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Moldmade Relief Bowls from Tel Dor, Israel —
A Preliminary Report

As a port city Dor had easy access to trade centers all over the Mediterranean. Thus, it did not come as a surprise, when a rich collection of Hellenistic fine table wares of different origin came to light during the 13 seasons of excavations (1980–1993): Attic ware, vessels in West Slope technique from Attic and Eastern workshops, white-ground lagynoi, red-glazed pottery, and lamps. Besides their artistic and aesthetic value, not to be discussed here, these wares help to establish trade patterns and enable us to differentiate between the lifestyle in those cities culturally and commercially close to the Graeco-Hellenistic world and those more rooted in local and regional traditions. Under this aspect pottery provides us with information about the ethnic and religious divisions within a settlement or a region, and it is this question which with the growing number of well-documented excavations and well-defined stratigraphical contexts leads to a new field of research.

Hemispherical moldmade relief bowls are an attractive group of luxury vessels and are easily recognized by ware and decoration. At Dor they constitute the common drinking vessel during the 2nd and 1st centuries BCE, having replaced kantharos and skyphos both in Attic ware and West Slope technique. The 185 fragments of mold-made relief bowls, registered so far, have been classified as Attic, Ionic, and Eastern bowls. Attic bowls are rare, while Ionic (East Greek) and Eastern (Syrian-Palestinian) bowls are common. Classification is not an easy matter and, due to the lack of archeometric investigations such as neutron activation analysis, should not be considered definite. Furthermore, there are two problems which complicate the matter. Firstly, the present state of research: published material available for comparison does not necessarily provide a definite attribution; secondly, the rather fragmentary nature of the bowls found at Dor does not permit a reliable typological, thematic and stylistic assessment.

Before discussing the present classification and attempting an evaluation, it is appropriate to summarize the conclusions reached in the final report on areas A and C (in press). The fragments from 64 bowls were classified as Attic (3), Ionian (36), and Eastern (25), the latter tentatively subdivided into 13 Syrian Eastern Sigillata A (henceforth ESA) and 12 dissimilar pieces. The scarcity of Attic imports falls within the general picture witnessed at Dor. The quantity of Attic ware, so common at Dor during the 4th century, was greatly reduced in the 3rd century and replaced by products from Eastern Mediterranean workshops, among them the moldmade relief bowls, typical of the 2nd and 1st centuries BCE. Since many fragments were found in stratigraphically insignificant or disturbed loci, little can be said about the dating of individual shapes and styles within the general period mentioned. The additional finds from the other areas have made it possible to modify the conclusions; however, since the stratigraphy of those areas is not yet finalized, chronological questions cannot be discussed. The addition of fragments from probably 121 bowls did not change the basic division, worked out previously, only the Eastern class can be subdivided differently. The already identified ESA group could be verified and enlarged. Of special importance is the fact

---


2 Dr. G. Schneider of the Free University of Berlin has kindly agreed to carry out some tests.
that a group of local or regional bowls can now be singled out, for which I use the term South Syrian/North Palestinian in accordance with J.W. Hayes' definition of a regional group of Roman provincial lamps. A bowl of this group has already been published from Tel Meverakht 4 and together with Dor No. 154 may serve as prototype. Bowls in this group are outcurved, sometimes with a rounded rim, relatively thick-walled compared with Ionian production; the wheelmade section of the rim is not always carefully finished, nevertheless the bowl was fired and sold to customers.

In conclusion, the fragments of the 185 bowls registered until the end of the 1993 season can be classified as 5 Attic, 108 Ionian, 50 Eastern (32 in ESA ware, 17 of the South Syrian/North Palestinian group), 21 various and 2 Knidian gray relief bowls (Pl. 9:12–13).

Attic bowls Nos. 1–5 Pl. 1:1–5
Ionian bowls (foliage) Nos. 6–26 Pls. 1:6–4.1
Ionian bowls (rim figs.) Nos. 27–66 Pls. 4:2–7.13
Ionian bowls (gray ware) Nos. 67–85 Pls. 8.1–9.11
Knidian relief bowls Nos. 86–87 Pl. 9:12–13
Ionian bowls (various) Nos. 88–102 Pls. 10.1–11.6
Figured bowls Nos. 103–14 Pls. 11.7–12.8
Red-glazed bowls Nos. 115–46 Pls. 13–15:13
South Syrian/North Palestinian bowls Nos. 151–53 Pl. 16
Various dissimilar bowls Nos. 154–68 Pls. 17–19

