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Introduction

A highly fragmented and poorly preserved mask-and-garland mosaic was recently discovered in Tel Dor, Israel which likely belonged in the dining room of an elite residence. This mosaic is currently being dated by excavators and scholars (namely S. R. Martin and W. Wootton) to the late 2nd century B.C.E., and is thought of as Hellenistic. The goal of this thesis is to provide evidence that supports a later date of the 1st century B.C.E for this mosaic, which would place it in the Early Roman period of Tel Dor. The evidence that will be used includes stylistic parallels, which are mostly from 1st century B.C.E. Pompeii, as well as examining the archaeological context of Tel Dor and the region of the Southern Levant in general.

Unfortunately, the archaeological evidence from Early Roman Tel Dor is almost non-existent, although the Late Hellenistic and Roman remains are substantial. As a result, it is necessary to turn to other sites in the Southern Levant in order to gain a better understanding of the shifts of the socio-economic and political culture in the area, and how Tel Dor fits into this bigger picture. Once the 1st century B.C.E. regional context is established, the mosaic can be evaluated in its new context. This will reveal interesting insights into the effects of Roman cultural contacts in the Southern Levant and help to shed light on a less understood time period of Tel Dor’s history. The Tel Dor mosaic reveals the

mindset, consumption habits, wants, and needs of the social elite of Tel Dor as the dominating force in Mediterranean shifts from Hellenistic to Roman culture.

In order to fully explore the date of this mosaic from Tel Dor and its larger implications in the Mediterranean world, multiple aspects of the mosaic and its context will need to be considered. In chapter 1 the mosaic and its archaeological context will be discussed as well as previous scholarship on the mosaic and its date. Once this foundation is laid, a more in-depth discussion of stylistic parallels and the implications they have for the date of the Dor mosaic will ensue in chapter 2. The points of stylistic comparisons for the Tel Dor mosaic are the perspective meander, the mask-and-garland frieze, and the mask itself. The broader archaeological context of Tel Dor and the parallel sites of Tel Anafa and Tel Kedesh will be explored in chapter 3 and the necessary implications of this context drawn out. Throughout, the focus will remain on the date of the mosaic and how it fits into the larger archaeological context of the Southern Levant and what cultural connections can be seen.
Chapter 1: The Tel Dor Mosaic

Discovery and Background

On the coast of modern-day Israel lies the ancient harbor city of Tel Dor (also known by its Hellenistic and Egyptian names, Dora and D-jr, respectively) which was founded in the Middle Bronze Age and was continuously occupied up through the Crusader period (Figure 1.1). The site was first surveyed in the 1920s by John Garstang, and excavations began in the 1950s under the direction of J. Leibowitz and have continued to the present day. While ownership of the Levant passed between the Ptolemies and the Seleucids, Dor was then taken over by Zoilos, Alexander Jannaeus, the Hasmoneans, and finally the Romans who “freed” it in 64 BCE. At Tel Dor an impressive Hellenistic city has been uncovered. A series of finds made in 2000 expose new evidence for the process of Hellenization there, including architectural pieces of a temple or propylon\(^2\) and over 200 fragments of a stunning mosaic in *opus vermiculatum*\(^3\) (a highly refined technique). This superb decorative mosaic is the basis for the following discussion of the Hellenization of Tel Dor through trade organizations and the historical significance of these influences.

The mosaic from Tel Dor (Figure 1.2) was discovered in a large pit (pit 2) on the east side of the same mound on which the “Persian Palace,” a large building of the Early Hellenistic period, had been discovered (Figure 1.3).\(^4\)

\(^2\) Stewart and Martin 2003, 121.
\(^3\) Wootton, 209.
\(^4\) Stewart and Martin 2003, 122.
Although this large construction was definitely in use during local phase 3 (Early Hellenistic Period), it was previously thought that it had been built during local phase 4 (Late Persian Period). However, now it seems likely that the “Persian Palace” was actually constructed during phase 3, with earlier fills and remains being cut by the palace, making the “Persian Palace” Hellenistic. Parts of this palace were continued in phase 2 (Late Hellenistic Period), forming a large structure with narrower walls likely constructed by using single large ashlars as diatons in the rubble walls of the “Persian Palace” (a technique known as ‘pseudo a-telaio’). It is to the East of this building that Pit 2 was discovered.

The mosaic was found in Area D1 (on the southwestern part of the town) which in the 5th century B.C.E. was part of a network of insulae and in the 3rd century formed part of the “Monumental Hellenistic Complex” (Figure 1.4); in the early Roman period, likely in the 1st century C.E. the area was repurposed for industrial use, a phenomenon observed throughout the site in this period.5 Pit 2 in Area D1 was Roman and contained the 200 fragments of the mask-and-garland mosaic in opus vermiculatum, the first and best example of a high-quality mosaic in this region.

Although individual decisions differentiating mosaics opus vermiculatum and opus tessellatum can be arbitrary, a mosaic is classified as opus vermiculatum by smaller tesserae size, and by an increase in the use and variety of colors and material, as well as andamento (the organized course in which the tesserae are

laid). All of these result in a more sophisticated mosaic with a greater ability to depict images in finer detail (because there are smaller interstices and so more complicated patterns can be laid out). The tesserae in the decorative borders (and probably in the missing central panel) of this mosaic are characteristic of opus vermiculatum, but become opus tessellatum in the outer red bands and the adjusting borders beyond that.

Due to its fine quality, either earthquake damage or urban renewal is the most likely reason for the dismantling and subsequent deposition of this mosaic in the Roman pit. Sadly, since the mosaic was not found in situ and the original floor and building have yet to be found, it is difficult to discuss more specifically the pre-pit history of this mosaic. If it is true that the mosaic was broken up purposefully after damage from an earthquake or as part of an urban renewal or house remodeling, then perhaps the central emblema was kept to be reused, hence its absence from the pit. Although it could be the luck of preservation, the reuse of the central panel seems likely, particularly if there was earthquake damage to the rest of the mosaic but the majority of the central panel was largely intact. There was little else found in the pit aside from a small amount of pottery consisting of a 2nd century A.D. Roman lamp and an attic black-glaze fragment with Roman Western Terra Sigillata fabric. These allow for a terminus post quem of mid-second century C.E. for the deposition of the material, although that

---

6 Wootton, 210.  
7 Wootton, 211.  
8 Stewart and Martin 2003, 132.  
9 Stewart and Martin 2003, 132.
says nothing for the construction date.\textsuperscript{10} Thus the construction date must remain speculative until the original architectural context is discovered.

Although recent excavation seasons remain largely unpublished, according to preliminary reports from 2004 and 2005, Pit 2 was excavated northward into D4 where the pit was found to also contain ashlars, column drums, thresholds, voussoirs, and rafter-supports, as well as fresco and mosaic fragments of unknown date. The mosaic fragments found were white limestone and poorly tessellated. Excavators believe they are a part of the mosaic found in 2000, but likely was the part of the floor which would have been under the \textit{klinai} (the dining couches which would have lined the dining room the mosaic adorned). It was discovered that the continuation of Pit 2 was cut by a large Roman building, now believed to be a bath or fountain house; the bathhouse is currently being dated to the late 1\textsuperscript{st}/early 2\textsuperscript{nd} century C.E.\textsuperscript{11} The robber trench of the south wall of the bath house clearly cuts the dump, and several small tesserae of the same mosaic were sealed beneath the floor of this large Roman building which, like the rest of Roman Tel Dor, has two construction phases. The first is defined by the ashlars built on rubble foundations, while the second, later phase consists of cement mortar on concrete foundations.

\textsuperscript{10} Wootton, 209.
\textsuperscript{11} Tel Dor Excavation Project, “2005 Preliminary Reports,” Tel Dor Excavation Project, \url{http://dor.huji.ac.il/2005report.html} (accessed December 5, 2012).
**Description and Design**

The mosaic itself, as reconstructed by Will Wootton in his 2012 study of the mosaic, is designed in a concentric layout around the missing central panel (Figure 1.2). The panel was most likely figural, although without further evidence the iconography can never be known. This missing central panel is surrounded by a sequence of decorative borders. Starting from the innermost border, a thin frame in red tesserae is followed by a slightly thicker area of white tesserae, which is in turn enclosed by a perspective meander framed by two bands of red (with white tesserae layers between the red bands as background). This is followed by a mask-and-garland border which is framed on the outside by the same two red bands. After this the mosaic floor has a wide area of plain tesserae that has possibly more red bands and dissipates into random plain tessellation (as opposed to orderly rowed and orthogonal tesserae layout).

The first section of stylistic importance is comprised of the two meander fragments (Figure 1.5) which allow for a full reconstruction of the sequencing of the meander pattern (Figure 1.6). The color scheme of the perspective meander is complicated but follows an unwavering system. The foundation of the perspective meander lies in the white tesserae which are used as the viewer-edge and on their own create the double meander pattern with boxes, inside of which are geometrically rendered rosettes in the place where sticks are sometimes found. The color of the meander on the edges differ from the color of

---

12 Wootton, 210.
the box it surrounds, but the same color pattern of blue, red, green, and yellow is followed throughout.

The sequence follows this color pattern so that the color of the box inside the meander is the same color of the meander following it (going to the right). For example, where the meander is blue on the outside, it is red on the inside; in the next section it is red on the outside and the box inside is green; the following section then has green on the outside meander and yellow for the box, while the last section of the sequence is yellow on the outside and blue for the inside box, which then loops into the beginning. Each color (blue, red, green, yellow) is used in two shades (one light and one dark) whether it is on the outside meander or the inside box. This emphasizes the perspective nature of the meander. Similarly the geometric rosettes offer further opportunity to explore the perspective technique, something valued in mosaics as it was in paintings.

The mask-and-garland frieze section as well as the bouquet fragment of the same frieze provides a second point of stylistic comparison (Figure 1.7-8). Although the mask controls the gaze of the viewer when looking at this section, the garland and bouquet into which it is integrated should not be overlooked, as they can be their own stylistic subject. The floral motifs which can be seen in smaller quantities around the mask soon take over the frieze and consist of ivy (kittos and korymboi), pinecones (konoi or strobiloï), wild olives (agrieldai), pomegranates (rhoai), oak leaves, and wild roses (rhoda agria), usually with five
or six petals.\textsuperscript{13} The frieze is set against a dark blue background that enhances the shadowing portrayed by the detailed pieces of the glass and stone tesserae, and often the edges of pomegranates or of the golden ribbon wrapping around the garland will extend beyond this blue background into the white tessellation leading into the double red border strip.

While the mask-and-border frieze is an important stylistic component, the mask alone deserves its own stylistic discussion, as the rendition of the human face, whether mask or not, is complex and requires individual attention (Figure 1.9). The mask is rotated to the left, rather than facing the viewer straight-on, as was more typical of theatrical masks of the Late Hellenistic/Early Roman Period. It has a soft, rounded face, reminiscent of femininity while still retaining its categorization of a male mask. His eyes are dark, heavy-lidded, and deep set, the detail of which is achieved with incredible success; according to Martin the left iris and pupil alone use at least 28 tiny tesserae.\textsuperscript{14} His mouth is also prominent, as it has full, bright red lips which reflect the light of the room it would have occupied and are parted to reveal the blackness of the mask underneath. The hair to the side of the face is neat but not archaic in its corkscrew curls, and the hair atop his head is swept up into an extravagant trefoil-shaped hat, complete with fillets, ribbons, ivy, and fruit clusters.\textsuperscript{15}

The mask is one of the most complicated and detailed fragments recovered from the mosaic, with an average of nine to sixteen stone tesserae

\textsuperscript{13} Stewart and Martin 2003, 134-137.  
\textsuperscript{14} Stewart and Martin 2003, 134.  
\textsuperscript{15} Stewart and Martin 2003, 134.
being used per square centimeter. This level of specificity allows for intense shadowing and contour lines, as seen in the mask’s eyelids, hair, and even his cleft-chin. Color, as well as the small size of the tesserae, allows the mask to take on its life-like appearance. Light pink, light brown, and light gray are used for the face, while darker pinks and reds are used for the full contour areas of the cheeks (especially the left one), chin, and ears. Areas of the face, such as the cheek-bones, are highlighted with light pinks and yellows, giving the face an animate depth of the highest quality.

Although most of the mosaic was destroyed, one small fragment from the central panel was able to be reconstructed. Rebecca Martin in a 2011 stylistic analysis of the center piece identified the main object in the section as a logobolos, or a throwing stick used in hunting (Figure 1.10).\textsuperscript{16} The hunting scene that Martin proposes belongs in the central panel, combined with the mask and garland frieze, is highly suggestive of a Dionysian scene, which would be appropriate for a symposium setting. Dionysus was often associated with the drinking and feasting that happened in the androns and triclinia, and his iconography is often seen adorning the floors of such dining rooms. The ivy, florals, and fruits of the frieze give the mosaic a general exotic and lavish Dionysian essence, which would have been enhanced and emphasized by a Dionysian theme in the central panel.\textsuperscript{17}

\textsuperscript{16} Nietschke, Martin, and Shalev, 145.
\textsuperscript{17} Stewart and Martin 2003, 134.
While it is true that the central panel was likely Dionysian in style and content, the presence of the *logobolos* cannot be used as evidence of the mosaic’s Hellenistic date, as Martin suggests. Rather, a mosaic from the second century C.E. in Roman Britain shows Actaeon holding a *logobolos* which supports a coin of Ariadne and a satyr who is also holding a *logobolos* from the reign of Septimius Severus and Julia Domna (Figure 1.11), which lasted from 193-198 CE. Since there are many examples of a *logobolos* being used by satyrs and hunters well into the second century C.E., it is clear that the content of this mosaic is universal and popular enough to span several centuries.

**Previous Scholarship**

Will Wootton carefully deconstructs and interprets the construction techniques used to make the mosaic. This is done primarily by meticulously studying the bedding of the pavement, something of great value that should be held up as an example for all mosaics to be excavated and studied in the future. With careful examination, Wootton has provided a glimpse into the construction of Late Hellenistic and Early Roman mosaics and the painstaking process of creating one of these masterpieces *in situ* (as he believes the Tel Dor mosaic was done).

Although the fact that this mosaic is one of the most spectacular found in the region is indisputable, in order to accurately place the Tel Dor mosaic into the existing chronology, a different approach will be necessary. Sadly (as previously stated), few to none other Late Hellenistic or Early Roman mosaics
have been studied as well as this one; so the new information concerning the bedding construction of the Tel Dor mosaic cannot be accurately correlated with existing data because there is no existing construction data. The existing chronology of Hellenistic mosaics is based on style and surface techniques, not bedding. Bedding is a relatively new aspect of the study of Hellenistic and Roman mosaics, and one that should become more important for dating as the study of these mosaics continue to develop. However, for now, it may be prudent to also date mosaics using comparative stylistic arguments and surface techniques.

Wootton dates the Tel Dor mosaic to the second half of the second century B.C. While he does draw some artistic parallels between the Tel Dor mosaic to others in the Hellenistic world, the contemporaneous ones are weak parallels (as will be discussed in Chapter 2), and the stronger parallels tend to be later than Wootton’s given date. He also uses historical circumstances and time periods to date the mosaic, although perhaps not accurately.

Wootton’s stylistic and historical arguments use the nearby Tel Anafa (Figure 1.12) (where a Hellenistic mosaic in *opus vermiculatum* is known to have been discovered but is unfortunately unpublished) as a parallel. Wootton cites the time between 125 and 75 B.C. as a period of economic prosperity in Tel Anafa. This was also a time when local Seleucid control was weak, and it has even been argued that Tel Dor may have been an independent city-state at this

---

38 Wootton, 209.
39 Wootton, 230.
time. Wootton argues that the lessened Seleucid control also created a small period of prosperity in Tel Dor as it did in Tel Anafa. Thus travelling craftsmen would have been freer to come to Tel Dor to make the mosaic, which would have been bought with the profits from the recent influx of prosperity.

While it is a valid argument that the mosaic was likely made during a time of increased prosperity, it seems unfounded to assume that when the region was under Seleucid control, it would have resulted in less Hellenistic influence. There is little evidence to support such an amount of cultural control by the Seleucids, even when they were in political power over the region, and so there is no reason why the mosaic could have been made at another period of prosperity. Coincidentally, there was a known period of prosperity at Tel Dor after its re-establishment by Pompeius in 63 B.C. that lasted until 33 B.C. While the existence of this period of increased wealth alone would not be evidence enough to date the Tel Dor mosaic to this period, there is also sufficient stylistic evidence to place it securely in the first century B.C., which will be discussed in Chapter 2.

