thasian jars are marked with the earliest emblem-free stamps of chronological *Group 1* datable to the beginning of the 390s BC. Thus we have good reasons to ascribe the earliest magisterial stamps of Herakleia to the very beginning of the 4th century BC.

The above dating can be verified by an analysis of the amphora material from the *dromos* of the stone vault at Kurgan no. 8 of the "Five Brothers" barrow-group in the necropolis of Elizavetovskoe. Here, nine stamped amphorae of Herakleia bearing the names of four different magistrates along with five morphologically uniform Sinopean jars were unearthed, of which one has a stamp of the *astynomos* Chabrias.

The dating of this complex is disputed. I.B. Brašinskij who was the first to publish it, supposed that the Sinopean amphorae were the latest material here and that the mention of the *astynomos* Chabrias who was magistrate around 325 BC should date the erection of the kurgan.²⁷ A different date for the complex was proposed by B.A. Vasilenko, who applied his own chronology for the Herakleian stamps to the ones found here and assigned the deposit to the beginning of the second quarter of the 4th century.²⁸ Brašinskij did not agree with this proposal, although he admitted that his original dating was too narrow and that it could be expanded to cover the entire third quarter of the century.²⁹

Curiously, both of the proposed dates proved to be justifiable, as shown by the recent re-examination of the assemblage by S.Ju. Monachov. In fact, the Herakleian amphorae from Kurgan no. 8 represent a rather long time span, and they can reasonably be divided into two chronological blocks: five

vessels of type II were produced under the magistrates Andronikos and Lysitheos of MG III, while four jars of the late variety of type III bearing the stamps of the magistrates Archippos and Peisistratos belong to the beginning of MG V.³⁰ The time span between these two blocks amounts to about 30 years.

The question arises therefore, which of these two blocks the Sinopean *astynomos* Chabrias should be linked to? Referring to N.F. Fedoseev's article, then in print, Monachov dated the activities of Chabrias to 345-340 BC and supposed that his amphora should be contemporary with the jars of Lysitheos. However, when the article he was referring to was published, it proved to date Chabrias to the end of 350s.³¹ Moreover, from the moment of the appearance of Fedoseev's chronology of Sinopean stamping,³² his absolute chronology was criticised, and the suggestion was made to lower his dates by 15-20 years.³³ Thus in the most recent chronological system developed by N. Conovici, Chabrias is assigned to the very beginning of the chronological *Group II* and dated to the end of the 330s.³⁴

The acceptance of this date would settle the issue. The Sinopean amphorae from Kurgan no. 8 are contemporary not with the earlier but with the later group of Herakleian amphorae bearing the stamps of Archippos and Peisistratos. They consequently have to be dated to the end of the 330s as well. Taking into account that about 70 officials of MG I-MG IV preceded these two magistrates of MG V, the date of the beginning of magisterial stamping in Herakleia must be the turn of the 5th to the 4th century BC.

However, as stated above, the first magisterial stamps in Herakleia are preceded by a period of stamping with fabricants' names. Defining its length would set up the initial date of the stamping of ceramic containers. The answer to this question was obtained by studying the most representative collections of early Herakleian stamps from the excavations in Chersonesos and Kerkinitis.

Under consideration were all of the stamps of the EFG and the stamps of the five first magistrates of MG I (*Subgroup A*) found there. In Chersonesos 337 stamps of the EFG and 121 stamps of the first stage of the magisterial stamping were registered (the ratio being 2.8:1). A similar picture is provided by the stamps from Kerkinitis: 228 and 90 stamps respectively (the ratio being 2.5:1). As it seems unlikely that the density of the distribution of stamps throughout the first period (EFG) differed significantly from that of the first five magistrates of *Subgroup A* of MG I, it is quite reasonable to suppose that the stamps of the EFG must have been in use respectively 2.5-3 times longer, i.e. during a period of at least 12-15 years. We then arrive at 415-410 BC, which in my opinion, is the most likely date for the beginning of stamping amphorae in Herakleia.

Incidentally, such a date is quite consistent with the economical and political history of Herakleia during the last quarter of the 5th century BC.

