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Introduction
Twenty two amphora stamps from the Tatarlı Höyük excavations in Cilicia (2008-2017) are the subject of this article. Eighteen are identified as of Rhodian origin, two from Cyprus, one from Chios, and one from Knidos. The Rhodian stamps are included in this study primarily due to their numerical density and they are listed chronologically under this title. Following the Rhodian section, the stamps from Cyprus, Chios and Knidos are given.

Location and studies on Tatarlı Höyük
Tatarlı Höyük is situated in the Tatarlı village, formerly Yedigöz/Yedioluk, 24 km east of Ceyhan, Adana (Fig. 1). Located in the eastern part of the Çukurova, the mound has a strategic position, located on important trade routes1. It is one of the largest sites in Cilicia Pedias (Plain Cilicia). It is a flat-topped, wooded mound on a basalt rock outcrop, with its base measuring 350 m by 180 m and with a height of 37 m (Fig. 2)2.

The mound was first referred to in M. V. Seton-Williams’s Cilician Survey, who mentioned the presence of Neolithic, Chalcolithic, Late Bronze, Hellenistic and Byzantine period material in 19513. Later, M. H. Sayar and his team in 19914, and the team headed by K. S. Girginer in 20055, during their research in the region visited the mound6. Excavations which began in 2007 are continuing under the head of K. S. Girginer from the Çukurova University, Department of Archaeology7.

As a result of the excavations conducted to date at the Tatarlı Höyük, 8 cultural strata were found dating from the Neolithic to the Early Roman Period; while the uppermost layer has Byzantine
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1 Girginer – Oyman-Girginer – Akl 2010, 454.
2 Girginer – Collon 2014, 59.
4 Sayar – Siewert – Taeuber 1993, 179, 189 fig. 6.
5 Girginer 2007, 177.
7 For the results of the excavations, see Girginer – Oyman-Girginer – Akl 2010; Girginer – Oyman-Girginer – Akl 2011; Girginer 2012; Girginer et al. 2014; Girginer et al. 2017.
Both its location and its closeness to the surrounding water sources/springs have caused the mound to be inhabited in all periods 9.

Tatarlı Höyük has similarities with the Hellenistic period strata of the mounds of the Çukurova in terms of its settlement model 10. The excavation results indicate that the Hellenistic Period of the Tatarlı Höyük had two different phases from the architectural remains 11: Tatarlı II a-b 12. The construction phases could be dated exactly from the coin and pottery finds. The Hellenistic pits in the mound also provided important data for this period, however, they also ruined earlier architectural structures on the site 13. Incurved rim bowls, outcurved carinated bowls, Eastern Sigillata A vessels, bowls and plates ornamented in West-Slope technique, mould made bowls, fish plates, unguentaria, lamps, miniature cream vessels 14 and amphorae form the Hellenistic pottery repertoire of Tatarlı Höyük 15.

A huge number of pyramidal, conical or discoidal loom weights dating from the Hellenistic Period indicate the textile production at Tatarlı Höyük 16. Archaeobotanical research also provide evidence to support this 17. It is possible from the archeological evidence to say that Tatarlı Höyük was primarily a centre of weaving, evident from the data obtained from the excavations 18.

Rhodian 19


---

9 Girginer – Oyman-Girginer – Akıl 2010, 466.
10 Girginer et al. 2014, 186. For the Hellenistic layers of the mounds in the region, see Goldman 1950; Kreutz 2012, 140-154; Yıldız 2016.
11 The Hellenistic architecture of Tatarlı Höyük is being studied by Res. Ass. M. Cem Fırat as a MA Thesis, Çukurova University, Department of Archaeometry.
12 Novak et al. 2017, 175.
14 For the publication of the miniature cream vessels from the mound, see Akıl 2017.
17 Aslan – Çakan – Girginer 2015, 103.
19 The catalogue of Rhodian stamps entries include the matrix title and designations as established by ongoing research on Rhodian stamps in the Alexandria Amphora Research Center (CEAA) of the Centre d’Etudes Alexandrines (CEAlex). RE: Rhodian Eponym and RF: Rhodian Fabricant. For matrix studies of Rhodian amphora stamps, see Cankardeş-Şenol 2017, 215-223; www.amphoralex.org.
20 Communication from G. Cankardeş-Şenol.
21 Finkielsztejn 2001, 188.
Name of the eponym Ἀγέστρατος I appears in two lines, in the genitive case and with the preposition ἐπί. The eponym officiated during Period I, and appeared on amphora of the fabricants Ἰεροτέλης and Ὀνάσιμος I.

**SH 2.** Inv. No: TH.17.AZ-185.53/26, Findspot: AZ-185, VIII-X / h-k, Form: rectangular, Dimension: -, Fabricant: Onasimos I, Month: -, Device and device place: -, Inscription mode and direction: Normal, Matrix: RF-ΟΝΑΣΙΜΟΣ 01-002, Date: ca. 270 - ca. 247 BC (in Period Ib)

The name of the fabricant Ὀνάσιμος I appears here in two lines in the genitive case. The fabricant was dateable due to the eponyms: Αἰνησίδαμος I, Πολυκλῆς and Ἀγέστρατος I. The fabricant was dated to ca. 262-ca. 247 - ca. 245 B.C. based on the associated eponyms in recent studies.