The Attic fragments, decorated with foliage and imbricated leaves, are characterized by their fine hard ware and the quality of their black glaze, even though none of the pieces displays the superior smoothness and gloss of good Attic ware. Therefore, a different source cannot be excluded, while at the same time some of the fragments in reduced firing, i.e. our gray group on Pls. 8–9, might be of Attic origin. At Dor, these finds amount to less than 3% of the moldmade relief bowls. A single Attic fragment noted among some 200 bowls in Hama-on-the-Orontes points to a similar distribution pattern. Indeed, S. Rotrof 5 observed that while Attic bowls were widely exported they were never found in great numbers. In the Mediterranean area and on the Black Sea not Attic, but Ionian bowls are widespread. 6 For Tel Dor, the occurrence of Attic bowls might have two meanings. Firstly, it might indicate a change in trade: Attic products were no longer in favour and consumers turned to Eastern Mediterranean markets. Secondly, there might have been economical reasons: Attic products of superior quality were more expensive and the consumers turned to cheaper Eastern imitations. Attic production started in 240–220 BCE, 7 the Dor fragments were found in well-defined stratigraphical contexts: No. 1 — Area C0, Phase 4, 2nd century BCE; No. 4 — Area C0, later than Phase 4, last quarter of 2nd and first quarter of 1st century BCE; No. 3 — Area C1, Phase 3a, ca. 175–150 BCE. Ionian (East Greek) bowls clearly form the majority of imports; even though not all attributions are definite, more than 50% are East Greek vessels. For these bowls Launomer's publication of the Delos finds is the standard reference, still the attribution to specific workshops remains difficult and often hypothetic. Seldom the fragments are large enough to display a sufficient number of decorative elements; nearly half of the recorded pieces are rim fragments too small for attribution; finally, the exchange of and the trade in stamps as well as their theft and copying must be taken into account. 8 The workshops were not situated on the island of

---

7 See note 5.
Delos, where there are no suitable clay sources, but were located in the Greek coastal settlements of Asia Minor. Thus the quantity found on Delos is an evidence for the city’s intensive commercial activities. The production set in later than in Athens, the workshops did not yet exist in the second half of the 3rd century, in Launomer’s opinion they were active during the years 166-69 BCE, however, the earliest bowls are now dated to around 180 BCE.\(^9\) Compared to the number of fragments registered from Areas A and C (36 out of 64, see above) the stratigraphical evidence is rather meagre. In Area C0, loci 564, 508 and 611 are dated to the 2nd century Phase 4, the following pieces are relevant: No. 8 from the workshop of the Square-Monogram potter; No. 103 from the same workshop; No. 15, No. 24; Nos. 63, 65, 66 — three stylistically insignificant rim fragments with ovolo band. The six fragments of bowl No. 11 were found in different loci with their date ranging from the 3rd century BCE to the 2nd century CE. (Area C1, L 639, Phase 4, 3rd century; L 4322, Phase 3a/b??, from the middle of the 3rd to the middle of the 2nd century; L 4337, Phase 2?, later than 150 BCE into Roman period). Other finds came to light in even more disturbed loci or in topsoil with no chronological relevance.\(^10\)

Of special interest is the attribution of fragments to the production of the Square-Monogram potter. Already Launomer had discovered that his products were strongly represented among the finds from Delos and suggested that he operated in Ephesos towards the end of the 2nd century BCE, probably being the most important Aegean potter.\(^11\) This suggestion has now been confirmed by the Ephesos excavations.\(^12\) Molds for bowls and lamps have proven that both the Square-Monogram potter and Apollonios operated in Ephesos. 64 fragments of bowls and molds were published from the basilica area to the north of the commercial agora, while the excavations near the Magnesian Gate yielded some 600 pieces with fragments of 40 molds. Products of the Square-Monogram potter dominate in the finds from Berenice in Libya and Stobi in Southern Yugoslavia,\(^13\) and indeed also among the Dor finds (probably Nos.: 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 13, 16, 17, 18, 26, 101, 103 — see Plate list for details). As a separate group of Ionian bowls there are those in gray ware (Pls. 8–9, including two fragments of Knidian gray ware Pl. 9:12–13), the fabric does not differ from bowls of brown and reddish-brown clay with black and gray slip (Pl. 10:1, 8; Pl. 11:1–2) and the same motifs are found: pine-cones Nos. 88–90, imbricate leaves Nos. 91–98, long petals No. 99, concentric semicircles No. 100, the net pattern Nos. 101–02. It has already been pointed out that the production technique of this gray ware is like that of some Ephesos and Knidos lamps;\(^14\) late Hellenistic lamps with radiate decoration of Eastern manufacture and the so-called gray Herodian lamp of Judean manufacture were produced in the same fabric.\(^15\) Thus, it remains to be verified whether gray moldmade relief bowls are all part of the Ionian production, furthermore the question is whether the gray color is accidental, resulting from reduced firing, or deliberate. Figured bowls (Pl. 11:7–10, Pl. 12, Nos. 103–14) have been arranged separately, compared to foliage and linear bowls their number is relatively small. On the basic of fabric they can be divided into three groups: Ionian — Nos. 103–04, tentatively Nos. 108, 112–14; Eastern Sigillata A bowls (ESA) — Nos. 105–07, 111; South Syrian/North Palestinian bowls — Nos. 109–10. Fragment No. 103, attributed to the Square-Monogram potter, and No. 104 as well as the ESA fragments Nos. 105–07, 111 are characterized by a smooth red glaze, the difference is in the

---

\(^9\) Launomer (see note 8), p. 7 and Kernick (see note 6), p. 107.

\(^10\) Note that the phases from Area C0 and C1 have separate datings, for details see the forthcoming Final Report.

\(^11\) Launomer (see note 8), p. 132.

\(^12\) Mitropoulos-Leon (see note 8), pp. 68–69.


\(^14\) Mitropoulos-Leon (see note 8), p. 67.

