

DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.813172

## THREE AMPHORA STAMPS FROM TYMNOS (BOZBURUN, TURKEY): A CASE STUDY REGARDING PROVENANCE

E. Deniz OĞUZ-KIRCA

*Post-Doctoral Researcher, Department of Mediterranean Studies, Lab. of Archaeometry and Lab. of Environmental Archaeology, University of the Aegean, Rhodes, Greece  
e-mail: zedok33@gmail.com*

Received: 10/03/2017

Accepted: 18/06/2017

---

### ABSTRACT

The objective of the paper is to explain and suggest about the three stamped amphora handles which were recorded at the site of Kaletepe that is considered to be the *demos* center of ancient Tymnos. The interpretation of field data is based on the widely accepted chronological span of the Rhodian trade amphorae. Despite the lack of an *eponym* or an accompanying month name on the stamps, they broadly allow the dates to be between 256-86 B.C.

It is conceivable, for the present, that Tymnos was one of the trade nexus of the Peraia. The contributory role of this *demos* in the trafficking of Rhodes across the Mediterranean becomes clear as it can be better understood through the availability of the amphora stamps. Also, plenty of fragmentary canonical forms, that were come across all over Kaletepe can be valuable to add to our knowledge about the short-range origins and extent of circulation of the merchantable products in the periphery of Hellenistic Rhodes.

Owing to the uncertainty about his provenance and the nuances in the linguistic clues, the name of Imas appears to be rather conspicuous, hence can be highlighted as an indicator of a policy oriented toward "glocalization", in our mini data set. The verisimilitude of his localness (presumably, a non-Rhodian/ Peninsular fabricant) is suggestible while the remaining names also deserve an emphasis for manifesting the Peraia's role in the well-developed market of the Island. Inferentially, Tymnos is deemed to contain the potential evidence to unveil new names which can help gain further insight about the dynamic commercial life led by a major actor of the Hellenistic era, simply Rhodes.

---

**KEYWORDS:** Bozburun, Rhodian Peraia, Tymnos, Trade Amphorae, Stamp, Hellenistic

---

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Kaletepe is an unobtrusive site, rising in the NE of the modern town of Bozburun which is ancient Tymnos (Fig.1). The vast majority of the archaeologi-

cal debris appears in the form of surface materials that are associable with the Hellenistic-Roman and post-Roman periods.



Figure 1. The position of Kaletepe in the west of the Rhodian Peraia

The reason for the site's long negligence by the researchers is owed to the *terra-incognita* character of the ancient Bozburun Peninsula (where the site is situated) as well as to its "*demos*" status (like the neighbouring settlements) arising from small scale, rural, socio-political "*domains*". It is often difficult to trace substantial evidence over such ruralities. Likewise, the town lost its architectural texture due to the modern public works and dense settlement; nothing remarkable remained, to launch an attractive research project, except for our knowledge about its dependency on Karia during the Classical period and on Rhodes (as a member of the Rhodian "*Peraia*" on the mainland) in the Hellenistic age. As a matter of fact, the architectural features that are subject to a plan or drawing can be barely found. Despite such lacuna, three epigraphs and some associate materials along with supportive ceramic pieces, which were documented during the 2012 campaign, are regarded as the samples highlighting the possible status of the Peninsula in the ancient commercial environment. Under this scope, this paper shall in-

tensely lay emphasis on the Hellenistic period of Tymnos.

Of the presumptive inlets, which could have served the growing trafficking of the Hellenistic period, must be Gelme Bay and the modern marina (see Fig.1). Forgetting about the territories of the neighbouring *demoi* for a while, the bulk of the agricultural products must have been dispatched from the mini-peninsula stretching to Apostol Promontory, in the western sector and the enclaves between Avlana-Yeşilova districts. This is a separate topic which shall be discussed in a future article. What is of significance here is that Tymnos could have offered a notable potential, in terms of wine and olive oil, even of grain production in antiquity.

## 2. RHODIAN AND PERAIAN AMPHORAE

The place and importance of Rhodes in the ancient trade world has been a topic for many researches. We are particularly acquainted with distinctive evidence through the vast quantity of Rhodian amphorae that were retrieved in Alexandria

(Şenol 2009: 47). Before the taking over by Rome in the overall Mediterranean, following the 2<sup>nd</sup> century B.C. (Polybius 30.5; Akşit 1971: 66-67), many other cities and regions like Attica, Delos, Pergamon, Naukratis, etc. were also involved in surviving close trade links with the Island (Coulson *et al.* 1997: 47-48). There is knowledge that the source of the amphorae assemblages excavated in early Hellenistic Ephesus is attributable to Rhodes, the local character Nikandros group, Knidos region, Rhodian Peraia and Kos (Lawall 2007: 29). Something beyond dispute is that Rhodes preserved a key status for the “logistic” function along with supplying many facilities in maritime trade. She was on the main sailing routes in the Mediterranean, having two ports in the northern tip of the island (de Graauw 2014: 134). The reputation of the Island was a rightful outcome of her strong relations with many sub-geographies, as well as of her persistent policies that were inseparable of a notable number of dominions and sometimes allies, including the Peraia on the opposite mainland. As we are informed, the Peraia unveiled significant samples of the amphorae manufactured by the Rhodian potters<sup>1</sup>, hence, it, either way, assisted the maritime trade in the Hellenistic period. Ateliers and discards were also reported from the near environs, in almost the same way as for the Knidian (Reşadiye) Peninsula (Tuna *et al.* 1991: 38-49). Of the well-documented evidence on the storage and transportation of the local products has been acquired through the works of the potter, Hieroteles (Tuna and Empereur 1989). The scholars have no doubt that his amphorae travelled from the Aegean to the Black Sea and Alexandria. Many were (beginning from the first quarter of the 3<sup>rd</sup> century B.C.) seized in Hisarönü/ Çubucak excavations that were carried out in the north of the Peraia (Tuna and Empereur 1989: 288; Şenol 2009: 123).

