In addition to the large quantity of artefacts considered in other sections of this volume, excavations in house U6 yielded a representative collection of scratched or painted inscriptions and marks of various kinds, amounting to 81 items in all. The vast majority of these inscriptions were examined by me \textit{de visu}; however, in those cases where they were inaccessible or lost, the descriptions and the graffiti and dipinti themselves are presented according to the field inventory list. With the exception of two graffiti on astragali (H 27, H 29) and a single mark on the handle of a stone louteron H 17 all the inscriptions appear on tableware or transport amphorae.

The chronological range of the inscriptions is rather narrow and covers the period from the middle of the 4th century B.C. to the 70s of the 3rd century B.C. when the whole settlement suddenly ceased to exist. However, in each case the date has been assigned not only on the basis of the context of the find but also with the regard to the dating and possible reuse of the object bearing the inscription; and, where possible, or applicable – \textit{e.g.} for containers or vessels such as amphorae – the relevant catalogue entry gives details of the measured or reconstructed volume or capacity. Palaeographic data played an auxiliary role here.

Taking into consideration the general chronology of the building, we may suppose that slight variations in the form of certain letters were due to individual peculiarities of the handwriting and the material, as well as to the implements used by each writer. Only in a few isolated instances (\textit{theta} and \textit{omicron} equal in their size to other letters – H 24, \textit{pi} with a short right \textit{hasta}, and squat \textit{omega} with the wide ‘gates’ – H 31), and when, moreover, there is no doubt of the vessel having been reused, can these peculiarities be considered as a chronological indication. But in general, the characters in most of the inscriptions are typical to their time. The one point worthy of special note is that the lunate sigma, though totally dominant in the dipinti (H 52-53, H 56-60, H 69), occurs only in the final position in the graffiti (H 32).

The material available characterises various aspects of the life of a remote rural district of Chersonesos; however, it does not show any great diversity of types, and can be subdivided into just four categories of varying size. These categories are presented as follows in the catalogue below.

1. \textit{Dedications}\hfill
2. \textit{Owners’ marks}\hfill
2A. Private ownership\hfill
2B. Public ownership\hfill
3. \textit{Numerical and Commercial marks}\hfill
3A. Indications of Capacity\hfill
3B. Price Marks\hfill
3C. Client Names\hfill
4. \textit{Varia}
Except for the very large group of 'Client names' (items H 42-72), the reasons for distinguishing which will be explained in the relevant introduction, all the other categories are fairly traditional for publications of this kind. Within each group the inscriptions are ordered alphabetically.

1. DEDICATIONS (H 1-2)

Both of the two inscriptions that make up this group were found in the western corner of house U6 – in rooms 14 and 12. Judging by the material found here, these rooms had the status of domestic sanctuaries, and were accordingly connected with the worship of Herakles as the patron of the Chersonesean territory as well as with the worship of deities in the agricultural sphere (Demeter and Sabazios). Evidence of the special role played by the cult of Herakles in the life of the rural population of Chersonesos is represented in quite a number of reliefs depicting the hero and in dedication graffiti found at several different settlements. One such dedication to Herakles Soter from house U7 at Panskoye I, along with various aspects of the corresponding cult in the territory of the Chersonesean state I have already discussed in detail elsewhere.1

Of special interest is graffito H 2 on a black-glazed cup-skyphos which, to my knowledge, is the earliest evidence of the cult of Sabazios not only in Chersonesos but in the Black Sea area in general. According to A.M. Gilevi2, also to be connected with the cult of Sabazios are the two figured pendants representing a multi-faced bearded head from the same assemblage, as well as the coiled snake made of silver wire2 found in the courtyard of U6 near the entrance to room 27.

---

**H 1** U6 room 14. Find list 7/2. 1971. Pl. 150.

Bell-shaped ritual vessel (G 16). Typical Chersonesean clay with white lime inclusions. Size: H. 28.0, D. of rim 23.8, D. of body 23.2, D. of base 1.9 cm. Traces of repair. Dipinto in red on upper part of body. Height of letters: c. 5.5 cm.

c. 300 B.C.: Ἰεριστὸν ἑλπίδος (lit., salvation, retrograde).

As mentioned above, the vessel comes from a cult assemblage where it was found in situ along with a limestone relief representing the standing Herakles (see G 1). The latter fact enables us to take the ligature as the abbreviated name of this hero. Possibly, the reason for the retrograde writing in this case was to stress the difference between the abbreviation of hero's name and the similar abbreviations of personal names frequent on amphorae. Moreover, the inscription under discussion is done in paint, which may indicate its having already been executed before the vessel was brought to the settlement, like the dipinti on amphorae.


Black-glazed thin-walled cup-skyphos (B 98), base not preserved. H. c. 8.5, D. of rim 15.8 cm. Graffito on upper part of body, starting at the handle and ending at the other one. Height of letters varies from 1.0 to 1.7 cm. Publications: Štcheglov 1976, 139, 142, fig.; Štcheglov 1987, 266, fig. 17, 1; Chtcheglov 1992, 177, fig.; Solomonik 1984, 11; Gilevich 1989, 71 ff., 118, fig. 1; Hannestad 2002, 148, fig. 8. Find-spot: northern part of the room, under handmade vessels.

c. 325-300 B.C.: Ἰεριστὸν Ἐλπίδος

i.e. 'The sacred [kylix] of Sabazios'. Although ware of such a type has been given the name 'cup-skyphos' in the literature, the gen. fem. ἐλπίδος indicates that the inmates of the house possibly used less specialised terms in the everyday life e.g. ἐλπίς or ἓν ἐλπὶν – which in ancient times may have collectively signified vessels that, though different in type, were similar in shape and use.
2. OWNERS’ MARKS [H 3-32]

2A. PRIVATE OWNERSHIP

This group of inscriptions is one of the most representative, yielding first place in terms of number to ‘Client Names’ alone. In addition to graffiti on ceramic objects of various different types, two marks on astragali [H 27 and H 29] and an inscription on the handle of a stone louterion [H 17] are also included in this group. The marks under discussion are, as a rule, just single letters or the initial symbols (up to four symbols) of personal names (PN). Fairly common are ligatures [A and II (H 8-9), A and P (H 10, H 12), A and N (H 18), E and T (H 18), H and P (H 20-21), N and E (H 28), II and P (H 30)], as well as monograms (H 7, H 26).

