

The Contribution of Inscriptions to the Chronology of Rhodian Amphora Eponyms

Nathan Badoud

From Morocco to India, and from the Strait of Dover to Ethiopia, Rhodian amphora stamps are one of the main “*fossiles directeurs*” of the Hellenistic period.¹ They particularly abound in the Mediterranean and the Black Sea regions: one can estimate that more than 200,000 specimens have been unearthed so far. Since the end of the nineteenth century, the chronology of these amphora stamps has been patiently developed in order to re-establish the line of succession of the eponym magistrates named upon them. In Thasos, Sinop and many other centres, the amphorae were dated by a minor magistrate responsible for the stamping (an astynomos or agoranomos, for instance), who may have been qualified as a “false eponym” by Louis Robert.² However, in Rhodes, a magistrate who bore the title of priest (ιερεὺς) dated the amphorae. John Stoddart was the first to recognize the priest of Halios (ιερεὺς Ἁλίου), attested in the Rhodian inscriptions as the city’s eponym: this particular clue, among others, allowed him to determine the origin of the Rhodian stamps.³ The purpose of this paper is three-fold: first, to explain why such a necessary and incontestable identification was called into question by the best specialists, and how a chronology of the amphora eponyms could be developed independently, and sometimes backwards, from the epigraphic data; second, to study the ways of improving the dating methods as currently applied to the Rhodian stamps, and to identify their intrinsic limits; third, to show how the monumental inscriptions can help to exceed these limits and develop new dating methods.

The priests of Halios versus the amphora eponyms

For a long time, the chronologies of amphora stamps were uncertain or even contradictory, because they were based on a prosopography and a paleography that were still uncertain. Carl Schuchhardt was the first to date these documents with a relative accuracy. Publishing nearly 800 stamps, mainly Rhodian, from the “Pergamon deposit”, he attributed the accumulation of the amphorae upon which they were impressed to some particularly favourable political circumstances. Rhodes was an ally of Attalos I, king of Pergamon, during the Second Macedonian War (200-197 BC), and then against Antiochos III (192-188 BC); but the friendship between the two states had ended under

the reign of Eumenes II (197-159 BC), because of their rivalry in Asia Minor. Thus, the deposit was apparently built up over a few decades, at most, at the turn of the 3rd and 2nd centuries BC.

In 1896, young Adolf Wilhelm published an inscription from Seleukia on the Kalykadnos honouring Εὐδημος Νίκωνος, a diplomat from the city who had travelled through the Greek world to promote the interests of Antiochos IV, who had become king at the end of 175 BC. The inscription included a number of foreign documents about the diplomat's activity, among which was a decree from the Boiotian Koinon (dissolved in 171 BC) and a Rhodian proxyeny file dated by the priest of Halios Δαμοκλῆς Δαμέου (= Δαμέα), which was itself narrowly connected to the Third Macedonian War (172-168 BC) or its preparations. Therefore, the priesthood of Δαμοκλῆς had to be dated between 175 and 171 BC, which confirmed and made more accurate the chronology of the Pergamon deposit, where many stamps attested the eponym.⁴

As only ten inscriptions seemed to mention the same priests of Halios named on the amphora stamps, it quickly became important to develop a proper methodology for this second category of documents. One of the features of Rhodian amphorae is that eponyms and fabricants generally appear on two different stamps, each on a different handle. Pairs of handles, however, are rarely found intact. In his thesis on Rhodian amphora stamps, published in 1907, Friedrich Bleckmann tried therefore to restore as many connections between fabricants and eponyms as possible, in order to gather more or less contemporary magistrates in "packets". Moreover, he attached great importance to the site where the amphorae were unearthed. Following Schuchhardt's idea, he registered the eponyms attested in the "Pergamon deposit" (41 according to the *editio princeps*) in a period when, he believed, good relations existed between Rhodos and the Attalid kingdom, i.e., between 220 and 180 BC. The contradiction with Wilhelm's dating of Δαμοκλῆς, between 175 and 171 BC, was obvious. Nevertheless, when Hendrik van Gelder published his study of the Εὐδημος monument in the *Sammlung der griechischen Dialekt-Inschriften* (1899), he had presented it merely through a slip of the pen as a decree passed "in favour of a friend of Antiochos III of Syria", king from 223 to 187 BC.⁵ Without any consideration for the arguments in the subsequent commentary, which showed clearly that Εὐδημος had in reality served the cause of Antiochos IV (175-163),⁶ and through over generalizing, Bleckmann was able to put forward a document "which the editors attribute to the early 2nd century BC" as totally conforming to his – wrong – dating of the Pergamon deposit.⁷ The foundations of Alexandria (in 331 BC) and Phintias (in 281 BC) happened before the Pergamon deposit and gave a *terminus post quem*; the destructions of Corinth and Carthage happened after, in 146 BC, giving a *terminus ante quem*, the importance of which Schuchhardt had already underlined.⁸