Obviously, an ideal piece of evidence for any amphora is a complete one with both the eponym and the year on one handle and the name of the fabricant on the opposite. Quite intact stamps and their variants are available in the Alexandria Museum inventory ([www.amphoralex.org](http://www.amphoralex.org) (amphoralex)). The Peraia had typical amphorae and fabricants. A reality, regardless of localness, was that the region co-acted with Rhodes as it was an integral part of the Island’s trade and commercial life, for a substantial period. This is quite perceptible through the stamping practices, stylistic similarities, eponymous marks, etc. Perhaps equally prevalent for the Knidian and Koan amphorae, the sharpening perpendicular angles on the handles date to the 2<sup>nd</sup>-1<sup>st</sup> centuries B.C. Also, those found in the Peraia were observed to be in concordance with the manufactures for storing late Rhodian wine, beginning from the end of the

2<sup>nd</sup> century B.C.<sup>2</sup> We are enlightened about the general Rhodian typologies through the systematic publications of Grace while the classification of Monachov is based on the long-necked and short-necked amphorae (Monachov 2005: 71). We found the two types (to which Monachov calls attention) at Kaletepe. Apart from these, we observed numerous canonical forms (the base scatters, in particular), which were similarly reported from the rest of the Peraia.<sup>3</sup>

What is intended with this study is not to brief and compile who did what, how and to which extent but to take the pre-established chronologies as default (although some are still argumentative). Otherwise, we would run into the problem of remedying a chronology, which is totally beyond our objective. Widely accepted is that Rhodes’ severe involvement in the wine trade started later than those of some other famous *poleis* (e.g. Cnidus, Miletus, etc.). The emergence of the transport amphorae was only in the 4<sup>th</sup> century B.C. while the use of the stamped category by the Island is attributable to the turn of 4<sup>th</sup>-3<sup>rd</sup> century B.C. (Monachov 2005: 69-70). Grace (1934) examines the development process and canonical arrangement of the catalogued Rhodian amphorae in seven periods and Finkielsztjn (2001) revises and refines to an absolute chronology. Lawall (2007: 31) reminds<sup>4</sup> them in one final work and gives as such:

“Period I (ca. 304 to ca. 235 B.C); Period II (ca. 234 to ca. 199 B.C); Period III (ca. 198 to ca. 161 B.C); Period IV (ca. 160 to ca. 146 B.C); Period V (ca. 145 to ca. 108 B.C); Period VI (ca. 107 to ca. 86 B.C); Period VII (ca. 85 to Augustan period).”

Although there is uncertainty about some groups and hardly explored fabricant names (as wells as the problems in associating fabricants and eponyms and sometimes rigours between the eponymous officials and priests of Halios) (Badoud 2014: 22-23), we shall track the chronology given above.

### 3. DATA, CONTEXT AND CHRONOLOGY

Presumably, part of the amphorae pieces detected at Kaletepe had relation with the sepulcher remains. But, as was previously stressed, this hilly terrain must have been initially inhabited at the outset (Oğuz-Kırca 2016: 236-237, 240). That it solely hosted many underground (particularly the Roman) tombs would be an objectionable approach (without any other contemporaneous ruins) since the platforms for daily use activities such as the press stones (contextual ceramic included) reinforce the stress of settlement all over this site. From such perspective, albeit appearing as complex confusing contexts from time to time (e.g. the terrace sets), the density of the off-site profiles of the stamped amphorae that attest to trafficking corroborates our arguments about the

site's function as a residential/ even production/ dispatch area, etc. However, the inquiry made in this paper, particularly about the origins of the stamps, is not a working hypothesis but rather a spin-off discussion emanating from the spatio-archaeological studies over the long-skipped site of Tymnos.

Describing an amphora and an attempt for chronologization<sup>5</sup> (even within the pre-established limits) requires great caution. Neither can we claim an absolute date from the angles as we are totally devoid of the morphological features and complete condition of the vessels, in the case of Kaletepe. But the stamped handles are quite indicative of the trade amphorae. Amongst our data that include many other material of the same type, three samples catch the eye with very readable names inscribed on the handles. Two of them, which do not exceed 10 cm in the physical extent, carry the rectangular stamps of Imas and Nikarchos while that of Euphranoridas is circular. The rest could not be defined with the same precision.

#### Stamp 1

Reading: IMA (fabricant)

Description: Fragment/ handle of transport amphora. Oval handle to sharp turn. Horizontally inscribed rectangular stamp, appearing with a caduceus symbol at the top line (toward right), in the relative vertical position. The fabric has a hard, fairly pinky-brown texture with creme-light yellow slip on the outer surface; chaff remains visible. No remain of a paint.

Dimensions: ~ 2x5 cm; length of handle not exceeding 9 cm.

Findspot and Context: In the SW sector of Kaletepe, found amongst many sherds that are scattered nearby a lower code water source (45-50 m). Visible are the profiled blocks that belong to the possible tombs, an altar? and part of an architrave?; Π form rock tomb (Fig.2, shown with black arrow on the right), level areas of the *aloni* type and modern orchards, in the vicinity. A few minutes walk to the water source (where traces of looters were observed) lie a next group of *terra-cota* bases and extremely eroded

mixed, multi-coloured fragments (as well as the handles, one of which might bear the radiated head of Helios?, rose in the center? with retrograde letters? while the letters on some rectangular stamps are almost worn) that are datable to the Classical-Roman periods. The lid of a Roman *urguentarium*? is conspicuous (Fig.2, shown with black arrow on the left), alongside of a good many surface fragments.

Date: possibly 188-186 B.C/ 160-146 B.C

Period/Culture: Period IIIb/ IV, Hellenistic

Display: Fig.3(a)

#### Stamp 2

Reading: NIKAPXOΣ (fabricant)

Description: Horizontally inscribed rectangular stamp. Calcareous fabric; red light clay colour with creme slip on the outer surface.

Dimensions: ~ 1.5x 5.5-6 cm; length of handle measuring ca. 7 cm.