Although our collection contains no example of an owner’s name given in its full form, the frequent repetition of the same initials on different kinds of ware from a single room, or from a group of adjacent ones, enable us to identify these symbols as nothing other than owner’s marks. The actual location of the majority of the inscriptions serves as further proof for this conviction. With the exception of H 16 and H 17, where the marks are on the handles, all owners’ graffiti on tableware are on the bottom or underside of the article (H 3-4, H 10, H 15, H 18-19, H 22, H 24-25, H 30-31). Amphorae by contrast, as a rule reused as storage jars at the settlement, invariably bear their marks of ownership on the lower part of the neck or on the shoulder (H 5-9, H 11-14, H 20-21, H 23, H 26, H 33(a)). Several non-verbal graffiti in the form of simple crosses on amphora necks from Heraklea and Chersonesos which are included in the ‘Varia’ category (H 77-78, possibly also H 38(a)) can probably also be interpreted as owners’ marks. The cross, being one of the most elementary and widespread signs, served to meet the need of an owner for individualisation of his vessel at a fairly early period. Well-known examples are the vessels of the late Bronze Age from Bogazköy and with crosses. In the 6th-4th centuries B.C. the cross, as an owner’s mark, is represented in abundance e.g. on Phrygian ware from Gordium. As L. Roller states, the practice of using signs and symbols as owners’ marks was at its most widespread in Gordium during the period of the hegemony and independence of the Phrygian and Lydian kingdoms, as well as during the Achaemenid domination in Anatolia, while the decreases of this practice, from the second half of the 4th century B.C., coincided with the rise of Greek influence here. In this connection, it seems tempting to propose that crosslike marks on amphorae from U6 may have served as the marks of ownership of an illiterate or a non-Greek. We may compare here the ‘signatures’ of illiterate Russians in the first years of the Soviet government. It is also of interest to note that both the crosslike marks (H 77-78) were found within the area near the gate. However, it need hardly be said that these marks may well have had some quite different origin.

It is of course natural to suppose that the overwhelming majority of the owner’s graffiti (except for the marks H 27 and H 29 on the above-mentioned astragali, which served for spooling threads) contain abbreviations of masculine personal names. However, notwithstanding the fairly large number of graffiti included in the present group, the actual total of names represented by them is rather small. The names, of varying degrees of completeness, enable us to identify the following individuals: Ἀρτεις, Ἀρτε, Λέγεται, Εὐφοῖ, Ἰρακέφ, Ἐρακέφ, Θεόκτιστος, Θεοκτίστος, Θεοκτίστκε, Λεγεται, Ευφοῖ, Ἰρακέφ, Ἐρακέφ, of which Ἐρακέφ is the most frequent. Taking into account the fairly long period of occupation of the house, these names must have belonged to at least two generations of inmates.

Mapping of the inscriptions that make up the group under consideration shows that their distribution throughout the area of the building is extremely irregular. The main concentra-
tion of graffiti is in the rooms of the south-western range, which is cut by the gate into two almost symmetrical household blocks. Moreover, the contiguous rooms 13, 16, 17, and 18, located to the north-west of the gate, are given a certain special unity by the find there of three inscriptions (H 15, H 17, and H 33(a)) all bearing the same initial ‘Ε’, under which name of the master of this household is undoubtedly concealed. Two dipinti (H 61 and H 63) with the same abbreviation and also from room 13, offer additional evidence in favour of this supposition. On the other hand, the almost total absence of inscriptions from the rooms in the rest of the house is striking. The only exception is room 3 in the north-western range. It probably served as a storeroom for collective use.6 In the store there were 37 amphorae of which 30, including 15 with stamps, were from Chersonesos. Six amphorae-graffiti, showing abbreviations of at least three different owners’ names, come from this room (H 5, H 7-9, H 21, and H 23).

See also H 35(a), H 36, H 40(a), H 77-78.


H 6. U6 well, no. 11. 1977. Pl. 150. Fragment from neck and shoulder of Chersonesean transport amphora. Graffito on shoulder: faint and carelessly executed. Height of mark: 2.5 cm. 320-270 B.C.:

H 7. U6 room 3. Find list 6/2. 1969. Chersonesean transport amphora Ad 10 stamped with the mark of the astynomos Dioskourides (AE 52a). The jar belongs to the type Monachov 1989, I.B. VI. Its places stamps of Dioskourides in group 1B,7 which enables us to date the vessel to 300-285 B.C. Publication of the jar: Kac and Monachov 1977, 99, fig. 2; 6, Monachov 1980, no. 30; Brainskij 1984, 202, no. 14; Monachov 1989, 147, no. 26, pl. 6; Monachov 1999a, 498, pl. 211, 7 Graffito on lower part of neck. 300-270 B.C.:

Of the names so beginning, only ΑΠΙΩΡΙΕΩΣ found twice in inscriptions of the 4th-early 3rd century B.C. from Chersonesos (NEPCh II 135, 172 = F5390F F 710. Cp. G.40X 241) need be considered. The amphora, of which the measured capacity was 19.25 l, contained grain, of Appendix IV.


The same individual as in H 7. The earliest date of the inscription results from the dating of the stamp, which belongs to group 1A according to VI. Kac’s classification.8 Because of the possible reuse of the amphora, it cannot be ruled out that the graffito was made much later than the vessel itself.


This graffito is not only similar to H 8 but also comes from the same room. This fact allows us to suppose here an abbreviation of the name of the same individual, and to date both inscriptions accordingly.

H 10. U6 well, no. 231. 1977 + U6 courtyard, V-2. Pls. 150 and 156. Two adjoining sherds from foot of brown-glazed kantharos (B 75). Graffito on underside. Height of letter: 1.0 cm. 300-270 B.C.:

Of the names so beginning, only ΑΠΙΩΡΙΕΩΣ found twice in inscriptions of the 4th-early 3rd century B.C. from Chersonesos (NEPCh II 135, 172 = F5390F F 710. Cp. G.40X 241) need be considered. The amphora, of which the measured capacity was 19.25 l, contained grain, of Appendix IV.


B( )
as well as on the stone louterion of Pavlenkov and in this part of the building leave no doubt that it is an abbreviation of the owner’s name.


320-270 B.C.: E

H 14a. U6 room 12. Find list 6/10a. 1971. Pls. 150 and 156. Fragmentary transport amphora (Ad 87). Mediterranean atelier. Clay light brown, micaceous. Main dimensions: H 82.0 cm, H*: 8.0 cm, H0: 34.0 cm, H1: 22.0 cm, D: 43.0 cm, d: 8.4 cm. The capacity of the jar is 38.16 l. Fragmentary graffito on shoulder. Height of letter: c. 3.5 cm.

320-270 BC: E

Owner’s mark. Perhaps the same individual as H 13-17, H 33(a).