The *polis* had by then become one of the largest producers of marketable wine. Naturally, the Herakleians could hardly overlook the markets of the various cities in the northern Black Sea area, and it is in the last quarter of the 5th century BC that great opportunities for the commercial penetration of that region were opened due to the reduction of the trade and political activities of the Athenians during the course of the Peloponnesian War.³⁵ One can hardly consider as accidental the closeness in time of such important events in the life of Herakleia as the successful repulse of the siege by the Athenian fleet, the establishment of the colony of Tauric Chersonesos in 422/421,³⁶ and the mass exportation of Herakleian wine to the northern Black Sea region. The appearance of the practice of amphora stamping in Herakleia during precisely this period thus seems quite natural.

The turn of the 5th to the 4th century became the starting point for the establishing of the absolute chronological limits of particular magisterial groups (Fig. 1), which were estimated according to the number of the eponyms represented in each of the groups. Since by now we know of 91 magistrates who controlled the ceramic production in Herakleia, the terminal date for magisterial stamping must be assigned to the end of the 4th century BC. Some time ago, P. Balabanov attempted to link the abolition of the institution of eponyms and the shift to the fabricants' stamps of the LFG with the general weakening of the central power in the course of the internal struggle unleashed after the death of the tyrant Dionysios in 305 BC.³⁷ It still remains unclear whether there was such a link, but there is no doubt that the two phenomena were fairly close in time.

On the other hand, the hypothesis of Balabanov about the cessation of the amphora stamping immediately after Herakleia was seized by the troops of Lysimachos in 285 BC can hardly be accepted. Some archaeologically complete amphorae with the stamps of the LFG which are far from being the latest were found lying on the floor of the buildings in the Area U7 at the settlement of Panskoe I which perished in the 270s BC.³⁸ The very latest stamps of the group are well represented among the materials from the settlement of Elizavetovskoe, which was deserted in the late 260s. Thus, the cessation of stamping ceramic containers in Herakleia should be dated between 275 and 265 BC.

What has been presented here is only the first version of the chronological classification of the stamps of Herakleia. Most of the names of the fabricants of EFG and LFG have been identified, and 91 eponyms have been divided into five magisterial groups. At the same time, we have not yet been able to verify a number of single amphora stamps containing magisterial names mentioned in some publications and reports. These have not been included in our list. Undoubtedly, most of these names result from incorrect reading of damaged stamps. The possibility cannot, however, be ruled out, that some of them will supplement our list of the magistrates, thus permitting the completion of the stamping scheme of Herakleia Pontike.

Notes

1. Fedoseev 1994; 1999; Conovici 1997; 1998.
2. Kac 1994.
3. Monachov 1999.
4. Grakov 1926.
5. Balabanov 2001.
6. Garlan 1999, 1.
7. Kac 1996, 52.
8. Gavrillov & Fedoseev 2002, 49-50.
9. Balabanov 2001, 21.
10. Balabanov 1985.
11. Arsen'eva, Kassab Tezgor & Naumenko 1997.
12. Grakov 1955, 15 ff.
13. Brašinskij 1965; 1980; 1984; Vasilenko 1970; 1974; Balabanov 1985; Pavličenko 1992.
14. Cf. Pavličenko 1999, 13-21.
15. Brašinskij 1980, 38-41.
16. Later, in the appendix to N. Pavličenko's paper (1999, 18-19) a list of Herakleian magistrates was presented which contained 69 names. However, this list is not complete and the magistrates are not divided into chronological groups.
17. At present, only a few stamps of this variant are known. The third name is probably the patronymic of the workshop-owners, although one cannot rule out the possibility that in one case we are dealing with two strongly abbreviated names of magistrates (cf. note 20).
18. Monachov 1999, 160-248.
19. Vasilenko 1974, 6.
20. Stamp: ΗΡΑΚΛΕΛΔΑΦΙ|ΗΡ: Kytaia 1982. Inventory no. A 1/5.
21. Burial 72 (1862) in Kerch, Kurgans no. 1 near the village of Pribugskoe and 4x and 4s near the village of Petuchovka (Monachov 1999, 258-260, 272-274, 276-277).
22. The barrows situated near the village of Krasnoflotovskoe and in the Sivash area (Monachov 1999, 303, 311).
23. Monachov 1999, pls. 113.3, 115.2.
24. Brašinskij 1965, 26.
25. Monachov 1999, 193-238.
26. Vinogradov 1972, 47; Brašinskij 1965 22-24; Monachov 1999, 194-201.
27. Brašinskij 1961, 178-186.
28. Vasilenko 1970, 17; 1971, 247.
29. Brašinskij 1980, 43.
30. Monachov 1999, 358-362.
31. Fedoseev 1999, 41.
32. Fedoseev 1992; 1994, 189-190.
33. Turovskij 1997, 219; Conovici 1997, 153.
34. Conovici 1998, 26, 51.
35. Frolov 1974, 128; Saprykin 1981, 176; Kac 1990, 105.
36. Tjumenev 1938.
37. Balabanov 1985, 18.
38. Monachov 1999, 517-519.

