# PART FIVE

A brief comparison is made between the Jewish tombs of Jerusalem and the extensive later catacombs at Beth Shearim in Palestine. Clear distinctions emerge.

## A BRIEF COMPARISON WITH THE CATACOMBS OF BETH SHEARIM

This brief account of the Jewish catacombs at Beth Shearim in the area of the Plain of Esdraelon is designed to show the contrasts between the Jewish art of the period after the fall of the Temple and of Jerusalem - as it is found here (and in the Galilean synagogues) - and the art of the ossuaries, sarcophagi and tomb-facades examined in Parts I and II of this work. The great, communal, rock-cut burial-chambers of Sheikh Ibreiq (Beth Shearim) are dated by Maisler and Avigad from the second to the fourt centuries of our era. (JPOS, 1938, pp.41-48; IEJ, 1955, pp.205-239; IEJ, 1957, pp.73-92, 239-255; 1959, pp.205-220). The evidence for this date comes from inscriptions, pottery, burial-forms and the art.

Beth Shearim is mentioned frequently in the Talmud as a central cemetary for the Jews of Palestine and the Diaspora in the centuries immediately after the fall of Jerusalem in AD 135. We are no longer concerned here with small - or indeed large - family tombs, but with enormous, public burial-halls. Maisler found that one catacomb alone - a long, rock-cut hall opening on various burial-chambers - contained some four

hundred burials. The burial-forms found by Maisler in the earliest seasons of work (ILN, June 18, 1938, pp.1100-1101) were:

trough arcosolia
troughs in benches or floors
wooden coffins
wooden ossuaries
bone niches cut in the walls
stone sarcophagi
lead sarcophagi
terracotta sarcophagi
kokhim

Once more the wooden 'ossuaries' were in fact the iron nails and corner fittings of ossuaries, like the large numbers of iron nails found in some of the Jerusalemite tombs. That these were ossuaries and not coffins was indicated by the fact that the remains were on top of small heaps of bones. In one trough the remains of a wooden coffin were found in a good state of preservation. The common form of burial is the trough and the trough arcosolium; kokhim are rare and are taken by Avigad to indicate a date in the first century. At Beth Shearim the trough arcosolium, of which we found one example at 'Dominus flevit' on the Mount of Olives, has ousted the

kokh almost completely. Another feature of contrast is in the style of the entries. At Jerusalem these are low, rectangular holes, or possibly large openings framed by the Ionic T-frame and cymatia; occasionally we saw a distyle in antis porch. At Beth Shearim the long halls of the catacombs are entered through stone doors of a more elaborate type than those found in only one instance at Jerusalem - inside the Tomb of Helena. The facade of catacomb 21 (Avigad, IEJ, 1957, pls. 17, 18) is an interesting example. The entries have T-frame mouldings, but are framed by arches which spring from pilasters and which are adorned by egg-and-tongue, a debased fret and an astragal; altogether ornate and complex forms. Large studs are represented in the panelling of the stone doors.

The art of the interiors and of the sarcophagi is also different, though I know of one instance where rather crude rosettes are carved on a wall (together with a menorah; fig. 418), and another where a panelled doorway is seen between arches (fig. 419), a motif which perhaps compares with my ossuaries catalogue nos. 20f in Part I, fascicle i above.

In catacomb 21 were found almost a hundred and thirty massive sarcophagi of local limestone,mostly unornamented and with ponderous, gabled lids which have 'acroteria' at the angles.

Each weighs three to five tons. Where there is ornament it is crudely done. The lion, the bull's head and the eagle are recurrent motifs; also garlands hanging between columns, menorot and occasional large and isolated rosettes. Here we have both human and animal figures in a catacomb with inscriptions which indicate rabbinic families and are in 'pure, mishnaic Hebrew' (ibid. p.250). Contrast the complete absence of all representations of human or animal forms at Jerusalem in the Herodian period. Only in the Hasmonaean Tomb of Jason (c. 100 BC) did we find these - the figures in the ships and the deer scratched on the plaster of the vestibule. At Beth Shearim there are also imported marble sarcophagi with figural scenes from Greek mythology, comparable in style to non-Jewish sarcophagi from Tell Barak and Turmus 'Aiya (Savignac, RB, 1913, pp.106-111, 2nd century AD; Bulletin of the Brt. School of Archaeology, IV, p.55, pl. IV, 2nd-3rd centuries AD). This same type of tolerance is also common on the Galilean synagogues, which are usually dated to the same period. We cannot believe that religious Jews of rabbinic family were devotees of Greek mythology. Here the mythological scenes must, as Avigad points out, be cut off from pagan beliefs and regarded as conventional and fashionable forms of adornment (and see supra I, vii,4 ). The burial forms, the

motifs permitted and preferred and the tomb facades of Beth Shearim have hardly anything in common with the Herodian funereal arts of Jerusalem.

# PART SIX

In this part the forms and art of the Jewish tombs at Jerusalem are found to be linked with the earlier non-Jewish forms used at Marisa in the Palestinian She phela by a colony of hellenised Sidonian settlers. Comparisons are made with Alexandrian tombs, and, at Jerusalem, particularly with the Tomb of the Bene Hezir.

# THE INHERITANCE FROM MARISA

In 1873 came another of the interesting discoveries of Clermont-Ganneau (Arch. Res., Vol. II, 1896, pp.445f). In a cemetary at Beit Jibrin, close by the mound of ancient Marisa (Tell Sandahannah), was found a tomb with gabled loculi for the dead. Two graffiti written above loculi were published - the names Agatharchos and Abounos.

Soon after this in about 1900 local Arabs, their interest aroused by the excavations and explorations of the P.E.F. in the Shephela in 1898-1900, came upon further tombs at Beir Jibrin. The tombs were robbed, and in addition the devout iconoclasts defaced some important frescoes. Fortunately two scholars of repute, J. P. Peters and H. Thiersch, happened to be at hand, and investigated the finds almost at once. They published four tombs, two of them in considerable detail. Genealogies and dated inscriptions from three of these tombs (nos. I, II, III) provide useful information, to which I add evidence from another tomb (no. VII) which was explored in 1913 by Moulton and in 1923 by Abel:

Tomb I

A long inscription written over sarcophagus chamber XXXVI of my fig. 420 reads (fig. 421):

> 'Apollophanes, son of Sesmaios, head of the Sidonians at Marisa and regarded as the most upright and dutiful of his generation, died in his seventy-fourth year.'

From this inscription the tomb is named the 'Tomb of Apollophanes'. The inscription informs us that we are concerned with a hellenised Sidonian colony which had settled at Marisa. The other useful information provided is the spread of dates between 196 and 100 BC which accompany the names of the dead above their loculi. The earliest names are Greek or Phoenician, but Idumaean theophorics indicate intermarriage with the local population in the course of the second century. Presumably Apollophanes died about the beginning of the century, and the tomb originated in the late 3rd century BC. A Hellenistic lamp and three stamped Rhodian jar-handles confirm this Hellenistic date (PT, pl.XXI). Notice that the colony settled at Marisa in the period of Ptolemaic control.

Tomb II

Here inscriptions over the loculi were dated 188, 169, 164, 159, 144 and 143 BC. The names are Greek and Phoenician, and Philotion is described as 'a woman of Sidon'. Evidently at this date the colony had still not intermarried with local elements.

Tomb III

The date 134 BC is clear on one inscription. Tomb II was only slightly later than tomb I, but tomb III probably belongs about the mid 2nd century BC.

Tomb VII

The dated inscriptions fell between 141 and 112 BC. The names are Greek, and once more a 'woman of Sidon' is mentioned.

We may date the construction of these tombs from the late 3rd century BC to the mid 2nd century BC. As we have seen they are not Jewish, and it is unnecessary for me to describe them more than is justified by my purpose, which is to compare them - especially tombs I and II, the best appointed and most sophisticated of the group - with Jewish tombs at Jerusalem.

The tombs are hypogean, not merely rock-cut. Their exteriors are plain and concealed; ornament is confined to the interior, which is entered by a stepped descent. Fig. 420 shows that the plan of tomb I is:

sarcophagus chamber

sarcophagus chamber  kline niche (E)  sarcophagus chamber

loculus chamber (D)

loculus chamber (B)  central hall (A)  loculus chamber (C)

vestibule

stepped descent

It is a very developed example of the Hellenistic 'cross' plan referred to above in Parts II and III, and the earliest known example in Palestine. The hall is almost a part of the three burial-chambers upon which it opens, so wide and high are the entries from it. Contrast the small, low entries characteristic of even such splendid Jerusalemite examples as the Tomb of the Bene Hezir and the Tomb of the sons of Nikanor. A large entry between the hall (A) and the long loculus chamber (D) acts as a visual frame (fig. 422 top) to the impressive decor of the gabled recess or kline niche (E). The loculi are impressive. They are tall and gabled. Between them are painted Ionic fluted columns, which appear to support the gables. Schematic 'acroteria' indicated at the top and

angles of each gable confirm this impression. We may note in passing that the form of the acroteria supports the interpretation given by Rahmani to similar schematic 'acroteria' on ossuary 29 of my catalogue (supra I,i, no. 29). Above the loculi in tomb I runs a festooned garland of flowers and leaves (fig. 422). In addition to the loculi each of the burial-chambers has benches round two or three sides (figs. 420, 422).

A wide frieze adorned with painted animals is carried round the long burial-chamber (D) just above the gables of its loculi. On the South wall it depicts a trumpeter wearing fillet, chiton and chlamys; a rider with spear and flying cloak, who sits astride a charger with an embroidered saddle-cloth; a leopard, facing the rider and already wounded and harried by one of the two hunting hounds; and a tree with a gnarled trunk. Then a bull gushes blood, sunk upon its front knees in front of a huge snake. There follow a variety of animals, and finally a human figure which had been defaced by the Arabs. On the opposite wall are two large fish; a crocodile with an ibis above it; a hippopotamus; a wild ass striking at a snake; a fabled monster; an animal which resembles a tapir but has a horn; a porcupine; a lynx with very exaggerated ear-tufts; and an odd animal with a leonine body and a large,

extraordinary face. Above each animal or scene is its description in Greek.

The rear wall of the same chamber (D) has in it a high, wide, gabled recess, below which is left a bench of rock, carved as a kline with two short legs (PT, frontispiece). What is left of the chamber wall to the sides of this kline recess is occupied by paintings. At the top the festooned garland is continued from the side walls and runs over the gable of the recess. The gaps above this are occupied by eagles. The lower parts of the wall are painted red as the pedestal for golden tripods with curved legs and clawed feet. On the tripod at the left is a fiery censer with griffin feet. On the right is a similar vessel, taller and slimmer with graceful handles, but partly destroyed. In the recess itself are three entries - one in the rear wall and one in each side wall - to plain, sarcophagus chambers. The entries in the side walls are large, but plain. That in the rear wall is richly adorned (fig. 425) and crowned by a pediment. Painted pilasters with crude bases and capitals support a painted architrave which is as high as the Doric frieze above it. In Greek style triglyphs are placed at the very angles of the frieze, which though painted is remarkably similar to that of

the portico of the Bene Hezir at Jerusalem. The metopes are long, low and undecorated, and there are three cylindrical guttae carelessly placed without regulae below each triglyph (compare fig. 425 with fig. 229). The pilaster capitals are simply abaci over a splay face; rosettes are painted at the top of the shaft, just as small, painted rosettes adorned the capitals of the Ionic columns painted between the loculi of the burial-chambers in the tomb. The tympanum of the pediment is painted with a palmette and spiralling tendrils. On the wall beside the pilasters are tall Greek amphorae on red plinths; they have lids and are wound about with fillets.

Tomb no. 2 of Marisa is less regular in plan, but equally impressive (fig. 423). To the left of the vestibule is a loculus chamber; to its right is a small, plain chamber. Beyond it is the long, main burial-chamber, fitted out with benches and loculi. The loculi are gabled, as in tomb 1 (fig. 424). A wider space at the far end of the main burial-chamber is marked off by 'pilasters' projecting from the side-walls (plan; where D meets E). This wider space has the same sort of function as the unique gabled recess in tomb 1; for in the centre of its rear wall is the entry to a large compartment, presumably for sarcophagi; the other openings arrayed around

its walls seem to be the usual gabled loculi, but in fact, as I noted above, are doubled in width behind their openings. It is interesting also that the loculus chamber to the side of the vestibule has two of these doubled loculi, as well as four of the normal width and two others which are different again (fig. 423).

The painted decoration of this tomb is confined to the vestibule and D and E. In the vestibule a painted frieze of looped ribbon runs just below ceiling-level. Over the loculi in the side-walls of D are painted green garlands with pink and black border-lines below and above. On the shaft of the pilaster where D meets E is what Peters and Thiersch describe rather unsatisfactorily as a tall stand (yellow; i.e., gold) with a reddish lamp upon it (fig. 424) and two small figures below. In the rear wall of E at the sides of the entry to the sarcophagus compartment are the most impressive paintings of the tomb. On the left, two musicians are painted in green, red, yellow and pink; a male figure, wearing a chaplet and a chiton, plays two pipes and behind him a woman in a peplos and a short over-garment plays the harp. The scene on the right was libatory or festal, but is largely destroyed.

The contrast between this ornate interior and the plainness of the Jerusalemite tombs is striking. Of equal interest is the contrast in the forms of loculi. I use the term loculi for this non-Jewish tomb. But in fact the kokhim are simply a Jewish form of the Hellenistic loculus. Kokhim are never gabled, but either flat-topped or arched. This seems to me important enough to deserve some attention. I shall not describe tomb III at Marisa any further than to say that it consists simply of a vestibule and one burial-chamber, and that the loculi are mostly gabled, but two are flat- or square-headed. This fact, combined with the date of the tomb a half-century later than tombs I and II, indicates that a development took place or is reflected at Marisa around 150 BC. The complete absence of the gable top at Jerusalem implies that Jerusalemite tombs began to use the loculus (kokh) only after this development had taken place. Its origin at Jerusalem may well be due to the Hasmonaean conquest of the plain and coast, which had already absorbed Alexandrian and Phoenician influences to a much greater extent than Jerusalem. If such loculi were taken over actually in the cities of the Shephela as a Jewish burial-form, their appearance at Jerusalem would quickly have followed. The kokhim in the two earliest tombs that I know at Jerusalem - the Tomb of the Bene Hezir and the tomb of Jason do indeed show

affinities with the mid 2nd century BC loculus forms of tombs I, II and III at Marisa. Those of the Tomb of Jason are tall, regular and square-headed, like the two square-headed loculi in tomb III. Those of the Tomb of the Bene Hezir are doubled, widened only to one side of the opening, like those of Tomb II (fig. 423). There is then no need for Avigad's hypothesis that Jewish workmen were not used to hewing out narrow tunnels at this date (supra II,i,7). The widened kokh is in fact inherited together with the square head from contemporary Marisa. At the same time the Hellenistic 'cross' plan is accepted at the Tomb of the Bene Hezir, but rejected at the Tomb of Jason, which prefers a burial-chamber and a bone-chamber. Moreover at Jerusalem the rock-cut tomb has surfaced and drawn attention to itself by external forms of decor which are completely opposed to the hypogean plainness of the Marisan tombs. The kline itself is found at Jerusalem in only one clear case to my knowledge - within the Conch Tomb, which is one of a very small group of tombs in the Hinnom Valley that favour some kind of internal decor. Perhaps too the gabled recess of Tomb I with its kline is to be regarded as harbinger of the bench-arcosolium at Jerusalem. But there are burial-forms at Alexandria which are of greater interest in this respect (infra Part X).

The only analogy to the internal painted decor of the Marisan tomb (tombs I and II) in the Jewish area is that of the tomb at Moqata Abud (supra I,xi). Here we saw that red panels were painted between the kokhim, while above them is a narrow strip of lozenges and squares, and then a festoon.

I think, as I shall show more fully in Part X, that Alexandrian influence was the dominant one in the diffusion of these burial-forms, types of decor and tomb-plans. Here one or two particular features individual to tomb I and again indicative of Alexandrian influence may be pointed out. The animal frieze is Greek insofar as it tries to present a connected composition with spacial relationships between different forms. But Egyptian influence is suggested by the selection of animals. The crocodile, hippopotamus and ibis are all given great prominence by Herodotus in his description of the fauna of Egypt (II,65-79). Merrill (PT addendum, pp.93-94) points out that the eagles which flank the gabled kline recess of Tomb I have the '..characteristic scraggy appearance of the Ptoloemaic period'. He also identifies the leopard, porcupine, oryx and lynx of the animal frieze as African not Palestinian species of fauna. This combination of Greek and Egyptian influences points of course to Alexandria.

# PART SEVEN

The ruins of the palace at Araq el-Emir near Ammon-Philadelphia are discussed in this part. In the forms of their Greco-Roman details the orders are most closely linked with the Tomb of the Bene Hezir and the Marisan tombs. But older Oriental tradition is still felt in this structure of 182-175 BC. Not only most of the decor but all the certain features of the building are derived from Greek traditions. Little can be decided as to the upper storey in the light of the fragmentary nature of the remains.

# THE PALACE OF HYRCANUS TOBIAH
# NEAR AMMON-PHILADELPHIA

In the valley of the Wadi se-Sir about 14 miles West of Rabbath-Ammon (Philadelphia) and about 10 miles North of Heshbon the ruins of 'Araq el-'Emir (the Cliff of the Prince) are located (fig. 426). In the cliff itself are two storeys of chambers which were formerly used for dwellings and stables (fig. 426, C-D; 429). Further down the Valley is a depression where the wadi bed was damned (fig. 429, B) to form a lake around a knoll (fig. 429, etang). On the high ground which was surrounded by this moat was built a Hellenistic palace, which was already badly ruined when visited by Capts. Irby and Mangles in 1818. The ruin, known as the Qasr el-'Abd (the Castle of the Slave) was drawn by de Vogüé (fig. 430) and drawn and photographed by Butler (figs. 431, 435). It stands on a flat, rectangular platform which is enclosed by retaining walls and was formerly encircled by water except at the N.E. angle (fig. 426, E). From here a roadway connected the knoll with other high ground to the East and with the cliff-dwellings. Butler also found remains of an aquaduct, and well-built terraces which extended from the ruin both towards the cliffs

and down the valley. These he took to be the remains of ancient, terraced gardens associated with the palace. Further North than the palace itself, and near the angle formed by two of these terraces, were the remains of a square structure. The foundations of this were still in situ, and among its collapsed members were unfluted column-drums, a moulded anta capital and the blocks of a Doric entablature. However such traces paled into insignificance before the drafted megaliths of which the white-stone palace was built, and its frieze of gigantic, paratactic lions (figs. 430, 435, 437).

The form, style and location of these ruins link them with the account given by Josephus (Loeb, Ant. XII, 154-236) of Joseph the son of Tobiah and his children. Joseph secured, by wit and the wise giving of gifts, the favour of Ptolemy Epiphanes (204/3-181/180 BC) and with it the tax-farming rights for Coele-Syria. Of his numerous sons Hyrcanus, born of a different mother from the rest, was the object of the concerted envy and hostility of his brothers and the particular favour of his father (XII, 190). He was commissioned by Joseph to present gifts at the court of Alexandria, but committed the serious crimes of overspending and winning impressive personal favour (XII, 221). When he returned to Palestine the rancour of his

brothers turned to an attempt at murder, which was made with the foreknowledge of Joseph ( καὶ τοῦ πάτρος εἴδοτος ). Thereupon Hyrcanus withdrew beyond the Jordan. Later when his father died he attempted to return to Jerusalem, but was prevented by the combined efforts of his brothers and the Oniad High Priest Simon. He was forced to spend the last seven years of his life in a mountain fastness near the territory of Heshbon ( ὃν πόρρω τῆς Ἐσσεβωνίτιδος ), which he named 'Turos' (Aram. 'Tura'). On the succession of Epiphanes to the Seleucid power, which Antiochus III had wrested from the Ptolemies, he despaired of his situation and killed himself. The key passage for us is Loeb Ant. XII, 229-234:

> 'So Hyrcanus gave up his intention of returning to Jerusalem, and settled in the country beyond the Jordan, where he waged unceasing war against the Arabs till many were killed or captured. And he built a strong fortress made entirely of white stone to the very roof. Upon it huge beasts were carved, while around it ran a wide and deep moat. And cutting through the scarp of the rock over against the mountain he hewed out caves many furlongs in extent, and then chambers, some for banqueting and some for living-quarters. To these he diverted an abundant supply of running water, a delight

and adornment to his lands.....Nearby he had made enclosures of remarkable size, which he adorned with large pleasure-gardens. And the place which was so made he called 'Fastness' (Turos). This place is between Arabia and Judaea, beyond the Jordan not far from the territory of Heshbon.'

(tr. J. Kane)

The features of the account of Josephus which correspond with the ruins of 'Araq el-'Emir are:

1. The location notfar from the territory of Heshbon.
2. The description 'Mountain Fastness'.
3. The palace of white stone, its moat and its frieze of gigantic animals.
4. The caves in the cliff hard by, and traces of the aquaduct.
5. The ancient terracing of the gardens.

In addition we may add the evidence of:

6. The survival of the name 'Tura' in the Arabic name for the Valley, which is the Wadi es-Sir.
7. An inscribed name cut in the cliff near one of the dwellings - simply 'Twbyh' (Tobiah).

These various points establish to my mind very satisfactorily that the ruined Qasr el-'Abd is in fact the ' βᾶρις ἰσχυρά ἐκ λίθου λευκοῦ ' of Hyrcanus with its ' ζῷα παμμεγεθέστατα ' (Ant., XII, 230). The architectural form, as I shall show in detail below, is not possible before the Hellenistic period, but belongs to about the same time as the tombs of Marisa and the Tomb of the Bene Hezir at Jerusalem (c. 200-150 BC). Like the Pyramid of Zachariah at Jerusalem it represents the fusion of Oriental and good Hellenistic members and forms.

The latest archaeological investigations, undertaken by Lapp in 1961 and 1962, bring the evidence of ceramic forms which are closely datable to bear upon the identity of the ruins. Remains were excavated of constructions near the cliff-dwellings, as well as the palace itself and the square, Doric structure on one of the terraces near it. Pottery clearly dated all of these to the early second century BC, a time which corresponds to the death of Hyrcanus in 175 BC. No earlier Hellenistic pottery was discovered; the finds included Rhodian jar-handles (BASOR, 165, pp.33f; 171, pp.24, 33-38; ADAJ, p.86). Other finds were remnants of a retaining wall at the perimeter of the moat, and clear-cut evidence that the

palace had never been completed, as one would expect of the short-lived undertaking of Hyrcanus. Blocks in the lowest course of the East wall had unfinished bosses. There was a fragment of the string-course at the N.E. angle which had no dentils. And one of the huge frieze blocks was carved only with the roughed out head, back, hind leg and tail of the lion.

There remains a slight difficulty over the inscribed name 'Tobiah'. It seems very likely that this was the other name of Hyrcanus himself on two grounds. One is that no traces of earlier Hellenistic of Persian (Iron Age) settlement has been indicated in the locality by pottery, coins or structural remains. This perhaps confounds those critics who suggest that the name 'Tobiah' refers to the 'Tobiah of Ammanitis' mentioned in the Papyrus correspondence of Zenon, one of the chief ministers of Ptolemy II Philadelphos (285-246 BC). This Tobiah was presumably the immediate forebear of Joseph, and two generations removed from Hyrcanus. In fact the Tobiad family was important in the area of Rabbath-Ammon as early as the time of Nehemiah (Neh.2,10 and 19; 4, 7; 6, 1, 12, 14, 19; 13, 4, 8). The ancestry of the family is analysed by Gressmann, Mazar and Tscherikower (supra bibliography). The second ground is that the name 'Hyrcanus' is a transliteration of an aristo-

cratic Iranian name 'Vurkan', which was adopted by the Tobiads in the Persian period (Mazar, IEJ, 1957, p.138). Hyrcanus would have possessed a Jewish name also, but Josephus is not in the habit of providing us with both names of the figures in his drama. For instance we only know that the Hebrew name of the Hasmonaean Antigonus is 'Mattathiah' from his coins. And (to quote a striking parallel) of the two Hasmonaean rulers called 'Hyrcanus' we know that the Hebrew name of the first was 'Yehohanan', but we do not know whether the name of the second was 'Yehohanan' or 'Yehonatan', though coins indicate that it must be one or the other. We have a further clue as to the name of Hyrcanus. Clermont-Ganneau long since argued that ' Ὑρκανου τοῦ Τωβίου ' in II Macc., 3, 11 should be understood as ' Ὑρκανου τοῦ καὶ Τωβίου ', which means not 'Hyrcanus, son of Tobiah' but 'Hyrcanus, surnamed Tobiah' or simply 'Hyrcanus Tobiah' (Arch. Res., II, pp.262-263). The Latin version, for what it is worth, supports this with the translation 'Hyrcani Tobiae', which can only be the two names of Hyrcanus. (This assumes that the incident in II Macc., which is not noted for its historicity, is wrongly related to Seleucus IV, and should refer to Antiochus IV Epiphanes.) All of this seems quite conclusive. The name on the cliff-face at the 'Cliff of the Prince' refers to the Tobiad princeling Hyrcanus Tobiah, son

of Joseph, son of Tobiah. And we may add that it is commonplace to find onomastic atavism from grandfather to grandson in this period of Jewish history. The difficulty mentioned above is that the palaeographers refer the ductus of the inscription to the mid 3rd century BC (Albright, JBL, 1937, pp.155-156) or even about the turn of the 4th and 3rd centuries BC (Cross, DJS, 1961, note 13, p.191). The only satisfactory explanation of this is that made by Lapp - the survival in this remote valley of older forms of script, an example of 'cultural lag'.

We come then to an account of the ruined palace itself. I shall introduce this with a description of the various fragments found by de Vogüé, de Saulcy and Butler (figs. 428, 431, 433, 434, 438). De Vogüé mentions Corinthian capitals, a Doric frieze, moulded cornices and leaf-bases. His drawings (my fig. 428, 21-25) are:

21. A large cornice with profiles which do not correspond to any of Butler's drawings.

22. A low, denticulated cornice which again does not correspond to Butler's fragments.

23. The fragment of a Doric frieze from the North facade, which corresponds to Butler, PE, fig. 5, fragment 4, where

it is more accurately drawn (my fig. 433, no. 4).

24. A Corinthian half-capital of heterodox form, engaged to a pilaster or anta from the portico of the North facade. This corresponds to the photo and drawing of PE, figs. 5 and 6, fragment 3 (my fig. 433, no. 3).

25. A base from a free-standing column of the same portico. This corresponds to the photo and drawing of PE, figs. 5 and 6, fragment 1 (my fig. 433, no. 1).

De Saulcy took back to the Louvre a half-column capital from a smaller order, which he suggested belonged to an upper storey. It was in fact a double order with half-columns engaged back to back in the same blocks (Voyage, pp.228-229; Mém. p.102). He had one block split in half for transportation (fig. 434). The order corresponds to PE, figs. 5 and 6, fragment 9 (drawing my fig. 433, no. 9). He also took back one of the column-bases encircled by a leaf-calyx (as PE, ibid. frag. 8, my fig. 433, no. 8). But the finds to which he gave greatest prominence were the fragments of a colossal, winged lion-sphinx:

> "... la tête...d'un lion colossal de ronde bosse, coiffé en sphinx.."

and

"... la patte de ce lion colossal.."

(Mém., pp.102-103 with drawing of foot; see too Dussaud 'Monuments..', no. 68)

And animals recur. He mentions capitals with animal protomai (Mém., pl. VI, top right). The drawings show just how badly destroyed these capitals were. The most that can be said of the drawing is that it is carved with the form of some winged bird between two animal protomai which are unrecognisable. This corresponds to PE frag. 11 (my fig. 433, nos. 11a, 11b). Finally there was a frieze with bulls heads and rosettes on it (Mém., pl. IV, upper left).

Butler publishes a bewildering variety of orders, represented by cornices, friezes, capitals and bases (my figs. 433 and 438). It seems best to give them some form of coherence by itemising them thus:

1. The fragment of a cornice from a gate in the wall of the palace-enclosure (fig. 438).

2. From the portico of the North facade - fragments 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 (fig. 433).

3. The string course or denticulated cornice below the frieze of lions - fragment 6 (fig. 433).

4. A small order, restored to an upper story, of which a capital and leaf-base are drawn and photographed - fragments 8 and 9 (fig. 433; photo 434, corresponding capital found by de Saulcy).

5. A crowning cornice, restored to the North facade of the palace - fragment 7 (fig. 433).

6. A capital very similar to that of the small, upper order, but much larger. This is restored to angle pilasters in the North facade - fragment 10 (fig. 433).

7. The fragment of a capital with unrecognisable protomai and bird. This is restored to the interior of the North portico, and corresponds to capitals within the main space of the palace - fragment 11 (fig. 433, nos. 11a, 11b).

8. Yet another form of the Corinthian capital - fragment 12 (fig. 433).

9. Further cornice fragments - fragments 13, 14, 15 (fig. 433).

10. A smaller Doric frieze - fragment 16 (fig. 433).

All of these fragments are of considerable interest. They are mostly Greek in form, but with notable exceptions. The Greek forms are good. For instance the bases of the lower order of the North portico are of Attic form upon plinths. Murray

points out that the form of the profiles is very similar to that of the propylon of the agora at Magnesia, the tholos at Epidaurus, the Monument of Lysicrates and even the Erechtheion. The proportion of architrave to frieze is 1 to 1.4, almost the same as that of the Temple of Asklepios at Epidaurus (HAS, pp.6-8). The forms of the Corinthian capitals are pre-Vitruvian and heterodox (fig. 428, no. 24; 433, nos. 2-3, 9-10; 434 photo; 436-437). In some (433, 9 and 10; 434; 436 upper order and angle pilasters) the leaves have the serrated form of the Greek acanthus, but in others we find the same unveined leaf-calyx that we have already seen at a later date on the finial of the Monument of Absalom (c. 40 BC), at Helena's Tomb (c. AD 60) and at the Tomb of the Herods (c. 35 BC). The same leaf form is employed on the palace of Hyrcanus as the calyx round the leaf-bases of the small, upper order (fig. 433, 8; 436). I hope to show below in Part X that these features and others are derived from known Hellenistic fashions at Alexandria.

Other details are best explained by reference to Persia or Phoenicia. But this does not apply decisively to the animal capitals, as has been assumed. It should be noticed first of all that this is not the Persepolitan bull-bracket capital. I am not even sure from the drawings and photographs what

animal is represented; Butler expressed himself equally uncertain. If it is the bull, then there are two points to be considered. The basic form of the capital is that of the Greek Corinthian, not of the Persepolitan bracket and the complex, multiple forms based upon it in the great Achaemenid palaces. This is well shown on fig. 433, 11b. Second, the bull's head is known on Hellenistic Greek capitals of the Corinthian and Ionic orders - at the Hall of the Bulls on Delos (Th. Homolle, Bull. de corresp. hell., 1884, pl. XVII),on a Cypriot capital in the British Museum (JHS, 1891, p.134; Durm, BG, 1910, fig. 282) and on Ionic capitals of Ephesus, Magnesia and Miletus (BG, figs. 282, 283).

The paratactic frieze - a static composition in low relief - of huge lions is definitely of non-Greek form, and must be referred to the influence of Phoenica or Persia. Very little is known of the form and decor of Phoenician temples, but bulls, lions and sphinxes are dominant in the remains of stelai and sarcophagi (Perrot, 1892, Vol. I, fig. 151; Vol. II, p37 and figs. 33-35). The reliefs, the huge lion-sphinx and the colossal stones could all be explained by the eclectic and megalithic traditions of the Phoenician craftsmen, who were dominated now by Egypt, now by Mesopotamia (Babylon, Assyria, Persia).

One find of Greek form is very recent. The expedition of Lapp uncovered a lion-head spout in the lowest course of the East wall of the palace, carved from local dolomite (Hill, BASOR, 171, pp.45-55). The lion has no teeth or tongue, as it commonly would on Greek lion-spouts, but it does have the characteristic lean paws with long, pointed nails (ibid. p.48). It is more common for a Greek spout to represent just the head, not the whole form of the lion. The lion is of course known in all the Syro-Mesopotamian arts, but it was used as a spout only by the Greeks. On Greek work it is found from the 6th century BC with this function. Hill suggests that the pose of the legs here with the right legs bent under rather awkwardly is derived from the skilled portrayal of perspective in regular Greek work, but is a provincial execution of this at several removes from a sophisticated form. In contrast to the large animal frieze this small spout is in true high relief, a moulded and corporeal form. Though the body is represented in side-view it does not follow the tradition of flat relief which is typical of the processional Oriental frieze. The head is turned in three-quarters view. The whole form is well-proportioned and not ignoble.

The palace was so badly ruined when it was seen by de Vogüé and Butler that its restoration involves many problems. Our starting point must be the account of Butler, which is very circumstantial, and serves as a corrective to the reconstructions offered by de Vogüé (fig. 427). The whole structure was completely collapsed except for parts of four visible courses in the East wall, (figs. 430, 431, 435). These include the denticulated string-course and the blocks of the frieze. But between the angles only the lowest courses were in situ, and the second was broken at regular intervals (figs. 430, 434, A). The basic ground-plan was clearly a rectangular chamber with porticoes at each end (fig. 434, B). The gaps in the second course had been described by de Vogüé as 'windows' and a 'door'. But Butler found stones which exactly fitted these gaps and which were lying just inside the wall, where they had fallen. Their form was that of inner spur-walls with engaged half-columns on the interior. The capitals were adorned with the same worn animal protomai as were lying in the North portico (figs. 431, C; 432). In this way nine half-columns with decided diminution were restored to the side walls of the palace (the East and West walls). The exterior of the lower storey of the North portico was equally easy of resolution, and was done from details which lay unburied where they had fallen.

The portico was distyle in antis (figs. 436, 437), a fact established by the bases of the two freestanding columns, which were only slightly dislodged, and by the lower part of the West half-column engaged in situ to the anta. Fig. 431, C distinguishes in solid black or hatched grey the parts in situ and the restored members. All of the Doric frieze and cornice above the lower order of the North portico were found. In fact the restoration of the whole lower order of this portico may be regarded as certain. Other members are restored according to reasonable conjectures. Thus the upper order of the portico and the breaking off of the lion frieze are based on the number of fragments, their size and where they were found. The interior of the portico remains problematic (fig. 431, C), even more so the entablature of the side (long) walls, and the extent of an upper storey which is indicated by the stepped ascent within the porch to the left (fig. 432).

Butler corrects the analysis of de Vogüé as follows:

1. The rough interior walls and vaulted chambers see by de Vogüé are of small stones quite different in character from the rest of the structure and of much later date.

2. There are no 'windows' or 'doors'. On the contrary the gaps in the lowest courses indicate the positions of spur-walls and half-columns which adorned the long, side walls of the main part of the interior.

3. There are not enough blocks of the lion frieze to restore it down the sides of the building or even continuously on the North facade, where a small, upper order is probable.

4. The lower storey of the North portico is certain - distyle in antis with Attic bases on plinths and Hellenistic, heterodox capitals of the Corinthian order. Above this an architrave and a Doric frieze of good proportions and form, and a low cornice.

5. The interior of the North portico is uncertain.

6. An upper storey is indicated at the North portico by a stepped ascent within it and to the left. It is not known how far the upper storey extended or whether the central space of the building was covered.

The two possible restorations favoured by Butler are given in my figs. 431C and 432 top centre.

Finally, we come to the plans of Brett and his suggested restorations, which have to cope with the new discovery that foundation-walls ran in both directions under the central area, indicating either the colonnades of an open court or the walls

of chambers. In the main he unhesitatingly follows Butler in his observations upon the restoration of collapsed members lying more or less in situ, as is shown by the very valuable isometric sketch (fig. 440). Here we have the internal spur-walls with engaged half-columns, the distyle in antis North portico, the ascending stairs of the step 'tower'. He confirms too that the South porch was a false porch, not communicating with the side chambers or the main area of the palace (compare figs. 439, 440 with 431C and 432 top centre). A door was discovered into the West side-chamber of the North portico, and two windows in the rear wall of the same porch (fig. 440). One significant point of divergence from Butler's interpretation emerges. A door was found fairly high up in the rear (South) wall of the stair tower of the North porch. It opened inwards into the centrel area of the palace beyond the porch, as is indicated by the bolt-hole and socket found by Brett. This discovery has repercussions on the restoration of some of the spur-walls in Butler's plans. The last one of these in the Eastern row at its North end cannot be accepted now that the inward-opening door from the stair-tower has been discovered. In fact not only are there no traces of the last <u>two</u> spurs of Butler's lines of nine, but also the other seven are actually engaged in the wall, whereas the wall is unbroken

at the point where these last two spurs would have been inserted. The last point was already shown on Butler's plan; fig. 431,C). Taking all of this together the restoration of an upper chamber at this point (fig. 439), either above a lower chamber or above freestanding supports, is the only possible solution.

The foundation lines N, S and U cannot have supported walls for the following reasons. N. is on the line of two spur-walls near the South end of the main hall. Obviously walls could not have existed on the same line as short inner walls ending in supports with decorative capitals adorned by animal protomai. S and U are parallel with the outer side-walls, and not much further in than the spurs. If walls had existed along these two lines the decorative half-columns and their protomai would have been cut off and excluded from view except to somebody walking down a narrow side-passage. One concludes then that these three lines of foundations were for columns; Brett has rows of columns along the two longer lines (fig. 439). This gives us a long, wide hall with a tripartite span and a very wide central span for the free-standing columns to take. One wonders why these columns were not taken further in away from the exterior walls to provide

three more equal spans for the superstructures. The central foundation-lines O, P and T are still not explained. Brett suggests that they were part of an original scheme which got no further than the foundations before being revised. This seems a weak proposal, but I can think of nothing better.

Butler made the suggestion - among other possible alternatives - that the palace was single-storeyed except for towers at the ends or at the four angles. But the many small columns of the upper order, faced back to back, are too numerous and varied to be restored to angle-towers alone, or only above the porches. Butler's alternative suggestion was that there were also galleries down the sides of the building (fig. 432, bottom; Brett fig. 439), and it seems that this much of an upper storey is the least we can accept. But the steps of the stair-tower do not provide a landing at the right level for a side gallery down the length of the building. It may be that the step-tower communicated directly with a balcony or a flat roof, and that entry to an upper storey was through the newly discovered door from a low level of the stairway and by means of the low upper room so provided just behind the North porch. Such conjectures are made necessary by the fragments which must be restored to an upper floor of considerable extent.

Murray's verdict on the palace was that some of the elements, including cornice and base mouldings, were Hellenic (as opposed to Oriental or Roman) in a structure 'otherwise thoroughly Oriental in conception and execution'. Watzinger says much the same - that the Greek forms are 'nur schmückendes Beiwerk' to a structure of 'orientalisch-syrische Grundform'. Other more obscure articles echo the same sentiments. Welter, for instance, says:

> 'Über die Bestimmung des Gebäudes dürfte trotz gegenteiliger weitverbreiteter Ansicht kein Zweifel bestehen: es ist ein Lust- oder Jagdschloss eines Fürsten von Rabbath-Ammon (Philadelphia), eine hellenistisch-syrische Umbildung des persischen Jagdschlosses im Pardeisos' (p. 406).

It seems to me, however, that comparisons with temple and palace plans of various types indicate that the form of the structure is substantially Hellenic insofar as we know it. The exponents of its 'Persian' form have made much of the 'towers', which may or may not exist as isolated members. But one feature of the ground-plan which is absolutely assured and which must demonstrate Greek influence is the employment of porches at both ends, one of which is a false porch designed

only to give the palace a more grand, bi-facial aspect. I can find nothing like this in any of the Mesopotamian or Syrian traditions of temples or palaces. The traditional temple of Mesopotamia is a cluster of rooms round a central court, and has only one facade (Gressmann, 'Altor. Bilder..', nos. 471, 481, 482; Babylon, Ashur); the form comes right through to the Temple of Atargatis at Dura-Europos (Rostovtzeff, 'Dura-Europos and its Art', 1938, pp.42-43). The 'Iranian' temple-plan is different. It is found for instance at Hatra and Kuh-i-Khwaja (Reuther, p.436 of Pope's 'Survey of Persian Art', Vol. I; Hopkins, Berytus, 1942, pp. 6, 7) and in the Nabataean cultural area at Sia, Sahr and Sur in South Syria (Butler, PUAES, IIA, figs. 342, 371, 387) and Khirbet et-Tannur and Wadi er-Ramm in Transjordan (Glueck, 'Deities and Dolphins', 1966, end-plan A; Kirkbride, RB, 1960, pp.65-92). The form is of a square cult-room enclosed by corridors. This plan too bears no relation to the one at the palace of Hyrcanus. Achaemenid palaces at Persepolis are irregular systems of chambers and large hypostyle halls (Godard, 'Art of Iran', fig. 128). Parthian palaces at Hatra, Ashur and Dura-Europos are based upon the iwan (Godard, figs. 137, 138; Rostovtzeff, p.16). Inner half-columns attached to short spur-walls are another feature derived from Greek architecture; they are found

for instance at Bassae in the 5th century BC (Dinsmoor, pl. XXXVI, p.145). The distyle in antis facade with half columns at the angles attached to antae or pilasters and with formal Attic and Corinthian elements is another thoroughly Greek feature of the palace. At the same time the common Greek plan of this period - a hexastyle peripteros around the naos and pronaos - is not found here. The oustanding Oriental elements - that is the ones which are known for certain - are the great frieze, the megalithic masonry and the lion-sphinx. The use of drafts for the stones is derived from the Hellenistic Greek world, perhaps through Phoenicia together with the taste for megaliths.

# PART EIGHT

The Jewish coins of the Hasmonaeans, Herodians and the two Revolts are discussed in this part of the thesis. It is noticed that most of the attributions and interpretations are not now involved in dispute. The types employed by the Hasmonaeans and Herodians were in effect claims to power and status in the 'language' of their contemporary Hellenistic environment. The types of the two Revolts also assert the independence of the Jewish people, but reject Hellenistic types in favour of emblems connected with the Temple.

PART VIII, bibliography

# BIBLIOGRAPHY ON JEWISH COINS

The basic catalogues are those of Hill and Reifenberg in the lists below. Some of their attributions and interpretations have to be revised in the light of more recent work. The most valuable of the latest publications is "The Dating and Meaning of Ancient Jewish Coins and Symbols" (Israel Numismatic Society, Jerusalem, 1958), which is given as DJC under its contributors' names below. The contributions to purely Jewish coinage in the series Corpus Nummorum Palaestinensium are still represented only by Kadman's "Coins of the Jewish War of 66-73CE" (Tel Aviv-Jerusalem, 1960); volumes on the Hasmonaean, Herodian and Second Revolt coinage are imminent.


J. Baramki — QDAP, VIII, 1939, pp.77-80; "Coins in the Palestine Archaeological Museum, III" (espy. p.77 shekel). This concludes two earlier articles by C. Lambert.

E.R, Goodenough — "Jewish Symbols in the Greco-Roman Period", Vol.I (N.Y., 1953) pp.268-279 text, Vol. III photos 671-699. His pagan interpretations do not find support from numismatic specialists involved in recent research. In this he follows Romanoff ("Jewish Symbols on Ancient Jewish Coins", 1944) and Watzinger (DP, Vol. II), and he fits the coins into his general thesis of 'wine symbolism'.

## VIII, bibliography


G.F. Hill "A Catalogue of the Greek Coins in the British Museum - Galilee, Samaria and Judaea" (London, 1914) pp. 184-316; pls. XX-XXXVIII; introduction and tables pp.lxxxix-cviii.

G.F. Hill "The Shekels of the First Revolt of the Jews", QDAP, VI, 1938, pp. 78-83 and pl.XXIV.

INB,INJ Israel Numismatic Bulletin
Israel Numismatic Journal
Some articles from these are listed below under authors' names. Other useful notes on coin finds are INB, 1, Jan-Mar. 1962, p.18 (1st Revolt hoard from 'Dominus flevit'); INB, 2, Apr.-Jul.1962, p.57 (discovery of a Second Revolt hoard); INJ, Vol. 1, fasc.2, June 1963, pp. 40-41 (Silver quarter shekel of First Revolt); INJ, Vol. 1, fasc. 3, Nov. 1963 (finds of First Revolt at Masada). For the silver quarter shekel see too V. Clain-Stefanelli, INJ, Vol. 2, fasc. 1-2, p.7.

L. Kadman "The Hebrew Coin Script - a study in the epigraphy of ancient Jewish coins", pp.150-169, IEJ, 1954. On epigraphic grounds he places coins of the Hasmonaeans, First Revolt and Second Revolt in three clearly distinct groups; expressed conveniently in tabulated form pp.164-165.

L. Kadman "The Coins of the Jewish-Roman War", pp.42-61, DJC. Descriptions of the three series, and the grounds for their attribution to the First Revolt.

L. Kadman "The Development of Jewish Coinage - a summary", pp.98-end, DJC. A summary of the interpretations

and attributions in the five essays of this volume.

L. Kadman "A coin Find at Masada", pp.61-65, IEJ, 1957. Comprehensive arguments that silver and bronze coins formerly attributed to Simon Maccabaeus should be assigned to the First Revolt.

L. Kadman "The Coins of the Jewish War of 66-73CE (Tel Aviv-Jerusalem, 1960). This is the latest catalogue for First Revolt coins; but it is already rendered inadequate by the finds of Yadin at Masada.

B. Kanael "The Beginning of Maccabean Coinage", pp.170-175, IEJ, 1951. An attempt to establish that Simon Maccabaeus had no opportunity to issue coins, and that Hasmonaean coinage begins under Hyrcanus I.

B. Kanael "The Greek Letters and Monograms on the Coins of Yehohanan the High Priest", pp. 190-194, IEJ, 1952. An attempt to explain various Greek letters on the reverse of coins which have the obverse inscription 'Yhwhnn hkhn hgdwl whbr hyhwdym'.

A. Kindler "Some Unpublished Coins of King Herod", pp.239-241, IEJ, 1953. A publication of four coins.

A. Kindler "The Jaffa Hoard of Alexander Jannaeus", pp.170-185, IEJ, 1954. Discovery at Jaffa of 850 imitation varieties of the Jannaeus anchor/ star type with unintelligible Hebrew legend.

## VIII, bibliography


A. Kindler — "The Coinage of the Hasmonaean Dynasty", pp. 10-28, DJC. A full investigation of attributions, symbols etc. with a classification (tabulated on p.14) based partly on legends and palaeography.

A. Kindler — "The Coinage of the Bar-Kokhba War", pp. 62-80, DJC. A strong statement that the coin types of this war are propaganda aimed at recalling the Temple services.

A. Kindler — "Thesaurus of Judaean Coins from the 4thcBC to the 3rdcAD" (Jerusalem, 1958; Hebrew with English summary) Valuable in that it presents very large and clear photos of some of the Hasmonaean, Herodian and Revolt coins.

E.W. Klimowsky — "Symbols on Ancient Jewish Coins", pp. 81-97, DJC. Specifically Jewish interpretations of various types, as opposed to Hellenistic interpretations offered by others (see Goodenough).

E.W. Klimowsky — "The Cup on the Shekel", INJ, II, fasc. 1-2, 1964, pp. 11-13; and "The Amphorai on the Coins of the Jewish War", ibid. fasc. 3-4, 1964, pp. 8-10. These two articles suggest interpretations of the chalice and the amphora that appear on coins of the Revolts.

## VIII, bibliography


E.W. Klimowsky "Religious Symbols on Ancient Jewish Coins", INB, 3-4, Aug.- Dec., 1962, pp. 81-87. A warning against indiscriminate interpretations of coin types as 'symbolic'.

C. Lambert "A Hoard of Jewish Bronze Coins from Ophel", pp. 84-88, PEQ, 1927. Announces the discovery of over 300 coins of Jannaeus during excavations on Ophel. He attributes the restruck anchor/flower Jannaeus type and the type with legend 'Yntn' (but not 'hmlk') to Jannaeus.

C. Lambert "Note on the Obverse Type of the Tetradrachms of the Second Revolt of the Jews", QDAP, I, 1932, p. 69.

C. Lambert "Coins in the Palestine Museum", QDAP, I, 1932, pp. 70-73 on Jewish coins (pp. 130-138 on non-Jewish local coins).

L.A. Mayer "A Bibliography of Jewish Numismatics" (Jerusalem, 1966) Arranged under author index and a short subject index which includes rulers' names.