---

20 Wootton, 230.
Figure 1.1—Map of the eastern Mediterranean in the Hellenistic period

Figure 1.2—Reconstruction of the Tel Dor mosaic

Figure 1.3—Tel Dor Site Map of Areas Excavated from 1980-2010

Jessica L. Nitschke, S. Rebecca Martin, and Yiftah Shalev, “Between Carmel and the Sea, Tel Dor: The Late Periods,” *Near Eastern Archaeology* 73, no. 3 (2011): 133, fig.2.
Figure 1.4—Plan of Tel Dor with Monumental Hellenistic Complex

Jessica L. Nitschke, S. Rebecca Martin, and Yiftah Shalev, “Between Carmel and the Sea, Tel Dor: The Late Periods,” *Near Eastern Archaeology* 73, no. 3 (2011): 133, fig.14.
Figure 1.5—Two Perspective Meander Fragments from the Tel Dor Mosaic


Figure 1.6—Reconstruction of the Perspective Meander from the Tel Dor Mosaic


Figure 1.9—Close-up of the Mask from the Tel Dor Mosaic

Andrew Stewart and S. Rebecca Martin, “Hellenistic Discoveries at Tel Dor, Israel,” Hesperia: The Journal of the American School of Classical Studies at Athens 72 no. 2 (April-June 2003): 135, fig. 8c.
Figure 1.10—Logobolos Fragment from the Tel Dor Mosaic (#2)

Figure 1.11—Coin from Septimius Severus and Julia Domna, Showing Sleeping Ariadne on one side surrounded by satyrs holding *logobolos* (193-198 CE)

Figure 1.12—Map of the Upper Galilee, including Anafa

Peter J. Stone, “‘Provincial’ Perspectives: The Persian, Ptolemaic, and Seleucid Administrative Center at Tel Kedesh, Israel, in a Regional Context” (PhD diss., University of Cincinnati, 2012), fig.1.3.
Chapter 2: Style and Technique

Mosaic Development: From Pebble to Tesserae

When Alexander the Great left Pella in 334 B.C. to defeat the Persian Empire, he started a chain of events that would cause a shift in the political, economic, and cultural powers of the Mediterranean from West to East. Initially Alexander’s conquests created an influx of wealth in Macedonia, resulting in the famed mosaics of Pella, which remained the height of sophistication in the pebble technique. As one of the earliest forms of Hellenistic mosaics pebble mosaics were created using natural pebbles chosen for uniformity and color, but never cut or artificially manipulated. While the pebble technique remained popular throughout the third century B.C. in the newly expanded Hellenistic world, from Ai Khanoum in modern-day Afghanistan to the numerous eastern cities founded by Alexander during his campaigns, a need for newer and more sophisticated techniques was developing in the east. 21

Much like the place of origin of pebble mosaics, the origin of tessellated mosaics is unclear, and it is likely that no one single place is responsible for the invention of tesserae in mosaics. Rather, simultaneous experiments using the traditions of each city and culture probably lead to the use of tesserae in multiple locations in the third century B.C. 22 However if there were one city which could stake a claim to be the inventor, or at least to the first use of

22 Katherine M. D. Dunbabin, Mosaics of the Greek and Roman World (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), 18
tesserae in mosaics, it would be Alexandria.\textsuperscript{23} As capitol of the wealthiest Hellenistic kingdom and the first to be established after Alexander’s empire was broken up, Alexandria led the way in the Eastern provinces under the kingship of the Ptolemies in the cultivation and patronage of arts and literature, of which mosaics played a large part. Even if tessellated mosaics were not first invented or used in Alexandria itself, it certainly produced high-quality mosaics in the experimental phases of the third century, and later produced more with more sophisticated uses of tessellated technique.\textsuperscript{24}

The development of tesserae in mosaics in the third century B.C., whether first in Alexandria or in multiple places simultaneously, was both a pragmatic and aesthetic advance. Pebbles were not always readily available in the necessary size and shape in all environments, making high quality mosaic work difficult in some areas with limited pebble resources, forcing them to search for alternative materials and methods.\textsuperscript{25} The choice was also an aesthetic one, however; since artists struggled to capture the same level of detail in their mosaics as in the paintings they so often imitated, the need for materials and technique that could be manipulated became more urgent.\textsuperscript{26}

In Alexandria, the transition from pebble to tessellated mosaics can be traced following the development of mosaics in general as well as the visible effects of political, socio-economic and cultural factors, which are clear starting

\textsuperscript{23} Ling, 24.
\textsuperscript{24} Dunbabin, 23.
\textsuperscript{25} Dunbabin, 18.
\textsuperscript{26} Ling, 24.
in the fourth century B.C. through to the decline of the Roman Empire.\textsuperscript{27} The existence of floor mosaics themselves in the Nile Delta is evidence of influence from outside cultures, specifically Hellenistic. After the death of Alexander the Great there was an inundation of Macedonian and Greek settlers in the Delta and in the Fayum who brought with them more wealth and Hellenistic culture. Although Egypt had already developed the techniques and skills necessary for inlay and the incrustation of furniture, walls, and sarcophagi, they were not comparable to those of Greek mosaics.\textsuperscript{28} Unlike other foreign importations, Hellenistic floor mosaics never truly became integrated into Egyptian culture. Even though Alexandria was one of the leaders in mosaics of the Hellenistic world, it was never as popular in Egypt as it was in other parts of Alexander’s Empire, even in Roman times. It is possible that the Greeks and various Hellenized foreigners felt some resistance to Egyptian culture, since their mosaics demonstrate little variants from the Hellenistic artistic koine; and only adapted somewhat to their new environment later by using local flora and fauna mixed with traditional Greek motifs.\textsuperscript{29}

This increased technical ability with \textit{opus vermiculatum} results in a mosaic capable of pursuing the stylistic accomplishments of painting, and it is thought that many of the Hellenistic stock mosaic designs were actually based upon either one famous painting or paintings of the same stock theme. The goal

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{27} Wiktor Andrzej Daszewski, \textit{Corpus of Mosaics from Egypt: Hellenistic and Early Roman Period} (West Germany: Philipp von Zabern, 1985), 1: 2.  \\
\textsuperscript{28} Daszweski, 2.  \\
\textsuperscript{29} Daszweski, 2. 
\end{flushright}
of Hellenistic mosaics was to achieve verisimilitude at the same level as painting; the closer a mosaic came to achieving this theoretical goal, the more wealth and status it meant for the owner of the mosaic.

**Mosaic Development: Sub-Surface Construction Techniques**

Although the development of mosaic production techniques varied from region to region, there was a general trend toward methods that allowed an increase in the complexity of the mosaic itself, as seen in the development from pebble to tesserae and beyond. Along with this increase in sophistication of stylistic techniques came the necessary developments in production. In Ancient Greece a simple process was used: the floor would be excavated deep enough to pour a layer of cement with pebbles and stone chips, followed by a six inch deep layer of lime mortar tempered with sand and ash, which would be leveled and smoothed to form the bedding of the mosaic itself.\(^{30}\)

However, even by the 1\(^{st}\) century B.C. more advanced techniques were used, the details of which are pieced together from archaeological finds, Vitruvius’ *On Architecture* 7.1.2-5., and from the later Pliny’s *Natural History* 36.186-87.\(^{31}\) The Roman technique described by these authors and corroborated by archaeology begins by excavating the floor to a depth of two feet, the bottom floor of which was then carefully compacted. On top of this, two layers of wooden planks were set down and nailed, with each layer having the

---


\(^{31}\) Pappalardo and Ciardiello, 18.
planks run perpendicular to the other layer (Figure 2.1). Between this wooden platform and the first layer was a thin covering of fern or straw in order “to protect the wood from being hurt by the lime.”

This first layer, the *statumen*, was then laid down. The *statumen* was composed of a bed of fist-sized rocks (hence the *statumen*); on top of this layer was the ten inch thick *rudus*, a quarter of which was rocks and the other three-quarters gravel. The *rudus* was then beaten “again and again with wooden beetles into a solid mass.” On top of the *rudus* was laid the *nucleus*, a five-inch thick layer composed of one part lime and three parts crushed tile or potsherds mixed in. This layer was carefully measured by rule and level to create a perfectly flat and even surface so that whatever would have been laid into the surface would be able to be flush, no matter the shape and material. For *opus signinum* mosaics the *nucleus* itself was the floor surface, but otherwise the tesserae were laid using the *nucleus* as the base.

Often, on top of the *nucleus* a mixture of lime and marble dust/powder would be spread to help create a stronger base for the decorative material. After the final surface of the mosaic was laid in and set, the entire surface of the mosaic would be polished to make as hard and shiny a surface as possible for both the aesthetic pleasure and the pragmatism of having a good stone floor that

---
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would last the wear and tear of being tread upon.\textsuperscript{37} Although each layer was allowed to dry before the next was constructed, the surface of the layer would be re-wet immediately before the next subsequent layer was added so that the two layers would adhere more easily together.\textsuperscript{38}

These are the layers that would have been created by the \textit{pavimentarius}, and after all the layers were ready it would be the turn of the \textit{pictor} to make the preparatory drawings. There were different ways to make these necessary guidelines; they could have been incised into the wet top mortar, possibly with an awl, or literally drawn on with charcoal or even charcoal powder blown through a straw. Another technique which originated in the city Sinop in Turkey (\textit{sinopia}) was to outline the prominent forms in a red ochre mixed with water. These preparatory drawings were necessary for complicated pictorial or geometric mosaics, but could also be the cause of mistakes, as in the Alexander Mosaic where there is a discrepancy between the number of horses’ heads and feet.\textsuperscript{39} There were likely many levels of detail that the drawings could go into, from simply scratched outlines of the design to complete paintings done in color. Evidence comes from the House of Fabius Rufus in Pompeii where, on the support of a complex polychrome meander in the second style, could be seen both incised lines and colored wash.\textsuperscript{40} This allowed the \textit{tessellarius} and the

\textsuperscript{37} Haswell, 38.
\textsuperscript{39} Pappalardo and Ciardiello, 19.
\textsuperscript{40} Pappalardo and Ciardiello, 20.
musivarius could follow the very complicated and precise design and colored pattern.

In the late Roman period this meant a division of labor into four general tasks, something that was necessary for very large and important projects such as in the Great Palace of Constantine, but in smaller commissions most likely would have been performed by one or two artists.41 The first of the four categories of workers is the pavimentarius, whose task was to prepare the ground for the mosaic to be set into. Second was the pictor who would then draw the design on the top and final layer of plaster which was laid by the pavimentarius. This design was followed almost to completion by the tessellarius, who would lay the tesserae for the entire mosaic excluding the figures, which were left to the purview of the musivarius.42

If there was an emblema in the mosaic, the pavement foundation would become slightly more complicated as they were usually put in separately from the rest of the mosaic. In order to install an emblema an inset tray must be cut through the nucleus and into the rudus. The emblema then goes into this space so that its surface is continuous and preferably seamless with the surface of the rest of the mosaic.43 When done in this way, from the surface the emblema and the rest of the mosaic would look as if it had all been constructed the same way at the same time, it is only in the cross-section that one can see the inset tray and

41 Pappalardo and Ciardiello, 17.
42 Pappalardo and Ciardiello, 17.
43 Fischer, 141.
the different bedding between the emblema and the rest of the mosaic. One of the reasons that from the surface they would be seamless is that after the mosaic was constructed the interstices between the tesserae were filled with more mortar or grout until the surface was completely level. After this the entire mosaic was polished, often with sand.

The exact technique used to finish mosaics varied greatly depending on the function of the mosaic. Depending on whether it was purely decorative or more functional, and if it was going to be outside and exposed to the elements or be inside and protected, different finishing techniques were used on the mosaic. Some variations included how far the tesserae were pushed down into the nucleus, and how much of the resulting crevices remained visible. The shadows of the crevices were often used to the stylistic effect of emphasizing the individually set tesserae and could make geometric patterns much more dramatic. However it would not be beneficial to the artist if the insular nature of tesserae were emphasized inside of a figurative mosaic since it would then ruin the uniformed and smooth nature of the figures. A filled-in and even-surfaced mosaic would also be desirable if the mosaic were intended to be outdoors for the obvious benefits of a single, hard surface against the elements.

The most common and possibly the only way in which tesserae could be set is the direct system, in which the tesserae were pressed individually and
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directly into the wet, soft top plaster. This technique allows for the most individual and expressive mosaics, as the artist can play with the angle of each tesserae in order to achieve an added depth and movement in the mosaic. There are certain times when complete flatness is desirable for lighting and stylistic effect however, and it is possible that the by the Roman period indirect or reverse system may have been in use. In this technique the tesserae are glued onto a piece of paper or canvas, face-down in lateral inversion. Then once the entire mosaic has been glued and possibly cut into sections for ease, they are reassembled on the floor. By pressing the exposed side of the glued tesserae into the wet plaster the mosaic ends up with the picture facing the correct way, since it was glued in later inversion. Once the tesserae are where they need to be the paper is soaked to the point where it can be peeled off of the front face of the tesserae, which are now sticking out of the bedding layer. The entire mosaic is now very flat and smooth because it was glued onto a flat surface for the face of the mosaics. The edges of the various sections of mosaic would have been left ragged so that once the pieces were in place on the plaster the spaces could be filled in via direct system to create a smooth surface. The surface could then be finished in any of the styles previously discussed, allowing for adjustment to fit the environment and situation.
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Tel Dor Mosaic: Materials and Construction

Against this background the materials and construction of the Tel Dor mosaic can now be examined. The mosaic uses tesserae composed of a variety of materials including stone, ceramic, and glass which are set into “shelly mortar” with a wide color range using mainly blues, greens, reds, and yellows.⁴⁹ The color scheme deliberately varies depending on the material used in each particular section. The brightest colors and highest quality materials are used on the more high-profile sections of the mosaic, while being aware of the various aesthetic qualities of color in all parts of the mosaic. Again, one is left to wonder at the beauty the absent central emblema would have held when admiring the skill and execution of the various border sections. The bedding of the Tel Dor mosaic is composed of a series of layers superimposed upon one another which become thinner and finer grained as they progress closer to the surface of the mosaic.⁵⁰ It is the top layer, the finest and thinnest layer that the tesserae are laid into. This ultra-thin top layer allows the tesserae to be laid as sophisticatedly as possible.⁵¹

The layers of bedding in the Tel Dor mosaic are as follows (Figure 2.2): the bottom-most layer (or as Vitruvius names it, the statumen) is composed of a bed of fist-sized stones and is ca. 12.0-13.0 cm thick (the entire fragment is 22.0-23.0 cm thick). This bottom foundation layer is followed by the second (12.0-13.0cm thick) and third (4.0-6.0cm thick) layers (the rudus and nucleus,

⁴⁹ Stewart and Martin 2003, 133.
⁵⁰ Wootton, 214.
⁵¹ Wootton, 213.
respectively), which are both composed of gray-buff mortar and have densely-packed inclusions.\textsuperscript{52} Vitruvius created the original and most commonly used terminology for the bottom three layers, but Wootton creates a new term for the previously unnamed fourth, top layer: “setting bed”. The top and final “setting bed” layer is 1.6-1.8cm thick and has occasional, small inclusions. Although few other mosaic beddings have been studied, the few that have (although certainly not to the same extent as the Tel Dor mosaic) have 2-3 bedding layers, instead of the impressive 4-5 of the Tel Dor mosaic.\textsuperscript{53} The number of layers and the technology needed to make them shows a more advanced construction technique in this Tel Dor mosaic than any Hellenistic mosaics that have been previously studied.

The 4-5 layer construction technique of the Tel Dor mosaic, as Wootton describes, is similar to the process described by Vitruvius, only with additional layers. Since Wootton views the Tel Dor mosaic as a second-century Hellenistic mosaic, he interprets this to mean that the Tel Dor mosaic is the most complicated Hellenistic mosaic studied to date. However, when viewed as a first-century Early Roman mosaic, it now agrees the assertion previously made that this process as described by Vitruvius is in use by the first century B.C.E.\textsuperscript{54} It could even be argued that because this mosaic is more complicated than that described by Vitruvius, it could be later than the first-century B.C.E.; however,

\textsuperscript{52} Wootton, 213.  
\textsuperscript{53} Wootton, 213. Wootton uses Pergamon as a comparison, although he does not name specific mosaics.  
\textsuperscript{54} Pappalardo and Ciardiello, 18.
due to the lack of study on the bedding and construction process of the Hellenistic and Roman mosaics, this would be impossible to prove. Instead, thought must be given to the existing stylistic parallels, as this approach will allow datable materials to be compared.