Second half of 4th cent. B.C.: E


325-270 B.C.: E


325-270 B.C.: E

The numerous repetitions of the sign both on tableware and on amphorae from different production centres found only in this part of the building leave no doubt that it is an abbreviation of the owner’s name.


325-270 B.C.: E (ligature)

Possibly (b) was scratched by a different hand. Probably these are the names of two successive owners (father and son?).


320-270 B.C.: H

Cf. graffito H 20, which resembles this one. However, in view of the fact that the horizontal of the stt is not complete and the semicircle of the is incised less deeply than the vertical lines, it is possible that the inscription is an adaptation of a price mark, i.e. 1 drachm and 1 obol.


320-270 B.C.: H

Cf. dipinti H 65-67.
Fragment from neck of Chersonesean transport amphora. Graffito on lower part. Height of letters: 1.8 cm.
320-270 B.C.: Ηποστ (H and P in ligature)
The ligature is drawn so lightly that it is wholly discernible only under a binocular magnifier.

Foot of a black-glazed kantharos (B 24). D. 5.2 cm. Rose clay; lustrous black glaze. Graffito on underside – in the centre of the base and on the vault of the foot. Height of letters: 0.4-1.4 cm. The specimen is less than half the size of the other letters.
320-270 B.C.: 
(a) [ ] II
(b) H
\( \text{Π} \) (ligature)
The graffito (a) undoubtedly comprised the initial letters of the former owner’s name which were later thoroughly scratched out. Judging by the dimensions of the final size the initial inscription consisted of approximately 3-4 letters. When re-marking the vessel (b) the new owner intended to begin the inscription at the very centre of the bottom. Having noted, however, that there was not enough space he crossed out the initial et and executed the signature in complete form nearby.

Fragment of Sinopean (?) transport amphora. Graffito on neck. Height of letters: 0.3-1.2 cm.
320-270 B.C.: Θπετ (ligature)

Гретти и Дипинті

Profiled foot of a black-glazed kantharos (B 67). Dull glaze. A hole of truncated-cone shape in the middle of the foot indicates its reuse as a spindle wheel. Graffito on underside of foot. Height of letters: 0.7-1.1 cm.
c. 320-310 B.C.: Θπετ (ligature)

Judging by the large size of the specimen, the inscription was made while the vessel was still complete. For the personal name of the Chersonesean compounds Θπετ-κλατ (and Θπετ-κατ) (JOSPEF 403 A, 8 = SEG XL 615 A, 12-13; third quarter of 3rd cent. B.C.).

Brown-glazed salt celliar (B 129). H. 4 cm, D. of rim 5.8 cm. Graffito on underside of ring foot. Height of letters: 0.5-0.7 cm. Find spot: beside H 2.
300-270 B.C.: Θπετ (ligature)

Neck sherd of a transport amphora with graffito. Height of mark: 1.9 cm.
320-270 B.C.: Κες (monogram)

Astragalus with graffito. Νυσ συδ, represented here according to drawing in the find list.
300-270 B.C.: Α (ligature)

Probably an abbreviation of owner’s name (a child?).

Fragment from neck of Chersonesean (?) transport amphora. Graffito on lower part of neck. Height of letters: 1.0-1.2 cm.
320-270 B.C.: Νετ (ligature)

Abbreviation of personal name (IPN), such as Νικηδαλδικς, Νικηδαλδικς et sim., which are well known in the Chersonesean onomasticon.

A large astragalus with ground surfaces; used as a spooling reel. Νυσ συδ, represented here according to the find list.
300-270 B.C.: ιι (ligature)

Perhaps an abbreviation of owner’s name (a woman?)

Pierced fragment from floor of a black-glazed open vessel, decorated with stamped palmettes (B 165). Graffito on underside. Height of letter: 0.9 cm.
320-270 B.C.: Πετ (ligature)


Salt celliar and ring foot from massive fish plate (B 222). Dull, grey slip. The fragment was reused as a lamp (see H 11). A socket for the wick has been cut into the wall of the salt compartment; the edge is covered with spot. Graffito on underside of ring foot. Height of letters varies from 0.1 to 1.4 cm. Find spot: on the floor.
350-325 B.C.: Πος (ligature)

The fact of the vessel’s reuse and the squat shape of the orifice with its broad ‘gate’ seem to justify the early dating of the inscription. Possibly, the PN is of the type of Ποσόντατος (cf. Amoch in 1877, no. 95; early 3rd cent. B.C.), or something similar beginning with Ποσόντατος.
2B. Public Ownership

Here there is only one inscription (H 32) to be commented upon. As in the case of numerous graffiti in the preceding section, the reconstruction of a PN, of the type Δαμός της, Δαμός της, and sim., might be considered a possibility. However, the unusually large size of the dish suggests, rather, its use for public feasts – making it similar to numerous finds of tableware with the abbreviation δήμους from the Athenian Agora. I would also refer to an example from Korinth where the inscription δήμους appears on an oinochoe shoulder;14 a similar graffito (ΔΕΜΟΣΙΟΣ) on a kylix base from excavations at Polychrono in the Chalcidice15 is dated to the first half of the 5th century B.C. In the northern Black Sea area in general, graffiti designating public property dating to the 6-5th centuries are known from Berezan. In 1968-1970 a series of inscriptions ΠΟΛΕΩΣ, and ΠΟΛΕΩΣ on polis-owned black-glazed pottery dating to 525-475 was found during excavation of the gymnasium in Olbia. But among the entire assemblage of Chersonesean epigraphy, the graffito from Panskoye published here as yet the only inscription of its kind – though in the ‘public domain’ one can point to stamps ΔΑΜΟΣΙΟΣ on amphorae from Chersonesos dated by V.I. Kac to the end of 4th – beginning of the 3rd century B.C.;18 probably these amphorae were produced in public ergasteria. Recently Yu.G. Vinogradov related one other graffito to this group – an example on the foot of a black-glazed kantharos found in grave MO 47 in the necropolis of Panskoye I. On studying the photograph of this graffito he read it as δήμος της πολεοδομίας (‘Gefäß des Volkes aus der Stadt’).20 However, a de visu examination of the inscription, which is preserved in IIMK RAS, leaves no doubt that Vinogradov misread an ‘inverted’ kappa what is actually an upsilon with the glaze peeled off to the left of its vertical hasta. Hence, the graffito should be read as the gen. of a personal name with patronymic: Δημο( ) Εύπολ(ε).

