Transport amphorae have attracted a good deal of scholarly attention in recent years,\(^1\) not least the Rhodian ones. Nathan Badoud and others have focused on the chronology of the eponym priests and ‘fabricants’ named on their stamps,\(^2\) while Gonca Cankardeş-Şenol and her collaborators at the Centre Alexandrin d’Étude des Amphores have been hard at work distinguishing their die types.\(^3\) The publication under review belongs to a third category of such studies: it is a collection of amphora stamps from a single site, Kaunos in Karia, which comprises more than 900 specimens found there between 1988 and 2006.\(^4\) The vast majority are Rhodian.

Turkish archaeologists have carried out excavations at Kaunos since 1969,\(^5\) assisted in the late 1980’s and early 1990’s by a team of German archaeologists, headed by Professor Bernhard Schmaltz from the University of Kiel, the author of the volume under review. He relates in the Preface (pp. VII–VIII), that his systematic study of the amphora stamps from Kaunos began in 1988, prompted by the interest of Virginia R. Grace, who contributed her expertise to this material until November 1993, when her collaborator, Maria Savvatianou-Petropoulakou, took over. The stated aim of the monograph is to publish the stamped amphora handles found at Kaunos between 1988 and 2006 with a view to throwing light on the history of the city in the Hellenistic period (p. VII). We are dealing almost exclusively with «isoliert erhaltene Henkelfragmente, die aus konkreten Grabungsarealen, meist aus Füllschutt, stammen oder als Oberflächenfunde … gesammelt wurden» (p. VII).\(^6\) Some may regret that the study is solely concerned with the stamps, since the other amphora parts (rims, unstamped handles, bases, body sherds) need also to be taken into account if we

---


\(^4\) Except for KA 613 (p. 260), which comes from an ancient site near Köyceğiz (p. 403).


\(^6\) For the stratigraphy of the ‘Tempelterrasse’, where about two thirds of the stamped amphora handles were found, see H.-D. Bader, ‘Mengenanalyse der hellenistischen Keramik der sog. Tempelterrasse, Kaunos, Südwest-Türkei’, Ph.D. Dissertation (Philippus-Universität Marburg 1993) 11–26, which is not included in the bibliography.
are to gain a full picture of the fluctuating patterns of amphorae at a given site. That being said, it is of course legitimate for a scholar to focus on the stamps only.

The first part of the monograph, ‘Hinweise zum Katalog’ (pp. 1–4), contains general information, e.g. about the practicalities of recording amphora stamps using rubbings and photographs and about the amphora archives Schmaltz has consulted in his relentless search for parallels to the Kaunos material. It also comprises a list of abbreviations etc. employed in the Catalogue, the voluminous second and central part of the study (pp. 5–402).

The Rhodian stamps are enumerated first (pp. 5–338). Each chronological period (I–VIIa) begins with the eponym stamps, followed by those of the ‘fabricants’, with four stamps naming only months making up the tail end. Particularly noteworthy are two amphorae with both handles preserved, which provide a secure connection between an eponym and a fabricant. With 786 catalogue numbers, the Rhodian stamps constitute the vast majority of the 938 entries, but their actual figure is higher, because some Rhodian stamps are somewhat unconventionally also included among the ‘Monogramme/Ligaturen/Embleme’ (pp. 339–357) and the ‘Unbestimmte Stempel’ (see below). After the Rhodian stamps follow the ‘Amphorenstempel aus anderen Regionen (nicht-rhodisch)’ (pp. 359–402). They are listed in alphabetical order according to their presumed source, but when ranged according to the find numbers there are 30 stamps classified as Knidian (KA 842–871), 19 as Thasian (KA 890–908), 7 as Coan (KA 872–877), five as Chian (KA 833–837), four are ascribed to Nagidos (KA 884–887), three to Mende (the Parmeniskos-group) (KA 888–882), two each to Ephesos (the Nikandros-group) (KA 817–838), Herakleia Pontike (KA 840–841), Kourion/Cyprus (KA 878–879), and one each to Chersonesos (KA 832), Pamphylia (KA 888) and Sinope (?) (KA 889). The catalogue is rounded off by the ‘Unbestimmte Stempel’ (KA 909–935, pp. 391–402), a somewhat ambiguous heading seeing that the sources of several of these is known. Nos. KA 911–913 (pp. 392–393), KA 920 (pp. 395–396), KA 926 (pp. 397), and KA 932–936 (pp. 400–401) are thus Rhodian, and mostly identified as such in the text, while others may be Knidian (see p. 406 note 20). Moreover, three or four stamps are probably not from amphorae at all but instead from lagynoi.