Appendix

Early Fabricants Group (EFG): the late 5th to early 4th century BC

*Fabricants engaged
within the EFG only*

1. Ἀγάθων I
2. Αἰάκης
3. Ἀρίσταρχος
4. Γῆρυς
5. Ἐργασίων
6. Ἐρμαγόρας
7. Ἐρμᾶντος
8. Εὐῶπις
9. Εὐφράνωρ
10. Κώκημος
11. Μέκων
12. Μίκκος
13. Νικασίων
14. Ῥαμφίας
15. Σάμνος
16. Σύρος
17. Τιμάσανδρος
18. Φώκριτος
19. Χαρέσιος

*Fabricants active within
the EFG and the MG I*

- | | |
|-----------------|---------------|
| 20. Ἀργεῖος | 39. Λάκων |
| 21. Ἀρίστιππος | 40. Μόσχος |
| 22. Ἀρίστων | 41. Νόσσος |
| 23. Ἀρχέλας | 42. Ὀνασος |
| 24. Ἀρχέστρατος | 43. Πυρονίδας |
| 25. Δαμάτριος | 44. Σατυρίων |
| 26. Δᾶος | 45. Σιλανός |
| 27. Διοκλῆς | 46. Σωτήρ |
| 28. Διονύσιος | 47. Τιμόλυκος |
| 29. Εὐαρχος | 48. Χίων |
| 30. Εὐκλείων | 49. Ὠφελίων |
| 31. Εὐπάμων | |
| 32. Εὐρύδαμος | |
| 33. Ἴηραίων | |
| 34. Ἴηρακλείδας | |
| 35. Θεογένης | |
| 36. Θεόξενος | |
| 37. Καλλίας | |
| 38. Κρομνίτης | |

Eponyms of MG I: 390s BC

Subgroup A

1. Ὁρθεσίλας
2. Ἀριστοκλῆς
3. Ἴα(...)
4. Πα(...)
5. Λυ(...)

Subgroup B

- | | |
|--------------|--------------|
| 6. Θε(...) | 11. Λευ(...) |
| 7. Κόας | 12. Τυ(...) |
| 8. Νικ(...) | 13. Φι(...) |
| 9. Ἴηρ(...) | |
| 10. Εὐκ(...) | |

Eponyms of MG II: the end of the 390s to the middle of the 370s BC

Subgroup A

1. Βόταχος
2. Ἀθανόδωρ(...)
3. Μένιππος
4. Σωσίος
5. Κρωμνι(...)
6. Εὐπιτίων

Subgroup B

- | | |
|----------------|---------------|
| 7. Διονύσιος I | 14. Εὐγειτίων |
| 8. Μολοσσός | 15. Ἔωρος |
| 9. Αἰθέρ(...) | 16. Κερκίνος |
| 10. Ἀρίστων | 17. Κῦρος |
| 11. Ἀλκέτας | 18. Πανσανίας |
| 12. Στύφων | 19. Λαίσας |
| 13. Δεινόμαχος | |

Eponyms of MG III: the end of the 370s to the middle of the 350s BC*Subgroup A*

1. Λύκων
2. Διονύσιος II
3. Ἄγνoδαμος
4. Καρακϋδης
5. Σκϋθας
6. Μᾶτρις
7. Κρυπτ(...)