**Stylistic Analysis: The Perspective Meander**

There are three sections of stylistic importance in the Tel Dor mosaic: the mask-and-garland frieze, the mask itself, and the perspective meander. These are all fairly common in the decorations of Hellenistic and Roman mosaics, and thus provide viable points of comparison with mosaics from varying times and locations. While there are many mosaics which provide good parallels as examples of a mask-and-garland border and a perspective meander, the closest and thus finest examples come from Pompeii in the first century B.C. Indeed, the closest parallel of a perspective meander to the Tel Dor mosaic comes from the House of Fabius Rufus in Pompeii from the first century B.C.E. (Figure 2.3).

These fragments are very similar in quality to the Tel Dor meander, though of course they are much better preserved. The color scheme of the Pompeii meander follows the same type of pattern as Tel Dor, with alternating colors in dark and light shades. Although not enough of the Pompeii meander is preserved to tell the exact color scheme, it is clearly similar. Additionally its mastery of the perspective meander technique mirrors that of the Tel Dor mosaic, although where Tel Dor has a geometric rosette at the center of the

---

55 Pappalardo and Ciardiello, 20.
inside boxes, this Pompeii meander has a stick, boasting an even more complicated use of perspective.

Two mosaics from the second century B.C. also have perspective meanders. One from a house beneath the church of San Pietro in Vincoli dates to the late second century B.C. and has managed to master the technique behind the perspective meander, it has not learned to use color (Figure 2.4). The entire mosaic and *opus signinum* floor is done in shades of red, and while the meander does use two tones of red, there is no alternating pattern of any kind, although it too has the full stick in the center of the inside squares, rather than the geometric rosette seen on the Tel Dor mosaic.

On the other hand, the famed Queen Berenice II from Thumis (signed by Sophlios) dates to circa 200 B.C. (Figure 2.5), also contains a perspective meander, and is used as a stylistic parallel by Martin, though she examines only the center emblema, and not the meander. This double meander is two-toned, but is very simple and lacks either a geometric rosette or a stick in the center of its squares. Although it executes the perspective technique well it does not attempt to show off with tricks, and has a simple color-blocking pattern which is uninspiring when compared to the Tel Dor and Pompeii meanders. Thus the best parallel to the Tel Dor perspective meander is from Pompeii in the first century B.C. in both technique and use of color.
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Stylistic Analysis: The Garland Border

This mosaic from Tel Dor is one of the most successful surviving examples of *opus vermiculatum* in the Hellenistic Near East, and this assessment can be made even from the quality of the craftsmanship in the mask-and-garland border alone (Figure 1.7). Although the central emblema is missing, it seems a safe assumption that (whatever it depicted) the level of craftsmanship in the central panel would have exceeded the level of intricacy in the border. Wootton argues that the border is the most intricate section of the mosaic, and is thus closest to and oriented towards the viewers.\(^{59}\) It is broadly true in the development of Hellenistic mosaics that as technologies improve and tesserae size gets smaller, the smallest tesserae are used in the most important parts of the mosaic (generally the figures, and especially the faces, of those in the central panel), with less energy and money being spent the further out from the central panel.

This trend is true in the Tel Dor mosaic fragments that remain: the mask-and-garland frieze contains the smallest tesserae, with the greatest skill and diversity in style and technique. Meanwhile the more plain outer bands of white and red are composed of larger tesserae and are laid in straight rows rather than in the complex patterns of the frieze. However, even the intermediate perspective meander shows an incredible mastery of both the technique of perspective itself (as developed first in painting), as well as the use of color. It

\(^{59}\) Wootton, 211.
also has a similar complexity of tesserae orientation as seen in the mask-and-garland frieze. This is all true despite the fact that there is inherently less opportunity for the artist to display his skill in the perspective meander than in the frieze just by the nature of the subject being portrayed.

The mask-and-garland border from the Tel Dor mosaic is arguably the highlight of the mosaic, and provides inkling into what the quality of the missing emblema may have been like. However, the frieze alone is certainly beautiful and impressive, and allows for comparison with other mask-and-garland friezes. The best such example also happens to be from Pompeii, from the House of the Mosaic Doves, room (n) and dated to the early first century B.C.E. (Figure 2.6).\(^\text{60}\)

Surrounding a central panel depicting a rendition of the famous Drinking Doves mosaic from Pergamon (which does not survive but was described in Pliny and was famous enough to inspire many copies, particularly in the Roman period) is a beautiful mask-and-garland border.

While there are certainly many differences between this frieze from early first century Pompeii, particularly with respect to the flora and fauna and other details that would have been easily influenced by the two local traditions, the similarity is clear. A gold and white ribbon wraps around the fruits and leaves of the garland in the same fluid and undulating way as the Tel Dor garland, though the Pompeian example appears much darker due to the more subdued colors and the completely dark background. This garland has a similar style in its use

\(^{60}\) Pappalardo and Ciardiello, 117.
and placement of pomegranates, pinecones, wild roses, and vegetation to the Tel Dor garland, and the masks are also of similar quality, especially the older female on the left side of the mosaic. The similarity between these two mosaics is even clearer when the Tel Dor mask-and-garland border is compared to other mosaics with mask-and-garland border friezes.

One such example has been found in the House of the Faun from Pompeii, dating to the late second century B.C.E. (Figure 2.7). Although it is also from the Pompeii, the difference in style is staggering, and tightens the comparison between Tel Dor and the Dove mosaic from the early first century B.C.E. For example, although many of the elements of the garland are the same as the Tel Dor and Pompeian Dove mosaic, such as the pomegranates, pinecones, ivy leaves, and wild roses, the portrayal of these elements is more ragged, isolated, and harsh than seen in the Tel Dor mosaic. In addition, the overall tone of the garland is one of hectic frenzy as each individual element stands out in different directions from each other, very unlike the smooth, uniform, contained nature of the Tel Dor mosaic.

**The Mask Itself**

**Martin’s Interpretation**

The mask fragment from Tel Dor (Figure 1.9) is identified by Rebecca Martin as a New Comedy mask using Pollux’s *Onomasticon*, and based on the
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characteristics in the youthful face, such as his eyelids, eyes, mouth and lips.\textsuperscript{62} Julius Pollux briefly describes the 44 mask types used in Hellenistic theater, though he himself was writing in the 2\textsuperscript{nd} century C.E. It is of course nearly impossible to categorize every mask, both tragic and comedic, nearly four centuries after their initial use; as a result many Hellenistic and Early Roman masks are a hybrid of his categories. Martin determines the Dor mask to be one such depiction, and argues that it is a hybrid between two of the comic masks in the young man category; the first is mask 13, the Delicate Young Man, and the second is number 16, the Second Wavy-Haired Young Man.\textsuperscript{63}

Even if Martin were correct in her interpretation of the Tel Dor mask as a Late Hellenistic New Comedy mask, it could not be said with certainty that it belongs to this period because there is no identifiable difference between Late Hellenistic and Early Roman New Comedy masks. Thus a date of this single mask (if interpreted as a New Comedy mask) is difficult without either the other masks in the border, or more context.

\textit{Masks and Theater}

Although Pollux’s \textit{Onomasticon} is a widely used diagnostic tool for masks, his brief descriptions tend to be too vague to be used in any concrete way with regards to dating. For example, these are his descriptions of mask types 13 and 16:

\textsuperscript{62} Stewart and Martin 2003, 134.
\textsuperscript{63} Stewart and Martin 2003, 134.
(13) The Delicate Young Man has hair like the Admirable and is the youngest of all, white, reared in the shade, suggesting softness.

(15) His hair is wavy, as is that of (16) the Second Wavy-Haired, who is more delicate and fair-haired.\textsuperscript{64}

While Pollux is useful for thinking about which features were important in masks, his descriptions are not detailed enough to be used for dating purposes, and while they allow for a common language, often they can hinder accurate comparisons. Iconographic comparisons then become more useful, though some things can be said about the development of theater and mask use that will inform those comparisons.

Although the descriptions Pollux provides are themselves too vague to be useful, a seminal study was done by Webster in which he catalogues all of the monuments illustrating New Comedy masks using the terminology of Pollux and thus lending real archaeological meaning to these short, vague descriptions. For example, while Pollux’s verbal description of Mask 16 is almost comically vague, Webster was able to trace the development of Mask 16 in its style and uses. According to Webster there is a version of Mask 16 which has his hair swept into a roll on his head with curled side-hair descending on the sides of his head (Figure 2.8).\textsuperscript{65} This description is a good match to the Tel Dor mosaic, especially when compared to the earlier version of Mask 16 (Figure 2.9), whose loose wavy hair is unlike the Tel Dor mask. This version of the mask is similar to Dor and is a later manifestation of Mask 16 most commonly found from 150 B.C.E. to 50


\textsuperscript{65} Webster, Green, and Seeberg, 1:22.
C.E., but soon merged with Mask 13; in the Imperial period (50 C.E. onwards) it was lost to the general koine of Young Man masks.

The Tel Dor mask should so well match the characteristic features of this particular manifestation of Mask 16 is fascinating. Although Webster gives no absolute date range in his description of the mask, he does cite examples of this type. Some examples he cites are from his Period 3, which ranges from 150-50 B.C.E., and a known example he gives is from a gem engraving dating to his Period 4, which is from 50 B.C.E. to 50 C.E.\textsuperscript{66} Thus it can be assumed that the period during which this version of Mask 16 was most in use was from 50-50 C.E., with some earlier examples. This would further suggest a later date for the Tel Dor mosaic, whose mask generally resembles this type.

While the mask from the mask-and-garland border on the Tel Dor mosaic indeed matches the general description of the Late Hellenistic form of Mask 16, there are important differences in what could be considered a standard Mask 16. It is important to remember that the Pollux categories are meant to be broad categories, and so differences are to be expected. However, the differences between the Tel Dor mask and Mask 16 are great enough that it is worth considering other explanations and comparisons for the Tel Dor mask.

The contexts in which these masks were being used, namely theater, should now be examined; since developments in theater affected the development of masks, and thus the manner of their portrayal. For example, in

\textsuperscript{66} Webster, Green, and Seeberg, 1:22.
the transition from Greek Old Comedy, in which men were often shown to be the worst version of themselves, full of carnal self-interest to New Comedy, which strove to depict man exactly as he was, no better, no worse. The shift in the writing style and subject was reflected in their masks, which change from grotesque and ugly to realistic, though of course not in the modern sense of the word. This is contrasted by the contemporary change in tragedy, which while New Comedy edged to realism, tragedy moved towards idealism, hence the introduction of the onkos, to give the actor a larger-than-life appearance. Examples of images of New Comedy masks are the most common, and are found on frescoes, mosaics, archways, lamps, jewelry, theatre tickets, and miniature terracotta replicas, which were used as dedications to Dionysus. Although they became more realistic, they still appear exaggerated in their artistic renderings because in use they were viewed from far away and from above, so all facial features were heavily exaggerated to compensate for the distance and perspectival angle.

New Comedy greatly affected the development of Roman theater, which, like so many aspects of Roman culture, was an eclectic mix of local tradition and borrowed foreign traits. The two early definitive Roman playwrights, Plautus (d. 184 B.C.E.), and Terence (c.184-159 B.C.E.), are both heavily influenced by the Greek New Comedy style, and their masks were likely similar to New Comedic

68 Wiles, 68.
69 Wiles, 80.
70 Wiles, 82.
masks as well.\textsuperscript{71} This is supported by the fact that despite the popularity and renown of Plautus’ plays, which were in use for over a century, no definitive Plautine iconography ever developed; this likely means that there was nothing new or independent about the Plautus’ early Roman version of New Comedy.\textsuperscript{72} These Roman versions of the Greek New Comedic masks were certainly popularized by the famous Roman actor Roscius (c.120-62 B.C.E.) who supposedly wore a mask to cover his squint.\textsuperscript{73} Although analysis of Greek New Comedic masks is extensive, it has been argued that when Terence borrowed from the Greek repertoire he had only the most basic sense of which types of masks belonged to which roles.\textsuperscript{74} Even if Terence himself fully understood the nuanced cultural language the masks conveyed in their original Greek context, it is likely that the Roman audience did not.\textsuperscript{75}

There were many ways masks could be represented in various media, including mosaics. A standard mask-and-garland border had eight masks which followed the standard of two old men, two slaves, two young men, and two young women.\textsuperscript{76} Often these masks are arranged with the two slaves in the bottom corners, two old men at the top corners, the two young men at the center sides, and two young women at the central vertical axis.\textsuperscript{77} In this way the masks
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are organized by social status (slaves on bottom, old men on top), and visual attractiveness (youths in the centers, asymmetrical masks in the corners).

However, masks can also be arranged in a way that tells a story, and this is one such possibility for how the Tel Dor mask may have worked is its original context. An example of this is found in the analysis of a parallel mosaic from Pompeii, showing Eros riding a tiger surrounded by a mask and garland border (Figure 2.10). Wiles argues that the arrangement of the masks in this border tells a story of an attempt at taming sexual desire. 78 The arrangement is as follows: bottom center is a courtesan (desirable object), bottom left is an amorous youth looking at her, and bottom right is an angry old man (his father), top center is a young woman (bride intended for amorous young man), and top left is an old man (her father), center right is a tan young man (soldier also in love with courtesan), and his slave in the top right, who is opposed to the slave of the amorous young man in the center left. 79 Wiles argues that instead of attempting to identify each mask as an individual by seeking similarities with Pollux’s catalogue, more information can be determined by looking at the differences between the masks, and establishing relationships via oppositions using the same characteristics emphasized by Pollux. 80 This approach would be ideal, but unfortunately there is only one mask surviving from the mosaic in Tel
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Dor, and so its relationships with the other masks which would have resided in the garland border cannot be examined.

**Further Interpretations**

Another complication in dating the Tel Dor mask is that it was very common for scenes with masks to be copies of older illustrations or scenes from a play, although sometimes the artist would copy the scene and then update the masks to whatever was the current fashion.81 An example of this, as discussed by Green, is the Dioskourides mosaic from Pompeii which dates to the late 2nd century B.C.E. but has a scene from Menander’s *Synaristosai* copied from an early 3rd century painting. In this case the overall layout and structure of the painting was copied in the mosaic, but the costumes and masks were updated to the current fashion.82 Either way the Tel Dor mosaic is likely an early Roman copy of a Late Hellenistic or possibly an even earlier artwork, since the non-mask stylistic evidence points towards an early Roman date and mask itself has some similarities with the New Comedy style.

One of the main differences between Mask 16 and the Tel Dor mask is that Mask 16, as a Young Man mask, is characterized by his youth, seen in his boyish, plump face, and if often used as a younger brother to Mask 15.83 However, the Tel Dor mask is not young or boyish, but actually looks remarkably mature (Figure 1.9). The smoothness of the face, the roundness of the features,
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and the slight fullness in the face are more reminiscent of femininity than boyishness. The shape of the eyebrows are an important feature in masks, and the Tel Dor mask has very fine, beautifully arched eyebrows, entirely different from the typical Young Men masks like Mask 16, which typically have flat, even worried eyebrows.84 This highly arched eyebrow increases the look of femininity of the Tel Dor mosaic, and when combined with the full, red lips, provides ample evidence of the mature and feminine nature of the mask. Thus, despite the similarities between the general form of the Tel Dor mask and Mask 16, it is clear that there is something different happening in the Tel Dor mask. In addition to smaller, stylistic differences, there is also the unmistakable presence of the large filleted trefoil-shaped hat which sits upon the head of the Tel Dor mask.

Martin describes this headpiece as a speira (rolled style) being kept in place by a brown wool fillet and a blue tainia (ribbon) which crosses over the front of the hat and comes billowing out the sides.85 While the fillet is a common feature of New Comedy masks, the headpiece as an ensemble is unusual in New Comedy masks, and when combined with the definitively feminine features of the mask itself, is instead suggestive of Dionysus, who is often portrayed as serene and feminine with a head decoration of ribbons, fillets, or ivy leaves, particularly in symposiastic contexts.

84 Webster, Green, and Seeberg, 22.
85 Stewart and Martin 2003, 134.
The young, beardless Dionysus (as opposed to a bearded adult in a chiton) is first introduced by the Dinos Painter in ca.420 B.C.E. on Attic black-figure vases. This beardless Dionysus is paralleled in the development of early Apulian red-figured vases. Although this area of Southern Italy was heavily influenced by imported Attic pottery, they soon developed their own understanding and portrayal of the beardless Dionysus. Even on Early Apulian vases there are many Dionysian scenes which mostly appear on kraters found in tombs. Alongside the feminine Dionysus was often a naked young man, whom Carpenter identifies as the deceased preparing to partake in the Dionysian symposium in the after-life. Here the feminine Dionysus has a local Southern Italian traditional association with feasting in the afterlife, as can be seen in the volute krater which dates to ca.390 B.C.E. (Figure 2.11). What makes this particular krater so interesting in relation to the Tel Dor mosaic are the elaborate fillets and ribbons on Dionysus’ head, which strongly resembles that of the Tel Dor headpiece.