2 Due to an editorial oversight, the catalogue bears the heading ‘Katalog der rhodischen Amphorahenkel’ (also in the index), even if it also comprises stamps from the other amphora-producing centres.


4 KA 316 (p. 129) naming the eponym ΑΡΙΣΤΕΥΣ is linked with KA 186 (p. 81) naming the fabricant ΔΑΜΟΣΘΕΝΗΣ. KA 79 (p. 37) naming the eponym ΘΕΥΑΥΤΟΣ is in all likelihood linked with KA 183 (pp. 79–80) naming the fabricant ΒΡΑΧΥΛΟΣ or ΒΡΑΧΥΛΛΟΣ, even if the two handles are not joining.

5 See p. 407 note 23, KA 817, 822 and KA 915, to which KA 914 (p. 393) may be added.
All catalogue entries are accompanied by 1:1 photos (and occasionally rubbings at 3:2) and in many cases also by contour drawings of the handles at 2:3. The latter are not true profile drawings, i.e. sections showing the external and internal shape and thickness of the amphora wall, rim and handle, but they nevertheless provide useful chronological pointers, because the handle shape changed with time. Grace’s and Petropoulakou’s readings and comments are cited verbatim throughout the catalogue, a token, perhaps, of the author’s wish to provide as complete and authentic a documentation as possible. Yet, some of the quotations cannot help but confuse the reader, when they have been superseded by new, improved interpretations. The eponym’s name on the Rhodian stamp KA 473 (p. 197) suggested by Petropoulakou (ἈΡΙΣΤΟΝΟΜΟΣ) has, for instance, been corrected by Schmaltz himself (ΞΕΝΟΦΩΝ-ΑΓΕΣΤΡΑΣ). In addition, her reading of a stamp naming the ‘fabricant’ ΤΜΩΛΟΣ (KA 753, p. 321) is quoted, even if it is contradicted by a stamp in Alexandria (ABC 0016.07). Might it not have been better either to omit these obsolete comments or to relegate them to a footnote? The ‘new’ die types from Kaunos that were published too late for the printed version of Cankardeş-Şenol’s ‘Lexicon of Eponym Dies on Rhodian Amphora Stamps’, have now been incorporated in the database http://www.amphoralex.org/. A contribution from Aris Tsaravopoulos, Andrei Opaiț and Gelly Fragou on the Chian stamps may be added to the bibliography. The parallels published there to KA 836 (p. 361) suggest that the name on this stamp should be restored as MEN(-) and that the handle in question originated from a lagynos rather than an amphora.

The final part of the volume, ‘Die Amphorenstempel von Kaunos – Ein Rückblick’ (pp. 403–421) sets the evidence in a broader context within the history and topography of Kaunos. The section entitled ‘Fundverteilung in Kaunos’ (pp. 403–406) makes clear that all of the stamps found at Kaunos come from the area of the ancient city except for four found in the proximity of tombs. Approximately two thirds were brought to light in the ‘Tempelterrasse’ and ca. 20% originated in the ‘Palastraterrasse’. The author observes (p. 404) that «sehr viele Amphorenfüße … sowie Mengen von Wandscherben» found on the


2 Including asides like: «Illegible – after cleaning could be read» (p. 398 ad KA 928), «we need a better rubbing or photo» (p. 396 ad KA 922), and «Rhodian, we need a better rubbing» (p. 397 ad KA 926).

3 KA 1 (p. 5) is thus now classified as die RE-ΑΓΕΛΟΧΟΣ-016, KA 3 (p. 6) as RE-ΑΓΕΣΤΡΑΤΟΣ-01-010, KA 6 (p. 7) as RE-ΑΓΕΣΤΡΑΤΟΣ-01-011, etc., etc.


5 KA 680 (p. 289), KA 779 (p. 335), KA 390 (p. 161), and KA 471 (p. 196).

6 The amphora finds from the ‘Tempelterrasse’ are discussed in Bader 1993 (note 6), 42–56 and passim.
‘Tempelterrasse’,¹ leave no doubt that wine was consumed at this spot, the shrine of a local hero (p. 419), as shown also by the «zahlreichen mit gefundenen Reste von meist rf. Krateren und Schwarz-Firnis-Geschirr». By contrast, hardly any amphora toes were brought to light on the ‘Palästraterrasse’ (pp. 404–405), but no explanation is offered for this curious discrepancy. Schmaltz draws attention to the considerable chronological difference between the stamps from the two find spots (pp. 403–406 Diagram 1),² concluding that