Y. Meshorer "Maritime Symbols on Ancient Jewish Coins", INJ, II, fasc. 1-2, 1964, pp. 8-10. Ships and anchors on Hasmonaean and Herodian coins.

J. Meyshan "The Symbols on the Coinage of Herod the Great and their Meanings", pp. 109-121.

## VIII, bibliography


A sensible interpretation of Herodian types as concerned with general prosperity and the Temple, not with pagan symbolism. His attempts to link obverse and reverse types are not uniformly successful.

A. Muehsam "Coin and Temple" (Near Eastern Researches, I: E.J. Brill, Leiden, 1966) An examination of the Second Revolt types with tetrastyle facade, chest and portico.

A. Reifenberg "Der Thoraschrank auf den Tetradrachmen des zweiten judischen Aufständes", pp. 51-54, JPOS, 1931. An unconvincing interpretation as synagogue and shrine of the Law.

A. Reifenberg "A Hoard of Tyrian and Jewish Shekels", pp. 83-85, QDAP, XI, 1945. A find which helps to establish the attribution of First Revolt coins.

A. Reifenberg "Ancient Jewish Coins" (Jerusalem, 1947) A full-scale catalogue to be used with Hill BMC Cat. for Palestine. But many attributions and interpretations have since been revised by numismatists.

A. Reifenberg "Ancient Hebrew Arts" (New York, 1950). Coins are presented pp. 68-70, 82-83, 87-89, 92-93; this partly revises 'Ancient Jewish Coins'.

## VIII, bibliography


A. Reifenberg "Israel's History in Coins" (London, 1953) with revisions of material in 'Ancient Jewish Coins'.

C. Roth "Messianic Symbols in Palestinian Archaeology", pp. 151-164, PEQ, 1955. The 'hope for Redemption' is suggested as the guiding principle for interpreting a large number of 'symbols'.

A. Spijkerman "Trésor de siècles juifs trouvé au Mont des Oliviers à Jerusalem", pp. 25-32, Schweizer Münzblätter, 1961. Publication of a coin hoard found in a tomb at 'Dominus flevit' together with a Herodian lamp. The hoard, deposited in AD 70, is of shekels and half-shekels of years 1-3 and 5 of the First Revolt and two other coins dated 52/3 and 61/2AD.

A. Spijkerman "Some Rare Jewish Coins", pp. 298-318, Liber Annuus, Vol. XIII, 1962-1963. These types supplement catalogues.

C. Watzinger "Denkmäler Palästinas", Vol. II, pp. 23-24 (Hasmonaean types) and pp. 106-107 (Herodian-Second Revolt types). Watzinger relies on attributions and interpretations which have been emended by recent research.

Y. Yadin "The Excavation of Masada 1963-1964", pp. 1-120, IEJ, 1965. Coin hoards from the First Revolt were found during excavations - pp. 76, 80, 81 and pl. 19, F-G.

## VIII, bibliography


Y. Yadin "Masada - Herod's Fortress and the Zealots' Last Stand" (London, 1966). The same coins with more finds during the second season pp.108-109 text and photos.


The following abbreviated references will be used for books in this bibliography:

Goodenough JS;Hill GCPal;Muehsam CT;Reifenberg AJC,AHA,IHC; Spijkerman SM,LA;Kadman CJW;Kindler TJC;Watzinger DP;Yadin M.

To this bibliography, which provides the dating, attributions and interpretations of the Jewish coins of the Hasmonaeans, Herods and the two Revolts (i.e. the coins issued by Jewish authorities, not the procuratorial and Judaea Capta coins issued by Roman authorities) should be added a further bibliography which shows contemporary issues of the Seleucids, Ptolemies and coastal cities of Palestine:


E. Babelon "Catalogue des Monnaies grecques de la Bibliothèque Nationale - les rois de Syrie,d'Armenie et de Commagene" (Paris, 1890).

P. Gardner "The British Museum Catalogue of Greek Coins - the Seleucid Kings of Syria" (London, 1878).

B.V. Head "Historia Numorum - a manual of Greek numismatics" (Oxford, enlarged edn. 1911).

C.M. Kraay "Greek Coins" (London, 1966; photos M. Hirmer).

## VIII, bibliography


G. MacDonald "Early Seleucid Portraits", pp. 92-116, J. Hell.St., 1903.

O. Morkholm "Studies in the Coinage of Antiochus IV of Syria" (Historisk-filosofiske Meddelelser, Bind 40, nr.3, Copenhagan, 1963).

E.T. Newell "Late Seleucid Mints in Ake-Ptolemais and Damascus", No. 84, Numismatic Notes and Monographs (American Numismatic Society, 1939).

G. Seltman "Greek Coins" (London, 2nd edn. 1955).


Abbreviations used for these works are Babelon CMG; Gardner BMCS;Head HN;Kraay KGC;MacDonald ESP;Morkholm SCA;Newell LSM;Seltman SGC.

# JEWISH COINS

## COINS OF THE HASMONAEAN PRINCES.

Antiochus VII Sidetes is said in I Macc., XV,6 to have given Simon Maccabaeus permission to mint a local coinage καὶ ἐπέτρεψά σοι ποιῆσαι κόμμα ἴδιον, νόμισμα τῇ χώρᾳ σου in an attempt to win him over against his rival Tryphon, the de facto ruler of the remnants of the Seleucid empire. With this in mind numismatists have attributed three denominations and sizes of bronze coin to Simon. All three types have the inscription 'Year 4: for the Redemption of Zion' and a device of lulabs with ethrogs (bundles of sticks and palm-branches with a kind of small, aromatic citron); in addition the largest bronze type has a palm-tree between two baskets of fruit, and the smallest type has a chalice on the reverse. The same attribution to Simon was made for silver shekels and half-shekels with a similar legend ("Year 2 (or Year 3): Freedom of Zion"), the same chalice as the smallest bronze denomination and three pomegranates on a stem.

But in 1914 Hill definitely broke away from this attribution to Simon of the silver coins. On slender epigraphic grounds he assigned these to the First Revolt (from the forms of the letters aleph, beth, he, waw). But both Hill's catalogue of 1914 (GCPal,xc,pl.XX, 8-15) and Reifenberg's catalogue of 1947 (AJC, nos. 4-6) left the bronze coins to Simon. Hill's opinion on the silver

shekels was supported later (QDAP, 1938, pp. 78-83, pl. XXIV) when sixty-four unworn silver shekels of Year 3 turned up in the hands of Jerusalem dealers together with two coins of Ptolemy Philadelphus (mid 3rdcBC) and 23 Tyrian shekels dating between 40-39BC and AD 19-20. These coins appeared about the same time, and Hill asserted that they must have been found together, though there was no evidence forthcoming for this. It was left for Reifenberg to demonstrate convincingly that silver shekels of Years 1 and 2 belonged to the First Revolt. This was achieved by the publication of a bronze pyxis (QDAP, 1945, pl.XIX) bought from a dealer, which contained three silver, Jewish shekels of Years 1 and 2 and nine Tyrian shekels dating from 13-12 BC up to AD 64-65 (see too AJC, pp. 30-31; AHA, p.33). It is interesting to note that Josephus War, II, 592 refers to the use of Tyrian coins at the time of the First Revolt.

With the position of the silver coins established the argument now spread to the three bronze denominations. In 1947 (AJC, p.58, no. 147a) Reifenberg published a bronze type of Year 2 overstruck on a coin of Agrippa I, who ruled AD 40-44 - absolute proof that the bronze series was a lot later than Simon Maccabaeus. In 1957 Kadman put forward comprehensive arguments (IEJ,pp. 63-64) demonstrating that neither the silver coins nor the bronzes of Year 4 had features characteristic of the whole range of Hasmonaean coins. The Hasmonaean legend

with the name and title of the High Priest or King was lacking, and its place taken by the formulae 'Jerusalem the Holy', 'Freedom of Zion', 'For the Redemption of Zion'. Dates and denominations, specifically Jewish (as opposed to Hellenistic) symbols and palaeographic distinctions were further marks distinguishing them from the Hasmonaean types; moreover they were much more finely executed. These arguments - each individually valid, cumulatively overwhelming - were prompted by a find in the <u>same</u> locus on Masada of coins already assigned without controversy to the First Revolt (bronzes of 'Year 2: For the Redemption of Zion' with amphora/vine-leaf) and one of the bronzes of Year 4 (lulab between ethrogs/ chalice, and legend 'Year 4: For the Redemption of Zion'). This was a positive association and positive reasoning. Interestingly enough negative arguments led Sellers and Albright to the same conclusion; their excavation of Beth-Zur, a site known to have been captured and fortified by Simon and Hyrcanus I, produced many coins of Hyrcanus, but none of the silver shekels or Year 4 bronzes. This produced the reasonable conclusion from them that

> "..there are no existing Jewish coins antedating the reign of John Hyrcanus I .... the silver shekels and the coins of Year Four belong to the First Revolt." (O.R. Sellers, "Citadel of Beth-Zur", 1933, p.69).

After Kadman's find on Masada Reifenberg, uncertain in his attribution of the Year 4 bronzes in 1947 (AJC, p.28), definitely ascribed them to the First Revolt (AHA, p. 89; IEJ, 1951, p. 177, coin 3; IHC, p.13). It should be noted that Roth (PEQ, 1955, pp. 159-160) bases his observations on Reifenberg without being aware of this important revision, already published by Reifenberg in 1950.

The most recent discoveries have brought to light more specimens of the rare silver shekel of Year 5, and have definitely associated Years 4 and 5 with the other First Revolt coins; it is hardly surprising that few coins were minted in Year 5, the last year of the Revolt. The find made in a tomb on the Mount of Olives at 'Dominus flevit' is significant: a shekel of year 5, shekels of years 1-3, half shekels of years 1-2, a Tyrian shekel of AD 52-53, and an imperial tetradrachm of Nero from the Antioch mint of AD 61-62 (SM, pp. 25-32; INB, I, 1962, p.18, pl. 1, 15-16). In 1939 only three shekels of Year 5 were known (QDAP, 1939, p.77, pl. XLI, 2); the one from 'Dominus flevit' was the fifth, and the first to be found in a hoard. Finds on Masada have further established the association of Year 5 with the others. In locus 1039 silver shekels were found in a stratified level in the casemate wall used by the Zealots of the First Revolt - ten of Year 2, two of Year 3, two of Year 4, three of Year 5 (IEJ, 1965, p.80 and pl.19 F-G). These were together with other coins, of which the latest was a bronze of Ascalon of AD72-73, countermarked by the Tenth Legion (ibid. p.81). In locus 1045 at Masada many more

First Revolt coins - including another of Year 5 - were found in a conflagration layer 2m deep (ibid. p.76). Next season two hoards were found in one of the chambers of building IX (M, pp. 106-107 site; pp. 108-109 coins) - one hoard of 38 siver shekels and half-shekels, many of Year 4, with the coins stuck together and with fragments of cloth still adhering to them from the bag which they had been in; the other of 12 more in a bronze pyxis. In these finds at Masada all the years of the Revolt are represented. They are all technically far superior to the Hasmonaean ones; differences are clearly tabulated by Kadman (IEJ, 1954, pp. 164-165).

It is clear then that Hasmonaean coinage begins with John (Yehohanan) Hyrcanus, and ends with Mattathiah Antigonus, whose Hebrew name is found on his coins ('Mttyh' or just 'Mt'). There is also no dispute that coins with the legend 'Yehuda the High Priest and the Community (hbr) of the Jews' are the issues of Judas Aristobulus. But problems arise from the fact that we do not know whether the Hebrew name of Hyrcanus II was 'Yhwntn' (Jonathan) or 'Yhwhnn' (John). This affects the attribution of coins which may belong to this ruler, or to John Hyrcanus I or to Alexander Jannaeus (Yhwntn).

Hill treated this problem in rather cavalier fashion by assigning to John Hyrcanus I all types with the legend

'Yhwhnn hkhn hgdl whbr hyhwdym'

and none at all to Hyrcanus II. This left five types and an overstruck one to Alexander (GCPal pp. 188-196; 198-211), as follows:

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Type A: | anchor/flower | Legends: and 'Yhwntn hmlk'. |
| Type B: | palm branch/flower | Legend 'Yhwntn hmlk' only. |
| Type C: | A overstruck with D. | |
| Type D: | cornucopiae with poppy/wreath | Legend 'Yntn hkhn hgdl whbr hyhwdym'. |
| Type E: | cornucopiae with poppy/wreath | Legend 'Yhntn hkhn hgdl whbr hyhwdym'. |
| Type F: | anchor/wheel | Legends as anchor/flower type Also 'imitations' with unintelligible Hebrew. |

It will be noticed at once that these attributions assume that Jannaeus abandoned the royal style. The discovery during excavations on Ophel of a hoard of over 300 coins, nearly all of the anchor/wheel type, led Lambert to suggest that types A, B and F were the earliest, and that after the issue of these Pharisaic pressure forced Jannaeus to issue a new type - D with its variant E - and to overstrike coins of type A, already minted, with D. In the new type the title 'King' is abandoned in favour of 'High Priest'; also the plene spelling with waw is rejected in favour of 'Yhntn' or 'Yntn', possibly because

the occurrence of the tetragrammaton 'Yhw' was offensive to conservative opinion. But this last revision is also found in anchor/wheel types from the Ophel hoard - nos. 13-295 have 'Yhntn', nos. 9-12 have 'Yntn'.

Reifenberg was not satisfied with the suggestion that Alexander Jannaeus, who was a strong militarist, abandoned his royal title. Indeed this does not seem to conform to the character which Josephus gives to him (Ant. XIII, 373; 383 nick-name 'Thrakidas') nor the phrase διὰ τούτους (τοὺς Φαρισαίους) ὑβρισθέντας ὑπ' αὐτοῦ (ibid. 402) in his death-bed speech. Instead Reifenberg, assuming that Hyrcanus II had the Hebrew name 'Yhntn', attributes types C, D and E to this ruler, upon whom Rome conferred the High Priestly style, but not Kingship, in 63BC (Ant. XIV, 73). On the other hand Kindler takes the Hebrew name of Hyrcanus II to be the same as that of Hyrcanus I. He assigns all coins with the name 'Yhwntn', 'Yhntn' or 'Yntn' to Jannaeus; those with 'Yhwhnn' he divides between Hyrcanus I and Hyrcanus II. He suggests that this can be justified palaeographically; but such a justification has not yet been attempted, and there seems no decisive means as yet devised of solving this problem. For this study the types GCPal series A, B, F can definitely be attributed to Jannaeus. It must remain doubtful which of the other types belong to which of the three rulers. In a discussion of the emblems used this hardly matters, since they remain the same right down to Antigonus.

Alexander Jannaeus struck three certain types - with an anchor and a wheel (star), an anchor and a flower, a flower and a palm-branch. The coins of doubtful attribution among the three rulers (with the names Jonathan or John, and the title High Priest) have crossed cornucopias and a poppy-head together with a laurel wreath on the same side as the legend. A rare type is assigned by Reifenberg to Hyrcanus I (AJC, pp. 13-14, 40-41, pl.II, 7), and by Kindler to Hyrcanus II (DJC, pp. 15-16). This has filleted, jugate cornucopias, and on the obverse a crested helmet with visor and cheek-piece. Crossed cornucopias occur with bunches of grapes hanging over their lips on a type of Antigonus (AJC, no.22); or with an ear of barley between them (AJC, no.25: LA, p.300, fig.9) on another type of the same ruler. I can also see this ear of barley on a type of Jannaeus which is mistakenly put in the 'poppy' series by Hill (GCPal, series D of Jannaeus, no.37; pl. XXI, 20). On his reverse of the cornucopias type Antigonus put an ivy wreath (IHC, p.22, no.4). On his small denominations occurs the menorah, either with this wreath (AJC, no.23) or accompanied by an .."object with horizontal line and four verticals, swelling in middle and tapering to tops", as Hill puts it (GCPal, p.219, no.56, pl.XXIII, 11; AJC, no.24; TJC pl.4 menorah). This last enigmatic object is described by Kindler as a 'shew-bread table', presumably on the principle that obverse and reverse types are to be thematically connected. But most of the types mentioned are straightforward, and have been

interpreted without dispute - anchor; cornucopias, crossed or jugate, filleted or brimming with fruit or neither; poppy; ear of barley; palm-branch; flower; crested helmet; and the menorah. The GCPal. series F of Jannaeus was formerly interpreted as a wheel (without any satisfactory explanation of its significance); but it seems to me that Kindler has successfully challenged this interpretation on the grounds that the encircling ring is not part of the emblem, but simply a frame, which sometimes recurs round the anchor emblem also. There are analogies to be drawn with a star attribute found on Seleucid types (infra: IEJ, 1954, p. 173; DJC, pp. 12-13).

It seems to me unjustified to interpret the menorah of Antigonus as involving the same aspirations and symbolism as menorot found in the tombs of Beth She'arim, and on a wealth of Jewish material of the 2nd to 4thcAD. The material which dates later than the destruction of the Temple in AD 70 or of Jerusalem in AD 135 reflects passions which are intensified by loss, and are symbols of national identity and national aspiration - of "..the Redemptive Hope of restored Temple and State..", as Roth puts it (PEQ,1955, pp. 152-155). Such menorot are often found together with the shophar (curved ram's horn) and lulab (palm-branch), which now takes the particular form of a curved branch, as can be seen from many of the illustrations in Frey's "Corpus Inscriptionum Iudaicarum". These are true symbols, representing not just the religious life of a state - for both state and Temple are gone - but the purpose and ambition of a

restored Zion, and the very identity of the dispersed and defeated Jewish people. In contrast to all of this we meet the menorah of Antigonus in company with Hellenistic emblems of power and prosperity; it must be understood simply as a cult implement, sounding forth the healthy religious life of a small, independent nation. In fact I am arguing for the interpretation of the emblems on Jewish coins (and elsewhere for that matter) in the light of known historical circumstances. It seems important to state here that the method of standardised interpretation of such emblems is totally misleading; with time and place the significance of the object represented also changes, and should not be divorced from contemporary circumstances; in short, history is dynamic, not static. At the same time it should also be remembered that any given object may mean something more or something different to a particular group or class or individual than it does to the majority. For instance the educated Alexandrian Jew Philo says that everyone knew that the menorah represented the seven planets with its seven arms (Quaest. Ex., 78) and Josephus (Ant.III,6,4;7,7) refers to the cosmic symbolism of the three divisions of the Temple; but both are highly educated men, and cannot be used as gauges of the mentality of the ordinary people. Insofar as static interpretations are concerned, one should particularly deplore the standardised interpretations given by Goodenough (JS) to representations spread over five centuries and the whole Mediterranean world; in many cases he assumes that a tomb or sarcophagus is Jewish without grounds, and proceeds to interpret the decor as 'symbols' according to his preconceived system.

The menorah is the only purely Jewish object to be found on the Hasmonaean coins. Several of the other types can be related very successfully to Hellenistic emblems already established on Seleucid etc. coins. The cornucopias are an interesting case. They appear on the Jewish coins crossed or jugate, overflowing with fruit or not, and sometimes filleted. And in the same varieties they appear on Ptolemaic coins and Seleucid ones. For instance jugate cornucopias are found on types of Ptolemy II, Ptolemy III and Ptolemy IV, who ruled 221-204 BC (KGC,802-805,808; SCA, pl. XV,7). A single cornucopia, brim-full with fruit to signify prosperity, was minted by the Seleucids Demetrius I Soter (162-150 BC; BMCS, pl. XIV,4; CMG, pl. XVI, 15) and Alexander Balas (150-145 BC; BMCS, pl. XVII, 6). Jugate cornucopias were minted by the Seleucid Cleopatra of 126-125BC (LSM, no.7) at Ake-Ptolemais; and both jugate cornucopias full of fruit and crossed cornucopias appear on coins of Alexander II Zebina (125-123BC) which were minted at Damascus (LSM, no.80; BMCS, pl.XXII, 3, 8, 9; CMG, pl. XXIII, 5, 10, 11). This means that types with both crossed and jugate cornucopias were coined at Ake-Ptolemais or Damascus by Seleucids actually during the early reign of John Hyrcanus I (135-104BC); it should be remembered that coins with both forms of cornucopiae are attributed to <u>him</u> by Hill and Reifenberg. The anchor too is a Seleucid type - it appears already on coins of Seleucus Nicator (312-280BC; BMCS, pl.II, 1,2,6,8,9; CMG, pl.II, 10,12,13,16) and is still found on coins of Demetrius II (146-138 and 130-125 BC), Antiochus Sidetes (138-129BC) and Alexander Zebina (128-123BC). In fact on coins of Antiochus Sidetes, who was the last strong

Seleucid ruler, appears the same anchor/flower type that we have already seen on coins of Jannaeus (BMCS, pl.XVIII, 7; XX, 14; XXII, 12; CMG, pl. XIX;XXII, 1; XXIII, 2,8). Again the close link in time demonstrates that a Seleucid type was taken over by rulers striving to establish their rights upon parts of the former Seleucid realm. Another type clearly emulating Seleucid coins is the helmet attributed variously to Hyrcanus I or II. A spiked Macedonian helmet with cheek-pieces is found on coins of Antiochus VI (145-142BC), Tryphon (142-139BC) and Sidetes (138-129BC) (BMCS, pl. XIX, 7; XX, 1, 2, 3; CMG, pl. XXI, 1, 2, 3; SCG, pl. LIV, 4; MacDonald, "Zeitschrift fur Numismatik", 1912, no.28). As general signs of prosperity both the ear of corn (on early Italiot-Greek coins, and coins of Metapontum) and a palm-tree with fruit (on Siculo-Punic coins) are old Greek types, obvious choices for coin emblems. The ear of corn on its stalk continues through to coins of the first reign of Demetrius II (146-138BC; CMG, pl.XIX,5); the palm-tree to coins of Antiochus III(222-187BC; BMCS, pl. IX,8) and Demetrius II (CMG, pl.XXII, 20). On the Hasmonaean coins both of these types are set between cornucopias. Even the large star on coins of Jannaeus links back with the star adjunct on Seleucid coins, as is suggested by Kindler (DJC, p.12). This adjunct is already found on coins of the 3rdcBC (ESP, pl. 1,2,3 assigned to Antiochus II by MacDonald, to Antiochus III by Gardner and Babelon) and continues through to Seleucid types just before the reign of Jannaeus - those of Demetrius I (BMCS, pl. XIV, 10), those minted by Grypus at Ake-Ptolemais in his first reign (121/120-114/113BC; LSM, nos. 28, 35, 36), those minted by Cyzicenus at Ake-Ptolemais

in his first reign (113-108BC: LSM, nos. 39,40) and those minted by Antiochus VIII in both his short periods of power (120-113 and after 109; LSM, nos. 89-105, 111-113). The form of this star adjunct adds conviction to the proposal that Jannaeus borrowed the type, and gave it sole prominence - it has the same central knob, and the same eight rays, which taper to spear-points in both cases. Finally the laurel wreath, an adornment of Greek lamps, coins, mosaics etc. in the form of a trefoil with two berries on stalks, appears in the same form on Hasmonaean coins. An Athenian series with this wreath overlaps the beginning of the Hasmonaean coinage (SGC, pl.LXIII, 2, 3, 10; c.220, 190 and 87BC). But more relevant is the fact that once again this emblem appears on coins of Sidetes, Grypus and Cyzicenus, minted at Ake and Damascus in the last quarter of the 2ndcBC (LSM, nos. 26, 48-49, 52-53, 55, 91-119 etc.).

This investigation makes it abundantly clear that most of the Hasmonaean types are derived from contemporary Seleucid ones, minted locally and in current circulation. It is striking that all representations of animals or human figures are avoided, though these are also characteristic of contemporary Greek coinage, as indeed of all forms of Greek art. Types on Greek coins have been classified in two major groupings - those with religious significance, and those with 'local products' (e.g. see KGC, p.13). It is clear that the Hasmonaean types largely designate national power, expansion and prosperity (anchor, helmet flower, palm, ear of grain), while the menorah signifies the importance to the nation of the Temple and its cult. Perhaps too the eight-rayed star may be regarded as some form of religious emblem, derived as such from Seleucid coins.

## COINS OF THE HERODIAN DYNASTS WHO RULED THE JEWS.

We are considering those coins minted by Jewish authorities, and are therefore confined here to the Herods who ruled areas heavily populated by Jews - Judaea, Galilee, Peraea - viz. King Herod, his sons Archelaus and Antipas, and Agrippa I. But the coinages of Philip, of Agrippa II and of the dynasty of Chalcis are useful 'controls' in that they show the liberties which the Herodians were inclined to take and could take with human images when ruling non-Jewish populations. It will also be noted that the procurators of Judaea kept carefully to inoffensive types.

There are no problems in the attribution of the Herodian types to particular rulers, as there are with the Hasmonaeans. The names and titles of the ruler appear on his coinage. 'Herod the King' clearly designates Herod, since his sons were not kings. Equally clearly 'Herod the ethnarch' is Archelaus, upon whom Angustus bestowed this title, and 'Herod the tetrarch' (with reverse 'Tiberias' or 'TS') is Antipas, tetrarch of Galilee. Agrippa I is termed 'King', and sometimes 'Great King' after the Persian tradition.

Only four of the types of King Herod have dates - all of Year 3, which should be interpreted as 37BC, the third year of his rule as decreed by Rome, but the first year of his actual power. The coins of Archelaus (4BC-AD6) are not dated. Those of Antipas are dated by regnal year (4BC-AD39), and those of Agrippa by his second to eighth regnal years (38-44/5).

The coins of King Herod continue the Hellenistic types employed by the Hasmonaeans - palm-branch, helmet, cornucopias, wreath, poppy-head, anchor. New types, still Hellenistic, are the shield, the aplustre (an adornment at the prow of a ship), the warship, the kerykeion or caduceus and the eagle. There also occur three types connected with the Temple - a tripod with curved legs, an incense altar and an incense burner. The full array of types is given by Meyshan (PEQ, 1959, table p. 121 with pl. VI) as follows:

incense altar/incense burner between palm-branches (with star)
helmet with crest and cheek-piece/circular shield
winged kerykeion/poppy-head on stalk with leaf on either side
aphlaston or aplustre/palm branch between two unrecognisable objects
eagle/cornucopias
tripod with curved legs/palm-branch
tripod/legend
anchor within wreath/legend
anchor/double cornucopias
wreath enclosing letter 'taw'/tripod between two palm-branches
anchor/war galley with oars

Watzinger (DP, p.23) goes so far as to give cultic pagan interpretations to the kerykeion and tripod - describing them as the 'kerykeion of Hermes' and the 'tripod of Apollo'; Goodenough follows this more recently (without having got into the bibliography properly) with mention

of the "..Dionysiac tripod with pot (lebes)..". But these terms are singularly inappropriate. From what we know of the strength of the Pharisees and of the restraint which Herod exercised in all his art, even in out-of-the-way fortresses like Herodeion and Masada, we cannot suppose that he would have given deliberate offence in this way. It is of course clearly to be understood that kerykeion and tripod derive from Greek types which are connected with Greek deities; but either neutral or specifically Jewish explanations of their significance can readily be evoked. The kerykeion, like the poppy-head, palm-leaf and cornucopias, is an allegory for plenty. In the same type of category come the shield, symbol of strength, and the anchor, aplustre and war-ship, symbolic of sea-power.

Hill mistakenly designated as a ceremonial head-dress what has since been recognised as an incense-burner or thymiaterion on one of the types of Year 3 of Herod (AJC, no.26). Reifenberg has suggested that tripod and thymiaterion (AJC, nos. 26, 30-32) "..probably ..represent vessels used in the temple cult". Meyshan enlarges on this with some very important observations. He notes that the form of the incense-burner (the Greek word does not really seem appropriate) with its three short feet, conical lid and crowning star exactly corresponds to the modern Arab heating-censer (PEQ, 159, pl.VI, 3 with 2). Also clear on his pl. VI, 1a are two palm-branches on the same face as the incense-burner. This association suggests that here the palms also may be connected with the Temple or Thanksgiving.

We should note that the palm-branch and menorot occur as crude graffiti on the tomb of Jason at Jerusalem, where they may date from the later Hasmonaeans or the time of Herod; and similar crude drawings of palm-branches are sometimes added freehand to the regular, formal elements of ossuary decor (c.40 BC-AD70). The obvious inference is that the palm is a symbol of hope or victory associated with thanksgiving - on tombs and ossuaries one would want to connect this with the fact that the deceased was faithful to the requirements of the Law, or has died in the expectation of personal resurrection. The palm-branch is mentioned in the books of the Maccabees as a token of thanksgiving connected with victory (I Macc., 13, 51; II Macc., 10, 5 and 7). Simon Maccabaeus occupied the Akra at Jerusalem with praises, with palm-branches and with songs and music; the Purification of the Temple was celebrated with myrtle, ethrogim and palm-branches in the hand. The palm, then, in literary sources, is associated not only with the Feast of Tabernacles, but also with jubilation in general. Palm-branches were also strewn before Jesus when he entered Jerusalem (Mt.21, 8-9; Mk. 11, 8-9; Jn. 12, 12-13). All in all the palm seems to have a particular significance for the Jews of Palestine in the Maccabaean and Herodian periods not merely as an allegory for plenty - though it may only be this on Hasmonaean and Herodian coins - but as a symbol of Tanksgiving and Deliverance.

On the obverse of the coin with the incense-burner is what Hill (GCPal. p.220) and Reifenberg (AJC, p.42) interpreted as a tripod - not the tripod with curved legs that occurs on other coins of Herod, but a different form.

However Meyshan has demonstrated (PEQ, 1959, pl.VI, 1a, 2) that this has a base to it, and interprets it as the incense-alter of the Temple with its horns (Ant, VIII, 3, 8). There is a fine illustration of this AHA, p.82, no.1, where both base and horns are clear to see.

The tripod which does occur is a form with curved legs, and seems to be closely associated with the palm-branch. On one type it is between two palm-branches, on another it occurs with the palm-branch on the other face of the coin. Otherwise it is found with the legend, but no other emblem.

The 'taw' is a cross, both upright and diagonal - the old form of the letter. It is also found on ossuaries in both forms, sometimes very large and bold. It is linked by Klimowsky (INB, nos. 3, 4, 1962, pp. 86-87; DJC, pp. 94-95) with the taw as a sign of protection (Ezek. 9, 4: BT Shabbat, 45 "Go and mark the foreheads of the Just with a Taw of ink that the Angels of Destruction may not overpower them").

Of all the types of Herod's issues only the eagle is likely to have caused offence to the devout. The fate of a Golden Eagle dedicated by Herod over a gate of the Temple - the gate of the Sanctuary itself - is instructive. It was pulled down and chopped into pieces by the disciples of the rabbis Judah and Matthiah (Ant. XVIII, 150 Loeb). This passage of Josephus implies other offensive acts of Herod:

unless it be taken as a typical piece of Greek historiographical what-should-have-been-said.

One more type of Herod may be added to those published by Meyshan. Spijkerman (LA, p.302) shows a coin with the usual tripod, but on the reverse are crossed palm-branches (ibid. fig.13).

Of Herod's sons Philip, who received areas in the North far removed from Judaea, was able to coin types (4BC-AD34) with the head of Augustus. Antipas, ruler of Galilee and Peraea, was more careful. Until recently it was thought that he minted one type only - with palm-branch or palm-tree, and a wreath enclosing the legend (DJC, p.34). The palm-branch is very similar to ossuary graffiti in form (AHA, p.82, coin 5; TJC, pl.8). Spijkerman has now published an additional type with a lily - paired leaves and the flower with stamens at the top - dated AD 20/21 and minted at Tiberias (LA, pp. 303-304). Archelaus, set over Judaea itself, was just as careful. He repeated the Hellenistic types already used by the Hasmonaeans or his father - cornucopias, wreath, aplustre, anchor, warship - and also minted an issue which shows a helmet with cheek-pieces and a double crest (sic AHA, p.82, no.6: IHC, p.11 and no.11), and has on the obverse a single pear-shaped bunch of grapes with an enigmatic object to the left (GCPal pl. XXV, 12).

Agrippa I received from Caligula the title of kingship and the territories of Philip and Antipas when they died; he also took over Judaea and Samaria from the procurators of Caesarea for a brief three years (AD42-44) until his death. Some of his issues are

portrait coins (AHA,p.83 no.1; IHC, p.26 no.12, minted at Caesarea in AD44/45), but they are rare; they were minted at Paneas, Tiberias or Caesarea (IEJ,1954, pp. 193-194). The only common coin of his is the prutah of Year 6 with three ears of barley and a fringed canopy (ibid. pl.17, 4-5); it was minted in the brief period when he ruled Judaea. Meyshan suggests the mint was actually at Jerusalem, where this type would be acceptable. Reifenberg has already suggested that only this type with its 'neutral symbols' was struck for Judaea (AJC, p.20). In illuminating contrast, which demonstrates the force of Jewish feeling in Judaea and Galilee, are the portrait coins of Agrippa II, who ruled various areas of Ituraea (with a non-Jewish population) from AD50. Similarly Herod, king of Chalcis, brother of Agrippa I, struck portrait coins (AD41-48; LA, pp. 306-309).

The Roman procurators were equally careful to strike types without human heads, busts or figures. They used the palm-branch, palm-tree, ears of grain, augur's staff, crossed shield with two spears etc. These coins, struck by Roman overlords between AD6-41 and AD44-70, do not come within the designation 'Jewish' as I am applying it.

In sum Herodian types are a continuation of those already borrowed from the Seleucids by the Hasmonaeans together with further types from the same source. This refers not only to the well-known kerykeion and tripod types found on Greek coins, but also to several other fresh issues. The aplustre occurs already on coins of the Seleucid Alexander Balas (QDAP, 1932, p.70 and pl. XXXVIII,1) struck at Ascalon in 147-146BC, and on coins

of Alexander Zebina (128-123BC: GCS, pl.XXII, 11; CMG, pl. XXIII, 14). A warship or part of a warship occurs on coins of Antiochus III and Seleucus IV (CMG, pl.XI, 5,6,17,20), Demetrius I and II (GCS, pl.XIV, 7; XVIII, 4; CMG, pl. XX, 4,5) and Sidetes (138-129BC; CMG, pl.XXI, 8). The eagle was greatly favoured by the Ptolemies and the Seleucids. It was stuck by Alexander Balas (KGC, 751), Tryphon, Sidetes (CMG, pl.XIII, XXI), Demetrius II, Grypus, Cyzicenus (LSM, nos. 2-4, 6,13,20,22,24, 29-31, 33-34, 43,46, 50-51); and by Ptolemy VI (c.160BC), Ptolemy XIII (c.60BC), and Cleopatra (47BC and 30BC). In using it Herod was proclaiming that his state was to be compared with contemporary Egypt, and was the successor of the Seleucids: coins are, in fact, the obvious means for this type of propaganda. The bunch of grapes and the ears of barley of Archelaus and Agrippa I fall into the common category of the fruits of the land as emblems of its prosperity. The fringed canopy of Agrippa I was not explained until recently, when Klimowsky (DJC, pp. 92-94) pointed out that the title 'Great King' and the canopy are both derived from the Persian (Achaemenid and Parthian) tradition, and signify the high estate of the King.

COINS OF THE FIRST JEWISH REVOLT (AD66-73).

There is now general agreement (see above VIII, pp. 1-5 that three series of coins belong to the First Revolt:

1. Silver shekels and half-shekels (and one quarter-shekel has been found) which depict a chalice, and a stem from which three pomegranates spring. These are dated in Years 1 to 5, and have the legend 'Jerusalem the Holy' or 'Jerusalem is Holy'.

2. Bronze coins which have representations of an amphora, and a vine leaf with attached tendril. These are dated to Years 2 or 3, and have the legend 'Deliverance of Zion'.

3. Three different bronzes, varying in size, weight and denomination. The larger two series are labelled 'half' and 'quarter'. The legend is always 'Year 4: for the Redemption of Zion'. From the largest to the smallest respectively the emblems are:

Ethrog with lulabs/palm-tree with baskets of fruit
Lulabs/ethrog
Lulab with ethrogs/chalice

The lulab is not simply a palm-branch in the Hellenistic form, but a bundle of sticks and branches bound together (AHA, p.89, nos. 4, 5; AJC, nos. 4,5,6). Both this and the ethrog, an aromatic citron, are associated with festivals and jubilation (I[I] Macc., X,5,7). The palm tree is connected with vigour and fertility; in

'Song of Songs' VIII, 7,8 Shulamit was compared with the palm-tree. That it represents Israel in some special way is indicated by its prominence on the Judaea Capta coins of Vespasian (IHC, p.32, no.28).

We are dealing here with the Zealot revolt. It is not surprising then to find indisputable evidence that the chalice of these coins was a cult implement from the Temple; it is represented among the spoils carried off by Titus from the Temple on the Arch of Titus at Rome (INJ, II, fasc. 1-2, 1964, pl. II, 5).

The amphora on bronzes of Year 2 and 3 is narrow-necked, and has a fluted belly and small, curved handles (AJC, nos. 147-150) which sometimes reach halfway up the neck (nos. 147-149) and on other coins extend right up to the lip (no. 150). The most elaborate are gadrooned, and have some sort of moulding or incrustration at the lip (no.148). The form is sometimes covered, sometimes not, and the neck varies in width (INJ, II, fasc. 3-4, 1964, pp. 8-10; CJW, nos.12,13,15 narrower). Klimowsky suggests that it is a Temple utensil. But very similar free-hand amphoras are added to the formal ornament of a few ossuaries, which may indicate that it stood for something more - perhaps Deliverance, both temporal and eschatological.

The representation of cult implements is to be expected on these coins, for this is an assertion that Israel is an independent, priestly state. It is also possible to interpret the types at a different level

of significance, as expressions of the prosperity and fertility of the land, advantages promised to the Chosen People in Deut. 8,8, where vine, pomegranates and wheat are mentioned. It may be relevant that a decoration of 200 pomegranates was associated with the capitals of the two pillars of the Temple of Solomon (I Kings, 7,20) wrought by Hiram of Tyre. But Roth insists that these types on First Revolt issues reflect "..the pervading Messianic spirit of those excited days.." (PEQ, 1955, pp. 159-164). In this light we are not thinking simply of Temple implements, or fertility, but of the expected Deliverance, temporal and national, as well as religious, of Zion. The amphora he interprets as a representation of the 'Cup of Salvation' of Ps.CXVI, 13 and Jer. XVI, 7. We may point out here, in passing, that Roth is mistaken when he says that the chalice figures on some ossuaries; it is in fact the amphora, as mentioned above.

The amphora and the palm-tree are represented on old Greek types - for instance the grapes and amphora of Naxian coins (SGC, pl.XIII, 13: KGC, 523-524, p.13). But there is no evidence for direct connections between these and the First Revolt types, in the way that Hasmonaean and Herodian issues can be connected with contemporary Seleucid ones. To all intents these are new, distinctively Jewish types. This is not surprising, since here we are for the first time concerned with rulers involved in the assertion of a priestly state, and not in striving to establish themselves as part of the late Hellenistic pattern of petty princes.

## COINS OF THE BAR KOKHBA REVOLT (AD132-135)

On these issues 'Simeon' or 'Jerusalem' or 'Eleazar the Priest' usually appears on one side; the legend 'For the Deliverance of Jerusalem' or 'First (Second) Year of the Redemption of Israel' is found on the other (AJC, nos. 163-207).

The types are few. A three-fold bunch of grapes, always in the same form, is almost ubiquitous; this is very similar to the bunches on the Doric frieze of the Tomb of Helena, though the side clusters are reduced on the coins (AJC, nos. 171, 177-179, 185-189a, 195; GCPal pl. XXXIII, 7, 8, 14, 15, pl. XXXIV, 1,2,3, pl.XXXV, 1-13, pl. XXXVIII, 6-11). It occurs with a variety of emblems on the other side of the coin - palm-branch; one-handled, gadrooned jug with palm-branch and ethrog; palm-tree; two trumpets; a type of lyre; wreath and legend. The same two-handled amphora that we saw on coins of the First Revolt recurs here. There is also another type of lyre (kithara). The palm-tree recurs as obverse to an ivy-leaf. Finally there is the representation of a tetrastyle facade with a small shrine within it, and an obverse of lulab and ethrog. Of these types the trumpets, lyres, lulab, ethrog, amphora, jug and grapes all seem specifically connected with the Temple.

Klimowsky suggests that the lyres and trumpets are self-evidently instruments of Temple music. The trumpets appear on the Arch of Titus together with the chalice, as noted above in the section on the First Revolt.

'Branches and palms' is the key phrase in II Macc., 10,7, when Judas the Maccabee celebrated his successes.. 'as at a Feast of Tabernacles'. This comparison tells us that the lulab, in the form which is represented on the coins, was used at this great Temple Feast. Finally, the bunch of grapes which recurs on so many of the types of the Second Revolt recalls the Golden Vine hung in the Temple (Mishnah Middoth, III, 8). Kindler sums up the position as follows (DJC, p.65):

> "..the minting authorities of the Bar-Kokhba War... intended to present the fighting people with emblems that recalled the Temple and its services. It is therefore no wonder if we find here the Temple portal, the musical instruments used by the priests, the oil pitcher, the amphora, and at last the Lulav and Ethrog... A whole issue of coins was here clearly used as means of propaganda..."

Many of the types are presented on large and clear plates in TJC.

The issue with the tetrastyle facade is the most debated. Hill described it as a building with four fluted columns and an architrave shown by a row of dots over a continuous line; inside, an arched structure with two horizontal cross-pieces and two dots (GCPal p.284; pl.XXXII, 1-9; XXXIII, 1-3). Following Rogers he interprets this as the Pillars for the Veil and the Ark of the Covenant (Exodus, 26, 31-32). Lambert (QDAP,1932, p.69) concurs with this suggestion, but says a structure

like a Temple portico is represented, presenting the Pillars of the Veil in terms of contemporary architecture (TJC, pl.19). These interpretations do not seem satisfactory. Nor does that of Reifenberg (JPOS, pp.51-54) who suggests that we have here a synagogue and Torah shrine with two scrolls. His view is not supported by the material he quotes - for instance the so-called 'carruca' of the Capernaum synagogue has never been satisfactorily explained, and the ossuary representations bear no resemblance to the coins (AJC, p.60). At this time Jewish aspirations were centred on restoring the Temple; it seems clear to me that this is what is here represented. The Ark of the Covenant replaces the cult image which usually occupies the central intercolumniation on Greek coins. In a very detailed study Muehsam suggests that the tetrastyle facade represents one of the Temple gates, and agrees with Madden ("Coins of the Jews", 1881 and 1903, pp.239, 244) that a portico of the Temple (Solomon's Porch) is also represented on her types III-IX (CT, pp.66-67). It should be stated here that the type of ossuary decoration compared by Reifenberg to this coin does not resemble it, and is clearly neither a Torah Shrine, nor the Ark of the Covenant.

In seeking to relate the two-handled amphora found on coins of both Revolts and on a few ossuaries with the Temple at Jerusalem it is interesting to turn to a representation of a gold goblet found in the cemetary of St. Peter and Marcellinus ad duas Lauros, and dated to the 3rd to 4thcAD. This unmistakably represents the Temple of Solomon with its two monumental columns of bronze made

by Phoenician craftsmen. But in fact the Temple and its surrounding portico are Greek in style, reflecting the contemporary environment of the craftsman who made the golden goblet. The Temple furniture is unmistakably represented in the foreground - including the menorah, and the two-handled amphora in the same form as we have already seen it. This clearly implies that the amphora of the coins of the two Revolts was a temple implement. (For the goblet see H. Leclercq in "Manuel d'Archeologie chretienne", Vol. I, Paris, 1907, p.349, fig. 108).

## CONCLUSIONS

An examination of the Jewish coins of this period has shown a great cleavage between those of the Hasmonaeans and Herods on the one hand, and those of the two Revolts on the other. The former are largely types borrowed from the Seleucid dynasts, representing the claim to normal Hellenistic kingship, and depicting the power and wealth of the nation in terms of military strength, the acquisition of sea-power and the produce of the land. A few are connected with the Temple, being simple depictions of cult furniture. These coins are also artistically poor. But the Revolt coins reflect the power of the Pharisees and their extremists the Zealots, whose ambitions evoked strong support. The coins are concerned with the Temple and the Deliverance of the nation, probably both in temporal and eschatological terms. These coins are also much more finely executed.

It is notable that on only one type of Herod does a living figure appear, and on no other coins circulated in Judaea throughout this period. This matches the prohibitions imposed by the Law in the decoration of the ossuaries, sarcophagi and tombs, and even in the fortress-palaces of Herod.

The links between the coins and other art-forms are few, as is to be expected since coins are employed as a means of propaganda. The motifs of the taw and the amphora appear on a few ossuaries, not as formal elements of the decor, but as freehand additions. Palms, menorot and a chalice are found in the Hasmonaean-Herodian tomb of Jason at Jerusalem. The three-fold bunch of grapes is

found on the frieze of the tomb of Helena, on the Grape tomb etc. Warships are represented in the tomb of Jason, and were used to decorate the tombs of the Maccabees at Modin.

# PART NINE

The buildings of Herod are examined in detail at Jerusalem, Masada, Herodion, Jericho, Caesarea and Sebaste. They are found to be in a late Hellenistic style or to reflect distinctively Roman forms.

# THE BUILDINGS OF HEROD AT JERUSALEM.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY FOR THE TEMPLE OF HEROD


| | |
|---|---|
| Ch. Clermont-Ganneau | RA, 1872, pp. 214-234, 290-296 for the discovery of the Greek inscription forbidding entry to the Inner Temple (now in the Louvre). |
| S. Corbett | PEQ, 1952, pp. 7-14 for first-hand observations on the Double Gate, Triple Gate and Golden Gate. |
| R. Dussaud | "Les Monuments palestiniens et judaïques" (Paris, 1912) No.8, pp. 25-27. The Louvre inscription again. |
| R.P. J-B Frey | "Corpus Inscriptionum Judaicarum qui vont du IIIeme siecle avant J.C. au VII siecle de notre ere. (Rome, 1952) no. 1400. Both texts of the inscription. (discovered 1871 and 1935). |
| J.H. Iliffe | QDAP, 1936-1937, pp. 1-3. Another fragment of the warning inscription (now in the Constantinople museum). |
| K.M. Kenyon | "Jerusalem" (Thames and Hudson, 1967) pp. 139-144 Herod's Walls and Temple, briefly described in the wider context of the topography of Jerusalem. |

A. Parrot — "The Temple of Jerusalem" (translation in 1957 of a French edition of 1954; SCM, London). pp. 76-100 Herod's Temple. This is a useful introductory account in English, drawing largely on de Vogue and Watzinger.

E. Renan — "Mission de Phénicie" (Paris, 1864, large fol.)
Only pp. 797-799 and pl. XLI which are a description, assessment and photo of the monolithic column and capital in the Double Gate under the Mosque el-Aqsa of the Haram esh-Sharif at Jerusalem. (Huldeh Gate of the S.Wall of the Temple enclosure).

J. Simons — "Jerusalem in the Old Testament. Researches and Theories" (Leiden, 1952).
Ch.VI The Temple Area pp. 344-436. A) Haram esh-Sharif. B) Problem of the Temple.

G.A. Smith — "Jerusalem from the Earliest Times to AD 70", Vol. II (London, 1908) pp. 499-520 are on the Temple of Herod.

Pere H. Vincent — RB, 1954, "Le Temple hérodien d'après la Mishnah" Part I pp.6-35 Le Temple d'après le Traité Middoth; Part II pp. 398-404 Caractere du Temple de la Mishnah; Part III pp. 405-418 Le Temple d'après la Mishnah et Josèphe. (with criticisms of Holtzmann, Hollis, Berto) Fig. 2 is a reconstruction of the Mishnaic sanctuary (viz. the three courts, altar, temple).

idem and A.M. Steve — "Jérusalem de l'Ancien Testament - IIème partie: Archéologie du Temple. ch. XV Le Temple d'Hérode pp. 432-470 ch. XVIII Le Temple hérodien d'après la Mishnah pp. 496-525 ch. XVIII Le Haram esh-Sharif pp.526-586 ch. XIX Adaptation du Temple au Haram pp.587-610. A learned study from a wealth of experience and scholarship, and the first assembly which deals comprehensively with both literary and archaeological sources. Invaluable also for its fine photographs and reconstructions.