\(^15\) Many thanks to Mrs. Malka Hershkovitz for this information and for discussing the matter with me. The evidence will be presented in the forthcoming report on the lamps from Massada. See also the Dor Final Report, chapter Lamps: Types 12, 16, 22.
clay. Nos. 103-04 are of reddish-brown micaceous clay close in colour to the glaze, Nos. 105-07. 111 are of buff to light brown clay, the glaze is uneven with lighter and darker patches, only No. 107 is of micaceous clay. Altogether the figured bowls from Tel Dor are difficult to classify and to date.

The same problem is found with regard to the red-glazed moldmade relief bowls (Pls. 13-15:13, Nos. 115-46; Pl. 16, Nos. 151-53), definition by fabric is not sufficient and, hopefully, archaeometric investigations will help to clarify the matter. Nos. 124-30 are defined as Ionian and the others are attributed to the ESA group, Nos. 151-53 being long-petal bowls. In J.W. Hayes’ typology of ESA the latter are given as type 19B and are dated to the first half of the 1st century BCE, the others (Nos. 117, 131, 133) are given as type 24, 1st century BCE into 1st century CE. The relief bowls in ESA, considered to be of Syrian manufacture, have been discussed in detail in the Final Report on Areas A and C. Unfortunately, the fragments came to light in unsealed and chronologically insignificant loci and thus cannot be dated precisely. Since the amount of Hellenistic ESA recovered at Tel Dor is much smaller than one would have expected at a prosperous coastal site, ESA cannot be used for reference. Thus it is with some hesitation that the following suggestion is put forward. By evaluating the evidence from Tel Dor and from other sites, it seems that from the middle of the 1st century onwards Syrian potters were the sole manufacturers of buff-bodied, red-glazed moldmade relief bowls and that they continued for another century at the most. For the beginning of the ESA production Tel Dor did not yet provide stratigraphical evidence, it appears that at Tarsus, with Ionian bowls scarce, ESA bowls were dominant from the middle of the 2nd century BCE onwards. When looking at the relation between Ionian and Syrian products, there are two possibilities to be considered. Firstly, the success of Syrian bowls might have caused the decline of the Ionian workshops; secondly, Syrian workshops could have started the manufacture of relief bowls on large scale only after the cessation of the Ionian workshops, i.e. around the middle of the 1st century BCE. These suggestions should be further examined.

Lastly, there is group of bowls with outcurved rim, some thick-walled of hemispherical shape (Nos. 154-57, 166) or funnel-shaped (Nos. 159-61), some thin-walled (Nos. 109-10, 167). The clay is buff to reddish-brown, non-micaceous or with a few speckles, with gray and white grits clearly visible, it is not as fine as that of other groups and does not break as cleanly. An uneven slip is characteristic, showing stripes from double-dipping, the interior slip tends to be reddish-brown, the exterior slip varies from dark gray to brown and reddish-brown with a combination of colors, on the interior of the lip a dark band is quite common.

On the interior of the bowls deep irregular wheel-marks are clearly discernible, appearing to a lesser degree also on Ionian and ESA bowls. Wheel-marks are also found on the exterior, mostly on the hand-made upper rim section. The rim of bowl No. 154 was touched before firing and is dented. Since the fabric of these bowls appears to be identical with that of Roman provincial lamps, produced in Southern Syria and Northern Palestine, these bowls are considered to be of local and regional manufacture. Herewith the statement made in the Final Report that no bowls of local manufacture could be defined is corrected. Not well-documented in the already stratigraphically analyzed material from Area C (Nos. 155-57, 167 were found in topsoil or dis-

17 This is the ETS-I group, considered to be of Cypriot origin by J. Gamweg, I. Perlman, J. Yellin, The Provenience, Typology and Chronology of Eastern Terra Sigillata, Jerusalem 1983, p. 31. The Cypriot provenience has been convincingly rejected by the NAA research group at the University of Missouri (see the article by M.L. Raiman).
18 For details see the forthcoming Dor Final Report.
20 The fragments given in Fig. 5.5.13-16 of the Final Report are now considered local, see here Pl. 18:1-2, 19:7, 17:2.
turbed Roman loci), it is not possible to date these bowls, tentatively, any date from the 2nd century BCE onwards is possible. The question is whether their production started at about the same time as the Ionian production or slightly later or whether they are a later development, possibly parallel with the ESA bowls, of the 1st century BCE. Nothing definite can be said about a number of dissimilar bowls, registered as Nos. 147–50 and 169–85. Nos. 147–50 are made in a fine, metallic ware, Nos. 169–72 could belong to the South Syrian/North Palestinian group. The classification of the moldmade relief bowls from Tel Dor is based on fabric and is the result of a prolonged contact with the local finds. A detailed study of the motifs represented on these bowls, comparisons with the material from neighbouring key sites such as Antioch, Tarsus, and Hama and local sites such as Tel Shiqmona, Caesarea Maritima, Tel Michal, Ashdod, Samaria, and Jerusalem will have to follow. The bowls are more common in settlements with a population open to Greek culture already since the Persian Period, i.e. the coastal sites and some inland towns such as Samaria and Mariisa; they are rare in Jerusalem for reasons of her inhabitants ethnic composition and religious affiliation.21

The scarcity of Attic bowls has been mentioned before; moldmade relief bowls are a typical class of imports in the 2nd and 1st centuries BCE, their origin being Ephesus (the products of the Square-Monogram potter) and other East Greek settlements in Asia Minor and the Aegean, the Syrian workshops of the ESA ware and the coastal? workshops of the so-called South Syrian/North Palestinian group. The problems of their origin, dating and distribution, mentioned in this presentation, will have to be investigated further, but is beyond the scope of this preliminary investigation.