Van Gelder was the first, and for a very long time the only one, to contest his predecessor's conclusions, without realizing that they were a consequence

of his own mistake. In an article published in 1915 (but unknown by the specialists for thirty years), he rightly noticed that the monument of Εὐδήμιος precluded a date for the Pergamon deposit as early as Bleckmann guessed; nonetheless, he just dated the priesthood of Δαμοκλῆς under the reign of Antiochos IV, whereas Wilhelm had clearly demonstrated that it was a little later than 175 BC.⁹ Furthermore Van Gelder counted a dozen of eponyms that were not in the Pergamon deposit but attested in Carthage that was besieged from 149 BC. As one of them, Ἀστυμήδης, had played a preeminent part in politics during the second quarter of the 2nd century BC, Van Gelder concluded that they were all later than the Pergamon deposit. He consequently dated the deposit's closure around 165 BC.

In 1931, the American School of Classical Studies started its archaeological excavations in the Athenian Agora. From 1932, Virginia Grace used the stratigraphy and the typology of the amphora handles for the first time, which allowed her to distinguish among homonymous priests. In a deeply innovative paper, she dated the oldest Rhodian stamps of the Agora to the early 3rd century BC, and the appearance of the stamping to the late 4th century. The keystone of her chronology was still the Pergamon deposit, which she dated between ca. 220 and ca. 180 BC, considering Bleckmann's hypothesis as an established fact.¹⁰ In the meantime, her colleague Homer Thompson used the Agora's closed deposits to define five consecutive groups of Hellenistic pottery.¹¹ As both dating systems admirably completed each other – especially as the deposits contained some Rhodian stamps –, they consequently worked the same way. Moving closer to ceramology, amphorology was emancipated from epigraphy, which Grace justified as follows: “the epigraphical references are not many and the date of the inscription is usually subject to dispute.”¹²

The consequences of this would soon appear. In 1950, Grace noticed that in Tarsos, the majority of the Rhodian handles were “datable earlier than the deposits in which they were found [...], usually by a considerable period of time.” But instead of bringing the phenomenon together with the gap that Bleckmann's chronology had installed between the Pergamon deposit and the monument of Εὐδήμιος (which she could have done by referring to Van Gelder's article, which she had read in 1948),¹³ she explained it by the “character” of the site, favourable in her opinion to the “stray finds of earlier date.”¹⁴

In 1952, Luigi Morricone published a stele that contained the first part of the catalogue of the priests of Halios, from the synoecism until the early 3rd century BC (with a lacuna, dated by him from ca. 373 to ca. 331 BC).¹⁵ Four years later, Grace drew attention to a Rhodian stamp dated by the eponym Ἄγχιος, which was found in a deposit related to the construction of the Athenian city wall near the Pnyx. This deposit was dated with reference to pottery from Thompson's Agora Groups A and B that favoured a date from the late 4th century BC. Nevertheless, she did not notice that, paradoxically, Ἄγχιος was not mentioned in the preserved part of the catalogue of the priests of

Halios.¹⁶ Then, Eugene Vanderpool, James McCredie and Arthur Steinberg's excavations at the camp on the Koroni peninsula (Attica) revealed an amphora dated by the eponym Ἀγχιος and associated with the same type of ceramics as found in the Pnyx (City Wall) deposit.¹⁷ On the basis of coins of Ptolemy II, the Koroni excavators argued that the camp was built during the Chremonidean War (from 267/6 to 262/1 BC) and that the ceramics it contained could not date from the 4th century BC.¹⁸ It was then obvious that if Ἀγχιος was not named in the catalogue of the priests of Halios, it was because he had become a priest after the last eponym named in the inscription.¹⁹