**SH 3.** Mus. Inv. No: ETD.09/103, Findspot: AL-175, 3002/3, Form: circular, Dimension: R. 2.6 cm, Fabricant: Hieroteles, Month: -, Device and device place: point - in the center, Inscription mode and direction: Normal, the letters inward, Matrix: RF-ΙΕΡΟΤΕΛΗΣ-018, Date: Period I-II

---

22 Doğer 1994, 216.
24 There are some considerations that the names of “fabricants” read on the Rhodian stamps may actually belong to the *wine merchants*. For discussions on this hypothesis, see Rauh – Autret – Lund 2013, 151; Dündar 2017, 386-387. Despite this hypothesis, the “fabricant” designation was used throughout the study, as it has been the case with other relevant studies.
26 For the dating of Period Ib, see Finkielsztejn 2001, 188.
27 Schmaltz 2016, 111, KA 273. The eponym Αἰνησίδαμος I was dated to ca. 245 by G. Finkielsztejn (2001, 188).
28 N. Conovici and M. Irimia (1991, 23, no. 257) suggested that the fabricant was active before ca. 225 B.C. from the Pietroiu deposit and associated eponyms.
29 LexEp IV, 238.
The name of the fabricant Ἱεροτέλης appears here facing inwards on the circular stamp with a dot in the central declivity. Known to have worked at the Hisarönü-Çubucak site in Rhodian Peraia31, the fabricant was active between ca. 273/272-225 B.C. and associated with about 43 eponyms32. The fabricant Ἱεροτέλης is known to be the first fabricant in the Rhodian amphora chronology to have used the name of the month on a second rectangular stamp besides the main stamp, beginning ca. 240 B.C.33.


Ἐπὶ Ἀθανόδοτος Ἀγριανίου ἅμα νας.

The name of the eponym Ἀθανόδοτος appears facing inward on a circular stamp with a rose symbol in the center. The month name cannot be read, but it is restored as Ἀγριανίου in respect to a complete stamp from Alexandria36. His stamps have been found in the fills of the Middle Stoa37 and the Pergamon deposit38 and the eponym was dated within Period IIId by G. Finkielsztejn39. The eponym is associated with fabricants: Αρίστων40, Μαρσύας41, Αμύντας42, Ἀγαθοκλῆς III43, Ἀντίμαχος44, Δαμοκράτης I45, Ζωίλος46, Ἰπποκράτης47, Σαραπίων48, and Φιλαινίος49.

31 Empereur – Tuna 1989, 277-299.
32 For Rhodian eponyms whose names appeared on Hieroteles’ amphoras, see Doğer 1994, 207, 217-218.
34 LexEp I, 99.
36 LexEp I, 99 (Alex ABC 0040.30, MGR P.23623).
37 Grace 1985, 8-10.
38 Börker – Burow 1998, 19 nos. 30-40.
40 Cankardeş-Şenol 2000, 396 no. 7; Nicolaou 2005, 429 no. 117.
41 Barker 2004, 80 no. 8.
42 Nicolaou – Empereur 1986, 516-517 no. 3.
44 Buzoianu 1980, 123.
45 Grace 1985, 10.
46 Jöhrens 1999a, 53 no. 134.
47 Sztetyło 1991, 21 no. 5.
48 Grace 1985, 10; Nicolaou 2005, 429-430 no. 118.
49 Finkielsztejn 2001, 124 Tab. 6.
SH 5. Inv. No: TH.17.AZ-185.54/48, Findspot: AZ-185 filling of wall D1, Form: rectangular, Dimension: 3.5 x 1.6 cm, Eponym: Aratophanes, Month: Dalios, Inscription mode and direction: Normal, Matrix: RE-ΑΡΑΤΟΦΑΝΗΣ 01-ΔΑΛΙΟΣ-00550, Date: 169/167 B.C. (in Period IIIe)

Ἐπὶ Ἀρατο-
ϕάνευς
Δαλίου

The name of the eponym Ἀρατοφάνης I appears here with the month Δάλιος in three lines. The stamps of the eponym have been found in the Pergamon deposit51 and the eponym was dated within Period IIIe52. There is a later homonym dated to Period V. A fabricant with the same name who was active in Period V is also known53. The stamps of Ἀρατοφάνης I have been found in Athens54, Cro-
codilopolis-Arsinoë55, Carthage56, Gezer57, Alexandria58, Akoris59, Jerusalem60 and Patara61.