Findspot and Context: Appeared amongst numerous sherds that were seen along the steep slope in the southern sector of Kaletepe. Many of them seem to be the off-site scatters that flew off the peak or the upper code terraces. No significant ruins apart from the Karian type architectural blocks that are visible all over the main site.

Date: 145-108 B.C/ 107-88/86 B.C

Period/Culture: Period V/ Period VI, late Hellenistic

Display: Fig.3(b)

#### Stamp 3

Reading: ΕΥΦΡΑΝΟΠΙΔΑΣ<sup>6</sup> (eponym), retrograde, letters outwards

Description: Circular stamp with a dot in the middle, incised on rather a short handle. Partly calcereous cover; paler red-pinky color with yellow-creme slip on the surface.

Dimensions: ~ 2 cm diameter; length of handle measuring ~ 5 cm.

Findspot and Context: Same as Stamp 2

Date: 256-249 B.C.<sup>7</sup>/ 246-235 B.C.<sup>8</sup>

Period/Culture: Period Ic<sup>9</sup>, Hellenistic

Display: Fig.3(c)



Figure 2. Selection of images of field data (surface fragments; argenteum lid? with black arrow on the left;  $\Pi$  form rock tomb with black arrow on the right)



Figure 3 (a). Stamp of Imas



*Figure 3 (b). Stamp of Nikarchos*



*Figure 3 (c). Stamp of Euphranoridas*

**Other****a)**

Reading: None

Description: Two similar circular and extremely eroded stamps; appearing with a rose figure? or a Knidian lion.<sup>10</sup> Reddish texture appearing with tiny grids.

Dimensions: ~ 2 cm. diameter

Findspot and Context: Over the skirts of Kaletepe; interwoven with many other Roman fragments.

Date: 3<sup>rd</sup> century B.C.?

Period/Culture: Hellenistic?

Display: Fig.4 (1, 2)

**b)**

Reading: Monogram? ending with "E", rest is missing

Description: Rectangular stamp. Fine reddish clay; texture appearing with very thin chaff.

Dimensions: ~ 1 cm. width; tapering long side

Findspot and Context: Kaletepe

Date: 3<sup>rd</sup> century B.C.?

Period/Culture: Hellenistic?

Display: Fig.4 (3)

**c)**

Reading: Monogram? beginning with "H/P"?, rest is missing. Perhaps Rhodon(os)?

Description: Rectangular stamp; reddish clay silicate, micaceous texture

Dimensions: ~ 1x2 cm.

Findspot and Context: Kaletepe

Date: 3<sup>rd</sup> century B.C.?

Period/Culture: late Hellenistic?

Display: Fig.4 (4)



Figure 4. "Stamps of other (uncertain) group (rose/ Knidian lion? (1-2); monogram? ending with "E" (3); monogram? beginning with "H/P?" (4))

Even though we have to be contented with basically the names of the two potters and an eponymous official in our case, the literature on the vast quantity of trade amphorae aids us to assign them to the era between the 3<sup>rd</sup> and 1<sup>st</sup> centuries B.C, on a broad scale. The likely interval for the three solid evidence are pertinent to the dates which begin around 256 B.C. and end ca. 86 B.C.

Looking further through a selection of the corpus of the Rhodian stamped amphorae, we find out and may record the following:

- Stamp 1 (Imas) is enlisted with the eponymous priests (with the reading "IMA") of the Sun in Rhodes, whose origins are announced uncertain or uncommon (Stoddart 1850: 26-27, 29, 117 (no.169). But views have changed over the last century, in favour of being a fabricant. Two rectangular samples of Period IV from Egypt (one of Ras el-Soda origin and the other of an unknown provenance) and bearing caduceus symbols below the names, with a lateral cornucopia<sup>11</sup>? are hosted in the Krakow Museum (Hasegawa 2013: 161-162 (no.8), 165 (no.19).
- A caduceus symbol was used by many potters (Nilsson 1909: 159). They are well

visible on the products of e.g. Dion, Drakontidas, Philon<sup>12</sup>, Eukleitos who was attributed to the Rhodian V<sup>th</sup> period (Coulson *et al.* 1997: 52-53 (no.s.15-17), etc. At the same time, it was grabbed in various regions and sites; Knidos, Kos, etc.<sup>13</sup> A circular stamp of Imas (depicted with a caduceus) that resembles those resting in Alexandria was found in Xanthus (Stoddart 1850: 44, 55). Those retrieved in Egypt, Naukratis (?) are displayed in the transport amphora catalogue of the British Museum. Registered as a "Rhodian fabricant", all of his stamps are dated to 160-145 B.C (Period IV). The caduceus is seen to be depicted below the name, in this group.<sup>14</sup> The stamps of Imas—all dated to Period IV, are displayed in 11 matrices of the Alexandria Collection ([www.amphoralex.com](http://www.amphoralex.com)).

- Grace articulates that there is connection between fabricant Imas and eponym Pausanias II; the date must be later than 180 B.C. while Timourrhodos and Damainetos are also given as the associated eponyms (Grace 1934, 219 (fig.2), 225).<sup>15</sup> It could well have matched the period of the eponymous official, Symmachos (Period III d: 175/173-169/167

B.C.)<sup>16</sup>; a fine rectangular stamp with the names of Symmachos and Ima on both handles (dated to 188-186 B.C) was found in Sicily (IG XIV (SEG 52: 890,2).