**List of plates**

(Drawings are 1:1 except for shapes of bowls which are 2:5 and Pl. 17.) The following abbreviations have been used: ESA – Eastern Sigillata A; ext.

---

21 Both the excavations in the Armenian Garden and in the Jewish Quarter have revealed few fragments of molded relief bowls.
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*Pl. 1:1–5 (Attic), 6–10 (Ionian).*

1. No. 1. = FinRep Fig. 5.3.1. Area C0, L4123, Reg.No. 40545/1. Brown clay, micaceous, good black glaze. Foliation bowl.


3. No. 3. FinRep Fig. 5.3.2. Area C1, L4340, Reg.No. 43271/12. Reddish clay, micaceous, gray to black silvery glaze. Foliation bowl.

4. No. 4. FinRep Fig. 5.3.3. Area C0, L457, Reg.No. 43350. Light gray-brown clay, black glaze. Foliation bowl: imbricate leaves.


8. No. 8. FinRep Fig. 5.3.6. Area C0, L508, Reg.No. 47391/1 + L564, Reg.No. 4897 (2 frgs). Reddish-brown clay, ext. glaze red from below the two rim zones, reddish-brown above these and on int., on the wheelmade rim section inside a black band. Foliation bowl. Parallels suggest an attribution to the workshop of the Square-Monogram potter: for the tendril Launmonier (see note 8), pp. 148–49 and Pl. 33:9332, 9640, pp. 204–05, decoration motif No. 5 (frequent in series of this workshop, but also found in others) and Pl. 46; for the corolla of six acanthus and six lanceolate leaves p. 149 and Pl. 33:1097, 471; for the chevron pp. 165–66 and Pl. 37:3010, 3043.

10. No. 10. Area B2, L12374, Reg.No. 123628/2. Reddish-brown clay, ext. glaze on upper half black, on lower brown, on int. brown. Foliage bowl. For the chevron Laumoriser (see note 8) p. 159 and Pl. 36:1231, from the workshop of the Square-Monogram potter.

Pl. 2 (Ionian).

1. No. 11. FinRep Fig. 5.3.9-10. Area C1, L639, Reg.No. 524774 + L4322, Reg.No. 432974 + L4337, Reg.No. 432989 (several frgs.). Reddish-brown clay, unglazed. Foliage bowl. Parallels: this type of chevron and laurel sprays are common motifs. The nearest examples appear to be Laumoriser (see note 8) p. 220 and Pl. 49:1875 from the “Atelier de la Petite rose spiralée” for different versions p. 187 and Pl. 41:109, p. 63 and Pl. 13:2380; the corolla could be the type of six acanthus leaves alternating with three pointed and three lanceolate leaves (p. 184 and Pl. 40:1978) or four acanthus leaves alternating with four lanceolate leaves (p. 154 and Pl. 34:408, both from the workshop of the Square-Monogram potter. Note that in the FinRep the base fragment has been wrongly attributed to a separate bowl.


3. No. 13. FinRep Fig. 5.3.11. Area C0, L4050, Reg.No. 40325/5. Brown clay and glaze. Parallels: for the laurel sprays Laumoriser (see note 8), Pls. 35:385 and 46 passim; for the corolla p. 157 and Pl. 35:809 with four acanthus leaves and four triangular leaves or p. 146 and Pl. 33:3179, p. 154 and Pls. 34:38 and 124:384 with six acanthus and three triangular and three lanceolate leaves, all from the workshop of the Square-Monogram potter.


5. No. 15. FinRep Fig. 5.3.13. Area C0, L564, Reg.No. 4930. Reddish-brown clay and darker glaze. Foliage bowl.


Pl. 3 (Ionian).

1. No. 17. FinRep Fig. 5.3.4. Area C1, L4322, Reg.No. 43297. Brown clay, reddish-brown glaze, on ext. from lip to below the rim zone a black band. Parallels: the foliage scroll is Laumoriser (see note 8) p. 90 and Pl. 20:1189+160, 1588; the corolla, of which little has been preserved, is presumably the type of Laumoriser p. 85 and Pl. 19:407, both examples from the “Atelier des Belles Méduses.” However, an identical area palm foliage scroll occurs once with the linear foliage scroll typical of the Square-Monogram potter, Kennick (see note 6) p. 107, compare Laumoriser p. 203 and Pl. 19:1831 with Pl. 45:1764, 1830.


5. No. 21. FinRep Fig. 5.3.5. Area C0, surface of unit I 47, Reg.No. 4007/1. Brown clay and glaze. Parallels: presumably Laumoriser (see note 8) p. 82 and Pl. 18:769, a medallion with Medusa head, encircled by waves turning to right and a large foliage scroll of grapevine and bunches of grapes; from the “Atelier des Belles Méduses.”