SH 6. Inv. No: TH.11-10.028, Findspot: 10.028, Form: rectangular, Dimension: 4.3 x 1.8 cm, Eponym: Archilaidas, Month: Panamos, Inscription mode and direction: Normal, Matrix: RE-ΑΡΧΙΛΑΙΔΑΣ-
ΠΑΝΑΜΟΣ-00262, Date: ca. 165/163 B.C. (in Period IIIe)

Ἐπὶ Ἀρχιλαί-
δα
Πανάμου

The name of the eponym Ἀρχιλαίδας appears here together with the month Πάναμος in three lines in the genitive case. Having previously been dated to ca. 182-176 B.C.63, the eponym was later dated to ca. 165/163 B.C. by G. Finkielsztejn64. His name appeared on a complete amphora of the fabricant

50 LexEp I, 277.
51 Börker – Burow 1998, 21 nos. 72-73.
52 Finkielsztejn 2001, 192 Tab. 19.
53 For the eponym Ἀρατοφάνης II, see Grace 1950, 143 no. 49; Finkielsztejn 2001, 195 Tab. 21. For the eponym Ἀρατοφάνης II stamps and eponym-fabricant links, see LexEp I, 283-287. For fabricant Ἀρατοφάνης, see Cankardeş-Şenol 2000, 74 no. 4. For the varied dies of the fabricant, see www.amphoralex.org.
54 Fraser – Matthews 1987, 56.
55 Empereur 1977, 207 no. 16.
57 Macalister 1912, 353-354 nos. 73-76.
60 Ariel 1990, 43-44 S112-S120.
61 Dündar 2017, 109 Rh.36.
62 LexEp I, 537.
63 Grace 1985, 8; Börker – Burow 1998, 26 nos. 145-150.
64 Finkielsztejn 2001, 192 Tab. 19.
Nikaísiov found in Nea Paphos, and on an amphora of the fabricant Άριστοκλής II found in Nicosia.

The eponym was also associated with the fabricants: Άμύντας, Δαμοκλής, Άγαθοκλής ΙΙΙ, Άγοράναξ, Δίος Ι, Δωρίων, Μαρσύας.

**SH 7.** Inv. No: TH.11-1220/6, Findspot: 1220/6, Form: circular, Dimension: R 2.9 cm, Fabricant: Ζωίλος, Month: -, Device and device place: Rose - in the center, Inscription mode and direction: Normal, zeta like iota, the letters facing inward, inscription between two circles, Matrix: RF-ΖΩΙΛΟΣ-004, Date: ca. 170/168 B.C. (in Period III)

The name of the fabricant Ζωίλος appears facing inward on circular stamp with a rose symbol used in the center. The fabricant is known to have been active during Period III and is associated with the eponym Άθανόδοτος. Published stamps of Ζωίλος include, Kaunos, the Alexandria Greco-Roman Museum and the Nicholson Museum. A stamp from the same die as on the Tatarlı example was found at Pergamon.

---

65 Barker 2004, 82 no. 16.
66 Grace 1949, 185 no. 5, pls. 19-20 nos. 4-5; Nicolaou – Empereur 1986, 519 no. 5; Jöhrens 2001, 376 fig. 6, no. 1.
67 Jöhrens 2001, 375 fig. 5 no. 2.
68 Cankardeş-Şenol 2007, 113 no. 1.
69 LexEp IV, 192.
70 www.amphoralex.org.
71 For the dating of the fabricant, see LexEp IV, 227; for the dating of Period III, see Finkielsztejn 2001, 192.
72 Jöhrens 1999a, 53 no. 134. C. Barker (1999, 113) stated that the fabricant Ζωίλος was probably active between the years 210-175 B.C. He gave this date according to V. Grace’s date in the Athenian Agora. For Grace’s dating, see Fraser – Matthews 1987, 196.
73 Schmaltz 2016, 223 KA 531.
74 Botti 1901, 190 nos. 42-43.
75 Barker 1999, 113 no. 3.
Imported Hellenistic Stamped Amphora Handles from Tatarlı Höyük

SH 8. Inv. No: TH.17.BA-183.9/3, Findspot: BA-183, IV-VII/a-k, Form: rectangular, Dimension: 3.8 x 1.7 cm, Fabricant: Olympos I, Month: -, Device and device place: Burning torch - in the right, Inscription mode and direction: Normal, Matrix: RF-ΟΛΥΜΠΟΣ 01-00677, Date: ca. 198 - ca. 161 B.C. (Period III)78

Name of the fabricant Ὄλυμπος I appears here in the genitive case and in a single line with a symbol of burning torch to the right of his name. The fabricant with his stamps found in the Pergamon deposit was dated to Period III79. Ὄλυμπος I was dated to the last quarter of the 3rd century B.C. by V. Grace in previous studies80. The fabricant is associated with the eponyms: Αἰνησίδαμος II81, Δαμοκλῆς II82 and Κλευκράτης I83. The characteristic device of this fabricant is a burning torch. A stamp of the fabricant from the same die as the Tatarlı example has been found in Alexandria.

SH 9. Inv. No: TH.17.AZ-185.55/2, Findspot: AZ-185, VIII/e, Form: circular, Dimension: R 2.9 cm, Fabricant: Hippokrates, Month: -, Device and device place: Rose - in the center, Inscription mode and direction: Normal, the letters facing inward, the inscription between two circles, Matrix: RF-ΙΠΠΟΚΡΑΤΗΣ-00784, Date: ca. 186 - ca. 122 B.C. (in Period III-IV-V)85

The name of the fabricant Ἱπποκράτης appears facing inward on a circular stamp with a rose symbol in the center. Ἱπποκράτης is known to have been associated with many eponyms, including: Τέρων I and Άριστατος86, and is dated to ca. 186 - ca. 122 B.C.87.