3. Numerical and Commercial Marks (H 33-72)

3A. Indications of Capacity

Only six inscriptions have been included in this group. All the marks of this type are found on amphorae, and are represented exclusively by graffiti executed at the base of the neck or on the shoulder of the vessels. For the most part, we have nothing more than small fragments; however, in just two cases (H 33 and H 34) completely preserved amphorae of Chersonesean and Rhodian manufacture are available to us, and the actual capacity of these two specimens was of course measured and used for interpretation of all the graffiti.

Although various methods of marking have been identified in our inscriptions, they are all based on the acrophonic-numeric system. In one case (H 33), we encounter a recording method that combines acrophonic numerals with simple strokes to designate the number of unit-measures fewer than five and their fractions. Another method is represented by a com-
combination of acrophonic numerals (with an indication of the number of basic unit-measures) and acrophonic signs of the fractional units. Of these fractional units, possibly aryster (H 35) and oxybaphon (?)(H 36) may be reconstructed.

A comparison of the true capacity of the completely preserved amphorae with the marks inscribed on them shows that the capacity of these vessels was calculated up to the rim, using dry measures – choinix – as the main units. This fact possibly indicates that the capacity inscriptions were made in connection with the secondary use of the amphorae; that is, for storing grain – as confirmed by the find of a Chersonesian amphora containing rye and wheat in room 3 (H 7, find list 6/2; see also Appendix IV). And this supposition would also explain the fact that, notwithstanding the known engagement in agricultural production at house U6, pithoi, which were traditionally used for storing grain are practically absent from the material from the house.22 Moreover, the measuring of a great quantity of ware carried out by S.Yu. Monachov23 seems to confirm the use of the choinix in calculating amphora capacity standards in Hellenistic Chersonesos.24 This fact would find its logical explanation in the supposition that amphora production in the city was directed not only towards the needs of the wine trade but also towards the transportation of grain.


c. 325-300 B.C.: (a) R I] = ΔΔΔΔ

For the date of H 13. The vessel was found along with 17 other amphorae from a burnt-down foodstore originally located above room 13. It is in this part of house U6 that the fire was at its fiercest. This circumstance as well as the runnels of greasy soot discernible on the inner surface of most of the pots have led to the inference that E in the present case designates their contents: E[khos].25 Accordingly, the second graffito was interpreted as indicating either the price26 or the volume of the stored stuff; 27 and, taking into account that the capacity of the amphora is 31.43 l., the numerical mark (b) most probably indicates the capacity of the vessel: 29 choinix and 2 λαθυρί. If this supposition is correct then we have for the Chersonesian owner a value of about 1.065 l: that is, slightly less than the volume of the corresponding Attic unit. However, the supposition that there existed a local standard of capacity in Chersonesos demands further verification on the basis of a much larger body of material which, for the present, is not available to us.

Moreover, the isolated stipple on the opposite side of the vessel is quite probably not an indication of its contents. Repetition of this mark not only on amphorae but also on tableware and stone objects found in this part of U6 suggests an abbreviation of the name of a single individual, i.e. the householder.


H 63.0 cm; H. of upper part 32.9 cm, D. of body 42.0 cm, D. of rim (estim.) 9.0 cm. Graffito on shoulder. Publication of the jar: Monachov 1999, 501, pl. 214, 5.

300-270 B.C.: ΔΔΔΔ

Like graffito H 33(b), this is probably an indication of the vessel’s capacity: 30 choinix. If we are justified in proposing that a choinix, or some related local unit of about 1.065 l. was the basis of the measuring system, then the capacity must have been 32 l. The capacity of the amphora calculated on the basis of its reconstructed parameters according to Heron’s formula for ‘pithoide’ ([11/14 × H + (DSEG)²/2]) is 32.18 l. This value is close to the similar standard capacity established for ‘proto-Rhodian’ amphorae28 and considerably exceeds that of later Rhodian amphorae.29


c. 325-300 B.C.: ±ΔΔΔΔ

The mark designated 20, or if there is in fact one character missing at the break, 30, choinixes and 2 smaller units of which the name is concealed under abbreviation ‘Α: this should possibly be understood as a term ἀρύστηρ, attested by Herodotus (Hdt. II, 168) and Alcaeus (Alc. fr. 58, 9 Voigt, Cd. Callim. fr. 178, 17 Pfeiffer, EM 151, 2) as a liquid measure. It seems from Herodotus that aryster was the East Greek or Ionian equivalent of the Attic ἁλύσθης.30 Hesychius also relates it to λάθυρος (Hesych. A 756a: ἀρύστηρ- of ὀρόστηριον ἀρόστηριον). In addition to certain previously identified examples,31 aryster as a measure of volume may be reconstructed in the case of several numerical marks on pithoi from the settlement of Chaika: Δ[ ] Α | (complete? C 89 7960; Jeremenkov 1998, 74 and note 12). Δ[ ] Α [ – ] G (GCAC 274, 24 cm. B.C.); Δ[ ] Α [ – ] G (GCAC 271, ΔΑΔΑΔΑΔ) (GCAC 278).
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3B. PRICE MARKS

As well as graffiti H 39-41 listed below as price marks, this group can be taken to include H 44(b) and possibly H 19, which are discussed in other sections. The extremely small amount of material considered here naturally precludes us from any possible general conclusions. Unfortunately, it is not certain in every case whether the price indicated is that of the single vessel on which it appears or that of a whole consignment of similar ware. Therefore I shall limit myself to comments within the individual catalogue entries.


320-270 B.C.: [ΔΩ]

As in all the graffiti of this type from house U6 the drachm sign is incised lightly but legibly. However, 1 drachm could not have been the price of a single kantharos, which must have cost much less. Possibly, the mark indicates the price of a consignment of similar vessels; their number, in contrast to the graffiti published by M. Lang (1976, E13), is not specified. Cf. [ΔΩ] the base of a red-figured skyphos dating to the first half of the 4th century B.C. from Chersonesos34 and the graffito on a black-glazed saucer from Theodosia.35 In the light of a series of graffiti presented by Johnston,36 where the price starts with [ΔΩ], it might be supposed that in our case too alpha was associated with the drachm sign, e.g. as the Doric form of the symbol used for designating the half denominations, i.e. α αὐτοὶ διπλοὶ, διπλαὶ ὀξυβάφον etc. i.e. associated with the drachm sign, e.g. as the Doric form of the symbol used for designating the half denominations, i.e. α αὐτοὶ διπλοὶ, διπλαὶ ὀξυβάφον etc. However, the fact that the letter is curved some distance away from [ΔΩ] and somewhat deeper suggests that it may have been added later, as an abbreviation of the owner’s name.