6. No. 22. FinRep Fig. 5.3.12. Area A2, L1005, Reg.No. 10057/1. Reddish clay, red glaze.

7. No. 23. FinRep Fig. 5.4.1. Area C0, L468, Reg.No. 4579/6. Reddish clay, shiny brown glaze.

8. No. 24. FinRep Fig. 5.4.2. Area C0, L564, Reg.No. 4928. Reddish clay, reddish-brown glaze.

9. No. 25. FinRep Fig. 5.3.14. Area C0, L4045, Reg.No. 40387/8. Reddish clay, red glaze. Not definitely Ionian.

Pl. 4 (Ionian).

1. No. 26. Area D2, L5184, Reg.No. 51187 + 52003 (3 frgs.). Reddish-brown clay and glaze. A small fragment with a Lesbian cyma was found in Area D3, L1477, Reg.No. 141224, apparently of the same vessel. Foliage bowl. Parallels: the interlocking meander running around squares divided by diagonals is a very common rim zone on Ionian bowls, compare Laumoriser (see note 8) Pls. 10:5148, 17:3112, 30:1185, 47:2146, 68:4555, 82:1970, 87:3325, etc. From the workshop of the Square-Monogram potter see Pl. 36:1231 for Lesbian cymatium; Pl. 31:388, 884, 9608, 1015 for square stars; Pls. 30:31 passim for leaves alternating, ringed stem.

2. No. 27. FinRep Fig. 5.4.17. Area C0, L 446, Reg.No. 4275/1. Reddish-brown and darker clay, on ext. black glaze, on int. brown glaze, on the wheel-made rim section a black band inside.


6. No. 31. FinRep Fig. 5.4.18. Area A0, L 1099, Reg.No. 10525/2. Reddish-brown clay, glazed partially red and brown.

7. No. 32. Area B2, L 7410, Reg.No. 73718/1. Brown clay, on ext. brown-gray glaze, on int. red to black glaze, black band on rim.

8. No. 33. FinRep Fig. 5.4.16. Area C0, L 479, Reg.No. 4464/9. Brown clay, on ext. black glaze, on int. brown glaze except for wheel-made rim section. Parallels: Laumonier (see note 8) p. 428 and Pl. 100:869 for a row of vertical double spirals, touching each other in the middle.

Pl. 5 (Ionian).


2. No. 35. FinRep Fig. 5.4.19. Area C1, L 4340, Reg.No. 43271/3. Brown clay, reddish-brown glaze.


4. No. 37. FinRep Fig. 5.4.20. Area C1, L 4435, Reg.No. 48240/3. Reddish-brown clay. On ext. black glaze from top to below rim zone, brown glaze continuing and on int.


7. No. 40. FinRep Fig. 5.4.3. Area C1, L 4355, Reg.No. 43385/5. Brown clay, black glaze to below upper rim zone, then red. Foliage bowl: imbricate leaves. Parallels: Laumonier (see note 8) p. 90 and Pl. 20:1831, from the ‘Atelier des Belles Méduses’; p. 203 and Pl. 45:830, from the workshop of the Square-Monogram potter. Foliage bowls with imbricate leaves and those with imbricate leaves as corolla, were manufactured in various workshops (Laumonier pp. 459-76 and Pls. 106-110). The fragments found at Dor cannot be attributed to any particular workshop, and the comparison cited for each type of foliage should therefore not be considered exclusive.


9. No. 42. Area D1, L 5572, Reg.No. 54333/1. Light brown clay, shiny black glaze.

Pl. 6 (Ionian).

1. No. 43. Area D1, L 5430, Reg.No. 54211/3. Light brown clay, black glaze, on ext. below ovolo brown glaze.

2. No. 44. Area E1, L 6361, Reg.No. 62809/2. Light brown clay, dull brown to gray glaze.


4. No. 46. FinRep Fig. 5.4.8. Area C0, L 479, Reg.No. 4464/10. Reddish-brown clay, brown glaze.

5. No. 47. FinRep Fig. 5.4.15. Area C1, L 602, Reg.No. 5195/6. Reddish-brown clay, brown glaze. Parallels: Laumonier (see note 8) p. 204 and Pl. 46:1920.

6. No. 48. Area E1, L 6315, Reg.No. 63147/1 + L. 6261, Reg.No. 62842/2 (2 frgs. of same bowl). Reddish-brown clay, on ext. black-gray to red glaze from rim onwards, on int. red glaze except for narrow band around rim.


8. No. 50. Area E1, L 6467, Reg.No. 64980/1. Reddish-brown clay, on ext. shiny black glaze with brown spots, on int. brown glaze.


10. No. 52. Area B2, L 7410, Reg.No. 73718/2. Reddish-brown clay, on ext. glaze close to clay colour, on int. red glaze.


Pl. 7 (Ionian).

1. No. 54. Area D2, L 10422, Reg.No. 104228. Reddish-yellow clay, red glaze.


9. No. 62. FinRep Fig. 5.4.21. Area C0, L462, Reg.No. 4372/4. Brown clay, on ext. brown glaze from lip to below rim zone, then red glaze, on int. brown glaze except for black band on wheel-made rim section.

10. No. 63. FinRep Fig. 5.4.24. Area C0, L564, Reg.No. 4799. Brown clay, black glaze.

11. No. 64. Area E1, L 6572, Reg.No. 66672. Light brown clay, black-gray glaze.

12. No. 65. FinRep Fig. 5.4.23. Area C0, L564, Reg.No. 4977. Brown clay, on ext. black silvery glaze, on int. red glaze except for lip.