78 Finkielsztejn 2001, 192.
79 Börker – Burow 1998, 50 no. 497 pl. 18.
80 Grace 1934, 306 no. 5. For discussions the fabricant’s dating, see Nicolaou 2005, 201 no. 525.
81 Empereur – Guimier-Sorbet 1986, 130; Conovici – Irimia 1991, 170 no. 10 fig. 17; Finkielsztejn 2001, 205 no. 5.
82 Gentili 1958, 37 nos. 22a-b.
83 LexEp I, 232.
85 For dating of the fabricant, see LexEp IV, 229.
86 These are the earliest and latest known eponyms dated to the fabricant.
87 LexEp IV, 229. For the eponyms, see Finkielsztejn 2001, 192, 195.
SH 10. Inv. No: TH.17.BA-185.4/2, Findspot: BA-185-VI/1, Form: rectangular, Dimension: 3.9 x 1.21 cm, Fabricant: Marsyas, Month: Dalios, Device and device place: -, Inscription mode and direction: Normal, Matrix: -, Date: ca. 186 - ca. 158 B.C. (in Periods III-IV) 88

Μαρσύα
Δαλίου

The name of the fabricant Μαρσύας appears here with the month name of Δάλιος. He was first dated between the years ca. 210 and ca. 175 B.C. from his stamps found in the Pergamon deposit 89. However, due to the associated eponyms, Z. Sztetyłło suggested he began operating at ca. 197 - ca. 195 B.C. 90. The fabricant Μαρσύας is dated within Period III and IV from the 33 eponyms 91. Such eponyms as Ἱέρων I92 and Γόργων93 helped in dating the fabricant.

SH 11. Inv. No: TH.17-2017/1, Findspot: Surface, Form: rectangular, Dimension: 3.5 x 2.0 cm, Fabricant: Pausanias III, Month: -, Device and device place: Rose, Inscription mode and direction: Normal, Matrix: RF-ΠΑΥΣΑΝΙΑΣ 03-00394, Date: Periods III-IV (ca. 198 - ca. 146 B.C.)

Παυσανία

encodeURIComponent(rose)

The stamp carries the name of the fabricant Παυσανίας III inscribed in the genitive case in a single line. The rose was used as a symbol under the fabricant name. Παυσανίας III is the last of the three fabricant homonyms to use the same name 95. The fabricant was active at the end of the Period III to Period IV 96.


90 Sztetyłło 1991, 75-76 no. 131.
91 For the eponym list related with Μαρσύας, see LexEp IV, 230.
92 Nicolaou – Empereur 1986, 516 no. 2.
93 Finkielsztejn 2001, 138 Table 8.
95 Concerning this matter, see Grace 1934, 224-225; Empereur 1977, 225 no. 75; Ariel 1990, 58, S254; Dündar 2017, 129, 180 Rh.63, Rh.142.
96 His stamp was found in the Pergamon deposit, see Börker – Burow 1998, 51 no. 502. According to G. Finkielsztejn (2001, 76 no. 55), the activity of the fabricant lasted into Period IV.
97 LexEp II, 26.
The name of the eponym Δαμαίνετος appears on the stamp with the month Πάναμος. Having previously been dated within Period IV, to ca. 175 - ca. 146 B.C., the eponym has been dated to ca. 159/158 B.C. in recent studies. It is known that the eponym Δαμαίνετος helped in dating the amphoras of the fabricants Ἴμας, Μενεσθεύς and Τιμώ II. He also appears on round-formed stamps and on stamps from different dies.


The name of the eponym Άλεξιμάχος appears in the genitive case, in three lines with the name of the month Δάλιος. Stamps with this eponym have been found in the Pergamon-Asklepieion, and the eponym was dated to ca. 149 - ca. 146 by V. Grace and dated to ca. 150 - ca. 147 B.C. by G. Finkielsztejn. Associated fabricants include: Άνδρικός, Μηνόθεμις, Άντιμαχος, Θεύμανστος, Εύκλειτος, Μάνης and Ερμίας.

---

99 Cankardeş-Şenol 2000, 298 no. 35.
100 Finkielsztejn 2001, 193.
102 Grace 1934, 219.
103 Cankardeş-Şenol 2000, 124-125 no. 19. For other fabricants he has dated, see LexEp II, 21.
104 Jöhrens 1999a, 79 no. 205.
108 Börker – Burow 1998, 81 no. 46.
110 Grace 1974, 96 A5.
111 Grace 1974, 94 A3.
113 Cankardeş-Şenol 2000, 277-278 no. 7.
114 Grace 1974, 97 pl. 22, nos. 1-3; Nicolaou 2005, 31-32 no. 41. For the other fabricants, see LexEp IV, 215.