Another example of the femininity common to Dionysus is a mosaic from the impluvium of the House of Dionysus at Delos from the late 2nd century B.C.E (Figure #). Here the face has very similar characteristics in the full red lips, softly rounded cheeks, and rounded, serene face. The context of the face is
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completely different from that of the Tel Dor mosaic, being that it is part of a full-bodied Dionysus in his classic position atop a leopard, but still serves as a parallel for the type of femininity that is often attributed to Dionysus in mosaics and other media such as paintings and sculptures.

Another Dionysian connection lies in the headpiece of the Tel Dor mask, which is similar to a type of Roman Dionysian herm which was very popular from the 2nd century B.C.E. to the 1st century C.E. The oldest examples of this type of herm are two bronze herms which were both using the same original model, according to Mattusch; these herms likely would have been used as garden ornaments, updated to satisfy the sophisticated tastes of the patrons, be they Greek or Roman. Although one of these herms has no context or known date (Figure 2.13), the other (Figure 2.14) was found in the Mahdia shipwreck (70-90 B.C.E.) near Rome, although the herm itself dates to the 2nd century B.C.E. A similar marble example dating to the 1st century B.C.E. to the 1st century C.E. from the House of Loreius Tiburtinus in Pompeii has also been found and is thought to represent Dionysus after his return from the East (Figure 2.15). Also in marble is a Roman disk relief from the mid-late 1st century C.E., which is almost the same as the earlier examples, though the ribbons are looser and there
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is emphasis on the ivy leaves (Figure 2.16).\textsuperscript{95} The headpieces for this specific type of Dionysian herm are more flamboyant than the headpiece from Tel Dor, but all of the elements are the same. The base of the headpiece is a hat which is then covered in intricate fillets and ribbons which dip through and around the headpiece, giving the whole herm a sumptuous, Dionysian tone.

The Tel Dor mask therefore appears to combine the general construction of Mask 16, dating from 50-50 C.E., possibly earlier, with the femininity associated with Dionysus and a Dionysian headpiece commonly used on Dionysian herms from the 1\textsuperscript{st} century B.C.E. to the 1\textsuperscript{st} century C.E. It would be logical then to propose that the Tel Dor mask is not a Young Man New Comedy mask as suggested by Martin, but rather a mask of Dionysus which uses the Late Hellenistic prototype of Mask 16 as the basis on which it builds the Dionysian narrative. A discussion of the possible implications of this Dionysian mask in place of a theatrical mask sadly does not belong here, but it can be said that the mask of Dionysus would certainly tap into the symposiastic atmosphere that would have pervaded the dining room. The Roman influence in the headpiece is another significant example of the Roman stylistic influence taking place in the Tel Dor mosaic. The combination of Late Hellenistic and Roman/Pompeian influence in the Tel Dor mask is fascinating and could have many explanations.

One such explanation for the unique mixture of Hellenistic and Roman styles is that the social elite of Tel Dor had adopted the Hellenistic styles in their

symposium decoration in order to show their cosmopolitan style to their guests. After the Romans replaced the Hasmoneans in Tel Dor, the elites then turned to Roman styles for artistic inspiration and this results in the mixture of Late Hellenistic and Roman influences in the mask. However, in light of the other stylistic parallels for the perspective meander, the mask-and-garland border in general, and the development of Roman, specifically Pompeian influence on the Southern Levantine coast (to be discussed), it seems more likely that another scenario is taking place.

Rather than the elites of Tel Dor holding on to previous Hellenistic influence while adapting to the new Roman styles, it could be that the mask is wholly Roman in style. The Mask 16 has a later time use, and as previously discussed Late Hellenistic New Comedy masks and early Roman theater masks are very similar because the Romans borrowed the Hellenistic theater and the masks that went with it. Therefore it is entirely possible that this is a Roman rendition of Dionysus, using the borrowed Roman version of Mask 16 as a basis of construction. This would make the whole mask congruent and entirely Roman in influence, although it is a Roman interpretation of Hellenistic Mask 16, which is why many scholars initially judged the mask to be Hellenistic. However, interpreting the Tel Dor mask in this way accounts for all of the stylistic evidence holistically, and it provides key evidence of the development of Roman influence in the Southern Levant.
**Summary**

Therefore, based on the construction technique of the Tel Dor mosaic, which was used in the 1st century B.C.E. and later, and the stylistic parallels of the perspective meander, mask-and-garland border, and the mask itself, the Tel Dor mosaic can be dated to the 1st century B.C.E., or possibly even later. The stylistic parallels also reveal strong connections and influence with Southern Italy, with contemporary parallels coming mostly from Pompeii and a strong feminine Dionysus at symposium tradition in Apulia. However, in order to fully understand if this interpretation makes sense, the larger archaeological context of the Southern Levant must be considered. This will be done by examining Tel Dor, along with the sites of Tel Kedesh and Anafa, and the ways in which the increasing influence of Roman culture affects the archaeological records there.
Figure 2.1—Vitruvian Mosaic Construction and Preparation

Figure 2.2—Construction of the Tel Dor Mosaic

Figure 2.3—Perspective Meander from the Insula Occidentalis, House of Fabius Rufus, 1st century


Figure 2.4—Perspective Meander from a house beneath the church of San Pietro in Vincoli, late 2nd century B.C.E.

Figure 2.5—Perspective Meander from Thumis, Egypt, ca. 200 B.C.E.

Figure 2.6—Mask-and-Garland border from the House of the Mosaic Doves in Pompeii, surrounding the mosaic of Drinking Doves from room (n), early 1st B.C.E.

Figure 2.7—Mask-and-Garland border from the House of the Faun in Pompeii, late 2nd B.C.E.


Figure 2.8—Mask 16, the Later Version

Figure 2.9—Mask 16, the Earlier Version

Figure 2.10—Mask-and-Garland bordering Eros riding a tiger from House of the Faun in Pompeii, late 2nd century B.C.E.

Figure 2.11—Apulian red-figure volute krater with a Dionysiac symposion, ca. 390 B.C.E.

Figure 2.12—Close-up of winged Dionysus on a tiger from House of Dionysus on Delos, late 2nd century B.C.E.

Figure 2.13—Bronze Dionysian Herm in the J. Paul Getty Museum, Malibu


Figure 2.14—Bronze Dionysus herm from Mahdia shipwreck (70-90 B.C.E.), from the 2nd century B.C.E.

Figure 2.15—Marble head of Dionysus, from the House of Loreius Tiburtinus in Pompeii, 1st-1st C.E.


Figure 2.16—Marble disk with a herm of Dionysus in relief, 3rd quarter of the 1st century C.E.

Chapter 3: Archaeological Context

The stylistic and construction techniques of Greek and Roman mosaics have now been discussed, and the conclusion that the Tel Dor mosaic seems to belong to the 1st century B.C.E., or the early Roman period at Tel Dor, has been reached. Thus it is now prudent to explore the archaeological contexts of these mosaics and the Southern Levant as a whole.

Elite Luxury Consumption

A mosaic such as the Tel Dor mosaic, particularly one with Dionysian themes, would most likely have been found in the home of an elite family, and the dining room in particular. The elite's decoration of dining rooms was often meant to portray the wealth and sophistication of its owners to the guests, as together they lounged and feasted in a symposia-style meal. This elite dining room decoration necessitates a discussion of the idea of luxury and elite consumption and emulation. Although the interactions of the elite in the Hellenistic and Roman periods in the Mediterranean were complicated and require specific dissection, luxury and the theoretical concerns of social hierarchy as it pertains to material consumption for social and political gains can be discussed on a broader scale. Luxury as a concept is relative to each society and the moral, political, and socio-economic composition of its members. Even though the study of luxury needs to be taken on a case by case basis, certain generalizations can be made about the characteristics of luxury items and food,
based on the consistency of human nature and the level of complexity of the society.

In his study on food as a luxury, van der Veen defines luxury foods as “those foods that are widely desired because they offer refinement or qualitative improvement of a basic food and a means of distinction because they are not yet widely attained.”\cite{96} Although this definition is for luxury food specifically, it also serves as a definition for luxury items in general. Luxury items are those which are not necessary or common, and often are used in contexts that are not ubiquitous for all levels of society. Luxury items are an indulgence, and the ability to indulge in such objects as well as the activities they are used in is a status indicator.\cite{97}

Because eating is a human necessity, dining related luxury is one of the most common forms of luxury in societies. As with luxury food, luxury items are usually distinct in either their quantity (especially if they involve meat or alcohol) or their quality (which is usually determined by expense, exotic origin, complexity, style, and etiquette).\cite{98} In general, there is a common evolution of luxury dining practices and food as observed by van der Veen. In simple societies luxury foods and items are mostly based on quantity rather than quality, and often the consumption of these things is communal, often in feasting. Here the experience of luxury is used to unify the members of the society, with

\begin{footnotes}
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the host of the feast being the only one who gains or maintains a higher social status.\textsuperscript{99}

On the other hand, in complex societies dining becomes a private affair with the emphasis turning from quantity to quality. The host is just judged on the expensive, rarity, and exotic nature of the food and related items, as well as the etiquette of the meal itself.\textsuperscript{100} In this more complex, private setting, the role of luxury changes from communal unification to individual exclusivity.\textsuperscript{101} The host of the prove dinner party uses their economic status and ability to further their social status, thus distancing themselves from others, creating an elite class and status. In this way the elite evolve, as those of a lower class attempt to use their monetary wealth to prove their ability to imitate those above them, and as elites compete amongst each other to have the newest and best luxury item, or as is the case in this study, luxury decoration.

An example of the evolution of elite markers can be found in Athens in the mid 2\textsuperscript{nd} century to early 1\textsuperscript{st} century B.C.E. when there was an increase in imported pottery and local imitations. This is known from a cistern on the south slope of the acropolis containing a Sullan deposit dating to 75-50 B.C.E. These changes in consumption are the result of a shifting political and economic climate, but they also parallel a shift in Athenian society.\textsuperscript{102} In 166 B.C.E. Athens
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became the administrator of Delos, which was given to them by the Romans with the stipulation that it become a free port, presumably in order to further Rome’s own economic interest in the East. This action, combined with the destructions of Corinth and Carthage in 146 B.C.E., caused a complete change in the trade routes; the new routes focused on Delos, thereby cutting out Rhodes, and created an east-west orientation in the Mediterranean, with Italy at one end, Delos in the middle, and the Near East/Asia Minor on the other end. Because of this Rome is now able to become the largest purchaser of Greek goods and Delos, as the contact point between east and west, becomes inundated with foreign traders from Rome, Syro-Palestine, and Asia Minor.

The sudden rise of Delos and change in trading patterns is reflected in this deposit from the south slope, which has a large number of imports and imitations whose forms parallel places like Tel Anafa, Pergamon, and Italy. Many of these Natalia Vogeikoff-Brogan, who published the assemblage, argues are also skeuomorphs, imitating metal vessels. Inscriptional evidence suggests that the leading political figures of Athens in the end of the 2nd century and the beginning of the 1st were those who had held important positions at Delos, or whose families were heavily involved in the commercial trade at Delos. This is a concrete example of the parallel social changes that were happening at this time. Before the 2nd century B.C.E., the Athenian elite would have had little to do with mercantilism, leaving it to the equivalent of the upper middle class to do
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such things, at least theoretically. So this change in the composition of the Athenian elite, as it was flooded with international traders from Delos, shows the affluence of those involved in trade at Delos. These new members of the Athenian elite were now in a position to influence the traditional Athenian elite with the more cosmopolitan/international tastes and views that they brought with them from Delos.\footnote{Vogeikoff-Brogan, 326.}

With the 2nd century B.C.E. elite leading the way in being cosmopolitan, a “trickle-down” effect would have occurred, where “elite fashions can influence taste lower down the social scale.”\footnote{Michael Vickers, “Nabatea, India, Gaul, and Carthage: Reflections on Hellenistic and Roman Gold Vessels and Red-Gloss Pottery,” \textit{American Journal of Archaeology} 98, no.2 (Apr. 1994): 235, quoted in Vogeikoff-Brogan, 326.} Following Vogeikoff-Brogan then, this means that the \textit{nouveaux riches} in Athens from Delos were likely the ones using the elite metal wares in their dining practices, which make the imported skeuomorphs found in the cistern the emulations of non-elites.\footnote{Vogeikoff-Brogan, 326.} This modification in consumption behavior by the lower classes in an attempt to model the elite is the reasoning for the relatively sudden adoption of metal ware vessel forms in ceramics and imported, foreign pottery and goods in Athens at the end of the 2nd century B.C.E.

While 2nd century Athens is an excellent example of the importation of elite luxury items, namely pottery, and how it relates to the composition of the social elite, it does not address the issue elite importation of architectural features from foreign (and therefore luxurious) elite. A useful architectural
example of elite emulating other, foreign elite can be found in the Romano-British houses of the 1st to 3rd centuries C.E., as seen in a study done by Simon Ellis. He argues that a villa (defined as “a rural house exhibiting clear signs of influence by the classical style of Greek and Roman architecture”) in Britain becomes a sign of ‘Romanization’, which he defines as “the adoption by the local British elite of architectural elements and behaviour that have become common in other parts of the British Empire (especially the Mediterranean provinces).”

The presence of a villa is a marker of the assimilation by the Romano-British elite of the central elite of the Empire in an attempt to conform to the Roman ideals of aristocracy. Of course the same problem arises here (as does in most places) where there is an importation of a new luxury item or feature which in its original context also belongs to a cultural tradition. When the British elite are importing these classical features in their villas, are they also adopting the social practices that the Romans would have done in them? Or are they simply adopting the items and features, but using them to their own purpose, or as a competition with their fellow elite with no interest in the Roman cultural qualities of the import?

Ellis argues that in the case of the villas in Romano-British elite they were also adopting Roman behavior by the end of the 3rd century C.E. due to the complexity of the architectural features and décor. However, he stipulates
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that the nationality of the inhabitants of the house can never be truly determined; in other words, there is no way to identify the villa of a settler from the central Empire or Italy itself from a native of Britain, but either way these villas represent the “translation of the Roman style into a British context” and the owner of the villa would be influencing other elite with their Romanized house.\(^{113}\) Ellis uses the example of the Romanizing villas of the Romano-British to argue that assimilation of another culture by the elite occurs in two steps. First the “concrete expressions of a culture” which are easier to replicate are adopted by the provincial elite, though this is done as a show of status, and the behavioral aspects that are associated with the objects or features being adopted do not translate.\(^{114}\) In the second stage however, the “abstract social concepts” are then assimilated alongside the concrete, and they now become a part of the larger elite dialogue.\(^{115}\)

Thus both pottery and architecture can often show the changes in elite consumption, and these developments in the wants and needs of the various local elites are often reflective of the larger movements in economy and trade. As new locations and cultures are added into the dialogue of the Mediterranean and as the dominating force in the Aegean changes, the desires and consumption habits of the elite classes change as well. These ideas of elite consumerism and emulations are important when thinking about an artifact such as the Tel Dor
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mosaic, where the various influences are present, as they can reveal interesting things about the owner and their desires and purpose.

**Dining Practices and Spaces**

*Dining in Hellenistic Houses*

In order to fully appreciate the context and use of the Tel Dor mosaic, it is important to know the typical elite houses and dining habits in Greece and Rome. Until the regularization of city planning in the gridiron approach as headed and credited to Hippodamos of Miletos, houses in the Greek world were not regular.\(^\text{116}\) However, with the invention and implementation of grid planning a regular pattern can be seen. In the fourth and fifth centuries B.C. many sites have these housing structures, but none are more fully excavated as Olynthus. Located in the Chalcidice, Olynthus has produced more than fifty houses from its North Hill which was in use starting in 400 B.C. and was destroyed by Phillip II of Macedon in 348 B.C. The city blocks follow the regular Hippodamian plan of several avenues running north and south with regular east-west streets intersecting them to make regular rectangles which were then filled with houses. An example from this is from a different quarter in Olynthus which dates to 432, where each block has five houses on each the north and south sides of the street with a narrow alley that separates the rows (Figure 3.1).\(^\text{117}\)


\(^{117}\) Biers, 212.
Although the size of the houses varies, they all follow the same plans, including those found in Athens. Each house was centered inward around a courtyard so that street access was limited. There was typically only one entrance to the street which was often blocked by a wall or similar construction so that passer-bys could see directly into the house.\textsuperscript{118} After entering the house however, access fairly open. On the other side of the usually cobbled courtyard was the pastas, or long corridor off of which many rooms could be entered. A typical Olynthian house had ten rooms on the first floor, with sleeping rooms and storage upstairs. With the exception of the andron, or dining room, which had couches lining the edges of the room, most ground-floor room functions cannot be determined on architecture alone.