Grace refused to admit the arguments of the Koroni excavators for a long time. After trying to date the fortification earlier (which made her attribute the coins of Ptolemy II to his predecessor, contest the presence of some Egyptian forces in Attica and describe the camp on the Koroni peninsula as the "pied-à-terre" of an *euergetes*),²⁰ she attributed the creation of the Rhodian amphora stamps to the Macedonian garrison who had settled in the city between 332 and 323 BC. According to her, the commander of the occupation troops held responsibility for the stamping during this "garrison period". After the expulsion of the garrison, the Rhodians apparently kept the habit of stamping their amphorae. It seemed that, during the 3rd century BC, they made the eponymous magistrate of the city responsible for the stamping, and, at that time the title of "priest" appeared on the Rhodian stamps: so, she concluded in 1970, that it was fruitless to search for the name Ἀγχιος in the catalogue of the priests of Halios.²¹

Grace's hypothesis (which does not appear to have any evidential basis and was perhaps inspired by some recent events in European history, such as the creation of the Allied Military Government of Occupied Territories) did not question the dating of the Koroni camp. Moreover, she did not describe the organisation of the stamping during the very period that was meant to separate the expulsion of the Macedonians from the introduction of the title of "priest" upon the Rhodian stamps. Finally – this had been an established fact since 1909 –,²² Ἀγχιος was himself described as a "priest" on the Rhodian stamps. Therefore, the "garrison theory" did not allow dating Ἀγχιος to the 4th century BC. Only after the eponyms attested on the Rhodian stamps were counted (as published in 1974), Grace noticed the existence of a 35-year lacuna in the first two periods of her own chronology that were earlier than the Pergamon deposit: then, it appeared that Ἀγχιος had not been an eponym during the 4th century BC, but between 280 and 270 BC. Nevertheless, not all problems had been solved, since a 15-year lacuna appeared in Period IV, which included all eponyms later than the Pergamon deposit, but attested in Corinth and Carthage. Grace attributed this lacuna either to some interruptions in the stamping or to the existence of some homonyms that had not been identified yet; she did not call into question the date of the Pergamon deposit.²³

In a PhD thesis submitted to Harvard University in 1970, exactly when the

controversy of Koroni was in full swing, Barbara Turzynski Drushell made a quick inventory of the priests of Halios attested in the epigraphy. She noticed five cases of contradictions between the chronology of the inscriptions and the chronology of the stamps, the latter being systematically too high.²⁴ Noticing that Grace's system raised "serious problems" revealed by the catalogue of the priests of Halios as well as the Tarsos and Koroni amphorae, she suggested lowering the end of Period I by 30 years and Periods II and III by 15 years. Even if it was insufficiently verified, this radical solution resolved the chronological conflicts opposing Rhodian amphorae both to early Hellenistic ceramics, on the one side, and to inscriptions and coins on the other; it explained the discordance between the catalogue of the priests of Halios and the list of the eponyms of Period I; it also allowed the correlation of Period IV (179-146 BC, according to Grace) with a number of years corresponding with some eponyms that could be attributed to it (about 15). In return, Bleckmann's dates given to the Pergamon deposit had to be abandoned.²⁵ Since it was based on her own unpublished and provisional lists of eponyms and fabricants, and also on some information she had gathered herself, Grace was firmly opposed to the publication of Turzynski Drushell's thesis;²⁶ neither she nor the other specialists would mention it, despite the availability of an abstract in the *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology*.²⁷

In her last paper on the Rhodian chronology, published in 1985 – but based on a draft written in the first months of 1968,²⁸ when the "garrison theory" was elaborated –, Grace reaffirmed her faith in Schuchhardt's and Bleckmann's "historical considerations". Going back over the case of Δαμοκλῆς that her chronology dated earlier than 188 BC, while the monument of Εὐδημος precluded a date before 175 BC, she concluded: "If the date of the inscription cannot be put earlier, we must accept the fact that the eponym Δαμοκλῆς 2nd in the stamps is not the same person as the eponym Δαμοκλῆς of the inscription, and then apparently that the stamp eponyms (often called priests in the stamps) are not the priests of Halios who date other Rhodian documents."²⁹ That same year (without having heard of Grace's paper), Donald Sippel proposed the identification of them as the members of a college of "state licensors" responsible for the amphora production and minting.³⁰

Thus, Grace's successors would have to face a chronological gap of 15 years in Period IV, as well as a conceptual gap between an "amphora eponym" and a homonym priest of Halios, as these two functions were considered likely distinct. Despite their related character, these problems were to be faced independently of one another.