Ἐπ’ ἱε[ρ]έως Παυσανία Θεσ[μοφ]ορίου

The name of the eponym Παυσανίας III appears here together with the name of the month Θεσμοφόριος. Before his name is the title ἱερεύς. Παυσανίας III has been dated to ca. 152 B.C. in Period IV\textsuperscript{115}. The eponym is associated with the fabricants: Ἡφαιστίων\textsuperscript{116}, Νικίας\textsuperscript{117}, Όνασιοικός\textsuperscript{118}, Ἀριστοκλῆς \textsuperscript{119}, Ἐπικράτης\textsuperscript{120}, Νύσιος\textsuperscript{121}, Θεύμναστος\textsuperscript{122}, and Ἰμᾶς\textsuperscript{123}.

SH 15. Inv. No: TH.17.AZ-183.15/5, Findspot: AZ-183, I-X/a-k, Form: rectangular, Dimension: 3.6 x 1.6 cm, Eponym: Pausanias, Month: Artamitios, Inscription mode and direction: Normal, Matrix: RE-ΠΑΥΣΑΝΙΑΣ 03-ΑΡΤΑΜΙΤΙΟΣ-010\textsuperscript{124}, Date: ca. 152 B.C. (in Period IVb)

Ἐπὶ Παυ-

σανία

Ἀρταμιτίου

The name of the eponym Παυσανίας III appears in the nominative case together with the name of the month Ἀρταμιτίος. For the eponym, see SH 14.

SH 16. Inv. No: TH.17.BE-174.7/4, Findspot: BE-174, IV-X/a-k, Form: rectangular, Dimension: 4.5 x 1.7 cm, Eponym: Lapheides, Month: Artamitios, Device and device place: -, Inscription mode and direction: Normal, Matrix: RE-ΛΑΦΕΙΔΗΣ-ΑΡΤΑΜΙΤΙΟΣ-001\textsuperscript{125}, Date: ca. 140 - ca. 138 B.C. (in Period Va)\textsuperscript{126}

\textsuperscript{115} Based on the Korinth and Carthage deposit finds, see Finkielsztejn 2001, 193 Tab. 20.
\textsuperscript{116} Grace 1947, 450 fig. 8; Nicolaou – Empereur 1986, 522-523 no. 7, fig. 6.
\textsuperscript{117} Barker 2004, 83 no. 20.
\textsuperscript{118} Gentili 1958, 35 no. 7.
\textsuperscript{119} Ariel – Finkielsztejn 2003, 138-139 Rh 1.
\textsuperscript{120} Grace 1934, 302 nos. 4-5.
\textsuperscript{121} Grace – Savvatianou-Pétropoulos 1970, 304-305 E12.
\textsuperscript{122} Zeitoun – Christophi – Empereur 1998, 370.
\textsuperscript{123} Grace 1934, 219.
\textsuperscript{124} LexEp III, 211.
\textsuperscript{125} LexEp III, 2.
\textsuperscript{126} Finkielsztejn 2001, 195.
The name on the stamp can be restored as Λαφείδης from stamps in the Alexandria Benaki Collection\(^{127}\) and Paphos\(^{128}\). The name of the eponym Λαφείδης appears in the genitive case, in three lines with the name of the month Ἀρταμίτιος. The eponym was dated to a year between ca. 141 - ca. 138 B.C. by G. Finkielsztejn\(^{129}\). A stamp from the same die as the Tatarlı sample is in the Benaki Collection.

**SH 17.** Mus. Inv. No: ETD.09/60, Findspot: AZ-173, I/c, 2001/1, Form: rectangular, Dimension: -, Eponym: -, Month: Artamitios, Device and device place: -, Inscription mode and direction: Normal, Date: in Periods III-IV (ca. 198 - ca. 146 B.C.)

The preposition ἐπί and the name of the month Ἀρταμίτιος appear on the rectangular stamp with three lines, while the name of the eponym is illegible. However, this stamp may belong to the eponym Ἀγέστρατος II\(^{130}\). It is possible to date it to Periods III-IV from the handle profile.

**SH 18.** Inv. No: TH.12-97/107, Findspot: 97/107, Form: rectangular, Dimension: 3.4 x 1.3 cm, Eponym/Fabricant: -, Month: -, Device and device place: -, Inscription mode and direction: Normal (?), Date: ca. 198 - ca. 146 B.C. (in Periods III-IV)

Only the *eta* letter at the end of the first line can be read in the rectangular shaped stamp. It is possible to date it to Periods III-IV from the handle profile.

**Cypriot**

**SH 19.** Inv. No: TH.11-1262/23, Findspot: 1262/23, Form: oval, Dimension: 1.5 x 1.2 cm, Device and device place: -, Inscription mode and direction: Cypriot syllabary, Date: 3\(^{rd}\) century B.C.

\(^{127}\) LexEp III, 2.

\(^{128}\) Nicolaou 2005, 91 no. 205.

\(^{129}\) Finkielsztejn 1998, 53.

\(^{130}\) For the eponym, see Dündar 2017, 105-106 Rh.31.
Two syllabic signs from the Cypriot alphabet appear on this oval stamp, which can be read as we-wi or ma-we based upon the study by O. Masson\textsuperscript{131}. Similar stamps were dated to the 3\textsuperscript{rd} century B.C. on the amphorae found in Kourion-Cyprus\textsuperscript{132} and at Alexandria\textsuperscript{133}.