«Im 3. Jh. ist offensichtlich die ‹Tempelterrasse› bzw. das unter ihr liegende Heiligtum ungleich bedeutender gewesen als das Heiligtum unter der byzantinischen Kirche der ‹Palästraterrasse› ... In der folgenden Periode nimmt die Menge der Stempel von der ‹Palästraterrasse› um fast die Hälfte zu ..., wogegen auf der ‹Tempelterrasse› die Anzahl um fast die Hälfte abnimmt ... Mit Periode III steigt die Anzahl in beiden Bereichen leicht an und mit Periode IV erfolgt ein weiterer Anstieg ... Anschließend erfolgt auf der ‹Tempelterrasse› ein sehr deutlicher Rückgang ... in Periode V ... VI/VIIa ... Auch auf der ‹Palästraterrasse› beträgt der Rückgang in Periode V recht genau 50 %, doch in den folgenden beträgt er nur 23,5 %, sodass in dieser Phase mehr Henkel von der ‹Palästraterrasse› erhalten sind als von der ‹Tempelterrasse›» (pp. 405–406).

The heading of the last section of the book reads ‘Zur Herkunft der Amphoren’ (pp. 406–421), an issue which is, however, only discussed at its very beginning (pp. 406–407), where the dominant role played by Rhodian stamps is stressed yet again and explained with reference to the geographical proximity and commercial power of the island of Rhodes. In the 3rd century BC, non-Rhodian amphorae were nevertheless present, «wogegen sie im 2. Jh. deutlich zurückgehen ... In dieser Zeit scheint Kaunos – legt man die Amphoren-Importe zugrunde – eindeutig im ‹Windschatten› der benachbarten ‹Weltstadt› zu liegen» (p. 407). This seems reasonable enough, even if evidence from the non-stamped amphorae (had it been included in the present study) would surely have provided a more nuanced picture.³ The pages that follow (pp. 407–419) are devoted to a discussion of various aspects of the Rhodian amphorae, in particular in the early periods, for instance interesting observations concerning their fabric (pp. 409–410). Attention is among other things drawn to two stamps, which may indicate – or so it is argued – that their dies could have been made of wood, rather than

¹ Bader 1993 (note 6), 131–132 pl. 31–34.
² The diagram is apparently based on the actual number of stamps from both find spots. It would be interesting to see the same figures converted to percentages.
³ It should not be forgotten, either, that Rhodian amphorae are over-represented because they were stamped on both handles, whereas others only carried one stamp, and the rate of stamping varied from one city to the next, cf. T. Panagou, ‘Patterns of Amphora Stamp Distribution’, in E.M. Harris, D.M. Lewis and M. Woolmer (eds.), ‘The Ancient Greek Economy. Markets, Households and City-states’ (Cambridge 2016) 207–229, in particular 209–211 note 3, where is recorded that only between 1 and 10% of the Coan amphorae were stamped. Also, the considerable variation in the holding capacities of transport amphorae need to be taken into account: Coan amphorae may for instance carry nearly twice as many litres as the Rhodian ones, cf. Panagou op. cit. 210 note 3 and J. Lund, ‘Speaking volumes: the holding capacities of transport amphorae from the Hellenistic Period through to Late Antiquity’, in H. González Cesteros and J. Leidwanger (eds.), ‘Regional Convergences: Mass Production and the Development of Roman and Byzantine Amphora Standardisation’, forthcoming.
metal, wood or clay (pp. 413–414). No actual Rhodian dies have been found, but two preserved Thasian ones are in fact made of clay, and most scholars seem to think that this was also the case with the Rhodian ones.

The tentative addition (p. 417) of two new names: ΦΙΛΑΗΡΑΤΟΣ (KA 141, p. 62) and ΚΑΛΕΠΟΜΑΧΟΣ I (KA 91, p. 42) to the sequence of eponyms in Period I has not been adopted by the online database of the Centre Alexandrin d’Étude des Amphores. KA 141 is probably not Rhodian, but KA 91 seems to be, and it is hard to come up with a better reading than the one suggested by Schmaltz, so the verdict is still out on this individual. The material from Kaunos also comprises a few hitherto unknown ‘fabricants’: ΔΩΡΙΩΝ I (Per. I) (KA 209, p. 89), ΕΥΞΕΝΟΣ I (Per. I) (KA 225, p. 94), ΜΕΝΕΣΤΡΑΤΟΣ I (Per. I) (KA 266, p. 108), and ΠΙΣΤΟΣ I (Per. I) (KA 277, p. 112).