In his thesis (1993) and his very useful *Chronologie détaillée et révisée des éponymes amphoriques rhodiens* (2001), Gérard Finkelstzejn demonstrated that the internal coherence of Period IV imposed a reduction of its duration, which led him to date Period III 15 years later. On this matter, he shared the conclusion Mark Lawall reached after having examined the archaeological context of the Pergamon deposit,³¹ but also the solutions Van Gelder and Turzynski

Drushell had defended in 1915 and 1970, relying on an inscription published in 1896; as its editor, Wilhelm had clearly underlined the interest of the document to date the deposit.

Still, in 2001, such interest was not self-evident, as the question about the amphora eponyms remained.³² Despite the extraordinarily increased documentation, the judgment about epigraphy was still the same as in 1934: “les inscriptions datées par des éponymes rhodiens ne sont, relativement, pas très nombreuses et ne peuvent que modestement contribuer à l’étude chronologique qui est la nôtre.”³³ So, Christian Habicht deserves much credit when, two years later, he resumed his much earlier predecessors’ efforts³⁴ by making an inventory of “all amphora eponyms” attested in the inscriptions engraved between ca. 270 and ca. 40 BC, in order to establish their identity and to specify their chronology. During this period, the names of 52 out of 65 priests of Halios appeared on the amphora stamps, so that “the identity question ought now be settled.”³⁵ Apart from the dating details and the definition of the corpus, both of which need to be discussed,³⁶ the demonstration raises two issues. On the one hand, seven out of 65 priests identified are homonyms too quickly created in order to solve contradictions between the inscriptions and amphora stamps chronologies; ten other priests are not attested in the priesthood of Halios or do not belong to the period examined. On the other hand, there may be between ten and 18 eponyms “whose names do not (so far) appear on amphora stamps, but only on an inscription or inscriptions.”³⁷ The number is too important in comparison with the number of eponyms – there may be only ten – that are supposed to prove a “perfect or almost perfect” concordance between the inscriptions and the amphora stamps. Especially, considering the gaps in the epigraphic documentation, one should admit the existence of several tens of others priests of Halios (still unknown amongst the inscriptions) who may not be found on amphora handles: it would cause such a shift in the chronology of the Rhodian stamps that the identification of their eponyms would be excluded as a consequence. Moreover, Grace’s hypothesis about some frequent interruptions of the stamping should not be put forward,³⁸ since it is condemned by the chronology of which one intends to show the validity.

Thus, the connection between the amphora eponyms and the priests of Halios, perfectly clear at the origin, was obscured when amphorology became independent from epigraphy; the dialogue between the specialists of both disciplines could not re-establish such a connection. The current view is that, originally, the lack of certainty regarding the status of the amphora eponyms could explain why the inscriptions were not taken into consideration. On the contrary, doubts about the identification of the amphora eponyms and the hypothesis of long breaks in the stamping led to and maintained a chronology that the inscriptions had already proved to be too high. In the extreme this led to a call to distrust textual sources.³⁹ There may be several reasons for this phenomenon: a lack of historiographical studies; a wish to give a new scientific

field its own methodology; an inconsistency between the *object* of amphorology, thus a certain category of ceramics (stamped or not), and the *objectives* of the discipline, which include the chronological understanding of eponyms that were also attested in other kinds of documents, such as inscriptions. The importance of cross-analysis will be fully apparent after an examination of the limitations and possibilities of the traditional dating methods.

The possibilities and limitations of the traditional dating methods

Today, the chronology of Rhodian amphora stamps allows the attribution of an approximate term to the eponyms of Periods II to V (ca. 270 – ca. 108 BC). The magistrates who served a full mandate between ca. 300 (the beginning of the stamping) and ca. 271 BC, and their successors who held office from ca. 107 to ca. 40 BC (the end of the stamping) were only listed in three large groups (Periods I and VI-VII). Moreover, the work period of some 400 fabricants of Rhodian amphorae already listed is also still a very much unexplored field of research.⁴⁰ Various aspects of the most advanced parts of the current chronology can also be improved.