**SH 20.** Inv. No: TH.17.BA-167.LOC-10/1, Findspot: BA-167, 10/1, Form: circular, Dimension: R 1.9 cm, Device and device place: -, Inscription mode and direction: Abbreviation, Matrix: -, Date: 3\textsuperscript{rd} century B.C.

\[\text{ΙΔΕΡ} (\text{or} \ ΙΔΡΕ} (\text{retr.}\]

A ligature of four letters appears on this circular stamp. The fabric and handle profile show the characteristics of amphorae of Cypriot production. It is possible to identify the letters appearing on the stamp as ΙΔΕΡ (or ΙΔΡΕ). An example from the same die as with SH 20 in the Warsaw Museum was read as ΙΔΡΕ\textsuperscript{134}. Similar letters have been identified on a rectangular handle found in surface investigations at Elaia/Aiolis\textsuperscript{135}. A similar example found in Alexandria was unearthed from the same layer as a stamp belonging to the Rhodian eponym Τιμοκλείδας, who was dated to 240 B.C.\textsuperscript{136}.

**Chian**

**SH 21.** Inv. No: TH.17.BA-184.14/8, Findspot: BA-184, IV-VIII / d-k, Form: rectangular, Dimension: 2.5 x 0.7 cm, Fabricant: Hikesios, Device and device place: -, Inscription mode and direction: Normal, Matrix: Χ-ΙΚΕΣΙΟΣ-001\textsuperscript{137}, Date: ca. 250 - ca. 225 B.C.

\[\text{Ικεσίου}\]

The stamp carries the name of the fabricant Ικεσίος inscribed in the genitive case on a rectangular stamp in a single line. Ικεσίος is among the early amphora producers on Chios\textsuperscript{138}. The fabricant is

\textsuperscript{131} Masson 1983, 57 fig. 1.
\textsuperscript{132} Grace 1979, pl. 29, nos. 12-22.
\textsuperscript{133} Cankardeş-Şenol – Şenol 2013, 77-80 CyAS20-25.
\textsuperscript{134} Szetyłło 1983, 195 no. 382.
\textsuperscript{135} Doğer – Cankardeş-Şenol 1997, 15, 48 no. 25.
\textsuperscript{136} Cankardeş-Şenol 2000, 505 no. 173.
\textsuperscript{137} Alkaç 2012, 309.
\textsuperscript{138} Lawall 2007, 55-56; Alkaç 2012, 129.
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dated by V. Grace to the 3rd century B.C.\textsuperscript{139}. Stamps of Ἱκέσιος from the same die as with the Tatarlı example have been found in Pergamon\textsuperscript{140}, Kaunos\textsuperscript{141}, Salamis\textsuperscript{142}, Paphos\textsuperscript{143} and Alexandria\textsuperscript{144}.

**Knidian**

**SH 22.** Inv. No: TH.17.BD-174.5/3, Findspot: BD-174, I-X/a-k, Form: rectangular, Dimension: 3.3 x 1.4 cm, Eponym: Lysanios, Fabricant: Aristocrates, Device and device place: -, Inscription mode and direction: Retrograde, Matrix: KT 269\textsuperscript{145}, Date: The first half of the 2nd century B.C.

Λυσανίου

Ἀριστοκρ- retr.

άτ[ευς]

The names of the eponym Λυσάνιος and the fabricant Ἀριστοκράτης appear on the stamp. V. Grace notes that the eponym Λυσάνιος was never named φρούραρχος in his period, and that many fabricants who date stamps by his name work at the beginning of Period IV A (ca. 188 - ca. 167 B.C.). For this reason, Grace suggests that the date of Λυσάνιος should be shortly after 188 B.C.\textsuperscript{146}. In addition, the name of the eponym is found on an inscription in Thyssanous (Saranda-Karia)\textsuperscript{147}. It is known that the eponym Λυσάνιος dates the fabricants such as Ἀριστογένης and Διονύσιος\textsuperscript{148}. The fabricant Ἀριστοκράτης is known to be associated with the eponyms Φίλιππος\textsuperscript{149} (Period IVa - ca. 188 - ca. 167 B.C.) and Διογένης\textsuperscript{150} (Period IVb - ca 167 - ca. 146 B.C.). This stamp from Tatarlı shows that Λυσάνιος also dates the fabricant Ἀριστοκράτης. The first half of the 2nd century B.C. can be recommended for this stamp.

**Conclusion**

The twenty two stamped amphora handles found at Tatarlı Höyük, which is one of the major mound sites of Cilicia Pedias (Plain Cilicia), are important material, providing information on this subject in the region. The materials in particular provide important information not only on the dating of the settlement’s Hellenistic Period strata, but also concerning the spread and statistics of the materials in question within Asia Minor’s Mediterranean geography. The fact that there are no publications on

\textsuperscript{139} Grace 1956, 166 no. 198.

\textsuperscript{140} Börker – Burow 1998, 121 no. 567, pl. 36.

\textsuperscript{141} Schmalz 2016, 360 KA 835.

\textsuperscript{142} Calvet 1972, 47 no. 96.