13. No. 66. FinRep Fig. 5.4.22. Area C0, L564, Reg.No. 4931. Brown clay, on ext. reddish-brown glaze, on int. black glaze.

Pl. 8 (Ionic, gray ware).


4. No. 70. FinRep Fig. 5.4.6. Area C0, L516, Reg.No. 4633/8, 12 (2 figs.). Foliage bowl: imbricate leaves.

5. No. 71. FinRep Fig. 5.4.7. Area C0, L531, Reg.No. 4684/2. Foliage bowl: imbricate leaves.


8. No. 74. Area D1, L5402, Reg.No. 54026. Foliage bowl: imbricate leaves. In Athens, bowls with pine-cone scales and imbricate leaves — overlapping leaves or petals — are dated ca. 225–150 BCE, Rotroff (see note 5) p. 15.

Pl. 9 (Ionic, gray ware and Knidian relief bowls).

1. No. 75. Area E1, L6573, Reg.No. 66672/5. Foliage bowl.


4. No. 78. Area D1, L5410, Reg.No. 54090/1. Foliage bowl.


10. No. 84. Area E1, L6141, Reg.No. 61264/7. Linear bowl: long petals.

11. No. 85. FinRep Fig. 5.4.14. Area Co, L499, Reg.No. 4496. Linear bowl: concentric semicircles. In Athens, the type was introduced after 150 BCE, Rotroff (see note 5), pp. 38–39.


Pl. 10 (Ionic, various).


2. No. 89. FinRep Fig. 5.4.9. Area C2, L4520, Reg.No. 45068/1. Brown clay and glaze. Foliage bowl: pine-cones.


9. No. 96. FinRep Fig. 5.4.5. Area C1, L492, Reg.No. 4491/1. Light brown clay, on ext. dark brown glaze, on int. reddish-brown glaze. Foliage bowl: imbricate leaves.

Pl. 11 (Ionic, various and figured bowls of different origin).

1. No. 97. FinRep Fig. 5.5.24. Area C1, L4868, Reg.No. 48346. Light brown clay, on ext. shiny black glaze, on int. red glaze. Thick ware, very micaceous. While the question of
origin was left open in the FinRep, the fragment is now considered to be Ionian. Foliage bowl: imbricate leaves.


5. No. 101. FinRep Fig. 5.4.10. Area C1, L524, Reg.No. 4804/4. Brown clay, black glaze. Linear bowl: net pattern. Parallels: Launomier (see note 8) pp. 482–83 and Pl. 112; pentagons are found in all workshops in small numbers, but in large numbers only in the workshop of the Square-Monogram potter. For the type also Edwards (above, under No. 100) pp. 179–82.

6. No. 102. FinRep Fig. 5.4.11. Area C0, L600, Reg.No. 5071. Reddish-brown clay, brown and grey glaze. Linear bowl: net pattern.

7. No. 103. FinRep Fig. 5.3.7. Area C0, L611, Reg.No. 5068. Reddish-brown clay, red glaze. Figured bowl: Amazonomachy. Ionian. Parallels: for the row of Amazonomachy, to which our fragment can definitely be attributed, Launomier (see note 8) pp. 139–40, 168 and Pls. 31:3343; 37:3358; for the rim Pls. 34:372; 35:403, 3050; from the workshop of the Square-Monogram potter.

8. No. 104. FinRep Fig. 5.3.8. Area C1, L4344, Reg.No. 4337/10. Reddish-brown clay, red glaze. Figured bowl. Ionian.

9. No. 105. FinRep Fig. 5.5.1. Area C1, L4876, Reg.No. 48384/2. Buff clay, reddish-brown glaze. Figured bowl: lion hunt. ESA ware. Parallels: Reisner 1924, Pl. 72c; Waage 1948, Pl. 10:68 (below, under No. 106).


Pl. 12 (Figured bowls, various).


8. No. 114. Area E1, L 6546, Reg.No. 66404. Light brown clay, on ext. brown to black glaze, on int. brown glaze. Tentatively classified as Ionian. Subject: centaur playing a drum, Rotrof (see note 5), No. 212 on p. 70, Dionysiac trio, musical centaurs, and Erotes.

Pl. 13 (ESA ware, buff clay, red glaze).

1. No. 115. Area E1, L6141, Reg.No. 61306/1.


6. No. 120. Area B2, W219, Reg.No. 2337/5. Foliage bowl.


8. No. 123. FinRep Fig. 5.5.9. Area C2, L4600, Reg.No. 46028. Foliage bowl.

*Pl. 14 (Red-glazed).*

Nos. 124–130 of reddish-brown and brown clay, with red to brown-red glaze and micaceous are tentatively classified as Ionian; Nos. 131–133 of buff to flesh color clay with a red glaze are classified as ESA ware.


6. No. 129. FinRep Fig. 5.4.12. Area C0, surface of unit I 48, Reg.No. 4005/1. Not ESA as defined in FinRep. Linear bowl: net pattern.


8. No. 131. FinRep Fig. 5.5.2. Area C1, L441, Reg.No. 4376/1.

9. No. 132. FinRep Fig. 5.5.21. Area C0, L418, Reg.No. 4279/4. Flesh color to yellow-reddish clay, few remains of red glaze. Now considered ESA. Foliage bowl.