Indeed, until now the dating criteria⁴¹ have not been exhaustively used, a situation which is easily explained by the number of sources to be considered. In this respect, Marek Palaczyk seems to have shown the way forward by creating an inventory of all secondary stamps scattered in the bibliography. Even if the modalities of use of these pottery marks remain difficult to understand, they have a real chronological interest, since they allow the gathering of eponyms in approximately contemporary “packets”.⁴² As for the associations between fabricants and eponyms, it is the same. John Lund recently argued that their statistical analysis allowed the viewing of a new sequence of the magistrates in the first half of the 2nd century BC.⁴³ This reasoning could be extended to other dating method criteria, such as archaeological contexts. It is, of course, not necessary to underline the chronological interest of the big deposits (Pergamon, Villanova, Olbia, the Middle Stoa...) and cities ransacked or at least half abandoned in 146 BC (Corinth and Carthage), 108 BC (Samaria) or 69 BC (Delos). However, the existing bibliography mentions many other assemblages that should also be considered; their more limited size does not mean that they are less interesting.⁴⁴ Finally, all chronologies are based on an analysis (even implicit) of the stamping system. In this perspective, it will be particularly important to understand why and how, after the mid-3rd century BC, the emblems of one fabricant could be alternated or combined on the stamps. Without any workshop excavation for the period, we have to rely on the material already published.

Nevertheless, whatever their degree of exhaustiveness and refinement, the dating methods mentioned above will always include some margin of error, for at least four reasons:

1. Bleckmann began with the assumption that the amphorae found in the Pergamon deposit all “roughly belonged to the same period,” and that their eponyms represented a “continuous sequence of years.”⁴⁵ In other words, the number of eponyms attested in that deposit would give the exact duration of its accumulation. It is now clear that the formation of such sets is a phenomenon a lot more complex than has been imagined: we have to reckon with some discontinuities in the supply of amphorae and a constitution of the deposit in several phases.⁴⁶
2. We know that in Thasos the same engraver was in charge of making all stamps in the city, which allows the acknowledging of a succession of hands.⁴⁷ The situation was different in Rhodos, where the choice of the engraver depended on the fabricants, many of whom were active over a period of several years. If many fabricants worked with only one engraver, then it is difficult to infer the order of some chronologically close eponyms from the style of their stamps.
3. Grace was the first to establish the existence of some homonyms on the amphora stamps by using such criteria as the shape of the handles, the working contexts or the associations between eponyms and fabricants. These criteria do not allow the distinction between some individuals separated by less than around ten years. Given the traditional nature of Greek onomastics, particularly the Rhodian, it is nonetheless possible that homonymous fabricants worked in parallel, and that some eponyms who shared the same name had succeeded each other at close interval.⁴⁸ The Rhodian stamping system may have been conceived in order to distinguish the first ones, but we still need to understand how. Nothing seems to have been foreseen for the second: indeed, only three eponyms are very occasionally mentioned with their patronymics – Ξενοφάνης Ιέρωνος, Παισανίας Τελέωνος and Εὐκλείδας Χάρμευς –, and the stamps of the latter are too rare to be attributed to two distinctive persons. There may still be a few homonyms to identify among the 258 magistrates already registered on the Rhodian stamps.
4. Finally, the city may have suspended its amphora stamping at some time or another. Today, the lack of disruption between the different eponym packets, the stylistic coherence of the stamps and the points of reference allowed by the absolute chronology would not lead to the previously suggested 15-year lacuna in Period IV. However, some interruptions too rare or too brief to be detected only on the basis of the amphora material are still possible.

What can we learn from inscriptions?

In addition to the contributions to the chronology of the eponyms just discussed, the inscriptions enlighten the onomastic and prosopographical study of the fabricants.⁴⁹ Moreover, they allow the reconstitution of the sequence of

the months attested on the stamps, and thus not only the understanding of the production curve of the Rhodian amphorae, but also the extremely accurate dating of the stamps naming an eponym whose year of office is already known.⁵⁰ Finally – and this will be the only point addressed here –, they reveal all kinds of information regarding the relative and absolute chronologies of many magistrates, as well as the existence of individuals unattested or not yet identified on the stamps.