\textsuperscript{143} Nicolaou 2005, 247-248 no. 733.

\textsuperscript{144} Alkaç 2012, 309-340 nos. 117-179.

\textsuperscript{145} We would like to thank G. Cankardeş-Şenol for information about the matrix of the stamp at the Alexandria Benaki Collection.

\textsuperscript{146} Grace 1974, 199-200.

\textsuperscript{147} Fraser – Bean 1954, 37.

\textsuperscript{148} Jöhrens 1999a, 102, 104 nos. 270, 276.

\textsuperscript{149} Jöhrens 1999a, 123 no. 351.

\textsuperscript{150} Dumont 1871, 176 no. 206; Pridik 1896, 147 no. 67.
this subject, other than from Gözlü Kule/Tarsus\textsuperscript{151}, Sirkeli Höyük\textsuperscript{152} and Kinet Höyük\textsuperscript{153} in Cilicia Pedias, increase the importance of these Tatarlı examples. Despite their limited number, the fact that all of them are readable except for two, is more important than the materials in question.

Eighteen of the twenty two stamped amphora handles are of Rhodian origin. Only two of the Rhodian stamps are not legible (SH 17-18). Eleven of the legible stamps belong to the eponyms, while the remaining seven belong to the fabricants. The earliest Rhodian stamp found on the site belongs to Ὀνάσιμος I (SH 2) and is placed into Period I according to the Rhodian stamp chronology. Apart from the fabricant Ὀνάσιμος I, stamps belonging to fabricants placed in the Periods III and IV such as Ζωόλος, Ὀλυμπος I, Ἡποκράτης, Μαρσύας and Παυσανίας III, were also found. The stamp of only one fabricant from the Rhodian Peraea appeared amongst the stamps found at Tatarlı Höyük. The fabricant Ἱεροτέλης, (SH.3) operated intensively during Periods I and II. The eponym stamps in the site are placed within a wider date range than the fabricant stamps. The eponym stamps in the site are as follows: Ἀγέστρατος I dated to Period Ib, Ἀθανόδοτος dated to Period IIId, Ἀρχαφάνης I and Ἀρχαφαίδας dated to the Period IIIe, Δαμαίνετος dated to the Period IVa, Ἀλεξίμαχος and Παυσανίας III dated to the Period IVb, and Δαμίου dated into the Period Va. The overall number of the Rhodian stamps found at the site suggests that the numbers from Period III and IV are remarkable. This situation seems consistent with Rhodian commercial policy\textsuperscript{154}.

The second group in the Tatarlı Höyük is of Cyprus origin. One of two amphora handles in this group has a stamp written in the Cypriot syllable (SH 19), but it cannot be clearly read. On the other Cypriot example there is also a monogram or an abbreviation consisting of four letters (SH 20). It is possible from both the handle profiles and comparisons to date both examples from Cyprus within the 3\textsuperscript{rd} century B.C. Only one Chian stamp was found (SH 21). The name of the fabricant Ἰκέσιος, who is thought to have been active between ca. 250 - ca. 225 B.C., has been read on this Chian stamp found at the site. However, perhaps the most important example among the Tatarlı examples is the Cnidian stamp. On this stamp (SH 22) both the name of the eponym Λυσάνιος and the name of the fabricant Ἀριστοκράτης are found. The date of this stamp is somewhat problematic, as the eponym and fabricant have been dated to different periods in previous studies\textsuperscript{155}. The eponym Λυσάνιος had been placed in Period III and the fabricant Ἀριστοκράτης had been placed in Period V in earlier studies. The appearance of both names together on the Tatarlı example indicates the chronology of these names, which had been dated to different periods in previous studies, has to be revised from this new evidence and, for this reason, a somewhat broader date range has been given to both the eponym Λυσάνιος and the fabricant Ἀριστοκράτης, the first half of the 2\textsuperscript{nd} century B.C.

The fact that this number of stamped amphora handles were found at Tatarlı Höyük, a site located inland, is important, in showing this site, which had lived its brightest period in the 2\textsuperscript{nd} millennium B.C., was still a member in the active maritime trade of the Hellenistic period. In addition, these

\textsuperscript{151} Grace 1950.
\textsuperscript{152} Hrouda 1997, 295 (there is no picture).
\textsuperscript{153} Gates 1994, 195, 198 fig. 3.
\textsuperscript{154} Lund 1999, 199-202; Rauh 1999, 165-166.
\textsuperscript{155} See discussion given under SH 18. There may of course be two fabricants with the same name. One worked in Period III-IV and one in Period V.
stamps are also important in terms of providing data from the region, especially for Rhodian and Knidian matrix studies.