H 39-41 B.C.: [ΔΩ]

H 39-41 B.C.: [ΔΩ]


300-270 B.C.: (a) [Α] (at one side) (b) [Δ] (at other side)

As in all the graffiti of this type from house U6 the drachm sign is incised lightly but legibly. However, 1 drachm could not have been the price of a single kantharos, which must have cost much less. Possibly, the mark indicates the price of a consignment of similar vessels; their number, in contrast to the graffiti published by M. Lang (1976, E13), is not specified. Cf. [ΔΩ] the base of a red-figured skyphos dating to the first half of the 4th century B.C. from Chersonesos34 and the graffito on a black-glazed saucer from Theodosia.35 In the light of a series of graffiti presented by Johnston,36 where the price starts with α αὐτοὶ διπλοὶ it might be supposed that in our case too α όϕεις was associated with the drachm sign, e.g. as the Doric form of the symbol used for designating the half denominations, i.e. α αὐτοὶ διπλοὶ, διπλαὶ ὀξυβάφον etc. i.e. associated with the drachm sign, e.g. as the Doric form of the symbol used for designating the half denominations, i.e. α αὐτοὶ διπλοὶ, διπλαὶ ὀξυβάφον etc. However, the fact that the letter is curved some distance away from [ΔΩ] and somewhat deeper suggests that it may have been added later, as an abbreviation of the owner’s name.

320-270 B.C.: [ΔΩ]

Judging by the proportions of the vessel we may suppose the loss of a further delta, i.e. δΔΩ.


320-270 B.C.: [ΔΩ]


320-270 B.C.: [ΔΩ]


320-270 B.C.: [ΔΩ]


320-270 B.C.: [ΔΩ]

GRAFFITI AND DIPINTI

Fragmentary, probably Attic, black-glazed plate with thickened rim and ring foot (B 152). Restored with plaster. Traces of ancient repair. Graffito on outer surface near the foot. The incision is neat and easily legible. Height of mark: 0.5 cm. 320-300 B.C.: Ι

Traces of fierce burning on inside of neck. Graffito on neck. Height of marks: 2.0-2.5 cm. 320-270 B.C.: \(\text{C}/\text{g}51\)

As in H 40 it is difficult to accept the drachma sign on the plate as a price for an individual piece. Most likely we should see it as a price indication for a fixed set of probably similar shapes.

Fragment from neck of Chersonesean transport amphora. Traces of fierce burning on inside of neck. Graffito on neck. Height of marks: 2.0-2.5 cm. 320-270 B.C.: \(\text{C}/\text{g}51\)

The peculiar semicircle frequently reported as the hemiobol sign would suggest that the graffito was a price mark. The vertical line to its right probably corresponds to a smaller denomination, i.e. chalcon. Such a low price – 1 hemiobol and 1 chalcon – can hardly be related to any contents but is rather the cost of the empty jar intended for reuse. In urban centres with their own established ceramic production, the price of such goods must have been considerably lower. Thus, e.g. in Athens in the late 5th century, 21 empty amphorae, though possibly smaller and of poorer quality than the specimen represented by our fragment, were sold at a total price of 3 obols. 39

3C. CLIENT NAMES

‘Client names’ constitute the third and most numerous group within our category of Numerical and Commercial Marks. Although one never meets a section so called in any of the existing classifications of Greek ceramic inscriptions, a series of facts revealed through comparison of various items in the epigraphic collection from U6 suggest the proposed interpretation of the material grouped together here.

All inscriptions in this group are dipinti on amphorae. And most of these [H 42-59, H 63-65, H 68, H 70-71] appear on pottery of Chersonesean manufacture. Two of the marks, however, were found on amphorae from Sinope (H 66 and H 69); one on each of the amphorae from Thasos (H 61) and that of the Solokha-I type (H 60); and three on vessels of unidentified origin (H 62, H 67, and H 72).

The location of the inscriptions on the vessels does not show much diversity. In all cases the dipinti are drawn on the lower part of the neck or occasionally on the shoulder of amphorae, but, since there is no marked transition between these two areas, they may be taken as the same position. The direction of writing is always parallel to the rim. The dipinti are mostly extremely laconic, being intended for persons who were anyway perfectly familiar with their purpose. Only in one case (H 60) does the record consist of more than three signs. As with owners’ marks, the letters often form ligatures: A and P (H 44), H and P (H 65-67), II and P (H 71). The paint used for writing varies from light to dark red in colour. The height of the letters as well as the breadth of the lines (i.e. the brush-strokes) also vary from inscription to inscription in the range 1.3 to 5.0 cm and 1.5 to 4.0 mm respectively. In some cases these objective criteria, along with the style of writing, enable us not only to identify certain groups of marks associated by time of execution and author but also to distinguish the work of at least three or four different writers overall.

The lack of studies on amphora dipinti from other sites 40 and, in our case, the additional problems created by the fragmentary state or simple brevity of the texts (often consisting of just one letter) are factors that make their interpretation difficult and open the way for widely differing explanations. Thus B. Böttger and D. B. Selov 41 having studied more than 3000 dipinti of the late antique period from Tanais proposed the following list of information which may have been inserted in the inscriptions:

1. For transportation and sale:
   a) the nature of the amphora contents;
   b) the quality and/or origin of the contents;
c) the volume and/or weight of the contents;
d) capacity and/or weight of the empty amphora;
e) name of the owner or seller of the goods.

2. For storing:
   a) owner’s name;
b) the volume and/or weight of the contents;
c) enumeration of the stored goods;
d) designation of contents substituted for original contents of the amphora;

In our case the range of possible interpretations must be much narrower. Firstly, the possibility of any connection between the marks and contents of the vessels is to be rejected. As mentioned above, the overwhelming majority of the marked ware comes from ceramic workshops in Chersonesos. Even boldest imagination would hardly suppose that the range of goods imported in this ware could have been so great as to explain the diversity of the inscriptions preserved. The same may be said concerning the possible indication of the provenance, volume, or age of the goods [most often wine]. Considering the rather strict standardisation of transport amphorae, which often bear the stamps of successive, annually-serving astynomoi, any additional record of that kind would seem superfluous. Our arguments are confirmed in particular by the presence of identical marks on vessels of different capacity and contents (H 61 and H 63-64, H 65 and H 66), and by the absence of parallels to our dipinti at other settlements in the Chersonesos or in Chersonesos itself. Still less tenable would be a proposal that the dipinti constitute some kind of numerical record.