10. No. 133. Area E2, L 6029, Reg.No. 60155/2. Buff clay, on ext. brown glaze, on int. red glaze except for brown band around lip.

*Pl. 15 (Nos. 134–46 of buff to flesh color clay with a red glaze are classified as ESA ware, Nos. 147–50 are of Eastern manufacture).*

1. No. 134. FinRep Fig. 5.5.3. Area C1, L4445, Reg.No. 48233/2. Foliage bowl.

2. No. 135. FinRep Fig. 5.5.4. Area C1, L4914, Reg.No. 48481. Foliage bowl.


4. No. 137. FinRep Fig. 5.5.11. Area C1, L4883, Reg.No. 48341/1. Foliage bowl.

5. No. 138. FinRep Fig. 5.5.8. Area C1, L4878, Reg.No. 48312. Subject: pendant drops. A common decorative element, the thinner version is sometimes described as ‘daggers,’ for selected parallels see reports cited under No. 106 — Reisner Pl. 72:e; Waagé Figs. 9, 10, 11; 13; 12; 17, etc.; Crowfoot Figs. 62:9, 12, 14; 63:11; Elgashish Nos. 319–20; Jones (see note 19) No. 151.

6. No. 139. FinRep Fig. 5.5.7. Area C1, L4868, Reg.No. 48319/3. Subject: bud pattern. A common motif on Syrian and Palestinian sites, for selected parallels see reports cited under No. 106 — Reisner Pl. 72:b; Waagé Figs. 9, 10, 12, 14, passim; Crowfoot Figs. 62:5, 15; 63:3; Elgashish Nos. 316, 325; Bounni Fig. 36:2, 4–6 on p. 289; Jones (see note 19) No. 151.

7. No. 140. FinRep Fig. 5.5.6. Area C1, L 4868, Reg.No. 48319/2. Subject: unclear buccharian, see below No. 141.

8. No. 141. FinRep Fig. 5.5.5. Area C1, L4878, Reg.No. 48456/2. Subject: buccharian. For parallels see reports cited under No. 106 — Reisner Pl. 72:b,g; Waagé Pl. 11:15.


11. No. 144. FinRep Fig. 5.5.10. Area C1, L4868, Reg.No. 48319/1. Foliage bowl: tendril.


13. No. 146. FinRep Fig. 5.5.12. Area C0, L418, Reg.No. 4322/2. Linear bowl: net pattern. Parallel: Edwards (see above under No. 100) No. 919 on p. 182 for complete bowl in “dotted-line net.”

14. No. 147. FinRep Fig. 5.5.19. Area C0, surface of unit I-H 47, Reg.No. 40040. Reddish-brown clay with yellowish tinge, gray to black glaze. Foliage bowl.

15. No. 148. FinRep Fig. 5.5.18. Area C0, L493, Reg.No. 4537. Reddish-brown clay, gray glaze with red spots. Subject: running ivy.

16. No. 149. FinRep Fig. 5.5.23. Area C0, L607, Reg.No. 4963/6. Light brown clay, irregular black and red glaze. Unusual shape: straight wheel-made section with three grooves. Thin ware. Foliage bowl: pine cones. Parallel: Crowfoot (see above under No. 106) Fig. 62:1 for shape and motif.

17. No. 150. FinRep Fig. 5.5.20. Area C0, L533, Reg.No. 4771/2. Yellow ochre light clay, remains of black glaze. Foliage bowl: acanthus leaf and tendril.
Pl. 16 (Long-petal bowls in ESA ware).

1. No. 151. Area D2, L 5240, Reg.No. 52181 (several frgs.). Buff clay, red glaze.


Not illustrated. No. 153, Area D2, L5306, Reg.No. 52342/2-3 (2 frgs.). Buff clay, red glaze. Double dipping. For references to the type see above note 16.

Pl. 17 (South Syrian/North Palestinian bowls).

(Reduced to 7/8 and 7/20 for bowl shape)

1. No. 154. Area B2, L3885, Reg.No. 38464 (6 frgs.). Buff clay, on ext. brown glaze until bead row of ovolo, from there to base red glaze, on int. brown glaze. Rim touched before firing. Figured bowl: hunting scene. S. Rotroff describes the scene: the hunters are mortals or Erotes, mounted or on foot, accompanied by hounds, they pursue various animals such as leopards, lions, boars, stags, hares, while birds fly above. The subject occurs from the last quarter of the 3rd to the middle of the 2nd century BCE, thereafter only in much reduced numbers. Attic production the combination of long petals as coffila and the hunting friezes as main register is not found. Rotroff (see above note 5) p. 19. For a hunting scene on bowls of ESA ware see above No. 105.

2. No. 155. FinRep Fig. 5.5.16. Area C0, L4032, Reg.No. 41024/16. Light brown clay, reddish-brown glaze.

Pl. 18 (South Syrian/North Palestinian bowls).

1. No. 156. FinRep Fig. 5.5.13. Area C1, L4446, Reg.No. 48224. Flesh ochre clay, glaze spotted and irregular in shades of brown and red. Figured bowl: mythological (centaur) or hunting scene (see above No. 105).