- Nikarchos is a common name<sup>17</sup> which can be found in various contexts, particularly in the corpus of Greek inscriptions, e.g. Nikarchos Mennis- an archont in Delos (end of 3<sup>rd</sup> century B.C) (IG XI.4 114)<sup>18</sup>, Nikarchos of Myrina (2<sup>nd</sup> century B.C) from Kos who was amongst the winners of pentathlon (IG XII,4: Kos (Klee, Geschichte 8,II.B1); Zarnowski 2013: 119). According to Grace, the rectangular seals bearing the name of Nikarchos (Νικάρχου) (Stamp 2) do not antedate the 2<sup>nd</sup> century B.C. (1934: 231 (R.64)). The stamp of a potter (on a Rhodian amphora handle) of the same name which was found in Bottiaia in Macedonia, at Pella is dated to 146-108 B.C, in SEG 50: 612<sup>19</sup> whereas the stamp with the identical name allows a date to the late Hellenistic period, specifically falling into the VI<sup>th</sup> period (ca. 107-88/86 B.C), in the matrice of Rhodian stamps.<sup>20</sup> This part is rather perplexing.
- We can safely propose that he (Stamp 3) was the eponymous official- Euphranoridas (nominativus form) as the space left between "I" and "Σ" (following the half readable "Δ") is quite equal to the space used for the legible "A" in the first syllables. Presumably, the fabricant associated with eponym Euphranoridas is Aksios, corresponding to Period Ic.<sup>21</sup> In the matrice of stamps of the Rhodian eponyms, Ic is dated to 246-235 B.C.<sup>22</sup> while Lawall denotes 256-249 (2007: 47).<sup>23</sup>

Nilsson (1909) records that the circular stamps of Euphranoridas (151), like those of Hieroteles as attributed to Period I-II<sup>24</sup>, is characterizable with the button type (Nilsson 1909: 151). Let us also address that Lawall (2007) points, regarding the usage of the similar button stamps by the eponyms, to the likely association of fabricant Hieroteles with many names within which Euphranoridas is included (39 (AH 21a-c)).<sup>25</sup> An unusual thing about Euphranoridas is his denomination as a fabricant by Nilsson (1909) when the chronology was not well established in the beginnings of the 20<sup>th</sup> century B.C. Opposed to this, Euphranor (with a circular stamp) is in the list of the eponyms (154). The name with a nuance- Euphranor(os) for example, who is mostly depicted with a bunch of grapes<sup>26</sup> or a rose in the middle,<sup>27</sup> seems to be completely away from our sample due to the stylistic difference. The only hint for Euphranor(os)<sup>28</sup> might apply to the Period attested as II

(last quarter of 3<sup>rd</sup> century B.C.) which somehow approximates that of Euphranoridas (see above). But this still seems to be a very poor indicator, also due to the stylistic differences between the two.

- It is too hard to make an explicit remark on the uncertain group. The extremely eroded group (a), could have depicted a Knidian lion or a Rhodian rose. The sample ending with "E" (b) seems to be part of a monogram stamp so it might be put to analogy with the specimen given amongst the late 3<sup>rd</sup>-2<sup>nd</sup> century B.C. finds of Nikandros group ending with "IE" (uncovered in Ephesus, Lawall 2007: 50 (AH 48)). The problem is with the shape (circular) of the stamp found in Ephesus. The final one (c) could have been a work of Rhodon (Stoddart 1850: 11)<sup>29</sup> II? (Period V (145-108 B.C)) that was exported to Pompeii, Delos, Cyprus, etc. (Grace 1934: 231 (no. 62); Coulson *et.al* 1997: 56 (no.s 27-28)). We are never sure. Perhaps slightly appearing as "H...", an analogy might be established with the specimen, attributed to Samos? in the British Museum.<sup>30</sup> The provenance of the circular stamp with the reading (H[ ]o?) and displayed in the Krakow Archaeological Museum has not been identified yet but was grabbed in Ras el-Soda (Egypt) during the 2<sup>nd</sup> World War (just like the case of Imas). No chronology was attributed to this sample (Hasegawa 2013: 165 (no.21)).

#### 4. DISCUSSION

The interpretation of evidence presented in this paper is not an easy touch due to the lack of systematically acquired field data but we can confidently manifest that the presence of the stamps imply an active trafficking of the merchantable products. Of the possible practices is that, the products reaped in the *khora*i were filled in the amphorae which were manufactured in the collecting or nearby stations and then exported, in order to meet the requirements of Rhodes, in the first step.

For some, the production of the Peraian amphorae terminated in the 2<sup>nd</sup> century B.C. and that the Rhodian amphorae were sent back to be filled with the Peraian wine instead (Held *et al.* 2009: 225). If we were able to judge through a complete historical lense, we could perhaps question the cost-effectivity of manufacturing all the amphorae in Rhodes even though this could also be a practical method of managing an "intra-system". Reading from the reverse, why not pause for a while about the issue of continuation under a regained autonomous status. That none of our evidence bears a clear rose symbol may



hold up this case to an extent, but this cannot be a definite judgement, either.

We are not to be stuck with monocausalities, though. Many other factors might have been behind the scene, such as, it is equally possible that some of the Rhodian potters kept on residing in the Peraia (e.g. Hieroteles who has been discussed as a Rhodian potter of the Peraia (see Tuna and Empereur 1989)). Perhaps, the local potters (regardless of chronological sequence) had to operate in the officially imposed procedures under the patronage of Rhodes, as an outgrowth of the political economy.

From the aspect of periodization, the stamps of Kaletepe offer different spans of time but mostly refer to the Hellenistic. This must have appertained to both the activities of the Rhodians on the mainland and the Peraians (being the heirs of the Karian civilization) themselves. Even though there will always be a "margin of error (Badoud 2014: 23-24)", we choose to bring forward the idea of glocalization which made it profitable for Rhodes to survive her interests in the international trade environment.

What about the different geographies that disclosed the Rhodian amphorae and their relation to the notion of citizenship or localness in the socio-political background? Were they all manufactures of the culturally integrated Rhodian (non)citizens, out-bound products of the dominions, and the like? New questions can be raised. In this regard, could Imas be a Peraian (he might well be a Tymnian) origin fabricant? We are quite aware that multi samples need to be examined in order to understand this, however can turn to something interesting that was recorded about our semi-enigmatic figure; Nilsson attributes the name of Euphranodiras to purely free Greek patronyms and names (probably to establish an organic link with the citizenship of Rhodes) whereas he attests Imas amongst the barbaric. Such a clue comes out when he rejects to put his name (where IMA is not an abbreviation, either) in the Greek onomastics but throws him into the category of indigenous slaves (Nilsson 1909: 84, 89, 99).