Subgroup B

- | | |
|----------------|--------------|
| 8. Καλλίας | 15. Ἔχεμος |
| 9. Ἄνδρoνικος | 16. Εϋξενος |
| 10. Λυσίθεος | 17. Κέραννος |
| 11. Εϋφρόνιος | |
| 12. Φιλίνος | |
| 13. Μνασίμαχος | |
| 14. Σάτυρος | |

Eponyms of MG IV: the middle of the 350s to the beginning of the 330s BC*Subgroup A*

1. Ἄμφίτας
2. Βάκχος
3. Ἡρακλείδας
4. Ἄγασίλλος

Subgroup B

5. Ἄπολλώνιος
6. Μενoίτιος
7. Δαμάτριος
8. Σπίνταρος
9. Εϋρυφῶν
10. Φιλόξενος

Subgroup C

11. Ἄγάθων
12. Ἔλυρος
13. Θεώνικος
14. Μαρονίδης
15. Μελάνοππος
16. Σιλανός
17. Σίμος
18. ὉΣτρός (Ἰστρός?)
19. Φυλεύς
20. Ἀρχέσας
21. Νικοκλήης

Eponyms of MG V: the 330s to the 310s BC*Subgroup A*

1. Ἄνταγος
2. Ἄμφίκρατος
3. Λεόφαντος
4. Ἄρχιππος
5. Πεισίστρατος
6. Ἄπολλώνιος
7. Κρόνιος
8. Ἰφικράτης
9. Ματροδῶρος

Subgroup B

- | | |
|-----------------|------------------|
| 10. Γέρος | 19. Λεύκιππος |
| 11. Δημήτριος | 20. Πίνδαρος |
| 12. Δημοκράτης | 21. Πυθοκλή(...) |
| 13. Θέμιστ(...) | 22. Φώκριτος |
| 14. Θεόκυρος | |
| 15. Θεόπροπος | |
| 16. Θεύδορος | |
| 17. Κλισ(...) | |
| 18. Ληώδας | |

**Late Fabricants Group (LFG): the end of the 4th
to the first quarter of the 3rd century BC**

- | | | |
|-----------------|----------------|-----------------|
| 1. Ἀριστοκράτης | 12. Ἐπικράτης | 23. Μηνήτος |
| 2. Ἄψογος | 13. Ἐράτων | 24. Νι(...) |
| 3. Βάκχιος | 14. Ἔτυμος | 25. Νικόστρατος |
| 4. Βατίων | 15. Ἡρακλέδας | 26. Πασιάδας |
| 5. Γλαῦκος | 16. Ἡράκλειτος | 27. Ποη(...) |
| 6. Γόργιος | 17. Ἡρακλέων | 28. Πυθιον(...) |
| 7. Δαμόξενος | 18. Ἡρόδωρος | 29. Σωκράτης |
| 8. Διοκλῆς I | 19. Κερκῖνος | 30. Σωτήρ II |
| 9. Διονύσιος II | 20. Μεμη(...) | 31. Τι(...) |
| 10. Δοῦλος | 21. Μένης | 32. Φιλίσκος I |
| 11. Εἰρηναῖος | 22. Μένιππος | 33. Φιλότιμος |

Bibliography

- Arsen'eva, T., D. Kassab Tezgor & S. Naumenko 1997. Un depotoir d'atelier d'amphores a pate clare. Commerce entre Heraclee du Pont et Tanais a l'epoque Romaine, *Anatolia Antiqua*. V, 187-198.
- Balabanov, P. 1985. Analiz i datirovanie amfornych pečatej Geraklei Pontiki, *Tracia Pontica* 2, 12-23.
- Balabanov, P. 2001. Englifičeskie pečati na amforach: novaja postanovka problemy, *Ol'vija ta antičnij svit*. Odessa, 20-21.
- Brašinskij, I.B. 1961. Amfory iz raskopok Elizavetovskogo mogil'nika v 1959 godu, *SovA* 3, 178-186.
- Brašinskij, I.B. 1965. Keramičeskie klejma Geraklei Pontijskoj, *NumEpigr* 5, 10-27.
- Brašinskij, I.B. 1980. *Grečeskij keramičeskij import na Nižnem Donu v V-III vv. do n.e.* Leningrad.
- Brašinskij, I.B. 1984. Voprosy chronologii keramičeskich klejmov i tipologičeskogo razvitija amfor Geraklei Pontijskoj, *NumEpigr* 14, 3-22.
- Conovici, N. 1997. Problèmes de la chronologie des timbres sinopéens, *Pontica* 30, 117-154.
- Conovici, N. 1998. *Histria VIII. Les timbres amphoriques 2. Sinope*. Bucarest-Paris.
- Fedoseev, N.F. 1992. Itogi i perspektivy izučenija sinopskich keramičeskich klejmov, in: *Grečeskie amfory*. Saratov, 147-163.
- Fedoseev, N.F. 1994. Chronologija sinopskich magistratskich klejmov, in: *Problemy skifo-sarmatskoj archeologii Severnogo Prichernomor'ja. Tezisy dokladov konferencii*. Zaporož'e, 188-190.
- Fedoseev, N.F. 1999. Classification des timbres astynomiques de Sinope, in: Garlan (ed.) 1999, 27-48.