A key to understanding the inscriptions of this group is the supposition that they are abbreviations of the personal names of inmates of house U6. A comparison of the dipinti with the list of owners’ graffiti (H 3-31, above) seems to corroborate this hypothesis. The painted inscriptions in fact point to the same circle of individuals already known to us from the owners’ marks: Αρτ(ήριο) (H 44), B(ήριο) (H 45-55), Εὐφρ(ένιο) (H 61-64), Ἡρ(ήνιο) (H 65-67), Θεσ(ένιο) (H 68), Πήρ(ένιο) (H 71), etc. Identical marks, albeit made by different means, are found sometimes in the same room or household unit (Εὐφρ(ένιο) – Εὐφρ(ένιο) in room 13, Θεσ(ένιο) – Θεσ(ένιο) in room 5). Moreover, as in the case of the graffiti, it can hardly be mere chance that B(ήριο), Εὐφρ(ένιο), and Ἡρ(ήνιο) are represented in the majority of the inscriptions.

However, it would be a mistake to lump together both these groups according to their function and to see the difference only in the technique. Dipinti, which by their nature would have been thought of as only temporary, were intended for merely utilitarian purposes. Unlike graffiti, they would not have been sufficiently effective and durable as owners’ marks, being easily removed; and it is for that reason that we do not find dipinti being used in this, or any other, way on the table- and household ware from U6. What, then can explain the same repertory of names in inscriptions on both of the groups?

The only interpretation consistent with the facts seems to be to consider the dipinti as commercial records, and the abbreviations and sigilli appearing on amphorae as a means of labelling the goods according to the customers’ names. That wine came to Panskoye not only as a retail item but also in wholesale lots has already been convincingly proved by A.N. Šeglov on the basis of amphora stamps from two storerooms in U6.42 One further argument in favour of our hypothesis is the series of dipinti of the same type, executed by the same hand and possibly at the same time. It must be said, however, that the commercial transaction identified in connection with house U6 is the first instance of a sale based on remote ordering of goods that we know of.43 Depending on the extent to which the trading network had developed, the consignments of wine or other goods [including imports] transported in amphorae could be collected both from Chersonesos proper and from the neighbouring seaports such as Kalos Limen or Kerkinitis.
Graffiti and Dipinti 239

Fragments of Chersonesean transport amphora. Dipinto in red on lower part of neck. Not read; represented here according to drawing in the find list.
320-270 B.C.: A( )

Neck fragment of Chersonesean transport amphora. Dipinto in red. Height of letter: 2.5 cm; breadth of brush-stroke: 0.3 cm.
320-270 B.C.: A( )

Neck fragment of Chersonesean transport amphora. Light brown clay; lime and pyroxene particles. Dipinto in red on lower part of neck (a). To right, nearby, graffito (b).
Height of dipinto: 4.5 cm; breadth of brush-stroke: 0.5 cm.
320-270 B.C.: a) 'Ap( ) (ligature)
   b) ( )

The repetition of this ligature as a graffito too suggests here the initials of some inmate of the farmhouse. Cf. H 10 and H 12. Less tenable seems the supposition that the abbreviation indicated the quality of the wine: 'difpɔ̂ ας - 'the best', 'fist-rate', or ογγαρος - 'old', seasoned wine.

Mark (b) is of later origin and possibly indicates the price of the empty amphora: 1 obol sign (cf. Lang 1976, 22 E 4; Johnston 1978, 222 f., 1979, Type 14 F, 15 E, fig. 12c; Scheibler 1995, 147, Abb. 129).

Fragment from neck of Chersonesean transport amphora. Dipinto in red on lower part. Height of letter: 3.1 cm; breadth of brush-stroke: 0.4 cm.
320-270 B.C.: B( )

The handwriting differs from that of similar letters made with a broad brush on other vessels. For the mark as well for all the whole series of B/BIC dipinti compare H 11-12.

Neck sherd of Chersonesean transport amphora. Dipinto in red. Height of letter: 3.4 cm; breadth of brush-stroke: 0.3-0.4 cm.
320-270 B.C.: B( )

Neck fragment of small Chersonesean amphora. Presumably similar to Monachov 1989, Type II. Dipinto in red on lower part of neck. Height of letter: c. 5.6 cm; breadth of brush-stroke: c. 0.8 cm.
320-270 B.C.: B( )

Neck fragment of Chersonesean transport amphora. Dipinto in red on lower part of neck. Estimated height of letter: c. 3.0 cm; breadth of brush-stroke: 0.4 cm.
320-270 B.C.: B( )

Fragment of small Chersonesean amphora. Presumably similar to Monachov 1989, Type II. Remains of dipinto in red on lower part of neck. Estimated height of letter: c. 4.0 cm; breadth of brush-stroke: 0.6 cm.
320-270 B.C.: B( )

Small fragment from neck of Chersonesean transport amphora. Dipinto in red. Height of letter: c. 4.0 cm; breadth of brush-stroke: 0.3-0.4 cm.
320-270 B.C.: B( )

Neck sherd of Chersonesean transport amphora. Remains of dipinto in red. Estimated height of letter: c. 3.5 cm; breadth of brush-stroke: 0.4 cm.
320-270 B.C.: B( )

Neck fragment of Chersonesean transport amphora. Dipinto in red. Height of letters: 2.2-3.0 cm; breadth of brush-stroke: 0.3-0.4 cm.
320-270 B.C.: BIC

The inscription may be read as an abbreviation either of a single name (cf, e.g., Chersonesean Bερβής44) or of a name with patronymic – i.e. B( ) ι[ε]ν( ). However, the rarity of names beginning with Bερ – as well as the example of H 69, in which ι[ε]ν( ) is inadmissible, inspire more enthusiasm for the latter reading.

Small fragment from neck of Chersonesean transport amphora. Remains of dipinto in red. Breadth of brush-stroke: c. 0.6 cm.
320-270 B.C.: BIC

See H 52.

Neck fragment of Chersonesean transport amphora, with dipinto in red on lower part. Height of letters: 4.0 cm; breadth of brush-stroke: 0.4 cm.
320-270 B.C.: B( )

This dipinto seems to be analogous to H 53-54 – as suggest-ed by the colour of the paint, the breadth of the brush-stroke, and the shape of the letters. Presumably an abbrevi-a-tion of a name with patronymic, i.e. B( ) ι[ε]ν( ). For ι[ε]ν( ) compare H 69.
H 55. U6 room 3. Find list 6/73. 1969. Pls. 154 and 159. Fragment from shoulder and neck of Chersonesian transport amphora. Remains of dipinto in red. Height of letters: c. 4.0 cm; breadth of brush-stroke: 0.6 cm.