Regardless of having a preference over the two intervals, the potential duration of the performance of Imas must be 40-42 years, in the broadest scale, which would be a considerable period from a craftsman's aspect. Further to that, anyone can pose an extra question: Could Imas attain his mature style in the upcoming times? That the position of the caduceus rests above the name (it is consistently traceable below the names of the fabricants who acted later than Imas)<sup>31</sup> in our sample may hint at an early production. If so, it is conceivable that 188-186 B.C which is our "possible" earlier date (although the date set in PHI is disputable from our point of view) and the eponym Symmachos might be a point

of intersection for his name (not specifically for Imas but for both, theoretically, the intersection of Period III d and IV which is ca. 167-160 B.C.). Moreover, the broken bar Alpha (that began to be in used (in 3<sup>rd</sup>-1<sup>st</sup> centuries B.C) inter *alia* the normal former cases, McLean 2002: 41<sup>32</sup>) can suggest a temporal context that holds by this final tentative date, in any case. However, an exception comes out with some prototypes depicting the caduceus at the bottom.<sup>33</sup> Should these be of earlier dates, the situation gets complicated. Something appreciable for Tymnos is the caduceus symbol (the equivalent of Mercury in the Roman mythology) which has strong links with trade and prosperity. This is known to be the symbol (wand) of God Hermaios, frequently given by Homer in his Iliad (e.g. XXIV.343). Within the numismatic context, it is commonly found as a patron divinity on Patara coins, relating to the well-being of the commercially oriented *polis* and its merchants, since the earlier periods (Özüdoğru 2007: 35).

Turning to Stamp 2, Nikarchos must be the latest representative in our small trio data set. Leaning on the epigraphical context within which the stamp of the potter in Pella<sup>34</sup> shows up, it could be a product of the late Hellenistic interval of 145-108 B.C.<sup>35</sup> when Caria and Lycia were already declared *civitas libera* (Akşit 1971: 66-67). But, no one should expect that the Rhodians could have left the Peraia, all of a sudden. Yet, our judgement is wide open to any refusal at this point.

Stamp 3 predates all the other readable samples. As it seems, the Peraia was possibly kept in close eye from the earliest times of political integration as Period I match up with the beginnings of the Rhodian practice of stamping (Grace 1953: 118; Lawall 2007: 30). Also worthy of note may be that, whether it is Euphranor or Euphranoridas, the letters deciphered as "EY" in Turgut-Bayır ateliers (Tuna and Empereur 1989: 289) might have had relation with Stamp 3. In view of the floating intervals, the potential period for Euphranoridas' officiating is about 18 years within which he could have shared some time with Hieroteles. Yet, we cannot know how long Euphranoridas held office or co-appeared with the associated fabricant(s).

The monograms are majorly attributed to Rhodes and Knidos whereas an abbreviation tradition of the Peraia is lacking. In parallel to how Doğer states (Doğer and Şenol 1996: 65-66), we choose to refrain from being assertive as to whether they belonged to the eponymous officials or fabricants, despite divergent views about the subject matter. But provenance can matter. The monogram? ending with "E" shows resemblance with the sample presented in the "Uncertain provenience" catalogue by Grace (1934: 289 (no.269)). That nothing remains relational with

Rhodes may reinforce a view towards a non-Rhodian origin. Yet, a case ending with an “E” could not be determined.

For the unattributed monogram? beginning with “H/P”?, it might have belonged to Samos? Cyprus? Rhodes?<sup>36</sup>. We simply cannot know, hence definitely leave it open.

The handles of the post 167 B.C simply apply to the period when Rhodes gradually began to lose control and influence in the ancient world. These could too be the discards of local production rather than being likely associated with the commercial concerns. As per the supportiveness of the bases and in the context of their contribution to the commercial life, the non-Rhodian plaster banded amphorae back up views on localness, to an extent. Some of the disconnected samples present semblance with the proto-Koan and Knidian/ late Knidian samples, though. Notwithstanding, the relationship of the vast majority with Rhodes is still strong and apparent (Fig. 2). Particularly those with the hallowed or conical bases are in accord with the ovoid form Rhodian and Knidian amphorae. The hallowed bases also remind of the second half of 4<sup>th</sup>- first quarter of 3<sup>rd</sup> century B.C. Cypriot typologies (Şenol 2009: 130-131, 193). Again, there is a possibility that ring plaster banded and cylindrical solid toes with round bases (Doğer and Şenol 1996: 63, 69-70) or short conical (Doğer 1994: 198) bases (these are not typical of the Rhodian amphorae and many were reported from Karaca-Naltaş ateliers), belonged to the potter Hieroteles or one of his contemporaneous fabricants. When it is considered that the canonical form Rhodian amphorae began to emerge ca. 240 B.C. (Doğer and Şenol 1996: 68), it is unexceptional that the Peraia could have joined this well-developed market in a similar way.

## 5. CONCLUSION

Tymnos is one of the current cases (despite unsystematic evidence) to develop an idea in favor of the glocalization of widely appealed products in the influential sphere of Hellenistic Rhodes.

Just as we are certain that the products of Hieroteles travelled relatively long distances, so must be valid for the potential Tymnian/ other Peraian fabricants. The only mainstay that we have is that some of the distinctive bases resemble Type 1 class Koronoi and Knidian samples and that they were manufactured by the mainlander (not necessarily of Knidian origin) fabricants (Monachov 2005: 75-76 (fig.2.2)).

Although it was not mentioned, the availability of the black glazed pieces encourage us to add to the views about the flatter base proto Peraian amphorae

that could have survived from the late Classical period. Some of the instances recalling the Chian and Cypriot typologies (they could have been dispatched from these spots, as well) give rise to thought about the Peraia’s affairs with more distant islands in the Mediterranean before falling under the hegemony of Rhodes.