**Index of Greek Names and Abbreviations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ἀγέστρατος I</td>
<td>SH.1, Rh. ep.</td>
<td>Rh. ep.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ἀθανόδοτος</td>
<td>SH.4, Rh. ep.</td>
<td>Rh. ep.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ἀλεξίμαχος</td>
<td>SH.13, Rh. ep.</td>
<td>Rh. ep.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ἀρατοφάνης I</td>
<td>SH.5, Rh. ep.</td>
<td>Rh. ep.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ἀριστοκράτης</td>
<td>SH.22, Kn. fab.</td>
<td>Kn. fab.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ἀρχιλαίδας</td>
<td>SH.6, Rh. ep.</td>
<td>Rh. ep.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Δαμαίνετος</td>
<td>SH.12, Rh. ep.</td>
<td>Rh. ep.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Διὸς</td>
<td>SH.7, Rh. fab.</td>
<td>Rh. fab.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἸΔΕΡ( or ΙΔΡΕ(</td>
<td>SH.20, Cyp.</td>
<td>Cyp.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ἰκέσιος</td>
<td>SH.21, Chi. fab.</td>
<td>Chi. fab.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ἰπποκράτης</td>
<td>SH.9, Rh. Fab.</td>
<td>Rh. Fab.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Δαμαίνετος</td>
<td>SH.21, Chi. fab.</td>
<td>Chi. fab.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Θεσμοφόριος</td>
<td>SH.14</td>
<td>Rh. Fab.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Θσσομοροίος</td>
<td>SH.14</td>
<td>Rh. Fab.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Πάναμος</td>
<td>SH.6, 12</td>
<td>Rh. Fab.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Rhodian Months**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ἀγριάνιος</td>
<td>SH.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ἀρταμίτιος</td>
<td>SH.15-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Δάλιος</td>
<td>SH.5, 10, 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Θσσομοροίος</td>
<td>SH.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Πάναμος</td>
<td>SH.6, 12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Tatarlı Höyük’ten (Adana) Hellenistik Dönem İthal Mühürlü Amphora Kulpları

Özet


Bu çalışmada değerlendirilen iki mühürlü amphora kulpundan on sekizi Rodos kökenli olduğu tespit edilmiştir. İkisi okunamayan Rodos mühürlere içerikleri, yedisi ise üreticilere aittir. Höyükte bulunan ikinci büyük höyük yerleşimlerinden biri olan Tatarlı Höyük 350 metrede 180 metre boyutlarında ova zemininden 37 metre yüksekliktedir. Çukurova’nın doğusunda bulunan höyük önemli ticaret rotaları üzerinde yer alır.

Bu çalışmada değerlendirilen iki mühürlü amphora kulpundan on sekizi Rodos kökenli olduğu tespit edilmiştir. İkisi okunamayan Rodos mühürlere içerikleri, yedisi ise üreticilere aittir. Höyükte bulunan ikinci büyük höyük yerleşimlerinden biri olan Tatarlı Höyük 350 metrede 180 metre boyutlarında ova zemininden 37 metre yüksekliktedir. Çukurova’nın doğusunda bulunan höyük önemli ticaret rotaları üzerinde yer alır.
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(173)

Gephyra 15, 2018, 153-174

Twenty two amphora stamps from the Tatarlı Höyük excavations in Cilicia (2008-2017) are the subject of this article. Tatarlı Höyük is situated in the Tatarlı village, formerly Yedigöz/Yedioluk, 24 km east of Ceyhan, Adana. It is one of the largest sites in Cilicia Pedias (Plain Cilicia), and is a flat-topped, wooded mound on a basalt outcrop, with a base measuring 350 m by 180 m and a height of 37 m. Located in the eastern part of the Çukurova, the mound was in a strategic position with its location on important trade routes.

It was determined that eighteen of the twenty two stamped amphora handles in this study were of Rhodian origin. Nine of the Rhodian stamps belong to the eponyms, and seven to the fabricants. Only two of the Rhodian stamps are illegible. The second group from the Tatarlı Höyük are of Cyprus origin. One of two amphora handles in this group has a stamp in the Cypriot syllable, but it cannot be clearly read. On the other Cypriot example there is also a monogram or an abbreviation consisting of four letters. Only one Chian stamp was found. The name of the fabricant Ἱκέσιος, which is thought to have been active between ca. 250 - ca. 225 B.C., is read on this Chian stamp found at the site. Perhaps the most important example among the Tatarlı examples is the Cnidian stamp. On the stamp both the name of the eponym Λυσάνιος and the name of the fabricant Ἀριστοκράτης are recorded. The appearance of both these names together on the Tatarlı example raises questions concerning the published chronology of these names, as they have been dated to different periods in previous studies. In the context of this find, it seems the place of these two figures in the chronology may need to be revised. For this reason, a somewhat broader date range has been given to both the eponym Λυσάνιος and the fabricant Ἀριστοκράτης, the first half of the 2nd century B.C.

These twenty two stamped amphora handles found at Tatarlı Höyük, a major mound site of Cilicia Pedias (Plain Cilicia), provide us with a body of information on this subject for the region. This material, in particular, provides important information not only for the dating of the settlement’s Hellenistic Period strata, but also concerning the spread and statistics of the amphora within Asia Minor’s Mediterranean geography.

Keywords: Tatarlı Höyük, stamped amphora handles, Cilicia, Hellenistic Period.
Fig. 1) The mound sites and settlements mentioned in the text (E. Dündar)

Fig. 2) Tatarlı Höyük Aerial Photo (Tatarlı Höyük Excavations Archive)