Comte de Vogue — "Le Temple de Jérusalem" (Paris, 1964) Ch. IV pp. 37-61 Description du Nouveau Temple. pp. 37-48 are brief accounts of the Qasr el-Abd, and of tombs at Jerusalem (Absalom, Zechariah, Kings, Judges, St. James, el-Messaneh) as back-cloth to Herod's Temple. Plates XV,XVI are reconstructions of the total ground-plan and elevation of the Temple enclosure.

C. Watzinger — "Denkmäler Palästinas", Vol. II, pp.33-45. Watzinger favours the treatise Middoth and speaks of the 'customary exaggerations' of Josephus. Reconstructions of the gound-plan, elevation and facade of the Temple.

Col. C.W. Wilson — PEQ, 1880, pp. 9-65 "The Masonry of the Haram Wall" and Lieut. C.R. Conder "Notes on Colonel Wilson's Paper on the Masonry of the Haram Wall", ibid.pp.91-97.

Further bibliography, to which I have not referred, can be found in the Loeb Josephus, Vol. VIII, in Appendix D under 'The Building Programme of Herod the Great: Temple Area', p.581.

Reconstructions of the ground-plan of the Temple by de Vogue, Watzinger and Vincent are given as my figs. 444-447 and 450. Continual reference should be made to these by the reader of this fascicle.

THE TEMPLE OF HEROD

In discussing the ossuaries, sarcophagi, tombs, building at Araq el-Emir and coins we found the evidence was largely derived from sources other than literary. In discussing the Temple of Herod, however, we are largely concerned with ancient documents; in fact with documents which in some details are either self-contradictory or contradict each other. The loci principes are the Jewish War of Josephus, V, 184-228 (Loeb), the Antiquities of Josephus, XV, 380-425; the treatise Middoth in the Mishnah (Danby's translation). Whereas both Josephus and the Mishnah are occasionally contradictory of passages in their own text, the task of reconciling the two sources is far more problematic. For whereas Josephus is concerned above all to impress his reader with the splendour of the arrangements and architecture and costly materials of the new Temple in which he had served as a young priest, the editor of the treatise Middoth is far more concerned with a system of ideal measurements and with the increasing sanctity and cult purposes of various parts of the enclosure to the extent of ignoring nearly all details of its structure and decor and not deeming worthy of mention the outer court upon which Herod lavished his attention. For instance it is characteristic that Josephus devotes so much space to the Royal Portico, but practically ignores the Altar; whereas Mishnah Middoth describes the Altar minutely, but ignores the existence of the porticoes of the Outer Court.

It seems sensible to commence with a synopsis of the two long passages of Josephus, to which detailed reference will not then have to be made in the body of this section:

WAR, V, 184-228:

188-189: Foundations of great depth were laid down in some parts (i.e. the platform was extended). Some stones used in the building were 40 cubits long (i.e. stones in the foundations).

190-192: in the first court were dipteral porticoes with white marble columns, 25 cubits high (μονόλιθοι λευκοτάτης μαρμάρου) and ceilings of cedar. Josephus says that the stone of the columns was too fine to be spoiled by paint. This outer court was paved with stones of various types ( παντοδαπῷ λιθῷ˜) The porticoes were 30 cubits broad.

193-194: the second court was surrounded by a stone balustrade three cubits high. In this were set plaques stating in Greek and Latin that no Gentile should enter the Holy Sanctuary

( το ἅγιον = το δεύτερον ἱερόν )

198-200 Entry to this area was by four gates on the North, four on the South, and in the East one which opened onto the Court of Women, and another facing this on the opposite side (West) of the same court. Of the gates on the North and South the most Easterly were also entries to this same court, beyond which women were forbidden to go. There were no gates on the West.

200: inside the second court, between these gates, were porticoes - single rows of tall beautiful columns, which stretch in front of treasury chambers.

201-206: nine of the gates had gold and silver overlaid on their double doors and frames. The entry on the East of the Court of Women was of the even more precious bronze of Corinth. The double doors were 30 cubits high and wide. Inside they were like towers 30 cubits wide and long, 40 high with chambers on each side and two freestanding columns supporting the interior. All of these gates were the same size except for the gate between the Women's court and the inner courts, which was larger and more richly overlaid with gold and silver; the approach to this gate was also more magnificent, consisting of fifteen low steps. The nine gates overlaid with silver and gold were the gift of one Alexander, father of Tiberius (Note: there is no mention here of who gave the Corinthian Gate).

207-224: the Sanctuary itself (ὁ ναός = το ἅγιον ἱερόν) was 100 cubits wide and high, and approached by a flight of 12 steps; but behind the porch it became narrower - 60 cubits wide. The entry in the facade was 70 cubits high and 25 broad. It was without doors, but the frame was overlaid with gold ( κεχρύσατο δὲ τὰ μέτωπα πάντα ) Through it the chamber beyond ( ὁ πρῶτος ὄικος ) was visible; this was 90 cubits high, 50 long,

20 broad. The gate here was also overlaid with gold, and above it hung clusters of golden vines and grapes (τὰς χρυσᾶς ἀμπέλους βότρυες ἀνδρομήκεις). In front of its golden doors - 55 cubits high, 16 broad - hung a Babylonian tapestry with rich colours (blue, scarlet, purple) embroidered as the panoply of the heavens (ἅπασαν τὴν ὀυράνιον θεωρίαν πλὴν τῶν ζωδίων) . Beyond this door the interior of the Sanctuary (ὁ ναός) was 60 cubits high and long, 20 wide. The first chamber took up 40 cubits of this length; it contained the 7-branched Menorah, the Table of Shewbread and the Altar of Incense. The inmost chamber - 20 cubits long and wide - was called the Holy of Holies ( ἁγιου ἅγιον ). This too was screened by tapestry. The ground-floor described above housed chambers in three stories; the upper storey - another 40 cubits high - had no chambers. The whole exterior of the building was covered with gold (χρυσοῦ στιβαραῖς πάντοθεν) Sharp gilded spikes acted as bird-scarers on the roof. Some of the stones used on the structure were immense - 45 cubits long, 5 high, 6 wide.

225-227: the Altar was a square of 50 cubits, and horned; its height was 15 cubits. A low stone parapet marked off the Court of Priests (with the Sanctuary and Altar) from that of the Laity.

ANTIQUITIES, XV, 380-425

391-395: new foundations were laid, and a Sanctuary 100 cubits long, 120 high was erected. The stones used were 25 cubits long, 8 high, 12 wide. The middle part of the building was higher than the sides. The doors (between the porch and inner chambers) were hung with tapestries, and over them was set a great golden vine with grape-clusters hanging from it.

410: there were four gates to the precinct in its West Wall. One led over a bridge to the palace, two led to the suburb, and one to the Upper City. This last was near steps from the Tyropoeon Valley up the Mount.

411-416: along the South Wall was the Royal Portico, three aisles formed by three freestanding rows of columns and a row of half-columns engaged in the Wall. The columns numbered 162, and were 27 feet high. They had Corinthian capitals, and a double moulding round the base (διπλῆς σπείρας ὑπειλημένης).

Of the three aisles the centre one was 45 feet wide, the side ones 30 feet each; the centre aisle was 100 feet high, the side aisles 50 feet. The ceilings were of wood ornamentally carved (πολυτρόποις σχημάτων ἰδέαις) ; that of the centre aisle was higher. (the meaning of 416 is not clear)

417-420: within this outer court ( ὁ πρῶτος περίβολος ) was a second - above a flight of steps and surrounded by a stone balustrade "with an inscription prohibiting the entrance of a foreigner under threat of the penalty of death" ( γραφῇ κωλύον εἰσίεναι τὸν αλλοεθνῆ , θανατικῆς ἀπειλουμένης τῆς ζημίας ) .

On the South and North side this inner court ( ὁ ἐντὸς περίβολος ) had three-chambered gateways; on the East side there was one great gateway. Inside this inner court were further restricted areas - the Holy Sanctuary ( το ἱερόν ) forbidden to women, and, farther within this, a third court (τρίτον) open only to priests. Within the Court of Priests was the Sanctuary itself ( ὁ ναός ) with the Altar of Burnt Offerings before it.

420-421: the porticoes and the outer courts ( τοὺς ἔξω περιβόλους ) Herod finished in eight years; the Sanctuary itself ( ὁ ναός) in 1 year 6 months.

In these two passages there are one or two minor discrepancies in measurements:

| | |
|---|---|
| Ant. XV, 391f. | Sanctuary 100 cubits long, 120 high. Stones used 25 cubits long, 8 high, 12 wide. |
| War, V, 207f. | Sanctuary 100 cubits wide, 120 high. Stones used 45 cubits long, 5 high, 6 wide. |

But there are no contradictions about the general form, gates and decor, which are the aspects we are particularly interested in. The total picture from the two passages is as follows:

1) The foundations of the platform were enlarged with the aid of huge stones.
2) The precinct wall had four gates on the West side, and gates on the South side.
3) The Royal Portico was a basilica along the South side of the Outer Court (called by scholars 'Court of the Gentiles') against the great Wall.
4) Round the other sides of this court were dipteral porticoes.
5) Within the First (Outer) Court was the Holy Sanctuary, preceded by a terrace above a flight of steps. On the terrace was a screen-wall. In front of the steps was a low balustrade with warning plaques in Greek and Latin, forbidding entry to foreigners under threat of death.
6) There were nine entries to this Holy Sanctuary in its outer wall, and an even more magnificent entry from the easternmost court - the Court of Women. The gate in the outer East wall was also exceptional, being of costly Corinthian bronze. The eight others in the outer wall, and especially the gate on the West side of the Court of Women, were overlaid with gold and silver, and were the gift of Alexander, son of Tiberius. As to disposition all the entries apart from the inner and outer East gates already detailed were along the North and South sides - regularly spaced, four on each wall. Of these eight gates the two most easterly ones were entries to the Court of Women, like the outer East gate. There were no gates on the West.

7) Beyond the Court of Women into the West Court only men could proceed; even so, within this court was a third, open only to priests.
8) There were further porticoes - single rows of columns this time - around the Holy Sanctuary (i.e. around the courts open respectively to women and men).
9) The 10 gates had double doors. All were of the same size and form - like three-chambered towers with two free standing columns within - except that the Corinthian gate was more costly, and the gate on the West side of the Court of Women was larger, richer in gold and silver, and approached by a magnificent flight of steps.
10) Within the Court of Priests were the great Altar of Burnt Offerings and the Sanctuary itself.
11) The Sanctuary consisted of a porch and two inner chambers, the inmost being the Holy of Holies. The Porch was wider than the rest of the building behind it, and the entry to the porch was very high with a frame overlaid in gold, but no doors. The entry to the two inner chambers was also large; its double doors and frame were overlaid with gold. Above the entry hung the great Golden Vine, and before the doors a rich Babylonian tapestry. This ground-floor housed chambers in three stories. The upper storey had no chambers. The whole exterior of the sanctuary was covered with gold, and on the roof gilded spikes acted as bird-scarers.

Such is the information provided by these two passages. We can add to this the following supplementary information from other Josephan passages:

War, II, 537 refers to a gate in the North Wall of the precinct during the attack of Cestius (and this locus again refers to the porticoes).

But note that Vincent is wrong (JAT, p.448) in giving Ant. XV,424 as a reference to a gate on the East, since this is concerned with a gate in the Inner Court. No eastern gate is mentioned by Josephus; nor does he give either the size or plan of the outer gates, as he does the inner ones.

The whole account of the capture of the Temple by Titus (War VI, 71-285) confirms information in the other passages:

71-75: the Romans attempt to take the Temple from the captured fortress Antonia.

164-165: the Jews set fire to the N.W. portico, connected with Antonia.

166-167: the Romans destroy more of this by fire.

177-191: the Jews fill the space between the ceiling and rafters of the West portico with combustibles, and trap a party of Romans when they set it alight. They then hack away the rest of the wood of the same portico.

192: the Romans burn the whole North portico.

220-228: Assaults with rams and seige-engines on the outer West wall of the precinct prove unavailing. Attempts to scale the walls are also repulsed.

228: Titus orders the gates set on fire.

233-236: This is done.

243: The fires are then extinguished by the Romans, and a way cleared through the debris.

244: next day the Jews make a sally from the East gate upon the guards of the Outer Court (i.e. the Romans had captured the Outer Court) ( τοῦ ἔξωθεν ἱεροῦ) .

248: the Jews are confined to the Inner Court, after a repulse. ( τὸ ἔνδον ἱερόν )

251-253: Roman troops attempt to extinguish fires in the Inner Court, and drive the Jews right back into the Sanctuary ( ὁ ναός) A Roman soldier sets fire to one of the chambers on the North wall of the Inner Court.

254-259: conflagration, confusion and slaughter ensue.

265-266: a Roman soldier sets fire to the interior of the Sanctuary ( ὁ ναός ) by thrusting a brand into the hinges of the gate.

281-285: final destruction of the gates and porticoes of the Inner Temple by fire.

232: remains slightly puzzling. It must be a reference to the attempt to fire the gates of the Inner Court before we have been explicitly told that the outer court was taken. This passage and 281-285 make it clear that the frames of the 10 gates into the Inner Court were of wood. 265-266 indicates the same for the doorway between the porch and inner chambers of the Sanctuary itself. Clearly the doors, as well as the frames, of the entries to both the Inner Court and the Sanctuary were of wood covered with gold leaf and silver leaf.

In Ant. XVIII, 159 and 259 further reference is made to Alexander, father of Tiberius, who paid for this gold and silver work in the entries to the Inner Court. He was the brother of the philosopher Philo, and head (alabarch) of the Jewish community at Alexandria.

THE TREATISE MIDDOTH

Some useful additions to the information provided by Josephus are found in this treatise of the Mishnah. Thus:

I,3: the South gates to the precinct are specified as the two Huldeh gates. A gate on the West is referred to as the Qiponos Gate. The North gate, the Tadi Gate, is mentioned with the proviso that it was not used for normal purposes. An East gate is also mentioned, on which the palace of Susa had been formerly represented; by this the priest went out to the Mount of Olives for the sacrifice of the red heifer without blemish (Numbers, XIX). It is specified that the Huldeh and Qiponos gates were used for entry and egress.

Comment: it will be remembered that Josephus referred to four West gates in the precinct wall with exact accounts of where they led to. Vincent suggests that Middoth mentions only one of these because this was the one which gave directly onto the Temple proper from the town. The rabbis are not interested in the others. Here and elsewhere it seems clear that they are not interested so much in giving an account of the actual precinct as erected by Herod as they are in some edited concept connected closely with the older temples and Ezekiel's vision.

In fact the Mishnaic description seems modified by ideas as to what the temple should be, rather than describing precisely what it was. This is also indicated by the fact that they ignore the Outer Court of Josephus, to which Gentiles had access.

II,4: all the walls around the precinct were high but for that on the East. This was because the priest sacrificing on the Mount of Olives had to be able to see into the inner chambers of the Sanctuary itself.

Comment: Vincent remarks that the reason given is irrelevant (and the information false?). Since the summit of the Mount of Olives is high above the Temple Mount, the distinction does not make sense in terms of the structure which actually existed.

II,3-5: within the First Court is the soreg (Balustrade) and then the hel (rampart) which encloses the Court of Women, Court of Israel and Court of Priests (see II,7 also).

Comment: Sukkah, V,4 adds to this information by telling how on the last night of the Feast of Tabernacles two priests would sound trumpet-blasts at the "Upper Gate", and then cross the Women's Court to leave by its East Gate. Thus these two gates correspond to the inner East gate and the Corinthian Gate of Josephus.

II,7: gives more information about the gates. It names four gates on the North and South of the Inner Court; and an East gate, called the Gate of Nikanor.

Comment: however both the number of the gates and the exact location of the gate of Nikanor are not as clear as they might be, since other passages seem to contradict II,7. Here again the Mishnaic description seems connected with motives other than a desire to give a precise description of the Temple as it stood. For a discussion of the gates see Vincent, RB, pp. 17-22. The description as given in this passage tallies with nine of the 10 gates described by Josephus.

Vincent wants to identify the Gate of Nikanor with the second or inner East Gate of Josephus (see JAT, pp.452f.) as in Middoth I,4 (see too Hastings' Dict. of Bible, Vol. IV, p.714 under Gates for the view of Buchler, Schurer, Gratz, Spiess, Nowack). In II,7, however, it seems to be the Corinthian Gate of Josephus. Moreover Josephus specifies that the inner East gate, like those on the North and South sides, was of gold and silver overlay, and that all of these nine gates with the same overlay were the gift of Alexander the alabarch of Alexandria. However this may be, this is certainly the Nikanor mentioned on the ossuary inscription referred to supra I, iii, no.60 and III,1-2. See too Yoma, III.

III,1-6: a long and detailed description of the Altar and the sacrificial arrangements connected with it. The demarcation between the Courts of Israel and Priests is mentioned. Steps, mentioned rather vaguely in II,7, are confined by Vincent to E on his plan, which I reproduce (fig.447).

III, 7-IV,7: the Sanctuary itself had a port (ulam) and above the entry to this were five oak beams with stone courses between them. Over the door of the first chamber (hekal) was a Golden Vine to which dedicants added leaves and grapes. Within the sanctuary were 38 small chambers - 15 each on the North and Sourth arranged in three stores of five each; 8 on the West in three stories of three, three, two. The porth itself contained chambers for the sacrificial knives. The Sanctuary was narrow behind, wide in front.

Comment: Middoth II, 3c adds that the facade entry is without doors. All of the above information confirms Josephus, but with the added details of the exact number and disposition of the chambers in the lower storey, and the account of the very strange 'lintel'. The description 'wide in front, narrow behind' matches the statement in Josephus that the porch was wider. Oddly there is no mention of the veil before the hekal.

To this account of the literary evidence for the form of the Temple of Herod some traces of the structure are to be added.

MONUMENTAL REMAINS

It may be that the remarks of Josephus on the size of the stones used in the Temple enclosure are exaggerated. How much so it is difficult to tell. For the Sanctuary may have been of larger stones than those which do survive in situ in what can be seen, and what was explored by means of tunnels and shafts by Warren.

Of these stones the longest is 24 cubits, the highest 3.7 cubits, assuming the cubit to be 0m.50, as is generally done. These, the largest stones, come in range of the lowest estimates given by Josephus.

But in fact the remains are not those of the Sanctuary, nor of the Inner Temple, but parts of the great Wall of the enclosure, which survive today as the lower courses of the Moslem Haram esh-Sharif. Even so the stones are worthy of the comment:

This area, third most holy to the Moslem world, has not been available for excavation for a century. It is, then, doubly fortunate that Warren was permitted to sink his shafts and tunnels even before the use of ceramic interpretation was developed by archaeologists. He revealed that the S.E. angle of the Haram or Wall of Herod goes down 47m below the level of the Temple court; the S.W. angle 30m. Fourteen of the courses of masonry at the S.E. angle are still above ground (25 courses below), including a master course of exceptional height - up to 1m 85 cms. The corner-stone is 7m long, and weighs over a hundred tons (Simons, p.358); its length, but not its weight, is surpassed by a block of nearly 12m in the West Wall.

This Herodian masonry is of regular drafted blocks laid in horizontal courses with vertical joints; a smooth face projects within the drafts. At the S.E. corner of the Haram and along the West wall as far as the Double Gate this refined dressing and regular dry-stone coursing is found at its best (fig.442).

A variant has the face within the draft left rough; this type is found in the lower courses of the Wall West of the Double Gate. In all Herodian courses are found in the West, South and East walls of the Haram, and in the remains of a tower at the N.E. angle. The South Wall is known today as the 'Wailing Wall' (fig. 443). Outside Jerusalem such stone-dressing is found only in the Haram el-Khalil (Precinct of the Patriarchs) at Hebron.

Of the Herodian gates in this great outer Wall there are meagre remains of three. Two immense jamb-stones still mark the location of the East gate (at the walled-in gate now called the Golden Gate). Another huge jamb-stone remains in situ at the 'Triple Gate', which would be the site of the East Huldeh Gate of Middoth. These stones are carved as two members - the last ashlar and the jamb mouldings, consisting of plate-bande and cyma (Corbett, PEQ, 1952, p.9). On the West survive the lintel of 'Barclay's Gate' and the remains of viaducts which spanned the valley to the town (Wilson's Arch, JAT, p.446; Robinson's Arch, JAT pp.546-548 and pl.CXX).

The remains of the 'Double Gate' - to be identified with the West Huldeh Gate - are more substantial. There is a huge Herodian lintel ($5\frac{1}{2}$m long, nearly 2m thick) with drafts. The very slight oversail of this lintel on the Herodian stones beneath leads Corbett to conclude that there were revetment stones at the sides of the openings. The central pier of the gate also remains. In addition Corbett discovered a side-door within the vestibule, which

must have been concealed behind plaster when de Vogue investigated the Temple. The end of ramps leading from the two Huldeh Gates up to the level of the Haram can still be seen cut in the rock. But the most interesting testimony to the impact of Greek forms is the capital of the monolithic column inside the vestibule of the W. Huldeh Gate (figs. 452, 453).

This capital is in the proto-Corinthian style without volutes - astragal, a ring of acanthus alternating with lotus or some other water plant, abacus. The overall shape - that of a cup or inverted bell - is like the Egyptian prototypes from which the Greek Corinthian capital partly derives. In these Egyptian capitals the leaf rings are not plastic, but press tight against the cup. When the arrangement was transmitted to the capitals of the Tower of Winds and the Theatre of Dionysus at Athens, the lanceolate Egyptian leaves were given a more plastic form and a Greek acanthus ring was added. This is just as we find it in our example at the Huldeh Gate. For both the Egyptian forms and the proto-Corinthian ones see Durm, "Baukunst der Griechen", pp.346f and illn. 331. In addition Renan pointed out that the shape of the capital is very similar to that found in temples of the late Ptolemaic and Roman periods in Egypt at Edfu, Philae and Esneh (Mission de Phenicie, pp. 797-9 and pl.XLI). Once again one feels the influence of Alexandrian forms in Palestine at the late Hellenistic period; these lanceolate leaves are similar in conception and execution to those already noted in the Hauran, at Araq el-Emir, on the Monument of Absalom and at the Tomb of Helena - and of course at Alexandria ad Aegyptum. Watzinger gives it as his opinion that not only is this

monolithic column "... in späthellenistischer oder augustischer Zeit allein denkbar..", but so too are the simple profiles of pilaster-capitals within the gate (Lesbian cyma, quarter-round, cavetto).

The form of the vestibule is of four arches rising from the central monolithic column, and these have four flat cupolas with pendentives. De Vogue saw the stucco relief decor of one of these cupolas. Around a circular centre-panel are strips adorned with the Near Eastern rope, Jewish trefoil and ubiquitous rosette and Greek scroll. Within this panel is an arrangement of eight small, lozenge-shaped panels between which spreads a vine with leaf and grapes. Right at the centre is an inner circle enclosed by a volute-ring and more rosettes. Outside all this there remain the spandrels with fluting in a triangular frame. Circles and squares, lozenges, rosettes and scrolls are all found in late Hellenistic mosaics; while trefoils, rosettes and vine with grapes have already been often described among the remains of Herodian funereal art. Moreover the cupola on a square base and with pendentives we have already seen imitated in the rock cut architecture of late Hellenistic Alexandrian tombs (Delbrueck, "Hellenistische Bauten in Latium", Vol. II, p.78), and a flat cupola is found in tombs in the Hinnom Valley at Jerusalem. There is then nothing to prevent us from regarding the cupolas and their decoration (still, as I say, only imperfectly known) as Herodian.

Two more finds of interest were made in 1871 by Clermont-Ganneau and in 1935 by J. H. Iliffe. These are a perfect and a fragmentary text of the inscription mentioned by Josephus, which warned strangers under threat of death to stay outside the Inner Temple.

The text and translation are as follows:

> Μηθένα ἀλλογενῆ εἰσπορεύεσθαι ἐντὸς τοῦ περὶ τὸ ἱερὸν τρυφάκτου καὶ περιβόλου. Ὃς δ'ἂν ληφθῇ ἑαυτῷ ἄιτιος ἔσται διὰ τὸ ἐξακολουθεῖν θάνατον.
>
> "Let no Gentile venture within the barrier and wall of the Sanctuary. Whosoever is taken shall himself be responsible for the death penalty which follows."

Such are the scant remains of this ambitious precinct.

SOME THEORIES:

But determined enquiries have not stopped short here; de Vogue, Watzinger and Vincent have pressed forward with their own theories of reconstruction.

De Vogue: I reproduce his restorations of the whole ground-plan and elevation of the precinct (figs. 444-445).

It seems worth adding that he regarded the dipteral porticoes of the Outer Court - briefly mentioned by Josephus - as belonging to the Doric order (apart from the Porch of Solomon). His reason for this is that he found incorporated in the later substructures preceding the Triple Gate (E. Huldeh Gate) part of a Doric frieze and architrave cut in a great monolith.

Watzinger and Vincent:

Both interpret the phrase at the end of Ant.XV,413 to signify Attic bases (i.e. the double moulding refers to a double torus, and implies the normal Attic base). We have seen that Attic bases are found in Herodian tombs. This interpretation seems a likely one (see DP, p.40 and JAT, p.444, fig. 137). There is also no dispute that the extra height of the Royal Basilica was achieved by a superimposed order over the wide centre aisle. Whether the aisles were flat-roofed or the centre gabled and the sides sloping (as Vincent; my fig.449) is a matter of conjecture upon which we have no evidence.

Neither Josephus or Middoth givesus any idea of how the facade of the Sanctuary was decorated. Reconstructions arise only from the experience and judgement of the scholars who have attempted them. We may look at four:

1) de Vogue restores a facade decorated with superimposed Greek orders. His reconstruction is based on the Nabataean temple which he had explored at Sia in the Jebel Druze ("La Syrie Centrale..", pl.IIf.). This reconstruction is seen on my fig.445.

2) Smith, after noting the strange lintel of oak and stone in alternation, adds (p.505):

"Such a detail warns us against attributing to the architecture of the House that Grecian style which many are tempted to give it because of the Corinthian pillars of the outer cloisters and the Grecian qualities of Herod's military architecture. It was one thing to plan cloisters for the court of the Gentiles, or revetments at the base of fortresses, but quite another to replace an ancient

Jewish Temple. While the Temple of Herod was much more lofty than that of Zerubbabel, jealous care would be exercised to model it on the same lines, and priests alone effected its construction. We may conceive of the style either as Babylonian, the builders of the Second Temple having come from long residence in Babylon, or as perpetuating the Phoenician and Egyptian traits which distinguished the Temple of Solomon. Neither Herod nor his generation were likely to feel incongruous the conjunction of several styles of building on the same area. And this is why all modern reconstructions of the work, except the outer cloisters, must be more or less fanciful".
3) Watzinger (DP, pp.42-45) suggests that because the porticoes and basilica of the Outer Court are Greek in form the Sanctuary itself should be restored with engaged Corinthian columns and a Greek pediment. Like de Vogue he turns to Nabataean architecture to furnish possible local and contemporary parallels - in this case to Petra, not Sia. He suggests that the door-frame and gable of his fig.28 (my fig.451) are justified by Tomb-facades at Petra; the attic and flat roof above by the Qasr Firaun. (".. mit dem orientalischen Kernbau eine griechisch gestaltete Schale."). The flat roof is, of course, not Greek. My figs. 451 and 452 show Watzinger's reconstruction of the ground-plan and elevation of the Sanctuary.
4) Vincent (JAT, pp.457-466) offers a more oriental restoration. A comparison of the two reconstructions by Watzinger and Vincent will show that <u>all</u> of the decor is simply a matter of guesswork. Vincent puts in windows and conceives of the roof as having a low gable, partly hidden by the wall-coping, to which he assigns crenellations. His drawing (fig. 143, p.400; my fig. 448) employs a cavetto

over the outer entry, Greek T-frame and pediment over the inner one. My figs. 446 and 447 show Vincent's reconstructions of the ground-plan of the Temple; fig.447 is based solely on Mishnah Middoth.

It cannot be overemphasised that these reconstructions - fascinating exercises though they are - are highly personal creations by their authors, and not at all likely to present us with a true and correct picture. We cannot know what sort of pressures or stylistic requirements were at work here.

CONCLUSIONS

It is clear that Greek forms have made some type of impact even upon so conservative a structure as the Jewish temple. For Herod was able to follow contemporary tastes in the style of masonry which he used, in his employment of Greek columns in the gateways and outer and inner porticoes, in the use of Greek door-frame mouldings at least in the outer gates (cyma and plate-bande). In one case indeed we have more than the impact of a form; for the portico embodies part of the Greek way of life and its very existence within the Outer Courts shows the successful penetration of Greek mores as well as Greek orders. However it is also clear that the Temple - that is the Inner Temple - was in its conception and plan totally Jewish, embodying older prescriptions and clear-cut areas of increasing sanctity. We have nothing to do here with the familiar Greek pronaos, naos and opisthodomos; not even with a distyle in antis portico, such as we have found in some tombs at Jerusalem; and not with any type of peristyle arrangement. The Sanctuary itself harks back in its arrangement of ulam, hekal and debir (porch, holy place, holy of holies) to the Temple of Solomon; it even has - according to Middoth - the same arrangement of 38 chambers within it. Herod made it higher and widened the porch. Whether its decor was contemporary or traditional we cannot know: Josephus says nothing of this. The outer arrangement of a succession of courts within each other is well-known as an ancient Semitic plan, reflected at this time also at Baalbek and Palmyra; a succession of courts with chambers all around them is also found at Dura-Europos. Vincent makes the point that the very tall outer entrance to the Sanctuary itself is in a Mesopotamian

tradition (Strabo, XVI, 1, 5; Epic of Gilgamesh, see JAT, p.461 and note 6). The cult furniture (Altar of Incense, Table of Shewbread, Menorah) and the Babylonian veil go back to the Temple of Zerubbabel, as does the name of the East outer gate in Middoth (Susa Gate).

As for details we know that there were Corinthian capitals and probably Attic bases employed for the columns of the Royal Basilica, though we do not know the form of the ornament carved upon its wooden ceilings. Perhaps de Vogue is right in assuming that others of the porticoes were Doric with triglyph and metope friezes. But of what actually remains we cannot fail to be impressed by the regular drafted courses of masonry. Such courses were used by the Greeks for instance in the Hellenistic ramparts of Perge in Pamphylia (see the fine photos in R. Martin, "Monde grec", 1966, Fribourg, pp.33 and 36). And drafted courses with smooth faces were imitated in the 'Incrustration' style of painted stucco, moulded to look like marble revetment blocks in the Hellenistic period at Delos, Alexandria and Popeii. The influence of this type of dressing and regular coursing is also found in the Temple of Eshmun at Sidon, which is still being excavated by the Lebanese Department of Antiquities; and at Araq el-Emir, with its megalithic inheritance from Phoenician architecture. The very large and heavy corner-stone at the S.E. angle of the master-course of the outer Wall of the Temple is in an old Palestinian trandition - see Job 38,6 - which had passed into a figure of speech by the N.T. period (Matth.21, v.42). Small stones with a draft and rusticated face also go back to an older Israelite tradition; more have recently

been discovered at Ramat Rahel, just outside Jerusalem. Imitation of drafted stones in regular courses with a smooth face is also found in the Herodian period at Jerusalem in the tomb Mugharet el-Amed; and in Samaria at Deir ed-Derb.

# THE FORTIFIED PALACE ANTONIA

BIBLIOGRAPHY:

Archaeological work is reported by Vincent in RB, 1933 pp.83-113 and RB, 1937, pp. 563-570. Note that the bibliography of Loeb Josephus, Vol. VIII, Apendix D is wrong in giving RB, 1954, pp. 87-107 by Vincent as the result of further excavations; this last is an article concerned with the literary sources. Simons also devotes some space to the Antonia, but only to literary and topographic problems, not the excavations (see pp. 325-8, 374-81, 413-7, 429-35). The doctoral thesis "La Forteresse Antonia a Jerusalem et la Question du Pretoire" (Soeur Marie Aline, Franciscan Press, Jerusalem, 1955; henceforth FAJ) is a thorough examination of literary and archaeological evidence to that date. The archaeological material discussed includes the cisterns, tracing of the general form and plan, the water system and some other features with which I am not concerned except insofar as they establish the nature of the site. But many of the drawings and photos are relevant to this study, together with pp.40, 89-94, 95-106, 107-118, 154-172.

JOSEPHUS, War, V, 238-246

Josephus locates the Antonia at the angle where the West and North porticoes of the Outer Court of the Temple of Herod meet - on a precipitous Mount which was covered with smooth flags. The interior was fitted out as a palace - with cloisters, baths, courts and rooms of every type. The palace-fortress was 40 cubits high, fortified by towers at each angle, and surrounded by a wall. The highest angle tower (at the S.E.) dominated the Temple.

Comment: the problem as to how near the Temple enclosure it was is controversial, and does not concern us here. But see Simons pp. 414-417.

MATERIAL REMAINS

The site now identified as that of the Antonia was acquired by the Order of Zion in the 19thc. During its clearance in 1874 it was visited by de Saulcy, who advised the preservation of a rock wall 3m high, which was surmounted by two Herodian courses (FAJ, pl.12,2). A large pedestal was also preserved in situ (FAJ, pl.32 bottom right). From 1931-1937 excavations were pursued by Mere Godeleine under the guidance of Pere Vincent - the great court was excavated, and the 'salle du silo'. Later work also located the fortified entry to the palace. The hypaethral court was found to have been surrounded by a peristyle on tall pedestals, whose main element was a sort of swollen torus (FAJ, pl.34 plan). The fortified gate was partly located through its approach of striated flags (left of the court on pl.34); nearbye a column-drum, pedestal and Corinthian capital were found (Savignac, RH, 1907, pp. 122f; FAJ, pl. 59, 3 and my fig 462) - all belonging to an engaged order. A large court was cleared and found to be paved with stones which were marked by the rough sketches used in well-known Roman games (lusoriae tabulae, FAJ, pp. 119-142). Above the rock-wall of the fortified gate Herodian masonry of the type with rusticated face was identified (pl. 12, 2) as well as among the debris (1.24) and elsewhere on the site (pl.31,2). Both headers and stretchers were found. At Antonia (and also in the Upper Palace of Herod at Jerusalem, and at the fortress Alexandreion) two different forms of masonry-dressing were

found - one type left as a crude boss within the drafts, the other neatly dressed back and its face picked out. Of course neither is to be compared with the finish of the smooth Temple stones. The capital mentioned above is of the same type as those from the Tomb of Helena, though much more badly worn (my figs. 459 and 462). Remains showed that columns had been both monolithic and made up of drums. Some of the bases were like the Attic, but more broken up with the mouldings above the scotia well cut back (my figs. 454, 459). In some cases the base is cut from a single block together with the pedestal. As these are the only certain Herodian pedestals that we have they are of considerable interest: the various types are shown on my figs. 455-456 and 460-461. All have the element mentioned above of the large convex: type II especially is like the pedestals of the Temple of Kore at Sebaste.

The same type of pedestal recurs later in the Galilean synagogues. For the comparative pedestals see my figs. 457, 458, 463.

CONCLUSIONS

Here, as in the other palace-fortresses of Herod, the style of the decor which survives is frankly Greek, scant though the traces are - once more we find that the Corinthian order was used, and the great peristyle of the open court was rendered more impressive by its large pedestals. As to the baths Josephus mentions, we must judge them by the Herodian baths that we shall find elsewhere. Watzinger also describes the massiveness and the use of great, squared stone which give the fortress its impressive bulk as characteristic features of the late Hellenistic fortress (DP, p.33).

THE UPPER PALACE

No excavations have been carried out on the site of the Upper Palace except at the tower of Phasael, which is known today as the Tower of David. Excavations by Johns here found Herodian levels (C.N. Johns, QDAP, 1950, pp. 121-190). In this vicinity the rusticated Herodian masonry is known at the Tower of David, under the Frere's College at the probable site of the Herodian Tower Psephinus (PAM records) and in the Upper Palace wall (Vincent, JAT, Vol.I, pl.LVIII, 2 and LIX, 2; Johns, PEQ, 1940, pls. V, 2 and VI.2).

But in dealing with the Upper palace we are largely concerned with Josephus, War, V, 176-183 and with the preceding description of the towers (ibid. 156-176) and First and Second North Walls of the city (ibid. 142-146). For in fact the walls of this second fortified palace of Herod at Jerusalem were on two sides also the walls of the city; but on the South and East they were newly constructed for the palace. Of the palace itself Josephus says that it baffled all his attempts to describe it, and that it was impossible to present it adequately to the reader. The enclosing wall was broken by ornamental towers. The interior of the palace held large banqueting-halls, bed-chambers for a hundred guests and a host of apartments. The ceilings were beautifully decorated, and all sorts of fine stones were used. Moreover

> "All around were many circular cloisters, leading one into another, the columns in each being different, and their open courts all of greensward; there were groves of various trees intersected by long walks, which were bordered by deep canals, and ponds

> everywhere studded with bronze figures, through which the water was discharged, and around the streams were numerous cotes for tame pigeons." (Loeb, ibid. 180-182).

The North side of this fortress cum palace was protected by the three great towers which formed part of the defences of the First North wall of the city - the towers Hippicus, Phasael and Mariamme.

1. Hippicus was solid for 30 cubits of its height. Above this was a reservoir 20 cubits deep. And above the reservoir were a double-roofed chamber and the turrets and ramparts.

2. Phasael was larger, and solid for 40 cubits of its height. The upper structure of the tower, set back from the edges of the lower part, was encircled by a cloister protected by bulwarks. This part had sumptuous apartments, including baths. Battlements crowned the tower.

3. Mariamme was the smallest, and was solid only to a height of 20 cubits. But the decoration and luxury of its upper living quarters surpassed that of the others.

CONCLUSIONS

In the absence of details and of remains little can be said. We should note however that once more cloisters and baths are mentioned. In the palace and in the great towers Herod is concerned for luxury and magnificence, as well as strength. The picture of ponds and walks and cloisters is one of very adequate provision. In the light of the detailed observations that we can make from the remains on Masada and Herodium there is no reason to doubt that Greek orders and decor were used lavishly.

THEATRE, AMPHITHEATRE, HIPPODROME

Ant., XV, 268-276 mentions, as a feature of Herod's departure from native customs - a departure which aroused great resentment - that he built a theatre in Jerusalem, and after that an amphitheatre in the plain. Athletic and musical contests, horse and chariot races, and wild beast fights were held.

Ant., XVII, 255 a hippodrome is mentioned. This is possibly the amphitheatre under a different name.

No remains have been found of the amphitheatre or hippodrome. But C. Schick published in the PEQ, 1887, pp. 161-166 an article erroneously entitled "Herod's amphitheatre, Jerusalem", which possibly indicates the site of the theatre of Herod. The only information given is that there was a semicircle of steps or seats with flights of steps cut in them. There is no evidence for the date.

Even in the absence of remains we know of course that these buildings, entirely foreign to the land, were Greek in style.

# HERODIAN JERICHO

## JOSEPHUS

The structures at Jericho are mentioned by Josephus as follows:

War, I, 417. Above Jericho King Herod built a fortress - named Kypros after his mother. (the parallel passage, Ant., XVI, 143, adds that it was most pleasant to stay in).

War, II,484. During the First Revolt (AD 66-73) the Jewish forces took Kypros, and levelled its defences.

War, I, 407. At Jericho between the former (Hasmonaean) palace and the fortress Kypros King Herod had new buildings constructed, which were commodiously appointed for guests. He named them after Augustus and Agrippa.

War, II, 57. But after Herod's death in 4BC the succession of Archelaus to Judaea was disputed. The Royal Palace at Jericho was burnt during the unrest.
Ant., XVII, 274. Archelaus built the palace again in fine style during his brief rule (4BC-AD6).

War, I, 659 and 666; Ant. XVII, 161, 175, 194. A hippodrome and an amphitheatre at Jericho are mentioned. Both here and at Jerusalem this may simply be a confusion of terms for the same structure.

War, IV,451-475. This is an account of the fertility of Jericho and its warm climate when the hill

districts are suffering the snows of winter. But Jericho is sweltering when Jerusalem enjoys its summer heat. It is obvious then that the structures built by Herod at Jericho were a winter resort; in fact scholars often refer to the 'Winter Palace'.

ARCHAEOLOGY

This information has proved a spur to archaeological investigation. A brief notice is given in the third volume of the Survey of Western Palestine (Memoirs, Judaea, pp. 224-226; PEF, London, 1883, Capts. C.R. Conder and H.H. Kitchener) of two mounds ("Telluh Abu el- 'Aleik") and opus reticulatum structures. Then in the nineteen twenties Watzinger excavated here (at the outlet of the Wadi Qelt into the plain); he mentions the opus reticulatum, stucco from walls, and columns with fluted stucco attached to them (DP, pp. 53-54). The ruins of the fortress Kypros have also been located on an isolated peak South of the Wadi Qelt.

However it is the American School of Oriental Research at Jerusalem which has explored Tulul Abu el-Alayiq with modern excavation techniques. This was achieved between 1950 and 1954, and published in their annuals:

J.L. Kelso and D.C. Baramki, Vols. XXIX-XXX, AASOR, 1955: "Excavations at New Testament Jericho and Khirbet en-Nitla".

J.M. Pritchard, Vols. XXXII-XXXIII, AASOR, 1958: "The Excavations at Herodian Jericho".

Kelso and Baramki:

Tell 1 (on the South bank of the wadi) was found to be associated with terraced structures leading down towards the wadi bed. The structures were as follows:

1. A large structure covered the tell itself, but looting and previous excavations meant that the ground-plan of this was impossible to recover. However it was linked with the other structures by its Herodian pottery, opus reticulatum and opus quadratum work, painted stucco and stucco mouldings. There were also terra-cotta revetment panels and crestings. It was oriented to the wadi, and a stepped way descended from it to the buildings lower down.

2. Before this on the same site had existed an ashlar building. On the S.W. of the tell a burnt level separated the two this burnt level contained Herodian pottery. The ground-plan could not be recovered. For the Herodian ashlars see my fig. 466.

3. Before the ashlar building on the same site had existed a square Hellenistic tower, which formed the core of the tell. This was made of large, roughly cut stones in a clayey mortar, and was buttressed on the side facing the wadi. The interior was circular, divided into nine rooms and two stories, which were separated by a bonding course of wooden beams (as later recommended by Vitruvius, "De Architectura", 1, 5, 3).

The remaining structures were not on the tell itself. In the volume by Kelso and Baramki pl.33 (my fig.464) gives the location of the complex as a whole, with its relation to the wadi and hills. Pl.38 (my fig.465) shows the North part of the Hellenistic tower on the tell (top left) and the relationships of all the other structures - with the

chambers lettered A to G - to the tell and the stepped descent. These structures are of the same period as the opus reticulatum on the tell (not the fortress or the ashlar building) and are all likewise made in the opus reticulatum technique.

4. The stepped way from the top of the tell down to the lower structures is carried on vaults and ends in a stairwell (B on fig. 465).

5. West of the stairwell was a barrel-vaulted building finished with opus reticulatum on the interior and on the exterior down to ground level. In the main front (N. wall) was a doorway with opus quadratum pilasters carrying a decorative arch; also a rectangular niche. (A on fig. 465).

6. In front of the stairwell and the barrel-vaulted building are concrete (good grade mortar used like concrete) footings and opus reticulatum ruins together with painted and moulded plaster (pls. 19, 20 in Kelso), concrete columns covered with fluted stucco, and reed-lathes. The excavators suggest that this was"a pleasant, shady pergola".

7. A is at the East end of the long decorative facade with a large stepped exedra at its centre. Another barrel-vaulted building matches A at the West end of this facade (D on fig.465). Findings further West are uncertain (ibid., p.15). The lower sections of two pilasters - "concrete" with opus quadratum facing - flanking the entry were still in situ; and there was a niche corresponding to that in A.

8. The space between A and D is a long frontage which is at once a decorative facade and the wall separating an upper terrace of gardens to the South (i.e. behind the facade and away from the wadi towards the tell) and a sunken area to the North (i.e. towards the wadi and in front of the facade). This occupies a large part of the plan on my fig. 465; its elevation is drawn on Kelso's pls. 39, 39A, 39B; (centre my fig. 465A) parts of it are photographed on Kelso's pls. 6,7, 8 (my figs. 467-468). The form of this wall or facade is that of a central exedra and 25 small niches on each side in the long arms. The small niches are alternately rectangular and semi-circular, but for the two rectangular niches just to the sides of the exedra. Of these the nearer ones of each pair are shallow, forming a transition between shallow panels in the exedra itself and the deeper niches of the wall. The semicircular niches terminate in a half-dome, the rectangular ones in a flat soffit. Above the niches was a high cornice, but its details are missing. Kelso's pl.7 (West end) shows the best preserved of the niches. Between the niches are colonnette units.

9. Below and in front of the niches and exedra ran a narrow water-basin (ibid. pl.8; my fig. 467).

10. The exedra is stepped (like a theatre) and has a stepped way cut in at the centre, from which the cut-stone treads are missing (my fig.467). It has a very low, panelled wall - continuing the niches of the facade - and behind this the steps or terraces, interpreted as terraced gardens because of the flower-pots found in their earch. In front of the panelled wall are only a low opus reticulatum wall, a flat bench and the water-basin. The

panelled wall has nine shallow recessed panels on each side of the central steps (my figs. 465, 465A, 467). The excavators suggest that these panels were finished in mosaic, since green(glass), blue (paste) and grey and white (stone) tesserae were found among the debris of the exedra. Other tesserae were found along the niches of the facade wall. Behind three of the benches of the terraces flower-pots were found in situ.

11. The 50 niches, and the central terraced exedra-garden form the South side of a sunken garden. The North side ran along the very bank of the wadi, but is totally destroyed apart from some foundations. The South section of the West wall was still in situ (my fig. 468). This and the East wall were low retaining walls with unfaced 'concrete' on the exterior (which was underground). On the interior was opus reticulatum and a massive, overhanging cavetto cornice (my fig.468).

12. Opposite the tell, on the North bank of the wadi are the ruins of more opus reticulatum structures with identical masonry and plaster as those already described, and with the same Herodian pottery.

13. Excavations at the tell on the North side of the Wadi Qelt were much less conclusive (ibid. paras. 24-27). One chamber was uncovered with its walls covered in plaster which was painted to imitate cloudy veining in marble, a style reminiscent of Pompeii. It is very reminiscent of the North palace at Masada on its lowest terrace. But for some reason - which he does not explain - Kelso suggests that it is not earlier than the second century AD (see ibid. paras. 27 and 202; my fig. 473).

Such were the structures investigated and described in the final report. The earliest pottery was late Hellenistic and Herodian; the coin finds are not particularly helpful, since their stratification is not given, and there were only a few. In detail the pottery includes much of the well-dated and well-known Herodian ware - cooking-pots, globular juglets, pilgrim flasks etc. - with one late Hellenistic lamp (pl.14, 6) and one Herodian one (pl.14,4). But the most decisive element for dating - in the absence of a clear treatment of the levels - is the use of the opus reticulatum technique with some elements in opus quadratum, and the use of a sort of mortar as though it were cement, i.e. by those used to the technique of cementing stones together. This is the only large group of opus reticulatum structures found East of Italy, and the details of the construction date it quite definitely, according to the experts, to the Augustan period. This technique was not used again till the time of Hadrian, when it has different characteristics.

Kelso, pl.4 top centre shows the make-up of concrete and rubble in the opus reticulatum walls. The method of construction is the same as that employed in Italy (p.42, para. 185). Columns and colonnettes were made up of small stone blocks, cut as the quadrants of a cylinder, and bonded to a solid concrete core. But columns (not colonnettes) always had a solid drum at the base. The forms in the long facade wall were those of engaged colonnettes attached to piers (para 192). Colonnettes were finished at the site with a thin coat of smooth plaster; but the columns had a heavy coat of fluted plaster (as already noted by Watzinger). The great decorative arch on the pilasters of room A (pl.5) was

of 'concrete' bonding faced with stones which were cut in the traditional shape of voussoirs. Such were the techniques used with the masonry of wall, column and arch. In the opinion of the excavators - and it could hardly be otherwise - "Roman architects and Roman builders were definitely in charge of this work" (p.5).