In our case, two appears with an endorsing name of the fabricant while only one shows up through the appellation of the eponym Euphranoridas. Fabricant Imas (who was presumably a non-Rhodian/ Peraian and in activity during when the eponymous official Symmachos also held office) is a recent evidence from Tymnos. Owing to the undecided provenance among the scholars and the nuances in the linguistic clues, his name needs to be overemphasized in our small data set. Insofar as being a mainlander holding a *demesman* status (in that case, a Tymnian?, etc.) or Rhodian citizenship<sup>37</sup>, he might well have been an ordinary member of the indigenous population. Obviously, much more archaeological evidence should become available to comment that Imas or any other was a Peraian. The remaining names also deserve a highlight for manifesting the Peraia’s role within the socio-economic domain of ancient Rhodes, as well as being some fine indicators and components of a well-developed market in the Hellenistic period. Equally arguable is Tymnos’- a long neglected site’s (in)direct involvement in the process.

Should our arguments (despite the limitations of the study) about the contributory status of Tymnos to the amphora manufacture or traffic in the Peraia be correct, new quests can be pursued in Kaletepe and the near surroundings. However, the owners of the stamps could well be bound up with the other *loci*. To put it differently, we don’t strain at pinning it on Tymnos. What matters is the potential Peraian imprint and expected future data on the same and equivalents.

About local production and reminding the case of Bybassos that lies to the north of the Peraia; it would be a good solution to work through the application of chemical analyses of the visually detectable samples in our catalogue, given above. Following their petrographical examinations<sup>38</sup>, the compatibility of the amphorae attributes with the local geographical and pedological characteristics can be assessed and some informative results can be obtained.

Lastly; in as much as their traceability along the coasts, it is considered that Tymnos has the potential to contribute to the generation of new evidence and knowledge in respect of trade in late antiquity, accompanied with a complementary field- underwater archaeology.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The data presented and questioned in this paper emanates from the results of 2012 Bozburun Peninsula campaign, conducted under the permissions given by the Republic of Turkey, Ministry of Culture and Tourism. The author offers sincere thanks and gratitude to the General Directorate of Antiquities and Museums, in this respect. Special thanks are owed to two modern and true Tymnian friends, Tuna Ünlü and shepherd Dursen, for their everlasting support, to date. She also offers warm thanks to Kostas Antonaras, the Director of the Archaeological Museum of Rhodes, for his cordial welcome during the visits. This work is made as postdoctoral fellow at the University of the Aegean, Dept of Mediterranean Studies, Rhodes, Greece.

## REFERENCES

- Akşit, O. (1971) *Hellenistik ve Roma Devrinde Likya*, İstanbul, İstanbul Üniversitesi Edebiyat Fakültesi Matbaası.
- Akyol, A.A. Kadioğlu, Y.K. and Şenol, A.K. (2013) Bybassos Hellenistik Ticari Amphoraları Arkeometrik Çalışmaları (Archaeometrical Studies on the Hellenistic Transport Amphorae from Bybassos). *Cedrus (The Journal of MCRI)*, Vol.1, 163-167.
- Badoud, N. (2014) The Contribution of Inscriptions to the Chronology of Rhodian Amphora Eponyms. In *Pottery, Peoples and Places: Study and Interpretation of Late Hellenistic Pottery*, P.G. Bilde and M.L. Lawall (eds.), 17-29, Black Sea Studies 16, Aarhus, Aarhus University Press.
- Cankardeş-Şenol, G. (2006) *Klasik ve Helenistik Dönemde Mühürlü Amfora Üreten Merkezler ve Mühürleme Sistemleri*, İstanbul, Ege Yayınları.
- Cankardaş-Şenol, G. and Canoğlu, E. (2009) Mısır-Alexandria Greko-Romen Müzesi'nde Bulunan Düğme Formlu Mühürler (Button-Type Amphora Stamps in the Greco-Roman Museum in Alexandria-Egypt). *Arkeoloji Dergisi*, Vol. 14, No. 2, 109-164.
- Amphoralex. Centre Alexandrin d'Etude des Amphores (The Alexandria Center for Amphora Studies). Accessed from: [www.amphoralex.org](http://www.amphoralex.org)
- Coulson, W.D.E., Mook, M.S., Rehard, J.W. and Grace, W.R. (1997) Stamped Amphora Handles From Tel Beersheba. *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research* 306, 47-62.
- de Graauw, A. (2014) Ancient Ports and Harbours (4<sup>th</sup> ed.), Vol.1: The Catalogue. Accessed from: <http://www.ancientportsantiques.com/wp-content/uploads/pdf/AncientPortsVol-I-List.pdf>
- Dillon S. and Baltus, E.P. (2013) Monuments on the Dromos of the Sanctuary of Apollo on Delos. An appendix to Honorary Practices and the Politics of Space on Hellenistic Delos: Portrait Statue Monuments Along the Dromos. *AJA*, Vol. 117, No. 2, 207-246. DOI: 10.3764/aja.117.2.0207
- Doğer, E. (1994) Rodoslu Çömlekçi Hieroteles. *Arkeoloji Dergisi*, Vol. 2, 195-218.
- Doğer, E. and Şenol, A.K. (1996) Rodos Peraiasi'nda İki Yeni Amfora Atölyesi. *Arkeoloji Dergisi*, Vol. 4, 59-73.
- Finkielstjtn, G. (2001) *Chronologie detaillee et revisee des eponymes amphoriques rhodiens, de 270 a 108 av. J.C. environ*. Premier bilan, Oxford.
- Grace, V. (1934) Stamped Amphora Handles Found in 1931-1932. *Hesperia*, Vol. 3 (3), 197-310.
- Grace, V. (1953), The Eponyms Named on Rhodian Amphora Stamps. *Hesperia*, Vol. 22, 116-128.
- Hasegawa, S. (2013) Amphora Handle Stamps in the Archaeological Museum in Kraków. *Materiały Archeologiczne*, Vol. 39, 159-169.
- Held, W., Cankardaş-Şenol, G. and Şenol, A.K. (2009) 2008 Yılı Bybassos Araştırması. *AST*, Vol. 27.3, 215-233.
- Homer. *The Iliad* (trans. A.T. Murray and W.F. Wyatt), London, 1924.
- Homer. *İlyada*, 23<sup>th</sup> ed. (trans. A. Erhat and A. Kadir), İstanbul, 2007.
- Johnston, A. (2013) Stamped Amphorae. In *Naukratis: Greeks in Egypt*, A.M. Villing, M. Bergeron, G. Bourogiannis, A. Johnston, F. Leclère, A. Masson and R. Thomas (eds.), 1-20. [www.britishmuseum.org/naukratis](http://www.britishmuseum.org/naukratis) (Online research catalogues).
- Jöhrens, G.(1999) Amphorenstempel im Nationalmuseum von Athen: Zu den von H. G. Lolling aufgenommenen, "unedierten Henkelinschriften" Mit einem Anhang: Die Amphorenstempel in der Sammlung der Abteilung Athen des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts, Mainz.
- Lawall, M.L. (2007) Hellenistic Stamped Amphora Handles. In *Forschungen in Ephesos: Die Basilika am Staatsmarkt in Ephesos. 2. Teil: Funde klassischer bis römischer Zeit*, V. Mitsopoulos-Leon and C. Lang-Auinger (eds.), 28-61, Vienna, Österreichisches Institut.
- Matera, M. (2014) Analiza importu towarów w amforach rodyjskich na podstawie materiałów odkrytych w Tanais. Zarys kontaktów handlowych Rodos z obszarem dolnego Donu w III-I w p.n.e. Tom I. (Ph.D. dissertation), Warszawa. Accessed from: <https://depotuw.ceon.pl>
- McLean, B.H. (2002) *An Introduction to Greek Epigraphy of the Hellenistic and Roman Periods from Alexander the Great Down to the Reign of Constantin (323 B.C- AD. 337)*, Michigan, University of Michigan Press.
- Monachov, S. (2005) Rhodian Amphoras: Developments in Form and Measurements. In *Chronologies of the Black Sea Area in the Period c. 400-100 BC*, V.F. Stolba and L. Hannestad (eds.), 69-95, Aarhus, Aarhus University Press.
- Nilsson, M.P. (1909) *Timbres Amphoriques de Lindos: Publiés Avec Une Étude Sur Les Timbres Amphoriques Rhodiens*, Copenhagen, Imprimerie Bianco Luno.