- Frolov E.D. 1974. Tiranija v Geraklee Pontijskoj, *Antičnyj mir i archeologija* 2, 117-139.
- Garlan, Y. 1999. *Les timbres amphoriques de Thasos I. Timbres Protothasiens et Thasiens Anciens*. Paris.
- Garlan, Y. (ed.) 1999. *Production et commerce des amphores anciennes en Mer Noire*. Aix-en-Provence.
- Gavrilov, A.V. & N.F. Fedoseev 2002. Amfornye klejma iz antičnych pamjatnikov okrugy Feodosii, in: *Bospor Kimmerijskij, Pont i varvarskij mir v period antičnosti i srednevekov'ja*. Kerch, 44-59.
- Grakov, B.N. 1926. Englifičeskie klejma na gorlach nekotorych ellinističeskich ostrodonnyh amfor, *Trudy Gosudarstvennogo Istoričeskogo Muzeja* 1, 165-206.
- Grakov, B.N. 1939. Gerakleja Pontijskaja. Klejma na gorlach amfor, na kalipterach i keramidach, IOSPE III. Archives of the Institute of Archaeology RAS, R-2, no. 2179.
- Kac, V.I. 1990. Emporij Chersones, *Antičnyj mir i archeologija* 7, 97-111.
- Kac, V.I. 1994. *Keramičeskie klejma Chersonesa Tavričeskogo*. Saratov.
- Kac, V.I. 1996. Pričiny perechoda ot "rannich" k "pozdnim" ottiskam v praktike fasoskogo klejmenija, in: *Drevnee Pričernomor'e. III čtenija pamjati professora P.O. Karyškovskogo*. Odessa, 51-53.
- Monachov, S.Ju. 1999. *Grečeskie amfory v Pričernomor'e. Kompleksy keramičeskoj tary VII-II vv. do n.e.* Saratov.
- Pavličenko, N.A. 1992. K voprosu o vremeni bytovanija predloga EIII v geraklejskich klejmach, in: *Grečeskie amfory*. Saratov, 138-147.
- Pavličenko, N. 1999. Les timbres amphoriques d'Héraclée du Pont: bilan et perspectives de recherche, in: Garlan (ed.) 1999, 13-19.
- Saprykin, S.J. 1979. Ekonomičeskie osnovy kolonizacionnoj dejatel'nosti Geraklei Pontijskoj, *Problemy grečeskoj kolonizacii Severnogo i Vostočnogo Pričernomor'ja*. Tbilisi. 177-178.
- Turovskij, E.Ja. 1997. K voprosu ob absoljutnyh datach sinopskich klejm, in: *Nikonij i antichnyj mir Severnogo Pričernomor'ja*. Odessa, 217-220.
- Tjumenev, A.I. 1938. Chersonesskie etjudy, 1. K voprosu o vremeni i obstojatel'stvach vznikovenija Chersonesa, *VDI* 2, 245-275.
- Vasilenko, B.A. 1970. Zametki o geraklejskich klejmach, *SovA* 3, 217-224.
- Vasilenko, B.A. 1971. K voprosu o datirovke sinopskich klejm, *SovA* 3, 245-250.
- Vasilenko, B.A. 1974. O karaktere klejmenija geraklejskich amfor v pervoj polovine IV v. do n.e., *NumEpigr* 11, 3-38.
- Vinogradov, Ju.G. 1972. Keramičeskie klejma ostrova Fasos, *NumEpigr* 10, 3-63.