The city of Rhodes was founded in Καρνεῖος (October/November) 408 BC, when Ialysos, Kamiros and Lindos were united through a synoecism. After giving up their liberty, the three ancient cities became the constitutive units of the new Rhodian state, as communities or tribes. According to the ‘trienal rule’, since Δάλιος (August/September) 407 BC, each community would, in turn, give its eponym to the city. In the “tribal cycle”, Ialysos preceded Kamiros, itself followed by Lindos. Therefore, if the original community of a priest of Halios is known, only one year out of three can be attributed to him. This is what we learn from the catalogue of the priests of Halios.⁵¹

Thanks to a set of catalogues of magistrates from the 1st century BC,⁵² enlightened by a scholion of Pindar⁵³ (confirmed itself by the Antikythera Mechanism⁵⁴), we also know the cycle of the six main Rhodian feasts and their years of celebration in the Hellenistic period: Ἀλῖεια, Διπανάμια, Ἐρεθίμια, Ἰπποκαθέσια, Ῥωμαῖα, Τριετηρίς (=Ἀλεξάνδρεια καὶ Διονύσια). A list of the Ἐρεθίμια probably allows us to ascertain that three priests of Halios attributable to Period I held office within five years, according to a trieterical rhythm.⁵⁵

The Διπανάμια warrant closer attention. Indeed, their name shows that they were organized during the month of Πάναμος δεύτερος, which means that the rhythm of the feast was modelled on the Rhodian intercalary cycle. Thus, one can affirm that within a period of eight years (ὀκταετηρίς), years 1, 4 and 5 were intercalary, but one can also determine the exact date of all embolisms of the Hellenistic period. Eponyms that were associated with the month of Πάναμος δεύτερος on amphora stamps can then only be attributed to these years.⁵⁶

Furthermore, inscriptions give us important information on the structure of sacerdotal careers. If the priest of Halios was the eponym for the whole city of Rhodes, there was also an eponym for each community: in Kamiros, it was the δαμιουργός; in Lindos, the priest of Athena Lindia. The chronology for these community eponyms is fairly well known, because it was fixed by catalogues, many fragments of which have been preserved. Quite often, a former δαμιουργός or former priest of Athena Lindia became priest of Halios. Given the autonomy of the city toward the community *cursus*, the contrary was possible but rarely occurred because the priesthood of Halios was considered the highest. An exceptional case, Ζηνόδοτος Διοφάντου, is not a regular priest, but a prophet, which was another magistrate attached to the sanctuary of Halios. When the eponym was incapable of serving as such

(at least in the 1st century BC), the prophet would replace him and bear the title of ἐπιλαχὼν ἱερεὺς Ἀλίου.⁵⁷

Consequently, when we know that a priest of Halios was δαμιουργός or priest of Athena at a certain date, we have a *terminus post quem* (or sometimes *ante quem*) for his year as priest of Halios. In Lindos, from ca. 220 BC, every eponym of the community had to hold the priesthood of Artemis Kekoia two years after serving Athena Lindia, so that he could not become priest of Halios during this second term.⁵⁸

As we can see, the Rhodian institutions give structure to the chronology of the priests of Halios. In order to go further, one needs prosopographical elements. The first of these are directly linked to the institutions and inscriptions just mentioned: community of origin, term corresponding to the celebration of a festival, association to the intercalary month, *curriculum*. The remaining elements are very diverse: historical background of some document dated by a priest of Halios, activity period of a sculptor commissioned for a statue dedicated by the official, etc.

Finally, a very few priests of Halios are mentioned in the inscriptions without being named on the contemporary stamps. As all amphora eponyms from the beginning of Period II until the end of Period V are known, if a new priest appears on an inscription from this period, it means that he may have been in office while the stamping was interrupted, or he may have been the substitute of a magistrate whose name had been kept on the stamps despite the interruption of his mandate. For the moment, there is no epigraphical evidence of any eponym attested on the amphora stamps but not identified by the archaeological methods because of its proximity with an homonymous magistrate.⁵⁹

One can see with how much profit a cross-analysis of amphora stamps and inscriptions can be carried out. The enterprise has been attempted in Rhodos: it could now be extended to the other major stamping centres, all of which have produced an abundant monumental epigraphy.