- Oğuz-Kırca, E.D. (2015) Karya Khersonesosu'nda (Pera) İki Tip Kale/ Kale Yerleşimi (Two Models of Fortresses/ Fortress Settlements in the Carian Chersonesos. *TÜBA-AR*, Vol. 18, 125-143.
- Oğuz-Kırca, E.D. (2016) Tymnos'un Kayıp Mabedi: Hera ve Zeus'a Adanan Tapınak Neredeydi?. *Arkeoloji ve Sanat Dergisi (Journal of Archaeology and Art)*, Vol. 151, 231-247.
- Özüdoğru, Ş. (2007) Pttara and the Dynast Wakhsepddimi (Wekhssere II). *Adalya*, Vol. 10, 31-49.
- Polybius. *The Histories* (Book 5), E.S. Shuckburgh (2002), trans. Cambridge-Ontario.
- Rice, E.E. (1999) Relations Between Rhodes and the Rhodian Peraea. In *Hellenistic Rhodes: Politics, Culture, and Society*, V. Gabrielsen, P. Bilde, T. Engberg-Pedersen, L. Hannestad and J. Zahle (eds.), 45-53, Vol. 9, Aarhus, Aarhus University Press.
- Searchable Greek Inscriptions (PHI)  
Regions: Thrace and the Lower Danube (IG X); Aegean Islands, incl. Crete (IG XI-XIII); Sicily, Italy, and the West (IG XIV)  
Accessed from: <http://epigraphy.packhum.org>
- Sherwin-White, S. and Kuhrt, A. (1993) *From Samarkand to Sardis: A New Approach to the Seleucid Empire*, Berkeley and Los Angeles, University of California Press.
- Stoddart, J.L. (1850) *On the Inscribed Pottery of Rhodes, Cnidus and Other Greek Cities*, (Transactions of the Royal Society of Literature), London, Hughes and Robinson.
- Şenol, A.K. (2009) *Taşucu Arslan Eyce Amphora Müzesi*, Silifke, Taşeli.
- Tuna, N. and Empeur, J-Y. (1989) Hiérotélès, potier rhodien de la Pérée. *Bulletin de Correspondance Hellénique*, Vol. 113, No. 1, 277-299.
- Tuna, N., Empeur, J.-Y., Doğer, E. and Desbat, A. (1991) Rapport sur la Première Campagne de la Fouille Franco-Turque de Reşadiye (Péninsule de Cnide, Juillet 1988). *Anatolia Antiqua*, Vol. 1, 38-49.
- van Bremen, R. (2007) Networks of Rhodians in Karia. *Mediterranean Historical Review*, Vol. 22, No. 1, 113-132.
- Villing, A., Bergeron, M., Bourogiannis, G., Johnston, A., Leclère, F., Masson, A. and Thomas, R. (2013-2015) Naukratis: Greeks in Egypt. Accessed from: [www.britishmuseum.org/naukratis](http://www.britishmuseum.org/naukratis) (online research catalogues).
- Zarnowski, F. (2013) *The Pentathlon of the Ancient World*, North Carolina, McFarland.

<sup>1</sup> A general perception is that the ancient potters were male or they worked solo. The prosopographical studies have shown that they could, although rare, be female or the males could have worked with the potters who owned ateliers (Coulson *et al.* 1997: 48, 57, 59). Also see Hasegawa 2013: 162 (no.10) for “Διόκλεια”.