320-270 B.C.: BI]

H 56. U6 courtyard, VG-2, 3 [5]. 1971. Pls. 154 and 159. Neck fragment of small Chersonesian amphora like H 47 and H 49. Dipinto in red on lower part of neck. Height of letters: c. 3.0 cm; breadth of brush-stroke: 0.3 cm.

320-270 B.C.: IC

Cf. H 52-55, also H 69.


320-270 B.C.: IC

Cf. H 52-55, also H 69.


320-270 B.C.: IC

Cf. H 52-55, also H 69.


320-270 B.C.: IC

Cf. H 52-55, also H 69.

H 60. U6 courtyard, DE-6. Find list 17/50. 1972. Pls. 154 and 159. Fragmentary transport amphora with the mushroom-shaped rim (Ad 89). Upper part with both handles is preserved. Dimensions: H. preserve: 24.3 cm; H. of upper part c. 23.0 cm; H. of neck 13.5 cm; D. of body c. 34.0 cm; D. of rim 8.5 cm. Clay yellowish with many inclusions of mica. Dipinto in red on neck. Height of letters: 2.0-3.0 cm; breadth of brush-stroke: 0.2 cm.

325-270 B.C.: ONCII

The inscription starts from near the handle and can thus hardly be a mistake for Δήλων. Cf. H 36. If the inscription is preserved completely, then an abbreviation of a name and patronymic: e.g. Ὠνοματζέας [Δήλων Ονόματεος κοινός] [Il. 3, 246: ἰταλέος οὗτος]. However, in view of absence of any parallels at other sites in the Chersonesian chora, the later hypothesis seems less tenable.


320-270 B.C.: E[ ]


320-270 B.C.: E[ ]

Of the second letter only the lower part of the vertical stroke is preserved. Cf. the next item and graffiti H 13-18.

H 64. U6 room 3. Find list 6/75. 1969. Pl. 155. Fragment of Chersonesian (?) transport amphora. Dipinto in red on lower part of neck. Height of letters: 0.8-1.1 cm; breadth of brush-stroke: 0.15 cm.

320-270 B.C.: E[ ]

Most probably this represents a client’s name, e.g. ἴταλεος, ἰταλέος, not infrequently attested in Chersonesus, or ἰταλέος, οὗτος, with the second element beginning with ϕ. In the light of Hesychius’ gloss: ἰταλέος, ἰταλέος, we might also suppose this abbreviation to indicate that the amphora contained sweet wine. Cf. Il. 3, 246: ἰταλέος οὗτος. However, in view of absence of any parallels at other sites in the Chersonesian chora, the later hypothesis seems less tenable.

H 65. U6 courtyard, VG-2, 3. 1971. Pl. 155. Neck fragment of Chersonesian transport amphora. Light brown clay; no visible temper. Dipinto in red. Height of letters: 2.7 cm; breadth of brush-stroke: 0.3-0.4 cm.

320-270 B.C.: ‘’伊ταλέος’’ (ligature)

320-270 B.C.:  
Small neck fragment of a transport amphora. Dipinto in red. Height of letter: 1.3 cm; breadth of brush-stroke: 0.2 cm.

320-270 B.C.:  
Fragment from neck of Chersonesean (?) transport amphora. Reddish brown clay; lime particles. There is a streak of burnt stuff on the inside of the neck. Dipinto in red on shoulder. Height of letters: 1.8 cm; breadth of brush-stroke: 0.4 cm.

320-270 B.C.:  
Fragment from neck and shoulder of Sinopean (?) transport amphora. Remains of dipinto in red.

320-270 B.C.:  
Chersonesean transport amphora Ad 13. Type Monachov 1989, I-B. The capacity of the vessel is 19.60 l. Dipinto in red on neck. Height of letter: 2.3 cm; breadth of brush-stroke: 0.2 cm. Publications: Kac and Monachov 1977, 96, fig. 4; Monachov 1980, 164, fig. 5, cat. no. 32; 1989, 111, pl. V, 23, 1999a, 499, pl. 212, 3.

320-270 B.C.:  
Small neck fragment of Chersonesean transport amphora. Remains of dipinto in red. Estimated height of mark: c 2.0 cm; breadth of brush-stroke: 0.3 cm.

320-270 B.C.:  

320-270 B.C.:  

320-270 B.C.:  
Neck fragment of a transport amphora. Light brown clay; lime particles. Traces of fierce burning on the inside. Dipinto in red on lower part of neck. Height of mark: 2.2 cm; breadth of brush-stroke: 0.3 cm.

4. VARIA (H 73-79)

The category ‘varia’ is composed of those inscriptions that it was not possible to assign to any of the preceding categories. With the exception of graffito H 79 on the bottom of a black-glazed bowl these are marks scratched or painted on amphorae.

Fragment from neck of Sinopean transport amphora. Dipinto in red on lower part of neck. Height of letters: 1.5 cm; breadth of brush-stroke: 0.2 cm.

320-270 B.C.:  

320-270 B.C.:  
Chersonesean transport amphora Ad 13. Type Monachov 1989, I-B. The capacity of the vessel is 19.60 l. Dipinto in red on neck. Height of letter: 2.3 cm; breadth of brush-stroke: 0.2 cm. Publications: Kac and Monachov 1977, 96, fig. 4; Monachov 1980, 164, fig. 5, cat. no. 32; 1989, 111, pl. V, 23, 1999a, 499, pl. 212, 3.

320-270 B.C.:  
Small neck fragment of Chersonesean transport amphora. Remains of dipinto in red. Estimated height of mark: c 2.0 cm; breadth of brush-stroke: 0.3 cm.

320-270 B.C.:  

4. VARIA (H 73-79)

The category ‘varia’ is composed of those inscriptions that it was not possible to assign to any of the preceding categories. With the exception of graffito H 79 on the bottom of a black-glazed bowl these are marks scratched or painted on amphorae.
Neck fragment of Sinopean transport amphora. Remains of dipinto (lower part of vertical hasta) in red.

Neck sherd of Herakleian transport amphora. Graffito on lower part of neck. Height of mark: 3.2 cm.

320-270 B.C.: cross  
Marks of such a kind could be employed for a number of different purposes, and it is not impossible that they served as ownership marks for some illiterate proprietors (cf. Private ownership section, above). An identical mark (H 78) was found near the gate.

Fragment from neck and shoulder of Chersonesean transport amphora. Graffito on shoulder. Height of mark: 2.3 cm.

320-270 B.C.: cross  
Cf. H 77. During the drawing of the horizontal, the point of the spike evidently slipped and made an irregular line which was then retouched more accurately.