2. No. 157. FinRep Fig. 5.5.14. Area C1, L4443, Reg.No. 48221/1. Flesh ochre clay, spotted red to brown glaze. Figured bowl. An unusual element of composition detail is the figure reaching into the rim zone, where an ovolo is left out to accommodate the head. A Homeric bowl, classed as Boeotian, where figures of the main register reach into the rim zone, is published in: AJA 45, 1941, pp. 229-30, No. 197.


4. No. 159. Area E1, L6261, Reg.No. 62842/1 + 63052/2 (2 frgs.). Buff clay, on ext. black glaze until bead line separating the two main registers, then red; on int. black glaze on wheel made rim, red glaze until bead line separating the two main registers, then brown. Foliage bowl.

5. No. 160. Area E1, L6572, Reg.No. 66497/1 + 66336/1-2 + 66412/3 + 66672/1 (several frgs. of same bowl). Buff clay, on ext. black glaze until bead line, then red; on int. gray to black on wheel made rim, then red. Foliage bowl.

Pl. 19 (South Syrian/North Palestinian bowls).


2. No. 162. Area B1, L2080, Reg.No. 20217/1. Buff clay, on ext. black glaze, on int. reddish-brown glaze.


6. No. 166. Area A1, L2034, Reg.No. 20117/1. Buff clay, on ext. black glaze until bead line, then brown; on int. black glaze on wheel made rim, then reddish-brown.

7. No. 167. FinRep Fig. 5.5.15. Area C1, L4357, Reg.No. 43306/1. Flesh ochre clay, brown to red glaze, spotted and irregular.


Pl. 20 (Various dissimilar bowls, Nos. 169-172 could belong to the South Syrian/North Palestinian group).

1. No. 169. Area E1, L6121, Reg.No. 61196/1. Buff clay, on ext. brown, on int. black glaze.


6. No. 174. FinRep Fig. 5.5.22. Area C1, L4056, Reg.No. 40107/1. Yellow ochre light clay, gray glaze.

7. No. 175. FinRep Fig. 5.5.17. Area C2, L45945, Reg.No. 45142. Reddish-brown clay, brown glaze of different shade on ext. and int.


Not illustrated. No. 182. Area E1, L6261, Reg.No. 62842/2. Buff clay, on ext. black to red, on int. red glaze. Wall fragment with chevron and imbricate leaves.


Not illustrated. No. 185. Area E1, L6470, Reg.No. 64850/1. Wall fragment with ovolo and bead line.

Discussion

Salles
I have a small question, which is not related to decorated relief bowls, I am sorry. On the slide, where you showed all the pottery (left bottom) there was a plate with red decoration....

Rosenthal
Plate, red and black decoration with circles and bands. But we do not know where that is from. But it is something we have quite often. I mean it reminded me of the black-glazed — brown-glazed material, which we saw in the lecture before.

Salles
Yes, but the circles are very regular, they are a true decoration.

Rosenthal
Yes, they are. And sometimes there are fish-plates. We have fish-plates where the depression is brown, then you have black around and brown again. The material does not look local, it is metallic ware, very finely levigated, but the plate is not Attic, I mean it is another thing, we can say.

Salles
This type of pottery with band decoration, which might be inspired by what we use to call “East Greek” production of the sixth and fifth centuries. These types are totally unknown during the fourth and third centuries in their supposed centres of production (Asia Minor, etc.); On the other hand, they were found in Kition, and in Amathus as well. The question of locating the origin of these “East Greek”-like productions of the fourth/third centuries is a big issue in the study of the Hellenistic pottery in Cyprus.

Rosenthal
But Jane Waldhaum is now doing a study on the Eastern Greek pottery and she goes down into the Hellenistic period, because we have several types of Eastern Greek pottery, which should be dated to the fifth century, but are found clearly in third century levels.

Mlynarczuk
You said that some grey bowls resemble in fabric some of the lamps found at Tel Dor, including those with the Erotes decoration. Do you think that such lamps might have been manufactured somewhere on the Phoenician coast?

Rosenthal
Yes, I think so. The problem is that you have so many lamps, which are from the antiquities market. Where do you place these? You have them in Tel Anafa, and they go as well into the red glazed. I mean we have exactly the same kind of designs in black and in red glazed Erotes lamps. And we have them in quantities, so where else do you find them in quantities — only in the area of the Palestine.

Mlynarczuk
Like in Maresha (Marissa). But in Maresha several fabrics are represented: grey, that pale grey which is certainly local to Maresha, as far as I remember, and another kind of grey fabric, which seems to have come rather from Phoeacia.

Salles
I would like to ask to which extent do you feel these remains are more Phoenician than Palestinian?

Rosenthal
I think all the finds from Tel Dor in that period and in the Roman period are related to Phoenicia. Although for example, we have limestone bowls which are typically Herodian. We have a Jewish population, so the so-called Bar Kokhba and Herodian lamps could have been specifically brought for the Jewish community. But altogether, the material culture is the Phoenician culture.
The fifth century, but small bowls.

So far, in fabric some resemble those with the Phoenician potsherds. Such lamps might be used in the Phoenician market. Where do you have so many lamps? And not in red glazed ware in red glaze or grey which is certain, and in grey which is certain. I remember, and it seems to have come from Tyre...
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Pl. 3