<sup>2</sup> For sharp perpendicularity that emerged down to the late Hellenistic, see Şenol 2009: 125, 128-129.

<sup>3</sup> See Tuna and Empeur 1989; Tuna *et al.* 1991; Doğer and Şenol 1996; Cankardeş-Şenol 2006; Held *et al.* 2009; Akyol *et al.* 2013; Oğuz-Kırca 2015.

<sup>4</sup> Also see Monachov 2005: 71.

<sup>5</sup> Dates are given with a separatrix in Stamp 1 and Stamp 2 as the nuances in date were fixed by different sources to similarly inscribed names found in different *loci*.

<sup>6</sup> Referable to the circular sample with inventory no. ALEX ABC 0125.17 (amphoralex). This sample also has no preposition before the reading. The others belonging to the same name all seem to be rectangular.

Referable to the Rhodian sample found in the basilika of Ephesos (Lawall 2007, 33 (AH 7)).

<sup>7</sup> Lawall 2007: 47.

<sup>8</sup> [www.amphoralex.com](http://www.amphoralex.com)

<sup>9</sup> Lawall 2007: 33 (AH 7). Also check AH 70 for the similarity in terms of abbreviation in late Knidian stamps (EYΦ).

<sup>10</sup> For a thorough appearance of the scalp of the Knidian lion of the 3<sup>rd</sup> century B.C., see Johnston 2013: Fig. 39, RN (registration number) 1955,0920.72 in the British Museum.

<sup>11</sup> For Imas with cornucopia, also see inventory no. ALEX ABC 0368.24 (amphoralex).

<sup>12</sup> See the images (Villing *et al.* 2013-2015 JB.0825, JB.0948, JB.0751) with RN e.g. 1925,0119.413.b; 2011,5004.69; 2011,5003.301.

<sup>13</sup> See the images (Villing *et al.* 2013-2015 JB.0335, JB.0123) with RN e.g. 1925,0119.669; 1955,0920.130. Also refer to Stoddart 1850: 63, for the parergic mark of Cleombrotus.

<sup>14</sup> For the Rhodian amphorae found in Naukratis, particularly see the catalogue of the British Museum ([www.britishmuseum.org/naukratis](http://www.britishmuseum.org/naukratis)). See the images (Villing *et al.* 2013-2015 JB.0928, 0929, 0930, 0931) with RN 2011,5004.101; 2011,5004.48; 2011,5004.21; 2011,5004.1).

<sup>15</sup> Also find different periods of Pausanias in Grace 1953: 118.

<sup>16</sup> In 38 matrices of the Alexandrian inventory (amphoralex), Symmachos' stamps are dated to Period III d.

For a stamp of Symmachos found in Tanais, see Matera 2014: 82 (Tom II, no.69); the same with a rose symbol acquired in Naukratis (?), see the image (Villing *et al.* 2013-2015 JB.0904) with RN 2011,5003.74).

<sup>17</sup> For the name actually pointing to cultural Hellenisation, also see “Anu-uballit Nikarchos (son of Anu-iksūr)”, the governor of Uruk under Seleukos 2<sup>nd</sup> around 244/43 B.C. (Sherwin-White and Kuhrt 1993: 150-151). For the economic and commercial relations of the Seleucids, as well as the affairs with Rhodes, immunities like *ateleia*, etc., especially see pp.65-71.

<sup>18</sup> Also see Dillon and Baltes 2013: 207-246.

<sup>19</sup> SEG 50: 612 (IG X Macedonia). Reading: “Νικάρχου”

<sup>20</sup> e.g. BIBALEX 0039 (MGR P.17011) (amphoralex).

<sup>21</sup> ALEX ABC 0920.31 (MGR P.24994); ALEX ABC 0920.33 (MGR P.24996) (amphoralex).

<sup>22</sup> ALEX ABC 0125.17 (amphoralex).

<sup>23</sup> The stamp of Aksios, which was grabbed in Grusevskoe, allowed a date to ca. the end of 250s/240s B.C. (Monachov 2005: 76).

<sup>24</sup> e.g. Hisarönü 1993, A.11.07.1 (amphoralex)

<sup>25</sup> The proposed date as 244-236 B.C. (Jöhrens 1999: 14-16) for Euphranoridas' association with Hieroteles should be expected normally (Lawall, *Ibid.*). Also note that the name of the fabricant Euph(r)(onos) with slight difference in reading relates to the same period (ca. 270-244 B.C), with the preposition Παρά. We are not certain whether the name was completed in certain instances (Lawall 2007: 38-39 (AH 19-20)).

<sup>26</sup> See Tuna and Empereur 1989: 298 (no.24)

<sup>27</sup> Period IIc. Name is represented with ca. 22 matrices (see amphoralex). Also see Cankardaş-Şenol and Canoğlu 2009: 130 (Fig.61).

<sup>28</sup> See Coulson *et al.* 1997: 53 (no.18).

<sup>29</sup> Nilsson (1909: 159) points to his attribute of a trident.

<sup>30</sup> See Johnston 2013: Fig. 24, British Museum no. 1925,0119.608b.

<sup>31</sup> See almost the identical pair of this symbol, as given by Matera 2014: 167 (Tom II, no.147).

<sup>32</sup> Related to Alpha, see e.g. the transport amphora with RN: 2011,5004.101, 2011.5004.48 (Villing *et al.* 2013-2015 JB.0928, 0929). Perhaps same for the one registered as 2011,5004.21 (*Ibid.* JB.0928, 0930).

<sup>33</sup> e.g. ALEX ABC 0651.19 (amphoralex)

<sup>34</sup> See note 19.

<sup>35</sup> This date may still need a strict recheck.

<sup>36</sup> See Grace 1934; Coulson *et.al* 1997; Johnston 2013, 11 (fig.24, RN 1925.0119.608b).

<sup>37</sup> On the citizenship and *demesmen*, especially refer to van Bremen 2007; Rice 1999.

<sup>38</sup> See Akyol *et al.* 2013: 168.