Terra-cotta revetment panels and crestings (ibid. pl.18; my fig. 469) came from the opus reticulatum building on tell 1. These have the moulded shapes of Greek dentils and various stylisations and sizes of the palmette. From some of the larger palmettes runs a fairly free-curving tendril with pomegranates growing from it (espy. frags. 175, 176). Other fragments had simply Greek profiles or the egg-and-dart (my fig.472). These are not terra-cotta, but pieces of moulded plaster found in tell 1 and the building at the foot of the stepped descent (A). Plate 20 top (my fig. 470) is the finest specimen, and was from the latter. The drawings on pl. 20A (my fig. 470A) show that cavetto, cyma and torus profiles were used. Other plaster fragments were not moulded, but were painted with solid colours (commonly red or yellow) and borders of various Greek motifs - lotus, palmette, scroll, egg. There are no landscape designs, no figures, human or animal. Like all Jewish art from this time and locale so far examined the interest is in geometric and plant forms. It is also significant that small fragments of plaster painted with an imitation of a sort of cloudy veining known in some types of marble were found here(my fig.471 frags.P53, P69). This is like the well-preserved painted plaster of

the room on the North tell (tell 2; my fig. 473). And we shall find more elsewhere.

From the very brief notices of Josephus concerning the palaces built by King Herod and then by Archelaus it is impossible to tell whether these opus reticulatum remains were the work of father or son; both knew Rome well from personal visits. The important indications seem to me to be that Herodian stones (fig.466) with smooth drafts and rough-picked face (of the type we have already noticed at Jerusalem) were found beneath a burnt level upon which sat the opus reticulatum; and that Josephus mentions the destruction of Herod's palace by looters in 4BC. In this case the ashlar building on the tell is to be associated with the King, the opus reticulatum with his son. In any case, since Archelaus ruled only from 4BC-AD6 the issue is an insignificant one.

Pritchard:

Pritchard's excavations were conducted at the location of a large building just to the West of tell 1 (Pritchard, pl.66 shows the relationship of this large building with Kelso's long facade). The remains consisted of chambers around a large court and a smaller, colonnaded court, with more chambers (my fig.474, on which the rooms are numbered). Like the ashlar building on the tell itself this structure was built of rusticated Herodian masonry. All that remained in place of this masonry was one course on the foundations for pedestals in the small court (room 33; pl. 12,2,pl.13, pl.14,1), part of the first course of the large court (pl.14,3), and a stone in the South wall of room 16 (pl.3,1). Of the rooms round

two sides of the large court some still had remnants of plaster (e.g. room 3 - a dark grey plaster on the walls). Room 10 was a rectangular cistern (ibid. pl.5,1). Room 15 was a rectangular bath with six steps leading down to the bottom. Just on the surface of the first step was found a coin of Archelaus. Room 9 was another rectangular, plastered, stepped bath with six steps leading to the bottom. The pottery of the lowest metre of debris was homogeneous Herodian ware. Also found here were fragments of blue, red and yellow painted plaster from walls or ceiling. Rooms 17 and 18 had mosaic floors of white tesserae, bordered with a rectangle of blue-black ones (my fig.475). Most interesting is the hypocaust (room 19; my fig. 476) with its stoking-room (room 20). The floor-system used for the circulation of hot air in this caldarium was that of an upper level with a mozaic upon large flags; the system of suspensurae (Vitruvius, 5,10) below this was underfloor 'columns' made up of superimposed ceramic discs (pl. 9, 4 shows that at least nine were set on one another at each support) topped by small ceramic flags. These colonnettes themselves rested on a lower flooring level of 72 ceramic flags. Twenty-one baskets of tesserae coloured white, black and red were gathered here; pl.11 shows fragments set in plaster of several layers with the Greek scroll pattern and a less common geometric design (my figs. 477, 478).

Chambers 1 to 19 are around two sides of the large court. Within the court were the foundations for a colonnade. Column-drums were found in the S.W. angle of the court. Two crude examples of Ionic capitals also came from the general area of the court (pl.18,3,4 and my figs. 479A, 479B; the other is similar). Of the 13 drums one showed traces of fluting in its plaster (see pl. 16, 1, 2; my fig. 480). Also about 30 smaller fragments were found in various places; some had unfluted white plaster with traces of red paint on it.

An entry from the large court gave direct access to the small one, which was surrounded by chambers that were only partly investigated. Only the foundations of the outer wall of the court remain (pl. 12,1,2; 13,1) with sills and door-jambs on the East and South - the former connecting with the large court. Of the colonnade there survive the foundation wall on three sides, the stones of one course of Herodian rusticated ashlar set on this, and pedestal bases. Pritchard's pl.13 (my fig. 481) shows the two best preserved pedestals; the photos show that these have a cavetto base and also a cavetto cornice with abacus. They are very different in form and profiles from those at the Antonia in Jerusalem. Nos.1,2, 5,6 are drawn ibid. p.8. Two fairly well preserved Corinthian pilaster capitals were found in the West part of the building (from the original structure, but re-used in late alterations) and 13 fragments of Corinthian capitals were found elsewhere, mostly around rooms 13 and 29. Pl.18, 1 and 2 shows the best preserved of the pilaster capitals; the acanthus is of the same type as that found at Masada; it is not a single row, as

Pritchard suggests, but a compressed version of the double row in a pre-Vitruvian manner(my figs. 482,483). Three fragments bear traces of red, blue and gold paint.

35 blocks or fragments of cornices of various sizes were found in the area. The mouldings were dentils and egg-and dart (pl.16, 1: and my figs. 484-487). Fragments of Greek entablature mouldings were also numerous, though no detailed description or drawings are published (my fig. 488). Fragments of carved rosettes of various sizes were found (my fig. 489). Nothing is published of the 32 fragments of column bases which were discovered. Finally one more capital fragment is illustrated (my fig. 490).

But if there is something lacking in the publication of the architectural decor, the pottery receives very full treatment. The Herodian wares (pp. 21-23; pls. 38-49, 58-59) consist of storage jars, bowls, globular juglets, cooking pots of Kahane's types A and B, Herodian lamps (36, mostly fragmentary), pilgrim bottles (lentoid flasks with twisted handles). There were also a few fragments of Pergamene sigillata. The bulk of the coins is from King Herod (14) and Archelaus (24) with a few more up to AD 70 (9); also a few Hasmonaean and late coins. As already noted, the lowest levels of pottery from the bath (room 9) and reservoir (room 10) and the other bath (room 15) were properly stratified Herodian wares. And on the first step of room 15 was a coin of Archelaus.

There seems to me nothing against identifying this building as one of those constructed by Herod between the earlier palace and Kypros (War, I, 407). It had an Ionic and a Corinthian colonnade, rooms with plastered and painted walls and ceilings, mozaics and hot and cold baths.

We shall see that all of these features recur on other Herodian sites. The building was used up to AD 70 at least. It is similar in plan to the Palazzo delle Colonne at Ptolemais in Cyrenaica, which also had a great central court and a colonnaded hall opening into this with rooms disposed on four sides. The large cache of unguentaria suggests the luxury which Herod was accustomed to dispense.

Concluding remarks about Jericho, Sebaste, Masada, Herodion and Caesarea will be presented below, as a whole.

# SEBASTE in Samaria

## JOSEPHUS

Samaria, ancient capital of Omri, was re-founded by Alexander the Great or one of his generals and colonised by Macedonians. Two centuries later, when the effete Seleucid power was faced by a revival of Jewish military strength under the Hasmonaean princes, John Hyrcanus overwhelmed the city (between 111 and 107). Henceforth hostile to the Hasmonaeans, the inhabitants supplied Herod with provisions (Ant., XIV, 408) and joined him against Antigonus (XIV, 411). Herod was able to deposit his family there for safe-keeping when Masada was threatened (XIV, 413) and he married Mariamme there (XIV, 467). After the death of Antony Augustus gave Samaria to Herod together with some cities of the Palestinian coast and of the Decapolis. (War, I, 396; Ant. XV, 217). In honour of Augustus Herod re-founded it 'Sebaste', the Greek equivalent of 'Augusta', re-fortified it and re-colonised it.

The following information about the city is especially relevant to us:

War, I, 165: Gabinius, governor of the new Roman province of Syria from 57 to 55, rebuilt the cities laid in ruins by the Hasmonaeans including Samaria and encouraged re-settlement there.

War, I, 403: King Herod built walls around Samaria, settled 6,000 colonists on fertile land, and gave them a privileged constitution.

Ant. 292-293, 296-298: King Herod re-founded Samaria, a secure refuge only a day from Jerusalem, as 'Sabaste'. He settled non-Jewish elements there, and gave the foundation prosperous lands round about. The city was enclosed in a strong wall over two miles in circumference. Within it he erected a fine temple in its own consecrated precinct, and he adorned various parts of the city in a variety of ways.

In the disturbances following Herod's death the city took no part; accordingly it was spared by Varus (XVII,289). Sabaste was given to Agrippa I by Claudius (Ant.XIX,274,351) when for the first time since Herod's death his former realms were re-united.

REMAINS

Samaria was excavated by an expedition from Harvard University under Reisner, Fisher and Lyon, which published to volumes entitled "The Harvard Excavations at Samaria" (Cambridge, Massachussetts, 1924). Unfortunately knowledge of pottery was inadequate at that time, and dating was made problematic by the fact successive structures on one location were taken down to bedrock repeatedly. Many serious errors in dating have to be corrected by the work of the later Joint Expedition. This later expedition was still handicapped (1931-1935) by similar problems; for instance, close dating of Roman pottery was not possible at that time. Harvard, the British School, the PEF and the Hebrew University all combined in this second effort; the buildings were published in 1942 by Crowfoot, Kenyon and Sukenik ("The Buildings of Samaria - Reports of the Work in 1931-1933 and 1935 at Samaria-Sebaste, No.1", PEF, London; henceforth SS). In

addition Watzinger analyses some of the results of the Reisner-Fisher expedition in DP, Vol.II, pp.25-27 (Gabinian houses) and pp. 48-53 (Herodian structures).

Some of the remains from the Hellenistic period before Herod are of interest, since they provide a key to influences at work in Herodian techniques and styles of building. For instance the early (late 4thcBC) Hellenistic round-towers must be mentioned. These are Greek in conception and style, comparing with the Redoubt and West Wall at Dura-Europos, and to round towers at Tyndaris, Eleusis, Phyle and the Piraeus (see G. Saflund, Opuscula Archaeologica, I, 1935, p.99 and figs. 10,11,13 16). They show the grip of the Macedonian colonists. They are also the forerunners of round towers in Herod's wall. Remains from the Gabinian period are also of interest. Two houses (Reisner's 4A and 7C; Watzinger figs. 37,38) have well-preserved foundations and walls which indicate a central court and rooms on three sides. House 7C also has an upper storey reached by a stone stairway. Column-shafts and Doric and Ionic capitals from the same levels indicate that the courts had colonnades around them. In house 4A the middle chamber on the South opens like an exedra onto a henostyle in-antis arrangement in the court. This henostyle arrangement is also found in the Hasmonaean tomb of Jason at Jerusalem (supra II, ii, 1,2,5). The arrangement of an exedra-like chamber with its frontage on a colonnaded court is typical of houses in the 2ndcBC at Delos (DP, p.27). Other interesting details from the Harvard Excavations of 1908-1910 are recorded HE, pp.145, 184-185. One house was

built with the masonry covered by a rough grey plaster and then stucco; the stucco was used to cover columns and details as well as the walls, as we frequently find also in Herodian work. Moreover the stucco was painted in red, white, purple or yellow panels, or with speckled and lined effects to represent marble and stone. At the 'Atrium House' stucco fluting was still retained on two half-columns at the angle of the court - flutes with sharp arrises ran right to the floor without any base. Obviously this was a Doric order. The walls of the court and all interior walls were stuccoed and then panelled and painted in white, black, red, green, purple and yellow (ibid. fig.101). Some details from pre-Herodian Samaria match those at Dora (Bulletin 6 of Brt. Sch. Archy., 1924, pp.65-73, "Tanturah (Dora) - the Site and Excavations"). Anta capitals at Samaria have a steep echinus, like the Doric capitals of the columns at Dora. Both at Dora and at Samaria an Ionic capital was used which had no volutes, but was adorned with astragals and egg-and-dart (DP,p.28). At Dora these were set on unfluted shafts and had Attic bases on plinths (DP, fig.2). These capitals once more demonstrate the freedom of the forms used in the late Hellenistic period in Palestine.

It is uncertain whether the stadium at Samaria dates from just after the efforts of Gabinius or from the time of Herod himself. The form is that of a regular Greek arena - the same length as the one at Miletus - with the colonnades of a rectangular walled peristyle enclosure around it. Fragments of the colonnade were found in situ - three columns at the S.W. angle (SS, pl.XLVIII, 1,2) and an angle pier with half-columns attached at the S.E.

(my fig.491). No entablature was found. The shafts had no bases; one normal Doric capital and two less regular ones were discovered. The rear wall of the portico was found on the South and the West sides of the arena; at the S.W. angle still 4m high. The poor masonry was plastered, and the plaster was painted as large rectanguler panels, alternately red and yellow (my fig.492) - the same style as the Gabinian houses. The panels are framed with thin strips of colour in the shape of a rectangle, and below them is a dado; only the lowest 'course' of panels survived.

Attributable with certainty to Herod are some walls and towers. One of the round towers near the West Gate has the drafted stones with flat chisel-picked centres as its lower courses. Above these are stones of a later renovation, and below them are the lower courses of a square Hellenistic tower. The Herodian stones are quite unmistakable (fig. 493); they are of exactly the same form as those found at Jericho, and are laid in alternating courses of headers and stretchers, like the structure on tell 1 at Jericho (supra fig.466). The same stones, laid in the same way, were found by Sukenik re-used as substructures at the N.W. corner of the late Temple of Kore. There were also remains of a Herodian wall near the Temple of Augustus (SS,pl. LXV, 1). But most of the wall and the towers in it are not in any of the Herodian types of dressing that we have seen elsewhere; these must be the work of local masons - this applies to the wall on either side of the West gate and the two round towers there, to parts of the North wall and the North extremity of the East wall, and to the five rectangular towers found on the North. Most of the pottery from the foundations was late

Hellenistic or early Roman (SS, pp.39-41). The use of both square and round towers in a circumvallation is found in Palestine in the Hellenistic period at Beth-Yerah (Philoteria) in a city wall of mud-brick. (SH. Yeivin, "A Decade of Archaeology in Israel, 1948-1958", Istanbul, 1960; sketch-map p.21).

Traces of the Temple built by Herod are few. The basic form is clear - a great court leads up to the Temple, which is set high upon a podium above a flight of steps. But most of the structures are either robbed or below later ones. Part of the flight of steps was uncovered below other steps. The podium is plain, lacking the base and cornice mouldings found on most Roman podia. Coins dating down to 39BC were found in the fill beneath the Temple by the Harvard Expedition. For this temple, as with the Temple platform at Jerusalem, Herod had to extend a platform and support fill with retaining walls. Unfortunately only the foundations of the retaining walls survive (SS, pp.123-124; pl. LXII, middle distance). This consists of headers on edge with courses of flat stretchers at intervals. Since nothing of the Temple remains above its foundations, the foundation lines are the only indication of its form. It is not agreed whether there was a peristyle arrangement or a prostyle one with internal rows of columns. Corinthian capitals found near the site (LXXXIV, 1-3) have been assigned to the Temple, but there seems no real foundation for this. Watzinger has noted that the ground-plan has similarities with the Temple of Dionysos Kathegemon at Pergamon.

From the packing at the N.W. corner of the Temple of Kore - where the Herodinan stones were re-used - come sixteen crenellated coping stones covered with painted stucco (SS, pl.LX,1); also cornices with cavetto or cyma profiles, Ionic capitals finished with stucco, and Attic bases. The colouring of the crenellated stones is in bright yellows, pinks, reds, greens and browns (SS, p.64; HE, p.163).

In sum the Herodian material at Sebaste is rather fregmentary, and some of it less closely dated than one would like. The survival of crenellations in the Phoenician or Persian tradition is not surprising; it is also found in sites in Lebanon, Syria and Jordan. There is no trace of any distinctively Roman, as opposed to late Hellenistic, influence in the Herodian structures at Sebaste. (see SS, pp.34-35.)

Oddly enough some material at Sebaste from the Third and Fourth Roman periods is of interest from what we know of Herodian structures at Jericho, Masada, Herodion and Caesarea. For instance stepped and plastered baths are found in the Fourth period, and in the Third period are associated with the hypocaust of a caldarium (pl.LXXII, 1, 2; LXXIII, 2). No traces of the furnace for the hypocaust were discovered. The underfloor system was of 20 suspensurae of circular bricks, superimposed on each other to form colonnettes supporting the upper floor-level. This is similar to what we saw at Jericho. In a house of the Fourth Roman period was a mosaic (pl.LXXVII, 2 and LXXVIII,2) of the same pattern as the Jericho find of my fig. 478. In another find the stones were plastered and then painted with cornice, dado and panel designs; the cornices were of dentils, palmettes, lotus and egg-and-dart.

The panelling, imitating masonry revetments, includes clouded veining like that on some marbles; it is above a high dado strip (SS, pl. LXXXIII). These stones were incorporated with Herodian masonry in the rubble fill of a tower of the Third Roman period; they, like the stones, may date back to the time of Herod. In another house of the Fourth Roman period (SS, p.137) there was a mosaic with a border design of the Greek scroll (SS,pl.LXXXVII) like the Herodian mosaic at Jericho (my fig. 477). Examples such as these may signify that the mosaics at Sebaste - in the light of robbing and rebuilding on one location - have been dated too late; whereas those at Jericho are securely dated. Finally I may mention two painted plaster fragments from Sebaste which are in the Palestine Archaeological Museum. One has the painted dado, rectangular panels and clouded veining which are found at Herodian Jericho and the Herodian fortresses of Masada and Herodion (fi g. 494; PAM I. 10729). The other has a type of spear-armed rosette or "sun-wheel", which is of the same form as a coin type of Alexander Jannaeus (supra VIII, 9), as well as painted egg-and-dart (fig.495; PAM 32.2454).

IX,iv,1

# CAESAREA MARITIMA

JOSEPHUS

War, 1, 156 The city formerly called Straton's Tower was refounded by Herod as Caesarea with magnificent buildings ( λαμπροτάτοις κατασκευάσμασιν)

War, 1, 408-416 Herod rebuilt Straton's Tower, a coastal town, in white stone ( λευκῷ λίθῳ ) as a new foundation, Caesarea, with a magnificent palace ( λαμπροτάτοις βασιλείοις ) . He made it the harbour for the Palestinian sea-board between Dora and Joppa, lowering huge blocks into the sea as foundations, and setting upon them a mole 200 feet across - half acting as a breakwater, half supporting a stone wall with massive towers, the most magnificent of which was named Drusion in honour of Drusus, step-son of Augustus. The mole was broken by an entry for shipping which faced North; at the right side of this entry were three colossi upon columns which were supported by a massive tower; at the left side were three colossi upon columns supported by two great monoliths. Houses were built right up to the harbour, also in white stone; and the streets of the town on the regular (Hippodamian) plan, converged on the harbour. On a height facing the entry to the mole was the Temple of Augustus and Rome. The cult statue of the emperor was modelled on the Olympian Zeus; that of Rome rivalled the Hera at Argos. An amphitheatre, a theatre and agorai were also constructed, and penteteric games instituted.

War II, 172. (and Ant. XVIII, 57) Pilate concealed an army in the stadium ( ἐν τῷ σταδίῳ ) at Caesarea to deal, with a throng of importunous Jews. In the passage of the 'War...' the Greek is ἐν τῷ μεγάλῳ σταδίῳ .

War, II, 175. Pilate had an aqueduct constructed. It is not clear whether this was at Caesarea, Jerusalem or elsewhere, but it follows a passage concerned with events at Caesarea.

War, II, 266. In the disorders at Caesarea c.AD59-60 the Jews claimed that the city belonged to them. But the other inhabitants argued that Herod must have meant the city for Greeks; the pagan statues and temples which he built were offensive to Jewish feeling.

Ant.XV, 331-341. Herod converted Straton's Tower into a magnificent city of white stone ( ἐκ λευκῆς πετρᾶς ) He adorned it with a costly palace and civic halls. Above all he created a well protected harbour with a circular mole. The foundations in the sea were of huge stones fifty feet long, and the mole itself was two hundred feet wide. Half acted as a breakwater; the other half had upon it a wall, the finest tower of which was called Drusus after the stepson of Augustus. The entry through the mole faced North. Just to the right of it was a great tower; just to the left two huge monoliths. Round the harbour itself were fine dwellings, and on an eminence among them the Temple of Augustus and Rome with its two cult statues. And just as much effort was expended on the drainage and sewerage systems of the city, so that an incoming sea flushed it from below. Herod also built a theatre of stone in the city, and an amphitheatre South of the harbour. All this took twelve years.

Ant. XVI, 136-141. Caesarea was completed after ten years. Then a great celebratory festival was held with athletic and musical contests, gladiators and wild beasts, and horse races; this became a penteteric celebration.

Ant. XIX,344. The theatre was in use in Agrippa's reign, here for the penteteric festival inaugurated by Herod.

The total picture from Josephus is of the following structures:

1. A harbour with a mole of two circling arms, acting as a breakwater and also as a defensive wall strengthened by towers, of which the most impressive was named Drusion or Drusus.

2. Colossi on the mole at its mouth on massive substructures.

3. Houses of white stone on the harbour front.

4. Regular streets converging on the harbour.

5. A city wall on the mainland is not mentioned, but must have existed.

6. A magnificent palace.

7. The Temple of Augustus and Rome with two huge cult-statues in the best Greek style (presumably imported).

8. Amphitheatre, South of the harbour.

9. Theatre in the city.

10. Agorai - which implies porticoes.

11. A great stadium.

12. Horse-races are mentioned, which may imply the existence of a special hippodrome.

13. Aqueducts?

14. An elaborate drainage and sewerage system.

REMAINS

Caesarea has hardly been explored as yet, and earlier efforts tended to be unsystematic. The first accurate plan was that undertaken by the Palestine Exploration Fund and published in the Survey of Western Palestine. The useful bibiography is:


| | |
|---|---|
| A. Reifenberg. | IEJ, 1951, pp.20-32: "Caesarea, A Study in the Decline of a Town". An account of surface remains and aerial photography. |
| C.T. Fritsch and I.Ben-Dor | BA, Vol.XXIV, 2, 1961, pp. 50-59: "The Link Expedition to Israel, 1960". p.55 on the mole. |
| A. Negev. | ILN, Oct. 26, 1963, pp.684-686 and Nov.2, 1963, pp. 728-731: "Caesarea Maritima - A Summary of Recent Excavations. Part 1: the Crusader and Arab Cities. Part 2: Excavations, Herodian and Byzantine. A brief report of work in the area of the Crusader fortifications. |
| A. Frova. | Annuario della Scuola Archaeologica di Atene e delle Missione Italiane in Oriente, New Series, Nos. 23-24, 1961-1962, pp. 649-657: "Gli Scavi della Missione archeologica italiana a Cesarea (Israele)". |

This is a report of excavations undertaken from 1959 to 1962, and is concerned with Herodian walls and towers, the High Aqueduct, and (principally) the theatre with its various reconstructions at different periods.

A. Albricci. Bolletino d'Arte, IV, 1962, pp. 289-304: "L'Orchestra dipinta del Teatro erodiano di 'Caesarea Maritima". A detailed account of the Herodian orchestra of the theatre with a great deal of comparative material. (This article was included without necessary revisions in the final publication of the Italian Excavations in 1965).

A. Frova. "Scavi di Caesarea Maritima" (Accademia di Scienze e Lettere, Milano, 1965). The final publication of the results of the Italian excavations at Caesarea.

A. Negev. IEJ, 1964, pp. 237-249: "The High Level Aqueduct at Caesarea". It is suggested that the High Aqueduct was part of Herod's foundation.

An expedition under Link took aerial photographs showing the form of the mole with its entry visible under the water in the position described by Josephus. The entry was located and explored by divers. The mole is described as a circular breakwater enclosing the harbour with its entry on the North side.

The exploration under Negev of the Crusader City by the Commission for Landscaping and the Preservation of Historical Sites has revealed that the Byzantine and later structures are set over Herodian foundations. Only brief notes on the work have been published. The foundations of a large building were uncovered with late Hellenistic and Herodian pottery in the fill. Both here and in some vaulted substructures (vaulted substructures were also used at the Jerusalem Temple and the Temple at Sebaste) the type of Herodian masonry with a draft and rough boss, as at the Antonia, was used (ibid. figs.13 and 16).

The High Level Aqueduct of Caesarea runs from sources on the slopes of Mount Carmel, and its progress can still be traced to a point along the shore North of the city. It is a union of two conduits side by side. The Eastern was built first and was originally meant to serve without its companion, as the ornamental ledge on <u>both</u> sides shows; the Western (seaward) conduit was added with a ledge on the outside (seaward side) only. This addition occurred shortly after the first conduit had been erected, since the seaward face of the latter has hardly suffered from weathering. Parts of the Western aqueduct had to be repaired in the 2ndcAD, as is shown by inscriptions (Negev, IEJ, pp. 244-248). But it is still the considered opinion of Negev that the original construction took place a long time before this - under Herod or soon after. The arches of the aqueduct are supported by "piers" with a cavetto cornice (ibid., pl. 50, C). Indeed we know from Josephus that Herod furnished an elaborate drainage and sewerage system for Caesarea, and there is a certain mention of his having built an aqueduct elsewhere (Laodicea; War, I 422 ὑδάτων εἰσαγωγήν ). It seems reasonable to suppose that he provided the chief harbour of the Palestinian coast with one.

An account of the Herodian wall and towers is to be found in Frova's interim report in the annual of the School at Athens pp.649-650, and in the final Italian publication pp. 249-292. A rough semicircle facing the sea, seen in air photographs, was found to be Byzantine. But in 1960 a splendid section of wall with two round towers in it was brought to light further in towards the coast on the N.W. of the circumvallation area. This was further explored in the later seasons. My fig. 496 shows the ground plan of this area - sections of wall, two round towers in this (North) wall, a polygonal tower at the angle were the North wall turns South to become the East wall, and the first part of the East wall. Within the wall on this figure is marked part of the regular street system which came to light from excavations, interpretation of some surface remains and regular lines seen on air photographs. The Westernmost section of the North wall shown on the plan still had its lower strata in situ; here were found an Herodian lamp (illn.305,p.252 ibid.) a fragment of a 1stcBC/AD piece of terra sigillata and two cooking-pots (illns. 306,307 ibid.). Within the wall similar finds were made (ibid. p. 258). The Eastern circular tower had terra sigillata of the same date at the level of its foundations (ibid., p.271).

The wall follows the advantages of the terrain. Its irregular line and the location of its towers recall the Herodian wall of Sebaste with its round and square towers, and are typical of Hellenistic circumvallations. The diameter of the round towers - 13 metres - is also that of the very fine early Hellenistic round towers at Samaria and their successors, the Herodian round towers of Sebaste.

The Herodian round towers of the fortress Herodian are 15m in diameter. The masonry at Caesarea is of the rusticated types - with the face flat-picked on most of the walls, but left with the large rounded boss on the towers (and in the last inside section of the North wall). We have already seen the use of both styles together in Herodian work at Jerusalem. A further length of walling was found by underwater research in the summer of 1964 (ibid. p. 280). The wall is, of course, to be prolonged out into the parts of the shore-line that have since been submerged, and carried, as Josephus informs us, out onto the two arms of the mole. It should be noticed that the circular towers, thrust forward from the line of the wall, enable flanking casts at assailants; and the polygonal corner-tower gives an added number of fronts to the defendants, while maintaining a position at right angles to the wall on its North and South lines.

Of the regular streets converging on the harbour, of which Josephus makes mention, parts of the cardo and decumanus were identified (ibid. fig. 375; pp.284-286) and further details were made out near the city-wall, and elsewhere from surface remains and air photographs.

But work was concentrated on the theatre (pp.56-244 of the final report). Three main phases were found, involving radical modifications of the scena and cavea. Of the cavea the oldest period is preserved only in part of the praecinctio on the South, and in some steps of the summa cavea, later covered by a grey mortar conglomerate which also invaded the praecinctio; a final adaptation achieved the total abolition of the praecinctio. Only a

late phase of the lateral additi maximi onto the orchestra is preserved; later still the orchestra was transformed for spectacles - plastered to hold water, and its additi stopped up by marble slabs covered with mortar. In the Arab period two siloes were established on its floor. But fortunately - in spite of all later modifications - the earliest plaster and marble pavings of the orchestra were well preserved in situ, and thoroughly investigated by the excavators. The substructures and passage below the orchestra were difficult to interpret (Final Report, pp. 168-169). The situation of the hyposcenium is confused: a find here of a large quantity of ceramic lamps of the Augustan period - large and ornate with figural decoration and leaf handles - is useful for dating purposes. Also found here were sigillata dishes with the Augustan stamp XAPIC. Some elements of the Herodian scena remained beneath the Imperial one; this area was covered with an accumulation of marble fragments - mostly dated to the 2nd and 3rdc AD - of cornices, tympana, architraves, friezes, niche conches, capitals etc. But some architectonic fragments were found which can be attributed to the Herodian period - cornices, tympana, bases and shafts of columns, mostly covered with stucco (Final Report, p.171). There was also a large Ionic capital; but details of these elements are not published. The arrangement of the scenae frons was of a central rectangular niche flanked by exedrae on the diagonal. The elevation remains hypothetical - certainly colonnaded, but the order is not known. The lateral connection between scena and cavea also remains uncertain.

Much of the picture is one of very fragmentary knowledge of the Herodian structure. The repeated re-building of the theatre up to the late antique period means that every attempt to restore many of the substantial forms is founded on guesswork, not evidence in situ.

But both clarity and close dating are possible in the interpretation of the various stages of the front of the pulpitum and the pavements of the orchesta associated with each stage. Here we have the most substantial documentation of the form of the Herodian theatre, which elsewhere escapes us (Albricci, fig.2 on p.290). Directly below the last covering of the orchestra with pink plaster for the water spectacles was found a floor of marble flags with a square frame in a diamond pattern at the centre, and opus sectile panels forming a disc surrounded by toothing within a square (fig.497). This is dated to the second half of the 1stc AD (Final Report, pp.94, 178); below it was a uniform stratum of fill with pottery of the 1stc AD (Albricci, p.290); below the fill were fourteen successive layers of painted plaster (Final Report, pp. 167-168.). These original and rapidly renewed floors were set upon a coarser plaster, which covered substructures of stone and concrete, heaps of stones and banks of sand and yellow earth. The earliest form given to the front of the pulpitum is contemporary with the earliest layer of the painted plaster floor; large exedrae alternate with large rectangular niches (Albricci, fig.4) on either side of a pair of exedrae at the centre (A on my fig. 497). The next pulpitum (ibid.B) corresponds to all of the successive 13 renewals of the painted plaster floor (Final Report, p.167). This

presented a straight front without niches, like the theatre of Pompey at Rome and the early theatre at Orange: renewed layers of painted plaster here correspond to the layers of the floor of the orchestra. The final form of the pulpitum front - a system of small, deep, alternately exedral and square niches - corresponds in time with the floor of marble slabs. This form had two phases, the second (D on my fig.497) set back more than the first (ibid.C). Phase D had marble revetment slabs, which include two of white marble painted with a large rhombus leaving angle triangles - a very similar pattern on marble to that on stucco on some of the pedestals in the lower terrace of the North palace at Masada. This marble floor and pulpitum revetment of marble slabs was in use for a long period, and the floor continued in use - partly plastered - when the niches of the pulpitum were finally blocked out, and new marble revetments put all around the orchestra for water spectacles (as at Athens, Corinth, Syracuse, Argos, Ostia).

The latest (topmost) of the painted plaster floors is that which has been most fully examined and published; it forms the principal subject (with a colour illustration, pl.III; my fig. 498) of the article by Albricci. The orchestra floor is covered with a basic pattern of squares and rectangles alternating in strips right across the semicircular space which is filled; at the perimeter is a special strip of curving rectangles. The squares of the main floor space have discs or diagonal squares of a different colour set in them, as do alternate squares of the perimeter. The rectangles of the main floor space have a pattern of bubbles imitating some types of marble veining

(red on a yellow field) or brown strokes on a whitish ground. Traces of green remain on the diagonal squares, and the triangles left at the angles of the squares which contain them are red, like some of the discs, or have imitation marble veining in green, red and yellow (ibid. pl.IV and fig.7) in the cloudy style. The corners of the squares in which the discs are inserted have red bubbles and strokes of green, red and yellow-brown (ibid. fig.8). At the perimeter the curved rectangles are alternately whitish with traces of green, or occupied by red rhombi with yellow or bright red corner triangles. The frames, and some angles and rhombi have imitation veining (figs. 9,10 ibid.). Yet another red is used for the thin frames of the squares and rectangles of the main floor space. Clearly here - as at Masada, Herodion, Jericho and Sebaste - various types of marble are being imitated (Albricci lists dark red porphyry, paonazetto, giallo antico, onyx or alabaster) with different forms of variegation, veining and crystals, and in both monochrome and polychrome styles. The motif is not realistic, but stylised into bubbles and patterns like clouds or smoke-rings. The attention is directed to a rich polychrome effect rather than a convincing reproduction of the revetment courses which are imitated. This layer of painted stucco is probably no later than the first quarter of the first century AD; at such a time it is unique as a system of flooring. Its counterpart on other Herodian sites was a floor of mosaic, often succeeded by opus sectile.

The two plaster floors just under the most recent employ a different decor - the strip along the perimeter is on a yellow base and has a double row of irregular brush-strokes rather freely disposed in the form of a V; a black line picks out the inner edge, beyond which is a uniform red zone. Near the pulpitum a wide white band and a narrower red one were distinguished. The principal motif is the imbrication pattern of overlapping scales, cut in half and painted red, orange, black, white, pick, yellow, green; the colours alternate along an oblique line (ibid. fig. 15). This scale motif is to be found in most of the layers from II to X (the second most recent and the eight before it) with variation in proportions, colour and arrangements. The smoke-ring type of veining in polychromatic effect is also found in the oldest layers (Final Report, p.168). Simple panels of one colour with linear frames are found on the phase B pulpitum with straight front, preserved at the South aditus to the orchestra.

My concluding remarks will be found below at the end of this part of my work.

MASADA

This is a convenient place for an introduction to the fortrèsses which Josephus tells us Herod built. Herod proudly displayed three of them (as well as Caesarea and Sebaste) to Marcus Agrippa - Alexandreion, Herodeion and Hyrkania, the onces close to Jerusalem. The three have been identified with Qarn Sartabeh, Jebel el-Fureidis (15 km. SE of Jerusalem) and Khirbet Mird (c. 8 miles SE of Jerusalem). Of the others Masada is near Ein Gedi on the West shore of the Dead Sea; Machaerus is on the opposite side of the Dead Sea. Four of the fortresses (all except the one named after Herod) were built by the Hasmonaeans. In Hyrkania, Alexandreion and Machaerus Queen Alexandra kept her most precious possessions (Ant. XIII, 417). These same three fortresses were surrendered by her grandson, the Hasmonaean Alexander, to Gabinius, the Roman governor of Syria, in 57 BC. Masada on the other hand does not appear on the scene of events until it is taken by Herod from his father's assassins in 42 BC (War, I, 237-238; Ant. XIV, 296). Alexandreion was restored in 38 BC under Herod's orders, during his struggle to secure the rule bestowed on him in 40 BC by the Roman senate (Ant., XIV, 419). His

mother-in-law, Alexandra, and wife, Mariamme, were kept there for safety in 30 BC; and his two sons by Mariamme, Alexander and Aristobulus, were buried there in 7 BC in the tomb of their ancestors (ibid. XV, 185; XVI, 394). We are not given a description of the fortress by Josephus, and no excavation work has been done there as yet. Hyrkania was used as a prison by Herod (Ant. XV, 366) after he had repaired its fortifications (War, I, 364). His son by Doris, Antipater, was buried there (War, I, 664; Ant. XVII, 187). Again Josephus does not describe the fortress, and no excavations have yet been carried out there.

Machaerus, restored by Herod between 25 and 13 BC, is described by Josephus in some detail in War, VII, 166-189. A town was established within a fortified wall protected by towers. From this town an ascent led up to the crest upon which the citadel was set. A further wall surrounded the crest with towers 60 cubits high at its angles. Within this enclosure Herod built a palace with fine chambers ( μεγέθει τε καὶ κάλλει τῶν οἰκήσεων πολυτελής ) and furnished cisterns and an armoury. The fortress was at the South extremity of Peraea on the borders of the Nabataean kingdom above Kallirhoe, to which it was linked by road (20 kms.). It was here that John the Baptist was beheaded at the order of Antipas. Bassus took it in AD 72.

Herodeion was the name of a fortified palace, and Herodia the name of a town built around it; both marked the place where Herod, fleeing Jerusalem and the Parthians, defeated a pursuing party of Jews on his way to Masada (Ant. XIV, 360). Herod himself was buried here (War, I, 673; Ant., XVII, 199) and the town became one of the toparchic capitals of Judaea (War, III, 55). Ant., XIV, 360 describes the palace as βασίλειον ἀξιολογώτατον . Some details of the foundation are given by Josephus in War, I, 419-421 and Ant., XV, 323-325:

"The crest he crowned with a ring of round towers; the enclosure was filled with gorgeous palaces, the magnificent appearance of which was not confined to the interior of the apartments, but outer walls, battlements and roofs all had wealth lavished upon them in profusion." (Loeb)

A steep ascent connected this crest with the plain around it, which became a large township. The crest was in fact a high artificial mound; and Herod erected further palaces for his own furniture and for the accommodation of his friends at the foot of it. There is only one slight discrepancy in the two passages - the 200 steps up to the crest are described as of

purest white marble ( μαρμάρου ) in one, but simply as of hewn stone ( ξεσταῖς βαθμίσιν ) in the other.

Masada too is described in some detail (War, VII, 280-303) because of the extensive transformations which Herod made to the Hasmonaean fort. The isolated and precipitous peak had such sound natural defences that the Romans were forced to erect a huge ramp on the West side to take the zealots of the First Revolt, who holed up there. Herod enclosed the summit with a wall of white stone ( λευκοῦ λίθου ) fortified by 37 towers, each fifty cubits high, which gave access to apartments round the inside of the wall (i.e. it was a casemate). A palace was built on the North side outside the wall (κατὰ τὴν ἀπὸ τῆς ἑσπέρας ἀνάβασιν, ὑποκάτω μὲν τῶν τῆς ἄκρας τειχῶν πρὸς δὲ τὴν ἄρκτον ἐκκλίνον ). The palace wall was strong, high, and had towers 60 cubits high at its four angles. Within were sumptuous apartments, colonnades and baths; the columns are described as monoliths. A path was cut out, concealed from below the fortress, from the palace to the summit. Inside and outside the wall of the fortress many new cisterns were cut. Corn, wine, oil, pulse and dates were stored against a long siege; also a supply of arms ( παντοίων πλῆθος ὅπλων ) and ingots of iron, brass and lead. (This implies store-rooms for food, and an armoury.)

It will be seen (infra) that this is a very brief description, but reliable in the main.

Mention has been made in part IX,ii above of the references by Josephus to the Herodian fortress Kypros, which he did not describe in any detail.

Masada has long been a focus of interest because of the remains at its foot of Roman camps from the reduction of the Zealots; more recently it has been surveyed and excavated by the Israelis. The following is the useful bibliography:

| | |
|---|---|
| R. E. Brünnow and A. V. Domaszewski | "Die Provincia Arabia", Vol. III, Strassburg, 1909, pp.221-224: "Die römischen Befestigungen von Masada"; The main interest is in the Roman camps; comments of earlier investigators are quoted in detail. |
| A. Schulten | ZDPV, 1933, pp.63-77 of article "Masada, die Burg des Herodes und die römischen Lager". Plan XIII is fairly accurate according to the later Israeli survey. Once more the main interest was in the |

Roman works. Particularly to be noted is his identification of a palace on the West with that described by Josephus (pp.68-72). He compares the series of long, narrow rooms at the North end of the peak with the magazine of the citadel of Pergamon (p.65).

M. Avi-Yonah,
N. Avigad,
Y. Aharoni, etc.

IEJ, 1957, pp.1-60: "The Archaeological Survey of Masada, 1955-1956". A survey of the surface remains with soundings. Fig. 3 is the overall ground-plan, on which six building complexes, A to F, are interpreted respectively as A house, B house, C West palace, D military quarters, E stores, arsenal, barracks, house, tower, F North palace; an account is also given of the cisterns. Attention is concentrated on the impressive remains of the hanging palace in three terraces on the North; figures 11-20 of this are particularly valuable, and pls. 4B, 6-9, 10-13, including columns, pilasters, bases, capitals, painted stucco.

Y. Yadin

IEJ, 1965, pp.1-120: "The Excavation of Masada, 1963-4: Preliminary Report". This is a report of the first season of work with a plan of numbered structures. Nos. I-III and X are the North and West palaces; V and VI store-rooms; IX the barracks. Other identifications are more precise than the Survey had been - the 'tower and associated structures' emerged as a great bath-house, numbered IV; houses A and B of the Survey were identified as small villa-palaces (pp.65-68; plan nos. XI, XII); structures in the store-room complex apart from the store-rooms and the bath-house were numbered VII and VIII, and the resemblance of VIII to the small palaces XI and XII was noted. Plates show the clearances of the palaces, store-rooms, bath-house and part of VIII. Some details of pottery and coin finds are given.

Y. Yadin

"Masada - Herod's Fortress and the Zealots' Last Stand", London, 1966.

This is not the definitive report of the excavations, but nevertheless contains fresh material from the second season, revised interpretations and some very fine photographs. Especially noteworthy for architectural detail are the coloured prints on pp.44, 46, 48-49, 66, 67, 70, 71 (of the North palace); 79, 82, 83 (of the baths); 102 (of the gate to the store-room area); 120-121, 124-125, 129 (of the West palace); 136-137 of the small palace VIII (this is pl. XIII, B of IEJ, 1965 but in colour, showing the paints used); Useful details is also to be found on the black-and-white prints on pp.45, 47, 51, 58, 63 (North palace); 76-77, 78, 80, 84 (baths); 91 (masonry of the store-rooms); 118, 122, 123, 126, 127 (West palace). The identifications are as above, IEJ, 1965, but with the recognition of five small palace-villas and a large bathing-pool near the West palace

(photo, p.135); IX is termed the 'apartment or garrison building', and VII is identified as an administrative centre. Pottery is hardly presented; but Herodian ware is shown on pp.94-95 (jars), 148 (lamps) and 161 (cooking-pots).

M. Livneh and Z. Meshel "Masada", National Park Authority, Israel, 1965. A well-presented guide-book to the site.

The Israeli teams concentrated a good deal of their attention on the North palace, where the baths, columns and concealed descent mentioned by Josephus were identified. Only the four 'angle-towers' remain a mystery. The likely explanation for this description and for misinformation about sheer drops on either side of the 'Snake Path' ascent to the peak is that Josephus only saw the site from the Roman assault point on the West - where he mistook the great buttressing walls for towers. This explains his mistakes in two other minor points - the columns of Masada are not monoliths of white stone, but sandstone drums covered with stucco; and the walls of the palace

are not covered with various types of stone, but with plaster painted in imitation of polychrome alabaster and other types of marble. The same view-point would explain his reference to the palace as on the West slope ~~9~~ it is in fact at the North tip, but since the peak narrows to a point at the North end the palace seems to be on the West slope to an onlooker from the West.

This North palace is constructed as a series of structures on three terraces at the North tip of the fortress. The lowest terrace is a square, level platform supported by huge buttressing walls on the North and the East (IEJ, 1957, pl.9A, B; IEJ, 1965, pp.10-17; Masada, 1966, pp.40,43). In the North buttressing wall were remains of wooden beams used for bonding. IEJ, 1957, fig. 13 (my fig. 499) is the only published ground-plan of this terrace, and shows the basic form as an outer peristyle on the very edge of the platform, and an inner peristyle set well back from the edge. The substructures of the extension to the natural rock platform are of hard Masada stone; the walls and porticoes are of a local sandstone. All walls and columns are plastered (IEJ, 1957, p.38 analyses the plaster). Much less of the outer peristyle is preserved than of the inner (Masada, pp.44, 45, 46, 48-49) as the outermost structures have slipped

into the abyss. But parts of the outer wall on the North and West are in situ up to near the floor level of the platform; and remains of the half-columns engaged in these outer walls are preserved on the inside of the West wall, in collapsed remains of the external half-column at the same location, and along the South wall (against the North rock-face of the middle terrace). The collapsed remains of the half-column in the outside of the West wall are shown IEJ, 1957, pl. 10D. In addition quarter-columns at the angles of the South wall show the return of this peristyle down the inside of the West and East outer walls (fig. 500). Plaster remains on the South wall right up to the tops of the capitals in places; but there is none higher than this to indicate that an upper storey was constructed.

The inner peristyle forms a central rectangular area of about 9m by 10m. In both the inner and outer peristyles we are not dealing with freestanding columns, but with walls in which half-columns were engaged back to back (figs. 499 and 501). All of the tolumns rise from gpound-level except those inside the inner peristyle, which are set much higher upon tall pedestals (figs. 502, 503). The columns are Corinthian ones with fluted stucco covering the drums of the shaft, and treated, as is normal, with fillets between the flutes and a semicircular

finish at top and bottom; the Attic bases (torus, astragal, scotia, astragal, torus) are cut in the same sandstone block as the lowest drum of the shaft, and covered with stucco shaped to their mouldings (figs. 504-508); they stand on plinths (IEJ, 1957, pl.10C). The column shafts have slight diminution, but no entasis. The capitals are of hard sandstone, which has survived well; they are coated with a lime whitewash, not plaster (figs. 509-511).

Altogether six (not five as in the Survey drawing) half-columns were engaged in the well-preserved wall against the South rock-face (Masada, p.44 four in colour;, IEJ, 1965, pl.3A; my fig. 502) and at its angles were double quarter-columns, serving the South, West and East walls (figs. 500, 506). The plastered wall between these columns was covered in its lower part with a painted decoration of panels (figs. 502-503) which imitates a high course of marble revetment stones in exaggerated headers and stretchers. They form a pattern of three different sizes of panels which are edged in red and on a green field (Masada, p.44; IEJ, 1957, fig. 16, III-III; IEJ, 1965, pl.3A,B). The colours are a dark and bright red monotone, imitations of veining in green, red and yellow in the narrow panels ('headers'), and again in the long panels the

same type of imitation of a cloudy veining of alabaster in a dark colour on a yellowish ground (Masada, p.44). Fragments of painted plaster found in the debris along this South wall had designs of plants and flowers (IEJ, 1965, p.12).

The central space within the inner peristyle had a plaster floor, still well preserved on the South. The peristyle itself was preserved on the West and South up to the bases of the interior half-columns. The bases of the exterior stand on a stone course, like a stylobate, at floor level. But on the inside the columns are set upon tall pedestals engaged in a parapet wall of the same height (fig. 502). here the Attic bases have no plinths. A base moulding composed of fillet, ovolo, fillet and fillet runs around the inside of the parapet wall (and pedestals). The cornice of the pedestals is the succession fillet, ovolo, cyma, fillet. Above this cornice in the second intercolumniation on the North side a sill was found preserved. In the centre of the South wall is an entry, framed by two of the engaged pedestals already mentioned. At the S.W. angle the corner pier of the inner peristyle lay on the debris almost intact in form (figs. 512, 513; restored 514); this returned a pilaster and attached quarter-column on each exterior face, and a quarter-column alone on each interior face. The pilasters -

which may be regarded as our only surviving trace of the wall above its low parapet for the inner pedestals - are cut in imitation of drafted masonry with a smooth face in alternating courses of headers and stretchers (the width of each pilaster gives space for one stretcher or two headers; fig. 514). This is reminiscent both of the finest Herodian masonry of the Jerusalem Temple enclosure and of the similarly moulded plaster of the tomb Mugharet Umm el-Amed at Jerusalem, and the tomb at Deir el-Derb in Samaria. Capitals of half-columns and quarter-columns were found in the debris in the areas of the walls of the inner peristyle.

On the well-preserved West and South interiors of the inner wall - viz. on the wall and its engaged pedestals - are considerable areas of painted stucco (IEJ, 1957, pl.13C,D; fig. 16 I-I, II-II; IEJ, 1965, pl.3A; Masada, 1966, pp.44,46, 48-49, 50, 51). The wall itself corresponds to the outer South wall which I have already described - red and yellow frames on a green ground, three sizes of panels, solid red monotones, cloudy marble veining. The pedestals either have the same type of veining - yellows, greens, reds and a dark colour are used - or a geometric arrangement of a panel enclosing a rhombus or lozenge with an inner rectangle, and having triangles at the

angles (figs. 515, 516). This geometric system is also covered with wavy or cloudy veining; that drawn in the figure of the Survey has red and green cloudy veining in the triangles, and wavy lines over the whole panel with black bands dominant in the inner rectangle. We have already seen this type of decoration at Jericho, Sebaste and Caesarea.