Notes

- 1 The author would like to thank Pia Guldager Bilde and Mark Lawall for their remarks, Margaret Sasanow for her proofreading, as well as Natalia Vogeikoff-Brogan for her warm welcome in the Archives of the American School of Classical Studies at Athens.
- 2 Robert 1963, 67-68. Cf. Sherk 1990, 255-256.
- 3 Stoddart 1850, 8, 12.
- 4 Wilhelm 1896, 109, 116.
- 5 SGDI 3751, page 418.
- 6 SGDI 3751, page 419.
- 7 Bleckmann 1907, 18;
- 8 Schuchhardt 1895, 432.

- 9 Van Gelder 1915, 197-200.
- 10 Grace 1934, 214-220.
- 11 Thompson 1934.
- 12 Grace 1934, 215.
- 13 Archives of the American School of Classical Studies at Athens, V.R. Grace's papers, file 718: comment on the translation of Van Gelder's article, dated to June 22, 1948.
- 14 Grace 1950, 137.
- 15 Morricone 1949-1951.
- 16 Grace 1956, 141, n° 70.
- 17 Vanderpool et al. 1962, 35, n° 27.
- 18 Vanderpool et al. 1962, 56-60. The authors dated the war to 265-261.
- 19 Vanderpool et al. 1964, 74-75.
- 20 Grace 1963.
- 21 Grace & Savvatianou-Pétropoulakou 1970, 285-286, 289-302.
- 22 Nilsson 1909, 357, n° 21.
- 23 Grace 1974.
- 24 Ἀγήσιππος, Ἀγλώκριτος, Ἀριστωνίδας, Δαμοκλῆς [2], Φιλόδαμος[2].
- 25 Turzynski Drushell 1971, 13, 116-136. (n.b. the thesis was submitted in 1970, but the date listed for it in all bibliographic entries and the Harvard University Library is 1971, hence the date used here – the editors).
- 26 American School of Classical Studies, Virginia R. Grace Papers, file 179: letter of June 4, 1968, sent to B. Turzynski Drushell, with copy to S. Dow, supervisor of the thesis.
- 27 Turzynski Drushell 1972 (only cited by Börker 1998, 16, n. 51, about the status of the fabricants).
- 28 Archives of the American School of Classical Studies, Virginia R. Grace Papers, file 695: "Dating of the Rhodian Eponym Damokles and of the Original Pergamon Deposit". This document dated 25 May 1968 must be compared to a letter written January 18 of the same year, in which Grace announces to B. Turzynski Drushell "as I promised you, I shall be very glad to investigate as thoroughly as I can the dates of an names of eponyms in Rhodian stamps that match names of Rhodian eponyms for which you can give me reference from literature or inscription."
- 29 Grace 1985, 44.
- 30 Sippel 1985.
- 31 Lawall 2002.
- 32 Finkielsztein 2001, 207.
- 33 Finkielsztein 2001, 45; cf. Finkielsztein 2004.
- 34 Bleckmann 1907, 17-20; 1912, 252-258; Hiller von Gaertringen 1931, cols. 835-840.
- 35 Habicht 2003, 545.
- 36 Badoud 2014, 161-181.
- 37 Habicht 2003, 545, 565-567, 569, appendix 1 (the names given in these four lists are not matching).
- 38 Habicht 2003, 545, n. 16.
- 39 Empereur 1990, 205.
- 40 Badoud & Dana forthcoming.
- 41 On these criteria, Garlan & Badoud 2011, pp. 416-418.
- 42 Palaczyk 1999; 2000.
- 43 Lund 2011.

- 44 Cf. Badoud 2012, 145.
- 45 Bleckmann 1907, 15.
- 46 Cf. Lawall 2002 and Badoud forthcoming.
- 47 Garlan 2000, 95.
- 48 Garlan, forthcoming.
- 49 Badoud & Dana forthcoming.
- 50 Badoud, forthcoming.
- 51 Badoud 2014, cat. no. TRI 1 (Morricone 1949-1951 [1952], 354-355), with Badoud 2014, 155-159
- 52 Badoud 2014, cat. no. TRI 2 (*SER* 5); Badoud 2014, cat. no. TRI 6 (*SER* 5b).
- 53 Schol. Pind., *Ol.* VII, 147c.
- 54 Iversen & Morgan, forthcoming.
- 55 Badoud 2008; 2013, 122-125
- 56 Badoud 2014, 135-150.
- 57 Badoud 2014, 111-117.
- 58 Badoud 2014, 155.
- 59 Badoud 2014, 177-181.