300-270 B.C.: K(?)/ or Φ(?).  
A. Johnston places such signs among trademarks (cf. Johnston 1979, 85, Type 32 A, IV). However, their meaning remains rather unclear. In our graffito H 79 the horizontal strokes are not parallel, however. Joining on the left of the vertical, they diverge at a slight angle on its right. This gives some grounds to suppose a καππα here, and to consider it as the initial of one of the inmate’s names (cf. H 26). For comparison we may refer to a graffito on a black-glazed jug from the settlement of Chaika (unpublished, inventory no. Ch. 66/572) in which the lateral hastae of the καππα form an angle of 15° and join at the left of the vertical. Also a καππα with practically parallel lateral hastae is known from the legend on the obverse of Kerkinitian coins dating to the turn of the 4th-3rd century B.C. 46

Of similar shape are some marks on vessels from Berezan 47 and Chersonesos (GACh 1620). In the case of GACh 1620, such a sign repeated twice on the base of a single vessel is undoubtedly a variant of φι, for at the second occurrence it is the initial letter of the PN /g77/g64/g68/g58/g92/g84/g60 (cf. GACh 1622: /g77/g64/g68 ( ) where φi has a similar shape. Cf. also Guarducci 1967, 383).

NOTES

6. Ščeglov 1974a, 49; Kac and Monachov 1977, 91, n. 3. B. Böttger and D. B. Ščelov, considering dipinto from Tanais, also noted joint use of storerooms (Böttger and Ščelov 1998, 126/127).
9. Monachov 1989, 142, no. 15. According to A. Ščeglov (Gilević and Ščeglov 1996, 105) the capacity of the amphora is c. 31-32 l.
12. For the name, see esp. Stolba 1996a, 449, no. 15; Tocchas’ev 1997, 380.
13. In the Athenian Agora c. fifty such marks with delta-epsilon ligature have been found (see Talcott 1936, 353 f. with reference to a kylix from the National Museum with an inscription ΔΕΜΟΣΙΑ in full on the underside of the foot; cf. Corbett 1949, 341, no. 138). See also Guarducci 1967, 402.
403, fig. 217; Lang 1976, 51-52, Fa 1-26, Fb 1-3; Roberts 1986, 25, no. 41, fig. 13; Rotroff and Oakley 1992, 36 ff., fig. 21, 147, 160, 169-173, 206, 215-216, 268-269, pl. 53, 268-269. The same ligature occurs also on vases from the Acropolis and possibly from the Pnyx, see Graef and Langlotz 1925-1933, 127 f., nos. 1517, 1523; Davidson and Thompson 1943, 32, nos. 13(?), 15, fig. 15.

16. Jajlenko 1982, 284, no. 30 (Berezan’).
17. Vinogradov 1983, 386; Vinogradov 1989, 62, 63, fig. 4.
18. Kac 1994, 80, 132 Type C, no. 1, pl. CX.
22. The only exceptions are one small vessel of Sinopean manufacture (Ac 3; U6 room 3, Find list 6/1), the capacity of which does not exceed that of a medium-sized Chersonesean amphora, and the single fragment of pithos rim from room 13 (Ac 1).
24. Cf. the graffito on a fragment of 1st cent. B.C. jug neck from the settlement near the village of Mikhailovka. The publishers suppose the mark to be a ‘designation of the volume unit – 3 choes – or designation of price – 3 chalcoi’ (Jemec and Peters 1994, 168, fig. 2, 9). However, the complete jug would have been too small for 3 choes, suggesting that for it too, as in the case of Chersonesean graffiti H 33(b), H 34, H 36, the units of measurement might have been choinikes. Evidence from the Athenian Agora may here be added: tryblion as another name for the choinix appears in two capacity marks on the base of a black-glazed oinochoe and on an amphora neck (Lang 1956, 13, nos. 60-61).
28. Grace 1963, 323, fig. 1, 333 no. 1 (according to the dimensions given by Grace, the capacity of the amphora from the Benaki collection is c. 30 l.); Empereur and Hesnard 1987, 58, pl. 2, 8.
31. Lang 1976, 91 f. L 25 (dipinto on amphora shoulder, 1st cent. A.D.); Johnston 1979, 153 Type 2F, nos. 47-48, 154 Type 4F, nos. 1-5; Vos 1981, 36, fig. 1, pl. 14 C (graffiti on Panathenaic amphorae). Cf. also the graffito on a fragment of a Megarian bowl of the 2nd century B.C. from Tyras, which instead of ημί οψινητηρα [του δεινου] proposed by V.P. Jajlenko ([Jajlenko 1982, 268, n. 23; Yaylenko 1995, 250, no. 13 = SEG XLV 1029), should evidently be read as ημιπροστηθηρα] by analogy with ημικυκλεν, ημικυκλενον, ημικυκλεφρονον, etc. Cf. now also J.G. Vinogradov (SEG XLV ad 1029), who reads in the same sense: ημιπροστηθηρας.
32. For other references on oxybaphon, see Wolf 1995, 353 f., SEG XLV 2345.
34. GACA 548. Less probable is the reading proposed by Solomonik: 20 drachms.
35. Stern 1897, 29, no. 84, pl. III.
36. Johnston 1979, 18C, 59 and 63, fig. 6b-c; 24F, 2, fig. 13m; fig. 14t.
37. Possibly the same applies to the inscription on a kylix base from Nymphaion: AtEH[ (unpublished; the State Hermitage Museum, Nymph.-51.274) and to a graffito of the 6th century B.C. from Berezan’ ([Jajlenko 1982, 303, no. 174, 231, fig.). Judging from the figure, the inscription from
Berezan’ should evidently be read retrogradely: | A1 E. ETAI, with the retrograde epsilon proposed by the publisher, is doubtful because of a clear drachm sign to the left of the alpha, and because the vertical line on the right is three times longer than the other letters, so could hardly be an iota.

40. Unfortunately, most of the dipinti from the Athenian Agora were left out of the publication by M. Lang (see Lang 1976, 1). Among recent works cf. Böttger and Šelov 1998. Although the dipinti were considered there according to the archaeological assemblages, they were not evaluated in relation to any other group of Tanais inscriptions such as graffiti; this fact in my view reduces the possibilities for full and accurate interpretation.

42. Stolba 1996a, 445 f.
43. Possibly, the well-known graffito of a ‘Postenaufrechnung’ on a red-figure pelike from Naples may be considered as evidence of such trade relations, see Scheibler 1995, 147, Abb. 129, discussed earlier by Johnston 1978, 222 ff.; 1979, 229, fig. 12: 14F, 15 (E).
44. On this name in Chersonesos, see esp. Stolba 1996a, 445 f.
47. Jajlenko 1982, 286, nos. 75-76.