

quantity of graffiti (45) are listed. The descriptions of individual specimens are restricted to the most significant information. In some cases of badly preserved inscriptions a reference to the exact parallel, based on which the reading is reconstructed (for instance nos. 100 and 300), would be elucidating. For some readings one must trust in the great experience of the author alone, because either almost nothing can be seen on the stamp itself (nos. 5. 29. 167), or the preserved fragment is very small (nos. 199. 249). All but four names of eponyms known from period V are represented. And many of the dies used here are lacking in the Alexandria database⁴, so the collection from Tell Iztabba is a welcome addition to it. Few hitherto unknown or very rare connections between eponym and fabricant are documented: Aristakos with Aphrodisios and Nikias I (nos. 265–266), Kallikrates III with Glaukias (no. 274), Teisamenos with Aphrodisios (no. 298) and possibly Teisamenos with Philotas (no. 295). The sequence of officials appearing on the stamps is based on the former works of the author and corresponds exactly to Cancardeş-Şenol⁵.

In addition to the stamps the graffiti on the Rhodian amphorae, all of them scratched in after firing, are presented as well. In many cases, they consist in names or abbreviations. Of special interest is a group found at the same spot showing Π and P: in four cases P intersects Π in the middle (nos. 225. 287. 306. 320), in one case (no. 305) the letters follow each other. The reading proposed by Finkielsztein: Π P O T Γ I, in one case (no. 305) Π P O T Γ E I, is hardly convincing. By contrast H and P in ligature (no. 315) or following each other (no. 270) are read as H and P! The chronological interval between the oldest and the youngest amphora featuring Π intersected by P is 40 years, which means that some vessels have been in use for such a long period of time.

A number of regrettable small editorial errors have occurred. Several photographs are upside down (nos. 164. 167. 207. 247. 253b), at no. 152 the stamps of eponym and fabricant are reversed. Some transliterations are incomplete or erroneous: no. 5: »Επι« was overlooked; no. 69: on the stamp a »ζ« and not a »σ« can be seen; at no. 98 the brackets in »Επι Κλ{ε}vo« are unnecessary – »Κλεvo« is well preserved; at no. 288b the brackets are facing wrong directions: Δ[αμοφ]ίλου instead of Δ]αμοφ[ίλου, and a Latin »l« appears instead of a Greek »λ« (the same at no. 282b), and so on. The reference to no. 185 made at no. 300 is wrong and no. 301 cannot be from the same die as no. 102, because the herm looks once to the left and once to the right. At no. 82 the eponym Timotheos is dated to 130–128 BCE, at no. 281 to 128 BCE; the same for Aristogenes: once to 130–128 BCE (no. 84) and later to 129 BCE (no. 278). The terminus *fabricant* – the role of the person in the Rhodian stamping system is still a subject of ongoing discussion⁶ – is not being used consistently: at no. 208 it is said »secondary stamp used by the fabricant Midas«, but at no. 356 »secondary stamp (understood to be that of the potter that made the vessel)«.

The second part of the book deals with sealings found in the city, a very common category of material during antiquity, but rarely preserved in archaeological contexts. Chapter 3 presents 99 sealings, all of them with excellent pictures and exact descriptions, chapter 4 the petrological analysis of the bullae. The archive is precisely dated by stamps at 128 – 108/107 BCE and interpreted by the authors as a »private« one⁷. The impressions were made with signet rings on clumps of clay that were evidently used to seal papyrus rolls. The rolls must have been burnt, the clay being baked and the sealings preserved in the process. More than half of the images on the *bullae* show Greek mythological characters, first of all Athena (nos. 1–20),

4 www.amphoralex.org.

5 G. Cancardeş-Şenol, *Lexicon of Eponym Dies on Rhodian Amphora Stamps 4* (Alexandria 2017) 215–218.

6 At last C. Börker, *Der ΕΡΓΑΣΤΗΡΙΑΡΧΗΣ und die rhodischen Amphorenstempel*, ZPE 209, 2019, 78–90.

7 The remark that the Kallipolis archive was a private one runs contrary to the opinion of the excavator P. Themelis, *Ausgrabungen in Kallipolis (Ost-Aeolien) 1977–1978*, AAA 12/2, 1979, 245–273. Themelis calls it »zweifelloso das offizielle Stadtarchiv« (p. 265).

followed by Tyche. But also, the local divinity Nysa with infant Dionysos is represented in five examples (nos. 21–25). Another group presents male portrait busts (nos. 53–72), some of them possibly of official nature, but none can be identified⁸. Only two sealings are considered to have an official character without doubt (nos. 87 and 75). Petrological analysis of the fabrics used for the *bullae* reveals that more than a half of the sealings are of local origin, a quarter come from the region and only few have travelled greater distances, viz. from Greece or Cyprus. So the sealings help to differentiate and enrich the picture of the contacts of the city as it has been given by the amphorae.

This refreshing compact volume is an important contribution not only to local history, but also to Hellenistic life in the Eastern Mediterranean in general. Its large collection of eponym and fabricant names and their connections within period V of Rhodian chronology allows new thoughts about the fine tuning of their sequence. The work benefits from the authors' great experience and knowledge of the local situation and the complexity of international networks during Hellenistic times.

8 Cf. the most recent publication on official Hellenistic portraits on bullae: H. Kyrieleis, *Hellenistische Herrscherporträts auf den Siegelabdrücken aus Paphos (Paphos IV B)*, AF 34 (Wiesbaden 2015).