The square platform described above has extensions outside its two peristyles at the S.E. and S.W. angles. On the East side the substructures are vaulted - like those found by Negev in the Crusader area of Caesarea, and like those found under the temples at Jerusalem and Sebaste; on the West side the extension is achieved by a retaining wall which must have been roofed with wooden beams across to the outer peristyle substructures (IEJ, fig. 17, 1957 shows both). This is not a cellar, but a construction technique whereby the absence of solid fill prevents the transmission of stresses to the outer retaining wall (IEJ, 1965, p.13).

At the S.E. angle of the platform several interesting finds were made after excavation - the S.W. angle of a room at an upper level with traces on the wall of painted panels in a black frame, and of a 'dado' adorned with stylised palmettes (fig. 517); nineteen rock-cut steps leading to a narrow passage,

and then through an arch to four small chambers. In the area of these four small rooms the Survey found plaster fragments painted in delicate brown lines and triangles; also the remains of wood, linen and mats. Upon investigation one of these chambers remained unidentified (boiler-room?) but the other three were found to be the frigidarium, tepidarium and caldarium of a bath-house. The caldarium was also the vestibule, and presumably the apodyterium; it was paved with a mosaic of white tesserae; from it both the cold bath and the hot room could be entered. The frigidarium was a barrel-vaulted chamber (IEJ, 1957, pl.14D) with its whole floor space occupied by the pool - plastered and stepped like pools at Jericho, Sebaste and Qumran. Tesserae were also found in the caldarium, and the under-floor hypocaust was well preserved on the East side; its suspensurae were colonnettes of round bricks standing on square clay slabs, as at Jericho. The upper floor (above the hypocaust) was completely destroyed. The clay pipes from the walls were found, and marks in the plaster indicated where they had been (for Jericho see Pritchard, p.11).

The conception, architectural members and decor of this terrace are totally Hellenistic Greek. Obviously the outer peristyle and engaged half-columns in the exterior of the wall

of the inner peristyle had members upon them (architraves of plastered wood are suggested by the Survey) and formed a covered colonnade. Fragments of stucco were found (figs. 518-519) which correspond perfectly to those from Jericho (Kelso, pl. 19 top; 20). The height of the bases of the inner half-columns of the inner peristyle implies that these columns were that much higher than those of the colonnades, and this seems to indicate that the central area was roofed (hypaethral?) and not simply an open court. The absence of debris here is easily explained by the fact that the Zealots removed the roofing beams for the inner wall of wood etc. which they erected against the Romans (War, VII, 311-314).

The situation on the middle terrace is less complex (IEJ, 1957, pp.29-35; 1965, pp.17-21). It is a square platform 10m above the lower terrace, made to look like a built structure by the cutting back and plastering of the rock-faces on the North, West and East. On this level terrace two concentric rings of masonry were found, which have been variously interpreted (fig. 520). The Survey has established that these were in fact substructures with their carefully levelled uppermost course still in situ. On the South side the natural rock did not need building upon to reach the required height; a better

way of putting this is to say that the two rings were built up to the natural height of the terrace in the space left behind (South of) them. This demonstrates once more that they were foundations, not part of a round tower as has been suggested. The same construction technique was used here and at the S.W. angle of the lower terrace - the avoidance of stress on the outer wall by wooden covering instead of a fill. Into the space between the two rings of substructures fragments of plaster and column-drums had fallen (IEJ, 1957, pl.7B); in the space inside the inner ring were fragments of architecture and charred wood. These finds imply what one would naturally assume from the whole character of this pleasure palace - that here there was a typical Hellenistic tholos supported by columns, a sort of pleasure pavilion.

Behind this tholos is the area level with the top of its foundations and the rock-face of the cliff between the middle and upper terraces. This area is occupied by a stairwell at the West angle (IEJ, 1957, pl.2), the ruins of a chamber at the East angle, and an area which was roofed and open to the front in the long space between these two (ibid.). The East chamber had plastered and painted walls; traces of panels in various colours were made out by the Survey (black, green and

red were used). Between the stairwell and the large East room pillars were set against the rock-face wall; they are of sandstone covered with white stucco, and are set on a raised stone base or 'stylobate' (IEJ, 1957, fig. 12; 1965, pl.4A) like the engaged half-columns in the exterior of the inner peristyle on the lower terrace. This rear wall and its two side walls (i.e. the exterior side-walls of the stairwell and East room) were painted with a horizontal strip in black, green and red, and with more panels. The three walls evidently formed a roofed pergola, like that envisaged at Jericho by Kelso.

The upper terrace has its frontage occupied by two concentric semi-circles of foundations, built in the same technique as the rings on the middle terrace. White tesserae were found from a mosaic which paved this semi-circle. Behind this area were the ruins of a large structure (IEJ, 1957, fig. 11 with Byzantine additions). This has two wings - on the West and East - and a wide entry on the North side, defined by the projection of the walls of the two wings. Yadin suggests that two columns made this a distyle entry, as in small palaces VIII, XI, XII and the West palace. The structure was of squared sand-stone blocks laid as stretchers, and plastered inside and out. In the debris the Survey found: "Small fragments of coloured plaster.... showing a design of stripes (8cm. wide),

red, yellow and white, or yellow, black and red". The East wing comprised two large chambers with a passage between them. The large chambers in both wings were floored with two areas of mosaic 'carpet': a continuous hexagon pattern in black tesserae on a white ground, and a continuous four-point rosette pattern in the same colours. The designs are in double rectangular borders. The passages were covered in white mosaic with a simple black frame (IEJ, 1957, pl.5,C-E; my fig. 520 and 521). The Survey also found the remains of a mosaic in the central area between the wings. Excavation in the West wing uncovered wall designs - a low painted dado edged with a black strip, and traces of other designs above this (IEJ, 1965, p.23). In the debris in this chamber were found "plaster fragments bearing designs of plants and other painted designs".

Other walls to this structure - shown on the Survey plan - are Byzantine additions: such are the three square rooms in the central space, the wall connecting them with the West wing, the blocking up of passages and entries. The three central chambers had a white floor of powdered lime in which were Byzantine sherds, clearly establishing that they are late additions to the Herodian structure. Debris was cleared from the site when the Byzantines made it once more habitable, and

was dumped over the great Wall just South of the structure (IEJ 1957, figs. 11,18). In this dump were found stucco painted with geometric and plant motifs, moulded stucco, capitals, bases, drums; several of the column bases were plastered and painted like those of the West palace; Attic bases, Corinthian capitals and Ionic capitals were among the finds (IEJ, 1965, pl.6B and Masada, p.64 for the wall; Masada, p.66 bottom, p.67, p.70 top for the finds; p.67 is my fig. 522). This great South wall closed off the palace from the rest of the fortress, but did not extend right across to the Eastern extremity of the peak; here an entry was left with a guard bench nearby (IEJ, 1957, fig. 11). In front of this plastered bench the Survey found fragments of moulded stucco, some still adhering to pieces of cane, demonstrating that they adorned a roof or ceiling (the same type of finds were made at the location of the pergola at Jericho); and in the same place fragments of plaster painted red, yellow and green, two Ionic capitals and part of a Corinthian capital (IEJ, 1957, pp.27-28; capitals at Masada were cut from two blocks of sandstone).

We have described three terraces of sumptuous apartments, colonnades, pergola, bath-house, mosaics, frescoes, Greek mouldings, Corinthian and Ionic details. It seems that Herod brought his skilled Jewish craftsmen from Jerusalem to execute

this magnificent and daring conception which utilised the contemporary Hellenistic Greek structures, members and decor. It is worth noting that even in this remote eyrie no figural motifs were used, perhaps because Jewish craftsmen (that such they were is established by Semitic markings on column drums) would have refused to execute them in this period. This is not a place for business; but a secluded retreat with a magnificent view. One must admire both the ingenuity of its conception and the élan of its execution.

Detailed plans and sections of the West palace have not yet been published; the plans in IEJ, 1957, figs. 6 and 7 are to be corrected by Masada, p.117 and by the guide leaflet, which shows entries and distyle arrangements of columns in antis not given in the book. However discrepancies between the guide and the book show that a definitive plan is yet to be published. Nevertheless the overall plan in three wings is clear, and the royal residence wing is admirably shown in the photo IEJ, 1965, pl.10 (by which the plans should be corrected). The whole complex was about 67m by 48m. On the S.W. are long, narrow store-rooms; on the N.W. a wing with a large court, and another block North of this, which is oriented to the casemate fort wall, not the rest of the palace, and is also right by the main

North entry to the whole palace complex. On the N.E. is a large, regular block around a court; on the North side of this are small dwelling quarters. Between the N.W. and N.E. blocks is the gateroom at the main entry - a long room with plastered benches and walls which have stucco cut to imitate drafted masonry (like the gate room of the Snake Path). From here there was immediate access to the N.W. and N.E. wings. Access to the South wing was through a long court and then another elaborate gate-room, which again had benches and white plaster on the walls, cut into drafted panels.

The most important discoveries so far published (from the first season only) were made in the S.W. area which was found to be the royal residence and reception wing of Herod. It consists of chambers on four sides of a court 12 by 10.5m. The walls of the central court were plastered with a yellowish-white, unpainted plaster; and it was floored with a smooth grey plaster. The Survey made three soundings here in 1956-1957 (IEJ, 1957, X, Y, Z); the first two reached the plastered floor of the court (since uncovered by the excavations) but Z exposed part of the wall and entries (fig. 525) to a chamber at the S.E. of the court, a discovery now supplemented by the 1965 findings (for the Survey finds see IEJ, 1957, fig. 8 and pl.30). The combined discoveries have revealed here an antechamber with

a distyle in antis front on the North (figs. 523, 524); the antae are painted with broad black bands (IEJ, 1957, pp.17-18), the columns in red - which is reminiscent of the Hellenistic tomb of Apollophanes at Marisa, and the Anfushi tomb at Alexandria. Near here were found part of an entablature with dentils, and "many fragments of a fine Ionic capital, partly carved, and partly moulded and painted" (Masada, p.122 bottom).

East of this antechamber was Herod's official reception room; three entries were formed on the West side by two great piers between antae. The front faces of these piers was covered with stucco cut to imitate drafted masonry courses (figs. 523, 525), as on the pilaster faces of the S.W. angle pier in the inner peristyle of the lowest terrace at the North palace. The left-hand entry still had fragments of the wooden door-sill in situ. The debris found here by the Survey included charred wood and moulded stucco. It seems reasonable to interpret the four large holes in the floor as pegs for the frame of a canopy about the receptkon seat of Herod (IEJ, 1965, p.52). This reception room could also be entered from the North, where there is another chamber with a distyle in antis front. The columns here are painted red, like those of the larger antechamber, but its main feature is a large polychrome mosaic

(Masada, pp.120-121, 124-125; my fig. 526) part of which is well preserved. There is a succession of border patterns - Assyrian crowsteps, Greek scroll, plain framing lines, Greek fret - all of which are common in contemporary Greek mosaics. Within this are the type of motifs that we have already found to be well loved by the Jewish artists who carved the ossuaries, sarcophagi and tomb facades of Jerusalem - the Greek laurel and berry motif, probably regarded as the native olive, a scroll with various fruits and leaves - vine leaves, another leaf identified by Yadin as fig, pomegranates, and the tight three-fold cluster of grapes - in irregular alternation, Greek palmette with tendrils dependent from it (similar to the Jericho stucco pieces of Kelson, supra fig. 46(), and at the centre a continuous rosette pattern such as is found both on Hellenistic mosaics and on the Jewish ossuaries and sarcophagi. Here it is a continuous overlapped pattern of six-point compass-style rosettes with points added round the circumference also; it occurs in just this fashion on some ossuaries. The colours used are white, black, brown-red, and some green and blue in the special centre patterns. (IEJ, 1965, pp.53-54). Outside this chamber (and elsewhere in the palace) steps to an upper storey are still preserved.

On the North side of this court is a bath-house. The big entry hall or vestibule, which served as the tepidarium and presumably as the apodyterium also, has a fine mosaic on the North, in the same polychrome style as the one already described near the reception room. It has frames of red or black strips (Masada, p.129) of crowsteps and scrolls, and at the centre a fine rosette in blues, reds, black and white (fig. 527); the style is that of a ruler-drawn rosette with eight double points. To the West of this room is a frigidarium - a plastered pool with nine steps; to the East a narrow corridor, paved with plain white mosaic, leads to the caldarium (IEJ, 1965, pl.12A; Masada, p.126) where the hot bath has the form of a trough in an arched recess in the wall, adorned by a cornice with a ribbed profile (fig. 528). Another installation in this room has left only traces. On the West of the court is a large room whose walls were painted with panels like those of the North palace; Yadin suggests that this was Herod's bedchamber. Much of the excavation was not completed in the first season; the final publication will fill out on some of the architectural details. The West palace was obviously the official palace of Masada and must have housed many servants. Its most impressive features are the size and spaciousness of its conception. The courts were not

colonnaded, as was the Hellenistic fashion in more pretentious structures of the period. The practice of grouping rooms round a court belongs both to an old Near Eastern tradition and to the contemporary Greek Hellenistic one. The fine mosaics also employ Greek motifs, or motifs which had passed into the repertoire of fashionable Hellenistic mosaics; only at the centre of the large polychrome mosaic does the selection of native fruit-and-leaf motifs appear, such as constituted a uniquely Jewish style in the Jerusalemite tombs and sarcophagi and on certain ossuaries. The other polychrome mosaic shows once more the penchant for rosette forms. The variation of the compass and ruler styles, and of the six single points and eight double points is exactly the type of variation found on the ossuaries. The hot bath installation here does not have the typical system of underfloor and wall-pipe circulation, as found at Jericho and in the North palace of Masada. The Hellenistic decorative system whereby moulded stucco imitated stone revetments is employed, as in other Herodian work; but only in the richest rooms is the pattern of painted panels introduced. In some ways, as is to be expected, Herod lavished far more care on his North palace.

Three other structures - sumptuous residences for royal kin or high persons - markedly resemble the S.E. wing of the

West palace in ground-plan, as the descriptions in IEJ, 1965, pp.46-48 (VIII), pp.65-67, (XI), and pp.67-68 (XII) show. No detailed plans have yet been published, but the pattern of rooms round four sides of a court, and an open antechamber with a distyle in antis front, leading to the principal chamber of the complex at the S.W. corner, repeats itself. The columns and pilasters are painted red or black. In VIII a cornice was found in fragments near the columns (no details are given). There are panelled frescoes on the lower parts of the walls in all three of the South rooms here (fig. 529). The pattern of wide and narrow panels already found in the North palace is repeated - the wider panels are in solid dark monotones, black and red; the narrow panels are painted with mottled veining; as elsewhere, the ground is green. In XI the room on the East side next to the principal room used moulded plaster on walls and ceiling. Of other similar structures XIII is not yet published; VII and IX, though large complexes of rooms round a court do not repeat either the special arrangements or any of the sumptuous decor of the large and small palatial structures already described. It has been suggested that VII is an administrative structure, and IX a barracks. Associated with VII and IX is a complex of store-rooms just to the South of the North palace. A sounding by the Survey in one of these

revealed remains of a burnt roof of beams, reeds and plaster. The entry to the whole storeroom and arsenal complex was at the N.W. angle of VII? where it almost met the casemate wall of the fortress (Masada, plan p.103, photo p.102). The photo shows that rusticated Herodian drafted stones were sometimes used on Masada - of the type with picked, flat face within the drafts.

The most exceptional building erected by Herod (its orientation, frescoes and mosaics establish its contemporaneity with the North palace in particular) on Masada apart from his two palaces is the large bath-house just North of the store chambers and arsenal and just South of the upper terrace of the North palace, with which it is aligned. This bath-house is entered from the North; entry is to a large court, and then the apodyterium, which leads to the tepidarium. On either side of the tepidarium are the frigidarium and caldarium (IEJ, 1965, p..7A air photo; my fig. 532). The court was paved with a black and white hexagon mosaic, like those of the upper terrace of the North palace (fig. 533). There were colonnades with Nabataean capitals round the North, West and East sides of the court. The walls were painted with frescoes (Masada, pp.83-85). Parts of a Doric frieze were found scattered in the debris of

the court, and re-used by the Zealots in alterations to the furnace for the hypocaust of the caldarium; one block is on my fig. 535 - the triglyph is damaged, the patera of the metope is a flat, raised disc which has set upon it in relief a carved 12-point compass rosette. In style and form the rosette is like those found on ossuaries. We may contrast for instance the more naturalistic and plastic form used by the Nabataeans at Khirbet et-Tannur some time later (fig. 537; and notice the ethrogs). The floor of the apodyterium is paved in opus sectile with alternating triangular slabs of black and white; much of this is preserved intact. The panelling of the wall frescoes is just like that of the caldarium, to be described below, and is shown in colour Masada, p.82 top (my fig. 534). Fragments of painted stucco with the marks of reeds on the back must be from a ceiling of beams and plastered reeds. The colours (Masada, p.82 bottom) include some attractive blues; the fragments show 'coffered' designs, frames of Greek egg or scroll, and a design very like the 'sun wheel' of Hasmonaean coins, but without felloe (fig. 536). This motif too is derived from the Hellenistic Greeks.

The tepidarium is a small, square chamber West of the caldarium, and connected with it by an arched entry (Masada, p.74). An original mosaic floor is preserved near the walls

(no details are given); later above this was added a stone opus sectile floor of bright red and black (IEJ, 1965, p.33 and pl.8C; Masada, p.78). Frescoes are painted on the lower part of the walls - a 'dado'; then a 'course' of panels alternately wide and narrow in red and yellow monotones on the usual green field of the Masada artists; then above this long, dark panels in a narrow horizontal strip, and between them small squares which are painted with the clouded veining pattern (fig. 530). Here too fragments of the stuccoed, reed ceiling were found. The frescoes in this tepidarium are very similar to those of the apodyterium (fig. 534) and also to the dado and panel pattern on the South outer wall of the lower terrace of the North palace (figs. 502, 503) and in the smaller palatial residence VIII (fig. 529).

The frigidarium is on the West of the tepidarium; it is a large, plastered pool with seven steps.

The caldarium is a large room (fig. 532) rectangular in form, and has an exedra in its North wall and a rectangular niche directly opposite in its South wall; it was roofed by a barrel-vault constructed with voussiors, now collapsed. The hypocaust is made up of 200 colonnettes, which are mostly of plastered stone, but near the two niches are made up of seven

or eight ceramic discs, and crowned by a stone or ceramic slab (fig. 531). Above this system was plastering, and the ceramic floor tiles (Masada, pp.76-77; IEJ, 1965, pl.7B). Upon this hypocaust was at first a mosaic floor, then opus sectile of black and white. Ceramic pipes ran up the walls from the underfloor system; in the South angle some were still in situ (IEJ, 1965, pl.8B; Masada, p.80). A stone tub was used in the exedra, a built and plastered tub in the other recess. In the debris were hundreds of fragments of painted plaster and moulded plaster (IEJ, 1965, p.32 no details).

Many technical and chronological problems connected with the use of the baths await clarification in the final report. This large-scale use of water at arid Masada was made possible by the construction of large cisterns and by the trapping of waters from sudden rains and floods. One of the most interesting features of the building is that it was the Nabataean adaptation of the Greek Corinthian capital that was used in its court; what then of the still unexcavated fortress on Machaerus, the border fort between Judaea and the Nabatene? The mosaics, roofing system, hypocaust system, frescoes, colonnade and Doric frieze all match other Herodian work at Jerusalem, Jericho, Sebaste, Caesarea and Herodion. The form

of the caldarium is just like that at Herodion, and that of the Stabian baths at Pompeii.

Masada, the best preserved of all the Herodian towns or fortresses, provides us in its plans and details with late Hellenistic conceptions and decor such as are found at Pompeii, Herculaneum, Ostia, Priene, Delos and Alexandria. I shall establish this in Part X below.

Such is the conclusion for palaces and baths. The fortress wall and its towers were also excavated. The wall is a casemate, a traditional Palestinian type found, for example, at Samaria (outer wall of Omri). The material is hard dolomite, quarried on the spot (there is a quarry near the store-room complex) and covered with white plaster inside and out. The interstices between the stones are filled with small ones. About 110 rooms of the casemate, and 27 towers, have so far been identified; only substructures of the towers remain in situ, recognisable from their thick walls. The Snake Path gate-house is a rectangular chamber with benches and its wall plaster incised to imitate masonry (like the gate of Masada, p.102 bottom). Scores of coins of Jannaeus are the only indication of the Hasmonaean presence so far published; hundreds of coins of

Archelaus, the procurators and Agrippa show occupation continued through the 1st century AD; and caches of First Revolt coins were found.

# HERODEION (HERODION)

The description by Josephus has already been given (supra IX,v,2).

The fortress was visited by de Saulcy (F.de Saulcy, "Voyage en Terre Sainte", Vol. 1, 1865, pp.171-183) who described the structure crowning the cone as an enclosing wall with one circular tower on the East, and three circular half-towers at the other points of the compass. At the East tower he found "une large plaque de mosaïque hérodienne", which was carried off to the Louvre. Villefosse and Dussaud inform us that this was tesserae of white stone found in the ground-level chamber of the East tower ("Notice..", no.75; "Monuments..", no 60). Of the masonry de Saulcy remarked that by comparison with the Herodian Temple precinct at Jerusalem "..il y a tout un abîme..". The type of stone dressing used for the structures on the plain below was the same. De Saulcy found no carved or moulded ornament:

> "Dans tout cela, malheureusement, il n'y a pas une seule moulure, et si, comme la chose ne parait douteuse, ce palais a été somptueusement ornementé jadis, tout a disparu, soit que les ornements aient été enlevés comme materiaux, soit qu'il en reste sous terre. II est d'ailleurs tout simple que les corniches, qui sont tombées les premières, aient été les premières utilisées par ceux qui ont eu intérêt à voir dans cette ruine une carrière économique; quant aux bases, elles sont trop profondément enterrées sous les décombres pour qu'on puisse, autrement qu'à l'aide de fouilles intelligentes, les étudier aujourd'hui".

Fortunately such excavations have now been carried out (1962-1964) and a preliminary notice of the first two seasons is published in Liber Annuus, 1963, pp. 219-266 and plan 1 ("L'Herodion di Gebal Fureidis") with a brief note on the third in Terra Santa, March, 1965, pp. 81-86, both by the excavator V. Corbo. As yet no further accounts or definitive reports have appeared.

The plan in Terra Santa, p. 86 shows the results of the three seasons - the uncovering of the outer face of a large circular fortress with a double ring-wall; the clearance of the passage between the rings; the excavation of the East tower, strong point of the fortress and of the three half-circle towers on the North, South and West; the remains of the stepped way leading up to the fortress; the excavation of a bath-house within the fort at the North West; the long stylobate running North-South down the centre of the fort, dividing it into two halves; the exedrae just inside the inner ring-wall on the West side; and another stylobate on the N.E. in front of the North exedra. My fig. 538 shows the excavation at an earlier stage.

The masonry used on the walls was of large, squared, limestone ashlars with the draft and flat-picked inner face that we have seen in so much Herodian work (fig.539). The cross-walls shown inside the towers on the plan are late additions. The exterior of the outer ring-wall is best preserved at E in fig. 538. The steps mentioned by Josephus up to the fortress are gone, but their foundations are in situ (LA, pp.230-231). Plaster is well preserved in the North half-tower and in the ring corridor (LA, p.237; fig.8 on p.238). Ancorage sockets for the

wooden beams of the floor for the ring-corridor can also still be seen. The jambs of a gate in the inner ring-wall were found intact just East of the North exedra. An important stray find should be noticed - a Corinthian capital found at the angle of the North half-tower with the outer ring-wall to the West. Corbo says this is in the same style as those of Masada, and the pilaster capitals of Jericho (Pritchard, pl.18, 1,2). But these introductory accounts of the excavations largely ignore architectural detail, which are to be considered fully in the final report (not yet published).

The complex IX-XIII is a bath-house, separated from other structures by a passage to the South (XIV) and an open area to the East (VII). The whole area of the bath-house was covered with stone cupolas and vaults; all other areas of the site so far excavated had timber ceilings. The arrangement is - IX apodyterium, X tepidarium, XI frigidarium, XII large caldarium, XIII small court. Presumably the entry was from the court. This led into the disrobing-room and then the warm room, from which either the cold or hot baths could be reached.

At the apodyterium charred remains of door-leaves at the court entry were uncovered (LA, p.239); the door between the apodyterium and tepidarium was arched. The ceiling of the apodyterium was vaulted, and the stonework had the draft and flat-picked slight boss already mentioned. The walls are plastered, and the lower parts are painted with the same large, rectangular panels that we found at Masada - Corbo details red-brown, ivory-yellow and a ground of green; above the lowest line of panels were more, mostly

destroyed (fig.540). West of the apodyterium is the tepidarium - a circular chamber with a cupola as its ceiling and arched doors to the apodyterium, caldarium and frigidarium. Both the apodyterium and tepidarium were paved with mosaics in black and white - black rectangular borders on a white ground - but the centres of these are destroyed; there may have been other patterns here (like the hexagons and rosettes at Masada). The wall frescoes in the tepidarium are preserved to a considerable heigh (fig. 541). At the bottom is a high 'dado', a continuous band of red going round the chamber; above this is another continuous band - this time brown and more narrow; then a great field with pairs of tall rectangles alternating with large squares in a pattern of five, of which the central one overlaps the other four - a more elaborate schema than anything that has survived at Masada. The rectangles are flesh-coloured, the squares azure or yellow, the central squares flesh-coloured. The frigidarium, West of the tepidarium, is squeezed into the bath-system at the angle it makes with the curving inner ring-wall of the palace-fortress: it forms an odd triangular shape. As we have found by now to be usual with the Herodian frigidarium the whole chamber is occupied by the pool. Steps at the West corner create a deeper area there.

The caldarium is a rectangular vaulted chamber with its short sides at the West and East. The rectangle is enlarged by a wide, deep exedra at the East and by a deep, square recess opposite this at the West. There are also shallow rectangular recesses in the long sides right at the centre (figs. 11, 13 in LA, pp. 246,250); these two

recesses are adorned with painted stucco - panels on the rear walls (brown, red, yellow, white and black are used on a green ground), and very bold examples of the imitation cloudy veining - like the succession of concentric, irregular ripples made by a stone thrown cleanly into still water (fig. 542). This is most reminiscent of Herodian Masada, but also of Jericho and Sebaste, and of the orchestra of the Herodian theatre at Caesarea Maritima. Of the hypocaust over 60 suspensurae were found (LA,fig.13, p.250). They are stone colonnettes crowned by a small square head, and covered with ceramic tiles - slightly different arrangement from that found at Jericho, but the same as that used at Masada. Traces of the curved sections of ceramic wall-pipe were found here, as at Jericho and Masada. The hot bath was found in fragments (p.252). The little court is a small rectangle broken by an extrados which is formed by the exedra of the caldarium. It was floored with a black and white mosaic (LA, fig.15; my fig. 543). The white ground has a black rectangular border and a small black square frame at the centre; within this centre frame is a circular frame of black and white tesserae, enclosing a 6-point, compass-style rosette - one could almost have forecast the central motif. There are traces of an upper storey above the frigidarium and tepidarium, repeating the triangular and circular forms of the lower rooms.

An area East of the baths was also cleared. Just East of the apodyterium (i.e. North of the open area VII, and entered from it) was found a square chamber (fig. 544) with remains of charred ceiling beams, and an entry on its North side to the ring-corridor which was already blocked up, plastered and frescoed in the

Herodian period. The frescoes are the same schema of alternately light and dark panels in a green field; only the lowest parts are preserved. The colours are white and red.

East of this chamber an exedra was excavated (fig.545), which was found in the third season to have its counterpart in a matching exedra at the S.E. of the fortified palace complex. Both of these exedrae are just East of a stylobate which runs North-South right down the centre of the fortress; and both are also against a section of the inner ring-wall. The bath-house is North West of the great central stylobate; and this same stylobate is returned East before it reaches the exedrae, leaving a space in front of them. The lower drums and bases of Ionic or Corinthian columns were found in situ on the East return of this stylobate at its North end, and also across the mouth of the North exedra. The columns have Attic bases on plinths (fig.546). The mouth of the exedra has its own stylobate. Plaster still clung to the West column of the two in the exedra mouth, and to parts of the great stylobate, which is itself large, squared ashlars. This great stylobate with its East returns at the North and South extremities seems to be part of a colonnade outside which is the central area of the East side of the fortress-palace. At the foot of the East tower Corbo found a red soil which leads him to suppose that this was an open garden area (as Herod had at Jerusalem). Most of the work before the publication of the reports in LA and TS was done at the North exedra and the N.E. arm of the great stylobate. The exedra - with

the distyle arrangement already described - had its hemicycle plastered and painted with the familiar panelled frescoes above a black base strip (fig.545). The short wall East of the exedra (which runs East to meet the inner ring-wall by the gate already mentioned above) is decorated with the same large panels of solid colour - black, white, red - on a green ground (LA, fig.22, p.263). No evidence has been published as to whether the exedra was covered or open. In the debris around the column bases and drums in situ on the N.E. arm of the main stylobate were fragments of Corinthian capitals, an Ionic capital and a cornice; once more the Corinthian capitals are like those of Masada (LA,p.264).

The West sector of the fortress - South of the baths - was hardly touched by the excavations so far published. One anticipates Herod's residential quarters, and accommodation for the garrison. The area enclosed is, of course, far more restricted than the great flat peak of Masada. But the bath-house of Herodion is most similar to the great bath-house of Masada; there is a fondness for exedrae, as at Jericho; the same taste for the uncomplicated Attic base and the Ionic and Corinthian orders. The township at the foot of the peak has not yet been investigated.

# IX

## INITIAL CONCLUSIONS

My conclusions on the buildings of Herod will be elaborated and developed in Part X infra. The remarks here are introductory ones.

The use of painted stucco and of stucco incised to represent drafted ashlar courses is characteristic of all the monuments which we have studied. The style used is a late Hellenistic one which is closely related to the Pompeian 'Incrustation' paintings, and even more closely to late Hellenistic Alexandrian tomb-paintings. The common Herodian work favours large geometric panels with 'dados' below and a low 'frieze' of stretchers above. In addition all sorts of painted stucco borders adorned by Greek motifs (running scroll, egg-and-dart, palmettes etc.) were used. Almost as popular as the large monochrome panels in double frames of contrasting colours were patterns of polychrome clouded or smoky veining, which are by now far removed from the types of marble or alabaster which were their inspiration, and are intended to form a rich, polychrome pattern.

The orchestra of the Caesarean theatre offers the same technique and motifs applied to a floor. In addition bubbles and overlapping scales (the imbrication pattern) were employed here. The theatre shows clear evidence of Roman, as opposed to Hellenistic, forms. Unfortunately much of its Herodian phase is irrecoverable. But traces of the pulpitum front (proscenium) and of the scaenae frons serve together with the well-preserved orchestra floor as indications of its general form.

## IX, conclusions

Herodian mosaics belong to the late Hellenistic and the Roman traditions. Both black and white carpet mosaics and the rug style are employed. The motifs found are entirely geometric, as with the painted stucco. The finest examples are the two polychrome mosaics of the Western Palace at Masada. The characteristic vegetal motifs of Jerusalem in the Herodian period are found once more in the larger of the two.

The opus reticulatum and opus quadratum structures at Jericho form an extensive winter resort and pleasure garden dating from the time of Herod or Archelaus. They are the most striking demonstration that we shall find of Roman Augustan influence. The bonding techniques used are those of concrete.

A taste for the Roman type of baths is well established in the remains - at Jericho, Masada and Herodion. There are variations in size, ornament and the form and dispositions of the chambers.

Palatial residences of three types at least have been found at Jericho and Masada. They may be compared with palatial Hellenistic residences at Priene and Delos.

Herodian masonry and Herodian towers are to be linked with late Hellenistic remains. And the same applies to the provincial orders used, which depend to a certain extent on earlier Palestinian styles. The orders employed are not distinctively Roman, but are linked with Alexandrian traditions.

## IX, conclusions

The official art of Herod draws upon fashionable contemporary styles and forms - both those of the South Eastern Mediterranean, and those being employed in Italy. It bears hardly any trace of distinctively Jewish features, and must be contrasted with the fashionable but orientalising tomb art of the period at Jerusalem, and with the popular traditions of Near Eastern art which are still finding expression in the Jewish ossuaries. All traces of Egyptian or Phoenico-Persian forms are gone.

# PART TEN

The conclusions of my Part X develop many of the arguments tentatively suggested in Parts I, II, III, VI, VII, VIII and IX. Arguments are pursued at considerably more depth in order to try to establish a common pattern or spread of cultural influences and styles in this period for Palestine. Points where the Jews were receptive to Greek forms, or accepted and transformed Greek motifs or detail are investigated at length. Points where they proved adamantly hostile are assessed and explained. The synopsis at the beginning of this work may be regarded as a very brief summary of my results.

## ADDITIONAL BIBLIOGRAPHY FOR CONCLUSIONS ON TOMBS, SARCOPHAGI AND OSSUARIES

Abbreviated references which will be used here are indicated in brackets.

The sequence is according to the abbreviated reference, or, where no abbreviation is used, the author's name.


E. Breccia — 'Municipalité d'Alexandrie: Alexandrea ad Aegyptum - guide de la ville ancienne et moderne et du musée greco-romain', Bergamo, 1914. (AA)

A. Adriani — 'Repertorio d'Arte dell'Egitto greco-romano', Serie A, Vol. I, Palermo, 1961.

R. Vallois — 'L'Architecture hellénique et hellénistique à Délos', Vol. I, paris, 1944. (ARD)

AJA — American Journal of Archaeology.

W. Andrae and D. Lenzen — 'Die Partherstadt Assur', Leipzig, 1933.

| | |
|---|---|
| Ann. arch. syr. | Annales archéologiques de Syrie. |
| Ant. | The Loeb edition of the Antiquities of Josephus. |
| H. Seyrig | 'Antiquitées syriennes - extraits de 'Syria', Series I, 1934, II 1938, III 1946, etc., Geuthner, Paris. (Ant. syr.) |
| J. M. C. Toynbee | 'The Art of the Romans', London, 1965 (AR) |
| Arch. Anz. | Archaeologischer Anzeiger<br>These are found in the Jahrbuch des deutsch. archaeologisch. Institute. |
| M. Avi-Yonah | see OA and OE. |
| J. Durm | 'Die Baukunst der Griechen', Leipzig, 1910. (BG) |
| F. Chamoux | 'Greek Art', London, 1966. (Chamoux GA) |
| G. Contenau | 'La Civilisation phénicienne', Paris, 1926. (CPh) |
| C. Watzinger and K. Wulzinger | 'Damaskus - die antike Stadt', Berlin and Leipzig, 1921. (DAS) |

N. Glueck — 'Deities and Dolphins', London, 1966. (DD)

C. Watzinger — 'Denkmäler Palästinas', Vol. II, Leipzig, 1935. (DP)

H. Frankfort — 'The Art and Architecture of the Ancient Orient', London, 1954.

R. Macalister — 'The Excavation of Gezer', Vols. I-III, London, 1912. (Gezer)

I. H. Grinnell — 'Greek Temples', N.Y., 1943. (GT)

Th. Fyfe — 'Hellenistic Architecture', Cambridge, 1936 (HA)

Th. Reinach and Hamdey Bey — 'Une Nécropole royale à Sidon', large folio, Paris, 1896. (Hamdey)

T. Webster — 'Hellenistic Art', London, 1966. (HArt)

R. Delbrueck — 'Hellenistische Bauten in Latium', Vol. II, Strassburg, 1912. (HB)

F. Matz — 'Hellenistische und römische Grabbauten' in 'Die Antike', Vol. IV, pp.266-292. (HBGrab)

| | |
|---|---|
| G. Richter | 'A Handbook of Greek Art', London 1959. (HGA) |
| E. E. Herzfeld | 'Archaeological History of Iran', London, 1935 (Sweich lectures for 1934). |
| IEJ | Israel Exploration Journal. |
| JHS | Journal of Hellenic Studies. |
| E. R. Goodenough | 'Jewish Symbols in the Grecc-Roman Period', Vols. I-III,f., 1953 on. (JS) |
| H. Kähler | 'Rome and her Empire', London, 1963. |
| K. M. Kenyon | 'Excavations at Jericho', Vol. II, London, 1965. |
| N. Avigad | 'Matzevot qedumot beNahal Kedron', Jerusalem, 1954. (KV) |
| Mel. univ. St. Jos. | Mélanges de L'Université Saint Josèph, Beyrouth. |
| M. Morehart | 'Early Sculpture at Palmyra' in Berytus, XII, pp.58-83. |
| E. Renan | 'Mission de Phénicie', large pholio, Paris, 1864. (MP) |

M. Avi-Yonah — 'Oriental Art in Roman Palestine', Rome, 1961. (OA)

idem — 'Oriental Elements in the Art of Palestine in the Roman and Byzantine Periods'. Three articles in QDAP, 1942, 1948, 1950. (OE)

R. Brunnow and A. Domaszewski — 'Die Provincia Arabia', Strassburg, 1909. (PA)

H. C. Butler — 'The Princeton Expedition to Syria in 1904-1905 and 1909; Division II Architecture', Leiden, 1909. (PE)

G. Dalman — 'Petra und seine Felsheiligtümer', Leipzig, 1908. (PF)

R. Macalister — 'The Philistines: their History and Civilisation', Sweich Lectures for 1911. (PHC)

J. Starcky — 'Pétra et la Nabatène', in fasc. 39 of 'Supplément du Dictionnaire de la Bible', VII, Paris, 1964. (PH)

QDAP — Quarterly of the Mandatory Department of Antiquities of Palestine.

Sir M. Wheeler 'Roman Art and Architecture', London, 1964. (RA)

Ch. Clermont-Ganneau 'Recueil d'Archéologie orientale', Vols. I-VIII, Paris, 1888-1924. (RAO)

RB Revue biblique.

C. Robert 'Die antiken Sarkophag-Reliefs', Berlin, 1890-1919.

K. Ronkzewski 'Description des chapiteaux corinthiens et variés du musée greco-romain d'Alexandrie', in suppl. to Bull. soc. d'arch. d'Alex., 1927, pp.1-36.

D. Krencker and W. Zschietzschmann 'Römische Tempel in Syrien', Berlin, 1938. (RT)

D. Schlumberger 'Les formes anciennes du chapiteau corinthien en Syrie, en Palestine et en Arabie', in 'Syria', 1933, pp.283-317.

D. Shoe 'Architectural Mouldings of Dura-Europos', in 'Berytus', Vol. IX, pp.1-40.

D. Sourdel 'Les Cultes du Hauran à l'Epoque romaine', Paris, 1952.

M. Murray and J. Ellis — 'A Street in Petra', London, 1940. (SP)

J. W. Crowfoot — 'Samaria-Sebaste III: The Objects', London, 1957. (SS III)

War — Loeb Josephus 'The Jewish War'.

B. Segall — '119-120 Winckelmannsprogramm: Tradition und Neuschöpfung in der frühalexandrinischen Kleinkinst', Berlin, 1966.

# AN ADDITIONAL BIBLIOGRAPHY
# FOR CONCLUSIONS ON HEROD'S BUILDINGS


A. Adriani — Annuaire du Musée greco-romain, Vol. III, 1940-1950, pp.47-128 Nécropoles de l'île de Pharos. Espy. pp.107-110 for the Masonry Style.

M. Bieber — The History of the Greek and Roman Theater. (Princeton, 1961).

M. E. Blake — Memoirs of the American Academy in Rome, VIII, 1930, pp.7-160 and pls. 1-50; "The Pavements of the Roman Buildings of the Republic and Early Empire".
For mosaic motifs like those used by Herod.

M. Bulard — Fondation Eugène Piot: Monuments et Mémoires, XIV, 1908: "Peintures murales et mosaïques de Délos", 2ème partie - décorations murales pp.92-184. Also for mosaics pp.185f, figs. 63-67 and pl. X.

A. Maiuri — Pompeii (official guide)

A. Maiuri "Roman Painting" (Geneva, 1953) Part 3: The Mural Painting of Campania, pp.35-70 with fine coloured illustrations of Herculaneum and Pompeii.

R. Martin "Architecture universelle: Monde grec" (Fribourg, 1966) pp.17-37 on Hellenistic fortresses. (photos)

A. Mau "Pompeii - its Life and Art" (London, 1899). pp.446-460 on the wall-paintings; pp.196f on the baths near the forum.

E. Pernice "Die Hellenistische Kunst in Pompeji: Band VI - Pavimente und figürliche Mosaiken". (Berlin, 1938)

G. E. Rizzo Monumenti della pittura antica scoperti in Italia, Sezione terza, La Pittura hellenistico-romana: "Roma: fasc. 1 Le pitture della 'Casa dei grifi' (Palatino)".

D. S. Robertson "A Handbook of Greek and Roman Architecture" (2nd edn., 1945, Cambridge), espy. pp.243-62 passim for baths; pp.297-302 for houses and palaces.

J. M. C. Toynbee "The Art of the Romans" (Vol. 43, Thames and Hudson, Ancient Peoples and Places, London, 1965) for mosaics, frescoes.

# CONCLUSIONS

## BACKGROUND

This work began from an interest in the extent to which the Jews of Palestine were hellenised in the time from Alexander the Great to the two great Revolts of AD 66-73 and 132-135. The subject is one of vast complexity, since the cultural history of the Mediterranean littoral at least as far as the Syro-Mesopotamian steppes was deeply influenced by the Macedonian conquest and then by Greek settlement, trade, and ways of life and thought including language and art (Formenwelt). Influence emanated partly from the poleis founded or refounded by Alexander, the Diadochoi and the Ptolemies, though it was not the Pharaonic aim either in Egypt or outside it to establish the great numbers of Greek cities on which the Seleucids relied; partly from long, hellenised coastal cities, and very much also from the contacts of Palestinian Jewry with Alexandrian Jewry and in general terms from Alexandria with its immense prestige in the spheres of learning and art. It is notable that Ptolemaic control of Palestine never provoked the sharp hostility aroused by Seleucid control; that it was

a period of peace and security in which Greek culture was able to send down its roots into the receptive soil of the Jewish mind. At the same time it must never be forgotten that the influence of the highest achievements of the Greeks in city institutions, athletic culture, the literary and intellectual spheres of education, art etc. was confined to the upper classes of the cities. Since the settlement of Syria-Palestine was in agrarian villages or remote emporia apart from the coastal cities of Phoenicia and Philistia this type of Greek influence was limited. Still Hellenistic Ptolemais-Ake, Beth Shan-Skythopolis and Samaria exercised considerable influence in the Jewish region. The end of the Ptolemaic period resulted in a claim to polis status from the priestly factions at Jerusalem; and we know that in the Seleucid period there was a gymnasium and an ephebate there. It is at Jerusalem that we should look at this period both for the deepest marks of the hellenisation of Palestinian Jewry and for the most stalwart resistance to it. For different reasons and at different levels both the wealthy priestly class and the Pharisees (and earlier Hasidim) had good reason for resisting Hellenism as a total way of life and thought, since Judaism itself was intended to be all-embracing in its application. How rigorously the Law was applied by the Scribes and Pharisees can be seen from encounters in the Gospels and by Pauline teaching in the New Testament.

Throughout these periods of peace and vicissitudes, of receptivity and hostility, Greek art-forms gained ground in Palestine. Of the official art employed for the public buildings of Jewish Palestine in the Ptolemaic, Seleucid and Maccabean periods we have no knowledge except a reference to the gymnasium at Jerusalem in the First Book of Maccabees.

## THE PALACE NEAR PHILADELPHIA AND THE PHOENICO-ALEXANDRIAN CULTURAL ZONE

Problems of interpretation are illustrated by one of the oldest structures that survives: the palace of Hyrcanos at 'Araq el-Emir from the end of the Ptolemaic period of control (182-175 BC). Butler, Murray and Watzinger declared that this was a structure of Oriental form which employed Greek decor. In particular the base with a leaf calyx, the capital with "bull" protome, the stiff paratactic frieze of gigantic lions carved in the bas-relief style traditional to the Near East (without any attempt at the plastic forms of Greek high relief) and the Lion-Sphinx are pointed to as "Persian" features. But by 182 BC the Persian empire with its hybrid official art had long since collapsed. A more informed explanation of the presence of such forms in Coele-Syria in the late 2nd century BC

must refer to the combined influence of Alexandria and Phoenicia.....

There is of course no doubt that a strong and vigorous art tradition was established in Alexandria; nor is there any doubt that Alexandria and Phoenicia were culturally linked. In this connection the re-foundation of Ptolemais-Ake (c. 261 BC; coins) should be noted and the long century of Ptolemaic control over both Phoenicia and Palestine. Moreover by this time the 'Philistine' cities had long since lost their separate identity (PHC, pp.62-7). In fact Macalister goes so far as to suppose that Pulasati (Philistine) or Zakkala elements which had been absorbed by the Phoenician Canaanite cities made possible the distinctive achievements of the Phoenicians that mark them off from the rest of the Canaanites (PHC, pp.68-70, 127). Excavations have shown that the whole coast of Coele-Syria was in Phoenician hands in the Persian period, a situation reflected also by the Periplous of Skylax, the Greek admiral who served Darius. Phoenician cultural dominance is still indicated by Strabo (book 6) who includes the 'Philistine' cities Azotos, Askalon and Gaza with the 'Phoenician' cities Iope, Ptolemais, Tyre, Sidon and Berytos in his 'Phoenicia'. This does not correspond to the political realities of the time, on which

Pliny and Ptolemy perfectly agree (HN,V,69,75; Ptol. V, 14,3), but presumably reflects the cultural situation. As to individual cities:

1. One of the Sidonian kings records the gift of the Plain of Sharon - including the coastal cities Dora and Iope - to Sidon from the Persian Great King (CIS, I, e).
2. Strato's Tower (Turris Stratonis) was founded by one of the Sidonian Stratos in the Persian period.
3. The strength of Tyre and of Gaza was shown by their long resistance to Alexander.
4. Strabo and Diodorus both say that the chief port of the Persians for operations against the Egyptians was Ake.

We have then in the 5th and 4th centuries BC a picture of vigorous city life dominated by eclectic Phoenician culture. The Palestinian coast was far from being an unimportant backwater. Raphia, Gaza, Askalon, Azotos, Iops, Dora, Iamnia, Apollonia and Strato's Tower were all important towns below the pivotal area of Phoenician power at Ake, Tyre and Sidon.

At the same time the cities of this Phoenician area were being hellenised both before and during the early hellenistic period. Several kings with the Phoenician name 'Abdastart also put a Greek transliteration on their coins in the form

'Strato' (BMC, Phoen., pp.145-149). One Strato brought in Greek dancers and musicians to Sidon (Ath. XII, 531). More striking is the invasion of Tyre by an institution utterly foreign to the Semites - the Greek practice of penteteric games. This is demonstrated by the fact that II Macc., 4, 18-20 records how the Jewish High Priest Jason sent money to the games of Melqart-Hercules at Tyre (early 2nd century BC). An interesting link between Alexandria and Coele-Syria is the establishment throughout this area but no further North of the mysteries of Isis-Serapis and Eleusis (Demeter-Persephone), the reception of which was buttressed by identification of Isis-Demeter with a native mother-serpent goddess (AS, I, pp.56-61). The Zenon Papyri show that the inland towns Mareshah and Adoaim were also important at the time of Ptolemy II Philadelphos. And in fact the rich tombs of Beit Jibrin-Mareshah show that a hellenised Sidonian colony settled there in the 3rd century BC, and intermarried with Edomite elements in the 2nd century. Well before the time of Alexander the Palestinian coast was penetrated by Greek products favoured by the Phoenicians (DP, p.9). Iliffe notes imported Greek pottery from the 7th to the 4th centuries BC in the Shephela (QDAP, 1932, pp.15f and plates). At Atlit 5th and 4th century Attic Black- and Red-figure lekythoi were excavated, but with a preponderance of

the products of Egyptian and Phoenician small arts (Johns, QDAP, 1933, pp.41-47). Fine Greek pottery was also imported to Samaria in the Persian period (SS III, p.3, 210-216). More Black- and Red-figure ware was found by Hamilton at Tell Abu Hawam on the Gulf of Ake (6th-4th centuries BC; QDAP, 1934, pp.74-80).