\textit{Androns}, or men’s rooms, were commonly the site of the symposium, which was a drinking party hosted by the owner of the house to his friends or even to business partners, as it is speculated that these sometimes served as political meetings as well. Guests would recline on the couches around the room and eat small bites of many kinds of food. At the end of this main meal the krater would be brought in, and the host would libate with the unmixed wine; afterwards the wine would be mixed with water in proportions pleasing to the guests and ladled into the guests’ cups.\textsuperscript{119} While the shape and style of the kraters, serving vessels, and drinking cups changed over time and from place to

\textsuperscript{118} Lisa C. Nevett, \textit{Domestic Space in Classical Antiquity} (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010), 47.

place, the spirit of the symposium and the architecture of the andron remained much the same until near the end of the Hellenistic age.

The andron is usually a square chamber with an off-center doorway and with raised borders along the edge of the floor where continuous couches would have been placed so that occupants could recline. If any room in the house were to be more decorated it was usually the andron which often had red and yellow plaster decorative panels.\textsuperscript{120} The floor was sometimes mortar, and in nicer houses mosaic centers are often found. The floors at Olynthus are known for their black and white pebble mosaics in geometric patterns or with mythological scenes. Depending on the size of the andron there would be three to seven benches, for six to fourteen people, with the large open center used for serving, and in some cases possibly music and dancing. The position of the andron within the home suggests that although sometimes, probably during symposiums, separation and privacy was needed (high thresholds and sometimes antechambers separate the andron from the rest of the house), when in this particular use, the andron was likely part of the usual house flow—possibly acting as a living room or some other open purpose.\textsuperscript{121}

However, when the architecture of a house does not survive, except for perhaps the foundation levels, it becomes almost impossible to determine the function of any room in the house, if indeed individual rooms can be discerned. It is at this point ceramics and decorative fragments become essential. Even if
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rooms can’t be architecturally decided, the presence of certain artifacts can certainly hint as to whether or not a house had an andron, or how grand that room might have been.

The presence of an andron can usually be determined by high-end decorations such as frescoes and mosaics. These types of social statements would have made their home in the dining rooms of the ancient world, where they would add to the festive nature of the symposium and impress guests and possibly allies. Vessels meant for the serving of food and wine in fine fabrics or expensive material are also suggestions of the need to impress guests in a situation that involved serving these things. Such events would presumably have occurred in dining rooms, and so these ceramics are helpful. Within these general categories of serving and drinking vessels and decorative elements the date and wealth of the dining room can be estimated, but depending on the archaeological context it may not be able to determine anything more specific about the house or the dining room.

*Dining in Roman Houses*

The typical plan of a Roman house comes from three houses found in Pompeii: the house of the Surgeon, of Pansa, and of Sallust. These are from the third century B.C., and although were later modified, represent the patrician domus (Figure 3.2). Between these three houses and Vitruvius’s *De architectura* a fair amount is known about the plan of a typical Roman house and details of what was going on inside. Much like the Hellenistic houses, Roman houses are
inward centered and have openings onto the street only on one side. These entranceways were called the fauces, or “jaws”.\(^{122}\) The long axis ran from the fauces, through the atrium, and into the tablinum which was the main reception space. In the atrium a basin called the impluvium rested under an opening in the roof for the collection of rainwater called the compluvium. These houses did not typically have rooms that were made for symposium style parties, as this was before heavy Greek influence infiltrated the Roman world and the Bay of Naples in particular.

However, in the second century B.C. the Hellenized domus-with peristyle came into fashion. The colonnaded peristyle from Greek houses became an extension of the fauces-atrium-tablinum axis and was treated as gardens. New rooms formed around the peristyle including a triclinium, which was essentially an andron. These special dining rooms were for invited guests only, and had three couches (klinai) for Greek-style dining parties. According to Vitruvius the view from these rooms were often strategically planned for the pleasure and status of the owners and their invited guests.

As with Hellenistic housing however, if the architectural remains are not substantial enough it becomes difficult to determine much about a residence, especially the particulars of room functions. The presence of fine dining and serving vessels, and decorate themes associated with drinking can be indicative of a triclinium. As for dating and wealth, the materials and the style of the

decoration can similarly give information in this area. As with any house, no matter the era, these types of dining rooms, meant for drinking, feasting, and entertaining, are generally restricted to the homes of the wealthy and middle-class. Houses of the lower classes were too small to hold such rooms, and their inhabitants had no need of the show nor the resources for the splendor. Hellenistic or Roman, well decorated houses of the elite and of the middle class imitating them remain the possible venues for a dining room that could house such a mosaic as the one found in Tel Dor. Artifacts found in these homes that would indicate the style and wealth necessary to need such a level of mosaic include fine dining and serving vessels and decorative materials such as mosaic floors, frescoed walls, and even painted plaster.

**Tel Dor**

**Overview**

It is now necessary to examine the larger archaeological record at Tel Dor in order to better understand if there is a place for the mask-and-garland mosaic at Tel Dor and how it would fit in the larger history of the region. Although Tel Dor was occupied continuously from its founding in 2000 B.C.E to its abandonment in the third century CE, there were many changes in the composition of its character and the role it played in the development of the Southern Levant and its relations to the rest of the Mediterranean and beyond. One consistency in the architecture of Tel Dor is the layout of its streets, which remained constant starting from the rejuvenation of the city in the Persian
Period until the end of the Roman. While the streets may have remained constant, the architecture of the buildings between them and the nature of the small finds left by their inhabitants show the truly dynamic changes that occur between the streets. These small finds and architecture reveal the local continuity of the community of people living in Tel Dor as well as their changes in taste as they adopt various characteristics and goods from foreign cultures that influence both their own sense of artistry and lifestyle. In adopting these foreign traits they in turn create a new culture that can be seen in the rest of the Southern Levant.

*Persian-Early Hellenistic*

During the Persian and Hellenistic periods a heavy Greek influence is clear. The Greeks were likely important trading partners at Dor since many ceramic imports from Chios, Samos, Miletos, Mende, Thasos, and Clazomenia as well as one of the largest Attic assemblages in Israel have been found there. The types of Attic ceramic ware found also reveals something about the inhabitant of Dor. While dining ware, drinking, serving, and perfume vessels, as well as lamps are common; any other types of pottery are rare to unknown. The assemblage present at Dor demonstrates the interest in the Greek symposium culture, and the use of Attic imports to indicate a status of wealth and luxury in the formal dining situations.

---
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Before 500 B.C. there was little evidence for Greek influence at Tel Dor other than a few imported Mycenaean pottery pieces and some references to Greek traders. Starting around 500, or shortly thereafter however, the importation of Attic black-figure and black-glaze pottery began in earnest. Attic red figure replaced Attic black-figure in 450 B.C. and continued to be the most popular Greek import until it stopped being produced in the late fourth century.

Although over 1,000 black-figure, red-figure, overpainted/West Slope, and black-glaze sherds and vessels have been studied recently by A. Stewart and R. Martin, much of the Attic pottery from Areas A and C (which were published in Stern 1995) have been lost as the building they were being stored in was vandalized and robbed. However, the assemblage that was left is more than sufficient to shed light on a part of the process of Hellenization at Dor.

Most of the black-figure pottery are cup-skyphos, and many of them can be attributed to the Haimon Painter and his workshops.127 The Haimon Painter himself is dated to 500-475 B.C., but it is unknown for how long his workshop was in business, as his work can be extended all the way to 430 B.C. The red-figure pottery is more diverse, but is mostly Type A Skyphos, stemless cups, bowls of both the incurve rim and the projecting rim variety, and plates, both fish and not. Black glaze and over painted/West Slope technique ceramics have much the same assemblages as the red-figure pottery.

The earliest Attic imports into Dor are those vessels used in symposiums, such as kraters, cups, and cup-skyphoi. Although there is a range in the quality and style, these vessels continue in popularity through the fourth century. They were likely used in marzeah, a Syro-Phoenician elite version of a symposium. By 500 B.C. Attic fine tableware such as red and black-figure askoi, black-glaze dishes, plates, and salt cellars begin to appear alongside the symposium vessels, and by around 400 replace the local versions almost completely. Attic tablewares continue to dominate until shortly after 300 when it trickles out of circulation. However, Attic amphorae, pelikae, hydriae, stamnoi and oinochoae are practically nonexistent at Tel Dor, in essence serving and kitchen wares; importation was limited to objects that would have been seen and used by guests, thereby acting as a status symbol. The shapes that would have been used for transportation, storage, and preparation of food and drink are East Greek products, not Attic. The rather sudden stop of Attic imports after 300 is surprising, but may be explained through a coincidental combination of political, economic, and social circumstance in Athens, the Ptolemaic kingdom, and at Dor.

As far as the houses that these ceramic assemblages would have been used in, many residential areas have been excavated which date to the Persian and Hellenistic periods, primarily in Areas A, C, and D2. All of these residential insulae are similar to each other in plan, generally in following with the
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Hippodamian plan. Most of the walls were built in “ashlar pier” style which uses alternating segments of ashlars and rubble that is associated with Phoenician craftsmen. In the first of two building phases of these areas the street system was laid with the insulae being built next to it. The second phase leaves the system but reorganizes the areas within the outer walls. Many of the insulae were mixed with commercial endeavors, as some shops were discovered scattered throughout the houses, similar to Ashkelon and Beirut.

In the fifth century B.C. Tel Dor was rejuvenated due to Sidonian patronage and to Dor’s desire to establish themselves more firmly in the Levant, and a city-wide rebuilding occurred, basically completing the Hellenization process, though of course Phoenician traits and influences remained. In Area D2, the Persian insulae were continued in use, though the addition of more streets and structures in the Hellenistic period show that the city plan was concerned more with local needs and topography than with keeping orthogonal city plan. A silver Athenian tetradrachm was found sealed under a white plaster floor in one of the insulae of D2, and provides the terminus post quem of second half of the fifth century B.C. for the second phase of reconstruction.¹³⁰

*Late Hellenistic*

The archeological remains that have come out of Hellenistic Tel Dor better our understanding of what the city was like at this time. Three natural harbors were the lifeblood of the ancient city. Trade, ship building, fishing, and
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murex shells (used to make the cities’ famous purple dye) were all a part of the cities’ status as a maritime center and were the foundations for its economic success. In the eastern part of the tel (areas A, B, and C), the main gate and parts of the well-fortified wall were found; elsewhere in Tel Dor several houses, workshops, olive presses, terracotta, pottery, and coins were also discovered.131

Alexander the Great and his armies invaded the Levant around 330 BCE, and after his death his successors fought for control in the broken pieces of his empire. The effects of the political turmoil of the Hellenistic Period does present itself in the material culture at various junctures, but Tel Dor’s primary function as a maritime trade center remained the same, and allowed Dor to stay in contact with foreign cultures as power struggles raged around them. Dor’s continued economic success during this period can be owed not only to their prime position but also to their impressive Hellenistic fortifications. Josephus describes Hellenistic Dor as “a fortress difficult to take”, and the increasing Hellenization of the city shows that this protection helped to keep the constant flow of goods and cultural influence.

While there was certainly a strong Hellenistic influence at this time – reflected in Greek imports such as wine amphorae, table-wear, and a marble herm, as well as the presence of the Greek language on ostraka, catapult balls, pottery, and lead weights –Tel Dor’s local Phoenician tradition remained. Ancient Phoenician building techniques as well as the textile-dyeing traditions
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persisted throughout the Hellenistic period. A sling bullet made for Tryphon (a pretender to the Seleucid throne from 149-139 B.C. who caused the city to be unsuccessfully sieged) that was found outside of the city walls had both Greek and Phoenician inscriptions on it, showing the confluence of Phoenician tradition and Hellenistic influence.

There are many architectural elements at Dor that show the increased Hellenization during this time, including a newly discovered “Monumental Hellenistic Complex” in Areas D1-D2 (Figure 1.4), overlooking the harbor, as well as two similar structures at the base of the acropolis. This complex is possibly the largest known structure in Hellenistic Palestine and has a *terminus post quem* circa 200 BCE, towards the end of Ptolemaic rule. Unfortunately only the foundation levels remain of the structure, and few artifacts were found inside. Whatever its exact function, this monumental building surely represents a wealthy and well-established bureaucracy at Dor. The residents of Dor likely lived in the *insulae* which run along a North-South street near the gate to the city as well as in the mixed domestic and industrial Areas D and F to the South and West of these *insulae.*

The residential areas of Tel Dor revealed the local pottery taste as they changed throughout the Hellenistic period. While Attic imports (especially dining/symposium ware) continued to be popular through the reign of Alexander, there is a significant drop around 300 BCE; this continues until the

---

second century when the “West Slope” technique becomes dominate and Attic lamps and vessels are again seen at Tel Dor, though not as frequent as they were in the fourth century BCE. Alongside the imported Attic “West Slope” pottery are vessels from Rhodes, Knidos, and Thassos, Attic and Ionian mold-made relief bowls, red-glazed pottery (Eastern Terra Sigillata A), and eastern imitations of “West Slope” technique.\textsuperscript{133} The same wealthy residents of the insulae who purchase these luxury import items also support quality art in the Hellenistic koine at Tel Dor such as rings, a carnelian gem, and mosaics of various quality.\textsuperscript{134}

*Early Roman*

Although there are historical sources such as Josephus to describe the political transition in the Levant into the Roman Empire, there is a surprising dearth of both historical references specific to Dor, as well as archaeological remains of the first century BCE city. Due to the lack of published stratigraphic excavations at this time, as well as the broad dating of ceramics to first century BCE-first century CE it is difficult to understand the exact effects of the transition into the Roman province of Syria had on Tel Dor. The best that can be done is to use imported pottery seriation and attempt to combine them with clear historical events and existing clear stratigraphic evidence.

What is known is that Pompey the Great granted Dor a level of autonomy as a free city-state under the rule of the Governor of Syria in 63 BCE. This re-establishment by Pompeius stimulated a period of economic activity that lasted
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from 63 B.C. to 33 B.C. that would have resulted in an increase in the consumption of luxury items (such as mosaics). The effects of this transition on daily life and foreign cultural influence are uncertain, but Dor again becomes traded by the Romans when it is given as a gift by Mark Antony to Cleopatra circa 34 BCE. After this however, Dor is no longer specifically mentioned until Pliny the Elder calls Dor abandoned in the first century CE.\footnote{Pliny Nat 15.2}

When Tel Dor was reestablished by Gabinius under the orders of Pompey, a reconstruction phase followed in an attempt to restore this still important port city to its Hellenistic koine. During the Roman period at Dor there was a second building phase which occurred soon after the Second Jewish Revolt which converted most of the remaining buildings into workshops and industrial areas as Dor adjusted to its new role as second best port after the founding of Caesarea.\footnote{Ephraim Stern, \textit{Dor, Ruler of the Seas: Twelve Years of Excavations at the Israelite-Phoenician Harbor Town on the Carmel Coast} (Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 1994), 271.}

Although the remains from Tel Dor from the second and third centuries CE are phenomenal and the extent of the wealth and Romanization of Dor is clear, there is very little evidence of the early Roman period, except for some foundation walls and the \textit{opus vermiculatum} mosaic. This is due to the massive amounts of construction done in the later Roman period which largely destroyed the remains from first century BCE to first century CE. These later large building projects included paved streets, piazzas in Areas B and G, a basilica in Area A, a theater, a bathhouse in Area E, a complex water system, and large upper class
houses complete with frescos and mosaics in Areas D1, D2, and H, as well as heavy cultic activity with monumental temples in Areas F and H.\textsuperscript{137}

However, there is evidence that suggests that Dor remained wealthy continuously from the end of the Hellenistic period through to 300 CE. One of the identifying factors is the large amount of coins being minted at Dor starting in 63 BCE. When Pompey granted Dor autonomy this evidently included the right to mint their own currency, and based on the amount of coins found from this period in Dor, it is evident that the economic status of Dor was just as thriving as it was in the Hellenistic period. In addition to the persuasive coin collection at Dor, there is evidence in Areas A and C, although poorly preserved, of residential insulae.\textsuperscript{138} They expand an impressive area of the tel, and although only the foundation level remains (the rest was systematically plundered for building material in later centuries), they are evidence of an extensive residential area during this time.

\textit{Roman}

Excavations have revealed some archaeological remains from the first, Roman construction phase all over the Tel. The city was still being protected by the Ptolemaic city walls which, after some minor repairs, were still in good working condition. While the plan of the city continues to follow the plan from the Persian and Hellenistic periods, the structures are larger, more isolated, and
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show an increase in the use of cement and mortar in construction techniques.\textsuperscript{139} There is also an increase in mosaic floors and pottery-tile roofs. In Area B the public buildings surrounded the plaza near the central gate; in Areas E and F a long series of temples were found along with a bathhouse.

