

Review of: Nathan BADOUD, *Le Temps de Rhodes. Une chronologie des inscriptions de la cité fondée sur l'étude de ses institutions* [Vestigia 63], München: Verlag C. H. Beck oHG 2015; XVII+ 542 S.; (ISBN 978-3-406-64035-3 [108 Euro])

This is the re-worked form of the author's (: N.B.) dissertation at Neuchâtel and Bordeaux 3 prepared under the respective supervision of Denis Knoepfler and Alain Bresson, supported in 2007. Thus we have here a detailed, laborious and penetrating study of all inscriptional testimonies on the basic priesthoods of the unified polis of Rhodes and some important magistracies as a fundamental chronological grid of the island and its political and social life. The inscriptions considered (and often re-dated and re-evaluated) include name catalogues of priests and archons not only from the constituent demes (and ex-poleis) of the island, Lindos, Kamiros and Ialysos, but also from the rich evidence of Rhodian amphora-stamps found at many places outside Rhodes. One has in all the impression of a huge material being here for the first time so meticulously organized and questioned to gain not only crucial conclusions on the dating of Rhodian documents but also insights into the system on the basis of which the whole island state worked.

In a first part N.B. examines and clears the use of the two official years of Rhodes: (a) the 'eponymic' one based on the old tradition of eponymous priests practiced already by the three independent poleis of Rhodes before the synoecism of 408 BC (here, p. 23, dated more exactly to the 1st day of Karneios equated with the 17th of October); (b) the 'civil' one, divided in two semesters and corresponding to the rhythm of sessions of assembly and council in the unified city.

Systematic analyses and rearrangements of the lists of crucial Rhodian priesthoods follow. First, the catalogue of priests of the Lindian Athena is re-examined and partly re-dated. The significant subscription intending to restore the jewelry and the precious vases of the goddess is brought in connection with Poliorketes' siege of Rhodes (304) and not with earlier damages of Athena's temple. A similar scrutiny of the catalogue of priests of Poseidon Hippios at Lindos concludes a lowering of their whole date by ten years (from ca 325 to 315 BC) and a considerable lapse of time (fifteen or even thirty years) in the assumption of this priesthood in relation to that of Athena. The focus falls then on the other ex-city/deme of Rhodes, Kamiros, where other such lists (of civil magistrates and priests) invite close cross-treatment. The result is the exact dating of many magistrates of Kamiros mentioned in these catalogues.

Lists which include some additional notes ('catalogues annotés') allow further conclusions. Thus the institution of the 'prophets' (*prophetai*) of the Rhodian polis is safely recognized not as a religious office but as a sort of deputies of the eponymous priest of the city. The list of the *presbyteroi* is dated in a way that imposes interpreting the mention *κατὰ Ῥωμαῖα* therein as referring to the aftermath of Sulla's victory over Mithridates and the consequent acquisition of new areas in Asia Minor by the Rhodians as Roman allies in the 80ties BC. The recognition that the festival of the *Dipanamia* on Rhodes was named after and corresponded to the intercalary month *Panamos deuterios* also allows the identification of all years with an intercalary month in our evidence, a considerable part of which consists of amphora stamps.

The culmination of Rhodian institutions, and this research, are then the (eponymous) priests of Helios of the unified polis. N.B. combines again stone inscriptions and amphora stamps to reconstitute a chronological list with as few gaps as possible. Among other gains, he places now the priest of Helios Autokrates, dating the Nesiotic decree IG XII.5, 824 from Tenos, ca 155 BC (during the period of the Second Cretan War). However, his concomitant inference that the absence of stamp

testimonies for priests of the period 168-164 BC is due to a formal suppression of Rhodian institutions by Rome in the aftermath of the Third Macedonian War is certainly exaggerated (and not supported by Polyb. 30. 31. 10 as claimed).

The book further offers a detailed chronological table of 1067 more or less precisely dated inscriptions from all places of the Rhodian state and some further sites. Various other systematic lists follow, i.a. of eponymous priests and sculptors in the documents utilized. Finally, the whole dossier of the most important inscriptions used in the study, in the form of a useful epigraphic collection including the ancient texts, textual notes, bibliography and a French translation, also contributes to the value of the work. Various bibliographical tables and indices conclude the volume.

In all, one has assured here an indispensable tool for a better knowledge and future research of the polis of Rhodes and its institutions. This was a real timely addition to our Rhodian scholarly instrumentarium, for the zeal of which all specialists ought to be thankful.

Kostas BURASELIS