The particular talent of Phoenician art has always been its eclecticism, which in the older period was shown by selection from Egyptian and Assyrian motifs and styles. The same spirit was displayed by Achaemenid official art. Features of Persian culture must have exercised a strong influence in Phoenicia. For instance the Persian robe was worn right up to the Roman conquest, (AS, III, pp.45-73) and the Persians drew upon areas as far West as Egypt and Asia Minor for sculptors and other craftsmen and for materials. But Persian influence on Phoenician art is hard to demonstrate, since Achaemenid art is itself an eclectic hybrid, utilising the Egyptian roll and cavetto and hypostyle hall together with the Assyrian narrative (but artistically static) bas-relief and merlons. Features which are clearly Iranian are often connected with Mazdaism or Zarathustrianism. This is true of the Fire-Temple, and of reliefs showing the conflict of Good and Evil in the persons of the Great King and some fabled monster. However Herzfeld was

satisfied that he had traced the tall slim column with its bull protomai bracket-capital to Iranian wooden prototypes; such protomai are ubiquitous at Persepolis, Susa and Naqsh-i-Rustam. One of the few unequivocal indications that official Achaemenid art added new dimensions to Phoenician eclecticism is an enormous and fine example of this type of capital from Sidon in the Beirut museum, dated to the 5th century BC. The Egyptian roll-and-cavetto and the Assyrian merlon had already been incorporated into the Phoenician repertoire. But perhaps their prestige under Persian rule in Achaemenid art influenced their continuing popularity, continuing the well-established dominance of Egyptian elements in Phoenician art. That Egyptian forms still retain strong influence in the Hellenistic period is not surprising, as we know that in Egypt temples of pure Egyptian style were still built through the Hellenistic and Roman periods and that in the Hellenistic tombs of Alexandria Egyptian symbolism and iconism connected with Isis, Osiris, Horus, Anubis and Thoth is found alongside Hellenistic burial-arrangements and Greek rock-cut porticoes. Here too Doric and Corinthian capitals are found with papyriform ones, and Greek dentils are combined with the plain Egyptian architrave and cornice of cavetto and roll. At Alexandria too portraits of the Ptolemies as traditional Pharaohs were being carved as

well as portraits of them in Greek style (Berytus, 1949, pp.129-141).

It seems a fair assumption then that the lion frieze and bull protomai of the Qasr el-Abd at Araq el-Emir are influences mediated through Phoenicia. The great lions of Araq are in fact too weathered to show details. The massiveness and formal paratactic arrangement are found at Achaemenid Susa. But nothing else can be said except to contrast the traditional low relief of the Near East with Greek high relief, which is illustrated by the lion-spout recently uncovered by Iapp's team at the Qasr and classed as a provincial Greek work. It was part of Greek naturalism to be interested in moulded, plastic volume; whereas the Near East, though interested in detail in its animal creations, conceived a stylised form. It is interesting too to contrast the inflexible attitude, the complete lack of movement and inter-relationships of the Araq lion frieze and the variations in attitude on even such a poor frieze of provincial Greek style as the procession of animals inside the tomb of Apollophanes at Beit Jibrin. Petra, also within the Alexandro-Phoenician sphere of influence, offers the nearest analogy to the great lions in a large lion carved in the rock of the Wadi el-Farasa, which belongs, as Avi-Yonah has pointed out, in its massiveness

and lashing tail to a Near Eastern tradition stretching back through Achaemenid, Neo-Babylonian and Assyrian intermediaries to its Hittite creators (OE, p.143).

But it should be pointed out also that the bull-and-eagle (remembering that the 'bull' may be a unicorn or a horse and that the eagle is badly worn) capitals of the Qasr are Corinthian, and are not the bracket capitals of Achaemenid-Phoenician type discussed above, but based on a cup or inverted bell (for origins see BG, p.346). The bull is known on Greek Ionic capitals, which are nearer in form to the Persepolitan type, often with the bull emerging sideways from the bolster. These Hellenistic capitals are from Ephesos and Magnesia in Asia Minor (BG, pp.304-5), where Achaemenid influence is obvious, especially since we know from a long inscription that Lydian and Carian craftsmen were used by Darius in Persis. A capital of the same type comes from Cypriot Salamis in the Phoenician cultural zone (BG, p.304, fig. 283).

It is to the point here to notice that in the Egyptian capitals which Durm draws as the prototypes of the Corinthian the decor is not moulded but is pressed in tight against the bell; this was carried over into the earliest Greek Corinthian

(proto-Corinthian) capitals. The capitals of the Theatre of Dionysos at Athens, for instance, have an upper zone of lotus pressed flat against the bell, but a lower zone of acanthus proclaims the Greek interest in naturalism (BG, p.346., fig. 331). It is precisely at Araq el-Emir that a non-Greek leaf-zone appears on a true Corinthian capital of heterodox form. This is the same form of leaf or petal as that on the Athenian capital mentioned above- without veining or serration apart from a strong central line - only a little broader, and curved in Greek fashion at the tip (BG, pp.353-4 for the Greek acanthus form). But I have observed and photographed this same leaf-calyx at Suweida in the Jebel Druze of Syria (ancient Auranitis) employed for a Nabataean temple (1st century BC/AD) and at Jerusalem at the Tomb of Helena (c. AD 60), and on the Monument of Absalom (c. 40 BC). Butler found it at Si'a in Nabataean Auranitis (1st century BC/AD) as a calyx adorning a basically Doric form of capital from the peristyle of the theatron (PE, II, A, p.379, illn. 328, frag. 10). It occurs on the capitals of the Khazneh at Petra (1st century BC/AD). But most significant of all it is found adorning early Alexandrian small arts (Segall, WP; a Hellenistic silver vessel with acanthus and lotus cup) and on an Egyptianising Corinthian capital of good Greek form in the

museum at Alexandria (AA, p.216, fig. 79; HB, II, p.158, illn. 101). The latter is to be placed in an early Hellenistic group of Alexandrian experimental forms which is similar to 4th century BC Corinthian forms, as found on the tholos at Epidauros. The rest of the Alexandrian group have normal serrated acanthus with curled tips (HB, p.159, illn. 100, 1 and 2). The half column capital (illn. 100, 2) of this group has helices emerging from acanthus stalks <u>together with a blossom on a thin tendril</u>. Moreover the normal form of the helices is that they emerge together with the volutes from the same cauliculus and acanthus calyx or sheath, and then curl inwards towards each other. This inward curl is usual even on heterodox forms of the Corinthian capital, but on several of the Hellenistic capitals of the Alexandria museum the helices rise together above the acanthus zones and then <u>curl away from each other</u> (AA, p.216, fig. 78 in contrast to 79, 80; HB). There is one example of both the central blossom on a tendril and of helices curling out (Ronczewski, Bull. soc. Alex., 1927, suppl. p.21, figs. 17, 18) exactly the same as on the capitals of Araq (PE, II, A, illn. 5, frags. 2, 9, 10). In sum we have the leaf form, the outcurling helices and the blossom on a tendril all pointing to Alexandrian influence, while it is notable that all the examples I quoted of the leaf form are from the area of Ptolemaic Coele-Syria. The

same lotus calyx at Araq is found around the bases of the column shafts (PE, illn. 5, frag. 8) and is known elsewhere only at Si'a and Alexandria. At Alexandria we can add to Delbrueck's fragment (HB, p.173) late Ptolemaic column and pillar bases of the Roman period with calices in old Egyptian style (AA, pp.107,109) and two column-bases from the Alexandria museum drawn by Fyfe (HA, p.75, fig. 21). The diffusion from Alexandria of this Grecised form of an old Egyptian stylised plant is obvious. Perhaps we should make a point of noticing that the unveined and unserrated 'leaf' derived from the lotus-petal cannot be regarded as unfinished; it should be contrasted with the leaves (which are unfinished) recently excavated by the Swiss team at the precinct of Baal Shamin at Palmyra (Collart, Ann. arch. Syr., 1957, pl. V,3). A detailed study by Schlumberger has shown that heterodox forms of the Corinthian capital are found in Coele-Syria but not further North. He suggests that these forms en bloc are the result of Alexandrian influence, whereas the normal Corinthian capital in S. Syria emerged under influences by way of Antioch or Asia Minor (Syria, 1933, pp. 283-317). A similar idea - less precise and from more limited evidence - had already been broached by Weigand as long ago as 1914 (Jahrb. kais. deutsch. arch. Inst., pp.42-43) on the basis of a heterodox Corinthian capital at Baalbek:

"Unser Kapitell verbürgt uns neben Petra und Arak el Emir neuerdings, dass die in Alexandrien bekannt gewordenen reichen, spielerisch-en Formen des freien korinthischen Kapitells in Syrien herrschen, nicht das Normalkapitell.."
This position is sound, but Schlumberger has shown that it applies to Coele-Syria, not to Syria as a whole.

So far everything points to Alexandria or Phoenicia - influence from hellenised centres which still diffuse vital elements of the Oriental traditions. The fragments of the colossal, winger Lion-Sphinx found by de Saulcy also indicate Egyptian influence, whether direct or already absorbed and diffused by Phoenicia. In addition Watzinger has pointed out that the fragment of a frieze carved with rosettes and bucrania matches the frieze ornament of the propylon of Ptolemy II Philadelphos on Samothrace. This theme of Alexandrian and Phoenician influence will be resumed in connection with other monuments.

It remains to deal with the accepted opinion that Araq is oriental in form, and that Greek influence is confined to the superficialities of its decor. This seems to me far from the truth. First the distyle in antis porch is certainly a Greek form. It too was popular in the Hellenistic tombs of Alexandria.

In fact fragments of Hellenistic date exactly corresponding to the arrangement of half-column attached to pilaster or anta have been found at Alexandria (from Gabbari; HB, p.135; mostly late Hellenistic, but including a Corinthian capital of c. 3rd century BC). Then too the long naos and false opisthodomos behind it are features central to the stream of development of the Greek temple. Bifaciality is an integral part of the Greek tradition, and often the opisthodomos is false, as at Araq. For instance in the following temples a distyle in antis porch (pronaos), a long cella and a false opisthodomos are combined:

Temple of Hera, Olympia, c. 600 BC

Temple of Apollo, Corinth, c. 540 BC

Temple of Apollo, Delphi, c. 520 BC

Temple of Aphaia, Aegina, c. 485 BC

Temple of Zeus, Olympia, c. 470-460 BC with stairs leading to a gallery

Temple of Hephaistos, Athens, c. 449-444 BC

Temple of Poseidon, Sounion, c. 440 BC

Temple of Apollo, Bassai; soon after 430 BC

In fact the most informative examples in comparison with the building at Araq are the temple of Apollo Epikourios at Bassai, the temple of Athena Alea at Tegea (c. 360-350 BC) and

the great sanctuary of Apollo at Didyma outside Miletos (from c. 334 BC on into the 1st century AD). The temple of Apollo at Bassai is an astonishing conception considering its date in the 5th century, since it already foreshadows Hellenistic taste in its use of all three Greek orders and in the importance attached to the interior, which is the pivot of the whole conception and which consists of short spur-walls with attached half-columns, just as at Araq (RA, p.12; p.13 reconstructed interior). At Bassai the spurs are obviously designed to shorten the span of the central roofing over the naos. They were never repeated in the temples of Greece, the Aegean or Asia Minor, so far as we have remains to instruct us. They are found in one earlier example - the temple of Hera at Olympia (Chamoux GA, pp.22-23). But in another way Bassai does lead on to something new. At Tegea sixty years later we once more find internal engaged half-columns (HA, pp.22-23) and concentration upon the interior. Fyfe suggests that this development has its fruition at Didyma, Baalbek and Palmyra - the last two names bringing us very near to Araq. The temple of Apollo at Didyma (GT, pp.55-56, pl. LI, LII) is the only Greek temple whose possession of a hypaethral court or open naos - such as may have existed at Araq - is not open to dispute, since the small shrine for the cult statue is obviously designed to protect it from the weather.

This court has Ionic pilasters engaged around it walls. The exterior dipteral peristyle is typical of the Hellenistic temples of Asia Minor, but of no interest to us, since the Qasr has no peristyle. There are however many similarities with the Qasr. Ionic capitals with the heads of gods and bulls (GT, pl. LI, B) were on the exterior. The magnificent pronaos (tetrastyle, three rows deep) had behind it an antechamber on a higher level and supported by two Corinthian columns. The naos was entered below the antechamber through small side passages from the pronaos. Above these passages and entered from them were stairways leading either to upper chambers or the roof. These analogies are not part of the central stream of Greek forms. Nevertheless Fyfe confidently asserts that Bassai, Tegea and Didyma foreshadow two Syrian temples. One is the temple of Bacchus at Baalbek (1st century AD), which has fluted Corinthian half-columns married to the side walls of its naos (HA, pp.38-39). The other is the temple of Bel at Palmyra with an interior described by Fyfe as an architectural set piece (plan HA, p.36). It seems clear, then, that in our palace the concentration on the interior as well as the forms used here may be said to be Greek with prototypes in Greece and Asia Minor. Unfortunately the temples of Alexandria and Phoenicia from this period have not survived to provide us with further analogies.

It is possible that the facade of Araq was flanked by step-towers. This leads naturally to Amy's important study of "temples a escaliers" (Syria, 1950, pp.82f). Some of his examples are uncertain, and most belong to the 2nd century AD or later. However both the temple of Bel at Palmyra (dedicated AD 32) and the temple of Baal Shamin at Si'a (dedicated 33/32 BC) are certain and relatively early examples of a temple with steps leading up towers, presumably to a flat tower-parapet or roof where important cult rites were enacted. Watzinger - who in 1921 stated that the Qasr had a vestibule flanked by towers (DAS, pp.37-38) but in 1935 (DP, pp.16-17) suggested that perhaps the corner chambers of the facade were towers and the naos was an open court - also suggested that the towers of Roman period temples in South Syria derive from older traditions of building connected with astrological observations and the worship of Sun gods (DAS, p.38; DP, p.16). Vallois on the other hand speaks of terraces or towers for the offering of burnt sacrifices of sheep, goats and birds. He suggests that sacrifices and altars on temple roofs or terraces may go far back into Syrian history, and that the step towers of the Roman period are connected with older Syrian cult-practices (AHD, p.326). Clermont-Ganneau mentions the old Semitic (Assyrian, etc.) practice of conducting a cult on the terrace or roof of a

private house or palace (RAO, III, pp.338-339 and refs.; also II, p.372). It seems sensible to think of the development of a new temple type in Syria as one aspect of the renascence of the 1st century BC, like frontality in sculpture. But this does not imply that the architectural form is dependent on Syrian or Mesopotamian architectural traditions. In fact I have been able to find nothing apart from the Qasr el-Abd to indicate a possible step tower before the 1st century BC in Syria. It must be contended that the corner towers of Araq are an uncertain restoration. Practical provision for access to galleries may be derived from Hellenistic civil architecture (HA, p.37), or one remembers that the temple of Apollo at Didyma had access from its pronaos to upper levels by a stair way.

De Saulcy suggested that the Qasr el-Abd was a temple on the basis of the fragments of the great Sphinx which he found; his pointed remarks successfully ridiculed any idea that it might be a fortress. Welter suggested that it was a 'Jagdschloss'. Amy includes it in his analysis of temples with step towers. Josephus calls it 'baris', which may be interpreted as 'fortress' or 'palace', and in practical terms leaves us only with 'palace'to be considered. None of these things may be regarded as conclusive. All analogies point to late

classical and Hellenistic temples in Greece or Asia Minor or to the reception and development of similar temple forms in Syria in the 1st century BC. Between these two is a gap in date and form that the Qasr may or may not fill. I confess myself more inclined to rely on the single word 'baris' in Josephus than on all comparisons with earlier and later temple forms, when trying to decide the purpose of the Qasr. We have in fact far less knowledge of palace forms than of temple forms, which helps to explain why all of the analogies have to be with temples. Recent investigations have added to the complication of uncertainties while clearing up or confirming some basic points. I am inclined to think that the Qasr had a columnar hall or naos, and galleries down the sides of its upper storey. But these are things which may or may not be. That the Qasr is in its ground-plan and decor basically a Greek building we can be certain.

Another matter of interest remains to be mentioned as a postscript. The mouldings employed on the Qasr were hardly discussed by Murray and Butler. The cornice fragments (supra Part VII and figs. 433-437) are, however, of interest in showing the dominance of the slant profile and the cavetto. Here there is no question of influence from a non-Greek source, since only the large Egyptian roll and cavetto were in use before the Greeks

developed their characteristic mouldings. Fyfe mentions the prevalence of cavetto and cyma (HA, p.95) in Hellenistic architecture. But the cyma is not found on the cornice fragments of the Qasr. The slant profile or splay face is in fact part of the breakdown of the cyma reversa in the Hellenistic period; we shall see below that it is found also at Jerusalem and Alexandria. At Dura-Europos Shoe has been able to trace the break-down in detail. Ovolo and good Greek cyma reversa are used in the Hellenistic period, but later the diagonal Pergamene ovolo was taken up, and the cyma changed in sympathy to a cavetto with upper diagonal or splay face. The profiles and the dentils of Butler's fragments are small. Delbrueck has pointed out that Alexandrian Hellenistic profiles tend to be elegant and small, whereas those of Asia Minor and the Pelopponese are more severe and heavy (HB, pp.166-168).

## THE TOMB OF THE BENE HEZIR AND INFLUENCES FROM ALEXANDRIA

At Jerusalem our earliest monument, the tomb of the Bene Hezir, with its Doric portico of good Hellenistic style and proportions still shows the proper understanding and combination of the members of the Greek Doric order. The taste displayed - the rather heavy column and the preference for the simple,

severe and unadorned Doric forms - is more classical then hellenistic, more restrained and therefore more in keeping with the highest Greek ideal and achievement. In its proportions, details, pure Doric style and simplicity it stands in contrast to all the other surviving tombs of Jerusalem. Here, too, we must be dealing with a product of Alexandrian influence, cut in the period of Ptolemaic control or soon after this finished. The profiles of the cornice (KV, p.44,1) are the same as two fragments of the 2nd century BC from Luxor and Cairo, which are drawn by Delbrueck (HB, p.167). In the Egyptian examples as in the cornice of our porch a notch above the diagonal face separates off the upper cavetto as a true cavetto - a coping moulding, properly used as the crowning finish to the principal moulding, as it is also found at Dura (Shoe AMDE). The slant and cavetto below are a breakdown of this principal moulding, the cyma reversa, still very close to good Greek usage. Delbrueck has already argued this point for the Egyptian fragments, and the convincing and detailed study by Shoe of the same breakdown of the cyma reversa at Dura is conclusive. The use of a distyle in antis porch is known at Alexandria, for instance in the tomb-system at Gabbari (HB, p.102) which includes a peristyle court, a distyle in antis arrangement and loculus chambers with a special niche at the far end.

The rock-cut, peristyle court of Alexandrian Hellenistic tombs is also - like the distyle in antis porch - found at Jerusalem in the Hakeldama tomb (HB, p.78, fig. 45), together with entries with an Egyptian cavetto cornice. Significantly this is a chamber behind a distyle in antis porch. Here the columns are unfluted and the capitals a crude and heavy Ionic. The same internal rock-cut peristyle is found at Petra in the Wadi el-Farasa, but with fluted columns and a better form of capital. A further example of the rock-cut internal peristyle court at Alexandria is to be found in the tombs at Mustapha Pasha (3rd/2nd centuries BC). Here the Greek order is very fine - engaged, Doric, fluted half-columns with capitals of very low echinus together with a high architrave and a triglyph frieze with bi-facial, square-headed glyphs. A distyle vestibule with columns and capitals of traditional Egyptian style (the capitals are Corinthianising) is found in the great, complex, hypogean tomb-system of Kom esh-Shuqapha, which is of late Ptolemaic style and early Roman date, (AA, p.107, fig. 28). There is also an undated rock-tomb at Paphos with a Doric court (HB, p.150). These examples, including the Bene Hezir porch at Jerusalem, indicate the diffusion from Alexandria of both the distyle porch and the peristyle court as rock-cut arrangements in the House of the Dead.

The interior of the Bene Hezir tomb is, as I have pointed out, closely related to earlier tombs at Marisa in the form of its kokhim or loculi. In basic terms the Iron Age Palestinian rock-cut tomb was simply a rectangular chamber with divans, as Mackenzie found at Beth Shemesh, Bade at Tell en-Nasbeh and Petrie with his 'Philistine' tombs at Beth Pelet. These 'divans' were wide, low benches round three sides of the chamber for the disposition of the corpse. The Bene Hezir arrangement adds to this - apart from its proliferation of burial-chambers, which is simply an indication of the prosperity and numbers of the family for which it was cut - the double-width, square-headed kokhim in three burial-chambers, a form traceable to Beit Jibrin or some lost necropolis of the Palestinian (hellenised Phoenician) coast, and derived from Alexandria. But the earliest form of the loculus is that with gable or 'obtuse, dihedral vault'. Such dihedral loculi are found in Egypt in Hellenistic Alexandrian tombs of the 3rd and 2nd centuries BC at Chatby and Mustapha Pasha (AHD, pp.276-278), and in Phoenicia at Sidon (MP, pl.LXIII, fig. 1 - tomb I). At Chatby they are in the great vestibule of the funerary chamber, as they are in the tomb of Apollophanes at Beit Jibrin. By the late Ptolemaic and early Roman periods at Alexandria the arrangements of the loculi have developed into vast systems - far beyond anything found at

Jerusalem or in Phoenicia - such as those in the second storey of the catacombs of Kom esh-Shuqapha (AA, p.105), where there are also special chambers with bench-niches on three sides like the arcosolia chambers of Jerusalem. There is a certain amount of dispute as to whether loculi came to Jerusalem from Alexandria or Phoenicia, which does not matter for our purposes, since both areas are heavily hellenised and I am concerned to show the fundamental influence of them both on Jewish art. In fact most of the loculus tombs discovered in Phoenicia seem to belong to the Roman period (CPh. pp.255-265; Dunand, Bull. mus. Beyrouth, 1965, pp.5-51) though some are undoubtedly Hellenistic (infra).

In the Hellenistic tombs of Anfushi on the Isle of Pharos at Alexandria (AA, p.116 ground-plan) the arrangement of a stepped descent leading to a rectangular central hall from which long vestibule halls (with benches in hypogee II) open off as the access to small funerary chambers is found, as at Beit Jibrin in the Palastinian Shephela. At Anfushi we again find loculi - in the funerary chamber of tomb II. This has the following points in common with the Tomb of Apollophanes at Marisa:

1. a stepped descent.
2. a central hall or atrium.

3. a long vestibule with benches.

4. a special and pre-eminent burial compartment beyond this, which is presented architectonically behind a carved and painted entry.

5. Burial niches in the form of loculi.

But the Tomb of Apollophanes is more developed than the tomb at Anfushi (i.e., later). It has long halls on three sides for burials, as opposed to two only at Anfushi where the tombs are cut too closely together for a third side to be of use. The long halls of Marisa have loculi, while at Anfushi they are simply vestibules to small funerary chapels. In the tomb of the Bene Hezir we still find a vestibule, a central hall and three burial-chambers with loculi (kokhim) as at Marisa; and the loculi are square-headed, the form which came into use c. 150 BC at Marisa. The special burial-place at the head of the tomb, in itself an arrangement and location deriving from Alexandrian examples, is off axis and seems a later addition to the plan of the Jerusalemite tomb. But the most distinctive changes are the 'surfacing' of the tomb into a commanding position in a sheer rock scarp, and the concentration of ornament upon its facade. The portico shows no Egyptian influence, but is pure Doric.

The use by the Sidonians at Beit Jibrin of a carved and painted entry to the kline recess also derives from Alexandrian tombs like those at Anfushi. Here in tomb II the parallel is an entry to a special burial compartment. The entries at Beit Jibrin and at Anfushi both have their pilasters painted in squares, a high Greek architrave and a Doric frieze. A slight distinction between the two is that the Alexandrian tomb has an arched pediment, a form popular in the Hellenistic period. At the Tomb of Apollophanes the traditional Greek gabled or dihedral pediment is retained. That such pediments were used at Alexandria is demonstrated by Delbrueck's reproduction of the stele of Dorion (HB, p.167 left). Other details of the entry at Anfushi are distinctively Egyptian. The cavetto-and-roll cornice is used, and lotiform pilaster capitals. These features match the Egyptian iconism of the tomb. Those buried here were clearly Egyptian, not Greek or Macedonian settlers.

In the earliest period at Alexandria the kline niche was used for burials (DP, pp.70-71). At Mustapha Pasha (3rd/2nd centuries BC) for instance there is a niche in one of the chambers where the kline is adorned with a coloured plaster imitation of a mattress and of shaped wooden legs (HA, p.64). But this arrangement gave way to the bench recess (DP, p.71).

Thus the kline recess at Beit Jibrin - where it occurs only once - is a product of diffusion once more from Alexandria. So far as I know it is unknown further North on the Phoenician coast. The Jewish arcosolium also seems to have developed from the kline recess, though no-one has yet suggested this. There is a striking example in the 'Conch' tomb of Jerusalem where the legs of a kline are still reproduced, and a sort of pillow or head-rest is indicated. The latter is also found inside the chamber of the Monument of Absalom. But nearly all Jerusalemite examples are bench-recesses with low arched ceilings. There is never any attempt at Jerusalem at mural frescoes or carved, painted entry-ways. Again this indicates that the Jewish tombs represent a derivative art, less costly and elaborate than the forms which it imitates, and soon settling upon its own favoured arrangements and forms.

The arch, the vault and the cupola are all known in Hellenistic Alexandria (HB, pp.102-103) at Anfushi, Sidi Gaber, etc., in the rock-cut tombs, where they presumably imitate contemporary freestanding structures of wood and baked brick (HB,p.103). At Jerusalem cupolas occur in the Hakeldama tomb and the Conch tomb, two of the early group in the Hinnom valley. These are the same tombs which collectively exhibit internal columns, the

Egyptian cavetto and kline legs carved from the rock beneath arcosolium benches. The closest form to the Jerusalemite arcosolium at Alexandria comes very close indeed - a kline niche with a flattened arch over it in the hypogee of Sidi Gaber described by Thiersch (Zwei Grabanlagen.., pp.14f, pl.1). On the Phoenician coast the arcosolium is almost unknown - I have seen published only one late example with a trough. The excavations at Dominus Flevit have shown that the trough was just coming in at the end of the 1st century AD. The rock-cut sarcophagus with decoration found in tomb 7 at Sanhedriyyeh in Jerusalem is rather different, and earlier. Ceilings of tomb chambers at Jerusalem are often slightly arched, as also in Phoenicia. The proclivity for a flattened arch at Alexandria we also saw above in the entry inside the Anfushi tomb. It is found again at Petra together with Dihedral pediments in the entries to the 'Palace Tomb' or 'Tombeau a trois Etages'. A rock-cut free-standing cupola is found in Phoenicia at Amrit, the necropolis of Marathus, crowning a solid funerary nefesh. While on the subject of burial-forms we should note that at Petra also benches, loculi and arcosolia occur, though not so systematically as at Jerusalem (PA passim).

Such comparisons are intended to show the cultural influence which Alexandria exerted upon the Palestinian and Phoenician coast and at Petra and Jerusalem.

## THE PYRAMID OF ZACHARIAH AND THE SOLID SEMITIC NEFESH

The material which may be compared with the solid pyramidal nefesh (the Pyramid of Zacharaiah) in the Kedron Valley at Jerusalem is equally absorbing. The architectonics of the monument are derived from Egypt - pyramid on a square base, Egyptian entablature - but relate more directly to the 'Tomb of Pharaoh's Daughter' located further down the valley, which belongs to the Persian (early post-Exilic) period and has the same cubic form, pyramidal crown and Egyptian cornice. It is striking that the appeal of Egyptian forms continues at Jerusalem in the Persian and Hellenistic periods, and that the older monument exercises a strong influence on both the Pyramid of Zachariah and the Monument of Absalom. There can be no doubt of its pyramid, which is now gone. An examination of the top of the monument shows not only a difference in weathering at the edge, from which the pyramid was set back (something also noted by Renan at Amrit), but also the beginnings

of its inclined rock-cut faces. But the 'Tomb of Pharaoh's Daughter' differs in one important respect from the 'Pyramid of Zachariah'. It is a genuine tomb-chamber with burial provisions. The Pyramid is a solid cube, a nefesh.

In concept and purpose as well as in its basic form the Pyramid of Zachariah is Semitic, not Greek. The solid, rock-cut nefesh is found at Amrit on the Phoenician coast, and at Petra - the expression of Semitic ideas in both places. That in some way this marks or commemorates the spirit or personality of the dead individual is indicated by Nabataean inscriptions at Petra published by Starcky, and, more pointedly, by a Nabataean inscription of Madeba long since published by Clermont-Ganneau (RAO, II, pp.189-197; VII, pp.241-7; year 46 of the reign of Haretat Philopatris) which records the erection of a tomb and two nefashot for two Nabataean officials, father and son, who held office at Madeba for twenty-six years. The Maccabaean tomb at Modin is an early and striking example - seven pyramids for seven dead - and the Greek 'hepta puramidas' (I Macc. 13, 28) is translated in the Peshita (Targum) on this verse as 'sheva nephshan'. The various inscriptions and developments in the meaning of the word 'nefesh' are examined by Avigad (KV, pp.66-73).

The Amrit monuments hold a vital place in our knowledge (MP, pp.63-90). Here Renan discovered two naiskoi with roll and cavetto; one had uraei on a fascia above this Egyptian cornice (MP, pl. IX). The other - the Maabed - has now been dated by the excavations of Dunand (Ann. arch., 1956, pp.3-10), plan pl. 1; 1961-2, p.10) to the turn of the fifth and fourth centuries BC. On a hill in the centre of the Amrit ruins are 'el Awamid el-meghazil', solid funerary nefashot, marking rock-cut tombs with loculi. The largest of these (MP, pl. XIII; CPh fig. 117) is a solid, rock-cut nefesh of superimposed drums ending in a dome or cupola. It is adorned by two copings or cornices consisting of horizontal rings of merlons crowned in each case by the stepped form also in horizontal rings. Lion protomai in the socle appear to carry the whole monument on their backs, and are reminiscent of the great lions which 'support' the sarcophagus of Ahiram, King of Byblos (IEJ, Vol. 8, pl.10D, 11A, B). The merlons are found at the Maabed also (Ann. arch., 1961-2, pp.6f,11). The other monuments are of the same form as each other, and bear a pyramid over an Egyptian cornice, like the Pyramid of Zachariah (MP, pl.XI, XII, XVII), but the smaller one has a square attic like the tomb of Jason at Jerusalem, where attic and pyramid are of cut stone set over the rock-cut tomb. All of the monuments at Amrit are set

over rock-cut tombs (MP, pl. VII, XIII, XVII, XVIII, espy. VIIK and M) often of several chambers (ibid. pl. VII, H). Renan says they are the largest and best cut on the Phoenician coast (p. 76). Ceilings are flat, slightly domed or slightly dihedral, and loculi are placed along the sides of the chambers, with a more considerable niche cut in the rear wall. An early date for the tombs is suggested by the absence of stucco and paint, and the irregular lines of the work. They seem to mark a time when the Phoenician shaft-tomb is giving way to loculus chambers reached by a flight of rock-cut steps, as at Beit Jibrin. This would date them to the early Hellenistic period as suggested by Will (Syria, 1949, pp.283f) or the end of the Persian period at the earliest. Also discovered by Renan at Amrit was 'el Burj el-bezzak' (ibid. pp.80-90 and pl. XIV-XVI), an enormous mausoleum of cut stone with compartments which housed sarcophagi or corpses in two superimposed chambers; the mausoleum was crowned by an Egyptian cavetto and a pyramid which may have been above a square attic like the small monument above (pl. XVII) and the tomb of Jason at Jerusalem.

A funerary pyramid on a square socle is in fact found in many areas of Phoenician settlement - on Cyprus at Paphos (Mel. univ. St. Jos., XV, 1930-31, p.178); in Algeria the

monuments of Akbu, Raten and Flavius Maximus (MP, addenda to p.81; refs.); in Phoenicia itself again at Mashnaqa (MP, pl. XXXV; Mel. univ. St. Joseph, 1930-31, p.178, fig. 17) where Renan calls it a 'petit temple' but Ronzevalle says it is very like the funerary pyramid of Adonis (wrongly identified as the baetyl of Astarte according to him) on Roman coins of Byblos. It is found spilling over from the coastal strip West of Mount Lebanon at Kalat Fakhra (RT, pp.51-55, illns. 73, 75,79) with an inscription of the reign of Claudius (AD 41-54). Here it is set on a high socle and has inner chambers. Its ornament strangely combines the proto-Ionic type of capital already known in Phoenicia, Cyprus and Palestine (Hazor, Megiddo, Ramat Rahel) in the Iron Age with fragments of Attic bases. And a Doricising triglyph frieze which has a high architrave, a narrow taenia and regulae with six guttae (RT, illn. 75) is set below an Egyptian roll-and-cavetto cornice crowned by stepped merlons. It is found at Hermel in the Beq'a, North of Baalbek, on a monument restored by the French (RT, pp.161-162, illns. 231-233; Syria, 1932, p.295). This has a stylobate, a high socle with angle pilasters and a square upper storey with engaged pilasters, an undecorated architrave of three superimposed plate-bands and a simple cornice, Finally above the upper storey is the pyramid. In this case it is set upon a

very low attic with a short vertical face and a roll moulding. It is found in Galilee in the Qabr Hiram at Cana (Mel. univ. St. Jos., 1930-31) and at Suweida in the Hauran in the 1st century BC, where a structure with a stepped pyramid - a form derived from Asia Minor (the Nereid Monument, etc.) - is described by a Nabataean inscription as the 'nefesh of Hamrat', erected by her husband (fig. 547). Here too there are Greek additions in the form of the engaged half-columns on the exterior, and the arms (helmet, shield etc.) which adorn the walls between the half-columns. I introduce this list of examples with quite full descriptions since it seems to me that the forms at Amrit are inescapably more primitive and early than the examples spread West and South of the Phoenician area, which seem to belong largely to the 1st centuries BC and AD or later. These comparisons also show that the Pyramid of Zachariah belongs in its conception and its basic form to a type of funerary monument or nefesh diffused from Phoenician in the Hellenistic and Roman periods. That the roll and cavetto are common in Phoenicia is also indicated by a large entry uncovered at Rumeli (Macridy, RB, 1904; my fig. 548).

The form of the pyramid of Zachariah is much more simple than the later examples and still clearly akin to the late Persian or early Hellenistic monuments of Amrit. It completely

lacks the elaboration later found at Kalat Fakhra or Hermel. Matz (HRG rab., pp.266-292) has attempted to classify the Hellenistic types of tomb monument from which Roman forms developed, and though he seems to me to a certain extent to confuse the different basic concepts with the superfician indications of their architectural decor his distinction of two basic types is a useful one. Of these types one is the Heroon or Shrine to the dead, erected on a high socle, like the Nereid Monument at Xanthos in Lycia, the Mausoleum at Halicarnassos (4th century BC) and the tomb-monument of Theron at Akragas on Sicily. The original architectonic conecpt for this type is found in Asia Minor, and according to Matz owes its origin to the heroisation of the dead. The other type is the Nefesh, a monumental cube crowned by a pyramid (and at Amrit by a dome). The earliest examples that we have of this type are those at Amrit and at the Punic mausoleum of Dougga in Tunis (mid 2nd century BC). The raison d'etre for the form, he suggests, is the idea that continued existence must be connected with some solid object, erected over or near the tomb itself, and where the spirit of the dead has its seat. This satisfactorily explains the origins of the type, though as the Hellenistic period progressed it may have been influenced by Greek ideas as well as adopting decor from the Greek orders. In origin,

as at Amrit, it is carved with typical Near Eastern adornments - roll and cavetto or crowsteps.

The Pyramid of Zachariah must be one of the earliest examples of a preference for Greek decor - in this case Ionic columns of good Hellenistic (Hermogenetan) form. The spear-headed darts of the capitals may seem odd, but they clearly stem from a good Greek tradition, for an identical capital was found at Ephesos near the theatre (HB, note 1, p.162). Avigad has dated the Pyramid of Zachariah to the second half of the 1st century BC (KV, p.130), stating that the strongest (in fact the only) architectural evidence against the date in the 3rd century BC assigned to it by Vincent is the occurrence of pilasters linked with quarter-columns at the corners. It is indeed true that three-quarter columns are retained into the 1st century BC. This occurs, for instance, on the nefesh of Hamrat at Suweida or the tomb-monument of Theron at Akragas (HBGrab., illn. 7). But in principle the rock-cut monument with anta and quarter-column at the corners and half columns 'in antis' was created as soon as the freestanding distyle portico between antae with attached half-columns came into existence. And in fact this form occurs in the early 2nd century BC in the facade porch of the Qasr el-Abd at Araq

el-Emir. The Pyramid of Zachariah is simply the translation of it into a rock-cut, solid medium. The quarter-column attached to a rock-cut anta represents a free-standing half-column attached to an anta (PN, col. 951). That forms like this were being experimented with in the Hellenistic period can be established at Alexandria. Here half-columns attached to a free-standing pier are known (HA, pp.78-9; fig. 22b and note 1, p.79). Also rock-cut quarter-columns at the corners of a peristyle court are known in the angles of a peristyle court among the tombs at Mustapha Pasha (3rd-2nd centuries BC); one of these on Fyfe's photo (HA, p.64 and pl.IIA) is linked to an anta or door-jamb. It is only a small step from such an arrangement to a rock-cut pilaster against which a quarter-column is placed. In fact there is nothing to prevent us from assuming a date in the 2nd century BC for the Pyramid of Zachariah, the same period as the cutting of the porch of the Bene Hezir.

In sum then the Pyramid of Zachariah may be assessed as a monument of Semitic conception and Phoenician form (incorporating Egyptian elements already absorbed into Phoenician and Palestinian architecture) with the addition of Ionic Greek engaged columns of good Hellenistic form which permit a date

in the snd century BC. The purity and good Hellenistic form of its Greek style are - as with the porch of the Bene Hezir - to be contrasted with the later tombs of Jerusalem of the 1st century BC-AD.

The nearest analogy to the Pyramid of Zachariah is a rock-cut tomb monument at Petra at the side of the Wadi Musa near el-Ji, which was compared by Murray and Ellis (SP, pp. 32-35) to the Amrit monuments. Here there are three large rock-cut cubes of sandstone (PA, nos. 7-9) of which the central one has a stepped base and stepped pyramid (the top steps are gone). This and one of the others are funerary chambers as well as monuments. But the third cube is a solid monument which is described by Brunnow and Domaszewski as having four half-columns attached to each face. Dalman (PF, p.106 and illn. 26) is careful to correct this:

"Das Genauere ist, dass jede Seite mit zwei Halbsaüllen versehen war, und dass die letzteren sich an Eckpfeiler lehnten".

I quote Dalman since it is now impossible to make out the form of these angle arrangements because of weathering (Dalman's observation was published in 1908). This monument cannot be

dated accurately (2nd-1st centuries BC?). Starcky remarks that the rock-cut facades of Cyrenaica - not far West of Alexandria - also have the same forms of columns and antae (PN, col. 951f). He sees in this (as I have in many forms and artistic details mentioned above) the influence of Alexandria with its funerary arrangements of columnar porches and courts. Petra could have borrowed its forms direct from Alexandria or through Phoenicia or Palestine. The pyramidal cube of this Petraean group has crowsteps, like the round, domed nefesh of Amrit. The more common form of nefesh at Petra - a small pyramidal rock-relief - is more closely related to the Egyptian obelisk, which might be described as a very tall pyramid on a very small base. The obelisk form at Petra is clearly a funerary monument, since four obelisk nefashot occur there on the facade of the Obelisk tomb in the Bab es-Siq. It seems then that the two very large obelisks of Zibb Atuf at Petra are not baetyls, but nefashot (PF, pp.77-78). At any rate we are clearly once more concerned in cultural events in which Alexandria, Petra, Palestine and Phoenicia are involved.

THE PYRAMIDAL TOMB OF JASON - ANOTHER ECLECTIC FORM

From the end of the 2nd century BC or beginning of the 1st century BC dates the pyramidal tomb of Jason recently discovered,

restored and published. This too has a pyramid and attic, like the smallest monument of Amrit. At Jerusalem the form is a built superstructure over a rock-cut tomb; at Amrit it is a solid rock-cut monument with its own socle, but associated with a rock-cut loculus tomb. Of the interior of the tomb of Jason it is notable that the large, square-headed loculi of chamber A are closer to the later Beit Jibrin form than to the large numbers of smaller, less regular and arched kokhim of the Herodian period. The approach to the tomb is a free-standing, monumental one, a system of three courts partly faced with well-cut masonry and involving an arched entry and a stone door. The porch serves also as the central hall, and from it open a rough bone-chamber and the loculus chamber.

The moulded fragments are few, badly worn and difficult to place apart from the column capital and base; many of the details of the restoration are hypothetical. The beautiful Greek cyma profile of my fig. 273,2 may in fact be far more Greek than what actually existed, since by this date the Greek cyma had degenerated into a variety of forms, and the only evidence for the restoration seems to be the fragment of my fig. 274. However there is no doubt that the mouldings used for the cornices were Greek, and not in the older Egypto-

Phoenician tradition. The arrangement of a column henostyle in antis is very unusual. The echinus of the Doric capital is compressed and has necking rings like annulets, a form similar to the Doric capitals of the rock-cut court at Mustapha Pasha, Alexandria (HA, pl. II,A). The monument represents Jewish burial-practises (bone-chamber) and religious feeling (scratched menorot and chalice). Its architectonic form is in its magnificence a typical product of the Hellenistic period, and combines the Egypto-Phoenician pyramid with Hellenistic burial-forms drawn from Alexandria and the coastal cities of Palestine, and with Greek orders in column and cornices. Of course, according to Greek practice the Doric shaft should not have a base.

THE MONUMENT OF ABSALOM - A GRECO-ORIENTAL FUSION

The tomb of Jason belongs basically to the old tradition in the Near East of a rock-cut, hypogean tomb marked by a monument. The Pyramid of Zachariah was a solid nefesh, a Semitic product. But the Monument of Absalom is different from both. In form we still seem to have a nefesh with a stylobate, a high socle, an attic and crowning members, but it is more complex and in many ways more interesting than the Pyramids of Zachariah or Jason. The high socle is still crowned by an

Egyptian cornice, and adorned by Ionic columns of the Hermogenetan type, as far as the badly worn remnants can be made out. But in addition the Hellenised perceptions of the architect can be seen. It was felt that a Doric frieze was necessary between the plain Egyptian architrave and the high Egyptian cornice. This contrast, with the traditional Egyptian entablature, which had no frieze, whereas both the Dorians and Ionians developed set members related to earlier wooden beams and joists.

Avigad has pointed out that the cornice mouldings are a series common in Roman architecture, and, most significant, that the column-bases are strictly Roman in form (found for instance at the Colosseum). The inverted cyma recta of these is not found in Attic or Ionic bases, though in the last there are varying degrees of complication and an inverted cyma reversa may occur (HA, p.73, fig. 19, f, g, h). It is this base-moulding which forces us to bring the date of the monument down to the latter part of the 1st century BC, the earliest time when marginal encroachment of Roman detail might be expected. The bases are on plinths, as at Araq el-Emir and in many monuments of Hellenistic Asia Minor. We note here - for its significance later - that the tympanum of the tomb of

Jehosaphat, which is definitely to be associated with the Monument of Absalom in purpose and date, shows the beginnings of the adoption of a motif from Hellenistic Greek art which is later to be transformed in the tympanum of the Tomb of the Judges, on the Tomb of Helena and on sarcophagi to a rich and unique Jewish style of ornament. This will be discussed after I have dealt with the tombs per se.

Matz in discussing the tomb of Absalom said it lacked a socle and the chamber was not set up high, so that it belonged essentially not to the Western heroon or mausoleum type but to the Phoenicial monumental monolith, like the Pyramid of Zachariah and the Monuments of Amrit. But he is wrong here on all counts. The Monument of Absalom does contain a funerary chamber <u>high up</u> at the top of its rock-cut portion (KV, fig. 53), and the cube of rock adorned with Ionic half-columns etc. <u>is</u> to be regarded as a <u>high socle</u>. In this respect it is to be compared with the burial-monument of Hermel (1st century BC?) which has angle-pilasters engaged in a high socle, and another storey above (RT, pp.161-2). In fact the Monument of Absalom could be described briefly as an adaptation of an Egypto-Phoenician nefesh or monumental monolithic form to the type of the Greek heroon with the addition of elements of Greek decor

which are still basically good Hellenistic forms. The monument is a genuine tomb in its own right, a tomb raised high upon its socle, as well as a monument marking the burial-chambers of 'Jehosaphat'. It may also still be regarded as a nefesh. If so it has lost the pyramidal form proper to this product of the S.E. littoral of the Mediterranean, and assumed instead the conical roof, whose home (like the step pyramid found at Petra and Suweida) was originally Asia Minor, but which by the early Roman period must have been widespread in the West. Some of the Western examples are discussed by Avigad (KV, pp.112-115) - the Monument of Lysicrates at Athens (4th century BC), the Monument at Aquileia in Italy (2nd century BC; KV, fig. 69, 6), frescoes from Pompeii (fig. 69, 7, 8,) and later examples even further west.

With the occurrence of the same form at Petra on the upper storey of the Khazneh (late 1st century BC) - where also occur heterodox Corinthian forms of capital originated in Alexandria and the symbol of Isis (SS, III, p.322, fig. 76, 3; where it is compared to many other forms of the Isis head-dress) - one is tempted once more to think of the influence of the magnificent structures of late Hellenistic Alexandria which have long since vanished from our ken. The same type of cone probably

crowned the Monument of Herod at Jerusalem of about the same time as the Monument of Absalom. It definitely crowned the Pyramids of Helena a century later, just before the abortive 1st Revolt, as Kon has proved. The monument of Absalom, though it can be compared with this or that monument elsewhere, is in its own right a unique and satisfyingly balanced achievement. It reflects a compromise happily reached between the Semitic nefesh and the Greek heroon both in form and function; it reflects a strong tradition local to the Kedron Valley, and embodied over the six preceding centuries in the Pyramids of 'Zachariah' and 'Pharaoh's Daughter'; it reflects an increasing taste for Greek decor as the proper architectural finish to a funerary monument - columns, frieze, cornice. In fact there was nothing else to compete with the Greek frieze in the Near East and hardly anything to compete with Greek capitals (only the Egyptian, Persian and proto-Ionic forms) or cornices (only the Egyptian roll and cavetto). The Monument may also mirror the fact - in its cone-roof with lotus finial - that Alexandria, though politically expunged still exercised cultural dominance, over the S.E. Mediterranean. Finally it certainly reflects Jewish religious feelings in the removal of the offensive, columned pavilion-shrine proper to the form, whether this is completely rejected or represented as a solid drum. The two

cable mouldings are a traditional Near Eastern motif too widespread to be traced in detail; they were not adopted into the Greek repertoire of ornament.

THE EARLY TOMBS IN THE HINNOM VALLEY - FURTHER ALEXANDRIAN INFLUENCES

The tombs in the Hinnom Valley were re-used in the Roman and Byzantine periods, when structural alterations were made and painted decoration applied on stucco. This fact has tended to obscure the fact that some of them, with monumental though badly ruined features, form a distinctive group. This remark applies to monumental tombs like Firdus er-Ram, the Hakeldama and the Conch tomb, which may in my opinion be as early as the late 2nd century BC. Watzinger speaks here of 'trough arcosolia', but in fact Macalister's section EF (supra fig. 405A) shows only a very slight hollow, nothing like the trough arcosolia as normally understood. I am led to this early date by the fact that the tombs do not correspond to the dispositions and structural formulae applied to the great majority of Jerusalemite tombs, which belong to the 1st century BC and AD; by the fact that they are part of the same necropolis as the Bene Hezir tomb, Zachariah's pyramid and older tomb groups dealt with by Vincent and Avigad; and by the fact that the differences in their form seem to me to be linked with Hellenistic Alexandria.