The Roman period generally continued to be a time of prosperity, but Tel Dor never became a major player in the region nor grew beyond the size of a moderate city. This may have been due to the construction of an artificial deep-water harbor at Tel Dor’s nearest southern neighbor, Caesarea (also known as Strato’s Tower), which was begun in 37 B.C. by Herod the Great (Figure 1.1). The superior facilities at Caesarea likely allowed it to surpass Tel Dor in its economic role of harbor city. Although the Hellenistic walls were disused as the city spread to 15 hectares (compared to Caesarea’s 100), occupying the plain below the tel, Tel Dor had all of the trademark amenities of a proper Roman city. The people of Tel Dor enjoyed benefits meant for everyone, such as paved streets, public squares, central sewage systems, running water via aqueduct, a bath-house, and grand temples for the city gods, as well as the beauty of mosaics and frescoes in the homes of the wealthy few.

Although evidence for these buildings are almost gone now, in photographs of the site from 1948 the buildings can still be seen, at least in part, before the material was robbed for use by the local village of Tantura. From these aerial photographs it is clear that the hippodrome, gymnasiuim and other
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sporting facilities which were first built in the Hellenistic period were clearly repaired and still used in the Roman period. In addition to the evidence for a beautiful, cosmopolitan city in the Roman period, there was a lower city in the area below the tel, outside of the city walls. The ruins of monumental structures, a well-paved road, and many buildings of unknown use were found below the tel, showing the true extent of Roman Dor.

The large, wealthy houses from Areas F and H, like the rest of Roman Dor, had two main building phases. The first was from the first to mid-second centuries CE and consisted of a series of rich residences overlooking the sea; this was then rebuilt into two monumental (possibly religious) precincts. Despite being built over, the domestic residences have survived remarkably well, presenting a clearer picture of Roman Dor than Early Roman Dor. These houses were decorated in a sophisticated Roman style, similar to those found in Pompeii. For example, a high-quality mosaic floor depicting two dolphins flanking a trident was found in the upper story of House 2, which also had thousands of fragments of a figural fresco with some vegetative and animal motifs.

Because there is no in situ archaeological context for the mask-and-garland mosaic, it is not possible to say with certainty whether it came from the Late Hellenistic, 1st century B.C.E.-1st century C.E., or from this mid 1st-2nd century C.E. period. There is evidence for upper-class residential areas for all
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three periods, although the 1st-1st period is the most poorly preserved, with a terminus post quem of mid-2nd century C.E. it truly could be any of the three. It is for these reasons that the stylistic evidence and the archaeological context of the region (as will be explored through the sites of Kedesh and Anafa) become so important in attempting to determine the date of this mosaic.

The archaeological evidence suggests that the plan of the Tel Dor remained essentially the same starting in the Persian period through the end of the Roman period. The plans of individual buildings, both public and private, also kept the same outline, but were remodeled or repurposed throughout the occupation of the site. In general, however, it can be seen that buildings kept their original purposes and design until the mid-Roman period, when Tel Dor became smaller and generally more industrialized as it shifted from being a port city to manufacturing goods itself. There is clear and well-preserved archaeological data, both architectural and small finds, that shows the wealth and splendor of the city in both the late Hellenistic and Roman periods. So while specific archaeological data for the early Roman period is non-existent, save for coins and some foundation levels, it seems a reasonable statement to say that early Roman Dor was just as wealthy and cosmopolitan as the periods before and after. In addition (as a newly Romanized city) it would be logical for a wealthy resident, whether he be a local or a Roman, to remodel a grand house and outfit it with the mask-and-garland mosaic in a style representative of the new Dor—Roman Dor.
Tel Kedesh

Overview

There is a site in the Upper Galilee called Kedesh (Figure 3.3), which should not be confused with other ancient sites around the southern Levant also named Kedesh/Kadesh, such as Kadesh Barnea, Kedesh Tell Abu-Qudeis, and Khirbet Kedesh.143 Kedesh of the Upper Galilee was known in antiquity for its mountainous geography and for its position in the north as a site on the trading route from Hazor to Tyre on the coast. Kedesh is on a double mound and is about 22-25 acres in area; many groups have taken advantage of this fertile land over the years of its occupation including the Canaanites, Naphtali, Phoenicians and most recently by Palestinians who abandoned the site in 1948.144 Archaeological evidence shows occupation of the site starting in the Early Bronze Age through to the Arab period with varying depths and unclear relationships between each period.145

Textual evidence for Kedesh begins as early as the 19th century B.C.E. and continues through to the Hellenistic period when it is cited twice in the Zenon papyri, dated to 259 B.C.E.; once as a flour supplier, and once as a place where Zenon took a bath.146 There is also a reference in 1 Maccabees to the Greek forces of Demetrius II encamping there before the battle against Jonathan in the
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plain of Hazor, at which they were routed back to Kedesh and taken in what is believed to be September, 145 B.C.E., although the text could refer to 144/143.\textsuperscript{147} Josephus also refers to the city and emphasizes its location between Tyre and Galilee; he even calls it “Tyrian Kedesh”, though of course this is later, in the first century C.E.\textsuperscript{148} From this archaeological and textual evidence then, the most recent excavators of the site, Herbert and Berlin, conclude that Kedesh of the Upper Galilee is characteristically a border site between Tyre and the rest of the world to the south and east.\textsuperscript{149} Its geographic features and location make it the perfect place for such a site, and although at various times it’s aligned with a different side, it always acts as the border, one way or another.

Despite the site’s rich history, one of the most fascinating discoveries belongs to the Persian-Hellenistic period and is known as the Persian-Hellenistic Administrative Center, or PHAB (Figure 3.5). Built in 500 B.C.E. and used until its abandonment in the second half of the second century B.C.E. (except for a short abandonment period in the late fourth century, likely related to Alexander’s the Great travels through the area, according to Herbert and Berlin).\textsuperscript{150} Fortunately there is little later disturbance of the building, with most of the vast number of small finds found \textit{in situ}. The lifespan of the building goes
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though three political cycles: Persian, Ptolemaic, and Seleucid. Analyzing the material culture left behind by the various administrators for different rulers can reveal interesting comparisons concerning their lifestyles in what is supposed to be a less culturally refined area in antiquity, not particularly cosmopolitan in any way.

The PHAB is about 40x56m in total, but only occupies a small part of the south Tel. A Hellenistic house was discovered to the west of the PHAB, but it is the only remaining evidence so far found that dates to the Persian and Hellenistic periods, leaving little to be said for the lifestyle and ethnicity of the surrounding population. Instead, attention will be paid to what can be discerned about the lifestyle of the administrators who worked in the PHAB. When the PHAB was constructed in 500 B.C.E., it was built over the foundations of one or many Iron Age structures, parts of which were reused as foundations for the Persian Period PHAB and consequently nothing more can be told about the Iron Age building. Evidence for the Persian Period occupation of the PHAB comes mostly from ceramic evidence. Persian common wares were found sealed by the earliest floors of the courtyard, and more importantly Attic imports dating from the late 6th or early 5th century until the late 4th or early 3rd century allow for more specific dating of the Persian PHAB. Many of the Hellenistic PHAB walls were built so that they mirror the known fragments of the Persian PHAB walls,

---

151 Peter J. Stone, “‘Provincial’ Perspectives: The Persian, Ptolemaic, and Seleucid Administrative Center at Tel Kedesh, Israel, in a Regional Context” (PhD diss., University of Cincinnati, 2012), 3.
152 Stone, 28.
153 Stone, 29.
154 Stone, 29.
thus it can be assumed that most of the existing Hellenistic walls were in the same orientation as the Persian ones.\textsuperscript{155}

The PHAB was oriented east-west and the main entrance was on the eastern side through an entrance court. The ashlar foundations for this were originally a stylobate that had Doric columns on it. This entrance court followed the alignment of the central courtyard to its west, giving the PHAB a sense of monumentality.\textsuperscript{156} Elongated rooms surround the courtyard on three sides (all sides except for the side that leads to the entry court) and Doric columns lined one end of the entrance courtyard and framed the entrance into the main courtyard from there.\textsuperscript{157}

Stone, in his dissertation, compares this floor plan with the “residency” in Lachish in the Shephelah, which was a Persian period palace.\textsuperscript{158} Although he does not consider the Persian PHAB to be on the same scale as the royal Persian palaces which were resplendent with sculpted friezes and large halls, Stone concludes that its inhabitants were certainly very wealthy and powerful, likely with official political connections or positions, whether or not they actually lived, or just worked there.\textsuperscript{159}
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The stratigraphy of the Hellenistic PHAB is much clearer and had three phases: Hell 1, Hell 2/2b, and Hell 3. While the PHAB may not have been occupied between Alexander the Great in 332 to the beginning of the 3rd century, it is clear from coin evidence that it was active throughout the 3rd century, and this has been assigned to Hell1—the earliest Hellenistic occupation. Wall to wall floors dateable to the 3rd century also serve as evidence for continued occupation in Hell 1. The PHAB was likely remodeled following the change to Seleucid control in the region. This is supported by a coin of Antiochus III dating from 199-188 B.C.E. which was sealed between the Hell 1 floor and the Hell 2 floor that was above it. Another example of this remodeling between the 3rd and 2nd centuries is a blocked doorway and trend to subdivide larger rooms.

Despite this remodeling, there is continuous occupation throughout the transition of the southern Levant into Seleucid control, and based on coins and stamped amphorae handles Kedesh was very active until 143 B.C.E. At this point it seems likely that the battle between the Seleucid general Demetrius and Jonathan the Maccabee which took place nearby drove out the inhabitants. During this Hellenistic 2 phase, the PHAB is known to have contained storerooms, an archive complex with over 2000 clay bullae for papyrus, industrial rooms, and rooms for measuring out produce, cooking. The PHAB at
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this time also had drains in some spaces as well as an extensive dining and reception complex with painted plaster wall decorations.¹⁶⁶

_Persian PHAB_

Due to the generally lax economic trading policies of the Achaemenid kings during the fifth century, an influx of Attic pottery and Athenian wine amphorae is evident along the coastal cities of the southern Levant. Although this importation of Greek goods is certainly concentrated along the coast, they did sometimes trickle to the inland sites, such as Kedesh.¹⁶⁷ The presence of Attic pottery at a coastal site and especially an inland site such as Kedesh does not prove the cultural Hellenization of the site. Most often these Attic wares are meant for perfumes, dining, and serving, and are often found alongside the local versions of these vessels, indicating that the Attic imports are not supplanting the local wares, but just being used in conjunction with them, likely in the manner of local traditions rather than fully adopting the Greek/Hellenistic customs.¹⁶⁸

At Kedesh there are 170 dateable Attic fragments, most of which date to 510-480 B.C.E., and the rest spread out through the 5th century until the arrival of Alexander the Great in 332/1.¹⁶⁹ From this point it is unclear whether the PHAB was continuously occupied, or if it was abandoned after Alexander and not re-established again until the beginning of the 3rd century and the rule of the
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Ptolemies.\textsuperscript{170} There are nine different wares found at Kedesh during the Persian period, most of which were made in the eastern Upper Galilee or Hula Valley, with the exception of the Attic tablewares, which (when can be proven to be directly imported) are from Athens.\textsuperscript{171} Although due to the fragmentary nature of the pottery it can be difficult to differentiate the true Attic from the Atticizing imitations, they both represent the same international trading connections as they both would have come from the same places, and are representative of similar wants and interests on behalf of the PHAB occupants, which is why Stone quantified and discusses them together in his dissertation.\textsuperscript{172}

Based on the holistic pottery assemblage at Kedesh in the Persian period, and after comparisons to numerous other sites, both inland and coastal, Stone argues that Kedesh has much more in common with the other inland sites than with the larger cosmopolitan coastal cities, despite the presence of the PHAB.\textsuperscript{173} Although it clearly had constant contact with the coastal cities, its function was likely related to the collection and possibly distribution of agricultural produce and other goods from its environs.\textsuperscript{174}

\textit{Third Century PHAB}

In the third century Kedesh came under the rule of the Ptolemies, and although there is a scarcity of archaeological evidence for the third century in
Kedesh and the southern Levant in general as compared to the Persian period and the second century, it is clear the Greek and Greek-style objects continued to be bought and used, though not nearly as many or as widespread.\textsuperscript{175} In the third century PHAB, despite the possible abandonment after Alexander, it was reoccupied as early as 300. Attic vessels from this period include three spool saltcellars of the last quarter of the 4\textsuperscript{th} century/beginning of the third, two skyphoi from the first quarter of the 3\textsuperscript{rd} century, three kantharoi from 290-260, and hour outturned rim bowls from the turn of the third century.\textsuperscript{176}

The floor plan of the 3\textsuperscript{rd} century PHAB is mostly inferred from the Persian foundations and the 2\textsuperscript{nd} century remodeling which destroyed much of the 3\textsuperscript{rd} century remains.\textsuperscript{177} However, it is clear the entire building was in use throughout the 3\textsuperscript{rd} century from coins and dateable 3\textsuperscript{rd} century pottery found throughout the building and is assigned to the earliest Hellenistic phase, Hell 1.\textsuperscript{178} Unfortunately, due to a lack of preservation at Kedesh for this century, further subdivisions are not possible as many of the assemblage dates are based on nearby sites such as Tel Dor where the pottery similarly cannot be dated with more precision.\textsuperscript{179} However, even without knowing more specific details, it is clear that based on what is currently known that the 3\textsuperscript{rd} century PHAB would
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have been the nicest and most important building in its area, and was possibly being used in some official Ptolemaic capacity.\textsuperscript{180}

The 3\textsuperscript{rd} century pottery at Kedesh shows a strong continuation of forms and fabrics form the Persian period of the PHAB, including Attic and Atticizing tablewares, albeit in smaller quantities. Phase Hell 1 also brings the introduction of two new wares which are central costal fine ware and Cypriote tablewares.\textsuperscript{181} Also in keeping with the Persian period PHAB was the domination of local fabrics from the Upper Galilee/Hula Valley and the central Levantine coast, with rare confirmed imports coming mostly from Cyprus in this period.\textsuperscript{182} Also, the importation of Attic and Atticizing pottery stops sometime in the middle of the 3\textsuperscript{rd} century, leaving Kedesh with a barebones collection of spool saltcellars, skyphoi, kantharoi, and plates dating to the 4\textsuperscript{th} and early 3\textsuperscript{rd} centuries.

By far the most frequent import in this period is two types of Cypriote wares.\textsuperscript{183} The most common was a gray-brown fabric, and had a semi lustrous dark gray-brown or purple slip and are particularly known from southern Cyprus.\textsuperscript{184} Petrographic testing on the second Cypriote ware suggests a northeastern Cypriote origin and is a similar fabric to the gray-brown fabric, only a paler pink-brown with a red or black slip and is named by Stone as
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northeast Cypriote fineware. Both of these Cypriote wares come in bowls, saucers, and skyphoi.

The local wares from the Upper Galilee/Hula Valley region, such as red-brown gritty ware, coarse orange ware, and spatter painted ware, along with central Levantine coast fabrics like sandy cooking ware, Phoenician SF, and Central coastal fine ware, were mostly fragmentary but are mostly represented by jars and cooking pots. However, transport and storage vessels such as holemouth jars, holemouth jars with thickened rims, and torpedo jars with narrow necks and thickened rims are the same as those from the Persian period, and distinguishing between late Persian and 3rd century vessels such as these proved to be difficult. But the large quantity suggests, according to Stone, that they were traded at the site regularly throughout both periods, followed by a sharp decline in Hell 2 when they are replaced by a new form of storage jar, the Phoenician SF (Semi-Fine) baggy jar.