Finally (pp. 419–421), Schmaltz summarizes his conclusions concerning the contribution the amphora stamps from Kaunos may make to the economic history of the city. He calculates the number of Rhodian amphora handles per year for each period (p. 419 Diagram 2). The figure for Period I is: 4,723 p.a., for Period II: 3,057 p.a., for Period III: 3,783 p.a., for Period IV: 5,714 p.a., for Period V: 2,810 p.a. and for periods VI/VIIa: 0,39 p.a., a pattern that is markedly different from those of Kameiros and Lindos (p. 420). He tentatively attributes the rise in the figures by the beginning of the 2nd century BC to the acquisition of Kaunos by Rhodes between 197 and 188 BC, and (perhaps somewhat contradictorily) the even higher growth from around 150 BC to «die Befreiung der kariischen und lykischen Gemeinden durch Rom im Jahre 167» (p. 420), which supposedly inaugurated a flourishing period for the city. The decreasing number of Rhodian amphora stamps in Periods VI and VIIa is seen as a possible indication of «einem Rückgang der Wirtschaftskraft der Stadt». Indeed, other evidence points to the decline of cities in Western Asia Minor in the 1st century BC. The volume includes indexes of the names of the Rhodian eponyms and ‘fabricants’ according to period (pp. 423–428) and arranged alphabetically (pp. 429–433), an alphabetic list of names on stamps from other production centres (p. 435) and a Bibliography (pp. 437–447).

To sum up: Bernhard Schmaltz has spared no effort to identify and make sense of the amphora stamps from Kaunos, and he has fully achieved the goals set for the publication. The volume is a valuable addition to the literature on ancient amphora stamps and adds in no small way to our understanding of the consumption economy of Kaunos in the Hellenistic Age. The author rightly stresses its

3 KA 141 is probably not Rhodian according to Nathan Badoud 2019 (note 1), p. 228.
limitations in the final sentences of the volume, but such is the nature of archaeological research. We must depart from the evidence at hand in the full knowledge that new discoveries or insights are bound to lead to a revision of previously held theories. However, as far as the amphora stamps of Hellenistic Kaunos is concerned, we now have a yardstick against which new finds may be measured.

Copenhagen

John Lund


Après avoir été ‘Juniorprofessor’ à l’université de Tübingen, Johannes Lipps est aujourd’hui professeur à l’université Gutenberg de Mayence. Il publie ici le gros travail qui l’a habilité à exercer ces nouvelles fonctions. L’argument principal de l’ouvrage est une tentative de reconstitution graphique de la couverture de l’oecus tetrastylus découvert en 1973 par Gianfilippo Carettoni au cours de ses fouilles de la ‘maison d’Auguste’ au Palatin, mais s’élargit à la question des couvertures antiques, un thème fondamental qui n’a jamais été traité dans son ensemble. J. L. nous offre donc ici le résultat d’un patient travail de recomposition d’un décor stuqué extraordinairement émietté, puisqu’il a fallu examiner 4340 fragments conservés au Palazzo Altemps, souvent réduits à très peu de chose. Le livre se répartit en six chapitres, examinant tour à tour l’oecus tetrastylus de la ‘maison d’Auguste’ avec la restitution du décor stuqué de sa couverture (voûte centrale et deux plafonds plats latéraux), ainsi que le problème controversé de l’identification et de la datation de la maison, puis est envisagée l’histoire des couvertures antiques depuis surtout l’époque grecque classique (440 couvertures pré-augustéennes, répertoriées dans la première annexe), des couvertures d’époque augustéenne, avec l’étude, d’une part, des vestiges matériels, et, d’autre part, des sources textuelles (littéraires, épigraphiques et papyrologiques). J. L. nous amène ensuite à réfléchir sur le rôle des couvertures en rapport avec la fonction de la pièce, et d’abord au sujet de l’oecus tetrastylus de la ‘maison d’Auguste’, en étendant l’enquête aux pièces avoisinantes, distribuées sur deux côtés du péristyle. Ce chapitre se clôt par des réflexions sur la chronologie relative des couvertures de la fin de la République. Puis, J. L. sollicite les sources textuelles (199, répertoriées dans la seconde annexe) pour essayer de comprendre comment les Anciens réagissaient à la vision des couvertures de divers points de vue (valeur esthétique, dimension sociologique, aspects moraux etc.).

L’oecus tetrastylus est une vaste pièce, comportant un espace antérieur sous plafond plat, tandis que la partie postérieure de la pièce est encadré par quatre supports de colonnes ou de piliers qui supportaient une voûte stuquée. Le fond de la partie voûtée était à l’origine entièrement ouvert (J. L. hésite entre l’hypothèse d’une niche ou d’un passage) et a été ensuite bouché par une maçonnerie en réticulé au moment où la maison a été engloutie dans les fondations du sanctuaire d’Apollon Palatin, tandis que tous les matériaux précieux (colonnes ou piliers et marbres de couleur de l’opus sectile du sol) étaient retirés de la pièce. L’entreprise de J. L.