Firdus er-Ram, though hardly noticed by scholars, is more complex than the burial-system of the Bene Hezir, but concentrates on arcosolia, not loculi. The tomb had a porch which was distyle in antis, but unfortunately it has been quarried away. The two main chambers had domed ceilings, which reminds one of the many kinds of vaults and cupolas used at Alexandria. The inset benches (rather than troughs) of the arcosolia do not conform to the Jerusalemite practice, and the arrangement of the arcosolia in pairs instead of round three sides of a chamber is another deviation from the basic grammar of burial dispositions. It is interesting that a larger, more carefully squared chamber with the normal display of three bench arcosolia is found in the far depth of the tomb where it must have been added last and indicates the earlier date of the doubled arcosolium arrangement (Bogenbankganggrab). So far as I know the false doors are unique to this tomb and the Conch tomb. At Firdus er-Ram these doors and the destroyed porch are the only decorative features. The mouldings of the doors must be Greek (though how fine or debased one cannot tell). They are the Ionic T-frame mouldings surmounted by a pediment where the raking cornice may or may not correspond to the horizontal cornice. The destroyed porch must also have been Greek in style. In fact in the Hakeldama the distyle portico was still

preserved, but neither Macalister nor Delbrueck say anything about it! The tomb itself is an extensive, complex arrangement in which the doubled arcosolium is once more dominant, but with a few added kokhim and an additional small bench-chamber. Here too the Greek T-frame with pediment appears, and the main chamber is once more domed as opposed to the usual flat or slightly arched ceilings at Jerusalem. And we have the additional feature that the main, domed chamber (HB, p.78) is a rock-cut peristyle court with porticoes of Ionic columns (with crude capitals admittedly) as in the Greek court of Mustapha Pasha at Alexandria (3rd/2nd centuries BC). We must add to this that the tall, arched entries to the burial dispositions from the main chamber are crowned by an Egyptian cavetto, not by a Greek cornice and pediment. This too indicates Alexandrian influence.

The Conch tomb is of the same type, but the vestibule was already destroyed and conversion to a chapel or ancorite's retreat effected long before the first modern investigations. The artistic claims of what survives are higher than those of Firdus er-Ram or the Hakeldama. The conch of the facade is of an unusual form. In examples from the Roman period - for instance, in Kom esh-Shuqapha at Alexandria (AA, p.106, fig. 27 and text) or at imperial Jerash or the 2nd century AD temple at

Atil in the Jebel Druze or in the Galilean synagogues - the segments of the arrangement radiate from the bottom centre upwards. Our example is different, subtler and compares closely with the rosette-dome inside the tomb; it seems likely, as Dalman suggested, that the segments, which radiate downwards and correspond in form to those of the rosette inside, met in a small rosette at the top instead of the usual Roman arrangement. I think I can just see the bottom of this rosette in my photographs (fig. 367). The ceiling of the main chamber is also interesting - a hanging cupola adorned by the rosette already mentioned and spandrels of flat ceiling adorned by palm-branches of a form similar to the later acanthus-lyra of Jerusalem. Such concentration on the straight line and the compass arc (geometric forms) and on stylised foliate shapes is to become characteristic of Jewish art in the Herodian period, and to blossom to a specifically Jewish style with its own techniques and aesthetics. This Conch tomb is also the tomb already referred to as having kline legs carved on the benches of the arcosolia. The kline is derived from Greek art; the Ionic T-frame entry mouldings are derived from Greek art; the cyma epikranitis in the main chamber and the pilaster with adjoined quarter-column (I think these 'mouldings' should be

interpreted in this sense) of the facade are also derived from Greek art.

The cupola-rosette is to be contrasted for instance with the relief patera of the coffer in the ceiling of the chamber of Absalom's Monument. In the latter case the plastic relief (demonstrated well by Avigad's drawings, KV, p.103 top) is derived ultimately from the paterae used in the metopes of the Greek Doric frieze at least from the time of the tholos at Epidauros (c. 350 BC). (The patera may be defined as a circular, plate-like decorative feature in relief, moulded or carved in a variety of ways; HA glossary). Such paterae often take the form of a rosette with or without the petals indicated - as in the Monument of Absalom, on the upper frieze of the Tomb of Helena and the frieze of the Qasr Bint Farun at Petra (1st century BC). And in fact the rosette of plastic form in relief was used in Hellenistic friezes. Both at Jerusalem (sarcophagus of Queen Helena) and at Petra (many examples from small niches to large tomb facades) this may be reduced to a flat, circular disc displaying no interest in plastic form, but simply cut straight back from a flat, raised surface. Such a technique is characteristic of Palestinian and Syrian artistic feeling at many levels.

Another interesting point about the Conch tomb is the finials or acroteria of the carved Greek entries in the main chamber. These are not the traditional palmettes, sphinxes, etc. dear to Greek feeling and found on the pediments of Jehosaphat and the Tomb of the Judges at Jerusalem. They can only be compared with the popular urn finials of Petraean tombs like the Khazneh, the Lion tomb, the Corinthian tomb and tombs in the Wadi el-Farasa and at el-Bared (PF, pp.77-78 for a list). One connects this immediately with the widespread use at Alexandria of cinerary urns of various forms from the 3rd century BC on, from which the painted, foliate designs of Nabataean pottery may also be derived. Such urn finials presumably become a conventional feature of Hellenistic architecture without implying the practice of cremation, which was not followed by the Jews and probably not by the Petraeans, whose burial-forms indicate inhumation.

## THE TOMB OF HELENA - THE DISRUPTION OF GREEK FORMS AND THE DEVELOPED JEWISH STYLE

The culmination of the Hellenic impact on Jewish craftsmen in Jerusalem may be seen on the facade of the tomb of Helena, the most magnificent of the tombs of Herodian Jerusalem. The magnificence of the approach is unique, and the cost would

surely have been prohibitive had not there been in this place, as Vincent suggests, an abandoned quarry. (This is also the case in the Sanhedriyyeh district). Once again we should note a plain arched entry - the sort of thing also found on the ossuaries - like that (built, not rock-cut) at the Tomb of Jason, and without any intimations of Greek taste - mouldings, decor or pediment. The basins are presumably connected with lustral necessities imposed by the Law. Within the tomb are the expected kokhim and arcosolia, and the rolling-stone of the entry is also found at the tomb of Herod's family (Nikophorieh) and in some small tombs, including those of Galilee. The sarcophagi will be dealt with later; the ossuaries are of the simplest type with zig-zag and rosette decoration lightly scratched or deeply gounged. The stone door-leaves of the interior with Greek mouldings on them are a rare feature.

But our main interest in searching out the impact of Greek forms and artistic sensibilities is to be concentrated on the rock-cut facade and on the fragments of the pyramids. These pyramids are still to the same number as the important dead within (Helena , Izates, Monobazos) like the Nabataean tomb at Madeba, the tomb of the Maccabees at Modin and the Obelisk tomb at Petra. Ideas that these represent the personality of the

dead in some way may still have been held. The lower frieze of the facade I shall deal with below together with other developments of the same type of decorative style and motif.

The upper frieze and the cornice are Greek in style, and still retain good Greek forms, proportions and profiles. The only (very minor) fault that one can find is that the projecting soffit of the cornice is either horizontal or slightly sloped the wrong way to perform its function as a dripstone; this misconception is already found in the porch of the Bene Hezir a good two centuries earlier, so that it can hardly be regarded as a serious deterioration of understanding. The mouldings of the cornice are from bottom to top a cavetto, fillet, cyma reversa, projecting dripstone with plate-band above and below, fillet, ovolo, double fillet, cavetto and abacus. The cavetto is used correctly as a coping moulding to give extra projection, and the main moulding is supported by the ovolo for extra height, according to proper Greek practice. The profiles are all still well-formed and of proper curvature. Below this the Doric triglyph frieze is carefully cut. External facets are added to the central facets of the glyphs. The abaci of the triglyphs have curved profiles. There is the regulation regula with six guttae below the taenia. All of this shows a care to

observe Greek forms down to the last detail. The paterae are of good plastic form, like double rosettes without the petals being indicated.

At the very centre of the frieze however the Greek form is abandoned and replaced by forms which deserve a special discussion - grapes hanging in three bunches from a short stalk, wreaths with bows and the acanthus lyra. Oddly enough the regulae and guttae appropriate to triglyphs are retained below this group. Presumably the functional origin of the Greek Doric frieze from timber supports was never understood by the Jerusalemite craftsmen, and though in earlier tombs the proper relationships and proportions of members are observed here at the tomb of Helena we see a breakdown of the Greek form, a part being retained which does not make sense on its own. Delbrueck has characterised this replacement of triglyphs and metopes at the centre of a Doric frieze by some tableau alien to Greek architecture as peculiar to the lands of the S.E. Mediterranean. It is found only here in Jerusalem and in Alexandria at the Doric tomb of Gabbari, where uraei are employed as the centrepiece (HB, p.150).

The grapes are presented in a flattened surface - the plane from which the whole frieze was cut back - but with some

attempt to give them body. The form is stylised with grape overlapping grape in a thick cluster. The central cluster is larger and hangs lower; the side bunches are small, high up and of a rather triangular shape. This form may be dealt with in full here. It is also found on coins of the 2nd Jewish Revolt (Ad 132-5), on a frieze of the Capernaum synagogue (2nd century AD?), on the Grape tomb (Macalister's drawing should be rectified slightly by fig. 354), on the tomb at Moqata Abud in Samaria, on the ornate sarcophagus lid from the tomb of Helena and on sarcophagus no. 1 from Dominus Flevit. The prototypes of the form go back to Egyptian and Assyrian monuments (OE, p.150), and later it is found in its developed form on Greek coins and pottery. As well as being found at Jerusalem at this time it is also found on fragments from, and on the portal of, the temple of Bel at Palmyra (HA, pl.XX,a), where the grapes appear as hexagons, and at Khirbet et-Tannur (period III; late 1st century AD; DD, pp. 128,138) inside an acanthus-scroll (fig. 549). Its occurrence on the coins of the 2nd Revolt leads one to suppose that at that time it symbolised the Golden Vinestock of the Temple (Ant., XV, 11, 3 and 3,1) after this had been destroyed, and was then part of the rallying propaganda of the nationalist cause. That it had this special significance on the tomb of Helena seems to me

doubtful on two counts - first that the motifs with it are not connected with the Temple or the Revolts, second that it fulfils a singularly nondescript role on the sarcophagus lid from the same tomb, where it is just one among a multitude of fruits. Such fruits are natural motifs for the sculptors of agrarian peoples, who are concerned with the fertility of their land. Different forms of grape cluster were used at Palmyra (fragments from foundation T) before the 1st century AD, and commonly in the Hauran in the 1st century BC and AD (Suweida, Si'a) and later (Qanawat, Atil), but not at Jerusalem. The form inside the scroll on the tympanum of Jehosaphat is compressed and twisted by its frame. If anything, then, the influence seems to have spread from Jerusalem, since the earlier fragments at Palmyra are different; it is not found in the Hauran or at Petra, and the example from Tannur is late. At Jerusalem the form may have been derived from Greek art; but the evidence is insufficient to give a firm indication.

It is interesting to note that the wreaths are made up of little 'blobs'; the same technique is used for representing the hair of an Edomite god assimilated to the sculptural type of Zeus at Tannur (period III; fig. 550). Comments on wreaths and wreath-knots have been made briefly by Avi-Yonah (OE, pp. 156-7), who contrasts 'Occidental' and 'Oriental' forms. It is

the Oriental reef-knot form which occurs on the two wreaths of the frieze of the tomb of Helena, whereas on sarcophagus no. 1 at Dominus Flevit (DF, pl.14, 15) - where both 'blobbed' and foliate wreaths are found - the bow-knot is used. On an ossuary at St. Anne's (my fig. 216) the 'blob' wreath is adorned with a loop-bow, which is converted to a foliate spray with a stylised 'ribbon' hanging from it. Another of the small number of ossuaries carved in relief has the same wreath (PAM 35.9905; JS, III, illn. 126).

The acanthus lyra is an adaptation of a Greek motif, which will be discussed below.

Whereas the cornice and most of the triglyph frieze of our tomb can be described as Greek forms carefully executed and correctly used, the facade below the Doric friese discards Greek forms. There is no architrave; the Doric frieze and cornice are left suspended on the rock face without support. Below them is just a blank strip. And below this the wide distyle entry to the porch is surrounded by a flat, raised band adorned with fruits and leaves. Genuine feeling for or understanding of trabeated architecture is gone, replaced by the desire for a rich, stylised strip of foliate decor in a

non-Greek technique and using native fruits together with acanthus, This means that all of the Greek elements - the frieze and cornice - are regarded simply as decoration, and their relation to function is lost.

The only anta capital with an intact profile resembles an anta capital from Priene. The Corinthian capitals belonging to the tomb (four were found) are in the 'normal' tradition, but the cauliculi and calices are left plain, and the two zones are not acanthus, but lotus or some form close to the lotus, and connected with capitals at Suweida, Araq el-Emir, the Monument of Absalom and Alexandria, which have already been mentioned. The technique is the same as on the others - straight-edged leaves left plain apart from the central vein, and set flat against the drum of the capital except for the curled top.

It is certain - we owe the research and establishment of the form to Kon - that the pyramids were of similar form to that of the Monument of Absalom. They consisted in their upper parts of a concave cone roof and finial, set on a drum with perhaps an attic below; the mouldings were Greek. The Greek elements can then be briefly summarised as the frieze and cornice of pure Doric form, a Corinthian order, a distyle in antis porch, and the upper elements and mouldings of the three

'pyramids'; inside the tomb, the frame-mouldings of the doors. This comprises all of the architectonic decor of the tomb. The non-Greek elements of the upper frieze and the insertion and form of the lower frieze are specifically Jewish creations of a very different type from the Greek architectonics, being vegetal decoration pure and simple. They show the assertion of a new native style which causes a serious disintegration of the proper function and balance of the Greek members of the facade. However the Greek features, such as they are, are harmonious, well-formed and well executed. It is as though fine representatives of different traditions and different aesthetic sensibilities were suddenly thrown together in one creation; in fact we shall see below that the two traditions co-exist in Jewish Herodian art, and the tomb of Helena may be regarded as the culmination of this phase.

VARIOUS TOMBS WITH GREEK FORMS

Another fine rock-cut tomb with a built monument in association with it was the Tomb of the Herods at Nicophorieh. Here loculi and arcosolia were abandoned in favour of special sarcophagus chambers befitting a royal sepulchre. The basic plan is that of the Marisa tombs. But there is no plastered

and painted interior here. Instead it is faced with well-squared and fitted freestone blocks. The severity of the tomb interior is matched by the severity of the ornament on one of the sarcophagi. In contrast the monument - preserved to us in fragments of rich Greek architectural forms which have never been restored - is ornate; it includes repetitions of the egg-and-dart, Greek forms of the palmette and parts of Corinthian capitals. It was apparently a thoroughly Greek monument. Schick found a stone finial with lotus like that of Absalom, which tempts me to suggest a cone-roof of the same type as at the tomb of Absalom and the tomb of Helena.

The Tomb of the Judges (Sanhedriyyeh no. 14) again has a tympanum adorned in the style of the lower frieze of the Tomb of Helena, which will be discussed below. The wide entry is framed by Greek mouldings and a small pediment with raking cornice and palmette finials like those of the tomb of Jehosaphat. The vestibule has a small entry in its rear wall with T-frame Greek mouldings and a small pediment with destroyed finials. These are the only decorative features of the tomb, which belongs to the 1st century AD.

The rest of the tombs belong to the 1st century BC-AD and are less considerable than the great monumental facades and

monuments described above. The Greek features in some can be summarised very briefly. Tomb 8 of the Sanhedriyyeh group has a distyle in antis porch with Doric columns. The arrangement is plain and mediocre without any frieze or cornice. The echinus is a tall cavetto, a marked deterioration of the form. And the mouldings of the antae do not even match each other. Tomb 2 of the same group has an entry framed by Greek mouldings. The trough arcosolia of Tomb 7 are also framed by the cyma.

The Grape Tomb with its system of six chambers is the most considerable of those left to be described, rivalling the tomb of the Judges, but without its distinctive use of an upper row of loculi set back within arcosolia. The facade of the Grape Tomb has Ionic T-frame mouldings around its entry, crowned by a pediment with raking cornice and decorated tympanum. But the details are wrong; they display the deterioration of Greek conceptions and forms. Many examples from the detail can be given to establish this point - the door-frame cyma is curved, but not a true Greek shape and the cyma of the raking-cornice is converted to the cavetto and oblique face to which we are by now accustomed as Hellenistic practice. Ionic dentils have dropped oddly to the door-frame lintel, sit upon a moulding which is not carried any further around the frame, and finish in peculiar oblique terminations. The 'ears' of the T-frame

project beyond the horizontal cornice of the pediment, a fault to be contrasted with the correct form in the Conch tomb. The corner acroteria are set on the lintel of the entry instead of the corners of the pediment. An inverted egg moulding has been set along the base of the tympanum. None of these features could be called attempts to create new forms or assert other artistic traditions; they are simply bungled attempts at forms with which the Jerusalemite craftsman is not really in sympathy. One point of special interest seems to establish Delbrueck's contention that the cavetto crowned by an oblique face (at Alexandria and in Egypt) was a deterioration of the Greek cyma reversa - on the door-lintel is a true cyma (of bad form, as noted above), while on the raking cornice in the corresponding position and with the corresponding mouldings above and below, is a cavetto with an oblique face above it. The acroteria are Jerusalemite transformations of Greek motifs. The crowning palmette is set upon a pedestal with leaf carving, as are the corner acroteria, which are made up of rosettes within wreaths topped by a tiny trefoil leaf. The rosette and the trefoil leaf recur on the tympanum, which will be discussed later. Its decoration is certainly not that which one would expect on a Greek creation, where figural motifs play a dominant role and

the sophisticated conventions of high relief and perspective would have been employed.

Within the Grape Tomb we are reminded once more of Alexandrian tombs with rock-cut courts, and of the Hakeldama in the Hinnom valley. For there are Greek details appropriate to the House of the Living transposed to the House of the Dead. These are the cavetto epikranitis around the walls of the vestibule, and the pilasters in each corner. The inner entry between vestibule and main hall is unfortunately lost to us; only a fragment of a trefoil upon a pedestal, reminiscent of the facade, remains. Another Greek feature which is oddly used is the representation of carved pilaster-capitals on the side face only of the jambs of the facade entry (under the span of the lintel). The panelled soffit of Greek architecture is also found here, the only case of its occurrence in Jewish tombs. Elsewhere in Palestine this was soon to be transferred to the pilaster itself (e.g., at Tannur, period III, DD, pl.103, 104; HA, pp.110-111). In the Grape tomb the panels or coffers of the soffit are decorated with rosettes and leaf forms, as one has come to expect. The same applies to the pilaster capitals and to the ceiling of one of the chambers. The Greek egg, found on the tympanum of the facade, is also carved on the cavetto profile of the pilasters together with palmettes of

varied form. Properly speaking the egg belongs on the ovolo profile in Greek practice.

The entry to the Frieze tomb can be briefly described: an Ionic cornice set over a Doric frieze is supported by a low architrave and pilasters with capitals of degenerate Greek profile. Fragments of cut stones and a moulded cornice show that some other structure with Greek elements was associated with the burial-chambers. It is difficult to assess this facade in detail, since it has now disappeared, and the published accounts have discrepancies on small but significant points of profile and decoration. The Doric frieze has here at its centre a wreath, as at the tomb of Helena, but the triglyphs are not displaced and the basic form of the frieze is not disturbed as it was there. Apart from the wreath the metopes are decorated with paterae elaborated as various forms of rosettes. Minor details show less care for Greek forms than at the tomb of Helena - there are no external facets cut on the triglyphs, and no regulae under the taenia. The Ionic cornice consists of a succession of small profiles, all of which are filled with ornament except the cavetto or cyma (which profile this is is not clear). The ornament of these profiles is entirely Greek in form - dentils, egg and dart, little consoles and palmette

anthemia. The union of Doric frieze and Ionic cornice is of course a commonplace of Hellenistic architecture. As a Greek element we must also note the framing mouldings of the bench-face ('sarcophagus') under one of the arcosolia.

The facade of the Two-Storey Tomb is also composed entirely of elements from Greek architectonics and architecural decor. The porch is distyle in antis with Doric columns between pillars. The echinus of the Doric capitals has the degenerate tall cavetto profile already noticed at tomb 8 of the Sanhedriyyeh group, and an abacus of very little projection. The Doric frieze displays the same form of triglyphs (cavetto abacus; regula with six conical guttae) as is found at the Tomb of Helena except that exterior facets are not cut. The metopes are filled by paterae which are in plastic relief and of double rosette form without the petals being cut. This also is very similar to the tomb of Helena, and in marked contrast to the Frieze tomb with its ornate rosette forms. The paterae of the Monument of Absalom are also far less ornate than those of the Frieze tomb, but there each one has slight variations from the next. Nowhere on the tomb-facades of Jerusalem are there plain plate-like discs as there are on tomb facades of Petra and sarcophagi or thick-walled ossuaries at

Jerusalem. It is not known how the Two-Storey Tomb was to be completed, since its execution was interrupted for some reason. It is certain however that there was an upper order of pilasters, and the bases of these were carved before the work was interrupted. They are in general form like Attic bases on plinths, but with the torus replaced by the cyma. What sort of cornice or pediment was intended to crown the facade will never be known. Here as at tomb 8 at Sanhedriyyeh there are slight discrepancies between the pilaster profiles.

The tomb called 'Mother of Columns' (Mugharet Umm el-Amed) also has a distyle in antis porch with a Doric frieze and an Ionic cornice. The columns are gone, but it is certain that they had Attic bases of good form on plinths, and that the antae had the same bases. The only capital known is that of the pilasters at the very angles of the facade, which have cavetto profiles like those of other tombs referred to above. The work of the frieze and cornice is careful and has regard to detail - the correct number of guttae, exterior facets cut in the triglyphs, tiny trunnels in groups of twelve on the dripstone and rosettes of well finished form in the metopes of the frieze. Even so some details of the best Greek work are missing - for instance mutules, regulae and the cyma profile.

This tomb is the best illustration of all those in Jerusalem that the tomb was regarded as the House of the Dead. The rock-face of the court and porch are cut as imitation stone-work, like the sides of some ossuaries. This concept is an old one (Job 30, 23).

We have dealt with only a small proportion of the tombs carved out around Jerusalem from the Ptolemaic period to the fall of the Temple. Most of course are not monumental, and have no architectural decor to show. However my study of these tombs does help to establish the dates of the more monumental tombs, since the burial forms in the latter are also found - with coins and dateable pottery - in the former. Only traces of Greek influence can be found on other tombs (Part II, xii) - pediments or T-frame mouldings.

GENERAL ASSESSMENT OF THE JERUSALEMITE TOMBS

In sum the Jewish tombs of Jerusalem show ready acceptance of Greek architectonics in the more lavish imitations of the Houses of the Living. The most expensive and complicated of the tombs at the early period - the Tomb of the Bene Hezir and the three tombs in the Hinnom valley - are probably influenced by Alexandria, where rock-cut porches and peristyle courts are

known in the Hellenistic tombs. The only one of these with its porch preserved is the tomb of the Bene Hezir, inaccessible because of its position in a sheer cliff face, and this shows good Hellenistic Doric forms in proper relation to each other. This may indicate an understanding of the structural functions of the Greek members, or it may simply be a slavish imitation of good forms. This is to be contrasted two centuries later with the even more magnificent Tomb of Helena, where the technical execution of Greek elements is still very careful and no cost is spared by skimping details (as may have been the case with the Bene Hezir porch), but where Greek architectonics are completely disrupted by a fully developed native technique of decor. The solid Pyramid-Nefesh of Zachariah stands isolated as a Semitic conception derived from the Phoenician Formenwelt but adorned with Ionic Greek decor. Its Hermogenetan capital could have been derived from anywhere between Alexandria and Asia Minor, but since the only close analogy to the Greek decor is at Petra an informed guess would look to Alexandrian inspiration once more. The Pyramid of Jason is very different in spite of superficial similarities. Here the architect has preferred Greek cornices to the Egyptian cornice retained in the Kedron Valley down to the Monument of Absalom. The fragments of Greek mouldings are difficult to place or assess.

Here too the Greek porch occurs, but with an unusual heno-style arrangement. The Monument of Absalom has even more taste for Greek ornament, and turns out to be the opposite case from the Pyramid of Zachariah: superficially a Semitic nefesh, but in fact a Hellenistic heroon, modified by the religious demands which controlled all Jewish art at this period. The triumphant dominance of Greek columns, pillars, pilasters, antae, bases, capitals, friezes, cornices, door-mouldings and epikraniteis is overwhelming in all of the lesser monumental tombs, and very often good forms are retained. At the same time discrepancies in detail, misplacements and miscogenations show a lack of sympathy with the forms which belong to this prevailing fashion. It is particularly in the matter of mouldings that the Greeks excelled in inventiveness and variety all past civilisations including the Egyptian one, so that it is not surprising to find Greek profiles continually used.

It is notable that the magnificent painted and carved interiors of Alexandria and Beit Jibrin are completely lacking. Only the three tombs in the Hinnom valley and the interior of the Monument of Absalom show anything more than graffiti. The only trace of anything that might, loosely, be termed symbolism -is the reproduction of features which must also have been found

at this time in the houses or palaces occupied by the wealthy living. And this is the only indication that we have at Jerusalem of how Greek architectonics influenced the styles and magnificence of the houses of the upper classes in the Hellenistic period. We may presume that those forms of Greek architecture commonly found on costly tombs were also preferred in costly houses; that Doric, Ionic and Corinthian styles were all known at Jerusalem. One wonders then whether the 'flat roof' retained e.g. at Mugharet Umm el-Amed reflects the retention of the flat Near Eastern roof in even the best Jerusalemite houses. The poorer houses would naturally continue to be constructed from traditional materials and according to traditional techniques. The distyle porch was a significant introduction from the Greek world; we may assume that it was a commonplace in more expensive tombs and houses. The penetration of forms from Alexandria and the Mediterranean littoral again seems a fair assumption, since the popularity of the distyle porch is known from Alexandrian, Hellenistic, rock-cut tombs.

At the same time we should remember that Jerusalem was a small city by Greek standards, a jumble of houses and bazaars, as the Old City still is today. It had not the spaciousness of the Greek Hippodamian plan, nor the regularity of the insula

arrangement. One wonders whether the continual penchant for the cavetto in capitals, cornices and epikraniteis is just a matter of prevailing Hellenistic taste, or more particularly of Alexandrian taste, which would eagerly receive the cavetto as a traditional Egyptian form. By 'degeneration' or 'deterioration' of Greek profiles one is often referring not to a particular Jerusalemite development, but to a widespread trend in Hellenistic times to lose the balance and curves for instance of the cyma and the ovolo by resolutions into plate bands, splay faces, quarter rounds and cavettos. At the same time Jerusalem is to be associated with Alexandria in this too. In notable contrast are the odd profile combinations found on the earliest material at Palmyra, studied by Seyrig, where the liking for combinations of ovolo and plateband is paralleled only by material further East. It may be a development of Eastern Hellenism, cut off and reformed by Iranian or Mesopotamian taste, and reflected at Palmyra through trading contacts with Parthian Seleucia-on-Tigris or some other great Mesopotamian trading city.

GALILEE AND SAMARIA

Nothing to match the Jerusalemite tombs is known in Galilee and the Esdraelon plain, though we do find the same rock-cut

tombs, benches, kokhim, arcosolia, rolling-stone entries and pottery (though mostly from the late 1st-early 2nd centuries AD). Samaritis is the only area where Jerusalemite taste is repeated - the crude piers and capitals of Tibneh, the rock-cut imitation masonry, Doric frieze with rosette paterae and Ionic cornice of Deired-Derb (similar to Mugharet Umm el-Amed), tombs at Moqata Abud. At Deir ed-Derb some forms are heterodox to traditional Greek taste, like triglyphs with eight guttae and no regula, but the form of the profiles seem to be good. At Moqata Abud tomb 7 has a Doric frieze on the exterior; details of the form are not known. Tomb 3 of the same necropolis is - in a poor sort of way - akin to the Tomb of Helena in having three-clustered grapes and vine-leaves on the frieze together with rosette paterae and diglyphs or triglyphs. Here Greek forms are corrupted and disrupted, and native elements preferred. But in one point it goes beyond all Jerusalemite examples. One burial-chamber is stuccoed and painted on the walls above the kokhim with plain-coloured lozenges, squares and a wavy festoon. Once more this is reminiscent of Alexandrian Anfushi, as well as of Beit Jibrin.

THE RECEIVED GREEK FORMS - REJECTION OF LIVING IMAGES

It is striking that the received Greek forms are confined to architectonic ones like cornices, lintels, columns, friezes, entry-mouldings, pediments, epikraniteis, and to features that were regarded as the only proper accompaniments of these like carved rosette paterae in metopes, palmette acroteria, egg-and-dart, etc. on the appropriate profile. In fact in this period these forms had hardly any competition except for the old Egyptian forms long since used in the area. Greek mouldings like the cyma, astragal and ovolo are the only alternatives to the simple Egyptian cavetto and roll received by Persia, Phoenicia and Palestine before this. Greek decor received by the Jews is confined entirely to geometric or stylised plant motifs; even these are not common, and are used with restraint. There is very little taste for rich Greek decor of this type - an exception is the Frieze tomb - for the Jerusalemite artist was developing a new native style derived from Hellenistic motifs.

No figural decor of any type was used in Jewish tombs, sarcophagi and ossuaries of the Herodian period at Jerusalem or in the Samaritan centres described. The Jews were not merely

indifferent, but fundamentally hostile to representations which reflect the main struggles and achievements of Greek sculptors from the Archaic to the Roman period - reductions in stiffness of the pose, efforts to express a perfect type, emotionalism, mastery of anatomy, high relief, perspective. In these the Jew had no part; indeed he was forbidden to receive this achievement. For the fundamental resistance of Palestinian Jewry to Greek artistic achievement was based on the rigid interpretations of the Law then current.

Exodus, 20, 4f forbade the making of any graven image of any creature; its injunction was repeated by Deut., 5, 8. The strict interpretation of this is very clear from events recorded by Josephos in the Herodian period. Among the many things recorded as trying to the Jews which Herod did (Ant. XV, Loeb 267f) the setting up of trophies in the theatre at Jerusalem is represented as most irksome (ibid. 276), because it was suspected that these were images (eikonas). When Herod was thought to be moribund, the rabbis Judah and Matthiah of Jerusalem incited their followers to pull down the works built by Herod in violation of the Law (Ant. XVII, Loeb 150), especially the great golden eagle erected over the gate of the Temple, since the Law forbade the setting up of images (ibid. 151; Wars, I,

Loeb 650f). Later Pilate tried to introduce busts of the emperor (AD 26?; see Loeb, note 2, p.46) into Jerusalem, a thing avoided by previous Roman procurators. The resistance was so strong that he was forced to abandon this design. (Ant. XVII, Loeb 55-59). At the time of Tiberius' death Vitellius was in Palestine leading an expedition against Aretas; he was diverted from Jewish soil by the request not to carry through Jewish areas standards with images upon them (Ant. XVIII, Loeb, 120f). A little later the fact that Jews refused to honour Caligula by erecting his statue in the Temple was one of the accusations brought against them by Apion of Alexandria. Finally just before the outbreak of the Revolt of AD 66, Josephus was commissioned by the Jerusalemite leaders to go into Galilee and press for the demolition of the palace of Herod Antipas at Tiberias, because it contained representations of animals (ζῴων μόρφας ἔχοντα ) and this was forbidden by the Law (Vita, Loeb 65).

VEGETAL DECOR IN HELLENISTIC ART

But the Hellenistic art with which the Jews came into contact was also experimenting with forms of vegetal decor; and these the Jewish artists were able to receive. In one sense,

then, it is fundamentally un-Greek that we should find the tympana of Jehosaphat, of the Grape Tomb and of the Tomb of the Judges, the lower frieze of the Tomb of Helena, and the sides and lids of sarcophagi and a few ossuaries adorned with vegetal motifs; for on Greek tympana, Ionic friezes and Greek sarcophagi one expects figural scenes depicting mythology, history, the after-life etc. In another sense this vegetal decor is Greek. For it derives from Jewish contact with Greek motifs, most plausibly I think with the late Ptolemaic art of Alexandrian hellenism. This aspect of Greek influence has - remarkably - attracted almost no scholarship. Watzinger refers briefly to the love of Alexandrian hellenism for mixed stylised and naturalistic forms, and gives a few references; Vincent, Avi-Yonah and Avigad have done no more than repeat almost his exact words.

The vegetal elements in Greek art are linked by Webster with a symposion tradition (HArt, p.24). To this tradition, for instance, he ascribes the bronze Dhervini krater (c. 320 BC) found near Salonika. This has fruited ivy round its neck and a naturalistic free-running vine-tendril around the top of the body, as well as Dionysiac figural representations (HArt, pl. 1, p.21). The thick vine-tendril with its properly rounded stalk bears leaves on short stems and curled tendrils; the

leaves are veined, serrated and twined in very naturalistic fashion (see too Chamoux GA, pp.55-56). In the same tradition are the floral borders of the Greek artist Gnosis; the example illustrated by Webster has mixed flowers, leaves and tendrils growing out of a bunch of acanthus leaves. The motifs include rosette, crocus and lily (HArt, pl. 19, p.65). Three-fold clusters of grapes with small side-clusters (the motif we have already noted found in Jewish art) are found on a Diocysiac vase of c. 300-275 BC from the Athenian agora (HArt, pl. 22, p.78), and again in the festoons of a tall pedestal drum from the theatre of Dionysos at Athens (ibid. pl. 43, p.148), carved with ivy, acanthus and bay (laurel) leaves, ivy fruit and pomegranates. A silver cup of the 1st century BC in the British Museum (ibid. pl. 52, p.187) still continues this tradition with beautifully mixed ornament - stems emerging from an acanthus sheath, pomegranate and vine etc. An acanthus cup, scrolls, fruits, leaves and flowers were carved on the altar of Eumenes II (197-159 BC) at Pergamon, and upon a marble table-support in the same style (HGA, p.366 and fig. 49), which Richter's photo shows with an acanthus-cup (bottom centre). From this cup emerge cauliculi and calices of acanthus, twisting at the ends to scrolls and bearing fruits, leaves and flowers

in naturalistic manner (acorns, grapes, rosettes, lilies, etc.). A running tendril-scroll is found already as the crowning moulding inside the cella of the temple of Athena Alea at Tegea (GT, pl.XLVIII, c). The pattern here is that from a cauliculus comes a plain, curling calyx and two scrolls curled in opposite directions, one having an acanthus leaf as its companion; the scrolls themselves alternate between plain grooved lines and serrated acanthus leaves. A study of that monumental work 'Die antiken Sarkophag-Reliefs' by Robert will show the great predominance of figural motifs on Greek sarcophagi, but even here vegetal elements occupy a place, albeit humble. For instance there is a Greek sarcophagus (ibid., part II, Mythologische Cyclen, pl. VI, no. 20) dated to the third century BC, which depicts the myth of Achilles, but also has a form of acanthus cup with six leaves, from which emerge on either side scrolls inhabited by rosettes, etc. In the same volume another Greek sarcophagus has an acanthus-cup of three leaves along a frieze at its base (ibid., pl. VIII, no. 21). We see then that there was a tradition in Hellenistic Greek art of vegetal ornament with some stylised elements like the acanthus-cup and the running scroll, but mainly naturalistic in conception and plastic in form. It is found in ornamental architecture, on sarcophagi, and in the small arts.

Indeed this tradition is found as far afield as S. Russia. For from Kertch Rostovtzeff published (JHS, 1919, pp.144-163) a tomb of the 4th/3rd centuries BC with frescoes on the walls, which indlude a large acanthus-cup. From the cup emerge scrolls formed by a succession of sheaths, each of which widens to a slender horn-shape, like those on the tympanum of Jehosaphat at Jerusalem or the 'Neo-Attic' sarcophagus from the Tomb of the Herods. At Kertch the large acanthus-cup is serrated and has outer fronds which curl out at the tips very like those of the tympanum of Jehosaphat. The acanthus-and-scroll motif is combined with various leaves and fruits, including the pomegranate popular at Jerusalem.

This Hellenistic tradition is continued into the Roman period, and strikingly illustrated by the Ara Pacis Augustae (13-9 BC) at Rome (Kahler pp.66-71). On this is a varied combination of acanthus, rosettes, ivy, vine and berries, expressing the inexhaustible prosperity made possible by the Augustan Peace. Once more the scrolls, calices and cup are executed in a very naturalistic manner. Toynbee suggests that this naturalistic rendering was inspired by the Hellenistic school of Pergamon (AR, pl. 36 and pp.87-88). In other Hellenistic centres, especially those dominated by the Neo-Attics,

floral motifs are more formal and conventionalised. The composition is static and objects separate, clear-cut and well-spaced (ibid. p.50). This is not to deny that the Neo-Attics inherited a taste for naturalistic trailing-vine, grape clusters and wreaths of flowers, as well as archaistic figures (Dickins, pp.75-79).

LATE HELLENISTIC ALEXANDRIAN VEGETAL DECOR

Such is the general background. But we are, once more, especially interested in Alexandrian work of around 50 BC, and it happens that the evidence that remains to us is from the small arts of metal, glass and ceramic wares, which Rostovtzeff has already specified as valuable evidence for the style and motifs of contemporary Hellenistic wall-painting (JHS, 1919, p.155) amongst other things. Segall in her examination of some early Alexandrian vessels demonstrates for us once more the continuing dominance of figural motifs in Greek work. But a silver alabastron (WP, p.23, illns. 7f) from a tomb at Palaiokastro in Thessaly, with the form of an early Ptolemaic faience alabastron, is of interest to us (ibid. p.19 for find and date). For here the cup of leaves is presented in three dimensions, spreading up from the base of the alabastron. The cup has alternating acanthus and lotus forms, the latter also pointing to

Alexandria; the lotus here is similar in form to all those types of Corinthian capital mentioned above, only the central vein being represented.

In 'Die Antike', Vol. V, pp.45f, Zahn described three Alexandrian vessels which he dates on technical grounds to the late Ptolemaic period. One is a vessel from Cyrene in the Berlin Museum; the other two - a vase and a bowl - are from a tomb near Sopron in Hungary, but have Egyptian figural motifs on them. Below the handle of the Cyrene gold-glass vessel is a single great acanthus leaf, which sends a long thin serrated arm out at each side. From the arms emerge tendrils which are simply pairs of incised parallel lines, purely geometric in conception. The tendrils form two large scrolls within which are large and naturalistic rosettes and lilies. Also emerging from the acanthus-leaf - an unnatural combination with it, but naturalistically rendered - are thin, free-winding tendrils of ivy with leaves and berries. Note that the tendril emerging from the acanthus leaf is double, winding in two opposite directions, and is of stylised geometric form, a frame rather than a plant, while at the same time the ivy, lilies and rosette are naturalistic. The acanthus itself has serrated leaves, but its conception and patterned movement are stylisations. Zahn typifies the creation as a groundwork of abstract lines combined

with elegant naturalistic motifs 'in freiem Spiele der Phantasie'. As such, he says, it is a characteristic product of late Alexandrian art:

'Durch zahlreiche Beispiele aus der Kleinkunst lässt sich dartun, dass diese Mischung sehr verschiedener Elemente gerade eine Eigentümlichkeit alexandrinischer Dekoration ist.'

Perhaps 'Eigentümlichkeit ' is too strong a word, since we have seen the same thing elsewhere; but this combination was at least preferred and well-favoured at Alexandria.

The Sopron bowl (ibid. pp.50-52) is decorated at the centre with a wreath of laurel leaves of naturalistic form, and within this are charming Nilotic animals and lotus flowers. But a double scroll runs round the upper part of the bowl. It emerges from a variant of the acanthus cup - this time two facing serrated leaves - and is partly sheathed in acanthus calices very like those from which the helices and volutes of a Corinthian capital emerge above the cauliculus. Various types of lily and lotus inhabit the convolutions of the scroll, which here as elsewhere double back and forward from each acanthus sheath. The form is smaller and less naturalistic than that on the Berlin gold-glass vessel. Whereas the Berlin vessel

is like the Pergamene examples, that at Kertch and the Ara Pacis, this cup on the Sopron bowl is like some Roman funerary reliefs (HArt, p.185, fig. 52, late 1st century BC-AD). Both forms are represented in the Jewish style which developed from these motifs, though the larger and more leafy type is preferred. It is for instance developments of this which we find on the tomb facades. The more compressed example like the Sopron bowl is found adorning Egyptian head-dresses which are carved on limestone plaques from some time in the Hellenistic period (found on Ophel at Jerusalem in 1923-5; PEF Annual, 1926, pp.159, 161); also on sarcophagi from Dominus Flevit (fig. 212d) and the Tomb of Helena (fig. 202).

## JEWISH PLANT AND FRUIT DECOR - THE JERUSALEMITE TRANSFORMATION OF THE HELLENISTIC MOTIFS

It is from the Hellenistic tradition, most probably the late Ptolemaic tradition at Alexandria, that Jerusalem draws in its first experiments with such vegetal forms. The earliest example at Jerusalem is found on the tympanum of Jehosaphat early in the 2nd half of the 1st century BC. This is basically still something that belongs to Hellenistic art, but has special Jerusalemite features added to it. The cup of three

leaves is reminiscent of various examples given above - the Kertch tomb, the Berlin vessel, the Ara Pacis dado.

THE ARA PACIS AND THE TYMPANUM OF JEHOSAPHAT

Detailed comparisons with the only one of these three carved in relief - that of the Ara Pacis - are most instructive both for the Etrusco-Roman tradition of realism and for the Jewish technique and stylisation. The form on the Ara Pacis is of a true cup of leaves, given as much depth and three-dimenstional quality as possible, curling outwards at the tips and with a bed of curled leaves from which emerge the three main leaves - a full-view wide central leaf and then one on each side carrying us round the sides of the cup - which are, so to speak, on our side of the cup. It is from behind these that the scrolls emerge, leaving the impression that they come up from the middle of the cup; it may well be that this 'cup' concept was first developed from alabastra or other vessels like the one discussed by Segall which are 'in the round'. The scrolls themselves are truly vegetal - thick and round with true body, graceful curves and calices of leaves.

In comparison the alternative, hellenistic form chosen by the Jewish sculptor of the tympanum of Jehosaphat (figs. 259, 261-263) reflects his taste for the still and lifeless. The leaves are not presented in the typical Graeco-Roman manner as groups of folioles with eyelets between, but as a continuous strip with half-eyelets at critical parts of the form, this being part of the patterning, not part of the impression of depth and naturalism. The shape is that designated by Watzinger as the 'lyra' rather than the 'cup'. The quality of moulded depth is lost - either abandoned or found impossible to reproduce by the Jerusalemite artist. The 'bed' of leaves seems strangely out of place. They are not acanthus, and anyway the main form, the sweep at the base of the side leaves, is carried across unbroken over this bedding. The curl of the leaves is sideways not outward - in a flat plane with the rest of the ornament.

The technique used for the acanthus-cup is like that of chip-carving in wood. We found this technique constantly employed on the ossuaries, but here the tympanum of Jehosaphat represents its infancy. It is used only for the side leaves of the acanthus, not on any other motif of the tympanum. At that date - and 40-30 BC ties in with the dating of sarcophagi and

ossuaries - the technique was just beginning to be explored in stone at Jerusalem. The contrast with the Tomb of the Judges and that of Helena is striking. On these the deep-gouged technique is far more developed, as on some sarcophagi and ossuaries. It seems clear, too, that it was first mastered in the soft limestone of the ossuaries and sarcophagi, which appear from about 40 BC, and only then was put to the test as a prominent display on tomb facades. The central 'leaf' of the Jehosaphat lyra is quite unique in the Jerusalem repertoire (fig. 261); it is patterned (rather than veined) with vertical or slightly curved piping, and is the only member of the tympanum to betray a tendency, spilling over from Greek style, to moulded depth, rather than being stamped out in a flat plane. Here, typically, is a Greek form divorced from the roots of its conception and beginning to be treated by an alien aesthetic according to a conception which is fresh and creative, but strictly limited by the Near Eastern tradition of flat relief and by the Jerusalemite soft-stone chiselling technique. The interest of the artist and his creativity are centred on the developing local technique, on parallelism and patterning, and on a sort of stylised richness which he achieves; not on the Greek formulae, techniques and sensibili-

ties from which the motif is borrowed. In addition the motif itself is being changed through a preference for local fruits.

The tendril-scroll too lacks the naturalism of the Ara Pacis. It is flattened into the same plane, and forms a curved tube, widening (as we have seen elsewhere) into a trumpet-mouth. From this issue two further scrolls, turning in opposite directions. From the further scroll issue two more, and so on. This pattern of a 'tendril' in an elongated trumpet shape, which gives birth to pairs of tendril-scrolls winding in opposite directions, is in fact a sort of frame for the leaves and fruits used inside the scrolls. As we have seen it was already so used at Alexandria and elsewhere in Hellenistic Greek art. The large leaves inside the scrolls here are left flat with patterned serrations cut at their edges and a single central vein.

THE TYMPANUM OF THE GRAPE TOMB (fig. 354)

The tympanum of the Grape Tomb is another early example of the interest in fruits, leaves, flowers - before the 'Kerbschnitt' style had been properly developed. So are the palm-leaf cups in the Conch tomb in the Hinnom valley. At the

Grape tomb there is much more freedom of movement for the tendril, which seems to be that of the vine, since vine leaves and grapes are in evidence. At the same time the tendril sends out other leaf types too in an unreal organic fusion which Avi-Yonah has characterised as one of the 'conceptual' features of the orientalising, Jewish style.

ON THE TYMPANUM OF THE TOMB OF THE JUDGES (figs. 343, 346-347)

The later form of this style with its orientalising aspects far more developed is found on the tympanum of the Tomb of the Judges and in the friezes of the Tomb of Helena. The basic shape of the acanthus lyra on the upper frieze of the Tomb of Helena is still that of the tympanum of Jehosaphat, but the central leaf is reduced to the same style as the others. On the tympanum of the Tomb of the Judges the development of this style represents the culmination of orientalising taste, grotesque to Greek eyes. The acanthus is geometrised to an arc and a vertical cut richly in the opposing-planes, chip-carved technique, and this same technique is used for calices and leaves all over the tympanum. Thus the surface is completely covered by a confusing riot of leaves, like embroidery without the advantage of colour. Gradually the eye can pick out the

submerged shapes of flat tendril-scrolls and small local fruits. The whole aim is concentrated on patterning and rich effect in a way which must strike Western taste as degenerate and smothering. Here, if anywhere, the Oriental horror vacui is placated. It seems almost ridiculous to call the leaves acanthus. A glance at photographs of the two tympana will show the comparative restraint and body of the carving on the tympanum of Jehosaphat (contrast figs. 259, 261-263 with 343, 346-347).

ON THE LOWER FRIEZE OF THE TOMB OF HELENA (figs. 303-310)

The same crowded, patterned, flat, endless, optic succession of fruited acanthus fills the lower frieze of the tomb of Helena. But here the Greek motif of tendril-scrolls emerging from an acanthus cup and enclosing leaves, flowers and fruit is abandoned; moreover we no longer have the Greek framework of a pediment. The motif seems attractive confined to this narrow strip and removed from its Greek context. And greater efforts are made to indicate a variety of leaves and fruits (pineapple, almond, acorn, ethrog, etc.). Here a specifically Jewish style has asserted itself to break down a Greek formula. Surely one must connect this resurgence of native self-confidence with the growing national and religious feeling. Rome and the Herods provided the secure, stable frame

within which such developments were possible after the unsettled Seleucid and Maccabaean periods.

ON THE SARCOPHAGI (figs. 207, 202, 212)

The acanthus cup and tendril scroll are also found on a sarcophagus and sarcophagus lid from the tomb of Herod's family. The sarcophagus has already been linked above with the classicising style of the Neo-Attics in its soberness and static, clear-cut composition. The classical restraint here (fig. 207) is in striking contrast to the flat embroidery bf the developed, orientalised style. The lid from this tomb is in a more developed style, and should perhaps be dated about the turn of the eras (fig. 208).

A different local development of the same Greek motif is found on the rich sarcophagus lid from the tomb of Helena. Again this is packed with ornament, and again it is within the framework of Greek mouldings. The decoration includes two long panels of the Greek trefoil with berries which is found for instance on Attic coins and Greek Hellenistic lamps.