Phoenician SF baggy jars are about 50cm in height and are used for transporting liquid goods and are produced on the coast in the 3rd century, though they first being to appear slowly at Kedesh in Hell 1 and are mostly found in the 2nd century. Other vessels such as globular cooking pots, a small number of Rhodian amphorae handles, and casserole dishes (which appear here for the first time and are used for Greek-style dishes) also are found in the
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PHAB 3rd century assemblage.\textsuperscript{189} Although evidence from the 3rd century ceramics is lacking compared to the other periods, it is clear that there was a lack of fine vessels meant for formally serving liquid which (according to Stone) likely means that formal drinking occurred infrequently at the PHAB in this period.\textsuperscript{190}

Despite the apparent lack of formal entertainment in the 3rd century, the PHAB was almost certainly still used to collect goods from the agricultural environs of the Upper Galilee and Hula Valley as it did in the Persian period.\textsuperscript{191} A change from the Persian period is the transition from most of the table and service vessels being of truly local fabric to being imported from the coastal suppliers; in addition the central coastal fine wares of the 3rd century that Kedesh was buying were modeled after Greek prototypes, imitations of the shape and surface treatment of the Attic ware that stops occurring in the 3rd century.\textsuperscript{192} This indicated a preference for the central coastal wares, as similar shapes in less variety were available more locally. A similar ceramic assemblage pattern appears in the southern Levant and eastern Cyprus as well as in the city of Samaria according to Stone, with imported amphoras and transport jars shipped through the Levantine coast, cooking pots, casserole, some pans, incurved and everted rim bowls, saucers, skyphoi, plates, and kraters (both of
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which were often imported from the Aegean) and some imported Atticizing and west slope pottery.\textsuperscript{193}

Other than an increase in the variety of cooking and serving vessels that were not locally available and had to be imported from the coastal cities and some changes in fabrics that were likely the result of a change in availability in the market rather than showing a specific preference of the occupants of the 3\textsuperscript{rd} century PHAB, along with a general increase in consumption of Greek style cooking pots and vessels, it is unclear whether the 3\textsuperscript{rd} century residents were the same as those from the Persian period. Except for the changes mentioned above, much stayed the same, which shows that the transition from Persian to Ptolemaic rule had little effect on the material remains of the PHAB.

\textit{Second Century PHAB}

In 198 B.C.E. the Seleucids under the leadership of Antiochus III took back the southern Levant from the Ptolemies, causing a major shift in the material culture of the region.\textsuperscript{194} Although the details are missing due to a lack of papyrological evidence, the seals from the PHAB demonstrate a complex bureaucracy during this period, and the increase in quantity and quality of archaeological evidence for the southern Levant indicates a general increase in prosperity and economic expansion.\textsuperscript{195}
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The PHAB reaches its grandest phase in this final occupation period, complete with stylishly decorated entertainment rooms, expansive archives, and the continued storage of local goods.\textsuperscript{196} The ceramic assemblage stays consistent in the first half of the 2\textsuperscript{nd} century as what was there in the 3\textsuperscript{rd}, including the importation of Cypriote wares, even though politically the two were now separated.\textsuperscript{197} This shows that the new Seleucid rule as not intrusive in their economic policies, as even Ptolemaic coins were still circulating contemporaneously with those minted by the Seleucids.\textsuperscript{198}

In the 2\textsuperscript{nd} century Aegean trade connections grow stronger and expand to include Italy by mid century if not sooner as Italian wares appear in small amounts at both coastal and inland sites.\textsuperscript{199} Although there was a continuation and even an increase in the Greek prototype vessels, at this point they had been in the local ceramic repertoire for more than a century, and as such should no longer be considered a conscious imitation of Greek vessels.\textsuperscript{200} By the 2\textsuperscript{nd} century they were imitations of imitations of imported imitations as and such had likely lost the “Greek” character in the minds of the consumers. However, the increase in monumental art and architecture during the 2\textsuperscript{nd} century parallels the diversification of imported and local pottery. A marble head from a bigger than life statue of Alexander from Beth Shean-Scythopolis (c. 175-164) and a herm from Tel Dor which was sculpted by foreign craftsmen are two examples of
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the increase in art, which matched the increase of Hellenistic-style interior decoration of private houses at this time.\textsuperscript{201} This coincides with the drafted and painted wall paintings from the entertainment rooms of the PHAB during this period, although there may have been some decoration in the 3\textsuperscript{rd} century as well.\textsuperscript{202}

It is known that the PHAB was continuously occupied throughout the transition from Ptolemaic to Seleucid control from coins, ceramic, and stratigraphic evidence.\textsuperscript{203} This includes stamped amphora handles from the first three quarters of the 2\textsuperscript{nd} century, but there is a gap in the dates of the amphora handles from 140/138-132, which Stone believes represents a short period of abandonment after the defeat of the Seleucids to the Maccabees in 143.\textsuperscript{204} After the abandonment the door to the archive rooms was blocked up and then the documents inside burned, though by whom and for what purpose remains unclear.\textsuperscript{205} After this abandonment, the PHAB was turned into a residential area by squatters in the 130s, which disturbed little of the architecture, leaving us with a clear picture of the 2\textsuperscript{nd} century floor plan.

In the middle of the 2\textsuperscript{nd} century the PHAB had archives, an expensive reception and dining complex, rooms for cooking and other household activities, and many storage rooms.\textsuperscript{206} The entertainment complex has three rooms, two of

\textsuperscript{201} Stone, 185.
\textsuperscript{202} Stone, 186.
\textsuperscript{203} Stone, 187.
\textsuperscript{204} Stone, 188.
\textsuperscript{205} Stone, 189.
\textsuperscript{206} Stone, 189.
which contained utility, cooking, table vessels, drains, and ovens; the third which was next to the entrance of the building had lamps, ungentaria, small juglets, cooking and table wares.\textsuperscript{207} Due to an absence of comparable room architecture and finds in an administrative complex Stone refrains from detailing the possible functions of the rooms in this entertaining suite until further study is done.\textsuperscript{208}

The 2\textsuperscript{nd} century ceramic assemblage, designated to phase Hell 2, is similarly consistent with the 3\textsuperscript{rd} century assemblage due to the lack of disruption and change from the political transition from Ptolemaic to Seleucid control.\textsuperscript{209} However, according to Stone, five new fabrics are introduced in this period: gritty cooking ware, northern coastal fine ware, the black slipped predecessor of ESA, Campana A, and Mesopotamian glazed ware.\textsuperscript{210} Although most of the storage jars, utility and cooking vessels are still of local/regional origin, according to Stone, there is a definite increase in imports from outside the region, particularly with respect to table and transport vessels.\textsuperscript{211}

Cooking vessels of the 2\textsuperscript{nd} century were mostly comprised of globular cooking pots in sandy and gritty coastal cooking wares with some spatter painted ware cooking pots interspersed.\textsuperscript{212} Casserole dishes were also still present in mostly sandy cooking ware, though more common than they had been in the 3\textsuperscript{rd} century; it is also in this century that Aegean/Aegean style pans are
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introduced. A shift can be seen in the table ware of this period, with the central coastal and northeast Cypriote fabric fine ware bowls and saucers from the early part of the century being replaced by northern Levantine coastal fine ware vessels soon after the turn of the century. By the mid-late 2nd century when the PHAB was abandoned, Stone noticed the regular use of BSP bowls, plates, and mold made bowls along with increased regularity of cups and mold made bowls imported from western Asia Minor, as well as some table vessels from Italy and Parthia.

Stone also observes that there seems to be an increase in vessels used to serve liquid at a table in the middle of the 2nd century, such as kraters, table amphoras, and Phoenician SF jugs and juglets, were especially common in the Hell 2b abandonment phase. Despite this increase in the variety in fabrics and shapes, as well as in imports, the utility vessels of Kedesh stay strictly local, showing the continuation of the economic trade routes that have been operating for the existence of PHAB. The importance of the increase in imported goods and the types of imported goods should not be overlooked however, and Stone argues that the residents of Kedesh and the PHAB in this period were frequently serving food to large visiting groups, hence the curious interest in the more cosmopolitan serving and dining vessels (and cooking wares to a lesser extent),
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as well as their ability to have access to these imports and the wealth to purchase them.\textsuperscript{216}

The purchase of the imported vessels for formal dining would provide a ceramic context for the dining/reception rooms of the PHAB with their monochromatic mosaic floors and brightly colored painted plaster with traces of egg and dart patterns on the edge.\textsuperscript{217} This, combined with the increase of both in the 2\textsuperscript{nd} century compared to the 3\textsuperscript{rd} indicates an increase in the formal dining practice that would have taken place in these rooms, the same practices which could be expected of the dining room of the Tel Dor mosaic.

The evolution of foreign imports at Kedesh’s PHAB shows the shift in the Aegean trading system from Greek Attic wares to Cypriot at the end of the 3\textsuperscript{rd} century, followed by an increased interest and importation of various places around the Mediterranean, including Italy beginning in the middle of the 2\textsuperscript{nd} century. This would have been possible through Kedesh’s connections with Tyre, which was beginning to have strong trade and contact with the Bay of Naples. Thus Kedesh exemplifies the beginning effects of the shifting Mediterranean trade from East to West, as well as the continued use of symposiastic dining and high-quality decoration.
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**Tel Anafa**

*Overview*

The site of Tel Anafa is 27 miles east of Tyre, on the eastern edge of the Hula Valley in the Upper Galilee (Figure 3.6). Although the Hula Valley is geographically a self-contained area with steep cliffs to the south and west, and Mt. Hermon and plateaus to the north and east, it was not isolated. Through mountain passes in the west it had connections to the Phoenician coast and to the lower Galilee with a narrow outlet in the south.\(^{218}\) As a result, Anafa was able to shift its associations from north to south as the political changes demanded.\(^{219}\) Anafa is naturally protected, and has continuous amount of fresh water flowing through, an ideal location for year-round agriculture.\(^{220}\) Excavations have revealed some occupation from the Middle Bronze Age through the Iron Age, after which it was abandoned. Anafa was then refounded in the Hellenistic period and reached the height of its development and population in the Late Hellenistic and Early Roman periods, after which it is essentially abandoned.

There are two main areas of excavation at Tel Anafa. The first is on the south slope where houses, courtyards, streets, and installations were discovered; the second is the north-eastern section of the mound and consists mostly of one large building centered around a courtyard.\(^{221}\) This large building,
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also known as “Late Hellenistic Stuccoed Building,” or LHSB (Figure 3.7), is the point against which the stratigraphic phases of the site were defined. A coin of Alexander Zebina, date to 128 BCE, was found under the original floor of the building and provided the *terminus post quem* for the construction of the building. Each following phase of the building were dated using coins and stamped amphorae handles found in associated walls, floors, and fills.\(^{222}\)

The stratigraphy of the site is nicely divided into three phases of the Hellenistic and Early Roman period, each from a different political rule. Stratum A is defined as Early Hellenistic and dates from c.275 to 250 BCE; Strata B, C, and D, are Late Hellenistic and date from c.125 to 80 BCE. After this there was a short abandonment period followed by Strata E and F, which are Early Roman and date from 0 to 50 CE. Stratum A was short and produced relatively few coherent architectural units and related finds. However, starting with Stratum B fascinating architectural and ceramic discoveries have been made; the greatest of these being the Late Hellenistic Stuccoed Building, or LHSB.

*LHSB Architecture*

The LHSB was first constructed in Stratum B and later modified in Strata C and D. The LHSB consists of a single, extravagant building with a central courtyard and smaller structures against the north and south walls. Also, houses were discovered to the west of the LHSB, and an enclosure wall was found to the
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north and east around the complex.\textsuperscript{223} The structures built to the north of the LHSB follow the same construction phasing as well as most of the houses. Later, in Strata E and F, a number of two-room structures were built of the ruins of the LHSB.\textsuperscript{224}

The plan of the LHSB itself clearly shows the wealth and sophistication of its owners, as it was likely meant to. It had a large, open, paved central court which was surrounded by rooms separated by corridors.\textsuperscript{225} There was an entrance on the west side of the building leading to a wide hall with massive floor blocks; a tripartite bath complex was uncovered on the east side in which the center room had a large plaster basin and black-and-white mosaic floor found \textit{in situ}.\textsuperscript{226} A furnace in the southern room was the basis for the simple hypocaust system of the bath complex, and the northern room was likely for dressing, and it also had a black-and-white mosaic floor. While the walls are constructed from limestone blocks and basalt fieldstones, they were covered with painted and gilded stucco, hence the name, Late Hellenistic Stuccoed Building. The stucco decoration consisted of zoned wall panels depicting lozenges or geometrical patterns, and had projecting molding and Ionic and Corinthian capitals—all in keeping with the trends of the Mediterranean at that
time, and often before the trends had become wide-spread. This was clearly a very metropolitan house with high-class owners.

**LHSB Pottery/Small Finds**

The wealth and status of the house is further confirmed by the discovery of the largest Hellenistic corpus of glass vessels in the Mediterranean (over 3000 glass bowls), which were used as common tableware and date from the Late 2nd century BCE. The frequency of Eastern Sigillata A, bronze vessels, gem stones, and coins (mostly from Tyre and Sidon) also support a high standard of living for the owners and inhabitants of the LHSB. As far as ceramics are concerned, Anafa, and the LHSB in particular have produced one of the well-dated and complete assemblages in the Southern Levant. Although in the early Hellenistic period ceramic finds were more limited in both number and forms (being severe and utilitarian in nature), they still showed that despite being under the political rule of the Ptolemaic Egypt at the time, culturally, the people of Anafa were connected with their northern Phoenician neighbors.

Despite the rather narrow timeline, or perhaps because of it, there have been many more fascinating discoveries at Anafa, and more specifically in the LHSB than architectural remains and dining ware. In the floors and fills of the second and final occupation phase of the LHSB, cooking vessels and lids, as well as a unique cooking stand were found with a secure date of 100-80 BCE. These
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Italian cooking ceramics were found in a deposit of some restorable vessels and bronze nails, the remnants of an ancient cupboard where these ceramics were stored.\textsuperscript{231} The Italian cooking vessels are a type of pan with no handles, flat bottoms, and short curved walls which end in a rounded rim. This pan type is made to receive lids, which were also found in parallel quantities alongside the pans, their counterparts. Around 24 pans and lids have been found in Tel Anafa from this time frame, and the fabric of these sets, coupled with the shape, make it possible to classify these pans as the \textit{orlo bifido} type. \textit{Orlo bifido} pans are common at Roman sites and are known to be manufactured at or near Pompeii. Examples from Pompeii match the fabric of the \textit{orlo bifido} found at Tel Anafa.\textsuperscript{232}

Pompeii, along with other sites in Southern Latium produced and exported these pans starting in 123/122 BCE, as they have been found at the Roman colony of Pollentia (Mallorca). \textit{Orlo bifido} pans remained popular in Roman sites throughout the Mediterranean and were still in use at Pompeii in the first quarter of the first century BCE.\textsuperscript{233} These pans are some of the earliest and furthest found from Italy, and are the only known examples of \textit{orlo bifido} known in the Levant. The imported Italian lids that match the \textit{orlo bifido} are also known from Pompeii and are commonly referred to as “Pompeian red ware.”\textsuperscript{234}

All of the lids found in Tel Anafa are classified as “Pompeian red ware” and have a shallow domed profile, thick walls, and a thicker rounded rim. All but

\textsuperscript{231} Andrea M. Berlin, “Italian Cooking Vessels and Cuisine from Tel Anafa,” \textit{Israel Exploration Journal} 43, no.1 (1993): 36
\textsuperscript{232} Berlin 1993, 36.
\textsuperscript{233} Berlin 1993, 37.
\textsuperscript{234} Berlin 1993, 38.
two of the lids are of the same fabric as the orlo bifido pans and thus Pompeian, strengthening the ties between Tel Anafa and Pompeian influence and imports. Pompeian red ware was especially popular and widely exported starting in the second century BCE and reaching its height from the late first century BCE to the first century CE.\textsuperscript{235} They are especially common at Roman legionary camps, as they were used to cook the flat cakes of bread, which consisted of a large portion of a Roman soldier’s ration; and at Pompeii these vessels were found holding bread of this type.

Although no other examples of orlo bifido are known from the Levant, later examples of Pompeian red ware are known (though rare) throughout the Eastern Mediterranean. However, the small number of vessels found at Tel Anafa makes it unlikely that they were left by Roman soldiers, as the Pompeian red ware and the orlo bifido only comprise 1 percent of the pottery assemblage at Tel Anafa.\textsuperscript{236} However, together with the imported Italian ware was a specially-made cooking stand of local fabric that clearly is meant to be used to cook the Roman flat bread. While globular cooking pots account for another 73 percent of the assemblage, it doesn’t reveal any new information about the inhabitant of Anafa, as these types of pots are one of the most popular forms of the Mediterranean and are commonly found in the Levant starting in the sixth century BCE and continue until the first century CE.\textsuperscript{237}
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The number and type of casserole dishes found in the LHSB on the other hand, provide further insight into the ethnicity of the inhabitants of Anafa at this time. Casserole vessels have rounded bottoms, wide bodies and mouths, and are designed for the boiling or stewing of meats and vegetables. These types of dishes form the basis of the ancient Greek diet at this time, and casseroles only appear in sizeable numbers at sites with Greek populations. At Anafa, casseroles comprise 26 percent of the late Hellenistic assemblage, a number that does not match any sites in the area, except for those with a known Greek population.

While the presence of these dishes does not necessarily prove that the inhabitants of LHSB were ethnically Greek, it does suggest that they were culturally Greek. Thus it is likely that the importation of the new Italian vessels spurned the invention of this cooking stand, a fascinating confluence of Roman, Hellenistic, and Near Eastern culture.

A comparable site is Ashkelon, a coastal site in modern Israel, 16 km north of Gaza and consists of two mounds (north and south) which cover the span of 60 hectares. Fine tablewares at Ashkelon in the Late Hellenistic and Early Roman period reflect the same trends that have been seen in other sites so far, namely that it is dominated mostly by Eastern Sigillata A, with Italian and Gaulish Sigillata showing trading contacts from those areas in the Western Mediterranean, but the presence is not significant enough to show that they
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were in any way popular.\textsuperscript{239} As seen at Kedesh, there is a strong connection to Cyprus, with Cypriot Sigillata maintaining its popularity from the Late Hellenistic period through to the Late Roman, when Cypriot Red Slip Ware is common.\textsuperscript{240}

The presence of Pompeian Red Ware as the most common imported cooking ware (though cooking wares were the least commonly imported) is most interesting, especially when put in comparison with the Pompeian ware found in Tel Anafa. This common connection with Pompeii strengthens the idea of increased Pompeian influence and contact with the Southern Levant, which includes Tel Dor, even though no archaeological evidence from Tel Dor in this period is available to support this. At Ashkelon it is uncertain if these Aegean cooking pans were brought as personal properties of travelers or if there they were actually bought and shipped to someone living in Ashkelon as an item of trade.\textsuperscript{241} Although normally small quantities of items are not shipped because it is not worth the expense of travel, it is put forth by Ashkelon 2 that it is possible that the small size of the Pompeian Red Ware was attractive to merchants as a product that could fill the small empty spaces in ships.\textsuperscript{242}

These ceramic connections with the Bay of Naples make sense when a strong connection between Tyre and Puteoli is understood. Puteoli, a city north of Pompeii in the Bay of Naples was colonized by the Romans in 194 B.C.E., and soon became an important port city known for trading heavily with eastern
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places such as Alexandria. By the 2nd century C.E. however, it was beginning to lose its prominence, and the economic effects could be felt by its occupants.

Evidence of this survives in a letter and response between the Tyrian counsel and the members of a well-respected guild of Tyrians dealing in the purple dye trade. The guild was in decline and struggling to pay the rent for their grand commercial establishment, so they sent a letter home to Tyre asking for the counsel to pay the rent for them, so that their good name would not be lost. The letter also makes reference to the decline in the number of Tyrians living in Puteoli; with people migrating from Tyre to Puteoli it would be easy for Italian cooking wares to make their way to Tyre, and then to Anafa.

**Chapter Summary**

The stylistic evidence suggesting a 1st century B.C.E. date and a Roman, specifically Pompeian style, for the Tel Dor mosaic, combined with the known period of prosperity at Tel Dor from 64/3 B.C.E. to 33/2 B.C.E. creates a likely period during which the mosaic was constructed. However, in order to fully appreciate and understand the mosaic in terms of what it demonstrates about the political, economic and cultural ties of the Southern Levant at this period of transition into the sphere of Roman influence, the greater archaeological context needs to be examined.

At Tel Dor, where the mosaic itself was found, there is clear evidence of a Romanized city in the 2nd and 3rd centuries C.E. complete with the high-quality
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mosaics and frescoes that one would expect to find in rich Roman houses. However, these building projects and remodeling destroyed the early Roman period of 1st century B.C.E. to 1st century C.E., making it difficult to draw conclusions about the mask-and-garland mosaic based solely on evidence from Tel Dor at this time. All that can be said is that the mosaic likely decorated the floor of a dining room. This is based on the iconography of the mosaic (Dionysian elements were common themes for dining rooms), as well as the haphazard, plain white tessellation which likely ran under the *klinai* of the dining room. The dining room the mosaic was in was likely in a house, but it is possible that it could have been part of a dining complex such as the one at Kedesh, serving as the entertainment area of a politically-oriented administrative center.

It is at this point that it becomes necessary to examine other sites in the Southern Levant, in order to gain a better understanding of the process of Roman influence in the area. In reviewing the evidence from Anafa, the Late Hellenistic Stucco Building, or LHSB, was likely the result of a wealthy Tyrian building a country villa as a place to both relax in luxurious comfort and style, as well as an opportunity to create surplus profit from agricultural pursuits. Although the LHSB is earlier than the projected construction date of the Tel Dor mosaic by 50 or more years, it provides evidence for the beginning of the Italian influence in the Southern Levant.
Andrea Berlin determined that in the LHSB phase dating from 100-80 B.C.E., the *orlo bifido* pans found could be traced back to the Bay of Naples based on the fabric and style of the pans. The lids to these pans were in a different fabric sometimes found along the Levantine coast known as Pompeian Red Ware, from the eponymous city, which is also in the Bay of Naples. The rest of the ceramic assemblage from Anafa unsurprisingly indicates strong ties with the nearby Tyre, and the importations from the Bay of Naples and Italy in general make it likely that these Italian imports were coming to Anafa via Tyre.

The connection between Anafa and Tyre being clear, it becomes necessary to further examine the connection between Tyre and Southern Italy, or more specifically the Bay of Naples. As previously discussed there was a known enclave of Tyrians living in Puteoli, and by the 2nd century C.E. they were in financial decline, as was Puteoli in general. Even though only the end of the Tyrian purple-dye industry is recorded in certainty, arguments have been made that suggest the beginning of the Tyrian presence in Puteoli beginning in the late 2nd/early 1st century B.C.E. when the Romans founded Puteoli and outfitted it to be a great trading port, which happens contemporaneously with Tyre gaining its independence in 125.

With Tyre newly independent and becoming quickly prosperous, it makes sense that the Tyrians would have used their famous purple dye industry and new wealth to make connections in Puteoli and establish a guild and enclave there. This connection between Puteoli, which is in the Bay of Naples, and Tyre,
explains the sudden appearance of Italian imports to Anafa; it also explains why
the *orlo bifido* fabric could be traced specifically to the Bay of Naples. With Tyre
becoming more cosmopolitan in general as a trading city, and with strong Italian
connections, it is no surprise that the Italian influence spread and could be seen
in the 1\textsuperscript{st} century B.C.E. LHSB.

Tel Dor was plentiful in its supply of murex shells, used to make purple
dye, and was also known for this industry, though less so than Tyre. It then
seems likely that Tel Dor and Tyre would have trade connections, giving Tel Dor
access to the Italian imports that Tyre was bringing back from Puteoli, and the
general Roman stylistic influence as well. Now that the connection between the
Bay of Naples, where Pompeii and Puteoli reside, and Tyre has been established,
and the connection between Tyre and Anafa, and Tyre and Tel Dor have been
explained, it is beneficial to look at the trading routes in the Aegean in general.

The Persian Hellenistic Administrative Building, or PHAB, from Kedesh, is
occupied during many political transitions as discussed, with varying effects on
it pottery consumption and use. However, the effects of a greater Aegean change
can be seen in its imports from the 2\textsuperscript{nd} century B.C.E. as Rome uses its influence
to make Delos the main port and access for the Romans to the Eastern
Mediterranean, which results in Delos replacing Rhodes and the main island
port. The effects of this can be seen in the 2\textsuperscript{nd} century B.C.E. PHAB where the
large number of Rhodian imports of the 3\textsuperscript{rd} century trickle down and there are
new imports from Southern Italy and the Northern Levantine Coast, from places such as Tyre.

From Kedesh the introduction of Italian wares and influence can be seen in the 2nd century B.C.E. assemblage as Rome begins to assert their influence in the Aegean trading system through Delos, though they are very limited and not used in any entertainment practices. The symposium at this time is still dominated by glass and Attic/Atticizing pottery, though mosaics and frescoes are being used. Once Tyre gains its independence in the late 2nd century and establishes an enclave and guild in the Bay of Naples, an increase in Italian wares inundates the Levantine Coast, mostly coming from Tyre and being traded down the coast. The Italian influence can be seen in Anafa, where the *orlo bifido* and Pompeian Red Ware where used in cooking bread and special Italian dishes to meet their Tyrian owners’ true Italian tastes. This initial Italian influence comes in simple, concrete forms like pottery, as they were desirable and easy to transport. The next step in the importation of Roman goods and subsequently culture comes in the more complex form of style.
Figure 3.1—Plan of House Blocks at Olynthus

Figure 3.2—Plan of the Patrician Domus of the 3rd Century B.C.E.


Figure 3.3—Picture of Kedesh

Peter J. Stone, “‘Provincial’ Perspectives: The Persian, Ptolemaic, and Seleucid Administrative Center at Tel Kedesh, Israel, in a Regional Context” (PhD diss., University of Cincinnati, 2012), fig. 1.4.
Figure 3.4—Plan of the PHAB
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Figure 3.5—Site plan of Anafa

Andrea Berlin et al., *Tel Anafa II, i: The Hellenistic and Roman Pottery*, ed. Sharon C. Herbert (Ann Arbor, MI: Kelsey Museum of the University of Michigan, 1997), viii.
Figure 3.6—Plan of LHSB

Conclusion

The mosaic discovered in 2000 in Tel Dor Israel was clearly a fantastic find, despite its unfortunate method of preservation. Even in 200 fragments, and not being in situ, this mosaic in *opus vermiculatum* is much more than a beautiful artifact. This mosaic reveals the mindset, consumption habits, wants, and needs of the social elite of Tel Dor (as discussed in Chapter 3), no matter the date. Although the scholars who first studied this mosaic, namely Will Wootton and Rebecca Martin, both claim the Tel Dor mosaic is Hellenistic and date it to 150-100 B.C.E., there are flaws in their arguments as well as a plethora of evidence to the contrary that make it possible to suggest a later date.

For example, Wootton bases much of his argument on the construction techniques used to build the mosaic in combination with the comparison of Anafa during its economic prosperity from 125-75 B.C.E. While Anafa is an important site for the discussion of this mosaic from Dor, its decoration in the LHSB is a poor stylistic parallel for the Dor mosaic. Anafa should be used only as an example of the types of buildings in which well decorated elite dining spaces are found, and as a means of exploring the trade and consumption patterns of elite buildings during this period. Wootton also argues that the political effects on the economy which allowed Anafa to prosper during this time would have had a similar economic effect on Dor, and this period of prosperity at Dor would allow the construction of such a fine mosaic. Martin, on the other hand, bases her arguments for the Tel Dor mosaic being Hellenistic on stylistic comparisons,
which in the preceding chapters have been proven to be less accurate than the Pompeian parallels given.

Even though there is a scarcity of evidence from Dor itself in this period of transition from Late Hellenistic to Early Roman, there is ample evidence from Anafa and Kedesh to supplement the second to first centuries B.C.E. The rising power of Rome during this time instigated important economic and cultural changes in the larger Mediterranean trade system, the effects of which can be seen in the trade and consumption of the Aegean world. As previously discussed, it is absolutely a valid argument that the Dor mosaic would have been constructed in a period of prosperity; however, it may be prudent to ensure that the period of prosperity is at the city in which the mosaic was discovered. Although Tel Dor was generally wealthy while it was under Seleucid control, the definite increase in prosperity that came with its re-founding by Pompey in 64/3 B.C.E. would be a much more appropriate date, especially in light of the stylistic evidence. In particular, the perspective meander, the garland frieze, and the mask within the garland. Based on stylistic evidence and parallels previously discussed, it is evident that there is a strong connection to the mosaics of 1\textsuperscript{st} century B.C.E. Pompeii. The Dionysian parallels for the mask, while not mosaics themselves, also suggest a later date and a more Roman than Hellenistic style, as they range from the 1\textsuperscript{st} century B.C.E. to the 1\textsuperscript{st} century C.E. and are distinctly Roman in style and culture.
This is in opposition to Martin, who claims that the mosaic is the product of the Hellenization of Tel Dor. The term “Hellenization” is used to describe the process by which a culture that is not ethnically Greek (as self/internally defined), consciously adopts the material culture and behaviors characteristic of the Greek world. This process also describes “Romanization” and often occurs through cultural contacts between the non-Hellenistic culture and the Greek culture by means of connections between their people, the nations themselves, and the exchange of material culture.

Because of the biased assumptions which were common when the idea of Hellenization was first being defined and used, preference is understandably placed on the “core” Greek and Roman cultures rather than the “periphery” cultures or the Mediterranean as a whole. As part of this bias the core cultures are thought to influence the cultures they come into contact with, thereby beginning the process of “Hellenization” or “Romanization.” According to this core-periphery understanding, the inevitable result of this contact is that the influenced periphery culture will evolve along a fixed continuum until it is as Hellenistic as it can be. In this way the incoming Greek influence, rather than engaging in a bilateral exchange with the other culture, instead begins to replace it. These bias assumptions become clearer when compared to the way “outside” cultural influences on Greek and Roman culture are discussed, in which the incoming influence is termed as “Orientalizing” or “Egyptianizing” influence, rather than Greek culture becoming “Orientalized” or “Egyptianized.” This is likely because of the way in which both Greece and Rome interact with outside
cultural influences; namely by taking the influence and creating something different out of it, making it part of their own distinct cannon.

This bias led to incorrect conclusions about the cultures of periphery areas, such as Phoenician Tel Dor. Due to a combination of a lack of understanding and the tendency of Phoenician culture to not have a set core of cultural markers, the interactions of this periphery culture was taken to be indicative of the passive adoption of foreign culture in place of their own culture. Martin acknowledges the detrimental effects that this bias point of view can have in cases like Phoenician Tel Dor, and argues that these beliefs are in direct contrast to the way that Phoenician cities interacted with outside cultures. Instead of passively adopting foreign traits, Phoenician culture’s interactions with other cultures was one of direct importation and selectively mixing the style and iconography from other cultures. Martin has shown that it is this very process of active selection and the Phoenician context into which these foreign influences are placed that make it culturally Phoenician, making the Phoenicians the agent of this active selection process, rather placing the agency on the incoming Graeco-Roman or Egyptian culture.

In the case of the mask-and-garland mosaic from Tel Dor, the inadequacies of terms like “Romanization” become painfully clear. This mosaic, as demonstrated, has clear evidence of stylistic influence from the Bay of Naples. When examined under the broader social and economic developments which are the results from the changing political climate of the Mediterranean however, it
does not represent the incipient cultural exchange that will lead to full “Romanization” (if assuming a spectrum). This mosaic provides no evidence for the process of Roman culture modifying the behavior of the inhabitants of Dor (as symposiums had already been adopted and internalized in the Hellenistic period), nor for the replacement of Dor culture with a Roman one. Instead of being subjugated and replaced, this mosaic, and its unique combination of references to and uses of the Roman *koine*, shows that the patron at Dor specifically chose these aspects and appropriated them for their own use, as was common in Phoenecian culture. The Phoenicians are known for their eclectic taste, and creating unique artifacts not through invention, but by hybridizing elements of various cultures. This differs greatly from the straight process of assimilation that is usually associated with “Hellenization” and “Romanization”.

This appropriation of Roman styles in a Phoenician manner is interesting, but is even more significant when this reciprocal influence is examined as a “bilateral process of interaction”. The evidence of this can be seen in the Eastern influence in the Bay of Naples, which was similarly likely the result of direct trade with the Levantine coast, and intensified by the Tyrian collective at Puteoli. This likewise can be seen in the importation of the cult of Isis into the Bay of Naples and the rest of Campania, where it was more popular and sooner than it was at Rome. Thus, there was clearly a mutual exchange of cultural ideas between the Roman Bay of Naples and the Levantine coast, which shows that
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this is not part of a unilateral process of “Romanization” and assimilation of the East into the Roman *koine*, but the West is also actively taking something from the East. Once the new influence is taken, it is re-contextualized in its new cultural home, and adopted into the local cultural landscape. So while the mosaic from Tel Dor, with its Romany stylistic associations and 1st century B.C.E. dating, represents this increase in availability of access to the Roman *koine* and the subsequent appropriation of selected aspects of that *koine*, it belongs to the wholly local cultural behaviors, traditions, and styles, and not as a symbol of the antiquated process of “Romanization”

This mosaic then represents an early stage of Romanization of the elite on Levantine Coast. While they are likely not yet importing the Roman culture, they are being influenced by the style, and using the Roman style as marker of elite consumerism. This is a deeper level of acculturation than simply importing concrete goods like pottery, because they are importing a style according to their own tastes and integrating it into their own context. However, it is not representative of the types of major cultural changes like those that occur in the 2nd and 3rd century C.E. when Roman citizens arrive and the acculturation of the city as a whole is intensified. Thus the mosaic from Tel Dor is an important find; not just for the archaeological factors of the mosaic itself, but for the information it gives on the acculturation of Roman style at Tel Dor, and the subsequently the Levantine coast in general.
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