The same motif is found on the great portal of the Temple of Bel at Palmyra (dedicated AD 32). One can assume that it

was a commonly received motif available at Palmyra from both East and West. On our sarcophagus it is enclosed by the Near Eastern rope moulding. The rest of the lid is occupied by the acanthus-cup motif - sending out its succession of trumpet-scrolls, which encircle grapes, rosettes, pineapples, pomegranates, acorns, ethrogs, lilies, bananas, etc., a mixture of Hellenistic and local fruits. The other ornate sarcophagus from this tomb has a variety of types of rosette in relief.

But a similar type of acanthus-cup (this is a form like the compressed and very stylised cup on the Sopron bowl) is found with its tendril-scrolls inhabited by leaves and fruits on the lid of the ornate sarcophagus from Dominus Flevit (fig. 212). Many features of this sarcophagus belong to the Greek tradition - the wreath with its bow-knot, the framing mouldings, the acanthus-cup, the tendril-scrolls, the egg-and-dart oddly decorating a patera on the main face, the curled tips of the acanthus-rosette on the rear face and its little eyelets. Yet it is a good representative of a reassertive, orientalising tradition with its rope-pattern, local fruits, and chip-carving notched back from flat relief. In addition there is present here another oriental style - which Seyrig has noticed among the early fragments from foundation T of the

temple of Bel at Palmyra - that of completely flat leaves with hardly any veining represented, and cut straight down onto the field.

Another Sarcophagus of Dominus Flevit has simply a running scroll of stylised form and without any foliate or vegetal accompaniments (fig. 211). A third has its lid decorated with a crowded dainty pattern of tiny myrtle leaves in flat-relief against a flat field (fig. 210). On the other hand the large rosette at one end of a unique ossuary (fig. 216) is a rare attempt at Jerusalem at plastic relief; it is similar to rosettes inhabiting scrolls at Kh. et-Tannur (fig. 551). On the long face of the same unique ossuary is a sort of stylised lily-cup, from which emerge scrolls with rosettes in them. All in all the more ornate sarcophagi (and the ossuaries very rarely) employ a Hellenistic Greek frame of acanthus-with-scroll into which they insert new forms derived from native flora, native feeling and native techniques. There is very little attempt at naturalism or plastic shape. The acanthus-cup is found in one more place - adorning an ossuary from the tomb of the sons of Nikanor with two small pomegranates emerging from it (fig. 93).

THE 'ORIENTALISING' OF GREEK MOTIFS

In its reception of Greek motifs and then its creation of an orientalised style Jerusalemite art is not to be considered unique, but to share its position with the neighbouring peoples. For in the whole of Palestine it is clear that Greek creations, techniques and sensibilities were 'scrambled' with others to varying degrees. Jewish art <u>is</u> absoluately unique in its rejection of figural representation in this period; but <u>not</u> in its reception of the vegetal elements of Hellenistic art. Unfortunately little is known about Phoenicia still; but it is interesting that Renan discovered (MP, pl.XX,4) at Byblos fragments of architectural carving including stepped merlons, the trefoil-and-berries motif, and sunken coffers carved with various forms of rosette (fig. 552).

AT PALMYRA (fig. 553)

At Palmyra Avi-Yonah has tried to establish specific and special connections with Jerusalemite art, and has theorised that stylised floral ornament at Jerusalem derives from Palmyra and the Nabatene, the desert fringe states. Some of his statements are misleading. For instance he says that the vine-scroll issues from a multiple root both at Palmyra and at

Dominus Flevit. But this statement is based on a negative which printed poorly (DF, pl.16, 35). The print supplied to me through the good offices of Father Bagatti shows that there is in fact no multiple root on the sarcophagus from Dominus Flevit, but curled tendrils and leaves rising from the single main stock (fig. 212). Moreover Seyrig has already remarked that the Palmyrene 'conical stump' is unique. In fact the vine-scroll is extremely rare at Jerusalem - so far as I know it is found only on this sarcophagus and on a drawing of an ossuary published by de Saulcy, but more conveniently available. in JS, III, illn. 124. It is the acanthus-scroll which is much preferred, and this is filled with a great variety of fruits and leaves, not just grapes and vine-leaves. This, of course, makes nonsense of Goodenough's assertion that 'Dionysiac symbolism' in the form of grapes and vine is the keystone of Jewish art at this period. Goodenough has failed to distinguish between the two forms of scroll, a distinction enjoined as long ago as 1936 by Fyfe (HA, p.104 and note 1).

On the other hand the acanthus-cup is not found at Palmyra; instead the vine-scroll is much favoured. Twelve of the fragments from foundation T (c. 30 BC - AD 30) at Palmyra have this vine-scroll, as have the portal of the temple of Bel and some

of the beams of its peristyles. Pomegranates were already found in the Greek acanthus and fruit motif. They are also found at Jerusalem, in a composite scroll at Si'a (PE, pp.283f, fig. 330E, 333D; theatron, late 1st century BC) and at Palmyra in foundation T and on the temple of Bel, before the dominance of Roman ornament set in. Among the early fragments from Palmyra are other scrolls too with flowers and berries in the convolutions. The vine scroll is sometimes carved with great vigour in high and full relief, as also at Suweida, but not at Jerusalem. And typical Greek ornament - trefoil and berries, overlapping bay-leaves, egg-and-dart 9 is favoured on jambs and lintels of the earliest Palmyrene period in contrast to the plain Jerusalemite jambs and lintels, where the emphasis is on an undecorated cyma. At the same time some of the earliest scrolls of Palmyra are in the technique where the leaf is a flat plane with its edges cut down vertically to the field. Seyrig contrasts this with other early fragments where the leaf is 'en dome' and has its edge cut down to the level of the field. These parallels between Jerusalem and Palmyra are striking in the general preference for similar forms and techniques. But the details are nearly always different, emphasising that each art took its own course of development away from its Hellenistic starting-point. Again Avi-Yonah says the similarity between

some tympana and sarcophagi at Jerusalem and the portal of the temple of Bel at Palmyra is striking; but the only motifs shared are the ubiquitous Greek trefoil-with-berries and the vine-scroll, very rare at Jerusalem. The details of their execution at Palmyra are different from those at Jerusalem. In fact what Palmyrene art shows at the time when the Jewish decorative style was being formulated at Jerusalem is the same interest in Greek profiles and stock classical motifs, and the same desire to fill flat surfaces with various forms of scrolls, leaves and fruits. But in the two centres the same tendencies produce purely local styles. The only notable motif which is exceptional and which is shared by Palmyra and Jerusalem is the pearl, if this is indeed found on fig. 212. It is common at Palmyra, where it derives from further East. In sum there is no reason to deny links between Palmyra and Jerusalem, but to derive Jewish art from Palmyra is unwarrantable. Both centres show local styles developed from Hellenistic motifs, styles which share similar attitudes and preferences, but which are distinct from each other. It is with the most ornate (late) sarcophagus lid from the tomb of Helena (fig. 202) and sarcophagus from 'Dominus flevit' (fig. 212) that the artists of Jerusalem come closest to using the same motifs as those of Palmyra.

IN THE NABATENE

The Hauran and Kh. et-Tannur also share the Jerusalemite interest in vegetal motifs from Greek art. Indeed as one studies developments at these various centres one is impressed by the simultaneous revival of spirit by these neighbouring oriental peoples from about the mid 1st century BC. It seems that the native overthrow of Seleucid control and then the peculiar situation in which Roman prestige produced stability and security but native dynasts continued to rule their own peoples enabled what Avi-Yonah has called the 'oppressed Oriental psyche' to reassert itself in religion and art with exuberant energy. It is in this revival and not in Parthian encroachment as far as the Euphrates ( century old already) that I am tempted to see the new emphasis on frontality in figural art. This view - in opposition to that of Roztovtzeff and Seyrig - has already been expressed by Dussaud and developed by Avi-Yonah.

In the Hauran as at Palmyra the acanthus scroll is not found. The main interest is in the vine-scroll, in composite scrolls of various leaves and fruits, and in local geometrised decor. This concentration on viticulture and fruits corresponds strikingly to the concern of the inscriptions examined by Sourdel for good harvests and fertility. And the base of a

statue at Si'a represents the god treading grapes.

The same emphasis on vegetal and foliate forms of decor and deities is found in the second half of the 1st century AD or earlier at Kh. et-Tannur (figs. 549, 551). Once more the decor derives from Hellenistic Greek motifs, and is now transformed by a local renascence in cult and art. The motifs - but not the style - are strikingly similar to the Jewish ones rather than those of the Hauran and Palmyra - the acanthus cup with its scrolls and calices, rosettes, figs, pomegranates and even ethrogs and the three-fold grape cluster. There are similarities in technique, though they are not so striking as the similarities of motif - the tendency to flattened relief (e.g. leaf-tips curling sideways instead of out) and deep-gounged leaves. The technique of the ossuaries is not found here; nor the flat leaf cut vertically back to the field. The deep-cut leaf in relief is also found at Si'a (PE, fig. 333C, 340), where the flat leaf with vertical edges <u>is</u> found.

In sum we can say that the various non-Greek techniques of carving stone which continue the traditional Near Eastern lack of interest in moulded and plastic form are shared by the whole Palestinian area at this time, like the new orientalising transformations of Hellenistic Greek vegetal motifs.

JEWISH SARCOPHAGUS ART - A UNIQUE STYLE

The very existence of Jewish sarcophagi and ossuaries shows that Jewish burial-customs were hellenised under the influence of the heavily hellenised cities nearby. But one must emphasise how strikingly original and different the Jewish art is with its compulsion to avoid representing figures, which was not shared by the Nabatene or Palmyrene, and with the new set of motifs it developed. In the terms to which the local artisans are limited we must regard the tympana and sarcophagi as expressing the tendencies to stylisation and richness typical of the Oriental aesthetic sense.

There are no connections with the sarcophagus art of contemporary neighbours, as such. The nearest we come to that is with the fruit and bunches of grapes which hang from the Alexandrian festoon sarcophagi, the earliest of which Adriani is tempted to date to the 1st century BC (Report., 1961, pl.1, nos. 1-4). The connection is not direct - but these continue to express the taste for stylised but naturalistic flora which we found earlier at Alexandria, and from which Jewish sumptuous funerary art probably derived. Even in terms of Jewish art this study indicates (supra Part V) a contrast with the period

immediately after. For the sarcophagi of Beth She'arim (2nd century AD on) have lions, eagles, human masks, etc., in a huge ungainly style.

Examples close in area and date to the Jewish sarcophagi, but belonging to the most sophisticated Greek traditions of sculpture with high relief figural composition, are the famous Sidonian sarcophagi. The most interesting of these from our point of view is the Alexander sarcophagus (Hamdy and Rienach, plages, vol. IV) which has many of the traditional Greek motifs - egg-and-dart, bead-and-reel, fret, guilloche and dentils - together with an angular vine-scroll with leaves only, and no grapes. Such an ornament from the late 4th/3rd century BC at Sidon recalls to mind Sourdel's assertion that the Nabataean Hauran was oriented in its cults towards Phoenicia-Syria, not towards the rest of the Nabatene. Imported marble sarcophagi - found at Turmus Aiya (end of 2nd century AD; Season sarcophagus from Rome) and at Tell Barak near Caesarea (early 3rd century AD; Amazon sarcophagus from Athens) - are rare in Palestine, and do not date before the 2nd century AD; local limestone sarcophagi imitating them must belong to the same period, and are not connected with the Jewish sarcophagi and ossuaries.

THE TRADITIONS OF POPULAR ART - THE OSSUARIES

The floral and geometric motifs on ossuaries have already been assembled and discussed. It seems to me an unavoidable conclusion that imported Hellenistic painted pottery with floral and geometrised motifs exercised considerable influence upon the Jewish floral ossuary decoration of this time. It is however a point that no-one has yet considered.

An examination of the imported Hellenistic pottery dug up at Samaria-Sebaste is sufficient to show what I mean. The decoration includes a compass-sexfoil with palmette tips (2nd century BC; SS,III, p.255, fig. 52, no. 36), and 8-petalled rosettes of familiar Graeco-Roman shape and style in relief (ibid. p.274, fig. 61 and pl. XIX, 9a and b; 2nd century BC). There are pointed leaves on slender stems arranged at the sides of a thicker central stem, a curving arrangement and less patterned than the same motif on the ossuaries (p.240, fig. 45, 8; krater sherd of 3rd/2nd centuries BC). Bowls which imitate the Attic West Slope ware have the 'ivy trail' common on Attic plates and saucers (p.243; fig. 47, nos. 2, 10; 3rd/2nd centuries BC). The Megarian bowl with 8-petalled rosettes mentioned above has also a frieze of disconnected groups of vine-leaf, tendril and grapes. Most interesting is the calyx, common on Megarian

bowls (p.273), of tall thin palm-leaves alternating with stylised palmettes, all springing from a central rosette. This forms a cup of leaves emerging from the base of the bowl, comparable to the example from Alexandria described by Segall. There are many foliate and fruit motifs on fragments of Megarian bowls of the 2nd and 1st centuries BC. They include ivy-leaves and palm-leaves (p.276, fig. 62), the running scroll with cauliculi, calices, vine-leaves and the three-fold bunch of grapes with small side-bunches (p.278, fig. 63). Also motifs occur with acorns, ivy leaves, oak leaves, lotus, acanthus, rosettes, laurel, ears of corn and pomegranates. There are more bases with the leaf-calyx - on one vessel alternating lotus and acanthus with tendrils between them, and rising from a double rosette (fig. 63, no. 19), and on another sherd palm fronds alternating with a spiky plant (fig. 64, 2).

Such pottery was making its impact right through the Hellenistic period. Its appeal to the Jewish artists must have been great, since it continues a more limited tradition of painted foliate pottery of the Iron Age in Palestine itself. Fanwise arrangements of palm-branches occur on late Bronze and Iron Age vases from Megiddo, Gezer and other Palestinian cities (OE, note 6, p.152). Vases from Gezer also have the

motif of branches represented geometrically at the top of the trunk and repeated below the 'tree' (Gezer III, pl.CLXXIII, 6), which is found on ossuaries.

Limestone incense-altars from Gezer (Gezer, II, p.442) have a tree indicated by vertical lines with zig-zags; branches by short diagonal strokes at the very top, and below this longer lines curving down and with very short straight stokes on the upper edge. These techniques are used on a variety of ossuaries to present geometrised, conceptual trees, far removed from anything Greek. They may be contrasted for instance with the trees in tomb I at Beit Jibrin. The crude palm-branch found on the ossuaries is also found on Jewish coins.

Nabataean painted pottery of the 1st century BC-AD has both this Iron Age native tradition and the Greek Hellenistic tradition behind it. We would, then, expect stylised vegetal ornament, and this is what we find. Unfortunately there is still not a great deal published. A visit to the Jerusalem and Amman museums is as useful as a perusal of the published material. The first two practically complete bowls were published by Harding (QDAP, 1946, pp.58-62 and plate) and are among the finest. They show that Nabataean bowls contemporary

with the ossuaries (these were found at Amman and are dated by unguentaria and Herodian lamps) used the same sort of patterned arrangements of leaves and branches. In the centre of one of the bowls is a long palm-branch, simply a symmetric arrangement of diagonal strokes at either side of a long vertical stalk. The other bowl has the same sort of painted leaf as in the narrow central vertical strip of various ossuaries, and arranged in the same way - on thin stems in pairs off the sides of the central stalk. Further leaf paintings on these bowls with forms like those on the ossuaries can be seen on pls. XII and XIV of Murray and Ellis. These bowls are the finest native pottery of the period in Palestine. We may conclude that the stylised and patterned leaf-arrangements on the ossuaries reflect a long native tradition given added prestige by Hellenistic imports and fine Nabataean bowls. Of course like other motifs on the ossuaries they are carved in two styles - rule and compass scratches, and chisel-gouges. It may be that the geometrised olive-spray that frames many ossuaries is connected more particularly with the ubiquitous Greek laurel-leaf trefoil of Greek coins, pottery etc.; if so the connection is one of origin only, for this spray- like the rosettes and roundels - is developed to a great variety of shapes and sizes at Jerusalem.

With the geometric decor of the ossuaries we must look even more deeply into the long centuries of Mesopotamian and Syrian art. For geometric forms - long ago absorbed and then ousted on Greek pottery - are commonplace in the Near East all down the ages. The geometric decor of the ossuaries may be regarded as the bastion of native taste, the expression of long, popular art traditions still uninfluenced by Greek aesthetics. We are concerned here with the rosettes, zig-zags, roundels, diagonal crosses, half-arcs etc. The same motifs can be traced back and back. At Jericho there were very few Iron Age tombs discovered; but bone-inlay decoration from tombs of the Middle Bronze Age shows strips of roundels (incised double circles with a dot at the centre) zig-zags and diagonal crosses (Kenyon, 'Jericho Excavns.), 1965; pp.387, 419, 437, 462, 463). On the Gezer incense-altars of the Iron Age are criss-cross and zig-zag geometric framing patterns (Gezer, II, pp.442-4, figs. 524-6). Incense-altars with geometric decoration have also been found at Petra (DD, pl.193,d). At Samaria-Sebaste cosmetic palettes were found with incised double-circle and dot decoration and a type of toothing (SS,III,fig. 116, nos. 1-3 and pl. XXVI, 1-3; early Iron Age). There were also bone spindle-whorls with incised circle and dot decoration (ibid., fig. 92a, p.401, nos. 18-20; undated except

no. 19, Herodian). The zig-zag motif is found on Iron Age pottery of Samaria (ibid. p.130, fig. 12, no. 17; p.194, fig. 32, nos. 9a, 10) and on Hellenistic pottery at Beth-zur (ibid.; note for no. 10).

These same motifs can be traced in earlier periods in Mesopotamia in Frankfort's 'Art and Architecture of the Ancient Orient'. Double roundels are impressed on the bodies of lions on a cup-base from Tell Agrab (c. 3500-3000 BC; text p.12; pl.6c). The boundary stone of the Kassite dynast Marduknadinakhe (c. 1100 BC; text p.64; pl. 71) represents the weaving of his garment with rosettes of varied numbers of points in strips of embroidery, with doubled half-circles opposite each other in long strips, and zig-zag patterning in other strips. Zig-zags and rosettes were used on the wall-paintings of the palace of Tukulti-Ninurta I of Assyria (c. 1250-1210 BC) just outside Assur (text, p.67; pl. 74). A bas-relief from Kuyunjik of Assurbanirpal (669-626 BC) killing a lion has strips of rosettes and double roundels embroidered on his garments; note too the decoration of crossing diagonals on the quiver of the attendant. It is obvious that geometrical patterned strips were traditionally used in Mesopotamia to adorn garments, and also to border figural designs in various

materials. Another Assyrian bas-relief - of Assurbanipal also, but from Nineveh - has geometric patterns on the umbrella-canopy over the chariot, on the garments of the king and on the trappings of the chariot frame. These include continuous 'all-over' rosette patterns, strips of roundels with a dot at the centre, diagonal crosses and half ovals of overlapping tongues.

The geometric motifs of the ossuaries are then a continuation of popular art traditions from earlier pottery, textiles, bone and presumably wood. These traditions are also continued in contemporary Palmyra and in parts of the Nabatene. Diagonal crosses decorate the garment on a bas-relief from the Temple of Bel at Palmyra (Ann. arch. de Syr., 1965, pl.III, fig. 4). A bas-relief from foundation T published by Seyrig shows a strip on the trappings of a horse decorated with a twelve-point, gouged whirl rosette; also roundels of the same technique and form as on the ossuaries, the only place where I have found this (fig. 554). The same rosette and similar roundels are found on another early Palmyrene bas-relief published by Rostovtzeff (Y.Cl.St., fig. 78 photo; Morehart fig. 7, p.59 drawing). On the other hand at Kh. et-Tannur, where a gouging technique is sometimes used, rosettes in relief

of my fig. 551 are of a form found at Jerusalem only on the ossuary of my fig. 216.

It is apparent then that certain motifs and techniques - as we have already noted for the vegetal decor - were shared by the different native Palestinian cultures and emerged from long traditions of native training and skills which reasserted themselves in the early Roman (Herodian) period. But at the same time it is absolutely clear that strong local developments took place. The vegetal forms of the tombs and sarcophagi are derived from Greek art and orientalised to a stylised and rich Jerusalemite decor. On the other hand a great deal of the geometric and geometrised floral art of the ossuaries is derived from native Syro-Mesopotamian traditions which had long since been accepted into Palestine and are found on older Palestinian pottery, bone and by inference textiles and wood. The prestige of the traditions are partly reinforced by the prestige of the same geometrised floral motifs on imported Greek pottery throughout the Hellenistic period.

The purely geometric rosette, the product of age-old Syro-Mesopotamian traditions which are reinforced by its popularity as a floral motif in Greek and Roman art, is the natural companion of roundels, zig-zags, arcs and crosses on

the ossuaries. On the sarcophagi it becomes a genuine floral rosette in relief, attracted to Graeco-Roman forms. On the ossuaries it remains purely geometric, but is elaborated in a great variety of ways to give it a richer effect. It seems to me that there is no reason to suppose that these rosettes were brought back from the Babylonian captivity (as Avi-Yonah suggests) or were influenced by the rosettes of Assur and Hatra, which probably belong to the late 1st or early 2nd century AD. A strong Palestinian tradition in small arts would account for them satisfactorily. If we must assert the influence of one area upon another, then the strong artistic self-assertion of Palestine from the 1st century BC on would lead me to suppose that motifs and techniques were mediated eastwards through Palmyra rather than westwards. The late date of all the 'Parthian' material also suits this assumption. Certainly, as we have seen there are some connections in detail as well as in spirit between Palmyra and Jerusalem. Palmyra must have mediated trends both East and West, so that it is impossible to say with any certainty - in the absence of a large body of closely dated material from all the relevant centres - which way the commonest motifs spread. This is more so because we lack much knowledge of Mesopotamian art of the Parthian period before the late 1st century AD.

There are still traces of Greek influence on the Jewish ossuaries in spite of all that has been said above. Very occasionally the egg-and-dart or bead-and-reel appear round the lip; more often, but still rarely, they appear on the sarcophagi. But the zig-zags long entrenched in popular art tradition do not usually suffer the encroachment of these alien forms, nor of the mouldings (ovolo or astragal) which they require. Greek motifs already found on the Sidonian Alexander sarcophagus are never found on the ossuaries - fret, guilloch, etc. It may be as Rahmani suggests that the patterned, geometric, deep-gouged olive-spray is influenced by the Greek bay-leaf motif. Finally the row of arcades found rarely on ossuaries may be derived from Greek sarcophagi (Watzinger, 'Holzsarkoph..', p.60; Arch. Anz., 1938, col. 738, fig. 47; D. F. Brown, AJA, 1942, pp.389-399).

Far more interesting is the reflection of contemporary architecture in the representations of arches, heterodox capitals and entry-ways on the ossuaries. Plain arches are represented, such as we have already seen at the tomb of Helena and the tomb of Jason - arched entries which reflect those in contemporary use. The arched entry of course dates well back into Mesopotamian history; Murray, Fyfe and Brown

see its origin there and its diffusion westward in the Hellenistic age. The most notable ancient example is the Ishtar Gate of Babylon. In the use of the arched entry at Jerusalem, then, there is no reason to see influence from Hellenistic architecture in Asia Minor. The arcades mentioned just above have arches resting directly on column capitals; this motif - extremely rare on ossuaries - may be simply copied from Greek sarcophagi, as noted above; the same arcade motif figures on the Parthian sarcophagi (2nd century AD?) unearthed by Andrae. It does not necessarily imply such arcades at Jerusalem. The heterodox capitals of the ossuaries are adorned with motifs from Greek art which otherwise do not belong to the repertoire of ossuary ornament, and must reflect contemporary practice and contemporary heterodox forms, which continued to the 1st century AD at least. But it is the entries which are most interesting in their variety and detail in reflecting Jerusalemite architecture. We find the Ionic T-frame entry mouldings sketchily represented; we have already seen it used in the rock-cut tombs. Also arched and gabled pediments, double and single leaf doorways, colonnettes on piers are represented. These are to be compared with the products of Hellenistic architecture, like the rock-cut entry with colonnettes and arched entablature inside the Anfushi tomb

at Alexandria (supra). Presumably on the ossuaries they reflect the houses or palaces of wealthy Jerusalemites. The ugly proportions (with one or two notable exceptions) of the columns and their capitals on the ossuaries demonstrate once more a lack of understanding of or concern for Greek ideas of balance and proportion. The sketch on my fig. 19 (ossuary 18) is a good example of the conceptual approach to a structural motif - a combination of steps, column, house and plant forms presented barely. The sketch is dominated by some form of symbolism, presumably concerned with the future life; the artist is obviously interested in what the motif signifies, not in what a building, column or plant actually looks like.

COIN TYPES - FROM HELLENISTIC TO JEWISH

The coins of the Hasmonaeans and Herodians fall into a completely different category of art, official propaganda demanding recognition from the Hellenistic world. I have shown that the majority of the types can be closely connected in form and date with Seleucid or more rarely Ptolemaic ones, and assert the prosperity and power of the ruler and his state. Such are the cornucopia, the anchor, the helmet, the ships, the palm, the poppy, the pomegranate, the ear of corn, etc.

With the struggle of the Jewish state for its independence in AD 66-70 the national identity is asserted on the coins by various objects connected with the Temple. By the time of the Second Revolt these objects, borne off to Rome and depicted on the Arch of Titus, have become symbolic rallying signs of the hope and true identity of Zion. The switch from Hellenistic power-and-prosperity types to national emblems at the time of the two Revolts is absolute.

THE BUILDINGS OF HEROD - THE ADVENT OF ROMAN INFLUENCE

One of the most striking examples of late Hellenistic influence on Herod's buildings was the 'Masonry' or 'Incrustation (First Pompeian)' style of wall-painting. We have seen this at Herodion in the bath-house, in room VIII, in the North exedra and on the wall between this and a gate just to the East; at Masada on the lower terrace of the North palace, in a fine chamber (Herod's bedchamber?) in the West palace, in some chambers of palatial residence VIII on Yadin's plan and in the large bath-house; at Jericho in the form of polychrome fragments with clouded veining on the South tell, and a room in the same style on the North tell, and more fragments found by Pritchard; at Sebaste in the Doric stadium

and in later houses; at Caesarea on a stucco orchestral flooring. The only known forebear to this Herodian style in Palestine is Hellenistic Beth-Yerah, where fragments of the panels with squares and rhombi in them were found (Sh. Yeivin, AJA, 1955, p.164).

The imitation of marbles in painted stucco is known at the end of the 4th century BC in Macedonia at Pydna and Eretria (Albricci, p.296 and note 20). The same style is well preserved in private houses of the late third and the second centuries on Delos, where the simplest form found is unpainted stucco divided into horizontal ashlar courses (or panels) by lines incised in the plaster (Bulard figs. 29, 30). Often a draft is indicated (ibid. fig. 31) and colour is also used (ibid. fig. 32). Bulard's fig. 35 (Maison du Lac Sacré, chamber F) is very similar in effect to the appearance of the finest Herodian drafted masonry employed at Jerusalem and Hebron. But this type of decoration reproduces a tall orthostat course or dado, several courses of isodomic masonry and a coping. The use of single or double coloured strips - as in Herodian work - is even at this early date common as a frame for the panels or 'ashlars'. Bulard notes that this imitation of the finest contemporary masonry by means of

relief cut in stucco is also found in the houses of Priene and Magnesia (ibid. p.120; refs. notes 3-5). At Delos the imitation of clouded marbles is fairly common (ibid. pl. VIA, Frag. a, parts B, e; Frag. c, part E) but much less common than red, black or yellow monochromes, imitating red porphyry etc. For a clouded marble effect in the high orthostat or dado course see fig. 81 under 'Delo' in the Enciclopedia dell'Arte Antica Classica e Orientale, Vol. III (Rome, 1960), which shows a larger section of wall than any of Bulard's illustrations.

But Albricci suggests that the most extensive and significant examples of this type of fresco are found at Alexandria (Albricci, p.296). Some of these at Ras el-Tineh and Anfushi - both on the island of Pharos - are published by Adriani (Annuaire.., III, 1940-1950, figs. 35, 36, 39, 40 Anfushi; pl. XXXII, 1 niche of tomb of Ras el-Tineh) - clouded marble effects on orthostats and 'drafted ashlars' above, which Adriani describes as 'une imitation de revetement de marbres polychromes avec les elements du premier style..' (ibid. p.107). In the style found here there are differences from the material known at Delos and Pompeii - for instance there is no cornice, and, far more significant, the flat boss

in relief surrounded by drafts is not found. Instead only light incisions or a surface in one plane:

> "Les différentes parties (socle, zone d'orthostates, bande intermédiaire, rangées d'opus isodomum, bande de couronnement) sont representées et par du lignes de contours plus ou moins légèrement creusées, et par la polychromie: le système à bossages manque".
>
> (ibid. p.108)

In the orthostats the most frequent imitation is that of an alabaster with wide polychrome veins of yellow, brown-black, red and blue:

> "L'analogia perfetta tra questi esempi di decorazione alessandrina e le decorazioni erodiane della Palestina ci mostra, nella seconda meta del 1 sec. a. C., tutto un ambiente dominato dallo stesso gusto, che si sviluppa nel giro di non molti decenni, del quale sono pressoche sconosciuti i diretti precedenti sul posto, ma che appare strettamente legato alla tradizione ellenistica, e nel quale si inserisce perfettamente la decorazione del teatro di Cesrea, peraltro particolarissima per quello che

riguarda il problema diciamo cosi 'tecnico' di un pavimento decorato a pittura". (Albricci, p.296).

This Hellenistic style was also transmitted to the Companian artists of Pompeii, Herculaneum and Stabiae, towns preserved for us because they were buried in an eruprtion of Vesuvius in AD 79; it is known too in houses at Rome. At Pompeii this first style was used c.150-80 BC; well preserved examples are in the 'House of Sallust', 'House of the Faun', 'House of the Centaur' and 'House of the Labyrinth'. Mau shows the end wall of a bedroom in the House of the Centaur (fig. 117, p.256) and the left wall of the atrium of the House of Sallust (fig. 250, p.450; fig. 251, p.451). He emphasised the role of Alexandria (ibid. p.451) in spreading and developing the style, which he interpreted as the imitation of marble revetment panels. He mentions scanty remains at Pergamon and Priene, as well as those at Delos. At Pompeii itself he notes a significant change in the system of panels soon after the Second Style comes in (earliest example small theatre, c.80 BC; in vogue till middle of rule of Augustus):

".. the imitation of marble veneering is no longer produced with the aid of relief; colour alone

is employed, upon a plane surface, as in the cella of the Temple of Jupiter (fig. 20, p.65)"

(quote ibid. p.452).

This is exactly how we find it at the palace-fortresses of Herod in Palestine - a system without relief, where the panels are formed by double frames in different colours. Note too that in the Temple of Jupiter the wider panels in monochrome colours alternate with very narrow panels (as found at Masada), and a narrow strip of long panels alternating with small squares is painted above the taller panels (as at Herodion and in the great bath-house on Masada). At the House of the Griffins on the Palatine at Rome the panels enclose rhombi or squares (Rizzo, fig. 15) or have clouded marble effects (figs. 24, 28; plates passim). Here, early in the Second Style, the panel treatment is still in relief. It is quite clear, then, from this large body of material in the eastern Mediterranean and in Italy in Campania and at Rome that the Herodian style of frescoes is a Greek inheritance contemporary with later examples of the Second Style at Pompeii; whether the dominant influence at this date is Alexandria or Rome I am unable to determine.

Other types of decor found painted on fragments of stucco at Herodian sites - egg-and-dart, running scroll etc. - are found as accompaniments to the system of panelling in the Second Style at Pompeii. For instance in the great frieze of the Dionysiac Mysteries the basic form of vermilion rectangles on a green ground has a yellow surround painted with egg-and-dart. Here in the Villa of Mysteries the paint is on a flat plane. With the Second Style Italian artists were experimenting with perspectives, figural motifs, columnar screens and 'window' effects; it is notable that Herod held to the simple 'solid wall' of dado and panels. Of course by this time the object of the style was not so much to imitate a wall as to produce a rich polychromy.

It is natural that such a rich effect in paint on stucco should also come to be applied to floors, as on the orchestra at Caesarea, where in addition to circles and rhombi, wavy and clouded veining, and the monochrome panels we find a bubble motif added to the repertoire. In fact the floor of the orchestra in Greek theatres was usually of beaten earth; Hellenistic and Roman theatres had an orchestra paved with stone flags (often polychrome marble) or in mosaic. The painted plaster floor at Caesarea is a unique survival from its

period; it is matched only by the Flavian painted plaster floor at Leptis. Its most significant forebears are painted stucco floors in Macedonian tombs from the IVth century BC on. The earlier layers of painted plaster at Caesarea had another prominent motif - the 'imbrication' pattern of overlapping scales. The same motif is to be found on a mosaic in the House of the Anchor at Pompeii (Blake, p.82 and pl.25, fig.4; Pernice, p.136 das Schuppenmuster). Pernice adds that it is found in vase-painting and toreutics in the S. Italiot-Siciliot culture. A fine polychrome example in painted stucco is from the House of the Griffins at Rome, as a motif of the wall panelling (Rizzo, p.22, fig. 24, pl.C).

The siting of the Caesarean theatre is a compromise between the Greek and the Roman traditions - the external ring-wall of the cavea is built, but starts from a higher level than the floor of the orchestra. This theatre of Herod is the earliest known in Palestine. The theatre near the exit of the Siq at Petra was recently excavated by Hammond, who suggested that it is 'early in the Roman period' (P. C. Hammond, Year Book of the American Philosophical Society, 1962, pp.545-549). But most of the theatres in Syria date from the 2nd and 3rd centuries AD (E. Frezouls, Ann. Arch. de Syrie, 1952, pp.46-100: 'Les

Theatres romains de Syrie'). Excavation at Sebaste was too limited to discover whether an earlier theatre existed on the site of that assigned to the 3rd century AD, though one would naturally expect one after the mention of theatres at Caesarea, Jerusalem, Damascus and Sidon (for the last two: War, I, 422) by Josephus, all products of the bounty of Herod. It is then all the more to be deplored that the one Herodian theatre which has been found and excavated has preserved so few ascertainable traces of its precise form at the Herodian period - the scaenae frons with the form of a deep rectangular niche between a hemicyclical one at each side on the diagonal; the pulpitum front (proskenium), originally with alternating square and semi-circular niches, which responded to the scaenae frons, later changed to a straight front without any niches; the orchestra in the form of a half-circle with its Hellenstic-style floors of painted plaster.

In fact all of these features are among those that distinguish the Roman theatre from the Greek Hellenistic theatre. An early pulpitum with a straight front with which Herod was personally familiar is that in the theatre of Pompey at Rome; this may explain the change in style at Caesarea. The pulpitum front adorned with alternate semi-circular and rectangular niches is more common; it is found for instance at Ostia, and

at Faesulae in North Etruria (Bieber, p.191 and figs. 647-650; p.194 and fig. 656). This Roman type of low, closed pulpitum front replaces the high, engaged columns of the Hellenistic proskenion (ibid. p.188). The orchestra in the shape of a half-circle is another Roman feature; the Hellenistic orchestra is a full circle. One presumes too that the Herodian theatre at Caesarea had a sumptuous architectural scaenae frons, not the wide openings (thyromata) of the Hellenistic stage; indeed the foundations already mentioned - a large central rectangular niche, and side-niches on the diagonal in semi-circular form - establish this. It is the same arrangement as in the theatre of Pompey at Rome but that the location of the side-niches on the diagonal seems to be an innovation. In sum the remains indicate a Roman theatre, not a Hellenistic one.

The painted plaster floor is not found at other Herodian sites. Instead pavings in mosaic are employed. In the palace excavated by Pritchard at Jericho were two plain, black-framed mosaics on a white ground covering the floor. In the caldarium were remains from a mosaic in black, white and red tesserae with a running scroll border and a plain ground interrupted by small crosses in two colours. The same motifs were found in the houses at Sebaste, which were given a later date. At

Masada black and white mosaics were found on the upper terrace of Herod's North palace, and in the court of the great bath-house; within black borders and on a white ground were continuous patterns of rosettes and hexagons. Similar traces were found at Herodion, including a fine rosette in the bath-house court.

But the finest Herodian mosaics are undoubtedly the two polychrome ones found in rooms of the West palace at Masada. The border patterns are plain strips, battlements, the running scroll, the Greek fret or maeander, and a pattern of two leaves (probably regarded here as olives, not the Greek laurel) with berries on stalks, derived from the Greek laurel trefoil with two berries. The central motif in both cases is a complex rosette; the colours used in the smaller one are very appealing. In addition the large mosaic has palmettes with trailing tendrils - rather like stucco mouldings from Jericho - and a scroll with native fruits. The last is the only trace in mosaic of that particularly Jewish style of ornament which we saw in the funereal art of Jerusalem at this period. The other motifs may be said to be standard ones to be found, for instance, at Pompeii and Delos. Those at Pompeii are discussed and illustrated by Blake (pp.78-86; pls. 24, 26, 29, 31) and

Pernice. Examples with patterns of rosettes are numerous (Pernice, pls. 11, 5; 13, 3; 18,2; 26,2; 36,6) and include one (ibid. pl. 28,1) which especially invites comparison - a continuous pattern of six-point, geometric rosettes with black frames and running scrolls (House of the Dioscuri). Still at Pompeii we find stepped battlements (crowstep) in the houses of Menander and Meleager (Pernice, pls. 24,6; 30,4), hexagons in the House of the Bear (ibid. pl. 45,1) and the trefoil with berries in the House of the Gladiators (ibid. pl.24,3). The mosaics at Delos are earlier, but have the same attachment for borders of scrolls, frets and battlements (Bulard, figs. 63-67 and pl. X). The mosaics at Herod's palaces follow a tradition represented already in the second century BC on Sicily and Delos, at Pergamon and Alexandria, and in Italy. Recently much attention has been given to the thesis that a wall-to-wall mosaic was a Western or Roman conception which existed at this period in tension with the Greek concept of central 'rug' emblemata (I. Lavin 'The Hunting Mosaics of Antioch and their Sources', Dumbarton Oaks Papers, XVII, 1963, pp. 181-286, figs. 1-142; Toynbee, pp.147-148 accepts this thesis). We should note that both the continuous all-over patterns and the central attention-fixing designs are found among Herod's works.

It has already been remarked that the opus reticulatum of the palace unearthed by Kelso at Jericho is the largest structure of its sort in the Eastern provinces. This is a Roman Augustan technique of building; the finds at Jericho are the only example of the work in Herodian structures, and are probably from the rebuilding of the palace by Archelaus. The building is carried out in concrete techniques on binding and supporting members, though in fact technically it is not concrete that is used. It seems reasonable to assume that Romans were in charge of the work.

A taste for the Roman type of baths is well established in the remains which we have considered. Baths were found at Pritchard's excavation of Jericho; two private systems in the large palaces on Masada; and the impressive bath-house on Herodion, and great bath-house at Masada. The old system of running off hot water from a furnace into a tub was found on its own in the small private baths of the West palace on Masada. But a new system of underfloor and double wall heating was devised in Italy in the 1st century BC (hypocaust and wall-pipes); and this is what we find in the small baths at Jericho and in the North palace of Masada, as well as in the great baths at Masada, and in the bath-house at Herodion. The

arrangements of rooms is as one would expect in a Roman establishment - the three bath-rooms at different temperatures and the disrobing room. In the small private baths on the lowest terrace of Masada's North palace the tepidarium and apodyterium may have been combined, or the latter may be accounted for by the traces of an upper storey which survive at this angle of the terrace. The most regular and the most finely decorated (wall-frescoes and floor mosaics) of these baths are the bath-house on Herodion and the great public baths of Masada. The plan of both is as follows.

A court leads to the apodyterium; from the latter one enters the tepidarium, which gives access to the cold and the hot rooms. The remains at Herodion are well-preserved, including the small court, adorned by a black and white 'rug' mosaic. At Masada the plan of all the rooms is a regular rectangle, but at Herodion the frigidarium is pressed into an angle with the ring-wall, and the tepidarium is a round chamber - like the frigidarium of both the early Stabian baths at Pompeii, and the later (c. 80 BC) baths near the Forum of Pompeii. Somed and vaulted ceilings were employed at Masada and Herodion; this is in contrast to the normal Herodian method of wooden beams and reeds plastered over, but follows the Roman tradition - for

instance a barrel-vault survives from the apodyterium of the Stabian baths at Pompeii, a dome from the frigidarium. The plan used for the caldarium is the same at Pompeii, Masada and Herodion - a rectangular, barrel-vaulted chamber with a rectangular niche at one end for a bath, and a semi-circular niche at the opposite end for the other bath. In addition Herodion adds slight, decorative niches on the other two sides. The frigidarium at the Stabian baths has a step down into the pool, which is surrounded by a marble-paved floor. The Herodian device is to cover the whole floor with a pool, which has six or so long steps on one side. That this is a native tradition seems illustrated by its occurrence at the community centre of the Qumran sect. It should be explained by the desire to secure a depth of water economically in a land where water is precious. The court of the great bath-house at Masada is the only one which compares with the traditional Roman form of a large, colonnaded court. Such a court occupied the place of the palaistra of the Stabian baths in the later baths near the Forum at Pompeii (Maiuri, 'Pompeii' guide, pp.26-27; pl. XVII, fig. 32 shows the decorated interior).

So far as palatial residences are concerned we have at least three different types to consider - the building excavated by Pritchard at Jericho, the upper terrace of the North palace

on Masada, and the residential wing of the West palace, which is the same in plan as at least three other palatian residences on Masada. Excavations in the S.W. area of Herodion may have revealed more residential structures which are not yet published.

The common pattern on Masada of a court surrounded by chambers but with an open fronted distyle in antis arrangement on one side (usually the South) is very similar to one type of Greek house known from the Hellenistic period at Priene. At Priene too occurs the court surrounded by chambers, but with "one room less deep than wide completely open to the court" (Robertson, p.298, fig. 124; Wiegand's reconstruction fig. 125; Robertson's comments on this p.299). This open-front was distyle in antis as at Masada. At Priene Robertson interprets the arrangement as the old Aegean megaron with distyle in antis pronaos (which was also the basis from which the Greek temple form developed). This is indicated by the fact that the chief chamber of the house is always behind this open-fronted chamber, and entered from a door in its rear wall. At Masada it can no longer be called a megaron arrangement, since the main room is set to one side of the open-fronted chamber, at the angle of the palace. This situation also permits an alternative access to the main room from the other side through the back of an

adjacent room - an arrangement for which I have been unable to find a parallel. It should be noted that house 4A at Sebaste published by Reisner had a middle chamber on the South, which was open at the front and had a henostyle in antis arrangement (the only one I have come across in Palestine apart from the Hasmonaean tomb of Jason at Jerusalem). But this house had a colonnaded court - a feature often found in the Hellenistic houses on Delos - and in fact Watzinger (DP, p.27) has already pointed out that an open chamber fronting onto a colonnaded court is typical of Delian houses of the 2nd century BC.

The best Delian houses from the 3rd century BC on and palaces at Pergamon had one or two peristyle courts; in few of the Delian houses are there rooms on more than two or three sides of the court. This rich Delian peristyle type is illustrated by Robertson with the 'Maison de la Colline' (Robertson, pl.XXII,a) which has a peristyle and rooms round three sides. This particular Delian house reminds one of the peristyle court with rooms on two sides at Jericho. Also in another way of the upper terrace of the North palace at Masada. Here the point of comparison is the arrangements of rows of rooms where one or two are wide and the other is narrow - in

the Maison de la Colline, as in the two wings at Masada. At Delos too, as was the Hellenistic practice, the walls were decorated with painted stucco, and a black and white mosaic of squares adorned the floor of the court. In this type of Hellenistic house, as in the Herodian structures now being considered, there was no room with an open front. One wonders whether a peristyle arrangement did in fact exist between the two wings at Masada, but such a theory seems dampened by the absence of peristyle colonnades from all other structures on Masada; the nearest one gets to a peristyle is in the court of the great baths. There was an elaborate type of Greek house with two courts, one being peristylar, as at Jericho (Vitruvius, VI, 7). And another structure which comes near to the Jericho palace is the Palazzo delle Colonne at Ptolemais in Cyrenaica, which has a large colonnaded court, an entry from this to a colonnaded hall, and chambers round the building (G. Pesce, "Il 'Palazzo delle Colonne' in Tolemaide di Cirenaica", Monografie di archeologia libica, 1950, Vol. II).

Something has already been said of Herodian masonry, which has forebears both in Palestine and in the Hellenistic Greek world. The casemate wall found on Masada is in an old Palestinian tradition (SS,I,p.118), but has the Hellenistic distinction of a plaster coat. Frova has already noted that

the two Herodian rusticated styles of stone dressing are found not only together in the same Herodian building, but also at Perge and at Rome (Frova, Final Report, p.292, notes 39, 40 for refs.). We have found in Herodian structures both round and square towers, and once (at Caesarea) a polygonal one. These towers are heirs to a tradition which arose on the Greek mainland in the 4th century BC after the defeat of Athens, when insecure political alignments resulted in the construction of frontier fortresses and towers (4th/3rd centuries BC). Frova mentions Gortys in Arcadia, Megara, Phile, Mantinea, Eleusis. Fine illustrations of the Hellenistic fortifications at Aegosthena in Boeotia, Eleutherae in Attica, The Messene of Epaminondas, and Perge in Asia Minor are given by Martin (Monde grec, 1966, pp.17-37 photos). At both Messene and Perge there were found and square towers, as at Herodian Sebaste. But of course the Herodian towers of Sebaste are linked with the fine Hellenistic round towers which preceded them on the same site. Polygonal towers are found at Paestum in the 5th century BC, at Hellenistic Dura-Europos, and in the West in the time of Augustus (Frova, ibid., refs. note 36).

The details of the Greek orders used by Herod are, of course, in many ways provincial in style. They depend on earlier Palestinian traditions, not on any distinctively Roman

ones. They are in fact a continuation of the Greek mouldings, bases, cornices, friezes, capitals etc. of Hellenistic Palestine, which was greatly influenced by the free forms of Alexandria. The base used is the Attic one; there is no trace of the distinctively Roman base spotted by Avigad on the Monument of Absalom. The capital in the Huleh gate of the Temple is directly in the Alexandrian tradition. The pedestals of Masada and Jericho are of the common type with a straight vertical face between base and crown mouldings; but those at the Antonia are distinctive with their assertion of convex profiles. The nearest analogy is the pedestals of the temple of Kore at Sebaste; and this tradition continued into the Galilean synagogues. Moulded stucco fragments with palmettes or egg-and-dart; cornice fragments with egg-and-dart or dentils; torus, cavetto, cyma, fillet, astragal, platebande are all found among the fragments. There was a particular fondness for the Corinthian order; one Corinthian capital at Masada still retained its gold paint when the excavators found it on the lower terrace of the North palace. A rosette patera from the bath court at Masada, and smaller carved rosettes found at Jericho demonstrate once more the Jewish fondness for this ubiquitous form. Nabataean capitals in the bath court at Masada are mentioned by Yadin, but not yet published. The

Herodian Corinthian capital - as found at Masada, Herodion and Jericho (the Caesarean fragments are not published; capitals that might belong to this period at Sebaste are different in form) - is an interesting Jewish creation. The acanthus zones are without any volume except for the leaf-tips which hang down. The leaves are wide and flat with deep, main veins and no fine work on them. From them emerge fluted cauliculi, calices cut in the same style as the leaves and helices curling inwards and formed as a curled flute. Angle volutes have not been preserved, but some capitals still show a floral or leaf form between the helices and against the abacus face.

One wonders, since fortresses like Masada and Herodion were so finely decorated, how far the palaces of Jerusalem excelled them. Were the Greek orders, wall paintings, mosaics, baths, mouldings etc. of Jerusalem even finer than those which have now been excavated? Structures which have been preserved must at any rate represent many more of the same type which were not preserved or have not yet been found and excavated. Herod employed many fine architectural conceptions drawn from Rome and Hellenistic Greece, but the North palace of Masada shows that on occasion he added to these something of his own

spirit. This official architecture of Herod's time, drawing as one would expect on fashionable contemporary Western styles for plans, construction techniques and decor, must be contrasted with the popular art-forms of the same period, which are illustrated above all by the ossuaries. We should note too that in Herodian structures all traces of the forms of the Phoenico-Persian tradition have disappeared, though they are retained at Jerusalem on the Monument of Absalom (C. 40 BC) which follows its own local tradition.